

Professor Welling Hall  
LBC 229  
Email: wellingh@earlham.edu

Office Phone: x1208  
Class Location: LBC 2  
Meeting Time: T, R 10:30

## POLITICS 375: THE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF SEPTEMBER 11

“What does it mean to say that “the world changed forever on September 11, 2001”?”

Our goal in this course, fulfilling the Comparative Practices distribution requirement, will be to investigate the above question among others:

- Were thousands of persons brutally murdered because of an inevitable clash of civilizations?
- Is terrorism a new form of warfare that overrides all previous expectations and “rules” about war?
- Is Islamic militancy a legacy of the proxy wars fought by the United States and the Soviet Union during the latter half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century?
- Who were the Taliban? Were Afghan women rescued from gender apartheid by Operation Enduring Freedom?
- What does terror mean for the future of global order?

Our discussion of these and related questions will be guided by reading and writing about books, essays, and interviews including a variety of disciplinary perspectives that inform the causes, consequences, and debates surrounding the events of 9/11.

### COURSE REQUIREMENTS

#### Books To Purchase:

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (Touchstone: 1996). Huntington is a noted American political scientist whose essays on the inevitability of a clash between the Islamic world and Western democracies have been powerfully influential among the decision-making elite in the United States. This book was published five years before 9/11.

Mary Kaldor, *New & Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* (Stanford University Press: 2001). Kaldor is a British peace studies scholar. Her work is very highly regarded both in peace studies and international studies circles as pathbreaking work that establishes important new approaches for thinking about violence by nonstate actors. This book was published about nine months prior to 9/11.

John K. Cooley, *Unholy Wars: Afghanistan, America, and International Terrorism* (Pluto Press: 2000). Cooley is an ABC news correspondent who started writing about the relationship between U.S. foreign policy and the support of international terrorists in Afghanistan during the Soviet war in Afghanistan in the 1980s. The first edition of this book was published almost two years before 9/11.

Anne E. Brodsky, *With All Our Strength: The Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan* (Routledge: 2002). Brodsky is an American social psychologist who has spent many months living with Afghan women in exile. Her work is important as the first (and to date only) book-length study of the lives and community aspirations of the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan which was established more than a decade before the Taliban came to power. Brodsky's book was published after 9/11.

Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order* (Palgrave: 2002). This collection of essays edited by Welsh professors of international politics. More importantly, this collection includes essays by both Western and non-Western scholars across political, economic, and social strata on the meaning of "terror," "order," and "worlds." The collection was published after 9/11.

#### Classroom Expectations:

The success of any course is determined by the contributions that all participants make. All students in IR of 9/11 are expected to conform with the following expectations:

- A. Demonstrate familiarity with the text assignment(s) for the day through short, in class open-ended quizzes.
- B. Pay respectful attention to what other students say.
- C. Speak your mind carefully and clearly.
- D. Practice synthesizing the thoughts of one or more people by bringing together what has been said to form a new insight, conclusion, or question.
- E. Encourage discussion and debate by disagreeing constructively.
- F. Announce materials (library materials, newspaper and journal articles, current events, etc.) relevant to this seminar.
- G. Complete and submit written assignments by their scheduled due dates.
- H. Attend all class sessions.
- I. Abide by the guidelines established by class members for "meeting for learning."

#### Writing Assignments:

Comparative Practices courses are writing intensive courses. IR of 9/11 will involve three different kinds of writing assignments: (a) weekly responses to the reading due approximately 24 hours before the scheduled reading is discussed in class; (b) two short papers that will involve comparing class texts with each other and with texts "external" to the course, such as websites and newspaper articles; and (c) a research project that will produce an annotated bibliography and a chronology. These writing assignments, combined with class participation, will account for the final grade earned in the course, according to this formula:

Class participation:	15 points
Weekly responses:	30 points

Paper I:	10 points
Annotated bibliography:	15 points
Chronology:	15 points
Paper II:	15 points

#### A. Weekly responses to the reading.

The class will be divided into two groups. Group 1 will submit weekly responses by MONDAY NOON in preparation for Tuesday’s class and Group 2 will submit weekly responses by WEDNESDAY NOON in preparation for Thursday’s class. These assignments *may* be submitted by email *if* you use the following subject line: Weekly Response for IR of 9/11 (otherwise your submission WILL be lost in my inbox). Your weekly response should address each of the following questions in a concise but engaging manner.

1. What seem(s) to be the author(s) main idea(s)?
2. Identify two passages that were not self-explanatory. What remains to be explained?
3. Identify two passages that are thought-provoking. What do you want to discuss?
4. What connections can you make between the assigned reading and other “texts” you have read recently?

An excellent example of a weekly response answering the questions above is attached to the end of this syllabus.

Note: Group 2 will have days “off” on 9/25 (Paper I is due), 10/09 (Mid-semester break), and 12/11 (Course Wrap-up). Group 1 will have days “off” on 10/18 (BI Session), 11/11 (Annotated Bibliography is due), and 12/09 (Chronology is due).

#### B. Paper I

Paper I will be 1200 – 1500 words long (if you were using Times New Roman, 12 point that would be 4 to 6 pages). The purpose of this essay is to address a question posed by the instructor, comparing some texts read in class with a new text selected by Welling. In constructing this essay you are expected to draw upon some ideas initially drafted in your weekly responses. This assignment will be specified on September 18 and is due on September 25.

#### C. Annotated Bibliography

This, in combination with the chronology, is a research assignment that will be conducted in conjunction with bibliographic instruction. The annotated bibliography will pull together a variety of resources print and online that can help student researchers answer a subset of questions about September 11<sup>th</sup>, its causes and consequences. You will pick your question in consultation with Welling. Our bibliographic instruction time will introduce you both to samples of successful annotations and provide keys for locating appropriate resources. This assignment will be clarified by a BI session on October 18 and is due on November 11.

## D. Chronology

This assignment goes together with the annotated bibliography, although they are not due at the same time. It would be impossible to list every significant date and event that accounts for some significant aspect of September 11<sup>th</sup> and its consequences. Therefore, this chronology will pertain to a subset of dates and events that are pertinent to answering a specific question addressed by the annotated bibliography. Samples of successful student chronologies will be available to look at. This assignment is due on December 9.

## E. Paper II

Paper II will be 1500 to 1800 words long. This essay should answer the question, “What does it mean to say that “the world changed forever on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 20”?” As a starting point you may choose to agree or disagree with the assertion. As with Paper 1, in constructing this essay you are expected to draw upon ideas initially drafted in your weekly responses. This assignment will be further specified on December 9 and will be due at the time of the scheduled final exam for this course.

## Topic and Reading Schedule (subject to change)

### Week I/II

- 8/28 Th = Introduction
- 9/02 T = Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, *Worlds in Collision*, Chapter 1
- 9/04 Th = Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations* (hereafter *Clash*), Part I

### Week III

- 9/09 T = *Clash*, Part II and Part III
- 9/11 Th = *Clash*, Part IV (8, 9, 10)

### Week IV

- 9/16 T = *Clash*, Part IV (11 and 12) and Part V
- 9/18 Th = Mary Kaldor, *Old and New Wars*, Chapters 1 – 3

### Week V

- 9/23 T = *Old and New Wars*, Chapters 4 - 7
- 9/25 Th = Paper I due

### Week VI

- 9/30 T = John K. Cooley, *Unholy Wars*, Chapters 1 - 4
- 10/02 Th = *Unholy Wars*, Chapters 5 – 8

### Week VII

- 10/07 T = *Unholy Wars*, Chapters 9 - epilogue
- 10/09 Th = Midsemester Break

Week VIII	<i>Remembering September 11, 2001</i>
10/14	The Smithsonian Institute, see <a href="http://911digitalarchive.org/">http://911digitalarchive.org/</a>
10/16	9/11 U.S. upside down, <a href="http://www.plato.2020media.co.uk/debates/debate-2-47.jsp">http://www.plato.2020media.co.uk/debates/debate-2-47.jsp</a>
	CNN Day of Terror video archive <a href="http://edition.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/day.video.10.html">http://edition.cnn.com/SPECIALS/2001/trade.center/day.video.10.html</a>
	<i>Remembering September 11, 2001</i> continued
	The Avalon Project at Yale Law School, September 11, 2001: Attack on America, see <a href="http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/sept_11.htm">http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/avalon/sept_11/sept_11.htm</a>
Week IX	
10/18	T = BI for Annotated Bibliography and Chronology
10/23	Th = <i>Worlds in Collision</i> , Part Two: Order, Chapters 14 – 18
Week X	
10/28	T = Drumbl, <i>Victimhood in Our Neighborhood</i>
10/30	Th = Brodsky, <i>With All Our Strength: The Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan</i> (hereafter <i>With All Our Strength</i> ) Chapters 1 – 3
Week XI	
11/04	T = <i>With All Our Strength</i> , Chapters 4 – 6
11/06	Th = <i>With All Our Strength</i> , Chapters 7 – 8
Week XII	
11/11	T = Annotated Bibliography Due
11/13	Th = <i>Worlds in Collision</i> , Part One: Terror, Chapters 2 – 6
Week XIII	
11/18	T = <i>Worlds in Collision</i> , Part One: Terror, Chapters 7 – 11
11/20	Th = <i>Worlds in Collision</i> , Part Two: Order, Chapters 12, 13, 19, 20, 21
Week XIV	
12/02	T = <i>Worlds in Collision</i> , Part Three: Worlds, Chapters 22 – 25
12/04	Th = <i>Worlds in Collision</i> , Part Three: Worlds, Chapters 26 – 31
Week XV	
12/09	T = Chronology Due
12/11	Th = Course Wrap Up
Final Exam	Paper II Due

Note that this sample weekly response was written for a different course and in response to a different set of texts.

Date: Fri, 1 Feb 2002 14:54:45 -0000

To: <wellingh@earlham.edu>

Subject: Reading Response for PT

From: "Jamie Katherine Arnett" <arnetja@earlham.edu>

<p>In these three chapters the authors seek to show the various campaign strategies and tactics within the human rights network, the environmental advocacy network and the women's advocacy network. The authors detail the campaigns in an attempt to pick out the major tactics used and show how they played out among the various actors in the network. The purpose is to show the issues tht arose, how strategies were used, and that campaigns are constantly adjusting and readjusting to factors within the networks.</p>	<p>Why is this an excellent response to a reading?</p>
<p>I found the discussion about the search for a harmony of interests within the networks very interesting. This fact really brought out the difference between an advocacy network and campaigns that seek to build solidarity. Especially interesting was the discussion on page 95 that detailed the difference between the two. Whereas the solidarity campaigns seeks to garner support based on a conviction for defending a cause the human rights networks is based more upon procedural issues and agreed upon norms such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and others. This was something I noticed in Susan Waltz's definition of human rights, that she purposely stayed away from subjective definitions of human rights and instead focused on the agreed upon norms between states. It seems that this serves two functions: (1) in building a larger potential area within which NGOs are capable of coming togher in and (2) a greater degree of leverage over states and institutions. This leads to another issue that I found very interesting: that of the attempts to build agreement across potential lines of conflict, i.e. between groups from the North and South or between groups with a similar goal but with diverse interests within that goal. An example that comes to mind is the campaign in Sarawak. The local NGOs and the International ones seemed to have completely different agendas within the issue of tropical deforestation. In this case the nature of the network appears to be not unidirectional or</p>	<p>This paragraph provides a concise, accurate summary of the assignment, locating the focus of the comments that follow.</p>
	<p>This discussion of thought-provoking passages in the reading demonstrates familiarity with the author's language ("advocacy network," "solidarity campaign," "human rights network" "building agreement across potential lines of conflict") and links them specifically to a current convocation, e.g. Susan Waltz' convo on the proliferation of small arms (a connection is made to other current events). The comments point directly to specific places in the text.</p>

necessarily coherent. The individual actors seem to be at odds with one another. This seems to be especially true in the case of the International versus local activists and between the International activists and the epistemic community.(page 157 and page 161)

A question I had related to the passage on p. 150 -1 that began "As organizations gain access . . ." This brought up an issue that I was wondering about that of the potential imbalance of power between the organizations of the North and South. The passage seems to suggest that decreasing intermediaries and such is the way to decrease the structural inequalities in the network. I am curious about whether or not the authors believe that the networks are created and fueled because of these structural inequalities. In other words the network seems to be made up of intermediaries so if shedding them is the way to reduce inequality then the next step seems to be that a complete equality would be when third world groups no longer need the network to address their problems. So I am just looking for a little more explanation of the inequality of the networks and how to deal with them. Relating the issue to current events - the issue of states having to be either willing to change or worried about potential pressure from the outside world in order for campaigns to be effective. It brings to mind an article about African states and the move away from authoritarianism to a softer kind of authoritarianism. It is related to a fear of international condemnation but the result of this fear is not a change but a superficial makeover in the way the regime is organized. It makes me wonder about the level of agreement and the degree to which norms really are internalized by some states.

The comments here reflect very close reading that generates serious questions about the text and its meaning for us.