

April 22, 2019

World Politics POLS/ SIS 426 Spring 2019

Instructor: Aseem Prakash
Class Time: Monday and Wednesday, 12:30-2:20 p.m.
Class Location: Smith 211
Office Hours: By Appointment
Office: 39 Gowen
E-mail: aseem@uw.edu
Home Page: <http://faculty.washington.edu/aseem/>

Teaching Assistant: Christianna Parr (parr182@uw.edu)
Office: Gowen 24
Office Hours: Monday 2:30 - 4:30 p.m.

Objective

Harold Lasswell, one of the most famous political scientists, described politics as who gets what, when and how. World Politics is no different. We see conflict and cooperation in virtually every sphere. We signal our politics in elections and in conversations. The choices we make as consumers are also political choices. Thus, we need to think of a more expansive notion of politics. You will, therefore, read and explore topics such as power transitions, democratization, gender issues, trade politics, public health and development, NGOs, foreign aid, and energy politics. I adopt a non-traditional teaching style that includes (along with the traditional lectures) class discussions and group projects. By the end of the course, I hope all of you will develop a more nuanced understanding of world politics and feel empowered to contribute to policy debates. Remember, participation by informed citizens in policy deliberation is essential for sustaining our democracy. Further, I hope this course and the broader UW experience will motivate you to think of politics and public service as your career.

Readings

No text books; I will use articles only. I will either provide their URL in the syllabus or upload them on Canvas.

This is a Device Free Class

Research suggests that the use of electronic devices in class can be distracting for you and for your colleagues. Therefore, to enhance your learning experience, during the class you are not allowed to use phones, tablets, laptops or any Internet connectable devices. Please take notes using a pen and a note book.

Course Expectations

I will adopt multiple pedagogical tools. To maximize your learning from this course, it is imperative that **you read the required texts in advance** and actively participate in class discussions. You will be graded on the following:

(Reflection) Paper #1

(1 page of text; references on page 2, single-spaced; **Due Date: April 17**)

As informed individuals, we must develop skills to convey our ideas to multiple audiences. This skill is sometimes lacking even (or particularly) among the educated. There are several platforms for excellent public scholarship including the *Washington Post's Monkey Cage* and *The Conversation*. Please subscribe to any daily "blog" as a part of your course work. Please pick any blog published on this platform since January 1, 2019. This blog should pertain to an issue with implications for world politics. For example, you can read a blog on Brexit and comment its implication for global politics. If you focus on a US-centric issue, the onus is on you to demonstrate that it has implications for world politics. Your reflection piece (paper) should have three sections:

- Section 1: What is the core argument?
- Section 2: What alternative explanations were considered (please make sure that you find a blog that identifies multiple explanations)?
- Section 3: Did you find the evidence persuasive? Why or why not?

Most blogs typically have embedded link to other articles. In writing your reflection piece in the above format, please read **any two** of the embedded articles and link them to the blog you are reflecting on. For example, you may find one article that helps you identify the core argument (section 1 of the reflection paper) and another article that provides evidence for the alternative explanation (section 2 of the reflection paper). When outlining the core argument, please briefly describe how article #1 piece helps you in this task. Similarly, when identifying alternative explanation, please briefly describe how article #2 provides the evidence. Next, you will read the blog and two articles that this blog has referenced.

Please bring a printed copy of your reflection paper to the class on April 17; email submissions are not accepted

Grading Criteria for Paper 1:

A (3.9-4.0)

This paper clearly identifies and succinctly describes the core argument and any alternative arguments. The author asserts a position either in support or against the evidence described in the article and supports their position with reason. The paper includes links to two additional articles. This paper exemplifies strong and able writing, with appropriate language, clarity, organization, grammar and flow. This paper is easy to read yet challenges the reader to think.

A-(3.8-3.5)

This paper is similar to an 'A' paper, but it is missing at least one of the elements found in an 'A' paper. The author asserts a position either in support or against the evidence described in the article and supports their position with reason. This paper, however, is weakened by either mechanics and/or clarity.

B+ (3.4-3.2)

This paper includes all required elements and asserts a position in response to the article, but the reasoning in support of the position is at times unclear. For example, ideas are slightly muddled, but in general there is a satisfactory level of understanding. This paper is strong in writing.

B (3.1-2.9)

This paper is similar to a B+ paper. It illustrates a similar comprehension of the article and takes a position in response to the article. This paper, however, differs from a B+ paper because the reasoning is weaker or because it is missing another required element. This paper also needs some improvement in writing.

B- (2.8-2.5)

This paper lacks a clear position in response to the article. While it attempts to identify the core argument of the article, it is overly simplistic in its explanation. This paper demands attention to writing mechanics.

C (2.4-1.9)

This paper is vague. This paper is not able to identify the core argument or take a position in response to the article. Writing mechanics are poor.

Below

This paper does not respond to the prompt. It does not identify the core argument or take a position in response to the article. The paper is also missing additional required elements. Writing mechanics are poor.

Paper #2

(5 pages of text; single-spaced; references on the 6th page; **Due Date: May 8**)

The Trump administration has reimposed sanctions on Iran but other Western powers have not done so. Broadly, the global community continues to debate on how to respond to Iran's alleged interest in developing and potentially acquiring nuclear weapons. Many, especially in Israel and Saudi Arabia, believe a "strong" response is required to prevent this development, and lifting of the sanctions by the Obama Administration was a big mistake. Others, especially in Europe and in Russia, are less favorable towards the idea of a strong response to dissuade Iran from pursuing its nuclear ambitions and have therefore not reimposing sanctions. Complicating the issue is the ongoing conflicts in Syria, Yemen, and Iraq that have turned the Iran sanctions into a wider subject of Middle Eastern politics.

Why do actors advocate different policy choices (i.e., support or oppose reimposing of sanctions) on how to respond to Iran's nuclear program? Identify the specific policy options advocated by **Iran, the US and France**. What objectives do these actors wish to achieve? How might these actors think of the benefits and costs of their preferred option as well as the options offered by the other two actors? Make sure that you relate how domestic, regional or international considerations influence the perceptions of benefits and costs of various options.

Your paper should be directed towards an academic audience. You are expected to undertake research on this subject (**say, carefully read and reference 7-10 additional articles**). Newspaper articles and encyclopedia references do not constitute such sources. Wikipedia is also not an appropriate source for this either.

Please bring a printed copy of your paper to the class; email submissions are not accepted.

Grading Criteria for Paper 2:

A (3.9-4.0)

This paper asserts a very clear thesis and supports the central argument with evidence. The paper illustrates a thorough understanding of this policy issue. It is able to identify the specific policy options advocated by the three actors and the objectives these actors wish to achieve. This paper offers an insightful analysis of the benefits and costs of each policy option from the perspectives of the three actors. All points are relevant and sufficiently developed. This paper exemplifies strong and able writing, with appropriate language, clarity, organization, grammar and flow. This paper is easy to read yet challenges the reader to think.

A-(3.8-3.5)

On the whole, this paper presents a clear argument and is able to support it with evidence. This paper is similar to an 'A' paper, but it is missing at least one of the elements found in an 'A' paper. In content, this paper illustrates policy options from the perspectives of three actors and offers a good analysis of these actors' positions on these policies. This paper, however, is weakened by either mechanics and/or clarity.

B+ (3.4-3.2)

This paper has a central argument that is presented and engages class material, but at times it is weak in argumentation and/or using supporting evidence. This paper does engage sufficiently with the policy options proposed by these actors. It is sometimes unclear or vague on the position of the three actors' on different policy options. Ideas are slightly muddled, but in general there is a satisfactory level of understanding. This paper is strong in writing.

B (3.1-2.9)

This paper is similar to a B+ paper. It illustrates a similar level of accuracy and understanding of the literature. This paper, however, differs from a B+ paper because it

illustrates a weaker display of effective argumentation. Ideas are at times muddled, and argumentation may not always be effective and/or well supported, and the central argument is either unclear or argued inconsistently. This paper also needs some improvement in writing.

B- (2.8-2.5)

This paper lacks a clear central argument. While it attempts to identify policy options and the actors' positions on them, it is overly simplistic in its explanation. This paper demands attention to writing mechanics.

C (2.4-1.9)

This paper has a strikingly vague argument. This paper is not able to identify policy options or the actors' positions on them. The paper minimally engages with the relevant literature. Writing mechanics are poor.

Below

This paper does not respond to the question. It lacks a central argument. Ideas are strikingly muddled and vague. It does not engage with the literature. Writing mechanics are poor.

Paper #3

(4 pages of text, single-spaced; References on the 5th page; **Due Date: May 29**)

Many commentators have employed the Vietnam analogy to describe America's predicament in Afghanistan. Is Afghanistan turning out to be America's Vietnam? Examine the validity of the Vietnam analogy to Afghanistan in terms of three dimensions: entry, commitment, and exit. Given the above assessments, what insights from the Vietnam War can be applied to the Afghanistan situation? How have America's domestic politics and international commitments influenced America's policy choices in both wars? Your paper should be directed towards an academic audience.

You are expected to conduct research on this subject (**carefully read and reference five articles each on both wars**). Newspaper articles and encyclopedia references do not constitute such sources. Wikipedia is also not an appropriate source for this either.

Please bring a printed copy of the paper to the class; email submissions are not accepted.

Grading Criteria for Paper 3:

A (3.9-4.0)

This paper answers the question by asserting a very clear thesis and supports the central argument with evidence. This paper considers how others might respond to this assessment. All points are relevant and sufficiently developed. This paper exemplifies strong and able writing, with appropriate language, clarity, organization, grammar and flow. This paper is easy to read yet challenges the reader to think.

A- (3.8-3.5)

On the whole, this paper presents a clear argument and is able to support it with evidence. This paper is similar to an A paper, but it is missing at least one of the elements found in an A paper. This paper, however, is weakened by either mechanics and/or clarity.

B+ (3.4-3.2)

This paper has a central argument that is presented and presents the evidence, but at times it is weak in argumentation and/or using supporting evidence. Ideas are slightly muddled, but in general there is a satisfactory level of understanding. This paper is strong in writing mechanics.

B (3.1-2.9)

This paper is similar to a B+ paper. It illustrates a similar level of accuracy and the use of evidence. This paper, however, differs from a B+ because it illustrates a weaker display of effective argumentation and/or use of supporting evidence. Ideas are at times muddled, and evidence may not always be effective and/or well supported, and the central argument either lacks clarity or is argued inconsistently. This paper also needs some improvement in writing mechanics.

B- (2.8-2.5)

This paper lacks a clear central argument and argumentation. It demands attention to writing mechanics.

C (2.4-1.9)

This paper has a strikingly vague argument. The paper only minimally provides supporting evidence. Writing mechanics are poor.

Below

This paper does not respond to the question. It lacks a central argument. Ideas are strikingly muddled and vague. It does not provide evidence to support the argument. Writing mechanics are poor.

Class discussions and Unannounced Quizzes

I want students to actively participate in class discussions, including discussions following the guest lectures, student presentations, and the documentaries. To create incentives for your active participation, we will have unannounced quizzes. Please ensure that you attend every session because you will not be allowed to write make-up quizzes. If for some reason you are unable to attend the class, please take Christianna's permission *prior* to the class. For example, if you are ill, please email us *prior* to the class. We will make reasonable accommodations such as allowing you to turn in your paper at a later date or not penalizing you for missed quizzes.

Group project

(5 pages of text; single-spaced; references on the 6th page **Due Date: June 5**)

You will participate in a group project (2-3 students per group) that will examine a policy challenge at the global, regional, or domestic level. In every policy context there are multiple actors, each with its own perspective. Our objective is to understand a policy issue from the perspective of these actors.

For a given policy issue, we have identified multiple actors. A team of 2-3 students will be assigned the role of a given actor. Each team will present their actors' perspective in the class and also turn in a written report. We expect each team to survey the relevant literature on the subject. Based on this literature survey, **each team will select one article and email it to their class colleagues to review prior to the class (if there are six teams scheduled to present on a given day, the class will read six articles)**. This should be a blog, a journal article, a policy report, or a book chapter.

I expect all students, presenters as well as non-presenters, to review these articles. I might test your knowledge of this material in an unannounced quiz.

Your paper and the in-class presentation should have four primary sections along with introductory and concluding sections:

Introduction

Section 1: The puzzle (What is the problem? Why/how did it originate?)

Section 2: Your position (What is the position of your government?)

Section 3: Critiques (What critiques do other actors have on your position and what is your response?)

Section 4: Solutions (Given all of the above, what solutions or compromises do you recommend?)

Conclusion

Your group will present to the class for 7-8 minutes followed by a brief Q&A. To save on time, your team should probably assign one member the responsibility for making the presentation. However, all group members should be present to respond to questions from the audience.

Making an effective power point presentation is an important skill. You can say a lot in 7-8 minutes if you are well prepared. Here are some ideas:

- This is a role-playing exercise. Speak in first person and defend the position of your country.
- No need to summarize the issue or provide a background.
- Be clear and focused. Highlight your key points. Don't ramble on. Stay on message.
- **Make eye contact with the audience; do not read your presentation.** Ideally, you should be able to take a quick look at the slide and then elaborate. Cards are also fine as long as you do not spend most of your time reading them.
- Don't talk fast. Make sure your audience is able to follow you.

- Enliven your presentation with visuals and even short video clips.
- Ensure that you have a **maximum of 5 slides, and not more than 5 bullet points per slide**. Note, the slides should focus the audience's attention to key issues. If there is too much text, your audience will spend time reading the slide, instead of hearing what you have to say.
- Practice the presentation prior to the class. If you can't persuade anybody to attend your practice talk, just do it by yourself.

Each group should email its power point presentation to Christianna prior to the class; this will be made available on the class Canvas page as well (recall, the group is also selecting one article to be shared with the class).

For submission of the final group report please submit it online on Canvas on June 5th. The assignment submission box can be found under the "Assignments" tab on Canvas. Please let Christianna know prior to the submission date if your group is running into "issues".

For those in the audience, please review the readings prior to the class and take extensive notes during the presentations. **It is likely that we will have a quiz that requires you to reflect on these presentations.**

Logistics

Make sure that you are checking your uw email; typically students use @uw email address to coordinate activities with their group members. In previous classes, some group members have also shared phone numbers to facilitating texting – but given the privacy issue, this is something you need to decide for yourself.

If you are having “issues” with your group members, please contact Christianna at least a week prior to your presentation date.

Evaluation

Paper 1 (April 17)	15 points
Paper 2 (May 8)	30 points
Paper 3 (May 29)	30 points
Group project (June 5)	10 points
Quizzes	15 points

Please Note:

- **This course qualifies for the W (writing) credit.**
- I reserve the right to change or modify the syllabus without prior notice.
- Papers should be turned in on the due date. Please hand them over to me or to Christianna in the class. If you are not well (and have contacted Christianna prior to the due date), we will accept late submissions or submission via email.
- I will follow UW's policy on plagiarism:

<http://depts.washington.edu/grading/issue1/honesty.htm#plagiarism>

- If you cannot turn your paper in on the due date for some other reason (e.g. you will be out of town), please contact Christianna **in advance**. Merely sending an email informing Christianna that the paper will be turned in late will not suffice. While we will accommodate reasonable requests regarding late submission, we may deny your request as well.

Class Schedule

Session 1

Monday, April 1

Introduction

Session 2

Wednesday, April 3

World Politics

- Walt. 1998. International Relations: One World, Many Theories. *Foreign Policy*, Spring, 29-44.
- Layne, 2009. The Waning of U.S. Hegemony – Myth or Reality. *International Security*, 34(1): 147-172
- Diamond. 2015. Facing Up to the Democratic Recession. *Journal of Democracy* 26 (1): 141-155.

Session 3

Monday, April 8

State Building

- *Afghanistan After Us*, Season 3, Episode, 13, VICE on HBO.
- Fukuyama, 2004. The Imperatives of State Building. *Journal of Democracy*. 5(2).
- Ahmad. 2014. The Security Bazaar. *International Security*. 39, 3, 89-4.

Session 4

Wednesday, April 10

Climate Change

- [Palm Oil Was Supposed to Help Save the Planet. Instead It Unleashed a Catastrophe.](#) *The New York Times*, November 20, 2018.
- [The Green New Deal and the new politics of climate change](#) *Forbes.com* March 13, 2019.
- [Americans say they're worried about climate change -- so why don't they vote that way?.](#) *The Conversation*, February 4, 2019.
- [Can the climate movement survive populism? Lessons from 'yellow vest' protests.](#) *The Hill*, December 6, 2018.
- [We Feel Your Pain: Environmentalists, Coal Miners, and “Embedded Environmentalism.”](#) *Solutions*, 7(January-February, 2016): 32-37

Session 5*Monday, April 15*Trade Politics

- *Fashion Victims*, <http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/fashion-victims/>
- Locke. 2013. *Boston Review symposium: Can Global Brands Create Just Supply Chains?* <https://bostonreview.net/forum/can-global-brands-create-just-supply-chains-richard-locke>
- Lim and Prakash. 2016. Do Economic Problems at Home Undermine Worker Safety Abroad?: A Panel Study, 1980-2009, *World Development*

Session 6 Paper 1 is turned in*Wednesday, April 17*Refugees and Statelessness

- *Escape to Europe*, Season 4, Episode, 38, VICE on HBO
- Emily Schulthesis and Kirshandev Calamur, 2018. [A Nonbinding Migration Pact Is Roiling Politics in Europe](#). *The Atlantic*.
- Chris McKenna and Brennan Hoban. 2017. [Problems and solutions to the international migrant crisis](#). *Brookings Now*.
- Tim McDonnell. 2019. [Climate change creates a new migration crisis for Bangladesh](#). *National Geographic*.
- Neli Esipova, Anita Pugliese and Julie Ray. 2018. [More Than 750 Million Worldwide Would Migrate If They Could](#). *Gallup*.

Session 7*Monday, April 22*Populism in Europe

Guest Speaker

Niko Switek

- Rovira Kaltwasser, Cristóbal, Paul A. Taggart, Paulina Ochoa Espejo, and Pierre Ostiguy, eds. 2017. *The Oxford Handbook of Populism*. First edition. Oxford Handbooks. Oxford, United Kingdom ; New York: Oxford University Press, p. 1-24 (Introduction)
- Rooduijn, Matthijs. 2019. "State of the Field: How to Study Populism and Adjacent Topics? A Plea for Both More and Less Focus" *European Journal of Political Research* 58 (1): 362–72.
- Franzmann, Simon T. 2016. "Calling the Ghost of Populism: The AfD's Strategic and Tactical Agendas until the EP Election 2014." *German Politics* 25 (4): 457–79

Session 8

Wednesday, April 25

Russia under Putin

- Interview with Gary Kasparov: <https://www.msnbc.com/morning-joe/watch/author--no-future-in-russia-under-putin-551911491737?playlist=associated>
- Henry Hale, Russian Patronal Politics Beyond Putin, *Dædalus*, Spring 2017
- *Russia's Great Power Strategy under Putin and Medvedev*
<https://www.ui.se/globalassets/ui.se-eng/publications/ui-publications/russias-great-power-strategy-under-putin-and-medvedev-min.pdf>
- 15 years of Vladimir Putin: 15 ways he has changed Russia and the world
<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/may/06/vladimir-putin-15-ways-he-changed-russia-world>
- Why Many Young Russians See a Hero in Putin,
<https://www.nationalgeographic.com/magazine/2016/12/putin-generation-russia-soviet-union/>
- Russia Resurgent.
http://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/cover_story/2017/01/how_vladimir_putin_engineered_russia_s_return_to_global_power.html

Session 9

Monday, April 29

NAFTA

- G1: Mexico
- G2: Canada
- G3: United States

Lebanon

- G4: Hezbollah
- G5: Saad Hariri
- G6: Israel
- G7: Jordan

Session 10

Wednesday, May 1

Syria

- G8: Syrian Government
- G9: Kurds
- G10: Turkey
- G11: United States

Huawei

- G12: US
- G13: China
- G14: EU

Session 11*Monday, May 6*Gender Politics

- *Saving Face*, a Documentary; DVD WMM 059
- Abdulmumini A. Oba. 2008. Female Circumcision as Female Genital Mutilation: Human Rights or Cultural Imperialism? *Global Jurist*, 8(3).
- Aseem Prakash and Joshua Eastin. [Why is India 'missing' 63 million women — even though development is roaring?](#) *Washington Post/Monkey Cage*, February 8, 2018.
- Lori Beaman, Esther Duflo, Rohini Pande, Petia Topalova 2012. Female Leadership Raises Aspirations and Educational Attainment for Girls: A Policy Experiment in India. *Science*. Volume 335.

Session 12*Wednesday, May 8* **Paper 2 is due**#Me Too in Global Politics

Speaker:

Christianna Parr

- Meighan Stone and Rachel Vogelstein. [Celebrating #MeToo's Global Impact](#). *Foreign Policy*. March 7th 2019.
- Audrey Carlsen et al. [#MeToo Brought Down 201 Powerful Men. Nearly Half of Their Replacements Are Women](#). *NY Times*. Oct 29th 2018. (interactive article)
- Suyin Haynes and Aria Hangyu Chen. [How #MeToo is Taking On A Life Of Its Own in Asia](#). *Time Magazine*. Oct 9th 2018.
- Hannah Ellis-Petersen. ['Time To Start Talking About Consent': Thailand's Nascent #MeToo Moment](#). *The Guardian*. Jan 17th 2019.
- Katrin Bennhold. [Another Side of #MeToo: Male Managers Fearful of Mentoring Women](#). *NY Times*. Jan 27th 2019.
- Anna North. [Why Women Are Worried About #MeToo](#). *Vox*. April 5th 2018.

Session 13*Monday, May 13*Venezuela crisis

G15: Mexico

G16: Brazil

G17: China

European Refugee Crisis

G18: Italy

G19: Germany

G20: Turkey

Session 14*Wednesday, May 15*Food Politics

- Meathooked & End of Water, Season 4, Episode 5, VICE on HBO
- Zerbe (2004). Feeding the famine? American food aid and the GMO debate in Southern Africa. *Food Policy*, 29(6), 593-608.
- Fuchs & Kalfagianni (2010). The causes and consequences of private food governance. *Business and Politics*, 12(3).
- [How Much Food Do We Waste? Probably More Than You Think](#), *The New York Times*, December 12, 2017

Session 15*Monday, May 20*NGO Politics

- Salamon, 1994. The Rise of the Non-Profit Sector. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4).
- Clifford, 2002. [Merchants of Morality](#). *Foreign Policy*, March/April: 36-45.
- Kendra Dupuy, James Ron and Aseem Prakash. [Across the globe, governments are cracking down on civic organizations. This is why](#). *Washington Post/Monkey Cage* July 5, 2017

Session 16*Wednesday, May 22*The Future of NATO

G21: US

G22: Germany

G23: Poland

G24: Russia

US-N. Korea engagement

G25: Japan

G26: South Korea

G27: China

G28: North Korea

Monday, May 27: Memorial Day; N Class**Session 17***Wednesday, May 29 (Paper 3 is due)*Foreign Aid

- Afghan Money Pit. Season 2, Episode 11, VICE on HBO
- Easterly and Pfutze. 2008. Where Does the Money Go? Best and Worst Practices in Foreign Aid. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(2).
- Kuziemko, Ilyana, and Eric Werker. 2006. How much is a seat on the Security Council worth? Foreign aid and bribery at the United Nations." *Journal of Political Economy* 114(5): 905-930.

Session 18

Monday June 3

Accountability

- Grant, Ruth & Robert Keohane. 2005. Accountability and abuses of power in world politics. *American Political Science Review*, 99(1), 29-43.
- Ebrahim, Alnoor. 2005. Accountability myopia: Losing sight of organizational learning. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 34(1), 56-87.
- Jacqueline Peel and Hari M. Osofsky. 2018. A Rights Turn in Climate Change Litigation? *Transnational Environmental Law*. 7(1): 37-67.

Session 19 **(Group Report is due: Online Submission on Canvas)**

Wednesday, June 5

Uyghurs

G29: China

G30: Turkey

G31: Uyghurs

G32: European Union

China's Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank

G33: China

G34: US

G35: UK

G36: Japan