* Peace studies as a field suffers from a number of problems which creates a need for self-justification
* The central concepts of peace studies generate different questions about familiar topics
* Peace is a universal concept with many different and sometimes conflicting interpretations
* Peace studies is separated from other disciplines because it asks different questions; the challenge of peace studies is to ensure that its’ questions are unique
* Peace through threat of violence?
* Self-Justification:
  + Peace studies has many common elements with other fields of study
  + Peace studies is often accused of having a “normative” perspective
    - Accused of always saying that Peace is the best and only viable option; it’s better than everything else
  + Peace studies is accused of being activism disguised as scholarship
* Image Problem:
  + Though peace has been around a long time, peace studies really evolved in the 1960s
  + It is often seen as a field that appeals to people who want to remain in the 1960s
  + Associated with passivity, weakness, and naiveté
* “False Friends”- a word that sounds like a word you know, but is completely different:
  + International relations
  + Security studies
  + Comparative politics
  + Political theory
  + Peace studies
* Key Concepts:
  + Peace:
    - Peace is as complex as war (obtaining and maintaining)
    - Social peace is maintained because the community actively constructs it
    - Peace is a relational: it has a subject and an object. Peace happens because it’s an active process, and people have to work to get it and maintain it
    - Understandings of peace are linked with understandings of conflict, violence, and power
    - Types of Peace:
      * Negative Peace: the absence of war and/or conflict or the suppression and managing of violence
      * Positive Peace: the active cultivation of relations that are acceptable and beneficial to all parties involved
  + Conflict:
    - Peace studies does not deny that conflict occurs
    - Peace studies assumes that conflict is endemic
    - Peace studies disagrees with the contention that conflict necessarily leads to violence and that violence is an effective solution to conflict
    - Conflict and violence are NOT synonymous
    - Conflict is the clash of incompatible goals or preferences (one person wants Chinese and other wants Sushi for dinner)
    - Peace Studies: conflict does not necessarily lead to violence
    - Peace Studies: conflict is a moment for opportunity for positive or negative action
    - Scale and Scope:
      * Peace studies approaches conflicts large and small with the same conceptual tool kit (macro and micro)
      * Micro –conflict: interpersonal
      * Macro-conflict: international or large-scale
  + Violence:
    - The use and/or threat of force or coercion to create a physical or mental harm
    - Direct violence: intentional agency with a specific target; person to person, event specific, and visible
    - Structural violence: impersonal agency with a general target’ structure to person, systematic, and invisible (ie: institutionalized racism, extreme poverty/economic inequality)
    - Cultural Violence:
      * Some argue it is a form of structural violence
      * Some argue it is a separate form of violence from direct or structural
      * Inner directed (perpetrator and victim are from same group), unlike racism
      * Controversial because it is within the culture and you can use the excuse that to an outsider, it may appear to be discrimination while within the culture says it’s fine (discrimination against and oppression of women)
* NOTE: The most effective way to determine whether or not you are subjecting another culture to your culturally-subjective belief/moral system is to look at their own belief system and see if those questionable action contradict their own belief systems as well as your own
  + Power:
    - The ability and capacity to force, coerce, or persuade others to do what they would otherwise not do
    - Is power an exercise of violence?
      * If yes, then what is “peace power”?
      * Can peace also be an act of violence?
* The state is central to understanding international peace and conflict
* Peace studies as a discipline both accepts and challenges the nature of the state (and state-based relations)
* Peace studies often focuses on alternatives such as international institutions that promote peaceful relations among states
* The state is often seen as the “natural” unit of politics
* It is the operative element of all international institutions
  + You cannot fully join the UN unless you are a full-fledged nation state
* State-centrism is the view that governments matter more than citizens
* Before nation states there were kingdoms, empires, and city states
* Radiating concentration of power: sovereign rulers; the further you got from the source of power (castle) the power got weaker and weaker
* Fluid boundaries (or geographic): no legal demarcation (where does England end? Where does France start?)
* Lack of clarity: opportunity for conflict and conquest
* Thirty Years War in Europe (1618-1648) began as a religious war that grew into an enormous, destructive war that raged throughout Europe and destroyed entire kingdoms
* Peace of Westphalia: series of treaties concluded between 1646-1648. Instituted new system of political and legal statehood (origins created by war and settled by peace); it created uniform sovereign power within legally demarcated boundaries (took away incentive to go to war to attempt to gain more power due to the issue of radiating concentration of power)
* Westphalian Nation-State System:
  + Uniform and legal sovereignty
  + Central monopoly on use of force (state as central actor; no more private militias)
  + Legal basis for war and peace
  + Legal basis for international relations
* Sovereignty equality between states
* Territorial integrity; boundaries
* Non-interference in domestic affairs of other states
* Legal obligation to abide by international agreements
* National Economies:
  + States had monopoly on use of force; states have a standing army
  + Maintaining an army is expensive
  + States needed money to pay for armies
  + Conquest and plunder (to get money) no longer possible…at least in Europe among legal states (only European states signed Westphalian treaty, and were therefore not part of the system)
* Recourses:
  + States without legal identies not considered states
  + Non-states were “fair game” (outside the system)
  + …Imperialism!
* Imperialism:
  + Euro-centric
  + Imperialism (and all related actions) was considered legal while it existed
  + Imperialism and statehood: to break out of the imperial system one had to build a state and embrace the state system (they needed to be legally recognized and embrace the very system that was taking advantage of them)—this is how the Westphalian system spread (states that were victims of imperialism became legal states through the Westphalian system in order to gain legally and internationally recognized independence)
  + While earlier empires engaged in Imperialism, European Imperialism was unique in that it used law to justify itself (as it existed, it was “legal”)
* The legalization of peace and war have all emerged out of the Westphalian System
* Statehood Requirements for all Nation-States to be nation-states (these four principles come from Montevideo Convention [1933]):
  + Territory with defined boundaries
  + Stable and permanent population
  + A stable, single government with effective power
  + Ability to enter into legal relations with other countries (does not mean that you have to, merely that you have the legal capacity to do so, which happens when other countries recognize that legal ability)
  + There is no magic number of other nation-states that must recognize you in order to become a legal nation-state
* A considerable part of the debate within the field of peace studies , and between peace studies and other fields, hinges upon the “natural” elements of war, peace, and violence
* The position a person takes on the natural or biological origins of war and violence will determine the theoretical and practical approaches to peace
* In the last decade, new research has radically altered out understanding of the status of animals and challenged nearly every assumption we have on the relationship between human and nonhuman species
* Depressing fact: war and related things like conquest and imperialism have taken up far more of human history than peace and cooperation
* Depressing historical footnote: war among humans has been around as long as there have been humans
* Is war the “norm” of human history?
* Is peace an accident, or an interlude?
* Is war natural? Biologically hard-wired into humanity?
* War, conquest, and violence might have been around for a long time, but when it occurs, it is nearly always accompanied by some kind of justification
* If we have to justify the violence then doesn’t that imply that human beings know that there’s something wrong with it??
* No one ever justifies peace
* Human Nature:
  + The shared biological, psychological, and genetic elements that determine human behavior
  + Collectively they supersede or considerably weaken free will and choice
  + Collectively they cross all religious, cultural, ethnic, and even gendered lines
* Is human nature prone to war and violence, or to peace and cooperation?
* The question has taken peace studies and related fields into many other fields and academic disciplines; biology, MCB, genetics, psychology, psychiatry, cognitive studies, neurobiology, philosophy, economics, law, religion
* Three options:
  + If war is natural, then peace is unnatural
  + If peace in natural, then war is unnatural
  + Nature deals us the cards (constraints); how we play them determines whether there is war or peace (possibilities)…why do those constraints sometimes create justifications for peace and why sometimes war? (if we can figure out which constraints result in peace and which result in war, then we can theoretically control it)
* Seville Statement:
  + A group of scientists meeting in Seville Spain issued the Seville Statement on Violence (may 1986)
  + It was adopted by UNESCO in 1989
  + Central Goal: to refute the idea that “organized human violence is biologically determined”
  + The five refutations of the Seville Statement:
    - We did not inherent a tendency to make war from out animal ancestors
    - Violent behavior is not “genetically programed” into the human nature
    - Human evolution has not shown a preference for violent behavior over other types of behavior
    - Humans do not have a “violent brain”
    - War in not a human instinct
* Robert Sapolsky:
  + Animal culture
  + Animal multiculturalism- chimpanzees who have to move from one group to another will have to assimilate
  + Animal societies
  + Inherited and learned characteristics, plus environment=war or peace (in all species)
  + One of the first to argue that humans are very similar to all other animal species
  + “You guys love bananas, we love bananas, let’s have sex”- Professor Zook
  + His research argues that human beings go to war over recourses, and how those recourses are shared determines whether or not the groups go to war or have peace
  + Human uniqueness is overstated
  + Uniqueness is not hierarchical; human beings are not naturally at the top of some natural hierarchy (we are one among many at the “top of the food chain”)
  + Difference between humans and other species is better viewed as the difference among species
  + Is it a bonobo or chimpanzee world?—it is reliant on an interplay between what we as humans are born with an the environment we create for ourselves
  + Bonobos’ “peace through love” culture is also based upon environment and recourses
  + Not all chimpanzee cultures are equally violent
* Ethology:
  + Konrad Lorenz :
    - Aggression is programmed into natural behavior
    - Aggression occurs as a way to overcome frustrated needs and desires
    - Aggression is essential to evolution; it produces benefits and rewards
    - Aggression is not the only important instinct
    - Developed the theory that is a baby animal sees another animal, regardless of species, first right after it’s born, it will automatically think that that is its mother
* Evolution:
  + Charles Darwin:
    - Competition drives evolution
    - Those that succeed in competition pass on their genes (natural selection)—“Survival of the fittest”; any biological entity that can find a way to pass on its genes is “fittest” and therefore able to survive (not necessarily through violent means, could also be through peace)
    - Darwin’s theories are complex and often misused
    - Aggression and violence can be part of competition, but are not necessarily so
    - Social Darwinism: the fittest end up on top, so whoever is on top must be the fittest (in any society, whichever group is dominant most likely fought its way to the top, and therefore has the right to rule)
* Margaret Mead (1901-1978)
  + Studied “primitive” societies
  + Main finding: war is a socially constructed idea entity/idea not natural
  + Conflict, violence, and war should be kept separate; a society can have violence but not war
  + Discovered isolated societies that knew conflict, but not war
  + In order to eliminate war, it must be removed in society’s mind as an option
  + Margaret Mead’s findings are considered controversial because in Samoan culture, they are expected to tell visitors what they believe the visitors want to hear as a sign of respect
  + Research and feminism: found tribal societies in Papua New-Guinea where females were dominant and peace prevailed
  + Also found male-dominated societies where peace prevailed and female-dominated ones that were aggressive
  + War and gender roles are both socially constructed; did not actually believe that if women dominated the world, it would lead to peace
* Sigmund Freud (1856-1939)
  + Aggression is related to libido: it is a natural psychological drive
  + Lust for power
  + Aggression must not and should not be repressed
  + Civilization is psychologically repressive for our lust for power; modern society is one complicated neurosis
  + There is a direct connection between sexual drive and violence
  + If one represses his or her desire for power, he or she will have neurosis
* Identity is something that everyone has, but it is often poorly understood
* Elements of identity are often at the heart of conflict, violence, and war
* Elements of identity can also be constructive and positive
* Identity is a social phenomenon
* “Self” only makes sense in the context of “non-self” or “other”; determining identity only works in a social situation, we must compare and contrast
* “The other” (specialized usage)
* Human nature: what we are born with vs what we create
* Self-Centrism:
  + Identity politics and narcissism (which creates identity hierarchy and conflict)
  + Identity and hierarchy
  + Self is always better?
  + Eurocentrism
  + Afrocentrism, Sinocentrism, etc.
  + Any centrism is flawed because it is viewing the world through ONLY the context of your own lens, and not viewing the world as itself
* Samuel Huntington and the “Clash of Civilizations”
  + Cold war ideology replaced by identity-based conflicts
  + Irreconcilable differences
  + “Good” and “bad” identities; Western civilization is more tolerant, while others are self-centric and therefore will have irreconcilable conflicts
  + Cold war was essentially an ideological debacle. Once it ended, many people said that world peace was finally upon us
  + Samuel Huntington believed that the Cold War merely delayed the global clash of civilization, the conflicts for which are deeply embedded (irreconcilable differences between global, identity view points)
* Nationalism:
  + The nation-state and identity
  + Nationalism and patriotism
  + Johannes Rau (former president of Germany): pleased but not proud; no one can be proud of their country because no one had the ability to choose in which country they wished to be born (why would you be proud of something you never had a choice in?!). controversy over naturalized citizens
  + Citizenship and loyalty: hearts, minds, and passports
* Ethnicity:
  + Group-based identity based on shared characteristics
  + History, culture, territory, language
  + Pleased but not proud? Ethnicity you are born into was not chosen
  + Ethnocentrism
* Race:
  + Confusion between race and ethnicity
  + Race: emphasis on genetic attributes
  + Race as a neutral element: like eye color
  + Race and racism: difference and hierarchy
  + Racism and dominance: necessity or excuse?
* Religion:
  + Unstable element
  + Faith without choice? Religion as culture
  + Choosing to believe: converting in an opting out
  + Fundamentalism versus extremism
* Language:
  + Linguistic narcissism
  + Official languages
  + The UN and language: six are REALLY important
  + Fluency and identity
  + Accents and shibboleths (was pronounced differently based on where the speakers were from. Shibboleth indicated whether or not someone was different)
* Gender:
  + From solid to fluid
  + Gender as biological
  + Gender as a state of mind
  + Gender roles: who is constructing whom?
  + Transgendered feminism and other challenges
* Realism and liberalism have been the most dominant theories in politics and peace studies
* Both are based on assumptions about human nature
* Both assume they are “universal” (not based on or valid only in Western culture)
* Academics are ill-equipped to deal with reality
* Everybody has a theory
* Conspiracy theory- something that is neither provable nor disprovable
* Theory is conceptual glue for concrete elements
* Elements can often be put together in different ways
* Some theories try to predict the best way to put them together
* Other theories try to understand how things got put together the way they are
* Theories have to be tested to see if they have promise
* Research is the continuous testing of theory
* Theories that are well supported by research are called “rigorous”
* Theories compete with one another because reality is a big sloppy mess
* Realism:
  + “realism” claims to explain the world as it “really” is
  + Is vs. Ought; realism explains the world as it is, not as it ought to be
  + Realpolitik- German for realist policy
  + Word games- “I’m a realist, therefore I know how the world actually is, so you can go live in your own little world, but I’ll stay here in the real one”
  + Elements of Realism:
    - Hostility occurs naturally as part of the competitive nature of international relations
    - States act in ways to maximize their self-interest (self-interest is measured in material terms, not morally or ideologically)
    - Anarchy (there is nothing higher than the nation-state that can enforce power on a nation-state) prevails at the international level, and states seek to survive by accumulating power; the UN is only a collection of nation-states, it doesn’t have any real power; there is nothing higher (on the power scale) than the level of nation-states. Nation-states survive by accumulating power
    - Power is a limited and finite recourse, so one state’s gain is another’s loss- “Zero-Sum Politics”
    - Peace occurs when no state can gain an advantage to accrue more power—“Balance of power”. Status quo politics: change is bad
  + Hegemony: when a state accumulates a preponderance of power in relation to other states (this is a stable position in the view of a realist, because that state is not going to do anything stupid to jeopardize that power)
  + Stability: when power accumulates in a small number of hegemonic states
  + Unipolar, bipolar, multipolar: less is more (for a realist, unipolarity is ideal. The more centers of power you have, the more likely that the balance of power will collapse and therefore war)
  + Realists assume that human beings are self-centered by design
  + Greed and self-interest generate and explain all human behavior
  + Famous Realists:
    - Thucydides (these city states that are talking about peace and easily defeated by those with lots of weapons) and the Peloponeisan War (5th century BCE)
    - Hobbes and the English Civil War (1640s); life is “nasty, brutish, and short”…so do what you need to do to survive
    - Machiavelli: The Prince (1513); it’s far better to be feared than to be loved. Power is what people respond to, not love
  + Modern Varieties:
    - Classical Realism: human nature is such
    - Structural Realism: the system is such
    - Neorealism= Structural Realism
    - Offensive Realism: aggression creates opportunities
    - Defensive Realism: protection preserves gains
  + Realists cannot explain why the Cold War ended without violence
  + Realists cannot explain the persistence of cooperation in international relations
* Liberalism:
  + Liberalism is often called “idealism”
  + Liberalism describes how the world “ought” to be and then tries to push it in that direction
  + Realists think liberals are not living in reality
  + Political Theory:
    - Individual action; nation-states each act on their own and are responsible for their own action
    - Equal moral worth; in any given line, we all wait in line because we all have equal moral worth (each individual has the same rights)
    - Individual autonomy
    - Individual choice of the good (normal) life; we should pursue our own individual pathway to our own good life
  + Political Ideology:
    - “Liberal media”
    - Democratic Party
    - “Progressives”
    - State should intervene (opposite of conservative)
  + Elements:
    - Marketplaces: of ideas and goods. Free circulation is necessary to evaluate all options
    - Individuals express preferences in concert with other individuals
    - Process works best in a cooperative environment. Or, conflict (and power) disrupts the process and creates imperfect choices
    - In a cooperative environment, the best choices will “win” over inferior choices (provided there is a free flow of ideas that are not warped or manipulated by power)
    - Individuals would rather cooperate than enter into conflict because we value the ability to make our own choices
  + Marketplace of ideas and goods: cooperation creates the best choices and the best products
  + Conflict is NOT a good choice: cooperation creates more and better prosperity than conquest
  + Harmony: convergence of mutual interests
  + Liberal Peace:
    - Peace occurs because nations realize that cooperation is a better choice
    - When conflict occurs, it is punished as a cost: war is too expensive
    - “Democratic peace”- democratic countries are more likely to be at peace, it because it provides democratic choice (and if you have all the choices in front of you, you will choose cooperation)
  + Liberalism assumes that human beings are cooperative by nature
  + Liberals also assume that states behave like people
  + Cooperative states build transnational institutions (UN, etc.)
  + Famous Liberals:
    - John Locke (1632-1704) and private property; we make our choices best, when we can make them with full autonomy (the government doesn’t own private property, so it’s just for us)
    - Adam Smith (1723-1790) and the invisible hand (no monopolies please)
    - Francis Fukuyama: and the winner of history is…it’s only a matter of time before all countries will become liberal democracies
  + Amartya Sen: no democracy has ever suffered a famine
  + The McDonald’s Hypothesis: no two countries with a McDonald’s have gone to war (up until recently)
* Not all theories rooted in ideas about human nature, or based on the idea that human nature is malleable
* Constructivism is a neutral theory; some theories are normative, or descriptive
* Some theories focus on the process of how norms are produced
* Constructivism:
  + Constructivism believes that human nature is malleable
  + Individuals construct value based frameworks to interpret their experiences
  + New experiences influence these frameworks continuously
  + Societies are collections of individuals and thus create a collective framework
  + Any person has the potential to do anything; their moral framework influences everything a person interprets around him or her (anyone has the potential to torture someone, the only difference is whether or not their moral framework allows for that)
  + New cultural environments can be indicated by alternative constructed frameworks
  + Elements:
    - Interpretive frameworks are necessary to make sense of events and experiences (they occur naturally)
    - Since social interaction is an influential process, over time, interpretive frameworks tend to converge on specific points. These points become social norms
    - Social norms tend to create “determinative structures” that filter new information into dominant frameworks
    - Frameworks become rigid over time, making dramatic and abrupt changes difficult.
    - Normative cascades: “trends” and other changes (Gangam Style, Justin Beiber, Poodle Skirts, etc)
    - Paradigm shifts: when existing structures can no longer explain new information, and we create an entirely new interpretive framework
    - Frameworks are content neutral and can be good (human rights) or bad (genocide)
  + Existence is more important than essence (what we’re born with is not the important thing); the important thing is how we construct our frameworks and what decisions and actions we make
  + For constructivists, realism and liberalism are products of their environments
  + Constructivism is a theory about theories
  + Brittleness and ossification; literally to turn something into bone; if we exist within an environment that is too homogenous, over time, we become brittle in our interpretive frameworks (if we don’t expose ourselves to difference, we become intolerant)
  + Preference for sameness: no need to accommodate new information if there is no new information (many people choose to primarily involve themselves in familiar, and comfortable environments, which can lead to brittleness because those people do not venture out of their comfort zones, and they are consequently less tolerant)
  + If you think x, and x is like y, then you should think y too
  + Evolution of norms: ethics and justice require consistency
  + Why do we eat some but not others?
* For some, mainstream theories have an inherent “elitist” bias (focusing on the leadership of the country, specifically on select leaders and individuals)
* “Radical” theories tend to present themselves as being more aligned with the needs of “the people”
* “The people” do not necessarily do a better job with peace and justice
* Marxism:
  + Karl Marx (1818-1883)
  + Marx co-wrote lots of stuff with Friedrich Engels
  + Marxist thought raises the question of whether violence can create a more just social order
  + The only way to arrive at peace is through necessary violence
  + Marxism is a theory of historical progression
  + Each stage of history is centered around a specific “mode of production” (the basis for the economy structure in any stage of history. Every stage of history has its own mode of production. Capitalism is a mode of production, because it is an economic structure. It allows one to understand the structure of society, who the elites are, etc)
  + Each mode of production contains “contradictions” (embedded in the mode of production. Those who benefit from the system [elites] will want to maintain their dominance. Those who suffer under the system will want to change their condition and want liberation)
  + Those who benefit from the system want to maintain their dominance (exploitation)
  + Those who suffer under the system want to change their condition (liberation)
  + As each stage of history progresses, power and wealth are concentrated in the hands of those who control the means of production
  + Divisions within society become irreconcilable
  + Liberation eventually requires revolution (and violence)
  + Capitalism is the last stage of historical progression
  + Capitalism is the most complex, and hence the most difficult to break
  + Capitalism is a necessary stage of history (cannot be skipped)
  + Communism comes after the revolution against capitalism
  + Communism is the end of history
  + Communism is the only stage of history with no contradictions
  + With no divisions and no exploitation within society (owners of and workers in the system are the same), there are no contradictions that remain
  + Marx: religion was the “opium” of the masses
  + Religion justified exploitation through “sin” or “karma”, etc
  + Religion was invented by elites in order to exploit the people by telling them that G-d wants them to go through suffering, and that they deserve it
  + Materialism for Marx: grounded in reality (what he sees in front of him) and not metaphysics or religion
  + Marx’s Problem:
    - Why didn’t the working class rebel??
    - Religion can’t explain everything (not everyone working the factories were religious, and yet they did not want revolution)
    - Civil society: the elite classes brainwash the working classes
      * Any part of society that is not part of formal government or formal rule (citizens governing themselves, and engaging in interaction without dissolving into chaos)
    - “false consciousness”- belief that you are not being exploited despite the fact that you really are
  + For Marx, only one identity mattered: class
  + Ethnicity and all other forms of identity are false: invented by elites to avoid the formation of “class consciousness”
  + The awareness of your class identity determined your revolution consciousness and potential
* Leninism:
  + Vladimir Lenin (1870-1924)
  + Answered the question of why working class in Europe did not rebel…because imperialism outsourced exploitation
  + Socialism: the interim phase when the revolution has occurred but counter-revolutionary elements/forces (elements of the old order) are still present (the state is still necessary to protect the gains of the revolution)
  + Communism: the final phase when no counter revolutionary elements remain (the state can finally wither away)
  + For Marx, peace would only come after liberation
  + Liberation was only possible after history passed through capitalism
  + Pace was not possible without first attaining communism
  + Question: can violence be justified if it is done in the hope of bringing about a better system?
  + Must it actually produce a better system to be justified?
* Religion is not always easy to define
* Religious-based theories are more challenging to refute: one must refute consistency with fundamental principles, not the principles themselves
* Not all adherents of a faith know their religion well
* One does not need to join a religion to know it well
* Commonalities can be a source of peace and justice
* Misunderstandings can be a source of conflict and violence
* Religion and politics, religion and war, religion and peace, religion and justice
* Islam:
  + Origins of Islam:
    - Arabian Peninsula
    - Prophet Muhammad (570-632 CE)
    - Mecca
    - Medina and hijra (AH); moment when the Islamic community fled Mecca and is considered the pivotal, foundation moment of Islam [622 CE]
    - Arabic and Islam
  + Umma: the entire, worldwide Islamic community
  + One of the most major divisions within the Umma is the division between the Sunni and Shia/Shiite/Shi’ite
  + Islam (the word):
    - Same root as a salam
    - Submission and surrender as peace…or through allegiance and trust?
  + Jihad (the word):
    - Refers not to war but to the idea of effort or struggle
    - Greater jihad: to be a better person
    - Lesser jihad: defense of Islam
  + Sharia law consists of civil and criminal law, though it was never meant to be the law for a nation state
  + Fatwa- a legal clarification, usually about mundane things issued by someone who is legally recognized by Islamic law who is qualified to issue that fatwa (only those who recognize the authority of that fatwa will follow it)
  + Identity conflicts within Islam:
    - Believers vs. non-believers
    - Religion vs. culture
    - Gender: inequality and polygamy
    - Ethnicity: Arabization and Islamazation (separation of Islamic belief from an Arabic practice)
  + Liberal Islam: Islam and Democracy are compatible, explore all options and then use that to make a logical, well-reasoned, and educated decision
  + Moderate Islam
  + Conservative Islam: Islam is distinct from all other things and should be separated
  + Radical (“Militant”) Islam
* Hinduism:
  + Origins:
    - Earliest records around 1800 BCE
    - Vedas (esp. Rig Veda)- earliest text associated with Hinduism
    - Coherence is difficult to establish (as in a moment when it organized into a religion)
    - Monotheistic or polytheistic? (multiple manifestations of the same G-d, or separate deities?)
  + Sanskrit language: texts are written in Sanskrit
  + Vernacular languages: as Hinduism spread, the texts were translated into other vernacular languages, and some of the content changed as it was translated (some would add aspects of local culture, lost/changed in translation, etc).
  + Large array of different texts, there is no central text that is the most important
  + Different manifestations of divinity: Siva (Shiva), Vishnu, Ganesh (Ganehsa), Krishna, Kali, etc.
  + Ramayana- central text in politics in India regarding Hindu nationalism. Sita is abducted by Ravana (evil person) and taken to the south. Rama goes and rescues Sita (however, because Ravana had touched her, she is no longer pure, and Rama no longer wants her).
  + Valmiki (Hindi, spoken in northern India) and Kamban (Tamil, spoken in southern India). In the Tamil version (because Ravna is from a southern area), Ravna is not evil, and is protecting her from Rama, who doesn’t treat her properly because he believes she is impure.
  + Origins: violence, suffering, poetry, religion
  + Story comes from the origins of poetry itself. Valmiki inspired by witnessing an act of violence to write the Ramayana
  + Karma: action and reaction; the sum total of the effect on the universe of everything a person does
  + Dharma: cosmic law of righteousness; the guidebook for how to make the right/wise decisions. The ultimate goal is peace
  + Self is the unit of action; you make your own decisions
  + Not “fatalistic”; you can make choices and decisions that give you power over yourself. You can choose a peaceful action
  + Ahimsa (nonviolence)
  + Not an absolute value; nonviolence is a goal, but that does not mean that it forces all Hindus to be passive and never fight back
  + Absolute preference when possible (“least harm”)
  + War is not prohibited but should follow “least harm” principle
  + Hindu “just war” (dharmayuddha)?
  + If dharma justifies war and violence, it is wrong not to do it; if you are in a situation in which violence solves a situation, it is wrong not to fight
  + If you know you are fighting on the side of justice, then you should always fight on that side (if you are fighting on the side of justice, then it’s not only ok, but what you are supposed to do)
  + Mahatma Gandhi: Bhagavad Gita (the song of G-d) as metaphor and blueprint. Gandhi never went anywhere without it, because it helped him make the right decisions. Gandhi said that he had never come across a situation in which violence was the necessary course of action
  + Shanti is a personal peace, found within through living a life of harmony
  + World peace can come from individuals who cultivate shanti
  + Not all Hindus are vegetarian
  + Vegetarianism is based on purity of the vegetarian, it is not concerned with cruelty to animals
  + It is related to status (higher status is associated with vegetarianism. ie: people who are vegetarians are more pure)
  + Vahanam (consort) of Shiva. The G-d gets around the universe riding a cow
  + Cows as cosmic taxis in the service of peace
  + The five gifts of the cow: milk, manure, yogurt, butter, urine (high in nitrate, good fertilizer)
  + Hindu Nationalism:
    - Desire to make India a Hindu Nation (constitutionally and legally, it is currently a secular country)
    - Members of other religions living in India must accept themselves as second class citizens
    - Muslims got their own country with Pakistan, so Hindus should get India
    - Hindu/Indian “right of return”
    - Hinduism is not concerned with national or ethnic origins
    - Holy War to protect Hinduism
    - Downplaying nonviolence as “feminine”
    - Nuclear weapons: Agni in 1998. India carried out a series of nuclear tests and declared itself a nuclear power
    - RSS: “the national self-volunteer corp.” A Hindu Nationalist movement that says that India should be a Hindu nation and should not cater to members of other religions. Because they are self-volunteer, they cannot carry arms, because otherwise they would be a separate militia, which is forbidden by the Indian constitution
  + Respect for all pathways to spirituality
  + Cyclical time and reincarnation
  + Meditation and the interior self. Goal is to create peace with yourself, and then you are most likely to make good, peaceful decisions
* Buddhism:
  + Origins:
    - Also originated in India
    - Origins in 6th or 5th century BCE
    - Some interpretations: Buddhism as a political and social protest against the idea of status in early forms of Hinduism. Buddhism is an option in which status does not matter, and that religious spirituality does not need to be obtained through an elite
    - Others: Buddhism as doctrinal “spin-off”
  + Life is characterized by suffering and sorrow
  + Suffering and sorrow are created through attachment
  + Attachment is associated with material (sometime emotional) desire
  + Freedom and sorrow requires overcoming attachment. Not suppressing, but stilling that sense of desire. Eliminate the attachment (not all the desire, just the attachment to the thing)
  + Mahayana- school of Buddhism
    - Bodhisattva ideal: delaying complete self-enlightenment to help others (altruism)
    - Path is open for all
    - Compassion for all sentient beings
  + Theravada (“Hinayana”)
    - Path is open for those who follow the elders (monks)
    - Monastic life as ideal
    - Meditation (effort) and compassion
  + Compassion:
    - Distinctions are “illusions”. We are all human, and our essence is the most important, and the same for all
    - Reincarnation follows neither gender nor species boundaries
    - Metta: compassions for the sorrow for others (empathy), which you should work to alleviate
  + Nirvana (Nibbana):
    - Literally “no wind”
    - Attachment is like a wind that blows us off course
    - The mind also wanders around in thought searching for attachment
    - When this ceases, nirvana occurs: attachment is broken
    - Pease is the result
* African Theories of Peace and Justice:
  + African theories of peace and justice differ from one another as much as they differ from what is “non-Africa”
  + African writings on justice can be “positive” (based on African principles) or “negative” (responses to Western theories and actions)
  + Oral cultures and the second-hand archive of the past: the problem of tradition. The elite have been entrusted with the history of the various social groups (not reliant on literacy); they are a walking human encyclopedia. Respect is rooted in how well you remember the history of your people
  + Much of African tradition is often delegitimized by written cultures because it is an oral culture, therefore not trusted by members of written cultures
  + Explaining how Africa became the way it is
  + Explaining how Africa was in the past (when things were the way they were supposed to be)
  + Explaining how Africa can be in the future (predictive/prescriptive theories)
  + Post-colonial perspectives: eternally returning to the West, and its influence on Africa
  + Apartheid: South Africa as exception and rule
  + Africa-American: writing from without and writing from within (some argue that African-American theories are not pure African, but should be separate)
  + Post-Colonial theory:
    - Africa exists in three stages:
      * Pre-colonial Africa: Africa “as it was” (and should have been?)
      * Colonial Africa: Africa distorted and dismantled
      * Post-colonial Africa: Narrating and documenting the injustices of colonial Africa in the present
    - Problems:
      * Why is post-colonial Africa so diverse in its outcomes?
      * Does it make sense to homogenize pre-colonial Africa?
      * It is Eurocentric to situate the arrival of Europeans as the most important moment in African history?
    - Questions:
      * Are all acts of injustice in the present the product of the colonial experience?
      * Is an Afrocentric reconstruction of the past and present an act of justice or just another distortion in a different direction?
      * Where to situate Islam, Christianity, and Judaism? (the “outsiders” problem; how could other outsiders have come in before colonization and yet not have had such a drastic affect?)
    - Frantz Fanon (one of the foundational philosophers of post-colonial theory):
      * European imperialism revealed the hypocrisy of Western philosophy (Europeans are not following their own ideas about peace, justice, etc.)
      * The colonial moment: the indigenous was taken by the settler, and injustice became a way of life
      * The struggle to reclaim the past forces Africans into the system of the oppressor: humiliation, dehumanization, and alienation
      * The structural violence of colonization saturated Africa and still remains after decolonization
      * Decolonization was not freedom: pre-colonial structures had been dismantled, colonial structures served only colonial interests
      * Decolonized Africa therefore became “neo-colonial”: African elites took on colonial roles in colonial institutions
      * The non-elite colonized must not fight their own struggle to restore what Africa “should have been”
      * Critique against him: “Heretical Marxism”- non-elite colonized who will eventually have to rise up and overthrow the oppressive system
  + Literature and African Philosophy:
    - Ngugi Wa Thiong’o:
      * Author and playwright from Kenya
      * Teaches at UC Irvine (among other things)
      * Project:
        + Rediscovering Africa through African’s own, authentic voice: identity as narration
        + Post-colonial literature: erasing the colonizer’s language
        + Earlier wrote in English; now focuses on Gikuyu-language work; your own language is how you articulate your true sense of African self
      * Challenges:
        + Christianity and Marxism: are these colonial or post-colonial? What is the role of Marxism and Christianity in resisting colonization and its effects?
        + Provincializing Africa: seeing only trees with no forest? Africans cannot mutually understand each other because African languages are so diverse and varied
    - Chinua Achebe:
      * Nigerian writer of novels, poetry, and philosophy
      * Teaches at Brown University (among many things)
      * Project:
        + Defends the use of English
        + African languages are also “colonized” (by many sources)
        + Colonization was destructive, but personal responsibility cannot be erased; we all had choices to make
      * Challenges:
        + Must an African writer be radical? Achebe is often accused of complacency
        + Translating culture, or just making it “worthy” of a foreign audience?
      * Wole Soyinka:
        + “I don’t care about the color of the foot stepping on my neck, I just want it to stop”
        + Nigerian playwright and activist (Nobel Prize for Literature in 1986)
        + Project:

Colonialism was violent and oppressive, but so is African history and tradition

Dismantling one still leaves the other in place: justice is a much larger project (you must also dismantle the aspects of African culture that were unjust before the Europeans arrived)

Reconstructing the moral self; this should be concerned with everyone living anywhere, regardless of race (don’t only focus on Africa and its people)

* + - * + Questions:

Many complain that Soyinka ignores colonization and the uniqueness of its effects

Others complain that Soyinka is too political

* + - * + Ubuntu:

Self only exists in the company of others; we better ourselves for the sake of ourselves and each other, and those actions affect and influence others to do the same

Unity and consensus: is Ubuntu democratic? We should all reach a solution that is best for everyone and upon which everyone agrees

Economically: prosperity and sharing. Your wealth is contingent upon others’ spending, therefore you must spend your wealth and invest it back into society

Ubuntu and peace

* China Culture and Philosophy:
  + Legalism:
    - Han Fei- author of the Han Fe Zi
    - Assumes that human beings are inherently selfish
    - In order to create peace, the state must create laws to prevent people from indulging their selfishness and punish offenders of those laws; regulation via law; reward and punishment
    - Legalism is primarily about power and authority, and the enforcement of that law is what gives us peace
  + Daoism (Taoism):
    - Lao Zi: author of the Daodejing
    - Individual is inherently good. We become bad the further we get away from our true selves. Laws, being forced to do things we don’t want to do, etc. all separate us from our natural selves
    - Self is cultivated by liberation from ritual and relationships
    - The way (dao) is eternal and harmonious; the universe has a harmonious direction. We must search for The Way
  + Confucianism (Confucius=Kong Fu Zi):
    - Individual is a blank slate
    - Moral self is constructed by society and cultivated from within
    - Moral self is “embedded” in ritual and in relationships. Every day is a ritual that we go through, and we are always (to a certain extent) learning with/from others
      * 5 chief relationships (those on the right always obey those on the left, no matter what):
        + Ruler: ruled
        + Father: son
        + Elder Brother: younger brother
        + Husband: wife
        + Teacher: student
        + One egalitarian relationship: Friend: Friend
      * If you are a mentor within one of these relationships then you have an incentive to set the best example possible
    - Humaneness and benevolence are intrinsic in our relationships
    - Regulation through shame (which allows people to determine what is right and wrong, as opposed to just responding to punishment out of fear. Having humaneness and benevolence allows us to self-regulate. Self-regulation allows us to cultivate morality, and with that, peace)
* Pacific Island:
  + The story of Ina:
    - Ina was in love with Tinirau
    - Tinirau was the G-d of the ocean and lived on a floating Island
    - Ina wanted to visit Tinirau but the surf was too strong
    - Ina asked the fish for help but they were too week
    - Ina then asked the shark, who agreed to help
    - Ina cracked open some coconut shells on the shark’s head
    - The shark dumbed her back into the sea
    - That is why sharks attack humans. Because of Ina’s irresponsible behavior towards the benevolent shark, sharks are to be respected (humans hurt them first)
    - Ina started to drown
    - Tekea, the shark king, swam to her rescue
    - Ina finally made it safely to see Tinirau
  + In the Pacific Islands, sharks are seen as benevolent spirits
  + Sharks are seen as moral enforces and ancestors of benevolent spirits
  + Palau:
    - World’s first shark sanctuary- sharks may not be harmed in any way, shape, or form
    - 240,000 square miles
    - To stop “finning”
    - Call to action at the UN
    - Other Pacific Islands began to follow suit
    - From this the Save the Sharks movement arose
  + The creation of the universe is fundamentally good thing
  + That includes all things within it
  + The creation took tremendous power
  + Power can be destructive or constructive
  + Peace requires us to figure out how to make as much power as possible work in a constructive manner
  + Pacific Island values are aimed at cultivating an understanding of power
  + Cultural practice aims to cultivate constructive power
  + Knowledge is a form of power
  + Aloha (exists in every single Polynesian language)- love
  + Former Absolute Kingdom of Tonga:
    - King of Tonga: bows out in favor of democracy (2009)
    - Not westernization, but rather, given pacific islander values, relations should embody respect and affection (horizontal- friend to friend) and not vertical (with one above another)
  + New Zealand:
    - Pakeha: original settlers of European descent; white people
    - Maori: indigenous, but still settlers (around the end of 13th century), came from other surrounding Pacific Islands
    - Treaty of Waitangi:
      * Signed in 1840
      * exists in two versions: English and Maori
      * both are equally legally valid, yet they are very different
      * central treaty of the current New Zealand government
      * sovereignty does not exist in Maori culture, but the local leader must maintain respect (once respect is lost, the citizens are no longer bound by the sovereignty)
    - Both Maori and Pakeha are legally obligated to understand each other’s concepts
    - Translation versus understanding (translate the language literally and translate/understand the concepts)
    - New Zealand is a legally bilingual country
    - The Crown has “honour and integrity” which must be respected
    - The Maori have “mana [good power] and taonga [cultural treasure that must be honored and respected, such as the Maori language]”
    - Taboo: full of power [something with Taboo is very powerful]
    - Maori=tapu
      * Power can be good or bad
      * Associated with power and respect
      * Things with tapu are “set aside” because they should be handled with respect and care because they have so much power. If they are treated with the right cultural respect, the power can be very good
* Obama speech paper:
  + Have a central theme/argument that organizes the entire paper
  + First paragraph introduces two theories, how they relate to each other, and what the central theme/argument is
  + Underline or italicize or bold the central theme/argument
  + Make sure it’s coherent and that the paragraphs follow logically
  + Well-written (proof-read!)
  + Structure and format are up to you
  + First person OK
  + Sight lecture, readings, and Obama’s speech. Persuasive argument=plenty of textual evidence (use lecture and readings in about equal measure). SITE ACURATELY!!!!
  + If you use end notes, you can put them all on a last page that will not count towards the page count
  + You could use one theory to critique another, or a compare and contrast paper, etc.
  + Do not say which theory is best, though you could say one theory is better suited for explaining the speech than another. Do not try to analyze which one Obama is from
  + Challenge yourself, try writing a slightly riskier and more creative paper
* Arab Spring:
  + Cold War politics divide the world into the free west and the unfree east; ideological war, not hot war
  + Czechoslovakie uprising in 1968 called the “Prague Spring”. Refers to the thawing of rigid authoritarianism and the blossoming of freedom
  + The Arab Spring follows this same metaphor
  + Tunisia:
    - Protests start on 18 December 2010
    - Self-immolation of Mohamed Bouazizi (street vendor) (died 4 January 2011). This symbolic act unleashed an enormous amount of pent-up discontent that had not been able to be expressed in an environment of such dictatorial rule
    - Ouster of President Ben Ali on 14 January 2011
    - Elections for an interim Constituent Assembly: held 23 October 2011 (no well-functioning government January-October)
    - Ennahda party wins largest share of votes (41%)
  + People have been electing “Islamist parties” because Islamist institutions can’t change Islam
  + Egypt:
    - Protests begin 25 January 2011
    - Prominent use of social media
    - President Hosni Mubarak vows to stay
    - Mubarak eventually ousted in February 2011
    - Military as “caretaker” of the revolution
    - Democracy versus stability: regional concerns
    - Is democracy always the most peaceful government?
    - Would it be better to have a totalitarian regime if it meant regional stability?
    - Fear of “Islamist democracy”; new groups emerging
    - Trials of former ministers: Egyptian courts and international crimes?
    - Mubarak sentenced to life in prison (june 2 2012)
    - Mohamed Morsi elected president (in office June 30 2012) head of the Muslim Brotherhood
    - Muslim Brotherhood (1928): a social organization (not a political party) that promotes the protection of Islam and Islamic charity (assistance to those victimized by totalitarian rule)
    - Freedom and Justice Party (2011) is Mohamed Morsi’s party
    - Rising number of attacks on Egyptian Coptic Christians
    - Christianity as “foreign”
    - Growing sense of unease over the identity of the revolution
  + Libya:
    - Protest begin 15 February 2011
    - Country is soon split into zones of differential sovereignty
    - Civil war is the result
    - Opposition is against rule of President Muammar al-Gaddafi
    - NATO operations to “protect civilians” are expanding
    - US use of “predator drones”; Libyan government claims this is an “act of terror” and a “crime against humanity”
    - Italy, France, and UK send military advisors to assist the rebel command (Transitional National Council)
    - Fear of “mission creep”—UN gives NATO or any other country legal authority to protect civilians, but then they militaristically go outside their legal boundaries; they are creeping outside the boundaries
    - UN recognizes the National Transitional Council as the legitimate representative of Libya (16 September 2011)
    - Gaddafi is captured and killed (20 October 2011)
    - Interim elections in July 2012: coalitions of liberal and secular parties dominate
    - Mohamaed Magarief (Congress Chairman)
  + Syria:
    - Protests start 26 January 2011
    - Protests against the President Bashar al-Assad
    - Also against one-party rule (of Baath Party)- demanding multiparty democracy
    - Protesters are demanding democracy and freedom
    - Estimated up to 100,000 civilians have died in the fighting
    - How much money is “too much” to intervene? Military organization and monetary constraints
    - Incredibly diverse and multicultural; democracy and democratic transitions generally don’t go well in a multi-cultural context
    - Complex array of different communities: is democratic or authoritarian multiculturalism better?
    - Regional issues: Syria and Lebanon, Hamas in Gaza, and Middle East Peace, Iranian support
    - UN Security Council: Russia and China have vetoed any attempt for intervention on behalf of the UN
    - US election campaigns; Obama couldn’t afford getting involved in a potentially bad international relation situation
  + Yemen:
    - Protest in Sanaa versus President Saleh: government responds with violence
    - Protests start January 2011 (largest initial is on 27 January)
    - President offered to leave office within 30 days if protests stopped and if he received immunity from prosecution
    - Factions of military defect: President claims this is therefore an “illegal coup”
    - Saleh resigns 25 February 2012
    - Nobel Peace prize to Tawakkul Karman (2011)—female pro-democracy leader
    - Prize awarded for non-violent struggle and women’s rights in the service of democracy
    - “Peaceful transfer of power” is desired
    - President: pro-democracy protesters are a minority so to let them have their way is undemocratic
* Resource Wars and Ethnic Conflicts:
  + Resource wars and ethnic conflicts have caused an overwhelming amount of violence and bloodshed
  + Resource wars: struggle to control access to or distribution of lucrative resources
  + Ethnic conflicts: conflicts created over inequality, exclusion, and discrimination between different identity-based groups
* Natural Resources and the Political Economy of Conflict:
  + IPE (international political economy):
    - Economic and political power are intertwined
    - In conflicts, IPE looks to economic causes
    - Natural recourses: management, mismanagement, scarcity
  + Causality:
    - Relative inequality: “grievances” settled through conflict; one person has ten slices of pizza, the other has one, and there’s something wrong here (everyone receives a resource, but it’s not fairly distributed)
      * Grievances:
        + Relative inequality as relative deprivation (conflict to address unfair imbalance)
        + Structural inequality (conflict to dismantle the structure); there is no direct link, but it is clear that X is causing the Y inequality
    - Scarcity: demand exceeds supply for an essential resource (ex: water in California)
    - Mismanagement: greed, corruption, etc.
  + Point Resources: location-specific (oil, mines, etc.)
  + Diffuse Resources: spread throughout a region (diamonds, timber, etc.)
  + Natural Resource Curse: What should be a benefit to the state ends up having a negative and destructive impact on the state. This happens when governments are too strong or not strong enough
    - Strong states:
      * Strong states are accompanied by point resources
      * “Rentier States” : state that can utilize resource and independently generate its own wealth and therefore detach itself from the society it governs
      * Corruption, inefficiency, repression, etc. (governments can’t be held accountable because their citizens have no power over them because they are not needed because they don’t pay taxes)
    - Weak states:
      * Weak states and diffuse resources creates “warlordism”—rebellion creates a higher payoff than peacetime civilian economic opportunities; the government is too weak to prevent the rebels from obtaining arms and from controlling the resource, which tempts the warlords to obtain them
      * Zones of control; control the resource, and you have a consistent source of income and control a region/area
      * Secessionist conflict
    - Saudi Arabia:
      * Oil as income source allows for an insulated government
      * High unemployment (40-45%)
      * Rampant corruption
      * The military protects the oil as much as they protect the royal family itself
      * No developed private sector (no economic diversification) because the government doesn’t need it
      * No uprisings because the military is well paid, and therefore loyal
    - Nigeria:
      * Nearly half of national income is generated by oil
      * Oil is located in the Niger Delta region; that region is home to Ogoni people and Ogoniland
      * There are no environmental regulation, therefore the people living there are victims of continuous destruction of their home
      * They don’t reap any of the benefits from the oil, which is taken from their home
      * Multinational corruptions
      * 1957: discovery of oil and displacement of Ogoni people (inequality)
      * 1979: Constitutional amendment gives power and complete control over land and resources to the Nigerian state (structural violence)
      * 1980s: Economic, social, and political marginalization of Ogoni people (relative deprivation)
      * 1990s: open conflict occurs
    - Sierra Leone:
      * Warlordism; weak state and diffuse resource
      * Blood diamonds; in various regions controlled by warlords, the warlords chose to pay for the arms they needed to fight the government and keep the wealth with diamonds (the diamonds are financing civil wars between warlords and their countries and amongst each other)
      * Brutal and violent conflict
    - Exceptions:
      * Natural resources do not automatically lead to conflict
      * Norway (petroleum); the money is placed in a fund that is then invested in the global market, and spent on resources that everyone in the country can use (education, public transportation, infrastructure, etc)
      * Botswana (diamonds); government chooses to invest money back in infrastructure to benefit the people
    - Good Governance:
      * Open economy (fair access for every citizen)
      * Diversification of revenue and equal/fair distribution
      * Transparency
      * Rule of law
      * Participation (citizen based without fear of repercussions)
* The UN system emerged just as the Cold War started
* The Cold War dominated global politics from 1950-1990 (world deeply divided by ideology)
* After the Cold War, the UN announced that it was finally time for New Peace for the world…that didn’t happen
* China and the USSR never allied themselves over ideological disputes
* What the Cold War was:
  + Ideological divide
  + The free “West” (US and its allies)
  + The communist or “Eastern” bloc (USSR and its allies)
  + Both had their military alliances that stated that an attack on an ally was an attack on them, and they would do anything to protect them; NATO and Warsaw Pact were there to reinforce this military stance
* Two sides developed nuclear weapons
* Deterrence: no “hot” wars ever occurred (hence, “cold war”)
* Realists: this is absolute stability
* “Proxy” wars (North Vietnam was supported by USSR, and South Vietnam was fought by USA)
* Wars were fought through and in other countries; the tragedies and consequences of war took place in other countries
* Violence played out in other locations around the world
* UN could do nothing due to Security Council stalemate
* How Cold War Ended:
  + Deng Xiaoping and US-China rapprochement; starting in 1976, the two countries came together, thereby isolating the Soviet Union (it made any communist alliances impossible)
  + Mikhail Gorbachev and perestroika; Gorbachev tried to reform the USSR to strengthen it, but his reforms only hastened the collapse of the already weak USSR
  + The Berlin Wall fell and Tiananmen Square pro-democracy uprising in China
  + By the end of 1990, the Soviet Union officially ceased to exist
* The 1990s
  + Cambodia in 1991 (UNTAC) became the first place where the UN set up a transitional authority system
  + Somalia became a failed state in 1991
  + Former Yugoslavia collapses
  + South Africa: end of apartheid
  + The UN was giddy
  + 1994: Rwanda genocide; UN doesn’t get involved until it’s too late
  + Kosovo (Yugoslavia collapses again after UN brokers a peace)
  + Sierra Leone: new brutalities, UN doesn’t get involved because it was so “messy”
  + Humanitarian Intervention; UN will get involved in any major conflict in the world, but by the late 1990s, it seemed that that didn’t apply for anything deemed too “messy”
* Other Challenges:
  + Rise of China; new wealth, new power
  + Russia: corruption, crime, and conflict with new democracy
  + Global terrorism
  + Global economic crisis
* The UN falters and struggles very quickly
* Collapse of Yugoslavia:
  + The collapse of Yugoslavia after the Cold War was one of the first major challenges of the post-Cold War UN
  + Multiculturalism “on trial”
  + Yugoslavia was part of the “Soviet bloc”
  + Socialism as ideology, which meant that all ethnic identities and potential conflicts between those ethnic groups were suppressed
  + Strong state
  + Transition:
    - Mikhail Gorbachev and reform in the USSR
    - Domestic focus gave new freedom to satellite states
    - Yugoslavian state begins to weaken in the 1980s
    - Best way to strengthen the state was to focus on peoples’ ethnic identities (or, it seemed like it was)
  + Demographics:
    - Slovenia-> mostly homogenous (Slovene)
    - Croatia-> mostly Croat with a substantial Serbian minority (12%) (experienced some genocide and violence and issues)
    - Bosnia-Herzegovina-> multicultural and multireligious (completely imploded)
  + Bosnia-Herzegovina:
    - 43% Bosniak (Bosnian Muslims)
    - 17% Croat
    - 35% Serb
    - Many other groups as well
    - On eastern side of Bosnia is Serbia, on northern side is Croatia
    - The most multi-cultural part of Yugoslavia, which was the root of all the problems
    - No one group was more than 50% of the population
    - Religion:
      * Bosnian Muslims: Sunni
      * Slovenes and Croats: mostly Roman Catholic
      * Serbs, Montenegrins, and Macedonians: mostly Eastern Orthodox
    - Language:
      * All languages in the region are “Slavic”
      * Serbs and Montenegrins use the Cyrillic (Russian) alphabet, which Croats and Bosnian Muslims use Latin alphabet
    - The complex demographics of the former Yugoslavia often tempted observers to simplify the situation into “good vs. bad” or “wrong vs. right”
  + The Conflict:
    - Independence:
      * June 1991 Slovenia and Croatia (demographically the most non-multicultural) declare independence—UN recognizes the rapid declarations of independence (which contradicts all former UN policies)
      * March 1992 Bosnia-Herzegovina declares independence
      * UN is there to serve and protect international peace and security. Recognizing these new countries as independent, the UN created a legal pretext to get involved in the conflict (they couldn’t do it before because it had only been a civil war, and was not able to get involved because the conflict wasn’t on an international scale)
    - Slovenia:
      * Most ethnically homogenous of all the provinces
      * Most economically developed
    - Croatia:
      * Also economically developed
      * Ethnic Serb minority (12%) asks for “protection” from other Serbians in the region in an effort to preserve Serbian identity
      * As a response to the Serbs’ request, other Bosnian Serbs began moving into the region, which generated conflict such as mass killings; “ethnic cleansing” (Croats went after the Serbs living in Croat areas, and Serbs went after Croats living in Serbian majority areas in order to claim that territory for the Serbs). Logic of ethnic cleansing is about making that territory ethnically homogenous
      * Since WWII, the ethnic Serb minority has had reason to fear acts of terror by Croat forces
    - Bosnia:
      * Elections result in a Bosnian Muslim dominated government
      * April 5, 1992: crowds march in Sarajevo in favor of secular democracy; advocating to let things be, non-violent protests; point at which conflict was irreversible
      * Snipers fire upon the crowds causing them to disperse (anyone in favor of a multi-cultural government); snipers belonging to ethnic-based militias.
    - Mobilization:
      * Ethnicity becomes the key variable of political mobilization
      * Ethnicity becomes “Pre-fabricated” idea for security (element of least effort)
      * Those snipers never left, which meant that the city had to spate itself ethnically to avoid being fired on during daily life
      * Simplified identities manifested as a form of security
    - Serbia:
      * Serbia quickly becomes the “villain” as portrayed by the media and international actors (short, clean, easy, 2 minutes segment)
      * Going after the Serbs seen as the most efficient resolution to the conflict
      * Most of the atrocities were coming out of Serbia, therefore all Serbian militias were being targeted by international actors
      * Atrocities committed by all actors
      * International efforts focus on constraining Serbia
    - Key Persons:
      * Slobodan Milosevic: Serbian political leader, believed the peace would result when ethnicities separated and societies became mono-ethnic
      * Radovan Kradzic: Bosnian Serb political leader
      * Ratko Mladic: Serbian military leader, commanded them to engage in ethnic cleansing
      * All were immediately turned into the villains of the conflict who were responsible for everything
    - Strategy 1:
      * May 1992: UN recognizes independence of Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia
      * UN can only intervene in international conflicts
    - Strategy 2:
      * Recognition rewards ethnic mobilization
      * Ethnic cleansing: matching territory with identity
      * Multiculturalism as a liability
      * Homogeneity as an asset
      * UN’s pretext for getting involved in the conflict is the exact opposite of what they preached
    - Strategy 3:
      * UN “safe havens” in 1993; UN created parcels of territory in which a specific ethnic group would be protected. This approach allowed one to leave the safe haven, but only those belonging to the ethnicity were allowed back in. Croation militias left the haven to attack Serbian villages, and then retreated back to their protected haven. This caused militias to begin firing upon UN troops because they were perceived of taking sides because they were only protecting non-Serbians
      * Recognizing geography while denying ethnicity?
      * Violence escalates
    - Srebrenica:
      * Safe havens used as launch points for Bosnian raids
      * Serbs declare UN peacekeepers “legitimize targets”
      * Safe havens overrun
      * UN troops pulled out of the safe havens for fear of being targeted to Srebrenica
      * Massacre of over 7500 men and boys
      * Single most violent occurrence in the conflict
    - UN and NATO:
      * UN invokes Chapter VII of UN Charter (authorizes use of lethal force)
      * NATO is authorized to use force on behalf of the UN; NATO is deputized so that it can become a justice and peace enforcer
      * “Enforcing” justice?
    - Dayton:
      * Peace talks in Dayton, Ohio
      * November 1995: Dayton Peace Accords signed
      * Let’s find everyone who were engaged in violence and invite them to the peace talks. People of Yugoslavia said that they were the last people who should be being rewarded
      * Rewards those who used violence and mobilization ethnicity
      * Divides region into ethnic enclaves and blocs
      * Result of accords was another conflict in Kosovo
    - Kosovo:
      * Dayton Accords did not deal with Kosovo
      * Serbian leaders: Dayton has an anti-Serbian bias
      * Kosovo was a part of Serbia
      * Kosovo, though part of Serbia (which has a Serbian majority) has an ethnic Albanian majority (90%); Serbs are the minority within the Serbian province
      * After the accords, Serbia declares that it will not give up any more territory
      * Slobodan Milosevics: Kosovo is the “heart” of Serbia
      * Kosovo was an autonomous region; that autonomy was eliminated in an effort to strengthen Serbia after the humiliation of the Peace Accords
      * Serbs wanted to remove autonomy to take Kosovo back
      * Nationalism and “dignity”
      * Nonviolence and Violence:
        + Ibrahim Rugova was the leader of the Democratic League of Kosovo and an outspoken nonviolence activist
        + Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) was formed to protect the Albanians
        + Militancy wins out
        + KLA: “just cause” means “just war”; our very existence and survival is at stake, therefore, anything we do is legal and justifiable
        + Serbian leaders: Anti-Serb terrorists must be stopped (because Kosovo was a part of the state, and was taking up arms against the state)
        + Both sides begin committing atrocities
      * Peace Talks:
        + Held in France
        + Rewards leaders who use violence to champion ethnic identity
        + Albanians want independence
        + Civil society, nonviolence actors not invited, instead, military leaders invited
        + Serbs wanted Kosovo to remain in Serbia
        + Talks accomplish nothing, which leads to more violence
      * March 1999: NATO begins aerial bombing campaign to try to force Serbia back to the negotiating table
      * Targets areas used and claimed by Serbs
      * Lasts 78 days
      * Accidental bombing of the Chinese embassy by USA
      * Over 1 million Albanian refugees flee to Albania from Kosovo
      * Humanitarian crisis
      * Serb leaders: not refugees but Albanians “returning home”
      * Bombing campaigns force Serbs to accept terms of peace talks
      * Small UN forces left in place to “keep the peace”
      * Future referendum for resolution of Albanian issue
      * Albanians say the UN protected the Serbs, and the Serbs claim that the UN protected the Albanians
      * Refugees return: revenge killings begins
      * UN investigates and promisess justice
      * UN sets up International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia (ICTY); people who had been invited to peace negotiations were now on trial for genocide, ethnic cleansing, and war crimes
      * UN couldn’t do anything in the conflict, so they tried to serve out justice
      * Kosovo declared independence in February 2008
      * July 2012: ICJ states that Kosovo’s declaration is not illegal
      * US, EU and nearly half of UN recognize Kosovo
      * China and Russia do not
      * Serbia: We will never recognize Kosovo’s independence (October 2010)
* Ecotourism:
  + Avoiding the sites that everyone goes to, but not necessarily focused on the environment
  + Responsible tourism
  + Conservation through ecologically responsible travel
  + Responsible travel to natural areas which conserves the environment and improves the welfare of local people
  + Raise sensitivity to host countries’ political, environmental, and social climate
* Somalia:
  + Somalia is ethnically homogenous
  + Somalia is religiously homogenous
  + Somalia is divided along complex lines of clans (extended family lineages) (sometimes called “tribalism”)
  + Independence in 1960
  + Previously a British colony (and then partly under Italian control)
  + Pan-Somalism (we’re all just Somali people) and tensions with Ethiopia and Kenya
  + Cold War politics; during the cold war, there was no familiarity with Somalia, and therefore, when there were issues in the country, no one knew anything about it
  + Clan-based politics
  + Mohammad Siad Barre: military regime change (1969)
  + Came into power through a coup
  + Stayed in power 1969-1991 because he created an alliance of clan leaders who accepted him as the state leader
  + Supreme Revolutionary Council
  + “end of tribalism, end of corruption”
  + “Peacekeepers”: government appointed local leaders
  + Engaged in a war with Ethiopia to gain land where there were Somalis living. He lost, and in doing so, was viewed as a weak leader, and the support from the clan leaders was slowly withdrawn
  + January 26, 1991: invasion of Mogadishu (capital city) by coalition of clan leaders
  + United Somali Congress (USC)—interim government, during which they were going to decide who would be the next leader
  + Mohamed Farah Aidid (leader of USC)—expected to be the next president, but the clan leaders and clan militias could not agree
  + Somalia breaks into different zones, each under different warlord control
  + When the old government is ousted, but a new government cannot be created (No central government): Failed State
  + Loss of central leadership, increasingly becomes more dangerous with issues between clans
  + Food supply is disrupted: famine
  + May 1991: Somaliland declares independence, but the UN does not recognize it. UN calls on all other UN countries to not recognize it.
  + Somaliland: defacto state that is economically stable and holds regular elections
  + UNSC Resolution 794 (3 December 1992): humanitarian mandate for UN to intervene in Somalia to deliver food to those without access to food (300,000 people had died as the result of the famine)
  + UNITAF: United Task Force (US-led coalition); only authorized to provide food aid
  + Humanitarian Intervention and mandate
  + First time UN invoked Ch. VII powers without authorization from host country/central government
  + Confused Mandate:
    - UN mandate: secure a safe environment to alleviate suffering (food aid)
    - “Warlord mandates”: protect one’s clan and show strength
    - Boutros Boutros-Ghali (secretary general of UN) mandate: prove the UN is relevant and capable
    - US mandate: election campaign and need to prove that the US can be a “moral superpower”
  + Failures:
    - Somalia: from “grave humanitarian emergency” to “failed state”
    - UN Special Representative Mohammed Sahnoun: reality versus ideal. Brokered arrangement with different warlord and clan leaders to stop fighting and let the UN agents in, but they get to deliver the food to their people (so that they look strong)
    - UN rejects plan because it doesn’t want to deal with clans (old fashioned, and wants to build Somalia into a “proper, civilized state”
    - UNITAF failure: nationalism versus internationalism; Somali leaders declared war against the UN because they wanted to build their own country, and not allow the international community to decide how to build their country
    - Operation Restore Hope (1992); original operation to deliver food aid to Blackhawk Down (October 1993); moment in the conflict where an American helicopter was shot down by clan leaders, and some American troops who went in to rescue their comrades were killed
  + Because the UN decided to intervene in a way that said “we will show you how to lead and build a nation-state” without involving local leaders, the conflict escalated
  + UNSC Resolution 814: establish the rule of law and create a secure environment in Somalia
  + UN wanted to bring Somalia back into the “civilized world of nations”
  + Agenda for Peace: Somalia as the first test case
  + From feeding the “good” to punishing the “bad”: the June 1993 killing of Pakistani peacekeepers
  + Unlike Yugoslavia, Somalia was not an international conflict; it was a domestic security problem, which the UN is not allowed to get involved in unless the host country invites them in. The UN was able to get involved because there was no central government to invite them in/tell them not to come
  + Feeding those suffering transitioned into a mission to punish warlords/the bad, and the UN was then viewed as a hostile, unwanted force
  + Black Hawk Down:
    - US and UN forces collaborate and cooperate
    - Security operation: find and punish Farah Aidid (viewed as the most dangerous warlord)
    - UN and US were so determined to punish these warlords that they were willing to accept collateral damage
    - 3 October 1993: operation to get Farah Aidid ends in disaster. An American black hawk helicopter was shot down by clan militiamen
  + UN and US now looking for an exit strategy in a very messy situation
  + US congress immediately issues withdrawal notice (by March 1994)
  + US refused to recognize genocide in Rwanda is because they didn’t want another “Somalia” or “African mess”
  + US Africa policy dramatically changes; US disengages from “mess Africa”
  + US security policy: “overwhelming force”; once you make the decision to seek a military solution to a problem, you go in 100% (show “mine is bigger”)
  + Agenda for Peace: a bunch of nice words? Went into Somalia with the idea of feeding people, and after inciting so much violence, the UN chose to leave
  + Humanitarian Intervention: legal and political reluctance. Think things through before jumping in when people need help
  + US and UN: an uneasy relationship
  + Peacekeeping: more trouble than it is worth? (UN is gone by 1995)
  + Broke strong US-UN ties, which had been considered a hallmark of the UN relationships (people thought that had the US gone in without partnership with the UN, things would have gone better)
  + Somalia is considered a failed state
  + Transitional Federal Government (TFG): sovereignty without power. Set up by the UN for the sole purpose of creating a legal entity that the UN could interact with
  + Informal economies: “hawala” money transfer and globalized finance; an informal way to get Somalia back online with the global economy, but was not recognized by any international system. Economy left to its own devises, currency began to circumvent the system
  + Piracy: from food aid to economic plunder (who is stealing from whom? Who failed whom?); trying to survive, not receiving food aid or any type of assistance from UN or anyone else
  + Now (22 years since initial collapse):
    - President Hassan Sheikh Mohamud elected September 2012
    - First presidential election held in Somalia since 1967
* Terrorism and Piracy represent major challenges to international politics and global trade
* They both involve the use of violence
* They both are perpetrated by non-state actors
* Piracy:
  + Piracy has been around for a long time
  + First “universal crime” in international law; because pirates are a threat to the entire international system, if a pirate is caught, any country can arrest and try that pirate in any court of law
  + Goal: to “steal” the wealth of nations
  + Many pirates are seen as a challenge to an unjust order
  + Does the lack of justice in the world order justify violence against innocent persons?
  + Piracy is a protest against an unjust global economic state; we’re not stealing from you, you stole from us, and we’re getting our fair share back
  + Physical piracy: stopping and taking goods from their scheduled recipient
  + Intellectual piracy: doesn’t require you to be on a boat!!
  + Violent vs. Nonviolent
  + Two piracy hot spots are in Southeast Asia and Somalia
    - Southeast Asia:
      * Corruption: corrupt officials will be bribed by pirates to not be arrested
      * Terrorism
      * Legal confusion in international law: whose water territory are the pirates in? Pirates take advantage of confusing maritime and legal boundaries
    - Somalia:
      * Lack of state protection
      * Poverty and global wealth: collapsed economy surrounded by ships with billions of dollars’ worth of cargo
      * Plenty of weapons available because there has been a constant state of violence with clan militias since the collapse
  + Targets: international shipping and ransom-based income
  + Piracy insurance is very expensive
  + Cost is added to goods, which we buy
  + Resolution:
    - Current approach: more military patrols
    - Structural approach: long term (not politically attractive)
    - Structural approach: who should pay (not economically attractive)
    - Piracy has continued to expand in the past five years, meaning that military action is not an ideal, effective long-term solution
    - Eliminating piracy means going after the structural issues
* Terrorism:
  + No single legally binding definition
  + All usually involve international harm or killing of civilians and coercion against official or legitimate actors
  + Violence is always an integral element
  + Is terrorism an acceptable strategy in situations of power asymmetry?
  + Is terrorism only wrong because states say it is?
  + Basic Elements:
    - Violence is acceptable, necessary, and effective
    - Use of violence is explicitly justified
    - Terrorist act: Goal+target+audience
    - Fear (terror) is the “amplifier”
  + Different Types:
    - Political (“I want this regime ousted”. Once that group is gone, the terrorist cell’s job is done)
    - Ideological
    - Religious—most difficult to deal with because it has open-ended demands and/or goals
  + Domestic (not as big a worry to the world because you can simply not go to that country)
  + International (makes people much more nervous because no matter where you are, you could be a target)
  + Terror is always an illegal tactic
  + Terrorist groups--illegal
  + Guerilla warfare—legal so long as they don’t adopt terror tactics
  + Insurgent groups—legal so long as they don’t adopt terror tactics
  + National liberation—legal so long as they don’t adopt terror tactics
  + Examples:
    - Different types of terrorism and different types of groups
    - Religious:
      * Domestic or international
      * Tend to radicalize quickly (“true believers”—want to entire world to join that “right” religion)
      * Goals tend to be vague, open-ended, or unattainable
      * The “permanent mandate” problem; makes it difficult to initiate an end to the terrorists’ design (can’t religiously purify the entire world)
      * Aum Cult:
        + Led by Shoko Asahara in 1984
        + Attracted those who felt marginalized by society, including some who were very wealthy
        + Didn’t initially want to purify Japan through violence. Began with running for office to implement policies. None were elected. Japan was thus viewed as hopelessly lost and corrupt, and thus violence was the only answer
        + “Purification through violence”
        + Because of the cult’s belief in reincarnation, they believed that the greatest kindness they would do to an impure person would be to kill them, so that they could be reborn and pure
        + Elimination of “impurities” so that Japan can become an enlightened country
        + Tokyo subway attack (Sarin gas) in March 1995—more people in the Tokyo subway system than in any other country in the world. Scientist followers developed a liquid version of Sarin gas, but thankfully the scientists were pretty bad. 12 people died, and 5000 were injured. The goal was to kill 5 million people. Sarin gas effects people’s sleep, and more specifically, their nightmares. This made victims fear falling asleep; the condition is irreversible
      * Al-Qaeda:
        + Formerly led by Osama bin Laden
        + Purification of Islam
        + Main manifesto: opposed to US foreign policy because it has brought the “non-Islamic government of the US” into Islamic countries, which is not ok
        + Purification of the world through Islam
        + Not just Islam, but their interpretation of Islam (thus, they carry out attacks against “bad Muslims”
        + Violent jihad: to defend the “only true faith”
        + End of jihad: when the world is united through Islam (and only Islam) (Permanent Mandate Problem)
* Laws of War:
  + Jus ad bellum (“right to wage war” or just war doctrines): determining conditions whereby the use of lethal force is permissible (were your actions initiating hostilities legal?)
  + Jus in bello (“right/law in wartime”): determining permissible actions and tactics once hostilities have begun
  + International Humanitarian Law: “laws of war” (comprehensive term)
  + Aggression in International Law:
    - Aggression: legal term for illegal use of force (non-defensive use of force)
    - Article 2.4 of the UN Charter (banning the threat and use of force) is central; the use of force is illegal
    - Nothing in the UN Charter bans the existence of armies or military expansion
    - Defensive purposes only: you have a legal right as a country to defend yourself
    - Domestic security not covered by international law (the UN doesn’t give a crap unless it’s a civil war or human rights issue)
  + Defining Aggression:
    - No legally binding definition of aggression exists (yet)
    - Wars of aggression are international crimes (against peace)
  + Applying International Law:
    - All warfare is under the jurisdiction of international law
    - Article 51of UN Charter: states engaging in defensive acts must notify the Security Council that they feel that they are engaging in defensive acts and why they are doing it
  + Self Defense:
    - “Anticipatory self-defense” or “pre-emptive self-defense” (the attack you are trying to thwart must be imminent)
    - Terrorism and the need for codification (all acts of aggression, violence, and war, require definitions)
  + Central Elements of Legal Self-Defense:
    - Necessity: no other alternative exists, or all other alternatives have been exhausted
    - Proportionality: only sufficient use of force as is required to neutralize the threat or harm of aggression is permitted (action beyond that would constitute aggression)
  + Jus In Bello and Laws of War:
    - Henry Dunant (1859): Cruelty and intentional suffering did not provide a strategic or tactical advantage (don’t create more suffering or kill wounded people for target practice if you’ve already won)
    - Created the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
    - Neutrality and compassion: (only jus in bello, not jus ad bellum) not going to pass judgment or take sides, but their job is to solely alleviate suffering; assistance to anyone who is wounded, regardless of which side they’re on
    - Geneva Conventions (1949):
      * Govern all aspects of armed force anywhere and everywhere in the world (apply to even non-state actors)
      * GC 1 (Wounded and sick combatants on land)
      * GC 2 (wounded and sick combatants at sea)
      * GC 3: (prisoners of war)
      * GC 4 (non-combatants and civilians)
      * Two optional protocols (1977): enhanced protection of non-combatants and civilians and application of laws of war to internal and civil wars
      * Those accused of war crimes violated the Geneva Conventions
      * Prisoners of war must be treated “humanely”
      * No unnecessary suffering or killing
      * Prohibition of weapons and tactics that create unnecessary suffering (weapons have to be evaluated and approved)
      * No indiscriminate violence (must always distinguish between combatants and non-combatants)
      * Collateral Damage:
        + The intentional targeting of civilians is a war crime
        + Collateral Damage: when, in the course of a legitimate military operation (done in accordance with the laws of war), civilians are killed unintentionally or accidentally
      * Combatants:
        + Law requires legal combatants to possess four characteristics simultaneously:

Uniform or symbol that clearly distinguishes from non-combatants

Weapons must be carried openly

Must be a part of a recognizable chain of command (rank)

Must fight and conduct operations in accordance with the laws of war

* + - * It is a war crime to act like a civilian and then engage in hostilities (which is why terrorists and terrorism is always a crime; they look like civilians and engage in lethal violence)
      * Command and Responsibility:
        + Hierarchy is essential to military structure
        + “Just following orders”: does not eliminate culpability (legal responsibility); not a legitimate defense
        + Commanding officers: responsibility to know
        + Laws of war require accountability of those in combat
        + The higher up in military rank you go, the greater legal responsibility you have (responsible for those who answer to you as well as yourself)
      * Terrorists and “illegal combatants”:
        + Terrorists do not abide y any of the legal requirements for combatants
        + They also intentionally target civilians
        + Terrorism is therefore always and everywhere illegal
        + It is illegal for legitimate combatants to use terror tactics
        + War law is indifferent to the “justness” of the cause
      * Military Targets:
        + Only legitimate military target and structures may be targeted
        + Hospitals, schools, religious structures, embassies, art museums, “culturally important” sites, etc: all are off limits
        + If a non-military site is used for military purposes, it becomes a legitimate military target (even if there are civilians present)
        + Human Shields:

Use of human shields (civilians): illegal for the side that uses the benefits, not for the side that targets (unless intentionally going after the civilians)

* + - * Non-Lethal Weapons:
        + Often called “less than lethal”
        + Designed to incapacitate rather than kill
        + Goal: war without casualties
        + Will this make war more attractive?
        + Is deathless warfare nonviolent?
        + Taser, non-lethal ray gun
* Humanitarian Intervention:
  + Legal Issues:
    - UN Charter is a legal document
    - Intervention without consent seemed to violate article 2.7
    - Humanitarian intervention might be illegal
    - What specific conditions would authorize intervention without consent?
    - How much suffering was “unacceptable”?
    - Who would determine when intervention was necessary?
  + The UN cannot agree on specific definitions and conditions
  + Humanitarian intervention is still discussed but begins to fade in the 1990s
  + AT WHAT POINT ARE CONCERNS FOR LEGAL RAMIFICATIONS OF INTERVENTION NOT A DECENT EXCUSE FOR NOT INTERVENING (Rwanda genocide)??????? WHY ISN’T “IT’S ILLEGAL” THE SAME AS “I WAS JUST FOLLOWING ORDERS”???
  + Concerns:
    - Failures and mistakes of UN operations in the 1990s
    - Nationalism and the suffering of others; peace keeping interventions had issues because people couldn’t understand why their people were being killed to fix another country’s problems
    - Suspicion of a UN “agenda for democracy”
* Responsibility To Protect (replacement for humanitarian intervention) R2P:
  + Attempt to retain as much of the presence of humanitarian intervention without violating the UN charter
  + Was there really nothing the UN could do in the face of so much suffering?
  + UN mandate: international peace and security
  + Original UN assumption: peace and security involved use of force
  + UN under Kofi Annan: maybe security could involve more than just the use the force
  + Insecurity could occur in a number of forms
  + Human Security:
    - Individuals have an inherent right o live in a security environment
    - Beyond the use of force
    - New, expanded definition of “international peace and security”; personal, environmental, health, food, etc. security
  + Legal arguments:
    - Individuals had a right to security
    - If the UN could not intervene, then member-states had an obligation to provide security to their citizens
* Tourism is a part of economic development
* Millennium Development Goals (MDG)
  + Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
  + Achieve universal primary education
  + Promote gender equality and empower women
  + Reduce child mortality
  + Improve maternal health
  + Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases
  + Ensure environmental sustainability
  + Develop a global partnership for development
  + Goals developed by the UN to create a platform for orchestrating global economic development
  + How they work:
    - Target system: incremental goals by year
    - Review summits every 5 years; 2015 is when the first massive summit will be
    - Country reports (3 years), regional reports (2 years), etc.
  + Problems:
    - Difficult to measure progress
    - Nothing new in goals
    - Not sufficiently ambitious
    - No vision of success (what does economic inequality mean?? What are we actually working towards??)
* Globalization:
  + Idea is global economic integration leads to prosperity for all
  + Goal: integrate countries into global economy
  + Method: drop trade barriers and expand free trade
  + Criticism:
    - Integration benefits those who are well-positioned in the global economy
    - Free trade does not mean fair trade
    - Globalization therefore globalized inequality (prosperity only for some)
    - The end of local culture?
* Debt Forgiveness:
  + Idea is that poor countries spend too much money repaying debt, and therefore can’t enter the global economy
  + Cancelling or “forgiving” the debt would allow them to pursue development and integrate into the global economy
  + The debt of forgiveness assumes that countries with debt are either not responsible for that debt (perhaps borrowed by a corrupt leader and the citizens shouldn’t be punished) or incurred the debt through manipulation by developed countries (implies that developing countries aren’t smart enough)
* Microcredit:
  + Goal: use of “social collateral” to provide entrepreneurial loans to the poorest of the poor; someone without collateral can be vouched for by others who will then have to sign onto the loan. This allows villagers to have access to money that they get to control directly
  + Bypasses institutions to go straight to the main actors
  + Grameen Bank:
    - Founded in 1970s by Muhammad Yunus
    - Focus on women as recipients of loans (women spend most of their time at home and are therefore easier to find)
    - “we are a bank—never forget this” (this is not charity, there is still interest and they still make a profit)
    - Teaches capitalism and thrift
    - Designed to teach villagers the virtue of capitalism and living within your means
    - Sixteen Decisions:
      * All loan recipients must agree to live their lives in accordance with the code of conduct
      * Controversy: associates wealth with “good” behavior, so the poor must be “bad”
      * Decision 15: “if we come to know of any breach of discipline in any center, we shall all go there and help restore discipline”
      * You cannot get out of the 16 decisions
* Poverty Studies:
  + Very trendy: race to build the biggest and wealthiest poverty centers
  + Universities as channels of philanthropy
  + Ideas:
    - Better to give money to people (academics) who study the poor rather than to the poor themselves
    - Poverty as a career move: huge amounts of money made available to study the poor
  + The newest export: celebrities
  + Poverty as an “event”: welcome to the global cocktail party
  + Number one goal has transitioned to getting on the A-list to raise money; the interest is not in going to those poor countries, but to get into the fancy cocktail parties because it makes them feel like they’re actually doing something
  + What would the end of poverty achieve?
* Second Assignment:
  + You are the expert and you are evaluating the USIP report
  + You are using your case study as your evidence (which come from outside sources)
  + Use the class readings to help you understand aspects of your case study and/or the article
  + ADEQUATELY SUPPORT YOUR CASE STUDY!
  + First person is fine
  + Different parts of countries are different (maybe focus on a specific part of the country…?)
  + Can quote lecture, but can’t be s substitute for readings