
Pol Sci 3782

Spring 2017

MW 2:30 – 4:00PM

Terrorism and Political Violence

Seigle 301

Instructor:

Casey Crisman-Cox

Seigle 251

Office Hours: Mondays, 4:30–5:30pm

c.crisman-cox@wustl.edu

Teaching Assistant:

Dominic Jarkey

Seigle 276

Tuesdays 2:30–3:30pm

dominic.jarkey@wustl.edu

Purpose

Terrorism is a common and frequently used tactic for small groups or individuals to disproportionately influence politics in developed and developing countries. In this course, we will consider questions about why individuals join terrorist groups, why groups adopt terrorism, how terrorist groups are defeated, and other important issues in understanding this avenue of violent politics. No previous knowledge of the subject is required.

Course Requirements

Evaluation is based on two exams (one midterm, one final), a short research project and presentation, and class participation/discussion. The midterm is worth 35% of the final grade, the project/presentation is worth 20%, participation is worth 5%, and the (cumulative) final exam is worth 40% of the final grade.

Exams are given on schedule, and make-up exams will only be administered for official (university sponsored events or hospitalizations) reason. Make all travel plans accordingly.

The date, time, and location of the final exam is determined by the registrar. Note that the registrar can change these details without consulting the course instructor. Check the registrar's website or office for exact details.

If you are entitled to examination accommodation, please coordinate with

the appropriate organization (Cornerstone: The Learning Center) in advance of the examination. Students will not be able to obtain accommodations directly from the instructor or the teaching assistant.

Final grades will be based on the weighted average of the course requirements plus extra credit. The grading scale is as follows:

$93 \leq x$	A
$90 \leq x < 93$	A-
$87 \leq x < 90$	B+
$84 \leq x < 87$	B
$80 \leq x < 84$	B-
$77 \leq x < 80$	C+
$74 \leq x < 77$	C
$70 \leq x < 74$	C-
$60 \leq x < 70$	D
$x < 60$	F

Attendance and Extra Credit

Attendance is highly encouraged, but not required. Three extra credit points will be added to a student's final grade if they miss no classes, two extra points for missing only 1-2 classes, one point for missing 3-4 classes and no extra credit will be awarded to students missing 5 or more classes.

If more than 95% of the class completes the on-line course evaluations everyone will have an extra 3 points to their final grade.

Texts

Books for this class:

1. Hoffman, Bruce. 2006. *Inside Terrorism, Revised and Expanded Edition* Columbia University Press. (Available in e-Book format through the library)
2. Richardson, Louise. 2006. *What Terrorists Want*. Random House. (Cheap on Amazon)

All additional readings will be available on blackboard. Lecture slides will also be posted to blackboard within 24 hours of the lecture.

Exam Format

The midterm exam will consist of two parts. The first part will contain 8 terms for identification. Students will identify 5 of these 8 terms. The second part of the exam will consist of an essay question (from a choice of two prompts). Additional details, along with grading rubrics for the essay and the identification terms, will be posted to blackboard prior to the first exam.

The final exam, like the midterm, will contain 8 identification terms with students choosing 5 to answer. Unlike the midterm, however, the final exam will have two required essay questions from a choice of three prompts.

All grading will be done by the Teaching Assistant, each identification question is worth 8 points and essays are worth 60 points. If an arithmetical error is discovered, students should approach the TA, who will fix the error. However, if a student wishes to challenge a grade of all or part of the exam, the following steps must be taken:

1. Email the instructor within 72 hours of the exams being returned.
2. Explain which aspect(s) of the rubric(s) should lead to a higher score. For each disputed element, the student should cite specific aspects of the rubric to justify why a higher grade is deserved. Specific appeals to lectures or readings should be included as applicable.
3. If the instructor deems that there is enough ground for the challenge, he will re-grade the entire essay or identification section, depending on what is being appealed. The student's grade may go up, down, or remain unchanged.

Any appeals not following this format will be ignored.

Academic Integrity

Please be familiar with the University's academic honesty policies (url: <https://wustl.edu/about/compliance-policies/academic-policies/undergraduate-student-academic-integrity-policy/>). Violations will be handled with the utmost seriousness. Violators will be referred to the academic integrity office.

Course Schedule

18 January: Course Introduction and Syllabus Review

Unit 1: What is terrorism?

23 January: Defining terrorism and levels of political violence 1

1. Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism*. Chapter 1
2. Sambanis, Nicholas. 2004. "What is Civil War? Conceptual and Empirical Complexities of an Operational Definition." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 48(6): 814-858

25 January: Defining terrorism and levels of political violence 2

1. Zohar, Noam J. 2004. "Innocence and Complex Threats: Upholding the War Ethic and the Condemnation of Terrorism." *Ethics*, 114(4): 734-751.
2. Richardson, Louise. *What Terrorists Want*. Chapter 1

30 January: Levels of terrorism

1. Dekmejian, R. Hrair. 2007 *Spectrum of Terror*. CQ Press. Chapters 1-2, 7.
2. Danzell, Orlandrew E. "Political Parties: When do They Turn to Terror?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 55(1): 85-105.

1 February: Historic background 1 (Partnerships due)

1. Shugart, William F. 2006. "An Analytical History of Terrorism." *Public Choice*. 128: 7-39.
2. Rapoport, David C. 1984. "Fear and Trembling: Terrorism in Three Religious Traditions." *The American Political Science Review*. 78(3): 658-677.

6 February: Historic background 2

1. Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism*. Chapter 2
2. Richardson, Louise. *What Terrorists Want*. Chapter 2

3. Rapoport, David C. 2004 "Four Waves of Terrorism." in *Attacking Terrorism: Elements of Grand Strategy* Georgetown University Press: 46-73.

Unit 2: Purposes of terrorism

8 February: Bargaining theories of conflict (Topics assigned)

1. Fearon, James. 1995. "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization*, 49(03), 379-414.
2. Reiter, D. 2003. "Exploring the Bargaining Model of War." *Perspectives on Politics*, 1(01), 27-43.

13 February: Signaling games 1

1. Filson, D., and Werner, S. (2002). "A bargaining model of war and peace." *American Journal of Political Science*, 819-837.
2. Rod Garrett slides on bargaining and signaling

15 February: Signaling games 2

1. Lapan, Harvey E. and Todd Sandler. 1993. "Terrorism and Signalling." *European Journal of Political Economy* 9(3):383-397.
2. Crisman-Cox, Casey. Unpublished. "Signaling Benefits in the Israel-Palestine Conflict."

20 February: Motivations for terrorism 1

1. Victoroff, Jeff. 2005. "The Mind of the Terrorist: A Review and Critique of Psychological Approaches." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(3): 3-42.
2. Richardson, Louise. *What Terrorists Want*. Chapter 3.
3. Crenshaw, Marth. 2006. "Have Motivations for Terrorism Changed?" in *Tangled Roots: Social and Psychological Factors in the Genesis of Terrorism*, ed. Jeff Victoroff.

22 February: Motivations for terrorism 2

1. Humphreys, Macartan and Jeremy M. Weinstein. 2008. "Who Fights? The Determinants of Participation in Civil War." *American Journal of Political Science*, 53(2): 436-455.
2. Crenshaw, Martha. 1981. "The Causes of Terrorism." *Comparative Politics*. 13(4): 379-399.
3. Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2005. "The Quality of Terror." *American Journal of Political Science*. 49(3): 515-530

27 February: Transnational terrorism

1. Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism*. Chapter 3
2. Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2007. "Transnational Dimensions of Civil War." *Journal of Peace Research*. 44(3): 293-309.
3. Dekmeijian, R. Hrair. *Spectrum of Terror*. Chapter 6

Unit 3: Tactics

29 February: Strategies of violence

1. Kalyvas, S. and L. Balcells 2010. "International system and technologies of rebellion: How the end of the Cold War shaped internal conflict." *American Political Science Review*.
2. Kydd, Andrew and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism." *International Security*. 31(1): 49-80.

1 March: Suicide terrorism (Proposal due)

1. Robert A. Pape. 2003. "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review*. 97(3): 343-361
2. Richardson, Louis. *What Terrorists Want*. Chapter 5.
3. Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism*. Chapter 5.

6 March: State sponsorship

1. Salehyan, Idean. 2009 *Rebels without Borders*. Cornell University Press. Pp. 19-26, 35-50.

2. Carter, David B. 2012. "A Blessing or a Curse? State Support for Terrorist Groups." *International Organization*. 66(1): 129-151.
3. Kenneth A. Schultz. 2010. "The Enforcement Problem in Coercive Bargaining: Interstate Conflict over Rebel Support in Civil Wars" *International Organization*. 64(2): 281-312.

8 March: Media and terrorism

1. Hoffman, Bruce. *Inside Terrorism*. Chapters 6-8
2. Kaldor, M. (2006) *New and Old Wars*. Selections.
3. Richardson, Louise. *What Terrorists Want* Chapter 4.

13 March: SPRING BREAK NO CLASS

15 March: SPRING BREAK NO CLASS

20 March: Review of midterm format and review

1. No readings

22 March: Midterm exam

1. No reading

Unit 4: Responses to terror

27 March: Counterterrorism 1

1. Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2007. "Politics and the Suboptimal Provision of Counterterror." *International Organization*. 61(1): 9-36
2. Richardson, Louise. *What Terrorists Want* Chapters 6-8

29 March: Counterterrorism 2

1. Biddle, S., J.A. Friedman, and J.N. Shapiro. 2012. "Testing the Surge: Why Did Violence Decline in Iraq in 2007?" *International Security*.
2. Lyall, Jason. 2010. "Are Co-Ethnics More Effective Counter-insurgents? Evidence from the Second Chechen War." *American Political Science Review*. 104(1): 1-20.

3. Lyall, Jason. 2010. "Do Democracies Make Inferior Counter-insurgents? Re-assessing Democracy's Impact on War Outcomes and Duration." *International Organization*, 64(1) 167-92.

3 April: Negotiations 1

1. Bapat, Navin. 2006. "State Bargaining with Transnational Terrorist Groups." *International Studies Quarterly* 50(2): 215-232.
2. Walter, Barbara F. 1997. "The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement." *International Organization*. 51(3): 335-364.
3. Kydd, Andrew and Barbara F. Walter. 2002. "Sabotaging the Peace: The Politics of Extremist Violence." *International Organization*. 56(2): 263-296
4. Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2005. "Conciliation, Counterterrorism, and Patterns of Terrorist Violence." *International Organization*. 59: 145-176.

5 April: Negotiations 2

1. Walter, Barbara F. 1999 "Designing transitions from civil war: Demobilization, democratization, and commitments to peace." *International Security*.
2. Svensson, I. 2009. "Who Brings which Peace?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*.
3. Kydd, Andrew. 2003. "Which Side are You on?" *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(4), 597-611.

10 April: Regime type and violence (Projects due)

1. Vreeland, James Raymond. 2008. "The Effect of Political Regime on Civil War: Unpacking Anocracy." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 52(3): 401-425.
2. Aksoy, Deniz, David B. Carter, and Joseph Wright. 2012. "Terrorism in Dictatorships." *Journal of Politics*. 74(3): 810-826.
3. Aksoy, Deniz and David B. Carter. Forthcoming. "Electoral Institutions and the Emergence of Terrorist Groups." *British Journal of Political Science*.

Unit 5: Case studies (student presentations)

12 April: Class Presentations 1

17 April: Class Presentations 2

19 April: Class Presentations 3

24 April: Class Presentations 4

26 April: Review for Final Exam

8 May (3:30-5:30PM): Cumulative Final Exam, Consult Registrar for Details, date, time, and location may change

Final Disclaimer

The schedule, policies, procedures, and assignments in this course are subject to change in the event of extenuating circumstances, by mutual agreement, and/or to ensure better student learning.

The project

The goal of this project is to have students prepare short executive summaries and presentations (or briefings) about the specific terrorist groups. Specifically, students will prepare a briefing for incoming President Trump about an existing terrorist organization, with a focus on group leaders, goals, state sponsors, territorial control, possible negotiations, and a proposal for U.S. policy. This project will consist of three parts: proposal, paper, and presentation. Teams will consist of 2 people, one team member will email the TA by February 1st with the identities of the team members. If your name does not appear in such an email, your partner will be randomly assigned. On February 8th, a topic (terrorist organization) will be randomly assigned to each team.

If at anytime you need help or have issues with your teammate (anything from minor spats through the nightmare scenario of your teammate being a deadbeat slacker), the TA is here to help you resolve those. Use him liberally.

The proposal (due 1 March, 5 points)

By the end of class on February 1st, your team needs to submit (email) your proposal to the TA. It will consist of 2 elements:

1. A one paragraph proposal of how work will be divided over the paper and presentation
2. A list of *at least* 5 sources you can use to create your briefing

You should consult the TA if you need help creating this proposal. The proposal should be 1-2 pages, double spaced, 1 inch margins, 8.5 × 11 inch paper, with 12-point times new roman font. Submit your proposal in either PDF (.pdf) or word (.doc or .docx) format. Sources should be listed using APSA bibliography styling. The APSA style manual is available on blackboard. If you require any help with formatting, discuss it with the TA.

The paper (due 10 April, 60 points)

The paper is the main part of this project, it should be written as a briefing addressed to the President. To that end, the first part should contain all of the following:

1. A brief history of group, include major attacks, leaders, primary targets, and key events

2. The group's ideology and goals
3. Sponsors and available funding information
4. Any splinter or rival groups
5. Recent activities (if the group is active)
6. Any major negotiations or peace deals and reasons for their success or failure

The second part will consist of a policy proposal designed to end the conflict (either peacefully or by force). You need to justify your proposal to the president. Make it a real proposal that you believe, rather than one tailored to the president's viewpoints (although if you share those views that should be reflected in your proposal). Obviously, for conflicts that have ended, this is a little trickier. In these cases, you should offer a full and justified opinion on the likelihood that the conflict reignites and steps that could either encourage or discourage reactivation.

The final paper should be 5-7 pages, double spaced, 1 inch margins, 8.5 × 11 inch paper, with 12-point times new roman font. In-text citations are important and expected. They should be done in author-year format according to the APSA style manual (available on blackboard). Papers will be emailed to the TA by the end of class on the due date, all late work will be penalized by 5 points each 12 hour period afterwards. If you require any help with formatting, discuss it with the TA.

The presentation (35 points)

Presentation dates will be randomly assigned and distributed by March 1st. If you have a (very convincing) conflict or university approved absence, you may trade with another presentation (it is your responsibility to find a team willing to trade with you). Roughly 7 presentations will be conducted each day. If we run out of time on a given day, make-up presentations will occur prior to the exam review on the last day of class.

The presentation will be 10 minutes long, and you should use slides to help us follow along. Your presentation will focus on all the important points from your paper, with an emphasis on your proposal (active groups) or risk assessment of the current situation (inactive groups). A 1-2 minute question session will follow each presentation.

Grading

Grading on the first two components will be done by the TA. The TA will consider the following guidelines in assigning grades. The instructor grades the presentation and he will also do so using the listed guidelines.

Proposal

- One point for a complete paragraph describing work distribution
- One point for 1-3 quality sources. Two point for at least three quality sources. Three points for having five quality sources.
- One point for spelling, grammar, and formatting.

Paper

- For items 1 and 6, above, 10 points are awarded for each if they are each fully addressed. 8 points are awarded for small omissions or factual errors. 5 points are awarded for major omissions or error and 0 for total omissions or errors. Partial credit between the levels can be added at the TA's discretion (Possible maximum: 20 points).
- Items 2-5, above, are each awarded 5 points if they are addressed fully. 4 points are awarded for small omissions or errors, and 2 points are award for major omissions or errors. Total omissions or errors receive 0 points. Partial credit between the levels can be added at the TA's discretion (Possible maximum: 20 points)
- For the policy recommendation (active terrorist group) or risk assessment (inactive terrorist group), 15 points are awarded for a well-reasoned, justified, and evidence based proposal or assessment with no factual errors. 12 points are awarded for minor flaws in reasoning, evidence, or factual concerns. 7 points are awarded for major flaws in reasoning, evidence, or factual concerns. Total omissions, unsupported conclusions, or no evidence-based reasoning receives 0 points. Partial credit between the levels can be added at the TA's discretion (Possible maximum: 15 points).
- Five points are award for appropriate (standard formal writing practices) spelling, grammar, formating, and style. Partial credit between can be awarded at the TA's discretion (Possible maximum: 5 points)

The late policy, above, is applied after the paper is graded according to these guidelines.

Presentation

- If each of the six of the above items is discussed in a concise, coherent manner, you receive 3 points per item. If an item discussed is unclear, too long or too short you receive 2 points for that item. Finally, if an item is missing, you receive no points for that item. Partial credit between can be awarded at the instructors's discretion (Possible maximum: 18 points)
- If the policy proposal or risk assessment is well-reasoned and presented concisely you receive 15 points. 12 points are awarded for minor factual or logical errors. 7 points are awarded for major flaws. 0 points are awarded if this section is missing or it contains unsupported conclusions, and has no factually correct statements. Partial credit between can be awarded at the instructors's discretion (Possible maximum: 15 points)
- The final two points are awarded if your presentation is professionally formatted with minimal spelling/grammar errors (Possible maximum: 2 points).

If a member of your team asks a reasonable or quality question of another team your team receives five bonus points.

Finally, if an academic integrity violation (including improper or missing citations) is discovered, the team receives a 0 on the whole project. Additionally, the matter is submitted to the proper office as specified in the syllabus.