

POLS 585: SECURITY

Professor Shawn L. Ramirez
slramirez@emory.edu
Office hours: Thurs 4-6
in Tarbutton 334

Fall 2013
Class meets Fri 9-12
in Tarbutton 313

Description

This course introduces students to security, conflict and peace studies with a unified approach to studying interstate and intrastate war. Topics include causes and consequences of war, the role of leaders, regime type, bargaining and dispute resolution, peace agreements, the use of violence, and terrorism. Students will become familiar with cases, a variety of methodological approaches, and develop their own research project. This is one in a two-course sequence alongside Conflict. There are no prerequisites for this course, but it is strongly advised that students have taken POLS 510.

Learning Objectives

Upon successful completion of this course, students can expect to have gained:

1. Practice presenting, critiquing and evaluating the literature including the assumptions, arguments/claims, research design, theory, methods, evidence, and room for progress.
2. Experience with and feedback on their own research.

What you will do in this course (and grading)

I. Peer Instruction and Participation (25%)

Attendance, completion of ALL readings and tasks before class, active participation, and being a considerate and constructive colleague are required.

Each week we will aim for a lively and informed discussion to evaluate the literature and consider room for progress. Students will serve as peer instructors (one per reading) each week (*see Peer Instruction below*). All students are encouraged to participate in open discussion, and also can expect to be called on at random.

Items with an asterisk (*) will not be presented, but are still required and will be discussed.

Peer Instruction

Peer instruction will improve your presentation and teaching skills, develop your ability to analyze and critique the literature, and demonstrate your creativity to expand upon research.

As a peer instructor, you should:

1. ***Prepare a 10-15 minute presentation*** in which you teach the class by working through the reading. Describe the following:
 - central question(s),
 - assumptions,
 - key aspects about the methods/approach (for example, you might work through their theoretical or empirical model or their case studies, or even consider how they constructed their variables),
 - findings/conclusions,
 - and contribution to the broader literature.

Do keep the “summary” portion clear and concise (strive to keep step 1. to 10 minutes – this takes practice!). Use Powerpoint or Beamer (also, great practice!). *Be prepared to field questions about the work you are presenting.* Consider providing thoughts and questions to motivate discussion throughout your instruction.

2. ***Introduce at least one NEW*** fact, data, figure, map, case, theory, or perhaps follow up on the empirical evidence in the paper (do their findings still hold today?). Do something that gets the class thinking beyond the research presented.
3. ***At the close:*** Introduce discussion questions for the class to consider, and close with at least one idea of where research could/should go next and why you think this is the case. What remains unasked, unresolved, overlooked, unexplored, misunderstood, etc.?
4. ***As a class,*** we’ll examine the reading further and consider new ideas.

II. Topic Reviews (25%)

Topic reviews will improve your knowledge of the literature, hone your writing and analysis skills, and prepare you for a consistent portion of your future -- conducting research and evaluation effectively.

A topic review summarizes six (6) highly visible and influential articles or books dealing with one narrow topic (10-12 double-spaced pgs., 12-pt. font, 1-inch margins, plus a Chicago-style bibliography). Each student will write **two** topic reviews. You can optimize the schedule by reading and analyzing 1-2 articles per week once you finalize your articles.

1. **9/6: Topics approved.** Choose two topics – one for each review – that are raised during this course. Topics for both reviews **must be approved by the professor** by 5pm.
2. **9/20: Article list approved.** Turn in two lists (one for each review) of articles/books to be read. No overlap is allowed on the topic reviews, i.e., you must cover twelve (12) different readings across both assignments. You may use up to three readings from the syllabus per review (at least half of each review must cover new material). Your lists with topics clearly indicated **must be approved by the professor** by 5pm.
3. **10/18 and 11/15 Submission deadlines.** For each article or book: identify the governing question; explain the approach; discuss the findings; identify the main contribution; and briefly describe what remains unresolved. This is an effort in analysis, not synthesis. Turn in your topic review (one per due date) by 5pm.

III. Research Project (50%)

Each student will work on a semester-long research project:

- **First few weeks:** Narrowing your realm of interesting questions to reveal a feasible central question is difficult. *See advice on choosing a topic below. **Feel free to discuss your topic with the professor at any time.*** Comb the literature to see what has been and is being written about things that interest you.
- **Week 4 (9/20): Governing question/theory-building day**

Now that you are aware of the background literature on your topic, you probably have a few ideas about what question(s) you would like to answer, and maybe even a plausible answer. ***In class, we'll work in small groups and discuss our final ideas aloud.*** Discuss your ideas, give and receive feedback to hone your governing question, theory, scope, ideas for managing complexity, etc. Make this day work for your research: sort through divergent literatures, draft a model, sort dependent and independent variables, consider cases, or do whatever you need to do to start working toward a research design.

- **Week 8 (10/18): Research design and feedback day**

After deciding on your question, you can take a few weeks to juggle ideas for how to conduct your research. Many of these attempts may not work out. Do some preliminary investigation to see what others have done. *See things to consider when planning research below.* ***In class, each student will give a 10-12 minute presentation*** that introduces/motivates their governing question, their methods/approach, and their main hypothesis/expectations. Do your best to present your research plans clearly, so that the feedback can sharpen your hypotheses and improve your plan before you embark in search of results.

- **Week 15 (12/6): Presentations and Final Abstracts**

After you have results but before you start your final paper – when you’ve completed the bulk of the research and can see where things are and are not going well – precisely at this time is when feedback can have the biggest impact on improving the final paper. Treat this like a conference presentation. ***In class, each student will give a 10-12 minute presentation of their work.*** Clearly articulate your research question, enough of the literature so that we understand how your research contributes to knowledge, your methods, and your results. Collect feedback from the talk, mull it over, *and then* go home and write a **150-word abstract**. This will set the overall pitch and organization of your future paper and its main point. ***Your abstract is due by 5pm the next day.***

Suggestions and Resources

Advice on choosing a topic:

Find an interesting article published in a top journal within the past 5 years. Read that publication carefully, including all the footnotes and bibliography (this will tell you what influenced the article), and see if it generates a question or a narrow topic to study. It is a good idea to build your project off of something influential (in the most visible journals) and on which other scholars have shown interest (a good number of citations). This is not a rule, just advice.

Advice on things to consider when planning research design.

You do not need to submit a written prospectus for this course, but it can help to consider what is normally answered in a prospectus. A prospectus should introduce your question, explain what research you will perform, and demonstrate that your research will contribute to knowledge about that subject. Here are some things you

might think about:

- Introduce the topic. Explain why this matters. Identify how you will contribute.
- Explain your theory or puzzle, or whatever it is that is motivating your research.
- State your hypothesis as clearly as possible. What exactly do you expect to see in the world? What claim do you need to validate? Is your hypothesis falsifiable: does your research allow for evidence that your theory is wrong? What is your scope?
- Explain your research plan as clearly as possible. How will you test the validity of your claims? What empirical methods will you use (quantitative, experimental, case studies, etc...)? What resources will you use? What data/cases will you use? Is your sample representative? How will you measure your concepts? Why is your research method appropriate?
- Briefly explain what knowledge you expect to obtain. How will your work contribute? Are you considering generalizability? If so, to what extent is your study generalizable?

Conducting a case study? Try these two sites:

<http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/guide.cfm?guideid=60>
<http://explorable.com/case-study-research-design>

Background research:

1. Google Scholar: <http://scholar.google.com>
2. Lexis-Nexis Academic for keyword searches of news articles
3. BBC Country Profiles:
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/country_profiles/default.stm
4. CIA World Factbook:
<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-worldfactbook/>
5. Economist Intelligence Unit:
<http://www.eiu.com>

Research and data resources:

1. <http://www.isadiscussion.com/view/0/datasets.html>
2. <http://www.icpsr.umich.edu/>
3. <http://dvn.iq.harvard.edu/dvn/>

4. <http://esoc.princeton.edu/>
5. <http://web.library.emory.edu/do-research>

Writing resources:

1. Emory's EPASS writing help at the library
2. Zinsser, William. On Writing Well: The Classic Guide to Writing Non-Fiction.
3. Strunk and White's Elements of Style.
4. Kate Turabian, 2007 A Manual for Writers of Research Papers, Theses, and Dissertations.
5. <http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/home.html>
6. owl.english.purdue.edu

Other resources:

1. Emory Office of Disability Services: Students who would like special allowances for things like extra time on exams must see the ODS for preapproval.
<http://www.ods.emory.edu/about.htm>
2. Stay healthy: <http://studenthealth.emory.edu/>
3. Manage your work and life: <http://www.worklife.emory.edu/>

Policies

1. **Absences, Late Assignments and Incompletes:**

- * You are allowed one absence (excused or not) without penalty. Each additional absence is 5 points off of your final course grade.
- * Late assignments drop a full letter grade – A to B, B to C – per day late *without exception*.
- * No incomplete will be given for this class.

2. **Academic Integrity:**

All assignments submitted by a student must be that student's own original work. There are many forms of academic dishonesty, which include, but are not limited to: cheating, plagiarism, false citations, creating or using fraudulent records or official documents, and aiding another person in their academic dishonesty. No form of academic dishonesty will be tolerated. Any case of suspected academic dishonesty will be reported and managed according to university rules as per the Emory Honor Code:
http://catalog.college.emory.edu/academic/policy/honor_code.html.
Please speak with the professor if you have any questions or concerns.

3. Electronics:

- * Tablets, laptops are encouraged and are seen as a privilege in this course. Look up information during class to add to discussion.
- * Cell phone use is not permitted during class.
- * Use of Facebook, Twitter, or anything that is not directly relevant to the class is absolutely prohibited!
- * Students who abuse these privileges will fail the course.

Recommended Books

- Reiter, Dan, and Allan C. Stam. 2002. *Democracies at War*. Princeton, Princeton U.P.
- Kalyvas, Stathis. 2006. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- *Bringing the State Back In* edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. Cambridge University Press.
- Desch, Michael C. 2008. *Power and Military Effectiveness: The Fallacy of Democratic Triumphalism*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.

Schedule

Week 1: Inter and Intrastate War

- Michael Howard's *Clausewitz* book published by Oxford University Press (on Reserve for 3 hrs at a time)
- Charles Tilly (1985) "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime" in *Bringing the State Back In*.
- Paul Collier and Nicholas Sambanis. "Understanding Civil War: A New Agenda." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 46, No. 1, Understanding Civil War (Feb., 2002), pp. 3-12.
- *Watch both of these talks by Professor Hans Rosling:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jbkSRLYSojo>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hVimVzgtD6w>

Week 2: War as a bargaining model II

- Kathleen G. Cunningham, "Divide and Conquer or Divide and Concede: How do States Respond to Internally Divided Separatists?" *American Political Science Review* 105 (May 2011): 275-297.

- RF Trager, “Diplomatic calculus in anarchy: How communication matters” *American Political Science Review* 2010
- Powell, Robert. “Bargaining and Learning While Fighting.” *American Journal of Political Science* 48(2), April 2004: 344-361.
- Hassner, RE. ‘To Halve and to Hold’: Conflicts over Sacred Space and the Problem of Indivisibility. *Security Studies* 2003.
- DG Press, SD Sagan. “Atomic Aversion: Experimental Evidence on Taboos, Traditions, and the Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons” *American Political Science Review*, 2013

Week 3: War Onset

- Bremer, Stuart. “Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate War, 1816-1965” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36, 2 (June 1992): 309-341.
- Havard Hegre and Nicholas Sambanis, “Sensitivity Analysis of Empirical Results on Civil War Onset,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50 (August 2006): 508-535.
- Schrodtt, Philip A. and Deborah J. Gerner. “Cluster-Based Early Warning Indicators for Political Change in Contemporary Levant.” *American Political Science Review* 2000.
- Richard A. Nielsen, Michael G. Findley, Zachary S. Davis, Tara Candland, and Daniel Nielson. (2011) “Foreign Aid Shocks as a Cause of Violent Armed Conflict” *American Journal of Political Science*. Vol. 55, No. 2, April 2011, pp. 219-232.
- Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson (2012) “10 Reasons Countries Fall Apart” *Foreign Policy*.
and
Foreign Policy Failed States Index: Look at the variables, rankings and methodology.
http://www.foreignpolicy.com/failed_states_index_2012_interactive

Week 4: Governing question/theory-building day

Week 5: Collective action, control, and the use of violence

- Kalyvas, Stathis. *Logic of Violence in Civil War*. Ch. 4-5 on Collaboration and Control and either Ch 8 or 9 (qualitative or quantitative evidence, class choice)
- Jeremy Weinstein, “Resources and the Information Problem in Rebel Recruitment,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49 (August 2005): 598-624.

- Benjamin Valentino, Paul Huth, and Dylan Balch-Lindsey, “Draining the Sea: Mass Killing and Guerrilla Warfare,” *International Organization* (April 2004): 375-407.
- Jason Lyall, “Does Indiscriminant Violence Incite Insurgent Attacks? Evidence from Chechnya,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53 (June 2009), 331-362.
- C. Blattman “From Violence to Voting: War and Political Participation in Uganda” *American Political Science Review* 2009
- *Watch/read these from Allam Stam and Chris Davenport’s work on Rwanda:
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0mH210cC3U8>
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EmIkxr7Ac0c>
http://www.genodynamics.com/Site_7/GenoDynamics.html
<http://www.psmag.com/politics/what-really-happened-in-rwanda-3432/>

Week 6: Participation, greed, grievance (Ethnic Conflict)

- Posner, D. 2004. “The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi.” *American Political Science Review*, 98(4), 529-545.
- Collier, Paul and Anke Hoeffler. 2009. “Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War.” *Oxford Economic Papers* 61(1): 1-27.
- Lars-Erik Cederman and Luc Girardin, 2007. “Beyond Fractionalization: Mapping Ethnicity onto Nationalist Insurgencies,” *American Political Science Review* 101 (1): 173-85.
- Macartan Humphries and Jeremy M. Weinstein, “Who Fights? The Determinants of Participation in Civil War,” *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (April 2008), 436-455.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Wimmer, Andreas and Brian Min. 2010. “Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel?” *World Politics* 62: 87-119.

Week 7: Resources and War

- Ross, Michael. “What Do We Know About Natural Resources and Civil War?” *Journal of Peace Research*. May 2004 vol. 41 no. 3 337-356.
- Habyarimana, James, Humphreys, Macartan, Posner, Daniel N., and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2007. “Why Does Ethnic Diversity Undermine Public Goods Provision?” *American Political Science Review* 101(4): 709-726.
- Lujala, Paivi. “Deadly Combat over Natural Resources: Gems, Petroleum, Drugs, and the Severity of Armed Civil Conflict,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53 (February 2009): 50-71.

- Basedau, M. and J. Lay. 2009. "Resource Curse or Rentier Peace? The Ambiguous Effects of Oil Wealth and Oil Dependence on Violent Conflict" *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 46. No. 6: 757-776.
- S Haber, V Menaldo "Do natural resources fuel authoritarianism? A reappraisal of the resource curse" *American Political Science Review* 2011

Week 8: Research design and feedback day

Week 9: Terrorism

- Carr, Caleb. "Terrorism as Warfare," *World Policy Journal* 13: 4 (Winter 1996-7), p. 1-12.
- Pape, Robert. 2003. "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 97(03): 343-361.
- Ivan Arreguin-Toft, "How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict," *International Security* 26:1 (2001).
- Jason Lyall, "Are Coethnics More Effective Counterinsurgents? Evidence From the Second Chechen War," *American Political Science Review* 104 (February 2010): 1-20.
- Berman, Eli, Jacob N. Shapiro, and Joseph H. Felter, "Can Hearts and Minds Be Bought? The Economics of Counterinsurgency in Iraq," *Journal of Political Economy* 119 (August 2011): 766-819.
- *Look at the Global Terrorism Database online:
<http://www.start.umd.edu/gtd/>
 Play with the 'Search the Database' and 'Browse by' options. Save the images of what you find to share with the class.

Week 10: Democracy and the Capitalist Peace

- Reiter, Dan, and Allan C. Stam. *Democracies at War*. Chapters 3 (Democracy and Battlefield Success), 6 (Democracy, Consent, and the Path to War), 7 (The Declining Advantages of Democracy: When Consent Erodes).
- Desch, Michael. Chapters 1 (Why Democracy is Not a Liability), 2 (Why Regime Type Hardly Matters), and 6 (If Not Democracy, Then What?) from *Power and Military Effectiveness*. (on Reserve)
- Gleditsch, Kristian, and Michael Ward. 2000. "War and Peace in Space and Time: The Role of Democratization," *International Studies Quarterly* 44(1).
- Gartzke and Hewitt. "International Crises and the Capitalist Peace." *International Interactions*. Volume 36, Issue 2, 2010, 115-145.

Week 11: Leaders and audience costs

- Debs, Alex and H. Goemans, “Regime Type, the Fate of Leaders, and War,” *American Political Science Review* 104 (August 2010): 430-445.
- Weeks, Jessica. 2012. “Strongmen and Straw Men: Authoritarian Regimes and the Initiation of International Conflict” *American Political Science Review* 106(02): 326-347.
- Croco, Sarah E. “The decider’s dilemma: leader culpability, war outcomes, and domestic punishment.” *American Political Science Review* 2011
- Jack Snyder and Erica D. Borghard, “The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound,” *American Political Science Review* 105 (August 2011): 437-456.
- Kenneth A. Schultz, “Why We Needed Audience Costs and What We Need Now,” *Security Studies* vol 21 no. 3 (2012): 369-375.

Week 12: Dispute Resolution: Law, Mediation and Political Cover

- Allee, Todd L. and Paul K. Huth, Legitimizing Dispute Settlement: International Legal Rulings as Domestic Political Cover,” *American Political Science Review* 100 (2006): 219-234.
- Huth, Croco and Appel. “Does International Law Promote the Peaceful Settlement of Territorial Conflicts? Evidence from the Study of Territorial Conflicts since 1945.” *American Political Science Review* 2011.
- Beardsley, Kyle. “Pain, Pressure and Political Cover: Explaining Mediation Incidence,” *The Journal of Politics* 2010.
- Gent, Stephen E. and Megan Shannon. 2010. “The Effectiveness of International Arbitration and Adjudication: Getting Into a Bind.” *The Journal of Politics* 72(2): 366-380.
- Cunningham, David E. “Veto Players and Civil War Duration,” *American Journal of Political Science* 50 (October 2006): 875-892.

Week 13: Peace Agreements: Design and durability

- Virginia Page Fortna, “Scraps of Paper? Agreements and the Durability of Peace,” *International Organization* 57 (Spring 2003), 337-372.
- Beardsley, Kyle. “Agreement without Peace? International Mediation and Time Inconsistency Problems.” *American Journal of Political Science* 2008.
- Thomas Chapman and Philip Roeder. “Partition as a Solution to Wars of Nationalism: The Importance of Institutions.” *American Political Science Review* 2007.
- James Fearon and David Laitin. “Neotrusteeship and the Problem of Weak States” *International Security* Vol 28, No. 4, Spring 2004, 5-43.

- Michaela Mattes and Burcu Savun, “Information, Agreement Design, and the Durability of Civil War Settlements,” *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (April 2010): 511-524.

Week 14: Thanksgiving Holiday

Week 15: Final presentations