

**Simulating Peacebuilding in Afghanistan:
Connecting Students Internationally
to Explore Post-Conflict Peacebuilding**

Carolyn Shaw
Wichita State University
Wichita KS 67260-0017
(316) 978-7130
carolyn.shaw@wichita.edu

David Mendeloff
Norman Paterson School of International Affairs
Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada
(613) 520-2600 x1373
david_mendeloff@ccs.carleton.ca

January 2007

Abstract:

This paper presents the design and preliminary results of a collaborative teaching endeavor between Wichita State University and Carleton University (Ottawa) on the topic of Post-Conflict peacebuilding. Because there are a wide variety of approaches to peacebuilding around the world, students may not be familiar with the activities that countries other than their own are engaged in, nor the attitudes towards peacebuilding seen in other countries. This collaborative course was developed in order to expose students to the views of students from different countries on this topic and encourage them to think more broadly about the complex set of activities and challenges involved in peacebuilding. It is our hope to take this course beyond a pilot project to encourage greater international student dialogue on this important topic and potentially develop international "learning communities".

Introduction

As the United States and its international partners continue to engage in efforts to rebuild Afghanistan and Iraq, the public is becoming increasingly aware of the challenges of post-conflict peacebuilding, a topic that is also sparking new scholarly examination. Students show a growing interest in learning more about the challenges that the international community faces to promote peace and stability in a post-conflict environment. These challenges include designing new political institutions, particularly powersharing arrangements, promoting democratization, structuring foreign intervention, and promoting truth and reconciliation efforts to name a few. Despite the prevalence of these issues in the media, however, these broad topics are difficult for students to grasp, particularly in a traditional classroom setting. Incorporating a variety of active learning methods into a course on post-conflict peacebuilding provides students with additional tools for understanding these important concepts and their application in countries around the world. Not only is it difficult to understand the myriad of topics that must be addressed in peacebuilding, but students may also have a narrow view of different peacebuilding strategies due to local/national media reports. Without deliberately seeking an international dialogue on the topic, students will have only a limited understanding of the different possible approaches to peacebuilding. Given the relevance of peacebuilding today and the need to help students grasp both the concepts and different international perspectives on the topic, instructors are beginning to take advantage of advances in technology to bring students together internationally to address issues in post-conflict peacebuilding.

This paper explores the development and teaching of a collaborative course on post-conflict peacebuilding with students at Wichita State University and Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada. It was the aim of the instructors to incorporate active learning components to engage the students, and to expose them to different international perspectives on peacebuilding by bringing the two classes together with technology. The interaction between the students included synchronous and asynchronous Blackboard discussions, three videoconference sessions, and an online simulation. Following the conclusion of the classes and an assessment of the student evaluations, we are led to ask whether and how technology can successfully bring students together internationally in a learning community. We begin with a brief look at the literature on learning communities, distance learning, teaching with technology, and

collaborative learning. We then discuss the goals and design of the course. Next, we evaluate the structure of the course design. Finally, we assess student learning and consider the potential for creating an even more effective international learning community in the future.

Literature Review

Before being able to answer the question of whether technology can successfully bring students together internationally in a learning community, it is important to elaborate on the concept of a learning community. Gabelnick et al. define learning communities as:

Any one of a variety of curricular structures that link together several existing courses—or actually restructure the curricular material entirely—so that students have opportunities for deeper understanding and integration of the material they are learning, and more interaction with one another and their teachers as fellow participants in the learning enterprise. (Gabelnick et al. 1990, 19).

Learning communities are often characterized by team teaching among the faculty, and interdisciplinarity. Cameron Thies (2005) identifies three different models of learning communities (LCs): smaller cohorts within larger classes, paired, linked or cluster courses, and team-taught courses. Some of the benefits of learning communities include developing and reinforcing skills that are essential to success in college and beyond. These skills include writing, speaking, critical thinking, the ability to work collaboratively, problem solving, the ability to appreciate multiple perspectives, and the ability to reflect on one's own learning process (metacognition) (Thies 2005,131). Tritelli (2003) notes that students enjoy being in learning communities and this contributes to retention of materials, better performance, and higher levels of involvement. There are also benefits for faculty members. Learning communities provide the opportunity to create community among faculty members of different disciplines. Collaboration in creating a learning community can lead to productive discussions about curricular reform, techniques for enhancing teaching and learning, and even collaborative research. Although our collaborative course does not quite fit any of the models of learning communities laid out by Thies (2005) because it occurs across two different campuses and is not interdisciplinary, it was our hope that it would embody some of the same benefits as LC's that occur on a single campus.

This body of literature on learning communities provided an ideal for which to aim. We wanted our students to become part of a learning community. The challenge that we faced with

our project was how to achieve this from a distance—the same challenge that many distance learning educators face when conducting online courses. Thus the literature on distance learning provides insight into this project even though the course was a hybrid where the classes still met in person with their instructor while incorporating online components. This literature became more meaningful to us after first conducting this course in Fall 2005, and helped inform the changes to the course design implemented in Fall 2006. We hope that by describing and analyzing the specifics of our course design, and the challenges we faced, we can provide guidance to others seeking to "internationalize" their courses through technology.

One common theme that is found in the literature on distance learning is the importance of creating "social presence" among the course participants to avoid feelings of isolation and poor learner outcomes (Smith and Stacey 2003; Assudani 2006; Paloff and Pratt 2005). Students need to feel connected to each other in order to promote effective learning at a distance. Some suggestions for achieving this include: having the instructor model the desired social behavior and providing a general discussion space for informal conversation in addition to a specialized discussion space. Smith and Stacey (2003, 167) note that "a social conversation provides the learner with a context and stimulus for thought construction and learning, which is the means by which the *group* contributes more to each learner's understanding than they are able to do individually" (emphasis added). Research also suggests that knowledge exchange is influenced by physical factors and the environment in which individuals are located (Assudani 2006). Participants in different geographic locations may have very different learning environments and social contexts that affect learning. These varying contexts are challenging to communicate across distances. A lack of common context among dispersed individuals may be uncomfortable to students early in a course. Smith and Stacey argue that "comfortable communication has to be established between students prior to more focused discussion occurring that assist with the construction of knowledge" (2003, 167). Literature on teaching with technology also addresses this concern with establishing "immediacy", a link between those involved in an online discussion. Swan (2003) notes that some of the behavioral conventions of face-to-face communication (facial expressions, tone of voice, etc) are missing in computer-mediated communications. Students must adapt their communications to try to fully convey their meanings through words alone. This is often done with emoticons, bold letters, all caps, or parenthetical comments that help to convey meaning beyond words. A content analysis study

by Swan identified and examined the impact of a variety of conversational conventions. Some of the most effective techniques that establish community are for participants to provide "acknowledgement, agreement and approval". Acknowledgement refers directly to the content of others' messages; Agreement expresses agreement with others' messages (example: "I'm with you on that, I think what you are saying is so right"); and Approval expresses approval and offers praise or encouragement (example: "you make a good point") (Swan 2003, 154). Swan argues that these are the "glue that holds asynchronous discussion together" (159).

In addition to the learning community and distance learning literature, scholarship on collaborative online learning also provides insights for this project. Palloff and Pratt (2005) examine the benefits and challenges of working in virtual teams. Collaborative learning promotes the development of critical thinking skills, the co-creation of knowledge and meaning, reflection, and transformative learning (Johnson and Johnson 2000). Some challenges to collaborative learning include determining the appropriate use of technology, cross-cultural management, and building trust among team members (Palloff and Pratt 2005, 13). Instructors must consider the needs of the team when determining what technology should be employed for team work (asynchronous vs. synchronous is one consideration). Instructors and students must also be sensitive to cultural differences when working with diverse groups. This may be as simple as determining what time zone members will work in and what days members will be active or not. Productive collaboration requires an atmosphere of trust where members feel safe offering new ideas for exploration.

Course Design

Our collaborative course design was based on a traditional advanced-undergraduate course structure with several additional active learning components to help engage the students. It was essentially a hybrid course, incorporating online elements into a traditional classroom. Although our learning objectives were the same as they would have been for a non-collaborative course, we hoped that the interactive components would help students better achieve the learning objectives than a traditional class structure alone. This would be achieved by creating a learning community that would 1) spark an increased level of interest among the students in thinking about and better understanding peacebuilding challenges, and 2) provide unique opportunities for international dialogue to help expose students to different perspectives on peacebuilding issues.

The course was taught concurrently at Wichita State University in Wichita, Kansas and Carleton University in Ottawa, Canada in Fall 2005 and again, after significant redesign, in Fall 2006.¹ Each class read the same materials and had the same graded components (see the course syllabus in Appendix A). In 2005, both classes were roughly the same size (12 and 13, respectively) and included generally the same student population (primarily advanced, i.e., junior and senior-level, undergraduates). In 2006, the Carleton class was significantly larger than the Wichita class (25 and 9, respectively)—an imbalance that clearly impacted negatively on the overall effectiveness of efforts to foster collaborative learning across different cultures, as discussed below. This section examines in detail the structure of the course and its interactive components.

In the first class session, the instructors informed students that the course would be an interactive one and that a significant portion of the grade would be based on their engagement in online discussions (20%) and the online simulation (70%). We hoped to signal to the students the value we placed on their interaction by making it such a large part of their grade. We believed these weights would reflect the time that students would need to put into their interactions to receive a good grade. Only 10% of their grade was based on more traditional graded components (class participation and attendance).

Online Discussions

Before engaging in online discussions, the students were asked to create an online "profile" using Blackboard. Students were given instructions on how to log on to Blackboard (Bb) and how to create a profile. WSU students were familiar with this platform. Carleton students were familiar with a similar platform – WebCT. They were encouraged to post a photo of themselves and to answer several social questions so that they know a little about each other before engaging in the Blackboard discussions (examples are found in the next section). There was no grade assigned for these profiles; they were done voluntarily in order to address any privacy concerns students might have. No student, however, raised any concerns about being asked to post a profile, and most did so. In the 2006 course, at the suggestion of students

¹ This paper will focus primarily on the most recent iteration of the course, offered in Fall 2006. The course content differed little from the prior iteration, but the design of the active learning and collaborative components were revised. Both year's courses included regular online discussions and simulation exercise, but in year 2, the structure of the discussion changed from exclusively asynchronous discussion to a mix of both asynchronous and synchronous discussion. In addition, the online simulation was changed from a two and a half week exercise at the end of the term, to a major component of the course spread out over nearly 12 weeks.

enrolled in the 2005 course, we scheduled a videoconference in the first week, the purpose of which was primarily for introductions and to put names to faces (as best as could be done). The instructors then engaged students in a one-hour seminar discussion on the topic of "defining peace and peacebuilding." Assudani's (2006) study of groups working collaboratively online supports the idea that this type of videoconference interaction is important. He notes explicitly that face to face meetings provide an important connection between participants that is impossible to create in online discussions alone

The students began their online discussions during the second week of class and continued them weekly for six weeks. In response to student suggestions, the 2006 online discussions included both asynchronous and synchronous forms of interaction. At the beginning of the week, the instructors posted a discussion question on Bb based on the week's readings and in-class discussions. Students had until Thursday afternoon to post at least one response to the discussion question. Students were then expected to read all posted comments in preparation for an unmoderated chat session over the weekend. Three chat sessions were scheduled for fixed times on Saturday and Sunday, and students self-selected which group they would join. The instructors made it clear that responses and discussions should be respectful, serious, thoughtful, and substantive, drawing on the weekly reading assignments and their own reactions to the readings. In addition, we made available throughout the semester an "informal chat room" on Bb that was not linked to the assigned discussion topics.

Online Simulation

The other major interactive and collaborative component was the semester-long, web-based simulation on peacebuilding in Afghanistan, which ran concurrently with the weekly online discussions for the first six weeks. The simulation was organized around a meeting of a fictional "Afghanistan Consultation Group"—a wide-ranging group of Afghan and international actors with a stake in the peacebuilding process in the country—convened to help draft a "Plan of Action" for effective peacebuilding in Afghanistan. The simulation was designed by the instructors to help students gain a greater appreciation of the primary tasks, challenges and potential solutions to post-conflict peacebuilding by examining the real-world case of Afghanistan. The simulation was created using the Fablusi SimPlay architecture (www.fablusi.com). Students portrayed a wide range of stakeholders in Afghanistan, researched

their roles, crafted memos on the main barriers and policy solutions to effective long-term peacebuilding, and collaborated with other actors to shape a comprehensive Plan of Action for peacebuilding in Afghanistan.

Though the purpose of the simulation and topic area remained unchanged from 2005, the structure and design were significantly revised for 2006, based largely on student suggestions. Most significantly, the 2006 simulation ran for nearly 12 weeks, beginning almost immediately at the start of the term, in contrast with the 2005 simulation, which ran for roughly two-weeks at the end of the term. The main advantages of the semester-long exercise were that students could spend more time researching their roles and relevant issue areas and preparing individual task assignments (as opposed to operating under the constraints associated with 24-48 hour deadlines), and could more readily forge relationships and strategic alliances with fellow players. In Fall 2005, students had done their research first, as a part of the class, then been assigned a character based on their research topic. In Fall 2006, students selected their own character, and then conducted their research within the context of the simulation from their character's perspective. This allowed students to feel more connected to their characters and more invested in the simulation. We hoped that this, along with other design changes described below, would allow students to develop a deeper knowledge of their particular characters, and a more nuanced understanding of the complexities, diverse interests and tradeoffs involved in trying to meet the challenges of establishing long-term peace and stability in Afghanistan, and international peacebuilding efforts generally.

The simulation consisted of two phases: The preparatory phase and the conference phase. The preparatory phase, which ran approximately seven weeks, consisted primarily of individual tasks designed to prepare students for working collaboratively with fellow players in phase two to produce a collective "Final Plan of Action." Students began the preparatory phase by reading general descriptions of all (fictional) characters, which were posted on the simulation webpage, and submitted their actor preferences to the instructors. There were six main types of actors in the simulation, each with different roles and responsibilities (and graded components). These included Afghan ministers, regional governors, Afghan presidential advisors, international diplomatic representatives (ambassadors, NATO and UN representatives, etc.), intergovernmental and NGO representatives, and Afghan and foreign media.² Once assigned to

² For a complete list of characters, roles and responsibilities see Appendix B below.

their role, students were tasked with creating a general profile for their character, indicating, for example, the character's educational, personal, professional and political background and expertise, their primary policy objectives in the conference (which was available for all to see), and a "private agenda" (which was visible only to the Moderators). Students were encouraged to research real-life individuals and institutions, and to use imagination and creativity, in generating their character's profile and defining their objectives.

During the preparatory phase most players also prepared individual memos on two issues: identifying the major barriers to peacebuilding in Afghanistan from the perspective of their actors, and the most viable policy options for overcoming those barriers. Ministers and governors submitted their memos to designated Presidential Advisors, who read them and, based on their own research and responsibilities for more than one ministry/issue area, provided critical analyses of the memos. Members of the international diplomatic community and local and international NGOs submitted reports to the media and to relevant ministers. Though the substantive work carried out during this phase was largely individual, students were nonetheless encouraged to keep abreast of latest developments by checking the postings of the international and local media, and to begin to interact with other actors in the simulation who might share similar interests and expertise. We believed that this would assist them in the preparation of their individual written work and in the more collaborative portion of the simulation later in the semester.

As noted above, another major player in the simulation was the local and international media. Assembled into collective editorial teams of 3-4 students with a designated editor, media members were tasked during the preparatory phase with writing news articles and editorials on issues related to peacebuilding in Afghanistan. This included interviews and profiles of key players, in-depth analyses of social and political issues, and reports on the analytical and policy memos. Each editorial team was responsible for producing three pieces per week. Students coordinated among themselves how they were to produce the required material. News items were submitted to the editor who posted them to the *International Tribune* and the *Kabul Times* pages, respectively, of the SimPlay website, for all to read.

The last four weeks of the simulation was the "conference phase," where players worked collaboratively, first in smaller Working Groups, and then in a plenary session, to draft a collective Final Plan of Action (POA) for peacebuilding in Afghanistan. Students were told that

the POA is intended to help major donor countries, international financial institutions, United Nations agencies, individual states and non-governmental organizations guide their policies vis-à-vis Afghanistan in the years ahead. The document was not intended to be a binding international agreement or to secure any international aid commitments. It was merely supposed to be a succinct policy document that clearly states the policy priorities for long-term peace and stability in Afghanistan arrived at through consensus among a wide-range of Afghan and international stakeholders.

During the first two weeks of the conference phase players sorted themselves into smaller thematic Working Groups. Students themselves were responsible for determining the focus of the Working Groups and to designate rapporteurs, who would be responsible for submitting each group's draft plan of action. The Working Groups were asked to produce a report that (a) identified the specific problem(s)/concerns within the Working Group's purview and explain how it is a problem for peacebuilding; (b) describe specifically the range of policy options available to address the problem(s) identified, and (c) the policy option the Group believes to be the most viable and explain why. Once submitted, the draft plans were made publicly available on SimPlay to allow all players to consult them. The intention was for the draft plans to serve as the basis of discussion in the plenary session.

The final two weeks of the conference phase were devoted to the plenary session, where all members worked together to draft a final Plan of Action (POA). Students were responsible for nominating and voting on a conference Chair and Deputy Chair and setting the agenda for the conference. The only instructions given were to produce a final Plan of Action that (a) identified the top three issues of concern for peacebuilding in Afghanistan; (b) explained why the problems in each of these 3 issue areas presents challenges for peacebuilding, and (c) described the policies that the consultation group believed will best address each problem area, and explain why the group believes these are the best policies.

In both the Working Groups and the plenary session, players used both asynchronous communication ("SimMail," and "Conference Room" discussion boards) and synchronous communication (SimPlay-enabled chat sessions) to set working agendas, discuss and debate the substance of the issues, and to work out the language of the collaborative reports. Players also used the various communication tools to forge alliances with players who shared interests and

policy priorities, and made contact with the media, through press releases or granting of interviews, to advance their own interests in the conference.

During the conference phase, the moderators notified all members of the media that all except two would be joining the Consultation Group conference as *participants*, rather than reporters, having been nominated by their respective journalist associations as official delegates representing civil society. This was done to engage those playing the media more directly in the policy discussions. Two reporters were assigned to the conference itself, and were tasked with issuing regular updates on the debates and to offer their own analyses of the issues.

At the completion of the conference phase all participants were required to submit a formal, written report assessing the Final POA document from the perspective of the particular actor they were portraying. Players were asked to comment on the POA's strengths and weaknesses, areas they believe might have been neglected that should have been included, and any additional comments/reactions they might have.

Two videoconference sessions were also held over the course of the simulation. In the first, carried out in advance of the Conference phase, the Afghan Ambassador to Canada addressed both classes (based at Carleton with teleconference hookup to Wichita). He provided historical background to the conflict in Afghanistan, his personal experiences in the country, and his own views on the state of peacebuilding there. Most important, he answered student questions for approximately 90 minutes.

The second videoconference took place at the conclusion of the simulation, where students engaged in a collective de-briefing session focusing on the substance of the Plan of Action (strengths and weakness, how it was arrived at, what they would have done differently, etc.) as well as student experience with the simulation experience. All of the students had an opportunity to identify who played which role in the simulation and to discuss their reactions to the exercise.

Evaluation of the Course Structure

In evaluating the structure of the course, it is clear that the interactive learning components were valuable teaching tools. Students expressed curiosity throughout the semester in various ways, including asking their instructors more details concerning Canadian foreign policy, the US constitutional framework, and government leadership of both countries. These

questions were clearly sparked by their online discussions. They wanted to better understand the source of the ideas coming from their discussion partners. The international interaction with students from abroad provided a new and exciting dynamic as well as a new perspective on the issues being presented in class. Despite these positive learning experiences, however, it was not at all evident that we succeeded in creating an international "learning community". Even with the modifications made for the second iteration of the course in the Fall of 2006, students did not develop particularly strong relationships with their peers at the other institution. This section addresses our reflections on the effectiveness of each interactive component as an instructional tool, as a method to build international dialogue into the class, and as a way to promote a learning community.

Use of Blackboard (Bb) and Video Conferencing

The first step to establishing a community is to have the members introduce themselves. This introduction took the form of posting an online profile using Bb. We wanted the students to be comfortable with each other so that the political discussions that would follow would be engaging and productive. This reasoning was clearly explained to students so that they would know why they were being asked to create a profile. As noted above, no students expressed any reservations about being asked to post a profile, and nearly everyone completed this task within the first week of class. Students posted their photos and answered a number of personal questions (e.g., favorite vacation spot, TV show, food, etc.) The profiles allowed students to gain a visual image of those assigned to their discussion groups. Students seemed to enjoy the seminar style videoconference session conducted during the second week of class, and a majority of the students contributed at least one comment to the class discussion. Students commented that it was "kind of cool" to see others who were at such a geographic distance so clearly through the video technology.³ It did help establish the "reality" of the students and instructor in the partner institution. Thus the introductions went well in helping the students get to know those with whom they would engage in dialogue all semester.

³ The videoconference sessions were made more difficult for Fall 2006 because our class schedules did not overlap and thus the WSU students had to adjust their schedules to meet on Tuesday (instead of Wednesday) for the videoconference sessions. Most were able to do this, but a few had work obligations.

Another step to creating a learning community is to engage in more extensive discussions, to both talk and listen carefully to other members in your group. A common framework for discussions was established with the common readings. The students for the most part met the weekly requirement of posting a substantive comment, and engaging in a synchronous chat session. There were some good reflective exchanges on the issues. Dialogues, however, were not as free flowing or as deep as we had hoped. Problems included: some absenteeism in the chat groups so that students were uncertain who would be participating week to week; finding time to be online at the assigned chat time; and managing the dynamics of rapid text exchanges in the chat sessions. Although most students managed to get online at the established times, they expressed a wish for the sessions to be scheduled at different times. Unfortunately, there was no consensus on what those different times might be. We discovered after the first chat session that having more than 6 students in a chat room was rather chaotic and frustrating for maintaining a coherent dialogue. Students had to learn to adapt to making their remarks more person specific (i.e. identifying which participant they were responding to when they posted a response.) A few students did request that the chats be moderated in some fashion so that the dialogue would be more structured, but they eventually were able to establish some order by themselves. As instructors, we chose to take a hands-off approach to the discussion board and chat sessions. We made specific references to the postings in class so that the students knew that we were monitoring their discussions, but did not participate in them directly.

Despite the opportunity for students to connect and form relationships with each other, they did not engage in much dialogue beyond the minimum amount required for a grade. Discussion board postings were strictly limited to the weekly topical questions and the informal chat room was not used at all. This was a bit disappointing since it would have been useful for the students to gain a broader cultural understanding if they had not limited their conversations to the course content, but it did not detract too much from the substantive strength of the discussions.

An additional problem with creating community online, stemmed from the existing communities that students had in their classes. As Swan (2003) notes, there are certain types of communication that can build a community, and others that can detract from it. Providing acknowledgement of previous comments made by group members builds community, but references to events or discussions that are not shared by all members of the group can serve to

isolate those members who have not been a part of those experiences. The Wichita State students were a rather diverse group with several different majors represented (education, history, political science) and did not know each other well. The Carleton students, however, were all in the same specialized degree program and had taken many classes together. It was only natural for them to make reference to past discussions they had had, but it left the Wichita students feeling out of the loop. Furthermore, in the 2006 course there was a numerical imbalance between the classes, with 9 WSU students and 25 Carleton students. This meant that there were not as many opportunities for Carleton students to be in dialogue with WSU students as with each other—a situation with which many Carleton students in the 2006 cohort expressed dissatisfaction. Despite these challenges, the students did respond favorably to the opportunity to be in dialogue with students abroad.

Online Simulation of Peacebuilding in Afghanistan

The modifications made to the simulation did address some of the weaknesses in the first simulation design and enhanced the learning opportunities for students, but only to the degree that they were willing to be fully engaged in the exercise. One additional change that we made was to provide a few more explicit instructions so that students better understood what actions their characters needed to take. We even specified that creativity was encouraged: "... creative exploration of the situation in Afghanistan is highly encouraged throughout the simulation. As long as you stay in character and accomplish your required tasks, you are free to be as creative as you would like in your interactions with other actors."

Few students took advantage of this license for creativity. Although the initial work was largely individual (researching the major barriers to peacebuilding and identifying policy options), the simulation was designed to be interactive so that students would gain a much better understanding of Afghan conditions as they engaged in dialogue with the other players. Despite explicit instructions, such as the following given to the government ministers, there was not significant dialogue between the players until the final stages as they worked on the Final Plan of Action:

Don't hesitate to consult with other Ministers or International Actors as you prepare your materials. They may have important information for you to consider. It will be important for you to build consensus with other actors on security issues and priorities as

you prepare for the ACG Conference. You may respond to inquiries from the Media as you choose, and may submit Press Releases to the media at any time.

The degree of collaboration was limited, with some actors taking a much greater initiative than others. The members of the Media campaigned actively for interviews and received some favorable replies that were incorporated into their weekly articles. The editor of the *International Tribune*, in particular, did an outstanding job of collaborating with her staff and producing quality reports each week. On the other hand, the Presidential Advisors engaged in virtually no consultation with each other despite several suggestions (from the Moderators) that it would be wise for them to do so. Each worked only with their own Ministers and only minimally to provide the required written critique of the proposals submitted to them. In general, until the players were given the specific task of drafting a collaborative document (the Plan of Action), they were hesitant to share much information with each other and did little more than post their written assignments for others to see. Several assertive students tried to get others to discuss their research further, but often got no reply. Overall, students basically performed the minimum tasks required rather than getting swept up in their enthusiasm for the simulation. The exchanges that occurred during the last two weeks when the characters were collectively working on the Plan of Action were the most substantive and intense of the whole simulation. It was ironic that the students were able to look back after the simulation ended and note (almost universally) that they should have spent more time early on engaged in conversations with other actors.

We chose to use an online design package (Fablusi.com) that would allow us to customize our own simulation. The control panels for the program were challenging for the instructors to learn and time consuming to navigate, but did allow us to include the elements we wanted in the simulation. We deliberately built in time in the computer lab and/or use of a power point presentation to instruct students on navigating the system. This allowed the students to become comfortable with the technology and be able to focus their attention on the content of the simulation rather than on the technology itself. The consultant with Fablusi was quite responsive in modifying the program to accommodate our requested changes in the appearance of the online interface, but some of the communication tools were still less than intuitive, and the overall architecture was hard to use. In the final evaluations, many students noted that the system made

it very difficult to follow discussions within the discussion board "Conference Rooms" and that the SimMail system was a bit "clunky." Students were able to navigate the system even with these challenges, but also faced some technical setbacks. The simulation server was down several times throughout the semester (unfortunately just before several of the major assignments were due). There were also many students who lost the content of their documents when they accidentally closed one of the many pop up windows in the system. (Some students adapted to this by typing all their work in Word and then pasting it into the simulation.) The instructors treated these technical glitches with humor, noting that we were simulating reality in Afghanistan, where internet connections are particularly unreliable. But even this old joke became tiresome for many students when faced with an impending deadline, and no way to submit their work.

The simulation was incorporated into the course to provide an active learning technique to help the students intimately engage in the details of peacebuilding in Afghanistan. It was quite effective in focusing their attention on the large number of issues and coordination challenges that must be addressed in order for successful peacebuilding to occur. Since the students were in character throughout the simulation, however, the exchanges in this context did not contribute to a genuine international dialogue in the same way that the Blackboard discussions did. The videoconference debriefing at the end of the simulation, however, did allow the students to interact with their international partners and consider different national perspectives.

Despite some technical difficulties and limited engagement on the part of some students, a majority of the students responded that they did enjoy the simulation and found it a good learning opportunity.

- It gave me a chance to be active in a realistic-like peacebuilding process and not just learn about the peacebuilding process in theory. I thought the hands-on approach helped me learn more because I had to actually get my hands dirty; I had to get specific detailed information about a certain case, Afghanistan, and apply it...
- The topic was relevant and interesting; it was fascinating to work on an issue that is currently playing out in the real world, particularly one of such importance. The experience was a true awakening to the complex challenges of peacebuilding, and discovering these through actually playing a character called upon to address them was a captivating approach.

- I enjoyed the simulation because I felt that it was good to have something other than an essay used to illustrate the points made in class. There was sufficient linkage in the simulation to the theories provide in class that we were able to learn the theories effectively.

Assessment of Student Learning

Our learning objectives included: having students be able to describe the major tasks and challenges involved in peacebuilding, describe the strengths and weaknesses of various political institutional approaches to peacebuilding (power-sharing, partition, identity manipulation, control and cooptation), and define "peacebuilding," "development," and "democracy" (among other terms) (see Appendix D for a complete list of learning objectives). Based on a preliminary analysis of the simulation evaluations filled out by the students, many of our learning objectives were met. (See Appendix C for complete list of evaluation questions.) The simulation provided a good outlet for students to gain a greater first hand appreciation for the tasks and challenges facing peacebuilders. In the evaluation, students addressed the question of what challenges their character faced in achieving their goals in terms of difficult circumstances and their interactions with other actors. Nearly every student mentioned the need to form alliances with other actors who share common interests in order to get their issues on the agenda. They also indicated the need to be assertive in putting forward their own ideas in order to be heard. One NGO representative noted "more of my stated objectives were achieved than I thought would be...but I think it was because of the coordination of non-governmental actors, and a lack of coordination and strength on the part of the governmental side." Some additional comments included:

- ...More general solutions to broader problems were able to get consensus, but this had the effect of relegating hospital infrastructure to a secondary priority of infrastructure efforts, precisely because the general idea of "building hospitals" was too broad. The need to initiate better training programs specifically for health professionals was also lost in the desire for more general education programs...it was a challenge to explain why it was necessary to not solely focus on primary education.
- [Challenges included] the complexities inherent in drawing out consensus from the group in order to build a report. Intense, sustained commitment was required during the days of the working group in order to ensure that all members were included and that the end solution was collaborative and acceptable to all.

The collaboration involved in producing a final Plan of Action got the students thinking seriously about policy options and the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches to peacebuilding. Students were asked whether they felt that the Plan of Action developed in the conference was a good one for their character, and as a best possible solution for the country. In addition they considered whether the plan was a viable one. They simultaneously recognized the need for more concrete policy proposals and the limitations of getting significant backing for such specific plans. Some of their comments included:

- The POA had several shortcomings - there was no discussion of timelines, funding, or concrete commitments from outside actors. Furthermore, vital yet controversial issues such as narcotics policy or security took a back seat to education...which I thought was very problematic.
- The Plan seems like it will cost a great deal of capital, both monetary and political, and I doubt that the Afghani government, in reality, has either to expend. I do think that given the right amount of incentive, NGOs could expend some of their own resources to help, but I think that the issues that prevent or discourage this help are still threatening. The insurgent situation must be dealt with first and quickly.
- [I wonder if] decentralizing many features of the plan is good or bad. I think that a lot of us took the opinion that if there is disagreement between groups and provinces, we should just let them do it on their own or with a large degree of autonomy. In the end I think we ended up with a perverse form of partition - but we were giving power to the wrong people...I think we could have come up with a more centralized plan if he had included a commitment in it to promote an inclusive system...
- The plan does address many of the key underlying obstacles to peace in Afghanistan, though as I have said, one of the main barriers is a lack of specifics as it pertains to implementing the proposed solutions to the challenges identified. In particular, I felt that the issues of government legitimacy and provision of services needed to be addressed, although as has been pointed out, there are direct links between these two areas and they perhaps could have been considered together.

Students grappled from the start with definitional considerations. Several actors were particularly concerned about human rights and debated throughout the simulation what rights ought to come to the forefront of peacebuilding efforts. The term Development was also controversial as students considered what issues were of top priority and which ones were less imperative, and the need to balance short- and long-term security needs.

Conclusions

Although it was gratifying to some degree that the students recognized (retrospectively) that they could have benefited from greater interaction with each other (within the simulation and on Bb), it was still frustrating that they did not more effectively engage each other. With students' busy schedules, balancing work, family and school, instructors are faced with a serious challenge when designing such a time-intensive course. We recognize that effective international collaboration/community building requires constant attention and commitment, but we can only provide minimal requirements to get that dialogue going; students need initiative to carry it through. Our challenge is to think of ways to design the interactions and perhaps the Simulation to better reflect that reality.

Based on our examination of this collaborative endeavor, we cannot conclude that we successfully brought students together in an international "learning community." Our collaborative effort may not provide any clear-cut guidelines for others on how to create a learning community with schools abroad, but it does illustrate some of the benefits that come from such collaboration. Technology was successful in facilitating communication between the two groups of students, and there was definitely a value to that interaction. Students were more engaged with the materials, and were exposed to new points of view that they had not considered before. The videoconferencing provided the opportunity for the Wichita State students to meet a foreign ambassador that they would not have had otherwise. Given our current structural constraints, it seems unlikely that we can create a more closely linked learning community between our two institutions, but continued international interactions will benefit all of those students involved.

APPENDIX A

Post-Conflict Peacebuilding

Political Science 390

Fall 2006

Professor: Dr. Carolyn Shaw
Class: M/W/F 10:30-11:20 LH 104
Office hours: T/Th 11:00 - 12:00 ; M/W 12:00 - 1:00 ; or by appt.
Lindquist Hall Room 418 B
Phone: Office 978-7130
691-9697 (home, between 9 am - 9 pm)
email: carolyn.shaw@wichita.edu

Course Description

This course examines peacebuilding, reconstruction and reconciliation in the aftermath of violent international and civil conflicts. The primary aim is to understand how states and groups can best prevent war from reoccurring. To that end, the course evaluates a range of post-war political, social and security arrangements and institutions, and the role of foreign intervention, in reducing or eliminating the sources of violence. The main questions investigated include: Why do some peace settlements last while others fall apart? Is the establishment of democratic institutions and practices necessary for lasting peace? Is foreign intervention necessary for successful peacebuilding? How can the security dilemma best be reduced among hostile states and groups? How can reconciliation among former belligerents best be achieved? The course focuses largely on theoretical considerations of these issues with some empirical cases presented as illustrations.

This course will be taught collaboratively as a Global Learning course at both Wichita State University and Carleton University, Ottawa Canada. Students will interact regularly with their peers at the other institution via the internet and videoconferencing.

Educational Objectives

This class is not structured like a traditional lecture and exam class. It is designed to be highly interactive and dynamic. It is my firm belief that students learn a lot more when they actively engage the course material through discussions, role playing, and analytical writing, rather than simply taking notes on it. Students can learn from each other as well as the professor and will be encouraged to do so. By the end of the course students should have a deeper understanding of the challenges and complexities of peacebuilding. Students should be able to discuss specific cases where elements of peacebuilding have succeeded and those where it has failed. Students' own opinions about peacebuilding as a foreign policy goal should also become firmly based on the theoretical and practical literature about peacebuilding.

Technology Requirements

This course is designed to heavily utilize computer technology through an online discussion board, chat sessions, and a web based simulation. The instructor will take every opportunity to introduce students to the technology and make sure that it is not difficult to use. The class will work in the social science computer lab during several class periods, but you will need to have regular access to the internet on your own in order to complete assignments on time.

- Ideally you should use the newest version of Firefox (browser) this can be downloaded at <http://www.mozilla.com/firefox/>. You can also use Internet Explorer.
- For the simulation, you must allow pop up windows for www.Fablusi.com; Or disengage your popup blocker. For the use of Bb (discussion board and chat room), you must allow pop up windows for www.blackboard.wichita.edu.
- You need to have a "java client": This can be downloaded from: <http://www.java.com/en/download/index.jsp>
- You need to have a Flash player in order to use the chat function in the simulation. This can be downloaded at <http://www.adobe.com/> (If you have a new browser that you have downloaded, flash player should already be included in it).

Required texts and readings

Byman, Daniel L. Keeping the Peace: Lasting Solutions to Ethnic Conflicts. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press: 2002. [ISBN: 0-8018-6804-1]

Course Packet for Pol Sci 390.

Blackboard

This course is facilitated by Blackboard, an online web aid accessible to all enrolled students at WSU. The Blackboard page for this course contains a copy of the syllabus, the writing assignment, **student 'homepages'**, current course grades, web links to a variety of topics on conflict resolution, AND most importantly, the online Discussion Board. In order to access this site (www.blackboard.wichita.edu) you need your MyWSU id number and pin number.

Graded Components

1. Attendance	10%	A = 90 - 100
2. Weekly On-line Discussion	20%	B = 80 - 89
3. Simulation		C = 70 - 79
Profile	10%	D = 60 - 69
Individual written assignments	40%	F = 59 or below
Simulation participation	15%	
Sim Eval / Reflections	5%	

1. Attendance: Students are expected to attend class regularly. Attendance will be taken and students will be allowed 6 absences without any deduction of points. After 6 absences, 1 point will be deducted for each absence (total of 10 possible). Students are encouraged to take an active role in class by asking questions and engaging in discussion. There will be opportunities throughout the semester for students to discuss current events as they pertain to the course.
2. Online Discussion Board and Chat Sessions: Students will engage in weekly Blackboard discussions with students from Carleton University in Ottawa Canada. Grading for the weekly on-line discussions will be based partially on quantity (1 or more responses must be posted each week), but mostly on quality. Students are expected to contribute an initial discussion board posting by Weds evening. The posting should address the question that is posed by the instructors and should attempt to draw on the weekly reading assignments and your own responses to these readings. You should read the postings of your classmates, then engage in one (or more) of the scheduled chat room sessions on the weekend. These chat sessions allow students to more fully explore the topic areas and the posted responses of their peers. Students should be respectful of their peers throughout the chat sessions.
3. Simulation Participation: Students will participate in a semester-long web-based role play exercise, beginning September 6 and continuing through December 1. The simulation will require you to work collaboratively with other students, both at WSU and Carleton, to complete a series of assigned tasks, culminating in the drafting of a Plan of Action for peacebuilding in Afghanistan. Participation is mandatory and will be graded. Students are expected to be engaged regularly in the simulation and to complete the assigned tasks as instructed. **On November 28 students will engage in a formal debriefing session with students from Carleton via videoconference**

Academic Freedom / Respect for Others

Each student is encouraged to participate in classroom and online discussions. In any class that includes discussion of political ideas, there are bound to be many differing points of view. Students may not only disagree with each other, but may also have disparate views from the instructor on sensitive and volatile topics. This is particularly true when including students from abroad that may have different perspectives on events and politics. It is my hope that these differences will enhance class discussion and create an atmosphere where students and instructor alike will be encouraged to think and learn. Therefore, be assured that your grades will not be adversely affected by any beliefs or ideas expressed in class or your assignments. Rather, we will all respect the views of others when expressed in classroom discussions.

Scholastic Dishonesty

As described in the Student Catalog, scholastic dishonesty constitutes a violation of college rules and regulations and is punishable according to the procedures outlined in the Catalog. Scholastic dishonesty includes, but is not limited to, cheating on an exam, plagiarism, and collusion. Plagiarism includes use of another author's words or arguments without attribution. Collusion is defined as the unauthorized collaboration with another person in preparing written work for fulfillment of course requirements. If a student commits any of these actions, I will seek disciplinary action in the form of an academic penalty, including a course grade of 'F'.

Dates	Topics	Assignments	Readings
Aug 18 (Fri)	Introduction/ Overview		
Aug 21 - Aug 25	Foreign Policy Perspectives	Notes on country	Internet research
Aug 28 Mon	Bb Introduction	LH 429 Social Science Lab	
Aug 30 - Sept 1	TBD		
Sept 4 Mon	NO CLASS Labor Day		
Sept 6 Weds	TBD		
Sept 8 Fri	Simulation Introduction	LH 429 Social Science Lab Sim Enrollment	
Sept 11 Mon	Defining Conflict and Peacebuilding		Course Packet readings: Lund, Cousens, and Hampson
Sept 13 Weds	Simulation	LH 429 Social Science Lab Create Profile	
Sept 15 Fri	Defining Conflict and Peacebuilding		
Sept 18 Mon	Causes of Deadly Conflict	Bb discussion/ chat # 1 Defining Pcbldg	Byman Text: Chaps 1-2; Course Packet readings: Byman and Van Evera, Brown, Fearon and Laitin
Sept 19 TUES *	Special Class Mtg 1:45 - 3:00 @ MRC	Video Conference w/ Carleton	
Sept 20 Weds	NO CLASS	Computer lab reserved	
Sept 22 Fri	Causes of Deadly Conflict		
Sept 25 - Sept 29	Causes of Deadly Conflict	Bb discussion/ chat # 2 Deadly conflict	
Oct 2 Mon	Democratization, Peacebuilding and Elections	Bb discussion/ chat # 3 Democratization; 1st Sim Report Due	Course Packet readings: Gleditsch, Mansfield and Snyder, Paris, Pagani;
Oct 4 - Oct 6	Democratization, Peacebuilding and Elections		
Oct 9	Peace Settlements	Bb discussion/	Course Packet readings: Wagner (in

Mon		chat # 4 Pc Settlements PA Sim Critique Due	Licklider, ed), Hampson, Walter, Stedman (in Turbulent Peace)
Oct 11 - Oct 13	Peace Settlements		
Oct 16 (M)	NO CLASS October Break	2nd Sim Report Due	
Oct 18 - Oct 20	Power Sharing/Control and Cooptation	Bb discussion/ chat # 5 Power sharing	Byman Text: Chapers 3 -4, (Chap 6 optional); Course Packet readings: Lijphart, Horowitz, Snyder;
Oct 23 Mon	TBD	Bb discussion/ chat # 6 Ambassador PA Critique Due	TBD
Oct 24 TUES	Special Class Mtg 3:00 - 5:00 @ MRC		Ambassador Samad of Afghanistan
Oct 25 Weds	NO CLASS		
Oct 27 Fri	Partition and Identity Manipulation		Byman Text: Chaps 5 and 7; Course Packet readings: Kumar, Kauffman (in Walter and Snyder,eds);
Oct 30 Mon	Partition and Identity Manipulation	Bb discussion/ chat # 7 Partition Sim Conf begins	
Nov 1 Wed	NO CLASS	Computer lab reserved	
Nov 3 Fri	NO CLASS	Computer lab reserved	
Nov 6 Mon	Foreign Intervention and International Trusteeship		Review: Paris (Oct 2), and Fearon and Laitin (Sept 18) Course Packet readings: Chandler, Kaplan, Fukyama
Nov 8 Weds	Foreign Intervention and International Trusteeship		
Nov 10 Fri	Foreign Intervention and International	Working Group Draft Due	

	Trusteeship		
Nov 13 - Nov 17	Truth and Reconciliation		Course Packet readings: Snyder and Vinjamuri, Akhavan, Huyse-The Process of Reconciliation, Bloomfield-The Context of Reconciliation, Huyse- Justice;
Nov 20 Mon	NO CLASS	Computer lab reserved	Spend time on Sim
Nov 22 Weds	NO CLASS	Computer lab reserved; Final Plan of Action Due	Spend time on Sim
Nov 24 Fri	NO CLASS Thanksgiving		
Nov 27 Mon	Peacebuilding in Perspective	Official Delegate Response Due	Licklider; Byman Text Chap 9
Nov 28 TUES	Special Class Mtg 1:30 - 2:45 @ MRC	Video Conference w/ Carleton	
Nov 29 Weds	NO CLASS		
Nov 30 Fri	Simulation Evaluation	Computer lab reserved Sim Evaluation	
Dec 4 Mon	TBD		
Dec 6 Weds	TBD		Last day of class - No Final Exam

*There are 3 class sessions that meet on Tues afternoon, instead of Weds in order to videoconference with Carleton University. Weds classes are cancelled for these weeks, and during one week Fri class is also cancelled. I cannot require you to attend these Tues sessions, but strongly urge you to do so. I would be happy to provide a letter to your employer if you need to alter your work schedule to attend.

Schedule of Topics and Readings

Readings average 60 pages per week, for a total of 719 pages. Note that some weeks have significantly more readings than others, so plan ahead.

September 11-15

Defining "Peacebuilding"? [29pp. total]

What is peace? What is peacebuilding?

1. Michael Lund, "What Kind of Peace is Being Built? Taking Stock of Peacebuilding and Charting Future Directions," January 2003 (Paper presented at the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) workshop, "What Kind of Peace?" Ottawa, Canada, Sept 30-Oct 1, 2002): 21-24 ("The Results of Post-Conflict Peacebuilding: A Hard Look at What We Know") and 25-29 ("Criteria for Measuring 'Sustainable Peace': A Sliding Scale"). [9pp.]
2. Fen Osler Hampson, "Can Peacebuilding Work?" Cornell International Law Journal 30, no. 3 (1997): 702-5 ("Definitions of Peacebuilding"). [4pp.] *The complete paper is available for free download from* http://web.idrc.ca/en/ev-28471-201-1-DO_TOPIC.html.
3. Elizabeth M. Cousens, "Introduction," in Peacebuilding as Politics: Cultivating Peace in Fragile Societies, ed. Elizabeth M. Cousens and Chetan Kumar with Karin Wermester (Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 2001), 1-16. [16pp.]

September 18-29

Hypotheses on the Causes of Contemporary Deadly Conflict

To prevent wars from reoccurring we first need to understand how they start. These readings provide a range of hypotheses on the sources of deadly conflict. If these theories are right, how should we design peacebuilding strategies to address the various causes? [126pp. total]

1. Daniel Byman and Stephen Van Evera, "Why They Fight: Hypotheses on the Origins of Contemporary Deadly Conflicts," Security Studies 7, no. 3 (Spring 1998): 1-50. [50pp.]
2. Michael E. Brown, "Ethnic and Internal Conflicts: Causes and Implications," in Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict, eds. Chester A Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela R. Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001), 209-26. [18pp.]
3. James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War," American Political Science Review 97, no. 1 (February 2003): 75-90. How important are economic and political grievances or ethnic and cultural differences in explaining civil war? [14pp.]
4. Byman, Keeping the Peace, Chapters 1-2 ("Ethnic Conflict in Today's World" and "Causes of Ethnic Conflict"), 1-43. Byman surveys the causes of ethnic conflicts. [44pp.]

September Oct 2 - Oct 6

Democratization and Peacebuilding

For many, peacebuilding and democratization are synonymous. Since "democracies are peaceful," democratic institutions and practices are considered essential to prevent war from reoccurring in war-torn societies. But is democracy in fact necessary or even feasible? [60pp. total]

A. The "Democratic Peace"

1. Nils Petter Gleditsch, "Peace and Democracy," in Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict, ed. Lester Kurtz (San Diego: Academic Press, 1999), Vol. 1, 643-52. A summary of the current state of "democratic peace" theory. [10pp.]

B. The Promise and Peril of Democratization

1. Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and War," Foreign Affairs 74, no. 3 (May/June 1995): 79-97. Some important qualifications to the claim that democracy is peaceful. [19pp.]
2. Roland Paris, "Wilson's Ghost: The Faulty Assumptions of Postconflict Peacebuilding," Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict, eds. Chester A Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela R. Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001), 765-81. [17pp.]
3. Fabrizio Pagani, "The Peace Process at its Culmination: The Reconciliation Elections" in The Psychology of Peacekeeping, ed. Harvey J. Langholtz (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1998), 223-36. [14 pp.]

October 9- 13

The Settlement of Deadly Conflict and the Prospects for Peace

How do wars end, and what are the implications for successful peacebuilding? How does the nature of the settlement affect the likelihood of lasting peace? When do negotiated settlements succeed and when do they fail? [67pp. total]

1. Robert Harrison Wagner, "The Causes of Peace," in Stopping the Killing: How Civil Wars End, ed. Roy Licklider (New York: New York Univ. Press, 1993), 257-63. [7pp.]
2. Fen Osler Hampson, "Why Orphaned Peace Settlements Are More Prone to Failure," in Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict, eds. Chester A. Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996), 533-49. [17pp.]
3. Barbara F. Walter, "The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement," International Organization 51, no. 3 (Summer 1997): 335-63. [29pp.]
4. Stephen John Stedman, "International Implementation of Peace Agreements in Civil Wars," in Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict, eds. Chester A Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela R. Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001), 737-50. [14pp.]

October 18 - 20

Domestic Political and Institutional Strategies I: Powersharing / Control and Co-optation

What political and institutional arrangements can help lessen mutual insecurity and fear in the aftermath of deadly conflict? What strategies are best able to mitigate long-term security dilemma problems and to promote a self-sustaining peace? Several possible strategies are presented here and in session 6. How do these arrangements work in theory? How have they worked in practice? What are the advantages and disadvantages of each? [128pp. total]

A. Powersharing

1. Arend Lijphart, "The Power-Sharing Approach," in Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies, ed. Joseph V. Monteville (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1990), 491-508. The classic statement on powersharing as a solution to ethnic conflict. [18pp.]
2. Donald L. Horowitz, "Making Moderation Pay: The Comparative Politics of Ethnic Conflict Management," in Monteville, Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies, 451-74. A critic of Lijphart offers an alternative form of powersharing. [24pp.]
3. Jack Snyder, From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict (New York: W.W. Norton, 2000), 273-87 ("Sri Lanka and Malaysia: Opposite Twins") and 296-311 ("Rwanda and Burundi: The Perils of Pluralism and Powersharing"). Snyder takes issue with both Lijphart and Horowitz. Which view of powersharing is most convincing? [30pp.]

B. Control and Co-optation

1. Byman, Keeping the Peace, Chapters 3-4 ("Control Policies" and "Co-optation"), 44-99. If groups can't get along, and separation is not an option, what then is left? Byman discusses two very common, yet little discussed, political and institutional strategies. [56pp.]

Optional:

4. Byman, Keeping The Peace, 125-153 (Chapter 6, "Participatory Systems"). An overview of the powersharing option. [29pp.]

October 23 - 27

Domestic Political and Institutional Strategies II: Partition / Identity Manipulation

Powersharing strategies seek to promote lasting peace by encouraging war-torn groups to cooperate and work together. However, some argue that living together is part of the problem, not the solution. Several prominent alternatives to powersharing are discussed here. [90pp. total]

A. Partition

1. Byman, Keeping The Peace, Chapter 7 ("The Promise and Perils of Partition"), 154-176. If mutual insecurity among groups is the problem, separation may be the solution. An overview of the partition option is discussed here. [23pp.]
2. Radha Kumar, "The Troubled History of Partition," Foreign Affairs 76, no. 1 (January/February 1997): 22-34. The problems with partition. [13pp.]
3. Chaim Kaufmann, "When All Else Fails: Evaluating Population Transfers and Partition as Solutions to Ethnic Conflict," in Civil Wars, Insecurity and Intervention, eds. Barbara F. Walter and Jack Snyder (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1999), 221-49. An answer to Kumar. Are you convinced by the arguments and evidence presented here? [29pp.]

B. Identity Manipulation

1. Byman, Keeping the Peace, Chapter 5 ("Manipulating Ethnic Identities"), 100-124. If identity is a source of violent conflict, and separation is not an option, then why not try to change identities: assimilate many into one, or create an entirely new one? Byman discusses the prospects and tradeoffs of identity manipulation strategies. [25pp.]

October 30 - Nov 3

Peacebuilding in Afghanistan [31pp. total]

Guest Lecture: His Excellency Omar Samad, Ambassador of Afghanistan to Canada.

November 6 -10

Foreign Intervention and International Trusteeship

How important is foreign military and humanitarian intervention to the peacebuilding process? When and how does foreign intervention work best for promoting peace? What problems do foreign interveners face? How much control should outside actors have? What tradeoffs should be made between respect for state sovereignty and the preservation of peace? [50pp. total]

1. Review: Paris, "Wilson's Ghost," from Session 3.
2. Review: James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, "Neotrusteeship and the Problem of Weak States," International Security 28, no. 4 (Spring 2004): 5-43. If trusteeship is the answer, how can it be made to work? [39pp.]
3. David Chandler, "Bosnia: The Democracy Paradox," Current History (March 2001): 114-119. Is trusteeship really the answer? Do ends justify means? Chandler charges that international efforts to bring democracy to Bosnia are fundamentally *undemocratic* (and won't bring about peace anyway). [5pp.]

4. Robert D. Kaplan, "Continental Drift: Africa's Dysfunctional Politics," New Republic, 28 December 1992, 15-20. A skeptical view on saving failed states and societies. [6pp.]
5. Francis Fukuyama, "Stateness First," Journal of Democracy 16, no. 1 (January 2005): 84-88. [5 pp.] Lack of state capacity dooms effective democracy building. What is the answer?

November 13- 17

Truth, Justice and Reconciliation

How should war-torn societies deal with war crimes? Is it best to ignore the painful episodes of the past in favor of political stability? Or is long-term stability even possible without confronting the past? What is the best way to achieve reconciliation among former adversaries? Is achieving justice (for example, through war crimes trials and reparations) or "truth-telling" (for example, through truth commissions and historical revision) necessary or desirable for achieving reconciliation? [105pp. total]

1. Jack Snyder and Leslie Vinjamuri, "Trials and Errors: Principle and Pragmatism in Strategies for International Justice," International Security 28, no. 3 (Winter 2003/04): 5-44. A more skeptical view of the deterrence argument and the general utility of retributive justice as a peacebuilding tool. [40pp.]
2. Payam Akhavan, "Beyond Impunity: Can International Criminal Justice Prevent Atrocities?" American Journal of International Law 95, no. 1 (January 2001): 7-31. Can war crimes trials deter future atrocities and bring about reconciliation? Akhavan says they can. Are you convinced by his evidence and arguments? [25pp.]
3. Luc Huyse, "The Process of Reconciliation," in David Bloomfield, Teresa Barnes and Luc Huyse, *Reconciliation After Violent Conflict: A Handbook* (Stockholm: International IDEA, 2003), 19-34. Available for download from the course website. [14pp.]
4. David Bloomfield, "The Context of Reconciliation," in Bloomfield, et al., *Reconciliation After Violent Conflict*, 40-48. Available for download from the course website. [8pp.]
5. Luc Huyse, "Justice," in Bloomfield, et al., *Reconciliation After Violent Conflict*, 97-115. Available for download from the course website. [18pp.]

November 27

Peacebuilding in Perspective

Is successful peacebuilding feasible? What obstacles are faced by war-torn states and outside actors, and how can they best be overcome? What have you learned from the simulation about Afghanistan and peacebuilding more generally? A videoconference debriefing will be held with our colleagues at WSU. [33pp. total]

1. Roy Licklider, "Obstacles to Peace Settlements," in Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict, eds. Chester A Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela R. Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001), 697-715. An excellent overview of the challenges of peacebuilding, from settlement to reconciliation. [19pp.]
2. Byman, Keeping the Peace, Chapter 9 ("Dilemmas and Choices"), 213-25. [13pp.]

Appendix B - Simulation Actor Descriptions and Assignments

There are six main types of actors in the Sim, each with different roles and responsibilities. A brief description of these roles and the tasks they will be expected to perform in the Preparatory phase follow below:

Ministers

There are eight Ministers: Defence, Interior, Anti-Narcotics, Development, Justice, Public Health, Finance, and International Trade. All ministers are expected to be knowledgeable of the issues that fall under the purview of their ministry, and specifically to understand how those issues affect peacebuilding, or how they can offer effective peacebuilding solutions. In preparation for the Afghanistan Consultation Group (ACG) Conference that will begin on Oct 31, ministers will provide two written reports (1,200 words maximum each) to the Presidential Advisor with responsibility for that ministry's issue area. The first report (due Oct. 3) will provide the minister's assessment of the most significant challenges to peace and stability in Afghanistan, explain how those issues are impeding effective peacebuilding, and rank those issues in terms of the attention the minister believes they ought to receive in peacebuilding efforts. The second report (due Oct. 17) will provide a clear set of policy proposals with solutions on how to address the top two priorities identified in the first report.

Regional Governors

There are two Regional Governors, one from Balkh Province in the north and one from Khandahar in the south. Regional governors are expected to have an understanding of the unique local dynamics within their provinces and how these impact peacebuilding efforts. In preparation for the Afghanistan Consultation Group (ACG) Conference that will begin on Oct 31, Regional Governors are expected to produce two reports to the President's Office (1,200 words maximum each). The first report (due Oct. 3) will provide an assessment, from a local perspective, of the most significant challenges to peace and stability in Afghanistan, explain how those issues are impeding effective peacebuilding, and rank those issues in terms of the attention the Governor believes they ought to receive in peacebuilding efforts. The second report (due Oct. 17) will provide a clear set of policy proposals with solutions on how to address the top two priorities identified in the first report.

Presidential Advisors

There are five Presidential Advisors, each with two related areas of responsibility: Defence and Security; Anti-Narcotics and Development; Social Welfare and Justice; Regional Relations; and Trade and Finance. As senior advisors to the President, PAs must have knowledge of the issue areas (or regions) under their purview and be prepared to provide critical, independent analysis on how those issues impact long-term peacebuilding. While PAs must maintain close contact with ministers, their loyalty is to the President. In preparation for the Afghanistan Consultation Group (ACG) Conference that will begin on Oct 31, the President has requested regular reports and policy proposals from his Ministers. Therefore, each PA will receive reports from their associated ministries (or provincial governments), which they will review and critically comment upon. Because their responsibility is broader than that of a single ministry, PAs will likely have a different perspective on the challenges and solutions to peacebuilding than that of an individual minister. While there may be areas of agreement, there are likely to be points of dispute, particularly in terms of priorities and solutions that are proposed. The PAs are expected to draft

individual responses to each of the Minister's (or Governors') Reports they receive (800 words maximum per response). They should be completed within one week of receipt of the Ministers' (or Governors') Reports (due Oct. 10 and 24, respectively). The ministers (or governor) will receive the PA responses, which should be helpful as the members of the Afghan Consultation Group make their preparations for the upcoming Conference.

International Diplomatic Representatives

There are eight international diplomatic actors: Ambassadors of Pakistan, Iran, the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom; UN Special Representative; NATO Liaison; and World Bank Representative. Each of these actors will have a seat at the table at the upcoming Afghanistan Consultation Group (ACG) Conference that will begin on Oct 31. In preparing for that conference, international diplomatic representatives are responsible for promoting the views of their home government/international organization on the conflict in Afghanistan and their solutions for effective peacebuilding. Specifically, these actors will file two reports (1,200 words maximum each) for circulation to the media and the Afghan government, via relevant ministries and Presidential Advisors. The first report (due Oct. 3) will provide an assessment, from the perspective of the actor's particular home government or IO, of the most significant challenges to peace and stability in Afghanistan, explain how those issues are impeding effective peacebuilding, and rank those issues in terms of the attention the actor believes they ought to receive in peacebuilding efforts. The second report (due Oct. 17) will provide a clear set of policy proposals with solutions on how to address the top two priorities identified in the first report.

Intergovernmental and NGO Representatives

There are six intergovernmental organizations and NGOs represented: Amnesty, CARE Canada, UNICEF, Human Rights Watch, the Senlis Council, and the Afghan Independent Human Rights Commission. NGO Reps are primarily in Afghanistan to assist in the improvement of humanitarian conditions in the country related to the NGO's area of interest. NGOs are primarily responsible for providing particular aid and assistance, but they are also there as policy advocates and to monitor, report on and publicize humanitarian conditions in the country. NGOs will all have a seat at the table in the upcoming Afghanistan Consultation Group (ACG) Conference that will begin on Oct 31. In preparing for that conference, field representatives have been asked to ensure that their organization's issues of concern are on the agenda and to promote their views on the conflict in Afghanistan and their solutions for effective peacebuilding. Specifically, these actors will file two reports (1,200 words maximum each) for circulation to the media and the Afghan government, via relevant ministries and Presidential Advisors. The first report (due Oct. 3) will provide the NGO's assessment of the most significant challenges to peace and stability in Afghanistan, explain how those issues are impeding effective peacebuilding, and rank those issues in terms of the attention the NGO believes they ought to receive in peacebuilding efforts. The second report (due Oct. 17) will provide a clear set of policy proposals with solutions on how to address the top two priorities identified in the first report.

Media

An important actor in the Sim is the Media. Four types of media actors are active: local press reporters for the Kabul Times; international press reporters for the International Tribune; and editors for both papers. Reporters and editors for each paper will work together as a team (3

reporters plus an editor) to produce weekly news items, special investigative reports, biographical sketches of cabinet ministers or NGO representatives, featured interviews with key actors regarding the upcoming Afghanistan Consultation Group (ACG) Conference, editorials or letters to the editor. Collectively each four-person press team will be responsible for publishing three items per calendar week (Mon-Sun) of no more than 400 words each. The first news items should be published no later than Sept. 24.

Typically, each member of the team will produce one item per week. However, the team, under the leadership of the editor, may divide up the weekly labor however they see fit. For example, the editor may ask one reporter to write two articles in one week and another reporter to write two articles the following week. As long as all team members at the end of the Sim have produced the equivalent of one item per week, any arrangement that is fair and equitable is acceptable.

Editors are required to coordinate the press teams and to submit articles for publication. Though there is no requirement as to the type of news item that a reporter must write (this is determined in consultation with the editor), editors are required to produce at least four editorials (400 words maximum) in the lead-up to the ACG conference beginning Oct 31. Note that some of the reporters may be tasked to cover the ACG Conference, while others may be asked to participate directly in the conference as a civil society representative. Those tasked to report on the conference will continue to produce the equivalent of one news item per week. Those who participate will be required to work with other delegates in the drafting of the Working Group Report and the Final Plan of Action, and to prepare an Official Delegate Response.

Appendix C - Simulation Evaluation Questions

1. What challenges did you face as a participant in the simulation? (This is not a question about the challenges your characters faced, but that you as a student face in playing your role)
2. Did you enjoy the simulation? Why/ why not?
3. What challenges did your character face in achieving his/her objectives as stated in your role profile? What difficult circumstances did your character face? Were there other actors that facilitated or hindered your character's actions?
4. What different actions might your character take if you were to engage in the simulation again?
5. Did you feel that the Plan of Action developed in the conference was a good one for your character? Was it the best possible solution for the country as a whole?
6. Do you think the Plan is a viable one? Why / why not? What are some of the barriers to implementation that this plan might face? How might these challenges be addressed?
7. What did you learn from your participation in this simulation? Do you have any suggestions on how it might be revised for the future?

Appendix D - Learning Objectives for the Course

Students should be able to

- Describe the major tasks and challenges involved in post-conflict peacebuilding.
- Describe the most commonly proposed causes of civil wars.
- Provide their own argument as to which causes are most important.
- Define "peace," "peacebuilding," "development," "reconciliation," "democracy" and "democratization"
- Describe the relationship between peace and democracy.
- Describe how democratization can lead to violence and offer some solutions for addressing this problem.
- Describe the major components of peace agreements and provide specific case examples of successes and failures.
- Provide a reasonable explanation for why some peace settlements do not last.
- Explain the security dilemma.
- Provide several options for how the security dilemma can be reduced among hostile states and/or groups.
- Describe the strengths and weaknesses of various political institutional approaches to peacebuilding (power-sharing, partition, identity manipulation, control and cooptation, international trusteeship)
- Provide several options for how reconciliation might be achieved among former belligerents.

Bibliography

- Assudani, Rashmi H. 2006. "Learning in a Geographically Dispersed Context: Building a Community of Learning in Dispersed Space" S. Pixy Ferris and Susan Godar, eds. Teaching and Learning with Virtual Teams. Hershey, PA: Information Science Publishing.
- Gabelnick, Faith, Jean MacGregor, Roberta S. Matthews, and Barbara Leigh Smith. 1990. "Learning Communities: Creating Connections Among Students, Faculty, and Disciplines." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* (Monograph No. 41). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Johnson, D. and F. Johnson. 2000. Joining Together: Group Theory and Group Skills. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Murphy, Karen and Yakut Gazi. 2003. "Collaboration and community through simulation/role-play" Som Naidu, ed. Learning and Teaching with Technology. Sterling, VA: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Palloff, Rena M. and Keith Pratt. 2005. Collaborating Online: Learning Together in Community. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Smith, Peter and Elizabeth Stacey. 2003. "Socialization through CMC in differently structured environments" Som Naidu, ed. Learning and Teaching with Technology. Sterling, VA: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Swan, Karen. 2003. "Developing Social Presence in online course discussions" Som Naidu, ed. Learning and Teaching with Technology. Sterling, VA: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Swenson, Penelope and Mark Evans (2003) "Hybrid Courses as Learning Communities" in Sorel Reisman, ed. Electronic Learning Communities: Current Issues and Best Practices, Information Age Publishing, Inc. pp. 27-71.
- Thies, Cameron G. 2005. "A Crash Course in Learning Communities for the Political Scientist." *Journal of Political Science Education*. 1 (1): 129-141.
- Tritelli, David. 2001. "From the Editor." *Peer Review* 3 and 4 (4 and 1): 3.