**POLITICAL VIOLENCE AND POLITICAL ORDER**

**What is politics (social)?**

Use of authority to allocate scarce resources\*

Means of coordinating social behavior

Two elements

–

Authority: capacity to direct social behavior (actions of others)

•

Often relies on coercion (distinct from pure coercion, legitimate, taxes): capacity to impose costs (physical, economic, social, emotional) if directive not followed

•

But presence of authority also rests on some legitimacy (target of directive recognizes right of person or organization to do so, even if they disagree with the command)

–

Allocation of scarce resources: implies some degree of competition or social conflict over that allocation

**How does violence shape political order?**

Political order: stable patterns or regularities of social behavior induced by authority relationships and/or coercion

•

Critical role for coercion and violence in politics

–

Violence (deployment or threat of it) often necessary for enforcement of directives

•

E.g. Hobbes Leviathan: centralized power gives the capacity to deploy it so that people so that people do not harm each other, so society can function

•

6th Street on a weekend night at 2 a.m. (cops have authority to coerce, legitimate)

•

But...

**FUNDAMENTAL DILEMMA OF POLITICS**

**How does violence shape political order? The fundamental dilemma of politics**

•

Government or organization strong enough to enforce its directives is also strong enough to leverage authority for its own gain (Weingast)

–

Violence can facilitate predation: the forcible redistribution of resources (as armed robbery by a political organization)

–

How empower government to enforce directives while also constraining its ability to engage in predatory activities that could strengthen its authority?

–

Successful societies in the long run have figured out how to regulate use of violence in a way that constrains its arbitrary use and makes its deployment legitimate

**Violence and international political order: implications for the U.S.**

If predators in international politics, what to do?

–

e.g. Hitler: use violence to overturn Weimar democracy and then embarks on horrific program of genocidal expansion

–

Use of violence for predation as self-sustaining: take what they want and then use those new resources to bolster military so can engage in more predation

•

Sometimes have to go to war to impose limits on or regulate violence

–

If do not counter force with force, future of political impotence as target of extortion

**Violence and international political order: implications for the U.S.**

•

Dilemma for the United States: American military power necessary to defeat Hitler, but how constrain American capacity for violence after 1945?

–

Competition with Soviet Union, containing soviet union

–

Ikenberry: bind American military power through institutions, legitimate (no arbitration)

•

Internal: democracy

•

External: NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization)

•

Dangerous legacy of 2003: Allies and U.N. say no to Iraq, but US does it anyway. America unbound? American power still legitimate outside of US?

•

US as indispensable nation: world needs US military power (e.g. ISIS in Middle East), but is exercise of US military power sufficiently regulated?

**What is war?**

Military contest among competing LARGE **organizations**

•

Organizations possess conflicting interests over some set of issues in dispute

•

Use of physical punishment to secure political concessions or disarm the adversary

–

Military force signal resolves (willingness to sustain costs in service of some political goal); reveals the distribution of military power between sides; and can enable one side to impose settlement on other

•

Violent means to some political end

–

Clausewitz: War as the continuation of politics by other means

**Can there be a Just War?**

Dilemma: How can an event as destructive as war be “just”? There is no overarching world government to police nations

•

Is killing ever ethically permissible? What conditions?

•

Realism, Idealism, Pacifism

–

Realism: morality (secondary) should not be considered in international relations, states exist in an anarchic world system, state of nature, strategic dictates

–

Idealism: morality must be taken into consideration but may require the use of force for just ends, Obama, wilson

–

Pacifism: killing is never justified; murder, maiming, and destruction is always wrong

**Just War Theory: jus ad bellum, jus in bello, jus post bellum, idealist**

Just War Theory – Dates to St. Augustine (5th Century) and Thomas Aquinas (13th Century).

•

Revival in 20th Century with advent of nuclear weapons and American involvement in Vietnam War., can be morally justified

•

Since 9/11, debate has re-emerged with changing nature of warfare and terrorism.

•

jus ad bellum – Just initiation of war,

•

jus in bello – Just conduct of war

•

jus post bellum – Justice after the end of war

**jus ad bellum – Just resort to war**

A just war has a just cause like self-defense., pearl harbor

•

A war is just only when armed conflict is taken as a “last resort” and all other means have been exhausted.

•

A just war can only be undertaken by a legitimate authority – a state., no private armies

•

A just war requires a “right intention” (motivated by defense, not aggression)

•

A just war has a reasonable chance of success.

•

Proportionality: the ends of war must be proportional to the means of war.

**jus in bello – Just conduct in war**

Discrimination: There are legitimate and illegitimate targets of war. Must be able to discriminate between combatants and non-combatants. Not permissible to kill those not engaged in fighting.

•

Proportionality: How much force is morally acceptable? Is anything that weakens the enemy, and can aid one’s victory, acceptable? Or are there certain actions that are off limits even in wartime? Most societies have agreed there are atrocities that should be avoided in wartime.

**jus post bellum – Justice after war**

•

After war, victors should achieve the goals of war but not pursue vengeance.

•

Principles of discrimination and proportionality apply. Civilians should not be harmed. Punishments for the conquered should not be severe. Rights should be protected.

•

The ultimate goal of a just war is to re-establish peace. That peace must be preferable to the peace that existed before the war.The Case for Just War

•

War as a necessary and lesser evil.

•

“As bad as war is, it may still be necessary if it prevents a greater harm.” – Crawford, p. 7.

•

Utilitarian approach: war can produce greater good than harm.

–

Defeat of Nazi Germany in World War II

–

Defeat of ISIS in Iraq and Syria.

**Just War Theory in the Age of Terrorism**:Discussion of Crawford Reading (I)

•

Just War Theory never neatly fit with changing nature of war

–

Nevertheless, the Bush Administration declared:

•

War has been transformed by terrorism

•

But, the fight against terrorism was a “just war”

•

War has been transformed in the age of terrorism

–

Terrorists fight wars differently than states and states counter the terrorist threat differently than countering the threat of other states, no definite beginning middle and end

•

Aims, combatants, and conduct of war has changed with the end of the Cold War

–

War is also transformed by terrorism because:

•

States fight terrorism with conventional forces making “just initiation of war” difficult

•

The line between war and peace is blurred making “just conduct of war” difficult

**Just War Theory in the age of terrorism:Discussion of Crawford Reading (II)**

•

Despite the transformation of war the Bush Administration:

–

Framed the U.S. counter-terrorism in Afghanistan and elsewhere in Just War terms:

•

Just initiation: Pre-emptive attacks were self-defense; attack on Afghanistan was last resort

•

Just conduct: Avoided civilian casualties and Islam per se is **not** the enemy

•

12 problems for Just War Theory and terrorism/counter-terrorism

–

Perennial Concerns:

•

What is self-defense?; What justifies preemption?; What is last resort against terrorists?; Don’t both sides feel they are fighting “just wars”?

–

Novel Concerns:

•

How to define terrorism?; How to limit terrorism/counter-terrorism war?; Can war on terrorism be successful?; How can counter-terrorism employ discrimination? How is counter-terrorism proportional?

–

Outside Just War Theory:

•

How does Just War Theory matter without strong international law?; Why not concentrate on avoiding war altogether?

Just counter terror war – us needs to take a different approach that deemphasizes counter terrorism war instead defense, peace tactics