

World Politics

POLS/ SIS 426

Fall 2009

Instructor: Aseem Prakash
Class Time: Tuesday and Thursday, 1:30-3:20 p.m.
Class Location: Johnson, 102
Office Hours: By Appointment
Office: 39 Gowen
Voice: 206-543-2399
E-mail: aseem@u.washington.edu
Home Page: <http://faculty.washington.edu/aseem/>

Teaching Assistant: Brad Epperly
Office Location: Gowen 26
Office Hours: 11am-noon, Tues/Thurs
E-mail: epperly@u.washington.edu

Objective

This is an advanced course in international relations that explores topics such as financial crisis, power transitions, globalization, terrorism, ethnic conflict, NGOs, and environmental politics. I adopt a non-traditional teaching style that includes (along with the traditional lectures) class discussions, group projects, and audio-visual delivery of knowledge via documentaries. 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

No required books.

I have created an electronic course reserve: <http://www.lib.washington.edu/services/course/>. Please log on and download the articles.

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 pages, single-spaced)

A topical and important question currently facing the global community generally and the US in particular is how to respond to Iran's interest in developing and potentially acquiring nuclear weapons. Many, especially in the US and Israel, believe a strong response is required to prevent this development, as it would change the regional balance of power. Others, especially in Europe and in Russia, are less favorable towards the idea of sanctions or intervention in Iran as a means to dissuade the country from pursuing its nuclear ambitions. Complicating the issue is the recent domestic upheaval in Iran around the 2009 presidential elections and the popular unrest that followed.

This paper seeks to evaluate your understanding of IR theory, and your ability to identify how theoretical perspectives of IR (such as Realism, Liberalism, or Constructivism) might interpret this issue. Employ at least one of these theoretical perspectives to evaluate the proposed policy (unilateral action, multilateral action, sanctions, military intervention, engagement, etc.) along with its sequencing advocated by one group seeking to influence US policy, taking into account the positions of other relevant global actors. In other words, please do the following: First identify the various options (including their sequencing) floated by various actors. Second, explain how these options relate to different IR perspectives. Third, please explain which IR perspective is best able to explain the options outlined by any given actor.

Your paper should be directed towards an academic audience. You are expected to do some research to identify the main proponents of one of the policy perspectives on Iran, and their ideas and policy goals. *You are encouraged to use examples from the course readings and the documentaries to support your argument.* The paper is due October 27.

Grading Criteria for Paper 1:

A (3.9-4.0)

This paper answers the question by asserting a very clear thesis and supports the central argument with evidence using class material. The paper illustrates a thorough understanding of the theory selected and offers an insightful analysis of how an actor's position on Iranian nuclear ambitions is better understood in light of the theory. This paper considers how other IR perspectives 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 class material. 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 a strong understanding of the theory selected and how to apply one position on Iran to that theory. This paper considers how other IR theories might respond to this assessment. 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 a theoretical perspective, but it is sometimes unclear or vague on understanding the theory and its application. 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 theory and use of class material. This paper, however, differs from a B+ 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. It attempts to explain the theory selected but does not illustrate a thorough understanding of the theory and/or 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 does not offer an explanation of a theory, and fails to engage a theoretical perspective in evaluation of a response strategy to Iranian nuclear ambitions. The paper only minimally engages class material. 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 class material. Writing mechanics are poor.

Paper #2 (3 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? Your paper should be directed towards an academic audience. You are expected to conduct some research on this subject. The paper is due December 1.

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 and to critically examine the documentaries we will watch over the next several weeks. To create incentives for your active participation, you will write several short commentaries on a topic that we have either discussed previously or a one that we are scheduled to discuss that day (in short, we will have unannounced quizzes). You are likely to be asked to comment on the documentaries that we screen in the class. 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 permission prior to the class.

Swine Flu will be a major issue this quarter. We will follow university guidelines in this regard. Please look up the updates provided on the university website (<http://depts.washington.edu/chsweb/h1n1/>). If you are ill, please email us or leave a message on my voice mail *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 (typically 4 students per group). Your group will examine how the current economic crisis has impacted the politics and economics of a given country, and how this country has (successfully or unsuccessfully) responded to it. We will focus on the following countries:

Asia:	Saudi Arabia, Jordan, South Korea, India, China, Malaysia, Singapore
Africa:	Nigeria, Morocco, South Africa, Kenya, Libya, Angola, Uganda
Europe:	France, UK, Poland, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Slovenia, Armenia
S. America:	Chile, Argentina, Nicaragua, Ecuador
N. America:	Canada, Mexico
Australia & Oceania:	Australia

Your group will present to the class for about 15 minutes (six presentations per session) followed by a brief Q&A. Please email your power point presentation to me prior to the class which I will post to the class email list. A printed copy of the group report (five pages, single-spaced) is due December 3. Please take extensive notes during the presentations. It is very likely that we will have a quiz that requires you to reflect on these presentations.

Evaluation

Paper 1	30 points
Paper 2	30 points
Quizzes	30 points
Group project	10 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 the TA 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 the TA in advance. Merely sending an email informing the TA 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

1. Thursday, October 1

Introduction

2. Tuesday, October 6

IR Theories

- Snyder. 2004. One World, Rival Theories. *Foreign Policy*, 2004, Nov/Dec, 53-62.
- Walt. 1998. International Relations: One World, Many Theories. *Foreign Policy*, Spring, 29-44.

3. Thursday, October 8

Global Transitions: The Case of World War 1

- Kennedy. 1984. The First World War and the International Power System. *International Security*, 9(1): 7-40.
- Van Evera. 1984. The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War. *International Security*, 9(1): 58-107.
- Bienhart. 1997. An Illusion of Our Time. *New Republic*, October 20: 20-24.

4. Tuesday, October 13

New Transition: End of U.S. Hegemony?

- Snyder, 2003. Imperial Temptations. *The National Interest*, Spring: 29-41.
- Kennedy, 2008. The Greatest Superpower Ever. *New Perspectives Quarterly*, 19(2): 8-18.
- Layne, 2009. The Waning of U.S. Hegemony – Myth or Reality. *International Security*, 34(1): 147-172.
- Joffe. 2009. The Default Power. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(5): 21-35.
- Altman. 2009. Globalization in Retreat. *Foreign Affairs*. 88(4): 2-7.

5. Thursday, October 15

Global Financial Crisis

- Johnson. 2008. The Quite Coup. *The Atlantic*, May 2009.
- Schwartz. 2008. Housing, Global Finance and American Hegemony: Building Conservative Politics One Brick at a Time. *Comparative European Politics*, 6:3: 262-284.
- Sinclair and King. 2003. Private Actors and Public Policy: A Requiem for the New Basel Capital Accord. *International Political Science Review*. 24(3): 345-362.
- *Inside Meltdown*, Michael Kirk et al, PBS home video
- Deeg and O’Sullivan. 2009. The Political Economy of Global Finance. *World Politics*, 61(4): 731-763 (this is an optional reading).

6. *Tuesday, October 20*

Anglo-American Capitalism: An Assessment

- Krugman. 2009. How Did Economists Get It So Wrong? *New York Times Magazine*, September 2
- Immerwahr. 2009. Polanyi in the United States: Peter Drucker, Karl Polanyi, and the Midcentury Critique of Economic Society. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 70(3): 445-466
- Laski, 1934. The Roosevelt Experiment, *The Atlantic*, February.
- Bremmer. 2009. State Capitalism Comes of Age. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(3): 40-55.
- Soros, 1997. The Capitalist Threat. *Atlantic Monthly*, February, 45-58.
- Dietrich. 2003. J. K. Galbraith: Liberal Politics and the Economics of the Modern Business. *New Political Economy*, 8(3): 385-400.

7. *Thursday, October 22*

Democracy and Nation Building

- Fukuyama, 2004. The Imperatives of State Building. *Journal of Democracy*. 5(2).
- Englebret 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.
- McMohan. 2009. The Death of Dayton. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(5): 69-83.
- Zook. 2009. The Curious Case of Finland's Clean Politics. *Journal of Democracy*, 20(1): 157-168.

Paper 1 is due October 27

8. *Tuesday, October 27*

Violence and Democratization

Lecture by Stephan Hamberg

- Mansfield and Snyder. 1995. Democratization and War. *Foreign Affairs* 74(3): 79-97
- Barnett. 2006. Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States After War. *International Security*, 30(4): 87-112
- Zakaria. 1997. The Rise of Illiberal Democracy. *Foreign Affairs*. 76(6): 22-43.

9. *Thursday, October 29*

Group Presentations

Russia, Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Slovenia, Armenia

10. Tuesday, November 3
Islam, Politics, and Democracy

Lecture by Ziad Zaghrou

- Zubaida. 2000. Trajectories of Political Islam: Egypt, Iran and Turkey. *Political Quarterly*, 71 (1): 60-78.
- Munson, Ziad. 2001. Islamic Mobilization: Social Movement Theory and the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood. *the Sociological Quarterly*, 42 (4): 487-510.
- Bayat, Asef .1998. Revolution without Movement, Movement without Revolution: Comparing Islamic Activism in Iran and Egypt? *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 40 (1):136-169.

11. Thursday, November 5

Group Presentations:

Libya, Angola, France, UK, Poland, Australia

12. Tuesday, November, 10

Visit of Congressional Medal of Honor recipients

- Maj. Gen. Patrick Brady
- Lt. Col. Bruce Crandall
- Col. Robert Howard

13. Thursday, November 12

Group Presentations

Chile, Argentina, Ecuador, Canada, Mexico, Nicaragua

14. Tuesday, November 17

Ethnic Conflict

- Posen. 1993. The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict. *Survival*, 35(1):27-47.
- Mousseau, 2002/2003. Market civilization and its clash with terror. *International Security* 27(3).
- Moghadam. 2008/09. Motives for Martyrdom. *International Security*, 33(3): 46-78.
- No Man's Land (DVD MGM 067)

15. Thursday, November 19

Group Presentations:

Malaysia, Nigeria, Morocco, South Africa, Kenya, Uganda

16. Tuesday, November 24

India and Pakistan

- Ganguly. 2008. The Burden of History. *Journal of Democracy*, 19(4): 26-31.
- Schafler and Mitra. 2005. India as a Global Power?
- http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/051216_indiaglobalpwr.pdf
- Children of Taliban, PBS documentary:
<http://changinguppakistan.wordpress.com/2009/04/16/children-of-the-taliban/>

Thursday, November 26
No Class, Thanksgiving

Paper 2 is due December 1

17. *Tuesday, December 1*

Russia: New Cold War?

- McFaul and Stoner-Weiss. The Myth of the Authoritarian Model, *Foreign Affairs*
- Lilia Shvetsova . Vladimir Putin. *Foreign Policy*
- Stephen Sestanovich. What has Moscow Done? Rebuilding US-Russia Relations. *Foreign Affairs*.
- Yuri Fedorov. Will Moscow Help With Trouble Spots? *Current History*.
- Schleifer and Treisman, A Normal Country: Russia after Communism. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* (optional).

18. *Thursday, December 3*

Group Presentations:

Saudi Arabia, Jordan, South Korea, India, China, Singapore

19. *Tuesday, December 8*

NGOs in World Politics

Presentation by Dean Chahim on NGOs in Nicaragua

- Salmon, 1994. The Rise of the Non-Profit Sector. *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4).
- Henderson, 2002. Selling Civil Society. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(2): 139-167.
- Clifford, 2002. Merchants of Morality. *Foreign Policy*, March/April: 36-45.
- Kolinsky, and Reis. 2009. Transnational and Domestic Relation of NGOs in Brazil. *World Development*, 37(3): 714-725.
- Ahmad. 2007. The Careers of NGO Field –Workers in Bangladesh. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 17(3): 349-366.

20. *Thursday, December 10*

Environmental Politics

- Barkin. 2003. The Counterintuitive Relationship between Globalization and Climate Change. *Global Environmental Politics*, 3(3).
- McAlpine, Etter, Fearnside, Seabrook, Laurance. 2009. Increasing World Consumption of Beef as a Driver of Regional and global Change. *Global Environmental Change*, 19(1): 21-33.
- Huber. 2008. Pioneer Countries and the Global Diffusion of Environmental Innovations. *Global Environmental Change*, 18(3): 360-367.
- Spaargaren and Mol. 2008. Greening Global Consumption: Redefining Politics and Authority. *Global Environmental Change*, 18(3): 350-359.