

IS 425W: Theories of War & Peace
Department of International Studies and Political Science
Virginia Military Institute

Dr. Aaron Gold

Office hours: MW 0900-1100
Office: 441 Scott Shipp Hall
Email: goldaj@vmi.edu

Fall 2018

Section 1: TR 1050-1205
Section 2: TR 1300-1415
Location: 448 Scott Shipp Hall

Description

This course is dedicated to surveying theories of international relations that seek to explain the central puzzle of war, that it is costly, but nevertheless recurs.¹ It is divided into five broad sections: 1) realism; 2) liberalism; 3) constructivism; 4) rationalist explanations; and 5) conflict processes. This course is taught from the level of an introductory graduate seminar, which means that cadets are required to come to class prepared, ready to critically evaluate the material by asking questions, discussing, analyzing, and applying the author's arguments to the real world.

Required Text

Vasquez, John A. (2012). *What Do We Know About War? Second Edition*. Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Classroom Policies

No tobacco products, food, beverages (except water in a closed container), or gum are allowed. Profanity and racial or gender slurs will not be tolerated. Use of cell phones or smart phones or other electronic devices for non-course-related communication during class is prohibited. Late submission results in ten points per day. Qualified cadets are permitted to take 3.2 cuts with the prior approval of the instructor.

Disabilities and Accommodations

VMI abides by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which mandate reasonable accommodations are provided for all cadets with documented disabilities. If you have a registered disability and may require some type of instructional and/or examination accommodations, please contact me early in the semester so that I can provide or facilitate provision of accommodations you may need. If you have not already done so, you will need to register with the Office of Disabilities Services, the designated office on Post to provide services for cadets with disabilities. The office is located on the 2nd floor of the VMI Health Center. Please call or stop by the office of LTC Jones, Director of Disabilities Services, for more information, 464-7667 or jonesl10@vmi.edu.

¹ Fearon, James D. (1995) Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49(3): 379.

Grading

The requirements for this course include a participation grade (20%), ten short daily summaries (20%), three response papers (30%), and a term paper (30%).

Participation: 20%

Cadets are expected to attend every class period on time, having read the material and ready to make reasonable contributions to the day's topic. This is not a lecture class. It is taught from the level of an introductory graduate seminar, which means cadets are expected to analyze, critique, and discuss the author's work in class with the goal of assessing whether it contributes to our understanding of interstate war. For each reading, one cadet will start the discussion with his or her critique. We will also conduct simulations that will be a part of your participation grade.

Daily Summaries: 20%. Due the day of the assigned reading at the start of class via Canvas. Cadets will write a 150- to 200-word minimum (approx. 1/2 page double-spaced) summary for each reading for ten sets of assigned readings of their choosing. This is solely a descriptive exercise designed to prepare you to take good notes for the term paper and in preparation for participating in class. Follow the other formatting guideline minus the title page: Times New Roman, 12-pt. font, 1-inch margins, in-text citations (no footnotes or endnotes), and a bibliography.

Response Papers: 30% (three for 10% each).

This assignment is intended for you to read, think critically, and then analyze key works in international relations. First, in no more than a paragraph briefly summarize the author's main theoretical argument. The rest of the paper should be your critique. This is not a descriptive exercise. Papers that merely summarize and detail the author's argument beyond the first paragraph will not receive a satisfactory grade. Much of the (latter) IR scholarly research is supplemented by rigorous statistical and game theoretic analyses; however, focus on the author's key theoretical arguments and avoid critiquing decisions about methodological choice and empirical strategy. Remember that the goal is to establish causality through rigorous theorizing, parsimony (simplicity), deduction, generalizability, logical consistency, accuracy, and falsification. Use the following questions to help you write your papers.

Response Paper #1 (Waltz 1979): Due on 9/13 at 2359 via Canvas

Response Paper #2 (Axelrod and Keohane 1985): Due on 10/9 at 2359 via Canvas

Response Paper #3 (Fearon 1995): Due on 11/15 at 2359 via Canvas

- 1) What are the strengths and weaknesses of the theoretical argument?
- 2) How can the argument be improved?
- 3) Does the argument rest on valid theoretical assumptions?
- 4) Is the argument logically consistent? What are the implications of the author's argument? (He/she argues X, therefore we should observe Y; but is that logical?)
- 5) Is there empirical evidence for the author's claims? If not, what evidence falsifies the author's argument? Is the evidence generalizable or just one case that, on average, does not falsify the author's argument?
- 6) Does the argument have policy implications?
- 7) How would you test the argument?

Formatting Guidelines

- 1) Times New Roman, 12-point font, double-spaced, 1-inch margins, and a title page.
- 2) Limit: 600-900 words minimum (approx. 2-3 pages double-spaced). Put the word count on your title page.
- 3) References: In-text citations only (no footnotes or endnotes).

Term Paper: 30%

Proposal Topic: Due on 9/4 at 2359 via Canvas

Rough Draft: Due on 10/16 at 2359 via Canvas

Final Paper: Due on 12/18 at 2359 via Canvas

Cadets will analyze an interstate war from a theoretical perspective from class. The goal of this assignment is: 1) to develop expertise on an interstate war and, 2) to apply your knowledge of international relations theory to critically evaluate the causes of an empirical phenomenon. Pick an interstate war from the choices below as documented by the Correlates of War. This assignment has three due dates. Cadets are required to turn in a proposal, rough draft, and final version. The rough draft is worth 20 out of 100 points on the final paper. I will meet with each cadet to offer suggestions about how to improve their paper after grading the rough drafts. Structure your paper as follows. In the first part, give a historical introduction and description of the war. Who were the important actors (e.g., executives, generals, cabinet members, legislators, publics)? What were the issues and/or events that lead to the war (e.g., regime change, territorial disputes, self-determination, resources)? Lastly, describe the war and what happened; for example, what was the revisionist state, how many people died, how was it fought, what were the most important events or turning points, what was the outcome, did the sides achieve their goals?

In the second part, pick one theory from class, describe it (or the larger debate) and then in simple, clear language, use deductive logic to identify why it best explains the causes of your interstate war. What are its strengths? Does it have assumptions or a level of analysis that provide more accurate explanations (e.g., positivism, systemic theories, domestic politics)? Are there instances where it does not fit or can be improved upon? The best papers will explain why it is the superior explanation as opposed to other theories from class.

Name (Correlates of War)	Side 2	Side 1
Iran-Iraq (1980-1988)	Iraq	Iran
Falkland Islands (1982)	Argentina	UK
War over Lebanon (1982)	Syria	Israel
War over the Aouzou Strip (1986-1987)	Libya	Chad
Sino-Vietnamese Border War (1987)	Vietnam	China
Gulf War (1991)	Iraq	Kuwait, US, Canada, UK, Italy, Morocco, Egypt, Oman, UAE, France, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Syria
Bosnian Independence (1992)	Yugoslavia	Croatia, Bosnia
Azeri-Armenian (1993-1994)	Azerbaijan	Armenia

Cenepa Valley (1995)	Ecuador	Peru
Badme Border (1998)	Ethiopia	Eritrea
War for Kosovo (1999)	Yugoslavia	Turkey, Italy, UK, US, Netherlands, France, Germany
Kargil War (1999)	Pakistan	India
Invasion of Afghanistan (2001-present)*	Afghanistan	Canada, France, UK, US, Australia
Invasion of Iraq (2003-present)*	Iraq	UK, US, Australia

* The Correlates of War project lists Afghanistan as ending initially in 2001 and Iraq as ending in 2003 because after those dates the level violence does not fulfill the threshold (1,000 deaths per year plus other monadic considerations) for the definition of an interstate war. For the purposes of this class, write your paper defining their tenure as listed above.

Formatting Guidelines

- 1) Times New Roman, 12-point font, double-spaced, 1-inch margins, and a title page.
- 2) Limit: 3,000 -3,600 words minimum (approx. 10-12 pages double-spaced). Put the word count on your title page.
- 3) References: 10 legitimate sources minimum (no “wiki” sites), in-text citations only (no footnotes or endnotes), include a bibliography.

Syllabus Alteration

The instructor reserves the right to revise, alter and/or amend this syllabus, as necessary. Students will be notified by email and/or Canvas of any such revisions, alterations, and/or amendments.

Due Dates in One Place

- 8/28: First day of class
9/4: Term Paper Proposal Topic due via Canvas at 2359
9/4: Last day for curriculum and course changes
9/13: Response Paper #1 (Waltz 1979) due via Canvas at 2359
9/14-9/15: 1st Fall Reunion Weekend
10/5-10/7: Fall FTX
10/9: Response Paper #2 (Axelrod and Keohane 1985) due via Canvas at 2359
10/16: Term Paper Rough Draft due via Canvas at 2359
10/19-10/21: Parents Weekend
11/2-11/3: 2nd Fall Reunion Weekend
11/2-11/3: Homecoming Weekend
11/9: Founder's Day (no classes)
11/13: Last day with withdrawal with a W
11/13: Last day to withdrawal with a W and WF (11/13 through seven days prior to the last scheduled class)
11/15: Response Paper #3 (Fearon 1995) due via Canvas at 2359
11/16: Ring Figure
11/16-11/26: Thanksgiving Furlough
12/12: Classes end
12/13: Reading Day
12/18: Term Paper due via Canvas at 2359

**Ten daily summaries are due via Canvas the day of the assigned reading

Course Schedule and Reading Assignments

I. Realism: Classical, Structural, Neo-Classical, and Hierarchical Theories

8/28: Introduction and Review of the Syllabus

- No readings

8/30: Theory Building and Introduction to IR Theory

- Bueno de Mesquita (1985). "Toward a Scientific Understanding of International Conflict: A Personal View." *International Studies Quarterly* 29(2): 121-136.
- Walt, Stephen (1998 Spring). "International Relations: One World, Many Theories." *Foreign Policy*.

9/4: Term Paper Proposal Topic due via Canvas at 2359

9/4: Classical Realism

- Carr, Edward Hallett (1939). *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. New York: Harper & Row, Chapters 5 and 6.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. (1978). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, 5th Edition*, New York: A.A. Knopf, p. 4-15.

9/6: Defensive Realism

- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979) "The Anarchic Structure of World Politics," in *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues, 12th Edition*. Art, Robert J. and Robert Jervis. New Jersey, 2015.

9/11: Defense Realism and the Balance of Power

- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1964). "The Stability of a Bipolar World." *Daedalus* 93(3): 881-909.
- Walt, Stephen M. (1987). "Alliances: Balancing and Bandwagoning," in *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, p. 17-32.

9/13: Response Paper #1, Waltz (1979) due in class via Canvas at 2359

9/13: Offensive Realism

- Mearsheimer, John J. (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Chapter 2.

9/18: Neorealist Critiques I

- Schweller, Randall L. (1994). "Bandwagoning for Profit." *International Security* 19(1): 72-107.
- Powell, Robert (1994). "Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate." *International Organization* 48(2): 313-344.

9/20: Neorealist Critiques II

- Rose, Gideon. (1998). "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy." *World Politics* 51(1): 144-172.

- Legro, Jeffrey W. and Andrew Moravcsik (1999). "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24(2): 5-55.

Meet on Wed, 9/26 not Tues, 9/25: Power Transition Theory

- Lemke, Douglas and Jacek Kugler (1996) Chapter 1: The Evolution of the Power Transition Perspective. *Parity and War: Evaluations and Extensions of The War Ledger*. Kugler, Jacek and Douglas Lemke (eds.).
- DiCicco, Jonathan M., and Jack S. Levy (1999). "Power Shifts and Problem Shifts: The Evolution of the Power Transition Research Program." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43(6): 675-704.

9/27: Hegemonic and Great Power Wars

- Gilpin, Robert (1998). "The Theory of Hegemonic War." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4): 591-613.
- Rasler, Karen and William R. Thompson (1994). *The Great Powers and Global Struggle, 1490-1990*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, Chapters 1 and 2.

II. Liberalism and Neoliberal Institutionalism

10/2: Neoliberal Institutionalism

- Jervis, Robert (1978). "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 30(2): 167-214.
- Axelrod, Robert and Robert O. Keohane (1985) *Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions*. *World Politics* 38(1): 226-254.

10/4: Neoliberal Institutionalism Applications

- Ikenberry, G. John (1999) "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order." *International Security* 23(3): 43-78.
- Ruggie, John (1982). "International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order." *International Organization* 36(2).

10/9: Response Paper #2, Axelrod and Keohane (1985) due in class via Canvas at 2359

10/9: Critiques of Neoliberal Institutionalism

- Mearsheimer, John (1994). "The False Promise of International Institutions." *International Security* 13(3): 5-49.
- Keohane, Robert and Lisa Martin (1995). "The Promise of Institutional Theory." *International Security* 20(1): 39-51.

10/11: The Democratic Peace

- Fearon, James D. (1994). "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes." *American Political Science Review* 88(3): 577-92.
- Maoz, Zeev and Bruce Russett (1993). "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986." *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 624-638.

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith (1999). "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791-807.

10/16: Term Paper Rough Draft due via Canvas at 2359

10/16: Critiques of the Democratic Peace

- Vasquez, Chapters 9 and 10

III. Constructivism, Feminism, and Marxism

10/18: Constructivism

- Wendt, Alexander (1992) Anarchy Is What States Make of It. *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues, 12th Edition*. Art, Robert J. and Robert Jervis. New Jersey, 2015.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. (1998) "The Constructive Turn in International Relations Theory." *World Politics* 50(2): 324-348

10/23: Constructivism Applications

- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink (1998). "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52(4): 887-918.
- Tannenwald, Nina (1999). "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use." *International Organization* 53(3): 433-468.

10/25: Feminism

- Tickner, J. Ann (1992). *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, Chapter 2.

10/30: Liberal, Difference, and Postmodern Feminism

- Goldstein, Joshua (2001). *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the World System and Vice Versa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 1.

11/1: Marxism

- Teschke, Benno (2010). "Chapter 9: Marxism," in *Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

IV. Misperception, Bargaining, and Rationality

11/6: Misperception

- Jervis, Robert (1988). "War and Misperception." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4).
- Levy, Jack (1983). "Misperception and the Causes of War: Theoretical Linkages and Analytical Problems." *World Politics* 36(1).

11/8: Bargaining

- Schelling, Thomas C. (1960). *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, Chapter 2.

11/13: Rationalist Explanations

- Fearon, James D. (1995) Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.

11/15: Response Paper #3, Fearon (1995) due in class via Canvas at 2359

11/15: Resolve

- Kertzer, Joshua D. (2016) *Resolve in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapters 1 and 2.

V. Conflict Processes

11/29: Territory

- Vasquez, Chapter 1.
- **Skim**. Frederick, Bryan A., Paul R. Hensel, and Christopher Macaulay (2017) “The Issue Correlates of War Territorial Claims Data, 1816–20011.” *Journal of Peace Research* 54(1): 99-108.
- **Skim**. Gibler, Douglas M. (2017). “What They Fight For: Specific Territorial Issues in Militarized Interstate Disputes, 1816–2001.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 34(2): 194-211.

12/4: Alliances

- Vasquez, Chapters 2 and 3.
- **Skim**. Leeds, Brett Ashley (2005). Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions (ATOP) version 3.0 Codebook
- **Skim**. Leeds, Brett Ashley, Andrew G. Long, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (2000) Revaluating Alliance Reliability: Specific Threats, Specific Promises. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(5): 686-69.

12/6: Rivalry

- Vasquez, Chapters 4 and 5.
- **Skim**. Thompson, William R. (2001) “Identifying Rivals and Rivalries in World Politics.” *International Studies Quarterly* 45(4): 557-586.

12/11: Arms Races and Nuclear Weapons

- Vasquez, Chapters 6 and 7.
- **Skim**. Fuhrmann, Matthew and Benjamin Tkach (2015). “Almost Nuclear: Introducing the Nuclear Latency Dataset.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 32(4): 443-461.

12/13: Reading Day

12/18: Final term paper due via Canvas at 2359

WORK FOR GRADE POLICY

Development of the spirit as well as the skills of academic inquiry is central to the mission of VMI's Academic Program. As a community of scholars, posing questions and seeking answers, we invariably consult and build upon the ideas, discoveries, and products of others who have wrestled with related issues and problems before us. We are obligated ethically and in many instances legally to acknowledge the sources of all borrowed material that we use in our own work. This is the case whether we find that material in conventional resources, such as the library or cyberspace, or discover it in other places like conversations with our peers.

Academic integrity requires the full and proper documentation of any material that is not original with us. It is therefore a matter of honor. To misrepresent someone else's words, ideas, images, data, or other intellectual property as one's own is stealing, lying, and cheating all at once. Because the offense of improper or incomplete documentation is so serious, and the consequences so potentially grave, the following policies regarding work for grade have been adopted as a guide to cadets and faculty in upholding the Honor Code under which all VMI cadets live:

1) Cadets' responsibilities

“Work for grade” is defined as any work presented to an instructor for a formal grade or undertaken in satisfaction of a requirement for successful completion of a course or degree requirement. All work submitted for grade is considered the cadet's own work. **“Cadet's own work”** means that he or she has composed the work from his or her general accumulation of knowledge and skill except as clearly and fully documented and that it has been composed especially for the current assignment. No work previously submitted in any course at VMI or elsewhere will be resubmitted or reformatted for submission in a current course without the specific approval of the instructor.

In all work for grade, failure to distinguish between the cadet's own work and ideas and the work and ideas of others is known as **plagiarism**. Proper documentation clearly and fully identifies the sources of all borrowed ideas, quotations, or other assistance. The cadet is referred to the VMI-authorized handbook for rules concerning quotations, paraphrases, and documentation.

In all written work for grade, the cadet must include the words **“HELP RECEIVED”** conspicuously on the document, and he or she must then do one of two things: (1) state “none,” meaning that no help was received except as documented in the work; or (2) explain in detail the nature of the help received. In oral work for grade, the cadet must make the same declaration before beginning the presentation. Admission of help received may result in a lower grade but will not result in prosecution for an honor violation.

Cadets are prohibited from discussing the contents of a quiz/exam until it is returned to them or final course grades are posted. This enjoinder does not imply that any inadvertent expression or behavior that might indicate one's feeling about the test should be considered a breach of honor. The real issue is whether cadets received information, not available to everyone else in the class, which would give them an unfair advantage. If a cadet inadvertently gives or receives information, the incident must be reported to the professor and the Honor Court. Each cadet

bears the responsibility for familiarizing himself or herself thoroughly with the policies stated in this section, with any supplementary statement regarding work for grade expressed by the academic department in which he or she is taking a course, and with any special conditions provided in writing by the professor for a given assignment. If there is any doubt or uncertainty about the correct interpretation of a policy, the cadet should consult the instructor of the course. There should be no confusion, however, on the basic principle that it is never acceptable to submit someone else's work, written or otherwise, formally graded or not, as one's own. The violation by a cadet of any of these policies will, if he or she is found guilty by the Honor Court, result in his or her being dismissed from VMI. Neither ignorance nor professed confusion about the correct interpretation of these policies is an excuse.

2) Faculty members' responsibilities

Each academic department will publish an official statement of supplementary departmental policies regarding work for grade, titled "Departmental Statement Concerning VMI's Policies Regarding Work for Grade." Each departmental statement will include explicit policies on the following: (a) tutoring* [e.g., Writing Center, Learning Center, athletic tutors, private tutors], (b) peer collaboration*, and (c) computer aids, including calculators, translators, spelling, style, and grammar checkers. Individual course assignments that deviate from the departmental work for grade policies must be approved by the department head in advance and must be explained to cadets in writing.

No departmental or individual assignment policies may contradict or compromise the Institutional principles expressed in the Academic Regulations, particularly notions of academic integrity and the requirement to document borrowed material and help received. Each departmental statement must be approved by the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty following review by the Academic Policy Committee of the Academic Board. A copy of the document must be filed with the Superintendent, the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty, and the Superintendent's Representative to the Honor Court. Such a statement must be signed by the department head and must be posted in each classroom used by the department.

As an essential part of the duty of teaching and a matter of professional citizenship, faculty are expected to adhere to established work for grade policies and to communicate clearly and regularly with their cadets about the values and practices of academic honesty and integrity. Each faculty member must therefore include work for grade policies in a syllabus for every course he or she teaches. Each syllabus must include an exact transcription of the section titled "Cadets' Responsibilities" from "Work for Grade Policies" in the VMI Academic Regulations and a full statement of the established departmental policies regarding work for grade, plus any approved course-specific policies.

Furthermore, all faculty members are responsible for discussing with all of their students the details, definitions, and implications of (1) the entire section of the Academic Regulations entitled "Work for Grade Policies"; (2) the relevant sections on quotations, paraphrasing, and documentation in the current VMI- authorized handbook; and (3) the departmental and any approved course- specific policies regarding Work for Grade. This discussion must take place before any work is submitted for grade, and it should be treated with the gravity and level of

detail that it merits.

Faculty must also review the Institute policy regarding the discussion of quizzes and exams with their classes. Specifically, faculty must remind cadets that they are prohibited from discussing the contents of a quiz/exam with anyone except the professor until it is returned to them or final course grades are posted.

If a member of the faculty believes that a cadet has violated one or more of VMI's, the department's, or the instructor's work for grade policies, he or she should report the evidence to the head of the department. The department head will decide whether the collected evidence justifies referral to the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty. If the department head decides that the evidence does not justify referral, then he or she will conclude the investigation. Otherwise, the department head will submit a written report to the Deputy Superintendent for Academics and Dean of the Faculty. The report must contain both a recommendation for action and all relevant documents, including a statement signed by the faculty member who reported the violation.

The instructor will assign a grade of "I" following a formal charge of an Honor Court academic violation in his or her course until the issue is resolved.

*Departmental policies must include a statement on whether tutors and peers may offer cadets **critical comments** on their papers. Offering **critical comments** means giving general advice on such matters as organization, thesis development, support for assertions, and patterns of errors. It does not include proofreading or editing.

Proofreading means correcting errors (e.g., in spelling, grammar, punctuation). It is the last step taken by the writer in the **editing** process. In addition to the corrections made in proofreading, **editing** includes making such changes as the addition, deletion, or reordering of paragraphs, sentences, phrases, or words. **A cadet may not have his or her work proofread or edited by someone other than the instructor. [Instructors may grant exceptions to this rule only if they have received written permission from the department head for a particular assignment.]**

Department of International Studies & Political Science
Work for Grade Policy

Work for Grade in this department is generally of the following types.

1. Written quizzes, tests, or examinations
2. Book reviews
3. Research Papers, policy memoranda, briefing papers, and discourse analysis-- identification and analysis of the critical differences in the findings and opinions of scholars on issues of interest to the discipline.

Cadets are permitted and encouraged to study with their peers to prepare for quizzes, tests and exams. However, when a cadet takes either written or oral quizzes, tests, and examinations, answers must be his/her own work without help from any other source including notes or consultation with others.

In the case of book reviews, research and other papers, as described in “2” and “3” above, research and composing of such works must be done by the cadet alone. Cadets are permitted to use spell and grammar-checking facilities.

IS cadets are encouraged to make use of all VMI tutoring services to receive critical comments (defined above). Cadets who do so and mark "Help Received" will not receive a lower grade on an assignment. Cadets are also permitted to seek critical comments on their written work from their peers. However, proof-reading and editing (**defined above**) of a cadet's written work is not permitted.

Any exceptions to these rules, including the use of tutors, collaboration among cadets, and the use of computer style, spell and grammar checkers; must be explained in writing by the course instructor. Instructors are at liberty to stipulate exceptions only with the written approval of their department head.

If you have any questions about the application of these rules, consult your instructor. Do not leave anything to chance.

Colonel Dennis M. Foster
Professor and Head