

Military Intervention and Political Violence

(Pol. 3 Module, 2015-16)

Lectures by Dr. Stefano Recchia

1. Why seek multilateral approval? Justice and legitimacy in contemporary uses of force

Sample questions:

- Does military intervention have to be authorized by the United Nations Security Council in order to be legitimate?
- Why do powerful states value multilateral approval and the resulting legitimacy?
- Can the approval of regional international organizations such as NATO substitute for the lack of UN approval?

Core reading:

Tom Farer, 'A Paradigm of Legitimate Intervention', in Lori Fisler Damrosch, ed., *Enforcing Restraint* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations, 1993). [Emphasizes and explains the importance of multilateral authorization and oversight.]

Martha Finnemore, 'Changing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention', in Finnemore, *The Purpose of Intervention* (Cornell UP, 2003). [How changing legitimacy norms regulate and shape humanitarian intervention; highlights the growing importance of multilateralism.]

Robert O. Keohane, 'The Contingent Legitimacy of Multilateralism', in E. Newman, R. Thakur, and J. Tirman, eds., *Multilateralism Under Challenge?* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2006). [Questions the legitimacy of 'statist' multilateral organizations].

Sarah Kreps, 'Multilateral Military Interventions: Theory and Practice', *Political Science Quarterly*, 123: 4 (2008), pp. 573-603. [Discusses various forms of multilateralism and develops a new, if controversial, definition].

Alexander Thompson, 'Coercion Through IOs: The Security Council and the Logic of Information Transmission', *International Organization* 60:1, 2006, pp. 1-34. [Powerful states such as the USA seek multilateral approval in order to reassure foreign citizens and leaders.]

Supplementary reading:

Lawrence Freedman, 'The Age of Liberal Wars', *Review of International Studies* 31, supplement S1 (2005): 93–107. [Modern wars need to be 'liberal' in order to be legitimate.]

Joseph S. Nye, 'Soft Power and American Foreign Policy', *Political Science Quarterly*, 119:2 (2004), pp. 255-270. [Introduces the seminal concept of 'soft power' and discusses how unilateral U.S. interventions might deplete America's soft power].

Robert Pape, 'Soft Balancing against the United States', *International Security* 30: 1, 2005. [Even powerful states need to legitimize their actions if they want to avert potentially harmful 'soft balancing' by their international partners].

Stefano Recchia, 'The Payoffs of Multilaterally Authorized Intervention: Averting Issue Linkage vs. Appeasing Congress', *International Relations*, forthcoming. [Critique of Alex Thompson's argument; the USA seeks multilateral approval for domestic political reasons.]

Alex Bellamy, 'The UN Security Council and the Use of Force', in Bellamy, *Global Politics and the Responsibility to Protect* (London: Routledge, 2011), pp. 162-195. [Discusses recent military interventions authorized by the UN Security Council].

Gareth Evans and Mohamed Sahnoun, 'The Responsibility to Protect', *Foreign Affairs*, 81: 6 (November/December 2002), pp. 99-110. [Key document outlining the 'R2P' doctrine; discusses the importance of multilateral authorization.]

Kenneth W. Abbott and Duncan Snidal, 'Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42: 1 (1998), pp. 3-32. [Good overview of the different reasons why states may channel military interventions through the UN or NATO].

Richard K. Betts, 'Confused Interventions', in Betts, *American Force* (Columbia UP, 2012), pp. 50-80. [If you choose to intervene, avoid half-measures and support one side decisively—unilaterally if needed. Hard-nosed analysis by a leading realist scholar.]

Katharina P. Coleman, *International Organizations and Peace Enforcement* (Cambridge UP, 2007). [Intervening states, whether Nigeria, South Africa, or the US, seek international organization approval to legitimize their actions and avoid international opprobrium.]

Bruce Cronin, 'The Paradox of Hegemony: America's Ambiguous Relationship With the United Nations', *European Journal of International Relations*, 7:1 (2001), pp. 103-130. [America has the 'hardware' to intervene abroad—yet hegemony requires more than that.]

Michael Doyle, 'The Ethics of Multilateral Intervention', *Theoria*, 53: 109 (2006), pp. 28–48. [Goes back to J.S. Mill to discuss the ethics of contemporary military intervention.]

Stanley Hoffmann, 'The Politics and Ethics of Military Intervention', *Survival* 37:4 (Winter 1995), pp. 29-51. [Cautious endorsement of multilateral humanitarian intervention by an 'old-school' liberal internationalist.]

Ian Hurd, *After Anarchy: Legitimacy and Power in the United Nations Security Council* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007). [Rigorous constructivist analysis of how politics at the UN Security Council has shaped our understanding of legitimacy].

Friedrich Kratochwil, 'On Legitimacy', *International Relations*, 20: 3 (2006), pp. 302-308. [Legitimacy is a conceptual minefield – Kratochwil attempts to introduce some clarity.]

Samuel Moyn, 'John Locke on Intervention, Uncertainty, and Insurgency', in Stefano Recchia and Jennifer Welsh, eds., *Just and Unjust Military Intervention: European Thinkers from Vitoria to Mill* (Cambridge UP, 2013). [John Locke, Moyn argues, can help us better understand the normative challenges related to identifying a 'just cause' for intervention.]

Michael Walzer, 'The Politics of Rescue', *Social Research* 62:1 (Spring 1995), pp. 53-66. [Multilateral intervention is OK to stop acts that 'shock the moral conscience of mankind.']

Jennifer Welsh, 'Authorizing humanitarian intervention', in Richard Price and Mark Zacher, eds., *The United Nations and Global Security* (London: Palgrave, 2004). [Explores the role of the UN Security Council as a collective legitimizer].

2. NATO's humanitarian war over Kosovo

Sample questions:

- Did the humanitarian crisis in Kosovo meet the threshold for military intervention?
- NATO's military intervention worsened the plight of Kosovar civilians. Discuss.
- What were the *costs* of channeling the Kosovo intervention through NATO?

Core reading:

Adam Roberts, 'NATO's "Humanitarian War" Over Kosovo', *Survival*, 41:3 (1999), pp. 102-123. [Excellent overview of the principal ethical and legal challenges].

Samantha Power, *A Problem From Hell: America in the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), chap. 12. Ebook: <http://search.lib.cam.ac.uk/?itemid=|eresources|81208>. [Good discussion of U.S. foreign policy making from a committed humanitarian standpoint].

David N. Gibbs, *First Do No Harm: Humanitarian Intervention and the Destruction of Yugoslavia* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2009), chapter. 7 [Trenchant critique; argues that NATO's military intervention probably made matters worse].

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: Allied Force or Forced Allies?* (London: Palgrave, 2000). [Asks whether regional organizations like NATO can be a substitute for UN authorization].

Nicholas Wheeler, *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society*, chapter 8. [Focuses especially on the role of the UN Security Council].

Supplementary reading:

Alex J. Bellamy, *Kosovo and International Society* (London: Palgrave, 2002), chaps. 3-6. [Detailed analysis of European and U.S. diplomatic initiatives in the run-up to the war].

Steven L. Burg, 'Coercive Diplomacy in the Balkans: The U.S. Use of Force in Bosnia and Kosovo', in Robert J. Art and Patrick M. Cronin, *The United States and Coercive Diplomacy* (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2003). [Investigates whether limited force can be used effectively to achieve ambitious policy objectives].

Richard K. Betts, 'Compromised Command: Inside NATO's First War', *Foreign Affairs* 80: 4 (2001), pp. 126-132 [Highlights the challenges involved in fighting a modern multi-national air campaign].

Stefano Recchia, 'Soldiers, Civilians, and Multilateral Humanitarian Intervention', *Security Studies* 24 (2), 2015: 1-33. [Highlights the role of a risk-averse US military leadership in steering American intervention policy towards multilateralism. Uses Kosovo as a case study.]

Independent International Commission on Kosovo (IICK), *The Kosovo Report* (Oxford: OUP, 2000). [Influential report, concluded that the intervention was 'illegal but legitimate'.]

Katharina P. Coleman, *International Organizations and Peace Enforcement* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), chapter 6. [Argues that the U.S. sought NATO's endorsement to legitimize the use of force in international society.]

Ivo H. Daalder and Michael E. O'Hanlon, *Winning Ugly: NATO's War to Save Kosovo* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2000). [Still the most detailed analysis of western and especially American policy making on the Kosovo War].

Richard Falk, 'Humanitarian Intervention After Kosovo', in Julie Mertus and Jeffrey W. Helsing, eds., *Human Rights & Conflict* (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 2006). [NATO's intervention was both legally and morally objectionable].

Timothy Garton Ash, 'Kosovo: Was It Worth It?' *The New York Review of Books* 47 (14), September 2000.

David G. Haglund, 'Allied Force or Forced Allies? The Allies' Perspective', in P. Martin and M. Brawley, eds., *Alliance Politics, Kosovo, and NATO's War* (London: Palgrave, 2000).

Daniel Keohane, 'The debate on British policy in the Kosovo conflict', *Contemporary Security Policy*, 21: 3 (December 2000), pp.78-94. [Good overview and discussion of the British policy debate.]

Alan J. Kuperman, 'The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans', *International Studies Quarterly* 52 (2008): 49-80. [Explains how talk of humanitarian intervention can embolden ethnic separatists, thereby making matters worse].

Eric Moskovitz and Jeffrey S. Lantis, 'Conflict in the Balkans', in Karl F. Inderfurth and Loch K. Johnson, eds., *Fateful Decisions: Inside the National Security Council* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004). [Concise overview of U.S. policy making on Kosovo].

David Rieff, 'A New Age of Liberal Imperialism?' *World Policy Journal*, 16:2 (1999), pp. 1-20. [Critique of the Kosovo intervention as an instance of Western neo-imperialism].

3. The U.S. invasion of Iraq, 2003: Was it a just war?

Sample questions:

- Why did the United States and Britain invade Iraq?
- Why did Washington and London fail to secure UN approval for the Iraq War?
- Is preventive war ever justified?

Core reading:

Alex J. Bellamy, *Just Wars: From Cicero to Iraq* (London: Polity, 2006), esp. chapter 8 on the legitimacy of pre-emptive and preventive war.

Philip H. Gordon and Jeremy Shapiro, *Allies At War: America, Europe, and the Crisis Over Iraq* (New York: McGraw Hill, 2004), chaps 4-5, pp. 93-154. [Good description and analysis of the transatlantic crisis over Iraq].

Robert Jervis, 'Understanding the Bush Doctrine', *Political Science Quarterly*, 118: 3 (2003), pp. 365-388. [Excellent analysis of the belief system behind the U.S. invasion of Iraq, by one of America's foremost international relations scholars.]

Adam Roberts, 'Law and the Use of Force After Iraq', *Survival*, 45: 2 (Summer 2003), pp. 31-56. [Reviews various possible justifications for the Iraq War].

Fernando R. Tesón, 'Ending Tyranny in Iraq', *Ethics & International Affairs*, 19: 2 (September 2005), pp. 1-20. [Justifies the 2003 Iraq War as a humanitarian intervention].

Supplementary reading:

Melvyn P. Leffler, 'The Foreign Policies of the George W. Bush Administration: Memoirs, History, Legacy', *Diplomatic History* 37: 2 (2013): 190-216. [Good overview of the causes of the Iraq War, based on a critical reading of the memoirs of former administration officials.]

James Cockayne and David Malone, 'Iraq, 1990-1991 and 2002-2003', in V. Lowe, A. Roberts, J. Welsh and D. Zaum, eds, *The Security Council and War* (Oxford: OUP, 2008), pp. 384-340. [Good overview of a decade of UN Security Council initiatives on Iraq].

Michael C. Desch, 'America's Liberal Illiberalism: The Ideological Origins of Overreaction in U.S. Foreign Policy', *International Security*, 32:3 (Winter 2007/08), pp. 7-43. [Argues that

America's peculiar reception of the liberal Enlightenment tradition leads it to over-estimate international threats and consequently to over-react].

Stefano Recchia, 'Did Chirac Say "Non"? Revisiting US-UN Diplomacy on Iraq, 2002-03', *Political Science Quarterly*, 130:4 (Winter 2015), pp. 625-54. [Challenges the argument that Washington and London failed to secure UN approval because of France's veto threat.]

Christopher Dickey and Evan Thomas, '[How Saddam Happened: America helped make a monster](#)', *Newsweek*, 23 September 2002. [How the demonization of Saddam Hussein came to severely limit U.S. policy options on Iraq].

Jane K. Cramer and A. Trevor Thrall, eds., *Why Did the United States Invade Iraq?* London: Routledge, 2012. [Useful collection of essays, see esp. chaps. 2, 3, 5].

Christian Enemark and Christopher Michaelson, 'Just War Doctrine and the Invasion of Iraq', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 51: 4 (2005), pp. 545-563. [Using traditional just war theory, the authors conclude that the 2003 Iraq War was unjust].

James Turner Johnson, 'Humanitarian Intervention after Iraq', *Journal of Military Ethics*, 5: 2 (2006), pp. 144-127. [Thoughtful analysis by a leading just war theorist.]

Terry Nardin, 'Humanitarian Imperialism', *Ethics & International Affairs*, 19: 2 (September 2005), pp. 21-26. [Critique of Nardin's argument that the Iraq War can be justified as a humanitarian intervention].

Kenneth Roth, 'Was the Iraq War a Humanitarian Intervention?' *Journal of Military Ethics* 5: 2 (2006), pp. 84-92. [Careful analysis by the head of the international NGO 'Human Rights Watch'. Answers the question in the negative].

Ramesh Thakur, '[Iraq and the Responsibility to Protect](#)', *Global Dialogue*, 7: 1-2 (Winter 2005). [Did the Iraq War meet the R2P criteria?].

Alexander Thompson, 'Why Did Bush Bypass the UN in 2003?' *White House Studies*, 11: 3 (2011), pp. 1-20. [...because he thought it would be unnecessary. Useful, detailed analysis].

Albert L. Weeks, *The Choice of War: The Iraq War and the Just War Tradition* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2007), pp. 39-112. [Evaluates the 2003 Iraq War against the criteria of traditional just war theory.]

Ruth Wedgwood, 'The multinational action in Iraq and international law', in Ramesh Thakur and Waheguru Pal Singh Sidhu, eds., *The Iraq Crisis and World Order* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2006). [Controversial study arguing that the Iraq War was justified under international law].

Bob Woodward, excerpts from his book '[Plan of Attack: Cheney Was Unwavering in Desire to Go to War](#)', *The Washington Post*, April 20, 2004. [Fascinating account that takes us inside the Bush administration leading up to the war].

4. After war: Jus post bellum and international trusteeship (Bosnia, 1995-present)

Sample questions:

- Is international trusteeship a necessary evil to stabilize war-torn countries?
- Is the imposition of democracy likely to help or hinder postwar peacebuilding?
- Was Bosnia a 'genocidal state' in 1995, and if so, does it matter?

Core reading:

Gary J. Bass, 'Jus Post Bellum', *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 32:4 (2004), pp. 384-412. [May outsiders legitimately transform the domestic political structure of war-torn societies?]

Florian Bieber, 'Power-sharing and International Intervention: Overcoming the Post-conflict Legacy in Bosnia and Herzegovina', in Marc Weller and Barbara Metzger, eds., *Settling Self-determination Disputes: Complex Power-sharing in Theory and Practice* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2007). [Good analysis by someone who knows the Balkans very well].

Stefano Recchia, 'Just and Unjust Postwar Reconstruction: How much external interference can be justified?' *Ethics & International Affairs*, 23:2 (2009), pp. 165-187. [The degree of external interference needs to be strictly proportional to local impediments to self-rule.]

Richard Caplan, 'Who Guards the Guardians? International Accountability in Bosnia and Herzegovina', *International Peacekeeping* 12:3 (Autumn 2005), pp. 463-476. [Highlights and discusses the problem of accountability for international state-builders.]

Elizabeth M. Cousens, 'From Missed Opportunities to Overcompensation: Implementing the Dayton Agreement on Bosnia,' in Stephen J. Stedman, Donald Rothchild and E. Cousens, *Ending Civil Wars: The Implementation of Peace Agreements* (Lynne Rienner, 2002).

Supplementary reading:

Michael Barnett, 'Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States After War', *International Security* 30:4 (Spring 2006), pp. 87-112. [Outsiders should promote new institutions that facilitate inter-ethnic deliberation, rather than full-fledged liberal democracy].

Michael W. Doyle, 'Postbellum Peacebuilding', in Doyle, *The Question of Intervention*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015.

Roberto Belloni, *State Building and International Intervention in Bosnia* (London: Routledge, 2008). [Comprehensive and balanced analysis].

Florian Bieber, 'Bosnia and Herzegovina since 1990', in Sabrina Petra Ramet, ed., *Central and Southeast European Politics since 1989* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).

William Bain, 'Saving Failed States: Trusteeship as an Arrangement of Security', in Bain, ed., *The Empire of Security and the Safety of the People*, (Routledge, 2006). [Critical historical and normative analysis.]

Sumantra Bose, 'The Bosnian State a Decade After Dayton', *International Peacekeeping*, 12: 3 (2005), pp. 322-335.

Richard Caplan, 'Devising Exit Strategies', *Survival*, 54: 3 (June–July 2012), pp. 111–126. [Discusses the challenges of ending complex international peace operations.]

Richard Caplan, *International Authority and State Building: The Case of Bosnia* (OUP, 2004). [Detailed analysis of the international state-building operation in Bosnia].

David Chandler, *Faking Democracy After Dayton* (London: Pluto, 2000). [The international state-building project in Bosnia is a not-so-veiled instance of neo-imperialism].

James Fearon and David Laitin, 'Neotrusteeship and the Problem of Weak States', *International Security*, 28:4 (2004), pp. 5-43.

Stephen Krasner, 'Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States', *International Security*, 29: 2 (Fall 2004), pp. 85-120.

Arend Lijphart, 'Constitutional Design for Divided Societies', *Journal of Democracy*, 15: 2 (2004), pp. 96-109. [Seminal argument on ethnic power sharing as a solution to the problem of political instability in divided societies].

James Mayall, 'The European Empires and International Order: Model or Trap?' in J. Mayall and R. Soares de Oliveira, eds., *The New Protectorates: International Tutelage and the Making of Liberal States* (London: Hurst, 2011).

Patrice C. McMahon and Jon Western, 'The Death of Dayton: How to Stop Bosnia From Falling Apart', *Foreign Affairs*, 88: 5 (September/October 2009), pp. 69-83.

Oisín Tansey, 'Democratic Regime-Building in Bosnia', in Tansey, *Regime-Building: Democratization and International Administration* (OUP, 2009). [Explores the role of international territorial administration in promoting democratic governance].

Roland Paris, *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict* (Cambridge UP, 2004), ch. 6.

Stefano Recchia, 'Beyond International Trusteeship: EU Peacebuilding in Bosnia and Herzegovina', *Occasional Paper No. 66* (Paris: EU Institute for Security Studies, 2007). [Shows that the prospect of EU accession can stimulate important political reforms].

Philip G. Roeder and Donald Rothchild, 'Power Sharing as an Impediment to Peace and Democracy', in Roeder and Rothchild, eds., *Sustainable Peace: Power and Democracy after Civil Wars* (Cornell UP, 2005), pp. 29-50. [Ethnic power sharing is part of the problem.]

Dominik Zaum, *The Sovereignty Paradox: The norms and politics of international statebuilding* (OUP, 2007), chaps. 2, 3. [Detailed analysis of the socially constructed norms underpinning international state-building projects, with a focus on Bosnia].

5. Strike and Retreat? Supporting local insurgents from the air (Libya, 2011)

Sample questions:

- Does humanitarian intervention require military occupation in its aftermath?
- Was the Libya intervention legitimate? Was it legal?
- What does the Libya experience tell us about the future of humanitarian intervention?

Core reading:

Jeffrey H. Michaels, 'Able but Not Willing: A Critical Assessment of NATO's Libya Intervention', in Kjell Engelbrekt, Marcus Mohlin, and Charlotte Wagnsson, eds., *The NATO Intervention in Libya*. London: Routledge, 2014. [Good overview of NATO's decision making from the outbreak of the crisis to the fall of Qaddafi.]

Christopher Chivvis, 'Libya and the light footprint', in Chivvis *Toppling Qaddafi. Libya and the Limits of Liberal Intervention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014. [Argues that the Libya intervention was a success—up to a point.]

Richard Andres, Craig Wills, Thomas Griffith, 'Winning With Allies: The Strategic Value of the Afghan Model', *International Security* 30: 3 (Winter 2005): 124-160. [Claim that Western reliance on air power and special forces, rather than large contingents of ground troops, facilitates the transition to stability and democracy by empowering indigenous allies].

Alan Kuperman, 'A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO's Libya Campaign', *International Security* 38:1 (Summer 2013), pp. 105-136. [Provocatively argues that NATO's military intervention made matters significantly worse.]

Derek Chollet and Ben Fishman, 'Who Lost Libya? Obama's Intervention in Retrospect', *Foreign Affairs* 93:2 (May/June 2015): 154-59. [Response to Kuperman. Cautious defense of the intervention, argues there were no 'good' alternative options.]

Supplementary reading:

Michael Walzer, 'The Case Against Our Attack on Libya', *The New Republic*, March 20, 2011. [Claims that Libya didn't meet the threshold for humanitarian intervention.]

Michael W. Doyle, 'Libya, the Responsibility to Protect, and the New Moral Minimum', in Doyle, *The Question of Intervention*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2015.

Erica D. Borghard and Costantino Pischetta, 'Allies and Airpower in Libya', *Parameters* 42 (Spring 2012): 63-74. [Argue that although precision airpower by itself is unlikely to bring about regime change, its 'cumulative attrition effect' can enable rebel victories.]

Robert A. Pape, “When Duty Calls: A Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention,” *International Security* 37: 1 (Summer 2012), pp. 41-80. [Outsiders should intervene only with a workable strategy to establish long-term security; uses Libya as a case study.]

Ramesh Thakur, ‘R2P after Libya and Syria: Engaging Emerging Powers’, *The Washington Quarterly*, 36:2 (2013): 61-76. [Explains why emerging powers will play a growing role in decisions of whether and when the ‘international community’ should intervene on humanitarian grounds.]

Luke Glanville, ‘Intervention in Libya: From Sovereign Consent to Regional Consent’, *International Studies Perspectives* 14: 3 (August 2013): 325-342. [Highlights the support of regional multilateral bodies as a key factor legitimating the intervention.]

Justin Morris, ‘Libya and Syria: R2P and the spectre of the swinging pendulum’, *International Affairs* 89: 5 (September 2013), 1265-1283. [Argues that NATO’s expansive interpretation of UNSC Resolution 1973 over Libya subsequently made it more difficult to invoke the R2P doctrine effectively over Syria.]

Aidan Hehir, Robert Murray, eds., *Libya, the Responsibility to Protect and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013. [Useful collection of essays discussing the ethics of NATO’s intervention and the role of multilateralism.]

Paul D. Williams and Alex J. Bellamy, ‘Principles, Politics, and Prudence: Libya, the Responsibility to Protect, and the Use of Military Force’, *Global Governance* 18:3 (Summer 2012), pp. 273-297. [Claim that the R2P norm ‘produced’ intervention in Libya.]

Jason Ralph and Adrian Gallagher, ‘Legitimacy faultlines in international society: The responsibility to protect and prosecute after Libya’, *Review of International Studies* 41: 3 (July 2015), pp. 553-73.

Jennifer Welsh, ‘Civilian Protection in Libya: Putting Coercion and Controversy Back into RtoP’, *Ethics & International Affairs* 25:3 (Fall 2011), pp. 255–262.

Simon Chesterman, ‘Leading from Behind: The Responsibility to Protect, the Obama Doctrine, and Humanitarian Intervention after Libya’, *Ethics & International Affairs* 25:3 (Fall 2011), pp. 279-285.

6. Freedom fighters or terrorists? The ethics of guerrilla warfare (Iraq, 2003-present)

Sample questions:

- Is ‘just guerrilla warfare’ an oxymoron?
- Can there ever be exceptions to the rule against attacking civilians?
- Does foreign intervention create insurgencies?

Core reading:

Michael L. Gross, *The Ethics of Insurgency: A Critical Guide to Just Guerrilla Warfare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015), chaps. 1, 2, 3, 7. [Applies liberal just war principles to the ethics of guerrilla warfare.]

James D. Kiras, 'Irregular Warfare: Terrorism and Insurgency', in John Baylis, James J. Wirtz, and Colin S. Gray, eds., *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, Fourth Ed. (Oxford University Press, 2013). [Good overview of the main ethical and legal issues.]

Giuseppe Mazzini, 'Rules for the Conduct of Guerrilla Bands', and 'Towards a Holy Alliance of the Peoples', in Stefano Recchia and Nadia Urbinati, eds., *A Cosmopolitanism of Nations: Giuseppe Mazzini's Writings on Democracy, Nation Building, and International Relations* (Princeton UP, 2009). [Justification of guerrilla warfare from a liberal nationalist standpoint.]

Ahmed S. Hashim, *Insurgency and Counter-Insurgency in Iraq* (Cornell University Press, 2006), esp. chap. 2. [Explains the origins of the Iraq insurgency].

Robert A. Pape and James K. Feldman, *Cutting the Fuse: The Explosion of Global Suicide Terrorism and How to Stop It* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), chaps. 1-2, pp. 19-86. [Suicide terrorism as a form of resistance to foreign military occupation.]

Supplementary reading:

Jean-Paul Sartre, *Colonialism and Neocolonialism*, translated by Steve Brewer, Azzedine Haddour, Terry McWilliams (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006). [Sartre's famous and controversial justification of anti-colonial violence.]

Carl Schmitt, 'The Theory of the Partisan', transl. by A. C. Goodson, 1962. Available at: <http://obinfonet.ro/docs/tpnt/tpntrex/cschmitt-theory-of-the-partisan.pdf> [Schmitt, a brilliant though controversial thinker, views the partisan or guerrilla fighter as a traditionalist who nevertheless contributes to the breakdown of the traditional political order.]

Hannah Arendt, 'A Special Supplement: Reflections on Violence,' *New York Review of Books* (February 27, 1969):25. [Arendt famously distinguished 'power' from 'violence'—here she uses the distinction to explain the success of modern revolutionary movements.]

Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth* (Grove/Atlantic, 2007). [Influential, qualified defense of anticolonial violence from a Marxist standpoint].

Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars* (Basic Books, 1977), chap. 11 on 'Guerrilla War'.

Toby Dodge, 'What were the causes and consequences of Iraq's descent into violence after the initial invasion?' Analysis submitted to the UK Iraq Inquiry, 2009. Available at: <http://www.iraqinquiry.org.uk/media/37045/dodge-submission.pdf>

James D. Fearon, 'Iraq's Civil War', *Foreign Affairs* 86 (March/April 2007), pp. 2-16 [Iraq's civil war can only be ended by Iraqis themselves, but it will take a long time to reach a viable ethnic power-sharing arrangement and it will be bloody].

Alan J. Kuperman, 'The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans', *International Studies Quarterly* 52 (2008), pp. 49-80. [Claims that talk of humanitarian intervention emboldens secessionist insurgents.]

Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism*, rev. and expanded ed. (Columbia University Press, 2006), pp. 1-45. [Very good conceptual and historical overview.]

Charles Tilly, 'Terror, Terrorism, Terrorists', *Sociological Theory* 22: 1 (March 2004), pp. 5-13. [Tilly brings some much-needed conceptual clarity to the debate about terrorism.]

Dipak K. Gupta, *Understanding Terrorism and Political Violence* (Routledge, 2008), chap. 3 [Highlights the desire to belong to a group as a motivating factor for terrorists.]

Michael Walzer, 'Terrorism: A critique of excuses', [Terrorism cannot be excused, not even as a last resort]; and "After 9/11: Five Questions about terrorism," [Why killing terrorist leaders is morally justified]. In: Michael Walzer, *Arguing About War* (Yale UP, 2004).

Bruce Hoffman, 'Insurgency and Counterinsurgency in Iraq', *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 29 (2), 2006: 103-21.

Paul Rogers. *Iraq and the War on Terror: Twelve Months of Insurgency*. I.B. Tauris 2006.

Questions for practice essays:

1. Was NATO's aerial bombing in Kosovo an acceptable means of humanitarian military intervention?
2. Would the 2003 Iraq war have been justified, had it been authorized by the UN Security Council?
3. Can military intervention without the approval of relevant multilateral organizations like the UN Security Council or NATO approval ever be legitimate?
4. Should liberal countries support just insurgencies through military intervention?