

Interdisciplinary Programmes

Academic year 2018-2019

Violence, Fragility, and Political Order

DE146 - Autumn - 6 ECTS

Course Description

This course focuses on violence and political order—also known as “governance”—in contemporary conflict-affected and fragile contexts. It offers a critical approach to the question of governance, focusing specifically on relationships between states and societies, and the contestation inherent therein. After taking the course, students will be familiar with key theories of state strategies of governance in contemporary conflict-affected and fragile states and be able to apply (and critique) these theories. Discussions will center on the role of violence in state formation and fragility, governance, civil conflict, and global governance. In addition to substantive goals, the course also aims to instill a critical mindset in students. To this end, the course will incorporate discussion and readings on data, methodology, and research ethics. Students will be asked to apply these insights throughout the course, thereby being critical consumers and analysts of the course materials. The course will use a variety of academic sources from the fields of anthropology, comparative politics, development studies, economics, political philosophy, and sociology. The course emphasizes states popularly understood as “fragile” or “failed”, with a particular focus on African countries.

> PROFESSOR

Rebecca Tapscott
rebecca.tapscott@graduateinstitute.ch

[Office hours](#)

> ASSISTANT

Donika Limani
donika.limani@graduateinstitute.ch

[Office hours](#)

Syllabus

Pre-requisites: This course is designed to build on the core courses of Power, Conflict, and Development stream. For this reason, for students taking the Power, Conflict, and Development Track, it is required that you have previously taken either of the two compulsory courses (per choice) "State-Building and War-Making in the Developing World" taught by Professor Mohammad-Mahmoud Ould Mohamedou or "Power, State, and Violence" taught by Professor Riccardo Bocco.

ASSIGNMENTS AND ASSESSEMENT:

- | | |
|---|-----|
| - Class participation and in-class activities | 15% |
| - Short paper 1: Causes of civil war | 20% |
| - Short paper 2: Conflict review dossier | 30% |
| - Final paper or exam | 35% |

Class participation will include discussion, as well as in-class activities, such as written responses to short prompts based on assigned readings. These will be graded on a ✓/✓+ scale and help me to assess how you understand the readings and class discussion. I have included questions in the syllabus for each class, which you should be prepared to discuss. These questions are subject to revision up to one week before the class.

Written assignments: The first two assignments have both group components and individual components, as well as written and oral components. The final paper is individual and written only. **Please submit all assignments as word documents to enable me to provide in-line comments.** Include your last name in your document, as well as the assignment number [e.g. Tapscott_Assignment 1.docx]

Assignment 1 – Causes of civil war [1500-2000 words]

Assignment 2 – Conflict review dossier

Final paper: Critical conflict analysis [3500-4000 words]

Please see additional instructions available on Moodle for each assignment.

EXPECTATIONS:

Academic integrity: The [Institute's academic honesty and integrity policy](#), and the applicable university disciplinary procedures, apply to all academic work including the taking of examinations and submission of written work. This includes poor citation, plagiarism and resubmission of one's own work. It is your responsibility to read and understand the guidelines before submitting any assignment. Feel free to ask me any questions you may have about them.

I will use a software program such as TurnItIn to check for plagiarism. If you plagiarize your work, you will receive a 0 on the assignment and the case will be referred to IHEID administration. Please look on Moodle for guidelines on what plagiarism is and how to avoid it. I do not mind how you cite materials as long as you use a recognized citation style (Chicago, MLA, or others).

Reading: For each class, I have assigned somewhere between 50 and 90 pages of required reading. I suggest that students read the selections in the order they are listed. Students are expected to have read all the assigned readings before class and be prepared to discuss them critically in the context of the session's themes, the discussion questions listed in the syllabus, and the course's overall themes.

In "optional" readings, I have included a few core readings that the class builds on. If you are not familiar with the general arguments made in these core texts, I suggest you read them or a summary of them before class.

Course attendance: You are required to attend class. Unexcused absences will affect your participation grade. The TA will keep track of attendance; any absences should be reported directly to her.

Office hours: I will hold regular office hours each week. If you need to see me outside these hours, please contact me by email at least 48 hours before you need to meet. We can also arrange Skype

calls if this is more convenient. For administrative questions or clarifications on assignments, please contact the TA.

Other: If you have a special condition that requires accommodation in this course, let me know after class or in office hours during the first week of class. I will be happy to consider appropriate accommodations provided timely notice is received and the arrangement is consistent with the Graduate Institute's policies.

TIMELINE:

Due dates for written submissions are in red, class activities are in blue. **Please note that class for Week 6 will be held on Thursday 18 October 2019 from 8:15am to 10am, and there will be no class on 30 October.**

1. 18 September
2. **25 September:** Complete online personal information sheet [part of class participation grade]
3. 2 October
4. 9 October
5. **16 October:** Causes of civil conflict debate [Class activity]
6. **18 October:** **THURSDAY, 8:15am – 10:00am – RESCHEDULED CLASS**
 - **21 October [Monday]:** Written assignment 1 due: Causes of civil conflict
7. 23 October
 - *****NB: 30 October – NO CLASS*****
8. 6 November
 - **12 November [Monday]:** Written assignment 2 due: Conflict Summary Dossier
9. 13 November
10. 20 November
11. 27 November
12. 4 December
13. 11 December
14. **18 December:** Praxis debate
 - **22 December [Saturday]:** Final paper/final exam due

PART 1: Critical approaches to contested concepts: What are we talking about, and why are we talking about it?

This introductory portion of the course delves into the concepts of “states”, “societies”, “violence” and “governance”—which, as we will find, are surprisingly complicated and even contested. What exactly is a state? What does it mean to live in one? What is “society” and how is it constituted? How does violent conflict challenge and change these relationships? What is the difference between violence and governance? In this section, we’ll discuss these questions, as well as why they matter. These classes will provide a foundation for the remainder of the course.

Week 1: State and society making

We often talk about state and society, and a “contract” between these two entities. How is such a relationship forged? This class uses two texts—one classic political science text and one contemporary case study—to probe the tensions and assumptions underlying concepts of “state-society relations”. During class, we will discuss the emergence of state and society, how the two constitute each other, the role of violence therein, and the inherent struggles to dominate on the one hand, and evade domination on the other. The class builds on scholarship including Charles Tilly’s

book “Capital, Coercion and European States” and Scott’s earlier work on “Seeing Like a State”. If you are unfamiliar with the arguments advanced in these texts, consider looking at the optional readings to get up to speed before class.

- **SCOTT, James C.** 2009. *The art of not being governed: An anarchist history of upland Southeast Asia*. Yale University Press. (pp. 1-22; 36-39)
- **STITES, Elizabeth**, and **Darlington AKABWAI**. “‘We are now reduced to women’: Impacts of forced disarmament in Karamoja, Uganda.” *Nomadic Peoples* 14.2 (2010): 24-43.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- How do the two readings each conceive of the relationship between people, violence, mobility, and resources?
- How do the two readings differ in their conception of the nature of the relationship between state and society? What role does violence play in each conception?
- What similarities do the two readings draw out? What are the major differences? To what might you attribute the differences?
- In your view, what does Stites and Akabwai’s use of gender analysis contribute to the article?

OPTIONAL

- **TILLY, Charles.** *Coercion, capital, and European states, AD 990*. Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- **SCOTT, James C.** *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press, 1998.

Week 2: “State-ness”, “twilight” institutions and other critiques of the state

States are key to our understanding of violence and political power—but what are states exactly? This class engages with several critical approaches to studying and understanding states, in particular examining performative and symbolic elements of statehood. The class grapples with the notion of “state-ness”, how it is constituted, and who can have it.

- **NORTH, Douglass, John Joseph WALLIS**, and **Barry WEINGAST**. “Violence and the rise of open-access orders.” *Journal of Democracy* 20.1 (2009): 55-68.
- **MITCHELL, Timothy**. “The limits of the state: Beyond statist approaches and their critics.” *American political science review* 85.1 (1991): 77-96.
- **LUND, Christian**. “Twilight institutions: public authority and local politics in Africa.” *Development and change* 37.4 (2006): 685-705.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- According to North, Wallis, and Weingast, what is the relationship between institutions, violence, and economic development? How does it link to the Weberian concept of the state?
- What is the difference between the Weberian concept of the state, and concept offered by Mitchell?
- What do the concepts of “public authority” and “twilight institutions” offer to discussions of governance? Are they useful?

Week 3: Governing subjects: disciplining body and mind

In many theories of governance, “society” stands opposite “the state”. But what is society exactly? And how are the members of it made into governable subjects? This class homes in on the making of

subjects and subjectivity, examining strategies to discipline people's bodies and minds. In particular, the readings focus on the role of violence in its various forms, as well as how governing actors can manipulate sporadic or discrete interventions so that even in the absence of ongoing, material violence, threat, fear, or anticipation of violence can govern subjects in their everyday lives.

- **WILCOX, Lauren B.** *Bodies of violence: Theorizing embodied subjects in international relations*. Oxford Studies in Gender and International Relations, 2015. [Chapter 1, pp. 17-48]
- **WEDEEN, Lisa.** "Acting "as if": symbolic politics and social control in Syria." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 40.3 (1998): 503-523.
- **GREEN, Linda.** "Fear as a Way of Life." *Cultural Anthropology* 9.2 (1994): 227-256.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- What is the theoretical relationship between governance on the one hand, and violence, bodies, and minds on the other, according to these authors? Where do they agree and where do they disagree?
- Why would feminist theory be useful in analyzing these relationships? Do you think it is a helpful framework to think with? Why or why not?
- To what extent are these author's claims limited to authoritarian and illiberal regimes?
- If what these authors argue is correct, what avenues are left for citizens to make viable claims on states (or governing authorities more broadly)?

OPTIONAL

- **FOUCAULT, Michel.** *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. 1975.
- **FOUCAULT, Michel.** *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975*. 1999.
- **AGAMBEN, Giorgio.** *Homo sacer: Sovereign power and bare life*. Stanford University Press, 1998.

Week 4: Problematizing "fragile" and "failed" states

We have thus far critically examined the state-society relationship, as well as the concepts of "state" and "society" (or perhaps more precisely, "subjects"). Today, we turn to the concepts of state "fragility" or "failure", and how they are used in global and domestic governance.

- **CALL, Charles T.** "The fallacy of the 'Failed State'." *Third World Quarterly* 29, no. 8 (2008): 1491-1507.
- **DUFFIELD, Mark.** *Global governance and the new wars: The merging of development and security*. Zed Books Ltd., 2014. (Chapter 2: pp. 22-43).
- **FISHER, Jonathan.** "When it pays to be a 'fragile state': Uganda's use and abuse of a dubious concept." *Third World Quarterly* 35, no. 2 (2014): 316-332.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

- What is a "fragile" state, and where does the concept come from? How do they differ from "non-fragile" states? Is it a useful term? Why or why not?
- How does using different units of analysis (local, national, global) change how we might think of as "fragility"?
- Who wins and who loses from the use of the term "fragile"?
- (How) do these readings change your assumptions about good governance and how it can be achieved?

PART 2: VIOLENT CONFLICT & CIVIL WAR

Part 2 of the course asks students to think about how our core concepts—state, society, violence, and governance—interact. How do people mobilize these concepts? For what ends? This part of the course focuses in particular on why people fight, and how we should understand these acts of collective human-made violence. While scholars from many disciplines study conflict, a particular area of political science has emerged that attempts to analyze conflict in order to develop causal explanations for why conflict occurs, often as a way to understand threats to state stability. The following three classes provide a taste of what is out there in terms of political science theories that attempt to explain conflict. Although a small part of the broader study of governance and violence, these theories filter into the policy space as they often offer parsimonious explanations for complex human behavior.

*****NB: The class for Week 6 is rescheduled and will be held on the same week as Week 5's class. This means you need to do the readings for both Week 5 and Week 6 in the same week*****

Week 5: Interrogating micro-explanations for contemporary civil war

For this session, the class will be divided into three groups. Each group will be assigned to one of the following topics: (1) greed/grievance; (2) identarian factors; (3) institutional factors, and will prepare for the class session by reading the two selections assigned to their group. During the class session, you will first spend 20 minutes in your group to discuss your group's readings, in particular reviewing the key arguments. You will then be divided into new groups with one representative from each topic, and each person in the group will get ten minutes to convince the other two members in your group why contemporary civil war occurs. This is in preparation for your first written assignment. **Please see the assignment sheet for additional information.**

Group 1: Greed/grievance

- **COLLIER, Paul**, and **Anke HOFFLER**. "Greed and grievance in civil war." *Oxford economic papers* 56.4 (2004): 563-595.
- **CEDERMAN, Lars-Erik**, **Nils WEIDMANN**, and **Kristian GLEDITSCH**. "Horizontal inequalities and ethnonationalist civil war: A global comparison." *American Political Science Review* 105.3 (2011): 478-495.

Group 2: Identarian factors

- **LAKE, David A.** and **Donald ROTHCHILD**. 1996. "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security* 21 (Fall): 41-75.
- **KAUFMAN, Stuart**. 2006. "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice: Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence." *International Security* 30, no. 4: 45-86.

Group 3: Institutional factors

- **ACEMOGLU, Daron**, and **James A. ROBINSON**. *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. Crown Business, 2013. [Chapter 1]
- **MANSFIELD, Edward D.** and **Jack SNYDER**, "Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War", *International Organization* 56 (2): 297–337 (2002).

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- According to the authors, what are the causes of civil conflict? If there are multiple causes, how are they related to each other?
- What assumptions do the authors in your group make? What is their unit of analysis? If you were to change these assumptions and/or the unit of analysis, would their findings still hold?

- When you think of other cases that you know, which arguments are most persuasive (and least) and why?

Week 6: Examining a case of violent civil conflict: The Lord's Resistance Army and the National Resistance Movement in Uganda

This week we will dive into a case of civil conflict in Uganda, focusing on the conflict between the Government of Uganda and the Lord's Resistance Army which ravaged the north of the country from 1986 until 2006. We will use this case to help ground the class exercise from Week 5 and first short paper.

- **TRIPP, Aili Mari.** "The Changing Face of Authoritarianism in Africa: The Case of Uganda" *Africa Today*. 50.3 (2004): 3-26.
- **ALLEN, Tim, and Koen VLASSENROOT.** *The Lord's Resistance Army: myth and reality*. Zed Books, 2010 (Introduction pp. 1-21)
- **And select one additional chapter from Allen & Vlassenroot 2010 in Parts 1 or 2 to read**

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- How do explanations for the conflict differ between the Government of Uganda under Museveni and the Acholi people who inhabit northern Uganda?
- What do you think were the main causes of the conflict between the LRA and the Government of Uganda? What about in relation to the causes of conflict that we discussed last week?
- For the chapter you selected from Allen & Vlassenroot: (1) which chapter did you choose to read and why? (2) What was the main argument of the chapter? (3) What is one thing you found interesting or surprising in the chapter?

Week 7: Class debate on causes of civil war

Before this class, your first written assignment is due on the causes of violent civil conflict. For readings, return to the four readings you did not do for Week 5—read them and use them along with the readings from Week 6 to write your essay. In class, you'll be asked to present your argument, explaining what you think the main causes of conflict were in northern Uganda, and why.

Part 2¾: A Critical Interlude

In Part 2¾, we will take a brief step back to interrogate our building blocks—data and method—as well as the broader landscape that we've been trekking.

Week 8: How is the sausage is made? Interrogating data, method, and human perception

In Week 8, we will discuss the nature of data. In Weeks 1-4, we discussed contested concepts, and the stakes of defining them. Here, we dive deeper, interrogating the production of information on which these concepts rely. First, we'll examine the nature of data—how much can or should we rely on quantitative and qualitative data? Next, we'll discuss the politics and ethics of data and method. How do people use data instrumentally? How *should* people use data? We'll discuss how we can be critical consumers of data, and responsible users. This class will also offer an opportunity to discuss how social structures shape our ability to use data, as well as how and if these issues have changed in recent years.

- **CRAMER, Chris.** "Homo Economicus Goes to War: Methodological Individualism, Rational Choice and the Political Economy of War." *World Development*. 30.11 (2002): 1845-1864.
- **SAMBANIS, Nicholas.** "What Is a Civil War? Conceptual and Empirical Complexities of an Operational Definition," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48.6 (2004): 814-58.
- **DOMINUS, Susan.** "When the Revolution Came for Susan Cuddy" *New York Times* 19 October 2017. https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/18/magazine/when-the-revolution-came-for-amy-cuddy.html?_r=0

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- What do the different readings suggest about the nature of data? Where, according to each of the different readings, does human interference matter?
- Do the readings support or contradict each other?
- If the authors are correct, what should we—as scholars, practitioners, or advocates—do about it?

OPTIONAL READING:

- **JERVEN, Morten.** *Poor numbers: how we are misled by African development statistics and what to do about it.* Cornell University Press, 2013.
- **DESAI, Deval** and **Marieke SCHOMERUS,** "There Was A Third Man...': Tales from a Global Policy Consultation on Indicators for the Sustainable Development Goals" *Development and Change*, 49.1 (2018): 89-115.
- **FUJII, Lee Ann.** "Shades of truth and lies: Interpreting testimonies of war and violence." *Journal of Peace Research* 47.2 (2010): 231-241.

PART 3: GOVERNING STRATEGIES AND CONTEMPORARY "FRAGILE" STATES

In Part 3 of the course, we will engage with various theoretical lenses to understand violence and governing strategies, including theories of the post-colonial and neo-patrimonial state, rentier states, hybrid or illiberal states, sneaky states, and privatized and networked governance. While each of these theoretical traditions emphasizes different causal factors for how actors govern and sustain power, we will see that they are intertwined, and each helps to better understand and critically assess the others. In this part of the course, we will engage with questions such as: what are the differences between violence and governance? And what are the similarities? How can we tell which one is which? For those of us interested in praxis, what might a "good" intervention look like, and how might this differ in the short versus long-term?

Week 9: The post-colonial and "neo-patrimonial" African state

A significant portion of popular academic work on governance comes from scholars based in the global north. As we saw with classes 5-7 on micro-explanations for civil conflict, these theorists often attempt to develop causal explanations for violence and institutionalization that are broadly generalizable. This class focuses specifically on theories of the sub-Saharan African state that address colonialism and its potentially long-lasting institution effects. While these readings are specific to African states, they offer some theoretical insights into cases in other parts of the world.

- **ENGLEBERT, Pierre.** "Pre-colonial institutions, post-colonial states, and economic development in tropical Africa." *Political Research Quarterly* 53.1 (2000): 7-36.
- **MAMDANI, Mahmood.** *Citizen and subject: Contemporary Africa and the legacy of late colonialism.* Princeton University Press, 1996. [Introduction, pp. 1-34]

- **DE SARDAN, JP Olivier.** "A moral economy of corruption in Africa?" *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 37.1 (1999): 25-52.
- **TITECA, Kristof.** "Want to understand Belgium's complicated politics and scandals? Let's look at Africa." *The Monkey Cage Blog, Washington Post* (10 July 2017).

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- According to each of these authors, how important was colonialism in shaping the modern-day African state? What are the legacies of colonialism?
- Are the legacies of colonialism path dependent? What kind of interventions might shift current trajectories?
- How do each of these authors conceptualize colonialism? What are the limits of these studies/approaches?
- What would we need to ask about the legacies of colonialism in some non-African cases in order to understand the state? How similar or different are these questions to the ones the authors ask of African states?

OPTIONAL READINGS:

- **BAYART, Jean-François.** *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly*. Longman, London. 1993.
- **MBEMBE, Achille.** "Provisional notes on the postcolony." *Africa* 62.1 (1992): 3-37.

Week 10: Rentier states and entrepreneurs of violence

In Week 10, we will examine the rentier state, looking at scholars who understand governance as fundamentally and inextricably tied to resource extraction and rent maximization. Each reading emphasizes different aspects of the relationship between capital and governance.

- **NORDSTROM, Carolyn.** *Shadows of war: Violence, power, and international profiteering in the twenty-first century*. Vol. 10. University of California Press, 2004 (Chs 3 & 7, pp. 25-39; 87-103).
- **DE WAAL, Alex.** *The real politics of the Horn of Africa: Money, war and the business of power*. John Wiley & Sons, 2015 [Chs 1 & 2, pp.1-34].
- **RODGERS, Dennis.** "The state as a gang." *Critique of Anthropology* 26.3 (2006): 315-330.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- According to each of these scholars, are there institutional constraints on the use of violence to extract resources? If so, what are they?
 - o How do these different assumptions about the role of institutions shape the implications of each scholar's arguments?
- How do these theories relate to the earlier classes we had on greed and grievance, as well as the conceptual classes on state and society?
- Do these arguments support or challenge the earlier theories of the state and society that we discussed in classes 1-3?

OPTIONAL READING:

- **OLSON, Mancur.** *Power and prosperity: Outgrowing communist and capitalist dictatorships*. Basic Books, 2000.
- **RENO, William.** *Warfare in independent Africa*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

- **VOLKOV, Vadim.** *Violent entrepreneurs: The use of force in the making of Russian capitalism.* Cornell University Press, 2016.
- **MUKHOPADHYAY, Dipali.** *Warlords, strongman governors, and the state in Afghanistan.* Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Week 11: Hybrid states: Illiberal or non-democracies, and electoral authoritarian regimes

This week we turn our discussion to illiberal regimes, focusing on illiberal democracies which have recently drawn increasing attention with the election of Donald Trump in the United States, and the continued rule of strongmen from Turkey to Russia, Hungary to Poland, and Uganda to Zimbabwe. But what is illiberalism exactly? And how can we understand its relationship to the institutionalization of violence in the contemporary bureaucratic state? This class aims to tease out the strategies that illiberal rulers use, and how they relate to the theoretical relationships between violence and institutions, and the state and society. In particular, it draws on the transition from monarchical rule to rule by the people, using Foucault's example of the French Revolution.

- **SCHEPPELE, Kim Lane.** "Autocratic Legalism." *University of Chicago Law Review*.85 (2018): 545-583.
- **FOUCAULT, Michel.** *Abnormal: lectures at the Collège de France, 1974-1975.* Vol. 2. Macmillan, 2003 (Chapter 4).
- **MICKEY, Robert, Steven LEVITISKY, and Lucan WAY.** "Is America still safe for democracy: Why the United States is in danger of backsliding." *Foreign Affairs*. 96 (2017): 20.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- Drawing on all three readings, how do illiberal rulers manipulate the concept of the "social body"? *Hint: According to Foucault, the conception of the "revolutionary people" or "social body" came to exist during the French Revolution as a type of faceless mob, the threat of which limits liberal institutions (pp 98-99).*
- Drawing on all three readings, how do illiberal rulers manipulate processes and procedures? And why would they maintain them, rather than just eliminating processes and procedures altogether? *Hint: According to Foucault, following the French Revolution, society itself decided who to use punitive violence against, and how. It did so through sciences and disciplines (which defined who or which act was abnormal), deployed through the processes and procedures of law. These processes and procedures limit the state's discretionary use of violence.*
- Are manipulations of the social body and governing processes and procedures necessarily linked? Why or why not?
- Are "hybrid" states or "illiberal democracies" strong or weak?
- Should we categorize such states as a distinct category? How unique or common are the characteristics that distinguish them from democratic or fragile states (or the other types of states and governing arrangements we have discussed)?

Week 12: Sneaky states: Instrumentalizing and manipulating disorder and fragility

In international development and international relations, scholars tend to have a bias toward order. We assume that states—and entrepreneurs of violence more generally—are trying to organize people, space, and time for maximum extraction. But what if that's not always the case? What about when states—or more precisely, the people who run them—purposefully create chaos, confusion, or contingency as modes of governance? This class explores a few such approaches, and asks what the implications are for modern day governance.

- **RANDERIA, Shalini.** "The state of globalization: Legal plurality, overlapping sovereignties and ambiguous alliances between civil society and the cunning state in India." *Theory, Culture & Society* 24.1 (2007): 1-33.
- **TAPSCOTT, Rebecca.** "The Government Has Long Hands: Institutionalized Arbitrariness and Local Security Initiatives in Northern Uganda." *Development and Change* 48.2 (2017): 263-285.
- **KING, Gary, Jennifer PAN, and Margaret E. ROBERTS.** 2017. "How the Chinese Government Fabricates Social Media Posts for Strategic Distraction, not Engaged Argument." *American Political Science Review*, 111.3 (2017): 484-501.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- How do the different authors conceptualize the relationship between unpredictability and governance? Do you find the arguments compelling? Why or why not?
- Drawing on Week 11, why might rule by disorder manipulate liberal institutions to govern through illiberalism, rather than simply suspend governing institutions?
- Does it matter if such strategies are intentional or just the outcome of state incapacity, disorganization, or fragility? How should we, as scholars, approach questions of intentionality in governance?

Week 13: Capital and privatization of violence

This class focuses on how violence works when it is wholly or partially privatized, and what this means when it does not correspond to the geographies of states. We will discuss whether this transition is inevitable as capital becomes increasingly fluid, as well as what it means for states and their citizenry.

- **ABRAHAMSEN, Rita, and Michael C. WILLIAMS.** "Security beyond the state: Global security assemblages in international politics." *International Political Sociology* 3.1 (2009): 1-17.
- **FERGUSON, James.** "Seeing like an oil company: space, security, and global capital in neoliberal Africa." *American anthropologist* 107, no. 3 (2005): 377-382.
- **WELCH, Michael.** "Fragmented power and state-corporate killings: a critique of blackwater in Iraq." *Crime, law and social change* 51.3-4 (2009): 351-364.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- How does taking a global or networked approach change the fundamental assumptions and implications of the study of governance and violence?
- Given the increasingly transnational character of the global economy, is it still useful to think about governance at the unit of analysis of sovereign states?

OPTIONAL

- **WILLIS, Graham Denyer.** *The killing consensus: police, organized crime, and the regulation of life and death in urban Brazil.* University of California Press, 2015.

Week 14: Where to from here?

In preparation for this class you will be asked to watch a film, and in class, we will use the concepts, theories, and tools we have acquired this semester to critically discuss what people in our positions might do—or advise others to do—in pursuit of normative ends such as state-building, conflict

mitigation, and peacebuilding. You can also draw on material you've learned in your other courses at IHEID and through your independent research projects. This synthetic discussion will help identify what we've learned, and—as always—the limits of our understanding.

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS:

- What is the main problem that shown in the film to address? Where should intervention start?
- What would you do differently from the characters depicted in the film? Or what would you encourage them to do differently?