

# American Civil-Military Relations

Sommersemester 2004  
Dozentin: Lindsay Cohn  
[LPC@DUKE.EDU](mailto:LPC@DUKE.EDU)  
Office Hours: Di. 10.00-11.30, Mi. 10.00-11.30  
Krankenhausstr. 2-4 Zi. 0.209  
Telephone: 09131/852 59 18

## Overview of Course:

The primary problem of Civil-Military Relations (CMR) is usually understood to be that of how a society, which creates experts in the use of force in order to protect its interests and its way of life, can keep those experts in force from turning their expertise against society in order to advance their own special interests and way of life. After all, a military that has been given the material, financial, and human resources to be effective in carrying out whatever defence and security tasks the government may desire is also strong enough to seize power so as to rule for itself, or at least to eat up more resources than the society can afford to spend. But if, on the other hand, the military is kept small, weak, and marginalised so it will not pose a threat to society, will it be capable of carrying out the national security policy?

Does this problem become more acute as civilian society loses its connection with the military? How distinctive must the culture and institutional setting of the military be from its host society – especially if that society is a liberal democratic one – to fulfill its special mission? Does the military's focus on the management of violence require military culture to stand apart from or even contrary to the civilian society from which it springs? Or should the military, particularly in a democracy, adapt to the culture of civilian society, reflecting civilian values and norms of behavior?

This course will examine these problems primarily in the context of the USA, but will be looking at theoretical concepts which could be applied to advanced democracies in general. Since the USA is in many ways an exceptional case for CMR, we will also take every opportunity in our discussions to compare and contrast it with other states whose political systems are comparable, but whose geopolitical position is very different.

We will read some of the classic and recent literature addressing these questions, and there will be discussion questions for each week's reading handed out the week before. Students who wish to do a *Schein* (certificate) will be required to write four short essays (3-5 pages each) and a group project. Those who wish to do the English *Schein* must turn in all written materials in English. See below for details.

### Short Essays:

**Students should look through the syllabus to see which topics will be addressed each week. Students should choose four weeks in which they find the topics particularly interesting, and plan to write short essays to be due in class for those weeks. Each essay should be 3-5 pages long and should address the readings and one or two of the discussion questions from that week. Each essay should identify and explain the two (or more) sides of**

whatever issue is under discussion. The point is for the student to integrate what he learns from the different readings, to respond to the discussion questions in more depth than can be done in class, and to learn how to argue both sides of an argument. Therefore it is very important that these essays NOT be:

1. A journal of the student's own opinions on the subject,
2. A mere report of what the readings said, or
3. A mere report of what I said in the lecture.

The essays should be critical responses to the reading, pointing out the strengths and weaknesses of the arguments in the text, identifying the authors' underlying assumptions, and offering possible alternative explanations. Three to five pages is not very much space to address complex issues, so students must be careful to make their prose precise and to the point. Essays which are mostly journalism (reporting a story) or polemic (stating a position with no evidence and no attempt to address counter-arguments) will receive low marks.

Essays should:

- Be in English (for those students NOT wishing to do a *Sprachschein*, the essays may be in German, but the grading standards will also be more stringent).
- Be typed in Times New Roman 11 point font, 1.5 space, with page numbers bottom right, printed double-sided if possible.
- Be stapled/bound.
- Be NO MORE THAN 5 pages.
- Be edited and proof-read for grammar and spelling mistakes.
- Present both sides of the issue.
- Address the readings critically.
- Convey information in an economical format.

They will be evaluated on originality of thought, insightfulness, quality of written communication skills, persuasiveness (if an argument is presented to be supported), use of evidence, consideration of alternative viewpoints, and attention to detail.

**Group Project:**

I hope and expect that the issues we will deal with in class will raise questions in the students' minds about their own countries and about the European Union. During one of the final meetings, I will divide the class into groups, and give each group a very general theme from the class. Each group will then have 10-15 minutes to choose a puzzle. The groups will present their puzzles and we will spend the rest of that session brainstorming. The groups will have to meet outside of class to finish the project, which must include the following:

1. A puzzle from the European context (either national or European, either current or historical)
2. How the puzzle can be connected to the American experience (similarities, differences, appropriateness of American scholarship on the subject)
3. A theory (either a theory from the literature we have seen or one which the group develops on its own as more appropriate to the European situation)
4. Hypotheses
5. An explanation of what kind of research (survey, statistics, game theory, case studies, etc.)

would be necessary to find the information that would confirm or disprove the hypotheses and theory.

The result will be an in-class presentation of no more than 15 minutes where the group presents its research design. A research design is something that states what the issue or “puzzle” is, why it is interesting, what connection it has to the material covered in class, what the proposed theory to be tested is, and what information one WOULD need in order to find out the answer to the puzzle (this includes the hypotheses).

Everyone will receive both a group mark (for the overall quality of the project) and an individual mark (for that person’s part in the oral presentation)

## **Learning Objectives**

- \* To master the basic texts and arguments in American civil-military relations theory and practice.**
- \* To appreciate the richness of the field of civil-military relations and to be sensitive to questions that remain unsettled, as well as to the complexity of foreign policy in general.**
- \*To think about the duties involved in the notion of democracy and to confront issues of citizenship in a democratic society.**
- \* To cultivate research techniques, understanding how to use statistical, historical, and other data to answer specific empirical questions.**
- \* To hone analytical skills and to refine one's ability to make a convincing argument.**

# Class Schedule

1. **Introduction: Civil-Military Relations** 20 April  
Organizational issues; introductory lecture; methodology
  
2. **Liberal Theory and the American Founding Fathers** 27 April  
**REQUIRED:**
  - Peter D. Feaver, "The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz and the Question of Civilian Control," *Armed Forces & Society* Winter 1997, pp. 149-178
  - *Federalist Papers*, No.s 8 and 51 (pp. 34-39, 288-293); Constitution Articles I section 8 (pp. 512-514) and II section 2 (pp. 516f).
  - The Anti-Federalist Writings, No.s 23, 24, and 25 (pp. 1-10)
  - Russell Weigley, "The American Civil-Military Cultural Gap: A Historical Perspective, Colonial Times to the Present" in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001) pp. 218-241.
  - Mill, *On Liberty* pp. 1-9, 10-14, 73-79, 87-88, 101-102, 113.
  - Cohen, *Citizens and Soldiers* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985) Ch. 5-6 (pp. 117-151)**RECOMMENDED:**
  - James Burk, "Theories of Democratic Civil-Military Relations" in *Armed Forces and Society* Fall 2002, pp. 7-29.
  
3. **Classical Theory I: Huntington** 4 May  
**REQUIRED:**
  - Huntington, *Soldier and State*, pp. 1-97, 143-192, 456-466
  
4. **Classical Theory II: Janowitz; Neo-Janowitzean Theories** 11 May  
**REQUIRED:**
  - Morris Janowitz, *The Professional Soldier* (Free Press, 1971), pp. 3-103, 196-232
  - Charles C. Moskos, "Institutional and Occupational Trends in Armed Forces," in Charles C. Moskos and Frank Wood, *The Military: More Than Just a Job?* (Washington: Pergamon & Brassey's, 1988), pp. 15-26**RECOMMENDED:**
  - Charles A. Cotton, "The Institutional Organization Model and the Military," in Moskos and Wood, *The Military: More Than Just a Job?* pp. 39-55
  
5. **Neo-Institutional Theories and Agency Theory** 18 May  
**REQUIRED:**
  - Deborah Avant, *Political Institutions and Military Change: Lessons From Peripheral Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1994), pp. 130-141
  - Peter D. Feaver, *Armed Servants*, pp. 16-38, 54-95, 96-114, 128-145, 174-178
  - Michael C. Desch, *Civilian Control of the Military: The Changing Security Environment* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1999), pp. 1-38, 135-141

**Note: on 19 May, the first court martial of soldiers involved in the prison abuse incident will begin. It will take place in Baghdad (where some of the soldiers are being confined awaiting court martial) and will be open to the media, so you may be able to follow it on television if you are interested.**

- 6. Guest Lecture: Colonel John R. Cohn, J.D. (USMC, Ret.)** **25 May**  
**The American Military Legal System in its Civilian Legal Context: fundamental democratic rights and the soldier's duties**

**Note: no class on 1 June - holiday**

- 7. The Use of Force and the Agony of Vietnam (note more reading!)** **8 June**  
**REQUIRED:**  
- Richard Betts, *Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises*, pp. 1-30, 96-104, 108-182, 214-236  
- Harry G. Summers, *On Strategy: A Critical Analysis of the Vietnam War*. (Dell 1982 edition): pp. 21-84, 133-150, 192-197, 203, 241-258

- 8. The Cold War, the Post-Cold War Crisis, and Contending Explanations** **(15 June)**  
**REQUIRED:**  
- Richard Kohn, "The Erosion of Civilian Control of the Military in the United States Today", *Naval War College Review* (Summer 2002), pp. 9-60.  
- "Exchange on Civil-Military Relations": William Odom (pp. 25-26), Samuel Huntington (pp. 28-29) and Richard Kohn (pp. 29-31), *National Interest* (Summer 1994)  
- Deborah Avant, "Are the Reluctant Warriors Out of Control: Why the U.S. Military is Averse to Responding to Post-Cold War Low-Level Threats," *Security Studies* 6, No. 2 (Winter 1996/97), pp. 51-90  
- Peter D. Feaver, *Armed Servants*, pp. 180-193  
**RECOMMENDED:**  
- Deborah Avant, "Conflicting Indicators of 'Crisis' in American Civil-Military Relations," *Armed Forces & Society* 24, No. 3 (Spring 1998), pp. 375-389.  
- Charles Dunlap (USA) "The Origins of the American Military Coup of 2012," in *Parameters* (Winter 1992-1993), pp. 2-20

- 9. The Culture Gap Thesis and New Evidence** **22 June**  
**REQUIRED:**  
- Thomas E. Ricks, "The Widening Gap Between the U.S. Military and U.S. Society," *The Atlantic Monthly* (July 1997), pp. 66-78.  
- John Hillen, "Must Military Culture Reform?" *Orbis* 43, no. 1 (Winter 1999), pp. 43-58  
- James Webb, "Military Leadership in a Changing Society," paper presented at the Naval War College Conference on Ethics, 16 November 1998, pp. 1-10.  
- Elizabeth Kier, "Discrimination and Military Cohesion: an Organizational Perspective" in Katzenstein and Reppy, eds., *Beyond Zero Tolerance* (Rowman and

Littlefield Publishers, Inc., New York; 1999), pp. 26-37, 47-51.

-Ole Holsti, "Of Chasms and Convergences: Attitudes and Beliefs of Civilians and Military Elites at the Start of a New Millennium," in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001) pp. 15-99.

-Summary of James Davis, "Attitudes and Opinions Among Senior Military Officers and a U.S. Cross-Section, 1998-99," in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), pp. 121, 127-128.

**10. The Culture Gap Continued and "So What?": the Use of Force** **29 June**  
**REQUIRED:**

-Paul Gronke and Peter Feaver, conclusion and summary of "Uncertain Confidence: Civilian and Military Attitudes about Civil-Military Relations" in Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn, eds., *Soldiers and Civilians* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001) pp. 159-161.

- David R. Segal et al., "Attitudes of Entry-Level Enlisted Personnel" in Feaver and Kohn (2001) pp. 174-212.

- Peter D. Feaver and Chris Gelpi, *Choosing Your Battles: American Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force*. Chapter 3 on veterans and the use of force (pp. 64-94) and Chapter 4 on casualty shyness (pp. 95-129, 132-148), plus pp. 150-151, 174-183.

**RECOMMENDED:**

-Cori Dauber, "Image as Argument: the Impact of Mogadishu on US Military Intervention," *Armed Forces & Society*, (Winter 2000) pp. 205-229.

**11. "So What?": Cooperation in Command** **6 July**  
**REQUIRED:**

- Don Snider et al, "Army Professionalism, the Military Ethic, and Officership in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century" Strategic Studies Institute, Dec 1999. pp. 1-3, 26-50.

- Eliot Cohen, "The Unequal Dialogue: The Theory and Reality of Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force," in Feaver and Kohn, *Soldiers and Civilians*, pp. 429-458.

-Peter Roman and David Tarr, "Military Professionalism and Policy-making: Is There a Civil-Military Gap at the Top? If So, Does it Matter?" in Feaver and Kohn, *Soldiers and Civilians*, pp. 403-428.

**12. European context, Social Sciences Methodology, group work** **13 July**

**13. Group Presentations (15 minutes each); Wrap-up** **20 July**