

**Comparative Civil-Military Relations**  
**Political Science 785**  
**Syracuse University**  
**Prof. Brian Taylor**  
**Spring 2007**

Classroom: MAX315  
Class time: T 6:30-9:15

Office: 531 Eggers  
Office Hours: T 11-12, W 3-4,  
or by appointment  
E-mail: bdtaylor@maxwell.syr.edu  
Phone: 443-3713

### **COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course is a graduate seminar on the major themes and debates in the study of civil-military relations. In every modern state the question of the proper balance between the armed forces and the civilian political leadership is a key feature of politics. In the most extreme cases, the military itself takes power. In established democracies civil-military relations does not take this extreme form, but there are still important debates about the proper degree of military influence over defense and foreign policy, and the degree to which military policy should be responsive to broader social and cultural values.

This course has five separate units, which are intended to introduce you to the major issues in the study of civil-military relations. Most of these units could be courses in themselves, so we will only scratch the surface of the existing literature. These five units are:

1. Foundations: States, Militaries, Nations, and Military Professionalism
2. Military Coups and Rule
3. Civilian Control: Authoritarian, Democratic, and “Transitional” Countries
4. Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force
5. New Challenges in Civil-Military Relations

As a subject of inquiry civil-military relations cuts across many of the traditional field divisions in political science. Most of the issues we will discuss are traditionally thought of as either comparative politics or international relations topics, but we also will touch on themes from American politics and public policy. Although we will not study the subject in this manner, many important texts in political theory (e.g., *The Republic*; *The Prince*) also discuss issues that we now think of as civil-military relations.

It should be stressed that this is a course on **politics**, and not on military science or warfare. To the extent that we discuss actual wars (primarily in the fourth unit), we will be focused on relations between the military and civilians in terms of political decision-making. Thus, even if you have little background (or even interest) in military history and military strategy, you should not feel at a disadvantage – this course is fundamentally, I repeat, about politics.

## READINGS

Five required books have been ordered at the SU bookstore:

Eliot A. Cohen, *Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime* (Anchor Books, 2003).

Samuel Decalo, *Civil-Military Relations in Africa* (Florida Academic Press, 1998).

J. Samuel Fitch, *The Armed Forces and Democracy in Latin America* (The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Belknap/Harvard, 1957).

Barry Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany Between the World Wars* (Cornell University Press, 1984).

Additional readings are either articles or book chapters. Many of the journal articles are available through e-journals on the library website; in each case I have noted which version you should use (PDF preferable). Articles or book chapters that are not available through e-journals are available through electronic reserve, also through the library website. I strongly encourage you to print these materials out, rather than reading them on-line (2 on 1, 2-sided will save lots of paper). You are much more likely to digest and remember the material if you underline/highlight, make notes in the margins, etc. Moreover, you should bring the relevant readings to class each week in case you or someone else refers to a specific argument in one of the texts. Finally, depending on interests and career plans, you may wish to search out used copies of many of the books from which we only have time to read small excerpts.

Note that the readings for each week are listed in the order in which I recommend you read them. This is **not** an indication of their importance, but there is a logic to how the readings fit together.

## COURSE EXPECTATIONS AND GRADING

This course is a seminar; attendance and participation are essential. Each student is expected to complete all the readings each week and to contribute to the seminar discussion. You should bring the week's readings to class. Additionally, by 1:00 on Tuesday each student should email me 2 questions about the week's readings. These should be no more than a paragraph long, and should focus on some of the key themes of the readings. Possible questions can be about how the readings relate to each other, aspects of the reading that are unclear, how the readings would apply to real world issue X, why you think author Y is an idiot, etc. Failure to turn in questions on time will affect your participation grade. Turning in poorly thought out questions in a rush just to fulfill the letter of the assignment definitely will be noticed. Class participation will be 20

percent of your grade; you will be graded both on the quantity and quality of your participation.

The major written product for the course will be a paper on civil-military relations in one country. This paper will be written in stages and will focus on four of the key themes discussed in the course. You are to choose your four themes from the following six:

- A. Coups and military rule (February 6 and 13);
- B. Civilian control (February 20 and 27);
- C. CMR and the use of force (March 6 and 20);
- D. The military and society (January 23 and March 27);
- E. CMR and 21st Century Military Operations (April 3);
- F. Security Sector Reform (April 10).

Everyone will write a paper for themes A and B. You must do at least one of C and D. Your fourth paper can be on the theme of your choice. In other words, the options for the four papers are: ABCD; ABCE; ABCF; ABDE; ABDF. The most likely pairing is ABCD for most countries, simply because the literature on themes E and F for most countries is pretty thin, but I leave this up to your judgment. Additionally, you may need to adapt the assignment somewhat to fit the country you are working on. To take one obvious example, if you are writing on a country that has never had a military coup, your first paper will attempt to explain this phenomenon, using the theoretical literature from that unit of the class.

Feel free, of course, to discuss this further with me. If this description is unclear, I trust the assignment will make more sense as the semester goes along. You may also have noticed that I did not list the readings for January 30 as relevant to any of the 6 themes; that is because they are potentially relevant to ALL of the themes. Why this is so should also become clear as the semester goes along.

For each theme that you write on you will initially write a 5-7 page paper for your country on that theme. Let's assume you're writing on Pakistan, and you decide to do ABCD. You would write one paper on military coups and rule in Pakistan, one paper on civilian control in Pakistan (focusing on those periods when there was not military rule), one on civil-military relations and use of force decisions (primarily in the wars with India in this case), and one on the military and society in Pakistan.

Each of these four papers is written as a stand-alone paper and is due on the dates indicated below. At the end of the semester you will produce a 20-25 page paper that brings these four short papers together into one coherent paper that provides an overview of civil-military relations in your country.

To maximize our collective knowledge, I would like each of you to write on a different country. Thus, when you submit your reading questions for January 23, please also submit a list of 3 countries you would most like to write on (rank ordered). As a general rule, larger and more prominent countries have more extensive literatures than those on

smaller countries. If you have a prior interest in a particular country or region, you are encouraged to explore that interest here. Finally, no one can write on the US – we already have 3-4 weeks devoted mostly to the US.

It is important that each of the short papers, as well as the finished product, are grounded in the theoretical literature on the relevant topics. The papers should not be a straightforward narrative. You should use the papers as a vehicle for applying, and potentially critiquing, the literature from the various units. You probably should not try to include all of the class readings on a particular theme, but you should definitely use one or more of these readings to give some framework to your analysis of your country. For example, when writing on coups (or non-coups) in country A, your paper should be informed by one or more of the readings from February 6 and 13. You will be graded on how well you perform this aspect of the assignment, as well as other important aspects of scholarly writing, including a clear introduction with a strong thesis statement, a coherent theme and structure, a good connection of evidence to theory, well-structured paragraphs (including topic sentences), correct usage and grammar, etc.

You are encouraged to consult Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science* (Cornell University Press, 1997), for a brief discussion of the various ways a paper can use theory (theory testing, theory creation, explaining cases, etc.), and for suggestions on how to shape and write a research paper. A copy is on reserve at the library, or you can borrow my copy.

The final three class sessions are reserved for student presentations on their papers. This is a chance for you to tell the class what you have learned, for you to get feedback before the final paper, and for us to benefit from your research. The length of the presentations will depend on final enrollment in the class. Your presentation will count for 10 percent of your final grade.

Two final points. First, you are highly encouraged to bring your case knowledge to seminar discussions. Because the course is organized more thematically than geographically, the readings pass over many important countries. Hopefully individual contributions from “experts” on these countries will somewhat fill the gap in our collective knowledge. Second, I strongly suggest that you start seeking out library resources very early. Some edited volumes that cover multiple countries and are useful for the papers have been placed on reserve. You also should consider getting materials through Interlibrary Loan that are not available at Syracuse, another reason to start your research early.

Each short paper is due on a Friday (noted in the syllabus) by 10 a.m., hard copy strongly preferred. The final paper is due on May 4 by 5:00.

Grades will be based on the following:

Class Participation	20%
Presentation	10%
Short Papers	40%
Final Paper	30%

There is no final exam for the class.

## **COURSE POLICIES**

Academic misconduct: Syracuse University's Academic Integrity Policies and Procedures state that:

At Syracuse University, academic integrity is expected of every community member in all endeavors. Academic integrity includes a commitment to the values of honesty, trustworthiness, fairness, and respect.... An individual's academic dishonesty threatens and undermines the central mission of the University. It is unfair to other community members who do not cheat, because it devalues efforts to learn, to teach, and to conduct research. Academic dishonesty interferes with moral and intellectual development, and poisons the atmosphere of open and trusting intellectual discourse.

Violations of these principles include giving or receiving aid in an exam or where otherwise prohibited, fraud, plagiarism, the falsification or forgery of any record, or any other deceptive act in connection with academic work. Plagiarism is the representation of another's words, ideas, opinions, or other products of work as one's own, either overtly or by failing to attribute them to their true source. University rules against plagiarism and academic dishonesty will be strictly enforced in this class. Students should be familiar with what academic misconduct and plagiarism are, with School and University rules and procedures on academic misconduct, and possible sanctions. You should familiarize yourself with the University's Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures [[http://provost.syr.edu/academicintegrity\\_office.asp](http://provost.syr.edu/academicintegrity_office.asp)], and the College of Arts and Science's Promoting Academic Honesty Guide [<http://www-hl.syr.edu/cas-pages/PromAcademicHonesty.htm>]. NB: I take this VERY seriously.

Reasonable accommodation: If you have any disability that may prevent you from fully demonstrating your abilities in this course, you should contact me as soon as possible to discuss accommodations necessary to ensure your full participation and to facilitate your educational opportunities.

Religious holidays: In accordance with SU policy, I will excuse any absences that result from religious observances, provided that you notify me in advance of the planned absence.

## IMPORTANT DATES TO REMEMBER

February 16	First Paper Due
March 2	Second Paper Due
March 30	Third Paper Due
April 13	Fourth Paper Due
May 4	Final Paper Due

## COURSE SCHEDULE AND READINGS

### *FIRST UNIT: THE FOUNDATIONS*

#### January 16: Introduction

This meeting is primarily administrative, and a chance to get acquainted.

At some point this week you should review a US Army website on how military units are organized: <http://www.army.mil/organization/unitdiagram.html>. Be sure to click on the links for fuller descriptions of the different types of units. You should also read the very brief (2 pp.) description of military ranks from James Dunnigan, *How to Make War*, pp. 308-309. This will be distributed in class.

#### January 23: States, Nations, Militaries, and War

Carl Von Clausewitz, *On War* (Princeton University Press: 1832/1976), pp. 75-89, 585-594, 605-610 [**electronic reserve**]

Max Weber, excerpt from "Politics as a Vocation," in Gerth and Mills, eds., *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (Oxford University Press, 1946), 77-83. [**electronic reserve**]

Charles Tilly, "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime," in Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol., eds., *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 169-191. [**electronic reserve**]

Miguel Angel Centeno, "Limited Wars and Limited States," in Diane Davis and Anthony Pereira, eds., *Irregular Armed Forces and Their Role in Politics and State Formation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 82-95. [**electronic reserve**]

Barry Posen, "Nationalism, the Mass Army, and Military Power," *International Security*, 18, 2 (Fall 1993), pp. 80-124. [**E-Journals, JSTOR**]

Ronald Krebs, "A School for the Nation? How Military Service Does Not Build Nations, and How It Might," *International Security*, 28, 4 (Spring 2004), pp. 85-124. [**E-Journals, Project Muse**]

January 30: Huntington, Janowitz, and Military Professionalism

Huntington, *Soldier and the State*, pp. vii-viii, 1-157, 163-169, 177-180, 184-192, 345-346, 456-466.

Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier* (Free Press, 1960/1971), pp. 417-442. **[electronic reserve]**.

Peter Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces & Society*, 23, 2 (Winter 1996), pp. 149-178. **[E-Journals, ProQuest Research Library]**

*SECOND UNIT: COUPS AND MILITARY RULE*

February 6: Coup Theories

Brian D. Taylor, *Politics and The Russian Army: Civil-Military Relations, 1689-2000* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 6-28. **[electronic reserve]**

Donald Horowitz, *Coup Theories and Officers' Motives: Sri Lanka in Comparative Perspective* (Princeton University Press, 1980), pp. 3-15, 217-221. **[electronic reserve]**

Samuel Huntington, *Political Order in Changing Societies* (Yale University Press, 1968), pp. 1-5, 192-263, 460-461. **[electronic reserve]**

Eric Nordlinger, *Soldiers in Politics: Military Coups and Governments* (Prentice-Hall, 1977), pp. 63-78, 85-95. **[electronic reserve]**

Aaron Belkin and Evan Schofer, "Toward a Structural Understanding of Coup Risk," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 47, 5 (October 2003), pp. 594-620. **[E-Journals, Sage]**

February 13: Coups and Military Rule in the Third World

**First Paper Due February 16.**

Fitch, *The Armed Forces and Democracy in Latin America*, pp. 1-35.

Decalo, *Civil-Military Relations in Africa*, pp. 1-57, pp. 93-143.

James Quinlivan, "Coup-Proofing: Its Practice and Consequences in the Middle East," *International Security*, 24, 2 (Fall 1999), pp. 131-165. **[E-Journals, Ingenta or JSTOR]**

*THIRD UNIT: CIVILIAN CONTROL: AUTHORITARIAN, DEMOCRATIC, AND  
“TRANSITIONAL” COUNTRIES*

February 20: Latin America and Africa

Fitch, *The Armed Forces and Democracy in Latin America*, pp. 36-213.

Decalo, *Civil-Military Relations in Africa*, pp. 185-206.

February 27: Communist and Post-Communist Countries

**Second Paper Due March 2.**

Timothy J. Colton, “The Party-Military Connection: A Participatory Model,” in Dale R. Herspring and Ivan Volgyes, eds., *Civil-Military Relations in Communist Systems* (Westview, 1978), pp. 53-75. [electronic reserve]

Andrew Cottey, Timothy Edmunds, and Anthony Forster, “The Second Generation Problematic: Rethinking Democracy and Civil-Military Relations,” *Armed Forces & Society*, 29, 1 (Fall 2002), pp. 31-56. [E-Journals, Sage]

Rachel A. Epstein, “When Legacies Meet Policies: NATO and the Refashioning of Polish Military Tradition,” *East European Politics and Societies*, 20, 2 (May 2006), pp. 254-285. [E-Journals, Sage]

Natalie Mychajlyszyn, “The Euro-Atlantic Strategic Culture, Democratic Civil-Military Relations, and Ukraine,” in Natalie Mychajlyszyn and Harald von Riekhoff, eds., *The Evolution of Civil-Military Relations in East-Central Europe and the Former Soviet Union* (Praeger Publishers, 2004), pp. 191-209. [electronic reserve]

Zoltan Barany, “The Politics of Russia’s Elusive Defense Reform,” *Political Science Quarterly*, 121, 4 (Winter 2006-07), pp. 597-627. [E-Journals, Ingenta]

Andrew Scobell, “China’s Evolving Civil-Military Relations: Creeping Guojiahua,” *Armed Forces & Society*, 31, 2 (Winter 2005), pp. 227-244. [E-Journals, Sage]

*FOURTH UNIT: CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS AND THE USE OF FORCE*

March 6: The European Experience

Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine*, pp. 7-80, 105-144, 163-167, 175-181, 192-193, 215-244.

Jack Snyder, “Civil-Military Relations and the Cult of the Offensive, 1914 and 1984,” *International Security*, 9, 1 (Summer 1984), pp. 108-146. [E-Journals, JSTOR]

Elizabeth Kier, "Culture and Military Doctrine: France between the Wars," *International Security*, 19, 4 (Spring 1995), pp. 65-93. [E-Journals, JSTOR]

March 13: Spring Break

March 20: U.S. Experience: Vietnam to Iraq

Cohen, *Supreme Command*, pp. xi-xv, 1-14, 173-264

Richard Betts, *Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises* (1991 edition), pp. 1-15, 32-42, 49-51, 231-236 (notes pp. 249-253, 258-263, 309-311). [electronic reserve]

H. R. McMaster, *Dereliction of Duty: Johnson, McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Lies That Led to Vietnam* (Harper Collins, 1997), pp. 323-334. [electronic reserve]

Kenneth Campbell, "Once Burned, Twice Cautious: Explaining the Weinberger-Powell Doctrine," *Armed Forces & Society*, 24, 3 (Spring 1998), pp. 357-374. [E-Journals, ProQuest Research Library]

Thomas E. Ricks, *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq* (Penguin Press, 2006), pp. 40-43, 68-76, 96-100. [electronic reserve]

Mackubin Thomas Owens, "Rumsfeld, The Generals, and the State of U.S. Civil-Military Relations," *Naval War College Review*, 59, 4 (Autumn 2006), pp. 68-80. [E-Journals, Expanded Academic ASAP]

Peter Roman and David Tarr, "Military Professionalism and Policymaking: Is There a Civil-Military Gap at the Top? If So, Does It Matter?," in Peter Feaver and Richard Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security* (MIT Press, 2001), pp. 403-428 [electronic reserve]

*FIFTH UNIT: NEW CHALLENGES IN CIVIL-MILITARY RELATIONS*

March 27: U.S. Military & Society: The Postmodern Military & the Civil-Military "Gap"

**Third Paper Due March 30**

Charles Dunlap, Jr., "The Origins of the American Military Coup of 2012," *Parameters*, 22, 4 (Winter 1992-93), pp. 2-20. [electronic reserve]

Charles Moskos, John Allen Williams, and David Segal, eds., *The Postmodern Military: Armed Forces after the Cold War* (Oxford University Press, 2000), pp. 1-6, 11-13 ("Armed Forces after the Cold War"), 14-31 (Moskos: "Toward a Postmodern Military: The United States as a Paradigm"). [electronic reserve]

Thomas Ricks, "On American Soil: The Widening Gap between the U.S. Military and U.S. Society," *Working Paper Series: U.S. Post-Cold War Civil-Military Relations*, No. 3, May 1996, Olin Institute for Strategic Studies, Harvard University. [Available at: [http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/olin/publications/workingpapers/civil\\_military/no3.htm](http://www.wcfia.harvard.edu/olin/publications/workingpapers/civil_military/no3.htm)]

Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, "The Gap," *National Interest*, No. 61, Fall 2000, pp. 29-37. [E-Journals, ProQuest Research Library]

Eliot A. Cohen, "Why the Gap Matters," *National Interest*, No. 61, Fall 2000, pp. 38-48. [E-Journals, ProQuest Research Library]

James Burk, "The Military's Presence in American Society, 1950-2000," in Peter Feaver and Richard Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security* (2001), pp. 247-274. [electronic reserve ]

Kathryn Roth-Douquet, "The Progressive Case for Military Service," *DemocracyJournal.Org*, Summer 2006, pp. 57-68. [electronic reserve ]

#### April 3: Civil-Military Challenges of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Military Operations

Robert Egnell, "Explaining US and British performance in complex expeditionary operations: The civil-military dimension," *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 29, 6 (December 2006), pp. 1041-1075. [electronic reserve]

Michael C. Williams, *Civil-Military Relations and Peacekeeping*, Adelphi Paper 321 (IISS and Oxford University Press, 1998). [electronic reserve]

Michael J. McNerney, "Stabilization and Reconstruction in Afghanistan: Are PRTs a Model or a Muddle?," *Parameters*, Winter 2005-2006, pp. 32-46. [<http://carlisle-www.army.mil/usawc/Parameters/05winter/mcnerney.pdf>]

Michael J. Dziedzic and Colonel Michael K. Seidl, "Provincial Reconstruction Teams: Military Relations with International and Nongovernmental Organizations in Afghanistan," *United States Institute of Peace Special Report No. 147*, August 2005 [<http://www.usip.org/pubs/specialreports/sr147.pdf>].

P.W. Singer, "Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry and Its Ramifications for International Security," *International Security*, 26, 3 (Winter 2001/2002), pp. 186-220. [E-Journals, Project Muse or IngentaSelect]

April 10: State Failure and Security Sector Reform: Solution or Illusion?

**Fourth Paper Due April 13.**

William Reno, "The Changing Nature of Warfare and the Absence of State-Building in West Africa," in Diane Davis and Anthony Pereira, eds., *Irregular Armed Forces and Their Role in Politics and State Formation* (Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 82-95. [electronic reserve]

Ariel I. Ahram, "Why States Choose Paramilitarism," *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter 2006), pp. 65-70. [E-Journals, ProQuest Research Library]

Barnett R. Rubin, "Constructing Sovereignty for Security," *Survival*, 47, 4 (Winter 2005), 93-106. [electronic reserve]

Nicole Ball, "Strengthening democratic governance of the security sector in conflict-affected countries," *Public Administration and Development*, 25, 1 (February 2005), pp. 25-38. [E-Journals, Wiley Interscience]

Eric Scheye and Gordon Peake, "To Arrest Insecurity: Time for a Revised Security Sector Reform Agenda," *Conflict, Security & Development*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (December 2005), pp. 295-327. [electronic reserve]

David Chuter, "Understanding Security Sector Reform," *Journal of Security Sector Management*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (April 2006), pp. 1-21. [available online at: [http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/jssm/jssm\\_4\\_2/](http://www.ciaonet.org/olj/jssm/jssm_4_2/)]

John. C. Hulsman and Alexis Y. Debat, "In Praise of Warlords," *The National Interest*, 84 (Summer 2006), pp. 50-57. [E-Journals, ProQuest Research Library]

April 18: Student Presentations

April 25: Student Presentations

May 2: Student Presentations

**MAY 4 FINAL PAPER DUE.**