

February 22, 2009

INR 3084-02: Terror & Politics

Will H. Moore

Spring 2009

MWF 10:10 - 11:00 am, Bellamy 115

Office Hours: Mon 11-noon & Wed 1:30-2:30

Office: Bellamy 561

voice: 644-6924

will.moore@fsu.edu

<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~whmoore/>

Description & Objectives

This course will introduce students to the use of terror by both governments and dissidents. The course assumes that you are familiar with the material covered in an Introductory International Relations course (e.g., INR 2002).

The topic is a contentious one fraught with ethical and moral issues, issues concerning the proper role of government, and the value of human existence. The course is discussion based, so civility, respect for others, and a respect for the value of free speech and a frank exchange of ideas are all important.

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 civil¹ 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 feelings. 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). 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 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

¹I discuss civil discussion in the following subsection.

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.²

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.
- 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;

²In 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*. Those shows 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* then be sure to check that type of rhetorical style at the door for this course.

- 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 Mon 26 January. 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 5:30 - 7:30 pm on Monday 27 April and will be held in Bellamy 115 (see 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

Absences

If you are ill or have a personal or family crisis that requires you to miss, or be unable to properly prepare for, either the quiz or the final exam, please notify me as soon as possible. You must notify me prior to the quiz/final unless you are physically unable to do so. Having notified me, please contact the Victim Advocate Program in the Dean of Students Department (<http://www.fsu.edu/~vicadv/>). They will validate your circumstances and provide me with any documentation needed to permit a make-up of the quiz or exam.

Posting Grades

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

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.

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	

Reading

The daily reading assignments come from one of two sources:

- the BlackBoard (BB) site for this course (under the Assignments tab)
- Bill's Bookstore (there is only one book: Lawrence Wright. 2007. *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*, Vintage).

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).

Wed 7 Jan:

No assigned reading.

1 Oppositional Terror: Historical Background

Fri 9 Jan:

Straus, Scott. 2001. "Organic Purity and the Role of Anthropology in Cambodia and Rwanda," *Patterns of Prejudice*, 35(2): 47-55.

—and—

Gorriti, Gustavo. 1990. "The War of the Philosopher King: The Strange Career of The Shining Path," *The New Republic*, June 18, 202(25):pp. 15-22.

Mon 12 Jan: *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright, Lawrence. 2007. *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda and the Road to 9/11*, (Vintage), chaps 1-3 (pp. 3-96).

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>

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>

Wed 14 Jan: *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright (2007), chaps 4-6 (pp. 97-164).

Fri 16 Jan: *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright (2007), chaps 7-10 (pp. 165-229).

Mon 19 Jan: Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday—*class does not meet.*

Wed 21 Jan: *Class does not meet.*

Read Wright (2007), chaps 11-14 (pp. 230-277).

Fri 23 Jan: *Class does not meet.*
Read Wright (2007), chaps 15-17 (pp. 231-339).

Mon 26 Jan: Quiz
Wright (2007), chaps 18-20 (pp. 340-421).
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

Wed 28 Jan:

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—

Ross, Jeffrey Ian. 2006. "Terrorism in the United States," in *Political Terrorism*, Lang, pp. 143-161.

Fri 30 Jan:

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

2 Theory

2.1 Conceptualization: What is Terror?

Mon 2 Feb:

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

Tilly, Charles. 2004. "Terror, Terrorism, Terrorists," *Sociological Theory*, 22(1):5-13.

Wed 4 Feb:

Kydd, Andrew H. & Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism," *International Security*, 31(1): 49-80.

Fri 6 Feb:

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.

2.2 Does Religion Play a Role?

Mon 9 Feb:

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

Wed 11 Feb:

Armstrong, Karen. 2001. *The Battle for God: A History of Fundamentalism*, Ballantine, pp. vii-xviii, 365-371,

—and—

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

Fri 13 Feb:

Jurgensmeyer, Mark. 2006[1988]. “The Logic of Religious Violence,” in R.D. Howard & R.L. Sawyer (eds.) *Terrorism and Counterterrorism*, McGraw Hill, pp. 168-186.

Mon 16 Feb:

Fox, Jonathan. 2007. “The Increasing Role of Religion in State Failure: 1960 to 2004,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 19(3): 395-414.

2.3 Is Poverty a Cause of Terror Attacks?

Wed 18 Feb:

Krieger, Tim & Daniel Meierrieks. 2008. “What Causes Terrorism?” Working Paper No. 2008-05, Center for International Economics, SSRN Paper 114862.

Fri 20 Feb:

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

2.4 What is Suicide Terror all about?

Mon 23 Feb:

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.

Wed 25 Feb:

Pape, Robert A. 2003. “The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism,” *American Political Science Review*,

Fri 27 Feb:

Pedahzur, Ami. 2004. “Toward an Analytical Model of Suicide Terrorism—A Comment,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 16(4): 841-844.

Mon 2 Mar:

Bloom, Mia M. 2004. “Palestinian Suicide Bombing: Public Support, Market Share, and Outbidding,” *Political Science Quarterly*, 119(1): 61-88.

Wed 4 Mar:

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>.

Fri 6 Mar:

Piazza, James A. 2008. “A Supply-Side View of Suicide Terrorism: A Cross-National Study,” *Journal of Politics*, 70(1): 28-39.

9-13 March: Spring Break—classes do not meet.

Mon 16 Mar:

Berman, Eli & David A. Laitin. 2008. “Religion, Terrorism and Public Goods: Testing the Club Model,” *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(10-11): 1942-1967.

Wed 18 Mar:

No reading assigned

Video in class: “Paradise Now” (2005), Augustus Film.

Fri 20 Mar:

No reading assigned

Video in class: "Paradise Now."

2.5 Do Democratic Institutions Make a Difference?

Mon 23 Mar:

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

Wed 25 Mar:

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

2.6 What Makes Attacks More Lethal?

Fri 27 Mar:

Asal, Victor & R. Karl Rethemeyer. 2008. "The Nature of the Beast: Terrorist Organizational Characteristics and Organizational Lethality," *Journal of Politics*. 70(2):437-449.

3 Policy: Counter-Terror

Mon 30 Mar:

Barker, Jonathan. 2006. "Assessing the Danger," *The No-Nonsense Guide to Terrorism*, Verso, pp. 32-60.

Wed 1 Apr:

Howard, Russell D. 2006. "Understanding Al Qaeda's Application of the New Terrorism—The Key to Victory in the Current Campaign," in R.D. Howard & R.L. Sawyer (eds.) *Terrorism and Counterterrorism*, McGraw Hill, pp. 91-106.

Fri 3 Apr: *Class does not meet.*

McKittrick, David, Seamus Kelters, Brian Feeney, Chris Thornton & David McVea. 2007. *Lost Lives: The Stories of the Men, Women and Children Who Died as a Result of the Northern Ireland Troubles*, Mainstream Publishing, pp. 46-59 and 1490-1504.

3.1 Deterrence and Conciliation

Mon 6 Apr:

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

Wed 8 Apr:

Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2003. "Conciliation, Counter-Terrorism, and Patterns of Terrorist Violence: A Comparative Study of Five Cases," paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the International Studies Association.

3.2 Termination of Campaigns

Fri 10 Apr:

Ross, Jeffrey Ian & Ted Robert Gurr. 1989. "Why Terrorism Subsides: A Comparative Study of Canada and the United States," *Comparative Politics*, xx: 405-426.

Mon 13 Apr:

United States Institute of Peace. 1999. *How Terrorism Ends*, Washington, DC.

3.3 Does Censorship Make a Difference?

Wed 15 Apr:

Nacos, Brigitte. 2000. "Accomplice or Witness? The Media's Role in Terrorism" *Current History*, 99: 174-78.

—and—

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

Fri 17 Apr:

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.

3.4 Prosecution

Mon 20 Apr:

View the 2006 Frontline show “The Enemy Within,” online at: <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/enemywithin/view/> (video length: 60 minutes).

3.5 Enhanced Interrogation

Wed 22 Apr:

Bowden, Mark. 2003. “The Dark Art of Interrogation,” *The Atlantic Monthly* 292(3).
—and—

Hoffman, Bruce. 2004. “A Nasty Business,” *The Atlantic Monthly* . . .
—and—

Hersh, Seymour M. 2004. “Torture at Abu Ghraib,” *The New Yorker*, 10 May.
—and—

Mayer, Jane. 2005. “The Experiment: Is the Military Devising New Methods of Interrogation at Guantanamo?” *The New Yorker*, 11 & 18 July, pp. 60-71.
—and—

Mayer, Jane. 2006. “The Memo: How an Internal Effort to Ban the Abuse and Torture of Detainees was Thwarted,” *The New Yorker*, 7 February, pp. 32-41.
—and—

Hitchens, Christopher. 2008. “Believe Me, It’s Torture,” *Vanity Fair*, August.

4 The State of the Literature

Fri 24 Apr:

Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2008. “The Political Economy of Terrorism: A Selective Overview of Recent Work,” *The Political Economist*, 10(1):1-12.

Mon 27 Apr: 5:30 - 7:30 pm
Final Exam (Bellamy 115).