

# ISS 1712: Just War

## Quest 1: War and Peace

### I. General Information

---

#### Class Meetings

- Fall 2025
- 3 credits
- Attendance: 100% In-Person, No GTAs, 35 Residential
- T Period 2/3 (8:30am-10:25am); Th Period 3 (9:35am-10:25am)
- Location CSE 0453

#### Instructor

- Patrick Hulme
- Office E432
- Tel: (352) 294-7205
- Office Hours – Tuesdays and Wednesdays, 1-3pm
- [patrick.hulme@ufl.edu](mailto:patrick.hulme@ufl.edu)

If you need to schedule an appointment outside of office hours, please email the course instructor.

#### Course Description

Can war be just? What is a ‘just cause’? The idea that war can and should be just holds a middle position between the refusal to impose any moral restraints on the waging of war (realism) and the rejection of all warfare as immoral (pacifism). Western just war theories gradually developed from the confluence of Greek philosophy, Roman Law, and the Judeo-Christian scriptural tradition. Just war theory asks two essential questions. Is the cause for going to war just (jus ad bellum)? And, is the conduct of the war just (jus in bello)? This multidisciplinary course surveys just war thinking from antiquity to the First World War. It includes historical case studies so that students can develop their own concepts of jus ad bellum and jus in bello.

#### Quest and General Education Credit

- Quest 1
- Humanities
- Writing Requirement (WR) 2000 words

*This course accomplishes the [Quest](#) and [General Education](#) objectives of the subject areas listed above. A minimum grade of C is required for Quest and General Education credit. Courses intended to satisfy Quest and General Education requirements cannot be taken S-U.*

*The Writing Requirement (WR) ensures students both maintain their fluency in writing and use writing as a tool to facilitate learning.*

*Course grades have two components. To receive writing requirement credit, a student must receive a grade of C or higher and a satisfactory completion of the writing component of the course.*

### **Required Readings and Works**

1. Required readings for the course are available as PDFs on Canvas.
2. The writing manual for this course is: *The Economist Style Guide*, 11th edn. (2015). ISBN: 9781610395755. This is available as a PDF on Canvas.
3. Materials and Supplies Fees: n/a.

### **Course Objectives**

1. Identify, describe, and explain the methodologies used across humanities disciplines to examine essential ideas about just war.
2. Identify, describe, and explain key ideas and questions about just war from antiquity to the present.
3. Analyze how philosophical, political and historical works from antiquity through the present explore just war.
4. Analyze and evaluate specific accounts of human reaction to concepts that challenge our own notions of just war, using close reading, critical analysis, class discussion, and personal reflection.
5. Develop and present clear and effective written and oral work that demonstrates critical engagement with course texts, and experiential learning activities.
6. Communicate well-supported ideas and arguments effectively within class discussion and debates, with clear oral presentation and written work articulating students' personal experiences and reflections on just war.
7. Connect course content with students' intellectual, personal, and professional lives at UF and beyond.
8. Reflect on students' own and others' experience with just war, in class discussion and written work.

## II. Graded Work

---

### Description of Graded Work

#### 1. Active Participation and Attendance: 20%

##### 1. Participation: 10%

- i. An exemplar participant shows evidence of having done the assigned reading before each class, consistently offers thoughtful points and questions for discussion, and listens considerately to other discussants. See participation rubric below. (R)

##### 2. Class Attendance: 10%

- i. On-time class attendance is required for this component of the course grade. You may have two unexcused absences without any penalty. Starting with the third unexcused absence, each unexcused absence reduces your attendance grade by 2/3: an A- becomes a B, and so on.
- ii. Except for absence because of religious holiday observance, documentation is required for excused absences, per [university policy](#). Excessive unexcused absences (10 or more) will result in failure of the course. If you miss 10 or more classes (excused or not), you will miss material essential for successful completion of the course.

#### 2. Experiential Learning Component (Rare Books Library Session): 10%

During the semester, the Hamilton School at UF will host numerous guest speakers as part of its “War, Strategy, and Statecraft” undergraduate and graduate program. Attendance at TWO of these events is mandatory for the full 10% of the Experiential Learning grade. You must attend TWO to earn the full 10%.

#### 3. In-class Reading Quizzes: 20%

- a. Reading quizzes will be administered at the start of class on Monday, five times throughout the semester. They will test the student’s knowledge of the week’s readings, and will contain short-answer, true/false, and multiple-choice questions. Professor will provide written feedback on your short-answer questions. See examination rubric below. (R)
- b. Quiz dates: Weeks 3 (Sept. 4), 5 (Sept. 18), 9 (Oct. 14), 12 (Nov. 4), 14 (Nov. 20).

#### 4. Midterm Examination: 25%

- a. In Week 7 (Sept. 30), a midterm examination will be administered in class. The examination will be an in-class, 50-minute exam including essay, short-answer, true-false, and/or multiple-choice questions. Professor will provide written qualitative feedback on your essay and/or short-answer questions. This feedback will aid students in preparing for their final written paper. See examination rubric below. (R)

#### 5. Final Analytical Paper: 25%

- a. By end of Week 13 (Nov. 15 at midnight), you will submit a 2,000 word (minimum) analytical essay addressing a prompt provided to you by Week 5 (Sept. 18). You will develop an analytic argument based on your own thesis responding to the prompt, incorporating course material on the history and philosophy of that relationship. Your paper must incorporate at least four course readings. See Canvas for more details. Professor will provide written feedback. See writing rubric below. (R)
- b. Professor will evaluate and provide written feedback, on all the student’s written assignments with respect to grammar, punctuation, clarity, coherence, and organization.

- c. You may want to access the university's [Writing Studio](#).
- d. An additional writing guide website can be found at [OWL](#).

### III. Annotated Weekly Schedule

---

#### WEEK 1: CONCEPTS OF JUST WAR

When political leaders are contemplating war, just war theory requires them to test their decision by evaluating several variables. The main just cause is to right a wrong. Sometimes a war fought to prevent a wrong from happening may be considered a just war. In the modern era, wars to defend the innocent are increasingly regarded as just. This week we will survey the various currents of thought that conceptualized 'Just War'.

**Readings (51 pages):**

1. Gregory M. Reichberg, "[Historiography of Just War Theory](#)," in *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of War*, eds. Seth Lazar and Helen Frowe (Oxford, 2015), pp. 59–79.
2. Rory Cox, "[The Ethics of War up to Thomas Aquinas](#)," in *The Oxford Handbook of the Ethics of War*, pp. 99–121.
3. Joel H. Rosenthal, "[Ethics and War in Homer's Iliad](#)," Carnegie Council in International Affairs (21 March 2012), pp. 2–11.

#### WEEK 2: MORAL AND LEGAL ARGUMENTS

Essential philosophical issues lie at the heart of just war theory. A war can be considered 'just' only if it is fought for a reason that can be justified, meaning a reason that carries sufficient moral and/or legal weight. For the decision to go to war to be just (*jus ad bellum*): 1) it must be made by the lawful and duly constituted national government 2) the intention of waging war must be morally upright; 3) it must be a self-defense response to a serious injustice committed by an aggressor. This week we will read about the moral and legal arguments that define just and unjust war.

**Readings (44 pages):**

1. Arthur Nussbaum, "[Just War—A Legal Concept?](#)" *Michigan Law Review* 42 (1943): 453–479 [26 pages].
2. Anna Stilz, "[Territorial Rights and National Defense](#)," in *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of War*, pp. 242–259 [17 pages].
3. The Ethics Centre "[Just War Theory - The Ethics Centre Ethics Explainer](#)." July 19, 2016. [1 page].

### WEEK 3: HERODOTUS AND THUCYDIDES

Now that we understand the twin concepts of *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello*, we turn to the ancient Greco-Roman era (fifth to first centuries BC), the first of three that comprise the historical roots of just war theory. This week we will look at the 'Father of History', Herodotus (484-425 BC), and the great chronicler of the Peloponnesian War (431-404 BC), the historian and general Thucydides (460- 400 BC), to determine if the Greeks engaged in conflict simply for the sake of waging war itself or did they seek a just cause?

#### Readings (49 pages):

1. Paul Kelly, "[Thucydides-The Naturalness of War](#)," in Paul Kelly, *Conflict, War and Revolution: The Problem of Politics in International Political Thought* (2022), pp. 31-61.
2. Eric Robinson, "[Thucydides on the Causes and Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War](#)," in *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, eds. Sara Forsdyke, Edith Foster and Ryan Balot (Oxford, 2017), pp. 115-124.
3. Herodotus, [On the War for Greek Freedom: Selections from the Historians](#), trans. Samuel Shirley (Indianapolis, 2003), pp. 1-3, 90-98.

**Assignment:** Reading Quiz #1 (September 4 in class).

### WEEK 4: SOCRATES, PLATO AND ARISTOTLE

Socrates (470-347 BC) bequeathed to his student, Plato (427-347 BC), the idea that moral virtues such as justice must govern all human acts, including war. Both Plato and his student, Aristotle (384-322 BC), shared the conviction that war-making should be subordinated to, and guided by, the demands of justice. This led Aristotle to criticize the militaristic culture of Sparta. This week we will answer the question if Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle bequeathed to the Western World an objective moral order against which human acts such as war can be measured.

#### Readings (52 pages):

1. Plato, [Laws](#), Book I 627d-630d.
2. Plato, [Republic](#), Book II 373b-375d; Book V 466d-469a.
3. Plato, [Statesman](#), 304c-308b.
4. Aristotle, [Politics](#), Book I 1256b; Book VII 1323a-1334a.
5. Daniel Little, "[A Socratic Morality of War](#)," *Understanding Society*, 19 September 2021, pp.1-7.
6. Henrik Syse, "[The Platonic Roots of Just War Doctrine: A Reading of Plato's Republic](#)," *Diametros* 23 (2010): 104-123.
7. Neel Burton, "[Socrates at War: Philosopher and Soldier](#)," *Psychology Today* (July 2023): 1-6.

## WEEK 5: CICERO AND ST AUGUSTINE

Christianity provided a framework for central theories of just war. Like the Greeks, the Romans celebrated war as a virtue, conquering the greatest empire in the history of the Western World. With such a politically-driven grand strategy of conquest, did the Romans wage war according to the dictum of just war? The Christian world of Western Europe arose amidst the collapse of the Roman Empire. How did early Christian leaders justify the contradictions between their own teachings and the almost non-stop warfare that accompanied the fall of Rome? This week we finish the first era of just war theory and begin the second, the medieval, which lasted from the 4th to the 14th century.

### Readings (57 pages):

1. Jed W. Atkins, "[Cicero on the Justice of War](#)," in *Power and Persuasion in Cicero's Philosophy*, eds. N. Gilbert, M. Graver and S. McConnell (Cambridge University Press, 2023), pp. 170–204.
2. John Mark Mattox, 'Augustine: Political and Social Philosophy', [Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy](#), pp. 1–13.
3. John Langan, "[The Elements of St. Augustine's Just War Theory](#)," *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 12 (1984): 19–38.

**Assignment:** Reading Quiz #2 (September 18 in class).

## WEEK 6: THOMAS AQUINAS AND THE CATHOLIC TRADITION

This week we continue our consideration of the theological framework for justification for war. The Christian world of Western Europe could not escape war and the issue of just and unjust war. With the thousand years between the 4th and 14th centuries just as bloody as the preceding millennial, did the Church have a position on *jus ad bellum*? If so, how did it justify the Crusades? We look at one of the medieval church's leading theologians, St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), for answers.

### Readings (48 pages)

1. Thomas Aquinas, '[Just War Theory from Summa Theologiae](#),' [2 pages].
2. Gregory M. Reichberg, "[Thomas Aquinas between Just War and Pacifism](#)," *Journal of Religious Ethics* 38 (2010): 219–241.
3. Marco Alexandre Ribeiro, "[The Double Effect Doctrine in Thomas Aquinas's War](#)," *Mirabilia* 31 (2020), pp. 1–18.
4. Richard Benson, 'The Just War Theory: A Traditional Catholic View', *The Tidings* (25 August 2006) [2 pages].
5. E. Christian Brugger, 'What is Catholic Just War Doctrine and How Does it Apply Today?', [National Catholic Register](#) (28 April 2021), [5 pages].

## WEEK 7: 'WESTERN' JUST WAR THEORY

Do objective scientific or empirical measures of the conditions that justify war exist? The concept of just war has been a part of Western culture from its beginnings. It is a complex, subtle, living set of standards that has evolved over more than two thousand years and continues to evolve as wars present themselves for moral consideration. This week we ask if the just war theory has clear and measurable conditions that can be tested empirically?

### Readings (37 pages):

1. Cian O'Driscoll, "[Rewriting the Just War Tradition: Just War in Classical Greek Political Thought and Practice](#)," *International Studies Quarterly* 59 (2015): 1-10 [10 pages].
2. Endre Begby, Gregory Reichberg, and Henrik Syse, "[The Ethics of War. Part I: Historical Trends](#)," *Philosophy Compass* 7, no. 5 (2012): 316-327 [11 pages].
3. Araştırma Makalesi, '[The Just War in Political Thought: from Cicero to Grotius](#)', *Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences Cankırı Karatekin University* 12 (2022), pp. 188-204 [16 pages].

**Assignment:** Midterm Examination (September 30)

## WEEK 8: HUGO GROTIUS AND JOHN LOCKE

Economic and trade concerns have loomed as justifications for war, especially after the Wars of the Reformation and the rise of capitalism, introduced new and challenging questions about *jus ad bellum*. Is it just for states to wage war over trade and fishing rights? Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) and John Locke (1632-1704) offered answers to these questions that remain relevant today.

### Readings (49 pages):

1. Hugo Grotius, [On the Law of War and Peace](#), ed. Stephen C. Neff (Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 23-42, 301-318, 343-348 .
2. Steven Forde, "[Hugo Grotius on Ethics and War](#)," *The American Political Science Review* 92, no. 3 (1998): 639-648
3. Alexander Moseley, "[John Locke's Morality of War](#)," *Journal of Military Ethics* 4 (2005): 119-128.



## WEEK 9: TOTAL WAR

What constitutes total war as opposed to earlier forms of warfare? Carl von Clausewitz (1780-1831), the nineteenth century 'philosopher of war' formulated the concept of total war that led to the slaughter of the First World War. Can such a massive loss of life as that which occurred during the First World War ever be considered just? Does total war honor the principles and spirit of *ad jus bellum*? Does the end justify the means?

### Readings (39 pages):

1. Ian Roxborough, '[Clausewitz and the Sociology of War](#)', *British Journal of Sociology* 45 (1994), pp. 619-636.
2. Jan Willem Honig, '[The Idea of Total War: From Clausewitz to Ludendorff](#)', *Proceedings: The Pacific War as Total War* (Tokyo, 2012), pp. 29-41.
3. Joseph R. Stromberg, '[The Claims for Total War Revisited](#)' (2002) [10 pages].

**Assignment:** Reading Quiz #3 (October 14 in class).

## WEEK 10: CASE STUDY: WORLD WAR I

This week we will examine the issue of *jus ad bellum* in the First World War. In 1961, German historian Fritz Fischer published *Griff nach der Weltmacht*, which roughly translates into 'seizing world power', to blame Germany for the outbreak of the First World War (1914-1918). In so doing, Fischer seemed to confirm what the victors of the war believed when they made the Germans accept the Treaty of Versailles and its 'War Guilt Clause' forty years earlier. Some thirty years after Fischer, historians have revised the narrative, some placing blame on Russia, others on France, some even on Great Britain. Current scholarship holds that there is enough blame to go around.

### Readings (46 pages):

1. Isabel V Hull, [A Scrap of Paper: Breaking and Making International Law during the Great War](#), 1-15; 317-32. Cornell University Press, 2014 [30 pages].
2. Joe Fox, "[Making Sense of the War](#)," *International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, eds. by Ute Daniel et al. (Freie Universität Berlin, 2017-01-08), pp. 1-8.
3. Jürgen von Ungern-Sternberg, "[Making Sense of the War \(Germany\)](#)," *International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, eds. by Ute Daniel et al. (Freie Universität Berlin, 2017-01-08), pp. 1-8.

## WEEK 11: CASE STUDY: THE MOVEMENT TO OUTLAW WAR

World War I was not the first event to initiate calls to outlaw war, but it certainly gave great impetus to the movement. Restrictions over the legitimate use of force (*jus ad bellum*) were included in the League of Nations Charter (1919). The Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) went further, fully outlawing war as legitimate. Of course, neither of these prevented the catastrophe of WWII, but many of their provisions were incorporated in the U.N. Charter in 1945, which is still in effect today.

### Readings (64 pages):

1. League of Nations. [\*Covenant of the League of Nations\*](#). June 28, 1919, arts. 10–16.
2. United States Department of State. [\*General Treaty for Renunciation of War as an Instrument of National Policy \(Kellogg-Briand Pact\)\*](#), signed at Paris, August 27, 1928. Treaty Series No. 796.
3. United Nations. [\*Charter of the United Nations\*](#). San Francisco, June 26, 1945, arts. 2(4) and 51.
4. Oona A. Hathaway, Scott J. Shapiro, [International law and its transformation through the outlawry of war](#), *International Affairs*, Volume 95, Issue 1, January 2019, Pages 45–62, [18 pages].
5. Oona Hathaway, et al. [“War Manifestos.”](#) *University of Chicago Law Review* 85, no. 5 (2018): 1139–1303. [Read pg. 1141-1152, 1170-1205. [46 pages]

## WEEK 12: CASE STUDY: NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND JUST WAR THEORY (I)

This week we consider the relationship between nuclear weapons and just war theory. Nuclear deterrence, especially during the Cold War, rested on the credible threat to completely annihilate the other side (Mutually Assured Destruction, or MAD). This often assumed mass (tens of millions) civilian casualties, sometimes even intentionally (so-called “countervalue” targeting, vs. “counterforce” which targets only adversary military targets). On the one hand, many argue nuclear deterrence prevented major war post-WWII. But is nuclear deterrence in itself unjust?

### Readings (64 pages):

1. Catholic Church, [“The Challenge of Peace: God’s Promise and Our Response; A Pastoral Letter on War and Peace by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops,”](#) (Washington, D.C.: United States Catholic Conference, 1983), p. 1-64.

**Assignment:** Reading Quiz #4 (November 4 in class).

## WEEK 13: CASE STUDY: NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND JUST WAR THEORY (II)

This week we continue to consider the relationship between nuclear weapons and just war theory.

### Readings (44 pages):

1. Nye, Joseph S. 2023. "Nuclear Ethics Revisited." *Ethics & International Affairs* 37(1): 5–17. doi: 10.1017/S0892679423000047 [13 pages].
2. Sagan, Scott D. 2023. "Just and Unjust Nuclear Deterrence." *Ethics & International Affairs* 37(1): 19–28. doi: 10.1017/S0892679423000035 [10 pages].
3. Weiner, Sharon K. 2023. "The Ethics of Choosing Deterrence." *Ethics & International Affairs* 37(1): 29–38. doi: 10.1017/S0892679423000011 [10 pages].
4. Rohlfing, Joan. 2023. "The Myth of 'Just' Nuclear Deterrence: Time for a New Strategy to Protect Humanity from Existential Nuclear Risk." *Ethics & International Affairs* 37(1): 39–49. doi: 10.1017/S0892679423000023 [11 pages].

**Assignment:** Analytical Paper Due (Nov. 15 by midnight)

## WEEK 14: CASE STUDY: VIETNAM

Vietnam was the longest war in American history and the most unpopular American war of the 20th century. It resulted in nearly 60,000 American deaths and an estimated 2 million Vietnamese deaths. Even today, many Americans still ask whether the effort in Vietnam was a blunder, necessary war, a noble cause, or idealistic failure to protect the South Vietnamese from totalitarian government. As the American role in the war escalated in 1965, a group of lawyers outside of the government (the "Lawyers Committee Concerning American Policy in Vietnam") argued the U.S. intervention violated international law. The Johnson Administration responded with a legal memo from the State Department written by Leonard Meeker.

### Readings (49 pages):

1. American Policy Vis-A-Vis Vietnam, Memorandum of Law from Lawyers Committee Concerning American Policy in Vietnam, reprinted at 112 CONG. REC. 2552 (daily ed. Feb. 9, 1966).
2. Meeker, Leonard C. [\*The Legality of United States Participation in the Defense of Viet-Nam\*](#). Memorandum to Senate Foreign Relations Committee, March 4, 1966.
3. Heller, Kevin Jon, and Samuel Moyn. "[The Vietnam War and International Law](#)." In *The Cambridge History of the Vietnam War*, 1st ed., edited by Lien-Hang T Nguyen and Pierre Asselin, III. Cambridge University Press, 2024.

**Assignment:** Reading Quiz #5 (November 20 in class).

## WEEK 15: CASE STUDY: US WAR ON TERRORISM

In the wake of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 on New York City and Washington DC, President George W. Bush declared a 'war on terror'. This has caused many observers to question whether the principles of just war theory are appropriate for this new form of military engagement. Does the just war theory apply in using military force against terrorist groups and non-state actors or does just war theory need to be adjusted?

### Readings (45 pages):

1. Neta C. Crawford, "[Just War Theory and the U.S. Counterterror War](#)," *Perspectives on Politics* 1 (2003), pp. 5-25.
2. William R. Pfeffer, "[Jus ad bellum; Relevancy in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century](#)," USAWC Strategy Research Report, 2010, pp. 1-26.

## IV. Grading Scale and Rubrics

---

### Grading Scale

For information on UF's grading policies for assigning grade points, see [here](#).

|    |           |  |    |          |
|----|-----------|--|----|----------|
| A  | 94 - 100% |  | C  | 74 - 76% |
| A- | 90 - 93%  |  | C- | 70 - 73% |
| B+ | 87 - 89%  |  | D+ | 67 - 69% |
| B  | 84 - 86%  |  | D  | 64 - 66% |
| B- | 80 - 83%  |  | D- | 60 - 63% |
| C+ | 77 - 79%  |  | E  | <60      |

## Grading Rubrics

### Participation Rubric

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| <b>A</b><br>(90-100%) | Typically comes to class with pre-prepared questions about the readings. Engages others about ideas, respects the opinions of others and consistently elevates the level of discussion.   |
| <b>B</b><br>(80-89%)  | Does not always come to class with pre-prepared questions about the reading. Waits passively for others to raise interesting issues. Some in this category, while courteous and articulate, do not adequately listen to other participants or relate their comments to the direction of the conversation. |
| <b>C</b><br>(70-79%)  | Attends regularly but typically is an infrequent or unwilling participant in discussion. Is only adequately prepared for discussion.  |
| <b>D</b><br>(60-69%)  | Fails to attend class regularly and is inadequately prepared for discussion. Is an unwilling participant in discussion.   |
| <b>E</b><br>(<60%)    | Attends class infrequently and is wholly unprepared for discussion. Refuses to participate in discussion.   |

### Examination Rubric: Essays and Short Answers

|                       | Completeness   | Analysis   | Evidence   | Writing  |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| <b>A</b><br>(90-100%) | Shows a thorough understanding of the question. Addresses all aspects of the question completely.  | Analyses, evaluates, compares and/or contrasts issues and events with depth.                                     | Incorporates pertinent and detailed information from both class discussions and assigned readings.   | Presents all information clearly and concisely, in an organized manner.          |
| <b>B</b><br>(80-89%)  | Presents a general understanding of the question. Completely addresses most aspects of the question or address all aspects incompletely. | Analyses or evaluates issues and events, but not in any depth.   | Includes relevant facts, examples and details but does not support all aspects of the task evenly.   | Presents information fairly and evenly and may have minor organization problems. |
| <b>C</b><br>(70-79%)  | Shows a limited understanding of the question. Does not address most aspects of the question.  | Lacks analysis or evaluation of the issues and events beyond stating accurate, relevant facts.                   | Includes relevant facts, examples and details, but omits concrete examples, includes inaccurate information and/or does not support all aspects of the task. | Lacks focus, somewhat interfering with comprehension.                            |
| <b>D</b><br>(60-69%)  | Fails fully to answer the specific central question.   | Lacks analysis or evaluation of the issues and events beyond stating vague, irrelevant, and/or inaccurate facts. | Does not incorporate information from pertinent class discussion and/or assigned readings.   | Organizational problems prevent comprehension.                                   |
| <b>E</b><br>(<60%)    | Does not answer the specific central question.   | Lacks analysis or evaluation of the issues and events.   | Does not adduce any evidence.  | Incomprehensible organization and prose.   |

## Writing Rubric

|                       | <b>Thesis and Argumentation</b>  | <b>Use of Sources</b>  | <b>Organization</b>   | <b>Grammar, mechanics and style</b> |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>A</b><br>(90-100%) | Thesis is clear, specific, and presents a thoughtful, critical, engaging, and creative interpretation. Argument fully supports the thesis both logically and thoroughly.                       | Primary (and secondary texts, if required) are well incorporated, utilized, and contextualized throughout. | Clear organization. Introduction provides adequate background information and ends with a thesis. Details are in logical order. Conclusion is strong and states the point of the paper.   | No errors.                          |
| <b>B</b><br>(80-89%)  | Thesis is clear and specific, but not as critical or original. Shows insight and attention to the text under consideration. May have gaps in argument's logic.                                 | Primary (and secondary texts, if required) are incorporated but not contextualized significantly.          | Clear organization. Introduction clearly states thesis, but does not provide as much background information. Details are in logical order, but may be more difficult to follow. Conclusion is recognizable and ties up almost all loose ends.                           | A few errors.                       |
| <b>C</b><br>(70-79%)  | Thesis is present but not clear or specific, demonstrating a lack of critical engagement to the text. Argument is weak, missing important details or making logical leaps with little support. | Primary (and secondary texts, if required) are mostly incorporated but are not properly contextualized.    | Significant lapses in organization. Introduction states thesis but does not adequately provide background information. Some details not in logical or expected order that results in a distracting read. Conclusion is recognizable but does not tie up all loose ends. | Some errors.                        |
| <b>D</b><br>(60-69%)  | Thesis is vague and/or confused. Demonstrates a failure to understand the text. Argument lacks any logical flow and does not utilize any source material.                                      | Primary and/or secondary texts are almost wholly absent.   | Poor, hard-to-follow organization. There is no clear introduction of the main topic or thesis. There is no clear conclusion, and the paper just ends. Little or no employment of logical body paragraphs.   | Many errors.                        |
| <b>E</b><br>(<60%)    | There is neither a thesis nor any argument.  | Primary and/or secondary texts are wholly absent.  | The paper is wholly disorganized, lacking an introduction, conclusion or any logical coherence.   | Scores of errors.                   |



## V. Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)

---

At the end of this course, students will be expected to have achieved the [Quest](#) the [General Education student learning outcomes](#) for Humanities (H).

[Humanities \(H\)](#) Humanities courses must afford students the ability to think critically through the mastering of subjects concerned with human culture, especially literature, history, art, music, and philosophy, and must include selections from the Western canon.

Humanities courses provide instruction in the history, key themes, principles, terminology, and theory or methodologies used within a humanities discipline or the humanities in general. Students will learn to identify and to analyze the key elements, biases and influences that shape thought. These courses emphasize clear and effective analysis and approach issues and problems from multiple perspectives.

**Content:** *Students demonstrate competence in the terminology, concepts, theories and methodologies used within the discipline(s).*

- Identify, describe, and explain the methodologies used across humanities disciplines to examine essential ideas about just war (Quest 1, H). **Assessment:** midterm exam, analytical essay, in-class reading quizzes.
- Identify, describe, and explain key ideas and questions about just war from antiquity to the present (Quest 1, H). **Assessment:** midterm exam, analytical essay, in-class reading quizzes.

**Critical Thinking:** *Students carefully and logically analyze information from multiple perspectives and develop reasoned solutions to problems within the discipline(s).*

- Analyze how philosophical, political and historical works from antiquity through the present explore just war (Quest 1, H). **Assessment:** analytical essay, midterm exam.
- Analyze and evaluate specific accounts of human reaction to concepts that challenge our own notions of just war, using close reading, critical analysis, class discussion, and personal reflection. (Quest 1, H). **Assessment:** analytical essay, midterm exam.

**Communication:** *Students communicate knowledge, ideas and reasoning clearly and effectively in written and oral forms appropriate to the discipline(s).*

- Develop and present clear and effective written and oral work that demonstrates critical engagement with course texts, and experiential learning activities (Quest 1, H). **Assessments:** analytical essay, midterm exam.
- Communicate well-supported ideas and arguments effectively within class discussion and debates, with clear oral presentation and written work articulating students' personal experiences and reflections on just war (Quest 1, H). **Assessments:** active class participation, experiential learning component.

**Connection:** *Students connect course content with meaningful critical reflection on their intellectual, personal, and professional development at UF and beyond.*

- Connect course content with students' intellectual, personal, and professional lives at UF and beyond. (Quest 1). **Assessments:** experiential learning component, analytical paper.
- Reflect on students' own and others' experience with just war, in class discussion and written work (Quest 1). **Assessments:** experiential learning component, analytical paper.

## VI. Quest Learning Experiences

---

### 1. Details of Experiential Learning Component

During this semester, the class will visit the Harold & Mary Jean Hanson Rare Book Collection in the UF Smathers Library. Students will meet with the collection's curator and examine a wide range of manuscripts and printed books related to just war. Students will experience handling these rare materials with their own hands and examining them directly. They will complete a short assignment during the session about the books they are handling (instructions to be given during the session).

### 2. Details of Self-Reflection Component

Self-reflection is built into class discussions, the in-class reading quizzes, the midterm examination, and the final analytical paper. This is indicated in the description of graded work section of this syllabus with an (R). Students will be continuously asked to reflect on how course activities and readings change their perspective on salient themes (justice and war) and affect their view of themselves in the contemporary world.

## VII. Required Policies

---

### Academic Policies

All academic policies in this course are consistent with university policies, which can be found here:  
<https://go.ufl.edu/syllabuspolicies>