

SEMINAR: WAR AND PEACE

GENERAL INFORMATION

Lecturers:

Dr. Alex Veit, veit@uni-bremen.de, University of Bremen, Institute for Intercultural & International Studies (InIIS), Mary-Somerville-Str. 7 (Unicom), Room 7.2260. **Office hours:** book on Stud.IP.

Dr. Philipp Schulz, pschulz@uni-bremen.de, University of Bremen, InIIS, Mary-Somerville-Str. 7 (Unicom), Room 7.2030. **Office hours:** on appointment by email.

Administrative details: M.A. International Relations: Global Governance and Social Theory, Winter term 2019-2020, course no. 08-351-3-MA-IR-A3.

Advanced students who are not enrolled in the MA International Relations may participate with the instructor's consent.

Time and place: Tuesdays, 10-13h, 1 October 2019 to 15 January 2020, Mary-Somerville-Str. 7 (Unicom), room 7.1020.

Literature: All literature is electronically available on Stud.IP.

Online communication: Register for the class on Stud.IP and make sure you receive, read and respond to emails sent through Stud.IP on a regular and timely basis.

THEMATIC SCOPE

War and peace are major topics in International Relations, but also for many other disciplines. This course discusses the most salient issues in war and peace studies from an IR perspective, but is also open to contributions from sociology, anthropology, and history.

We deal first with theories on the causes and conduct of war and peace, ranging from classics to recent contributions. We then proceed to issues of research with quantitative and qualitative methods, historical changes and continuities in the conduct of armed conflict, and the categories of inter-state and intra-state warfare. Another major topic is what happens during contemporary wars and conflicts. We discuss military organization and violence, political economies, ethnic and gender identities, and state formation. The last few sessions are dedicated to theories of peace and practices of peacebuilding.

In term papers, students shall link their own thematic interest with common ideas and debates in IR and conflict studies. Generally, sessions will consist of structured discussions of the mandatory readings. These debates will be supplemented by short inputs by the instructor as well as students' presentations and panel discussions.

Intended results

- knowledge of major theories of war and peace
- familiarity with strategies to enhance international security
- insights into major contemporary discussions in conflict studies

ASSIGNMENTS AND GRADING

6 ECTS Credit Points

- Class preparation and attendance: non-graded.
- Presentation (15 min.; handout/summary, c. 600 words) *or* panel discussion participation (handout/summary, c. 600 words): 50% of grade.
- Essay (on one session's literature, due in class, c. 1,500 words): 50% of grade.

7.5 ECTS Credit Points

- Class preparation and attendance: non-graded.
- Presentation (15 min.; handout/summary, c. 600 words) *or* panel discussion participation (handout/summary, c. 600 words): 35% of grade.
- Exposé of term paper (due last class meeting, up to 300 words): non-graded.
- Research paper (due 15 March, c. 3000 words): 65% of grade.

9 ECTS Credit Points (CP)

- Class preparation and attendance: non-graded.
- Presentation (20 min.; handout/summary, c. 600 words) *or* panel discussion participation (handout/summary, c. 600 words): 25% of grade.
- Exposé of term paper (due last class meeting, up to 300 words): non-graded.
- Research paper (due 15 March, c. 5,000 words): 75% of grade.

Presentation: Presentations serve to discuss aspects of the overall topic of the session. It is thus—as always—necessary to read mandatory texts, and think of how they relate to the presentation. Provide relevant details on the author(s) and summarize arguments. It is also important to reflect the academic context of the presented text. In this regard, some further research is absolutely necessary! Book reviews, for example, can be found on JSTOR.org. Articles are part of a larger discussion. Which approaches have been criticised by the author? Did other authors respond? For this purpose, you may e.g. check »cited by« on Google scholar, or other academic text databases. Conclude with a critical assessment on the text's contribution to the course discussion. See also the Institute of Political Science's [Study Guide](#) (Bremen 2016: 22-25) for further details.

Panel discussion: A panel discussion is another format to convey important aspects of the issue not detailed in the general reading. Participants should prepare an introductory statement (max. five minutes), which points out the major arguments of the text(s) of their choice. Thereafter, the panel chair (lecturer), as well as the audience, will pose questions. As a panel participant, do some research on the author you embody, but also your fellow participants, and the topic in general.

Essay: The essay interrogates the topic and the literature of one session, including the additional literature for presentations or panel discussions. It deals with a session other than the one in which you give a presentation or participate in a panel discussion. The essay opens with the analytical development of a question that will be analysed by making use of the literature and concludes with an argument in regards of your question. All rules of academic referencing apply. Additional literature may be consulted. It is recommended to discuss your essay question with a lecturer beforehand.

Research paper: submission as PDF-file or (not: and) paper copy. You may pick up a session's guiding question as your topic. You may alternatively choose your own research question. It is obligatory to discuss your topic with a lecturer, based on a written outline detailing the potential topic, central question and the structure of the paper. During the last session, there is occasion to discuss your ideas in class.

When reading and grading your term papers we presuppose that you have read all the compulsory reading. It is therefore strongly recommended taking notes (excerpts) while reading the texts. At the same time, writing a research paper means also researching additional material. This should be secondary literature, but may include original data and sources.

Writing a research paper will foster your capabilities in designing a research question, in researching primary sources and data or secondary literature, and of course in writing a longer academic text. See the Study Guide (ibid.) and M.A. [IR guidelines on style and assessment](#). If you encounter difficulties during the writing process, do not hesitate to ask us for advice.

PROGRAMME

#1 – 1 OCTOBER

INTRODUCTION

Alex Veit & Philipp Schulz

Discussion of the seminar topic, aims and requirements; literature overview; selection of presentations and other organizational requirements.

Thereafter, we look at the ethical challenges of researching and studying armed conflict. We will work in small groups and read (in class), present and discuss the following three texts broadly focused on methodological, ethical and emotional aspects of studying and researching violence, war and conflict:

Kreft, Anne-Kathrin. 2019. On Difficult Research and Mental Wellbeing. 14 March 2019, available at: <https://anne-kathrinkreft.com/2019/03/14/on-difficult-research-and-mental-wellbeing/>.

Theidon, Kimberly. 2014. "How was Your Trip? Self-care for Researchers Working and Writing on Violence." *Social Science Research Council: Working papers on Research Security*.

Wood, Elisabeth J. 2006. "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones." *Qualitative Sociology* 29(3): 373-86.

#2 – 8 OCTOBER

THEORIES OF WAR

Philipp Schulz

In this session, we compare and combine main findings of contemporary war studies in IR with a classic text. Carl von Clausewitz has been general, strategist and scholar in Prussia in the 19th century. We centralize von Clausewitz contribution, and contrast his findings with current IR theories and conflict studies, weighing merits and shortcomings.

Readings:

Clausewitz, Carl von. 2000 (1832). *On War*. New York: Modern Library: 264-82.

Herberg-Rothe, Andreas. 2009. "Clausewitz's 'Wondrous Trinity' as a Coordinate System of War and Violent Conflict." *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 3 (2): 204-19.

Panel Discussion:

Three participants discuss three different explanations for armed conflicts, including the onset of wars. The lecturer will chair the debate, and class participants will be able to ask questions and engage in the debate.

Fearon, James D. 1995. "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization* 49: 379-414

Gartzke, Erik. 1999. "War Is in the Error Term." *International Organization* 53(3): 567-87.

Powell, Robert. 2006. "War as a Commitment Problem." *International Organization* 60(1): 169-203.

#3 – 15 OCTOBER

DEFINING AND COUNTING WARS

Philipp Schulz

Defining and counting war is a thorny issue. What constitutes a war? Who is an important actor? Which variables may account for causes, dynamics, and outcomes? What impact have definitions on our findings? We discuss different approaches, focussing on the most influential projects. The Correlates of War (CoW) project pioneered the field, while today the Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP) arguably provides the most comprehensive data.

Readings:

Vasquez, John. 2009. *The War Puzzle Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 14-51.

Geller, Daniel S., and Paul F. Diehl. 2013. "The Forum: Reflections and Reassessments on the Early Work and Ideas of J. David Singer." *International Studies Review* 15 (2): 259–84 (especially 259-70).

Sarkees, Meredith Reid. 2010. "The COW Typology of War: Defining and Categorizing Wars (Version 4 of the Data).", online: <http://cow.dss.ucdavis.edu/data-sets/COW-war/the-cow-typology-of-war-defining-and-categorizing-wars/view> (accessed 24 September 2019).

Presentation: Databases of War and Conflict

The presentation debates the characteristics and qualities of the following databases, with an emphasis on the UCDP:

- Uppsala University, Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP), <http://www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP>. (See for a beginning: Wallensteen, Peter. 2011. *The Uppsala Conflict Data Program 1978-2010: The Story, the Rationale, and the Programme*. In *Peace Research: Theory and Practice*, 111-24. London: Routledge.)
- Correlates of War, <http://www.correlatesofwar.org>

#4 – 22 OCTOBER

NEW WARS, OLD WARS?

Alex Veit

One of the most heated debates in conflict studies after 1990 revolved around the concept of "New Wars". While immensely influential in the wider popular imagination, many researchers remarked that it may have been less the forms of warfare that have changed, but rather perceptions thereof. What has empirically changed in warfare in recent decades? What are the continuities?

Readings:

Kaldor, Mary. 2012. *New and Old Wars. Organised Violence in a Global Era*. 3rd ed. Stanford University Press: 1-31.

Keen, David. 2012. *Useful Enemies: When Waging Wars Is More Important Than Winning Them*. New Haven: Yale University Press: 1-10, 92-115.

Panel discussion:

Chojnacki, S. 2006. "Anything new or more of the same? Wars and military intervention in the international system 1946–2003." *Global Society* 20 (1): 25–46.

Kalyvas, Stathis. 2001. "'New' and 'old' civil wars: A valid distinction?" *World Politics* 54: 99–118.

Kaldor, Mary. 2013. "In Defence of New Wars." *Stability* 2 (1): 1-16.

#5 – 29 OCTOBER

TRANSNATIONAL WARFARE

Alex Veit

While conventional IR categorisation differentiates inter-state from intra-state warfare, the empirical reality has always been blurrier. In recent decades, global Jihadists waged wars beyond borders, as did Communist revolutionaries decades before. It is also rather difficult to find a civil war without some form of meddling from, ranging from resource provision to rebels to great power military intervention. Is it time to reconsider the categorisation of inside/outside?

Readings:

Crenshaw, Martha. 2017. "Transnational Jihadism & Civil Wars." *Daedalus* 146 (4): 59–70.

Harbom, L., and P. Wallensteen. 2005. "Armed Conflict and Its International Dimensions, 1946-2004." *Journal of Peace Research* 42 (5): 623–35.

Presentations:

Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede. 2007. "Transnational Dimensions of Civil War." *Journal of Peace Research* 44 (3): 293–309.

Kalyvas, Stathis, and Laia Balcells. 2010. "International System and Technologies of Rebellion: How the End of the Cold War Shaped Internal Conflict." *American Political Science Review* 104 (3): 415–29.

#6 – 5 NOVEMBER

STUDYING WARRIORS AND VIOLENCE

Philipp Schulz

In recent years, the study of mass-conflict has shifted away from macro-perspectives towards the study of actors and practices in the field, including on the micro-level. This change of perspective had to do with the decreasing number of interstate wars, and the growing political importance of non-state armed groups and civil wars. We discuss a number of approaches, their merits and limitations.

Readings:

Wood, Elisabeth Jean. 2003. *Insurgent collective action and civil war in El Salvador*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1-50.

Mampilly, Zachariah Cherian. 2011. *Rebel Rulers: Insurgent Governance and Civilian Life during War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 1-20.

Presentations:

Coulter, Chris. 2009. *Bush Wives and Girl Soldiers. Women's Lives Through War and Peace in Sierra Leone*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 1-30, in particular 16-30.

Schlichte, Klaus. 2009. *In the Shadow of Violence. The Politics of Armed Groups*. Frankfurt: Campus: 13-56.

Kalyvas, Stathis. 2006. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-31, 388-92.

#7 – 12 NOVEMBER WAR, DISORDER, AND STATE FORMATION

Alex Veit

The following sessions are dedicated to some specific causes, factors and outcomes of warfare. We begin with the question of the state and order: Does warfare destroy states, or is it a crucial step to their formation? Is it senselessly destructive, or is it a central stage of modernisation, ordering, and gendering?

Readings:

Tilly, Charles. 1985. "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime". In *Bringing the State Back In*, edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer and Theda Skocpol, 169-91. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2013. *Waves of War: Nationalism, State Formation, and Ethnic Exclusion in the Modern World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-36.

Presentations:

Stinchcombe, Arthur. 1999. "Ending Revolutions and Building New Governments." *Annual Review of Political Science* 2 (1): 49-73.

Nagel, Joane. 1998. "Masculinity and Nationalism: Gender and Sexuality in the Making of Nations." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (2): 242-269.

#8 – 19 NOVEMBER ECONOMIES OF WAR

Philipp Schulz

A popular perception in Western media as well as mostly liberal scholarship has been that civil war has become a form of enrichment by violent means. The debate about the economic dimensions of warfare has been intense. We discuss the merits and the limitations of particular approaches, and the explanatory power of economic perspectives in general. Is an economic outlook useful, or does it blind for the politics of war? Which politics follow from which economic perspective?

Fearon, James and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97 (1): 75-90.

Boix, Carles. 2008. "Economic Roots of Civil Wars and Revolutions in the Contemporary World." *World Politics*, 60: 390- 437.

Presentation: Greed: a central motivation for warfare?

Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2004. »Greed and Grievance in Civil War«. *Oxford Economic Papers* 56 (4): 563-95.

Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler and Dominic Rohner. 2009. »Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War«. *Oxford Economic Papers* 61 (1): 1-27.

#9 – 26 NOVEMBER THE ROLE OF ETHNICITY

Alex Veit

Ethnicity has become a popular concept for the causal explanation of intra-state wars. Yet the analytical value of the concept is contested. How do ethnic groups and boundaries come into existence? Do ethnic differences lead to warfare? Why do not all ethnic groups fight each other? Are ethnic boundaries an outcome, rather than the cause, of civil wars? And which role do media portrayals of the causes of war play?

Readings:

Brubaker, Rogers. 2002. "Ethnicity Without Groups." *European Journal of Sociology* 43 (2): 163–89.

Fearon, James and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 97 (1): 75–90.

Wimmer, Andreas. 2008. "The Making and Unmaking of Ethnic Boundaries. A Multi-level Process Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 113 (4): 970–1022.

Panel discussion: Which Use for the Concept of Ethnicity?

Three participants discuss different perspectives on ethnicity as an explanatory concept. The lecturer chairs the debate.

- Mann, Michael. 2004. The Argument. In *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-33.
- Seaton, Jean. 1999. "The New 'Ethnic' Wars and the Media." In: *The Media of Conflict: War Reporting and Representations of Ethnic Violence*, edited by Seaton, Jean and Tim Allen, 43–63. London: Zed Books.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Andreas Wimmer, and Brian Min. 2010. "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel? New Data and Analysis." *World Politics* 62 (1): 87–119.

#10 – 3 DECEMBER GENDER, WAR AND PEACE

Philipp Schulz

Feminist IR scholars in particular have long shown that 'gender makes the world go round'. Yet the explanatory potential of gender in explaining and describing war and peace has long been under-utilized. Throughout the past decade, however, this has begun to change, and gender has become a burgeoning focus of analysis in finding explanations for war and making sense of societies' experiences during times of armed conflict. We read and discuss texts that utilize the explanatory power of gender. Since this engagement with gender often comes through a focus on sexual violence, the presentations will provide an overview of the literature on this common aspect of war, while also complicating dominant understandings of gender in war through focusing on the role of masculinities during war and peace.

Readings:

Cockburn, Cynthia. 2010. "Gender Relations as Causal in Militarization and War." *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 12 (2): 139-57.

Hutchings, Kimberly. 2008. "Making Sense of Masculinity and War." *Men and Masculinities* 10 (4): 389-404.

Sjoberg, Laura. 2013. *Gendering Global Conflict. Towards a Feminist Theory of War*. New York: Columbia University Press: 44-67.

Presentations:

Eriksson-Baaz, Maria and Maria Stern. 2013. *Sexual Violence as a Weapon of War? Perceptions, Prescriptions, Problems in The Congo and Beyond*. London: Zed Books: 12-42.

Schulz, Philipp. 2018. "Displacement from gendered personhood. Masculinities and sexual violence in northern Uganda." *International Affairs* 94(5): 1101-19.

Film Discussion:

To complement the student presentations, we will also watch this short documentary on wartime sexual violence together in class and thereafter discuss it, in relation to the literature.

Refugee Law Project (RLP). 2011. 'They slept with me'. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6dxaFqezrXg>

#11 – 10 DECEMBER DEMOCRATIC PEACE THEORY

Alex Veit

The debate about the »democratic peace« is a central contribution of liberal theorists to IR and conflict studies. In this session we discuss critically the original liberal arguments. According to Immanuel Kant, lasting peace can be achieved through institutionalized democracy, cross-border trade, and international institutions. Michael Doyle undigged these arguments as one of the first contributors to the more recent democratic peace debate. We contrast their ideas with the empirical record, as well as theoretical objections. What are arguments for a democratic foundation of a lasting peace? Are building international institutions and fostering global democratization ways of preserving peace? Do cost-averse citizens prevent wars between democracies? Or is the democratic peace really a capitalist and imperial peace, and not even very peaceful?

Readings:

Doyle, Michael W. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12 (3): 205–35.

Kant, Immanuel. 2003 (1796). *To Perpetual Peace. A Philosophical Sketch*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Presentations:

Geis, Anna, and Wolfgang Wagner. 2011. "How Far Is It from Königsberg to Kandahar? Democratic Peace and Democratic Violence in International Relations." *Review of International Studies* 37 (4): 1555–77.

Oneal, John R., Bruce Russett, and Michael L. Berbaum. 2003. "Causes of Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885–1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 47 (3): 371–93.

Barkawi, Tarak, and Mark Laffey. 1999. "The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization." *European Journal of International Relations* 5 (4): 403–34.

#12 – 17 DECEMBER HUMANITARIAN MILITARY INTERVENTION

Alex Veit

Peace may be an elusive concept, but under the heading of »liberal peace«, a fairly hegemonic model of non-war has evolved. This concept, often implicitly, tended to guide peacebuilding from the late 1980s. In this session, we consider aspects of the core practice of peacebuilding: humanitarian military intervention. We discuss how this concept is legitimized and criticized.

Readings:

Finnemore, Martha 2003. *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press: 1-23, 52-84.

Walzer, Michael 2004. *Arguing About War*. New Haven: Yale University Press, IX-XV, 3-22.

Panel discussion: Liberal peacebuilding. Worth a try, or just a myth?

Participants discuss liberal peacebuilding. The panel, which also bridges to the next session, is chaired by the lecturer.

- Paris, Roland. 2010. "Saving Liberal Peacebuilding." *Review of International Studies* 36 (2): 337-65.
- Cooper, Neil, Mandy Turner, and Michael Pugh. 2011. "The End of History and the Last Liberal Peacebuilder: A Reply to Roland Paris." *Review of International Studies* 37 (4): 1995-2007.
- Selby, Jan. 2013. "The Myth of Liberal Peace-building." *Conflict, Security & Development* 13 (1): 57-86.

#13 – 7 JANUARY PEACEBUILDING & CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Philipp Schulz

Following (and/or accompanying) interventions, conflict-ridden societies are faced with the difficult tasks of sustainably resolving conflicts and building peace. In this session, we consider different aspects, approaches and strategies associated with the study and practice of peacebuilding and conflict resolution.

Readings:

Autesserre, Séverine. 2014. *Peaceland: Conflict Resolution and the Everyday Politics of International Intervention*. New York: Cambridge University Press: 59-96.

Greig, Michael J. and Paul F. Diehl. 2005. "The Peacekeeping – Peacemaking Dilemma." *International Studies Quarterly* 49: 621-46.

Babbitt, Eileen and Fen Osler Hampson. 2011. "Conflict Resolution as a Field of Inquiry: Practice Informing Theory." *International Studies Review* 13: 46-57.

Presentations:

Jarstad, Anna K. 2010. "Power sharing: former enemies in joint government." In: *From War to Democracy: Dilemmas of Peacebuilding*, edited by Anna K. Jarstad and Timothy Sisk: 105-33.

Svensson, Isak. 2007. "Bargaining, Bias and Peace Brokers: How Rebels Commit to Peace." *Journal of Peace Research* 44 (2): 177-94.

#14 – 14 JANUARY

CONCLUDING DEBATE

Alex Veit & Philipp Schulz

Feedback, questions, presentation of potential term paper topics, evaluation.