

THE POLITICS OF FORCIBLE INTERVENTION (FRESHMAN SEMINAR)

Political Science 101
Tuesday & Thursday, 9:30 – 10:50am
African Studies Seminar Room, 602 Library Place

Overview: This course addresses the debate over whether the international community has a duty to forcibly intervene to halt serious human rights abuses. Rooted in Kant's idea that democratic governance and respect for human rights would herald a "perpetual peace", 19th century European Great Powers intervened to compel new countries to respect minority rights and end oppressive practices. In the wake of the First World War, this mission confronted the reality not just of recalcitrant governments, but also of militias, internecine conflict and massive refugee flows. The end of the Cold War raised again raised the prospect of a "perpetual peace," and more recently, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), alongside prosecutions for war crimes and crimes against humanity that are now part of international humanitarian law (IHL) bring with them arguments for forcible international intervention to halt violations.

This course will include consideration of recent and contemporary cases of in which forcible intervention has been justified in part or substantially on humanitarian grounds, including in Kosovo, Iraq, Libya, Sudan and others. Alongside attention to the international politics of these interventions, the course will focus on issues related to populations that reject intervention and even attacked their supposed benefactors, problems related to the merging of military and civilian elements of foreign policy, the role of humanitarian organizations in conflict zones, and related topics.

In keeping with the freshman seminar format, assignments will consist of regular writing assignments in which students will have opportunities to revise essays. Students will be expected to participate in guided class discussions, including in the classroom and on a blog [more details immediately below].

By the end of the course students will be expected to differentiate between analysis of a political problem and their opinions concerning a political problem. Students should be able to express their analyses in clear and concise essays. Attention will be given to identifying relevant material and in judging the credibility of sources for these analyses.

Requirements: Course grades will be based upon the following components of this seminar:

Class discussion and participation (including class blog)	10%
Three papers (of about six pages)	60% (20% each)
Final paper (of about 10 pages)	30%

Class discussion and blog: Students are encouraged to speak up in the classroom. Students also will have an opportunity to participate in a public forum blog. Students will choose their own secret user names. The professor will moderate discussion and will accept suggestions from the class members for topics. This blog will be readable by the wider public, and thus expose students to the possibility that outsiders will be attracted to the discussion. Who knows? Perhaps policy makers may participate. [Blog details to follow.]

The three shorter papers: Students will compose three response essays to debates from class discussion and readings. Each essay should be on the order of six pages or so. Each essay will have two due dates; the first for a draft and the second for a final version.

The final paper: Students will compose a longer (10 page or so) analytical essay that grapples with a “bigger issue” question about forcible intervention. These questions will be decided in consultation with individual students. They can include (but are not restricted to) matters concerning the appropriateness or effectiveness of intervention strategies, moral and ethical considerations that are (or should be) associated with policies, the longer-term impact of policies on American political debates, and so forth.

More details about this and the other essay assignment will follow as students become familiar with some of the topics covered in this course.

Required Textbooks:

Kathryn Sikkink (2011) *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions are Changing World Politics*. W.W. Norton.

Peter van Buren (2011) *We Meant Well: How I Helped Lose the Battle for the Hearts & Minds of the Iraqi People*. Metropolitan Books.

Peter Andreas (2008) *Blue Helmets and Black Markets: The Business of Survival in the Siege of Sarajevo*. Cornell University Press.

CLASS CALENDAR

Historical Experiences of Forcible Intervention

27 September

This class session will feature introductions and will be used to attend to general freshman student questions about registration and other issues related to settling in. the professor will hand out some class materials and perhaps sing the official course theme song.

2 October

Stephen Krasner (1999) “Rulers and Ruled: Minority Rights,” *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 73-104.

Arthur Conan Doyle (1909) [*The Crime of the Congo*](#). London: Hutchinson & Co. Peruse this lengthy pamphlet. You are not expected to read the whole thing. Read further if you wish and have time. [I will help guide you to significant sections.]

Key issues: Krasner observes that intervention to protect minorities was a key justification for European insistence on the dismantlement of the European part of the Ottoman Empire. This

concern for minority rights and human rights in general has a long history in the justifications for forcible intervention in the affairs of other countries. Note some of the similarities between Arthur Conan Doyle's campaign of a century ago and ones of more recent vintage.

Some questions; Is forcible intervention on behalf of oppressed people simply a justification for the pursuit of national interests, or is it credible as action in service of moral objectives? Are moral objectives justifiable as national interests?

4 October

United Nations (1960) [Resolution 1514 of 1960](#). [*Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples*. New York: UN General Assembly.

Laurie Wiseberg (1980) "[Human Rights in Africa](#): Toward a Definition of the Problem of a Double Standard". *Issue*, 10(1), 66-76.

Key issues: Sovereignty provided a shield against foreign intrusion into the internal affairs of states. International organizations appeared to defend the interests of states rather than the rights of people who lived in them.

Some questions: Who was protected and who was not protected under the provisions of Resolution 1514 of 1960? Why were the majority of states in the post-World War II era so readily accepting of the principle of non-intervention?

+++ **Some class time will be devoted to preparing drafts of Essay One** +++

Intervention to Protect Civilians

9 October

International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (2001) [The Responsibility to Protect](#). Ottawa: International Development Research Centre.

Anne Marie Slaughter (2012) "[Syrian Intervention](#) Is Justifiable and Just." *Washington Post* (8 June), op-ed.

Jon Western & Joshua S Goldstein (2011) "[Humanitarian Intervention](#) Comes of Age: Lessons from Somalia to Libya", *Foreign Affairs*, 90:6 (Nov/Dec), 48-59, and Benjamin A Valentino, "The [True Costs of Humanitarian](#) Intervention," *Foreign Affairs*, 90:6 (Nov/Dec), 60-75.

Key issues include whether forcible intervention is simply imperial intrusion in new guise or whether it represents a fundamental shift in understandings about mutual responsibility. Try to discern the underlying assumptions in each argument presented in the readings. What kinds of assumptions are being made about the nature of the international system in each case, about how countries usually conduct their relations with one another, how they define interests, etc.?

Some questions: Is forcible intervention to protect populations a policy that will be evenly applied? What conditions have to exist for intervention to happen? Is this fair? What advice would you give to Barak Obama and other American political leaders concerning the current abuses of IHL that are occurring in Syria?

11 October

Peter Andreas (2008), “Longest Siege” and “Imposing the Siege,” 1-41.

Key issues: This book introduces the concept of war economies and the system of incentives that is attached to this kind of economy. Also note the distinction between the logic of formal rules and organizations and the logic of informal practices and the relationships and networks that grow out of these.

Some questions: Can international embargoes and other sanctions deal adequately with the informal practices that emerge in war economies? What other actions would remedy the problem of perpetrators benefiting from international interventions designed to hinder their activities?

+++ **The first essay is due in class** +++

16 October

Peter Andreas (2008) “Sustaining the Siege” and “Siege Within,” 42-103.

Key issues: The effort to remedy the suffering of victims of IHL violations produces unintended consequences. The resources intended to aid refugees fuels clandestine markets that support violators of IHL. The limited UN presence creates unintended consequences of this sort too.

Some questions: Should the UN and other international actors intervened more forcibly and at an earlier state, or would this intervention have met with similar outcomes? How do this who intervene forcibly prevent from becoming complicit, either directly or indirectly, in crimes?

18 October

Peter Andreas (2008) “Lifting the Siege,” “Aftermath,” “Extensions” and “Conclusions,” 104-65.

Key issues: The process of intervention does not necessarily lay the groundwork for returning a society to its condition before the war. Consider how the economy of the siege shapes politics after the war. Andreas also observes how some of these new developments—such as smuggling—also might lay the groundwork for inter-ethnic cooperation. Think about the limits of action among international actors by virtue of their status.

Some questions: Who are the “winners” in this war? Does forcible military intervention serve the cause of justice? How is the intervention force (and subsequent EU and other international interlocutors) to deal with the “criminalized elite”? Is there any other viable option?

23 October

Mary Kaldor (2006) “The Politics of New Wars,” in *New & Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 72-94.

Sue Nahm (2006) “From Bad to Better: Reflections on Refugee and IDP Militarization in Africa,” Rubert Muggah, ed., *No Refuge: The Crisis of Refugee Militarization in Africa*, Geneva: Small Arms Survey, 217-50.

Key issues: Contemporary war economies may (or may not) differ from those of previous generations. The conflicts in the context of failed states appear to exhibit dynamics that are particular to these situations. Think about the differences between the kinds of warfare that are clashes between two armies and warfare that involves multiple types of intermingled armed groups (“symmetrical irregular warfare”).

Some questions; Does the protection of civilians in the context of failed states and conflict require state-building as a necessary condition for success? {This issue will be considered at greater length in the next section.] Are contemporary war economies an “African problem”? Do people see the issue this way, whether merited or not?

25 October

Ian Smilie, Lansana Gberie, Ralph Hazelton (2000), [The Heart of the Matter](#): Diamonds and Human Security in Sierra Leone, Ottawa: Partnership Africa Canada.

Joanna Weschler (2009) “[The Evolution of Security Council Innovations](#) in Sanctions,” *International Journal*, 61(1), 31-43.

Key issues: International campaigns can lead to the creation of new sanctions regimes. The PAC report provides insight into the basis for the Kimberley Process to monitor and eliminate the trade in “blood diamonds”. The evolution of a UN sanctions regime is examined too.

Some questions: How effective are sanctions regimes? Does success in one region or economic sector lead to success in others? What are the consequences for sanctions of a shift to a more multi-polar world (i.e., the rise of China / India / Brazil, etc.)? Are sanctions a good alternative to state-building?

Intervention to Build New States

30 October

Frances Fukuyama (2004) “[The Imperative of State-Building](#)” *Journal of Democracy*, 15(2), 17-31.

Fernando Téson, (2003) “The Liberal Case for Humanitarian Intervention,” in Holzgrefe et al. (eds.), *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 93-129.

Key issues: Fukuyama argues that state-building needs to become a global priority. The failure of states at the hands of undemocratic governments produces numerous threats to the security of other states. Only the US can address this problem effectively, says F.F.

Some questions: Does Fukuyama’s argument lay the groundwork for a global effort to respond to failed states? Are undemocratic states the same thing as failed states? What do you think causes states to fail and how does this reflect on your ideas about state-building?

+++ **Drafts of the second essay are to be discussed in class** +++

1 November

Peter Van Buren (2011) *We Meant Well: How I helped lose the Battle for the Hearts and Minds of the Iraqi People*. [Read this book at our speed.]

Key issues: You should be able to read through this book fairly quickly and be entertained. Look particularly for episodes that illustrate the disjuncture between the state-builder in local actors. Pay particular attention to how the context of Iraqis that the author encounters shapes their interests and their relationships with the foreign state-builders.

Some questions: Why didn’t the state-builders try harder? What are the efforts in this book that demonstrated the most success, and do you think that you would find that they remain successful if you were to visit Iraq now?

6 November

Boutros Boutros-Ghali (1992) [*An Agenda for Peace*](#). New York: United Nations.

Key issues; The Secretary-General of the UN responds to a request for reform of the United Nations to better undertake peacekeeping operations. Note the references to “Chapter VII operations” and the argument to justify military intervention to bring about a cessation of hostilities and conformity to international law. This document is foundational in introducing the concept of “post-conflict peacebuilding”.

Some questions: Why was the UN willing to undertake more peacekeeping operations in the early 1990s, compared to previous decades? Is peacebuilding an adequate conceptual framework for analyzing and responding to conflicts?

+++ **The second essay is due in class** +++

8 November

Pierre Englebert and Denis Tull (2008) "[Postconflict Reconstruction](#) and Flawed Ideas about Failed States," *International Organization*, 32(4), 106-39.

Roland Paris (2002) [International Peacebuilding](#) and the 'Mission Civilatrice'", *Review of International Studies*, 28, 637-56.

Key Issues: These authors identify particular aspects of local politics and the interests of armed actors that undermine general plans for peacebuilding. These works can be used to debate whether conflicts generate their own resolutions or whether conflict creates conditions that have to be reversed to ensure that conflict does not recur.

Some questions: How are the analyses and criticisms of Englebert & Tull and of Paris similar to or different from the arguments in your textbook by Peter Andreas? Is state-building intervention more difficult in non-European states? Are international organizations a help or a hindrance for organizing effective intervention for state-building?

13 November

[Essays relevant to the situation in Libya and Syria: Stay tuned for updates]

Intervention to Serve Justice

15 November

Kathryn Sikkink (2011) "Introduction." "Navigating Without a Map: Human Rights Trials in Southern Europe," and "Argentina: From Pariah State to Global Protagonist," 1-85.

Jack Snyder & Leslie Vinjamuri (2003) "[Trials and Errors](#): Principle and Pragmatism in Strategies of International Justice," *International Security*, 28:3 (Winter), 5-44.

Key issues: Note how Sikkink makes her claim that she can demonstrate that truth commissions and trials work in terms of reducing human rights violations. At least she asserts that these measures do not cause harm. Note how Sikkink's argument contrasts with the argument of Snyder & Vinjamuri.

Some Questions: Why did new governments decide to prosecute their predecessors for violations of human rights? How do you explain the contrary conclusions (i.e., that prosecutions cause harm) in Snyder's & Vinjamuri's work in light of Sikkink's argument?

20 November

Kathryn Sikkink (2011) "Interlude," "The Streams of Justice Cascade," and "The Effects of Human Rights Prosecutions in Latin America," 87-161.

Key issues: Sikkink uses her data on prosecutions in Latin America to show how these affect prosecutions elsewhere. In doing so, she comes into conflict with the findings of other scholars who don't identify this effect or deny it.

Some questions: Does her desire to support certain norms drive Sikkink's analysis? Is this a problem in analytical terms (i.e., does this shape her core assumptions so that she finds what she wants to find)?

+++ **Drafts of the third essay will be discussed in class** +++

22 November – Happy Thanksgiving

27 November

Kathryn Sikkink (2011) "Global Deterrence and Human Rights Prosecutions," "Is the United States Immune to the Justice Cascade," and "Policy, Theory and the Justice Cascade?" 162-260.

Key issues: Sikkink shows the reader that prosecutions really deter human rights violations. She has to consider the US administration's decision to stave off prosecutions for its violations of human rights and IHL in the War on Terror. She claims that this US action strengthened rather than weakened the justice cascade, a proposition worthy of further analysis and debate.

Some questions: What is the place for norms in conducting a policy-relevant empirical study of this kind? Would international tribunals have been a better choice for some of the prosecutions covered in this book? Consider a country like Syria: What would be the tradeoffs in trying Assad in a national court versus an international tribunal?

+++ **Third essays are due in class** +++

29 November

Robert Pape (2012) "When Duty Calls: A Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention" *International Security* 37:1 (Summer), 41-80.

WCAS Reading Period starts on Monday, 3 December. Fall examinations begin on Monday, 10 December. Your **final essays are also due on Monday, 10 December**. Please submit these essays to your instructor, Will Reno, as attachments to an email message.