



ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE OF CANADA
Department of Political Science and Economics
POE432 - Civil Military Relations
Fall 2019

Instructor: Major Mike G. Fejes
Office: Girouard Building, Room 416
Phone: 613.541.6000 ext. **TBC**
Email: michael.fejes@rmc-cmr.ca
Office Hours: Thursday, 1200-1400, or by appointment
Class Times: Tuesday, 1000-12:50
Location: Girouard Building 425

Course Description:

The purpose of PO432 is to examine the military as an important actor in society, specifically as an agent which can significantly influence foreign policy decisions and in extreme cases, which can potentially determine who governs the state. This course examines contemporary issues in civil-military relations in a comparative context. It begins with a review of the classic literature drawing upon historical examples. It then considers the contemporary role of armed forces in society, especially their relationships to civil authorities, and concludes with a brief examination of the Canadian experience. Throughout the term, this course will address the major implications of civil-military relations [CMR] via readings and discussions about the most salient issues and difficult compromises.

Learning Outcomes:

- To better understand the different conceptualizations of civil-military relations;
- To be able to analyze the various theories presented over the course of the term on the different aspects of civil-military relations;
- To apply the various concepts to events in the world today and in the recent past, both to assess the applicability of the concepts and to gain insights into the key dynamics of these events;
- To improve one's research and writing skills in both short and long forms via the course assignments;
- To develop an ability to articulate opinions and arguments via course participation and the presentations at the end of the term; and
- To develop an ability to discern the policy implications from conflicting models of CMR.

Academic Misconduct: Plagiarism and Complementarity

Academic misconduct, including plagiarism, cheating, and other violations of academic ethics, is a serious academic infraction for which penalties may range from a recorded caution to expulsion from the College. Academic misconduct is a grave offence in any university, but even

more so at RMC, because it is intrinsically counter to CAF values and as future commissioned officers, to your individual morals and ethics. Any assignment handed in to me is subject to entry into RMC's plagiarism detection software

The RMCC Academic Regulations Section 23 defines plagiarism as: *“Using the work of others and attempting to present it as original thought, prose or work. This includes failure to appropriately acknowledge a source, misrepresentation of cited work, and misuse of quotation marks or attribution.”* It also includes *“the failure to acknowledge that work has been submitted for credit elsewhere.”* If you plan on writing on related topics in different courses, you must inform the instructors and discuss what will be acceptable in terms of overlap, and what is not. Failure to notify the faculty members will be viewed unfavourably should there be a suspicion of misconduct

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course's instructor. The Faculty conducts a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. As an additional reminder, plagiarism can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another's data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's works and/or failing to use quotation marks; and
- Submitting substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

All students should consult the published statements on Academic Misconduct contained in the Royal Military College of Canada Undergraduate Calendar, Section 23. When in doubt, cite it or ask the instructor.

Academic Accommodation and Extensions:

While unlikely, you may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term for reasons such as Pregnancy, Religious obligations, Personnel Crisis, or any other recognized Disability. For an accommodation request or request for extension, you will provide a written request (e-mail is acceptable) to the instructor during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation or extension is known to exist. After requesting accommodation, you will arrange to meet with the instructor in person to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Afterwards you will be provided with a written response detailing what is expected of you to complete the course.

Electronic Policy:

The internet can be both a benefit and a nuisance during class. Please turn off cell phones at the start of class. If you choose to text or answer a call during class, I will ask you to leave the class and you will lose credit for participation. Laptops can also be helpful or harmful to the discussion. If I find that laptops are inhibiting discussion, I will ask students to put them away.

Selected Texts:

- **Thomas C. Bruneau and Florina Cristiana Matei, Eds., The Routledge Handbook of Civil-Military Relations (New York. Routledge, 2013) Paperback ISBN 13: 978-1-138-92269-3**
- **Eliot A. Cohen, Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime (New York: The Free Press, 2002) Paperback ISBN 13: 978-1400034048**
- **Rebecca L. Schiff, The Military and Domestic Politics: A Concordance Theory of Civil-Military Relations (New York. Routledge, 2009) Paperback ISBN 13: 978-0-415-54919-6**

All other course material is available on line or will be provided to you directly. You should be able to find the majority of articles on your own through the library's access to online journals or google scholar. If there is an issue with access to an assigned reading, contact the instructor.

Course Requirements and Expectations:

The course requirements consist of reading, participation, and writing. The course will have both discussions and presentations and it is your responsibility to do the assigned work. If you need some sort of accommodation, such as extension, or face some kind of challenge, please see the instructor as soon as possible, when there are more options available. Do not wait until the last minute or after the fact.

- First, you are expected to attend the lectures each week. In order to prepare for the seminar, it is important to read the required texts. The mandatory readings are an integral part of the course for evaluation purposes and will not always be summarized during the lectures.
- Second, all assignments must be submitted before the end of the term, whether these will be marked or not. If all work has not been submitted, the instructor reserves the right not to grade your final exam. This policy reflects RMC regulations:
- Third, it is your responsibility, both as a student enrolled in this class and as a Canadian citizen, to keep abreast of current issues.
- Finally, you can expect that I will guide you in an engaging and dynamic manner throughout the semester. I will be ready to meet you to discuss the teaching material or any challenge you may be facing regarding this course. You can also expect from me that I provide useful feedback, in a timely manner, after each evaluation. While I will not proofread drafts, I will very happily discuss the main arguments you wish to make or any questions you have during my office hours.

Final Grade Evaluations:

EVALUATION	% OF 100	DUE DATE
Class participation	30%	n/a
Short paper	20%	22 October 2019
Research paper	30%	10 December 2019 (abstract due 19 Nov 19)
Presentation #1	10%	TBC
Presentation #1	10%	TBC

- **Participation (30%):** This course is a seminar will follow a seminar format based on discussion and debate. After approximately 90 minutes, the class will take a 15-minute break. The quality of the experience depends on the effort each student puts into it. The participation mark is based on the quality – **NOT THE QUANTITY** – of the participation in each week's class. The thoughtfulness of comments is far more important than their frequency. You should complete all the readings for each week ahead of time so that you come into class armed with questions, informed opinions, and perhaps even an improved background on the relevant issues. **Attending is not equal to participation.** To get an A grade for participation, the student must be engaged, providing informed input that is relevant, on a consistent basis. If you do not participate, do not expect a grade better than a C on this part of the course. Students who arrive late at the beginning of class or after a break may be considered absent for the purpose of grading that week's attendance. Students are expected to challenge the opinions of their classmates, but to do so in a respectful manner through paying attention, making constructive points, and sharing their perspective.

POINTS	MARK	BASIS FOR PARTICIPATION ASSESSMENT
4	A+	Student has made an exceptional contribution to discussion in the form of particularly insightful and original comments or questions that reveal an especially nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the material.
3	A	Student has offered a thoughtful, well-reasoned and constructive comment or question, such as those that spur further discussion or debate or reveal a sound grasp of the material
2	B	Student has made a contribution to the discussion in the form of a question or comment.
1	C	Student is present.
0	F	Student is absent.

- **One short paper (20%):** Over the course of the term, you will write one 5-10 page paper (double space, 12pt.). You will take a reading and apply it to a current event (broadly defined to mean something happening within the past 2-5 years). The first paper must be turned in by **22 October 2019**. Late papers will be penalized 1/3 of a letter grade per day late. All assignments must be submitted via email by 23:59h of the due date.
- **One Research Paper (30%):** For the end of the term, you will write one 15-20 page paper on a topic of your choosing, applied to any issue related to this class in the distant or recent past (double space, 12pt.). The paper will NOT be about something that is currently in process in the world and will NOT be speculative. 250-300 word

abstracts will be due **19 Nov 19**. The first paper must be turned in by **10 December 2019**. Late papers will be penalized 1/3 of a letter grade per day late. All assignments must be submitted via email by 23:59h of the due date. Papers will be graded according to the following criteria (each worth 25% of the final grade).

Rubric	Explanation for grade	Grade
Depth, Breadth, And Length Of The Analysis	- Are your ideas original? - Do you make proper use of facts and concepts studied in class? - Is your argument clear and coherent?	/25
Research And Sources	- Do you make reference to existing literature? - Do you rely on primary or secondary sources? - Do you make proper use of citations and footnotes/endnotes?	/25
Argument Structure And Flow	- Is your paper well organized? - the emphasis paper should be on analysis and NOT repetitive description	/25
Expression	- Clarity of writing (style), spelling, grammar, etc.	/25
Total		/100

- **Two Individual Presentations (2 x 10%):** Each student will be required to select two classes where they will present a brief literature review on the week's readings.
- Each student will synthesize the readings for one of the seminars in a presentation at the beginning of class and/or after the break. The aim of this presentation is not to summarize the readings, but to draw out key themes and topics for discussion. The presentation will be evaluated based on how well it captures the central points and debates in the week's readings. Students will be required to provide a **20 minute MAXIMUM presentation**. Students are encouraged to use creative media such as Power Point, maps, video, images, art, etc. However, these should not be a distraction – media should enhance the points being made. Further, should not take up too much time. Students should not read off of their notes and speak actively. Students will be given an individual mark for the quality of their delivery. (Content: 5% and Effort and Delivery: 5%). You should
 - Give **one important insight** and/or fact that you gained from **per reading** in one sentence each. What do you know understand or know that you didn't before doing this reading? What was most valuable to you about this reading?
 - Give **one major critique per reading**. Consider methodology, logic, biases, and any omissions. Does the author prove his/her argument convincingly? Avoid lazy or cheap criticisms like quantitative work is not useful or that the case may not be generalizable. If the latter, you must argue why it is not generalizable.
 - If you heard the author present this work at a conference, what probing question would you ask him or her?
 - Finally, given the readings of the week, what is the **one policy implication (only one per week)** you would want to tell a government official?

Week	Date	Presenter #1	Presenter #2	Remarks
1.	3 Sept 19: Introduction to Civil-Military Relations: Huntington and the "Normal" Theory of Civil-Military Relations	NA	NA	

2.	10 Sept 19: The “Unequal Dialogue”, “Agency Theory” and the “Gap”.			
3.	17 Sept 19: Civil-Military Relations in War			
4.	24 Sept 19: Other Perspectives on Civil-Military Relations I			
5.	1 Oct 19: Other Perspectives on Civil-Military Relations II			
6.	8 Oct 19: The American Experience I			<i>Special Guest</i> <i>Dr. Sokolsky TBC</i>
-	15 Oct 19	NA	NA	FALL BREAK
7.	22 Oct 19: The American Experience II			Short paper due
8.	29 Oct 19: The Western Experience			
9.	5 Nov 19: The Communist and Post-Communist Experience			
10.	12 Nov 19: Other Traditions and Experiences I			
11.	19 Nov 19: Other Traditions and Experiences II			Research Paper Abstract due
12.	26 Nov 19: Civil Military Relations in Canada			
13.	3 Dec 19: Conclusion of the Canadian Experience and Review			Research paper due one week after last class: 10 Dec 19.

SECTION I: Theories of Civil Military Relations (Weeks 1-5)

In this section we will consider various theoretical approaches to civil-military relations which will form the basis for further analysis of the relationship between ‘the soldier and the state’ in specific countries and political systems. In this section students will learn how various scholars have thought about civil-military relations; what are the key questions, problems and ways of understanding this aspect of governance. It is more than a matter of how to keep the military from overthrowing the civilian government in a coup d’état; rather civil-military relationship theory deals with a wide range of issues from decisions to go to war to budgetary and personnel matters.

Week One (3 Sept 19): Introduction to Civil-Military Relations: Huntington and the “Normal” Theory of Civil-Military Relations

Readings:

Jim Golby And Peter Feaver. “Thank You For Your Lip Service? Social Pressure To Support The Troops” <https://warontherocks.com/2019/08/thank-you-for-your-lip-service-social-pressure-to-support-the-troops/>

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier And The State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, Mass. The Belknap Press, 1959), Introduction and Chapters 4-5. (On reserve and chapter copies will be provided.)

Nielsen, Suzanne C. "American civil—military relations today: the continuing relevance of Samuel P. Huntington's *The soldier and the state*." *International Affairs* 88, no. 2 (2012): 369-376.

John Binkley, "Clausewitz and Subjective Civilian Control: An Analysis of Clausewitz's Views on the Role of the Military Advisor in the Development of National Policy," *Armed Forces & Society* 2016, Vol. 42(2) 251-275.

Legault, Albert, and Joel J. Sokolsky, eds. *The Soldier and the State in the Post Cold War Era*. Royal Military College of Canada, 2002. Ch 1,4 and 7.

Supplemental:

Feaver, P. D. 1999. "Civil-military relations." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2:211-41.

Feaver, Peter. 2003. *Armed servants : agency, oversight, and civil-military relations*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Janowitz, Morris. 1961. *The Professional Soldier*. New York: Free Press.

Objectives: To Understand Huntington's Ideas of military professionalism and subjective and objective Civil-Military Relations.

Week Two (10 Sept 19): The "Unequal Dialogue", "Agency Theory" and the "Gap".

Readings:

Cohen, *Supreme Command*, Chapters 1, 7 and Appendix

Peter Feaver, "An Agency Theory Explanation of American Civil-Military Relations during the Cold War," Working Paper. November 1997.

Thomas S. Szayna, Kevin F. McCarthy, Jerry M. Sollinger, Linda J. Demaine, Jefferson P. Marquis, Brett Steele, *The Civil-Military Gap in the United States Does It Exist, Why, and Does It Matter?* (Santa Monica, Calif, The Rand Corporation, Arroyo Center, 2007).

Objective: To understand Cohen's and Feaver's views on Civil-Military Relations especially the concepts of the "unequal dialogue" between the civilian and military leadership, the Agency Theory and the "gap" in civil-military relations.

Week Three (17 Sept 19): Civil-Military Relations in War

Reading:

Cohen, *Supreme Command*, Chapters 2-5

Bacevich, Andrew. "The End of (Military) History? The United States, Israel, and the Failure of the Western Way of War." *The Huffington Post*, July 29 (2010).

Objective: To Understand the history and lessons of Cohen's four historical examples of supreme commanders in terms of civil-military relations in War

Week Four (24 Sept 19): Other Perspectives on Civil-Military Relations I

Reading:

Bruneau and Matei, Chapters 1-3 and 6.

Objective: To Understand Bruneau and Matei's discussion and views on the different conceptions of Civil-Military relations.

Week Five (01 Oct 19): Other Perspectives on Civil-Military Relations II

Readings:

Schiff, Chapters 1-3.

Rebecca Schiff, "Concordance Theory, Targeted Partnership and COIN," *Armed Forces and Society* 2012, 38

Yigal Levy, "What Is Civilian Control of the Military? Control of the Military vs. Control of Militarization," *Armed Forces and Society* 41 1, (January 2016).

Supplemental Readings:

Luttwak, Edward (1979) *Coup d'Etat: A Practical Handbook*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Objectives: To be able to describe Schiff's "concordance theory" of civil military relations and explain the difference between civilian control of the military and control of militarization.

SECTION II: Studies in Comparative Civil-Military Relations (Weeks 6-12)

In this section we will examine civil-military relations in different countries, political systems and stages of development. The objective here is to understand how history, political cultures, ideologies religious beliefs and geopolitical circumstances influence the relationship between the political system and the military.

Week Six (08 Oct 19): The American Experience Part I

Readings:

Russell, F. Weigley, "The American Military and the Principle of Civilian Control from McClellan to Powell," *The Journal of Military History* 57, (October 1993)

Schiff, Chapter, Chapter 4

Cohen, Supreme Command, Chapter 6.

Suggested:

Davis, Vincent. "Americans and War: Crisis and Action." *SAIS Review* 4, no. 2 (1984): 25-41.

Ricks, Thomas E. *The generals: American military command from World War II to today*. Penguin, 2012.

Bacevich, Andrew. "A Modern major general." *New Left Review* (2004): 123-136.

Objectives: To understand the history of American Civil-Military relations and the issues that arose during the Vietnam War.

Week Seven (22 Oct 19): The American Experience Part II

Readings:

Schiff, Chapter 8.

Bruneau and Matei, Chapter 16

Mark R. Shulman, *Lead Me, Follow Me or Get out of My Way: Rethinking and Redefining the Civil-Military Relationship* (Carlisle, PA., United States Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, 2012)

Janowitz, Morris. "Volunteer armed forces and military purpose." *Foreign Affairs*. 50 (1971): 427-443.

Suggested:

Bacevich, Andrew. "A Modern major general." *New Left Review* (2004): 123-136.

Objectives: To understand the U.S. professional military educational system and the U.S. military industrial complex in the context of Civil-Military relations.

Week Eight (29 Oct 19): The Western Experience

Readings:

Bruneau and Matei, Chapters 15, 19, 22, 24-25.

David Chuter, "Civil-Military Relations: Is There Really A Problem?" *Journal of Security Sector Management* 7, 2 (November 2009).

Will Palmer, "The Military Covenant and Britain's Increasingly Visible Armed Forces," PSA Conference Paper, 15 April 2014.

Reykers, Yf, and Daan Fonck. "No wings attached? Civil–military relations and agent intrusion in the procurement of fighter jets." *Cooperation and Conflict* (2019): 0010836719850203.

Supplemental:

Auerswald, David P., and Stephen M. Saideman. *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting together, fighting alone*. Princeton University Press, 2014.

Objectives: To understand the ways in which liberal-democracies and both different and similar when it comes to civil-military relations.

Week Nine (05 Nov 19): The Communist and Post-Communist Experience Readings:

Bruneau and Matei, Chapters, 7, 9, 13, 18, 26-27.

Amos Perlmutter and William M. LeoGrande, "The Party in Uniform: Toward a Theory of Civil-Military Relations in Communist Political Systems," *The American Political Science Review*, 76, 4 (Dec., 1982).

Emil Avdaliani, "Russia Resurrects Mass Mobilization," BESA Center Perspectives Paper No. 1,208, June 25, 2019

Objectives: The objective here is to understand the nature of civil-military relations under a communist system and how those relations changed as former communist countries transitioned to democracies.

Week Ten (12 Nov 19): Other Traditions and Experiences I

Readings:

*Bruneau and Matei, Chapters, 10, 12, 14, 21, 23.

*Schiff, 5-7.

Gabriel Sheffer, "Review: Civil-Military Relations in Israel: Review Article," *Middle East Journal*, 61, 4 (Autumn, 2007).

Supplimental Reading:

Finer, S., S.E. Finer, and J. Stanley. 2002. *The man on horseback: The role of the military in politics*: Transaction Publishers.

Objectives: The objectives here are to understand the familiar and unique characteristics of civil-military relations of selected countries in different parts of the world.

Week Eleven (19 Nov 19): Other Traditions and Experiences II

Bruneau and Matei, Chapters 8 11 17, 20, 21 (see week 10)!.

Syed Islam, "Civil-Military Relations: Western and Islamic Perspectives," *The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences* 17, 2 (Summer 2000).

Section III: The Canadian Experience:

The objective here is to apply the theories of civil-military relations and the examples of other countries to understanding civil-military relations in Canada.

Week Twelve (26 Nov 19): Civil Military Relations in Canada

Readings:

Philippe Lagassé, "Accountability for National Defence: Ministerial Responsibility, Military Command and Parliamentary Oversight, *IRPP Study* 4 (March 2010).

Peter Kasurak, "Civilianization and the military ethos: civil-military relations in Canada, *Canadian Public Administration* 25 1 (Spring 1982).

Mulherin, Peter E. "Going to war democratically: lessons for Australia from Canada and the UK." *Australian Journal of International Affairs* (2019): 1-19.

Supplemental Readings:

Critchley, W. Harriet. "Civilianization and the Canadian Military." *Armed Forces & Society* 16, no. 1 (1989): 117-136.

Okros, Hill and Pinch, *Between 9/11 and Khandahar: Attitudes of Canadian Forces Officers in Transition*, 2008, ISBN: 978-1-55339-215-6

Bland, D.L. 1995. Chiefs of Defence: Government and the Unified Command of the Canadian Armed Forces.

Bland. 2001. "Patterns in liberal democratic civil-military relations." *Armed Forces & Society* 27 (4):525-40.

Gosselin, D. 2009. "Hellyer's Ghosts: Unification of the Canadian Forces is 40 Years Old."

Graham, R. 2002. "Civil Control of The Canadian Forces: National Direction and National Command." *Canadian Military Journal* 3 (1):23-30.

Roussel, S. 2004. "Canada's grand strategy and strategic culture - Guest editor's introduction." *International Journal* 59 (3):477-8.

Saideman, Stephen M. *Adapting in the dust: Lessons learned from Canada's war in Afghanistan*.

University of Toronto Press, 2016.

Shaw, G.D.T. 2001. "The Canadian Armed Forces and Unification." *Defense Analysis* 17 (2):159-74.

Sokolsky, J. 2004. "Canada's army - Waging war and keeping the peace." *Int J* 59 (4):974-8.

Stein, Janice Gross, and J. Eugene Lang. *The unexpected war: Canada in Kandahar*. Toronto: Viking Canada, 2007.

Week Thirteen (03 Dec 19): Conclusion of the Canadian Experience and Review

Readings:

Tim Dunne, "Canada's servicemen and women no longer well-served by Ottawa." <https://www.thechronicleherald.ca/opinion/local-perspectives/tim-dunne-canadas-servicemen-and-women-no-longer-well-served-by-ottawa-343182/>

Daniel Gosselin, "Unelected, Unarmed Servants of the State: The Changing Role of Senior Civil Servants inside Canada's National Defence," *Canadian Military Journal* 14 1 (Summer 2014).

Philippe Lagassé "A Mixed Legacy: General Rick Hillier and Canadian Defence, 2005-08," *International Journal*, 64, 3, (Summer 2009).

Philippe Lagassé and Joel J. Sokolsky, A Larger Footprint in Ottawa, "General Hillier and Canada's Shifting Civil-Military Relationship, 2005-2008, *Canadian Foreign Policy* 15. 2 (Summer 2009).

Suggested Essay Topics:

1. Civil-Military relations in Russia after the Cold War.
2. Islam and civil-military relations.
3. The Israeli experience with civil-military relations.
4. The "gap" in civil-military relations in the United States in the 1990s.
5. Chief of the Defence Staff General Rick Hillier and civil-military relations in Canada.
6. The communist experience with civil-military relations during the Cold War.
7. Military coups d'états.
8. Civil-Military relations and the PLA.
9. Legislative oversight of the military.
10. Post-Cold war civil-military relations in the new democracies of Eastern Europe.
11. NATO and democratic civil-military relations.
12. "Militarization" in American society (see Andrew Bacevich's works).
13. "Civilianization" of the Canadian Armed Forces.
14. Civil-Military relations and a volunteer military versus conscription.

15. The African experience of civil-military relations.
16. Is the military a threat to take over the government via coup d'état? How does one keep the military in the barracks? How do militaries govern?
17. For advanced democracies, the question became: how do civilians make sure the military does what it is supposed to do? What is the proper rule of each in the relationship? Are there gaps between how the civilians and military look at the world and are these differences consequential?
18. More recently, civil-military relations is often taken to mean how best to integrate the different agencies of governments as they engage in peace-building and counter-insurgency. Whole of government, Three D and all the rest are more salient these days as a result of experiences in Iraq, Afghanistan, East Timor, and elsewhere.
19. A topic of your choice selected in consultation with the instructor.

Annex A – GRADING ASSESSMENT:

MARK	SCORE	BASIS FOR GRADING ASSESSMENT
A+	94-100	Work of exceptional quality; meets all criteria for an “A”, but the ideas presented are original and add to existing debates in the field. This work could be submitted for publication in an academic journal.
A	87-93	Excellent work that meets all the criteria and exigencies of the exercise. The argument is clearly exposed; the demonstration is convincing and rests on coherent empirical and/or theoretical analysis; the work demonstrates an excellent capacity to think and write synthetically and a good comprehension of concepts and sources mobilized . The work incorporates concepts and ideas learned in class and in readings . The work is structured in a coherent manner . Language and syntax are of excellent quality. References and bibliography correspond to scientific standards.
A-	80-86	The work is of great quality, but there is still space for minor ameliorations regarding coherence of the argument, concepts, sources, and/or quality of language.
B+	76-79	The quality of this work generally meets the requirements for a “good” grade but is outstanding in a particular aspect, be it the quality or the coherence of the argument, the mastery of concepts and/or the structure and language quality.
B	73-75	Good quality work that generally meets the requirements of the exercise, but there is space for amelioration. For example, the argument is clear but could be enounced more explicitly and the demonstration could be more coherent. The text demonstrates a good understanding of the teachings of the course, but some elements are missing. A text that tends to resume the authors’ arguments or the course’s contents rather than to use them to build an original argument usually deserves a “B”. The text is well structure and the quality of language is satisfying but there is space for amelioration.
B-	70-72	Some weaknesses in the criteria mentioned for a “B” grade. No errors or major weaknesses in the content, but certain aspects need work in the coherence and clarity as well as structure. Some elements may be confusing or superfluous.
C+ C C-	66-69 63-65 60-62	This work meets assigned requirements but has important weaknesses either in the content, the structure, and/or language. For example, the argument is not clearly enunciated, or it is incoherent with the rest of the submission; the demonstration does not rest on factual elements or on a proper theoretical background. It does not incorporate adequately elements learned in class,. Structurally, the text lacks cohesion, there are no links between the different elements, or there is no logic to the flow of the argument. Language and syntax are poor and make it difficult to read the text.
D	50-59	The text meets minimal requirements for passing. Important weaknesses are found in the coherence or structure of the text; the argument is not clearly enounced or is confusing; there are important missing elements either theoretically or factually. Language, syntax, and structure are unsatisfactory and/or the text does not follow

		the expected guidelines in terms of format, length, references, etc.
E	40-49	Unacceptable work. Presentation and contents are weak. The topic is not corresponding to the guidelines, the arguments is incomplete, confusing, demonstrates little or no understanding of elements learned in class; structure and language do not correspond to university standards.
F	0-39	Botched or incomplete work; absolutely does not meet minimal requirements. Insufficient effort or plagiarism.