

August 21, 2010

## **INR 3084-02: Terror & Politics**

---

Will H. Moore	Office: Bellamy 561
Fall 2010	voice: 850.644.6924
Tue, Thu 9:30 - 10:45 am, Bellamy 004	will.moore@fsu.edu
Office Hours: Wed 10:30-11:30 & Thu 3:30-4:30	<a href="http://tinurl.com/WHMoore/">http://tinurl.com/WHMoore/</a>

---

### **Description & Objectives**

This course will introduce students to the use of terror by both governments and dissidents, though the emphasis is stronger on dissident's use of terror. The course assumes that you are familiar with the material covered in an Introductory International Relations course (e.g., INR 2002). You will be introduced to current theories and concepts related to the study of the use of terror. Further, because many students have limited exposure to important cases of terrorism, we investigate some prominent historical and contemporary cases of dissidents' and states' use of terror, with particular emphasis on the case of Al Qaeda and its attacks in sub-Saharan Africa (1998), the Gulf of Aden (2000), and in the US (2001).

The use of terror in pursuit of political goals is a contentious topic fraught with ethical and moral issues, issues concerning the proper role of government, and the value of human existence. Because the course is discussion based, civility, respect for others, and a respect for the value of free speech and a frank exchange of ideas are all important, and a non-trivial portion of this syllabus discusses your responsibilities in that regard.

In addition to the course content, I hope that you will further develop some skills that will be useful to you regardless of what you do after leaving FSU. Specifically, I will emphasize the importance of thinking analytically and critically, and verbally presenting and supporting logically sound arguments.

Finally, I want to stress that this course is challenging. I expect more of you than perhaps is typical, but the adage that "what one gets out of a course is a function of what one puts in" is appropriate. If you fall behind, fail to do the reading, etc. then the course will be a struggle and you will likely be frustrated and have a poor experience, not to mention a poor grade. If you do the assigned work you will become familiar with a world with which you were previously only vaguely acquainted.

### **Requirements & Evaluation**

You are expected to have completed the assigned reading prior to attending class. Being an upper division course, the emphasis is on reading and in-class discussion of same, supplemented with lecture.

There will be 3 mechanisms for evaluation:

1. Class participation (30%)
2. Quiz on *The Looming Tower* (20%)
3. A cumulative, in-class final exam (50%)

### ***Class Participation***

Class participation will be graded based on your civil<sup>1</sup> contributions to class discussion. You begin the semester with a 50 (out of 100, i.e., an F) for participation. By contributing civilly to class discussion you can earn participation points and raise your grade as follows.

In class I will call on people at random. Students who are present and contribute to civil discussion when called upon will earn 5 points. If a student is called upon and present, but declines to respond to the comment or query, or does so in a counter-productive fashion, s/he will lose 3 participation points for that day. Students who are absent when called upon will also lose 3 participation points. Students can earn a maximum of 5 points and lose a maximum of 3 points in any given class period. Students may earn a maximum of 100 points for participation.

Students need not wait to be called upon to participate. Anyone wishing to add to the discussion may do so by raising her/his hand. Of course, not everyone will be called on every day, so you might be able to show up ill-prepared and still not lose any participation points.

### ***Civility***

As you can see, discussion is a major part of this course. Further, we will be discussing contentious issues. Inevitably, you will be surprised and—perhaps—upset with some of the views of one or more of your classmates. There is **nothing wrong** with passion and strongly held beliefs. There is **nothing wrong** with being alarmed and surprised with the views of one or more of your classmates. The question is, what do you do with your emotions? That is, do you ‘fly off the handle’ and attack the person, or do you **challenge the ideas** raised, using a level tone of voice?

A website dedicated to classroom instruction offers the following description of a civil classroom: “A civil classroom is conducive to student expression. Classroom civility fosters an environment where students feel comfortable asking questions and proposing solutions without fear of being shouted down, made fun of, or brushed aside” ([http://taproject.rutgers.edu/services\\_tips/FAQ.php3](http://taproject.rutgers.edu/services_tips/FAQ.php3)). We have all experienced biting sarcasm, personal attacks, insulting asides to neighbors, etc. And we all know how it makes us feel to be the object of such comments.

I work hard to create a civil classroom—without it I cannot teach effectively. But I also value freedom of speech and I reject arguments that claim that there are ideas that are too

---

<sup>1</sup>I discuss civil discussion in the following subsection.

offensive to be entertained. Instead, I submit that there are presentations (tone of voice, insults, etc.) that are offensive. Creating a civil classroom is **not** about placing restraints on what can be said, but rather involves recognition by all members of the classroom their obligation to take other peoples' ideas seriously and challenge them with a respectful tone of voice and choice of words. I welcome passionate debate, but will penalize those who engage in hurtful speech. Phrases such as "Oh, please!" "Come on!!" "Get off it!" "You've got to be kidding!" "Do you *really* believe that?!?" "Are you a moron?" "That's idiotic!" "People who claim that are either ignorant or lying," "I can't believe you just said that!" "That's naïve!" etc. are out of bounds.<sup>2</sup>

How does one passionately challenge ideas one finds poorly considered, irritating or offensive? One great technique is to ask clarifying questions: "I don't understand why you contend that... Could you elaborate?" Another one is to expose unstated assumptions: "It seems to me that view assumes that..." A different approach is to say (sincerely), "That's an interesting view, but I see it differently" and then state your own position. The most important things to avoid are [1] attacking the speaker (we want to be critical of ideas, not people) and [2] using a disrespectful tone of voice.

Along these lines, the FSU Department of Political Science has produced the following statement.

Acceptable classroom behavior is an integral part of success in the college experience. Not only does an individual's behavior reflect on her/his own maturity, it can also add to or detract from the experiences of others. The following outline presents the very basic expectations for student behavior relative to class attendance, fellow-students, and instructors. The Department of Political Science supports these standards and holds each student accountable for her/his behavior. Each instructor will determine for him/herself how to implement these guidelines; but each student is advised to adopt them as their own standards regardless of enforcement measures.

Students are expected to:

- treat one another with respect:
  - do not inflict personal insults in word or gesture;
  - show tolerance for all opinions and points of view;
  - do not speak out of turn.

---

<sup>2</sup>In a classic *Saturday Night Live* sketch from 1978 Dan Aykroyd and Jane Curtin parodied a *60 Minutes* segment titled "Point/Counterpoint" which was a precursor to shows such as *The Capital Gang* and *Crossfire*, which have since morphed into shows such as *The O'Reilly Factor*, *Hardball*, *The Rachel Maddow Show*, etc. Shows such as *The Capital Gang* and *Crossfire* glorified supposedly witty, but definitely uncivil, speech. You can read a transcript of the *SNL* skit at the bottom of this page: <http://snltranscripts.jt.org/78/78eupdate.phtml>. If you are a fan of shows like *The Capital Gang* and *Crossfire* and their more contemporary outgrowths, then be sure to check that type of rhetorical style at the door for this course.

- treat the classroom setting with respect:
  - arrive on time and stay for the entire class;
  - turn off cell phones (or set for a silent alarm in emergency situations);
  - do not read or chat;
  - pay attention;
  - bring the appropriate supplies and equipment;
  - wear appropriate attire.
- treat the academic experience with respect:
  - do not engage in plagiarism or cheating;
  - attend class;
  - complete readings before class;
  - submit assignments on time;
  - know the course requirements and due dates.
- treat the instructor with respect:
  - visit during scheduled office hours or by appointment;
  - inform of disabilities or other factors that might affect performance;
  - inform of times when you will have to arrive late for class or leave early;
  - inform of expected absences according to the class’s attendance guidelines;
  - do not ask for exceptions to the established course standards;
  - do not criticize teaching or grading methods;
  - complete course evaluations honestly.

I close by offering one more reason why civility matters. A 2005 study reports that it affects the level of trust in a political community (Mutz & Reeves, “The New Videomalaise,” *American Political Science Review*, Feb 2005, 99(1):1-15):

Does incivility in political discourse have adverse effects on public regard for politics? If so, why? In this study we present a theory suggesting that when viewers are exposed to televised political disagreement, it often violates well-established face-to-face social norms for the polite expression of opposing views. As a result, incivility in public discourse adversely affects trust in government. Drawing on three laboratory experiments, we find that televised presentations of political differences of opinion do not, in and of themselves, harm attitudes toward politics and politicians. However, political trust is adversely affected by levels of incivility in these exchanges. Our findings suggest that the format of much political television effectively promotes viewer interest, but at the expense of political trust.

### ***Quiz***

There will be a 20 question, multiple choice quiz on Thu 23 Sept. Bring a number 2 pencil and an eraser.

### ***Cumulative Final Exam***

The final exam is a cumulative, multiple choice and True/False exam. During the final week of class I will provide a handout with more details.

The exam is scheduled by the university for 7:30 - 9:30 am on Wednesday 8 Dec and will be held in Bellamy 004 (see [http://registrar.fsu.edu/dir\\_class/spring/exam\\_schedule.htm](http://registrar.fsu.edu/dir_class/spring/exam_schedule.htm)). There will be no early exams: you are responsible for making yourself available to take the exam on that date and time.

### ***Administrative Stuff***

#### *Course Policy for Absences for Tests; Make-up Quiz/Exam*

If you are ill or have a personal, or family, crisis that requires you to miss, or be unable to properly prepare for, the quiz or the final exam, please notify me as soon as possible. Unless you are physically unable to do so, you must notify me prior to the quiz/exam or you will receive a score of zero.

Having notified me, please contact the Dean of Students Department:

Dean of Students  
4th Floor of the University Center- Bldg A, Suite 4100  
Ph.#: (850) 644-2428  
AIM: FSUDeanStudents  
Hours: M-F, 8 am—5 pm

They will validate your circumstances and provide me with any documentation needed to permit a make-up of the quiz/exam.

All make-ups for the quiz will be held during finals week. To schedule a make-up quiz you need to email me during the final week of classes and let me know that you wish to schedule a make-up. I will then contact all of the folks who need to make-up the quiz and we will find a mutually agreeable time when everyone who has to make-up that particular exam can gather to take it. We will meet at my office (561 Bellamy) for make-up exams.

Early quizzes/exams will not be given for any reason.

#### *Posting Grades*

At the end of the semester I will post grades on the course website.

## Grading Scale

Excellent		A = 100-93	A- 92-90
Good	B+ = 89-88	B = 87-83	B- = 82-80
Average	C+ = 79-78	C = 77-73	C- = 72-70
Below Average	D+ = 69-68	D = 67-63	D- = 62-60
Unacceptable		F = 59-0	

## Students with Challenges

Students with challenges who require individualized testing or other accommodations should identify themselves and express their needs during the first week of the semester. Where the challenge is not immediately apparent, verification will be required.

## Reading

The daily reading assignments come from one of two sources:

- the BlackBoard (BB) site for this course (under the Assignments tab)
- Lawrence Wright. 2007. *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*, Vintage. Please acquire a copy of this book at your favorite book seller.

## Course Schedule

The daily assignments are listed below. The readings are due on the day they are listed (i.e., we will be discussing those readings that day).

### **Tue 24 Aug:**

No assigned reading. Take roll (note: per university policy, you will be dropped from the course if you do not attend this day).

## **1 Conceptualization: What is Terror?**

### **Thu 26 Aug:**

Stohl, Michael. 1979. "Myths and Realities of Political Terrorism," in M. Stohl (ed.) *The Politics of Terrorism*, Marcel Dekker, pp. 1-19.

**Tue 31 Aug:**

Barker, Jonathan. 2006. *The No-Nonsense Guide to Terrorism*, Verso, pp. 10-31.  
—and—

Ross, Jeffrey Ian. 2006. “Introducing Oppositional Political Terrorism,” in *Political Terrorism*, Lang, pp. 1-8, 16-25.

## 2 Oppositional Terror: Historical Background

**Thu 2 Sep:**

Davis, Mike. 2007. *Buda’s Wagon: A Brief History of the Car Bomb*, Verso, pp. 1-66.

**Tue 7 Sep:**

Rapoport, David C. 2003. “The Four Waves of Rebel Terror and September 11,” in C.W. Kegley, Jr. (ed.), *The New Global Terrorism*, Prentice Hall, pp. 36-52.  
—and—

Hoffman, Bruce. 2007. “Origins of Contemporary Terrorism.” *Inside Terrorism*. New York: Columbia University Press, chapter 2.

**Thu 9 Sep:** *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright, Lawrence. 2007. *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*, Vintage), chaps 1-4.

*Additional Recommended Reading*

Berman, Paul. 2003. “The Philosopher of Islamic Terror,” *The New York Times Magazine*, March 23, available online at: <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?sec=health&res=9F01E7D91731F930A15750C0A9659C8B63>

—and—

Power, Carla. 2007. “Reconsideration: A Secret History,” *The New York Times Magazine*, 25 February, available online at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/02/25/magazine/25wwlnEssay.t.html>

**Tue 14 Sep:** *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright (2007), chaps 5-8.

**Thu 16 Sep:** *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright (2007), chaps 9-12.

**Tue 21 Sep:** *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright (2007), chaps 13-16.

**Thu 23 Sep:** Quiz.

Read Wright (2007), chaps 17-20.

The quiz will cover Wright (2007).

*Additional Recommended Reading*

Wright, Lawrence. 2008. "The Rebellion Within: An Al Qaeda Mastermind Questions Terrorism," *The New Yorker*, 2 June, [http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2008/06/02/080602fa\\_fact\\_wright?currentPage=all](http://www.newyorker.com/reporting/2008/06/02/080602fa_fact_wright?currentPage=all)

### 3 Theoretical Approaches

**Tue 28 Sep:** The Rationalist Approach to Understanding Terror

David Lake. 2002. "Rational Extremism: Understanding Terrorism in the Twenty First Century." *Dialogue IO* 1 (1): 15-29.

Crenshaw, Martha. 2002. "The Logic of Terrorism: Terrorist Behavior as a Product of Strategic Choice," in R.D. Howard & R.L. Sawyer (eds.) *Terrorism and Counterterrorism*, New York: McGraw Hill, pp. 54-66.

**Thu 30 Sep:** The Rationalist Approach Continued

Kydd, Andrew & Barbara Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism," *International Security*, 56(2): 49-80.

**Tue 5 Oct:** Psychology and Understanding Terror

Jeff Victorof. 2005. "The Mind of a Terrorist: A Review and Critique of Psychological Approaches." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(1): 3-42.

**Thu 7 Oct:** Psychology and Understanding Terror Continued

Martha Crenshaw. 2000. "The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the Twenty First Century." *Political Psychology* 20(2): 405-420.

**Tue 12 Oct:** Sociological Approach to Understanding Terror

Mark Juergensmeyer. 2001. *Terror in the Mind of God*. University of California Press. Chapters 1 and 11.

**Thu 14 Oct:** Sociological Approach to Understanding Terror Continued

David C. Rapoport. 1984. "Fear and Trembling: Terrorism in Three Religious Traditions," *American Political Science Review*, 78(3): 658-687.

—and—

Kimball, Charles. 2003. *When Religion Becomes Evil: Five Warning Signs*, Harper, pp. 1-40.

## 4 Insurgent Use of Terror

### Tue 19 Oct:

Ariel Merari. 1993. “Terrorism as a Strategy of Insurgency.” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 5(4): 213-251.

### Thu 21 Oct:

Sambanis, Nicholas. 2008. “Terrorism and Civil War,” in *Terrorism, Economic Development, and Political Openness*, P. Keefer & N. Loayza (eds), pp. 174-206.

### 4.1 Is Poverty a Cause of Terror Attacks?

#### Tue 26 Oct:

Piazza, James A. 2006. “Rooted in Poverty? Terrorism, Poor Economic Development, and Social Cleavages,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 18: 159-177.

#### Thu 28 Oct:

Eli Berman, Joseph Felter & Jacob N. Shapiro. 2009. “Do Working Men Rebel? Insurgency and Unemployment in Iraq and the Philippines.” National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 15547.

### 4.2 What is Suicide Terror all about?

#### Tue 2 Nov:

View the 2002 Frontline show “Sri Lanka: Living with Terror,” online at: <http://www.pbs.org/frontlineworld/stories/srilanka/> (video length: 16 minutes).

—and—

Laquer, Walter. 2004. “The Tamil Tigers: An Interview with Commander Pirabakaran,” in *Voices of Terror*, Reed Press, pp. 454-457.

#### Thu 4 Nov:

Robert A. Pape. 2005. “The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism.” *American Political Science Review* 97(3): 343-361.

**Tue 9 Nov:**

Mia Bloom. 2005. *Dying to Kill: The Allure of Suicide Terror*. Columbia University Press. Chapters 1 and 4.

**Thu 11 Nov:**

Veteran's Day: class does not meet.

**Tue 16 Nov:**

M. Najeeb Shafiq & Abdulkader H. Sinno. 2008. "Education, Income and Support for Suicide Bombings: Evidence from Six Muslim Countries," working paper available for download at: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1163046>.

### **4.3 Do Democratic Institutions Make a Difference?**

**Thu 18 Nov:**

Li, Quan. 2005. "Does Democracy Promote or Reduce Transnational Terrorist Incidents?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 49(2): 278-297.

—and—

Piazza, James. 2008. "Do Democracy and Free Markets Protect Us from Terrorism," *International Politics*, 45:72-91.

### **4.4 Does Censorship Make a Difference?**

**Tue 23 Nov:**

Wilkinson, Paul. 2006. "The Media and Terrorism," in *Terrorism versus Democracy*, 2nd ed., Routledge, pp. 144-157.

—and—

Scheufele, Dietram A., Matthew C. Nisbet & Ronald E. Ostman. 2005. "September 11 News Coverage, Public Opinion, and Support for Civil Liberties," *Mass Communication and Society*, 8(3): 197 - 218.

**Thu 25 Nov:**

Thanksgiving: Class does not meet.

### **4.5 Deterrence**

**Tue 30 Nov:**

Enders, Walter & Todd Sandler. 1993. "Effectiveness of Anti-Terrorism Policies: A Vector-Autoregression-Intervention Approach," *American Political Science Review*, xx: 829-844.

## 5 States' Use of Terror

### Thu 2 Dec:

Paul Wilkinson. 1981. "Can A State Be Terrorist?" *International Affairs* (Summer), 467-472.

David Claridge. 1996. "State Terrorism? Applying a Definitional Model," *Terrorism and Political Violence* (Autumn), 47-63.

Bruce Falconer, "Murder by the State," *Atlantic Monthly*.

### Wed 8 Dec:

Final Exam: 7:30-9:30 am, Bellamy 004.