

World Politics POLS/ SIS 426 Spring 2015

Instructor: Aseem Prakash
Class Time: Monday and Wednesday, 12:30-2:20 p.m.
Class Location: Smith 205
Office Hours: By Appointment
Office: 39 Gowen
E-mail: aseem@uw.edu
Home Page: <http://faculty.washington.edu/aseem/>

Teaching Assistant: Hyo Won Lee (lovehyo@uw.edu)
Office hours: Monday and Wednesday, 2:30-3:30 (Gowen 30)

Objective

Robert Dahl, one of the most famous political scientists (and UW alum), described politics as who gets what, how and when. World Politics is no different. We see conflict and cooperation in every sphere. The choices we make as consumer are also political choices. I want to introduce a more expansive notion of politics in this course. You will read and explore topics such as power transitions, democratization, gender issues, trade politics, public health, information technology 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. I have also arranged for lectures by eminent professionals in the field. 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 debates 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

I will use articles only which will be made available here:
<https://catalyst.uw.edu/workspace/lovehyo/44508/>

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:

Paper #1 (3-4 pages, single-spaced)

A topical and important question currently facing the global community is how to respond to Iran's 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. 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. Complicating the issue is the division within the Legislative and Executive branches of the US government regarding the appropriate strategy, and the ongoing conflict in Syria, Yemen, and Iraq that has turned this issue into a wider subject of Middle Eastern politics.

Why do actors advocate different policy choices on how to regulate Iran's nuclear program? Identify the specific policy options advocated by Iran, US (Executive Branch), and Israel. What objectives 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). The paper is due April 29. Please bring a printed copy to the class; email submissions are not accepted.

Grading Criteria for Paper 1:**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 #2 (3-4 pages, single-spaced)

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). The paper is due May 20. Please bring a printed copy to the class; email submissions are not accepted.

Grading Criteria for Paper 2:

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 papers. If for some reason you are unable to attend the class, please take my/Hyo's permission *prior* to the class.

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

You will be involved in a group project (3 students per group). We will focus on policy and political challenges at the global, regional, and domestic levels. 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 3-5 key actors. A team of three 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 email an article each for their class colleagues to review prior to the class. We expect all students, presenters as well as non-presenters, to review these articles. We might test your knowledge of this material in an announced quiz.

Your in-class presentation and the report should address the following questions:

1. Please briefly describe your actor (resources, membership, history, leaders, etc.)
2. Why does this issue concern you? What stakes do you have? What is your main goal and how are your present and future interests related to this goal?
3. What are your strategies to accomplish this goal?
4. Do you think international intervention is required or do you think domestic actors will be able to sort this out among themselves?

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.

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:

- 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.

Along with one reading, please email your power point presentation to me prior to the class which I will post on the class webpage. The group report (5pages, single-spaced) is due June 3. Please bring a printed copy to the class; email submissions are not accepted.

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.

NOTE: if you are having “issues” with your group members, please contact Hyo at least a week prior to your presentation date. Make sure that you are checking your uw email; typically students use uw email address to coordinate activities with their group members.

Evaluation

Paper 1	30 points
Paper 2	30 points
Quizzes	20 points
Group project	20 points

Please Note:

- 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 Hyo in the class. If you are not well (and have emailed me, called me prior to the due date, or requested one of your friends to inform me), we will accept late submissions or submission via email.
- 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 Hyo in advance. Merely sending an email informing Hyo 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.
- I will follow UW’s policy on plagiarism:
<http://depts.washington.edu/grading/issue1/honesty.htm#plagiarism>

Class Schedule

Session 1

Monday, March 30

Introduction

Session 2

Wednesday, April 1

Theories of World Politics

- Walt. 1998. International Relations: One World, Many Theories. *Foreign Policy*, Spring, 29-44.
- Sil and Katzenstein, 2010. Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics, Reconfiguring Problems and Mechanisms across Research Tradition, *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(2): 411-431.
- Lake, Why Ism are Evil. 2011. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55: 465-480.

Session 3

Monday, April 6

Global Transitions

- Kennedy. 1984. The First World War and the International Power System. *International Security*, 9(1): 7-40.
- Bienhart. 1997. An Illusion of Our Time. *New Republic*, October 20: 20-24.
- Layne, 2009. The Waning of U.S. Hegemony – Myth or Reality. *International Security*, 34(1): 147-172.

Session 4

Wednesday, April 8

State Building

- Fukuyama, 2004. The Imperatives of State Building. *Journal of Democracy*. 5(2).
- Englebert and Tull. 2008. Postconflict Reconstruction in Africa: Flawed Ideas about Failed States. *International Security*, 32(4): 106-139.
- Kaplan, 2008. The Remarkable Story of Somaliland. *Journal of Democracy*, 19(3): 143-157.

Session 5

Monday, April 13

Trade Politics: Global Supply Chains

Boston Review symposium: *Can Global Brands Create Just Supply Chains?* May/June 2013.

- Documentary: Fashion Victims, <http://topdocumentaryfilms.com/fashion-victims/>
- Essay by Richard Locke
- Responses by
 - Isaac Shapiro
 - Jodi L. Short and Michael W. Toffel
 - Hannah Jones
 - Aseem Prakash

- Layna Mosley
- Drusilla Brown

Session 6

Wednesday, April 15

Trade Politics: World Trade Organization

- Goldstein and Martin, 2000, Legalization, Trade Liberalization, and Domestic Politics: A Cautionary Note, *International Organization* 54 (3)
- Steinberg, 2002, In the Shadow of Law or Power? Consensus-Based Bargaining and Outcomes in the GATT/WTO, *International Organization* 56 (2)

Session 7 (G1-G8: make sure to email a reading each by April 19)

Monday, April 20

Israel/Palestine (Israeli-Palestinian conflict)

- G1: Israel
- G2: The Palestinian Authority
- G3: Hamas
- G4: United States (Executive Branch)

Yemen

- G5: Houthi Rebels
- G6: Saudi Arabia
- G7: Pakistan
- G8: United States

Session 8

Wednesday, April 22

NGO Politics

- Salmon, 1994. The Rise of the Non-Profit Sector. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4).
- Clifford, 2002. Merchants of Morality. *Foreign Policy*, March/April: 36-45.
- Dupuy et al. 2015. Stop Meddling in my Country! Governments' Restrictions on Foreign Aid to Non-Governmental Organizations, http://jamesron.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Dupuy_Ron_Prakash_2014_Backlash_Against_Aid_integrated.pdf

Session 9

Monday, April 27 (G9-G16: make sure to email a reading each by April 26)

Iraq-Kurdistan

- G9: Iraqi Government
- G10: Massoud Barzani, Kurdish leader
- G11: Turkey
- G12: United States

Expansion of the UN Security Council

- G13: US
- G14: China
- G15: South Africa
- G16: Pakistan

Paper 1 is due April 29

Session 10

Wednesday, April 29

Global Health Politics

Peter Small, Gates Foundations

- Global and regional mortality from 235 causes of death for 20 age groups in 1990 and 2010, *The Lancet*, 2012.
- *Financing Global Health for All*, Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation, 2012.
- Global Epidemiology of Tuberculosis, *Seminars in Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*, 2013.

Readings will be emailed and uploaded on Catalyst

Session 11

Monday, May 4

Global Environmental Politics: Climate Security

Doug Smith, EPA

Readings will be emailed

Session 12

Wednesday, May 6

Global Environmental Politics: Enforcement and Monitoring

Doug Smith, EPA

Readings will be emailed

Session 13

Monday, May 11

UK in Global Politics

Richard Wood, UK Embassy, Washington DC

Readings to be emailed

Session 14

Wednesday, May 13

Leadership in Global Governance (*Global Policy Symposium*)

- Adrienne Héritier and Aseem Prakash, "A Resource-based View of the EU's Regional and International Leadership."
- Angel Saz-Carranza, "Agents as Broker: Leadership in Multilateral Organizations."
- Walter Mattli and Jack Seddon, "New Organizational Leadership: Non-State Actors in Global Economic Governance."

Session 15

Monday, May 18 (G17-G24: make sure to email a reading each by May 17)

The Future of NATO

G17: US

G18: Germany

G19: Poland

G20: Russia

N. Korea (Nuclear program)

G21: North Korea

G22: South Korea

G23: United States

G24: China

Paper 2 is due May 20

Session 16

Wednesday, May 20

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).
- Aditi Mitra. 2011. To Be or Not to Be a Feminist in India. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work*, 26(2): 182-200.
- Amina Jamal. 2006. Gender, Citizenship, and the Nation-State in Pakistan: Willful Daughters or Free Citizens? *Signs*, 31(2): 283-304.

Session 17

Monday, May 25

MEMORIAL DAY: NO CLASS

Session 18

Wednesday, May 27

Information Technology and Economic Development

Salil Dave, Microsoft

Readings will be emailed

Session 19

Monday, June 1 (G25-G32: make sure to email a reading each by May 30)

Ebola

G25: WHO

G26: CDC

G27: Liberia

G28: Doctors without Borders

China's Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank

G29: China

G30: US

G31: UK

G32: Japan

Group Report is due June 3

Session 20

Wednesday, June 3

Energy Politics

- Gasland, DVD NVG 197
- Blackwill and O'Sullivan. 2014. America's Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution. *Foreign Affairs*, March/April 2014.
- Francis McGowan. 2014. Regulating innovation: European Responses to Shale Gas Development. *Environmental Politics*. 23(1).
- Parfomak, Pirog, Luther, and Vann. 2013. *Keystone XL Pipeline Project: Key Issues*
http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2016&context=key_workplace