



PEACE INTERVENTIONS AND THE POLITICS OF DEALING WITH THE PAST  
65326-01

Adam Kochanski  
Spring 2022

SYLLABUS

- Lecturer:** Dr. Adam Kochanski  
[adam.kochanski@unibas.ch](mailto:adam.kochanski@unibas.ch)
- Meetings:** Mondays, 12.00-14.00 Rosshofgasse (Schnitz), Seminarraum S 01
- Virtual office hours via Zoom:** Mondays, 16.00-17.00 (CET)  
Wednesdays, 12.00-13.00 (CET)  
*Please use Calendly to sign up: <https://calendly.com/adam-kochanski>*  
or by appointment  
*Please send me an e-mail to schedule a meeting outside my regular virtual office hours*

All inquiries sent to me via e-mail should receive a response back within two working days (weekends excluded).

- On ADAM:** Yes  
**Credit points:** 3  
**Language of instruction:** English  
**Assessment format:** Continuous  
**Scale:** 1-6 0.5 (see “Grading” on last page)

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

---

This course provides an introduction to the political, legal and ethical dimensions of international intervention, peacebuilding and dealing with the past (DwP) in ongoing armed conflicts and post-conflict transitions. It explores key decisions and dilemmas facing countries experiencing large-scale hostilities and/or transitioning from war to peace.

**Part I** of the course surveys the development of peace operations over time and space. Students will learn about (1) the genealogy of peacebuilding, (2) distinctions between peacekeeping, peacemaking, and peacebuilding, and (3) key frameworks, such as the Responsibility to Protect, the Protection of Civilians and Women, Peace and Security. **Part II** shifts to the intricate post-conflict stage through an in-depth examination of the four pillars of DwP: the right to justice, the right to know, the right to reparation and guarantee of non-recurrence. Students will take stock of the main instruments in the DwP “toolkit”, namely trials, truth commissions, reparations and institutional reforms, and scrutinize how each one fits within the larger post-conflict peacebuilding framework. **Part III** investigates cross-cutting themes (e.g., conflict prevention and the so-called local and postcolonial “turns” in peacebuilding and DwP).

Throughout the course, students will be encouraged to question dominant assumptions and reflect critically on both the prospects and limits of “international intervention” – whether as an aspiration or as a set of concrete practices – in these two distinct but overlapping fields. To animate concepts, theories and approaches, the course will draw on a plethora of case studies from across the world ranging from Latin America to Southeast Asia to Sub-Saharan Africa.

## LEARNING OBJECTIVES

---

*The main learning objective of this course is to provide students with a sound theoretical, conceptual and empirical understanding of humanitarian intervention, peacebuilding and DwP in war-affected societies.* These three areas of conflict and post-conflict response are inherently intertwined and interdisciplinary fields of research and practice. Students will learn about the conceptual and historical underpinnings of peacebuilding and DwP – as distinct but closely related fields of practice and scholarly inquiry – and obtain rich empirical insights from practical case studies. They will further be challenged to “connect the dots” across disciplinary boundaries through a critical reflection of the prospects and limitations of peacebuilding and DwP (more commonly referred to as “transitional justice”) interventions, whether during or after mass atrocity. By taking this course students will (1) sharpen their academic writing skills and oral presentation and communication skills, (2) strengthen their ability to work collaboratively in teams, (3) develop their capacity to undertake critical analysis and independent research, and (4) recognize key scholarly debates and policy stakes, which will prepare them to pursue further academic research on these topics or for a rewarding career in policy.

## TEACHING METHODS

---

This is a seminar and not a lecture course meaning, while there will be some formal instruction in some weeks (~10 to 15 minutes in length or as needed), the course is largely structured around weekly seminar discussions and group presentations facilitated by the professor centred on the required readings. Oral participation is a central component of the course – students are expected to come prepared to each meeting so they can make meaningful contributions to a critical and informed discussion. At times, our weekly discussions will be animated by an invited guest speaker.

## READINGS

---

Readings are available for download on ADAM and via the University of Basel’s online library catalogue. To succeed in this course, and to get the most from our discussions, please complete [all the course materials and readings prior to each meeting.](#)

## SENSITIVE CONTENT STATEMENT

---

Content warning: The fields of peace and conflict studies and transitional justice touch on numerous sensitive topics (e.g., war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide). Please be aware that students may find some of the course content disturbing but it has been included because it directly supports the learning objectives. Please contact the instructor if you have specific concerns about this before and/or at any point during the seminar.

## INCLUSIVE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

---

The University of Basel’s [Disability Statement](#) expresses its commitment to the equality of students with disabilities or chronic illnesses. As the instructor of this course, I strive to create an inclusive learning environment that is free from learning barriers. If you experience any barriers and require accommodations, please do not hesitate to discuss them with me and/or one of the [Students Without Barriers \(StoP\) service point](#) officers at the University: Patricia Winter (Tel. +41 61 207 17 19, e-mail: [patricia.winter@unibas.ch](mailto:patricia.winter@unibas.ch)) or Markus Adler (Tel. +41 61 207 59 82, e-mail: [markus.adler@unibas.ch](mailto:markus.adler@unibas.ch)).

## COVID-19

---

The University of Basel intends to resume face-to-face instruction in the upcoming spring semester, as far as the pandemic situation and local health requirements allow. The campus (classrooms, libraries, study rooms and catering facilities) should be as open as possible for student use.

The Federal Council lifted the requirements for a Covid certificate and to wear masks in public areas (such as lecture halls) and at the workplace on February 16, 2022. For the University of Basel, this means we will start the Spring semester without these restrictions in place. (1) courses will once again be freely accessible to all, and (2) masks will no longer have to be worn in University premises, including classroom. Note: the only exception is for individuals who have tested positive for Covid-19, who are still required to isolate for 5 days until further notice.

## COURSE REQUIREMENTS

(In the event of extraordinary circumstances beyond the University's control, the content and/or evaluation scheme in this course is subject to change. Class attendance is necessary to successfully complete this course.)

Components of the Final Grade		
Assessment	Weight	Due Date
Attendance	10 %	Weekly as of Week 4
Reading Responses	10 %	Weekly as of Week 4 by 12.00 (CET)
Group Presentations	30 %	Beginning in Week 2
<i>Flexible (students can choose which of the following two options they will complete)</i>		
Analytic Reflections	50 % (2 x 25 %)	March 28 May 9
<b>OR</b>		
Essay	50 %	June 15

**NOTE: All assignments must be in English.** *The font must be Times New Roman, 12-point font, double-line spacing and A4 paper size.* The use of condensed fonts is not permitted. Submit all written assignments in PDF format and use the Chicago Manual of Style 17th edition (author-date) for assessments requiring citations and/or a bibliography.

### ASSESSMENT METHODS

---

#### *Attendance (10%)*

Students are expected to regularly attend class and be active and informed participants. A quality contribution shows familiarity with the course readings, critical engagement with the course themes and respect for your peers' opinions. The instructor will routinely utilize roundtables to give students an opportunity to ask questions or share comments related to the readings, as well as a question-based model and breakout group discussions to promote engagement. This means coming to class ready with at least one or two questions about the readings and/or having completed your weekly reading response (see below). Starting in Week 4, the instructor will take attendance at the beginning of class and subtract 1 mark from 10 for each absence. Because things happen, **you may miss one class** without being penalized.

#### *Reading Responses (10%)*

I will post reading response questions each week on ADAM starting in **Week 4**. They will often form the basis of our seminar discussions. Please select **ONE** of these questions each week and submit a short, thoughtful response (~150 words) on ADAM. Your responses must explicitly engage with topics and/or concepts raised in that week's readings. No citations or bibliography is required. Responses are to be uploaded/e-mailed by 11.59 CET every Monday. They will receive a pass/fail grade (pass for completing the response and fail for late submissions or not submitting at all). The goal is to encourage students to think critically about the readings before class and to prepare for longer writing assignments. There will be 11 opportunities to submit reading responses and, like above, **you may miss one response** without being penalized.

#### *Group Presentations (30%)*

At the start of the semester, I will circulate a list of case studies that students can sign up for (one each week). You will be working in groups of approximately three for this creative assignment. Your task is to prepare a (maximum) 15-minute presentation. The presentation will offer a concise and engaging report of the country's experience with armed conflict. Given that 15 minutes is not a lot of time, each word should be chosen with purpose and intention. Your sentences should be crisp and delivered purposefully. You may or may not decide to supplement your spoken remarks with some visual aids, such as a few PowerPoint slides or similar. I will post further tips for this assignment on ADAM and several short 5-minute video presentations that were completed individually during the pandemic as examples (please do not circulate them further). Your presentation will be scheduled for the first hour of class and will be followed by a 10 to 15-minute Q&A. Your group will be assessed on the content and delivery of the presentation (the same grade for every team member). In addition to the presentation, your group is expected to submit a (maximum) 1-page bibliography.

Your presentation should:

- Provide a brief, high-level overview of the country and the nature of the armed conflict (do not get bogged down in detail – max 3-4 min).
- Give a synopsis of the peace/DwP interventions that have been enacted (or not) and relate the case study to that week's concepts and themes (this is the heart of the presentation, avoid trying to summarize the articles – about 6-7 min).
- Provide an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the approach taken in the context (the remaining time, feel free to be prescriptive).

### Flexible Option

*Analytic Reflections* (2 × 25% = 50%)

Over the course of the semester, you will prepare two 3-page double-spaced analytic reflections (you are expected to use the entire allocated space). The first paper will cover the course materials in Weeks 1 to 6 (inclusive), while the second reflection will address Weeks 7 to 12. The analytic reflections are to be submitted via ADAM by 23.59 CET on **March 28** and **May 9**.

You should start off your analytic reflections by identifying your own discussion question(s) that you will answer by engaging with the various weekly themes and readings. Papers should be structured as a short and coherent essay, organized around a central argument. They should not simply summarize the readings, but instead should identify one or two key issues and provide critical analysis of the readings through that lens. Ultimately, you want to get the authors “speaking” to each other and supplement that with your own analysis. A critical analysis may, for example, explore core themes across readings, compare one or two DwP instruments (e.g., trials versus truth commissions) or peace interventions (e.g., the Responsibility to Protect versus the Protection of Civilians), problematize key assumptions or discuss strengths and weaknesses of disparate approaches. Citations and a bibliography are not necessary given you will be relying exclusively on the course readings for this assignment. A title page is also not necessary. Simply state your name and your student number in the header, include a title at the top of the first page, and put the page numbers in the footer. Examples of exemplary analytic reflections will be posted on ADAM (please do not circulate them further).

**OR**

*Essay* (50%)

This ~9-11-page double-spaced paper (no title page, the page count does not include the bibliography) will give students an opportunity to examine a current issue in peace interventions and DwP (e.g., Women, Peace and Security, liberal peacebuilding, the International Criminal Court, a truth commission, a reparations programme, a memorialization project, a civil society initiative, and so on). The essay invites students to delve deeper into a topic that interests them – whether conceptually or theoretically, or empirically through a case study (students can either expand on one of the case studies discussed in class or use the essay as an opportunity to explore another example or body of literature in preparation for their Master's thesis). While writing styles may differ, the hallmark of a good essay is a well-structured paper with a clear and identifiable question and thesis. Students are strongly encouraged to speak with the professor about their essay topic before beginning their research. Your essay should be submitted via ADAM by 23.59 (EST) on **June 15**.

## ASSESSMENT POLICIES AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

### LANGUAGE QUALITY

---

While the content of written assignments will ultimately be the main factor in assessments, the writing quality will inevitably also play a role. Given all assignments for this course must be in English, students who are not proficient in the language are encouraged to make the most of the services offered by the University of Basel's [Language Center](#).

### POLICY ON LATE SUBMISSIONS

---

There is a penalty for late submissions. Exceptions are made for illness or other serious situations deemed as such by the professor. Regulations require all late submissions due to illness to be supported by a medical note.

*Group Presentations:* This is a time-sensitive assignment – your peers are counting on each group to be ready to go in time for class. Presentations not delivered during the class they were scheduled will receive a fail grade (below 4.0).

*Written Assignments:*

- reading responses received by 11.59 CET will receive a pass/fail grade. Responses not received by that time will receive a 0 grade.
- analytic reflections submitted late will receive a 0,5 deduction per week up to a maximum of 4 weeks from the original deadline. Assignments will no longer be accepted one month after the deadline, at which point they will receive a fail grade (below 4.0).
- late final essays will be accepted up to one week after the original deadline and will receive a 0,5 deduction. Final essays will not be accepted after **June 22**.

All regrade requests (applies only to the analytic reflections and final essay) must be provided in writing. Please note that grades on regraded assignments may go up, down or remain the same.

## **RESEARCH ETHICS AND ACADEMIC DISHONESTY**

---

The University of Basel values academic integrity. Students must know the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the University's [Code of Conduct](#). *The onus is on students to read and comply with the University's regulations on academic fraud.*

Here are some examples of academic fraud:

- engaging in any form of plagiarism or cheating,
- presenting falsified research data,
- handing in an assignment that was not authored, in whole or in part, by the student, and
- submitting the same assignment in more than one course without obtaining the written consent of the professors concerned.

Work submitted for evaluation as part of this course may be checked with text matching software within ADAM.

## **HOW TO READ AND PREPARE FOR THIS COURSE**

---

This is a challenging, reading-intensive seminar course.

Students are expected to come prepared to discuss each reading in class. As a guide, you might ask yourself some of the following questions when you have finished each reading:

1. The author's argument is ...
2. The following are the key concepts and terms that I noticed were in the reading ...  
Are any of these unclear?
3. Has this article introduced new ideas or made me think differently about a particular topic?
4. Do I agree or disagree with the argument? Why or why not?
5. What additional questions does the argument or information raise?
6. How does this reading relate to other assigned readings and concepts discussed in class?
7. How does the author support their conclusions?
8. What are the implications of the author's argument for research and practice?
9. The key takeaway from the reading is ...

## **COPYRIGHT STATEMENT**

---

© Instructor-generated course materials (e.g., PowerPoint presentations, syllabus, reading response questions) are protected by law and may not be copied or distributed in any form or in any medium without the instructor's explicit consent.

## COURSE OUTLINE

### I. Peace Interventions

#### Week 1 February 21

*What is Peace? – Introduction to the Course*

Required:

Richard Caplan, *Measuring Peace: Principles, Practices, and Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), Ch 1 “Conceptualizing Peace.”

Recommended:

Johan Galtung, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” *Journal of Peace Research* 6 (3) (1969): 167–191.

Barbara F. Walter, Lise Morjé Howard and V. Page Fortna, “The Extraordinary Relationship between Peacekeeping and Peace,” *British Journal of Political Science* 51 (4) (2021): 1705–1722.

#### Week 2 February 28

*Peace Operations in Historical Perspective*

Required:

Roland Paris, *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), Ch 1 “The Origins of Peacebuilding” & Ch 2 “The Liberal Peace Thesis.”

Marrack Goulding, “The evolution of United Nations peacekeeping,” *International Affairs* 69 (3) (1993): 451–464.

Recommended:

Richard Gowan, “Peace Operations,” in *Oxford Handbook on the United Nations*, eds. Thomas G. Weiss and Sam Daws (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 420–445.

Case study/group presentation: Rwanda

#### Week 3 March 7

*Fasnachtsferien (no class)*

#### Week 4 March 14

*Responsibility to Protect and the Protection of Civilians*

Required:

Emily Paddon Rhoads and Jennifer Welsh, “Close cousins in protection: the evolution of two norms,” *International Affairs* 95 (3) (2019): 597–617.

Ingvild Bode and John Karlsrud, “Implementation in Practice: The Use of Force to Protect Civilians in United Nations Peacekeeping,” *European Journal of International Relations* 25 (2) (2019): 458–485.

Recommended:

Paul D. Williams, “The R2P, Protection of Civilians, and UN Peacekeeping Operations,” in *Oxford Handbook of the Responsibility to Protect*, eds. Alex J. Bellamy and Tim Dunne (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 524–544.

Jennifer Welsh, “Civilian Protection in Libya: Putting Coercion and Controversy Back into RtoP,” *Ethics & International Affairs* 25 (3) (2011): 255–262.

Alex J. Bellamy and Charles T. Hunt, “Twenty-first century UN peace operations: protection, force and the changing security environment,” *International Affairs* 91 (6) (2015): 1277–1298.

Betsy Jose and Peace Medie, “Understanding Why and How Civilians Resort to Self-Protection in Armed Conflict,” *International Studies Review* 17 (4) (2015): 515–533.

Case study/group presentation: Libya

## **Week 5            March 21**

*Women, Peace and Security and Conflict-Related Sexual Violence*

### Required:

Paul Kirby and Laura J. Shepherd, “The futures past of the Women, Peace and Security Agenda,” *International Affairs* 92 (2) (2016): 373–392

Maria Eriksson Baaz and Maria Stern, “Why Do Soldiers Rape? Masculinity, Violence, and Sexuality in the Armed Forces in the Congo (DRC),” *International Studies Quarterly* 53 (2) (2009): 495–518.

### Recommended:

Anne-Kathrin Kreft, “The gender mainstreaming gap: Security Council resolution 1325 and UN peacekeeping mandates,” *International Peacekeeping* 24 (1) (2017): 132–158.

Case study/group presentation: Democratic Republic of the Congo

## **Week 6            March 28**

*Post-Conflict Peacebuilding*

### Required:

Naazneen H. Barma, *The Peacebuilding Puzzle: Political Order in Post-Conflict States* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), Ch 1 “Rethinking the Peacebuilding Puzzle.”

Séverine Autesserre, “Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention,” *International Organization* 63 (2): 249–280.

Roland Paris, “Saving liberal peacebuilding,” *Review of International Studies* 36 (2) (2010): 337–365.

### Recommended:

Ryerson Christie and Gilberto Algar-Faria, “Timely Interventions: Temporality and Peacebuilding,” *European Journal of International Security* 5 (2) (2020): 155–178.

Roger Mac Ginty, *Everyday Peace: How So-called Ordinary People Can Disrupt Violent Conflict* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), Ch 1 “The Everyday, Circuitry, and Scalability.”

Séverine Autesserre, *Peaceland: Conflict Resolution and the Everyday Politics of International Intervention* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Ch 2 “The Politics of Knowledge” & Ch 4 “The Interveners’ Circle.”

Case study/group presentation: Sierra Leone

## **II. The Politics of Dealing with the Past**

### **Week 7            April 4**

*Dealing with the Past: Conceptual and Historical Underpinnings*

### Required:

swisspeace, *A Conceptual Framework for Dealing with the Past* (Bern, Switzerland: swisspeace, 2016).

Ruti G. Teitel, “Transitional Justice Genealogy,” *Harvard Human Rights Journal* 16 (1) (2003): 69–94.

Kathryn Sikkink and Hun Joon Kim, “The Justice Cascade: The Origins and Effectiveness of Prosecutions of Human Rights Violations,” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 9 (1) (2013): 269–285.

### Recommended:

ICTJ, “What is Transitional Justice?” (2020), <https://www.ictj.org/about/transitional-justice>

Paige Arthur, “How ‘Transitions’ Reshaped Human Rights: A Conceptual History of Transitional Justice,” *Human Rights Quarterly* 31 (2) (2009): 321–367.

Marcos Zunino, *Justice Framed: A Genealogy of Transitional Justice* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), Ch 3 “The Birth of Transitional Justice: Emergence.”

Janine Natalya Clark, “The Three Rs: Retributive Justice, Restorative Justice, and Reconciliation,” *Contemporary Justice Review* 11 (4) (2008): 331–350.

Case study/group presentation: Argentina

**Week 8            April 11**

*Right to Justice*

Required:

Coalition for the ICC, “The ICC in 3 minutes” (2016), [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jw\\_cQrGwMJ0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jw_cQrGwMJ0)

Oumar Ba, *States of Justice: The Politics of the International Criminal Court* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020), Ch 1 “Regimes of International Criminal Justice” & Ch 2 “States of Justice.”

Kirsten Ainley, “The Responsibility to Protect and the International Criminal Court: counteracting the crisis,” *International Affairs* 91 (1) (2015): 37–54.

Recommended:

ICC, “Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court,” A/CONF.183/9, New York, 17 July 1998.

Christopher Rudolph, “Constructing an Atrocities Regime: The Politics of War Crimes Tribunals,” *International Organization* 55 (3) (2001): 655–691.

Mark Kersten, “As the pendulum swings – the revival of the hybrid tribunal,” in *International Practices of Criminal Justice: Social and Legal Perspectives*, ed. Mikkel Jarle Christensen and Ron Levi (New York: Routledge, 2017), 251–273.

Case study/group presentation: Kenya

**Week 9            April 18**

*Ostern (no class)*

**Week 10          April 25**

*Right to Know*

Required:

Adam Kochanski, “Mandating Truth: Patterns and Trends in Truth Commission Design,” *Human Rights Review* 21 (2) (2020): 113–137.

Onur Bakiner, “Truth Commission Impact on Policy, Courts, and Society,” *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 17 (1) (2021): 73–91.

Recommended:

Kelebogile Zvobgo, “Demanding Truth: The Global Transitional Justice Network and the Creation of Truth Commissions,” *International Studies Quarterly* 64 (3) (2020): 609–625.

Alexander Dukalskis, “Interactions in Transition: How Truth Commissions and Trials Complement or Constrain Each Other,” *International Studies Review* 13 (3) (2011): 432–451.

Case study/group presentation: South Africa

**Week 11          May 2**

*Right to Reparation*

Required:

Pablo de Greiff, “Repairing the Past: Compensation for Victims of Human Rights Violations,” in *Oxford Handbook of Reparations*, ed. Pablo de Greiff (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 1–18.

Frédéric Mégret, “The International Criminal Court Statute and the Failure to Mention Symbolic Reparations,” *International Review of Victimology* 16 (2) (2009): 127–47.

Recommended:

Luke Moffett, “Transitional Justice and Reparations: Remediating the Past?” in *Research Handbook on Transitional Justice*, eds. Cheryl Lawther, Luke Moffett and Dov Jacobs (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 2017), 377–400.

Margaret Urban Walker, “Transformative Reparations? A Critical Look at the Current Trend in Thinking about Gender-Just Reparations,” *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 10 (1) (2016): 108–125.

Case study/group presentation: Peru



**Week 12      May 9***Guarantee of Non-Recurrence*Required:

Maja Davidovic, "The Law of 'Never Again': Transitional Justice and the Transformation of the Norm of Non-Recurrence," *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 15 (2) (2021): 386–406.

Naomi Roht-Arriaza, "Measures of Non-Repetition in Transitional Justice: The Missing Link?" in *From Transitional to Transformative Justice*, eds. Simon Robins and Paul Gready (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 105–130.

Recommended:

Alexander Mayer-Rieckh, "Guarantees of Non-Recurrence: An Approximation," *Human Rights Quarterly* 39 (2) (2017): 416–448.

Pablo de Greiff, "Report of the Special Rapporteur on the Promotion of Truth, Justice, Reparation and Guarantees of Non-Recurrence," A/HRC/30/42, Geneva, 7 September 2015.

Case study/group presentation: Colombia**III. Issues and Developments in Theory and Practice****Week 13      May 16***Conflict/Atrocity Prevention*Required:

Charles T. Call and Susanna P. Campbell, "Is Prevention the Answer?" *Daedalus* 147 (1) (2018): 64–77.

Eglantine Staunton and Jason Ralph, "The Responsibility to Protect norm cluster and the challenge of atrocity prevention: an analysis of the European Union's strategy in Myanmar," *European Journal of International Relations* 26 (3) (2020): 660–686.

Recommended:

Jennifer Welsh, "The Responsibility to prevent: Assessing the gap between rhetoric and reality," *Cooperation and Conflict* 51 (2) (2016): 216–232.

Pablo de Greiff and Adama Dieng, "Joint study on the contribution of transitional justice to the prevention of gross violations and abuses of human rights and serious violations of international humanitarian law, including genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity, and their recurrence: Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation and guarantees of non-recurrence and the Special Adviser to the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide," A/HRC/37/65, Geneva, 6 June 2018.

Case study/group presentation: Myanmar**Week 14      May 23***Postcolonialism and (Liberal) Peacebuilding / Dealing with the Past*Required:

Sarah Maddison and Laura J. Shepherd, "Peacebuilding and the postcolonial politics of transitional justice," *Peacebuilding* 2 (3) (2014): 253–269.

Meera Sabaratnam, "Avatars of Eurocentrism in the critique of the liberal peace," *Security Dialogue* 44 (3) (2013): 259–278.

Recommended:

Vivienne Jabri, "Peacebuilding, the local and the international: a colonial or a postcolonial rationality?" *Peacebuilding* 1 (1) (2013): 3–16.

Augustine S. J. Park, "Settler Colonialism, Decolonization and Radicalizing Transitional Justice," *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 14 (2) (2020): 260–279.

Case study/group presentation: Germany/Namibia

**Week 15      May 30**

*The “Local Turns” and Civilian Agency – Where to from Here?*

Required:

Roger Mac Ginty and Oliver P. Richmond, “The Local Turn in Peace Building: a critical agenda for peace,” *Third World Quarterly* 34 (5) (2013): 763–783.

Paul Gready and Simon Robins, “From Transitional to Transformative Justice: A New Agenda for Practice,” *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 8 (3) (2014): 339–361.

Recommended:

Adam Kochanski, “The ‘Local Turn’ in Transitional Justice: Curb the Enthusiasm,” *International Studies Review* 22 (1) (2020): 26–50.

Juan Masullo, “Refusing to Cooperate with Armed Groups: Civilian Agency and Civilian Noncooperation in Armed Conflicts,” *International Studies Review* 23 (3) (2021): 887–913.

Case study/group presentation: Afghanistan

## GRADING AND GRADE POINT AVERAGES

The course is graded according to the 1-6 scale in 0.5 increments with 4.0 being the minimum possible passing grade.

Grades	Description	Numerical Scale of Grades
6.0	excellent	90 – 100%
5.5	very good	80 – 89%
5.0	good	70 – 79%
4.5	satisfactory	60 – 69%
4.0	sufficient	50 – 59%
below 4.0	fail	0 – 49%

### MARKING SCHEME

(Mark Descriptive Equivalent for Course Work and Class Assignments)

#### 6.0            **excellent**

The below + considerable critical analysis/originality.

#### 5.5            **very good**

The below + novel question, some critical analysis/originality, clear expression, considerable evidence of research, and faultless grammar.

#### 5.0            **good**

The below + well-framed question, independent analysis based on deep understanding of relevant concepts, strong evidence of research and knowledge of the literature, and sound logical reasoning. Some vocabulary errors.

#### 4.5            **satisfactory**

The below + good knowledge of the literature. Well-focused on the question, but question was poorly framed. Some analytical sophistication. Ability to combine factual knowledge with logical argumentation. Knowledge of the central concepts relevant to the question. Some factual errors. Some grammar, vocabulary, and structural errors.

#### 4.0            **sufficient**

Basic material presented but organization is not adequate, and the arguments are not clear. Rudimentary knowledge of the literature. Some understanding of central concepts, but not well focused on the question, which would have benefitted from greater specificity. Many factual errors. Grammar and vocabulary errors, and problems with organization at sentence and paragraph levels.

#### below 4.0    **fail**

Incomplete answer. Basic material presented but organization is not adequate, and the arguments are not clear. Based on poorly understood, anecdotal and/or unstructured material. Little evidence of scholarly research and many unsubstantiated claims and/or errors of fact. Concepts are disordered or flawed. Failure to express arguments clearly. Grammar and vocabulary errors, and problems with organization at sentence and paragraph levels.

---