

Course Code: IP3027	
Module Name: Theory and Practice of Conflict and Peace	
Academic Year and Term: 2017-2018, Term I	
Lectures: Thursdays, 10:00-10:50	
Dr. Alexander Lanoszka Rhind D522 Alexander.Lanoszka@city.ac.uk Office Hours: Tuesdays, 13:00—14:50	Tutorial I: Thursdays, 11:00—11:50 Tutorial II: Thursdays, 12:00—12:50 All held at Rhind DLG20 Twitter: #IP3027

Module Description

State leaders often have to grapple with morally ambiguous and strategically complex situations. These situations can involve uses of, or threats to use, military force at various levels of intensity, ranging from low-level conventional aggression to world-ending nuclear war. Difficult questions of statecraft arise. How do you craft durable international order after a major war? Do you fight an adversary alone or settle for peace on unfavourable terms? What do you do when your friends or your enemies try to acquire nuclear weapons? How do you stop a civil war in which competing great power interests are implicated?

To address these questions, we will focus on particular historical controversies in which state leaders made decisions that continue to have an impact on world affairs. We will examine both the choices made and, more importantly, the paths not taken so as to appreciate the contingent nature of key historical events as well as the acumen required for successful diplomacy. Though we will take seriously the political science literature on international security, this module will have a strong historical bent. Indeed, we will cover such topics as the Treaty of Versailles, Apartheid South Africa, and China's rise. Be forewarned: given its importance for European and transatlantic security, Germany will be a recurring case study.

Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this module, students will be expected to be able to:

Knowledge and Understanding

- Demonstrate an in-depth understanding of key concepts and issues in international security
- Demonstrate knowledge of the different theories to explain the development of violent conflict
- Understand and engage critically with the assumptions that drive contemporary third party interventions in peace processes
- Show awareness of the challenges confronting national decision-makers when trying to forestall conflict with, or between adversaries
- Apply a multidisciplinary approach to the study of conflict, drawing not only from international relations and political science but also history

Skills

- Distinguish empirical and normative statements from each other
- Define abstract concepts and apply them with consistency and rigour when making sense of complex issues that involve war and peace
- Formulate clear arguments in written and oral format
- Justify your own positions with evidence-based arguments on topics relating to conflict and peace studies
- Demonstrate the importance of IT and time management skills

Values and Attitudes

- Appreciate the complex nature of conflict management and international diplomacy

- Value the role that diplomatic history and strategic studies play within the broader International Relations field
- Demonstrate tolerance towards the opinions of your colleagues
- Produce written materials that indicate in a precise and honest the nature of your work with proper attribution to the work of others
- Show consideration for the rules and regulations of the University

Teaching Pattern and Tutorials

Pedagogically, this is a one term module with two contact hours per week. It relies upon a combination of lectures and tutorials. The lectures serve to introduce the core concepts and themes raised in the assigned readings. They are not substitutes for doing the readings themselves. Under no circumstance can students rely on lectures to be anything more than introductory guide to the subject material.

Tutorials will be more interactive since we will be discussing the materials raised in both the lecture and the readings. Specifically, we will address a question that I have already assigned in this syllabus. Using the readings and the concepts discussed in lecture, we will explore the questions posed from different angles—be they strategic, political, economic, legal, or moral. At least through weeks 1 and 5, we will set aside on a weekly basis to answer questions students may have from the preparatory work done. As such, students are expected to do the readings and to undertake independent study in order: (1) to understand the topics covered in the weekly sessions; (2) to broaden and to deepen their knowledge of the subject; and (3) to develop their own value positions on a number of topics relating to international security. **Attendance will be monitored regularly.**

Lectures and tutorials will take place between 5 October and 14 December 2017.

In general, good participation in the tutorial entails several things:

- **Carefully reading and understanding the assigned texts before coming to the tutorial:** Much of our discussion will be based on the assigned readings. Because citing specific passages and claims will be necessary to support an argument, it is necessary for you to be familiar with the material. I strongly

recommend that you prepare a one page “cheat sheet” for each reading that summarises its main points.

- **Coming prepared to raise questions you have about the material and to express your opinions about the author’s arguments:** Critical thinking goes beyond simple comprehension. It involves placing the arguments in their contexts and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. To simply like or to dislike a piece is insufficient. As important as your gut reactions, you must back your arguments with evidence and logic. Any lack of understanding regarding a certain topic in the lectures and readings should be raised during the first part of tutorial. Chances are that if you have difficulty grasping a concept, then someone else is facing that same difficulty as well. After all, much of this module centres on sophisticated scholarship produced in strategic studies, political science, and history.
- **Listening attentively to your classmates and responding respectfully to their comments:** The structure of tutorials is straightforward: I moderate and facilitate an informed discussion among students. For tutorials to be effective, please listen to the points that other students are making rather than simply waiting to make your next comment. Vigorous disagreement is a major part of the academic world, but it is important to maintain a respectful, civil, and collegial tone. Personal attacks have no place here.
- **Other points of courtesy:** Please avoid side conversations, arrive on time, and do not leave early unless you have spoken with me before the beginning of the tutorial. Use of cell phones is strictly prohibited.

Most importantly, have fun! Tutorials are a place for engaging intellectually with your peers. Do not be afraid to play the devil’s advocate and to adopt positions that you otherwise would find disagreeable. Do not be shy about asking questions. Moreover, engaging in a critical but collegial dialogue with your classmates will force you to be articulate and clear in your arguments. Sometimes you might even concede that your argument is wrong. To paraphrase John Stuart Mill, even if you stand by your argument at the end of the debate, defending it forces you to reassess your own premises in a way that *could* reinforce your convictions. Either way, you come out of the dialogue stronger than before.

Assessment

Coursework (50% of module mark—pass mark: 40%)

50% Policy Essay — Deadline: 21 December 2017 at 16:00.

For this policy essay, choose a historical or contemporary policy problem and write a compelling policy memo recommending a particular course of action given the strategic, ethical, and legal complexity of the problem at hand. **You must clear the topic with me by 15 November 2017.** It is better to be more specific than broad (e.g., addressing a particular crisis from the standpoint of a particular person or agency). Be sure to discuss alternative choices in addition to the potential objections to your recommendation. Conduct independent research so as to complement the required and recommended readings. A good bibliography should have at least **15** sources.

Please see this draft policy essay that I prepared last year.

<http://alexlanoszka.com/SampleEssayIP3027.pdf>

You should also consult exemplary students' essays that are available on Moodle.

The word limit per written essay is 3,000 words. Students may go over or under by 10%. The word limit runs from the Introduction to the Conclusion of the assignment and will include quotes and footnotes that appear in the body of the assignment. It does not include the following: title page, abstract, diagrams, graphs, images, bibliography, and appendices. I will only mark an assignment up to the word limit. The part of the assignment that exceeds this limit will not be marked. I will provide feedback and explain that the penalty has been applied.

Other rules governing the formatting of the essay:

- Times 12 or its close equivalent (usually the default setting)
- 1" margins all around
- Double-spacing

- Page numbers—if your first page is the cover page, then set this page number to 0. (In Word, select “Page Numbers” from the “Insert” menu and click on “Format.”)
- Consistent usage of one standard citation style (Harvard, Chicago, MLA, etc.)
- A standard cover page that includes the word count.

Failure to format your essay properly will result in a small deduction of your mark.

Examination (50% of module mark—pass mark: 40%)

Cumulative Final Exam (to be held in January) whereby all material covered in the lectures and required readings may appear. It will be closed-book/closed-note and will feature one-third “short answer questions” and two-thirds “essay questions.” It will be a 2 hour unseen examination.

Submission of Coursework

Students should refer to the Programme Handbook for information about coursework. To summarise:

- Deadlines are final:** Your work should be ready for submission on the deadline. Please do not leave submission until the last minute. Coursework submitted after the deadline will not be marked. If you anticipate that you will be unable to submit your coursework on time due to Extenuating Circumstances, then you must submit an Extenuating Circumstances claim to the School Office by the appropriate deadline in accordance with the School Policy. The onus is on you to submit such a claim in a timely manner. If the Extenuating Circumstances panel accepts your claim, then you will receive an extension and your work will be marked as normal. If it rejects your claim and you submit your work late, then you will receive a mark of 0% for your coursework and you will be required to resit at a later date. Resits are capped at the minimum pass mark for the module (50%). Note that travel delays and IT problems are invalid Extenuating Circumstances.
- Submission:** Students must submit an electronic copy of the assignment on the module on Moodle by the deadline—this will be your coursework receipt.

Do not submit elsewhere. Nor do you submit directly to the teaching staff. *The responsibility is on you to ensure that your coursework is submitted on time and in the correct manner. If you experience any difficulties submitting on Moodle, then please contact your Programme Administrator immediately.*

- (c) **Plagiarism:** By submitting your essay for assessment electronically, you are agreeing to the following declaration: “The work I have submitted is exclusively my own work except where explicitly indicated with quotations and citation. I have read and understood the statement on plagiarism contained in the School Handbook and understand that plagiarism is a serious academic offence and could result in my exclusion from the University.” If you are unsure whether you are paraphrasing properly, then at least provide the full citation and have all directly quoted passages in quotation marks. *All written work will be submitted electronically via Turnitin.*
- (d) **Assistance:** In case you need help with referencing or essay written, then please refer yourself to your Programme Handbook. The Student Centre also provides a series of workshops to help students develop study skills. You can email them at the following address: academiclearningsupport@city.ac.uk. You can find further details of the support available on their website: <http://www.city.ac.uk/studentcentre>.

Office Hours

Drop-in office hours are on Tuesdays, from 13:00-14:50 at D522. No appointment is necessary but I would suggest bringing something to read in case you have to wait. Please let me know if this time does not work with your schedule so that we can arrange an alternative appointment.

Twitter

Over the course of the term I might tweet relevant articles that bear on the subjects and issues raised in this module. Tweeted articles are not required readings—they serve to complement the material. I will be using the hashtag **#IP3027**.

Letter Writing Requests

Absolutely DO NOT put my name down as a reference without asking for my permission first. I strongly encourage all students contemplating further postgraduate studies to consult with me first. Please note that I have very specific guidelines about letter writing. Read the document first before approaching me. Doing so will save everyone time and energy.

<http://www.alexlanoszka.com/LanoszkaPolicy.pdf>

Email Confirmation and Communication

Once you have read through this syllabus, please send me an email with subject line **“IP3027: Syllabus Read”**. In this email, state your name, your reasons for enrolling in this course, previous modules that may be relevant, and statement of origin. The email should be no longer than four sentences.

Please note that all emails sent to me should include “IP3027” at the beginning of the subject line. Responses could take up to 1-2 business days (no weekends). If I believe that answering your email would take me more than five minutes to do, then I would invite you to meet me during my office hours instead. If you have not received a response after 2 business days, then please resend your email. I will NOT respond to emails that are not sent from your city.ac.uk account.

Twitter

Over the course of the term I might tweet relevant articles that bear on the subjects and issues raised in this module. Tweeted articles are not required readings—they serve to complement the material. I will be using the hashtag **#IP3027**.

SCHEDULE

Week	Date	Lecture Topic	Tutorial
1	5/10/17	Strategy and Statecraft	No tutorial
2	12/10/17	The Treaty of Versailles	How do you solve the 'German problem' in 1919?
3	19/10/17	The Second World War	Why did Britain <i>not</i> seek peace in spring 1940?
4	26/10/17	The Nuclear Age	Do nuclear weapons keep the peace?
5	2/11/17	The Cold War in Europe	How do you solve the 'German problem' after 1949?
Reading Week			
7	16/11/17	Post-1989 Europe	Would you expand NATO to include former Eastern bloc states?
8	23/11/17	Economic Sanctions	How do you stop Apartheid in Cold War South Africa?
9	30/11/17	Ethnic Cleansing and Genocide	Would you have intervened to stop the Rwandan Genocide?
10	7/12/17	Humanitarian Intervention	Do outside powers have the right to intervene in the affairs of a state that experiences domestic conflict?
11	14/12/17	Dealing with Rising Powers	How can you ensure that China rises peacefully?
Coursework Essay due on 21 December 2017			
Cumulative Final Exam sometime between 15 and 27 January 2018			

Reading List and Module Schedule

Recommended readings marked with * are *strongly* recommended.

Week 1: Strategy and Statecraft

What are the elements of statecraft and strategy? For what ends do states employ military power? What is deterrence and why does it matter? What is the difference between deterrence and compellence? Brute force and coercion? To what extent do moral concerns bear on how we conceive and practice coercion?

Required:

Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966): 1-34 (chapter one).

Richard Ned Lebow “Deterrence and Reassurance: Lessons from the Cold War,” *Global Dialogue*, vol. 3 (2001): 119-32.

Dan Reiter, “Exploring the Bargaining Model of War,” *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2003): 27-33.

Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2006): 1-20.

Weekly Word Count: 75

Recommended:

*Johan Galtung, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 6, no. 3 (1969): 167-191.

Henry A. Kissinger, “The Congress of Vienna: A Reappraisal,” *World Politics*, vol. 8, no. 2 (1956): 264-280.

Week 2: The Treaty of Versailles

Tutorial Question: How do you solve ‘the German problem’ in 1919?

How do you design an international order following a major power war like the First World War? What steps do you take in order to prevent another armed conflict from breaking out in the future? How do you balance between the need to exact costs on the defeated adversary and the need to develop cooperative ties with it in the future?

Required:

G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Orders after Major Wars* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000): 117-163.

Sally Marks, *The Illusion of Peace: International Relations in Europe, 1918-1933* (Basingstoke, UK: Palsgrave Macmillan, 2003): 1-28.

Marc Trachtenberg, “Versailles Revisited,” *Security Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3 (2000): 191-205. Available here: [http://www.polisci.ucla.edu/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/Ver\(ss\).doc](http://www.polisci.ucla.edu/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/Ver(ss).doc).

Weekly Page Count: 90.

Recommended:

Walter A. McDougall, “Political Economy versus National Sovereignty: French Structures for German Economic Integration after Versailles,” *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 51, no. 1 (1979): 4-23.

Marc Trachtenberg, “Reparation at the Paris Peace Conference,” *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 51, no. 1 (1979): 24-55.

Klaus Schwabe, “Woodrow Wilson and Germany’s Membership in the League of Nations, 1918-1919,” *Central European History*, vol. 8, no. 1 (1975): 3-22.

Adam Tooze, *The Deluge: The Great War, America, and the Remaking of the Global Order* (New York, NY: Penguin Books, 2015).

Margaret Macmillan, *Peacemakers: Six Months that Changed the World* (London, UK: John Murray, 2001).

Week 3: The Second World War

Tutorial Question: Why did Britain *not* seek peace in spring 1940?

Was Britain's choice to continue fighting Nazi Germany in early 1940 at the time —given what its leaders knew and faced at the same time? What were the roads not taken between the Remilitarization of the Rhineland in 1936 and the Battle of Britain in 1940? What were the costs and benefits (political and moral) of each of them?

Required:

Norrin M. Ripsman and Jack S. Levy, "Wishful Thinking or Buying Time? The Logic of British Appeasement in the 1930s," *International Security*, vol. 33, no. 2 (2008): 148-181.

Jeffrey L. Hughes, "The Origins of World War II in Europe: British Deterrence Failure and German Expansionism," *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, vol. 18, no. 4 (1988): 851-891.

David Reynolds, *From World War to Cold War: Churchill, Roosevelt, and the International History of the 1940s* (Oxford, UK, Oxford University Press, 2006): 75-98 (chapter 4).

Wilhelm Deist, "The Road to Ideological War: Germany, 1918-1945," in *The Making of Strategy: Rulers, States, and War*, eds. Williamson Murray, McGregor Knox, and Alvin Bernstein (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 371-385.

Weekly Page Count: 84

Recommended:

Norrin M. Ripsman and Jack S. Levy, "The Preventive War that Never Happened: Britain, France, and the Rise of Germany in the 1930s," *Security Studies*, vol. 16, no. 1 (2007): 32-67.

Daniel Hucker, "The Unending Debate: Appeasement, Chamberlain and the Origins of the Second World War," *Intelligence and National Security*, vol. 23, no. 4 (2008): 536-551.

*Randall L. Schweller, "Domestic Structure and Preventive War: Are Democracies More Pacific?" *World Politics*, vol. 44, no. 2 (1992): 235-269.

Randall L. Schweller, "Tripolarity and the Second World War," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 1 (1993): 73-103.

Jack S. Levy, "Preventive War and Democratic Politics," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 52, no. 1 (2008): 1-24.

Week 4: The Nuclear Age

Tutorial Question: Do nuclear weapons keep the peace?

Strategists and security scholars have put forward different arguments about the effects of nuclear weapons on stability. Some argue that they have had no effect—other trends in the international system are responsible for the lack of major power war since 1945. Others argue that they are important because the fear of nuclear devastation encourages cooperation. And yet some others that deliberate nuclear weapons use has become unthinkable.

Required:

Robert Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution: Statecraft and the Prospect of Armageddon* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1989): 1-45.

Nina Tannenwald, “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear No First Use,” *International Organization*, vol. 53, no. 3 (1999): 433-468.

Weekly Page Count: 81

Recommended:

Keir A. Lieber, *War and the Engineers: The Primacy of Politics over Technology* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005): 123-148.

*John Mueller, “The Essential Irrelevance of Nuclear Weapons: Stability in the Postwar World,” *International Security*, vol. 13, no. 2 (1988): 55-79.

Matthew Kroenig, “Nuclear Superiority and the Balance of Resolve: Explaining Nuclear Crisis Outcomes,” *International Organization*, vol. 67, no. 1 (2013): 141-171.

Matthew Fuhrmann and Todd Sechser, “Crisis Bargaining and Nuclear Blackmail,” *International Organization*, vol. 67, no. 1 (2013): 173-195.

Vipin Narang, *Nuclear Strategy in the Modern Era: Regional Powers and International Conflict* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014).

Scott D. Sagan and Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: An Enduring Debate* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton, 2013).

Week 5: The Cold War in Europe

Tutorial Question: How do you solve ‘the German problem’ after 1949?

What was the Cold War all about? Was it about mutual insecurity in a world dominated by two heavily-armed states? Was it about conflicting ideologies and political-economic systems? Or was it about the status of post-war Germany? What would these interpretations of the Cold War imply for diplomacy?

Required:

Robert Jervis, “Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma?” *Journal of Cold War Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2001): 36-60.

Marc Trachtenberg, *History and Strategy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991): 153-168 (chapter 4).

Francis J. Gavin, *Nuclear Statecraft: History and Strategy in America’s Atomic Age* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012): 57-74 (chapter 3).

Marc Trachtenberg, *The Cold War and After: History, Theory, and the Logic of International Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2012):154-182 (chapter 6).

Weekly Page Count: 88

Recommended:

Gene Gerzhoy, “Alliance Coercion and Nuclear Restraint: How the United States Thwarted West Germany’s Nuclear Ambitions,” *International Security*, vol. 39, no. 4 (2015): 91-129.

John S. Duffield, “Political Culture and State Behavior: Why Germany Confounds Neorealism,” *International Organization*, vol. 53, no. 4 (1999): 765-803.

Robert Jervis, “Cooperation under the Security Dilemma,” *World Politics*, vol. 30, no. 2 (1978): 167-214.

Week 6: Reading Week

Week 7: Post-1989 Europe

Tutorial Question: How do you manage post-Cold War Russia?

How did Europe change with the end of the Cold War and the subsequent collapse of the Soviet Union? What are the geopolitical and moral dimensions involved with integrating former members of the Warsaw Pact? What new purpose would NATO have in such a world order, if any? To what extent do you proceed with NATO expansion, if at all?

Required:

Mary Elise Sarotte, "A Broken Promise? What the West Really Told Moscow About NATO Expansion," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 93, no. 5 (2014): 90-97.

Joshua R.I. Shiffrin, "Deal or No Deal? The End of the Cold War and the US Offer to Limit NATO Expansion," *International Security*, vol. 40, no. 4 (2016): 7-44.

Mark Kramer, "The Myth of a No-NATO-Enlargement Pledge to Russia," *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2 (2009): 39-61.

Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, "The Unravelling of the Cold War Settlement," *Survival*, vol. 51, no. 6 (2009): 39-62.

Weekly Page Count: 92

Recommended:

*John J. Mearsheimer, "Why the Ukraine Crisis is the West's Fault: The Liberal Delusions that Provoked Putin," *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 93, no. 5 (2014): 77-89.

*Kathryn Stone and Michael McFaul, "Who Lost Russia (This Time)? Vladimir Putin," *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 2 (2015): 167-187.

Andrei Tsygankov, “Vladimir Putin’s Last Stand: The Sources of Russia’s Ukraine Policy,” *Post-Soviet Affairs*, vol. 31, no. 4 (2015): 27-303.

Week 8: Economic Sanctions

Tutorial Question: How do you stop Apartheid in Cold War South Africa?

Cold War era South Africa put American decision-makers in a bind that might seem difficult to understand today. On the one hand, the Apartheid regime was staunchly anti-communist . On the other hand, its domestic policies were very controversial to members of Western publics. What tools of statecraft can you use to ensure the friendliness of the South African regime while striving to change its unsavory domestic politics?

Required:

David A. Baldwin, *Economic Statecraft* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985): 29-50.

Robert A. Pape, "Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work," *International Security*, vol. 22, no. 2 (1997): 90-98; 106-110.

Philip I. Levy, "Sanctions on South Africa: What Did They Do?" *American Economic Review*, vol. 89, no. 2 (1999): 415-420.

Susan Hannah Allen, "The Determinants of Economic Sanctions Success and Failure," *International Interactions*, vol. 31, no. 2 (2005): 117-138.

Jay Gordon, "A Peaceful, Silent, Deadly Remedy: The Ethics of Economic Sanctions," *Ethics and International Affairs*, vol. 13 (1999): 123-142.

Weekly Word Count: 87.

Recommended:

*Jonathan Kirshner, "The Microfoundations of Economic Sanctions," *Security Studies*, vol. 6, no. 3 (1997): 32-64.

Risa Brooks, "Sanctions and Regime Type: What Works, and When?" *Security Studies*, vol. 11, no. 4 (2002): 1-50.

Margaret Doxey, "International Sanctions: A Framework for Analysis with Special Reference to the UN and Southern Africa," *International Organization*, vol. 26, no. 3 (1972): 527-550.

Week 9: Ethnic Cleansing and Genocide

Tutorial Question: What causes the outbreak of inter-ethnic violence?

Consider the case of Rwanda. Within one-hundred days, members of the Hutu majority government killed an estimated 500,000-1,000,000 Tutsi Rwandans. What are the causes of such genocidal campaigns? How can knowledge of the causes inform policy responses?

Required:

Stathis N. Kalyvas, "The Ontology of 'Political Violence': Action and Identity in Civil Wars," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 1, no. 3 (2003): 475-494.

Scot Straus, "Rwanda and Darfur: A Comparative Analysis," *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2006): 41-56.

Benjamin A. Valentino, *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000): 1-6; 9-29.

Stephen Van Evera, "Primordialism Lives!", *APSA-CP: Newsletter of the Organized Section in Comparative Politics of the American Political Science Association*, vol. 12, no. 1 (2001): 20-22.

Weekly Word Count: 67

Recommended:

Laila Balcells, "The Consequences of Victimization on Political Identities: Evidence from Spain," *Politics & Society*, vol. 40, no. 3 (2012): 311-347.

Roberto Belloni, "Civil Society and Peacebuilding in Bosnia and Herzegovina," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 38, no. 2 (2001): 163-180.

K. Andrieu, "'Sorry for the Genocide': How Public Apologies Can Help Promote Reconciliation," *Millennium*, vol. 38, no. 1 (2009): 3-23.

C.L. Sriram, "Justice as Peace? Liberal Peacebuilding and Strategies of Transitional Justice," *Global Society*, vol. 21, no. 4 (2007): 579-591.

Nicholas Sambanis, "Partition as a Solution to Ethnic War: An Empirical Critique of the Theoretical Literature," *World Politics*, vol. 52, no. 4 (2000): 437-443; 478-482.

*James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 97, no. 1 (2003): 75-82; 88-8.

Jennifer Lind, "Apologies in International Politics," *Security Studies*, vol. 18, no. 3 (2009): 517-556.

Week 10: Humanitarian Intervention

Tutorial Question: Do outside powers have the right to intervene in the affairs of a state that experiences domestic conflict?

According to international law, states are sovereign when it comes to their domestic affairs. To what extent can other states abridge such sovereign rights in order to intervene in a civil war—particularly against the wishes of the central government? What are the strategic, moral, and legal implications of humanitarian intervention?

Required:

Samantha Power, “Bystanders to Genocide: Why the United States Let the Rwandan Tragedy Happen,” *The Atlantic Monthly* (September 2001): 84-108.

Edward N. Luttwak, “Give War a Chance,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 78, no. 4 1999: 36-44.

Gareth Evans and Mohamed Sahnoun, “The Responsibility to Protect,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 81, no. 6 (2002): 99-110.

Virginia Page Fortna, “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace?: International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War,” *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 48, no. 2 (2004): 269-276; 288.

Roland Paris, “Peacebuilding and the Limits of Liberal Internationalism,” *International Security*, vol. 22, no. 2 (1997): 54-89.

Weekly Word Count: 85

Recommended:

*Barbara F. Walter, “The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement,” *International Organization*, vol. 51, no. 3 (1997): 335-364.

Carrie Booth Walling, "Human Rights Norms, State Sovereignty, and Humanitarian Intervention," *Human Rights Quarterly*, vol. 37, no. 2 (2015): 383-413.

Martin Binder, "Paths to Intervention: What Explains the UN's Selective Response to Humanitarian Crises?" *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 52, no. 6 (2015): 712-726.

Week 11: Dealing with Rising Powers

Tutorial Question: How can you ensure that China rises peacefully?

Some scholars argue that periods of power transition—whereby one major power declines and another rises—are likely to feature conflict, even war. Some historical examples like the First World War appear to support this proposition. Yet others seemingly contradict it, as in the case of Britain’s decline and America’s rise. This controversy matters since we might be amid an instance of power transition today if we consider the rise of China and the travails that trouble America today. What can both major powers do in order to avoid a major war?

Required:

G. John Ikenberry, “The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive?” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 87, no. 1 (2008): 23-37.

Aaron L. Friedberg, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?” *International Security*, vol. 30, no. 2 (2005): 7-45.

Thomas J. Christensen, “Obama and Asia: Confronting the China Challenge,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 94, no. 5 (2001): 28-36.

Yves-Heng Lim, “How (Dis)Satisfied is China? A Power Transition Theory Perspective,” *Journal of Contemporary China*, vol. 24, no. 92 (2015): 280-297.

Weekly Word Count: 79

Recommended:

Jonathan Kirshner, “The Tragedy of Offensive Realism: Classical Realism and the Rise of China,” *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 18, no. 1 (2012): 53-75.

Steve Chan, “Exploring Puzzles in Power-Transition Theory: Implications for Sino-American Relations,” *Security Studies*, vol. 13, no. 3 (2004): 103-141.

*Alastair Iain Johnston, “Is China a Status Quo Power?” *International Security*, vol. 27, no. 4 (2003): 5-56.

Nina Silove, “The Pivot before the Pivot: U.S. Strategy to Preserve the Power Balance in Asia,” *International Security*, vol. 40, no. 4 (2016): 45-88.