

# Syllabus

## PLS/SOC365 – Civil-Military Relations

**Instructor:** Dr. Willardson  
**Course:** Civil Military Relations  
**Class:** T/Th 10:30-11:45 8.307

**Office** 8.133  
**Office Hours:** MWF 13:00-14:00 and by appt.  
**Email:** [spencer.willardson@nu.edu.kz](mailto:spencer.willardson@nu.edu.kz)

---

## Course Objectives

The following are learning objectives that this course addresses directly and indirectly:

- Students will be able to read, understand, and evaluate the research designs and methods used in political science research.
- Students will be able to generate hypotheses and design research to test them.
- Students will know the foundational literature in Civil-Military relations.
- Students will be able to synthesize arguments.
- Students will demonstrate the ability to develop a research question and answer it using appropriate sources.

## Course Description

This course provides students with a foundational understanding of the social and political bargains that are made in order to keep the state safe from external threats. In the course we'll discuss the foundations of the military and the state, look at theories of how civil-military and state-military relations work, and then examine many specific aspects of this bargain. The material in the course is focused on the civil-military relations in a democratic context, but also touches on these aspects in authoritarian states. The instructional part of the course helps students understand what is know. The core part of this class is to partner with the students to learn what the civil-military relations in Kazakhstan look like. Through group, full class, and individual research projects, students will help to build knowledge about this topic as it relates to their country.

## Readings

This course is reading intensive. Much of that reading comes from books. New library procedures mean that I cannot post these book chapter excerpts on Moodle. They are available for you to copy in my office. These are marked with a (CP) below I will discuss how this will happen during the first day of class. Some materials are papers and a link is provided to them below. You can access them from campus computers. The reading load for the semester is about 1000 pages (960), which is an average of 80 pages per week. The largest reading week is 124 pages. Please make sure you plan your week to do the reading *before class*.

Sections from the books and full articles listed here constitute the primary reading materials for the course. Chapters from course pack (CP) books are listed in the weekly schedule included later in this syllabus.

- Atkinson, Carol. 2006. "Constructivist Implications of Material Power: Military Engagement and the Socialization of States, 1972–2000." *International Studies Quarterly* 50(3): 509–537. [Link to Article](#)
- Blair, Dennis C. 2013. *Military Engagement: Influencing Armed Forces Worldwide to Support Democratic Transitions*. Washington, D.C: Brookings Institution Press. (CP)
- Bruneau, Thomas C., and Scott D. Tollefson. 2008. *Who Guards the Guardians and How: Democratic Civil-Military Relations*. University of Texas Press. (CP)
- Desch, Michael C. 2001. *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. (CP)
- Diamond, Larry, and Marc F. Plattner, ed. 1996. *Civil-Military Relations and Democracy*. The Johns Hopkins University Press. (CP)
- Feaver, Peter D. 2005. *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations*. Harvard University Press. (CP)
- Feaver, Peter, and Richard H. Kohn, ed. 2001. *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security*. MIT Press. (CP)
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1957. *The Soldier and the State the Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. (CP)
- Lupton, Danielle L. 2017. "Out of the Service, Into the House: Military Experience and Congressional War Oversight." *Political Research Quarterly* 70(2): 327-339. [Link to Article](#)
- Owens, Mackubin Thomas. 2011. *US Civil-Military Relations After 9/11: Renegotiating the Civil-Military Bargain*. New York: Bloomsbury Academic. (CP)
- Porter, Bruce D. 1994. *War and the Rise of the State*. 1st ed. Free Press. (CP)
- Posen, Barry R. 1986. *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain, and Germany Between the World Wars*. Cornell University Press. (CP)
- Powell, Jonathan. 2012. "Determinants of the Attempting and Outcome of Coups D'état." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56(6): 1017–40. [Link to Article](#)
- Powell, Jonathan M. 2014. "An Assessment of the Democratic Coup Theory." *African Security Review* 23(3): 213–24. [Link to Article](#)
- Chacha, Mwita, and Jonathan Powell. 2016. "Economic Interdependence and Post-Coup Democratization." *Democratization* 0(0): 1–20. [Link to Article](#)
- Talmadge, Caitlin. 2015. *The Dictators Army: Battlefield Effectiveness in Authoritarian Regimes*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press. (CP)
- Thies, Cameron G. 2005. "War, Rivalry, and State Building in Latin America." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 451–65. [Link to Article](#)
- Thyne, Clayton L., and Jonathan M. Powell. 2016. "Coup D'état or Coup d'Autocracy? How Coups Impact Democratization, 1950–2008." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 12(2): 192–213. [Link to Article](#)

Tilly, Charles. 1990. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990*. Cambridge, USA: Blackwell. (CP)

Toronto, Nathan W. 2016. “Why Professionalize? Economic Modernization and Military Professionalism.” *Foreign Policy Analysis*: 1–22. [Link to Article](#)

Weeks, Jessica L. P. 2014. *Dictators at War and Peace*. Ithaca; London: Cornell University Press. (CP)

## Grading

You will earn points for the different activities in class. Your overall grade for the course will be determined by the cumulative points that you earn divided by the total number of points possible in the course (700). The final grade is subject to adjustment in the case of bad/non-attendance as outlined in the Attendance section below. Grades are assigned using the following scale:

### Letter Grade Calculation:

$\geq 95.00$	A	65.00 - 69.99	C
90.00 - 94.99	A-	60.00 - 64.99	C-
85.00 - 89.99	B+	55.00 - 59.99	D+
80.00 - 84.99	B	50.00 - 54.99	D
75.00 - 79.99	B-	$\leq 50$	F
70.00 - 74.99	C+		

*Note: I will post grades for all assignments on Moodle. However, your grade is not determined by Moodle. It is calculated according to the points earned divided by the total number of points in the class as above. Moodle is a bookkeeping tool and not your official grade.*

Table 1: All Graded items and Total Points for Course

Item	Due	Points Possible
Participation	Ongoing	100
Reading Quizzes(10)	Ongoing/Unannounced	100
Midterm Exam	22 February	100
Final Exam	TBD	100
Short Syntheses(2)	See Schedule	100
Paper Proposal and Outline	6 March	50
Paper Draft	27 March	50
Final Paper	12 April	100
<b>Total Points</b>		700

## Brief Description of Graded Items

All written work in class is due at the beginning of class on the day listed (i.e. at 10:30 a.m.). You must upload an electronic copy of the paper to Moodle and bring a hard copy to class. A grade will not be given if I don't have both an electronic copy and a hard copy.

## Participation

In this course we are both learning and doing. Classes will consist of lectures, activities, and discussion, and it is vital to your learning that you are in class and actively participating. Your participation grade is determined by your attendance and what you do while you are in class. Participation is more than answering a few questions, it is about being engaged and listening. I ask that you turn off your cell phones and not check them during class.

## Reading quizzes

These reading quizzes will vary in their format, but each one is designed to challenge your understanding of the day's assigned readings. These are unannounced, but will become increasingly difficult if a large percentage of students is not doing the readings. These quizzes may have true/false, multiple choice, short answer, or longer essay questions. You must come prepared each class both with an understanding of the readings and a pen or a pencil. I will give 11 quizzes (roughly every other day of class that we have assigned readings) and will take the scores of the highest 10.

## Midterm and Final Exam

These exams will test your cumulative knowledge and understanding of the overall concepts in the course. If you can pass the reading quizzes, these exams should be straightforward. **Make sure you read!**

## Short Synthesis

The short synthesis is similar to a reaction memorandum for 1 week's reading. It is a bridge between a short reaction paper and a longer literature review. The synthesis is a review essay that is assigned to help students distill the main ideas from a group of readings, to find connections between different topics, and to write an engaging synthesis with an original viewpoint and thesis using evidence from assigned readings. Students are encouraged to also utilize additional readings to help justify the positions that they are taking vis-a-vis the assigned readings in their thesis. A one-page guide to writing the synthesis and a rubric for how those papers will be graded is found in [Appendix A](#) at the end of this syllabus.

The first synthesis paper is due for the theory readings on 25 January. The second paper is based on the mechanics of civil-military relations in modern states and is due on 15 February.

## Final Paper

The final paper in this class gives you a choice of three different types of writing to do.

1. A news analysis paper. In this paper you take an event that has occurred in the last year that involves civil-military relations, and you analyze the event using the theoretical tools from this course.
2. A policy analysis paper focused on the policy of Kazakhstan. Using the readings from the course as a guide, pick a policy area within Kazakhstan and write a paper outlining what the current policy currently is, and how it can be improved using the knowledge gained from the course.

3. A research design for a project that examines civil-military relations in Kazakhstan. If during the course you have a question that relates to civil-military relations here in Kazakhstan, you can design research to answer that question (similar to the R.D. in PLS210).

The final paper has three elements: a proposal and an outline of the project, a rough draft, and a final draft. A more thorough description of the paper and a grading rubric for the paper is included in [Appendix B](#) at the end of this syllabus.

## Policies

These are the standard policies for all of my courses. Some wording (as to assignment penalties) may be less applicable to the format of this particular class.

### Attendance

Attendance in this course is necessary for student success. **Any non-excused absence will be grounds for adjusting grades downward.** Excused absences (such as documented illness, university-approved travel, etc.) must be cleared with me as soon as possible. Students are responsible for making up work missed during absence. In-class quizzes and assignments cannot be made up due to an absence of any sort. Late work is penalized. I reserve the right to grant an extension for work for absences that are cleared prior to occurring, or on the same day as class in the case of emergencies, but only in extraordinary circumstances.

### Academic Dishonesty

**Academic dishonesty will not be tolerated in any form or under any circumstances.** All students have been notified of Nazarbayev University's Student Code of Conduct and you have agreed to follow the university's standards. Plagiarism is defined as "intentionally or carelessly presenting the work of another as one's own." In short, all of the work you turn in for this class is expected to be yours and yours alone. Plagiarized work will receive a zero and students will be reported to university authorities. Lying about absences, illnesses, or other circumstances will also be considered as academic dishonesty.

Asking for extra points, extra credit, or a higher grade is also a form of academic dishonesty. *This is also something that will ruin your reputation with faculty members.* The time to worry about grades is on each assignment and exam - not at the end of the term when the final tally is made. Students **earn** grades based on their effort and results, grades **are not given** by me. Students have the right to question the grading of a particular item, and to make an appeal if they feel a grade for a given assignment was not fair. This should be done within a week of receiving feedback on an assignment. Any appeal to an assignment that occurred earlier in the semester at the end of the term will not be considered.

### Office Hours

I hold regular office hours (indicated on the top of the syllabus.) Students are encouraged to come and see me during my office hours. I am also available by appointment, but I prefer that students come see me during scheduled office hours, if possible. I reserve the right to send students away who come and see me outside of office hours without an appointment. **Please be considerate of my time.**

**Writing Center**

Writing is a key component of your education at NU. Your grade is dependent on you turning in assignments that convey ideas clearly using standard language, format, citation style, etc. Students are encouraged to work with the writing center to improve their writing. I will use my discretion in requiring students to use the writing center if assignments are consistently poorly written. I will notify you in writing if I will require you to work with the writing center on future papers.

Table 2: Course Schedule and Reading

<b>Week</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Readings</b>	<b>Deadlines</b>
<b>1</b>	9 January	Introduction Problems of Civil-Military Relations		
	11 January	Military and the State	Porter, Tilly, Thies	
<b>2</b>	16 January	Early Theory	Huntington 1-2	
	18 January	Early Theory II	Huntington 3-4	
<b>3</b>	23 January	Later Theory	Owens 1, Desch 1-2	
	25 January	Agency Theory	Feaver 1-2	Synthesis 1
<b>4</b>	30 January	Military Doctrine and State Needs	Posen 1, Feaver and Kohn 9	
	1 February	Civil-Military Gap at Top of Policy	Feaver and Kohn 11, Lupton	
<b>5</b>	6 February	Legislatures and National Defense	Bruneau and Tollefson 2	
	8 February	Ministries of Defense and Civilian Control	Bruneau and Tollefson 3	
<b>6</b>	13 February	Budget and Governance	Bruneau and Tollefson 7	
	15 February	Military Education	Bruneau and Tollefson 9	Synthesis 2
<b>7</b>	20 February	Exam Review	None	
	22 February	Midterm Exam	None	
<b>8</b>	27 February	Recruitment and Conscription	Bruneau and Tollefson 8	
	1 March	Professionalism and Modernization	Toronto 2015	
<b>9</b>	6 March	Attitudes of US Military Personnel	Feaver and Kohn 2, 3	Paper Proposal and Outline
	8 March	Holiday Womens Day	None	
<b>10</b>	13 March	Military Influence on society and outside influence	Owens 2, Blair 5, Atkinson 2006	
	15 March	Spectrum of Roles in Armed Forces	Bruneau and Tollefson 5	
<b>11</b>		Spring Break	NONE	
<b>12</b>	27 March	Soviet and Russian Military Relations	Desch 4, Diamond and Plattner 8	Paper Draft
	29 March	Transition to Civ. Control in Eastern Europe	Diamond and Plattner 7, Barany 7	
<b>13</b>	3 April	Authoritarian Regimes and Security	Weeks 1, Talmadge Intro and 1	
	5 April	Violence and Military-State Relations	Diamond and Plattner 9, Blair 6	
<b>14</b>	10 April	Coups I	Powell 2012, Thyne and Powell 2016	
	12 April	Coups II	Powell 2014, Powell and Chacha 2016	Final Paper
<b>15</b>	17 April	Liberal Traditions	Diamond and Plattner, Epilogue	
	19 April	Course Wrap Up		
	TBD	Final Exam		

## Appendix A - Description and Rubric for Synthesis Papers

The essence of the synthesis paper (sometimes called a reaction paper) is to allow you as a student to critically and creatively play with ideas that are generated from a set of readings. This is used as a pedagogical tool by me to 1) assess how well students understood a group of readings, and 2) to help students to move beyond simple reading and learning what others have said and to begin to formulate their own ideas.

A synthesis paper in this class will be no more than 1000 words in length. There is no minimum number of words, but realistically you will need at least 700-800 words to meet the requirements of the assignment.

You can approach a synthesis paper from a number of perspectives, but I suggest that you use one of the following:

1. Ask a question you feel is not addressed in the readings
2. Explore an interesting idea raised by an author in more detail
3. Argue against a perspective espoused by an author or multiple authors in the readings
4. Suggest a solution to a problem raised implicitly or explicitly in the readings
5. Explore contradictions between papers

In all cases, you are tasked with demonstrating a **mastery** of the selected readings. You must understand the arguments, nuances, approaches, and evidence of all of the authors of in the week. You will explicitly synthesize arguments and ideas from **all** of the papers in making your own argument. I recommend that you read or re-read Knopf (2005)<sup>1</sup> for ideas about how to treat this synthesis paper.

Your paper should follow APSA formatting for citations, headers, and other relevant information. You can single space the text. Neatness and presentation count, so make sure that you pay attention to the way that papers in political science look - including this syllabus. Each paper should include parenthetical references (author date, page#) and a full list of references at the end. You do not need a separate page for references, just begin the references section after the text ends with the appropriate header.

Each paper is worth 50 points. The rubric below is what I will use to grade the papers along with the point range for the five different elements that I will grade based on how well you address each element.

---

<sup>1</sup>Knopf, Jeffrey W. (2006) "Doing a Literature Review." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 39(1):127-132.



	<b>Poor (0-5 points)</b>	<b>Average (6-7 points)</b>	<b>Good (7-8.5 Points)</b>	<b>Exceptional (8.5-10 Points)</b>
<b>Thesis</b>	No thesis is evident.	There is a thesis, but it is not clear.	Thesis is clear and relevant to the week's reading.	Thesis is clear, concise, and very logical.
<b>Evidence</b>	Evidence from readings is not used, or is used haphazardly.	Evidence from the reading is there, but it is not organized clearly throughout or doesn't clearly support thesis.	Evidence from reading is there, it is organized, and it supports the arguments of the thesis.	Evidence clearly and logically supports the hypothesis.
<b>Understanding</b>	Student demonstrates little understanding of selected readings, or shows a major misunderstanding.	Student demonstrates some understanding of readings. Some small misunderstanding may be evident.	Student demonstrates solid understanding of readings with no or few small misunderstanding.	Student demonstrates exceptional understanding of readings and provides deep insight into the issue.
<b>Originality</b>	Student makes no effort to make an original argument.	Student demonstrates some original thought, but paper is formulaic or rote in tone.	Student demonstrates original thought or original approach to understanding readings.	Student makes exceptional arguments, or points out profound issues/insights with the readings.
<b>Mechanics</b>	Major issues with grammar, style, and references throughout.	Some errors in grammar, style, or references throughout. May have major issues in one area.	Small errors in grammar, style, and references only.	No major and few minor errors in grammar, style, and references.

Table 3: Rubric for Synthesis Papers

## Appendix B - Description and Rubric for Final Paper

The final paper in this class gives you a choice of three different types of writing. The purpose of our lectures and exams in this class is to give you knowledge about the general principles of civil-military relations. The purpose of the paper is to help you apply that to a problem or issue that **you** are interested in. I am also allowing you to work in different types of writing. In one paper you are doing writing that is evidence and theory based, but which uses logic and argumentation to explain an event.

The three different types of paper and a broad description of their elements are as follows:

### News Analysis Paper

In this paper you take an event that has occurred in the last year that involves civil-military relations, and you analyze the event using the theoretical tools from this course. This type of writing can be considered more like journalism than social science, but it uses many of the tools from PSIR courses.

### Policy Analysis Paper

This paper is focused on the policy of Kazakhstan. Using the readings from the course as a guide, pick a policy area within Kazakhstan and write a paper outlining what the current policy currently is, and how it can be improved using the knowledge gained from the course. Policy analysis papers are what you would use in a government job. You are examining what a policy is, and then using the theories and evidence from class, you are arguing about ways that a policy can be improved, why it should be eliminated, or why it should receive more attention or funding.

### Research Design

This research design is for a traditional political science project that examines a question or problem of civil-military relations in Kazakhstan. If during the course you have a question that relates to civil-military relations here in Kazakhstan, you can design research to answer that question (similar to the R.D. in PLS210). This type of paper is the type of academic/social scientific writing that we use and teach you to use as academics.

### Description of Requirements

The final paper has three graded elements: a proposal and an outline of the project, a rough draft, and a final draft.

#### Proposal:

The proposal is due on 6 March and is worth 50 points. In the proposal you will do the following:

1. Identify the type of paper you'll write
2. Identify the news item, policy, or research question you will explore<sup>2</sup>.
3. Identify 10 initial sources of information for arguments, policy analysis, or a literature review.

---

<sup>2</sup>This is dependent on the type (1 above) of paper you are writing.

4. Identify your main argument for news analysis, question or issue for the policy, or general theory for the research design.
5. Write 2-3 paragraphs about the project, why you are interested in it, and the challenges you think you'll face while completing it.

I will grade this proposal as follows: Incomplete (60%), meets expectations (75-79%), good (80-84%), great (85-94%), and excellent (95-100%). I will provide feedback about my ideas for the project along with the grade. You are demonstrating to me that you have thought about this project **a lot** by this point in the semester (nearly 2 months worth of class) and that you have an idea about your project. You need to complete the draft of the project by 27 March, so it is important that you've got a good plan by this point.

### **Rough Draft**

The rough draft is due 27 March. It is a full draft of your final paper. I expect that it will be the full length, that all arguments will be made, and that you will have performed the analysis that you need (for paper types 1 and 2) and thought through your theory, hypotheses, and research design (for type 3).

I will provide thorough feedback on the rough draft and will use the same scale to grade as for the outline: Incomplete (60%), meets expectations (75-79%), good (80-84%), great (85-94%), and excellent (95-100%). I will also provide you with an expected grade if you make the changes suggested and turn the rough draft into a final draft.

Writing is a process, and doing drafts of work and sharing it with others is an important part of writing in all applications. That is why I require you to write early and revise at least once as part of the course.

### **Final Paper**

The final paper is due on 12 April. This paper will use a similar rubric as that used for the synthesis papers. That modified rubric is shown in the table on the next page.

All papers will use APSA formatting for headings and citations. That means an in-text citation format. You will also provide a full list of references at the end of the paper. On this long paper, that list of references should begin on its own page. Sloppy and lazy citations are graded very harshly, so make sure you are paying attention to this process. I will grade the paper according to the rubric. I will also grade on appearance, so make sure you format your papers correctly.

The final paper should be between 3500 and 4500 words in length, not including references at the end.

	<b>Poor (0-10 points)</b>	<b>Average (10-14 points)</b>	<b>Good (15-19 Points)</b>	<b>Exceptional (19-20 Points)</b>
<b>Thesis/ Res. Question</b>	No thesis is evident. Research question is unclear	There is a thesis, but it is not clear. Research Question is too broad.	Thesis is clear and relevant.  Research Question is clear and focused.	Thesis is clear, concise, and very logical. Research question is clear and interesting.
<b>Evidence/ Lit. Review</b>	Evidence from readings or policy analysis is not used or used poorly. Literature Review is incomplete and haphazardly done.	Evidence is there, but it is not organized clearly or doesn't clearly support thesis. Literature Review points to some literature, but has gaps and is too general/too specific.	Evidence is there. It is organized and it supports the arguments of the thesis. Literature review is thorough and frames the research question.	Evidence clearly and logically supports the thesis. Literature review is thorough and frames the research question in an exceptionally interesting way.
<b>Understanding</b>	Student demonstrates little understanding of the project.	Student demonstrates some understanding of project, some small misunderstanding may be evident.	Student demonstrates solid understanding of project with no or few small misunderstanding.	Student demonstrates exceptional understanding of project and provides deep insight into the issue.
<b>Originality</b>	Student makes no effort to make an original argument.	Student demonstrates some original thought, but paper is formulaic or rote in tone.	Student demonstrates original thought or original approach to understanding problem.	Student makes exceptional arguments, or points out profound issues/insights with the problem.
<b>Mechanics</b>	Major issues with grammar, style, and references throughout.	Some errors in grammar, style, or references throughout. May have major issues in one area.	Small errors in grammar, style, and references only.	No major and few minor errors in grammar, style, and references.

Table 4: Rubric for Final Paper