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**I. Course Overview**

If states aren’t to go to war, what should they do instead? This course provides an advanced introduction to ethical debates surrounding the alternatives to war, such as economic sanctions, diplomacy, arming rebel groups, and nonviolent resistance. We focus on potential responses by states and other international actors when conflict or mass atrocities are already ongoing.

# ii. Learning Outcomes

On completion of this unit successful students will be able to demonstrate:

* the ability to assess critically Just War Theory, the responsibility to protect doctrine, and pacifism, and how they inform the ethical debates surrounding the alternatives to war.
* the ability to assess critically the ethical arguments surrounding each of the particular alternatives studied.

**III. Core texts**

* Fabre, Cécile (2018) *Economic Statecraft: Human Rights, Sanctions, and Conditionality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
* Gross, Michael and Tamar Meisels (2018) *Soft War: The Ethics of Unarmed Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
* Pattison, James (2018). *The Alternatives to War: From Sanctions to Nonviolence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
* Roundtable in *Ethics & International Affairs*, 32/3 (2018).

# Week 1: Introduction to the Course

# week 2: The Critique of War: Just War Theory and last resort

This week we consider what is wrong with war and the need to consider the alternatives to it. We focus particularly on the critique of war provided by Just War Theory, which holds that war may sometimes be morally justified, but is often hugely problematic. In doing so, we examine the central principles of Just War Theory (of ‘*jus ad bellum*’ and ‘*jus in bello*’), focusing on the critique of war implied in Just War Theory and the principle of last resort. The conceptual framework provided by Just War Theory will also help to assess the alternatives considered in the ensuing weeks.

**Key questions**

* What are the main critiques of war offered by Just War theorists?
* How does the critique of war differ between revisionists and traditionalists?
* What, if anything, is *particularly* morally wrong about war? Are these features necessary and/or unique to war?
* How should we understand the last resort principle in Just War Theory?

**Core Reading**

* Aloyo, Eamon (2015). ‘Just War Theory and the Last of Last Resort’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 29/2: 187–201.
* Lazar, Seth (2016). ‘War’ in Edward Zalta (ed.) *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/war/> [Survey of the current state of the field]
* McMahan, Jeff (2004). ‘The Ethics of Killing in War’ *Ethics*, 114: 693–733. (If struggling, an introduction to this piece is here: <http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/11/12/rethinking-the-just-war-part-2/>

**Further reading**

* Bellamy, Alex (2006). *Just Wars: From Cicero to Iraq* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
* Fabre, Cecile (2012). *Cosmopolitan War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
* Fisher, David (2011). *Morality and War: Can War be Just in the Twenty-First Century?* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
* Frowe, Helen (2015). *The Ethics of War and Peace: An Introduction*, 2nd Edition (London: Routledge).
* Lango, John W. (2014). *The Ethics of Armed Conflict: A Cosmopolitan Just War Theory* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press). The whole book is Open Access here: <http://oapen.org/download?type=document&docid=469286>
* Lazar, Seth and Helen Frowe (eds) (2018). *Oxford Handbook of the Ethics of War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
* Lee, Steven (2013). *Ethics and War: An Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
* McMahan, Jeff (2009). *Killing in War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
* Meisels, Tamar (2017). *Contemporary Just War: Theory and Practice* (London: Routledge).
* Shaw, William (2015). *Utilitarianism and the Ethics of War* (London: Routledge).
* Walzer, Michael (2015). *Just and Unjust Wars*, Fourth Edition (USA: BasicBooks).

# Week 3: Economic sanctions

This week we consider economic sanctions. These are often regarded as the leading option instead of going to war. But economic sanctions are often condemned for harming the innocent and being ineffective. We will consider these claims and the responses to them.

**Key questions**

* What are the deontological objections to economic sanctions?
* Are economic sanctions as morally problematic as war?
* Do targeted sanctions avoid the problems of comprehensive sanctions?

**Core Reading**

* Fabre, Cécile (2018) *Economic Statecraft: Human Rights, Sanctions, and Conditionality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press). [Chapters 2 and 3]
* Gordon, Joy (1999). ‘A Peaceful, Silent, Deadly Remedy: The Ethics of Economic Sanctions’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 13/1: 123–42.

**Further Reading**

* Early, Bryan and Marcus Schulzke (2018). ‘Still Unjust, Just in Different Ways: How Targeted Sanctions Fall Short of Just War Theory's Principles’, *International Studies Review*, Early View. Available at: <https://doi-org.manchester.idm.oclc.org/10.1093/isr/viy012>
* Fishman, Edward (2017). ‘Even Smarter Sanctions: How to Fight in the Era of Economic Warfare’, *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2017 Issue.
* Gordon, Joy (1999). ‘Reply to George A. Lopez’s “More Ethical Than Not”’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 13/1: 149–50.
* Gordon, Joy (2011). ‘Smart Sanctions Revisited’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 25/3: 315–35. [Also see reply by Lopez]
* Gordon, Joy (2017). ‘Reconsidering Economic Sanctions’, in Michael Gross and Tamar Meisels (eds), *Soft War: The Ethics of Unarmed Conflict* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
* Lopez, George A. (1999). ‘More Ethical than Not: Sanctions as Surgical Tools: Response to “A Peaceful, Silent, Deadly Remedy”’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 13/1: 143–8. [Also see original by Gordon]
* Lopez, George A. (2012). ‘In Defence of Smart Sanctions: A Response to Joy Gordon’, *Ethics and International Affairs*, 26/1: 135–46. [Also see original by Gordon]
* Pasternak, Avia (2009). ‘Sanctioning Liberal Democracies’, *Political Studies*, 57: 54–74.
* Pattison, James (2018). *The Alternatives to War: From Sanctions to Nonviolence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). [Chapters 3 and 4]
* Pierce, Albert (1996). ‘Just War Principles and Economic Sanctions’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 10/1: 99–113.
* Winkler, Adam (1999). ‘Just Sanctions’, *Human Rights Quarterly*, 21/1: 133–55.

**Sanctions App**: There is a very useful app for sanctions, produced by the Targeted Sanctions Consortium. It contains details about lots of cases in an easily accessible format. <http://www.sanctionsapp.com/>.You can download it on Google Play or through the Apple Store.

# Week 4: Diplomatic measures

This week considers what role diplomacy can play in tackling mass atrocities and serious external aggression. In doing so, we consider the case for diplomatic criticism (i.e. naming and shaming) of other states, even if it is hypocritical. We also examine diplomatic privileges and whether states should cut diplomatic ties with aggressors.

**Key questions**

* It is only states that have not engaged in human rights abuses that can permissibly criticise others?
* Are states required to shun and criticise aggressors and human rights abusers?
* States should reject megaphone diplomacy and adopt more subtle measures?

**Core Reading**

* Fabre, Cécile (2018) *Economic Statecraft: Human Rights, Sanctions, and Conditionality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press) [Chapter 6].
* Pattison, James (2018). *The Alternatives to War: From Sanctions to Nonviolence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) [Chapter 5].

**Further Reading**

* Beversluis, Eric H. (1989). ‘On Shunning Undesirable Regimes: Ethics and Economic Sanctions’, *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 3/2: 15–25.
* Bjola, Corneliu (2014). ‘The Ethics of Secret Diplomacy: A Contextual Approach’, *Journal of Global Ethics*, 10/1: 85–100.
* Gopalan, Sandeep and Roslyn Fuller (2014). ‘Enforcing International Law: States, IOs, and Courts as Shaming Reference Groups’, *Brooklyn Journal of International Law*, 39/1: 73–158. [It’s long, but most of it is footnote material that you don’t have to read]
* Gross, Michael (2015). *The Ethics of Insurgency: A Critical Guide to Just Guerrilla Warfare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). [Ch 9]
* Maller, Tara (2010). ‘Diplomacy Derailed: The Consequences of Diplomatic Sanctions’, *Washington Quarterly*, 33/3: 61–79.
* Toscano, Roberto (2001). ‘The Ethics of Modern Diplomacy’, in Jean–Marc Coicaud and David Warner (eds), *Ethics and International Affairs: Extent and Limits* (New York: United Nations University Press), pp. 42–83.
* Welsh, Jennifer M. (2015). ‘Mediation and Sanctions’, in Serena K. Sharma and Jennifer M. Welsh (eds), *The Responsibility to Prevent: Overcoming the Challenges of Atrocity Prevention* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 103–18.

# Week 5: NonviolenT Resistance

This week we consider nonviolent means of resisting serious external aggression and mass atrocities. Although often viewed as likely to be ineffective, we examine potential nonviolent means that might have some impact, such civilian peacekeeping and civilian national defence.

**Key questions**

* What are the instrumental and instrumental reasons in favour of adopting nonviolent measures over violent ones?
* When, if ever, can nonviolent measures be successful?
* Can nonviolence work in the face of a brutal aggressor?
* Is it morally problematic to insist that individuals adopt nonviolence if this will place them in great danger?

**Core Reading**

* Gross, Michael L. (2018). ‘Backfire: The Dark Side of Nonviolent Resistance’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 32/3: 317–28.
* Pattison, James (2018). *The Alternatives to War: From Sanctions to Nonviolence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). [Ch 6]
* Sharp, Gene (1990). *Civilian-Based Defense: A Post-Military Weapons System*, (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press). [www.aeinstein.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Civilian-Based-Defense-English.pdf](http://www.aeinstein.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Civilian-Based-Defense-English.pdf)

**Further Reading**

* Caney, Simon (2015). ‘Responding to Global Injustice: On the Right of Resistance’, *Social Philosophy & Policy*, 32/1: 51–73.
* Chenoweth, Erica and Maria J. Stephan (2011). *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict* (New York: Columbia University Press).
* Chenoweth, Erica (2017). ‘Trends in Nonviolent Resistance and State Response: Is Violence Towards Civilian-based Movements on the Rise?’, *Global Responsibility to Protect*, 9/1: 86–100.
* Lango, John (2009). ‘Military Operations by Armed UN Peace-keeping Missions: An Application of Generalised Just War Principles’, in Th. A. van Baarda and D.E.M. Verweij (eds), *The Moral Dimension of Asymmetrical Warfare: Counter-terrorism, Western Values and Military Ethics* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff), pp. 115–33. [Although it’s about UN peacekeeping, the application of Just War should be helpful for thinking about nonviolent measures.]
* Orend, Brian (2013). *The Morality of War*, Second Edition (Ontario: Broadview Press). [Chapter on pacifism]
* Parkin, Nicholas (2017). ‘Non-violent Resistance and Last Resort’, *Journal of Military Ethics*, 15/4:259–74.
* Sharp, Gene (1973). *The Politics of Nonviolent Action* (Boston: P. Sargent). [There are three parts to this: *Part 1: Power and Struggle*; *Part 2: The Methods of Nonviolent Action*; *Part 3: The Dynamics of Nonviolent Action*.]
* Sharp, Gene. with J. Paulson (2005). *Waging Nonviolent Struggle*: *20th Century Practice and 21st Century Potential* (Manchester, NH: Extending Horizons Books).
* Schweitzer, Christine (ed.) (2010). Civilian Peacekeeping: A Barely Tapped Resource, IFGK Working Paper No. 23. (Belm-Vehrte, Germany: Sozio Publishing). <http://www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org/images/news/CP_A_Barely_Tapped_Resource.pdf>
* Stephan, Maria J and Chenoweth, Erica (2008). ‘Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict’, *International Security*, 33/1: 7–44.
* Summy, Ralph (1994). ‘Nonviolence and the Case of the Extremely Ruthless Opponent’, *Pacifica Review: Peace, Security & Global Change*, 6/1: 29.
* Wallace, M. S. (2017). *Security Without Weapons: Rethinking Violence, Nonviolent Action, and Civilian Protection* (London: Routledge).
* Walzer, Michael (2015). *Just and Unjust Wars*, Fourth Edition (USA: BasicBooks). [See the afterward]

# Week 6: Positive Incentives

This week considers the ethical case for using positive incentives, such as financial aid, political recognition, and amnesties. The use of positive incentives raises the worry that it will reward aggressors and will encourage bad behaviour. We consider these claims, as well as the role that incentives can play in addressing mass atrocities and serious external aggression.

**Key questions**

* Do positive incentives wrongly reward aggressors for bad behaviour? If so, how much of a concern is this?
* Should we be worried that positive incentives encourage aggression?
* What are the objections to offering amnesties to aggressors and human rights abuses? When, if ever, can these be overcome?

**Core Reading**

* Fabre, Cécile (2018) *Economic Statecraft: Human Rights, Sanctions, and Conditionality* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press). [Chapters 4 and 5]
* Pattison, James (2018). *The Alternatives to War: From Sanctions to Nonviolence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). [Chapter 7]

**Further Reading**

* Baldwin, David A. (1971). ‘The Power of Positive Sanctions’, *World Politics*, 24/1: 20–38.
* Grant, Ruth W. (2006). ‘Ethics and Incentives: A Political Approach’, *American Political Science Review*, 100/1: 29–39.
* Grant, Ruth W. (2012). *Strings Attached: Untangling the Ethics of Incentives* (Princeton, N.J: Princeton University Press).
* Pattison, James (2018). ‘Covert Positive Incentives as an Alternative to War’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 32/3: 293–303.
* Sandel, Michael J. (2012). *What Money Can’t Buy: The Moral Limits of Markets* (London: Penguin).
* Wellman, Christopher Heath (2008). ‘Amnesties and International Law’, in Larry May (ed.), *War: Essays in Political Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 249–65.

# Week 7: Arming Rebels AND STATES

We examine the ethical case for providing arms to rebel groups and states, rather than engaging in direct military intervention. We consider the various ethical arguments for and against providing arms.

**Key questions**

* Does arming rebels avoid the ethical problems of direct military intervention? Should there be different standards for arming rebels and direct military intervention?
* Are senders fully responsible if those armed violate human rights or are the harms somewhat discounted?
* Is it ever permissible to arm rebels or states that aren’t clearly fighting for a just cause or don’t have good human rights records?
* Are complicit harms always wrong?

**Core Reading**

* Christensen, James (2018). ‘Arming the Outlaws: On the Moral Limits of the Arms Trade’, *Political Studies*. <journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0032321718754516>
* Renzo, Massimo (2018). ‘Helping the Rebels’, *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy*, 13/3: 222–39.
* Pattison, James (2015). ‘The Ethics of Arming Rebels’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 29/4: 455–71.

**Further Reading**

* Buchanan, Allen (2013). ‘The Ethics of Revolution and Its Implications for the Ethics of Intervention’, *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 41/4: 291–323.
* Christensen, James (2015). ‘Weapons, Security, and Oppression: A Normative Study of International Arms Transfers’, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 23/1: 23–39
* Finlay, Christopher (2015). *Terrorism and the Right to Resist: A Theory of Just Revolutionary War* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
* Gross, Michael (2015). *The Ethics of Insurgency: A Critical Guide to Just Guerrilla Warfare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
* Gross, Michael L. (2013). ‘Just War and Guerrilla War’, in Anthony F. Lang Jr., Cian O’Driscoll, and John Williams (eds), *Just War: Authority, Tradition, and Practice* (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press), pp. 213–30.
* LaFollette, Hugh (2000). ‘Gun Control’, *Ethics*, 110/2: 263–81. [On the broader issue of gun control, but arguments might be applied to arming rebels]
* Lepora, Chiara and Robert Goodin (2013). *On Complicity and Compromise* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
* Mearsheimer, John (2015). ‘Don’t Arm Ukraine’, New York Times, 8 Feb 2015. <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/09/opinion/dont-arm-ukraine.html?_r=0> [Not an academic piece but short, interesting remarks from leading US Realist].
* Pattison, James (2017). ‘Guns vs Troops: The Ethics of Supplying’, in Aidan Hehir and Robert Murray (eds) *Protecting Human Rights in an Age of Uncertainty* (London: Routledge), pp. 201–14.
* Pattison, James (2018). *The Alternatives to War: From Sanctions to Nonviolence* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). [Chapter 8]
* Wheeler, Samuel C. III (1999). ‘Arms as Insurance’, *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 13/2, 111–29. [On the broader issue of gun control, but arguments might be applied to arming rebels]

# WEEK 8: The IMPERATIVE TO RESPOND AND THE Responsibility to Protect

This week examines the imperative to respond and whether doing nothing in response to crisis would be a better option. We focus, in particular, on responses to mass atrocities and the ‘responsibility to protect’ (the ‘R2P’) doctrine, which emerged in the 2000s and has now become the predominant frame for responses to mass atrocities. In doing so, we consider the implications of the previous weeks for the R2P.

**Key questions**

* Is doing nothing sometimes morally required? Is it sometimes better to let conflicts burn out?
* What, if anything, is the basis of states’ responsibility to protect?
* What is the best means to fulfil the responsibility to protect when mass atrocities are ongoing?

**Core Reading**

* Bellamy, Alex J. (2018). ‘Ending Atrocity Crimes: The False Promise of Fatalism’, *Ethics & International Affairs*, 32/3: 329–37.
* Bellamy, Alex J. (2015). *The First Response: Peaceful Means in the Third Pillar of the Responsibility to Protect*, Policy Analysis, the Stanley Foundation, December 2015. Available at <http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/publications/pab/Bellamy3rdPillarPAB116.pdf>
* Luttwak, Edward (1999). ‘Give War a Chance’, *Foreign Affairs*, July/August.

**Major Reports on the R2P**

* Ban Ki-Moon (2009). *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: Report of the Secretary-General*, A/63/677. Available at <http://www.un.org/Docs/journal/asp/ws.asp?m=A/63/677>.
* Ban Ki-moon (2012). *Responsibility to Protect: Timely and Decisive Response*, UN doc A/66/87. Available at <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/UNSG%20Report_timely%20and%20decisive%20response.pdf>.
* ICISS (2001). *The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty* (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre). Available at <http://responsibilitytoprotect.org/ICISS%20Report.pdf>

**Further reading**

* Bellamy, Alex (2015). *The Responsibility to Protect: A Defense* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
* Bellamy, Alex and Tim Dunne (eds) (2016). *Oxford Handbook on the Responsibility to Protect* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
* Evans, Gareth (2008). *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press).
* Glanville, Luke (2010). ‘The International Community’s Responsibility to Protect’, *Global Responsibility to Protect* 2/3: 287–306.
* Pattison, James (2015). ‘Mapping the Responsibilities to Protect: A Typology of International Duties’, *Global Responsibility to Protect*, 7/2: 190–210.
* Roff, Heather (2013). Global Justice, Kant and the Responsibility to Protect: A Provisional Duty (London: Routledge).
* Shue, Henry (2004). ‘Limiting Sovereignty’, in Jennifer M. Welsh (ed) *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 11–28.
* Tan, Kok-Chor (2006). ‘The Duty to Protect’, in Terry Nardin and Melissa S. Williams (eds), *NOMOS XLVII: Humanitarian Intervention* (New York: New York University Press), pp. 84–116.

# WEEK 9: Pacifism

This week we consider how the arguments for and against the alternatives affect the persuasiveness of pacifism. We also examine various types of pacifism and how they relate to Just War Theory.

**Key questions**

* What are the differences between the various types of pacifism?
* How does pacifism differ from Just War Theory?
* Does the case for the alternatives mean that pacifists are right?

###### Core Reading

* Bazargan, Saba (2014). ‘Varieties of Contingent Pacifism in War’, in Helen Frowe and Gerald Lang (eds), *How We Fight* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.1–17.
* Fiala, Andrew (2014). ‘Pacifism’, in Edward N. Zalta (ed.), The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/pacifism/>.
* McMahan, Jeff (2010). ‘Pacifism and Moral Theory’, *Diametros*, 23: 3–20.

###### Further Reading

* Alexandra, Andrew (2003). ‘Political Pacifism’, *Social Theory and Practice*, 29/4: 589–606.
* Fiala, Andrew (2006). ‘Practical Pacifism, *Jus in Bello*, and Citizen Responsibility: The Case of Iraq’, *Ethical Perspectives: Journal of the European Ethics Network*, 13/4: 673–97.
* Howes, Dustin Ells (2013). ‘The Failure of Pacifism and the Success of Nonviolence’, *Perspectives on Politics*, 11/2: 427–46.
* May, Larry (2011). ‘Contingent Pacifism and the Moral Risks of Participation in War’, *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 25/2: 95–112.
* Orend, Brian (2006). *The Morality of War* (Ontario: Broadview Press). [Ch 9]
* Ryan, Cheyney (2015). ‘Pacifism(s)’, *The Philosophical Forum*, 46/1: 17–39.
* Ryan, Cheyney (2018). ‘Pacifism’, in Seth Lazar and Helen Frowe (eds), *Oxford Handbook of the Ethics of War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

# Week 10: Concluding Week