Answer one of the following prompts with an essay. **Upload a copy to Drop Box on TRACS before 11:00 AM on October 17th and bring a hard copy to class.**

Machiavelli, in *The Prince*, suggests that the leader of a government needs to do whatever is necessary to preserve the integrity of their state, even if that means committing unvirtuous acts such as murder and manipulation. This is because Machiavelli anticipates widespread evils to occur in a time of chaos, and he wants leaders to avoid such scenarios. To Machiavelli, “the ends justify the means” when it comes to political strategy.

However, Desmond Tutu, in “Nuremberg or National Amnesia: A Third Way”, addresses a scenario in which such horrible acts have occurred on either side that the state cannot move forward without addressing them in some fashion. Calling the guilty to answer for their crimes would lead to societal collapse – the guilty, here, have the military power. However, it would be impossible to simply forget it all happened and to merely forgive the guilty parties. He quotes George Santayana’s famous saying that “Those who forget the past are doomed to repeat it,” and, besides, to grant a general amnesty “would in effect be to victimize the victims . . . a second time” (p. 234). The only option available is a combination of truth and reconciliation: amnesty will only be granted to those who fully admit their crimes.

These authors posit two basic positions one can take with regards to conflict resolution. Either one side can be stopped at whatever means necessary, or the two sides can strike a compromise.

Prompt 1

Lin Tse-hsü speaks for an empire in a perilous position. **The British, who have military superiority**, disregard Chinese sovereignty and illegally sell opium to the Chinese people. This situation has saved England from economic ruin at a great expense to China, who, in this scenario, are experiencing a drug crisis. China needs to halt the opium trade and England needs it to continue. **Ignoring history**, imagine that Lin Tse-hsü’s letter was ignored by Queen Victoria, and nothing has changed. **How should China resolve this conflict? Are further attempts for truth and reconciliation, as laid out by Tutu, called for? Should China seek to undermine British opium trades in a Machiavellian fashion? Is there even a third way to resolve the conflict?**

Prompt 2

The aliens from Kapteyn B have taken over Earth! (Despite early reports, they turned out to be evil.) A small group of them have seized control over the general mass of humanity and have begun treating humans – directly or indirectly – humans as second-class citizens or worse. Tensions are building and we need to respond, but the aliens retain technological superiority. We can’t simply eject the aliens; their technology would advance humanity far more quickly than our own development would. The aliens, too, can’t leave; it turns out that a rare and previously unknown mineral in the earth’s crust is crucial for the alien technology. This mineral is more
highly concentrated here than anywhere they’ve ever seen, but the industrial processes needed to obtain it may be damaging to human interests. The first few rounds of negotiations were not promising: the aliens assure us that nothing is amiss, but they will not disclose their methods or documents, and they will not allow us to directly observe them. You are an advisor to what’s left of the governments of Earth. **How should Earth resolve this conflict? Are further attempts for truth and reconciliation, as laid out by Tutu, called for? Should the governments of Earth seek to undermine the alien research in a Machiavellian fashion? Is there even a third way to resolve the conflict?**

If you want to envision an alternative scenario, you are more than welcome to. The only condition is that, whatever your scenario may be, each party needs something from the other one. It can’t be an issue that can be resolved without conflict. **You need to get this scenario approved by me beforehand or your final paper grade will be penalized.**

Prompt 3:

Think back on your life. What conflicts have you witnessed or experienced between two sides that needed resolution in some way? **How should the conflict have been resolved? Were further attempts for truth and reconciliation, as laid out by Tutu, called for? Should one side have sought to undermine the other in a Machiavellian fashion? Would a third way have been more effective in resolving the conflict?**

Tips for success:
In these papers, I expect you to position your argument in relation to the arguments we have read. If your position is similar to an author we read, you need to bring them up.

**Use clear definitions, specific evidence, and a logical organization.**
**You need a minimum of 3 points on top of a counterargument.**
**Do not use examples that are present in the text or have been used in class.**
You may use your personal experience as anecdotal evidence for your argument but **you may not write a narrative.** If this is confusing, ask questions.

Format requirements:
**750 word minimum**
Double-spaced, 12 point Times New Roman, with 1-inch margins and indented paragraphs
Page numbers in the top right-hand corner
The first page of your paper should begin like this (replace with appropriate information):
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