

Professor Stefano Recchia
Office: Carr Collins 316A
Office Hours: Thu., 3.30-5.30pm
Email: srecchia@smu.edu



PLSC 4382: The Politics and Ethics of Military Force

Spring 2020

Wed 6.30PM - 9:20PM

Dallas Hall 116

Course description:

This course offers an advanced introduction to contemporary scholarship about the politics and ethics of military force in international relations. Questions addressed include: What arguments have traditionally been used to justify the use of force in international relations? Is the preventive use military force legitimate? Should powerful states intervene militarily to stop mass atrocities in foreign countries? What are some of the ethical and political challenges resulting from the use of force by non-state actors, such as private military companies and ethnic groups? To answer these questions, we will adopt an inter-disciplinary approach, drawing on scholarship in political science and international relations, as well as philosophy, history, and law. The first half of the course explores major conceptual and theoretical debates, drawing on just war theory. The second half zeroes in on the use of force by specific actors: powerful states, UN peacekeepers, private contractors, and ethnonational insurgents. Although there is no formal prerequisite for this course, students who have not previously taken any courses in international relations or political theory may find our discussions quite abstract and at times difficult to follow.

Course objectives:

(1) Acquire the tools to critically evaluate moral and political arguments for and against the use of military force in international relations; (2) Gain a sophisticated understanding of the motives and cost-benefit calculations that drive powerful states as well as private actors to threaten or use military force; (3) Develop analytical thinking, oral presentation, and writing skills; (4) Learn to apply complex academic theories to current affairs.

Readings:

The course will employ a combination of lectures, seminar-style discussion, and student presentations. The lectures will introduce the week's topic but will not present all of the required readings in detail. There is a significant amount of required reading for this course, averaging 80-100 pages per week. Students are expected to complete all of the required readings *before* class

so that they can engage in active discussion. It is advisable that students take notes on each of the required readings; in addition, students should print out the relevant articles and book chapters and bring them to class, as we will sometimes refer to particular passages in our discussion. Students who regularly skip the required readings or miss more than one or two class meetings will not be in a position to do well in the midterm and final exams and may fail the course. There is one required textbook for this course, listed below. All the other required readings will be made available through Canvas. The “suggested readings” for each week are intended as further guidance for students who want to explore a particular topic in greater depth, including as part of your research paper.

Required Textbook:

- Steven P. Lee, *Ethics and War: An Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).

Course requirements and grading:

Class attendance and participation: 15%

Midterm exam: 20% (on March 4)

Group presentation: 10%

Research paper: 30% (due on April 29)

Final exam: 25% (on May 6).

Class attendance and participation

Class attendance is mandatory, and active and informed student participation is expected. Students who consistently come to class late, seldom contribute to discussion, or blather showing no knowledge of the assigned materials, will be downgraded.

If you need to miss a class due to a family bereavement, illness, or officially sanctioned University extracurricular activity, you must notify the professor in advance via email and provide appropriate documentation. Religiously observant students who will be absent on religious holidays should notify the professor via email at the beginning of the semester. Students who miss a class should make arrangements to obtain the notes from another classmate.

Each week, one or two students will briefly introduce one of the required readings, in order to kick off our discussion of that particular text. This presentation should take no longer than 5-7 minutes. It should: (a) summarize the author’s main argument; (b) highlight what evidence the author uses, if any; and (c) identify some limitations in the argument and/or the evidence used. These short presentations will contribute to the student’s overall participation grade.

Midterm exam

For the midterm exam, students will be required to briefly identify five key concepts and write one short essay (choosing from two essay questions available), based on material from the first half of the course. The midterm will be held in class on March 4.

Group presentations

Each week, three students will deliver an oral presentation on a topic determined by the professor (presentation topics for each week are listed on the syllabus). These presentations are intended to expand upon the week's main topic and/or explore a particular aspect of the week's topic in greater depth. All three students are expected to contribute to preparing and delivering the presentation. For each week, the syllabus lists 3-4 additional readings intended to guide student's research for the presentation. These readings are available on Canvas. Students are welcome to consult additional materials while conducting research for their presentation. It is strongly advised that students meet ahead of their scheduled presentation to coordinate and divide up the required work. Students should prepare a one-page written outline of their presentation, structured in bullet points, and print out sufficient copies for distribution to the entire class. The oral presentation should take 20-25 minutes in total and will be followed by a discussion involving the entire class. Students who contribute to a group presentation should focus on the "additional" readings for the presentation and need to read only the first two required readings for that particular week (although they will still benefit from reading the rest).

Research paper

Students are required to write a research paper on a topic of their choice related to the politics and ethics of military force (excluding the topic that they have already explored in their group presentation). The research paper is a substantial project that requires independent research and careful analysis; it should not simply summarize and discuss the required course readings. The paper should either (a) explore a particular historical or contemporary case of actual/potential military intervention and apply theories from the course to illuminate that particular case, or (b) present an in-depth theoretical or conceptual discussion that goes significantly beyond what we have discussed in the course. Strong papers will display the following characteristics: they will be well written; clearly identify the question/problem to be addressed; present a sound argument based on logic and evidence; and draw on at least six to eight scholarly sources (including books checked out at Fondren library, and articles from scholarly journals that can be accessed through the SMU library website). Students are strongly encouraged to acquaint themselves with the resources available in Fondren library and ask the reference librarian for guidance as needed.

A one-page outline of the paper is due in hard copy at the beginning of class on April 1. A hard copy of the final research paper is due at the beginning of class on April 29. The paper should be 10-12 pages long (excluding bibliography), double-spaced, and use 12-point Times New Roman font. Electronic copies will not be accepted. Late submissions will incur a penalty of 10 percentage points for each 24-hour period.

Final exam

For the final exam, students will again be required to identify five concepts and answer *two* essay questions (choosing from three questions available), drawing on theories and arguments from the second half of the course. The final exam will be held between 6.30 and 9.30 pm on May 6.

Office hours: Students are always welcome to attend the professor’s office hours, if they have particular questions about the content of the readings or the lectures. Students should not come to office hours expecting to find out what exactly they need to know for the midterm and final exams. Beginning in week two of the course, students will be able to book their ten-minute office hour slot on the professor’s website, at <http://www.stefanorecchia.net/teaching.html>

Laptop policy: Studies show that students learn less when they work with laptops in class. Therefore, to minimize distraction and maximize learning, the use of laptops, tablets and smartphones in class is not allowed unless you have a medical reason to use one.

PART I: PRINCIPLES AND THEORIES

January 22 (Week 1)

Introduction: The use of military force – strategy and ethics

Topics: Strategic uses of military force; overview of Just War Theory; discussion of the syllabus; student presentations and other requirements

Required:

- Robert Art, “The Four Functions of Force” [9pp]
- Steven Lee, *Ethics and War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), chap. 1 [34pp]

January 29 (Week 2)

Historical foundations: The just war tradition and military intervention before the 20th c.

Topics: How have key thinkers since antiquity theorized “just wars”? On what grounds, and how, have powerful states intervened in the affairs of other polities in previous centuries?

Required:

- Lee, chap. 2. [33pp]
- March Trachtenberg, “Intervention in historical perspective” [22pp]
- Thomas Aquinas, excerpts from *Summa Theologiae* [8pp]
- Hugo Grotius, excerpts from *The Law of War and Peace* [10pp]
- Emerich de Vattel, excerpts from *The Law of Nations* [9pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** “What role did the principle of non-intervention play in international relations between the Westphalian Peace of 1648 and the nineteenth century?”

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Stephen Krasner, “Westphalia and all that,” in Judith Goldstein and Robert Keohane, eds., *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1993).
- Jennifer Pitts, “Intervention and sovereign equality: legacies of Vattel,” in Stefano Recchia and Jennifer Welsh, eds., *Just and Unjust Military Intervention: European Thinkers from Vitoria to Mill* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2013), pp. 132-153.
- Andreas Osiander, “Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth,” *International Organization* 55(2), 2001: 251-287.
- Luke Glanville, “The The Myth of ‘Traditional’ Sovereignty,” *International Studies Quarterly* 57(1), 2013: 79–90.

Further suggested readings on this week’s topic:

- Alex J. Bellamy, *Just Wars: From Cicero to Iraq* (Malden, MA: Polity, 2006), pp. 13-87.
- Richard Tuck, *The Rights of War and Peace* (New York: Oxford UP, 1999), chaps. 2, 3, 6.
- Sohail H. Hashmi, “Interpreting the Islamic Ethics of War and Peace,” in Terry Nardin, ed., *The Ethics of War and Peace: Religious and Secular Perspectives* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1996), pp. 146-168.
- David Trim, “Intervention in European History, c. 1520-1850,” in Stefano Recchia and Jennifer Welsh, eds., *Just and Unjust Military Intervention: European Thinkers from Vitoria to Mill* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2013), pp. 21-47.

February 5 (Week 3)

***Jus ad bellum* and the national defense paradigm**

Topics: National defense as a cornerstone of just war theory; the legalist paradigm as theorized by Michael Walzer; the relationship between self-defense and collective security

Required:

- Lee, chap. 3, only pp. 68-102 [35pp]
- Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, chaps. 2 and 4; pp. 21-33 and 51-73 [35pp]
- Fernando Téson, "Self-Defense in International Law and the Rights of Persons," *Ethics & International Affairs* 18(1): 87-91 [5pp]
- Thomas M. Franck, *Recourse to Force: State Action Against Threats and Armed Attacks* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2002), pp. 1-19 [19pp]
- United Nations Charter, Articles 1-2, 39-43, 51: www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Was the 1991 Persian Gulf War a collective (self-) defense or a collective security operation?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- David M. Malone, "New World Order Policeman," in *The International Struggle over Iraq: Politics in the UN Security Council* (New York: Oxford UP, 2006), pp. 54-83.
- Yoram Dinstein, *War, Aggression and Self-Defense*, 6th edition (New York: Cambridge UP, 2017), pp. 301-327.
- Nicholas Tsagourias and Nigel D. White, "States and Collective Security," in *Collective Security: Theory, Law and Practice* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2013), pp. 63- 90.
- Inis Claude, "Collective Security as an Approach to Peace" [11pp]

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Michael Walzer, "The Moral Standing of States: A Response to Four Critics," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 9 (3), 1980: 209-229.
- Janina Dill, "Just War Theory in Times of Individual Rights," in Chris Brown and Robyn Eckersley, eds., *Oxford Handbook of International Political Theory* (New York: Oxford UP, 2018), pp. 221-232.
- Charles R. Beitz, "The Moral Standing of States Revisited," *Ethics & International Affairs* 23(4), 2009: 325-47.
- Nico Schrijver, "The Ban on the Use of Force in the UN Charter," in Marc Weller, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the Use of Force in International Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 465-487. [23pp]

February 12 (Week 4)

Preventive and preemptive war

Topics: The classic distinction between preventive and preemptive war; The Caroline criteria; Does confronting new threats require new rules of anticipatory self-defense?

Required:

- Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, chap. 5, pp. 74-85 [12pp]
- Douglas Feith, "Sovereignty and Anticipatory Self-Defense," memo for the U.S. Secretary of Defense, August 24, 2002 [4pp]
- Michael W. Doyle, *Striking First: Preemption and Prevention in International Conflict* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2008), pp. chap. 2, pp. 43-65 and 84-96 [36pp]
- David Rodin, "The Problem with Prevention," in Henry Shue and David Rodin, *Preemption: Military Action and Moral Justification* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 143-170 [28pp]
- Kerstin Fisk and Jennifer Ramos, "Actions Speak Louder Than Words: Preventive Self-Defense as a Cascading Norm," *Int'l Studies Perspectives* 15(2), 2014: 163-185 [23pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Should the United States and its allies use military force against Iran to prevent it from acquiring nuclear weapons?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Matthew Kroenig, "Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike Is the Least Bad Option," *Foreign Affairs* 91(1), 2012, pp. 76-86.
- Alex Newton, "Ethics and legality: US prevention in Iran," in Deen K. Chatterjee, ed., *The Ethics of Preventive War* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2013), pp. 166-188.
- Colin Kahl, "Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort," *Foreign Affairs* 91(2), 2012, pp. 166-173.
- Marc Trachtenberg, "Preventive War and US Foreign Policy," in Henry Shue and David Rodin, *Preemption: Military Action and Moral Justification* (OUP, 2007), pp. 40-68.

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Richard K. Betts, "Striking First: A History of Thankfully Lost Opportunities," *Ethics & International Affairs* 17(1), 2003: 17-24.
- Allen Buchanan and Robert O. Keohane, "The Preventive Use of Force: A Cosmopolitan Institutional Proposal," *Ethics & International Affairs* 18(1), 2004: 1-22.
- Ashley S. Deeks, "Taming the Doctrine of Preemption," in Marc Weller, ed., *The Oxford Handbook of the Use of Force in International Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), pp. 661-677.

February 19 (Week 5)

Humanitarian intervention and the Responsibility to Protect

Topics: Should state sovereignty be contingent on the protection of basic human rights?
Theories of and objections to humanitarian intervention; challenges of implementation

Required:

- Lee, chap. 4, only pp. 109-138 [30pp]
- Michael W. Doyle, "The Politics of Global Humanitarianism," in Alex Bellamy and Tim Dunne, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the R2P* (Oxford UP, 2016), pp. 673-692 [20pp]
- Robert A. Pape, "When Duty Calls: A Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention," *International Security* 37(1), 2012, only pp. 41-61, skim the rest [21pp]
- Benjamin Valentino, "The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention" [8pp]
- Rajan Menon, *The Conceit of Humanitarian Intervention* (New York: Oxford UP, 2016), chap. 5, pp. 77-97 [21pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Are safe areas established by powerful states a legitimate and effective tool for protecting vulnerable civilians in humanitarian crises?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Sarah Sewall, "Military Options for Preventing Atrocity Crimes," in Serena Sharma and Jennifer Welsh, eds., *The Responsibility to Prevent: Overcoming the Challenges of Atrocity Prevention* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 160-188.
- Rutger Birnie and Jennifer Welsh, "Displacement, Protection and Responsibility: A Case for Safe Areas," *Global Responsibility to Protect* 10 (3), 2018: 332 – 361.
- Stefano Recchia, "The Paradox of Safe Areas in Ethnic Civil Wars," *Global Responsibility to Protect* 10 (3), 2018: 362 – 386.
- Taylor Seybolt, *Humanitarian Military Intervention: The Conditions for Success and Failure* (Oxford University Press, 2007), chap. 6, pp. 177-221.

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Martha Finnemore, *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing beliefs about the use of force* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2003), chap. 3, pp. 52-84.
- Gareth Evans and Mohamed Sahnoun, "The Responsibility to Protect," *Foreign Affairs* 81(6), 2002: 99-110.
- Roland Paris, "The 'Responsibility to Protect' & the Structural Problems of Preventive Humanitarian Intervention," *International Peacekeeping* 21(5), 2014: 569-603.
- Alan J. Kuperman, "The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans," *International Studies Quarterly* 52 (2008): 49–80.

February 26 (Week 6)

Legitimate authority and multilateral approval

Topics: Why do states seek multilateral approval for their military interventions from the UN or regional bodies? Why *should* states seek such approval? What are the tradeoffs involved?

Required:

- Terrence Chapman, *Securing Approval: Domestic Politics and Multilateral Authorization for War* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2011), chap. 1, pp. 19-36 [18pp]
- Alexander Thompson, "Coercion Through IOs: The Security Council and the Logic of Information Transmission," *International Organization* 60 (1), 2006, pp. 1-34 [34pp]
- Allen Buchanan and Robert O. Keohane, "Precommitment Regimes for Intervention: Supplementing the Security Council," *Ethics & International Affairs* 25(1), 2011: 41-63 [22p]
- Stefano Recchia, "Authorising humanitarian intervention: a five-point defence of existing multilateral procedures," *Review of Internat'l Studies* 43(1), 2017: 50-72 [23pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Was the 1999 Kosovo intervention legitimate?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- A. Roberts, "NATO's 'Humanitarian War' Over Kosovo," *Survival*, 41(3), 1999: 102-123.
- Alan K. Hendrikson, "The Constraint of Legitimacy: The Legal and Institutional Framework of Euro-Atlantic Security," in Pierre Martin and Mark R. Brawley, eds., *Alliance Politics, Kosovo, and NATO's War* (New York: Palgrave, 2000), pp. 41-56.
- Samantha Power, *A Problem From Hell: America in the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 2013), chap. 12, pp. 443-474.
- David N. Gibbs, *First Do No Harm: Humanitarian Intervention and the Destruction of Yugoslavia* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2009), chap. 7, pp. 171-204.

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Martha Finnemore, "Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity," *World Politics* 61(1), 2009: 58-85.
- Joseph M. Grieco et al., "Let's Get a Second Opinion: International Institutions and American Public Support for War," *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2), 2011: 563-583.
- Sarah Kreps, "Multilateral Military Interventions: Theory and Practice," *Political Science Quarterly*, 123(4), 2008: 573-603.

March 4 (Week 7)

Midterm exam

Topics: Everything covered in the course until now

- After the exam, we will watch this movie: *The Fog of War* (100 minutes)

March 11 (Week 8)

Fighting justly: *Jus in bello*

Topics: The principles of discrimination and proportionality. Who is a noncombatant? Are democracies less likely to target civilians? What do Americans think about killing civilians?

Required:

- Lee, chap. 4, pp. 154-199 [46pp]
- Jeff McMahan, "The Ethics of Killing in War," *Philosophia*, 34(1), 2006: 23-41 [19pp]
- Alex B. Downes, *Targeting Civilians in War* (Cornell UP, 2008), chap. 1, pp. 13-41 [28pp]
- Benjamin Valentino, "Moral Character or Character of War? American Public Opinion on the Targeting of Civilians in Times of War," *Daedalus* 145(4), 2016: 127-138 [12pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Does U.S. reliance on airstrikes delivered from unmanned aerial vehicles ('drones') increase the likelihood of compliance with jus in bello criteria?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Daniel Byman, "Why Drones Work," *Foreign Affairs*, 92(4), 2013: 32-43.
- Klem Ryan, "What's Wrong with Drones?" in Matthew Evangelista and Henry Shue, eds., *The American Way of Bombing* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2014), pp. 207-223.
- Michael Walzer, "Just and Unjust Targeted Killing and Drone Warfare," *Daedalus* 145(4), 2016: 12-24.
- Thomas Gregory, "Targeted killings: Drones, noncombatant immunity, and the politics of killing," *Contemporary Security Policy* 38(2), 2017: 212-236.

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars*, chaps. 8 and 9, pp. 127-159.
- Seth Lazar, "Evaluating the Revisionist Critique of Just War Theory," *Daedalus* 146(1), 2017: 113-124.
- Janina Dill, "The 21st-Century Belligerent's Trilemma," *European Journal of International Law* 26 (1), 2015, pp. 83-108.

March 18 (Week 9)

No class – Spring break

March 25 (Week 10)

After war: *Jus post bellum*

Topics: Should defeated states be punished or assisted? Are war crimes trials and postwar democracy promotion wise policies? Can international trusteeship build lasting peace?

Required:

- Lee, chap. 8, only pp. 284-295 [11pp]
- Gary Bass, “Jus Post Bellum,” *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 32(4), 2004: 384-412 [29 pp]
- Alex Bellamy, “The responsibility to protect and the problem of regime change,” in Don E. Scheid, ed., *The Ethics of Armed Humanitarian Intervention* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2014), pp. 166-187 [22pp]
- Leslie Vinjamuri, “The Distant Promise of a Negotiated Justice,” *Daedalus* 146(1), 2017: 100–112 [13pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** “Is international trusteeship a legitimate and effective means to stabilize war-torn societies, or are there better alternatives available?”

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Stephen Krasner, “Sharing sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States,” *International Security* 29(2), 2004: 85-120.
- David A. Lake and Christopher J. Fariss, “Why International Trusteeship Fails,” *Governance* 27(4), 2014: 569-587.
- Stefano Recchia, “Just and Unjust Postwar Reconstruction: How much external interference can be justified?” *Ethics & International Affairs* 23(2), 2009: 165-187.
- Caroline Hartzell and Matthew Hodddie, “Crafting Peace Through Power Sharing,” in Robert Art and Robert Jervis, *International Politics* (NY: Pearson, 2015), pp. 353-361.

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Michael W. Doyle, "Postbellum Peacebuilding," in Doyle, *The Question of Intervention* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015), pp. 147-185.
- Stefano Recchia, "Should humanitarian interveners promote democracy after genocide?" *International Theory* 10(1), 2018: 1-30 [read pp.1-19 and skim the rest].
- Séverine Autesserre, "International Peacebuilding and Local Success: Assumptions and Effectiveness," *International Studies Review* 19(1), 2017: 114–132.
- David Edelstein, "David Edelstein, "Foreign Militaries, Sustainable Institutions, and Postwar Statebuilding," in Roland Paris and Timothy Sisk, eds., *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding* (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 81-103.

PART II: ACTORS AND PROCESSES

April 1 (Week 11)

U.S. decision making on the use of military force

Topics: Who shapes U.S. decisions on the use of force? What roles do leadership beliefs, strategic culture, and public opinion play? How casualty sensitive is the U.S. public?

Required:

- Shoon Murray and Jordan Tama, "U.S. Foreign Policymaking and National Security," in Derek Reveron, Nikolas Gvosdev, and John Cloud, *The Oxford Handbook of U.S. National Security* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 57-76 [20pp]
- Elizabeth Saunders, *Leaders at War: How Presidents Shape Military Interventions* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 2011), pp. 20-40 [21pp]
- Colin Dueck, *Reluctant Crusaders Book Subtitle: Power, Culture, and Change in American Grand Strategy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2006), chap. 2, only pp. 21-36 [16pp]
- Daniel Kahneman and Jonathan Renshon, "Hawkish biases," in Trevor Thrall and Jane K. Cramer, eds., *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear* (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 79-96 [18pp]
- Christopher Gelpi and John Mueller, "The Cost of War: How Many Casualties Will Americans Tolerate?" *Foreign Affairs* 85(1), 2006: 139-144 [6pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** “Should U.S. uniformed leaders publicly voice their concerns about planned interventions, when they worry that using force will harm national security?”

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Samuel P. Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: The Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1957), chap. 3, pp. 59-79.
- Risa Brooks, “Militaries and Political Activity in Democracies,” in Suzanne C. Nielsen and Don M. Snider, eds., *American Civil-Military Relations* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), pp. 213-238.
- Leonard Wong and Douglas Lovelace, “Knowing When to Salute,” *Orbis* 52(2), 2008: 278-288.
- James Golby, Peter Feaver, and Kyle Dropp, “Elite Military Cues and Public Opinion About the Use of Military Force,” *Armed Forces & Society* 4(1), 2018: 44-71.

Further suggested readings on this week’s topic:

- Peter D. Feaver and Jason Reifler, *Paying the Human Costs of War: American Public Opinion and Casualties in Military Conflicts* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2009), chap. 2, pp. 23-66.
- Elizabeth Saunders, “War and the Inner Circle: Democratic Elites and the Politics of Using Force,” *Security Studies* 24 (3), 2015: 466–501.
- William G. Howell and Jon C. Pevehouse, “When Congress Stops Wars: Partisan Politics and Presidential Power,” *Foreign Affairs* 86(5), 2007: 95-107.

April 8 (Week 12)

Using force through multi-national coalitions

Topics: What are the tradeoffs involved in coalition warfare? What types of coalition support are especially useful to the United States? How constrained are U.S. allies in using force?

Required:

- Sarah Kreps, *Coalitions of Convenience: United States Military Interventions After the Cold War* (New York: Oxford UP, 2011), chap. 3, pp. 24-48 [25pp]
- Marina E. Henke, *Constructing Allied Cooperation* (Ithaca, NJ: Cornell UP, 2019), chap. 2, only pp. 11-30 [20pp]
- David P. Auerswald and Stephen M. Saideman, *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting Together, Fighting Alone* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2014), pp. 31-62 [32pp]
- Olivier Schmitt, *Allies that Count: Junior Partners in Coalition Warfare* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2018), pp. 1-31 [31pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** “Did the U.S. strategy of ‘leading from behind’ during the 2011 Libya intervention introduce a useful new model of coalition warfare?”

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Christopher Chivvis, “Libya and the Future of Liberal Intervention,” *Survival* 54(6), 2012: 69-92.
- Patricia A. Weitsman, *Waging War: Alliances, Coalitions, and Institutions of Interstate Violence* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford UP, 2014), chap. 27, pp. 164-87.
- Ryan C. Hendrickson, “The Role and Impact on NATO,” in Dag Henriksen and Ann Karin Larssen, eds., *Political Rationale and International Consequences of the War in Libya* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 211-227.
- Robert Egnell, “Lessons and Consequences of Operation Unified Protector,” in Kjell Engelbrekt, Marcus Mohlin, and Charlotte Wagnsson, eds., *The NATO Intervention in Libya* (New York: Routledge, 2014), pp. 221-235.

Further suggested readings on this week’s topic:

- Jason Davidson, *America’s Allies and War* (New York: Palgrave, 2011), pp. 1-10.
- Patricia A. Weitsman, *Waging War: Alliances, Coalitions, and Institutions of Interstate Violence* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford UP, 2014), chap. 2, pp. 14-43.
- Stéfanie von Hlatky, *American Allies in Times of War: The Great Asymmetry* (New York: Oxford UP, 2013), chap. 2, pp. 26-59.
- Marina Henke, “Buying Allies: Payment Practices in Multilateral Military Coalition-Building,” *International Security* 43(4), 2019: 128-162.

April 15 (Week 13)

Intergovernmental organizations: peacekeeping and peacebuilding

Topics: UN and regional peace operations; issues of command and control; the use of force in peacekeeping operations; Why do states contribute to peacekeeping operations?

Required:

- Lise Morjé Howard, *Power in Peacekeeping* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), chap. 1, pp. 1-31 [31pp]
- Shogo Suzuki, "Seeking 'Legitimate' Great Power Status in Post-Cold War International Society," *International Relations* 22(1), 2008: 45-63 [19pp]
- Paul Diehl, "Triage or Substitution? The Changing Face of UN Peacekeeping," *International Peacekeeping* 26(5), 2019: 540-544 [5pp]
- Cedric de Coning, "Africa and UN Peace Operations," in de Coning and Mateja Peter, eds., *UN Peace Op's in a Changing Global Order* (Palgrave, 2019), pp. 213-229 [17pp]
- Niklas Nováky, *European Union Military Operations* (New York: Routledge, 2018), chap. 1, pp. 1-24 [24pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Should UN peacekeepers be willing to use force offensively when confronting radical actors in war-torn societies?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Stian Kjeksrud and Alexander Beadle, "The utility of military force to protect civilians in UN peace operations," in Peter Nardin, ed., *The Use of Force in UN Peacekeeping* (New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 100-123.
- Mats Berdal, "What Are the Limits to the Use of Force in UN Peacekeeping?" in de Coning and Peter, eds., *UN Peace Operations in a Changing Global Order*, pp. 113-131.
- Touko Piiparinen, "Intervening to strengthen sovereignty: The lessons of the UN Intervention Brigade," *International Relations* 30(2), 2016: 154-175.
- Lise Howard, "Peacekeeping is Not Counterinsurgency," *International Peacekeeping* 26(5), 2019: 545-548.

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Michael Pugh, "Peace Operations," in Paul D. Williams and Matt McDonald, eds., *Security Studies: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 317-333.
- V. Page Fortna, *Does Peacekeeping Work?* (Princeton, NJ: PUP, 2008), esp. pp. 76-103.
- Linda Darkwa, "The strategic relationship between the African Union and its partners," in Cedric de Coning, Linnéa Gelot and John Karlsrud, eds., *The future of African peace operations* (London: Zed Books, 2016), pp. 65-76:<http://www.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:913028/FULLTEXT02>

April 22 (Week 14)

Private military companies (PMCs)

Topics: Ethical and political issues raised by the growing use of PMCs in war; Can the Just War framework offer any useful guidance on the ethical employment of PMCs?

Required:

- Sean McFate, *The modern mercenary: private armies and what they mean for world order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015), chaps. 1-4, pp. 1-40 [40pp]
- Deborah Avant, "An Ethical Approach to Private Military and Security Companies," in Daniel Brunstetter and Jean-Vincent Holeindre, eds., *The Ethics of War and Peace Revisited* (Georgetown UP, 2018), pp. 119-138 [20pp]
- James Pattison, "Just War Theory and the Privatization of Military Force," *Ethics & International Affairs* 22(2), 2008: 143-162 [20pp]
- Marina Malamud, "Private Military and Security Companies in UN Missions," *Peace Review* 26(4), 2014: 571-577 [7pp]

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Does Russia's employment of PMCs in places such as eastern Ukraine, Syria and Libya make Russia's military interference less problematic?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Neil Hauer, "The Rise and Fall of a Russian Mercenary Army," *Foreign Policy*, October 6, 2019 [6pp.]
- Christopher Spearin, "Russia's Military and Security Privatization," *Parameters* 48(2), 2018: 39-49.
- Sergey Sukhankin, "Continuing War by Other Means," in Theodore Karasik and Stephen Blank, eds., *Russia in the Middle East* (Washington, DC: Jamestown Foundation, 2018), pp. 290-318.

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Andrew Alexandra, Deane-Peter Baker, and Marina Caparini, eds., *Private Military and Security Companies: Ethics, Policies and Civil-Military Relations* (NY: Routledge, 2008).
- Anna Leander, "The Paradoxical Impunity of Private Military Companies: Authority and the Limits to Legal Accountability," *Security Dialogue* 41(5), 2010: 467-490.
- Deborah D. Avant and Renée de Nevers, "Military Contractors & the American Way of War," *Daedalus* 140(3), 2011: 88-99.
- Lindsay Cameron, *The Privatization of Peacekeeping* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

April 29 (Week 15)

Ethno-national insurgents and secessionists

Topics: Can non-state groups legitimately resort to military force? If so, under what circumstances? When is national secession justified? What may lead insurgents fight justly?

Required:

- James D. Kiras, "Irregular Warfare," in John Baylis, James Wirtz, and Colin Gray, eds., *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, 6th ed. (Oxford UP, 2018), only pp. 183-190 [8pp]
- Lee, chap. 7, only pp. 240-271 [32pp]
- Allen Buchanan, *Justice, Legitimacy, and Self-Determination* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), chap. 8, read only pp. 331-360 [30pp]
- Eric Patterson, "Arguing the American Revolution," in *Just American Wars* (New York: Routledge, 2018), pp. 21-36 [16pp]
- Nisha Fazal, "Rebellion, War Aims, and the Laws of War," *Dædalus* 146(1), 2017: 1–12.

>> **Student presentation topic:** "Was the Anti-American insurgency in Iraq between 2003 and 2007 an instance of just guerrilla war?"

Additional readings to guide your research for the presentation:

- Ahmed S. Hashim, "Insurgency in Iraq, 2003-2010," in Paul B. Rich and Isabelle Duyvesteyn, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of Insurgency and Counterinsurgency* (New York: Routledge, 2012), pp. 172-182.
- Bruce Hoffman, "Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in Iraq," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 29 (2), 2006: 103-21.
- Max Boot, "Carnage in Mesopotamia," in *Invisible Armies: An Epic History of Guerrilla Warfare from Ancient Times to the Present* (New York: Norton, 2013), pp. 529-534
- Charles Tripp, *A History of Iraq*, 3rd ed. (NY: Cambridge UP, 2007), chap. 7, pp. 277-316

Further suggested readings on this week's topic:

- Michael L. Gross, *The Ethics of Insurgency* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2015), chap. 2, only pp. 21-45 [25pp].
- Giuseppe Mazzini, "The European Question," in Stefano Recchia and Nadia Urbinati, eds., *A Cosmopolitanism of Nations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 2009), pp. 193-198.
- Christopher Finlay, "Legitimacy and Non-State Political Violence," *Journal of Political Philosophy* 18(3), 2010: 287-312.
- Sohail H. Hashmi, "Self-Determination and Secession in Islamic Thought," in *The New World Order: Sovereignty, Human Rights, and the Self-Determination of Peoples*, ed. Mortimer Sellers (Providence, R.I.: Berg Press, 1996), 117-52.