

Grand Strategy:

Combining diplomacy and military force in the face of uncertainty

Semester 2, 2014

Course outline V.5.4. (update 09/11/2016)

Instructor	Paul van Hooft
Email	p.a.vanhooft@uva.nl
Office	Binnengasthuis: Room 3.52
Phone	020 5252786
Office hours	Tuesdays 16.00-18.00 Or by appointment
Time	Mondays, 15.00-18.00, BG. 2.21 Two exceptions: Wednesday (23-04-2014), 09.00-12.00, BG . 2.12 Wednesday (07-05-2014), 09.00-12.00, BG . 2.12
Place	BG 2.21
Virtual home	http://blackboard.ic.uva.nl/

Summary

Grand strategy connotes images of veteran statesmen poring over maps and charts; of Bismarck, of Kennan's Long Telegram, of Nixon and Kissinger meeting Mao, and so forth. As a concept, grand strategy represents the highest level of statecraft, encompassing a wide range of instruments - diplomacy and alliances, military force, intelligence, and economic policies, and many others - that can be, and historically have been, assembled in a great many different combinations, and with varying levels of coherence and success.

Strategy is also subject to trade-offs and paradoxical outcomes: powerful states tend to encounter balancing coalitions, military successes may lead to overstretched armed forces, large and complex alliances are likely to increase uncertainty and may hasten conflict, and conversely the build-up of massively destructive weapons can ensure generations of peace instead of war. The course will chart the development of strategy from the ancient to the contemporary era and offer examples of successful and unsuccessful strategies of large and small states. The strategies discussed will include, among others, the Roman Empire's strategy of deep defence, Byzantine subterfuge, Bismarck's balance of power diplomacy, the complex whole of alliances and offensive doctrines preceding World Wars One and Two, and the American Cold War strategy of containment.

The course will also attempt to answer the question whether the concept of grand strategy is still applicable to the current post-Cold War (or even post-post-Cold War), post-September 11th age of uncertainty, which is manifested in the increasing importance of non-state actors and the challenge to the state monopoly of violence, the changing power distribution in the international system and the rise of China and India, as well as the resurgence of Russia.

Learning Outcomes

In doing so, it will prepare students not only for academic analyses of contemporary international security and state behavior, but also instill analytical skills useful for more policy-oriented work, whether analysis, advice, or engagement.

In this class, you will:

- learn how states (or other political units) use the tools at their disposal to achieve perceived interests; what roles the two most important tools at their disposal- military force and diplomacy – fulfill; how military force and diplomacy coherently relate to each other (or fail to) and why that matters; recognize the changing combinations of force and diplomacy in different, historical contexts, and how these contexts vary; critically apply that knowledge and articulate those critiques;
- also critically apply that knowledge to the analysis of current policies and threats; and the clear articulation and formulation of policy options.

Entrance Demands

Completed propedeuse Political Science and minimally 42 EC from the second year of Political Science, among which the Kernmodule: Internationale betrekkingen (12 EC)

Evaluation

The evaluation consists of (a) two written assignments (take home exams) that account for 70% of the grade; and (b) participation (discussions in class and written tri-weekly assignments) that accounts for 30% of the grade.

Take-Home Exams

Students will write two take-home exams, the first of which is 2250 words (+/- 15%), the second of which is 3500 words (+/- 15%). The first counts for 30% of the grade, the second for 40% of the grade. The take-home exam will be in the form of a short essay in response to one of several questions given by the instructor.

Papers will be judged according the following criteria:

- creativity;
- answering the actual question;
- application of theory (where needed);
- application of literature (where needed);
- empirics (use of evidence and examples);
- awareness of rival explanations (if applicable);
- cohesive and clear structure of the paper (introduction - argument - conclusion);
- clarity of writing;

- correctly citing sources; and
- presentation, spelling and grammar (proof-reading).

(The relative attention to theory and empirics depends on the specific question and the chosen approach in answering it).

(table below not to be included with outline for students)

	Fail (<5,5)	Pass (5,5-6,8)	Good (7-8)	Great (>8)
creativity;	None	Little or inappropriate	Some	A lot
answering the actual question;	Did not	Yes, but did not fully understand nuances	Yes, and comprehensively	Yes, and with nuance, sophistication, and implications
application of theory (where needed);	Basic or wrong	Basic, but simplistic	Yes, and correctly	Yes, and with nuance, sophistication, and implications
application of literature (where needed);	Basic or incomplete	Basic or incomplete	Yes, appropriately, and perhaps some additions	Yes, comprehensively, elegantly, and with additional work where needed
empirics (use of evidence and examples);	Basic, wrong or incomplete	Basic or incomplete	Complete, appropriate and systematic	Complete, appropriate, systematic, and perhaps critical (in relation to theory)
awareness of rival explanations (if applicable);	None	Basic	Yes	Yes, and with nuance and implications
cohesive and clear structure of the paper (introduction - argument - conclusion);	Absent or unclear	Present but inefficient	Yes, and clear	Yes, and clear, efficient and elegant
clarity of writing;	Messy, inaccessible	Functional	Clear and effective	Clear, effective, and evocative
correctly citing sources; and	No	Mostly or yes	Yes	Yes
presentation, spelling and grammar (proof-reading).	No, messy	Mostly or yes	Yes	Yes

Handing in papers late: 1 day late = deduct 1 point, 2 days late = deduct 2 points, 3 or more days late is deduct 3 points (i.e. highly unlikely to pass). Going over/under the (+/-15%) word count: depending on (ir)relevance to question, approximately 0,5 points per 250 words.

Formatting: preferably, papers use line-spacing of 1.5 and font size 11 or 12.

The exams should be handed in the Ephorus folders in the Content Section on Blackboard by the given deadline. Students are recommended to send an extra copy to the instructor through mail. No hard copy is needed.

Exam questions will be handed out well in advance of hand-in date.

	Hand-out date	Hand-in date
Take-home 1	18 March	28 March
Take-home 2	20 May	2 June

Grades for the first take home exam should be available 12th of April. Papers will include short written clarification of the grade. The instructor is available for further clarification on appointment.

For the second take home exam grades should be available two weeks after the hand- in date, along with the final grades for the students who passed both exams as well: June 16th.

Students are expected to pass both exams, and cannot compensate the grade of one exam for another. The first retry exam will be handed out two weeks before the second exam, and the retry of the second exam will be handed out after the grades of the second exam are available.

Students cannot take a retry exam if they failed to participate in the original first opportunity to do the exam.

Participation

Participation in class will count for 30% of the grade. Participations consists of: (a) preparation for and contributions to group discussions; (b) tri-weekly written assignments.

There are no student presentations in this class, because I prefer a more open discussion format. This means that every session students will called upon to explain specific points in the literature or shortly present their written essay, with the assumption that everyone will have read the literature for that session.

The class will be divided into three groups, based on the alphabet, the members of which will hand in an assignment every three weeks, which means four assignments in total for every student.

The assignments consist of min 1 / max 2 pages, with either (a) application of that week's literature to contemporary or historical debate not explicitly covered in the readings for that session; or (b) one or more solid topics to bring for the group discussion. Assignments must always contain references to literature used and to other sources (news articles, primary sources, etc.), where applicable.

Assignments will be handed in **before Monday, 09.00 (or Tuesday on the two replacement dates)**.

Session	Group	Session	Group
1	No assignment first week.	8	No assignment due to exam in the week before
2	A	9	A
3	B	10	B
4	C	11	C
5	A	12	A
6	B	13	B
7	C	14	C

Attendance

Students are expected to attend all 14 sessions, but one session absence is accepted, *but only if there is prior notification by email*. A second absence will lead to a replacement assignment.

First Section: Strategy, Drivers and Instruments

In the first section we discuss key concepts – grand strategy, military force, diplomacy, coherence, paradox, geography, technology, decision-making structures, international context and domestic context.

1. Introduction (Mon Feb 3)

- *Key questions: what do you think grand strategy is; is it relevant and why; why is it called 'grand' strategy; what roles do military force and diplomacy play; why is strategy prone to paradoxical outcomes; how does the structure of the international system constrain states (or other political units)?*

Mandatory Reading

- Chapter 1. 'Conscious Use of Paradox in War', and chapter 13. 'The Scope of Grand Strategy' Luttwak, E. N. (2001). *Strategy. The Logic of War and Peace*. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Introduction, Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company

Primary Sources

- 16 December 16 2013, Bureau of Public Affairs U.S. State Department, The East Asia-Pacific Rebalance: Expanding U.S. Engagement, Fact Sheet - <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/pl/2013/218776.htm>
- 25 November 2013, BBC, Shinzo Abe: China new air defence zone move 'dangerous' – <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-25050493>
- 26 November 2013, BBC, US B-52 bombers challenge disputed China air zone - <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-25110011>
- 28 November 2013, BBC, Japan and South Korea defy China air zone rules - <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-25133957>
- ...

Recommended Reading

- Strachan, H. (2005). "The lost meaning of strategy." *Survival* 47(3): 33-54.

2. Military Force (Mon Feb 10)

- *Key questions: why and how does military force matter in peacetime; what are the political functions of force; what does fungibility mean; what are the limits of military force; why does military doctrine matter, and what are the trade-offs in doctrinal choices; how do fungibility and doctrine relate to one another; how does force relate to other instruments of statecraft?*

Mandatory Reading

- Chapter 1. 'American Foreign Policy and the Fungibility of Force' - Art, R. J. (2009). *America's Grand Strategy and World Politics*. New York and London, Routledge.
- Chapter 1. "Diplomacy of Violence" – Schelling, T.C. (1966 (2008 ed.)). *Arms and Influence*. New Haven and London, Yale University Press.
- Chapter 1. 'The Importance of Military Doctrine' - Posen, B. R. (1984). *The Sources of Military Doctrine. France, Britain and Germany between the World Wars*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- Biddle, S.D. (1996). "Victory Misunderstood. What the Gulf War Tells Us about the Future of Conflict." *International Security* 21(2): 139 - 179.

Recommended Reading

- 'Conclusions and Implications' (Pages 73 - 90) Biddle, S.D., Friedman, J.A. (2008). The 2006 Lebanon Campaign and the Future of Warfare: Implications for Army and Defense Policy. SSI. <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=882>
- Mahnken, T.G. (2011) China's Anti-Access Strategy in Historical and Theoretical Perspective, *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 34:3, 299-323
- LaGrone, S. (2012) Pentagon's 'Air-Sea Battle' Plan Explained. Finally. *Wired*, 08.06.12. <http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2012/08/air-sea-battle-2/>

ETC.