



# Course Syllabus

Winter 2023 Advanced Program Course

## Instructor Information

### **INSTRUCTORS**

**LT GEN (RET.) JAMES DUBIK, US ARMY**

**DR. BRIAN BABCOCK-LUMISH**

**GEN (RET.) JOHN ALLEN, US MARINE CORPS**

## General Information

### Purpose

War uses lives. It ends some and changes others forever. This is true not only for those who fight wars, but also for the innocent who get caught up in wars, the families and communities who send their loved ones to war, and the political community on whose behalf wars are fought and waged. War's moral landscape involves all of this, and more.

There's a lot to talk about. On one hand, understanding the moral landscape of war fully and completely is not possible in 4 days. On the other hand, we can describe the landscape and its "key terrain features" so that you can continue your study using a proper "map." That's all this course is designed to do: provide a framework of understanding that you can use to further your study.

We'll start with one of war's central features: killing and risking life. We'll try to understand this aspect of war and its impact on those who return from war as well as on those awaiting their return. Then we'll ask two of the three basic questions: (1) what justifies asking this much of one's citizens—who-become soldiers (shorthand for sailors, marines, airmen); what justifies resort to the killing and destruction that occurs in war? (2) how can the killing and destruction be limited or contained—if it can. We will not discuss (3) how can a war end in a way that gives meaning to death and destruction and prevents the seeds of another war from being sown? This is an important question, but we just don't have enough time. Maybe this is another advanced course? We'll see.

This is a Hertog War Studies Advanced Course, so yes, there's a lot of reading to do and digest. We encourage you to do as much of the reading beforehand as possible. The way, in the evenings before the next day's class, you can re-read for more depth as you prepare.

I have added optional readings from the Law of Armed Conflict. Scan these to see the considerable overlap between the moral and legal dimensions of war. Our primary focus is the moral landscape, however.

Since we're going to describe the moral landscape of war, don't forget to review your Clausewitz. You can't understand war's moral landscape without first understanding war. You would think that is obvious, but it's not—as we will see. We'll describe the landscape from the American perspective. We'll use Michael

# Hertog War Studies Program



Walzer and Brian Orend as our “base case” because it represents the mainstream of just war thinking in the US. Walzer and Orend, for make more universal claims about morality in general and just war theory. We won’t. Our intent is narrower: understanding the moral landscape of war as American citizens and political leader generally see it, as a reflection of their expectations of political leaders during war as well as commanders and soldiers whom they send to war. This will be hard enough.

## Course Materials

### Required Materials

*Readings are on Microsoft Teams or provided in the books below.*

### Books

1. Gregory A. Coco, *A Strange and Blighted Land: Gettysburg and the Aftermath of a Battle*. Savas Beatie, 2017.
2. James M. Dubik, *Just War Reconsidered: Strategy, Ethics, and Theory*. University Press of Kentucky, 2016.
3. LTC Dave Grossman, *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*. Revised ed., Back Bay Books, 2009.
4. Jonathan Shay, M.D., PhD: *Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character*. Simon & Schuster, 1995.
5. Nancy Sherman, *Afterwar: Healing the Moral Wounds of Our Soldiers*. Oxford University Press, 2015.
6. Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. 5th ed, Basic Books, 2015.

<b>Lesson 1</b>	<b>February 17th</b>
<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION &amp; FRAMEWORK OF TRADITIONAL JUST WAR THEORY   THE EXPERIENCE OF WAR</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<p><i>Morning</i></p> <p>Introduction, the framework of traditional just war theory, and the structure of the course.</p> <p><i>Afternoon</i></p> <p>“The dead soldier takes his misery with him, but the man who killed him must forever live and die with him.” The experience of war is multi-faceted, paradoxical, stark, and permanent. Releasing the dogs of war entails a certain loss of control over where those dogs roam and who is affected by their release. War is one of the perfect examples of the law of unintended consequences.</p>
<b>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS</b>	<p><i>Afternoon</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What makes killing another human being so consequential, and how are those consequences made manifest? Can the “lack of enthusiasm” for killing or “the burden of killing” one’s fellow human being be overcome? All, part? How? How may distance be related to killing and its consequences?</li> <li>2. What is involved with the “massive unconscious cover-up”—“the actualities of war”—concerning the true nature of combat: individually and communally? Why is it “too painful for society to address what it does when it sends its young men and women” to war?</li> <li>3. What are the “psychological prices of war?” Who pays this price, how, when—what is “leader’s guilt” and why is this guilt paradoxical? How do the authors explain “war on the mind,” “fear of death,” the “weight of exhaustion,” and war’s “impact on the senses”? How do they explain PTSD? Of what does a soldier’s “well of fortitude” consist? How is it replenished, if it can be?</li> <li>4. How do Shay’s and Grossman’s accounts match? Where do they coincide? Where do they differ?</li> </ol>
<b>READINGS</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LTC Dave Grossman, <i>On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society</i>.</li> <li>• Jonathan Shay, M.D., PhD: <i>Achilles in Vietnam: Combat Trauma and the Undoing of Character</i>. Chapters 1-3, 5-6, 9, 10-11.</li> </ul>

## Lesson 2

February 18th

### TOPIC

THE EXPERIENCE OF WAR CONT | JUSTIFICATION FOR GOING TO WAR

### DESCRIPTION

*Afternoon*

What justifies asking such a sacrifices of citizens-who-become-soldiers, of their families and communities, and of the political community at large? *Jus ad bellum*: justifications and criteria for going to war. The first point where the moral and the strategic merge.

A Civil War general once said, “There are many who speak lightly of war as a mere heroic sport. They would hardly find it in their hearts to do so had they ever witnessed scenes [of war]. **A war brought on without the most absolute necessity is the greatest and most unpardonable of crimes.**” Quoted from Gregory A. Coco, *A Strange and Blighted Land: Gettysburg and the Aftermath of a Battle*.

### DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

*Morning*

1. How does Coco’s description of post-battle Gettysburg match Grossman’s and Shary’s account of war? Be specific: relate particular descriptions and passages to one another.
2. In what ways is Sherman’s account different from Grossman’s and Shay’s? In what ways does Sherman build upon Grossman’s and Shay’s accounts? What is the difference between PTSD and “moral injury” for Sherman?
3. What is “moral injury”? Who or what is injured? How? Why and in what ways are relationships so important in Sheman’s account? How can a returning soldier be both alive and dead? Can soldiers be “reborn,” if so how? How does Sherman define “resilience”? To whom does she apply the concept?
4. How is Sherman’s “waves of resentment” related to Shay’s “betrayal,” if at all? Why is “thank you for your service” not enough? What is “enough”? How might Sherman describe the relationship between soldiers and the political community on whose behalf they fight? What obligations does each have to the other? Why, what is the source of this obligation?

*Afternoon*

1. What is **Walzer**’s legalist paradigm? How does he argue for this paradigm? What are his exceptions, and why does he include these exceptions?
2. What are **Orend**’s criteria for a just war? What is the difference, for Orend, between classical and non-classical war?
3. In what ways do Walzer’s and Orend’s approach overlap? In what ways do they differ?
4. What is **Weigel**’s approach to justifying ware? Is it substantially different from Walzer’s and Orend’s? If so, how and what difference does it make? If not, why not?

---

**READINGS***Morning*

- Gregory A. Coco, *A Strange and Blighted Land: Gettysburg and the Aftermath of a Battle*. Chapters 1 and 2, and pages 149-189 of Chapter 3.
- Nancy Sherman, *Afterwar: Healing the Moral Wounds of Our Soldiers*. The Prologue, Chapters 1-2 and 4-6.

*Afternoon*

- Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. Part Two: The Theory of Aggression. Chapters 4-7. Walzer's Legalist Paradigm and its exceptions.
  - Brian Orend, *The Morality of War*. Chapters 1-2. *Just ad Bellum*, resisting aggression in classical and non-classical wars.
  - George Weigel, "Moral Clarity in a Time of War," *First Things*, January 2003.
  - OPTIONAL: Scan to pick up the overlap between the moral and legal perspectives. Geoffrey S. Corn, et.al., *The Law of Armed Conflict: An Operational Approach*. Chapters 3-4. The Law of Armed Conflict: what triggers it, what are its principles and foundations.
-

## Lesson 3

## February 19th

### TOPIC

### FIGHTING WARS | WAGING WARS

### DESCRIPTION

#### *Morning*

Fighting Wars: The tactical and operational perspectives of war's conduct. How do commanders "use" soldiers' lives well even as they pursue their wartime tasks and aim at battlefield success, *Jus in bello*'s answer.

#### *Afternoon*

Waging Wars: War's conduct, the strategic perspective. How do senior political and military leaders "use" soldiers well, *Jus in bello*'s answer. The second point where the moral and the strategic merge.

### DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

#### *Morning*

1. What is Walzer's War Convention? How does he argue for it? Upon what assumptions does his position rest? Are these assumptions all stated? If so, be prepared to describe them. If not, be prepared to fill in what they are.
2. What is Walzer's "theory of responsibility?" How do you assess the completeness and accuracy of this theory?
3. What parts of Walzer's position does Orend accept? What parts does he modify or change?

#### *Afternoon*

1. What is the gap in *jus in bello* that Dubik claims to have found? What does this gap matter? If it does, explain how. If it doesn't, explain why. How does Dubik fill that gap?
2. The principles that govern *jus in bello*'s strategic dimension are different from those Walzer and Orend say govern war's tactical dimension. How and why do they differ? Are these principles solely moral principles? If so, why? If not, what does that mean, if anything?
3. What is the relationship, if any, between Shay's concept of "betrayal," and Dubik's ideas on the four important, morally relevant relationships? How might Sherman assess Dubik's four relationships?

### READINGS

#### *Morning*

- Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations*. Part Three: The War Convention. Chapters 8-9. Part Four: Dilemmas of War. Chapters 14 and 16. Part Five: The Question of Responsibility. Chapters 18-19.
- Brian Orend, *The Morality of War*. Chapters 4-5. Conduct in war.
- OPTIONAL: Scan sufficiently to pick up the overlap between the moral and legal perspectives. Geoffrey S. Corn, et.al., *The Law of Armed Conflict: An Operational Approach*. Chapters 5-10 and 13-14. The law governing the conduct of war, command responsibility, and compliance mechanisms.

---

*Afternoon*

- James M. Dubik, *Just War Reconsidered: Strategy, Ethics, and Theory*. The Prologue and Chapters 1-2, and 6. *Jus in bello*'s war-waging dimension.
-

## Lesson 4

February 20th

<b>TOPIC</b>	<b>CIVIL-MILITARY DECISIONMAKING   WRAP UP &amp; MORAL VS LEGAL ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS</b>
<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<p><i>Morning</i></p> <p>Understanding the civil-military “dialogue” and its part in the decision to go to war and in the conduct of war: a third point where the moral and the strategic merge.</p> <p><i>Afternoon</i></p> <p>Wrap up. One of the main differences in the moral and legal dimensions of war is enforcement.</p>
<b>DISCUSSION QUESTIONS</b>	<p><i>Morning</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. What is the main dilemma in the civil-military relationship for Huntington? What are the main elements of Feaver’s, Cohen’s, and Dubik’s description of a proper civil-military relationship and the dialogue that this relationship should produce?</li><li>2. Where do each overlap? Where do each differ? How is each related to Huntington’s dilemma?</li><li>3. What does Moten contribute to this discussion? What would Clausewitz say about each, if anything?</li></ol>
<b>READINGS</b>	<p><i>Morning</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Eliot Cohen, <i>Supreme Command: Soldiers, Statesmen, and Leadership in Wartime</i>. Chapters 1, 6-7. Understanding the unequal dialogue.</li><li>• Peter Feaver, <i>Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight, and Civil-Military Relations</i>. Chapters 1, 3-4.</li><li>• James M. Dubik, <i>Just War Reconsidered: Strategy, Ethics, and Theory</i>. Chapters 3-5.</li><li>• Matthew Moten, <i>Presidents &amp; Their Generals: An American History of Command in War</i>. Introduction and Conclusion.</li></ul> <p><i>Afternoon</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• No further readings.</li></ul>