

09/25/2007

World Politics
POLS/ SIS 426
Fall 2007

Instructor: Aseem Prakash
Class Time: Tuesday and Thursday, 1:30-3:20 p.m.
Class Location: Anderson 223
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: Min-Hyoung Kim
Office Location: Gowen 34
Office hours: Tuesday and Thursday, 12:30-1:30
E-mail: mhkim@u.washington.edu

Objective:

This is an advanced course in international relations that explores topics such as 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.

Required Text

Book

Karen Mingst and Jack Snyder (editors) 2004. *Essential Readings in World Politics*, Norton ISBN 0393976971 (paperback).

Articles

We 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)

We are witnessing religious fanaticism and ethnic conflict all over the world. Many of these directly or indirectly threaten US security, or more broadly, the security and prosperity of the industrialized world. Neo-conservatives (NeoCons) believe that the US should embark on

preventive wars, pursue them unilaterally (or with like-minded countries), and use force to spread democracy. Some other countries including Russia have also used similar arguments.

This paper seeks to evaluate your understanding of IR theory, and your ability to identify how the NeoCon policy prescriptions share a common understanding of world politics with at least one IR theory and where the NeoCons depart from it. In effect, employ at least one of the theoretical perspective discussed in class (such as Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism) to evaluate the NeoCon perspective on world politics. Your paper should be directed towards an academic audience. You are expected to do some research to identify the main themes in the NeoCon perspective on world politics. You are encouraged to use examples from the course readings and the documentaries to support your argument. The paper is due October 23.

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 both the pros and cons to neo-conservatism from the view point of that 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 neo-conservatism 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 the neo-conservative strategy. 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 Iraq. Is Iraq turning out to be America's Vietnam? Examine the validity of the Vietnam analogy to Iraq in terms of three dimensions: entry, commitment, and exit. Given the above assessments, what insights from the Vietnam war can be applied to the Iraq situation? Your paper should be directed towards an academic audience. You are expected to conduct some research on this subject. The paper is due November 15.

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 may be asked to comment on a documentary that has been screened 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.

Group project

You will be involved in a group project (typically 4-5 students per group). Your project will pertain to one of the two themes.

- The first set of presentations will examine ethnic conflicts. We will study conflicts in Sudan, Nigeria, Sri Lanka, Cyprus, Turkey, Fiji, Northern Ireland, etc. Your group will examine the history of the conflict, what factors sustain it, and how it impact world politics.
- The second set of presentations examine how to various parties to a conflict have sought to make peace, sometimes unsuccessfully. The Nuremberg trials sought to punish the perpetrators of heinous war crimes and expose the world to the Nazi barbarities. Other topics that the groups will examine include the South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission, the Treaty of Versailles, the Simla Accord, the ongoing Hague Trials, and the Oslo Accord. Your group will examine the context in which the treaty was negotiated, the extent to which it succeeded in its objectives, and what contributed to its success or failure.

Your group will present to the class for about 15 minutes. A printed copy of the group report (five pages, single-spaced) is due December 4.

Evaluation

Paper 1	25 points
Paper 2	25 points
Quizzes	40 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 can provide appropriate documentation), we will accept late submissions or submission via email. If you cannot turn your paper in on the due date for some other reason, 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

Thursday, September 27

Introduction

Tuesday, October 2

Contending Perspectives

- Morgenthau, A realist theory of international politics, in Mingst and Snyder, 49-53.
- Doyle, Liberalism and world politics, in Mingst and Snyder, 73-85.
- Frank, The development and underdevelopment, in Mingst and Snyder, 86-93.
- Tickner, Man, state, and war: Troubled engagements between feminists and IR theorists, in Mingst and Snyder, 94-101.
- Finnemore, Constructing norms of humanitarian intervention, in Mingst and Snyder, 102-119.
- Walt, International Relations: One world, many theories, in Mingst and Snyder, 4-10.

Thursday, October 4

Cold War Politics

- CNN Volume 1 (2): The Iron Curtain (Videorecord WHV 125)
- CNN Volume 2 (2): Korea (Videorecord WHV 125)

Tuesday, October 9

Cold War

- Gaddis, The long peace, in Mingst and Snyder, 33-48.
- Kenan, The sources of Soviet conduct, in Mingst and Snyder, 28-32.
- Morgenthau, The balance of power, in Mingst and Snyder, 124-129.
- Mearsheimer, Anarchy and the struggle for power, in Mingst and Snyder, 54-72.

Thursday, October 11

Leadership: How Individuals Matter in World Politics

- CNN Volume 8(2): The Wall Comes Down (Videorecord WHV 125)
- Hermann and Hagan, International decision making, in Mingst and Snyder, 182-188.
- Jervis, Hypotheses on Misperception, in Mingst and Snyder, 189-201.

Tuesday, October 16

- The Trials of Henry Kissinger (DVD FRF 024)

Thursday, October 18

Ethnic Conflict

- Blood Diamond (DVD WHV 311)
- Haufler, The Kimberly Process, Club Goods, and Public Enforcement of a Private Regime

Paper 1 is due October 23

Tuesday, October 23

Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict

- Pape, The strategic logic of suicide terrorism, in Mingst and Snyder, 382-402.
- Posen, The security dilemma and ethnic conflict, in Mingst and Snyder, 357-366.
- Power, Beyond genocide, in Mingst and Snyder, 233-252
- Mousseau, 2002/2003. Market civilization and its clash with terror, *International Security* 27(3).

Thursday, October 25

Ethnic Conflict

- No Man's Land (DVD MGM 067)

Tuesday, October 30

Presentations on Ethnic Conflict

- Sudan
- Nigeria
- Sri Lanka
- Cyprus
- Northern Ireland

Thursday, November 1

Nation Building

- Krasner, Sovereignty, in Mingst and Snyder, 143-148.
- Fukuyama, 2004. The imperatives of state building. *Journal of Democracy*. 5(2).
- Documentary Ghosts of Rwanda, BBC Documentary (DVD PSHV 005)

Tuesday, November 6

Presentations on Ethnic Conflict

- Lebanon
- Turkey
- Spain
- Balochistan
- Fiji

Thursday, November 8

Economic Globalization

- Documentary, Black Gold (DVD CALN 024)

Tuesday, November 13

Economic Globalization

- Held and McGrew, Globalization, in Mingst and Snyder, 462-470
- Friedman, The backlash, in Mingst and Snyder, pp. 471-478.
- Sen, Universal Truths, in Mingst and Snyder, 477-480.
- Alan S. Blinder, 2006, Offshoring: The Next Industrial Revolution? *Foreign Affairs* (March-April)

Paper 2 is due November 15

Thursday, November 15

Presentations on Peace treaties

- Treaty of Versailles (1919)
- Simla Agreement (1972)
- Helsinki Agreement (1975)
- Dayton Agreement (1995)
- Rambouillet Agreement (2001)

Tuesday, November 20

NGOs

- Keck and Sikkink, Transnational advocacy networks in international politics, in Mingst and Snyder, 222-232.
- Salmon, 1994. The Rise of the Non-Profit Sector, *Foreign Affairs*, 73(4).
- Slaughter, The real new world order, in Mingst and Snyder, 149-156.
- Henderson, 2002. Selling civil society. *Comparative Political Studies*, 35(2): 139-167.
- Clifford, 2002. Merchants of Morality, *Foreign Policy*, March/April: 36-45.

Thursday, November 22, No Class, Thanksgiving

Tuesday, November 27

- In-class presentations: Peace treaties
- The Treaty of Portsmouth (1905)
- Nuremberg (1945-1949)
- South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (1995-)
- Paris Peace Accords (1973)
- The Oslo Accord (1993)

Thursday, November 29

Environmental Politics

- Victor, 2006. Recovering sustainable development. *Foreign Affairs*, Jan-Feb.
- Grossman and Kreuger, 1995. Economic growth and the environment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 110:353-75.
- Kütting, 2003. Globalization, poverty and the environment in West Africa: Too poor to pollute? *Global Environmental Politics*, 3(4).
- Barkin, 2003. The Counterintuitive relationship between globalization and climate change. *Global Environmental Politics*, 3(3).

Group project report is due December 4

Tuesday, December 4

- Documentary, Why We Fight, (DVD SONYHE 02)
- Eisenhower's farewell address to the country, January 17, 1961;
<http://mcadams.posc.mu.edu/ike.htm>

Thursday, December 6

Future of World Politics

- Marx and Engels, Communist manifesto, Part I,
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/communist-manifesto/>
- Soros, 1997. The capitalist threat, *Atlantic Monthly*, February
- Huntington, Clash of civilization, in Mingst and Snyder, 163-169.
- Said, The clash of ignorance, in Mingst and Snyder, 170-171.
- Wang Si, 2005, China's search for stability with America, *Foreign Affairs*,
September/October.