**Professor Ariane Chebel d’Appollonia Professor Simon Reich**

**Comparative Grand Strategy in America and Europe**

**Overview**

The field of grand strategy has historically been confined to the study of the United States and a small group of great powers, currently principally China and Russia. One assumption that lies behind this work is that only the most powerful of states, and only states, can have a grand strategy because its formulation, consolidation and implementation requires a large bureaucracy and a huge military. A second assumption of this literature is that states are largely driven by a rational cost-benefit analysis rather than by historical considerations.

Yet there is no reason to assume that only the largest and most powerful of states can have a grand strategy, nor that only states can do so. Indeed, provisional evidence suggests that many states may be more adept at responding to the exigencies of the international environment, whether threats or opportunities, than larger states who attempt to mold the global system. And an abiding question concern whether non-state actors, like the European Union, can have one. Further, the traditional rationalist approach to the study of grand strategy may be mistaken in ignoring the national pathologies that drive states, and thus define their strategic goals.

In this course, we examine the assumptions that frame the traditional field of grand strategy; an alternative framework that provides a means of examining international security strategies in countries and other actors like the EU; and an examination of how that framework is applied to both the United States and the European Union.

**Goals of the Course**

This course has three major pedagogical goals:

* To inform students about the content and substance of debates about grand strategy, and apply them to the current context.
* To develop professional verbal and written skills for either a professional policy or academic career.
* To produce an original piece of research suitable as a writing sample for a job or graduate school application, a publishable piece or a discernable component of a doctoral dissertation.

# **Requirements**

Students will be graded according to two criteria: Class participation and a written paper. Class participation and presentations will account for twenty percent of their grade. This component is composed of a combination of their contribution to class discussion of the readings and their feedback to other students presenting their research. Class attendance is mandatory.

The written component constitutes eighty-percent of the final grade, to be assessed by evaluating the project proposal, intermediate report and final paper. The proposal paper will constitute a five-page outline of the state they intend to study and the forms of grand strategy they will assess; the intermediate paper will provide a five-page discussion of sources for the material for the paper and a preliminary assessment of the research findings to accompany their presentation. The final papers should be 15-20 pages (double spaced) in length. The choice of which state and substance of the research paper is by agreement with the course instructor.

**Readings.**

There are no required purchases for this course. All readings should be available on the CEU system or for download via the web where indicated. Several are very short magazine or newspaper articles that are used to demonstrate a point related to the week’s readings. So, they should be read with care.

**Paper**

**Paper format and objectives**. Your paper should examine the grand strategy of one European or Canada.

* A clear introduction that summarizes the paper’s argument, structure and the evidence you use;
* An analysis of the threats and opportunities that the state currently faces – the international environment;
* A discussion of the history and resulting national pathologies of the country you examine;
* A description as to how the state organizes its decision-making processes in the realm of grand strategy;
* A description of the instruments that the state characteristically employs and the balance between those instruments;
* A recent or contemporary case study section that describes how the state employs those instruments when faced with specific threats and opportunities;
* A concluding section on the paper’s substantive findings and likely consequences for the country concerned.

Please use double-spaced 12-point font. Use Chicago style full citations for the first cite of material and short citations for subsequent mentions. This means you do *not* need to include a bibliography. Please use footnotes rather than endnotes. These will notbe counted as part of the word count.

**Section 1: International Relations and Grand Strategy**

1. **Introduction to the course.**
2. **Domestic Politics and International Relations.** What is determinative in the relationship between the constraints imposed by the international environment and the demand of domestic politics?
	1. Richard N. Rosecrance, and Arthur A. Stein, “The Study of Grand Strategy,” in *The Domestic Bases of Grand Strategy*, eds. Richard N. Rosecrance and Arthur A. Stein (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1993).
	2. Kevin Narizny, “American Grand Strategy and Political Economy Theory,” in *Oxford Research Encyclopedia*.
	3. Etel Solingen, “Domestic Coalitions, Internationalization and War,” *International Security*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Summer 2014), pp. 44–70.
3. **What is a grand strategy?** What are our opinions in how we define a grand strategy? What purpose does a grand strategy serve? How does it apply in the US and in other countries?
	1. Thierry Balzacq, Peter Dombrowski and Simon Reich, “Is Grand Strategy a Research Program? A Review Essay,” *Security Studies*, 2018.
	2. Paul Kennedy, “Grand Strategies in War and Peace: Toward a Broader Definition,” in Paul M. Kennedy, ed., Grand Strategies in War and Peace (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press)
	3. Rebecca Friedman Lissner, “What Is Grand Strategy? Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield,” *Texas National Security Review*, December 12, 2018.
	4. Peter Feaver, “What Is Grand Strategy and Why Do We Need It?” *Foreign Policy*, Shadow Government, April 8, 2009, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/04/08/what-is-grand-strategy-and-why-do-we-need-it/> \*

**Section 2: The Ends, Ways and Means of Grand Strategy**

1. **Values/Ends that define the goals of grand strategy.** Are the goals of a national grand strategy defined by the costs and benefits relative to threats and opportunities? Or do historical memories and national culture play a role in determining broad national goals?
	1. Thierry Balzacq and Simon Reich, draft chapter three in “Comparative Grand Strategy: Theory, Strategy and Policy.”
	2. Stacie E. Goddard & Ronald R. Krebs, “Rhetoric, Legitimation, and Grand Strategy,” *Security Studies* 24, no. 1 (2015): 5-36.
	3. Zheng Wang, *Memory* *Politics, Identity and Conflict*, pp 57-72.
2. **Ways: The processes of decision-making.** How does grand strategy actually get made? Is it a blueprint or a process? Is it a clinical or a messy business?
	1. Kevin Narizny, *The Political Economy of Grand Strategy*, pp. 1-38.
3. Ionut C Popescu, “Grand Strategy vs. Emergent Strategy in the Conduct of Foreign Policy,” *The Journal of Strategic Studies*, 41, no. 3 (2018): 438-460.
4. David M. Edelstein and Ronald R. Krebs, “Delusions of Grand Strategy: The Problem with Washington’s Planning Obsession,” Foreign Affairs 94, no. 6 (2015): 109-116.

**Proposal for paper (two pages) due at the beginning of class 6**

1. **Means: The Instruments of grand strategy.** What are our optional tools in implementing a grand strategy? How do they link to each other?
	1. Simon Saradzhyan and Nabi Abdullaev, “Measuring Russian power,” [https://russiamatters.org/analysis/measuring-national-power-vladimir-putins-russia-decline](https://na01.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Frussiamatters.org%2Fanalysis%2Fmeasuring-national-power-vladimir-putins-russia-decline&data=02%7C01%7Creichs%40newark.rutgers.edu%7C3b96d7e448a3495351d808d667b8c7ad%7Cb92d2b234d35447093ff69aca6632ffe%7C1%7C0%7C636810440667218974&sdata=RxFNncYTo3BW4uxEf7GXYnWrgMdNWPg8HlU9BGpMqQE%3D&reserved=0)
	2. Brendan Taylor, *Sanctions as Grand Strategy* (London: International Institute of Strategic Studies Adelphi Paper 411, 2010), pp. 1-24.
	3. Lars S. Skålnes, *Politics, Markets, and Grand Strategy: Foreign Economic Policies as Strategic Instruments*, chapter 2 (Strategic Need and Economic Discrimination).
	4. Richard L. Kugler, *New Directions in U.S. National Security Strategy, Defense Plans, and Diplomacy*, <https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/135654/new_directions_US_national_security_strategy.pdf>, pp. 123-148.
	5. Paul Sonne, “A Russian bank gave Marine Le Pen’s party a loan. Then weird things began happening,” *Washington Post*, December 27, 2018, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/a-russian-bank-gave-marine-le-pens-party-a-loan-then-weird-things-began-happening/2018/12/27/960c7906-d320-11e8-a275-81c671a50422_story.html?utm_term=.2174af503380>

**Section 3: The US and EU**

1. **The US in comparative perspective.** This week is the transition between the theory and case portion of the course. The benchmark case of the USA provides an example of how to apply the theoretical tools discussed in Sections 1 & 2. The remainder looks at its application in the context of the European Union. The abiding question for both is what are the ends, means and ways of their grand strategy?
	1. Peter Dombrowski and Simon Reich, “US” in Balzacq, Dombrowski and Reich, *Comparative Foreign Policy: A Framework and Cases*.
	2. Paul C. Avey, Jonathan N. Markovitz, [Robert J. Reardon](https://tnsr.org/author/robert-reardon/), “Disentangling Grand Strategy: International Relations Theory and U.S. Grand Strategy,” *Texas National Security Review*, vol. 2, No. 1, November 2018, <https://tnsr.org/2018/11/disentangling-grand-strategy-international-relations-theory-and-u-s-grand-strategy/>
	3. Patrick Porter, “Why America’s Grand Strategy Has Not Changed: Power, Habit, and the U.S. Foreign Policy Establishment.” *International Security* 42, no. 04 (May 1, 2018): 9–46.
2. **The EU’s notion of security: Conventional and Human Security.** This class focuses on the origins, evolution over time, and specificities of the EUsecurity strategy.
3. Ian Manners, “Normative Power Europe Reconsidered: Beyond the Crossroads,” *Journal of European Public Policy*, Vol. 13, No. 2, pp. 182-199. 2006.
4. George Christou, “The EU’s Human Security Discourse: Where Are We Now?”, *European Security*, 23 (3), 2014, pp. 364-381,
5. Daniel Fiott, “Uncharted Territory: Towards a Common Threat Analysis and a Strategic Compass for EU Security and Defense,” *Policy Brief*, EUISS, pp. 1-8, July 2020

**Second update on your paper (two-to-three pages) due at the beginning of class 9**

1. **EU security governance: institutions, agents, and the decision-making process.** This class critically examines the EU security toolkit by focusing on who is in charge of the EU security agenda and/or the effective security strategy.
2. Ben Rosamond, “Conceptualizing the EU Model of Governance in World Politics,” pp. 1-22 in Report published by the University of Warwick, 2005.
3. James Sperling and Mark Webber, “Security Governance in Europe: A Return to the System,” *European Security*, 23 (2), pp. 126-144, 2014.
4. Esther Polé and Pol Morillas, “The EU Global Strategy,” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 32 (6), pp. 753-770, 2019*
5. **EU security external policy areas: the CFSP & ESDP, and conflict prevention.** This class is focused on policy initiatives designed to protect the EU against external threats, as well as to improve human security abroad.
6. Fabian Breur, “Between Intergovernmentalism and Socialization: The Brusselization of ESDP”, *EUI Working paper*, 2010.
7. Laure Delcour, “The EU as a Security Provider in the Eastern Neighbourhood?” *European Security*, 19 (4), pp. 535-549, 2010.
8. EEAS, “EU Global Strategy on Foreign and Security Policy,” pp. 1-60, 2016.
9. **EU security internal policy areas: immigration and/or Terrorism as an example(s).** How does the EU manage the blurring of the distinction between internal and external threats? In addressing this question, this class evaluates the internal effects of the EU security strategy.
10. Sarah Leonard, “EU Border Security and Migration into the EU: FRONTEX and Securitization through Practices,” *European Security*, 19 (2), pp. 231-254, 2010.
11. Jorg Monar, “EU Internal Security Governance: The Case of Counter-Terrorism”, *European Security*, 23 (2), pp. 195-209, 2014.
12. Frida Hansen and Johanna Pertersson, “Contradictory Migration Management? Differentiated Security Approaches to Visa and Irregular Border Crossings in the EU,” *European Security*, pp. 1-18, 2021.
13. **Conclusion (or fourth presentation)**