

Ethics and Peacebuilding

SIS 419.020/619.025

Spring 2010



Guns into Plowshares,
Washington DC
Photo by K. Joosten, 2005

American University
School of International Service
Spring 2010
Monday 2:10-4:50
Room: Asbury 222

Dr. Reina Neufeldt
Office: McKinley 206A, x2510
Email: neufeldt@american.edu
Office Hours: Tues. 3:00 – 4:30, Thurs.
12:30-2:30 or by appointment

Course Description and Objectives

This graduate seminar will explore ethical dilemmas in international peacebuilding. It will seek to answer the questions: What ethical dilemmas arise in peacebuilding? How can we assess these dilemmas? Are ethical peacebuilding interventions possible? And, how can we improve ethical peacebuilding practice?

The course will divide ethical dilemmas into three categories of analysis: dilemmas that arise within peacebuilding paradigms, peacebuilding policies, and on-the-ground practices. First, we will explore dilemmas that arise within peacebuilding paradigms – that is, the values at stake and tensions within different worldviews and ways of thinking about peacebuilding writ-large. We will then explore the values and tensions that arise within policies that frame peacebuilding interventions as well as on-the-ground practices.

The course is designed to improve student's abilities to reflect upon and engage with ethical challenges that arise within peacebuilding. Over the course, students will be introduced to a number of core ethical theories, concepts and frameworks. Throughout the course, students will bring together concepts with real-world cases. The case applications are intended to ground and deepen our understanding of ethics in peacebuilding. Films, simulations and guest speakers will be used to enhance our understanding of the types of dilemmas that arise in peacebuilding practice.

The course aims to broaden students understanding of ethics and ethical challenges in peacebuilding, to explore theoretical and conceptual tools for analyzing ethical dilemmas and develop skills in designing ethical responses to the challenges that arise in peacebuilding practice. The course is designed primarily as a seminar, which means it will be largely discussion-based with some lectures. Students are expected to participate regularly and actively in discussions and analysis of the readings. Overall, the course seeks to help students think analytically and reflexively about ethical theory and practice in peacebuilding.

Learning Outcomes

- Knowledge of the history, development and current expression of ethical thought in peacebuilding and conflict resolution;
- Knowledge of the basic concepts of peacebuilding and ethics;
- Understanding of the major approaches to peacebuilding, including their characteristics, actors/institutions, strengths and weaknesses;
- Capacity to analyze key arguments and evidence strengthened;
- Awareness of ethical challenges and issues in peacebuilding;
- Capacity to analyze ethical dimensions of peacebuilding;
- Capacity to engage in reflexive ethical practice.

Required Textbooks

Murithi, Tim. 2009. The Ethics of Peacebuilding. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Paris, Roland & Timothy Sisk (Eds). 2009. The Dilemmas of Statebuilding: Confronting the contradictions of postwar peace operations. NY: Routledge.

Todorov, Tzvetan. (1984) The Conquest of America: the question of the other. Richard Howard (Trans.). NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Additional Recommended Texts:

Price, Richard M. (Ed.) 2008. Moral Limit and Possibility in World Politics. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Jarstead, Anna K. and Timothy D. Sisk (Eds.) 2008. From War to Democracy: Dilemmas of Peacebuilding. NY: Cambridge University Press.

Course Requirements and Expectations

Seminar Participation	25%
Analytical Papers (5)	25%
Simulation Papers (2)	20%
Research Paper	30%

Participation (25%): This course will largely be run as a seminar. This means that lectures will be kept to a minimum in order to introduce topics, concepts or cases, and a substantial portion of class time will be dedicated to a discussion format. On several occasions we will also utilize simulations to deepen our exploration of ethical dilemmas in practice.

A seminar is in many ways a conversation among people who share a common interest in expanding their understanding of an idea or a specific topic; in our class we are expanding our understanding of peacebuilding and ethics. Seminars provide a setting wherein you share your views and listen to those views and insights around you on a specific topic in order to expand, improve and deepen our collective understanding. A seminar promotes the skills of conversation, a complex set of habits and attitudes which, in large part, determine our abilities to deal with others in a group setting and are helpful in conflict resolution practice. The discussions that begin in-class will hopefully continue outside the classroom (over dinner, in the pub). The rationale for seminar-style learning rests on the finding that students learn far more from actively talking and listening to each other than they do from listening passively to a lecturer. Further, students remember what they learn in a seminar better than they do with lectures. Unfortunately, successful seminars do not just happen. Those

participating have to work to create and sustain a conversational setting in which, individually and collectively, the aims of the seminar are realized as fully as possible. This demands a continuing commitment from everyone to make the enterprise work. In our seminars, we will use three or four key questions as a launching point for our exploration and analysis of the readings each week to which you will need to contribute constructively and analytically. Course readings need to be completed before coming to class in order to contribute appropriately and really delve into the subject-matter at hand.

What am I looking for in good class discussion?¹

- Evidence of careful reading and preparation, including factual details (please do all of the assigned readings for class, and if you have time look at some of the recommended readings in a given paradigm to enrich our discussion);
- Contributions that are logically consistent, original and use relevant evidence;
- Comments that are clear, enthusiastic and respectful;
- Comments that contribute and are appropriate to the discussion, such as building-on other's ideas, providing constructive criticism, asking constructive, analytical questions, or contributions that show that you were listening carefully to others.

Small Group Discussions and Class Presentations: You will be divided into small groups and required to represent a particular branch of ethical thought in analyzing topics and dilemmas in some of our class sessions. While you are expected to understand all of the different branches of ethical thought we explore in-class, you will be responsible to your group for in-depth analysis of one approach in particular. Your other group members will be likewise tasked with a different branch of ethical thought. Each of you will apply one approach (e.g. ethics of care, virtue ethics) to the dilemmas being explored during that week's class and readings and be prepared to present to your group: 1) how problems are approached; 2) what is important; and 3) what it suggests for how to respond to the dilemma(s). Groups will be called upon to present key insights from their discussion to the rest of class (for example, points of tension, strengths and weaknesses of particular approaches, points of convergence and divergence between approaches with respect to how one might respond to dilemmas, and any ongoing challenges or outstanding questions).

Analytical Papers (25%): Between weeks three and nine, you are required to write five (5) analytical papers, which are each worth 5% of your grade. The analytical paper must be submitted on the day which we discuss the reading in class. The analytical papers should be no more than (2) pages in length (double spaced, 12 pt font; page count does not include bibliography; use Chicago Manual of Style or APA format for your citations). In the analytical papers you need to: 1) briefly summarize one of the scholarly readings assigned for the week and identify its key argument (select from the required reading book chapters or journal articles that are more than twenty pages in length); 2) identify the empirical evidence that most strongly supports the key argument; 3) identify a weakness with the evidence and

¹ Adapted from Maryann Cusimano-Love (Catholic University).

argument; and 4) conclude with your own thoughts. The papers are due before class starts (hand in hard copies unless otherwise instructed). You will be graded on: accuracy of summary, organization and clarity, depth and quality of analysis.

Simulation Papers (2 papers, total 20%): We will run two substantial simulations in class. You are required to write a paper reflecting on the ethical dimensions of your actions in each simulation. Each paper should be no more than eight pages in length, and include a bibliography for materials you reference (bibliography not included in page count). In the paper, review your actions and assess them based on at least two ethical frameworks that we have covered in class. The simulation papers are due one week after the class in which the simulation occurred.

Research Paper (30%): A research paper is due by 5pm on May 3, 2010. The paper should be a 15-18 page research paper (double spaced, 12 pt font; page count does not include bibliography; use Chicago Manual of Style or APA format for your citations) that analyzes a particular ethical dilemma or moral problem of your choice and suggests a course of action. Choose one of the ethical approaches that we have discussed in class as your frame for analysis. In your paper, provide background and context for your problem (who are the actors involved, what are they doing, where are they located). In suggesting your course of action, address any problems or concerns that might arise from the competing perspectives of the other schools (e.g. concern regarding outcomes if you are taking a virtue ethics approach). Draw in additional resources to ground your approach (go beyond class readings).

Paper Deadline Policy: The research proposal and your analytical papers are due at the start of class in hard copy unless otherwise instructed. The research paper is due by 5pm on April 28 2010, and can be submitted electronically via blackboard or in hard copy at SIS Faculty Services (get it time and date stamped). Papers not turned in on-time will lose 1/3 of a grade (e.g. a B+ becomes a B) and further mark penalties will be incurred over time, except in cases of genuine emergency.

Academic Integrity: Students are expected to follow the standards of academic integrity set forth by the University. Violations of academic integrity will not be treated lightly, and disciplinary actions will be taken. Please see me if you have any questions about what constitutes a violation of academic integrity. You can read the University's full Academic Integrity Code here: <http://www.american.edu/academics/integrity/code/htm>

Grading Policy: "F": Failing work. "D": Lack of fundamental knowledge of the material but sufficient knowledge for a passing grade. "C": Satisfactory knowledge of the basic information or data presented in the course. This is primarily knowledge of the "facts" or content and involves memorizing details and material. "B": Good ability to explain how certain issues and events are related to one another according to explanations currently held in the field; sees relationships between events and theories and can reproduce arguments. "A": Excellent, independent and original thinking and/or creative work.

Background Readings: If you have not taken a substantial conflict resolution or peacebuilding course before the following readings should be done in preparation:

Harbom, Lotta & Wallensteen, Peter. 2009. Armed Conflicts, 1946-2008. *Journal of Peace Research*, 46(4): 577-587.

Galtung, Johan. 1969. Violence, peace and peace research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 7(3): 167-191.

Kriesberg, Louis (2007). "Contemporary Conflict Resolution Applications" in C.A. Crocker, F. Osler Hampson and P. Aall (eds) *Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World*. Washington, DC: USIP Press.

Emergency Preparedness

In the event of a declared pandemic (influenza or other communicable disease), American University will implement a plan for meeting the needs of all members of the university community. Should the university be required to close for a period of time, we are committed to ensuring that all aspects of our educational programs will be delivered to our students. These may include altering and extending the duration of the traditional term schedule to complete essential instruction in the traditional format and/or use of distance instructional methods. Specific strategies will vary from class to class, depending on the format of the course and the timing of the emergency. Faculty will communicate class-specific information to students via AU e-mail and Blackboard, while students must inform their faculty immediately of any absence due to illness. Students are responsible for checking their AU e-mail regularly and keeping themselves informed of emergencies. In the event of a declared pandemic or other emergency, students should refer to the AU Web site (www.prepared.american.edu) and the AU information line at (202) 885-1100 for general university-wide information, as well as contact their faculty and/or respective dean's office for course and school/ college-specific information.

For this course, if the university closes some course requirements will be adapted, and we will utilize blackboard extensively as a platform to provide the basic structure for our class, assignments and group discussions.

Course Outline

Week 1: January 11

Introduction

- Review syllabus, course objectives, course format and learning objectives
- The challenge: ethical peacebuilding

- Reflective practice and moral limits

Required Readings

- Lederach, John Paul, Reina Neufeldt and Hal Culbertson. 2007. Reflective Peacebuilding: A Planning, Monitoring and Learning Toolkit. Mindanao, PH: Kroc Institute and CRS. Read Chapters 1 through 3 (pp.1-16). Available on blackboard.

Recommended Reading:

- Spector, Malcolm and John Kitsuse. 1987. Constructing Social Problems. NY: Walter de Gruyter, Inc. Read Chapter 1 (posted on Blackboard).
- Price, Richard. 2008. "Moral Limits and Possibility in World Politics." International Organization, 62 (2): 191-220.

No class January 18 – Martin Luther King Jr. Day

ETHICS AND PEACEBUILDING – PARADIGMS

Week 2: January 25

Key topics: What is peacebuilding? How do the different approaches and definitions of peacebuilding frame the core problem? What values are evident within each approach?

Required Readings:

- Diehl, Paul F. 2006. Paths to Peacebuilding. In T. David Mason and James D.Meernick (Eds) Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding in Post-War Societies: Sustaining the Peace. NY: Routledge, pp.107-129. (on Blackboard)
- Paris and Sisk, The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, Chapter 1 (pp.1-20).
- Lederach, John Paul. 1997. Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies. DC: USIP Press, read pp. 20-35 and 73-85. (on Blackboard)
- UN DPKO. Chapter 2 in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines, pp. 17-30 (on Blackboard)
- Murithi, The Ethics of Peacebuilding, Chapter 1 (pp. 1-12)

Week 3: February 1

Key Questions: How have ethics been approached in the field of conflict resolution and peacebuilding to date? What approaches can help us further explore ethics in peacebuilding?

Required Readings

- Laue, Jim and Cormick, Gerald. 1978. "The ethics of intervention in community disputes". In G. Bermant, H. Kelman and D. Warwick (eds) Ethics of Social Intervention. DC: Halstead Press, pp. 205-232. (On Blackboard)
- International Alert. 1998. "Code of Conduct: Conflict Transformation Work." (On Blackboard)

- Anderson, Mary B. 2001. "Enhancing local capacity for peace: do no harm" in L. Reychler and T. Paffenholz (Eds) Peacebuilding: A Field Guide. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp.258-264. (On Blackboard)
- Slim, Hugo. 2001. "Dealing with moral dilemmas" in L. Reychler and T. Paffenholz (Eds) Peacebuilding: A Field Guide. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp.497-509. (On Blackboard)
- Warfield, Wallace. 2002. "Is this the right thing to do?" in A Handbook of International Peacebuilding, Jossey-Bass, pp.213-223. (On Blackboard)
- Barry, Bruce and Robert Robinson. 2002. "Ethics in Conflict Resolution: the ties that bind," International Negotiation, 7(2):137-142. (On Blackboard)
- Fast, Larissa et al. 2002. "Toward ethically grounded interventions: reevaluating challenges in the 21st century," International Negotiation, 7(2):185-207. (On Blackboard)
- Murithi, The Ethics of Peacebuilding, Chapter 2 (pp.13-41)

Week 4: February 8

Key topics: Further approaches to ethics that can enhance our exploration.

Required Readings:

- Ethics of Care. Fiona Robinson. 1999. Globalizing Care: Ethics, Feminist Theory and International Relations, Chapters 2 and 3 (pp.11-51) (on Blackboard)
- Christian Reus-Smit. 2008. "Constructivism and the structure of ethical reasoning" in Moral Limit, pp.53-82. (on Blackboard)
- Crisp, Richard. 1996. "Modern moral philosophy and the virtues" in How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp.1-18. (on Blackboard)
- Hursthouse, Rosalind. 1996. "Normative virtue ethics" in How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues, Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp.19-36. (on Blackboard)
- Shapcott, Richard. 2002. "Cosmopolitan conversations: justice dialogue and the cosmopolitan project" Global Society, 16(3): 221-243. (on Blackboard)

Recommended:

- Check out the Santa Clara Markkula Center of Applied Ethics webpage (link posted on Blackboard)

Week 5: February 15

Key topics: Peacebuilding as encountering the other.

Required Readings:

- Todorov, Tzvetan. 1984. The Conquest of America. NY: Harper & Row, Publishers.

ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN PEACEBUILDING POLICY

Week 6: February 22

Key topics: Dilemmas in statebuilding.

Required Readings:

- Murithi, The Ethics of Peacebuilding, Chapter 3 (pp. 42-70).
- Barnett, Michael and Christoph Zürcher, “The peacebuilders contract” The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.23-52.
- Paris, Roland “Understanding the ‘coordination problem’ in postwar statebuilding” The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.53-76.
- Papagianni, Katia. 2008. “Participation and state legitimation” in Call & Wyeth Building States to Build Peace, pp.49-71. (on Blackboard)
- Menkaus, Kenneth. 2008. “Somalia: Governance vs. Statebuilding” in Call & Wyeth Building States to Build Peace, pp.187-215. (on Blackboard)

Week 7: March 1**

Key topics: dilemmas in security sector decisions.

** This class we are going to use distance learning approaches. We will utilize blackboard for both the lecture presentation and for class discussion.

Required Readings:

- Edelstein, David M. “Foreign militaries, sustainable institutions and postwar statebuilding” The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.81-103.
- Avant, Deborah. “Making peacemakers out of spoilers” The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp. 104-126.
- Strand, Arne. 2008. “Fighting for peace? Former combatants and the Afghan peace process” The Paradoxes of Peacebuilding Post-9/11, Vancouver: UBC Press, pp. 235-262. (on Blackboard)
- Film: The Peacekeepers (watch at the library)

No class March 8 – Spring Break**Week 8: March 15**

Key topics: dilemmas in governance.

Required Readings:

- Jarstad, Anna. 2008. “Dilemmas of war-to-democracy transitions” in From War to Democracy, NY: Cambridge University Press, pp.17-36. (on Blackboard)
- Roberts, David. “The superficiality of statebuilding in Cambodia” in The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.149-169.
- Samuels, Kirsti. “Postwar constitution building” in The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.173-195.

- Sisk, Timothy D. “Pathways of the political” in The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.196-223.
- Narten, Jens. “Dilemmas of promoting local ownership in Kosovo” in The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.252-283.

Simulation in-class.

Week 9: March 22

Key topics: Transitional justice, reconciliation, forgiveness

Required Readings:

- Tim Murthi The Ethics of Peacebuilding , chapters 5 and 6 (pp.113-159)
- Amstutz, Mark. 2005. “The ethics of political reconciliation” in International Ethics, pp. 62-81. (on Blackboard)
- Additional Reading TBA

ETHICAL DILEMMAS IN PEACEBUILDING PRACTICE

Week 10: March 29

Key topics: Dilemmas of intervention – strategies, funding, partners, options.

Required Readings:

- Barnett, Michael and Jack Snyder. 2008. “The grand strategies of humanitarianism” in Humanitarianism in Question: politics, power, ethics, Cornell University Press, pp.143-171. (on Blackboard)
- Hopgood, Stephen. 2008. “Saying ‘no’ to Wal-Mart?” in Humanitarianism in Question: politics, power, ethics, Cornell University Press, pp.98-123. (on Blackboard)
- Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation. 2007. “Report of Development Cooperation in East Timor.” (on Blackboard)

Week 11: April 5

Key topics: Dilemmas of staffing and partnership (choosing partners, funding limits, bearing risk, making choices about programming options)

Required Readings:

- Catholic Relief Services. 2004. Conflict as the beginning of Peace. Indonesia. (Excerpts on Blackboard.)
- “Chapter 2 Selecting People” in Peacebuilding: A Field Guide, pp.21-34. (on Blackboard)

Simulation in-class

Week 12: April 12

Key topics: TBD in consultation with class.

Required Readings:

- TBA

Week 13: April 19

Key topics: Dilemmas at the intersection of gender and culture.

Required Readings:

- Jennifer F. Klot. 2007. "Women and Peacebuilding." Independent Expert Paper Commissioned by UNIFEM and the Peacebuilding Support Office. (on Blackboard)
- Endah Trista Augustina and Maria Pakpahan (2004). "Women and Peace-Building: Central Sulawesi and North Maluku." Thematic assessment produced for UNDP. (on Blackboard)
- Woroniuk, Beth. 2001. "Mainstreaming a gender perspective" in Peacebuilding: A Field Guide, pp.61-71. (on Blackboard)
- Mathey, M.J. et al. 2003. "The role played by women of the Central African Republic in the prevention and resolution of conflicts" in *Women and Peace in Africa: Case Studies on traditional conflict resolutions practices*. Paris: UNESCO, pp.35-46. (on Blackboard)
- Becker, Heike. 2003. "Women, politics and peace in Northern Namibia" in *Women and Peace in Africa: Case Studies on traditional conflict resolutions practices*. Paris: UNESCO, pp.47-74. (on Blackboard).

Week 14: April 26

Course wrap-up: ethical peacebuilding praxis.

Required Readings:

- Murithi, The Ethics of Peacebuilding, chapters 7 and 8 (pp.160-185)
- Paris and Sisk. "Conclusion" in The Dilemmas of Statebuilding, pp.304-315.

May 3 (Exam schedule) – Research Paper due by 5pm