

POLS-320: Political Violence

Donald M. Beaudette, Ph.D.
Office: 214A Seney Hall
Email: donald.beaudette@emory.edu

Introduction:

This course introduces students to social scientific explanations for the causes, consequences and resolution of civil wars, insurgency and terrorism. We focus on critical engagement with recent theoretical and empirical social science scholarship on civil war, genocide and terrorism. A primary goal for this course is to encourage students to utilize the concepts and theories presented in the readings to analyze and understand significant events in the political world around them. While this is not a course in current events, a significant proportion of our time in class will be dedicated to discussing, and debating, the adequacy of current social science theories of violence with reference to contemporary events, such as the ongoing war in Afghanistan. The essential objective of this course is to provide students with the social science tools to understand *why* civil wars occur in some place but not others, *why* some groups resort to terrorism, but not others and *how* the decisions made by politicians—and voters—can both influence and be influenced by these outcomes.

This is also a writing intensive course and students should expect to spend a significant amount of time writing and revising their research papers. The purpose of the course's writing assignments are three-fold. First, the assignments provide students with an opportunity to apply the concepts discussed in class to current and historical events that are of significant personal interest. Second, the assignments are designed to encourage students to approach writing as a process, through which a finished product is produced through collaboration with peers through multiple stages of review and revision. Finally, the assignments provide the instructor with an opportunity to evaluate each student's facility with the theories and concepts covered in this syllabus, and to provide feedback and guidance as part of this assessment.

Evaluation:

Case Study Research Paper (60%)
Case Study Presentation (10%)
Fidelity Checks (15%)
Current Events Blog (15%)

Plagiarism is presenting someone else's work as your own. Please cite or quote all ideas that are not your own or common knowledge. If you are unsure about whether something would be plagiarism, please ask. Plagiarism will result in referral to the honor council. ***Any work found to contain plagiarized material will automatically be marked as a zero without the possibility of re-submission.***

Case Study Paper

Each student will select one of the theoretical articles assigned during the first section of the course (the *Civil Conflict* section). Having read and thoroughly understood the author's theoretical argument, the student will write a paper evaluating the validity of the author's argument in a case of internal conflict *other than* the one used by the original author (if the original study uses statistical analysis, then the student may choose any case of civil conflict for the purposes of this paper). The purpose of this assignment is for the student to demonstrate critical engagement with a complex theoretical argument by applying it to a novel case, while at the same time improving general research skills and gaining new, in depth knowledge of (one part of) the political world. Your emphasis should be on drawing out the testable predictions (hypotheses) from the theoretical article and presenting evidence to demonstrate whether or not the predicted relationship holds in the case you have selected. The final paper should be approximately 15 to 20 pages in length.

The Assignment

This paper will be written in six stages. Specific guidelines on the content of each section of the paper will be provided during the semester. The **first stage** will involve the selection of a case and the drafting of a research proposal. Cases should be selected using the Uppsala Conflict Database (<http://www.ucdp.uu.se/gpdatabase/search.php>). This should be done in consultation with the instructor. All students must schedule a face-to-face meeting with the Dr. Beaudette to discuss the concepts and cases that they are interested in researching. After meeting with Dr. Beaudette, each student will prepare a short (approximately two to three double spaced pages) proposal explaining which conflict they will be studying. The proposal will also briefly summarize the theoretical perspective adopted by the student and establish how the argument will be tested. This process should be completed *no later than* February 5th.

Stage two will require each student to provide an annotated bibliography, indicating the sources to be used for the research project and describing their relevance to the topic under consideration. The annotated bibliography must be submitted to the instructor via email prior to the beginning of class on February 19th.

For **stage three**, students will exchange first drafts of their papers with a partner in the course. Papers should be exchanged by midnight on March 20th. A draft copy should also be sent to the instructor. Each partner will carefully read the other partner's paper and provide written feedback (approximately one single-spaced, typed page in length) on the draft. Written comments will be exchanged in class on March 23rd, and students will meet with their partners in class to discuss their drafts.

Stage four will require each student to revise the draft submitted for stage three. These revised drafts will then be submitted to the instructor for comments. Revised drafts should be submitted to Dr. Beaudette via email *no later than* 8:00 pm on April 17th. Note that, as with stage three, your reading assignment for April 20th will be to read and comment on your partner's most recent draft.

Stage five will involve the writing of the final draft, which will be due at the beginning of the final examination period assigned to this course.

Stage six will consist of a brief (10 to 15 minute) research presentation, in which you will be expected to provide a clear summary of your research question and your findings. At the conclusion of your presentation, your peers will be given five minutes during which to ask you questions about your project.

Assignment Grading

There will be four components to your paper grade:

1. Research Proposal: 15%
2. Annotated Bibliography: 15%
3. Involvement in Revision Process: 15% Half of this grade will be based on your partner's evaluation (using a rubric designed by the instructor) of the quality of the feedback you provided. The other half will be based on the instructor's evaluation of the significance of the improvements/revisions made between your first draft and your final paper.
4. Content: 55% (To be assessed on the basis of the final draft). Provisional grades will be assigned to the paper at each stage of the revision process.

Participation and Attendance

Your active participation is very important. Always feel free to state your opinions in a way that invites discussion. Discussion of other scholarship, history, and current events will certainly be welcome when they are relevant, but **careful reading** of the materials assigned for this course and concentrated thinking about the ideas raised in class will be a sufficient basis from which to contribute profitably to class discussion. The first step toward participating in class is attending class. Attendance will be taken every day in the form of a signed attendance sheet. Each unexcused absence will result in a one-half letter grade reduction in the final grade for the course (e.g. an A becomes an A-). More than three unexcused absences will result in automatic withdrawal from the course (per the Morehouse College Student Handbook).

Current Events Blog

During the second half of the semester (the *Terrorism* portion of the course), each student will maintain a current events blog, to be hosted on the course Blackboard website. You must select four separate substantive topics from the syllabus and write a blog post that uses one of the theories covered as part of that topic to analyze events discussed in a recent news article. Posts should be approximately 300 - 500 words in length. Each post should provide a concise summary of the event depicted in the news item. The post should then use one of the theories from the assigned readings, either to explain why the event occurred or to offer an assessment of the significance/consequences of the event.

Fidelity Checks

Throughout the semester, there will be at least five but not more than eight unannounced 'fidelity checks.' Each fidelity check will contain a number of multiple choice or short answer style questions about the assigned reading material as well as recent developments in current events. There will be no make-ups for these fidelity checks except in extraordinary circumstances as provided for in the Oxford College Catalog. Your lowest fidelity check score will be dropped when calculating this component of your final grade.

Course Texts and Materials

Midlarsky, Manus, ed. 2009. *The Handbook of War Studies III: The Intrastate Dimension*. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

The textbook can be purchased at the Oxford College bookstore.

Reading and Discussion Schedule

January 14: First Day of Class/Introduction

Part I: Civil War and Internal Conflict

January 16: A History of (political) Violence:

1. Harbom, Lotta and Peter Wallensteen. 2014. "Armed Conflicts, 1946—2013." (Internet - <http://jpr.sagepub.com/content/51/4/541.full.pdf+html>).
2. The Fragile States Index. Foreign Policy. (Internet - <http://ffp.statesindex.org/rankings-2014>).

January 19: NO CLASS – MLK HOLIDAY

January 21 & January 23: Explanations for Intrastate Conflict - Overview

1. Mason, David T. 2009. "The Evolution of Theory on Civil War and Revolution." In Midlarsky (ed.) *The Handbook of War Studies III*. University of Michigan Press.
2. Lichbach, Mark. 2009. "Internal Wars over the State." In Midlarsky (ed.) *The Handbook of War Studies III*. University of Michigan Press.

January 26: Defining Ethnicity

1. Neal A. Jesse and Kristen P. Williams. 2010. "Chapter 1: Ethnic Conflict and Approaches to Understanding It."

January 28 & January 30: Do 'ethnic' internal wars have unique causes?

Required:

1. Fearon, James D. and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War." *American Political Science Review*. 97:1, pp. 75-90.
2. Elaine K. Denny and Barbara F. Walter. 2014. "Ethnicity and Civil War." *Journal of Peace Research*, 51:2, pp. 199 – 212.
3. Nils B. Weidmann and Idean Salehyan. 2013 "Violence and Ethnic Segregation: A Computational Model Applied to Baghdad." *International Studies Quarterly*, 57:1, pp. 52 – 64.

Recommended:

1. Brubaker, Rogers and David D. Laitin. 1998. Ethnic and Nationalist Violence Annual Review of Sociology (24), 423-452
2. Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 1996. "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation." *American Political Science Review* 90:4, pp. 715-735.

February 2 – February 6: Relative Deprivation & Resource Mobilization

Required:

1. Gurr, Ted. 1968. "A Causal Model of Civil Strife: A Comparative Analysis Using New Indices." *American Political Science Review* 62:4, pp. 1104-1124. Selected pages.
2. Tilly, Charles. 1973. "Does Modernization Breed Revolution?" *Comparative Politics*. 5:1, pp. 425-447. Selected pages.
3. Herge et al. 2009. "Poverty and Civil War Events: A Disaggregated Study of Liberia." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53:4, pp. 598 – 623.

February 9: The 'Rebel's Dilemma?' Collective Action & Insurgency

Required:

1. Lichbach, Mark 1994. "What Makes Rational Peasants Revolutionary: Dilemma, Paradox, and Irony in Peasant Rebellion," *World Politics* 46, pp. 383-418
2. Bahney et al. 2013. "Insurgent Compensation: Evidence From Iraq." *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*. 103:3, pp. 518 – 522.

February 11 & February 13: Rebel Recruitment

1. Gates, Scott. 2002. "Recruitment and Allegiance: The Microfoundations of Rebellion." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46, pp. 111–130
2. Humphreys, Macartan and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2008. "Who Fights? The Determinants Of Participation In Civil War." *American Journal of Political Science*. 52:2, pp. 436-455
3. Weinstein, Jeremy. 2005. "Resources and the Information Problem in Rebel Recruitment," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49, pp. 598-624

February 16 & February 18: Natural Resources & Economic Explanations

Required:

1. Collier, Paul. 2003. "The Market for Civil War." *Foreign Policy*.
2. Ross, Michael L. 2004. "How Do Natural Resources Influence Civil War? Evidence from Thirteen Cases." *International Organization*. 58:1, pp. 35-67. Selected Pages.

Recommended:

1. Collier, Paul. Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and their Implications for Policy

February 20: The Bargaining Model & Civil War Onset

Required:

1. Walter, Barbara F. 2009. "Bargaining Failures and Civil War." *Annual Review of Political Science*. 12, pp. 243-261

23 February & 25 February: Explanations for Intra State Conflict – Structural Explanations

Required:

1. Toft, Monica Duffy. "The Origins of Ethnic Wars." In Midlarsky (ed.) *The Handbook of War Studies III*. University of Michigan Press.
2. Posen, Barry. "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict." 1993. *Survival*. 35:1, pp. 27-47.

27 February: Ending Internal Conflict

1. Roy Licklider. "Civil War Outcomes" In Midlarsky (ed.) *The Handbook of War Studies III*. University of Michigan Press.

March 2 - March 6 The Causes of Genocide

Required:

1. Valentino, Benjamin. 2004. *Final Solutions: Mass Killings and Genocides*. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press). Selected Pages.
2. Midlarsky "Genocide Studies: Large N, Small N, and Policy Specificity" in *Handbook of War Studies*

March 9 – March 13: NO CLASS – SPRING BREAK

March 16 & March 18: Genocide in Rwanda

Required:

1. Film: "Frontline: The Triumph of Evil"

Film to be shown/viewed prior to class. After consulting with students on scheduling conflicts, the instructor will organize an on-campus showing of the film for members of class (location TBD). If you are unable to attend the showing, you are required to make arrangements to view the film on your own time.

2. Davenport, Christian and Allan Stam. "Rwanda 1994: More than Genocide." Available from: [http://web.mac.com/christiandavenport/iWeb/Site 7/GenoDynamics_files/maryland.htm](http://web.mac.com/christiandavenport/iWeb/Site%207/GenoDynamics_files/maryland.htm)

Our discussion of the film and article will focus on the question of what, if anything, the international community could/should have done in order to prevent the occurrence of the Rwandan genocide. Pay

close attention to the film's discussion of the (in)actions of the UN and other major international players. You should also think carefully about the argument presented by Davenport and Stam. How does their account of the genocide—and the potential for successful intervention—differ from the one offered in the film?

Part II: Terrorism

March 20: The Nature of Terrorism

Required:

BEFORE you do the readings: In a word processor, compose your own definition of terrorism in three sentences or less. AFTER you've done the readings go back to your definition. Do you still think your definition is appropriate/accurate? If not, why not? If so, how is your definition similar to or different than those offered in the readings? Write a short paragraph or two (250 words or less) reflecting on these issues.

Definitions and reflections should be submitted to the instructor via email no later than 8:00 pm on March 19.

1. Sanchez-Cuenca, Ignacio and Luis De la Calle. 2009. "Domestic Terrorism: The Hidden Side of Political Violence." *Annual Review of Political Science*. 12, pp. 31-49.
2. United States Department of State, Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003 available at: <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/crt/2003/c12153.htm>, pg. xii only.
3. Council of the European Union. 2002. "Framework Decision on Combating Terrorism." *Journal of the European Communities*. Available here, Articles 1 and 2 only.
4. Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. 2000. *Terrorism Act (2000)*. Available here, Section 1 only.
5. Government of Iraq. 2005. *Anti-Terrorism Legislation*.

Spend a few minutes looking at the data available at: <http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/>. Use the browse function to look at things like the types of weapons used in terrorist attacks and patterns of variation in the occurrence of terrorism across time and space. Make a note of anything interesting you observe and prepare at least one question or comment about the data for class (be sure to write down your question/comment before the beginning of class).

March 23: Peer Review Session

March 25: Defining Terrorism II: *The Wind That Shakes the Barley*

Required Readings:

1. FILM: *The Wind That Shakes the Barley*
1. Hart, Peter. 1997. "The Geography of Revolution in Ireland 1917-1923." *Past & Present*. No. 155, pp. 142-176. ***There are a lot of maps. It's not as long as it appears. That said, the maps are a vital part of the article, so don't just skip over them.***
2. Hanley, Brian. 2006. "Film Eye: The Wind That Shakes the Barley." *History Ireland*. 14:5.
3. Ó Drisceoli, Donal. 2009. "Framing the Irish Revolution: Ken Loach's *The Wind That Shakes the Barley*." *Radical History Review*. Issue 104, pp. 5-15.

March 27: The Strategic & Psychological Origins of Terrorism

1. Martha Crenshaw, "The Logic of Terrorism: Terrorist Behavior as a Product of Strategic Choice"
2. Jerrold Post, "Terrorist Psycho-logic: Terrorist Behavior as a Product of Psychological Forces"

March 30 – April 3: Causes of Terrorism: Roots vs. Routes

Required:

1. Krueger and Maleckova, "Seeking the Roots of Terrorism"
2. Blair, Fair, Neil and Shapiro, "Poverty and Support for Militant Politics: Evidence from Pakistan"
3. Fernando Reinares, "Who are the Terrorists? Analyzing Changes in Sociological Profile among Members of ETA"
4. Peter Hart, "Youth Culture and the Cork IRA"

April 6 – April 10: Suicide Terrorism

1. FILM: "Paradise Now"
2. Robert Pape, "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism"
3. Dan Reiter and Sara Jackson Wade, "Does Democracy Matter"
4. Mia Bloom, "Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror"

April 20: Peer Review Session

April 22: Consequences of Terrorism

Required:

1. Berrebi, Claude and Esteban F. Klor. 2006. "On Terrorism and Electoral Outcomes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 50:6, pp. 899-925.
2. Indridason, Indridi H. 2008. "Does Terrorism Influence Domestic Politics? Coalition Formation and Terrorist Incidents." *Journal of Peace Research*. 45:2, pp. 241-259.
3. Anna Gemansky and Thomas Zeitzoff. 2014. "Terrorism and Voting: The Effect of Rocket Threat on Voting in Israeli Elections." *American Political Science Review*. 108:3, pp. 588 – 604.

Recommended:

1. Abadie, Alberto and Javier Gardeazabal. 2003. "The Economic Costs of Conflict: A Case Study of the Basque Country." *American Economic Review*. 93:1, pp. 113-132.
 Read only pages 113-116 and 120-128.
2. Benmelech, Efraim, Claude Berrebi and Esteban Klor. 2009. "The Economic Costs of Harboring Terrorism." NBER Working Paper No. 15465. Selected Pages.

April 24: Counterterrorism

1. Chenoweth and Dugan, "Rethinking Counterterrorism: Evidence from Israel"
2. Perkosi and Chenoweth, "The Effectiveness of Counterterrorism in Spain: A New Approach"

April 27: Student Research Presentations

Final Exam Period: Papers Due and Remaining Presentations Given