

Department of History
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Instructor: Wayne E. Lee

History 951
Introduction to Military History Research
Spring Semester 2012

Hamilton 517

Wednesday 5-7:50

Goals. This seminar will introduce students to some of the classics, and to research, in the field of military history. The course meets weekly to discuss texts, methods, issues, and problems of research, to hear and analyze reports on topics and research strategies, and to read and critique research papers. The goal of the course is not only to introduce students to the tools, techniques, and special concerns of military historians, but also to produce an article-length paper of publishable quality which may serve as the basis or beginning of a master's thesis or doctoral dissertation. (Please note that this course does not replace or duplicate the introductory methods course required of all first-semester graduate students at Duke and UNC, and does assume that Duke and UNC students will be taking a history research seminar [History 900 at UNC] concurrently with this course—or if beyond the first year, thesis credits).

Requirements. Students will be required to prepare and deliver an oral report (with a written summary no longer than two pages) to the seminar on their topic and research design early in the semester; to read the common texts and in the case of the “classics,” to write reviews of no more than 750 words to share with the entire class by email on Tuesday evening before class; to present an article-length paper based on research in primary sources at the end of the semester; and to serve as “intensive reader” on a colleague's paper. Throughout the semester, students will be called upon to describe their projects and discuss their progress. Instructions for all assignments will be discussed as the course progresses and in some cases will be distributed in written form.

Students are expected to develop a comprehensive grasp of the secondary literature pertaining to their research question and to begin the process of identifying and using primary source materials available both locally and, to the extent possible, outside of the Triangle area.

For the portion of the course of readings in what might be termed military “classics,” students are required to file, the evening before class by 6PM local time, a review of the book **no longer than 750 words** analyzing the method of the work, its thesis, its argument, and its strengths and weaknesses as a work of military theory, history, political science, or whatever discipline/purpose one would judge it to be. These works generally don't fit precisely into the usual book review format. The class will together read each others' reviews before discussion on Wednesday evening.

Bibliography. For comprehensive starting places in the field, consult Robin Higham and Donald Mrozek, eds., *A Guide to the Study of American Military History* (Hamden, CT: Archon Books, 1975), and supplements I (1981), II (1986), III (1993), and IV (1998).

There are numerous reference works helpful to research and reading in the field beyond the more general such works for various period, national histories, and history in general. The most comprehensive, up-to-date, and congruent with the broad approaches being pursued in the field is John Whiteclay Chambers II, ed., *The Oxford Companion to American Military History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999). See also Daniel K. Blewett, *American Military History: A Guide to Reference and Information Sources* (Englewood, Colorado: Libraries Unlimited, 1995); James E. David, *Conducting Post-World War II National Security Research in Executive Branch Records: A Comprehensive Guide* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001), one of the more useful recent guides to records. A good web site is <http://tiger.uic.edu/~rjensen/military.html>. There are numerous general and special bibliographies in addition to the ones listed above, and helpful web sites as well.

Readings. The common readings should be purchased at the UNC Student Stores or elsewhere; **be certain to purchase or use the proper edition of these texts (Thucydides can be in a different edition).**

Thucydides, *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*
Robert B. Strassler, ed. (New York: The Free Press, 1998);

Sun-Tzu: The Art of War, trans. by Ralph Sawyer, trans. (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994);

Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince*, ed/trans. by Harvey C. Mansfield, 2d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998);

Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed/trans Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976);

Paret, Peter, *et al.*, eds., *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*
(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1986);

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957);

Wayne C. Booth, *et al.*, *The Craft of Research* 3d ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008);

Richard Marius, *A Short Guide to Writing about History*, 7th edition (New York: Longman 2009);

William Strunk, Jr., *et al.*, *The Elements of Style*, 4th edition (New York, Allyn & Bacon, 1999);

Kate L. Turabian, *et al.*, *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*,
7th edition (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2007).

In addition, there will be some readings on websites or emailed to students by the instructor.

Office Hours: I will generally be on campus TWTH, and available for appointments on those days. My official office hours, however, will be T 8:30-10:30, and TH 3-4.

Class Schedule, Readings, and Assignments

(This schedule is subject to minor changes as the semester progresses, esp. with regard to special events to be held around campus)

Wednesday 1/11 Introduction: Military History as a Field. Robert M. Citino, "Review Essay: Military Histories Old and New: A Reintroduction," *American Historical Review*, 112 (2007): 1070-1090; Wayne E. Lee, "Mind and Matter: Cultural Analysis in American Military History, A Look at the State of the Field," *Journal of American History*, 93 (2007): 1116-1162; Richard H. Kohn, "Military History in Academe Today," *Headquarters Gazette* [Society for Military History], 20 (2007): 2-4; Frederick W. Kagan, "Why Military History Matters," American Enterprise Institute, *National Security Outlook*, June 2006, 1-5; John Lynn, review of Yuval Noah Harari, *The Ultimate experience: Battlefield Revolutions and the Making of Modern War Culture, 1450-2000*," *American Historical Review*, 114 (2009):708-710. **Assignment:** come to class prepared to participate in a discussion of the field, and your own personal motivation for studying military history. **Note: these readings are available at www.unc.edu/~welee/share you can access that address using your ONYEN.**

Wednesday 1/18 Thucydides (review due previous day).

Wednesday 1/25 Posing a Question. Booth to 67, Marius to 55; Mary Beth Norton, "Finding the Devil in the Details of the Salem Witch-craft Trials," *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Jan. 21, 2000), B4-B5..

Student reports on research projects. **Assignment:** Offer an initial overview of your project per the seven questions outlined below, describing the subject, the topic, and the question you will be answering (in a *single* grammatically correct sentence). Present this in 15 minutes or less to the seminar, and provide the instructor and seminar members a short written description that includes, in addition, a research strategy and the state of the secondary literature on your question (the latter two should not be included in the oral presentation but will undoubtedly come up in the discussion). No more than two pages, summarizing your presentation, provided by email to the class the evening before.

1. What is your topic, or subject area?
2. What, specifically, is the question you are trying to answer?
3. So what? That is, why do we want to know? How is the question significant to the field, historiography, and/or current concerns? In other words, what is the purpose of your research?
4. How, exactly, do you intend to research the problem: your strategy, sources, and schedule?
5. What is your answer, or thesis (if you have one at this point)?

6. Outline the argument that persuades us that your thesis is valid (if you know at this point).
7. What in your judgment are your one or two greatest problems?

Wednesday 2/1 Sun Tzu (review due previous day)

Wednesday 2/8 Machiavelli (review due previous day), *Makers of Modern Strategy*, to p. 91.

Wednesday 2/15 Research, Making an Argument, Coping with Historiography. Marius, 56-105; Booth, 68-170. **Assignment:** Provide the instructor and seminar members with a detailed research plan, including sources and secondary literature, and a timetable, by email the evening before class.

Wednesday 2/22 Sea Power, Air Power, Battle, Guerrilla War. Selections (handouts emailed) from Mahan, Corbett, Douhet, duPicq, Mao Zedong, and *Makers of Modern Strategy*, 444-477, 648-778, 815-862. Also read Colin S. Gray, "Irregular Warfare: One Nature, Many Characters," *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, (Winter 2007), 35-57. <http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/2007/Winter/gray.pdf>

Wednesday 2/29 Writing. Marius, 105-end; Booth, 173-end. **Assignment:** Present to the seminar an update of your research prospectus (your subject, topic, question, research strategy, and timetable, thesis, argument, and problems, plus a working title) in 15 minutes, with a written version for the instructor and the class filed online the evening before.

3/7 SPRING BREAK

Wednesday 3/14 Clausewitz (review due previous day); Peter Paret, "Clausewitz: 'Half against my will, I have become a Professor,'" *The Journal of Military History*, 75 (April 2011): 591-601.

Wednesday 3/21 Huntington (review due previous day); Brian Holden Reid, "Michael Howard and the Evolution of Modern War Studies," *Journal of Military History*, 73 (2009): 869-904.

Wednesday 3/28 Style: Strunk and White, Turabian, 283-end. Please make a list of what you think the most important points of the book are and we'll discuss in class. We'll also have time to discuss any research issues or problems you are having. *By this time you should be finished with your research and beginning to write.* In critiquing a paper, the intensive reader should address these subjects:

1. Does the paper possess a thesis or argument? Is that thesis or argument clear, and

persuasive? If so, why, and if not, why not--that is, what could be done to make it persuasive?

2. Does the introduction clearly identify the topic, state the problem, indicate the thesis (or at least telegraph it to alert the reader), and answer the “so what” requirement to a reader’s satisfaction (i.e. is it persuasive)?

3. Does the paper stay focused on, and maintain, the thesis throughout? Does the discussion ever wander too far away, or travel down dead ends?

4. Is the research adequate to support the thesis? Is there enough evidence to support the various points that argue the thesis? Has the paper been adequately documented, using notes correctly, to persuade the reader and allow the reader to re-trace the authors steps without too much difficulty? Footnotes: does each accurately describe the source, down to the date, page, volume, publication information, etc.? Are there places in the text which lacked, but needed documentation or source support?

5. Does the conclusion summarize and interpret the material, and reiterate the thesis and enough of the argument to persuade the reader?

6. Writing/Presentation: is the writing clear, vigorous, smooth, interesting, economical, etc.? Does it violate any of the commandments or suggestions of Strunk and White? Is it free of typos, spelling errors, and grammar/syntax problems? Are there infelicities of style worth noting or discussing?

7. Overall, what are the strengths of the paper and what in your judgment could be improved?

Wednesday 4/4 Professional Ethics. Turabian, 77-10,129-130. Students should scan Turabian to make certain that their citations conform to the University of Chicago Manual of Style; papers need to have proper bibliographic footnotes, short citations after, and bibliographies according to this Manual.

Wednesday 4/11 **No Class** (papers to be discussed on 4/18 should be turned in today). All students will read all papers.

Wednesday 4/18 Discussion of Papers. (papers to be discussed on 4/25 should be turned in today) . Authors do not present; critiquers present.

Wednesday 4/25 Discussion of Papers.