

Dr. Mark Yaniszewski
E-Mail: myanisze@uwo.ca
all_politics@hotmail.com

Class Location: SSC 2020
Class: Mon. + Wed. 7-10 pm

Office: SSC 4141
Office Hours: Mon. + Wed. 6-7 pm
(or by appointment)

Political Science 3366E: International Conflict Management

An examination of theories and strategies of international conflict and conflict management, including the causes of war, arms control, and various methods of reducing or eliminating conflict.

This course combines both lectures and seminars. Consequently, students are expected to contribute — along with the instructor — to the success of the course.

Distribution of Marks

Students in Political Science 3366E will be graded on the basis of the following components:

- Participation = 15%*
- In-Class Tests — 3 x 10% = 30%
- Writing Assignment = 25%
- Final Exam = 30%

* Details regarding the breakdown and composition of the participation grade will be made available once the exact size of the class is known. A handout detailing these requirements will be distributed in a future class.

Weekly Schedule

For most weeks, classes will be organized along the following lines:

- Lecture Component: Class will begin with an introductory lecture by the instructor. These lectures will run for 30-60 minutes most weeks.
- Discussion Component: Discussions will last a minimum of one hour most weeks. During this period, students will be graded on their contribution to the discussion. (As already mentioned, details regarding student participation in the discussions will be provided once the size of the class is known.) At a *minimum*, students should come to class having read all the required readings and be prepared to ask relevant questions. Students who are uncomfortable talking in class (etc.) should consult the instructor as well as Student Development Services. Alternative arrangements will only be made in the case of students who are making an *active effort* to become more engaged in discussions.

Writing Assignment Due Date

A printed copy of the writing assignment must be handed in *directly* to the instructor (e.g., during class or office hours) on or before the end of class on **Monday July 4th**. No other arrangements are permitted (e.g., the assignment may ***not*** be submitted by e-mail ***nor*** may it be slipped under a door ***nor*** are assignments to be dropped in an essay drop box).

Late papers will be accepted until the end of class on **Monday July 11th** and are automatically **penalized by 15%**. All papers handed in *after class ends on Monday July 11th* will automatically receive a **grade of 0%**.

To summarize:

Assignments handed in on or before class ends on Monday July 4th — no late penalty

Late papers will be accepted until class ends on Monday July 11th — with a 15% penalty

After class ends on Monday July 11th — an automatic grade of 0% will be assigned

Note: **The late penalty is a flat rate penalty.** Papers five minutes late, one day late, five days late, or any variation therein receive the same 15% penalty. These penalties will only be waived in the case of illness (or similar serious circumstances) and will require proper documentation (e.g., a doctor's note). Otherwise, extensions will not normally be granted (e.g., forgetting to buy a new ink cartridge for your printer or having the dog eat your homework and so on does not constitute a legitimate excuse for not completing the assignment on time).

Additional details regarding the writing assignment are listed in the sections following the class schedule (below).

Important Notices

The University is a place of work and learning. It is not the time to play games, chat, listen to music, send text messages, or participate in similar recreational activities. Consequently, as a courtesy to the instructor and other students, the use of laptops, cell phones, iPods, PDAs, and other electronic devices for recreational purposes during class is strictly forbidden. Students violating this rule will be subject to sanctions including, but not limited to, being asked to leave the classroom. Only in exceptional circumstances (e.g., for world renowned brain surgeons on call at the emergency room of a local hospital) will this policy be waived.

Students must complete all course requirements. Failure to do so (e.g., missing an examination without cause) will subject the student to the relevant Departmental and University regulations (e.g., possibly failing the course.)

All students should also keep a duplicate copy of their assignments. Students must also note that it is a serious academic offense to hand in the same assignment to two or more courses or to pass off another person's work as their own (i.e., plagiarism). At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required to pass a brief oral examination on

their assignment before a final grade is assigned. (A detailed statement on plagiarism follows.)

Final examinations will be held during the regular examination period as set by the Registrar's Office. Except in the case of medical (or similar) problems, substitute examinations will normally not be given.

Plagiarism

Students must also note that it is a serious academic offense to hand in the same assignment to two or more courses or to pass off another person's work as their own (i.e., plagiarism). The University of Western Ontario "Handbook of Academic and Scholarship Policy" defines plagiarism as follows:

Students must write their essays and assignments in their own words. Whenever students take an idea, or a passage from another author, they must acknowledge their debt both by using quotation marks where appropriate and by proper referencing such as footnotes or citations. Plagiarism is a major academic offence (see Scholastic Offence Policy in the Western Academic Calendar).

At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required: (i) to pass a brief oral examination on their assignment before a final grade is assigned and/or (ii) provide and electronic copy of their assignment so that their work can be checked using plagiarism-checking software (e.g., Turnitin.com). As stated in the University of Western Ontario "Handbook of Academic and Scholarship Policy:"

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>).

If students have any doubt as to what constitutes plagiarism, there are various resources available to them including (but not limited to) the Student Development Centre and the instructor (during office hours). If in doubt — ASK!!!

As a general guide consider the following. When you make a direct quote — Yes, you need a footnote. When you closely paraphrase ideas (e.g., following a text that someone else wrote while changing a small number of words) — Yes, you need a footnote.

What about basic facts and dates? Do you still need a footnote? Say, for example, you are asked to write a paper on the Franco-Prussian War and you have never heard about that particular conflict. And then you write in your paper that the war started in 1870 and that France was led by Louis Napoleon. Would you need a footnote for that sort of information? No. Generally, basic facts and dates are covered by the "Common Knowledge Exception." If you picked up any general history of that conflict, they would

all relate how the war started in 1870 and that France that led by Louis Napoleon. (Another way to think of the “Common Knowledge Exception” is to call it the “Rule of Three” — if a basic fact is reported in three separate general academic sources, you need not provide a footnote.)

At the same time, if one general source was particularly influential in helping you write a section of your paper (even if you did not need to footnote specific passages from it directly), you can add a footnote like the following.¹

¹ The following paragraph is based on P. Jones, *History of the Franco-Prussian War* (Toronto: Penguin Press, 1999), pp. 20-25.

And what about material covered in class (e.g., basic facts and dates). Generally this material falls under the “Common Knowledge Exception” (i.e., no footnote needed), HOWEVER if students really want to use material from the lectures they should go back to *original* sources whenever possible — especially where specific facts or data are presented or if the words of individual theorists or other experts are presented. For example, imagine the instructor states in class that “some historians consider Louis Napoleon’s strategy during the war to be similar to that used by Alexander the Great.” If you wanted to use that idea in your lecture, you should ask the instructor “which historians said this” and “where did that idea come from” BEFORE you use it in your paper. In other words, you always want to go back to the original source rather than rely solely on the material covered in class. For one thing, as a conscientious academic, you want to make sure that your professor has not made a mistake!

Course Readings

There is no textbook for this course. Some readings are available at the Weldon Library Reserve Desk. Note that in the case of Reserve Desk materials, only one copy may be placed on reserve due to Canadian copyright restrictions. To avoid disappointment, students are encouraged not to wait until the last moment to access these readings.

Other course readings are available free of charge on the internet or as e-journals from the library. Obtaining e-journals articles is relatively straight forward:

- (i) Go to Library homepage and log in
- (ii) Click on Catalogue
- (iii) Select “Journal Title” and type in the name of the journal (e.g., Foreign Affairs)
- (iv) Select “Go”
- (v) Browse results. Many journals are stored at multiple electronic storage sites. Select the storage site that covers the date range you are looking for (e.g., some may store older issues while another covers more recent years and so on). Note also that some storage sites may have PDFs of the articles (e.g., versions that look like the hardcopy) while others only store HTML versions (which look like websites).

If you are having trouble accessing these readings, consult the instructor or any reference librarian.

Schedule of Classes

Class 1 — May 9 Overview/A History of War (I) (Lecture)

John Keegan, *The Face of Battle: A Study of Agincourt, Waterloo, and the Somme* (Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin Books, 1976), chapter 1. [Reserve Desk]

Gwynne Dyer, *War*, new ed. (Toronto: Random House, 2004), chapter 1. [Reserve Desk]

John Keegan, *A History of Warfare* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993), pp. 79-136. [Reserve Desk]

Class 2 — May 11 A History of War (II) (Lecture and “Practice” Discussion)

Colin S. Gray, “How Has War Changed Since the End of the Cold War?” *Parameters: Journal of the US Army War Collage*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (Spring 2005), pp. 14-26. [E-Journal]

Lawrence Freedman, “War,” *Foreign Policy*, No. 137 (July-August 2003), pp. 16-24. [E-Journal]

Andrew Mack (Director) *et al*, *Human Security Report 2009/10: The Causes of Peace and the Shrinking Costs of War and Peace in the 21st Century* (Vancouver: Human Security Report Project/Simon Fraser University, forthcoming). (Read part 3.)
<<http://www.humansecurityreport.info/>>

Discussion Themes

- (i) What is the dominant character of contemporary warfare?
- (ii) What is the future of warfare?

Theory Section

Class 3 — May 16 Causes of Conflict and War: Realism (Lecture)

David Boucher, *Political Theories of International Relations: From Thucydides to the Present* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), pp. 67-89. [Reserve Desk]

Martin Griffiths, Steven C. Roach, and M. Scott Solomon, *Fifty Key Thinkers in International Relations*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 9-16, 30-36, and 50-64. [Reserve Desk]

Class 4 — May 18 Causes of Conflict and War: Other Approaches
(Lecture)

Martin Griffiths, Steven C. Roach, and M. Scott Solomon, *Fifty Key Thinkers in International Relations*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 73-81, 287-294 and 302-307. [Reserve Desk]

Sigmund Neumann and Mark von Hagen, “Engels and Marx on Revolution, War, and the Army in Society,” in *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, ed. Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 262-280. [Reserve Desk]

John Shy and Thomas W. Collier, “Revolutionary War,” in *Makers of Modern Strategy from Machiavelli to the Nuclear Age*, ed. Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 815-862. [Reserve Desk]

Class 5 — May 25 Conflict Case Study: The Cuban Missile Crisis
(Lecture)

David A. Welch and James G. Blight, “The Eleventh Hour of the Cuban Missile Crisis: An Introduction to the Excomm Transcripts,” *International Security*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Winter 1987-1988), pp. 5-29. [E-Journal]

McGeorge Bundy and James G. Blight, “October 27th, 1962: Transcripts of the Meetings of the Excomm,” *International Security*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (Winter 1987-1988), pp. 30-92.. [E-Journal]

Class 6 — May 30 Test #1

Class 7 — June 1 The Causes of War
(Lecture and Discussion)

Andrew Mack (Director) *et al*, *Human Security Report 2009/10: The Causes of Peace and the Shrinking Costs of War and Peace in the 21st Century* (Vancouver:

Human Security Report Project/Simon Fraser University, forthcoming). (Read part 1.)
<<http://www.humansecurityreport.info/>>

Mark L. Haas, "A Geriatric Peace? The Future of US Power in a World of Aging Populations," *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 112-147. [E-Journal]

Robert D. Kaplan, "The Coming Anarchy," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 273, No. 2 (February 1994), pp. 44-76. [E-Journal]

Discussion Themes

- (i) How to best understand the causes of conflict?
- (ii) What does the future hold?

Just War Theory

Class 8 — June 6 Legal and Moral Limitations to War (Overview)
(Lecture and Discussion)

Martin Griffiths, Steven C. Roach, and M. Scott Solomon, *Fifty Key Thinkers in International Relations*, 2nd ed. (London: Routledge, 2009), pp. 341-350. [Reserve Desk]

Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1977), pp. 3-47. [Reserve Desk]

Hans J. Morgenthau (with Kenneth W. Thompson), *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6th ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), pp. 293-327. [Reserve Desk]

Ken Rutherford, "The Evolving Arms Control Agenda: Implications of the Role of NGOs in Banning Antipersonnel Landmines," *World Politics*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (October 2000), pp. 74-114. [E-Journal]

Discussion Themes

- (i) Are there limits to war?
- (ii) To what degree is international law effective?

Class 9 — June 8 *Jus ad Bellum* (The Right to Wage War)
(Lecture and Discussion)

Iraq Case

Irving Brecher, "In Defence of Preventative War: A Canadian's Perspective," *International Journal*, Vol. LVIII, No. 3 (Summer 2003), pp. 253-280. [E-Journal]

Franklyn Eric Wester, "Preemption and Just War: Considering the Case of Iraq," *Parameters: Journal of the US Army War Collage*, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Winter 2004-2005), pp. 20-39. [E-Journal]

Afghan Case

Matthew Scott King, "The Legality of the United States War on Terror: Is Article 51 a Legitimate Vehicle for the War in Afghanistan or Just a Blanket to Cover-Up International War Crimes?" *ILSA Journal of International & Comparative Law*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (Spring 2003), pp. 457-472. [E-Journal]

Myra Williamson, *Terrorism, War, and International Law: The Legality of the Use of Force Against Afghanistan in 2001* (Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing, 2009), pp. 161-231. [Reserve Desk]

Discussion Theme

- (i) Was the 2003 War in Iraq legal? Was it moral?
- (ii) Was the 2001 War in Afghanistan legal? Was it moral?

Class 10 — June 13 *Jus in Bello* (The Laws of War)

(Lecture and Discussion)

Voluntary Human Shields

Michael Skerker, "Just War Criteria and the New Face of War: Human Shields, Manufactured Martyrs, and Little Boys with Stones," *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (2004), pp. 27-39. [E-Journal]

Rewi Lyall, "Voluntary Human Shields, Direct Participation in Hostilities and the International Humanitarian Law Obligations of States," *Melbourne Journal of International Law*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (October 2008), pp. 313-333. [E-Journal]

Afghan Detainees

Stuart Hendin, "Do as We Say, Not as We Do: A Critical Examination of the Agreement for the Transfer of Detainees between the Canadian Forces and the Ministry of Defence of Afghanistan," *New Zealand Armed Forces Law Review*, Vol. 7 (2007), pp. 18-47. [E-Journal]

Kirby Abbott and Daniel C. Prefontaine, "Panel D-2 — Terrorists: Combattants [Sic], Criminals, or...? The Current State of International Law," in *The Measure of International Law: Effectiveness, Fairness and Validity*, Proceedings of the 31st

Annual Conference of the Canadian Council on International Law, Ottawa, October 24-26, 2002 (The Hague: Kluwer Law International, 2004), pp. 366-395.
[Reserve Desk]

Discussion Themes

- (i) What is the legal status of voluntary human shields under international law?
 - (ii) Does Canada's Afghan detainee policy violate international law?
-

Class 11 — June 15 *Jus Post Bellum* (Justice After War)

(Lecture and Discussion)

Post-Conflict Tribunals, Truth and Reconciliation Commissions, Amnesties

Jack Snyder and Leslie Vinjamuri, "Trials and Errors: Principle and Pragmatism in Strategies of International Justice," *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (Winter 2003-2004), pp. 5-44. [E-Journal]

Lyn S. Graybill, "Pardon, Punishment, and Amnesia: Three African Post-Conflict Methods," *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 25, No. 6 (September 2004), pp. 1117-1130. [E-Journal]

Susie Linfield, "Trading Truth for Justice: Reflections on South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission," *Boston Review* [On-Line Edition] (Summer 2000), pp. 1-14.
<<http://bostonreview.net/BR25.3/linfield.html>>

Nation-Building

David Beetham, "The Contradictions of Democratization by Force: The Case of Iraq," *Democratization*, Vol. 16, No. 3 (June 2009), pp. 443-454.

Bruce E. Moon, "Long Time Coming: Prospects for Democracy in Iraq," *International Security*, Vol. 33, No. 4 (Spring 2009), pp. 115-148.

Discussion Themes

- (i) What is just: international tribunals or amnesties/truth and reconciliation?
 - (ii) Can Democracy be imposed by force? Should it?
-

Class 12 — June 20 Test #2

Class 13 — June 22 Unconventional War: Terrorism and International Law

(Lecture and Discussion)

Andrew Mack (Director) *et al*, *Human Security Brief 2007* (Vancouver: Human Security Research Program, 2008), pp. 8-21. <<http://www.humansecuritybrief.info/>>

Max Abrahms, “Why Terrorism Does Not Work,” *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Fall 2006), pp. 42-78. [E-Journal]

William Rose and Rysia Murphy plus Max Abrahms, “Does Terrorism Ever Work? The 2004 Madrid Train Bombings [Correspondence],” *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (Summer 2007), pp. 185-192. [E-Journal]

Michael Walzer, “Terrorism: A Critique of Excuses,” in *Problems of International Justice*, ed. Steven Luper-Foy (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1988), pp. 237-247. [Reserve Desk]

Virginia Held, “Terrorism, Rights, and Political goals,” in *Violence, Terrorism, and Justice*, eds. R.G. Frey & Christopher W. Morris (Cambridge: UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991), pp. 59-85. [Reserve Desk]

Discussion Themes

- (i) Does terrorism work?
- (ii) Is terrorism a legitimate tactic?

The International Community

Class 14 — June 27 The History and Evolution of Peacekeeping (Lecture)

Alex J. Bellamy, Paul Williams, and Stuart Griffin, *Understanding Peacekeeping* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2004), pp. 95-110. [Reserve Desk]
[Note: Read the chapter on the “Types of Peacekeeping.” These page numbers refer to the 2004 edition whereas the library has the 2010 edition.]

Carol Off, *The Ghosts of Medak Pocket: The Story of Canada’s Secret War* (Toronto: Vintage Canada, 2004), pp. 145-200. [Reserve Desk]
[Note: Read Chapter 6 of the hard cover edition (i.e., the description of the actual battle). These page numbers refer to the pagination of the paperback edition.]

Class 15 — June 29 When Peacekeeping Fails (Lecture and Discussion)

Romeo Dallaire with Brent Beardsley, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of*

Humanity in Rwanda (Toronto: Random House Canada, 2003), pp. 510-522. [Reserve Desk]

Peter Uvin, "Reading the Rwandan Genocide," *International Studies Review*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Fall 2001), pp. 75-99. [E-Journal]

Alan J. Kuperman, "Rwanda in Retrospect," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 1 (January-February 2000), pp. 94-118. [E-Journal]

Samantha Power, "Bystanders to Genocide: Why the United States Let the Rwandan Tragedy Happen," *Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 288, No. 2 (September 2001), pp. 84-107. [E-Journal]

Discussion Theme

Could Rwanda have been saved?

Class 16 — July 4 When the International Community Makes Things Worse (Lecture and Discussion)

Edward N. Luttwak, "Give War a Chance," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 78, No. 4 (July-August 1999), pp. 36-44. [E-Journal]

Ann Hironaka, *Neverending Wars: The International Community, Weak States, and the Perpetuation of Civil War* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005), pp. 33-52. [Reserve Desk]

Matthew LeRiche, "Unintended Alliance: The Cooperation of Humanitarian Aid in Conflicts," *Parameters: Journal of the US Army War College*, Vol. 34, No. 1 (Spring 2004), pp. 104-120. [E-Journal]

Alan J. Kupperman, "Suicidal Rebellions and the Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention," *Ethnopolitics*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (June 2005), pp. 149-173. [E-Journal]

Fiona Terry, *Condemned to Repeat? The Paradox of Humanitarian Action* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 17-54 and 216-245. [Reserve Desk]

Discussion Themes

- (i) When does intervention makes things worse?
- (ii) What are the best practices for intervention?

Class 17 — July 6 Test #3

Class 18 — July 11 The International Community Goes to War
(Lecture and Discussion)

Desmond Morton, “Afghanistan: Famously Inhospitable to Foreigners,” *Policy Options*, Vol. 27, No. 10 (December-January 2006-2007), pp. 17-20. [E-Journal]

Christian Caryl, “Bury the Graveyard: If You Want to Figure a Way Forward for Afghanistan, Fake History is Not the Place to Start,” *Foreign Policy* [On-Line Edition] (July 26, 2010).
<http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/07/26/bury_the_graveyard>

James Clancy and Chuck Crossett, “Measuring Effectiveness in Irregular Warfare,” *Parameters: US Army War College Quarterly*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 2 (Summer 2007), pp. 88-100. [E-Journal]

Robin V. Sears, “Afghanistan: The Last War of Choice,” *Policy Options*, Vol. 31, No. 10 (November 2010), pp. 57-62. [E-Journal]

Discussion Themes

Who will win in Afghanistan?

Class 19 — July 13 War Outside the UN System
(Lecture and Discussion)

Albert Legault, “NATO Intervention in Kosovo: The Legal Context,” *Canadian Military Journal*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 2000), pp. 63-66. [E-Journal]

Harry Papaasotiriou, “The Kosovo War: Kosovar Insurrection, Serbian Retribution and NATO Intervention,” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (March 2002), pp. 39-62. [E-Journal]

Arman Grigorian, “Third-Party Intervention and Escalation in Kosovo: Does Moral Hazard Explain It?” *Ethnopolitics*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (June 2005), pp. 195-213. [E-Journal]

G. Gerard Ong, “Credibility over Courage: NATO’s Mis-Intervention in Kosovo,” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (March 2003), pp. 73-108. [E-Journal]

Paul Heinbecker, “Human Security,” *Canadian Foreign Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Fall 1999), pp. 19-25.
[Go to <http://www.carleton.ca/cfpj/> and follow the “Issue Archive”]

Discussion Theme

The KLA and NATO in Kosovo: Did the KLA tail wag the NATO dog?

Miscellany

Class 20 — July 18 Economic Sanctions and Other Efforts to End War

(Lecture and Discussion)

Robert A. Pape, “Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work,” *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Fall 1997), pp. 90-136. [E-Journal]

Focus on main article and skim the lengthy appendix.

Andrew Mack and Asif Khan, “The Efficacy of UN Sanctions,” *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (September 2000), pp. 279-292. [E-Journal]

Kimberly Ann Elliot, “Analyzing the Effects of Targeted Sanctions,” in *Smart Sanctions: Targeting Economic Statecraft*, eds. David Cortright and George A. Lopez (Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers, 2002), pp. 171-182. [Reserve Desk]

Risa A. Brooks, “Sanctions and Regime Type: What Works, and When?” *Security Studies*, Vol. 11, No. 4 (Summer 2002), pp. 1-50. [E-Journal]

Discussion Theme

Can Economic Sanctions Work?

Class 21 — July 20 Humanitarian Interventions

(Lecture and Discussion)

Gareth Evans, Mohamed Sahnoun (Co-Chairs) *et al*, *The Responsibility to Protect: Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty* (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2000), pp. 1-18 and 69-75.
<<http://www.iciss.ca/report-en.asp>>

Kenneth Roth, “Was the Iraq War a Humanitarian Intervention?” *Journal of Military Ethics*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (June 2006), pp. 84-92. [E-Journal]

A clipping file covering the conflict in Libya will be made available.

Discussion Theme

(i) The conflict in Libya.

Class 22 — July 25 Non-Violent Conflict Management
(Lecture and Discussion)

Readings TBA

Discussion Theme

- (i) Can the security dilemma be solved?
- (ii) The efficacy of non-violent conflict management strategies in a hostile world.

Class 23 — July 27 The End of War? Democratic Peace Theory Revisited
(Lecture and Discussion)

Michael W. Doyle, “Kant Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs,” *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (June 1983), pp. 205-237. [E-Journal]

Michael W. Doyle, “Kant Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs, Part 2,” *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, Vol. 12, No. 4 (October 1983), pp. 323-353. [E-Journal]

John M. Owen, “How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace,” *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Fall 1994), pp. 87-125. [E-Journal]

Thomas Schwartz and Kiron K. Skinner, “The Myth of the Democratic Peace,” *Orbis*, Vol. 46, No. 1 (Winter 2002), pp. 159-172. [E-Journal]

Discussion Themes

- (i) Does democracy bring peace?
- (ii) Why do democracies appear not to fight one another?

Writing Assignment

The Assignment

Each student must prepare an analytical essay on one of the following topics:

- (i) Is the conflict in Libya an example of a humanitarian intervention?
- (ii) Does peacekeeping lengthen or shorten the duration of armed conflicts?
- (iii) Will the spread of democracy bring an end to war as Democratic Peace Theory predicts?
- (iv) Do economic sanctions work? Can they be made to work better?
- (v) To what degree has the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine been integrated into international law and the practices of the international community?

(vi) Does Canada's Afghan detainee policy violate international law?

(vii) Which is more effective form of *jus post bellum*: an international tribunal, an amnesty, or a truth and reconciliation commission? Why? And in which contexts do each work best?

Requirements

As an analytical assignment, students are expected to look at both sides of the issue they have chosen to investigate (i.e., the pros and cons of the respective debate). One sided arguments will receive a lower grade.

Students are encouraged (albeit not required) to discuss their topic with the instructor. Although this consultation is voluntary, it may nonetheless be particularly useful in getting you headed in the right direction.

The writing assignment should run approximately 4,500 words in length (excluding bibliography). Significant deviations from this standard will result in a lower grade (i.e., the equivalent of one or two pages over/under is ok, but more than that is not).

Library research will also be a necessary component of these papers. As a rough guideline, students should expect to reference approximately 6-8 good quality academic journal articles and perhaps one or two relevant books or book chapters in their analysis. (This number depends on the quality of the sources and is not merely a quantitative issue!) Students may also use material from various websites, but should do so with caution (see below).

Grading

Papers will be graded on the basis of the following three criteria. First, papers will be marked on the coherence, complexity, clarity, and originality of your argument and the degree to which you demonstrate an understanding of the material. Second, papers will be graded on the strength of your writing style (including grammar and spelling) and the degree to which you are capable of communicating your thoughts. And third, you will be graded on how well you undertake the mechanics of scholarly writing at a university level (i.e., proper bibliographies and endnotes or footnotes). The first criterion (your content and argument) will constitute sixty percent of your grade while the other two criteria (writing style and mechanics) will each constitute twenty percent of your grade. See the sample marking key (attached below) for more details.

References

Note that you *must* use the formatting style outlined in this handout for your footnotes and bibliography. It is based on the "Chicago" formatting style. Representative examples of this style are included in this handout, but you should still buy a good style manual to cover some of the more exceptional cases.

You may *not* use the “sociological” format (i.e., the system wherein references are placed in the text within parentheses). Note also that the Chicago Manual of Style also includes an in-text referencing variant, but you must use the “footnote” variant as indicated by the examples that follow. Now these hints will not cover all the situations you can expect to face, but they should cover most of the main ones. If in doubt, consult the instructor.

Footnote Format

(A Simple Book)

¹Andrew Konawalski, *The Big Book of Knowledge* (New York: Friendly Publishers, 1996), pp. 56-58.

Note how this entry’s main components (e.g., author, title, publication information, and pagination) are separated from one another by commas — except where there is no comma in front of the parentheses () enclosing the publication information. Note also that for footnotes — *only* — the author’s name is *not* presented last name first. Note the hanging indent (for visual clarity). And finally, note how the title of the book is presented in **BOLD** plus *ITALICS*.

(An Article in a Journal)

¹Joan Wasniek, “My Important Article,” *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Fall 1980), p. 288.

Note how the title of the article (as opposed to the journal it was printed in) is not done using **BOLD** + *ITALICS*.

(Subsequent References by an Author Previously Cited in Full)

² Wasniek, p. 300.

³ Konawalski, p. 60.

(Subsequent References from Same Author)

If you used more than one source from the same author, you would write a full reference for each the first time they are used and then you would include a portion of the title (i.e., enough to differentiate them) with each subsequent reference.

² Wasniek, *The Big Important Book...*, p. 45.

³ Wasniek, “Some Crappy Little Article...,” p. 445.

(A Book with a Translator)

¹Ivan Ivanovsky, *A History of Russia: 1917-1921*, trans. Ronald Corey (Toronto: Abletown Publishing, 1925), pp. 3-4.

(A Chapter in an Edited Book)

¹John Smith, “The Chapter Title,” in *Title of Book*, ed. C.R. Thompson (Boston: International Publishing, 1966), pp. 6-12.

(Missing Data)

J. Smith, *The Origins of Politics* (n.p.: n.p., n.d.), p. 12.

In this case, certain data is missing (as sometimes occurs in older documents): n.p. = no publisher and/or no place of publication while n.d. = no date of publication.

(Internet Sources)

¹ William Easterly and Tobias Pfutze, *Where Does the Money Go? Best and Worst Practices in Foreign Aid*, Global Economy & Development Working Paper 21 (Washington: Brookings, 2008), p. 6.
< http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2008/06_foreign_aid_easterly.aspx>

You *must* include the full “http” number of the actual document — not the home page of the organization — the first time you cite a particular document. Present the http number between <> marks. If the http number is excessively long, you can put it on a separate line from the rest of the reference (otherwise your word processor will have difficulty coping). For internet sources, include as much of the usual information as possible (e.g., author, publisher, and so on). If specific information is missing, describe the document as best as you can (e.g., this document had no formal title). The http number is critical, but *not sufficient in itself* to constitute a proper footnote.

(Internet or Electronic Document without Page Numbers)

Lisa Smith, “Journalism in Canada,” *The Journal of Journalism* (August 1999), par. 16.

If an electronic document does not have page numbers, these can be added (an important consideration with lengthy documents). Refer to the page numbers you get when you print the document (i.e., after it is downloaded) or — better yet — number the paragraphs to identify individual passages.

Bibliography Format

The bibliography includes a list of books that you quoted from as well as a list of books that contained background information or an overview of the topic, but from which you did not directly quote (i.e., books that helped shaped your understanding of the topic).

(Book)

Yaniszewski, Mark. *Answers to Everything*. London: Megalomania Publishers, 2008.

No page numbers are included because one person wrote the whole book. Note the way the author’s name is presented last name first and how periods — not commas — separate the main sections. (Note differences from the footnote format!)

(Article with Two Authors)

Perlmutter, Amos and William M. LeoGrande. "The Party in Uniform: Toward a Theory of Civil-Military Relations in Communist Political Systems." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 82, No. 2 (September 1982), pp. 778-789.

Note the hanging indent used for the second and subsequent lines and how only the name of the first author of this article is presented last name first. The same rules regarding the names of the authors would apply in the case of a book as well.

(Book with Multiple Authors)

Yaniszewski, Mark, Dick Beddoes, and Gump Worsley. *The Correct Answers to Everything*. London: Megalomania Publishers, 2009.

(Chapter in Edited Book)

Latawski, Paul C. "The Polish Military and Politics." *Polish Politics: Edge of the Abyss*. Ed. Jack Bielasia. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1984. Pp. 268-292.

Include the page range when separate authors write individual chapters in a collected work. The same rule applies — albeit in a slightly varied format — in the case of articles found in a journal (see below). Note also how the title of the book is presented with a combination of bold and italics, but the title of the article is not.

(Journal Reference)

Doyle, Michael W. "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vol. 12, No. 3 (June 1983), pp. 205-235.

Note how the journal title, the volume and issue number, the date, and the page range are all part of one component and are *not* separated by periods from one another.

(Subsequent Listing Same Author)

----- "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, No. 4 (December 1986), pp. 1151-1169.

Note how five dashes and a period substitute for the repeated author's name (i.e., Doyle in this case).

(Newspaper with No Individual Author)

"Everything is Relative." *Ottawa Citizen* (January 18, 1992), p. B7.

(Book with No Individual Author)

The Military Balance. London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1991.

Remember:

- Bibliography entries are *not* numbered
- The notation p. = page (not pg.) and pp. = pages.
- Drop all references to "inc." or "co." or "ltd." when referring to publishers
- **Ibid.**, **opt cit.** and other forms are usually done incorrectly and are very much *out of style*. Do not use them.
- Present the bibliography on a separate page.
- Bibliography references are single-spaced and employ a hanging indent for the second (or subsequent) lines of text.

- In the bibliography, items without authors are listed alphabetically according to the first word of the title (not counting a, the, or similar articles).

Hints and Tips for Writing a Scholarly Paper

(Presented in no particular order.)

(1) This is not a high-school course, so please no duotangs, mini-binders, plastic covers, or similar garbage. A simple, separate title page (including the title, your name and student number, and the course number) and a staple (not a paper clip) are all that are required to give your paper a professional, *academic* look.

(2) Try to begin and conclude your essay with a strong introduction and conclusion. Start the reader (i.e., the *marker*) off on the right foot! Make a good first impression and conclude on a high note. There is no one formula for an introduction, but a good introduction usually involves more than one paragraph (e.g., 2-3 paragraphs) and typically includes the following elements: (1) a brief and interesting introduction to the overall topic (often stressing the importance of the topic or some similar point), (2) the actual thesis or topic to be investigated in the paper, and (3) a brief outline of the major arguments and conclusions to be presented in the paper (often referring to the various sections and subheadings of the paper). In most cases, the conclusion is the inverse of the introduction. If you have been presenting your individual conclusions and thoughts throughout the paper, the conclusion serves as more of an overall summary.

(3) Utilize headings and (when necessary) subheadings — just refrain from over-using them. These can improve the transition between different sections of your paper.

(4) Always keep a copy of your paper in case the original somehow gets lost.

(5) Avoid the first person (both singular and plural). Use a passive voice instead. The person marking your paper knows that this entire effort represents *your opinion* so they do not need to be reminded. **WRONG:** I will be describing two ideologies in this paper. **CORRECT:** Two ideologies will be described in this paper.

(6) Do not use contractions in your writing. It's, don't, haven't and so on are not proper for an academic paper. And speaking of apostrophes, in Canadian English, dates omit the apostrophe. **WRONG:** The 1980's were cool. **CORRECT:** The 1980s were cool.

As for acronyms, try to avoid them whenever possible. If you must use an acronym, you must explain it in full the first time you mention it. **EXAMPLE:** In this paper, the influence of the World Trade Organization (WTO) will be analyzed.

(7) Spelling errors will generally be marked with **sp.** or they may be **circled** in the text.

(8) Be careful about the way you throw around terminology and jargon. As political scientists, we all may as well get used to using these words their proper context.

(9) When adding or changing words, verb tenses, or capitalization within quoted material to make it fit your own sentence structure, use square brackets [] and not parentheses (). **CORRECT:** He said: "You [were] a pilot and a navigator." **WRONG:** He said: "You (were) a pilot and a navigator."

(10) Long quotations (typically 50+ words) are indented about 1/2 inch at both ends, single-spaced, and do not use quotation marks. An example would look as follows:

The solutions and preventive measures required to reduce or eliminate incidents of [fratricide] on future battlefields are problematic. Given the clear preponderance of direct human error as the source of most [fratricide] incidents, it is manifest that preventative measures must be directed toward the correction or improvement of human frailties, and these, as always, are the factors least amenable to correction.³

The rest of your essay would then continue as presented here (i.e., double-spaced and all the way to both regular margins). Note that you always want to conclude a paragraph with your own words — not words quoted from someone else. Consequently, you never indent the first line of text following a long quotation. Such indentations indicate the start of a new paragraph and not the continuation of an existing one.

Note also that the footnote/endnote number appears at the end of the quotation in 99% of all cases and generally should not appear in the middle of your sentence.

In cases where a footnote/endnote is missing, the notation **fn.** will appear in the text.

In the case of shorter quotations (which include quotation marks), the number follows the punctuation and the quotation mark. (British and American style practices sometime differ. **WRONG:** Hegel said: "It is so".³ **WRONG:** Hegel said: "It is so"³. **RIGHT:** Hegel said: "It is so."³

(11) Watch out for overly long paragraphs, one sentence-long paragraphs, and run-on sentences. There is nothing more aggravating than finding a dozen different thoughts or ideas thrown together in one huge, rambling sentence/paragraph. Try to vary the length and complexity of your sentences. Try to be creative in the way you organize your thoughts. Common notations for sentence structure errors are: **awk** (meaning awkward phrasing), **run-on** or **R.O.** (meaning a run-on sentence), **inc.** (meaning incomplete), **ss** (signifying some sort of sentence structure error), and **c.s.** (signifying a comma splice).

(12) Other common errors.

It's = it is (contraction). Its = possessive form. In addition, the abbreviation "i.e." means "that is" while "e.g." means "for example." You would not imagine how often these errors occur. Also, do not end sentences with a preposition. **WRONG:** It does not matter which political party they belong to. **CORRECT:** It makes no difference to which political party they belong.

(13) Single quotation marks (' ') are *only* used when a quotation appears in the original text of something you are quoting (i.e., a quote *within* a quote). There are no exceptions! Note the following quoted dialogue in a simulated essay. **CORRECT:** In the second act of the play, Varalla can be seen to be an important character. She says: "The only thing he could yell was 'Look out.' It was, unfortunately, too late for us to get out of the way." At all other times use double (" ") quotation marks. This is also true in the case of words or phrases you may wish to emphasize in the text. **CORRECT:** She was not known as "the Boss" for nothing. **WRONG:** She was not known as 'the boss' for nothing.

(14) Include page numbers. The most common format involves placing the number for page one in the *middle* of the bottom of the first page while all subsequent page numbers are placed in the top right corner of the page. Mark them in by hand if you are having difficulties with printer settings. [Aside: Leaving page numbers off of an assignment will not fool the marker into thinking the paper is longer than it is!]

(15) Beware the internet. The internet is a very useful tool — especially for current political issues and news. Just be careful whom you consult. Any idiot can put something on the web. Nevertheless, there are numerous sites which can and should be respected. For example, most major newspapers today have websites (e.g., the *NY Times*, the *Globe and Mail*, and the *National Post*) and these are great sources of material (especially if your topic involves a current event). Many government and intergovernmental organizations such as the UN, the OECD, the IMF, and so on also have useful websites. There are also numerous NGO sites that provide quality information (e.g., Amnesty International, Freedom House, Transparency International, and so on).

When using the internet, try to be careful. "Joe's House of Politics" is probably not a useful place to search if you are looking for reliable and unbiased information. Does this mean I have a bias against the internet? The answer is "sort of." There are very real differences between the so-called "new media" and so-called "traditional media." Specifically, the "bricks and mortar" nature of the traditional media (newspapers and other publishers) means that they have something "at risk" when they publish (i.e., they have assets and can be sued). Consequently, they have to be sure of their facts before they publish. In addition, traditional media outlets want — and expect — to be in business for an extended period of time therefore they are more likely to strive for quality to attract and keep readers. On the other hand, a blog written by some guy living in his parent's basement is much more ephemeral and consequently much more likely to be irresponsible. [**Remember:** Blogs are like opinions, and opinions are like.... Well, you get the idea. "Everyone has one" and their value is "uneven" — at best.]

A good rule of thumb when using the internet is to always check the website's "About Us" link. If there is no such link, run away...fast! Otherwise, look at the information provided. Who is the publisher? How long have they been in operation? Do you know and respect and of the publisher, editors, or other contributors to the site? You will soon develop the skills necessary to sort the wheat from the chaff.

And what about a site like Wikipedia? Is Wikipedia a good site or a not-so-good site? The short answer: “It depends.” Wikipedia is probably OK for a first, brief overview of a topic. In other words, if you have never heard of the Franco-Prussian War before and your Professor mentions that event in class, it probably won’t hurt to look it up on Wikipedia.

At the same time, Wikipedia, due to its nature (i.e., its anonymity and frequent lack of sources) is not the best source for academic research and writing. The quality of the material in Wikipedia can be uneven.

So why is this the case? Well, for one thing, Wikipedia is essentially self-edited by its users. And while most people contributing to Wikipedia are doing so for noble reasons, that is not always the case. It is, for example, estimated that 11% of all Wikipedia entries have been “vandalized” at some point or another.¹

Another problem with Wikipedia comes from the standards it uses to determine the veracity of the information contained in its entries. To quote a critic of Wikipedia:

So how do Wikipedians decide what’s true and what’s not? [...] Unlike the laws of mathematics or science, wikitruth isn’t based on principles such as consistency or observability [sic]. It’s not even based on common sense or firsthand experience. [...] On Wikipedia, objective truth isn’t all that important, actually. What makes a fact or statement fit for inclusion is that it appeared in some other publication — ideally, one that is in English and is available free online.²

The problem with such a “standard” is obvious: it makes no effort to distinguish the “gold” from the “garbage” — only that someone else already published the information. No effort is made to evaluate the quality of the publisher or to determine if the publisher bothered to do any fact-checking — a labourious and sometimes expensive proposition.

So what should you do if you find an interesting statistic or an interesting argument in Wikipedia? I would recommend that you seek the *original* source of the fact or opinion rather than rely on Wikipedia *per se*. In other words, if Wikipedia reports that in 2007 the International Red Cross was forced to reduce its activities by 10% due to budgetary constraints, I would research the Red Cross directly.

(16) Finally, the question of appealing your grade. First, *read* the comments written on your paper or the attached marking sheet. There is nothing more annoying than having someone skip over an hour's worth of comments/notations. For this reason, appeals will generally not be discussed on the day the assignment is returned (i.e., come and talk to me in the following days). There are a couple of things to keep in mind when considering an appeal. First, although I consider myself to be a *nice guy*, I do not care if you think you deserve a higher mark because "you are trying to get into law school" and

¹ Simson L. Garfinkel, “Wikipedia and the Meaning of Truth: Why the Online Encyclopedia’s Epistemology Should Worry Those Who Care about Traditional Notions of Accuracy,” *Technology Review*, Vol. 111, No. 6 (November-December 2008), p. 85.

² Garfinkel, pp. 84-85.

“you *have* to get an ‘A’” or whatever. (I’ve actually had this happen.) Your paper will be marked solely on its merits. Second, the claim “you have *never* had such a low mark before” will not cut it either as past performance is no guarantee of future performance. And worst of all, *never* argue you were “too busy” to give your paper the attention it deserved. *All* Professors hate to hear this. They all think their course should be your most important course. In short, all I ask is that students considering an appeal do so for *legitimate* reasons. The squeaky wheel does not always get the grease.

Sample Marking Sheet

Below is a sample of the kind of marking key that will be attached to each paper.

Essay Marking Key

Part A: Coherence, complexity, and originality of your argument as well as the degree to which you demonstrate an understanding of the material you are critically analyzing.

Overall

- ☐ Excellent (56-60)
- ☐ Very Good/Minor Errors (50-55)
- ☐ Good (40-49)
- ☐ Fair (30-39)
- ☐ Weak/Serious Problems (< 30)

Problems

- ☐ Main Question Addressed Little/Not At All (/60)
- ☐ Paper Too Descriptive
- ☐ Weak Introduction or Conclusion
- ☐ Not an Assigned Topic
- ☐ Paper Largely/Entirely Repeats Material Covered In Class
- ☐ Paper Fails to Address Both Pros *and* Cons of Topic
- ☐ Other/See Text

Part B: Writing style (including grammar and spelling) as well as the degree to which you communicate your ideas to the reader (i.e., the clarity of your arguments). (Note: specific and systematic corrections in most cases will only be indicated on the first page of the assignment. For additional details, please see the assignment handout and/or a style manual.)

Overall

- ☐ Excellent (19-20)
- ☐ Very Good/Minor Errors (17-18)
- ☐ Good (14-16)
- ☐ Fair (10-13)
- ☐ Weak/Serious Problems (< 10)

Problems

- ☐ Sentence Structure (inc. Punctuation/Awkward Phrases) (/20)
- ☐ Paragraph Structure (One-Sentence/Run-On Paragraphs)
- ☐ Spelling (including Contractions)
- ☐ Use of First Person or Colloquial Phrases
- ☐ Missing Title Page or Page Numbers
- ☐ Long Quotes Improper Format
- ☐ Other/See Text

Part C: Proper use of academic references (i.e., indicating sources employed) as well as proper footnote/endnote and bibliography style. (See handout for proper format.)

Overall

- ☐ Excellent (19-20)
- ☐ Very Good/Minor Errors (17-18)
- ☐ Good (14-16)
- ☐ Fair (10-13)
- ☐ Weak/Serious Problems (<10)

Problems

- ☐ No/Few Footnotes or Missing Bibliography (/20)
- ☐ Most Sources from Bibliography Not Reflected in Text
- ☐ All/Most Sources Too Dated for Topic
- ☐ Over-Reliance on Internet Sources
- ☐ Footnotes (Incomplete, Punctuation, Order of Items)
- ☐ Bibliography (Incomplete, Punctuation, Order of Items)
- ☐ Other/See Text

GRADE (/100)
LATE PENALTY (— /100)
OVERALL GRADE (/100)

**APPENDIX TO UNDERGRADUATE COURSE OUTLINES
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE**

Prerequisite checking - the student's responsibility

"Unless you have either the requisites for this course or written special permission from your Dean to enroll in it, you may be removed from this course and it will be deleted from your record. This decision may not be appealed. You will receive no adjustment to your fees in the event that you are dropped from a course for failing to have the necessary prerequisites."

Essay course requirements

With the exception of 1000-level courses, most courses in the Department of Political Science are essay courses. Total written assignments (excluding examinations) will be at least 3,000 words in Politics 1020E, at least 5,000 words in a full course numbered 2000 or above, and at least 2,500 words in a half course numbered 2000 or above.

Use of Personal Response Systems ("Clickers")

"Personal Response Systems ("clickers") may be used in some classes. If clickers are to be used in a class, it is the responsibility of the student to ensure that the device is activated and functional. Students must see their instructor if they have any concerns about whether the clicker is malfunctioning.

Students must use only their own clicker. If clicker records are used to compute a portion of the course grade:

- the use of somebody else's clicker in class constitutes a scholastic offence,
- the possession of a clicker belonging to another student will be interpreted as an attempt to commit a scholastic offence."

Security and Confidentiality of Student Work (refer to current *Western Academic Calendar* (<http://www.westerncalendar.uwo.ca/>))

"**Submitting or Returning Student Assignments, Tests and Exams** - All student assignments, tests and exams will be handled in a secure and confidential manner. Particularly in this respect, leaving student work unattended in public areas for pickup is not permitted."

Duplication of work

Undergraduate students who submit similar assignments on closely related topics in two different political science courses must obtain the consent of both instructors prior to the submission of the assignment. If prior approval is not obtained, each instructor reserves the right not to accept the assignment.

Grade adjustments

In order to ensure that comparable standards are applied in political science courses, the Department may require instructors to adjust final marks to conform to Departmental guidelines.

Academic Offences

"Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site:

<http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholoff.pdf>."

Submission of Course Requirements

ESSAYS, ASSIGNMENTS, TAKE-HOME EXAMS **MUST** BE SUBMITTED ACCORDING TO PROCEDURES SPECIFIED BY YOUR INSTRUCTOR (I.E., IN CLASS, DURING OFFICE HOURS, TA'S OFFICE HOURS) OR UNDER THE INSTRUCTOR'S OFFICE DOOR.

THE MAIN OFFICE DOES NOT DATE-STAMP OR ACCEPT ANY OF THE ABOVE.

Note: Information excerpted and quoted above are Senate regulations from the Handbook of Scholarship and Academic Policy. <http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/>

Students registered in Social Science should refer to <http://counselling.ssc.uwo.ca/> <http://counselling.ssc.uwo.ca/procedures/havingproblems.asp> for information on Medical Policy, Term Tests, Final Examinations, Late Assignments, Short Absences, Extended Absences, Documentation and other Academic Concerns. Non-Social Science students should refer to their home faculty's academic counselling office.

Plagiarism

"Plagiarism: Students must write their essays and assignments in their own words. Whenever students take an idea, or a passage from another author, they must acknowledge their debt both by using quotation marks where appropriate and by proper referencing such as footnotes or citations. Plagiarism is a major academic offence." (see Scholastic Offence Policy in the Western Academic Calendar).

Plagiarism Checking: "All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>)."

Multiple-choice tests/exams: "Computer-marked multiple-choice tests and/or exams may be subject to submission for similarity review by software that will check for unusual coincidences in answer patterns that may indicate cheating."

Note: Information excerpted and quoted above are Senate regulations from the Handbook of Scholarship and Academic Policy. <http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/>

PLAGIARISM*

In writing scholarly papers, you must keep firmly in mind the need to avoid plagiarism. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged borrowing of another writer's words or ideas. Different forms of writing require different types of acknowledgement. The following rules pertain to the acknowledgements necessary in academic papers.

A. In using another writer's words, you must both place the words in quotation marks and acknowledge that the words are those of another writer.

You are plagiarizing if you use a sequence of words, a sentence or a paragraph taken from other writers without acknowledging them to be theirs. Acknowledgement is indicated either by (1) mentioning the author and work from which the words are borrowed in the text of your paper; or by (2) placing a footnote number at the end of the quotation in your text, and including a correspondingly numbered footnote at the bottom of the page (or in a separate reference section at the end of your essay). This footnote should indicate author, title of the work, place and date of publication, and page number.

Method (2) given above is usually preferable for academic essays because it provides the reader with more information about your sources and leaves your text uncluttered with parenthetical and tangential references. In either case words taken from another author must be enclosed in quotation marks or set off from your text by single spacing and indentation in such a way that they cannot be mistaken for your own words. Note that you cannot avoid indicating quotation simply by changing a word or phrase in a sentence or paragraph which is not your own.

B. In adopting other writers' ideas, you must acknowledge that they are theirs.

You are plagiarizing if you adopt, summarize, or paraphrase other writers' trains of argument, ideas or sequences of ideas without acknowledging their authorship according to the method of acknowledgement given in 'A' above. Since the words are your own, they need not be enclosed in quotation marks. Be certain, however, that the words you use are entirely your own; where you must use words or phrases from your source, these should be enclosed in quotation marks, as in 'A' above.

Clearly, it is possible for you to formulate arguments or ideas independently of another writer who has expounded the same ideas, and whom you have not read. Where you got your ideas is the important consideration here. Do not be afraid to present an argument or idea without acknowledgement to another writer, if you have arrived at it entirely independently. Acknowledge it if you have derived it from a source outside your own thinking on the subject.

In short, use of acknowledgements and, when necessary, quotation marks is necessary to distinguish clearly between what is yours and what is not. Since the rules have been explained to you, if you fail to make this distinction your instructor very likely will do so for you, and they will be forced to regard your omission as intentional literary theft. Plagiarism is a serious offence which may result in a student's receiving an 'F' in a course or, in extreme cases in their suspension from the University.

*Reprinted by permission of the Department of History

Adopted by the council of the Faculty of Social Science, October, 1970; approved by the Dept. of History August 13, 1991

Accessibility at Western

Please contact poliscie@uwo.ca if you require any information in plain text format, or if any other accommodation can make the course material and/or physical space accessible to you.