

Aisha Ahmad
Department of Political Science
University of Toronto
Virtual Office Hours: Wed 10AM-12PM
Office Tel: 416-287-7321
Email: aisha.ahmad@utoronto.ca

POL466/POL2207: Advanced Topics in International Security

Department of Political Science
University of Toronto
Tuesdays 10AM-12PM EST in UC175

Course Description:

This seminar course investigates the most urgent issues in the field of International Security. The topics include American hegemonic decline, rising Chinese power, Russian military actions in Eastern Europe, great power competition, complex civil wars, and international interventions. The readings for this course are drawn from the most prestigious journals in International Relations, and the majority of them have been published within the past 3-4 years. All the readings are current and speak to serious international security crises that you will see on the news.

The class is not, however, about the headlines of the day. This is an advanced social science course that is heavy on academic research and writing. We are not satisfied to know *what* is happening in the world. Our goal is to understand the *why*. All of the assigned readings delve deeply into the causal mechanisms and logics behind international security crises that are reported on by journalists and observers. The academic readings for this course are heavy, but very necessary.

The first part of the course is focused on the academic readings, and there will be two quizzes that test your understanding of these articles. Because the readings for this course are substantial, you will be assigned to teams on the very first day of classes and asked to create and share reading *précises* with your teammates. The quizzes are online and open book, and your team reading *précises* will be your single-best resource to succeed.

The second part of the course focuses on your original research paper. If you are passionate about a particular conflict or topic in the field of International Security, you are welcome to investigate it using a rigorous social scientific method. There are no assigned readings in the latter part of the course; rather, these weeks will be dedicated to hosting research paper workshops. The workshops are designed in the same format as an academic conference, wherein students will present their own work, and also serve as discussants in others sessions.

This course is an advanced joint undergraduate-graduate seminar course that assumes a strong foundation in International Relations theory and previous coursework in International Security. Reading, writing, teamwork, participation, and presentations are required. There is no final exam.

Requirements:

Précises: 10%

Tests: 20% (2 tests at 10% each)

Participation: 20%

Research paper proposal: 10%

Research presentation: 10%

Final paper: 30%

Required Readings:

The course relies on a collection of academic journal articles, as outlined in this syllabus. The readings are a central part of the course. Students are expected to use the library search engines to find weekly readings, which are available with your student ID. All of the readings are freely available online via the university library system, and it is the responsibility of the student to search for these sources.

Special Considerations:

Students are responsible for completing all the course requirements on time, as stipulated by the syllabus. Disability-related accommodations must be requested through the AccessAbility office; if you have an approved accommodation, you can rest assured that your extra time on exams or other special needs will be arranged for you behind the scenes.

If you face a serious unexpected challenge for which you must declare an absence on ACORN, you are required to present evidence of that declaration of absence to the professor. Late work is not permitted, but your missed work may be reweighted into other assignments or tests. Please take note of the University of Toronto policies on special conditions, petitions, and appeals, found here: <https://www.utoronto.ca/registrar/petitions>

Academic Integrity:

The University of Toronto treats issues of academic integrity extremely seriously and these offenses can lead to suspension and permanent notations on your academic record. A false declaration of absence constitutes a very serious academic offense. Plagiarism is a serious breach of academic integrity. Please take note of the descriptions of academic integrity and punishable offenses, found here: <https://www.academicintegrity.utoronto.ca/perils-and-pitfalls/>

Classroom Etiquette:

This classroom is a safe, equitable and professional learning environment, in which students are encouraged to express their views in a collegial and respectful manner. To maintain a healthy learning environment, this classroom has a **zero tolerance policy** on racism, sexism, homophobia, transphobia, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, discrimination, and harassment. Violating this policy will result in expulsion from the classroom. Please familiarize yourself with the University of Toronto Scarborough principles of Equity and Diversity: <https://www.utoronto.ca/edio/>

Teamwork:

On the first day of classes, you will form your teams. There will be three undergraduate teams, which will consist of a maximum of 5 students each. Graduate students will form their own team. Please select a team name and a team captain. Because this course does not have a tutorial section, your teams are designed to be an essential social and learning connection throughout the semester. If you work together, your team can also drastically reduce the workload of this course.

You will stay in your teams throughout the course, so be trustworthy and reliable to one another and take your responsibilities to your peers seriously. Share your notes. Study together. Read each other's draft papers. Working in groups is essential to learning about both the frustrations and the synergies involved in actually working in international politics. Making a team succeed in the classroom is much easier than making a team function in a peacebuilding operation or a negotiation process. Make patience, responsibility and creative conflict resolution part of your character now.

The only graded component of your teamwork are your weekly reading précis. Your grade depends on your contribution alone, not the contributions of your teammates. However, teams that work together as one strong unit (writing high quality précis, sharing class notes, and studying together) always score higher than students that treat this work like a check in the box.

Précises:

Every week, you will write a short paragraph précis on at least one of the required readings for the upcoming class, and then share you précis with your group. To do this, you will divide the weekly readings among your team, so that everyone will choose to do 1-2 précis per week. You should decide among yourselves which article you'd each like to take responsibility for.

There are *a lot* of weekly readings, but there readings are only assigned for 7 weeks out of the entire semester. Each précis is worth 1% of the final grade, graded as a completion point, for a maximum of 10%. So, to get your maximum points, you should plan to do two précis for three of the weeks. Given this, it would be most logical to coordinate as a team, so that you ensure that your team has précis for every single reading.

Your weekly précis should very concisely outline the following information about your article: (a) the research question the author is trying to answer, (b) the hypothesis, i.e. the author's answer to the research question (e.g. the causal model), (c) the method the author used to answer the question, and (d) a comment or critique about how the article addresses the weekly questions. Use these four headings to structure your précis.

You must submit your reading précis for the upcoming class to your team leader, due by the end of day on the Friday before the upcoming class. Your team leader will then compile your précis into one Word document, circulate it to the entire group, and send a copy the professor indicating that each teammate has successfully completed their task. To ensure your points are recorded, you must follow the instructions *exactly* as outlined in the précis guide. Armed with your teammates' précis, you can then go back to the rest of your readings and approach them with greater focus

on how each reading helps to address the weekly discussion questions. You will then have detailed knowledge of the readings in advance of our class on Monday.

Your *précises* are your best study guide for the tests. The readings are heavy for this course, and the tests directly evaluate your comprehension of the assigned articles. Having a strong collection of *précises* will not only help you manage the workload of the readings, but it will also allow you to perform extremely well in the quizzes.

Presentations:

There is a research presentation component to this course, which is described in detail below. Although each student will make their own presentation, the discussant roles will be assigned by team. This means that everyone from Team A will serve as discussants for the presentations made on the first day, and everyone on Team B will serve as discussants on the second day. Graduate students will serve as discussants for their peers on their own team, but undergraduate students are required to attend the graduate presentations.

Although research presentations will be graded individually, teams that successfully coordinate a practice run session – wherein your full team meets and helps each member improve their work before their formal presentations – always fare better than those that go it alone. Teams are encouraged to collaborate heavily in the research-heavy second half of the course.

Quercus Quizzes:

There are 2 short online quizzes that will be scheduled at the beginning of class time (each 20 minutes long), which will test students on their knowledge and comprehension of the weekly readings. Students are required to log on to Quercus Quizzes at the correct time in order to complete the quizzes. The quizzes are open book, and students are strongly advised to have good notes prepared on the readings in advance. There are no make-up quizzes, so if a student misses a quiz for a serious medical or personal emergency, they can provide an explanation to the professor and ask for their second quiz to be re-weighted to cover the full quiz grade. The regular seminar session will begin right after the quiz is complete.

Participation:

Our weekly conversations are the heart and soul of the course. Active, thoughtful participation in the discussions is a key requirement and makes up a substantial part of your final grade. The weekly discussion questions are on the syllabus, which are designed to spark and guide the conversation. Students are encouraged to read the assigned readings with special attention to how they speak to the major debates. Participation in the research paper presentations is also an essential part of the course.

Simply showing up to class does not count as participation, and there is no score for attendance. As such, if you are sick or have an emergency, you will not lose points for not attending class. Nevertheless, your participation grade is based on your in-class participation through your “lead reflections”, and so it is necessary to be present to participate.

In exceptional situations (e.g. prolonged illness, pandemic isolation requirements, or sustained family, health, or personal emergencies), remote, asynchronous participation options will be made available to students who are structurally unable to attend classes. However, the class is not designed to be taken asynchronously, so these options will only be offered to students dealing with extreme circumstances.

Lead Reflections (10%):

Each weekly seminar session is guided by a set of leading questions. At the start of each class, up to five students will lead off the discussion for the first 15-20 minutes of the class. If you want to take the lead on any particular week, you simply need to raise your hand at the start of the discussion and say “I’d like to lead off”.

By taking the lead, these students will score participation points for starting off the class debate around the weekly readings and discussion questions, generating a thought-provoking discussion. To score well on their participation grades, students should plan to step up and take the lead at least three times in the semester. The better your engagement, the higher your scores. Look over the syllabus and decide which issues you are most passionate about, and then get ready to lead on your preferred weeks.

On the weeks that you have the lead, your job is to kick-start our weekly discussions. Think about the big concepts in the readings, and then engage with real-world examples and contemporary events that bring those concepts to life. For example, if you are talking about Russia, come ready to connect the readings to the evolving war in the Ukraine. Do NOT just recap or regurgitate the readings. *Brutal!* Think about the concepts and *spark a discussion about the real world*. You have 15 minutes to stimulate the discussion for the entire class, and then we will open the floor for everyone to jump in.

Discussant Feedback (10%):

The major assignment for this course is a research paper, and this work includes a presentation of your research in progress before you submit your final paper. In these presentations, each student will present their puzzle, hypothesis, and initial findings to the class for feedback. A significant portion of the participation grade is based on the quality of written and verbal feedback that each student provides to their peers, in response to their research presentations.

In academic seminars, this role is called the “discussant”. The job of a discussant is to provide constructive and usable feedback to the presenter on their work. Learning how to be a good discussant is an important skill in academia. Therefore, in addition to presenting their own work, students are also expected to attend other student presentation sessions in the discussant role. Each team will be assigned time slots where they will take on the role of discussant. A good discussant prepares their remarks and conveys their points in a concise and helpful manner. For these participation grades, students will be evaluated based on their preparedness, the quality of their verbal and written feedback on how to improve the work, and their generosity in supporting and assisting presenters with their research projects.

Research Paper:

The research paper is your major scholarly contribution in this course. Students are expected to write one original 15-20-page research paper that answers a “why” question, which falls within the subject of the course. Students are invited to create their own research puzzles and hypotheses, on any topic in the field of International Security. Essays should be written in 12-point font, double-spaced, and with 1-inch margins. An outstanding paper utilizes theory to construct an analytical argument, and then presents empirical evidence to test the thesis against competing arguments. The paper should ask *a falsifiable research question, present a clear causal model, and conduct an empirical test of that hypothesis*. The research paper assignment is worth 50% of your grade in total, broken into the following components: 10% for a proposal; 10% for a presentation; and 30% for the final paper.

Research Paper Proposal: 10%

Each student will submit a 1-2-page research proposal two weeks before the research workshops begin. The research proposal must include the following: (a) a research puzzle or “why” question on any scholarly topic pertaining to International Security; (b) a testable hypothesis that outlines a causal mechanism between independent and dependent variables, which seeks to answer this research puzzle; (c) a brief literature review of the existing literature that has attempted to answer this question; (d) a brief explanation of how this paper will build on or add something new to this literature, such as a new case application, or a challenge to a conventional theory; (e) a proposed methodological test to demonstrate variation in the dependent variable, either using across-case variation, within-case variation, or a large-N study; (f) a presentation of initial results; (g) a preliminary bibliography; and finally (h) a series of key questions or concerns that the student would like help with from his or her peers during the research workshop.

Students are not only responsible for submitting paper proposals for their own research, but in advance of the workshops, they are responsible for reviewing the proposals of their peers, and coming prepared with written and oral feedback for their colleagues, as outlined in the next section. Constructive contributions during the research paper presentations are an essential part of the participation grade.

Research Paper Presentations:

During the presentation weeks, students will each present their original research for their final papers. It is very valuable to learn how to present research (and serve as a discussant) in both an in-person and a virtual setting. We will hold two of our student presentations sessions in a virtual forum on the Fridays during our seminar week. Students will have the opportunity to choose whether to learn how to make an in-person or virtual presentation, both within and outside of normal class time. Presentation time slots can be booked on Quercus Calendars.

The purpose of these presentations is to give students the opportunity to workshop their ideas with their peers in the early stages of development and writing. To make this a useful exercise, students

MUST submit and circulate paper proposals to the entire class by the deadline so that their peers have the time to review and provide feedback on their work.

We have 25 students and 5 presentation days, each with 110 mins of class time. That means, each student shall have a maximum of 20 minutes, so a 10-minute presentation will leave 10 minutes for discussion. It is recommended that you have no more than 3-5 slides and spend absolutely no more 10 minutes presenting your idea, so that more time can be dedicated to giving you feedback. Your peers will already have your proposal (and their comments) on hand, so you should simply outline your research puzzle (your “why” question), explain your causal model, and give the class brief summary of your work. It is helpful to conclude your presentation by pointing to the areas that you’d like the most help with, so as to guide the group discussion in the most constructive way possible. The class is expected to actively participate in giving constructive criticism and feedback to their colleagues during their presentations of original work.

The paper workshops can be an emotionally challenging experience for new scholars. It constitutes receiving feedback on unpolished work, and unpolished work means that it will be messy. Some students are comfortable with criticism, but not everyone responds positively the first time. If you are inexperienced with receiving oral criticism on your original work, you might find this exercise a bit stressful, even in a collegial and safe environment like our classroom. Learning how to handle feedback, however, is an essential professional skill that you will need for your entire career. And without question, your work will be much better because of this. To help you navigate the art of the presentation, there are two keys to success.

First, remember that you are not being evaluated on a final product, and this is not an oral defence. Rather, your grade for this exercise is based on your ability to effectively present a work in progress. To fare well on your presentation, you should therefore focus on making your presentation of your thesis clear, making it easy for your classmates to help you (i.e. explain where you feel you need the most help), and navigating the Q&A session respectfully and professionally. [And here is the secret answer to the question in the first quiz: 87].

Second, if you find yourself unable to answer a particularly hard question, instead of getting defensive, you can ask your colleagues and teammates to help you work out the argument. Instead of seeing this as a confrontational experience, you can engage us and let us participate in your process. Remember that this is not a defence of your work, and everyone in the room is trying to help you produce an outstanding piece. This is a safe space to work out your ideas, with the support of your teams and peers. This exercise is therefore an opportunity for you to show that you can handle a professional presentation in a mature and respectful manner.

Peer Reviews:

There is a major research paper component to this course, which is described in detail below. Although each student will be evaluated on their own research paper, students are encouraged to use their teams to create a peer-review process, wherein one other member of the team proofreads and reviews the final paper before submission. The easiest way to do this is to trade draft papers with one of your teammates before the deadline, so that you can review each other’s work.

Late Policies

There is only one major research assignment for this course, and it is **due on the last day of class**. Because university regulations do not allow work to be submitted after the end of the semester, **late papers cannot be accepted for this course under any circumstances**. After the last day of classes, the course is over and the portal is closed. Any students who wish to submit their paper after the course has ended will be required to file a formal petition with the university in order to have their work graded. If a serious unexpected situation arises that requires that you request an extension, please keep your formal documentation and file a formal petition through the university system. Please note that the university only allows petitions for serious difficulties, not ordinary events like catching a cold two days before the final deadline or getting a flat tire. Accordingly, you are advised NOT to leave this paper until the last minute. In fact, you are strongly advised to plan to submit your paper several days **early**, in order to avoid any mishaps.

Course Schedule and Readings

January 10 **Introduction**

In the first week of class, our teams will be assigned for the entire semester, and you will select your team captains. This is also the only week where there is a lecture component, which recaps all the foundational concepts that students should already know from the prerequisite courses.

January 17 **American Hegemony**

The decline of American hegemony is one of the most urgent questions in the field of International Security. Hegemonic transitions are dangerous times in world affairs, especially when new challengers rise up to match a declining superpower. Is the USA destined to remain the world's dominant superpower, or is the global order shifting from unipolarity to multipolarity? What are the implications of American hegemonic decline for global security?

Carla Norrlof & William C. Wohlforth (2019) Raison de l'Hégémonie (The Hegemon's Interest): Theory of the Costs and Benefits of Hegemony, *Security Studies*, 28:3, 422-450

Paul Musgrave (2019) International Hegemony Meets Domestic Politics: Why Liberals can be Pessimists, *Security Studies*, 28:3, 451-478

Michael Mastanduno (2019) Partner Politics: Russia, China, and the Challenge of Extending US Hegemony after the Cold War, *Security Studies*, 28:3, 479-504

Kristen Hopewell, "When the hegemon goes rogue: leadership amid the US assault on the liberal trading order", *International Affairs*, Volume 97, Issue 4, July 2021, Pages 1025–1043

Yuan-kang Wang (2020) The Durability of a Unipolar System: Lessons from East Asian History, *Security Studies*, 29:5, 832-863,

Evan Braden Montgomery (2020) Primacy and Punishment: US Grand Strategy, Maritime Power, and Military Options to Manage Decline, *Security Studies*, 29:4, 769-796

Hugo Meijer, Stephen G. Brooks, "Illusions of Autonomy: Why Europe Cannot Provide for Its Security If the United States Pulls Back," *International Security* 2021; 45 (4): 7–43.

Amitav Acharya, "After Liberal Hegemony: The Advent of a Multiplex World Order," *Ethics & International Affairs*, (2017) 31(3), 271-285.

January 24
Chinese Ascendancy

Security scholars and practitioners have been tracking the staggering rise of China for over a decade. Today, most scholars concur that China is growing into a new superpower that could challenge American hegemony. What is China's strategic path towards building up this power? What security issues is Beijing most concerned with, and where might Chinese and American interests clash? Given China's current trajectory, what might the future global order look like?

Alastair Iain Johnston, China in a World of Orders: Rethinking Compliance and Challenge in Beijing's International Relations. *International Security* 2019, 44 (2): 9–60.

John M Owen, Two emerging international orders? China and the United States, *International Affairs*, Volume 97, Issue 5, September 2021, Pages 1415–1431

Evelyn Goh, “Contesting Hegemonic Order: China in East Asia”, *Security Studies*, 28:3 (2019), 614-644

Avery Goldstein, “China's Grand Strategy under Xi Jinping: Reassurance, Reform, and Resistance,” *International Security* 2020, 45 (1): 164–201.

Ketian Zhang, “Cautious Bully: Reputation, Resolve, and Beijing's Use of Coercion in the South China Sea,” *International Security* 2019, 44 (1): 117–159.

Mingjiang Li, The Belt and Road Initiative: geo-economics and Indo-Pacific security competition, *International Affairs*, Volume 96, Issue 1, January 2020, Pages 169–187,

Rajesh Rajagopalan, Evasive balancing: India's unviable Indo-Pacific strategy, *International Affairs*, Volume 96, Issue 1, January 2020, Pages 75–93

January 31
Russian Resurgence
*****First Quiz*****

With the breakup of the Soviet Union, Russian power and influence dramatically declined. In the early post-Cold War period, Moscow and Washington maintained friendly ties; however, these relations systematically worsened over the past two decades. More recently, Russia has engaged in direct military action in Eastern Europe to balance against what it perceives to be an escalating military threat from NATO. Why have US-Russian relations deteriorated so severely? Who is to blame for the ongoing crisis? How serious is the threat of future escalations by Moscow in Eastern Europe, and what are the global consequences of these actions?

Andrew Wolff, “The future of NATO enlargement after the Ukraine crisis,” *International Affairs*, Volume 91, Issue 5, September 2015, Pages 1103–1121

Joshua R. Itzkowitz Shiffrin; Deal or No Deal? The End of the Cold War and the U.S. Offer to Limit NATO Expansion. *International Security* 2016; 40 (4): 7–44.

Kimberly Marten, “NATO enlargement: evaluating its consequences in Russia,” *International Politics*, 57, 401–426 (2020)

Sushentsov, A.A., Wohlforth, W.C. “The tragedy of US–Russian relations: NATO centrality and the revisionists’ spiral,” *International Politics*, 57, 427–450 (2020)

Michael McFaul “Putin, Putinism, and the Domestic Determinants of Russian Foreign Policy,” *International Security* 2020, 45 (2): 95–139.

Bettina Renz, “Russian responses to the changing character of war,” *International Affairs*, Volume 95, Issue 4, July 2019, Pages 817–834

February 7 **Great Powers**

As the global balance of power shifts, conflict and cooperation among the great powers will have serious implications for international security. To start, there is strong evidence of an emerging Russia-China alliance, which would have significant implications for American power. Are Moscow and Beijing destined to form a military alliance that will balance against Washington, or are the difference between these two rising powers too great? There is also much concern about a renewed arms race between the USA, Russia, and China, which are each competing to develop new military technologies, including in space. Who is winning this new arms race, and how are other countries responding? What are the implications of both hypersonic missile and space competition for global security?

Alexander Korolev, “How closely aligned are China and Russia? Measuring strategic cooperation in IR,” *International Politics* 57, 760–789 (2020)

Artyom Lukin, “The Russia–China entente and its future,” *International Politics* 58, 363–380 (2021).

Dean Wilkening (2019) Hypersonic Weapons and Strategic Stability, *Survival*, 61:5, 129-148

Fiona S. Cunningham, M. Taylor Fravel, “Dangerous Confidence? Chinese Views on Nuclear Escalation,” *International Security* 2019; 44 (2): 61–109.

Paul B Larsen, “Outer Space Arms Control: Can the USA, Russia and China Make this Happen”, *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, Volume 23, Issue 1, Spring 2018, Pages 137–159

Namrata Goswami, “China in Space: Ambitions and Possible Conflict.” *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, vol. 12, no. 1, Air University Press, 2018, pp. 74–97

Hyun-Binn Cho (2021) Nuclear Coercion, Crisis Bargaining, and The Sino-Soviet Border Conflict of 1969, *Security Studies*, 30:4, 550-577

February 14
Proxy Wars

Direct great powers conflicts are extremely costly and risky, especially in the nuclear age. As a result, throughout the Cold War both Russia and the United States played out their battles in the so-called “Third World” by arming local proxies or forcibly installing puppet regimes to do their bidding. Why do great powers engage in proxy wars, and what are the implications of this illegal external interference on civil war intensity, duration, and resolution? If there is a Cold War 2.0 between the United States, Russia, and China, how might this new era of superpower competition affect the rest of the world?

Idean Salehyan, “Delegation of War to Rebel Organizations” in *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Vol. 54, No. 3, 2010), pp. 493-515

Eric Rittinger, Arming the Other: American Small Wars, Local Proxies, and the Social Construction of the Principal-Agent Problem, *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 61, Issue 2, June 2017, Pages 396–409

Lindsey A. O’Rourke (2020) The Strategic Logic of Covert Regime Change: US-Backed Regime Change Campaigns during the Cold War, *Security Studies*, 29:1, 92-127

Noel Anderson, Competitive Intervention, Protracted Conflict, and the Global Prevalence of Civil War, *International Studies Quarterly*, Volume 63, Issue 3, September 2019, Pages 692–706

Katherine Sawyer, Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham, and William Reed, “The Role of External Support in Civil War Termination” in *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (Vol 61, Issue 6, 2015), pp. 1174 – 1202

Wakako Maekawa, External Supporters and Negotiated Settlement: Political Bargaining in Solving Governmental Incompatibility. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 2019; 63(3):672-699.

February 18-24
*****READING BREAK*****

February 28
Complex Civil Wars
*****RESEARCH PROPOSALS DUE*****

There are several reasons why complex civil wars are particularly difficult to resolve. To start, when a civil war involves many different nonstate armed groups, it can be very difficult to get all of the parties to agree on a peace settlement. Moreover, such negotiations can also inadvertently foment conflict, particularly when spoilers or splinter groups threaten to undermine the peace

process unless they are given a greater share of the postwar spoils. What explains the in-fighting among nonstate armed groups in a civil war? Can a successful negotiated settlement between many armed groups lead to permanent stability? Or, is the only real solution to high levels of social fragmentation a decisive military victory by one party over all others? Even if decisive military victory is possible, are there some actors that should not be allowed to win?

David E. Cunningham, "Veto Players and Civil War Duration," *American Journal of Political Science* (Vol. 50, No. 4, October 2006), pp. 875-892

Victor Asal, Mitchell Brown, and Angela Dalton, "Why Split? Organizational Splits Among Ethno-Political Organizations in the Middle East," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56, no. 1 (February 2012): 94–117

Kathleen Gallagher Cunningham, "Actor Fragmentation and Civil War Bargaining: How Internal Divisions Generate Civil Conflict," *American Journal of Political Science* 57, no. 3 (March 2013): 659–72.

Hanne Fjelde and Desiree Nilsson, "Rebels against Rebels Explaining Violence between Rebel Groups," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56, no. 4 (August 2012): 604–28

Monica Duffy Toft, "Ending Civil Wars: A Case for Rebel Victory?" in *International Security* (Vol. 34, No. 4, Spring 2010), pp. 7-36

Anna O. Pechenkina & Jakana L. Thomas (2020) Battle Stalemates and Rebel Negotiation Attempts in Civil Wars, *Security Studies*, 29:1, 64-91

Aisha Ahmad, The Long Jihad: The Boom–Bust Cycle behind Jihadist Durability, *Journal of Global Security Studies*, Volume 6, Issue 4, December 2021

March 7

International Interventions

*****Second Quiz*****

When a domestic conflict threatens international peace and security, members of the UN Security Council have the power to authorize a legal military intervention to address that conflict. In addition to traditional peacekeeping missions, the UNSC has also employed the "Responsibility to Protect" doctrine as legal justification for intervention. Evaluating the record, how effective are these types of interventions in resolving complex conflicts? When and under what conditions do countries have the right or responsibility to intervene in the internal conflicts of other states?

Virginia Page Fortna, "Does Peacekeeping Keep the Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War" in *International Studies Quarterly* (Vol. 48, No. 2, June 2004), pp. 269-292

Hegre, Håvard; Lisa Hultman & Håvard Mokleiv Nygård (2019) Evaluating the conflict-reducing effect of UN peacekeeping operations, *The Journal of Politics* 81(1): 215–232

Alan J. Kuperman, “The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans” in *International Studies Quarterly* (Vol. 52, 2008), pp. 49-80

Aisha Ahmad, “Agenda for Peace or Budget for War? Evaluating the Economic Impact of International Intervention in Somalia” in *International Journal*, (Vol. 67, No. 2, Spring 2012) pp. 313-331

Jennifer M. Welsh, “The Responsibility to Protect after Libya & Syria,” in *Daedalus* Vol. 145, No. 4 (2016), pp. 75-87

C. Hobson, “Responding to Failure: The Responsibility to Protect after Libya,” *Millennium*, Vol. 44 No. 3 (2016), pp. 433–454.

Zheng Chen, Hang Yin, “China and Russia in R2P debates at the UN Security Council”, *International Affairs*, Volume 96, Issue 3, May 2020, Pages 787–805

Tuesday, March 14
In-Person Presentations

Friday, March 17
Virtual Presentations

Tuesday, March 21
In-Person Presentations

Tuesday, March 28
Graduate Student Presentations

April 4
Future Security Challenges
*****RESEARCH PAPERS DUE*****

No readings. No quizzes. No pressure.

In our final week, we will break virtual bread and take stock of the global transformations that have taken place over the course of our semester. We will talk about the future of conflict with Russia and China, the humanitarian and political crises in Afghanistan, Haiti, and Myanmar, and other major themes that captivated us over the semester. This week will be an essential debrief for the entire course, and an opportunity to reflect on the future security challenges that we should all be watching for. Attendance and engagement in gets you an automatic bonus point on your participation grade.