

International Security
Political Science PSC 8260-001 – Fall 2016

Instructor: Jennifer Dixon
Email: Jennifer.m.dixon@villanova.edu
Course time: Wednesday, 7:30 – 9:30 pm
Course location: 310 St. Augustine Center
Office hours: Mondays, 3-5 pm, or by appointment
Office location: 259 St. Augustine Center

Course Description

The graduate seminar is designed to introduce students to central approaches, concepts, and topics in the study of conflict and violence. We will start with the major theories in the field of international relations, which offer key theoretical lenses and concepts with which to analyze and understand important outcomes and dynamics in the study of war and conflict. In addition to these theories, we will also discuss the origins and nature of the state system, and (some of) the effects of the laws of war. Having started with these core building blocks, we will then cover a selection of topics related to conflict and violence, including: the causes and dynamics of civil war and insurgency, the causes of terrorism, the causes of genocide and mass killing, strategies and tradeoffs in counter-terrorism and -insurgency, the obstacles to and pitfalls of humanitarian intervention, and the systemic and institutional implications of the shifting balance of power. The emphasis throughout the course will be on analyzing the causes of and responses to different types of violence, with a strong focus on concepts, theories, and mechanisms. Alongside this strong analytical focus, many of the readings address particular conflicts – including the civil war in Syria, the wars and violence in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the Rwandan Genocide and the ongoing violence in the region.

The objectives of the course are to: 1) give you the conceptual and theoretical tools to think critically and analytically about the causes of different forms of conflict and violence; 2) develop your ability to critique and compare analytical arguments; and 3) develop your ability to clearly and effectively communicate, both in writing and orally.

Requirements

This discussion-based seminar is designed to encourage discussion and engagement with diverse concepts, theories, and approaches. To that end, you are expected to prepare for each seminar through careful reading of the required texts, and to come to class prepared to discuss the main issues covered in the readings, to raise and consider others' questions, and to critically evaluate concepts and theories.

Grades will be based on the following requirements:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Seminar participation and attendance | 20% |
| 2. Weekly discussion board posting | 20% |
| 3. Literature review on a topic of your choice (10 pgs, due by Sun. 11/27) | 30% |
| 4. Analysis of an op-ed article that I provide (10 pgs, due by Wed. 12/14) | 30% |

Seminar participation and attendance. The participation grade will include attending and participating in seminar each week. Good participation includes doing the assigned readings prior to class, along with actively listening, asking questions, and contributing to seminar discussions. Note that participation is not measured by the frequency with which you speak in class. Instead, it involves a balance of speaking, reading, and listening.

Understanding and debating the strengths and weaknesses of different concepts, approaches, and arguments are among the main goals of this seminar. It is inevitable that you will not agree with everything that I or other students say. However, even – and especially – if you strongly disagree with someone else’s comment or argument, please remember to focus your comments and questions on that person’s ideas, not on the person expressing the idea.

Weekly discussion board posting. Each week you are required to post a discussion question or comment on the course Blackboard site by 8 pm on Tuesday evening (i.e., the day before class), and you should come to class on Wednesday evening having read other students’ entries.

These comments are meant to stimulate discussion, intellectual curiosity, and engagement. The length of the posting may vary but should generally be 1-2 paragraphs in length. The best discussion board postings pose a good question, and/or make connections between different readings or between the current week’s readings and readings assigned in prior weeks. Do not point out that an article or argument was interesting or fascinating. Do not summarize what one or another author said. Rather, focus on assessing, critiquing, and comparing the assigned readings. This could mean: identifying the strengths and weaknesses of one or more of the assigned readings, posing questions prompted by one or more of the readings, comparing readings assigned in a given week, and/or making connections with readings assigned in prior weeks. You do not have to comment on all of the assigned readings in your posting.

You will be graded on the basis of whether you have posted comments and on the quality of your comments. If you do not post a discussion board comment, it will negatively affect your grade.

Literature review. You are required to write a 10-pg literature review on a particular topic or question *of your choice* from among those covered in the course. The paper should be organized, well-structured, critical, and focused. Your review should include readings from among the assigned readings, but you should also draw on additional readings. This assignment will be due by 8 pm on Sunday, November 27th (although you can hand it in anytime before then, so feel free to hand in the paper earlier in the semester if you’d like.)

Analysis of an op-ed article. You are required to write a 10-pg paper critically analyzing an op-ed article. I will provide several op-ed articles on different topics related to the course, and you

can choose which one to respond to in your paper. Or, if you find a different op-ed article that you would like to write on, show it to me and if it looks appropriate you can write your paper in response to it. Drawing on relevant assigned readings from the course, you should critically analyze the assumptions, arguments, and evidence presented in the op-ed. This paper will be due by 8 pm on Wednesday, December 14th.

*****All assignments should each be submitted by email as Word documents to jennifer.m.dixon@villanova.edu by 8 pm on the due date.*****

The grade scale used to assign letter grades is as follows:

A = 94-100; A- = 90-93; B+ = 87-89; B = 84-86; B- = 80-83; C+ = 77-79;
C = 74-76; C- = 70-73; D+ = 67-69; D = 64-66; D- = 60-63; F=59 and below

Readings

There is an average of 110 pages of required reading each week. The readings for this course include conflicting theories, approaches, and interpretations. Your task is to read critically, and to compare and evaluate these contending theories and interpretations. Key questions to keep in mind as you read are: What is the author's argument? What evidence is marshaled to support the argument? What is the quality of the evidence? How persuasive is the argument? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the article? Can you think of counter-arguments or evidence that would undermine the author's argument? How does the argument (and possibly the evidence) relate to other readings from this week or from other weeks?

There are no required books. The assigned readings are available on the course Blackboard site.

Class Policies

Attendance. You are expected to attend all seminars, to arrive on time, and to stay for the entire seminar. You should bring copies of the assigned readings with you to class each week. Excused absences will be granted only in the event of documented illness, family emergency, or university-sponsored travel. Unexcused absences will negatively affect your participation grade.

Electronics. All cell phones, smart phones, tablets, and laptops must be turned off during class. If you need to use a laptop or tablet in class for some reason, come talk to me about it.

Academic honesty and integrity. All students are expected to uphold Villanova's Academic Integrity Policy and Code. The work you submit should be entirely your own, and you should acknowledge others' words and ideas with proper and consistent citations. Academic honesty is a key component of the university community, and properly cited sources are necessary elements in an academic paper – they help the reader evaluate the quality of your information, and they enable you and the reader to track down your sources. Violations of academic honesty include copying others' work in your paper without citation, taking ideas or text from internet sites or

other sources without proper citation, having your work done by someone else, purchasing a paper on the internet, and doing someone else's work for them. If there is evidence of plagiarism or cheating, it will be investigated and punished according to the University's Academic Integrity policy. See the statement of the university's policy here:

www1.villanova.edu/villanova/provost/resources/student/policies/integrity/integritypolicy.html.

You can view the Academic Integrity Policy and Code, as well as other useful information related to writing papers, at the Academic Integrity Gateway web site:

library.villanova.edu/Help/AcademicIntegrity.

Extensions. Extensions and incompletes will be granted at my discretion and only in the event of verifiable illnesses or personal emergencies.

Disabilities. If you need accommodations for disabilities, please let me know as soon as possible so that we can make any necessary arrangements. It is the policy of Villanova to make reasonable academic accommodations for qualified individuals with disabilities. You must present verification and register with the Learning Support Office by contacting 610-519-5176 or at learning.support.services@villanova.edu or for physical access or temporary disabling conditions, please contact the Office of Disability Services at 610-519-4095 or email Stephen.mcwilliams@villanova.edu. Registration is needed in order to receive accommodations.

Course Outline

Week 1: Wednesday, August 24: Introduction [31 pp.]

This week's readings introduce the major theoretical approaches to the study of international relations, discuss the value of theory in the study of international relations, and reflect on how theories can inform policymaking. Key questions to think about as you read these articles are: What is the value of theory? What are the elements of a theory? What are the major theoretical approaches in the study of war?

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing is Bad for International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 19, no. 3 (2013), pp. 427-45 [stop at the section titled "Why is IR headed in this direction?"]. [19]

Jack Snyder, "One World, Rival Theories," *Foreign Policy* (November/December 2004), pp. 53-62. [10] [Gives a brief introduction and overview of the three major theoretical approaches in the study of international relations, and discusses their relevance in trying to understand important aspects of the post-9/11 world.]

Celestino Perez, Jr., "Soldiers in Dark Times: Military Education, Ethics, and Political Science," *Political Violence @ a Glance*, 1 September 2015, available at: <https://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2015/09/01/soldiers-in-dark-times-military-education-ethics-and-political-science/>.

Week 2: Wednesday, August 31: States, the State System, and Sovereignty [125 pp.]

This week's readings discuss the origins, nature, and development of the state system and sovereignty. While these issues are interesting and important on their own, understanding these core concepts also provides an important basis for later discussions of challenges to state-ness, states' sovereignty, and the international system.

Charles Tilly, "Cities and States in World History," in *Coercion, Capital and European States, AD 990-1992* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992), pp. 1-37. [37]

Hendrik Spruyt, "The Origins, Development, and Possible Decline of the Modern State," *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 5 (2002), pp. 127-49. [20]

Stephen D. Krasner, "Compromising Westphalia," *International Security*, vol. 20, no. 3 (Winter 1995-6), pp. 115-51. [37]

Tanisha Fazal, "State Death in the International System," *International Organization*, vol. 58, no. 2 (2004), pp. 311-344. [31]

Week 3: Wednesday, September 7: Neorealism [119 pp.]

This week's readings focus on neorealism, or structural realism, which is a systemic-level theory that argues that the likelihood of major power war is determined by the number of great power states in the international system. The theory is based on the assumptions that the international system is anarchic (i.e., that there is no authoritative power above states to adjudicate disputes), that the system's anarchic nature means that states must always look out for their own security, which is assumed to be states' primary goal, that a state's domestic politics is irrelevant in accounting for great power war, and that one only needs to consider the number of great power states to understand the most important aspects of international relations. As you read, work out the key variables, central assumptions, and the central claims of neorealism; and consider the strengths and weaknesses of the theory.

Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 18, no. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 615-628. [14] [Outlines major tenets of structural neorealism. Focuses on the third level of analysis – the international systemic level – and argues that all important outcomes in international relations [read: great power war] can be explained by the distribution of power in the international system [i.e., by the number of great power states]. This is a *very* parsimonious and reductionist theory, which is both its strength and one of its weaknesses.]

Robert Gilpin, "The Theory of Hegemonic War," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 18, no. 4 (Spring 1988), pp. 591-613. [23]

Stephen M. Walt, "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power," *International Security*, vol. 9, no. 4 (Spring 1985), only read pp. 3-26, stopping at the bottom of page 26. [24] [Addresses the question of 'what causes alignment?', explores the concepts of balancing, bandwagoning, and threats, and develops a set of hypotheses about the factors that shape states' alliance strategies. Explores in particular the importance of ideology and the roles of material incentives and coercive manipulation in alliance formation.]

Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, vol. 30, no. 2 (January 1978), only read pp. 167-86, stopping when you get to "III. Offense, Defense, and the Security Dilemma." [20] [Outlines the security dilemma and its implications, basic game theoretic approaches to understanding the security dilemma, and the factors that shape states' (and policymakers') perceptions of the threats posed by other states and the consequent likelihood of cooperation between states.]

Paul C. Avey, "Confronting Soviet Power: U.S. Policy During the Early Cold War," *International Security*, vol. 36, no. 4 (Spring 2012), pp. 159-188. [38] [This article is an example of how realist concepts are applied to analyze international relations. The article attempts to parse the relative effects of power concerns versus ideological concerns in the early Cold War period. Argues that at the beginning of the Cold War, the US was responding to Soviet power, not to Soviet ideology.]

Week 4: Wednesday, September 14: Institutionalism [100 pp.]

This week's readings focus on the role of institutions in facilitating cooperation between states. Pay attention to the ways in which institutions make cooperation more likely, and the role of information and uncertainty in these processes. Make sure you understand what is meant by the terms *institution* and *cooperation*. Also think about the similarities and differences between institutionalism and neorealism.

John Duffield, "What are International Institutions?," *International Studies Review*, vol. 9 (2007), pp. 1-22. [19]

Kenneth A. Oye, "Explaining Cooperation Under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies," *World Politics*, vol. 38, no. 1 (October 1985), pp. 1-24. [24] [Draws on game theory to explore the ways in which institutions can facilitate cooperation among states, even in an anarchic international system. Also identifies strategies that states can pursue to further enhance the likelihood and durability of cooperative behavior between states.]

Dan Reiter, "Exploring the Bargaining Model of War," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 1, no. 1 (March 2003), pp. 27-43. [11] [This article introduces the bargaining model of war.]

James D. Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War," *International Organization*, vol. 49, no. 3 (Summer 1995), pp. 379-414. [32] [Argues that the existing rationalist explanations for war fail to address the central puzzle in the study of war: war is costly, so leaders have strong incentives to avoid war, and yet they sometimes fail to do so and pay a high cost. Argues that this failure can arise from one of 3 causes: 1) private information and incentives for misrepresentation, 2) commitment problems, and 3) issue indivisibilities. The article primarily focuses on explaining the first two of these mechanisms.]

Virginia Page Fortna, "Scraps of Paper? Agreements and the Durability of Peace," *International Organization*, vol. 57, no. 2 (Spring 2003), only read pp. 337-47 and then read the conclusion on pp. 365-7. [14] [Focuses on mechanisms that end international wars and on the durability of peace. Argues that "mechanisms within agreements can make durable peace more likely by changing the incentives to break a cease-fire, by reducing uncertainty about actions and intentions, and by preventing accidental violations from triggering another round of fighting" (p. 338). As you read, connect the points Fortna makes with Oye's more abstract discussion. Note that an agreement is an example of an institution.]

Week 5: Wednesday, September 21: Constructivism [111 pp.]

This week's readings cover constructivism, which is the third major approach in international relations. This approach eschews the materialism of realism and institutionalism, arguing that norms, ideas, identities, and discourses play central roles in shaping contexts and outcomes in international politics. The three assigned articles illustrate different aspects of the constructivist approach.

Nina Tannenwald, "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use," *International Organization*, vol. 53, no. 3 (Summer 1999), pp. 433-68. [33] [Argues that rationalist and materialist factors cannot account for the non-use of nuclear weapons in the post-WWII period, and argues that a *norm* of nuclear non-use gradually arose among US policymakers in the first few decades of the Cold War. This article illustrates how ideas and beliefs can shape perceived and therefore available options in international relations. Pay attention to the three kinds of normative effects that she identifies and discusses.]

Boaz Atzili, "When Good Fences Make Bad Neighbors: Fixed Borders, State Weakness, and International Conflict," *International Security*, vol. 31, no. 3 (Winter 2006/07), pp. 139-73. [35] [This article argues that the "norm of border fixity" has influenced the nature of international relations and the likelihood of interstate conflict in some parts of the world.]

Ronald R. Krebs and Jennifer K. Lobasz, "Fixing the Meaning of 9/11: Hegemony, Coercion, and the Road to War in Iraq," *Security Studies*, vol. 16, no. 3 (July-September 2007), pp. 409-51. [43] [This article illustrates the causal importance of discourse, especially the strategic use of rhetoric and framing, in international relations.]

Week 6: Wednesday, September 28: Human Rights and the Laws of War [106+ pp.]

This week we turn from theory to law, focusing on the laws of war and human rights norms. I've assigned key articles from the UN Charter and the Geneva Conventions. The other assigned readings conceptualize the laws of war and discuss some of the ways in which these laws and norms impact states' behavior. As you read, consider these broader questions: What are the benefits – for individual states, citizens, and the international community – of having laws of war? How do the laws of war figure (or not) in the major theoretical approaches to war that we've discussed (namely, neorealism, institutionalism, and constructivism)?

Charter of the United Nations (1945), read Preamble, Ch. 1, Ch. 6, and Ch. 7, available at: <http://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>.

Selections from the Geneva Conventions:

- Convention (I) for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (12 August 1949), available at: <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/365?OpenDocument>, read Articles 1-3, 12-17, 19-22.
- Convention (III) relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (12 August 1949), available at: <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/375?OpenDocument>, read Articles 1-4, 12-16.

- Convention (IV) relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (12 August 1949), available at: <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/380>, read Articles 1-6, 13-34.
- Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of Non-International Armed Conflicts (Protocol II) (8 June 1977), available at: <https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/applic/ihl/ihl.nsf/INTRO/475?OpenDocument>, read Article 1.

Matthew Evangelista, “Chapter One: Norms versus Practice in International Law and Ethics,” in *Law, Ethics, and the War on Terror* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2008), pp. 6-22. [17]

David Armstrong and Theo Farrell, “Force and Legitimacy in World Politics: Introduction,” *Review of International Studies*, vol. 31 (2005), pp. 3-13. [10]

Stuart Gordon, “Civilian Protection – What’s Left of the Norm?,” in Sarah Perigo and Jim Whitman, *The Geneva Conventions Under Assault* (London: Pluto Press, 2010), pp. 74-98. [23] [Explores the principle of civilian protection in the laws of war.]

Colin H. Kahl, “In the Crossfire or the Crosshairs?,” *International Security*, vol. 32, no. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 7-46. [40]

Rebecca Sanders, “(Im)plausible Legality: The Rationalisation of Human Rights Abuses in the American ‘Global War on Terror,’” *The International Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 15, no. 4 (2011), pp. 605-26. [16]

Week 7: Wednesday, October 5: Causes of Civil War and Insurgency [125 pp.]

This week we turn from interstate war to intrastate war, focusing on the causes of civil war and insurgency. The various readings theorize different causes and mechanisms of civil war onset.

Thomas Zeitzoff, “Calculated or Emotional? How Insurgents are Both Rational and Ideological,” *Political Violence @ a Glance* (9 October 2015), available at: <https://politicalviolenceataglance.org/2015/10/09/calculated-or-emotional-how-insurgents-are-both-rational-and-ideological/>. [2]

Nicholas Sambanis, “Using Case Studies to Expand Economic Models of Civil War,” *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 2, no. 2 (June 2004), pp. 259-79. [15] [Argues “that by combining statistical and case study work we can better understand the political processes that lead societies to civil war” (p. 259). Finds that poor countries face the highest risk of civil war. Argues that it is impossible to understand the causes of civil wars by only looking at civil wars; need to also look at other forms of political violence.]

Seth G. Jones, “The Rise of Afghanistan’s Insurgency: State Failure and Jihad,” *International Security*, vol. 32, no. 4 (Spring 2008), pp. 7-40. [34] [Argues that the Afghan insurgency cannot be explained by the dominant explanations for the onset of civil war – namely, greed or grievance – and argues that instead, the start of the insurgency was due to the structure of power in Afghanistan at the time, and the power vacuum and opportunity created by “the collapse of governance after the overthrow of the Taliban regime” (p. 8). Further argues that a secondary cause of the insurgency was ideological.]

Michael L. Ross, "How Do Natural Resources Influence Civil War? Evidence from Thirteen Cases," *International Organization*, vol. 58 (Winter 2004), pp. 35-67. [30] [Investigates the relationship between natural resources and civil war, analyzing 13 cases of civil war to probe mechanisms underlying this correlation.]

Idean Salehyan and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, "Refugees and the Spread of Civil War," *International Organization*, vol. 60, no. 2 (April 2006), pp. 335-66. [28] [Argues that refugees displaced by conflict in one country can contribute to the start of conflict in another country.]

Güneş Murat Tezcür, "Ordinary People, Extraordinary Risks: Participation in an Ethnic Rebellion," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 110, no. 2 (May 2016), pp. 247-64. [16]

Wednesday, October 12: NO CLASS – FALL BREAK

Week 8: Wednesday, October 19: Dynamics of Civil War and Insurgency [110 pp.]

This week continues our focus on civil war and insurgency, but turns from factors that account for the start of civil war to the dynamics *within* civil war.

Stathis N. Kalyvas, "The Ontology of 'Political Violence': Action and Identity in Civil Wars," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 1, no. 3 (September 2003), pp. 475-94. [13] [Argues that in order to understand the dynamics of civil wars, we need to look at more than just the macro-political causes of a war, and that we need to also look at micro-level motivations for individuals, which often are inconsistent with macro-level explanations of "greed" or "grievance."]

Fotini Christia, "Introduction," in *Alliance Formation in Civil Wars* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), pp. 1-16. [16]

Wendy Pearlman, "Spoiling Inside and Out: Internal Political Contestation and the Middle East Peace Process," *International Security*, vol. 33, no. 3 (Winter 2008/09), pp. 79-109. [31]

Henning Tamm, "The Origins of Transnational Alliances: Rulers, Rebels, and Political Survival in the Congo Wars," *International Security*, vol. 41, no. 1 (Summer 2016), pp. 147-81. [35]

Paul Staniland, "States, Insurgents, and Wartime Political Orders," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 10, no. 2 (June 2012), pp. 243-64. [15]

Week 9: Wednesday, October 26: Causes of Terrorism [96 pp.]

This week's readings focus on the causes of terrorism.

Bruce Hofmann, "Chapter 1: Defining Terrorism," in *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006), pp. 1-41. [41]

Martha Crenshaw, "The Causes of Terrorism," *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 13, No. 4 (July 1981), pp. 379-99. [19] [Focuses on the causes of terrorism. Note that this article was published in 1981, so 20 years before September 11th and 10 years before the end of the Cold War!

Questions to focus on: How does Crenshaw define terrorism? What are the long-run and short-term causes of terrorism that she identifies? What are the five objectives or goals of terrorism that she mentions?]

- Jessica A. Stanton, "Terrorism in the Context of Civil War," *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 75, no. 4 (October 2013), pp. 1009-22. [13]
- Vincenzo Bove and Tobias Böhmelt, "Does Immigration Induce Terrorism?" *The Journal of Politics*, vol. 78, no. 2 (2016), pp. 572-88. [14]
- Mahmood Mamdani, "Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: A Political Perspective on Culture and Terrorism," *American Anthropologist*, vol. 104, no. 3 (September 2002), pp. 766-75. [9] [Offers a robust critique of post-9/11 discussions of "good" and "bad" Muslims. Argues that terrorism is a modern phenomenon, not a pre-modern phenomenon, and that to attribute terrorist tendencies to a particular religion or culture is misplaced, since the motivations that drive individuals to use violent methods are rooted in politics and history.]

Week 10: Wednesday, November 2: Counter-terrorism and -insurgency [122 pp.]

Having spent the past three classes discussing the causes and dynamics of civil war, insurgency, and terrorism, this week we turn to counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency. The readings focus in particular on the effectiveness, legality, and ethics of drones and targeted killing as tools and strategies in counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency.

- Kelly M. Greenhill and Paul Staniland, "Ten Ways to Lose at Counterinsurgency," *Civil Wars*, vol. 9, no. 4 (December 2007), pp. 402-19. [15]
- Arjun Chowdhury and Ronald R. Krebs, "Talking about Terror: Counterterrorist Campaigns and the Logic of Representation," *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2010), pp. 125-50. [21]
- Austin Long, "Whack-a-Mole or Coup de Grace?: Institutionalization and Leadership Targeting in Iraq and Afghanistan," *Security Studies*, vol. 23, no. 3 (2014), pp. 471-512. [41] [Considers and evaluates the effectiveness of the counterterrorism and counterinsurgency strategy of targeted killing, which has been a key element of US strategy since 9/11. Argues that the effectiveness of targeted killing is contingent on the level of institutionalization of the targeted group and that it is only effective against groups that are poorly institutionalized. As you read, figure out how Long defines and measures "institutionalized" and consider his argument in relation to Cronin's.]
- Michael J. Boyle, "The Legal and Ethical Implications of Drone Warfare," *The International Journal of Human Rights*, vol. 19, no. 2 (2015), pp. 105-26. [18]
- Martha Crenshaw, "Introduction," in Martha Crenshaw, ed., *The Consequences of Counterterrorism* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2010), pp. 1-30. [27]

Week 11: Wednesday, November 9: Genocide, Mass Killing, and Violence against Civilians
[108 pp.]

This week's readings focus on the intentional targeting of civilians. The first two readings introduce definitions of genocide and mass killing. The readings by Straus and McDoom – both of which discuss the Rwandan Genocide – focus on factors that account for the escalation of violence against civilians, as well as individual participation in mass violence. The last two readings – by Boyle and Üngör – discuss the escalation of and forms of violence against civilians in the recent (and still ongoing) conflicts in Iraq and Syria.

UN Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), pp. 278-86. [5]

Benjamin Valentino, "Chapter 1. Mass Killing and Genocide," in *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2004), pp. 9-15. [7] [In this chapter, which is from a comparative study of the causes of mass killing, Valentino defines mass killing. Only read the first 7 pages of the chapter!]

Scott Straus, "Retreating from the Brink: Theorizing Mass Violence and the Dynamics of Restraint," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 10, no. 2 (June 2012), pp. 343-62. [15] [Discusses factors that make genocide more likely to occur, along with factors that militate against the pull toward violence within a society. Argues that we should study both factors that *escalate* violence and factors that *restrain* violence, since both shape the nature and extent of violence in a case.]

Omar Shahbudin McDoom, "The Psychology of Threat in Intergroup Conflict: Emotions, Rationality, and Opportunity in the Rwandan Genocide," *International Security*, vol. 37, no. 2 (Fall 2012), pp. 119-55. [37]

Michael J. Boyle, "Bargaining, Fear, and Denial: Explaining Violence against Civilians in Iraq 2004-2007," *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 21 (2009), pp. 261-87. [22]

Uğur Ümit Üngör, "Mass Violence in Syria: A Preliminary Analysis," *New Middle Eastern Studies*, vol. 3 (2013), pp. 1-22. [22]

Week 12: Wednesday, November 16: Humanitarian Intervention [95 pp.]

This week's readings focus on humanitarian intervention, which is a topic that has had a prominent place in public and policy debates since the mid-1990s, and especially in the past few years. The readings present a diverse set of arguments in support of and against humanitarian intervention. As you read, keep in mind that intervention can mean different things; many of the articles assume some form of military intervention, but the form can vary, and intervention can also be used to refer to non-military forms of aid or support. Be attentive to this as you read the different articles. Also keep in mind that these articles address the issue of intervention to stop or resolve primarily *humanitarian* abuses or crises (although Mamdani would take issue with the inherently political nature of even making such a distinction.)

Samantha Power, "Bystanders to Genocide: Why the United States Let the Rwandan Tragedy Happen," *The Atlantic Monthly* (September 2001), pp. 84-108. [21] [Power analyzes the failure of the United States to do anything to stop or mitigate the 1994 Rwandan Genocide. What are

some of the factors that she identifies that contributed to US policymakers' (civilian and military) inaction and failure? What are some of the steps that she says the US could have taken (but didn't) to mitigate and/or stop the killing? What are the norms that are at play in this story?]

Benjamin A. Valentino, "Still Standing By: Why America and the International Community Fail to Prevent Genocide and Mass Killing," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 1, no. 3 (September 2003), pp. 565-78. [12] [Outlines key reasons why the international community failed to prevent or stop the genocide in Rwanda. Also discusses some of the risks of intervention.]

Mahmood Mamdani, "Responsibility to Protect or Right to Punish," *Journal of International Statebuilding*, vol. 4, no. 1 (2010), pp. 53-67. [13] [Outlines a robust critique of the R2P doctrine.]

Alan J. Kuperman, "A Model Humanitarian Intervention?: Reassessing NATO's Libya Campaign," *International Security*, vol. 38, no. 1 (Summer 2013), pp. 105-36. [32]

Jonathan Monten, "Intervention and State-Building: Comparative Lessons from Japan, Iraq, and Afghanistan," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, no. 656 (November 2014), pp. 173-91. [17]

Wednesday, November 23: NO CLASS – THANKSGIVING RECESS

→10-pg literature review due by 8 pm on Sunday, November 27th

Week 13: Wednesday, November 30: Pathologies of Humanitarian Interventions [106 pp.]

This week continues to focus on humanitarian intervention, probing some of its unintended effects and pathologies.

Benjamin A. Valentino, "The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention: The Hard Truth about a Noble Notion," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 90, no. 6 (November/December 2011), pp. 60-73. [14]

Sarah Kenyon Lischer, "Collateral Damage: Humanitarian Assistance as a Cause of Conflict," *International Security*, vol. 28, no. 1 (Summer 2003), pp. 79-109. [31] [Argues that humanitarian aid is more likely to be misused and to exacerbate conflict when a refugee group is highly politicized and when the receiving state is unwilling or unable to maintain order among the refugees.]

Adam Branch, "Humanitarianism, Violence, and the Camp in Northern Uganda," *Civil Wars*, vol. 11, no. 4 (December 2009), pp. 477-501. [21] [Discusses the ways in which humanitarian aid to refugees in Uganda exacerbated civilians' vulnerability, perpetuated the conflict, and fed the state's use of violence.]

Séverine Autesserre, "Dangerous Tales: Dominant Narratives on the Congo and their Unintended Consequences," *African Affairs*, vol. 111, no. 443 (2012), pp. 202-22. [21]

Aisha Ahmad, "Agenda for Peace or Budget for War? Evaluating the Economic Impact of International Intervention in Somalia," *International Journal* (Spring 2012), pp. 313-31. [19] [On the unintended costs and consequences of humanitarian intervention for the target country.]

Week 14: Wednesday, December 7: The Rise of China and American Decline [126 pp.]

In this last week, we turn back to great power politics, considering the rise of China and the US' relative decline. The five readings cover a range of theoretical perspectives and offer overlapping and different policy recommendations. As you read these articles, think about what theoretical perspective each author comes from, and how these more empirically-grounded pieces relate to the theoretical and conceptual work we read at the beginning of the semester. Consider, in particular, the reading by Gilpin on hegemonic war from Week 3.

Sheena Chestnut and Alastair Iain Johnston, "Is China Rising?" in Eva Paus, Penelope B. Prime, and Jon Western, eds., *Global Giant: Is China Changing the Rules of the Game?* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), pp. 237-59. [18] [A conceptual and empirical discussion of whether and how much China is "rising."]

Robert J. Art, "The United States and the Rise of China: Implications for the Long Haul," *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 125, no. 3 (Fall 2010), pp. 359-91. [33]

Etel Solingen, "Domestic Coalitions, Internationalization, and War," *International Security*, vol. 39, no. 1 (Summer 2014), pp. 44-70. [27] [Considers whether war is likely as China rises and the US declines. Focuses on the role of transnational coalitions of interests and their centrality in shaping the nature of the shifting balance of power.]

Evan Braden Montgomery, "Contested Primacy in the Western Pacific: China's Rise and the Future of U.S. Power Projection," *International Security*, vol. 38, no. 4 (Spring 2014), pp. 115-49. [35] [A discussion of the rise of China and the implications for US grand strategy and US military primacy.]

G. John Ikenberry, "The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism after America," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 90, no. 3 (May/June 2011), pp. 56-68. [13] [A discussion of American decline, the rise of China, and the implications for the "liberal international order."]

→ 10-pg op-ed analysis papers due by 8 pm on Wednesday, December 14th