INR 6065 - Seminar on War

Section: DW60

College of Sciences

School of Politics, Security, and Intl Affairs

Course Information

Term: Summer 2025
Class Meeting Days: ASC
Class Meeting Location: Online
Modality: WW
Credit Hours: 3

Instructor Information

Thomas Dolan
Title: Associate Professor
Office Location: HPH 314
Email: Thomas.Dolan@ucf.edu

Course Description

INR 6065 COS-POLS 3(3,0) Seminar on War: PR: Admission to degree-seeking program or C.I. Examination of theories and empirical evidence locating the cause of war at the systemic, state, and individual levels of analysis. Occasional.

Although major war has declined in frequency, war remains an important element of international politics. This course examines the nature of war as a military and political process, using classic texts, historical works, prescriptive manuals, and modern social science.

Student Learning Outcomes

After successful completion of this course, students will be able to:

- Understand the classical, prescriptive, and social scientific literature on war
- Be more able to do social scientific research on war-oriented topics
- Present and write more effectively

Required Course Materials and Resources

On War
Authors: Carl von Vluasewitz. Michael Howard and Peter Paret, Ed/Trans.

Killer Angels
Authors: Michael Shaara

Other readings available through the library/webcourses page

Course Assessment and Grading Procedure

Assignments

Research Design: 32%. 15 pages, double-spaced.
Students will write a term paper using either the research design model or the conventional wisdom model. See the Term Paper assignment page for more details.

Article Presenter: 15%

- Create and post by 23:59 on the Saturday before your week begins a narrated slide presentation (e.g. powerpoint) lasting not more than 5 minutes which effectively communicates the core elements of the text. For a social scientific article, your presentation should describe the question, the text's place in the literature, its theory, methods, and findings, along with a critical evaluation of the text. (*N.b.*, do not describe the article, communicate the arguments, theory, feedings, etc. of the article. There's a difference.) For a classic text that makes an argument or describes a method of doing something, be sure to effectively describe the author's task and explain how they execute that task (including a

full discussion of the substance they present); again, include a critical evaluation of the text. *Please note that it can take a while for powerpoint to save the video file combining voice and slides. For technical assistance (for powerpoint) see* https://goo.gl/PC6Sbp

- By 23:59 on Wednesday, respond to all questions that have been posed by fellow students by 23:59 on Monday (if fewer than 5 are posted contact instructor).
- Sign up for the texts that you would like to present during week 1.

Staff Ride Role Presentation: 10%
During Week 2, each student will be assigned a role to present in the Week 5 (virtual) Staff Ride. They will prepare a 3-5 minute narrated powerpoint presentation on what the person that they are representing did during the battle, and why. They will respond to questions from other students about why the person they are representing behaved as they did.

Weekly Papers: 3% per paper, 1 paper per week (totaling 9 Papers) = 27%
With the exception of the first week, by 23:59 on Monday, each student will post two 400-500 word papers per week, in response to the posted prompts. One of these papers will be turned in for grading by 9:00 AM on Fridays. [The other paper is factored into the participation grade.] Students should use the comments they receive on their papers to identify the stronger paper, and take advantage of those comments improve the paper—the final version, turned in for grading, should be a substantial revision of the draft that they posted on Monday.

- During the first week, each student will be responsible for posting (by 23:59 on Wednesday only one paper, which will be submitted for grading by 23:59 on Saturday.
- While students will be able to see other students' papers after their initial posts, they should take care to not duplicate others' papers.

Weekly Participation: 2% per week, with the lowest week dropped = 16%
With the exception of the first week, the staff ride week, and week 6, each student is responsible for asking one question about two different readings and making two constructive comments on other students' papers (both comments cannot be made in response papers addressing the same prompt). During the first week, students will be responsible for making two critical, constructive comments on other students' papers. During Staff Ride week, each student will ask question to at least 3 role-players, and critical, constructive comments on two papers (again, not all comments can be made in response to papers addressing a single prompt). The lowest weekly participation

grade will be dropped. During week 6, in addition to asking 3 questions and making 3 critical constructive posts, you will complete the tactics activity.

- Participation is graded in terms of the aggregate quality and timeliness of posted questions, prompts, and papers.

Note: See appendix at end of syllabus for advice on posts.

Weekly Course Activity Pattern

Weekly Course Activity Pattern

Week 1 Deadlines

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			23:59 +All week paper addressing the nature of war		**23:59 PM** +All make comments on two other peoples' papers by this point.	**23:59** + All turn in 1 paper for grading +Article presenters post presentations for next week by this point

Typical Week Deadlines

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	23:59 + All post Papers to discussion board by this point		**23:59** +All post comments on others' papers by this point		**9:00 AM** +All turn in 1 paper for grading	**23:59** Article presenters post presentations for next week

	+ All post response questions on presentation pages by this point		+Article Presenters post answers to questions by this point		by this point	

Staff Ride Week Deadlines (Week 5)

Saturday of Week 4	Sunday (of week 5)	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday o week 5
23:59 All post Staff Ride Presentations by this point		**23:59** + All post Papers to discussion board by this point + All post response Questions on presentation pages by this point		**23:59** +All post comments on others' papers by this point +(All) Role Players post answers to questions by this point		**9:00 AM** +All turn in 1 paper for grading by this point	**23:59** Article presenters presentati for next w

Grading Scale

Grades
Grades are assigned to both individual pieces of work and cumulatively. The grade scale I use for both is below (note that "g" refers to the numerical grade you receive). I do not usually curve grades, but reserve the right to do so if I deem it necessary. All material is graded on its own terms, rather than through comparison with other students' work. For the cumulative grades, I do not round: what you get is what you get.

100>g≥93: A	90>g≥88: B+	80>g≥78: C+	70>g≥68: D+	60>g: E
	88>g≥83: B	78>g≥73: C	68>g≥63: D	
93>g≥90: A-	83>g≥80: B-	73>g≥70: C-	63>g≥60: D-	

Policies for Course Grade

Missed/Late Assignments

Assignments can be turned in after they are due, but they may be subject to late penalties of up to 5% per day, losing up to 40%

Course Accessibility

The University of Central Florida is committed to providing access and inclusion for all persons with disabilities. Students with disabilities who need access to course content due to course design limitations should contact the professor as soon as possible. Students should also connect with Student Accessibility Services (SAS) (Ferrell Commons 185, sas@ucf.edu, phone 407-823-2371). For students connected with SAS, a Course Accessibility Letter may be created and sent to professors, which informs faculty of potential course access and accommodations that might be necessary and reasonable. Determining reasonable access and accommodations requires consideration of the course design, course learning objectives and the individual academic and course barriers experienced by the student. Further conversation with SAS, faculty and the student may be warranted to ensure an accessible course experience.

Academic Integrity

Students should familiarize themselves with UCF's Code of Conduct at Student Conduct and Integrity Office. According to Section 1, "Academic Misconduct," students are prohibited from engaging in:

a. Academic misconduct is defined as any submitted work or behavior that obstructs the instructor of record's ability to accurately assess the student's understanding or completion of the course

materials or degree requirements (e.g., assignment, quiz, and/or exam). Examples of academic misconduct include but are not limited to: plagiarism, unauthorized assistance to complete an academic exercise; unauthorized communication with others during an examination, course assignment, or project; falsifying or misrepresenting academic work; providing misleading information to create a personal advantage to complete course/degree requirements; or multiple submission(s) of academic work without permission of the instructor of record.

b. Any student who knowingly helps another violate academic behavior standards is also in violation of the standards.

c. Commercial Use of Academic Material. Selling of course material to another person and/or uploading course material to a third-party vendor without authorization or without the express written permission of the University and the instructor of record. Course materials include but are not limited to class notes, the instructor of record's slide deck, tests, quizzes, labs, instruction sheets, homework, study guides, and handouts.

d. Soliciting assistance with academic coursework and/or degree requirements. The solicitation of assistance with an assignment, lab, quiz, test, paper, etc., without authorization of the instructor of record or designee is prohibited. This includes but is not limited to asking for answers to a quiz, trading answers, or offering to pay another to complete an assignment. It is considered Academic Misconduct to solicit assistance with academic coursework and/or degree requirements, even if the solicitation did not yield actual assistance (for example, if there was no response to the solicitation).

Responses to Academic Dishonesty, Plagiarism, or Cheating

Students should also familiarize themselves with the procedures for academic misconduct in UCF's student handbook, *The Golden Rule*. UCF faculty members have a responsibility for students' education and the value of a UCF degree, and so seek to prevent unethical behavior and respond to academic misconduct when necessary. Penalties for violating rules, policies, and instructions within this course can range from a zero on the exercise to an "F" letter grade in the course. In addition, an Academic Misconduct report could be filed with the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity, which could lead to disciplinary warning, disciplinary probation, or deferred suspension or separation from the University through suspension, dismissal, or expulsion with the addition of a "Z" designation on one's transcript.

Being found in violation of academic conduct standards could result in a student having to disclose such behavior on a graduate school application, being removed from a leadership position within a student organization, the recipient of scholarships, participation in University activities such as study abroad, internships, etc.

Let's avoid all of this by demonstrating values of honesty, trust, and integrity. No grade is worth compromising your integrity and moving your moral compass. Stay true to doing the right thing: take the zero, not a shortcut.

Title IX

Title IX prohibits sex discrimination, including sexual misconduct, sexual violence, sexual harassment, and retaliation. If you or someone you know has been harassed or assaulted, you can find resources available to support the victim, including confidential resources and information concerning reporting options at Let's Be Clear and UCF Cares.

For more information on access and community engagement, Title IX, accessibility, or UCF's complaint processes contact:

- Title IX – OIE – Office of Institutional Equity & askanadvocate@ucf.edu
- Disability Accommodation – Student Accessibility Services – Student Accessibility Services & sas@ucf.edu
- Access and Community Engagement (including the Ginsberg Center for Inclusion and Community Engagement, Military and Veteran Student Success, and HSI Initiatives)
- UCF Compliance and Ethics Office – Compliance, Ethics, and Risk Office & complianceandethics@ucf.edu
- The Ombuds Office is a safe place to discuss concerns.

Reporting an Incident or Issue

If you believe you have experienced abusive or discriminatory behavior by any faculty or staff member, contact the Office of Institutional Equity online or at 407-823-1336. You can also choose to report using the UCF Integrity Line and can report anonymously or as yourself at 1-855-877-6049 or using the online form. UCF cares about you and takes every report seriously. For more information see the Reporting an Incident or Issue Webpage.

Deployed Active-Duty Military Students

Students who are deployed active duty military and/or National Guard personnel and require accommodation should contact their instructors as soon as possible after the semester begins and/or after they receive notification of deployment to make related arrangements.

Campus Safety

At UCF Public Safety and Police, safety is the top priority. Emergencies on campus are rare, but if one should arise, it's important to be familiar with some basic safety and security concepts.

- In an emergency, always dial 911.
- Every UCF classroom has an **Emergency Procedure Guide** posted on a wall near the door, which will show you how to respond to a variety of situations. This guide can also be found online here.
- In the event of an active threat, remember **AVOID, DENY, DEFEND**. Choose the best course of action and act immediately. Watch the video here to learn more.
    - **AVOID**. Pay attention to your surroundings and have an exit plan. Get as much distance and as many barriers between you and the threat as quickly as possible.
    - **DENY.** When avoiding is difficult or impossible, deny the threat access to you and your space. Lockdown by creating barriers, turning the lights off and remaining quiet and out of sight. Make sure your cell phone is silenced, but do not turn it off.
    - **DEFEND.** When you are unable to put distance between yourself and the threat, be prepared to protect yourself. Commit to your actions, be aggressive and do not fight fairly. Do whatever it takes to survive.
- For emergencies on campus, UCF will utilize the UCF Alert system. All UCF students, faculty and staff are automatically enrolled to receive these email and text alerts, however, it's a good idea to frequently ensure your contact information is up to date.

Financial Aid Accountability

All instructors/faculty are required to document students' academic activity at the beginning of each course. In order to document that you began this course, please complete this activity by the end of the first week of classes or as soon as possible after adding the course. Failure to do so may result in a delay in the disbursement of your financial aid.

Class Schedule

Schedule of Readings

Week 1: What is War? *Note: Week 1 begins on 17 May and ends on 22 May.*
Clausewitz, *On* War, Book 1, Chapters 1, 2, and Book 8
Recommended:
John Keegan, *A History of Warfare*, selection
Quincy Wright, *A Study of War*, selection
Jack Snyder, "Anarchy and Culture: Insights from the Anthropology of War," *International Organization* 56:1, pp. 7-45.
Thomas Schelling, *On Conflict*
R. Harrison Wagner, *War and The State*

Thomas Rid, “Cyber-War will not Take Place,” *Journal of Strategic Studies.* 2011, and responses in *Journal of Strategic Studies’* 2013 “Cyber Round-table,” in Vol. 34, Issue 1
Erik Gartzke, The Myth of Cyberwar, *International Security* 2014.

Week 2: Proximate Causes of War

Fearon, J. (1995) “Rationalist Expectations for War,” *International Organization*.49:3, pp. 379-414.
Branislav Slantchev and Ahmer Tarar, “Mutual Optimism as a Rationalist Explanation for War,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2010
Rachel Stein, “War and Revenge,” *American Political Science Review*, 2015
Ahsan I. Butt, “Why did the US Invade Iraq in 2003?” *Security Studies*, 2019
Todd Hall, “On Provocation,” *Security Studies*, 2016.

Recommended:
Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War*, 1973
Stephen van Evera, Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War, *International Security*, 1998.
Hein Goemans and Mark Fey, Risky but Rational: War as an Institutionally Induced Gamble." *Journal of Politics.* Vol. 71, Issue 1, (January) 2009: 35-54.
Peter Lieberman, “Punitiveness and US Elite Support for the 1991 Gulf War” *Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 51, #1* (February 2007), pp. 3-32.
N. Sambanis, Do Ethnic and Non-ethnic Civil Wars Have the Same Causes?: A Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry (Part 1) The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 45, No. 3 (Jun., 2001), pp. 259-282
Johnston, D. (2004) *Overconfidence and War*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Alastair Smith and Allan Stam, “Bargaining and the Nature of War,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2004.
Muhammet Bas and Robrt Schub, “Mutual Optimism as a Cause of Conflict: Secret Alliances and Conflict Onset,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 2016
Thomas M. Dolan, “Demanding the Impossible,” *Security Studies*, 2015
Andrew Little and Thoms Zeitzoff, “A Bargaining Theory of Conflict with Evolutionary Preferences,” *International Organization*, 2017.
Jonathan Renshon, “Status Deficits and War,” *International Organization*, 2016
Barry Posen, Putin’s Preventive War, *International Security*, 2025
Derek Bolton, Security, Society, and the Perennial Struggles over the Sacred, *International Organization*, 2024.
Dominic Tierney, The Iron Dice: Fatalism and War, *International Security*, 2024.

Week 3: Strategy

Clausewitz, *On War*, Book 1, Ch 7; Book 3, Ch 1, 11; Book 6: Ch 3-8; Book 7: Ch 1-6, 15, 16, 22
Sun Tsu, *The Art of War* (any version, including those online)
Reading from Luttwak, E. (2001) *Strategy: The Logic of Peace and War* (Revised and Enlarged edition). Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
Thomas Schelling. *Strategy of Conflict*. Harvard, 1960. Selection.
Betts, R. (2000) “Is Strategy an Illusion? *International Security*.

Recommended:
Liddell Hart, B. (1954) *Strategy*. New York: Praeger.
Jomini, A. H. *The Art of War*.
Thomas Schelling, *Arms and Influence*.
Alastair Iain Johnston, "Thinking about Strategic Culture," *International Security*, 1995
Jennifer Mitzen, "Illusion or Intention? Talking Grand Strategy into Existence," *Security Studies*, 2015
Erica Lonergran and Michael Poznansky, Competing Visions for US Grand Strategy in Cyberspace, *Security Studies*, 2024
Heidi Demarest, Tyler Jost and Robert Schub. Bureaucracy and Cyber Coercion. *International Studies Quarterly*, 2024

Week 4: The Practice of War
Julian Corbett, *Some Principles of Maritime Strategy*. Part II, "Theory of Naval War," available at http://www.gutenberg.org/files/15076/15076-h/15076-h.htm
Mao, *On Guerilla Warfare*. [Available online in a variety of places]
Mearsheimer, J. (1984) *Conventional Deterrence*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. (selection)
Robert Pape, *Bombing to Win*, 1996 (selection) AND R. Pape, "The True Worth of Air Power," *Foreign Affairs*. March 2004.
John Nagl, *Learning to eat Soup with a Knife*, Chicago, 2002. (selection)
Austin Long and Brendan Green, "Stalking the Secure Second Strike: Intelligence, Counterforce, and Nuclear Strategy," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 2015.
Nadiya Kostyuk and Erik Gartzke. Fighting in Cyberspace. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2023.

Recommended:
Avi Goldfarb and Jon Lindsay. Prediction and Judgment: Why AI Increases the Importance of Humans in War. *International Security*, 2022.
Anthony King, Robot War. *Journal of Strategic Studies.* 2023.
Ivan Oelrich et al., Anti-Satellite Warfare, Proliferated Satellites, and the future of Space-based Military Surveillance. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 2024.
Marcel Pilchta and Ash Rossiter. A One-war Attack Drone Revolution? *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 2024
Dominika Kunertova, The War In Ukraine shows the Game-Changing Effects of Drones Depend on the Game. *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, 2023.
Nadia Kostyuk and Yuri Zhukov, Indivisible Digital Front: Can Cyber Attacks Shape Battlefield Events?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2019
Peter Paret, ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy*, Princeton, 1986.
Owen Cote, *The Third Battle: Innovation in the Navy's Silent Cold War Struggle with Soviet Submarines*. Newport: Paper #16, US Naval War College Press, 2003.
Bernard Brodie, *Sea Power in the Machine Age*, 1943
Tami Davis Biddle, *Rhetoric and Reality in Air Warfare*, Princeton University Press, 2002.
US Strategic Bombing Survey, Summary Reports, 1945-46
Arreguin-Toft, "How the Weak Win Wars" *International Security*, 2001
D. Reiter and M. Horowitz, "When Does Aerial Bombing Work? Quantitative Empirical Tests, 1917-1999", *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45:2 (2001)
D. Scott Bennett and Allan C. Stam III, The Duration of Interstate Wars, 1816-1985, *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 90, No. 2 (Jun., 1996)
Andrew Mack, "Why Big Nations Lose Small Wars," *World Politics*, 1975

Patricia Sullivan and Johannes Karreth, “Strategies and Tactics in Armed Conflict,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2019
Trinquier, R. (1965) *Modern Warfare*.
US Army Field Manual FM 100-5, Operations, 1982
US Army/US Marine Corps Counter-Insurgency Manual, FM 3-24
Albert J. Marckwardt and Michael Burgoyne, *The Defense of Jisr al-Doreaa*. and E.D. Swinton, *Defense of Duffers Drift*
E. Rommel, *Infantry Attacks*.
Michael Horowtiz, Sarah Kreps and Matthew Fuhrmann, “Separating Fact from Fiction in the Debate over Drone Proliferation,” *International Security*, 2018
Providing for the Common Defense: The Assessment and Recommendations of the National Defense Strategy Commission, Eric Edelman and Gary Roughead, Co-Chairs. 2018. https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/2018-11/providing-for-the-common-defense.pdf
Herman Kahn, *On Thermonuclear War*, Princeton, 1960.
R. Harrison Wagner, Nuclear Deterrence, Counterforce Strategies, and the Incentive to Strike First. *American Political Science Review*, 1991

Week 5: Virtual Staff Ride Gettysburg
Michael Shaara, *The Killer Angels* [ALL]

Week 6: Military Power
*Do Tactics Assignment, and post answer on relevant discussion page.
Stephen Biddle, *Military Power*, Princeton, 2006 (selection)
Kenneth Pollock, *Arabs at War*, Nebraska, 2002 (selection)
Michael Beckley, “Economic Development and Military Effectiveness,” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 2010.
Stephen Biddle and John Severini, Military Effectiveness and Naval Warfare, *Security Studies*, 2024
Ryan Grauer, “Uncertain Victory: Information Management and Military Power,” *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 2017
Jason Lyall and Yuri Zhukov, Fratricidal Coercion in Modern War, *International Organization*, 2025.

Recommended:
Dan Reiter and Allan Stam, Democracy and Battlefield Miltiary Effectiveness, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1998.
David Lake, Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War, *American Political Science Review*, 1992.
Dan Reiter and Allan Stam, Democracy, War Initiation, and Victory, *American Political Science Review*, 1998
Stephen Biddle and Stephen Long, Democracy and Military Effectiveness, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2004.
Alexander Downes, How Smart and Tough are Democracies? Reassessing Theories of Democratic Victory in War. *International Security*, 2009
Caitlin Talmadge, Different Threats, Different Militaries: Explaining Organizational Practices in Authoritarian Armies. *Security Studies*, 2016.
Bruce Bueno de Mesquita et al., “An Institutional Explanation for the Democratic Peace,” *American Political Science Review*, 1999
Ryan Grauer and Michael Horowitz, “What Determines Military Victory? Testing the Modern System,” *Security Studies*, 2012

Michael Horowitz, *The Diffusion of Military Power*, Princeton, 2011.
Caitlin Talmadge, "The Puzzle of Personalist Performance," *Security Studies*, 2013.

Week 7: Learning and Innovation in War
Scott Gartner, S. (1997) *Strategic Assessment in War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Selection.
Stephen P. Rosen, (1991) *Winning the Next War: Innovation and the Modern Military*, selection
David Welch. (2005) *Painful Choices*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Selection
Thomas M. Dolan, "Go Big or Go Home," *International Studies Quarterly*, 2015
Alex Weisiger, "Learning from the Battlefield," *International Organization*, 2016.
Todd Lehmann and Yuri Zhukov, "Until the Bitter End? The Diffusion of Surrender Across Battles," *International Organization*, 2019

Recommendation
Jonathan D. Caverley, The Myth of Military Myopia: Democracy, Small Wars, and Vietnam," *International* Security, 34, 3 (Winter, 2009/2010)
Thomas M. Dolan, "Emotions and Strategic Learning in War," *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2015
Dmitry Adamsky, Quo Vadis, Russian Deterrence? Strategic Culture and Coercion Innovations. *International Security*, 2025.

Week 8: War Termination
Hein Goemans, *War and Punishment*, Princeton, 2000. Ch. 1, 2, 4. [Available online via the library website]
Elizabeth Stanley, "Ending the Korean War: The Role of Domestic Coalition Shifts in Overcoming Obstacles to Peace, *International Security*, 34:1 (Summer, 2009)
Slantchev, B. (2003). "The Principle of Convergence in Wartime Negotiations," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4, pp. 621-632.
Patricia Sullivan, *Who Wins? Predicting Strategic Success and Failure in Armed Conflict*, Oxford, 2012, Ch 2-5. [Available online via the library]
Sarah Croco, "The Decider's Dilemma: Leader Culpability, War Outcomes, and Domestic Punishment," *American Political Science Review*, 2011
Shawn Cochran, "Gambling for Resurrection versus Bleeding the Army," *Security Studies*, 2018.

Recommended
Dan Altman, "By Fait Accompli, Not Coercion: How States Wrest Territory from Their Adversaries," *International Studies Quarterly*, 2017
Symposium on War Duration, *Polity* 50:2, 2018
Ikle, F. (1971) *Every War Must End.*
Kecskmeti, P. (1958) *Strategic Surrender*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
Michael Koch and Patricia Sullivan, "Should I Stay or Should I Go? Partisanship, Approval, and the Duration of Major Power Democratic Military Interventions," *Journal of Politics* 2010
Alexandre Debs and H. E. Goemans. 2010. "Regime Type, the Fate of Leaders, and War," *APSR* 104, 3: 2
Shawn T. Cochoran, "The Civil-Military Divide in Protracted Small War," *Armed Forces and Society*, 2014.
Alex Weisiger, *Logics of War*, Cornell, 2013
Dan Reiter, *How Wars End*, Princeton, 2009.

Week 10: The Rules?

Brian Orend, “War,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*,
2005. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/war/
Lazar, Seth. 2017. “Just War Theory: Revisionists versus Traditionalists,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20:4, 37-54.
James Morrow, “When Do States follow the Laws of War?” *American Political Science Review*, 2007.
Nina Tannenwald, “The Nuclear Taboo,” *International Organization*, 1999
Scott Sagan and Benjamin Valentino, “Revisiting Hiroshima in Iran: What Americans Really Think about Using Nuclear Weapons and Killing Non-combatants,” *International Security*, 2017.
Charli Carpenter, Alexander Montgomery, and Alexandria Nylen. Breaking Bad? How Survey Experiments Prime Americans for War Crimes. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2021.
Joseph O’Mahoney. The Ripple Effects of the Illegitimacy of War. *International Studies Quarterly*, 2024.

Recommended:
Scott Sagan and Benjamin Valentino, “Not Just a War Theory: American Public Opinion on Ethics in Combat,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 2018.
Daryl Press, Scott Sagan, and Benjamin Valentino, “Atomic Aversion” Experimental Evidence on Taboos, Traditions, and the Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons,” *American Political Science Review*, 2013.
Richard Price, *The Chemical Weapons Taboo*, Cornell, 1997.
Richard Price, “Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines,” *International Organization*, 1997.
Thomas Dolan, “Unthinkable and Tragic,” *International Organization*, 2013
Vaughn Shannon, Norms are what states make of them: The Political Psychology of Norm Violation,” *International Studies Quarterly*, 2000.
Charli Carptenter and Alexander Montgomery, The Stopping Power of Norms. *International Security*, 2020.
Paul Lushenko, The Moral Legitimacy of Drone Strikes: How the Public forms its Judgments. *Texas National Security Review*, 2022/3.
Jeffrey Legro, Which Norms Matter? Revisiting the “Failure” of Internationalism,” *International Organization*, 1997.
Thomas Dolan, Ultimatums, Bargaining, and the Duty to Preserve Alternatives to War, *European Journal of International Relations*, 2022.

If I had another week…War and the Public
John Mueller, “Presidential Approval from Truman to Johnson,” *APSR*, 1970.
Gelpi, C., P. Feaver, and J. Reifler. (2005/6) “Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq,” *International Security*. 30:3, pp. 7-44.
Matthew A. Baum and Tim Groeling, “Reality Asserts Itself: Public Opinion on Iraq and the Elasticity of Reality,” *International Organization*, 64:3,(2010) pp 443 -479
Scott Gartner, “The Multiple Effects of Casualties on Public Support for War: An Experimental Approach, *American Political Science Review*, 102:1 (2008) pp.95-106.
Adam Berinsky, “Assuming the Costs of War: Events, Elites, and American Public Support for Military Conflict,” *Journal of Politics*, 69:4, (2007) pp. 975-997.
Michael Horowitz and Matthew Levendusky, “Drafting Support for War” Conscription and Mass Support for Warfare,” *The Journal of Politics*, 2011.

Taylor Damann, et al., Women and Men Politicians Response to War: Evidence from Ukraine. *International Organization*, 2024
Suthan Krishnarajan and Jakob Tolstrup, Pre-war experimental evidence that Putin's propaganda elicited strong support for military invasion among Russians, *Science Advances*, 2023.
Janina Dill and Livia Schubiger, Attitudes towards the Use of Force, *American Journal of Political Science, 2021*.

Recommended:
Scott Gartner, Gary Segura, and Michael Wilkening, "All Politics Are Local," *JCR*, 1997.
Douglas Foyle, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Elite Beliefs as a Mediating Variable," *International Studies Quarterly*, 1997.
Douglas Kriner, "Examining Variance in Presidential Approval: The Case of FDR in World War II," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 70:1, (2006), 23-47.
Dominic Johnson and Dominic Tierney, *Failing to Win: Perceptions of Victory and Defeat in International Politics*, Harvard University Press, 2006,
Richard K Herrmann, Philip Tetlock, and Penny Visser, "Mass Public Decisions to Go to War," *APSR*, 1999, 93:3.

Advice on Participation

Key issues for Papers:

- Does the paper have a clear argument, expressed from the very beginning? Is that argument well-founded and persuasive?
- Does it effectively address the prompt?
- Does the paper evince a clear understanding of social science principles?
- Does the paper evince a correct understanding of the readings?
- Has the author taken into account relevant feedback from other students, and possibly the instructor?
- Does the paper engage in evaluative/critical analysis of the weighty matters in the readings?
- Is the paper well-written?

Kinds of questions/comments that receive somewhat lower marks:
- Demonstrates superficial grasp of the material/indicates that the questioner/commenter did not read
- Asks simple definition questions like "how does the author define X" when the answer clearly appears in the text

    - (critical definition questions like ‘given Y, is the author correct to define X in the way that they do?” can be appropriate)
- Asks simple clarifying questions, when the answers are plainly evident in the text
- Asks irrelevant questions
- Asks questions/makes criticisms addressing tangential issues
- Criticizes the author for not doing something irrelevant to the issue they are concerned with
- Comments purely on matters of style or ease of reading.
    - (if a fellow student seems to be having difficulty with writing, a private message could be a generous and appropriate way of helping them.)