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1. **Scope and Purpose:**

Today’s states face many challenges from myriad directions.  Globalization, insurgencies, ethnic, sectarian and tribal affiliations and conflict, colonial legacies and borders, authoritarianism, transnational crime syndicates, failing governance systems, cultural dissonance, terrorism, and emerging health threats are just a sample of the dynamics that can weaken or bring down a state.  Failed or failing states provide space for the development of conditions that threaten neighbors, a region or the entire the international community. Disorder provides an environment in which direct threats to U.S., European and international security can emerge.

The United States has contributed to more than 20 post-war international interventions since the end of the Cold War, including massive commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan.  These have generally not been classic “peacekeeping” operations that separate combatants but rather “stabilization and reconstruction” operations that aim to leave behind viable states.  All these operations have been multilateral, with participation not only by intervening governments but also by intergovernmental organizations, host governments and nongovernmental organizations, both local and international.  The UN had more than 124,000 people serving in 16 peace operations in August 2015.

Hundreds of thousands of deployed troops and police, thousands of civilians and hundreds of billions of dollars later, what have we learned?  Can states be built?  What is the best way to go about it?  What resources are required?  How can mistakes of the past be corrected in the future?  This course will study salient cases (including countries like Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Rwanda, Kosovo, Liberia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Libya, Egypt, Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Ukraine and Afghanistan) in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of what is needed for success and what causes failure.

*Prerequisite:* Principles and Practices of Conflict Management (SA.640.718.01) is required to register. Exceptions are made on a case by case basis by Daniel Serwer on the basis of prior experience with and in conflict zones. Requests with appropriate experience cited should be emailed to him, with a resume’ attached.
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1. **Course objectives and lesson overview**

This introduction aims to provide students with a solid foundation in the theory and practice of contemporary stabilization and reconstruction operations. Based on a conceptual framework for analyzing these operations, we will explore the experience of practitioners in recent and ongoing cases, with a view to understanding the complexity and variety of post-war and other transition situations in the modern world. It will enable students to engage in further inquiry into related topics such as counter-insurgency, counter-terrorism, peace operations, peacekeeping, state-building, nation-building conflict management, democratic transition, humanitarian assistance and economic development. Emphasizing the complex, multidimensional and multilateral character of stabilization and reconstruction operations, including but not limited to military operations, this course will be useful for those with an interest in conflict resolution and security studies, including professionals in the fields of diplomacy, journalism, development assistance, finance, trade, humanitarian aid or international peacekeeping. The course will include readings, discussion, simulations, role plays, oral briefings, research and study of real events, historical and contemporaneous.

Weekly lesson schedule

1. Introduction and Overview

Part I: What Does Stabilization and Reconstruction Aim to Achieve?

1. Safe and Secure Environment – ***Each student presents for two minutes or less on the sources of fragility in one of the countries in the most recent Fragile States Index***
2. Rule of Law – ***Analytical paper topic (country or conflict) due (in class)!***
3. Stable governance
4. Sustainable economy
5. Social well-being – ***Analytical paper due (before class)!***

# Part II: Cross-cutting Principles

1. Leadership – ***Student proposed required readings for weeks 10-13 due!***
2. Host Nation Ownership and Capacity, Political Primacy, Security
3. Legitimacy, Unity of Effort, Conflict Transformation, Regional Engagement—

***Policy memo due (before class)!***

Part III: Student Presentations

1. Student Oral Presentations
2. Student Oral Presentations
3. Student Oral Presentations
4. Wrap-up
5. **Learning outcomes**

Students will learn

* To understand the goals of stabilization and reconstruction as well as contemporary best practices in efforts to achieve them.
* To appreciate the limits and capabilities of the international community in meeting stabilization and reconstruction requirements.
* To analyze, comprehend and evaluate recent and possible future stabilization and reconstruction operations.
* To describe key elements of a specific operation, using a systematic framework.
* To sharpen and develop their skills in devising solutions to stabilization and reconstruction challenges and enable them to contribute to future efforts.

1. **Course requirements/grading**

Attendance, participation and oral presentations 50%

Short essay and research paper 50%

* Attendance and weekly participation (25%): This is a seminar, not a lecture course. Quality student contributions are essential. Students are required to attend all sessions, arrive on time, have read *at least* the items listed under Required Reading prior to each session, and *be prepared to summarize them if asked to do so (consulting their notes as needed)*. Class, starting from the first session, will generally start with the instructor’s request for summaries from students, chosen at random. Students are also expected to respond amply and participate actively in discussions as well as in simulations or role plays, which on some occasions (noted below) will require extension of class time to 9 pm.

Students should keep themselves well-informed on current events related to the subject matter of the course. This can be done most readily by reading relevant portions of the Washington Post, New York Times or other major dailies as well as by listening to NPR on a daily basis and following Daniel Serwer’s blog [www.peacefare.net](http://www.peacefare.net) and tweets @DanielSerwer. The instructor or students may circulate from time to time relevant interesting items via Blackboard—these should be treated as optional, but highly recommended, additional readings. They may be discussed in class, along with current events.

* Initial oral presentations: Each student in week 2 should be prepared to present a brief (less than 2-minute) oral analysis of the main sources of fragility in one of the countries listed among the first 100 or so in the most recent version of the Fragile States Index. These initial presentations will not be graded, but failure to be prepared to do one in week 2 will reduce the maximum credit available on the final oral presentation to 20%. Students may focus on the same country for their later papers and oral presentation, but they cannot change their country of focus after week 3.
* Final oral presentation (25%): Each student will need to propose to the instructor in week 7 readings for weeks 10-12 relevant to their chosen policy memo topic. These readings will constitute background for oral presentation of the key points from their policy memo paper during class in weeks 10-12. These final oral presentations will last 8 minutes or less, followed by a 5-minute Q and A session as well as a critique in front of the class by the instructors. Students should be prepared to present cogently and effectively as well as answer questions from the class and the instructor.
* Analytical Paper (25%): Before class time in week 3, choose a currently failed or fragile state (you may use the same country on which you made your initial oral presentation), which the instructor will ask you to state during class. Your paper, due three weeks later, will characterize the current situation in this state using the Framework presented in the *Guiding Principles* and any other important dimensions, describe the salient organizational characteristics of any relevant international intervention or involvement by neighbours (including its strong points and limitations) and identify key current challenges preventing achievement of the five end-states. The paper should be no more than *five* well-edited, double-spaced, 12-point typed pages in length, plus any maps or other visual material (not text). References should be included as footnotes or endnotes, in any format that shows clearly the author, title and source (including URL if any). If the paper exceeds the page limit, the grade will be reduced. Students should submit one hard copy to the instructor and circulate the paper to the entire class via Blackboard. ***Due in Week 6 BEFORE class convenes*.**
* Policy Memo (25%): Imagine that you are leading efforts of a clearly identified organization to achieve or contribute to one of the end-states you wrote about in your analytical paper. Write a memo to your supervisor (who should be clearly identified) of no more than *two* well-edited, double-spaced, 12-point typed pages stating what the biggest current problems are and suggesting what needs to be done to enable success. This should include
  + a brief encapsulation of the problem to be resolved and the policy recommendations up front,
  + brief relevant background on the country or conflict in question,
  + a summary of the current situation within your selected end-state,
  + the primary obstacles to success and your recommended measures to overcome these obstacles.

Footnotes and endnotes need not be used, but ideas that come from other than your own imagination should have their source clearly indicated.

You may include in the memo relevant portions of the analytical paper, but **the focus should be on proposed organizational changes, program initiatives, resource requirements, political moves, diplomatic maneuvers or other policy measures needed at present.**  You need not limit yourself to action within your particular end-state but should make clear why action outside that end-state is required. This memo/policy paper will be the basis of your 8-minute class presentation in weeks 10, 11 or 12. ***The paper itself is due in week 9 BEFORE class convenes*.** It should be sent via Blackboard to the entire class. Students should also submit one hard copy to the instructor when the class meets in week 9.

* **Grading criteria**: I am a stickler, as professional life is, on grammar and spelling. Perfect is the expectation. In addition, these are the grading criteria I keep in mind:

Analytical paper

1. Depth and scope of the analysis
2. Clarity and cogency of the analysis
3. Quality of the sources and methods used
4. Effective use of the Framework from Guiding Principles, including interconnections among endstates and cross-cutting themes

Policy memo

1. Quality of the solutions proposed
2. Clarity and cogency of the arguments used to justify them and their expected effectiveness
3. Consideration of associated costs and other obstacles
4. Effective use of the Framework from Guiding Principles, including interconnections among endstates and crosscutting themes

* Late papers will be penalized one step per day (from A to A-, from A- to B+, etc). No exceptions or incompletes, except in a dire emergency. Save and print work as you write. Technology problems are not an acceptable excuse for late work.
* Footnotes or endnotes of the analytical paper should reference sources using a recognized style that includes more than a web address (at least author, title, date).
* All students are expected to meet the same high standards for written English. Students who need writing help are referred to the Writing Center (<http://www.sais-jhu.edu/atoz/language-studies-program#writing-help-sais-dc>). Students should indicate this assistance on the work they submit by attaching the following statement to the paper: “Assistance in terms of grammar and technical writing for this paper was provided by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_.”
* Students will observe the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity and abide by the Honor Code (The Red Book: SAIS Student and Academic Handbook).
* I am a relatively tough grader by today’s standards. Students may earn one-third of a grade added to their final grade (from C+ to B-, B- to B, etc.) by attending and writing up during weeks 1-6 (but NOT after class in week 6) a public event (speaker, panel, press conference, etc.) relevant to the theme of post-war reconstruction and transition. Write-ups should be no more than 800 words ***and circulated within 48 hours of the event*** to the entire class and the instructor via Blackboard. To avoid duplication, a student wanting to write up an event should inform the class and the instructor (also via Blackboard) in advance. First come, first served. No duplicates. I will offer the opportunity of posting some write-ups to [www.peacefare.net](http://www.peacefare.net)

**Required Readings**

Anna K. Jarstad, “The Prevalence of Power-Sharing: Exploring the Patterns of Post- Election Peace,” *Africa Spectrum*, 44, 3, 41-62 at <http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/giga/afsp/article/view/191/191>

Antonio C. David, Fabiano Rodrigues Bastos and Marshall Mills “Post-conflict Recovery: Institutions, Aid, or Luck?” IMF Working Paper WP/11/149

<http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2011/wp11149.pdf>

Ashraf Ghani and Clare Lockhart, *Fixing Failed States: A Framework for Rebuilding a Fractured World.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Charles T. Call, “Conclusion,” *Constructing Justice and Security After War* (Washington, DC: USIP Press, 2007), pp. 375-410.

Chris Blattman, “Corruption and development: Not what you think?” <http://chrisblattman.com/2012/11/05/corruption-and-development-not-what-you-think>

Christina Caan, Beth C. DeGrasse, Paul Hughes, and Daniel P. Serwer, “Is This Any Way to Run an Occupation?” Chapter 14 in Karen Guttieri and Jessica Piombo, *Interim Governments: Institutional Bridges to Peace and Democracy*, Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007.

Christoph Zurcher, et. al., *Costly Democracy: Peacebuilding and Democratization after War,* Chapter 6, pp. 112-130.

Daniel Serwer, *Righting the Balance: How You Can Help Protect America* (Potomac, 2013), Chapter 7, pp. 105-119.

David H. Bayley and Robert M. Perito, *The Police At War* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2010), chapter 4, “Balancing Force and Legitimacy” pp. 67-82.

Deborah Isser, Stephen C. Lubkemann and Saah N’Tow, “Looking for Justice: Liberian Experiences With and Perceptions of Local Justice Options,” USIP Peaceworks no. 63, 2009, at <http://www.usip.org/resources/looking-justice-liberian-experiences-and-perceptions-local-justice-options>

Department of the Army. *Field Manual 3-07: Stability Operations*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 2008. Chapter 4. Found at: <http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/repository/FM307/FM3-07.pdf>

Edward P. Joseph, “Ownership is Over-Rated” *SAIS Review*, Vol.  XXVII, No. 2; Summer-Fall, 2007 <http://edwardpjoseph.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/091107-SAIS-Review-Ownership-is-overrated-ejoseph.pdf>

Elizabeth A. Cole and Judy Barsalou, “Unite or Divide? The Challenges of Teaching History in Societies Emerging from Conflict,” USIP Special Report, June 2006. Found at: <http://www.usip.org/resources/unite-or-divide-challenges-teaching-history-societies-emerging-violent-conflict>

g7+ website, <http://www.g7plus.org>

ICG Report No. 133; August, 2002: “Macedonia's Public Secret: How Corruption Drags the Country Down” <http://www.crisisgroup.org/~/media/Files/europe/Macedonia%2015.pdf>

Interaction, “Country Ownership: Moving from Rhetoric to Action,” November 2011, <http://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Country%20ownership%20paper.pdf>

James Dobbins, “Guidelines for Nation Builders,” Strategic Studies Quarterly (fall 2010), pp. 15-42 at <http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/fall10.asp>

James Dobbins, Laurel Miller, et. al., *Overcoming Obstacles to Peace* (RAND, 2013), pp. 233-45 at <http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR167.html>

Jarrett Blanc, Aanand Hylland and Kare Vollen, “State Structures and Electoral Systems in Post-Conflict Situations, IFES, 2006, pp. 7-47 (also skim remaining pages on electoral systems)

Jeremiah Pam, “The Paradox of Complexity,” in Christopher M.

Schnaubelt, ed., Complex Operations: NATO at War and on the Margins of War

NATO Defense College Forum Paper n 14 (2010) at <http://www.ndc.nato.int/research/series.php?icode=2>.

Jock Covey, Michael J. Dziedzic, and Leonard R. Hawley, eds., *The Quest for Viable Peace: International Intervention and Strategies for Conflict Transformation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute for Peace, 2005.

Jon Lee Anderson, “The Mission: a Last Defense Against Genocide,” *The New Yorker*, October 20, 2014, <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/10/20/mission-3>

Krishna Kuman, “Promoting Social Reconciliation in Postconflict Societies: Selected Lessons from USAID’s Experience,” January 1999 at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/51/9/35112635.pdf>

Marc J. Cohen and Tara R. Gingerich, “Protect and Serve or Train and Equip? US Security Assistance and Protection of Civilians,” Oxfam America, November 12, 2009, <http://www.oxfamamerica.org/files/protect-and-serve-or-train-and-equip.pdf>

Niccolo’ Machiavelli, *The Prince*, David Wooton, ed. and trans. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1995, Chapters 1-6.

Paul Collier, “Post-Conflict Recovery: How Should Policies Be Distinctive?” *Journal of African Economies*, volume 18, AERC suppl 1 (2009) found at: <http://jae.oxfordjournals.org/content/18/suppl_1/i99.full.pdf+html>

Rachel Kleinfeld, *Advancing the Rule of Law Abroad*, Chapter 1, pp. 1-36.

Robert William Farrand, *Reconstruction and Peace Building in the Balkans: the Brcko Experience*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011, pp. 13-57.

Roger B. Myerson, “A Short Overview of the Fundamentals of State Building,” at <http://home.uchicago.edu/~rmyerson/research/stablizn.pdf>

Sarah Chayes, “Corruption: the Unrecognized Threat to International Security,” Carnegie Endowment for International Piece,” June 2015, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2014/06/06/corruption-unrecognized-threat-to-international-security/hcts>

*The Sphere Project,* <http://www.sphereproject.org/> general familiarization, especially with the Handbook

Stephen Biddle, Fontini Christia and J. Alex Thier, “Defining Success in Afghanistan: What can the United States Accept?” *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2010 at <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66450/stephen-biddle-fotini-christia-and-j-alexander-thier/defining-success-in-afghanistan>

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines*. New York, NY: United Nations, 2008. Chapters 1-3 at <http://www.peacekeepingbestpractices.unlb.org/Pbps/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf>

United States Institute of Peace and US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute. *Guiding Principles for Stabilization and Reconstruction.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2009. Found at: <http://www.usip.org/resources/guiding-principles-stabilization-and-reconstruction>

William J. Durch, “Are We Learning Yet? The Long Road to Applying Best Practices,” in William J. Durch, ed., *Twenty-First Century Peace Operations*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2006, pp. 573-607.

USAID, *Anticorruption Assessment Framework* (2009), pp. 8-23 <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadp270.pdf>

Valerie Hudson, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Mary Capriolo, Chad Emmett, *Sex and World Peace.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2012, Chapter 4, pp. 95-118.

Here are some items that, while not specifically assigned, shed light on the subjects we will be dealing with. Students would be wise to familiarize themselves with their main arguments.

John Darby. *The Effects of Violence on Peace Processes.* Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 2001.

Dambisa Moyo, *Dead Aid,* New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2009.

Daniel Kahneman, *Thinking Fast and Slow*, Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2011.

Daron Acemoglu and James Robinson, *Why Nations Fail: the Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty*, New York: Crown, 2012.

Francis Fukuyama, *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democr*acy, New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2014.

Larry Diamond, “[Chasing Away the Democracy Blues](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/10/24/chasing_away_the_democracy_blues): Why democracy is worth fighting for -- now more than ever,” Foreign Policy, October 24, 2014**,**

<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/10/24/chasing_away_the_democracy_blues>

William Easterly, *The White Man’s Burden,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

William C. Taylor, “Harvard’s Ronald Heifetz offers a short course on the future of leadership,” <http://www.fastcompany.com/magazine/25/heifetz.html>

1. **Detailed Course Schedule**

**WEEK 1 (January 27): Introduction and Overview**

We will discuss the design of the course and key objectives, as well as your expectations and relevant experience. I will provide a brief contextual discussion of stabilization and reconstruction as practiced since the end of the Cold War. Be prepared to identify any issues you have with course texts or the schedule of classes.

We will be using an analytical framework developed at the US Institute of Peace to better understand what it terms “stabilization and reconstruction.” The objective in using this framework is **not** to enforce unity of approach, but rather to present a common and simple starting point from which to develop your own way of understanding of what needs to be done in countries emerging from conflict. Come to class prepared to discuss and/or question the framework.

***Objectives:***

• Understand the design, organization and requirements of the course.

• Become familiar with the standard framework we will be using.

• Begin to understand the institutions, practices and principles on which post-war operations in the post-Cold War period depend.

***Questions:***

Why do we undertake stabilization and reconstruction operations? Why does this course only consider them post-1989? What kinds of staff are needed? What relevant capacities exist? Why are such operations so difficult? Which ones have been relatively successful? Which have failed? How can we improve preparations for them? How should we think about possible future operations? Where might they occur?

***Required Reading:***

*Guiding Principles for Stabilization and Reconstruction.* Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace and United States Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, 2009, Sections 1-5.

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines*. New York, NY: United Nations, 2008. Chapters 1-3 at <http://www.peacekeepingbestpractices.unlb.org/Pbps/Library/Capstone_Doctrine_ENG.pdf>

Civilian Stabilization Operations website, <http://www.state.gov/j/cso/>

Daniel Serwer, *Righting the Balance: How You Can Help Protect America* (Potomac, 2013), Chapter 7, pp. 105-119.

Jon Lee Anderson, “The Mission: a Last Defense Against Genocide,” *The New Yorker*, October 20, 2014, <http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/10/20/mission-3>

**PART 1: What Does Stabilization and Reconstruction Aim to Achieve?**

**WEEK 2 (February 3): Safe and Secure Environment**

This lesson begins our discussion of end-states, which will extend through the sixth week. Each week we will be discussing one end-state and reading about it in *Guiding Principles*. In addition, we will be reading other material that elucidates theoretical understanding as well as the problems encountered by practitioners in pursuing the end-state under discussion.

**\*\*Each student will present a less than two-minute analysis of the sources of fragility in one of the top 100 countries listed in the most recent Fragile States Index.\*\***

You may write about this country in your subsequent papers, or switch to another if you like. You will need to tell me at class next week which country or conflict you have definitively chosen.

***Objectives:***Understand

• The basic concepts and key definitions used in course readings.

• The different kinds of security challenges arising in countries emerging from conflict.

• The key problems that plague efforts to achieve a safe and secure environment.

• Methods of overcoming these problems.

***Questions:***

What do you do with “warring parties,” warlords, drug kingpins and militias in societies emerging from conflict? What role do intelligence services play? What is the relationship between a safe and secure environment and force protection? Where has a relatively safe and secure environment been established? How do we know? What capabilities are needed to create a safe and secure environment? How can one be restored? What is the role of interior and defense ministries?

***Required Reading:***

*Guiding Principles*, Section 6.

Marc J. Cohen and Tara R. Gingerich, “Protect and Serve or Train and Equip? US Security Assistance and Protection of Civilians,” Oxfam America, November 12, 2009, <http://www.oxfamamerica.org/files/protect-and-serve-or-train-and-equip.pdf>

Christina Caan, Beth C. DeGrasse, Paul Hughes, and Daniel P. Serwer, “Is This Any Way to Run an Occupation?” Chapter 14 in Karen Guttieri and Jessica Piombo, *Interim Governments: Institutional Bridges to Peace and Democracy*, Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007.

David H. Bayley and Robert M. Perito, *The Police At War* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2010), chapter 4, “Balancing Force and Legitimacy” pp. 67-82.

**WEEK 3 (February 10): Rule of Law**

Professor Joseph will lead this class, which continues the study of the end-states by focusing on rule of law. It is important to appreciate the difference between a “safe and secure environment,” which is at least initially the responsibility of military forces, and “rule of law,” which depends not only on the military but also on civilian institutions such as police, courts, prosecutors, defense attorneys and prisons, as well as bar associations and civil society more generally. Or in some contexts on less formal justice systems.

**\*\* Students should come prepared to state which country/conflict they have chosen for their analytical and policy papers\*\***

***Objectives:***Understand

* The distinction between rule of law and a safe and secure environment.
* Different approaches to establishing rule of law.
* Why establishing the rule of law is an urgent priority but one that will take a long time.

***Questions***:

What systems do other societies use to establish the rule of law? How can these “informal” or “traditional” systems interact with the more formal justice system? What is the role of Interior and Justice Ministries in more formal systems? Why is it important to worry about defense attorneys and prisons?

***Required Reading:***

*Guiding Principles*, Section 7.

Rachel Kleinfeld, *Advancing the Rule of Law Abroad*, Chapter 1, pp. 1-36.

Charles T. Call, “Conclusion,” *Constructing Justice and Security After War* (Washington, DC: USIP Press, 2007), pp. 375-410.

Deborah Isser, Stephen C. Lubkemann and Saah N’Tow, “Looking for Justice: Liberian Experiences With and Perceptions of Local Justice Options,” USIP Peaceworks no. 63, 2009, at <http://www.usip.org/resources/looking-justice-liberian-experiences-and-perceptions-local-justice-options>

**WEEK 4 (February 17): Stable Governance (6-9 pm)**

Governance in societies emerging from conflict is often difficult. Not only international intervenors but also host country populations may want nothing less than democracy and human rights, but conditions make that difficult, raising difficult issues of sequencing a “transition.”

This week will be the first of three weeks in which we add an hour to the class in order to engage in a difficult simulation concerning South Sudan that combines security, rule of law, governance, economic and social issues.

***Objectives:***Understand

• The particular problems and approaches associated with post-war governance, including power sharing and electoral engineering as well as local governance.

• The debate over whether elections, and democracy in general, are a good idea, as well as the priority afforded to human rights.

***Questions:***

What does political stability mean? Who generally has power during and after conflict? Who should have power after conflict? Why do intervenors often insist on national elections? Is local governance important? Why? How can governance be made more accountable and transparent? How can intervenors be made more accountable?

***Required Reading:***

*Guiding Principles*, Section 8.

Background reading for the simulation (handout)

Anna K. Jarstad, “The Prevalence of Power-Sharing: Exploring the Patterns of Post- Election Peace,” *Africa Spectrum*, 44, 3, 41-62 at <http://hup.sub.uni-hamburg.de/giga/afsp/article/view/191/191>

Stephen Biddle, Fontini Christia and J. Alex Thier, “Defining Success in Afghanistan: What can the United States Accept?” *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2010 at <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/66450/stephen-biddle-fotini-christia-and-j-alexander-thier/defining-success-in-afghanistan>

Jarrett Blanc, Aanand Hylland and Kare Vollen, “State Structures and Electoral Systems in Post-Conflict Situations, IFES, 2006, pp. 7-47 (also skim remaining pages on electoral systems).

<http://www.ifes.org/~/media/Files/Publications/ManualHandbook/2007/555/State_Structure_Electoral_Systems.pdf>

**WEEK 5 (February 24): Sustainable Economy (6-9 pm)**

The population in countries emerging from conflict is usually poor, sometimes desperately so, even if some individuals are rich and even if the country has ample resources. Military expenditures, sanctions, war deaths, black markets, corruption and other factors limit and distort the local economy. Professor Joseph will lead this session.

This week will be the second of three weeks in which we add an hour to the class in order to engage in a difficult simulation concerning South Sudan that combines security, rule of law, governance, economic and social issues.

***Objectives:***Understand

• How economic issues in a country emerging from conflict differ from those of a developing country, including corruption.

• How policy measures need to take these differences into account in establishing a sustainable economy.

***Questions:***

How is economic development affected by conflict? What happens in a society emerging from conflict? What should happen with state property? How should private property rights be handled? What can be done about corruption?

***Required Reading:***

*Guiding Principles*, Section 9.

Paul Collier, “Post-Conflict Recovery: How Should Policies Be Distinctive?” *Journal of African Economies*, volume 18, AERC suppl 1 (2009) found at: <http://jae.oxfordjournals.org/content/18/suppl_1/i99.full.pdf+html>

Antonio C. David, Fabiano Rodrigues Bastos and Marshall Mills “Post-conflict Recovery: Institutions, Aid, or Luck?” IMF Working Paper WP/11/149 <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/wp/2011/wp11149.pdf> The gist, not the details!

Sarah Chayes, “Corruption: the Unrecognized Threat to International Security,” Carnegie Endowment for International Piece,” June 2015, <http://carnegieendowment.org/2014/06/06/corruption-unrecognized-threat-to-international-security/hcts>

Chris Blattman, “Corruption and development: Not what you think?” <http://chrisblattman.com/2012/11/05/corruption-and-development-not-what-you-think>

USAID, *Anticorruption Assessment Framework* (2009), pp. 8-23 <http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pnadp270.pdf>

### WEEK 6 (March 2): Social Well Being (6-9 pm)

**\*\*Analytical paper due/no more write-ups for extra credit after this class\*\***

The immediate requirements in a society emerging from conflict often include food, water and shelter. But soon demands for the return of displaced people and refugees, for education, health and other social services arise. And all these will be affected by the degree of social reintegration and reconciliation that has, or has not, taken place.

This week is the third of three weeks in which we add an hour to the class in order to engage in a difficult simulation concerning South Sudan that combines security, rule of law, governance, economic and social issues. Students will be expected to brief the professors on their proposed courses of action.

***Objectives:*** Understand

• What is needed to enable the broader society to recover from war.

• How these efforts can be undertaken in a society riven by conflict.

***Questions:***

Who should handle basic human needs in societies emerging from conflict? How is humanitarian action organized? What standards apply? What should the relationship be between internationals and the host government? Why are displaced people and refugees important in societies emerging from conflict? What role should women play? What can be done about reintegration and reconciliation? When can it be done?

***Required Reading****:*

*Guiding Principles,* Section 10*.*

Cluster Coordination, <http://www.unocha.org/what-we-do/coordination-tools/cluster-coordination>

*The Sphere Project,* <http://www.sphereproject.org/> general familiarization. All should read pp. 5-20 of the Handbook. Other chapters will be assigned in class.

Watch Kilian Kleinschmidt: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oAP11e99TvA&feature=youtu.be>

Krishna Kuman, “Promoting Social Reconciliation in Postconflict Societies: Selected Lessons from USAID’s Experience,” January 1999 at <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/51/9/35112635.pdf>

Valerie Hudson, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Mary Capriolo, Chad Emmett, *Sex and World Peace.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2012, Chapter 4, pp. 95-118.

**PART 2: CROSS-CUTTING PRINCIPLES**

**WEEK 7 (March 9): Leadership**

***Student proposed required readings for weeks 10-12 due to instructor!***

***Objectives:***Understand

* How leadership can contribute to and detract from achieving the desired end-states.
* What command and control systems exist in societies emerging from conflict.
* How leadership and planning complement each other in stability operations.
* How leadership plays an important role in guiding the transformation of conflict.

***Required Reading:***

Niccolo’ Machiavelli, *The Prince*, David Wooton, ed. and trans. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1995, Chapters 1-6.

Department of the Army. *Field Manual 3-07: Stability Operations*. Washington, DC: Department of the Army, 2008. Chapter 4. Found at: <http://usacac.army.mil/cac2/repository/FM307/FM3-07.pdf>

Jock Covey, Michael J. Dziedzic, and Leonard R. Hawley, eds., *The Quest for Viable Peace: International Intervention and Strategies for Conflict Transformation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Institute for Peace, 2005. Chapter 4.

Robert William Farrand, *Reconstruction and Peace Building in the Balkans: the Brcko Experience*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011, pp. 13-57.

***Spring Break! March14-18***

**WEEK 8 (March 23): Host Nation Ownership and Capacity, Political Primacy, Security**

Professor Joseph will lead a discussion focused on “ownership” issues and the primacy of politics. Contemporary interveners do not often want to remain in a state emerging from conflict. Foreigners are rarely welcome for long, and their own populations may demand a quick withdrawal. But host nations may have little capacity to govern effectively, and the capacity that exists may steer things in a less than salubrious direction, risking re-initiation of conflict. Politics is particularly difficult post-war, but at the same time unavoidable.

***Objectives:***Understand

* The requirements, risks and priorities of developing host nation ownership and capacity building.
* The role of politics in transforming a conflict and develop sustainable settlements.
* The importance of security in transforming conflicts, stabilizing the host nation and supporting reconstruction.

**Required Reading:**

*Guiding Principles*, Section 3. (Review)

Roger B. Myerson, “A Short Overview of the Fundamentals of State Building,” at <http://home.uchicago.edu/~rmyerson/research/stablizn.pdf>

Edward P. Joseph, “Ownership is Over-Rated” *SAIS Review*, Vol.  XXVII, No. 2; Summer-Fall, 2007 <http://edwardpjoseph.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/04/091107-SAIS-Review-Ownership-is-overrated-ejoseph.pdf>

Interaction, “Country Ownership: Moving from Rhetoric to Action,” November 2011, <http://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Country%20ownership%20paper.pdf>pp. 6-16

g7+ website: “Who We Are,” “Our Mission,” “Our Work” <http://www.g7plus.org>

##### WEEK 9 (March 30): Legitimacy, Unity of Effort, Conflict Transformation, Regional Engagement

**\*\*Policy Memo Due\*\***

***Objectives:***Understand:

* The basic elements of legitimacy and their interrelationships.
* The concept of “unity of effort” and various ways different actors contribute to it.
* The goal and requirements of “conflict transformation.”
* The role regional neighbors and dynamics impact a state attempting to resolve a conflict.

***Required Reading:***

*Guiding Principles,* Section 3. (Review)

Ashraf Ghani and Clare Lockhart, *Fixing Failed States: A Framework for Rebuilding a Fractured World.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2008. Chaps 6-8.

Christoph Zurcher, et. al., *Costly Democracy: Peacebuilding and Democratization after War,* Chapter 6, pp. 112-130.

Conciliation Resources, “Building Peace Across Borders” <http://www.c-r.org/sites/c-r.org/files/Accord%2022_Crossborderpeacebuilding_policy_brief_201101_ENG.pdf>

**PART 3: STUDENT PRESENTATIONS**

**Recommended Format for Student Presentations**

1. Quick statement of conclusions up front (1 minute)
2. Conflict background (1 minute)

3. Current situation (1 minutes)

4. Primary obstacles to success in achieving the chosen end-state (2 minutes)

5. Recommended measures to overcome the obstacles (3 minutes)

**WEEK 10 (April 6): Student Presentations 1 through 6**

***Objectives:***

• To analyze the key obstacles to progress in a current stabilization and reconstruction operation.

• To propose specific remedies.

***Required Reading: TBA***

**WEEK 11 (April 13): Student Class Presentations 7 through 13**

***Objectives:***

• To analyze the key obstacles to progress in a current stabilization and reconstruction operation.

• To propose specific remedies.

***Required Reading: TBA***

**WEEK 12 (April 20): Student Class Presentations 13 through 18**

***Objectives:***

• To analyze the key obstacles to progress in a current stabilization and reconstruction operation.

• To propose specific remedies.

***Required Reading: TBA***

**WEEK 13 (April 27): Course Wrap-Up**

This lesson will wrap up and provide an overview of the main learning points of the seminar.

***Objectives:***

• To review what we learned.

• To consider unsolved problems and new perspectives on post-war reconstruction.

***Required Reading:***

James Dobbins, “Guidelines for Nation Builders,” Strategic Studies Quarterly (fall 2010), pp. 15-42 at <http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/fall10.asp>

James Dobbins, Laurel Miller, et. al., *Overcoming Obstacles to Peace* (RAND, 2013), pp. 205-45 at <http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR167.html>

Jeremiah Pam, “The Paradox of Complexity,” Christopher M.

Schnaubelt, ed., Complex Operations: NATO at War and on the Margins of War

NATO Defense College Forum Paper n 14 (2010) at <http://www.ndc.nato.int/research/series.php?icode=2>.

William J. Durch, “Are We Learning Yet? The Long Road to Applying Best Practices,” in William J. Durch, ed., *Twenty-First Century Peace Operations*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace, 2006, pp. 573-607.