
FYS 101: Ethics in International Relations

Prof. Stephen Long
1 804 647 8619 (WhatsApp)
slong@richmond.edu

Office Hours:
M 13:00–16:00
D 326

Course Website

Visit Blackboard at

<http://blackboard.richmond.edu/>

Why You Should Take This Course

This course explores pressing ethical and moral questions in the arena of international relations. The main areas of focus will be international conflict, international economics, and civil conflict. The format of the course, however, is just as important as the topic. In a discussion seminar setting, students share the responsibility for the quality of the class meetings with the professor. Students will receive one-on-one tutoring on their writing and public speaking, which they will practice through ungraded writing assignments in class, a draft and revision process for graded papers, and in-class debates. This course is a unique opportunity to discuss important ideas in a small group, then write about those ideas with support and advice from a professor, before moving to higher-level courses that will take these skills as a given.

The objectives of this course are as follows:

- Students will learn to read and think critically about arguments and puzzles relating to ethical behavior by individuals and societies in international relations. Relevant sources will include classical and modern texts, modern films, and other media selected to encourage reflection. Particular skills will include identifying the context of sources, interpreting their meaning, and critically analyzing them.
- Students will learn to write argumentative, persuasive essays on topics relating to ethics in international relations. Students will learn to write papers that offer a clear thesis or central argument, develop that argument logically, and support that argument with evidence from a single source or multiple sources.
- Students will improve their information literacy, learning how to identify reliable sources, synthesize information from those sources in a way that adds value, and cite sources properly.

- Students will improve their oral communication skills, learning how to listen actively to others, contribute to discussions and debates substantively and in a civil manner, and to participate in the intellectual community of the seminar.

How to Succeed in a Seminar

This course is not a traditional, lecture-focused introductory course. Students will speak more often and in greater depth in this course than in any other course they take as first year students. The readings, in-class assignments, and graded assignments are all designed to provoke students into engaging in serious self-examination. Excellent performance in this seminar will require that students 1) prepare in advance of class meetings, 2) have an active presence in the classroom as a listener and contributor, and 3) continuously try to improve written work by preparing first drafts and responding to constructive criticism through revision.

To prepare for class, students should read/view/listen to all of the assigned materials for the week in advance of the Monday discussion. Reading carefully involves not only finishing all of the assigned pages or minutes of video/audio, but taking notes on each assignment. Students should summarize the thesis or key points, supporting arguments or points, key evidence, and apparent weaknesses or fallacies of the piece in their notes. When asked, students should be able to provide this information to the professor without referring to the original material. Most importantly, students should bring questions about the assigned text or media to each class meeting.

To be an active listener and contributor in the classroom, students should be attentive when others are speaking, make eye contact with speakers and other listeners, and ask for clarification when speakers are not being clear. Students should not interrupt or talk over another speaker in order to make their own point. Quality of comments matters far more than quantity, so students should seek a balance in the discussion that allows other students to find room to contribute.

To show effort in writing, students should be timely in the submission of written assignments, able to accept constructive criticism from the professor and fellow students, and willing to make revisions that respond to criticism. Defensiveness is natural, but leaves little opportunity for improvement in writing. Students will perform best in their writing when they seek out criticism, ask for clarification of points, and show genuine interest in improvement.

Evaluation

All grades will be posted on Blackboard so that students have access to the latest information available at all times. The elements of the course grade will be as follows:

Three Short Papers

Students will begin by submitting a rough draft of each paper to the professor and the writing consultant. The consultant will provide feedback about organization, style, and grammar, while the professor provides feedback about the thesis, development of the argument, and use of evidence. Every student will receive extensive feedback on each paper, and will meet with the professor and/or writing consultant multiple times in the semester to discuss their progress as writers. Final versions will be submitted to the professor after revision. Students should note that revising and editing are not the same task. Revision may involve substantial changes to the argument, organization, structure, or even topic of the paper; far more than editing sentences and paragraphs for clarity and grammar.

Short Paper 1: Close Reading of Single Assigned Reading (20%)

In the first short paper, students will choose one assigned reading from the course syllabus. Students will then write a paper adhering to these guidelines:

- **Introduction:** The introduction should place the reading in context. What is the purpose of the piece? What is its intended audience? What is the genre (scientific, technical, persuasive, expressive, etc.)? It should also state, in the student's own words, the central claims and the secondary claims in the piece.
- **Thesis:** The thesis should identify multiple points of contention or weaknesses in the assigned reading. What does the author overstate or ignore? What counterpoints can be offered that disagree with the author? What evidence in the piece is missing, misused, or would seem to contradict the author's key points? A typical format for a thesis is "Author A makes a compelling argument for B, but his argument overemphasizes the risk of C, misinterprets evidence (D is happening instead of B), and commits the logical fallacies of E and F."
- **Development of arguments in thesis.** The remaining paragraphs should begin with a topic sentence that connects the paragraph to one of the points from the thesis. This orients the reader to the purpose of the paragraph and helps the paper flow smoothly. After each topic sentence, the paragraph should flesh out the argument with additional detail, and most importantly, evidence. Evidence should be drawn from the original assigned reading to be used in support of the student's thesis, citing each piece of evidence properly.
- **Conclusion.** A brief conclusion should summarize the key points of the paper and tie up loose ends, while maintaining a civil tone toward the author of the original piece.

Short Paper 2: Analytical Critique of an Assigned Reading Using Outside Sources of Evidence (20%)

In the second short paper, students will choose one assigned reading from the course syllabus. Students will then write a paper adhering to these guidelines:

- Introduction: The introduction should place the reading in context. What is the purpose of the piece? What is its intended audience? What is the genre (scientific, technical, persuasive, expressive, etc.)? It should also state, in the student's own words, the central claims and the secondary claims in the piece.
- Thesis: The thesis should identify multiple points of contention or weaknesses in the assigned reading, as in the first short paper. *However, unlike the first paper, this thesis should marshal outside sources to criticize the piece.* What does additional research into the issue reveal about the author's arguments, in terms of counterpoints and contradictory evidence? If others disagree with the author, what makes their points more compelling?
- Development of arguments in thesis. The remaining paragraphs should begin with a topic sentence that connects the paragraph to one of the points from the thesis. This orients the reader to the purpose of the paragraph and helps the paper flow smoothly. After each topic sentence, the paragraph should flesh out the argument with additional detail, and most importantly, evidence. Evidence should be drawn from the original assigned reading *and outside sources* to be used in support of the student's thesis, citing each piece of evidence properly.
- Conclusion. A brief conclusion should summarize the key points of the paper and tie up loose ends, while maintaining a civil tone toward the author of the original piece.

Short Paper 3: Identification and Analytical Critique of an Outside Reading Related to an Assigned Topic (20%)

In the third short paper, students will choose a reading that is not assigned in the syllabus, which they will identify through research at the library and on the web. The library's reference librarians will be a useful asset for this assignment. Students should choose an outside reading that pertains to one of the topics covered in the course. It should be a piece that makes a clear argument, not a news article or short blog post. Aside from the use of an outside reading, the guidelines for this paper are the same as those for the first paper (see above).

Annotated Bibliography of Six Connected Readings (10%)

Students will identify a topic relating to ethics and international relations that is not covered in the syllabus. After consulting with the professor about the topic, students will then read and select/curate a set of six connected articles, book chapters, or other readings of substantial depth and analytical content. Students will provide an annotated bibliography of these readings that provides the following information, in your own words, about each piece:

- Full citation.
- The key argument of the piece.
- The secondary arguments of the piece.

- The most important evidence used by the author to support the arguments.
- The genre and tone of the piece.
- An evaluation of whether the piece is making a fundamental or secondary contribution to the literature on the topic.

Class Participation, In-Class Assignments, and Debates (30%)

Discussions, in-class writing, and debates are crucial parts of this course. So long as students read the assigned articles each week and are active listeners (see the seminar success tips above), it will be easy to keep up with discussion and ensure a solid participation grade. Some of the readings are more advanced than others, and it is advisable to look up the definition and usage of any unfamiliar words while reading the assignments. Unexplained absences will result in a zero for the weekly discussion grade, and students will not be permitted to make up missed in-class assignments or debates.

Attendance Required

Attendance in this class is required. “Getting the notes” from a classmate is *not* an alternative to being in class, given that there is very little lecture content in the course. If a student is repeatedly and purposefully dodging class, the professor will follow up with him/her by telephone and file an online progress report with the dean of the relevant college (WC or RC). This is meant to allow staff at UR help students who are in academic or personal trouble.

Grading Policy

Letter grades for the course will be assigned along the following scale:

A+:	96.5% or greater
A:	93.5-96.4%
A-:	89.5-93.4%
B+:	86.5-89.4%
B:	83.5-86.4%
B-:	79.5-83.4%
C+:	76.5-79.4%
C:	73.5-76.4%
C-:	69.5-73.4%
D+:	66.5-69.4%
D:	63.5-66.4%
D-:	59.5-63.4%
F:	Below 59.5%

Additional Resources

- **Academic Skills Center** (<http://asc.richmond.edu> or 289-8626) helps students assess their academic strengths and weaknesses; hone their academic skills through teaching effective test preparation, critical reading and thinking, information processing, concentration, and related techniques; work on specific subject areas (e.g., calculus, chemistry, accounting, etc.); and encourage campus and community involvement.
- **Career Development Center** (<http://cdc.richmond.edu/> or 289-8141) can assist you in exploring your interests and abilities, choosing a major, connecting with internships and learning experiences, investigating graduate and professional school options, and landing your first job. We encourage you to schedule an appointment with a career advisor during your first year.
- **Counseling and Psychological Services** (<http://caps.richmond.edu/> or 289-8119) assists students in meeting academic, personal, or emotional challenges. Services include assessment, short-term counseling and psychotherapy, crisis intervention and related services.
- **Speech Center** (<http://speech.richmond.edu> or 289-8814): Assists with preparation and practice in the pursuit of excellence in public expression. Recording, playback, coaching and critique sessions offered by teams of student consultants trained to assist in developing ideas, arranging key points for more effective organization, improving style and delivery, and handling multimedia aids for individual and group presentations.
- **Writing Center** assists writers at all levels of experience, across all majors. Students can schedule appointments with trained writing consultants who offer friendly critiques of written work: <http://writing.richmond.edu>.

Course Materials

Required

- Paul Collier, *The Bottom Billion: Why the Poorest Countries Are Failing and What Can Be Done About It*, First edition. ISBN: 978-0-19-537338-7.
- Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein, *They Say, I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*, Third edition. ISBN: 978-0-393-93584-4.
- All articles assigned that are posted on Blackboard.

Schedule

August 22-26: Introductions and Inquiries

- Read syllabus front to back.

- Peterson, “Consequentialism”
- Rigstad, “Deontology”
- Weinstein, “Utilitarianism”
- Read next week’s assignments in advance in order to be prepared for Monday.

Going to War

August 29-September 2: Is War Ever Just? If So, When?

- Oren, *The Morality of War*, pp. 1-30
- Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars* excerpts from Chapters 4-6
- Graff and Birkenstein, “Introduction: Entering the Conversation” and “Chapter 1: They Say”

September 5-9: Is it Right to Compel an Individual to Fight?

- Twain, “The War Prayer”
- “The White Feather Diaries”
- Galston, “A Sketch of Some Arguments for Conscription”
- Fullinwider, “Conscription- No”
- Gorr, “Some Arguments Against Peacetime Conscription”
- Graff and Birkenstein, “Chapter 2: Her Point Is” and “Chapter 3: As He Himself Puts It”

September 12-16: What Do Societies Owe Their Veterans?

- Short Paper 1 Draft Due to Emily and Dr. Long Friday 5pm
- Iverson, Cornell, and Smits, “The ‘Army of Lost Souls’”
- Puniewska, “Healing a Wounded Sense of Morality”
- Horton, “Help Veterans by Taking Them Off the Pedestal”
- Graff and Birkenstein, “Chapter 4: Yes/No/Okay, But” and “Chapter 5: And Yet”

Terrorism and Insurgency

September 19-23: What Obligations Do We Have to Distinguish Between Combatants and Non-Combatants?

- Short Paper 1 Final Version Due to Dr. Long Friday 5pm
- Intelligence² Debate Video, “The President Has Constitutional Power to Target and Kill U.S. Citizens Abroad,” Dershowitz and Lewis v. Feldman and Shamsi (1hr 32m)
- Bilton and Sim, *Four Hours in My Lai* Ch. 4-5
- Perry, *Partly Cloudy* pp. 76-86
- Graff and Birkenstein, “Chapter 6: Skeptics May Object” and “Chapter 7: So What? Who Cares?”

September 26-30: Are Drone Strikes Morally Equivalent to Other Forms of Force?

- Evening Film Showing, *Eye in the Sky*
- Intelligence² Debate Video, “The U.S. Drone Program is Fatally Flawed,” Rashid and Weston v. Scwartz and Blair (1hr 48m)
- Graff and Birkenstein, “Chapter 8: As a Result” and “Chapter 9: Ain’t So/Is Not”
- 2x2 Debate: Drone strikes are morally equivalent to other forms of force.

October 3-7: What Can We Do with Captives?

- Intelligence² Debate Video, “Tough Interrogation of Terror Suspects is Necessary,” Francona, MacDonald, and Rivkin v. Cloonan, Hutson, and Rejali (1hr 45m)
- Perry, *Partly Cloudy* pp. 199-227
- Evening Film Showing, *Unthinkable*
- Graff and Birkenstein, “Chapter 10: But Don’t Get Me Wrong,” “Chapter 12: I Take Your Point,” and “Chapter 14: What’s Motivating This Writer?”

October 12-14: Surveillance: Whom and How?

- Short Paper 2 Draft Due to Emily and Dr. Long Friday 5pm
- Intelligence² Debate Video, “Mass Collection of U.S. Phone Records Violates the Fourth Amendment,” Abdo and Wydra v. Baker and Yoo (1hr 28m)
- Byman and Wittes, “Reforming the NSA”
- Graff and Birkenstein, “Chapter 17: Analyze This”
- 2x2 Debate: The U.S. Congress should limit national security surveillance to non-citizens inside and outside of the United States.

*Civil Wars and Genocide***October 17-21: Origins, Orders, and Individual Agency**

- Short Paper 2 Final Version Due to Dr. Long Friday 5pm
- Evening Film Showing, *The Act of Killing*
- Valentino, *Final Solutions* ch. 3
- Waller, *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing* ch. 6

October 24-29: Who Should Intervene in Civil Wars?

- Carnegie Council video, “All the Missing Souls: A Personal History of the War Crimes Tribunals,” Scheffer (12m)
- Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* ch. 10
- 2x2 Debate: The United States should intervene in civil wars when genocide is evident.

*Economic Inequality***October 31-November 4: How Severe Is Global Inequality? Who is to Blame?**

- Pogge, “World Poverty and Human Rights”
- Miller, “Justice and Global Inequality”
- Risse, “Do We Owe the Global Poor Assistance or Rectification?: Response to Pogge”

November 7-11: How Can Global Inequality Be Resolved Justly?

- Short Paper 3 Draft Due to Emily and Dr. Long Friday 5pm
- Collier, *The Bottom Billion* (all)
- Intelligence² Debate Video, “Aid to Africa is Doing More Harm than Good,” Ayittey, Easterly, and Rieff v. Lucas, McArthur, and Smith (1hr 45m)

*Migration and Refugees***November 14-18: What Do We Owe to Conflict Refugees?**

- Short Paper 3 Final Version Due to Dr. Long Friday 5pm
- Intelligence² Debate Video, “The U.S. Should Let in 100,000 Syrian Refugees,” Ford and Milliband v. Frum and Vaughan (1hr 45m)
- Kukathis, “Are Refugees Special?”
- Betts and Collier, “Help Refugees Help Themselves”
- United Nations Film, “Clouds Over Sidra”

November 21 and November 28-December 2: How Should Economic Migrants Be Treated?

- Intelligence² Debate Video, “Don’t Give Us Your Tired, Your Poor, Your Huddled Masses,” Kobach and Tancredo v. Jacoby and Castro (1hr 45m)
- Kukathas, “The Case for Open Immigration”
- Miller, “Immigration: The Case for Limits”
- Annotated Bibliography Due to Dr. Long Friday 5pm
- 2x2 Debate: Developed countries should offer economic migrants should the same treatment as conflict refugees.