

<b>Class</b>	<b>Political Studies 2224 – War in Human History.</b>
<b>Term:</b>	Winter term; February 4 – March 25, 2015.
<b>Lectures:</b>	Wednesday, 19:00-21:00hrs.
<b>Total Time:</b>	8 classes @ 2hrs each.
<b>Format:</b>	Lecture and discussion.
<b>Prerequisite:</b>	None.
<b>Online:</b>	Available through BLS (each student is automatically enrolled).
<b>Online:</b>	D2L. <a href="http://www.seanmclark.ca">www.seanmclark.ca</a>
<b>Office Hours:</b>	Wednesday, 18:30-19:00 (or by appointment). Location: SAC 452A.
<b>Contact:</b>	<a href="mailto:sean.clark@msvu.ca">sean.clark@msvu.ca</a>

### Course Description

“The art of war is of vital importance to the state. It is a matter of life and death; a road either to safety or to ruin. Hence it is a subject of inquiry which can on no account be neglected.”

**Sun Tzu**, *The Art of War*

“For what can be done against force without force?”

**Cicero**, *The Letters to his Friends*

War's brutality is stark; it is cruel and horrific in a terrifyingly simple way. On the battlefield, wrote Guy Sajer, a German soldier in the Second World War, "life and death can be so close that one can pass from one to the other without attracting any attention". Yet such tragedy belies the vast complexity, the myriad of jostling motives and material conditions, that sit beneath any outbreak of organized violence. And while war has been examined since the dawn of civilization, many of its riddles remain unanswered. The consequence of this ignorance is that war's horrors have yet to be banished from the political realm, and thus the challenge of securing peace for all looms large even still. With this in mind, POLS 2224 attempts to illuminate the path towards possible solutions by examining the forces underpinning the evolution of violence throughout human history

As the millennia have progressed, the particularities of war have taken far different shape. From Assyrian chariots and the Roman *gladius*, to aircraft carriers, cruise missiles, and the atomic revolution, the implements of war have changed radically. Both the technology of war, as well as civilization's ability to harness ever greater proportions of a society's resources in pursuit of physical coercion, have progressed in fits and starts since the beginning of organized violence, even while human biology—if not human nature—has remained unchanged and enduring. The question for this course, then, is straightforward: what has such technological and institutional change meant for both the conduct and resolution of violent conflict in humanity's long history? What impact do technology and material conditions have on war and peace? And critically, what can be

Sean Clark, Doctoral Fellow, Centre for Foreign Policy Studies

said about these dynamics, particularly as they relate to humanity's evolution from an exceedingly violent past, where war, or the expectation of war, was the norm, to today's (relatively) pacific state of international affairs? In short, has war become so dangerous that it has become obsolete, or has the recourse to violence remained a plausible option? *C'est plus ça change...* or does peace finally now sit on the horizon?

POLS 2224 adopts multidisciplinary approach, as the focus of its study sits at the nexus of politics, strategy, history, anthropology, and evolutionary biology. In particular, the class recognizes that while war may be a political phenomenon, an appropriately comprehensive tour of the political art known as war is a necessary precursor to unlocking its secrets. Course work includes seminar participation, a paper outline, a literature review, and a 12-page finished product, as well as a final exam.

### **Course Materials**

#### **Textbook:**

- John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), [Historical Narrative].
- John Keegan (ed), *Collins Atlas of Military History*, (London: Collins, 2006), [Atlas].

#### **Reader:**

- Robert J. Art and Kenneth N. Waltz (eds), *The Use of Force*, (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003).

#### **Recommended Reading:**

- Robert O'Connell, *Of Men and Arms*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).
- Trevor Dupuy, *The Evolution of Weapons and War*, (Fairfax: Da Capo, 1990).
- Bernard and Fawn M. Brodie, *From Crossbow to H-Bomb*, (Indiana University Press, 1973).
- J.F.C. Fuller, *Armament and History*, (Da Capo Press, 1998).
- Michael Howard, *The Invention of Peace: Reflections on War and the International Order*, (Yale, 2001).
- John Mueller, *Retreat From Doomsday*, (New York: 1989).

#### **Leading Journals:**

- *Journal of Military History*: <http://www.smh-hq.org/jmh/index.html>.
- *International Security*: <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/loi/isec>.
- *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*: <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/loi/jinh>.

#### **Online Resources:**

- *Canadian War Museum*: <http://www.warmuseum.ca/cwm/cwme.asp>.
- *Imperial War Museum*: <http://www.iwm.org.uk/>.
- *Technology of War*: <http://www.howstuffworks.com/war-tech.htm>.
- *Internet Modern History Sourcebook: Studying History*: <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/modsbook01.html#Nature%20of%20Historiography>.
- *The Nature of history*: <http://www.open2.net/historyandthearts/history/natureofhistory/index.html>.

**Course Requirements and Evaluation**

Class Attendance & Participation	10%	<b>Daily</b>
Paper Outline (2 pages)	5%	<b>Week 3</b> (July 17)
Literature Review	15%	<b>Week 5</b> (July 31)
Term Paper (10-12 pages)	30%	<b>Week 7</b> (Aug 14)
Final Exam	40%	<b>Week 8</b> (Aug 19)

Information on formatting and citations for term papers is available via Mount Saint Vincent’s Library and online at <http://www.msvu.ca/library/citing.asp>.

Plagiarism (intentionally or unintentionally representing other people’s ideas as your own) is a serious violation of academic ethics, and will be taken extremely seriously. For information on what plagiarism is, how to avoid it, and the penalties for not doing so, please see MSVU’s [academic calendar](#) for details, or the University of Toronto’s “How Not to Plagiarize,” at `

The grading thresholds are:

90-100 = A+	77-79.9 = B+	67-69.9 = C+	50-59.9 = D
85-89.9 = A	73-76.9 = B	63-66.9 = C	below 50 = F
80-84.9 = A-	70-72.9 = B-	60-62.9 = C-	

**Writing Tools**

It takes concerted effort to deliver a well-crafted argument. The quality of an author’s research, logical consistency, and writing all weigh heavily on the final grade achieved, and thus each must be seriously attended to during all stages of the writing process. The following are a series of tools to help improve the delivery and presentation of a student’s work.

***A Writer’s Checklist***

1. Edit for argument:	
a)	Is my thesis clearly stated?
b)	Is there an obvious 'route map' or preview of points to come?
c)	Are my arguments relevant, complete, and defensible?
d)	Are my facts complete, correct, and documented correctly?
2. Edit for organization:	
a)	Does my introduction supply suitable background information?
b)	Are my paragraphs well arranged and developed with topic sentences and good support details?
c)	Is my conclusion effective?
3. Edit for style:	

POLS 2224 (War in Human History) Syllabus, Winter 2015

	a) Is wordiness kept to a minimum?:
	b) Is diction suitable for the paper's intended audience?
	c) Does documentation follow established conventions?
	d) Does the paper adhere to course requirements?
4. Edit for correctness:	
	a) Is my paper grammatically correct?
	b) Is the spelling correct?
	c) Are there typographical and computer errors?

**Concerning Prose**

How well do you integrate your ideas?	
	Is there a logical flow to the narrative? Do you transit smoothly between ideas? Does your argument connect?
How accurate is your grammar? If you need help you can see the Writing Centre.	
	Consistent use of tenses?
	Correct spelling and punctuation?
	Agreement between subject and verb?
	Appropriate placement of modifiers (adjectives and adverbs)?
	Avoid sentence fragments (incomplete sentences)
	Avoid slang and unprofessional language
Do you properly and effectively cite your sources?	

**Concerning Analysis**

Is the topic relevant? Does it fill an existing gap in our literature?	
Do you probe the primary and secondary literature?	
How deep is your analysis? Are you making a unique contribution or just regurgitating what has already been said?	
How persuasive is your argument? How do you know it is superior to any alternative explanations?	
Is your analysis clear, concise, coherent, and escapes simple political polemics?	
Do you substantiate your claims with evidence?	
What errors might be associated with your data collection methods?	
How sure can you be sure the data supports your interpretation, and not any rival explanation?	
What further sources would have been beneficial?	

### **Course Outline**

There are three types of readings in this syllabus: textbook, reader, and supplementary. Students are required to cover the textbook and reader readings for each lecture. It is advised that this is done on a weekly basis, concurrent with the classroom lecture. Once a student slips behind in the readings, it is extremely difficult to catch up. Racing to complete all of the readings at the end of semester generally leaves insufficient time for reflection of the material, and hence a weaker understanding. As for supplementary readings, there is NO obligation for students to complete them. To repeat, students will not be required to know the supplementary material for the final exam. The purpose of these bibliographic details is simply to provide a starting point for further research. All are available either through the library or Inter-Library Loan request. For further reading suggestions, please see the instructor. Note that this outline is subject to change to meet class requirements at any time.

### **Part I. The Age of Muscle**

#### **Lecture 1: Introduction & Overview**

(Course outline; the birth of organized violence & weapons to accompany it)

*Textbook:* Keegan, chpt 1 ('War in Human History,' p1-77)

*Reader:* None.

#### *Supplementary Readings:*

1. Stephen Peter Rosen, *War and Human Nature*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
2. David Livingston Smith, *The Most Dangerous Animal: Human Nature and the Origins of War*, (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2007).
3. Keith F. Otterbein, *How War Began*, (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004).
4. Jean Guilaine & Jean Zammit, *The Origins of War*, Melanie Hersey (trans), (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005).
5. Lawrence H. Keeley, *War Before Civilization: The Myth of the Peaceful Savage*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

#### **Lecture 2: The Origins of Weapons & War; Essay Expectations**

(Writing overview & essay expectations; Paleo to Neo-lithic; *Megiddo*, Egypt & Assyria)

*Textbook:* Keegan, chpt 2 ('Stone,' p77-153).

*Reader:* *Atlas*, part 1 ('Egyptians...Persians,' p10-13).

#### *Supplementary Readings:*

1. Barbara Tuchman, *Practicing History*, (New York: Knopf, 1981).
2. Joanne Buckley, *Fit to Print: The Canadian Student's Guide to Essay Writing*, (Toronto: Harcourt Brace, 1998).
3. William, Zinsser, *On Writing Well*, (New York: Quill, 2001).
4. Martha Howell & Walter Prevenier, *From Reliable Sources: An Introduction to Historical Methods*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001).

Lecture 3: Hellenic Rise, Roman Conquest

**\*Paper Outlines Due**

(The Greek Phalanx & the Roman *gladius*)

*Textbook:* Keegan, chpt 3 ('Flesh,' p153-239).

*Reader:* *Atlas*, part 1 ('Greco-Persian...later Roman Empire,' p14-29).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Charles Freeman, *The Greek Achievement: The Foundation of the Western World*, (New York: Penguin, 2000).
2. Nels M. Bailkey, *Readings in Ancient History: Thought and Experience from Gilgamesh to St. Augustine*, (Lexington, MA: DC Heath and Company, 1996).
3. Adrian Goldsworthy, *The Complete Roman Army*, (London: Thames & Hudson, 2003).
4. Richard A. Gabriel, *The Great Armies of Antiquity*, (Westport: Praeger, 2002).
5. Richard A. Gabriel and Karen S. Metz, *From Sumer to Rome: The Military Capability of Ancient Armies*, (New York: Greenwood Press, 1991).
6. Arther Ferrill, *The Origins of War: From the Stone Age to Alexander the Great*, (London: Thames and Hudson, 1985).

Lecture 4: The Rise of the Horsemen

(Stirrup & Lance, 300-500 AD; Islamic explosion, 630-1000; Byzantium)

*Textbook:* Keegan, chpt 4 ('Iron,' p235-314).

*Reader:* *Atlas*, part 2 ('Fall of the Roman Empire...Byzantine Empire,' p32-37).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Fernand Braudel, *A History of Civilizations*, (New York: Penguin, 1993).
2. Gérard Chaliand, *The Art of War in World History: From Antiquity to the Nuclear Age*, (Berkeley: Univeristy of California Press, 1994).
3. Timothy Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, (Wiley-Blackwell, 2005).
4. Hugh Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates: The Islamic Near East from the 6th to the 11th Century*, (Longman, 2004).

Lecture 5: East Meets West

(The Crusades; Mongol whirlwind)

*Textbook:* Keegan, chpt 4 cont. ('Iron,' p235-314).

*Reader:* *Atlas*, part 2 ('Crusades,' p42-43).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. J.M. Roberts, *New Penguin History of the World*, (London: Penguin Books, 2004).
2. Michael Prawdin, *The Mongol Empire: Its Rise and Legacy*, (Transaction Publishers, 2005).
3. J.J. Saunder, *The History of the Mongol Conquests*, (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2001).

4. Kelly Devries, *Infantry Warfare in the Early Fourteenth Century: Discipline, Tactics, and Technology*, (Boydell & Brewer Inc, 1996).
5. Timothy Gregory, *A History of Byzantium*, (Wiley-Blackwell, 2005).
6. Hugh Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates: The Islamic Near East from the 6th to the 11th Century*, (Longman, 2004).
7. Jonathan Phillips, *Holy Warriors: A Modern History of the Crusades*, (Random House, 2010).

## **Part II. The Age of Gunpowder**

### Lecture 6: The Black Powder Revolution

(Emergence & evolution of firearms & artillery; return of the infantryman; fortifications)

*Textbook:* Keegan, chpt 5 ('Fire,' p317-386).

*Reader:* *Atlas*, part 4 ('Thirty Years War,' p56-7).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Norman F. Cantor, *The Civilization of the Middle Ages*, (New York: HarperPerennial, 1994).
2. Arnold Thomas, *Gunpowder Revolution*, (Cassell & Co.).
3. John Motley, *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*, (New York: 1960).
4. Charles Oman, *Art of War in the Sixteenth Century*, (New York: 1937).

### Lecture 7: Nations in Arms

#### **\*Literature Review Due**

(Squares & galleons; Adolphus & the marriage of infantry & artillery; Frederick; Napoleon; straight lines to open order; national mobilization)

*Textbook:* Keegan, chpt 5 cont. ('Fire,' p317-386).

*Reader:* *Atlas*, parts 4-5 ('Frederick...Napoleon at bay,' p70-87).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Jeremy Black, *Warfare in the Eighteenth Century*, (London: Cassell, 2005).
2. Andrew Lambert, *War at Sea in the Age of Sail (1650-1850)*, (London: Cassell, 2002).
3. Charles Tilly, *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990-1990*, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990).
4. David G. Chandler, *The Campaigns of Napoleon*, (Scribner, 1973).

## **Part III. The Age of Industrial War**

### Lecture 8: Perfecting Destruction

(US Civil War; Crimean War; application of science & technology; the naval revolution; machine guns, artillery & Dreadnoughts)

*Textbook:* None.

*Reader:* Art, chpt 1 ("The Fungibility of Force").

Posen, chpt 2 ("The Sources of Military Doctrine").

Van Evera, chpt 3 ("Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War").

*Atlas*, part 6 ('The Crimean War,' p90-91; 'Franco-Prussian...Civil War

II, p94-99).

Supplementary Readings:

1. Robert K. Massie, *Dreadnought: Britain, German, and the Coming of the Great War*, (New York: Ballantine Books, 1991)
2. William H. McNeill, *The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force and Society since A.D. 1000* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982)
3. David Stevenson, *Armaments and the Coming of War*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000).
4. John U. Nef, *War and Human Progress: An Essay on the Rise of Industrial Civilization*, (New York, 1950).
5. Phillip Knightley, *The First Casualty: The War Correspondent as Hero and Myth Maker From the Crimea to Kosovo*, (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002).

Lecture 9: The Great War

(WWI)

*Textbook:* None.

*Reader:* Snyder, chpt 9 ("The Cult of the Offensive in 1914").  
*Atlas*, part 7 ('The First World War', p125).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Hew Strachan, *The First World War*, (New York: Viking, 2004).
2. Stephen E. Miller *et al*, *Military Strategy and the Origins of the First World War*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991).
3. Hubert C. Johnson, *Breakthrough! Tactics, Technology, and the Search for Victory on the Western Front in World War I*, (Novato: Presido Press, 1994).
4. Bill Rawling, *Surviving Trench Warfare: Technology and the Canadian Corps, 1914-1918*, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997).

Lecture 10: World War II and the End of Days

(*Blitzkrieg*; industrial attrition)

*Textbook:* None.

*Reader:* Mearsheimer, chpt 10 ('Hitler and the Blitzkrieg Strategy').  
Sansom, chpt 11 ('Japan's Fatal Blunder').  
Morton, chpt 12 ('The Decision to Use the Atomic Bomb').  
*Atlas*, part 8 ('Blitzkrieg... Victory in the Pacific,' p134-57).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Martin Gilbert, *The Second World War: A Complete History*, (New York: Henry Holt, 2004).
2. Jeremy Black, *World War Two: A Military History*, (London: Routledge, 2003).
3. Heinz Guderian, *Achtung-Panzer!*, (Cassell, 2007).
4. Erich Ludendorff, *Der totaler Krieg*. (München, 1934).

**Part IV. The Obsolescence of War?**

Lecture 11: The Atomic Revolution

(Hiroshima, Nagasaki; the Cold War; arms control)

*Textbook:* Keegan, 'conclusion' (p286-393).

*Reader:* Halperin, chpt 13 ("The Korean War")  
Welch et al, chpt 14 ("The Cuban Missile Crisis")  
Sagan, chpt 23 ("Nuclear Instability in South Asia")  
Waltz, chpt 22 ("Nuclear Stability in South Asia").

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Bernard Brodie, *The Absolute Weapon: Atomic Power and World Order*, (New York: 1946).
2. Pierre Gallois, *The Balance of Terror*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961).
3. Kenneth Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May be Better*, Adelphi Paper 171, (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies).
4. Lawrence Freedman, *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy*, (London: St. Martin's Press, 1983).

Lecture 12: The Post-War World

('Limited' wars; 'responsibility to protect')

*Textbook:* None.

*Reader:* Berg, chpt 16 ("Coercive Diplomacy in the Balkans").  
Kaufmann, chpt 25 ("Intervention in Ethnic and Ideological Civil Wars").  
Posen, chpt 26 ("Military Responses to Refugee Disasters")  
*Atlas*, part 9 ('Korean War,' p62-63; 'Civil Wars in Africa,' p166-7; 'The Cold War... Vietnam War II,' p170-75).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. John A. Nagle, *Learning to Eat Soup With a Knife: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam*, (University of Chicago Press, 2005).
2. William Johnston, *War of Patrols: Canadian Army Operations in Korea*, (University of British Columbia Press, 2003).
3. John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War*, (Penguin, 2006).
4. Rupert Smith, *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*, (London: Penguin, 2006).

Lecture 13: War Made New

(Terrorism; Afghanistan; Iraq; the future)

*Textbook:* None.

*Reader:* Jenkins, chpt 5 ("International Terrorism").  
O'Hanlon, chpt 18 ("The Afghani War: A Flawed Masterpiece").  
Lacquer, chpt 28, ("The Changing Face of Terror").  
*Atlas*, part 9 ('Iran-Iraq...Iraq,' p180-85).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. David Hagerty, *The Consequences of Nuclear Proliferation*, (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1998).

2. Martin van Creveld, *Nuclear Proliferation and the Future of Conflict*, (New York: Free Press, 1993).
3. Gus Martin, *Understanding Terrorism: Challenges, Perspectives, and Issues*, (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2006).
4. Colin Dueck, *Reluctant Crusaders: Power, Culture, and Change in American Grand Strategy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).
5. Colin S. Gray, *Another Bloody Century: Future Warfare*, (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 2005).
6. Alissa J. Rubin, "Murky Identities and Ties Hinder NATO's Hunt for Afghan Insurgents, Report Says," *New York Times*, (May 10, 2011).

Lecture 14: Continuity and Change

**\*Term Paper Due**

(Lethality over time; invention & adoption; verities of combat; the future)

*Textbook:* None.

*Reader:* *Atlas*, part 9 ('Future War,' 186-7).

*Supplementary Readings:*

1. Sean Clark and Sabrina Hoque (eds), *Debating a Post-American World: What Lies Ahead*, (London: Routledge, 2011).
2. Trevor N. Dupuy, *Attrition: Forecasting Battle Casualties and Equipment Losses in Modern War*, (Falls Church: Nova Publications, 1995).
3. Barker, J. Craig, *International law and International Relations*, (London: Continuum, 2000).
4. Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect*, (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001).
5. David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild, eds., *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict: Fear, Diffusion, and Escalation*, (Princeton, 1998).

Lecture 15: Final Exam

*Textbook:* None.

*Reader:* None.

*Supplementary Readings:* None.

### Assignments

The course's written assignments consist of a broad research project, broken into three distinct components: a *paper outline*, *literature review*, and *final term paper*. This framework has been adopted so that the work of one assignment feeds that of another. This way, students begin thinking about the shape of their argument, along with the evidence necessary to support it, long before the term paper is actually written. Doing so dramatically improves both the quality of the argument as well as its delivery, and fosters the acquisition of key skills deemed vital for further research in the field. That being said, each assignment is viewed as discrete. There is no comparison of one assignment to the next, no attempt to ensure that the topic chosen for the paper outline is the same in the literature review and final product. Students are free to change their subjects at will.

Always use as many citations as possible. Every idea, every piece of evidence should be sourced to a particular author and publication.

#### I. Paper Outline (5%)

The term paper outline is designed to help the student clarify their paper's topic, as well as the structure of the argument to be contained within. If anything, the assignment will prevent students leaving the writing of their term paper until the night before its due date.

In terms of research subject, students are permitted to choose any political phenomenon that somehow relates to the various topics and themes covered in this class. Students are encouraged to pursue their *own* research interests, for the best research is conducted by scholars who are actually interested in their subject of study. That being said, students are expected to adhere to the 'rigorous' standards of social science work outlined below. In this light, the topic chosen is far less critical than the quality of the methods adopted to pursue it.

In approximately two double-spaced pages (500 words)—not including footnotes or bibliography—the student will detail the following elements:

1. Objective of the paper. What issue, related to the technological evolution of violent conflict, is the paper to study? Why is this exercise important and worthy of consuming precious research resources? How will this project benefit the study of war as a whole? How is it relevant to today?
2. Research question. In one or two sentences, what is the research question that the paper is trying to answer?
3. Thesis: What, in no more than two sentences, is the **main argument** of the paper? Be sure to denote this casual equation in **bold**. It is important that you are as specific here as possible, particularly regarding cause and effect. These are your 'independent' and 'dependent' variables, and your thesis **MUST** have both.

For example, *if* I observe X, *then* I will observe Y as a consequence.<sup>1</sup> Also, be sure not to personalize your thesis. People and countries are simply cases you use to illuminate your broader, more generalized model, not the focus of the study itself.

4. Theoretical framework. Where does the argument sit in relation to the rest of the literature in the field? How do your theories, arguments, and methodologies relate to those of the rest of the field? *Map* the intellectual terrain of your issue. Be sure to include at least a few scholars in each camp—and to cite their specific works. (**Hint**: a useful starting point for the theoretical framework is the course material itself. The review powerpoints are particularly handy, as they outline the core ideas and authors of field). Most importantly, what gap in our understanding are you trying to fill? Again, be sure to **cite** your sources.
5. Methodology ('research design'). This is the matter of how the paper is going to prove its argument. Methods are simply the definition and operationalization of the variables outlined in thesis statement. How will you define X? How will you define Y? How will you measure and track X and Y over time,<sup>2</sup> and where will you find this evidence? Just as important, how will you know that your measures are both *reliable* (that you enjoy a degree of confidence in their accuracy and precision, and that others could repeat your measures) and *valid* (that you are certain that the measures chosen actually reflect the underlying phenomenon which are you are attempting to test for)? Ultimately, how well you answer these questions will determine how compelling your thesis will be made to the reader. Be sure to cite your sources.
6. Prospective bibliography. Provide the **PEER-REVIEWED** sources that the paper will likely use to gather evidence in support of the thesis. At this stage of the process you should be able to cite 5-6 sources and include them in the discussions above. Be sure to include all relevant bibliographic details.

The paper **outline is due Week 3: Thursday, July 17, 2008.**

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that even normative arguments are causal in nature. Even though you are making a claim about how the world *should* be rather than *is*, your claim is nonetheless predicated on empirical grounds. You are comparing two or more alternatives and arguing one is more 'moral' than the others. To show this effectively, you must first define precisely what you mean by morality, and then provide evidence of how one policy delivers that in a greater quantity than its opponents.

<sup>2</sup> A useful way to think about methodology or research design is in terms of simple graphs; you should be able to plot your thesis in its most basic form on a straightforward line graph. For example, a thesis that argues 'wealth leads to democracy' (*if* I have wealth, *then* I will have democracy; independent and dependent variables; cause and effect) is easy to chart: as wealth increases, so too should the level of democracy. It is very helpful to have such a graph drawn out beside you during the research and writing stages of any paper project. It helps clarify the real-world predictions your model is making (such as, using this example, where democracy should flourish and where it should not). This, in turn provides a stunningly clear roadmap for the types of data required to make your argument about cause and effect convincing to the reader.

## II. Literature Review (15%)

The literature review assignment intends to develop the student's ability to critically examine historical literature as a whole. Successful scholars do not simply *read* an article, but rather subject it to a methodical analysis.

For this assignment, the student will choose **TWO** related articles found either within Art and Waltz's *The Use of Force*, or—if concerning issues outside the scope of the reader AND approved by the instructor—from a similarly scholarly resource. The student will then draw out the key points of the authors' arguments, detail how the two articles pertain to one another, and then describe where the two fit in relation to the broader debates of the study of the war and its resolution as a whole. The hope is that this assignment will “help students become more confident in identifying key issues; determining what factors influence outcomes in global interactions; considering how best to approach a world politics question historically, theoretically, and practically; and recognizing authors' biases, approaches, and assumptions so that every article can be understood as part of a story, rather than the story itself.”<sup>3</sup>

### Literature Review Questions

Specifically, the student will answer the following questions for each of the articles:

1. What debate is the author addressing? What question is he or she trying to answer?
2. What is the central argument the author is putting forward? What is his or her **thesis**?
3. What factors/processes/variables does the author feel to be the most important when explaining the core question? In other words, what are the crucial elements, the causes and effects, of the phenomenon under study?
4. What evidence does the author cite to defend his position? What resources are they employing in the service of their argument? How *reliable* (again, that you enjoy a degree of confidence in their accuracy and precision, and that others could repeat your measures) and *valid* (that you are certain that the measures chosen actually reflect the underlying phenomenon which are you are attempting to test for) are these measures?
5. How compelling is the author's argument? Is it likely to revolutionize our understanding of violent conflict, or will the piece be forgotten 5 years hence?

The assignment's summary and conclusion will detail:

1. How the articles compare to each other.
2. Which article is more persuasive, and why? Explain your evidence criteria. What makes the argument so compelling or so unsatisfying? Submit the articles to your *analysis*, and demonstrate how you were so persuaded.

---

<sup>3</sup> Steven L. Spiegel, Jennifer Morrison Taw, Fred L. Wehling, and Kristen P. Williams, *Readings in World Politics: A New Era*, “Introduction,” (Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2005), p5.

3. Explain how the articles fit in the broader debates of warfare in history. Do they support or refute conventional wisdom? Are they attempting to change our understanding of a particular aspect of war, or are simply intended to reinforce contemporary conclusions? When in doubt, explain how the article fits in the broader theoretical debates discussed in this class.
4. Conclude with any final thoughts as to where the study of conflict should travel next.

The length of the review is expected to be roughly 4 double-spaced pages in length, or 1,000 words—not including footnotes and bibliography. This works out to just over one page of analysis for each article, and a page and a half for the broader contextual discussion.

The literature review is due **Week 5: Thursday, July 31, 2008**.

### III. Term Paper (30%)

The term paper provides an opportunity for the student to demonstrate his or her ability to incorporate and apply historical details as part of a sophisticated analysis of an issue related to warfare and technology in human history. The fundamental aim of this exercise is to go beyond mere speculation, and examine issues in a critical and enlightened manner.

The student may select any paper topic, so long as it relates to the lecture material covered in this course. Find a question pertinent to the study of war, and then attempt to answer it. The course outline written above provides a detailed guide as to the topics suitable for examination. Should the student have any questions or require any clarification in regards to their topic, please see the instructor during office hours, or as otherwise scheduled. In addition, all students are encouraged to consult with the instructor prior to the paper's completion.

Expectations for the term paper are straightforward. The student will ably complete each of the following:

1. Introduction. The student will describe the research question that they have set out to answer, as well as explain why the reader should care about this topic. In addition, the thesis must be stated immediately. The thesis is the student's argument in its clearest and most concise form. Every piece of evidence that follows is to be strictly subjugated towards the purpose of supporting this argument. Furthermore, the paper's **thesis statement must be written in bold**, otherwise a **penalty of 3% will be levied**. This will enhance clarity for both the author and the reader.
2. Literature review. Briefly outline the various schools of thought that exist in relation to the paper's topic. Tell the reader what the body of conflict literature already says about the research question. Is the existing literature useful? Why,

- or why not? What gap in the literature are you trying to fill? (Do not worry about a comprehensive survey, just inform the reader of the main streams of thought in a paragraph or two).
3. Argument: Theory and Evidence. Here the student will advance their causal explanation (the thesis) in an attempt to answer the research question they have asked. What evidence suggests your hypothesis ably describes the causal mechanism, as measured against both logical consistency and the empirical record? What makes you so confident that your sample of evidence accurately reflects the larger population from which it is drawn? Be sure to present all the relevant evidence in support of the thesis in as clear a manner as possible.
  4. Conclusion. Restate the key points of the argument. Note if we can apply the results of your historical case to the contemporary world around us. Offer suggestions on where the research program should go from here.
  5. Bibliography. Include all works cited.

Footnotes are preferred. The instructor holds no preference over the format style, so long as it is consistently maintained throughout the term paper.

The length of the paper is expected to range between 10-12 double-spaced pages, or 2,500-3,000 words—excluding footnotes and bibliography.

Since a 10-page paper does not allow for an exhaustive history or superfluous detail, be sure that all the material included is directly relevant to supporting the main thesis. Ruthless editing is required to purge all unnecessary details.

Term papers will be marked, in part, on the clarity and strength of their arguments, as well as the demonstrated ability to use empirical evidence in support of the thesis.

The term **paper is due Week 7: Thursday, August 14, 2008**.

**General Policies Concerning Assignments, Deadlines and Grades**

All assignments are to be submitted in TWO copies. A hard copy is to be submitted directly to the instructor during class time, while an electronic copy must ALSO be sent via the course D2L website. Note that only the hard copy will be marked, as the soft copy is merely for insurance purposes. Do not submit papers to teaching assistants.

Any late material not submitted to the instructor directly *must be date-stamped by the Political Science Department Administrator* and placed in the instructor's mailbox in the Political Science Office, Science Building. Neither the instructor nor the department can assume responsibility for this material. Work that is not date-stamped will be determined to be handed in on whatever day the instructor takes delivery.

Extensions will NOT be provided, no matter the reason. Any late assignments will incur a **3% per day penalty**, including weekends. Again, this sanction will be levied without exception. **Late papers also receive no written feedback from the marker.**

Any student missing a deadline on account of illness is required to obtain a medical certificate indicating their incapacity. A copy of this declaration must be submitted with the assignment, as per the university's academic regulations.

Any student who misses an exam will receive no marks until they provide sufficient documentation that the illness itself precluded the writing the exam. To repeat, the illness ITSELF must be the cause of missing the exam, not any delays or inconveniences that an earlier illness may have imposed. It is only acceptable to miss this exam if a student is physically unable to attend. Should this condition be adequately demonstrated, a re-write will be arranged for a later date. Complete absolution of the exam is not an option.

Although medical documentation will excuse any late penalties assessed, students must be aware that all missing assignments MUST be submitted *prior to the completion of the semester*. Generally, the Registrar's cut-off for grades is one week following the final exam. All material received after this date will be assigned a '0%.'

Students are also encouraged to submit single-spaced assignments. Note, however, that word counts are based upon double-spaced paper lengths (approximately 250 words per page). A single-spaced assignment must contain the same minimum number of words as a double-space submission.

The grade appeals process is as follows. Firstly, initial requests for elaboration and clarification of an assignment's grading will be made to the marker directly. This includes, if the course has so used, the teaching assistant. If the student remains unsatisfied with the response given, the appeal may then be put before the instructor. This step must be accompanied by a written argument on the appellant's behalf. In the

case of term paper assignments, a one-page brief outlining the relative merits of the paper must be included. Here a case for methodological soundness, logical coherence, and a sense of theoretical location must be made, particularly as they relate to the marker's concerns and how the paper has risen above them. In terms of examinations, appeals must be accompanied by a comparison of the answer to the course content as a whole. This is usually most effectively done with assistance from the review powerpoints. Any lingering dissatisfaction will be addressed by direct appeal to the Department Head. Remember, too, that submission to the re-grading process is also license to have the assignment marked *downwards*, should the reappraisal find insufficient merit to warrant the existing grade.

**Disclaimer**

This syllabus is intended as a general guide to the course. The instructor reserves the right to reschedule or revise assigned readings, assignments, lecture topics, etc., as necessary. Be aware that the lecture descriptions are particularly tentative.