

POLS 405.090
Spring 2009
M 5:30-8:15 p.m.
Office Hours: MW 2:00-3:00 p.m.
TR 9:30-11:00 a.m. and by appointment

John Creed
26 Coming Street (201)
953-8137
953-5724 (messages)
Email: creedj@cofc.edu

Capstone Seminar: War

What is a Capstone? Course Objectives

The Capstone seminar in Political Science is designed to be a culminating experience for students. As majors, you all complete a common set of courses early in your program of study that establishes the foundation of the discipline and its primary concerns and initiates processes of skill building. You then branch off into different subfields (American politics, comparative politics, international relations, political thought and public law, public administration and public policy) and take a variety of courses with different substantive and skill emphases in the “middle” of the major. The Capstone provides a venue where you will be able (and expected) to draw upon the ideas and skills you have gained thus far to explore a new and overarching topic in Political Science that has relevance to your futures. Capstone seminars provide an integrative experience that substantively allows you to employ insights, ideas from work in different subfields and includes intensive writing, independent research, oral presentation, opportunities to apply theories and concepts to new problems and cases, and practice in articulating and defending your own views.

This seminar seeks to use the topic of war to accomplish the Capstone’s goals. War is a relatively rare event in the international system, but its impacts are always a part of international relations. Since the Treaty of Westphalia was signed in 1648 creating the modern nation-state system, there have been as many as 80 years in which no war occurred; however, 75 of the interstate wars that have been fought in that time have resulted in over 30 million battlefield fatalities among combatants and tens of millions of civilian deaths. Put another way, more than 100 states in the international system have never been parties to an interstate war but some have been parties to more than ten since the Congress of Vienna in 1815. As Daniel Geller and J. David Singer note, one paradox of war is that most societies are in continuous preparation for what is ultimately a very rare (or nonexistent) event for many ... but when war occurs, the stakes are enormous, not only for participating nations but for those around them.¹

The primary purpose of this seminar is to use and build on the backgrounds, skills and insights you have gained in Political Science up to now to explore how and why the United States and other international actors engage in war, how war has affected societies

¹ Daniel Geller and J. David Singer, Nations At War: A Scientific Study of International Conflict (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p. 1.

and how war may be changing with the continued evolution of the international system. As such, this seminar will examine the political, economic, cultural and personal implications of war in contemporary U.S. society, with international examples offered for comparative purposes. In the process, you will confront multiple perspectives on the nature of contemporary war and conduct independent research throughout the semester on an aspect of war that particularly interests you.

Course Content

It is impossible to even begin to comprehensively consider the vast theoretical and substantive literatures on war available to students today; thus, with one significant exception, what we will explore will largely be suggestive of the many different directions you can follow consistent with your individual interests. We will open the course by looking theoretically at responses posited to the question “why war?” and examine some of the empirical efforts to better understand the nature and evolution of war in the international system. This will be followed immediately by an exploration of some ethical and normative issues that are raised perennially about war. These early discussions will serve as a backdrop to a later consideration of recent work that notes significant changes in the frequency of wars and the ways wars are fought since the breakup of the bipolar structure that characterized the Cold War international system, as well as the steps states take toward reconstruction and reconciliation after war.

The one substantive exception to the suggestive survey of issues surrounding war will be a more pointed examination of America’s experience in Vietnam. Arguably, no single set of events has more profoundly affected America’s domestic and international politics in the last fifty years ... and yet even as its effects remain far-reaching, knowledge of the conflict itself and specific awareness of its lasting impacts continues to wane. We will look more explicitly at America’s Vietnam experience and its aftermath with an eye both toward better appreciating how it continues to affect America in today’s world and how the nature of that war and its legacy may be influencing the larger patterns of war becoming evident in today’s international system.

Method of Presentation

This course will be run as a seminar. Formal presentations by the instructor will be rare. Class sessions will serve as a venue for exploration and informed discussion of the materials we are reading and otherwise considering. We will also spend considerable class time working on aspects of your research throughout the semester.

Class Participation

Given the purposes of the Capstone and the way class sessions are structured, class participation is a vital component of this course and your **ACTIVE** involvement in all class sessions is **absolutely essential**. Participation in class discussion is expected and will be considered carefully in the final course evaluations. Such participation includes listening carefully and critically to the views expressed by classmates, as well as the

expression of your own ideas. It is also expected that you will be willing to periodically take the lead in discussing issues and ideas based on the materials you are reading and researching. You should always be prepared during each class session to discuss current political events as they relate to the subject of the course.

Due to the structure of the course, you should not expect to do well without regular class attendance and consistent, active participation. Given that this is a night class that meets only once a week, students who wish to succeed should plan on attending all class sessions and be present for the entire three hour period; **anyone missing more than one class session over the course of the semester (excused or unexcused – no distinctions are made) should expect to have their participation grade lowered significantly (this means being present for the entire class session – leaving early for any reason constitutes absence).**

Special Circumstances

If you have any kind of special circumstances that I should know about, please make me aware **right away**. For example, if you have a diagnosed (or undiagnosed) learning challenge, if you have a physical condition of any kind that affects your learning, or if you are an athlete or a club member who will travel during the semester, I need to know that at the start of the term in order to make certain that your needs can be met. It will be infinitely more difficult to accommodate you sufficiently if you delay in disclosing your needs. Confidentiality will be respected in all instances. In addition, if you are a student who has problems writing papers, taking class notes, presenting material orally, etc., there are many resources and programs you can take advantage of to improve your class performance. All you have to do is ask and I can direct you to the appropriate help.

Please note: If you are a SNAP student eligible for accommodation, you MUST provide me with a copy of the notification letter you have been given by the SNAP office well before the need for any accommodation arises. If you are a student athlete who will miss class time due to away events, you MUST follow the procedures set out by the College in order to expect due consideration. In both cases, I will not guarantee granting your request if I have not received proper notice.

Office Hours

I have designated sets of office hours that are established for you to use in order to meet with me outside of class. Do not be reluctant to come by my office at these times, especially if you have questions that are left unanswered from class or if you are experiencing any difficulties or uncertainties in the course. If these times conflict with your schedule, we can work out a mutually convenient time to meet. I am around a lot – do not hesitate to make use of me outside the classroom.

Course Groundrules

Attendance: You are expected to be present for all of the class sessions in this course. Absence from more than one class session during the term, whether excused or unexcused, is excessive. Students missing more than one class session (including leaving early from class sessions) will lose one full letter grade from the participation portion of their total average for each additional absence.

Late Work: Given the nature of this capstone and its structure, late work will not be tolerated. Work that is turned in after the date and time due will lose ten points off the total automatically (ie. a paper with a numerical grade of 85 becomes a 75) and an additional ten points will be subtracted for each subsequent extra day. Work is considered late (and the clock begins ticking) if it is not handed in at the time requested. All due dates and times are listed in the syllabus – you know right now when everything you are expected to produce should be finished so there should be no excuse for late work.

Electronic Submission: **NO** written work may be submitted to me electronically for credit under any circumstances. You must have legible printed copies of papers for me to collect when assignments are due.

Academic Dishonesty: You were bound by an Honor Code when you enrolled at the College of Charleston. I expect you to abide by that code. If you are found to have plagiarized any of your written work, you will automatically fail this course and be turned over to the Honor Board for further disciplinary action. If you have any doubts about what constitutes plagiarism or cheating of any kind, ask before you act.

Courtesy and Tolerance: As this course progresses, you will doubtlessly find that your ideas about politics and war do not always match the views of your fellow students, the authors of your texts, or your instructor. This is the stuff of politics and war. However, if this course is to prove rewarding for everyone, it is absolutely essential for each participant to respect and tolerate the ideas and opinions of others in the class. It is equally important for everyone to discuss issues on the basis of information and analysis rather than emotion and volume. By adopting such a posture, you will hopefully find the course will be a challenging and enlightening experience where you will have many opportunities to rethink what you know or believe to be true about politics and war.

Time Spent Outside of Class: I have high expectations for you in this course and have crafted it with that in mind. Given the nature of a Capstone experience, you will need to spend at least two to three hours working outside of class for every hour you spend in the classroom in order to successfully complete the work in this course. Some weeks may require more time. Students who are not committed to spending that kind of time studying and preparing for class should expect to struggle. It is important to note that time alone does not automatically ensure success – the kind of time you devote to your work and how you approach the endeavor may be just as critical. You can devote

time to preparing and studying that is effective and ineffective. If you ever wish to discuss these issues with me, feel free – there may be important changes we can make to your approach that can maximize your effort.

Readings and Texts

Reading assignments will be made out of the following books:

Lawrence Freedman, ed. War (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994)

George Herring, America's Longest War: Vietnam, 1950-1975 4th edition (New York: McGraw-Hill., 2002)

Tim O'Brien, The Things They Carried (New York: Penguin Books, 1990)

John Mueller, The Remnants of War (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004)

Roland Paris, At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflicts (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004)

All required texts are available at the College of Charleston and University Bookstores. Additional required readings are marked with an asterisk (*) in the course outline. These are available via the College Library's e-reserve program. A password giving you access to these readings will be delivered in the first class session.

The following list of scholarly journals may provide useful resources for your independent work:

International Security	International Interactions
Journal of Conflict Resolution	Journal of Peace Research
International Studies Quarterly	Perspectives on Politics
American Political Science Review	International Organization
American Journal of Political Science	Journal of Politics
European Journal of International Relations	World Politics
International Political Science Review	Cooperation and Conflict
Conflict Management and Peace Science	International Peacekeeping

It is also important for you to keep up with current events as you take this course. Unfortunately, the Charleston Post and Courier will not be much help in this regard. **I am therefore urging you to subscribe to The New York Times and read it as often as possible.** You may purchase a discount subscription from the College of Charleston Bookstore that allows you to obtain copies of the paper Monday-Friday for a significant savings over the newsstand price.

Method of Evaluation

Grades for this course will be determined as follows:

- 1. Class Participation (10%):** Your constructive input is an essential component of this course. It is expected that you will attend class consistently and that you will be prepared to discuss the required readings on the day they are assigned. At the end of the semester, you will receive a grade based on the contribution you have made to class proceedings.

Note: As part of your participation in class, you will be required to attend the POLS convocation on Wednesday, March 11 at 7:00 p.m. in Physician's Auditorium. Cynthia Enloe will speak on "Where Women Have Been in the Iraq War and Why It Matters". This is part of the Department's theme "Bodies and Borders: Rethinking Security for the 21st Century", which will be a focus of this course. You will write a short reaction to Enloe's address as part of evaluating your own participation in the first half of the seminar (details will be distributed in class).

- 2. Weekly Reading Reactions and Questions (10%):** Each week (sometime by Sunday at 10:00 p.m. prior to our Monday meeting), you will email me a reaction to the week's readings along with at least two thoughtful discussion questions. Your reaction narratives should encompass at least two paragraphs of reflection discussing the week's readings and may go beyond that minimum depending on how much you have to say. What struck you? What did you find interesting? Or not interesting? What – if anything – did the readings make you think about? These reactions are designed to be fairly casual and promote some out of class dialogue with me – no need to stress about whether or not you are saying something profound. Your reactions should, however, demonstrate that you have carefully read and critically assessed the material assigned for our upcoming class session. You may choose to focus on one of the readings or several of them in your narrative.
- 3. Analytical Essay (10%):** To follow up on our discussion of the Vietnam War, you will complete a 5-7 page analysis paper that will apply the theories and concepts explaining war to the Vietnam experience. More guidelines on this assignment will be distributed in class.
- 4. The Capstone Independent Research Assignment (70%):** Over the course of the entire semester, you will be engaged in your own research on some aspect of war – either generally or specific to a particular conflict, period of time, country or region of interest. After completing an initial reflection essay early in the term, you will be conducting your research in stages throughout the semester. Each of the components listed below will be graded and the final integrative paper will be turned in at the end of the semester. The components of the research paper include:

- a. an annotated bibliography (5%)
- b. a formal proposal (5%)
- c. a literature review (10%)
- d. a normative essay (10%)
- e. an empirical essay (10%)
- f. oral presentations of your work and peer review efforts (10%)
- g. an integrated final research paper (20%)

Due dates for each of these assignments are listed in the course outline below. More information on the research project is contained in an accompanying handout and instructions/guidelines for specific portions of the paper will be distributed during the semester.

Opportunities for “extra credit” are not available.

Grades will be assigned consistent with the following scale:

A – Superior (100-92)	A minus – Excellent (91-89)
B plus – Very Good (88-86)	B – Good (85-82)
B minus – Promising (81-79)	C plus – Fair (78-76)
C – Average (75-72)	C minus – Acceptable (71-69)
D plus – Barely Acceptable (68-66)	D – Merely Passing (65-62)
D minus – Barely Passing (61-59)	F – Failing (58-0)

Course Outline

(+) denotes reading from Lawrence Freedman’s edited volume *War*

(*) denotes reading found on the College Library’s e-reserve system (password protected)

Part I – The “Basics” of War (January 12-February 2)

I. Course Introduction – What is a Capstone? – January 12

Week’s Reading: None

Assignment: Write a typed two to three page narrative of interesting issues, questions surrounding war (generally or specific to a conflict) that you might find worthy of exploring in more depth over the course of the semester AND discuss why these ideas currently interest you, seem worthy of more examination. Consult class readings, description of Capstone research guidelines for ideas – think too about what you have been exposed to in other courses that might have relevance to this assignment. You will submit this essay to me before our next class session – **it is due in my office by 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 20**. Bring a copy of your narrative to class on Monday, January 26, as it will form the basis for part of our class discussion.

Monday, January 19 – Martin Luther King Holiday (no class)
(consider engaging in service)

II. The Causes of War – January 26

This class session will explore the many competing theories of “why war?” that inform international relations and delve into the factors (or correlates of war) that are judged to most heavily influence the emergence of interstate conflict. As such, we will begin examining war from several different levels of analysis and specifically assess the state of knowledge borne by the more recent methodological efforts to study war “scientifically”. We will also identify different kinds of wars, as well as make distinctions between war and “war” and debate why war has been a relatively understudied topic in American politics, even as it has been the overriding concern of scholars in international relations and comparative politics.

- Week’s Reading:** (+) Quincy Wright, “Definitions of War”
(+) Kenneth Waltz, Man, the State and War”
(+) Raymond Aron, “Biological and Psychological Roots”
(+) Saul B. Cohen, “Geopolitics”
(+) Martin Van Creveld “Why Men Fight”
(+) Ibn Khaldun, “Four Kinds of War”
(+) Martin Wright, “War of Gain, Fear and Doctrine”
(+) Robert Gilpin, “Hegemonic War and International Change”
(+) Vladimir Lenin, “Socialism and War”
(+) Seyom Brown, “Structural Factors”
(+) Michael Doyle, “Liberal States and War”
(*) Mary Tetreault and Ronnie Lipschutz, “People and War” in Global Politics as if People Mattered (Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005), pp. 107-124;
(*) Mary Caldor, “Old Wars” in New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era 2nd edition (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), pp. 15-32;
(*) Stuart Bremer, “Who Fights Whom, When, Where and Why?” in John Vasquez, ed. What Do We Know About War? (Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), pp. 23-36;
(*) David Mayhew, “Wars and American Politics” Perspectives on Politics 3 (September 2005), pp. 473-493.

Assignment: Based on the class discussion we have had today of possible research topics on war and what you have found interesting, begin compiling an annotated bibliography of scholarly readings in your particular area of choice. Your initial bibliography must contain at least ten scholarly citations. This preliminary annotated bibliography is due to my office by **4:30 p.m. on Friday, January 30.**

III. Arguing About War – the Ethics of Conflict – February 2

This class session will center on the ethical questions surrounding war that have been raised over time and the place they occupy in explaining and understanding different forms of conflict. A portion of this discussion will focus specifically on the concept of “just war”.

- Week’s Reading:** (+) Wilfred Owen and Herbert Reed, “Two Poems”
(+) John Yoder, “The Pacifism of Absolute Principle”
(+) Martin Ceadel, “Pacific-ism”
(+) Hans Morgenthau, “Six Principles of Political Realism”
(+) Lawrence Freedman and Efraim Karsh, “Why Bush Went to War”
(+) Michael Walzer, “Sieges”

- (+) Hannah Arendt, "The Trial of Adolf Eichmann"
- (+) Barrie Paskins, "The Responsibilities of Defense Scientists"
- (+) W. V. O'Brien, "Just War Doctrine and Revolutionary War"
- (+) J.E. Hare and Carey B. Joynt, "Intervention"
- (+) Paul C. Warnke, "Vietnam and Nuremberg"
- (*) Neta Crawford, "Just War Theory and the U.S. Counterterrorism War," Perspectives on Politics 1 (March 2003), pp. 5-25;
- (*) Randall Dipert, "Preventive War and the Epistemological Dimension of the Morality of War" Journal of Military Ethics 5 (January 2006), pp. 32-54;
- (*) Dominic D.P. Johnson and Dominic Tierney, "Match-Fixing" in Failing to Win: Perceptions of Victory and Defeat in International Politics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 37-76.

Assignment: Using the preliminary annotated bibliography of last week and the comments you have received as a foundation, complete the preliminary research proposal framework that is handed out in class. This assignment is due in my office by **4:30 p.m. on Friday, February 6.**

Part II – America’s Vietnam War (February 9-March 23)

IV. The French and American Mandarins (1950-1963) – February 9

This class session will examine the reemergence and eventual disintegration of the French colonial establishment in Indochina and the growth of an American presence in Vietnam. As part of this discussion, we will explore the political dynamics among the French, Vietnamese and American governments, as well as the changing American perspective on Southeast Asia as the Cold War became more serious.

Week’s Reading: George Herring, America’s Longest War, pp. 3-129;

- (*) David Levy, "The Contest: How Americans Got Involved in a Land War in Asia," in The Debate Over Vietnam 2nd edition (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), pp. 21-45;
- (*) Brian VanDeMark, "A Way of Thinking: The Kennedy Administration’s Initial Assumptions about Vietnam and their Consequences," in Lloyd Gardner and Ted Gittinger, eds. Vietnam: The Early Decisions (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1997), pp. 24-36;
- (*) Gareth Porter, "The Imbalance of Power, 1953-1965," in Perils of Dominance: Imbalance of Power and the Road to War in Vietnam (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), pp. 259-276.

V. America’s War in Vietnam (1964-1968) – February 16

Soon after John F. Kennedy’s assassination, his successor Lyndon Johnson escalated America’s efforts in Vietnam. By the middle of 1965, America was engaged in a full-fledged war to preserve the integrity of South Vietnam. This portion of the course looks at the decisions leading to the escalation and some of the retrospective political assessments of these decisions. It will also begin to seek an understanding of the initial optimism that accompanied these efforts and the gradual erosion of confidence as America’s war scope continued to grow. The consideration here will conclude with an examination of the Tet offensive and its role in exacerbating the growing political disillusionment with the war expressed by many American policymakers. Within months of the surprise North Vietnamese and Viet Cong offensive, the political landscape in the

U.S. had shifted dramatically and beckoned a new phase in America's Indochina encounter.

- Week's Reading:** George Herring, America's Longest War, pp. 131-268;
- (+) Edward Luttwak, "The Logic of Strategy"
 - (+) Michael Howard, "The Dimensions of Strategy"
 - (+) Thomas Schelling, "The Strategy of Conflict"
 - (+) Carl Von Clausewitz, "Key Concepts"
 - (+) Baron De Jomini, "Strategy and Grand Tactics"
 - (+) Napoleon, "Maxims"
 - (+) Helmuth Von Molke, "Doctrines of War"
 - (+) Charles Ardant Du Picq, "Moral Elements of Battle"
 - (+) Julian Corbett, "Command of the Sea"
 - (+) Giulio Douhet, "Command of the Air"
 - (+) B. H. Liddell Hart, "The Indirect Approach"
 - (+) F.O. Miksche, "Blitzkrieg"
 - (+) V.D. Sokolovsky, "Soviet Strategy"
 - (+) A. Beaufre, "A Strategy of Deterrence"
 - (+) Stanley Karnow, "General Giap on Dien Bien Phu and Tet"
 - (*) Michael Hunt, "That Bitch of a War" in Lyndon Johnson's War (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996), pp. 72-107.

Assignment: Based on the direction of your proposal and the feedback you have received on it, you are to take the scholarly sources you have found and craft a literature review that introduces and effectively summarizes the relevant published material surrounding your topic. Specific guidelines on writing a literature review will be handed out in class. This assignment is due to my office by **4:30 p.m. on Friday, February 20.**

VI. A War for Peace: Nixon, Kissinger and the Vietnamese Endgame (1969-1975) – February 23

When Richard Nixon assumed the presidency, he brought with him a plan to "Vietnamize" the war in Indochina – giving money and equipment to American allies and encouraging them to wage the conflict. At the same time, Nixon widened the war into Cambodia and Laos. This portion of the course examines the Nixon administration's strategies for extricating America from Vietnam and the terms under which Nixon sought to achieve "Peace With Honor" as well as the circumstances that led the Vietnamese communists to prevail in 1975.

- Week's Reading:** George Herring, America's Longest War, pp. 271-320;
- (+) Thomas Schelling, "The Threat that Leaves Something to Chance"
 - (+) Richard Hunt, "Pacification and Attrition in Vietnam"
 - (*) Jeffrey Kimball, "Reality versus Myth in Vietnam War Strategy from Nixon to Ford" in The Vietnam War Files (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2004), pp. 8-41;
 - (*) Jonathan Schell, "Man of Peace" in The Time of Illusion (New York: Random House, 1975), pp. 137-197;
 - (*) Gary Hess, "Nixon-Kissinger and the Ending of the War: A 'Lost Victory' or 'Neither Peace Nor Honor'?" in Vietnam: Explaining America's Lost War (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2009), pp. 179-206.

March 2-6 – Spring Break

VII. The Human Impacts of War – March 9

This portion of the course will examine the human impacts and effects of war and its aftermath. It will explicitly explore experiences from the Vietnam conflict and the most recent Iraq war.

- Week's Reading:** Tim O'Brien, The Things They Carried (all)
- (+) Davidson Loehr, "The Fresh Kill, Vietnam 1967"
 - (+) survey other readings from the Freedman collection on the Experience of War;
 - (*) D. Michael Shafer, "The Vietnam Combat Experience: The Human Legacy" in D. Michael Shafer, ed., The Legacy: The Vietnam War in the American Imagination (Boston: Beacon Press, 1990), pp. 80-103;
 - (*) Tim O'Brien, "The Vietnam in Me" The New York Times Magazine (October 2, 1994), pp. 43-57;
 - (*) Dexter Filkins, "The Man Within", "Pearland" and "Fuck Us" in The Forever War (New York: Knopf, 2008), pp. 149-167, 189-213, 296-306.

Wednesday, March 11 -- POLS Convocation, Physician's Auditorium, 7:00 p.m.

Assignment: You are to have completed the normative essay by **4:30 p.m. Friday, March 13.**

VIII. The American Political Debate Over Vietnam and Its Initial Policy Effects – March 16

The lasting ramifications of the Vietnam War on American society began to emerge long before the conflict itself drew to a close. This section will explore a number of these early effects, including the war's impact on the separation of powers between executive and legislative branches of government, its effects on the American media, and the repercussions it left on the U.S. military.

- Week's Reading:**
- (+) A. Giddens, "States and Military Power in Social Theory"
 - (+) C. Dandeker, "The Bureaucratization of Force"
 - (+) M. Janowitz, "The Military Professional"
 - (+) A. Vagts, The Military and Politics
 - (+) Phillippe Manigart, "Mass Armed Forces in Decline"
 - (+) Jean Elshtain, "Feminism's War with War"
 - (+) Charles C. Moskos, "Armed Forces in a Warless Society"
 - (+) Brian Holden Reid and John White, "Desertion in the American Civil War"
 - (+) Edward Shils and Morris Janowitz, "Undermining German Morale"
 - (+) N. Kinzer Stewart, "Military Cohesion"
 - (*) The War Powers Act (1973);
 - (*) Marc Jason Gilbert, "Introduction" in Marc Jason Gilbert, ed. Why the North Won the Vietnam War (New York: Palgrave, 2002), pp. 1-45;
 - (*) Leslie Gelb, "Vietnam: The System Worked," Foreign Policy (Summer 1971), pp. 140-167;
 - (*) Gary R. Hess, "The Military Perspective on Strategy in Vietnam: Harry G. Summer's *On Strategy* and Bruce Palmer's *The 25-Year War*," Diplomatic History (June 1986), pp. 91-106;
 - (*) Michael X. Delli Carpini, "Vietnam and the Press" in D. Michael Shafer, ed., The Legacy: The Vietnam War in the American Imagination (Boston: Beacon Press, 1990), pp. 125-156;
 - (*) William Lunch and Peter W. Sperlich, "American Public Opinion and the War in Vietnam," Western Political Quarterly (March 1979), pp. 21-44;

- (*) Arnold Isaacs, “The Generation” in Vietnam Shadows: The War, Its Ghosts and Its Legacy (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), pp. 35-64;
- (*) Robert Buzzanco, “The Struggles at Home: Civil Rights and Women’s Liberation” in Vietnam and the Transformation of American Life (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 1999), pp. 191-233;
- (*) Alan Brinkley, “1968 and the Unraveling of Liberal America” in Carole Fink et al., eds., 1968: The World Transformed (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 219-236.

IX. Understanding Vietnam from a Greater Distance – March 23

This section of the course looks at some of the longer term legacies left by America’s Vietnam experience and begins the examination of how they may have affected the way America has conducted itself in the world (and how it has waged war) since that time.

- Week’s Reading:** (*) Frances Fitzgerald, “A Clash of Cultures” in Andrew J. Rotter, ed. Light at the End of the Tunnel 2nd edition (Wilmington, DL: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999), pp. 297-313;
- (*) Noam Chomsky, “An Act of Imperialism,” in Andrew J. Rotter, ed. Light at the End of the Tunnel 2nd edition (Wilmington, DL: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999), pp. 323-342;
- (*) Norman Podhoretz, “A Defense of Freedom,” in Andrew J. Rotter, ed. Light at the End of the Tunnel 2nd edition (Wilmington, DL: Scholarly Resources Inc., 1999), pp. 343-352;
- (*) Andrew J. Rotter, “Chronicle of a War Foretold: The United States and Vietnam, 1945-1954 in Mark Atwood Lawrence and Fredrik Logevall, eds. The First Vietnam War: Colonial Conflict and the Cold War Crisis (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007), pp. 282-306;
- (*) Andrew Bacevich, “Wilsonians Under Arms” and “War Club” in The New American Militarism (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), pp. 9-33, 147-174;
- (*) “Interchanges: Legacies of the Vietnam War” Journal of American History (September 2006), pp. 452-490;
- (*) David Elliott, “Parallel Wars? Can ‘Lessons of Vietnam’ Be Applied to Iraq?” in Lloyd Gardner and Marilyn Young, eds. Iraq and the Lessons of Vietnam: Or How Not to Learn From the Past (New York: The New Press, 2007), pp. 17-44;
- (*) Robert McMahon, “Contested Memory: the Vietnam War and American Society, 1975-2001,” Diplomatic History (Spring 2002), pp. 159-185.

Assignment: You must have completed the analytical essay assignment on the Vietnam War by **4:30 p.m. on Friday, March 27.**

Part III – War in the Present and Future (March 30-April 20)

X. The Remnants of War – March 30

These next two weeks of the course will examine the empirical evidence emerging that suggests the nature and frequency of war is changing, particularly as the Cold War has

waned. We will explore and contrast the notions of “total” versus “limited” war and discuss the importance of such distinctions in today’s international environment.

- Week’s Reading:** John Mueller, The Remnants of War, pp. 1-84;
- (+) Geoffrey Parker, “The Military Revolution”
 - (+) Ian F. Beckett, “Total War”
 - (+) Andrew Lambert, “Crimean Illusions”
 - (+) Geoffrey Best, “Restraints on Land War”
 - (+) Douglas Porch, “The Tactical Offensive in France”
 - (+) Stephen Ambrose, “The Secrets of Overlord”
 - (+) Christopher Thorne, “The Image of the Japanese”
 - (+) Colin Gray, “The Strategy of Blockade”
 - (+) David Macisaac, “The Evolution of Air Power”
 - (+) “U.S. Objectives with Respect to Russia”
 - (+) Hedley Bull, “Disarmament and the Balance of Power”
 - (+) John Mearsheimer, “Instability in Europe after the Cold War”

Assignment: You are to have completed your empirical paper by **4:30 p.m. on Friday, April 3.**

XI. The Changing Role of War in the International System? – April 6

- Week’s Reading:** John Mueller, The Remnants of War, pp. 85-181;
- (+) C. E. Callwell, “Small Wars”
 - (+) Charles W. Gwynn, “Imperial Policing”
 - (+) L.J. Shadwell, “Savage Warfare”
 - (+) “Mao’s Military Principles”
 - (+) Walter Laqueur, “The Character of Guerrilla War”
 - (+) John MacKinlay, “The Failure of the Multi-National Force: Lebanon 1983-1984”
 - (+) Robert Osgood, “Limited War and Korea”
 - (+) Michael Handel, “Surprise in October 1973”
 - (+) Robert Osgood, “The Reappraisal of Limited War”
 - (+) Andrew Pierre, “The Impact of Arms Sales”
 - (+) Kenneth Waltz, “Nuclear Weapons: More May Be Better”
 - (+) Martin Van Creveld, “The Future of Low Intensity Conflict”
 - (+) Lawrence Freedman, “Weak States and the West”
 - (*) Gregg Easterbrook, “The End of War?” The New Republic (May 30, 2005), pp. 18-22;
 - (*) I. William Zartman, “Need, Creed and Greed in Intrastate Conflict” in Cynthia Arnson and I William Zartman, eds. Rethinking the Economics of War: The Intersection of Need, Creed and Greed (Washington: Woodrow Wilson Cetner Press, 2005), pp. 256-284;
 - (*) Deborah Avant, “Private Security Companies” New Political Economy 10 (March 2005), pp. 121-131;
 - (*) Ivan Arreguin-Toft, “How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict,” International Security 26 (Summer 2001), pp. 93-128;
 - (*) Gil Meron, How Democracies Lose Small Wars (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 3-26.

Assignment: Familiarize yourself with the findings of the Center for International Development and Conflict Management’s report entitled “Peace and Conflict 2005” by Monty Marshall and Ted Robert Gurr (on e-reserve). Also, look at the Center for Systemic Peace report “Managing Systemic Peace” and the Human Security Center’s 2005 Human Security Report “War and Peace

in the 21st Century” (directions for access to both in class). We will discuss the findings and methodologies of these works at the beginning of class on **Monday, April 13** as part of our conversation about empirical analysis.

XII. After War – Part I – April 13

This final substantive portion of the course will look at the research emerging about how to reconstruct societies that have experienced war as it occurs in the contemporary international system. Special attention will be devoted to evaluating samples of this literature in light of the recent difficulties the United States has had in Iraq. Final oral presentations of research work will take place over the last two weeks of the course.

Week’s Reading: Roland Paris, At War’s End, pp. 1-148;

- (*) Thomas Ohlson, “Understanding Causes of War and Peace” European Journal of International Relations 14 (March 2008), pp. 133-160;
- (*) Rajiv Chandrasekaran, “Who Are These People?” in Imperial Life in the Emerald City: Inside Iraq’s Green Zone (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2006), pp. 83-99;
- (*) Richard Brown, “Reconstruction of Infrastructure in Iraq: Ends to a Means or Means to an End?” Third World Quarterly (June 2005), pp. 759-775.

XIII. After War – Part II – April 20

Week’s Reading: Roland Paris, At War’s End, pp. 151-236;

- (*) Alex Bellamy, “The Responsibilities of Victory: *Jus Post Bellum* and the Just War” Review of International Studies 34 (October 2008), pp. 601-625;
- (*) Wolfram Lacher, “Iraq: Exception To or Epitome Of Contemporary Post-Conflict Reconstruction?” International Peacekeeping (June 2007), pp. 237-250;
- (*) Benjamin Sovacool and Saul Halfon, “Reconstructing Iraq: Merging Discourses of Security and Development” Review of International Studies (April 2007), pp. 223-243;
- (*) Rob Aitken, “Cementing Divisions?” Policy Studies 28 (September 2007), pp. 247-267.

Part IV. Concluding Thoughts – April 27

Week’s Reading: (*) William James, “The Moral Equivalent of War,” in Essays on Faith and Morals (New York: Meridian, 1962), pp. 311-328;

- (*) Martin van Creveld, “The Great Paradox” in The Culture of War (New York: Ballantine Books, 2008), pp. 411-415;
- (*) Mark Danner, “What Are You Going to Do with That?” The New York Review of Books (June 23, 2005), pp. 52-56.

Assignment: Your integrated research paper is due in my office by **4:30 p.m. on Friday, May 1.**

Spring 2009

POLS 405.090

The Capstone Independent Research Project

One of the major purposes of the Capstone course is for you to employ the skills you have developed through your program of study in conducting your own research on a topic of your choosing connected to the course theme. In the process, this will provide you with an opportunity to refine a number of the abilities you have been encouraged to master over your time as a Political Science major and you will have the chance to work collaboratively and constructively with other members of the class as you complete your own project.

In this particular Capstone seminar, you are all going to conduct independent research on some aspect of war that both interests you and can readily meet the requirements of the assignment described below. Given how broad the topic of “war” is, that means you have wide discretion initially about what your research focuses on. You may decide to concentrate on an aspect of war that encompasses several conflicts (such as examining the role scarce resources – or abundant resources – plays in fostering conflict in the developing world or how the volunteer military has changed the face of who fights America’s wars); look at a topic central to a particular conflict (such as the part played by foreign funders in supporting the Nicaraguan war of the 1980’s); examine a specific time period (such as the prevalence of “proxy wars” fought between the U.S. and Soviet Union during the Cold War); or analyze conflict in a particular country or region (such as the factors contributing to Africa’s “world war” or contrasting the 1967 and 1973 wars between Israel and the Arab states). Topics related to peace-building (the amelioration or absence of war) may also be perfectly appropriate.

The key to any successful research topic is that it must be relevant in some clear way to the course theme and it must contain researchable and related empirical and normative questions, which themselves will become the specific focus of your work. An **empirical question** is essentially a question answerable through observation or description of reality – by marshalling data and evidence to detail what we know and how we know it. A **normative question**, by contrast, deals with how we should use our knowledge – developing and examining subjective goals, values and moral rules to guide us in applying what we have learned to that reality.

Virtually all issues have empirical and normative elements to them and often you can identify multiple questions in each category. For example, if one were studying the use of the War Powers resolution in the United States since 1973, one could ask the empirical question of how often the President has invoked or abided by the legislation (or alternatively how and why it was applied as it was to a specific conflict, say the 1982 American military presence in Lebanon) – you could then collect evidence and data to support or undermine a hypothesis and provide an answer to that question. A related normative question that could be posed and debated is whether or not a president should be subject to the War Powers resolution (or alternatively what Congress should do given that presidents repeatedly ignore or misapply aspects of the resolution) – here you are

examining and evaluating different values and rules (presidential power, congressional oversight) in answering the question, rather than collecting data and evidence to answer the question (although data and evidence are relevant in potentially establishing and legitimizing the goals and rules you are promoting).

You will be conducting your own research in an area of your interest in stages. It will begin in the first two weeks of the semester, when we brainstorm possible ideas and directions for research. As a result of your thinking, you will then complete the following steps:

- a. preparing an annotated bibliography of existing scholarly literature you have found on the topic you are interested in pursuing;
- b. preparing a formal proposal for your research, including what specific and related empirical and normative questions you are intending to pursue and how you intend to approach them
- c. drafting a literature review of what scholars have already published relating to your specific topic;
- d. writing an essay that wrestles with the normative question you have identified;
- e. writing an empirical essay that explores and seeks to answer the empirical question you have identified;
- f. integrating your literature review, normative and empirical analyses into a coherent narrative that comes to terms more completely and synthetically with the topic you have pursued;

Additional guidelines and examples of component portions of your research will be handed out in class. Due dates for different assignments are listed in the course outline of the syllabus.

As part of this work too, you may be grouped with other members of the class working on similar or related topics. There will be an expectation that you will be reviewing and commenting on one another's work as the semester proceeds – serving as support and collaborators as you do your own work. We will devote significant portions of class sessions to discussing and evaluating one another's work and periodically individual class members will be presenting portions of their work in these sessions. Toward the end of the semester, individual (or perhaps groups) presentations of work will be conducted.

The ideal end result of the class effort will be a volume of essays on different aspects of war that could be read by other POLS students. For individual class members

with future graduate school or professional aspirations, portions of your research could serve as writing samples if done well.

As an addendum to each person's research work, you will leave the Capstone with a completed resume/cv and a sample cover letter for future use.