Human Security: From Policy to Practice

Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University

Syllabus version: December 24, 2019

Instructor:	Dr. Oskar Timo Thoms	Course number:	INAF 5704
Email:	timo.thoms@carleton.ca	Term:	Winter 2020
Office Hour:	by appointment	Class Time:	Fridays, 11:35-14:25pm
Office:	Richcraft Hall 5118	Class Location:	TBA

Contents

Students are expected to read this syllabus and do required readings before the first class!

1 Course Description

International relations theory has largely focused on the role of states in global politics, and as a corrolary, on national security as the driver and goal of statecraft. What about the people who live in them? This course introduces an alternative conception of security by asking: How should we think about the security of individuals in international society? UN General Assembly Resolution 66/290 states: "human security is an approach to assist Member States in identifying and addressing widespread and cross-cutting challenges to the survival, livelihood and dignity of their people." It calls for "people-centred, comprehensive, context-specific and prevention-oriented responses that strengthen the protection and empowerment of all people." To what extent do the norms and institutions of peace and security, human rights, and international justice change the nature of state sovereignty, and how do we know? When should and can international society intervene in states to protect individuals? Does international human rights law improve the security of people? Do the rules of war influence the conduct of states? Do peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention save lives? What is the role of international criminal justice?

2 Learning Goals and Teaching Method

The goals of this course are for students to acquire

- a familiarity with major concepts and complex debates in the human security literature;

- an ability to critically evaluate their contributions for understanding the impacts of human security policy and institutions; and

- critical synthesis, writing, discussion, and presentation skills.

We will have 12 weekly class sessions, each lasting 2 hours and 50 minutes (including a break), consisting of seminar discussions and at times short lectures and group work. To develop analytical skills, students will write three short discussion papers on themes in the readings, participate in seminar discussions and engage with their peers' written work, and write and present a final paper on a theme of the course. The final session will be devoted to student presentations and feedback on each presentation by a student discussant and the entire class.

3 Course requirements and grading

The final course grade will be made up of:

- participation (25%) [see section 6.3]
    - during all class sessions
- 3 discussion papers (600-750 words, 10% each, totalling 30%) [see section 7.1]
    - during Week 1, students will sign up for 3 slots during Weeks 2-11
    - due 48 hours before class for the selected weeks

- final essay proposal and outline (250-300 words, excl. bibliography, 5%) [see section 7.2]

    - due February 14 (in class)

- an oral presentation of the final essay project (4-5 min, 5%) [see section 7.3]

    - during the last class session

- final essay (3500-4500 words, 35%) [see section 7.4]

    - due April 9, noon

4 Required Reading

There is no textbook to be purchased. We will be reading a combination of journal articles and book chapters, as listed in in section 12. Where possible, this syllabus will provide hyperlinks to electronic copies of the readings, and I may make some electronic copies available through cuLearn or Ares, the CU Library Reserves system. On the CU network, online journal articles can usually be accessed via the Digital Object Identifier (doi). However, regardless of whether electronic links are provided, **it is the students' responsibility to gather all the materials in time** to do all their weekly reading and writing assignments. If you are unable to access any readings, please notify me.

Make sure to work from the most recent version of this syllabus. As the course proceeds, **I may change some reading assignments**. Any changes will be announced in advance, with sufficient time for preparation.

5 cuLearn and Communication

This course uses cuLearn, Carleton's learning management system. To access our course on cuLearn go to http://carleton.ca/culearn. For help and support, go to http://carleton.ca/culearnsupport/students. Any unresolved questions can be directed to Computing and Communication Services (CCS) by phone at 613-520-3700 or via email at ccs_service_desk@carleton.ca.

Written assignments will be submitted through cuLearn, and grades will be available on cuLearn. Instructor **announcements** may be made in class or on cuLearn. This syllabus is a living document; any changes will be announced and the most recent version will always be available on cuLearn. If you seek clarification on course logistics, please post your question in the *Discussions* forum on cuLearn, so that any responses are available to all students. While I will provide clarification when appropriate, **anyone** in the course is allowed and encouraged to answer questions in this forum.

If you want to talk to me in person, please send me an email to schedule an appointment. Note that I live outside of Ottawa and my access to campus on non-teaching days will be limited. Appointments will usually be before or after class on Fridays.

Student should use their Carleton email account for all course-related correspondence, and put "INAF5016: " at the beginning of the subject line for email filtering. If you do not do this, your email may go missing during busy times. I check my email regularly, but less so on weekends, and I do not guarantee an instant response. As a general rule, I will try to respond within 1-2 business

days. Please do not wait until the last minute to email me with questions, problems, or concerns, particularly before course deadlines; I simply will not be able to respond to a flood of emails the night before an assignment is due or a couple of hours before class.

Please feel free to give me feedback on the course and my teaching. **Really**. I will be open to constructive comments and criticism.

6   Class Expectations

6.1   Attendance on time

Attendance during every class session is mandatory. Unexcused absences and tardiness count against the participation grade since it is not possible to participate when absent. If you have to miss a class, it is important that you consult with me at least 48 hours in advance.

6.2   Advance preparation

Students are expected to complete all the assigned required readings for each week before class so that they are able to fully participate in seminar discussions. Academic reading is an active rather than passive pursuit of knowledge. You should wrestle with the authors' arguments, and come to class prepared to speak thoughtfully about the readings. I strongly recommend that you take structured notes of each reading as you read it (or right after). Good notes are succinct, one page or less for most readings. They should help you recall the authors' central question, core claim, key supporting arguments, critical evidence, position vis-à-vis other readings, broader implications for the themes of the week and the course, as well as shortcomings or weaknesses. Good notes are helpful for presenting a coherent argument or opinion in discussions. Students should support their arguments in seminar discussions with textual evidence. Citing specific passages, figures, and tables shows that you are engaged with the materials. These notes are also useful for future reference in writing assignments and possibly other courses and research projects. While you are free to use any note-taking system, I encourage you to choose and learn to use searchable bibliographical software for the purpose of keeping track of textual sources, notes and citations (see section 11.2).

6.3   Active participation

Full participation in the seminar is a key requirement of this course. Learning is an active and collaborative process; we learn through dialogue and collective discussions. Seminar discussions will be student-driven. You should engage and raise critical questions, and try to answer the questions of your peers. Your participation should demonstrate that you are thinking critically about the readings and the broader course themes, and that you are actively listening to your peers and assessing their comments. Be concise and precise. Do not repeat comments just made by someone else by rephrasing unless you intend to expand on them or make unrelated comments that do not engage with the ongoing discussion. I expect comments to respond to preceding remarks or directly engage a question or topic of the course. Feel free to critically attack arguments, but never people. It is important that students enter class discussions with open minds and are respectful of others.

Seminar participation also includes engagement with other students' work. **During the weeks when students do not write discussion papers themselves, they are required to read at least half of their peers' papers and be prepared to discuss them in class** (see section 7.1). If necessary, I may call on students to do so. You may agree or disagree with your colleagues' work but should do so in a constructive manner. Participation also includes serving as discussant for a peer's presentation during the final week (see section 7.3).

We will strive to make seminar discussions inclusive to motivate participation by all. The goal is to avoid the two extremes often found in many seminar classes, where some students are so eager to participate that they dominate discussions and others seem too shy to regularly contribute. In the professional world, we have to listen to others' views and we need to be able to contribute to discussions. It is my hope that this course will help you develop your discussion skills. If you find it difficult to speak up in class, please consult me so that we can discuss strategies for improving your participation. I am available to discuss your performance at any point in the semester, but it is best to address any concerns early in the semester rather than later.

6.4 Classroom courtesy

In addition to being respectful toward all in the group, please observe the following courtesies:

- Arrive **on time** and do not leave early.[1]
- Turn **off or mute** your cell phone before the beginning of class.
- Do not engage in side conversations.
- Use technology such as laptops, tablets and phones **only** for class purposes.

7 Assignments

This section details the nature and requirements of all assignments. Assignments will be graded based on the substance of the analysis and the quality of the writing. Note that word processing software has rendered nearly all errors of spelling and grammar technologically obsolete. For general advice on writing, see section 11.1.

A key ability that students should acquire in university is to gather, classify, synthesize, and analyze large amounts of information. Information is often abundant and appears to be expanding exponentially; it is important to be able to process it coherently. The written assignments in this course aim to foster students' capacity for critical synthesis. Students will benefit from this practice whether they are planning to move into professional work or further graduate study.

All written assignments shall be submitted through cuLearn. The final paper proposal must also be submitted in hard copy in class on the due date, in order to be used in a peer review exercise.

---

[1]If, on a rare occasion, this is not possible, discuss this with me beforehand.

7.1 Discussion papers

Students are required to submit a total of 3 discussion papers of about 600-750 words each during Weeks 2-11, **at least 48 hours before class**. During the first class (Week 1), all students will sign up for the weeks during which they want to write their discussion papers, with the constraint that there should be about the same total number of papers each week. The discussion papers have several purposes. First, they make students closely engage with the week's readings by practicing critical synthesis. Second, by requiring students to ask questions about the readings, they lay the groundwork for productive seminar discussions. Finally, writing skills are developed and strengthened through regular practice. These papers are intended to help us understand the readings for that week, so that we can assess and discuss them. They should discuss the concepts and main arguments of **at least two readings**, critically assess them, and connect them to themes of the course.

Instructions: Write your name, the week for which you are writing, and the author name(s) for the work(s) you are discussing (not the full reference) on the top line. Discussion papers must be written on the basis of the required readings listed in the syllabus. Provide proper citations where appropriate. A discussion paper should contain four explicit sections, as in the following model:

1. *Introduction*: Write a brief paragraph raising a central question or paradox about the readings. It should also provide an outline or agenda for the rest of your discussion paper. Having an explicit agenda or outline, however brief, is a crucial element in social-science writing.

2. *Synthesis*: Provide a brief synthesis of what the author is arguing. Identify the central questions, main points, concepts, and/or core arguments. Rather than analyzing all the ideas and arguments that the author presents, a synthesis focuses in depth on the most significant aspects of the reading, always noting the key concepts used by the author. Brief definitions of such concepts would help, including a reference to a specific page number or providing the author's most synthetic rendering of the concept(s) by using a textual quotation (with page number). Quoting and paraphrasing is important in order for you and your reader to make sure that you are rendering the authors' meanings as faithfully as possible. A synthesis is not the same as a summary. The latter is an attempt to provide an inventory of the entire text. A synthesis is not as easy because it presupposes that the text has been understood, and focuses on the core, most central parts. A good synthesis of a text requires an awareness and knowledge of the author's style of thinking, not just the particular facts that are presented to support an argument. Focus on interrogating the readings about their theory and/or methodology, whichever seems most relevant in a given text, as well as the core argument.

3. *Assessment*: Offer a brief assessment of the contributions and limitations of the authors' central arguments or concepts. Do the authors' evidence or analysis support their arguments and conclusions? How does their viewpoint color the interpretations they make? How well does the theory and method serve the author(s)? Do not simply state an opinion; you need to provide reasons for why you are convinced or not by specific parts of the argument. I encourage you to be contentious and take a risk by taking a strong stand that will get debate going in class and be ready to defend your stance with relevant evidence and/or analysis. Refrain from pointing out what the authors did not do; that is too easy. Focus instead on what they actually did and the extent to which that conforms with their own agenda.

4. *Questions* (not included in word count): Finally, provide **three** discussion questions or puzzles related to the readings, which would, if resolved, further clarify the readings' arguments, or promote constructive class discussion on some central substantive issue. Avoid questions that may lead respondents to speculate rather than further explore the text and analysis.

Discussion papers need to be posted as files in the relevant weekly containers on our cuLearn page, so that all members of the class have access to them. **All students not writing a discussion paper during a particular week are required to read at least half of the papers written by their peers in order to be able to discuss them in class.**

Discussion papers will be graded according to the following criteria:

- Contains the four explicit **sections**.

- Introduces main topic and sets up clearly defined **agenda**.

- Focuses on **core** arguments, concepts, and perspectives (rather than a summary or inventory).

- **Coherence** of explanation. **Clear** statements. **Succinct** (thorough, yet within word limit).

- Key terms and concepts are defined and **explained**.

- Assertions and arguments supported with specific **citations** to required readings.

- Assertions and arguments supported with specific **quotes** from required readings.

- Reasoned **assessment** of strengths and weaknesses (not merely opining or taking sides).

- **Depth** of coverage of required readings.

- **Questions** help elucidate readings, engaging them conceptually rather than eliciting opinion.

7.2 Final essay proposal, outline and bibliography

Students are required to submit a final essay proposal, including short outline and initial bibliography by February 14 (in class); this proposal should be 250-300 words, excluding the bibliography. The brief proposal should state the topic of your final paper (see section 7.4), a research question, a synopsis of any preliminary argument, and an annotated bibliography. Start by describing the main positions you have found in the literature on your topic. Then formulate a central question that you will try to respond to. If possible, propose a conjecture or hypothesis as to your anticipated answer. You may also want to adopt a side in a specific debate, in which case you should state how you intend to reinforce it with further evidence. Finally, provide a bibliography of at least ten scholarly works[2] that address your topic and which you intend to use as part of your research; this bibliography, including any annotations, is not included in the word count for the proposal. You are free and encouraged to include any required or recommended readings for this course where relevant. It is important to start on this assignment and decide on a topic for your final paper early in the semester, so that you have sufficient time to focus on your research. Note that you will be required to present your research to the class during the last week (see section 7.3).

---

[2]Scholarly works are written by academics, have copious citations, and provide detailed evidence for their claims. Books are published by academic presses and usually have citations in footnotes. Articles are published in peer-reviewed journals and normally have at least 8,000 words. If unsure, you can verify a scholarly source with a librarian.

7.3   Final Project Presentation

Students are required to present a draft of their final essay projects (see section 7.4) to the class during the last session. Students will present for 4-5 min with slides, followed by 2-3 min of comments by a student discussant, and then we will open it up to questions and comments from anyone else in the class. (We will have sign-up sheets for discussants on cuLearn prior to the presentations.) The purpose is to practice formal presentations and prepared remarks on a research project. Given the short length of the presentations, presenters cannot exhaustively make all the points of their essays, but need to highlight key arguments, and they need to make it interesting and understandable for the lay audience. The essence will be breadth rather than depth. Discussants should critically discuss their peers' research on its own merit: does the author convincingly engage his/her own question? Discussants do not use slides.

Slides: Presenters must use slides (in Powerpoint format or PDF). Use no more than 4 substantive slides, large font for text (36 point for main text, 44 point for titles), 3-5 lines of text per slide, and few words per line. You may use images or figures if you wish, to replace some text, but do not show dense figures or charts that are difficult to read. Here are some content guidelines:

1. Introduce your topic: what are you interested in and why?

2. Go over key theoretical positions and your position in the debate.

3. Briefly describe the empirical evidence as it relates to the debate and/or to your own stance.

4. What are your main conclusions?

Slides must be posted in the relevant section of our cuLearn page at least 24 hours prior to the class session on April 3, so that discussants have access to them. Presenters may share their final paper drafts with discussants if they would like more detailed comments. If you want feedback on your slides prior to your presentation, discuss them with me during the previous week.

7.4   Final essay

Students are required to submit a final essay of 3500-4500 words by April 9, noon. Your essay must not be exclusively descriptive but include critical examination of existing scholarly literature on your chosen topic and develop an argument related to the central themes of this course. This means that it should critically engage the empirics of one or more cases with concepts and theories examined in the course. While students should engage with scholarly literature, they may also conduct original research using publicly available sources. See section 11.1 for general advice on writing papers.

7.5   Citation and formatting requirements for all written assignments

In this course, your written assignments have the following formatting requirements:

• 12 point Times New Roman or a similar serif font and 1-inch margins.

• Single-spaced for discussion papers; single or 1.5-spaced for proposal and final essay.

• The title page or section must include your name, the date, and the title, of course.

- State the word count of your paper (excluding bibliography) in the title section. Word count requirements should be followed within 10% of the total. For instance, if the assignment calls for 500 words, your word count should be between 450 and 550 words. If your paper is shorter or longer, it may affect the grade.

- Use a proper social science citation style consistently throughout all of your papers. Consult the Chicago Manual of Style or another recognized style guide. I prefer footnotes (not endnotes!) for citations, because it maintains the flow of the text while making it easy to check for citations, but any consistent citation style will be accepted. You must provide page numbers for quotes and paraphrasing. Essays require a complete and proper bibliography, which means each cited work must appear in the bibliography and each item in the bibliography must be cited in the text. *Pro-tip*: If you learn to use the software and input all your references into its database, reference and citation management software can greatly help with quickly producing clean citations and bibliographies (see section 11.2).

7.6   Policy on late submissions

It is the students' responsibility to plan and manage their time – including time to deal with unforeseen technical problems – so that each and all of the assignments will be completed on time. **Late discussion papers will not be accepted, graded, or counted, except in case of emergencies.** Extensions may be possible for the final essay, but requests must be in writing and arrangements must be made with me **before** the due date. Late submissions of the final essay (without an extension) will be downgraded a third of a letter grade (for example, from "A-" to "B+") for each day or portion of a day late. Exceptions to these policies will be granted only for documented emergencies, such as serious illness or extraordinary circumstances (see section 8).

8   Documented excuses

Unless university policy explicitly mandates otherwise, excused absences from class or extensions of submission deadlines will only be granted for unforeseeable and urgent circumstances beyond your control that prevent you from fulfilling course requirements on time. In such cases, I will require supporting documentation, such as from a medical professional or equivalent, attesting to the severity of a condition so as to prohibit work. Please note that this is more than a document saying you were "seen" by a doctor; it needs to state that you are or were unable to complete the work on time due to an emergency. Any excuse based on a mitigating circumstance known to the student before a deadline or class session in question, where the student could have informed the instructor, **must** be approved in advance. If discussed with me in advance, I will likely also excuse absences for other legitimate reasons, such as important appointments related to a student's future professional career.

9 Academic Integrity

9.1 Plagiarism

The University Senate defines plagiarism as "presenting, whether intentional or not, the ideas, expression of ideas or work of others as one's own." This can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source;

- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;

- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;

- using another's data or research findings;

- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's works and/or failing to use quotation marks;

- handing in substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course instructor. The Associate Deans of the Faculty conduct a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. Penalties are not trivial. They include a mark of zero for the plagiarized work or a final grade of "F" for the course. For further information, visit http://carleton.ca/registrar/academic-integrity/ and download the Academic Integrity Policy (PDF).

The university's policies on academic integrity will be strictly enforced. **In the event of plagiarism or other academic dishonesty in this course, the I will pursue disciplinary measures through the university administration to the fullest extent.**

Resources for learning about academic integrity are available at:

- http://www.plagiarism.org/

- http://www.turnitin.com/static/plagiarism-spectrum/

9.2 Complementarity

Students are encouraged to build up expertise in areas that may cross multiple courses. It is acceptable to write assignments on related topics. However, you may not simply cut and paste your work from one assignment to another, or essentially submit the same work for two or more assignments in the same or different courses. If you plan on writing on related topics in different courses, you must inform the instructors and discuss what will be acceptable in terms of overlap,

and what is not. Failure to notify the faculty members will be viewed unfavourably should there be a suspicion of misconduct.

10   Academic Accommodation

You may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term. For an accommodation request, the processes are as follows:

10.1   Pregnancy obligation

Please contact the instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, visit the Equity Services website or download the Student Guide to Academic Accommodation (PDF).

10.2   Religious obligation

Please contact the instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, visit the Equity Services website or download the Student Guide to Academic Accommodation (PDF).

10.3   Academic Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

If you have a documented disability requiring academic accommodations in this course, please contact the Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (PMC) at 613-520-6608 or pmc@carleton.ca for a formal evaluation, or contact your PMC coordinator to send the instructor your Letter of Accommodation at the beginning of the term, and no later than two weeks before the first in-class scheduled test or exam requiring accommodation (if applicable). After requesting accommodation from PMC, meet with the instructor as soon as possible to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. For more details, visit the Paul Menton Centre website.

10.4   Survivors of Sexual Violence

As a community, Carleton University is committed to maintaining a positive learning, working and living environment where sexual violence will not be tolerated, and is survivors are supported through academic accommodations as per Carleton's Sexual Violence Policy. For more information about the services available at the university and to obtain information about sexual violence and/or support, visit: carleton.ca/sexual-violence-support.

10.5   Accommodation for Student Activities

Carleton University recognizes the substantial benefits, both to the individual student and for the university, that result from a student participating in activities beyond the classroom experience.

Reasonable accommodation must be provided to students who compete or perform at the national or international level. Please contact your instructor with any requests for academic accommodation during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist. For more details, see the policy.

You can visit the Equity Services website to view the policies and to obtain more detailed information on academic accommodation at carleton.ca/equity/.

11   Resources

11.1   Essay writing instruction

Writing is a skill. It takes time, effort, attention to detail, and stamina. A good paper requires content, structure, and precision. It tells readers from the start what it has to say, how it is going to convince them, and with what evidence. It follows a clear structure, reminding readers of where they are on the journey as it builds the argument, and summarizing key points at the end. It conveys ideas and evidence clearly, striving for readers to grasp the argument and weigh it with minimal effort. From the choice of words, sentence structure, paragraph structure, to the paper structure, the goal of all aspects of writing is to be as clear as possible in getting the point across.

Prose: Each sentence should have a clear point, and it should be as simple as possible. The reader should not be confused because your language is obtuse. Short sentences, clear causal directions within sentences, and flow are all vital. If the writing does not flow naturally, try out different sentence structures until it sounds right. Use plain language, especially when expressing complicated ideas. Leave no room for readers to be unsure of your meaning. Cut out unnecessary words. Be sure of your tenses. Know your punctuation. Technical mistakes distract the reader and detract from your argument. Do not use "don't", "couldn't" etc., unless in quotes. If you are inclined to verbose writing, please read and follow the advice in William Strunk and E.B. White's classic *The Elements of Style*: if you are not, you should still read this very short book.

Introduction: Introduce your full argument as early as possible. Tell the reader what they will be convinced of by the end of the paper (i.e. all the key points of your argument), and why they should believe you (i.e. the evidence you are going to use to convince them). Your introductory paragraph should lay out why the topic is important, what it is that is so puzzling that they should spend the time to read what you have to say. After this scene setter, you should then lay out the key points of your argument. If your argument is lengthy you may need to split the introduction up into paragraphs, and the general rule here is one sub-argument or group of sub-arguments with explanation and evidence per paragraph. Use common sense; when they get too long and unwieldy, split them up. If you end your paper with an opinion or personal view section, tell the reader that too, at the beginning.

Paragraphs: Each paragraph must have a topic sentence, which summarizes the main idea of the paragraph and relates to the thesis of the essay; the remainder of the paragraph expands on the topic sentence. Each paragraph and paper section must be clearly structured, logical, coherent, and well-reasoned, and clear to any reasonably educated reader. In the main body of your paper, each sub-argument deserves a separate paragraph with a lead sentence that introduces the paragraph. It is

possible to combine the objectives of lead and topic sentences into one sentence. A good general rule is that when all of the lead/topic sentences of the entire paper are taken together, there should be a clear progression from one to the next, and they should reflect the argument of the paper as a whole. Each paragraph leader should be able to remind the reader of the entire argument, as laid out in the introduction, and it should use the same language and key terms. Even without reading the introduction, the reader should be able to understand the entire argument. It helps the structure of your paper if you visually reinforce it, for instance by indenting every new paragraph and clearly marking new sections with sub-titles and/or extra line-spacing.

Summary and Conclusion: The conclusion recapitulates the argument, suggests weaknesses and strengths of the analysis, and proposes ideas for moving forward. You should have a clear summary section that pulls together the key points and restates the strongest evidence used; this could be part of the conclusion or a summary section before the conclusion. While this is repetitive when writing short papers, it becomes crucial for longer papers. In the latter, it also helps to summarize throughout the paper, at the end of sections, to remind the reader of where they have got to in the argument. Do not introduce new arguments in your conclusion, but feel free to point out the implications your argument may entail or provide a look forward (unless you have dealt with this more comprehensively earlier).

Content: Define terms that are not self-evident. Precision is key. Only give information that is relevant to your argument; do not provide gratuitous information. Ground your argument in your sources. Weave theoretical concepts and ideas with supporting evidence – in quotation or paraphrase form – for your claims. Proper citation is always required; unless otherwise instructed, use a recognized citation style consistently. Cite page numbers for direct quotes or assertions. Use quotes if they make the point better than you can with your own words, or if they reinforce your argument. Do not let quotes stand on their own; incorporate them into your narrative. Finally, anticipate how your argument may be challenged and present counter-points or qualifiers as appropriate. Cover your back. Take the opportunity to really persuade readers; do not let them dismiss your argument because you did not address obvious issues.

Good habits: Leave enough time for editing and rewriting. Read your paper out loud to yourself. Print out your paper to proofread and make corrections; you may need to do this more than once. Get feedback by asking your friends to read your paper; if they do not understand the argument, you need to revise until they do.

For further writing instruction, students can consult the appendix to a widely-cited guide on methods in political science, which provides excellent advice on writing well-structured and clear undergraduate essays:

- Stephen Van Evera. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, appendix (pp. 123-128).[3]

11.2 Reference management software

Specialized software is very useful for organizing source materials, notes and citations. There are many reference managers with various annotation capabilities, and some can also automatically

---

[3]Google it, and you shall find many freely available reproductions of this short appendix.

organize PDF files for you. Zotero is popular, free, and open-source. Other free options are Mendeley,[4] Endnote Basic, Docear, and Qiqqa (the latter is Windows only). Reference managers for purchase or subscription include Endnote, RefWorks, citavi (Windows only; there is a limited free version), Readcube Papers, and Bookends (macOS only). If you use LaTeX for academic writing, bibliographies are best implemented with biblatex, but this does not help with taking notes.

12   Weekly Schedule

The reading lists below are extensive, and the required reading loads are heavier for some weeks. An important part of graduate training for both academic and professional careers is to learn to read effectively and efficiently; that means prioritizing some parts for in-depth study and skimming others, both across and within reading assignments. I can provide guidance on what to prioritize, and students are free to ask questions on this. Also note that as we go through the semester, I may make changes to the required readings; please pay attention to course announcements in class and on cuLearn. Supplementary/recommended readings are provided as resources for student research projects and general interest.

12.1   Introduction: What is Human Security? (January 10)

12.1.1   Required Readings

- Roland Paris. 2001. "Human security: paradigm shift or hot air." *International Security* 26 (2): 87–102. doi:10.1162/016228801753191141.

- Fen Osler Hampson and Jean Daudelin. 2002. *Madness in the Multitude: Human Security and World Disorder*. Oxford University Press. [ch.1] [CUL hardcopy]

- Special Section on "What is Human Security?" in *Security Dialogue* (2004): 345-387.

- Stephen Pinker and Andrew Mack, "Why the World Is Not Falling Apart," *Slate*, December 22, 2014.

- Tanisha Fazal, "The reports of war's demise have been exaggerated," *Monkey Cage*, September 4, 2014.

12.1.2   Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Amitav Acharya. 2001. "Human security: East versus west." *International Journal* 56 (3): 442–460. doi:10.1177/002070200105600304.

- Commission on Human Security. 2003. *Human Security Now*. United Nations Publications. https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000130589. [ch.1]

- Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 2004. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [intro chapter]

---

[4]Mendeley is owned by Elsevier, a company that has aggressively fought against open access science.

- S. Neil MacFarlane and Yuen Foong Khong. 2006. *Human security and the UN: A critical history*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press. [chapters 1, 4, 5, 7]

- Mary Kaldor, Mary Martin, and Sabine Selchow. 2007. "Human security: a new strategic narrative for Europe." *International Affairs* 83 (2): 273–288. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2346.2007.00618.x.

- Kathryn A. Sikkink. 2011. *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics*. New York, NY: Norton. [intro chapter]

- Emilie M. Hafner-Burton. 2013. *Making Human Rights a Reality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [intro chapter]

- Mary Martin and Taylor Owen, eds. 2013. *Routledge handbook of human security*. London: Routledge.

- Charli Carpenter. 2014. *"Lost" Causes: Agenda Vetting in Global Issue Networks and the Shaping of Human Security*. Cornell University Press. [intro chapter]

- Tanisha M. Fazal. 2014. "Dead Wrong?: Battle Deaths, Military Medicine, and Exaggerated Reports of War's Demise." *International Security* 39 (1): 95–125. doi:10.1162/isec_a_00166.

- Amanda Murdie. 2014. *Help or Harm: The Human Security Effects of International NGOs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [intro chapter]

- David Andersen-Rodgers and Kerry F. Crawford. 2018. *Human Security: Theory and Action*. Rowman & Littlefield. [section 1]

12.2   Human versus traditional security: IR and the individual (January 17)

12.2.1   Required Readings

- Chris Brown. 2014. *International Society, Global Polity: An Introduction to International Political Theory*. London: Sage. [ch.1] [CUL hardcopy]

- Nicholas Thomas and William T. Tow. 2002. "The utility of human security: sovereignty and humanitarian intervention." *Security Dialogue* 33 (2): 177–192. doi:10.1177/0967010602033002006.

- Alex J. Bellamy and Matt McDonald. 2002. "'The utility of human security': Which humans? What security? A reply to Thomas & Tow." *Security Dialogue* 33 (3): 373–377. doi:10.1177/0967010602033003010.

- Kirsten Ainley. 2008. "Individual agency and responsibility for atrocity." Ch. 2 in *Confronting evil in international relations*, ed. by Renee Jeffery, 37–60. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. [preprint copy]

- David Chandler. 2008. "Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark." *Security Dialogue* 39 (4): 427–438. doi:10.1177/0967010608094037.

- Taylor Owen. 2008. "The Critique That Doesn't Bite: A Response to David Chandler's 'Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark." *Security Dialogue* 39 (4): 445–453. doi:10.1177/0967010608094038.

- Ruti G. Teitel. 2011. *Humanity's Law*. New York: Oxford University Press. [chapters 1 and 6]

- Edward Newman. 2016. "Human Security: Reconciling Critical Aspirations With Political 'Realities'." *British Journal of Criminology* 56 (6): 1165–1183. doi:10.1093/bjc/azw016.

12.2.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Charles Beitz. 1999. *Political Theory and International Relations*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [part 1] [CUL hardcopy]

- Martha Finnemore and Kathryn A. Sikkink. 1998. "International norm dynamics and political change." *International Organization* 52 (4): 887–917. doi:10.1162/002081898550789.

- Chris Brown. 2002. *Sovereignty, Rights, and Justice: International Political Theory Today*. Cambridge, UK: Polity. [chapters 1-4]

- Charli Carpenter. 2014. *"Lost" Causes: Agenda Vetting in Global Issue Networks and the Shaping of Human Security*. Cornell University Press. [ch.2]

- Alexander Cooley. 2015. "Authoritarianism goes global: Countering democratic norms." *Journal of Democracy* 26 (3): 49–63. doi:10.1353/jod.2015.0049.

12.3 Sovereignty and the norm of non-intervention (January 24)

12.3.1 Required Readings

- Friedrich Kratochwil. 1995. "Sovereignty as dominium: Is there a right of humanitarian intervention?" In *Beyond Westphalia?: State sovereignty and international intervention*, ed. by Gene Martin Lyons and Michael Mastanduno, 21–42. Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore. [CUL hardcopy]

- Janice E. Thomson. 1995. "State Sovereignty in International Relations: Bridging the Gap between Theory and Empirical Research." *International Studies Quarterly* 39 (2): 213–233. doi:10.2307/2600847.

- Stephen D Krasner. 1999. *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [ch.1] [CUL hardcopy & full text online]

- Anthony Carty. 2010. "International Law." Ch. 15 in *Ethics and world politics*, ed. by Duncan Bell, 274–291. New York: Oxford University Press. [CUL hardcopy]

- Chris Brown. 2014. *International Society, Global Polity: An Introduction to International Political Theory*. London: Sage. [ch.2] [CUL hardcopy]

12.3.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Anne-Marie Slaughter. 1997. "The real new world order." *Foreign Affairs*: 183–197. doi:10.2307/20048208.

- Charles Beitz. 1999. *Political Theory and International Relations*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [part 2] [CUL hardcopy]

- Chris Brown. 2002. *Sovereignty, Rights, and Justice: International Political Theory Today*. Cambridge, UK: Polity. [ch.5]

12.4 Indigenous perspectives on sovereignty (January 31)

12.4.1 Required Readings

- Joanne Barker. 2005. *Sovereignty matters: Locations of contestation and possibility in indigenous struggles for self-determination*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press. [ch.1: "For Whom Sovereignty Matters"]

- Karena Shaw. 2008. *Indigeneity and political theory: Sovereignty and the limits of the political*. Milton Park, Abingdon, UK: Routledge. [ch1: "Introduction: The Problem of the Political"]

- Mary Simon. 2009. "Inuit and the Canadian Arctic: Sovereignty begins at home." *Journal of Canadian Studies* 43 (2): 250–260. doi:10.3138/jcs.43.2.250.

- Lisa Ford. 2012. "Locating indigenous self-determination in the margins of settler sovereignty: an introduction." Ch. 1 in *Between Indigenous and settler governance*, ed. by Lisa Ford and Tim Rowse, 13–23. New York: Routledge. [CUL full text online]

- Mark Pearcey. 2015. "Sovereignty, Identity, and Indigenous-State Relations at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century: A Case of Exclusion by Inclusion." *International Studies Review* 17 (3): 441–454. doi:10.1111/misr.12251.

- Wilfrid Greaves. 2016. "Arctic (in)security and Indigenous peoples: Comparing Inuit in Canada and Sámi in Norway." *Security Dialogue* 47 (6): 461–480. doi:10.1177/0967010616665957.

- Sheryl Lightfoot. 2018. "A Promise Too Far? The Justin Trudeau Government and Indigenous Rights." Ch. 9 in *Justin Trudeau and Canadian Foreign Policy*, ed. by Norman Hillmer and Philippe Lagassé, 165–186. Palgave MacMillan. [CUL full text online]

- Hayden King, "The erasure of Indigenous thought in foreign policy," Open Canada, July 31, 2017.

12.4.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007).

- Margaret Kohn. 2010. "Post-Colonial Theory." Ch. 11 in *Ethics and world politics*, ed. by Duncan Bell, 200–218. New York: Oxford University Press.

12.5 Advocacy in world politics (February 7)

12.5.1 Required Readings

- Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [chapters 1 and 5] [CUL hardcopy & full text online]

- Noha Shawki. 2010. "Political opportunity structures and the outcomes of transnational campaigns: A comparison of two transnational advocacy networks." *Peace & Change* 35 (3): 381–411. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0130.2010.00640.x.

- Charli Carpenter. 2014. *"Lost" Causes: Agenda Vetting in Global Issue Networks and the Shaping of Human Security*. Cornell University Press. [chapters 2 and 3 and skim chapter 5] [CUL full text online]

- Denise Garcia. 2015. "Humanitarian security regimes." *International Affairs* 91 (1): 55–75. doi:10.1111/1468-2346.12186.

- Keith Krause. 2014. "Transnational Civil Society Activism and International Security Politics: From Landmines to Global Zero." *Global Policy* 5 (2): 229–234. doi:10.1111/1758-5899.12115.

12.5.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Richard Price. 1998. "Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines." *International Organization* 52 (3): 613–644. doi:10.1162/002081898550671.

- Clifford Bob. 2010. "Packing heat: pro-gun groups and the governance of small arms." Ch. 7 in *Who Governs the Globe*, ed. by Deborah D. Avant, Martha Finnemore, and Susan K. Sell, 183–201. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/cbo9780511845369.008.

- Amanda Murdie. 2014. *Help or Harm: The Human Security Effects of International NGOs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [chapters 2-3]

due February 14 (in class): final essay proposal

12.6 Human rights (February 14)

12.6.1 Required Readings

- Thomas Risse and Kathryn Sikkink. 1999. "The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms Into Domestic Practices: Introduction." Ch. 1 in *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Change*, ed. by Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, 1–38. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. [CUL hardcopy]

- Christian Reus-Smit. 2001. "Human rights and the social construction of sovereignty." *Review of International Studies* 27 (4): 519–538. doi:10.1017/s0260210501005198.

- Emilie M. Hafner-Burton and James Ron. 2009. "Seeing Double: Human Rights Impact Through Qualitative and Quantitative Eyes." *World Politics* 61 (2): 360–401. doi:10.1017/S0043887109000136.

- Beth A. Simmons. 2009. *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. [chapters 2 and 4, and skim one empirical chapter (5-8)] [CUL hardcopy & full text online]

- Gary Haugen and Victor Boutros. 2010. "And Justice for All: Enforcing Human Rights for the World's Poor." *Foreign Affairs* 89 (3): 51–62. doi:10.2307/25680915.

12.6.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948).

- Raymond John Vincent. 1986. *Human rights and international relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Henry Shue. 1996. *Basic rights: Subsistence, affluence, and US foreign policy*. 2nd ed. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [ch.1: "Security and Subsistence" and ch.2: "Correlative Duties"] [CUL hardcopy]

- Joanne R. Bauer and Daniel Bell, eds. 1999. *The East Asian challenge for human rights*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Tim Dunne and Nicholas J. Wheeler, eds. 1999. *Human Rights in Global Politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Chris Brown. 2002. *Sovereignty, Rights, and Justice: International Political Theory Today*. Cambridge, UK: Polity. [ch.7]

- David P. Forsythe. 2017. *Human rights in international relations*. 4th ed. New York: Cambridge University Press. [ch.2: "Establishing human rights standards"]

- Charli Carpenter. 2012. "'You Talk Of Terrible Things So Matter-of-Factly in This Language of Science': Constructing Human Rights in the Academy." *Perspectives on Politics* 10 (2): 363–383. doi:10.1017/S1537592712000710.

- Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp, and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. 2013. *The Persistent Power of Human Rights: From Commitment to Compliance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Emilie M. Hafner-Burton. 2013. *Making Human Rights a Reality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Chris Brown. 2014. *International Society, Global Polity: An Introduction to International Political Theory*. London: Sage. [chapters 4, 5, 6]

- Christopher J. Fariss. 2014. "Respect for Human Rights Has Improved Over Time: Modeling the Changing Standard of Accountability." *American Political Science Review* 108 (2): 297–318. doi:10.1017/S0003055414000070.

- Amanda Murdie (2014), "A Social Science of Human Rights: Some New Social Science," Duck of Minerva, July 3, 2014.

Winter Break: no class (February 21)

12.7 War law / law in war (February 28)

12.7.1 Required Readings

- Marco Sassòli, Antoine A. Bouvier, and Anne Quintin. 2011. *How does law protect in war? Cases, documents and teaching materials on contemporary practice in international humanitarian law*. 3rd ed. Geneva: International Committeee of the Red Cross. http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/publications/icrc-0739-part-i.pdf. [ch.1 (3-11) and ch.3 (50-59)]

- James D. Morrow. 2007. "When Do States Follow the Laws of War." *American Political Science Review* 101 (3): 559–572. doi:10.1017/S000305540707027X.

- Tuba Inal. 2013. *Looting and rape in wartime: Law and change in international relations*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. [chapters 1, 5 and 6] [CUL hardcopy & full text online]

- Bronwyn Leebaw. 2014. "Scorched Earth: Environmental War Crimes and International Justice." *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (4): 770–788. doi:10.1017/s1537592714002126.

- Geoffrey P.R. Wallace. 2014. "Martial Law? Military Experience, International Law, and Support for Torture." *International Studies Quarterly* 58 (3): 501–514. doi:10.1111/isqu.2014.58.issue-3. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12092.

12.7.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Ward Thomas. 2000. "Norms and security: The case of international assassination." *International Security* 25 (1): 105–133. doi:10.1162/016228800560408.

- Helen M. Kinsella. 2005. "Discourses of difference: civilians, combatants, and compliance with the laws of war." *Review of International Studies* 31 (S1): 163–185. doi:10.1017/s0260210505006844.

- Colin H. Kahl. 2007. "In the crossfire or the crosshairs? Norms, civilian casualties, and US conduct in Iraq." *International Security* 32 (1): 7–46. doi:10.1162/isec.2007.32.1.7.

- Maria Eriksson Baaz and Maria Stern. 2009. "Why do soldiers rape? Masculinity, violence, and sexuality in the armed forces in the Congo (DRC)." *International Studies Quarterly* 53 (2): 495–518. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2478.2009.00543.x.

- Dara Kay Cohen. 2013. "Explaining Rape during Civil War: Cross-National Evidence (1980–2009)." *American Political Science Review* 107 (3): 461–477. doi:10.1017/S0003055413000221.

12.8 International Security Architecture and Peacekeeping (March 6)

12.8.1 Required Readings

- Mark W. Zacher. 2001. "The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force." *International Organization* 55 (2): 215–250. doi:10.1162/00208180151140568.

- Erik Voeten. 2005. "The Political Origins of the UN Security Council's Ability to Legitimize the Use of Force." *International Organization* 59 (3): 527–557. doi:10.1017/s0020818305050198.

- Virginia Page Fortna and Lise Morjé Howard. 2008. "Pitfalls and Prospects in the Peacekeeping Literature." *Annual Review of Political Science* 11 (1): 283–301. doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.9.041205.103022.

- Lisa Hultman. 2010. "Keeping Peace or Spurring Violence? Unintended Effects of Peace Operations on Violence against Civilians." *Civil Wars* 12 (1–2): 29–46. doi:10.1080/13698249.2010.484897.

- Michael N. Barnett, Songying Fang, and Christoph Zürcher. 2014. "Compromised Peacebuilding." *International Studies Quarterly* 58 (3): 608–620. doi:10.1111/isqu.2014.58.issue-3.

- Valerie Morkevičius. 2015. "Power and Order: The Shared Logics of Realism and Just War Theory." *International Studies Quarterly* 59 (1): 11–22. doi:10.1111/isqu.12152.

12.8.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Virginia Page Fortna. 2004. "Does peacekeeping keep peace? International intervention and the duration of peace after civil war." *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2): 269–292. doi:10.1111/j.0020-8833.2004.00301.x.

- Virginia Page Fortna. 2008. *Does peacekeeping work? Shaping belligerents' choices after civil war*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Helena Carreiras. 2010. "Gendered Culture in Peacekeeping Operations." *International Peacekeeping* 17 (4): 471–485. doi:10.1080/13533312.2010.516655.

- Jasmine-Kim Westendorf and Louise Searle. 2017. "Sexual exploitation and abuse in peace operations: trends, policy responses and future directions." *International Affairs* 93 (2): 365–387. doi:10.1093/ia/iix001.

- Ragnhild Nordås and Siri C. A. Rustad. 2013. "Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by Peacekeepers: Understanding Variation." *International Interactions* 39 (4): 511–534. doi:10.1080/03050629.2013.805128.

12.9 Humanitarianism in World Politics (March 13)

12.9.1 Required Readings

- Sarah Kenyon Lischer. 2003. "Collateral damage: Humanitarian assistance as a cause of conflict." *International Security* 28 (1): 79–109. doi:10.1162/016228803322427983.

- Michael Walzer. 2011. "On Humanitarianism: is helping others charity, or duty, or both." *Foreign Affairs*: 69–80. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23039607.

- Séverine Autesserre. 2014. *Peaceland*. New York: Cambridge University Press. [introduction and conclusion] [CUL hardcopy]

- Charli Carpenter. 2014. *"Lost" Causes: Agenda Vetting in Global Issue Networks and the Shaping of Human Security*. Cornell University Press. [ch.4] [CUL full text online]

- Neil Narang. 2015. "Assisting Uncertainty: How Humanitarian Aid can Inadvertently Prolong Civil War." *International Studies Quarterly* 59 (1): 184–195. doi:10.1111/isqu.12151.

12.9.2   Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Alexander Cooley and James Ron. 2002. "The NGO Scramble: Organizational Insecurity and the Political Economy of Transnational Action." *International Security* 27: 5–39. doi:10.1162/016228802320231217.

- Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 2004. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [chapters 2 and 4]

- David Kennedy. 2004. *The dark sides of virtue: reassessing international humanitarianism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Jonathan Goodhand. 2006. *Aiding Peace? The Role of NGOs in Armed Conflict*. 239. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

- Michael Barnett. 2011. *Empire of Humanity: A history of humanitarianism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Thomas G. Weiss. 2013. *Humanitarian Business*. 200. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

- Amanda Murdie. 2014. *Help or Harm: The Human Security Effects of International NGOs*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. [chapters 4-6]

12.10   Mass atrocities and humanitarian intervention (March 20)

12.10.1   Required Readings

- Jennifer M. Welsh, ed. 2004. *Humanitarian intervention and international relations*. New York: Oxford University Press. [chapters 3 and 4] [CUL hardcopy & full text online]

- Matthew Krain. 2005. "International Intervention and the Severity of Genocides and Politicides." *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (3): 363–388. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2478.2005.00369.x.

- José E. Alvarez. 2008. "The Schizophrenias of R2P." Ch. 8 in *Human Rights, Intervention, and the Use of Force*, ed. by Philip Alston and Euan Macdonald, 275–284. New York: Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199552719.003.0008. [preprint]

- Gareth Evans. 2008. "The Responsibility to Protect: An Idea Whose Time Has Come ... and Gone." *International Relations* 22 (3): 283–298. doi:10.1177/0047117808094173.

- Alan J. Kuperman. 2008. "The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans." *International Studies Quarterly* 52 (1): 49–80. doi:10.2307/29734224.

- Benjamin A. Valentino. 2011. "The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention: The Hard Truth about a Noble Notion." *Foreign Affairs* 90 (6): 60–73. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23039629.

- Jon Western and Joshua S. Goldstein. 2011. "Humanitarian intervention comes of age: lessons from Somalia to Libya." *Foreign Affairs* 90 (6): 48–59. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23039628.

- Alex J. Bellamy. 2015. "The Responsibility to Protect Turns Ten." *Ethics & International Affairs* 29 (2): 161–185. doi:10.1017/s0892679415000052.

- Jennifer M. Welsh. 2019. "Norm Robustness and the Responsibility to Protect." *Journal of Global Security Studies* 4 (1): 53–72. doi:10.1093/jogss/ogy045.

12.10.2 Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Genocide Convention (1948).

- Josef L. Kunz. 1949. "The United Nations Convention on Genocide." *American Journal of International Law* 43 (4): 738–746. doi:10.2307/2193262.

- Martha Finnemore. 1996. "Constructing norms of humanitarian intervention." Ch. 5 in *The culture of national security: Norms and identity in world politics*, ed. by Peter J. Katzenstein, 153–185. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. [CUL hardcopy]

- Rome Statute of the ICC (1998).

- Jonathan Moore, ed. 1998. *Hard Choices: moral dilemmas in humanitarian intervention*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

- Alan J. Kuperman. 2000. "Rwanda in Retrospect." *Foreign Affairs*.

- Alison L. Des Forges and Alan J. Kuperman. 2000. "Shame: Rationalizing Western Apathy on Rwanda." *Foreign Affairs*.

- Nicholas J. Wheeler. 2000. *Saving Strangers*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

- William Bain. 2001. "The Tyranny of Benevolence: National Security, Human Security, and the Practice of Statecraft." *Global Society* 15 (3): 277–294. doi:10.1080/13600820120066267.

- International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. 2001. *The responsibility to protect: Final report of the international commission on intervention and state sovereignty*. Ottawa: International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/publications.

- Nicholas J. Wheeler. 2001. "Legitimating Humanitarian Intervention: Principles and Procedures." *Melbourne Journal of International Law* 2 (2): 550.

- Chris Brown. 2002. *Sovereignty, Rights, and Justice: International Political Theory Today*. Cambridge, UK: Polity. [chapters 6 and 8]

- David Chandler. 2002. *From Kosovo to Kabul: Human rights and international intervention*. London: Pluto Press.

- Gareth Evans and Mohamed Sahnoun. 2002. "The Responsibility to Protect." *Foreign Affairs*.

- R. Charli Carpenter. 2003. "'Women and Children First': Gender, Norms, and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991–95." *International Organization* 57 (4): 661–694. doi:10.1017/s002081830357401x.

- Martha Finnemore. 2003. *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- J. L. Holzgrefe and Robert O. Keohane, eds. 2003. *Humanitarian Intervention*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 2004. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [ch.5]

- Alex J. Bellamy. 2005. "Responsibility to Protect or Trojan Horse? The Crisis in Darfur and Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq." *Ethics & International Affairs* 19 (2): 31–54. doi:10.1111/j.1747-7093.2005.tb00499.x.

- Paul D. Williams and Alex J. Bellamy. 2005. "The Responsibility To Protect and the Crisis in Darfur." *Security Dialogue* 36 (1): 27–47. doi:10.1177/0967010605051922.

- Scott Straus. 2005. "Darfur and the Genocide Debate." *Foreign Affairs*.

- Alex J. Bellamy. 2006. *Preventing future Kosovos and future Rwandas: The responsibility to protect after the 2005 World Summit*. Carnegie Council on Ethics and International Affairs.

- Nick Grono. 2006. "Darfur: The international community's failure to protect." *African Affairs* 105 (421): 621–631. doi:10.1093/afraf/adl036.

- James Turner Johnson. 2006. "Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq: Just War and International Law Perspectives." *Journal of Military Ethics* 5 (2): 114–127. doi:10.1080/15027570600707706.

- Kenneth Roth. 2006. "Was the Iraq War a Humanitarian Intervention." *Journal of Military Ethics* 5 (2): 84–92. doi:10.1080/15027570600711864.

- Fernando R. Tesón. 2006. "Eight Principles for Humanitarian Intervention." *Journal of Military Ethics* 5 (2): 93–113. doi:10.1080/15027570600707698.

- Alex De Waal. 2007. "Darfur and the failure of the responsibility to protect." *International Affairs* 83 (6): 1039–1054. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2346.2007.00672.x.

- Alex J. Bellamy. 2008. "The Responsibility to Protect and the problem of military intervention." *International Affairs* 84 (4): 615–639. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2346.2008.00729.x.

- Hugo Slim. 2010. *Killing Civilians*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Louise Arbour. 2008. "The responsibility to protect as a duty of care in international law and practice." *Review of International Studies* 34 (3): 445–458. doi:10.1017/S0260210508008115.

- Jay Ulfelder and Benjamin Valentino. 2008. *Assessing risks of state-sponsored mass killing*. Political Instability Task Force. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1703426.

- David R. Black and Paul D. Williams, eds. 2010. *The International Politics of Mass Atrocities: The case of Darfur*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

- Stephanie Carvin. 2010. "A responsibility to reality: a reply to Louise Arbour." *Review of International Studies* 36 (S1): 47–54. doi:10.1017/s0260210511000088.

- Anthony F. Lang. 2010. "Humanitarian Intervention." Ch. 18 in *Ethics and world politics*, ed. by Duncan Bell, 324–341. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Ian Hurd. 2011. "Is Humanitarian Intervention Legal? The Rule of Law in an Incoherent World." *Ethics & International Affairs* 25 (3): 293–313. doi:10.1017/s089267941100027x.

- Thomas Weiss and Giovanna Kuele, "Whither R2P?," August 31, 2011.

- David Chandler. 2012. "Resilience and human security: The post-interventionist paradigm." *Security Dialogue* 43 (3): 213–229. doi:10.1177/0967010612444151.

- Thomas G. Weiss. 2014. "Military Humanitarianism: Syria Hasn't Killed It." *The Washington Quarterly* 37 (1): 7–20. doi:10.1080/0163660x.2014.893171.

- Alex J. Bellamy. 2016. "Humanitarian Intervention." Ch. 22 in *Contemporary Security Studies*, ed. by Alan Collins, 327–342. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Chris Brown. 2014. *International Society, Global Polity: An Introduction to International Political Theory*. London: Sage. [chapters 7-8]

- Bridget Conley-Zilkic. 2016. *How mass atrocities end*. Somerville, MA: World Peace Foundation. http://sites.tufts.edu/wpf/files/2017/05/How-Mass-Atrocities-End_policy-briefing.pdf.

- Jennifer M. Welsh. 2016. "The Responsibility to Protect after Libya & Syria." *Daedalus* 145 (4): 75–87. doi:10.1162/DAED_a_00413.

- Paul Bloom, "The Root of All Cruelty?" New Yorker, November 20, 2017.

- Christopher Powell and Amarnath Amarasingam. 2017. "Atrocity and Proto-Genocide in Sri Lanka." Ch. 1 in *Understanding Atrocities: Remembering, Representing, And Teaching Genocide*, ed. by Scott W. Murray, 19–47. Calgary: University of Calgary Press.

12.11 Politics of international criminal justice (March 27)

12.11.1 Required Readings

- Kurt Mills. 2013. "R2P3: Protecting, Prosecuting, or Palliating in Mass Atrocity Situations." *Journal of Human Rights* 12 (3): 333–356. doi:10.1080/14754835.2013.812421.

- Leslie Vinjamuri and Jack L. Snyder. 2015. "Law and politics in transitional justice." *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 303–327. doi:10.1146/annurev-polisci-122013-110512.

- Geoff Dancy and Florencia Montal. 2017. "From Law versus Politics to Law in Politics: A Pragmatist Assessment of the ICC's Impact." *American University International Law Review* 32 (3): 645–705. [electronic copy is available through CUL (search eJournals)]

- Christopher Rudolph. 2017. *Power and Principle: The Politics of International Criminal Courts*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. [introduction and ch.1: "Power and Principle from Nuremberg to The Hague"] [CUL full text online]

12.11.2   Supplementary/Recommended Readings

- Gary Jonathan Bass. 2000. *Stay the Hand of Vengeance: The Politics of War Crimes Tribunals*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [chapters 5: "Nuremberg" (147-205) and 6: "The Hague" (206-275).]

- Jack L. Snyder and Leslie Vinjamuri. 2003. "Trials and Errors: Principle and Pragmatism in Strategies of International Justice." *International Security* 28 (3): 5–44. doi:10.1162/016228803773100066.

- Allison Danner and Erik Voeten. 2010. "Who is running the international criminal justice system." Ch. 2 in *Who Governs the Globe*, ed. by Deborah D. Avant, Martha Finnemore, and Susan K. Sell, 35–71. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/cbo9780511845369.003.

- Oskar N. T. Thoms, James Ron, and Roland Paris. 2010. "State-Level Effects of Transitional Justice: What Do We Know?" *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 4 (3): 329–354. doi:10.1093/ijtj/ijq012.

- Kathryn A. Sikkink. 2011. *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics*. New York, NY: Norton. [ch.4]

- James Meernik. 2016. *International Tribunals and Human Security*. London, UK: Rowman & Littlefield. [chapters 3-4 (67-128)]

12.12   Student presentations (April 3)

Presentations of students' research paper projects, peer review, and course wrap up. We may have to increase the length of this session to have sufficient time for all presentations.

due April 9, noon: final essay