

PS 6120: Peace and Conflict Resolution

Middle Tennessee State University
Spring 2017

Instructor: Vanessa A. Lefler
Office: 251 Peck Hall
Phone: 615-494-7679
Email: vanessa.lefler@mtsu.edu

Office Hours: Mondays 1:00 - 4:00 PM, Tuesdays and Thursdays 9:00 AM - 12:00 PM; or by appointment.

To make an appointment, visit: <https://vlefler.youcanbook.me>.

Course Overview

“Thus, there are two aspects of peace as conceived of here: *negative peace* which is the absence of violence, absence of war — and *positive peace* which is the integration of human society.”

Johan Galtung (1964) Editorial on the first edition of *Journal of Peace Research*

This course is a seminar on the normative – and often divergent – conceptions of peace in international relations and the mechanisms through which states and other actors attempt to resolve conflict. The course begins with a discussion of the more philosophical approaches to peace. It then proceeds into the empirical study and practice of conflict management and resolution, with the greater balance of our attention paid to research on the strategies and effectiveness of various management tactics, including negotiation, mediation, arbitration and adjudication, and post-conflict reconstruction.

The academic literature on peace and conflict resolution is selected to support the research goals for this course. Over the semester, this course will investigate practical, problem-solving methods of conflict resolution. Specifically, this course highlights principled negotiation and the problem-solving workshop, which Kelman (1972, 168 emphasis added) describes as “Discussions, following a relatively unstructured agenda, [that] take place under the guidance of *social scientists who are knowledgeable both about group processes and about conflict theory.*” The creation of the

Social and Behavioral Sciences Team (SBST)¹ in the US government, the Behavioural Insights Team, also known as the Nudge Unit,² in the UK government, and the World Bank's Global Insights Initiative (GINI)³ demonstrate growing, albeit overdue, interest in the use of social science, which includes international relations, knowledge in policy. The methods studied in this course, then, represent strategies for combining basic research and practical application.

Required Readings

- We have one required book for this course:
 - Fisher, Roger, William L. Ury, and Bruce Patton. 2011. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 2nd Edition. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- There will also be assigned readings from scholarly journals. You are responsible for obtaining these other reading assignments. I recommend Google Scholar, available through the MTSU Library. Scans or .pdfs of more difficult to obtain readings will be distributed directly to the class via e-mail.
- For other, outside, reading, I also recommend the following blogs that study international relations and negotiation in the context of current events:

Political Violence @ a Glance
Duck of Minerva
The Monkey Cage
Program on Negotiation – at Harvard Law School

Course Expectations

Notifications

All course information will be shared through e-mail. You should, therefore, also be in the habit of checking your MTSU e-mail. This is also the best way to contact me as I do not regularly check messages sent through D2L.

Coursework

Your final grade for this course will be based on your performance on class participation, leadership of one discussion topic, weekly papers, and a research project.

¹<https://sbst.gov/>

²<https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/behavioural-insights-team>

³<http://www.socialsciencespace.com/2015/10/world-bank-unveils-its-own-nudge-unit/>

Attendance & Participation = 30%

Because we meet just once a week, it is expected that you will attend every class meeting. If, for some reason, you are unable to attend a meeting, let me know as soon as possible. Students will lose 10% of their Attendance & Participation grade for every unexcused absence.

You are expected to read all assigned readings before class and arrive prepared to discuss them. Students should feel free to ask questions and debate the topics at hand; you are strongly encouraged to participate even if you found the readings difficult or problematic.

Participation and Attendance will be assessed using the following scale:

Participation	
<i>Grade</i>	<i>Requirement</i>
A	The student had excellent attendance and made unusually strong contributions to the discussion. S/he demonstrated connections across the readings with questions and comments.
B	The student had good attendance and made good contributions to the discussion. S/he frequently asked important questions and/or exhibited an understanding of the material.
C	The student had fair attendance and occasionally contributed to the discussion. S/he asked questions and/or made comments that were primarily descriptive, rather than substantive or analytic.
D	The student had weak attendance and/or did not contribute meaningfully to the discussion.
F	The student did not attend or did not speak in class.

Discussion Leader = 10%

Each of you will be asked to be a discussion leader once this term.

Discussion leaders are expected circulate a list of discussion questions no later than 5:00 PM the day before class to facilitate preparation. Class leaders are expected to be particularly familiar with the week’s readings and to lead a significant portion of the class discussion (at least an hour). They are also expected to be able to answer specific questions that may arise about the reading.

Weekly Reading Application = 20%

Throughout the semester, you will submit a total of 6 one-page critical applications of the weekly readings. The purpose of these critical applications is to begin practicing your skills as a conflict management analyst. The application paper should, then, summarize a core take-away of the

readings for the week and identify how they could be relevant in the processes or dynamics of a conflict that you want to understand better.

Ideally, you will select the conflict that you want to analyze for your research project before you submit your first critical application and use each short paper to begin drafting the analysis portion of your final project. You may, however, apply the readings to any relevant conflict.

You can use single-spacing, one-inch margins, and no smaller than 11-point font. Critical reading applications should be printed and are due at the beginning of the class for which the paper was written. Late reading critiques will not be accepted under any circumstances. You will be allowed to drop your lowest paper grade.

Research Project = 40%

You will be asked to complete an original research project this term. The design of this project will be a case brief and conflict analysis such that you or another might lead a problem-solving workshop based on this work.

Though the canonical work in this field focuses on interstate or intrastate conflict, you are encouraged to choose any conflict area you wish. All conflicts are characterized by disagreements between two or more actors, so many of the elements that Kelman, Fisher, Ury, and Patton, and others examine are likely applicable. Regardless of the topic you choose, all papers will have four general sections: 1) an Executive Summary of the case and your analysis; 2) a Case Background or Framework in which you will outline the objective and subjective elements of the conflict, the interests of the key stakeholders, and the conflict dynamics; 3) a Conflict Analysis in which you apply your social science training, in Burton's words "to inject into discussion new information, not about the dispute in question, but about conflict, its origins and processes drawn from theoretical analysis and empirical studies" (qtd. in Kelman 1979, 183); and 4) a proposal for a Problem-Solving Workshop Design that identifies a setting, participants, agenda, and third party strategy and could serve as a blueprint for you or another to act upon the information collected in the brief and case analysis.

Regardless of the topic you choose, you want to be aware early on about the availability of information and data on your project. You may use whatever methodology you feel is most appropriate to the topic and which you feel qualified to implement. It may take a little working ahead to determine if the data, information, or access you need is even available.

The final paper should be about 20-30 pages in length and be written in the professional style of the American Political Science Association.

The final paper grade is based on the weighted component grades for each portion of the paper (given in parentheses):

1. *Case Background/Framework Draft (30%), due Monday, March 13th*

Submit a draft of the case background for your project upon which you will, in the final

draft, analyze and propose problem-solving strategies. The case background or framework should, therefore, prepare you think about the conflict management problems and potential bargaining strategies that will help resolve the conflict. It may briefly review the historical context of the conflict, interpret the conflict from each side – in addition to the points-of-view of other stakeholders, such as third parties or allies – and address the conflict dynamics, or trends or trajectories over time.

2. *Final Draft (40%), due Monday, April 24th*

Submit your final, complete paper. The final draft should include an executive summary, conflict analysis, and proposal in addition to the case background prepared in the first draft. It should also reflect revisions according to the instructor's suggestions on the initial draft and any relevant work on readings analysis papers.

3. *Final Project Presentations (10%), due Thursday, May 04th*

Each student will present his or her project for the class at the end of the semester. The presentations should be designed as a "pitch" that would convince an organization to host the project's proposed workshop or that would persuade disputant representatives to participate. Therefore, strong attention should be paid to the workshop's agenda and to its objectives and should also be sensitive to the issues that Kelman (1979), Ghosn (2012), and others raise about the concerns disputants regularly feel about coming to the negotiating table in the first place.

Presentations should be 10-12 minutes and presenters should be prepared to answer questions.

4. *Peer Discussant Reviews (10%), due Thursday, May 04th*

Each final draft will be read by the instructor and two other students in the class. Each student will prepare a discussion of their assigned readings, which includes a summary of the central contributions of the paper and its areas for improvement. It may also ask the writer to address questions for clarification. The discussant reviews may also make specific, but constructive, recommendations about how to improve the paper.

The two papers each student will review will be distributed on *Wednesday, April 26th*.

Discussant reviews will be shared during the Paper Presentations on Thursday, 04 May. On that date, printed copies of the review will be submitted to the instructor and the discussant should prepare 5-7 minutes of commentary.

Paper drafts (Case Background and Final Project) will be submitted electronically by 11:59 PM on the date they are due. Late papers will be penalized 10% for each day they are late; I will not accept any assignment more than one week after it is due.

Grading

Based on the above expectations, grades will be calculated according to the following scale:

Grade	Points	Grade	Points	Grade	Points	Grade	Points
A+	>97%	B+	87-89%	C+	77-79%	D+	67-69%
A	94-96%	B	84-86%	C	74-76%	D	64-66%
A-	90-93%	B-	80-83%	C-	70-73%	D-	60-63%
						F	<60%

Policies and Conditions

Grade Complaints

Complaints regarding graded assignments will only be taken 24 hours after an assignment has been returned. Complaints should be submitted in writing and explain the particular discrepancy and recommend an appropriate recourse. The instructor reserves the right to add or *subtract* points on work that is submitted for reconsideration.

Academic Honesty

A copy of the University's policies on academic misconduct and complaint actions is available on the University website. Read and become familiar with these policies.

Students caught violating conditions of academic honesty will fail this course and be reported to university authorities. It is recommended that you retain all notes and drafts of your coursework until two weeks after grades are received in order to protect your work.

Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities should notify the instructor as soon as possible. It is the responsibility of any student with a disability who requests a reasonable accommodation to contact Disabled Student Services. Disabled Student Services will arrange with the student and instructor a plan to ensure the student has the opportunities for full participation in the class.

Inclement Weather and Class Cancellation

Sign up for RAVE alerts from MTSU at <https://www.getrave.com/login/mtsu> to receive notifications related to campus schedule changes. You should also check your e-mail prior to class to confirm any schedules changes. Last, if the weather is inclement and you do not feel that you can make it to class, inform me *as soon as possible*. Do not take unnecessary risks to attend class.

Get Connected to Your MTSU Political Science Department!

Students who are the most successful – in their courses, graduating on time, finding jobs and developing careers in the field, getting into law school and graduate school, and just getting the most out of their college years – are those who stay informed about all of the opportunities and events they can take advantage of, and stay connected to the Department and other students.

Please use these resources to both stay informed and stay connected – and succeed.

MTSU Political Science Facebook Page

We use Facebook to notify our students of upcoming events and opportunities (including internships and study abroad) for PS and IR majors and minors.

Please “like” the page so you are always in the loop: MTSU Political Science

Department of Political Science Webpage

This is a huge resource of information on majors, minors, program requirements, faculty contacts, the Student Handbook, Newsletters, and much more.

Please bookmark the site and check it often and whenever you have questions:

<http://www.mtsu.edu/politicalscience/>

PS/IR Student Services Page

This site provides easy access to info on advising, law school, grad school, careers and job search, study abroad, internships, and much more to help you succeed.

Please bookmark the site and really use it to get the most out of your time in the Department.

[http://www.mtsu.edu/ps-ir-student services](http://www.mtsu.edu/ps-ir-student%20services)

Other Resource Tools

Much of this information – program requirements, Student Handbook, Newsletters, upcoming events, and so on – are available on the racks and bulletin board outside the Departmental Office in Peck 209.

Course Outline

Week 1 (01/19/17) – Introduction

Week 2 (01/26/17) – Concepts and Trends in Peace and Security

- Galtung, Johan. 1969. Violence, Peace, and Peace Research. *Journal of Peace Research*, 6(3): 167-191.
- Waever, Ole. 2008. Peace and Security: Two Evolving Concepts and Their Changing Relationships. In *Globalization and Environmental Challenges: Reconceptualizing Security in the 21st Century*. Part II. Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg. pgs. 99-111.
- Gat, Azar. 2013. Is War Declining – and Why? *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(2): 149-157.
- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Steven Pinker, Bradley A. Thayer, Jack S. Levy, and William R. Thompson. 2013. The Forum: The Decline of War. *International Studies Review*, 15(3): 396-419.
- Biton, Yifat and Bavriell Salomon. 2006. Peace in the Eyes of Israeli and Palestinian Youths: Effects of Collective Narrative and Peace Education Program. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43(2): 167-180.
- Clark, Janine Natalya. 2009. From Negative to Positive Peace: The Case of Bosnia and Hercegovina. *Journal of Human Rights*, 8(4): 360-384.

Week 3 (02/02/17 – Problem-Solving in Conflict Resolution – A Practice and a Research Agenda

- Kelman, Herbert C. 1972. The Problem-Solving Workshop in Conflict Resolution. In *Communication in International Politics*. Richard L. Merritt, editor. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Fisher, Ronald J. 2004. The Problem-Solving Workshop as a Method of Research. *International Negotiation*, 9(3): 385-396.
- Kelman, Herbert C. 2010. Interactive Problem-Solving: Changing Political Culture in the Pursuit of Conflict Resolution. *Peace and Conflict*, 16: 389-413.
- Broome, Benjamin J. 1997. Designing a Collective Approach to Peace: Interactive Design and Problem-Solving Workshops with Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot Communities in Cyprus. *International Negotiation*, 2(3): 381-408.
- Malhotra, Deepak and Sumanasiri Liyanage. 2005. Long-Term Effects of Peace Workshops in Protracted Conflicts. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(6): 908-924.

Week 4 (02/09/17) – Negotiation as a Conflict Resolution Approach

- Ghosn, Faten. 2010. Getting to the Table and Getting to Yes: An Analysis of International Negotiations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(4): 1055-1072.
- Druckman, Daniel and Mara Olekalns. 2012. Motivational Primes, Trust, and Negotiators' Reaction to a Crisis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 57(6): 966-990.
- Holmes, Marcus. 2013. The Force of Face-to-Face Diplomacy: Mirror Neurons and the Problem of Intentions. *International Organization*, 67(4): 829-861.
- Brochmann, Marit and Paul R. Hensel. 2011. The Effectiveness of Negotiations over International River Claims. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(3): 859-882.

Week 5 (02/16/17) – Getting to Yes: Bargaining in the Practice

- Fisher, R., W.L. Ury, and B. Patton. 2011. *Getting to Yes: Negotiating Agreement Without Giving In*. 2nd Edition. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Week 6 (02/23/17) – The Kantian/Democratic Peace

Dr. Tesi substituting

- Maoz, Zeev and Bruce Russett. 1993. Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986. *American Political Science Review*, 87(3): 624-638.
- Crescenzi, Mark J.C., Kelly M. Kadera, and Megan Shannon. 2003. Democratic Survival, Peace, and War in the International System. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47: 234-247.
- Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin. 2012. Norms and the Democratic Peace. In *What Do We Know About War?* 2nd Edition. John A. Vasquez, ed. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield. pgs. 167-188.
- Dorussen, Han and Hugh Ward. 2008. Intergovernmental Organizations and the Kantian Peace: A Network Perspective. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52(2): 189-212.

Week 7 (03/02/17) – Critical Perspectives on the Democratic Peace

Dr. Livingston substituting

- Schneider, Gerald and Nils Petter Gleditsch. 2010. The Capitalist Peace: The Origins and Prospects of a Liberal Idea. *International Interactions*, 36(2): 107-114.

- Mousseau, Michael. 2000. Market Prosperity, Democratic Consolidation, and Democratic Peace. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 44(4): 472-507.
- Gibler, Douglas M. 2007. Bordering on Peace: Democracy, Territorial Issues, and Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 51(3): 509-532.
- Peceny, Mark, Caroline C. Beer, and Shannon Sanchez-Terry. 2002. Dictatorial Peace? *American Political Science Review*, 96(1): 15-26.

Week 8 (03/09/17) – No Class, Spring Break

Week 9 (03/16/17) – Mediation: Strategies and Success

- Beardsley, Kyle. 2008. Agreement Without Peace? International Mediation and Time Inconsistency Problems. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4): 723-740.
- Reid, Lindsay. 2014. Finding a Peace that Lasts: Mediator Leverage and the Durable Resolution of Civil Wars. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Forthcoming. 1-31.
- Schrodt, Philip A. and Deborah J. Gerner. 2004. An Event Data Analysis of Third-Party Mediation in the Middle East and Balkans. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48(3): 310-330.
- Wehr, Paul and John Paul Lederach. 1991. Mediating Conflict in Central America. *Journal of Peace Research*, 28(1): 85-98.

Week 10 (03/23/17) – Conflict Management With Non-State Groups

Dr. Carleton substituting

- Walter, Barbara F. 1997. The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement. *International Organization*, 51(3): 335-364.
- Stedman, Stephen John. 1997. Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes. *International Security*, 22(2): 5-53.
- Briggs, Rachel. 2010. Community Engagement for Counterterrorism: Lessons from the United Kingdom. *International Affairs*, 86(4): 971-981.
- Stephan, Maria J. and Erica Chenoweth. 2008. Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict. *International Security*, 33(1): 7-44.

Week 11 (03/30/17) – Track-Two Diplomacy

- Bohmelt, Tobias. 2010. The Effectiveness of Tracks of Diplomacy Strategies in Third-Party Interventions. *Journal of Peace Research*, 47(2): 167-178.
- Paffenholz, Thania. 2014. Civil Society and Peace Negotiations: Beyond the Inclusion-Exclusion Dichotomy. *Negotiation Journal*, 30(1): 69-91.
- Schiff, Amira. 2010. “Quasi Track One” Diplomacy: An Analysis of the Geneva Process in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. *International Studies Perspectives*, 11(2): 93-111.
- O Dochartaigh, Niall. 2011. Together In the Middle: Back-Channel Negotiation in the Irish Peace Process. *Journal of Peace Research*, 48(6): 767-780.

Week 12 (04/06/17) – IGOs as Conflict Managers

- Shannon, Megan. 2009. Preventing War and Providing Peace? International Organizations and the Management of Territorial Disputes. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 26(2): 144-163.
- Dorussen, Han and Theodora-Ismene Gizelis. 2013. Into the Lion’s Den: Local Responses to UN Peacekeeping. *Journal of Peace Research*, 50(6): 691-706.
- Beardsley, Kyle and Holger Schmidt. 2012. Following the Flag or Following the Charter? Examining the Determinants of UN Involvement in International Crises, 1945-2002. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(1): 33-49.
- Hansen, Holley E., Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Stephen C. Nemeth. 2008. IO Mediation of Interstate Conflicts: Moving Beyond the Global versus Regional Dichotomy. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52(2): 295-325.

Week 13 (04/13/17) – Legal Dispute Resolution

Dr. Korobkov substituting

- Ginsburg, Tom and Richard H. McAdams. 2004. Adjudicating in Anarchy: An Expressive Theory of International Dispute Resolution. *William and Mary Law Review*, 45: 1229-1339.
- Gent, Stephen E. and Megan Shannon. 2011. Decision Control and the Pursuit of Binding Conflict Management: Choosing the Ties that Bind. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 55(5): 710-734.
- Huth, Paul K., Sarah E. Croco, and Benjamin J. Appel. 2011. Does International Law Promote the Peaceful Settlement of International Disputes? Evidence from the Study of Territorial Conflicts since 1945. *American Political Science Review*, 105(02): 415-436.

Week 14 (04/20/17) – Post-Conflict Reconstruction

- Hartzell, Caroline and Matthew Hoddie. 2003. Institutionalizing Peace: Power Sharing and Post-Civil War Conflict Management. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(2): 318-332.
- del Castillo, Graciana. 2001. Post-Conflict Reconstruction and the Challenge to International Organizations: The Case of El Salvador. *World Development*, 29(12): 1967-1985.
- Flores, Thomas Edward and Irfan Nooruddin. 2012. The Effect of Elections on Postconflict Peace and Reconstruction. *Journal of Politics*, 74(2): 558-570.
- Orjuela, Camilla. 2003. Building Peace in Sri Lanka: A Role for Civil Society? *Journal of Peace Research*, 40(2): 195-212.

Week 15 (04/27/17) – No Class, Study Day

Week 16 (05/04/17) – Presentations

- Final Project Presentations and Discussant Reviews