

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

NUMBER: INTL 4780
TITLE: **Defending Democracies**

INSTRUCTOR: Dr. Cas Mudde (mudde@uga.edu)
OFFICE: Candler 324
OFFICE HOURS: Wednesdays 1:00-3.00, sign up online

TERM: Spring 2021
DATE & TIME: Tuesdays & Thursdays, 12:45-2:00
ROOM: MLC 153 (but course will be fully online)
TWITTER: #INTL4780 ([@casmudde](https://twitter.com/casmudde))

Introduction:

While the 20th century has been described as the “age of extremes” (Hobsbawn), defined by totalitarian regimes in Europe and beyond (i.e. communism and fascism), it ended with Francis Fukuyama’s famous exclamation of the “end of history.” With the communist regimes of Eastern Europe all in shambles, many believed that democracy was hegemonic and no longer faced any major political challenge(r)s.

At least since 9/11 we know better. While democracy might be considered the best political regime by the majority of the people in the world, significant minorities continue to challenge ‘real existing democracies’ in their actions and/or goals throughout the world. And democracies strike back, defending themselves against real and perceived threats.

This course will look at the various ways in which contemporary democracies defend themselves against (perceived) political threats. The focus is predominantly upon domestic responses; hence, interstate war will not be studied! We are particularly concerned with the partly normative question: *how can liberal democracies defend themselves against extremist challenges without undermining their core values?*

The ultimate aim of the course is to come to a deeper understanding of the core values of liberal democracy, to critically assess the various political challenges to liberal democracy, and to identify best practices and develop recommendations of how liberal democracies *should* respond to a broad variety of political challenge(r)s. We will do this by looking at a variety of different political challenges – from animal rights groups to Jihadi terrorism – and the ways in which different democracies have responded to them.

Readings:

Many of the readings are articles and book chapter, which will be posted on the New-Elc course page well before the relevant class. In addition, we use three (short) books that you are strongly encouraged to buy.

Robert A. Dahl (2003) *How Democratic Is the American Constitution?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2nd edition. (Dahl) – [online access](#) UGA Library.

Cas Mudde and Cristóbal Rovira Kaltwasser (2017) *Populism: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press. (Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser)

Will Potter (2011) *Green Is the New Red: An Insider's Account of a Social Movement Under Siege*. San Francisco: City Lights Books. (Potter)

I will also use one or more episodes of my podcast [RADIKAL](#), which focuses on the radical aspects of music, politics, and sports, and is available on all podcast platforms.

Course objectives:

- ☑ To provide students with a conceptual and theoretical foundation to understand the political struggle of contemporary liberal democracies.
- ☑ To discover and explain the differences and similarities among 'extremist' challenges to contemporary democracies.
- ☑ To discover and explain the differences and similarities among democratic responses to similar extremist challenges.
- ☑ To help students analyze case studies of extremist challenges and democratic responses.
- ☑ To identify best practices in the way democracies have responded to various extremist challenges.
- ☑ To develop the best ways in the way democracies should respond to various extremist challenges.

Teaching Methodology:

- ☑ Lectures
- ☑ Class discussions
- ☑ Video presentations
- ☑ Film presentations

Course Evaluation:

- ✪ Participation (20%)

- ✪ Organizational Assessment (20%)
- ✪ Short Essay (20%)
- ✪ Group Video (15%)
- ✪ Final Essay (25%)

Participation (20%): includes both the *preparation*, i.e. reading and reflecting upon the compulsory readings for each class, and *participation* in discussion in class – primarily *online on the ELC course page*. You are expected to regularly participate (i.e. at least biweekly) in the course Discussion Board discussions in an active, civilized, and well-informed manner.

Organizational Assessment (20%): you have to write a short assessment of the (theoretical and empirical threat) to liberal democracy of one specific group in one country. Examples include, but are not limited to, the Animal Rights Militia (ARM) in Sweden, Antifascist Action (AFA) in Germany, National Movement (RN) in Poland, and Operation Rescue in the US. The assessment should be max. 1,000 words, use primary materials (group’s social media or website) as well as relevant compulsory and additional academic literature, and be well-referenced and -written. The deadline is **February 10** at midnight.

Short Essay (20%): you have to write a short essay on the question: *Has the US state responded appropriately to the challenge by animal rights activists?* The essay should be max. 1,000 words, use both compulsory and additional academic literature, and be well-referenced and -written. The deadline is **March 15** at midnight.

Group Video (15%): you will make one video (in a group of ca. 3 students) that assesses the threat to liberal democracy of a specific group/movement or of the state responses to that group/movement (schedule and topics to be announced in the third or fourth week of the course). The video should not be longer than **15 minutes** and must be well-produced and well-researched – that means, edited to ensure clear and consistent sound, include relevant visual clips, and be based on academic and primary sources that goes well beyond the compulsory readings.

Final Essay (25%): you have to write a final essay in which you answer the question: *how should liberal democracies respond to political threats?* The final essay should be max. 1,500 words and explicitly reference at least five course readings as well as at least 3 additional academic or primary sources. The deadline is **April 28** before 9.35 AM EST.

Classroom Attendance and Activity

This course will be *online* (only) and *synchronous*, which means we meet twice a week on Zoom at the set times of the course (Tuesdays and Thursday, 12.45 to 2.00). You are very strongly encouraged to attend all classes and to keep your camera on whenever there is no particular reason to have it off.

You are expected to **have read and reflected upon** the compulsory readings before the relevant class, to follow key events in far-right politics in the (international) media, and to **participate actively** in the discussions in class and (particularly) on the **ELC-discussion board**.

Grading:

Letter Grade	Points
A	93 – 100 points
A-	90 – 92 points
B+	87 – 89 points
B	83 – 86 points
B-	80 – 82 points
C+	77 – 79 points
C	73 – 76 points
C-	70 – 72 points
D+	67 – 69 points
D	63 – 66 points
D-	60 – 62 points
F	59 and below

Some Ground Rules:

1. I do not expect that your views on and perceptions of these controversial themes are identical with those of your classmates or me, either now or at the completion of the course. This course is a place for free (and perhaps even heated) exchange of ideas. I therefore expect you to *challenge viewpoints* that differ from your own, but also to *substantiate your arguments* on the basis of the readings, lectures and discussions.

2. If you need to use outside *reference works*, please consult Joel Krieger, et. al., *Oxford Companion to Politics of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001) as a place to start for political terms or concepts – do **not** use Webster or other dictionaries for political science definitions. For outside research sources, please use Galileo. Please do **not** use the notoriously unreliable **Wikipedia!**

3. If you believe that you should have received a better grade, please provide *an explanation* to me *in writing* and *within a week* of receiving the grade. I will then grade your *whole* exam/paper again and I will issue a “new” grade, which will be either the same, a higher, or a lower grade.

Academic Integrity:

As a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to abide by the University’s academic honesty policy, “A Culture of Honesty,” and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards described in “A Culture of Honesty” found at: <http://www.uga.edu/honesty>. Lack of knowledge of the academic honesty policy is not a reasonable explanation for a violation. Questions related to course assignments and the academic honesty policy should be directed to the instructor.

Disability Statement:

UGA is committed to the success of all learners, and we strive to create an inclusive and accessible online environment. In collaboration with the [Disability Resource Center](#), we work with students who have documented disabilities to access reasonable accommodations and academic supports. For more information or to speak with a Disability coordinator, please call the Disability Resource Center at (706) 542-8719, TTY only phone (706) 542-8778.

Coronavirus Information for Students

Face Coverings:

Effective July 15, 2020, the University of Georgia—along with all University System of Georgia (USG) institutions—requires all faculty, staff, students and visitors to wear an appropriate face covering while inside campus facilities/buildings where six feet social distancing may not always be possible. Face covering use is in addition to and is not a substitute for social distancing. Anyone not using a face covering when required will be asked to wear one or must leave the area. Reasonable accommodations may be made for those who are unable to wear a face covering for documented health reasons. Students seeking an accommodation related to face coverings should contact Disability Services at <https://drc.uga.edu/>.

DawgCheck:

Please perform a quick symptom check each weekday on DawgCheck—on the UGA app or website—whether you feel sick or not. It will help health providers monitor the health situation on campus: <https://dawgcheck.uga.edu/>

What do I do if I have symptoms?

Students showing symptoms should self-isolate and schedule an appointment with the University Health Center by calling 706-542-1162 (Monday-Friday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m.). Please DO NOT walk-in. For emergencies and after-hours care, see <https://www.uhs.uga.edu/info/emergencies>.

What do I do if I am notified that I have been exposed?

Students who learn they have been directly exposed to COVID-19 but are not showing symptoms should self-quarantine for 14 days consistent with Department of Public Health (DPH) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidelines. Please correspond with your instructor via email, with a cc: to Student Care & Outreach at sco@uga.edu, to coordinate continuing your coursework while self-quarantined. If you develop symptoms, you should contact the University Health Center to make an appointment to be tested. You should continue to monitor your symptoms daily on DawgCheck.

How do I get a test?

Students who are demonstrating symptoms of COVID-19 should call the University Health Center. UHC is offering testing by appointment for students; appointments may be booked by calling 706-542-1162.

UGA will also be recruiting asymptomatic students to participate in surveillance tests. Students living in residence halls, Greek housing and off-campus apartment complexes are encouraged to participate.

What do I do if I test positive?

Any student with a positive COVID-19 test is **required** to report the test in DawgCheck and should self-isolate immediately. Students should not attend classes in-person until the isolation period is completed. Once you report the positive test through DawgCheck, UGA Student Care and Outreach will follow up with you.

Other Important Resources for Students

UGA has a vast array of resources to support students facing a variety of challenges. Please don't hesitate to come speak with me or contact these resources directly:

Office of Student Care & Outreach (coordinate assistance for students experiencing hardship/unforeseen circumstances): T: 706-542-7774 or by email sco@uga.edu

Counseling and Psychiatric Services (CAPS): T: 706-542-2273 (during regular business hours) *After Hour Mental Health Crisis:* 706-542-2200 (UGA Police—ask to speak to the CAPS on-call clinician).

Relationship and Sexual Violence Prevention: T: 706-542-SAFE (Please note, faculty and staff are obligated to report any knowledge of sexual assault/relationship violence to UGA's Equal Opportunity Office. The advocates at RSVP can provide student confidentially).

Third-Party Software and FERPA:

During this course you might have the opportunity to use public online services and/or software applications sometimes called third-party software such as a blog or wiki. While some of these are required assignments, you need **not** make any personally identifying information on a public site. Do not post or provide any private information about yourself or your classmates. Where appropriate you may use a pseudonym or nickname. Some written assignments posted publicly may require personal reflection/comments, but the assignments will not require you to disclose any personally identifiable/sensitive information. If you have any concerns about this, please contact your instructor.

Important Dates:

February, 10	Deadline Organizational Assessment
March, 9-11	Cas Mudde's Unofficial Spring Break (No Class)
March, 15	Deadline Short Essay
April, 8	Instruction Day (No Class)
April, 28	Deadline Final Essay

Finally:

THE COURSE SYLLABUS IS A GENERAL PLAN FOR THE COURSE; DEVIATIONS ANNOUNCED TO THE CLASS BY THE INSTRUCTOR MAY (AND MOST PROBABLY WILL) BE NECESSARY!

THEMATIC OUTLINE

01/14 – Introduction

In this introductory class we will discuss the intentions and outline of the course as well as the mutual expectations. We will also assess the students' backgrounds in the politics of western democracies in general, and challenges to it in particular.

01/19 – Challenges to Liberal Democracy

There are many different types of challenges to democracy, depending upon not just the ideology but also the strategy. Each challenge is different and would therefore require another type of response by the state and other actors.

Compulsory Readings:

Mudde, Cas (2003) "Liberal Democracies and the Extremist Challenge of the Early 21st Century", *Nordic Journal of Human Rights* 21(4): 429-440.

PART I – ASSESSING THE US CONSTITUTION

01/21 – The Framers and the Constitution

*To get a better understanding of the complexities of democracy, including the strengths and weaknesses of the specific democratic system of the US, we will read Robert Dahl's provocative *How Democratic is the American Constitution?* First, we look at what the Framers (or "Founders") envisioned.*

Compulsory Readings:

Dahl, chapters 1-3 and Appendix A.

01/26 – How Does the Constitution Perform?

While things might look perfect on paper, this doesn't necessarily mean they also perform perfectly in practice. How does the US Constitution perform? Is it indeed the model of democracy the Framers envisioned?

Compulsory Reading:

Dahl, chapter 4-5.

PART II – MODELS OF DEMOCRACY

01/28 – Democracy/ies

Having looked at the specific case of the US Constitution, we will now look at what democracy as a generic model means. What are crucial institutions and values?

Compulsory Readings:

Dahl, Robert A. (1998) *On Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, chapters 4 and 5.

02/02 – Models of Democracy

Although we often use democracy in a unitary way, as if there is just one democracy, there are different models of democracy. The dominant model, at least within the so-called “Western World”, is that of liberal democracy.

Compulsory Readings:

Diamond, Larry (2003) “Defining and Developing Democracy”, in Robert A. Dahl, Ian Shapiro and José Antonio Cheibub (eds.), *The Democracy Sourcebook*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 29-39.

Plattner, Marc F. (1998) “Liberalism and Democracy: Can’t Have One without the Other”, *Foreign Affairs* 77(2): 171-180.

Compulsory Readings:

Mouffe, Chantal (1989) “Radical Democracy: Modern or Postmodern?”, *Social Text* 21: 31-45.

02/04 – Defending Democracy

Democracies defend themselves in different ways. Some are very open (like the US), while others set strict boundaries (like Germany). There are both ethical and practical aspects to defending democracy, particularly with regard to the role of the state.

Compulsory Readings:

Kirshner, Alexander S. (2014) *A Theory of Militant Democracy: The Ethics of Combatting Political Extremism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, chapter 2.

Optional Reading:

Chalk, Peter (1998) “The Response to Terrorism as a Threat to Liberal Democracy”, *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 44(3): 373-388.

Malik, Maleiha (2008) “Engaging with Extremists”, *International Relations* 22(1): 85-104.

Rummens, Stefan and Koen Abts (2010) “Defending Democracy: The Concentric Containment of Political Extremism”, *Political Studies* 58(4): 649-665.

Thiel, Markus (ed.) (2009) *The ‘Militant’ Democracy’ Principle in Modern Democracies*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

PART II – THREATS AND RESPONSES

02/09 – Anti-Abortion Activism

At least since Roe vs. Wade in 1973 abortion is one of the most contentious and divisive issues in American politics. On the fringes of this debate has been significant intimidation and violence by extremist individuals and organizations, such as Eric Rudolph, Army of God, and Operation Rescue.

Compulsory Readings:

Forrest, Jacqueline Darroch and Stanley K. Henshaw (1987) “The Harassment of U.S. Abortion Providers”, *Family Planning Perspectives* 19(1): 9-13.

Hewitt, Christopher (2003) *Understanding Terrorism in America: From the Klan to Al Qaeda*. London: Routledge, 38-41.

Seegmiller, Beau (2007) “Radicalized Margins: Eric Rudolph and Religious Violence”, *Terrorism and Political Violence* 19(4): 511-528.

Optional Reading:

Nice, David C. (1988) “Abortion Clinic Bombings as Political Violence”, *American Journal of Political Science* 32(1): 178-195.

02/11 – Responses to Anti-Abortion Activism

While only some anti-abortion activism has been illegal, pro-choice activists and abortion providers have argued that even some legal activities constitute harassment and should be banned, or at the very least restricted. What have been the legal responses and what should they be?

Compulsory Readings:

Eisenberg, Rebecca (1994) “Beyond Bray: Obtaining Federal Jurisdiction to Stop Anti-Abortion Violence”, *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 6(1): 155-227 (minus sections IV and V).

Further Readings:

Gershon, Dana S. (1994-1995) “Stalking Statutes: A New Vehicle to Curb the New Violence of the Radical Anti-Abortion Movement”, *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 26: 215-246.

Moretti, Michele R. “Using Civil RICO to Battle Anti-Abortion Violence: Is the Last Weapon in the Arsenal a Sword of Damocles?”, *New England Law Review*, Vol.25, 1990-1991, 1363-1414. (minus section II, 1378-1386)

Soule, Steven E. and Karen R. Weinstein (1993) “Racketeering, Anti-Abortion Protesters, and the First Amendment”, *UCLA Women’s Law Journal* 4: 365-398.

02/16 – Populism

According to media around the world, 2016 was the year of populism. While populism dates back to the mid-19th century, it has only really become a global phenomenon in the

21st century. This class will discuss the evolution of populism and identify the different types of populism today.

Compulsory Readings:

Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, chapters 1-2

Optional Reading:

Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, chapters 3-4

02/18 – State Responses to Populism

Initially, populism held overall positive connotations, particularly in the US, but today it is mostly seen as a threat to democracy. But populism and democracy are not straightforward terms and their relationship is complex and dynamic, rather than simple and static.

Compulsory Readings:

Mudde & Rovira Kaltwasser, chapters 5-6

Optional Reading:

Eatwell, Roger and Cas Mudde (eds.), *Western Democracies and the New Extreme Right Challenge*. London: Routledge.

Michael, George and Michael Minkenberg (2007) “A Continuum for Responding to the Extreme Right: A Comparison between the United States and Germany”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 30(12): 1109-1123.

02/23 – Radical Environmentalism I

According to media around the world, 2016 was the year of populism. While populism dates back to the mid-19th century, it has only really become a global phenomenon in the 21st century. This class will discuss the evolution of populism and identify the different types.

Compulsory Readings:

Potter, chapters 1-6

02/25 – Radical Environmentalism II

According to media around the world, 2016 was the year of populism. While populism dates back to the mid-19th century, it has only really become a global phenomenon in the 21st century. This class will discuss the evolution of populism and identify the different types.

Compulsory Readings:

Potter, chapters 7-11

[If A Tree Falls](#) (US, 85 min).

03/02 – Animal Rights Activism

Closely linked to radical environmentalism is animal rights activism, mostly known because of the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) – although there are other organizations, like the Justice Department and the Animal Rights Militia (ARM). The ALF in particular is associated with daring nightly rescues of little furry animals. However, animal right activism also has a dark side, which includes the threatening of people and the bombing of properties alleged to be involved in animal cruelty.

Compulsory Reading:

- Hirsch-Hoefler, Sivan and Cas Mudde (2014) “‘Ecoterrorism’: Terrorist Threat or Political Ploy?”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 37(7): 586-603.
- Vaughan, Christopher (1988) “Animal Research: Ten Years under Siege”, *BioScience* 38(1): 10-13.

Further Readings:

- Flükiger, Jean-Marc (2008) “An Appraisal of the Radical Animal Liberation Movement in Switzerland: 2003 to March 2007”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 31(2): 145-157.
- Monaghan, Rachel (2000) “Single-Issue Terrorism: A Neglected Phenomenon”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 23: 255-265.
- Munro, Lyle (2005) “Strategies, Action Repertoires and DIY Activism in the Animal Rights Movement”, *Social Movement Studies* 4(1): 75-94.

03/04 – Responses to Animal Rights/Environmentalism Activism

Although the ALF is not often in the news, before 9/11 the British security services considered it to be the biggest domestic threat. In what way does the ALF challenge ‘real existing democracies’ and how have they responded?

Compulsory Readings and Watching:

[*If A Tree Falls*](#) (US, 85 min).

- McCoy, Kimberly E. (2007) “Subverting Justice: An Indictment of the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act”, *Animal Law* 14: 53-70.
- Munro, Lyle (1999) “Contesting Moral Capital in Campaigns against Animal Liberation”, *Society and Animals* 7(1): 35-53.

Further Readings:

- Case, Denise R. (2002-2003) “The USA PATRIOT Act: Adding Bite to the Fight against Animal Rights Terrorism?”, *Rutgers Law Journal* 34: 187-233.
- Kniaz, Laura G. (1995) “Animal Liberation and the Law: Animals Board the Underground Railroad”, *Buffalo Law Review* 43: 765-834.
- Moore, Andrew N. Ireland (2005) “Caging Animal Advocates’ Political Freedoms: The Unconstitutionality of the Animal and Ecological Terrorism Act”, *Animal Law* 11: 255-282.

MUDEDE'S UNOFFICIAL SPRING BREAK

03/09 – NO CLASS, EXTRA OFFICE HOURS

03/11 – NO CLASS, EXTRA OFFICE HOURS

03/16 – Jihadi Terrorism in Europe

At least since the terrorist attacks on New York City and DC on 9/11 Jihadi terrorism is considered the number 1 threat in Europe and North America. While initially linked to al-Qaeda, recent Jihadi terrorism is more claimed, rather than necessarily organized, by the so-called Islamic State (IS).

Guest Lecture: Thomas Hegghammer (Norwegian Defence Research Establishment)

Compulsory Readings:

Nesser, Peter, Anne Stenersen and Emilie Oftedal (2016) “Jihadi Terrorism in Europe: The IS-Effect”, *Perspectives on Terrorism* 10(6).

Hegghammer, Thomas (2016) “The Future of Jihadism in Europe: A Pessimistic View”, *Perspectives on Terrorism* 10(6).

03/18 – Responding to Jihadi Terrorism: National and Regional Differences

While Western media primarily focuses on Jihadi terrorism in western democracies, Jihadi terrorism is a truly global phenomenon and many of the more devastating attacks have taking place outside of “the West”. How have states responded to the threat of Jihadi terrorism and what are some of the national and regional differences?

Compulsory Reading:

Desker, Barry and Elena Pavlova (2005) “Comparing the European and South East Asian Response to Terrorism”, *Journal of Conflict Studies* 25(1).

Additional Readings:

Lago, Ignacio and José Ramón Montero (2006) “The 2004 Election in Spain: Terrorism, Accountability, and Voting”, *Taiwan Journal of Democracy* 2(1): 13-36.

Spalek, Basia and Robert Lambert (2010) “Policing within a Counter-Terrorism Context Post-7/7”, in Roger Eatwell and Matthew J. Goodwin (eds.), *The New Extremism in 21st Century Britain*. London: Routledge, 103-122.

03/23 – The Anti-Fascist Movement (Antifa)

Although anti-fascism has been around as long as fascism, it only recently became known to the broader American public. Through violent altercations with fascists in cities like Berkeley and Portland, “Antifa” became a popular topic of media conversation and right-wing politicians and pundits. But what is “Antifa”? What do they stand for? Who

are they? We will focus primarily on the US, although Antifa is much stronger in several European countries (e.g. Germany and Greece).

Compulsory Listening:

RADIKAAL Podcast, [episode 27](#): Stanislav Vysotsky on American Antifa.

03/25 – State Responses to Antifa

In the past years conservative actors, from the NRA to the Republican Party, have led a relentless campaign against “Antifa”. President Trump has been one of the most vocal opponents and in the last days of his presidency signed a [Presidential Memorandum](#) on Antifa. How do and should states respond to Antifa?

Compulsory Reading:

Phillips, Joe and Joseph Yi (2018) “Charlottesville Paradox: The ‘Liberalizing’ Alt-Right, ‘Authoritarian’ Left, and Politics of Dialogue”, *Society* 55(3): 221-228.

Pyrooz, David C. and James A. Densley (2018) “On Public Protest, Violence, and Street Gangs”, *Society* 55(3): 229-236.

Copsey, Nigel (2018) “Militant Antifascism: An Alternative (Historical) Reading”, *Society* 55(3): 243-247.

LaFree, Gary (2018) “Is Antifa a Terrorist Group”, *Society* 55(3): 248-252.

03/30 – The Lone Wolf: Oklahoma City Bombing & Unabomber

While terrorism is mostly linked to secretive organizations, some of the most striking terrorist attacks have been the work of a single individual, a so-called ‘lone wolf’. In the past decades, the two most debated lone wolf terrorists have been Timothy McVeigh, the ‘Oklahoma City Bomber’, and Theodore (Ted) Kaczynski, the Unabomber. Do ‘lone wolves’ constitute a particular danger to liberal democracies.

Compulsory Reading:

Schuurman, Bart, Lasse Lindekilde, Stefan Malthaner, Francis O’Connor, Paul Gill and Noémie Bouhana (2019) “End of the Lone Wolf: The Typology that Should Not Have Been”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 42(8): 771-778.

Spaaij, Ramón (2010) “The Enigma of Lone Wolf Terrorism: An Assessment”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 33(9): 854-870.

Further Readings:

Feldman, Matthew (2013) “Comparative Lone Wolf Terrorism: Towards a Heuristic Definition”, *Democracy and Security* 9(3): 270-286.

[Unabomber’s Manifesto](#) (1995).

04/01 – Responding to Lone Wolves

So-called “lone wolves” constitute a particular challenge to intelligence and security services. While they usually, but not necessarily, are less deadly than groups of terrorists,

they are also more difficult to detect or infiltrate. How have states responded and what is the best way within liberal democratic boundaries?

Compulsory Reading:

Bakker, Edwin and Beatrice De Graaf (2011) “Preventing Lone Wolf Terrorism: Some CT Approaches Addressed”, *Perspectives on Terrorism* 5(5-6).

Michael, George (2014) “Counterinsurgency and Lone Wolf Terrorism”, *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26(1): 45-57.

“[FBI’s Unabomber Investigation](#)”, *ABC News*, 3 April 1996.

Further Readings:

Chermak, Steven M., Joshua D. Freilich and Joseph Simone Jr. (2010) “Surveying American State Police Agencies About Lone Wolves, Far-Right Criminality, and Far-Right and Islamic Jihadist Criminal Collaboration”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 33(11): 1019-1041.

Dishman, Chris (2005) “The Leaderless Nexus: When Crime and Terror Converge”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 28(3): 237-252.

04/06 – The Role of Gender in (Countering) Extremism

Few recent pieces of legislation have been so hotly debated as the USA PATRIOT Act. The “Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001”, as is its full name, was the major legal response to the terrorist attack of 9/11 and have become broadly seen as the victory of the state of security over the rule of law. But is the Patriot Act really at odds with the fundamental values of liberal democracy?

Guest Speaker: Shannon Foley Martinez (former neo-Nazi)

Compulsory Reading:

Phelan, Alexandra (forthcoming) “Special Issue Introduction for Terrorism, Gender and Women: Toward an Integrated Research Agenda”, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*.

Brown, Katherine (forthcoming) “Gender, Governance, and Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) in the UK”, *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*.

04/08 – INSTITUTIONAL BREAK, NO CLASS

PART III – METHODS

04/13 – The Torture Debate

For decades torture was associated with autocratic regimes in faraway places. The ‘War on Terror’ has changed this. At least since the revelations surrounding the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq, torture has become a legitimate issue for debate in liberal democracies.

*Have western countries like the UK and US been involved in torture (direct or indirect)?
And does torture work?*

Compulsory Readings and Viewing:

[*Torturing Democracy*](#) (2008; 62 min)

Dershowitz, Alan (2004) “Tortured Reasoning”, in Sanford Levinson (ed.), *Torture: A Collection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 257-280.

Greenberg, Karen (2006) “Introduction: The Rule of Law Finds Its Golem: Judicial Torture Then and Now”, in Karen Greenberg (ed.), *The Torture Debate in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1-9. (online access through UGA Library)

Posner, Richard A. (2004) “Torture, Terrorism, and Interrogation”, in Sanford Levinson (ed.), *Torture: A Collection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 291-298.

Scarry, Elaine (2004) “Five Errors in the Reasoning of Alan Dershowitz”, in Sanford Levinson (ed.), *Torture: A Collection*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 281-290.

Additional Readings:

Bagaric, Mirko and Julie Clarke (2007) *Torture: When the Unthinkable is Morally Permissible*. Albany, NY: The State University of New York Press.

Greenberg, Karen (ed.) (2006) *The Torture Debate in America*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wisniewski, J. Jeremy and R. D. Emerick (2009) *The Ethics of Torture*. New York: Continuum, chapter 1.

04/15 – The USA PATRIOT Act

Few recent pieces of legislation have been so hotly debated as the USA PATRIOT Act. The “Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001”, as is its full name, was the major legal response to the terrorist attack of 9/11 and have become broadly seen as the victory of the state of security over the rule of law. But is the Patriot Act really at odds with the fundamental values of liberal democracy?

Compulsory Readings and Viewing:

Whitehead, John W. and Steven H. Aden (2000-2001) “Forfeiting ‘Enduring Freedom’ for ‘Homeland Security’: A Constitutional Analysis of the USA PATRIOT Act and the Justice Department’s Anti-Terrorism Initiatives”, *American University Law Review* 51(5): 1081-1133.

Optional Reading:

[*Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism \(USA PATRIOT Act\) Act Of 2001*](#)

04/20 – The Internet

The Internet has given a whole new dimension to the struggle of extremists. It can virtually connect isolated individuals, giving them a sense of purpose and strength they

would not have had without the Internet. It also creates 'basement terrorists', i.e. people attacking websites etc. from their basement computers. And, as a fundamentally international and open network, it is extremely difficult to control by one specific country. So, how to respond?

Compulsory Reading:

Gill, Paul, Emily Corner, Maura Conway, Amy Thornton, Mia Bloom and John Horgan (2017) "Terrorist Use of the Internet by the Numbers: Quantifying Behaviors, Patterns, and Processes", *Criminology & Public Policy* 16(1): 99-117.
Szamania, Susan and Phelix Fincher (2017) "Countering Violent Extremism Online and Offline", *Criminology & Public Policy* 16(1): 119-125.

Additional Readings:

Freiburger, Tina and Jeffrey S. Crane (2008) "A Systematic Examination of Terrorist Use of the Internet", *International Journal of Cyber Criminology* 2(1): 309-319.
Hoffman, Bruce (2006) "[The Use of the Internet by Islamic Extremists](#)", Testimony presented to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, on May 4, 2006.
Whine, Michael (2000) "[The Use of the Internet by Far Right Extremists](#)", in Brian Loader and Douglas Thomas (ed.), *Cybercrime: Law, Security and Privacy in the Information Age*. London: Routledge.

04/22 – Countering Violent Extremism (CVE)

Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) has become one of the fastest growing sectors in counterterrorism. Around the world, governments have invested billions of dollars in CVE policies and a blooming industry of CVE organizations has emerged. But how do CVE policies relate to liberal democracy?

Guest Lecture: Vidhya Ramalingam (Moonshot)

Compulsory Reading:

Kundnani, Arun and Ben Hayes (2018) [The Globalization of Countering Violent Extremism Policies: Undermining Human Rights, Instrumentalizing Civil Society](#). Amsterdam: Transnational Institute.

04/27 – Different Threats, Same Response?

Most liberal democracies are confronted with a broad variety of different political threats. Not only do different groups have different ideologies, they also differ in terms of the severity of the threat as well as the relationship to the (majority) population. Do responses also differ or do states apply a "one size fits all" approach to CVE?

Compulsory Reading:

Jämte, Jan and Rune Ellefsen (2020) "Countering Extremism(s): Differences in Local Prevention of Left-Wing, Right-Wing and Islamist Extremism", *Journal of Deradicalization* 24 (Fall): 191-231.

04/29 – How *Should* Liberal Democracies Respond to Threats?

In this final class we discuss the crucial question: how can liberal democracies defend themselves against political threats without undermining their own values?