**Politics 142, International Politics v1.1  
First Block, 2018-2019  
David Yamanishi**

***Overview***

International politics is the study of political relationships between states as well as political relationships that cross state borders between entities other than states. We shall examine why states engage in conflict with one another and what determines their success or failure in such conflict, as well as why states engage in cooperation with one another and what determines their success or failure in such cooperation. Additionally, we will explore several issues that might require state cooperation or produce conflict: human rights, the rights of minority groups, the increasing prevalence of internationalized civil wars, the environment, development, terrorism, and others. We will look at several case studies from varying theoretical perspectives, ranging from World War I to the 2003 (and on) Iraq War to the war(s) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo following the Rwandan genocide to the recent refugee crisis. The emphasis will be on “security” issues, broadly speaking, as “economic” issues are covered in greater detail in other classes.

In addition to covering certain analytical tools (e.g. the levels of analysis heuristic, assessing causation in complex historical situations, key international relations concepts such as balance of power and intermestic politics), this class is intended to advance Cornell’s educational priorities: knowledge (you will engage with scholarly work on international politics in its own right and in the context of the broader liberal arts), inquiry (you will engage in a substantial independent research project that will let you practice research skills), reasoning (your project will also require weighing competing understandings of your paper’s theme through analysis of evidence and critical thinking), communication (you will engage in class discussion as well as more formal written and oral presentation of your research findings), intercultural literacy (we will work together to understand the emergence of conflict and cooperation in a variety of cultural settings and in the interstices between cultures), ethical behavior (we will work together to learn about how scholars have approached questions of ethics in international politics and we will weigh the ethical qualities of political and military actors’ decision-making ourselves), citizenship (learning about international politics and political constraints upon American and other states’ behavior will help you engage in more informed discussion of and influence upon global politics), and vocation (we will discuss academic and career possibilities that could follow upon this class).

As part of our First Year Seminar student development pilot program, this class will be accompanied by a number of additional events and assignments to help you learn about Cornell and integrate successfully into the campus community.

***Contact information***

Office hours: I’ll generally be in my office 930a (1015a Wednesdays) to 4p, except 12-1p, when I’m not with you, unless I announce otherwise due to a meeting or family engagement. I would like each of you to meet with me at least once in the first two weeks of this block and as often as you find helpful during the block in understanding the material, preparing for the assignments, and understanding how this class can contribute to your broader education at Cornell. Extension 4300.

Email: [dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu)

Peer advocate: Asher Muse  
 [amuse21@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:amuse21@cornellcollege.edu)

Learning community facilitator: Greg Cotton, Cole Library 303, x4454,  
 [gcotton@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:gcotton@cornellcollege.edu)  
 Hours: 8a-430p

Consulting librarian: Meghan Yamanishi, Cole Library 308, x4143,   
 [myamanishi@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:myamanishi@cornellcollege.edu)   
 Hours: 830a-5p

Writing consultant: Jennifer Farrell, Cole Library Writing Studio, x4812,   
 [jfarrell@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:jfarrell@cornellcollege.edu)   
 Studio hours: Monday-Thursday, 8a-11p;   
 Friday, 8a-5p; Sunday, 1-11p

Quantitative reasoning consultant: Jessica Johanningmeier, Cole Library 126, x4222,   
 [jjohanningmeier@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:jjohanningmeier@cornellcollege.edu)  
 Studio hours: Monday-Thursday, 8a-5p and 7-11p;  
 Friday, 8a-4:30p; Sunday, 3-5p and 7-11p

Academic advising: Your faculty advisor can help you with advice about class preparation as well as class selection and future plans. Additionally, Brooke Paulsen, our Coordinator of Academic Advising, can help you with adjustment to college, study skills, obtaining tutoring, and other valuable advice. Her office is on the third floor of the library.

I’m here to help, as are the folks at the library. Please take advantage of us!

***Disabilities***

Cornell College makes reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities. Students should notify the Coordinator of Academic Support and Advising and their course instructor of any disability related accommodations within the first three days of the term for which the accommodations are required, due to the fast pace of the block format. For more information on the documentation required to establish the need for accommodations and the process of requesting the accommodations, see <http://www.cornellcollege.edu/academic-support-and-advising/disabilities/index.shtml>.

***Feedback***

I am very interested in your suggestions for improvement of this syllabus and my teaching generally. Please share comments with me as you think of them or after the course is over.

***Books to buy***

The following books are available at the bookstore in the Commons and are required for all students in the class. (Some additional readings are on the class’s Moodle site; see below.)

Joseph S. Nye, Jr. & David A. Welch, *Understanding Global Conflict and Cooperation: An Introduction to Theory and History* (10th edition), Longman, 2017. ISBN 978-0134403168. [Any edition 8th or later will do, but note that chapters 6 and 7 in the 10th edition were combined as a long chapter 6 in the 8th and 9th editions.]

David Fromkin, *Europe’s Last Summer: Who Started the Great War in 1914?*, Vintage, 2005. ISBN 037572575X.

Jason Stearns, *Dancing in the Glory of Monsters: The Collapse of the Congo and the Great War of Africa*, PublicAffairs, 2012. ISBN 978-1610391078.

Gerald Graff and Cathy Birkenstein, *They Say, I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing*, Gildan Media, 2014. ISBN 978-1469028613.

***Reading and assignment schedule***

Readings other than Nye & Welch, Fromkin, Stearns, and Graff & Birkenstein are on Moodle.

Events with asterisks (\*) are part of the FYS student development pilot and are also required, but may be hosted by Asher, Greg, or various campus staff instead of (or in addition to) me.

All events are in South 302 unless otherwise noted.

*(Events marked like this line are optional.)*

Outline of international relations and international relations theory

Monday, August 27 9a All-College Gathering (at King Chapel)

930a Introductions, administrivia

Thucydides, “The Melian Dialogue”

Tuesday, August 28 930a Nye & Welch, chs. 1-2

John Mearsheimer, “Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold   
 War,” excerpted in Richard K. Betts, ed., *Conflict after the   
 Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War and Peace (3rd   
 ed.)*, Pearson, 2008

1p Diplomacy simulation

Wednesday, August 29 1p Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History?” (from Betts)

Nye & Welch, chs. 3-4

Thursday, August 30 930a Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations” (from   
 Betts)

Nye & Welch, chs. 5-6 plus \*one\* of the “flashpoints” in   
 ch. 7

Sample paper introduction & context

*(11a-1p ServaPalooza, OC)*

*(12-1p Fulbright Scholarship Information Session, Hedges)*

1p Diplomacy simulation

Friday, August 31 930a Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy Is What States Make of It”   
 (from Betts)

Judith Tickner, “Men, Women, and War” (from Betts)

Nye & Welch , chs. 8-9

1p Diplomacy simulation

*(330p Office of Intercultural Life Kickoff, Stoner House)*

**Saturday, September 1 2p Paper introduction and context due (via Moodle)**

\*Sunday, September 2 \*4p \*Student Success: Getting Involved with Asher Muse   
 (South 302)

Monday, September 3 930a First test

1p Source session with Meghan Yamanishi, Cole Library 2nd   
 floor

The origins of the First World War, as a case study in international relations

Tuesday, September 4 930a Writing workshop with Jennifer Farrell

Graff & Birkenstein, Introduction and Part 1

Sample paper through literature review

1p Fromkin, Prologue & pts. I-II

Wednesday, September 5 1p Fromkin, pts. III-IV

\*2p \*Time Management for Academic Success Workshop   
 (Hedges)

Thursday, September 6 \*9a \*Well-being and Self-care Workshop (South 302)

*(1110a Humanities & Arts Interest Group talk by Prof. Katy   
 Stavreva,“What Gender, Spirit? Shakespeare’s Ariel,   
 Cultural Authority, and Social Change in Post-Communist   
 Bulgaria,” Hedges)*

1p Fromkin, pts. V-VII

Friday, September 7 930a Fromkin, pt. VIII & Epilogue

*(1130a Student Involvement Fair, OC)*

1p Barbara Tuchman, “How We Entered World War I,” from   
 *Practicing History: Selected Essays*, Random House, 1982

**Saturday, September 8 2p Paper revision plus literature review due (via Moodle)**

Monday, September 10 930a Second test

Contemporary issues and methods in international relations

Tuesday, September 11 930a Stearns, Introduction and Part I

1p Writing workshop with Jennifer Farrell

*(330p Pre-Law Student Mixer & Info Session, Zamora’s)*

Wednesday, September 12 1p Stearns, Part II

Sample final paper

Graff & Birkenstein, Part 2

Thursday, September 13 1115a All-College Convocation (King Chapel)

1p Stearns, Part III

*(5-7p Dr. Kinohi Nishikawa on “The Final Look of ‘Black’ Books:   
 Who Is the Audience for African American Literature?,”   
 Hall-Perrine)*

Friday, September 14 930a Stearns, Part IV and Conclusion

Severine Autesserre, “Dangerous Tales: Dominant   
 Narratives on the Congo and their Unintended   
 Consequences,” *African Affairs* 111, 2012

Nye & Welch, ch. 10

**Saturday, September 15** *(9a-4p Lincoln High Arts Festival, uptown Mount Vernon)*

**2p Final paper due (via Moodle)**

Monday, September 17 930a Third test

1p Presentations

Tuesday, September 18 930a Presentations

1p Presentations

Wednesday, September 19 1030a Presentations

**3p Rewrite of final paper due (via Moodle)**

**Summary schedule:**

**Week Sunday Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday**

**1 930-12 930-11, 1-3 1-3 930-11, 1-3 930-12, 1-3  
2 4-5 930-12, 1-3 930-11, 1-3 1-3 9-11, 1-3 930-12, 1-3  
3 930-12 930-11, 1-3 1-3 1-3 930-12  
4 930-12, 1-3 930-11, 1-3 1030-12**

***Assessment***

I will calculate course grades as follows:

15% attendance and participation   
 10% journals (Diplomacy journals count triple)  
 20% tests (8% for the two higher grades, 4% for the lowest grade)  
 5% paper introduction and contextual section  
 5% revision of the first stage of the paper plus literature review  
 25% revision of the first two stages of the paper plus analysis and conclusion  
 10% paper rewrite  
 10% presentation

Note: failure to turn in the final paper will result in a grade of no higher than C-, regardless of the formula above.

All of the above will constitute 80% of your final course grade for Politics 142. The other 20% will come from the learning community component of the course, defined in its own syllabus. Your grade for the 80% of the course defined on this syllabus will appear in selfservice as your midterm grade for the class, and the final grade will follow after block 3.

While the particular things I’m looking for vary to some degree by assignment, in general an A on an assignment means that your work is outstanding in terms of:

* addressing the assigned question and avoiding digression,
* having a well-structured argument,
* expressing your argument clearly and effectively,
* making appropriate and properly cited use of material on the syllabus and other well-selected sources,
* and demonstrating thoughtful integration and interpretation of the course material and discussions.

Lower grades mean that you have not done all of these things or have done one or more of them less well that you could have. The order of items on the above list should not be taken to indicate their order of importance in determining your grade on an assignment, nor should you suppose that the items will carry equal weight on an assignment or invariant weight across assignments. Moreover, I expect your work to improve during the course and across courses.

To simplify communication about grades, I grade all assignments using the same marks that appear on your academic transcripts: letter grades. When I combine assignment grades to produce your course grade, I will do so using the same numbers that the college uses to determine your GPA (A = 4.0, A- = 3.7, B+ = 3.3, etc.). I will always round-up from the midpoint between grades (for example, a 3.85 rounds to an A, while a 3.84 does not). I may raise grades from what the raw numbers indicate in deserving cases, but I will never change the rank order of students’ grades in the class in doing so.

***Instructions for assignments***

*Participation*: Participation includes oral participation and (possibly) unannounced quizzes. If you punctually attend every class, appear to me to be paying attention and never make a contribution to our common discussion, you will receive some credit for participation. To get more credit than that for oral participation, you must participate orally in our common discussion. I assess oral participation more by thoughtfulness and attentiveness to the flow of the conversation than by quantity of oral communication. I do, however, expect you to contribute regularly. Office visits will help your oral participation grade, but are not a substitute for class attendance and participation. There may also be unannounced quizzes that address basic factual points from the readings if I’m not confident that y’all are showing up to class prepared to participate. Attendance and participation for the presentations and other special events may be weighted more heavily than that on other days. (This assignment emphasizes the educational priorities of Knowledge, Reasoning, Inquiry, and Communication.)

*Journals*: Each day of the course for which we have readings, you should submit a journal entry by two hours before the start of class via Moodle. You might consider a question or issue raised by the readings, or reflect upon how the readings for the day relate to earlier material and/or current events in the news. Feel free to offer your personal reactions to each piece, but I do want you to offer some interpretation or analysis of some kind in each journal entry. You should aim for 250 words per day. Journals will be graded according to (thoughtful) completion. That is to say: if you finish all of them and take them seriously, you will receive an A for the journal component of the course grade. You should also complete journals for the class day after each of the days that we engage in the Diplomacy simulation and one the day after the second day of our data lab exercise, so on some days there will be two journals due. I may permit extra journals for extra credit (or to replace missing journals) after relevant campus events. (This assignment emphasizes the educational priorities of Knowledge, Reasoning, Inquiry, and Communication.)

*Tests*: The test questions will require interpretive essay responses. These will be based primarily upon the issues that we discuss in class, and secondarily upon other questions and issues raised by the readings. I may hand out a set of test questions from which I will randomly pick the actual question in advance, if doing so doesn’t appear to damage participation by reducing the incentive to do the readings. (This assignment emphasizes the educational priorities of Knowledge, Reasoning, Inquiry, and Communication.)

*Paper, generally*: The goal of your paper is to ask and answer a question about international politics in light of the existing scholarly discussion of your topic. You should choose an international politics incident, policy decision, or problem that has been addressed by scholars representing at least two different perspectives. You should run your topic by me as soon as you come up with an idea (in part to avoid duplication with topics chosen by other students), and you should begin searching for relevant literature right away in order to ensure that it exists. Very recent situations can be problematic as puzzles for this paper, because the scholarly literature won’t have had time to catch up. (This assignment emphasizes the educational priorities of Knowledge, Reasoning, Inquiry, and Communication.)

Your research paper should have five parts: an introduction, a contextual section, a literature review, an analysis, and a conclusion. To wit:

* Your introduction should state your problem clearly in the first sentence, briefly describe your overall conclusion, and outline the structure of your argument. It’s also helpful to suggest why your topic should interest readers.
* Your contextual section should flesh out your question by defining the terms of your question and describing the facts that you mean to explain. You should not draw any conclusions in this section.
* Your literature review should relate how other scholars have explained the facts that you just described in the contextual section. You should not criticize or analyze their views in this section.
* Your analysis should advance your own argument based on the facts. You should begin by explicitly addressing the views of other scholars that you’ve described in the literature review. You should build your own argument on the pros and cons that you find in others’ arguments.
* Your conclusion should restate your question and briefly summarize the logic of your analysis. If you would like to offer suggestions for further work or other flowery thoughts, this is the place.

*Paper introduction and context*: Your paper’s introduction and context should indicate what puzzle you will address and make the terms of your question and their context clear. You should let readers know why your topic is important, and you should outline the rest of your paper. You should avoid answers to your question and explanation of causes (though these should appear in summary form in the outline in this part of your final paper). I will grade this assignment according to the quality of your statement of your central puzzle, the quality of the selection and presentation of facts that you offer to make the context of your puzzle clear, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis. We will select problems in class so as to avoid duplication. This assignment is mostly equivalent to the first two of the five parts of the overall paper, so you should write it as a coherent paper, not a set of bullet points. Your introduction and context should be about 1,000 well-chosen words; much shorter and you’ll have left something out; much longer and you’re probably trying to answer your question as well as ask it.

*Rewrite of the previous plus literature review*: Your literature review should describe how other scholars have answered your question as well as how they’ve critiqued each other’s answers. The goal is to describe the most important answers out there in the scholarly conversation about your question, as well as to trace the development of the conversation if you can. For each source that you review, you should describe its conclusion (what causes the effect), its reasoning (how the cause causes the effect), and its evidence (how the author knows she’s right). It can make the shape of the scholarly conversation clearer to your audience if you group scholars who take a similar approach to your question. It’s also helpful to readers to offer a summary of the perspectives about your question before and after the paragraphs in which you describe the sources in detail to help your readers know what you want them to retain. I will grade the rewritten introduction and context according to the previous criteria (you should remember to update your outline to cover the literature review). I will grade the literature review according to the quality and representativeness of your sources and the quality of your descriptions of their conclusions, reasoning, and evidence. Your paper should be up to about 2,500 well-chosen words at this point; much shorter and you’ll probably have left out relevant literature; much longer and you may be getting carried away with the sources or have moved on prematurely to critiquing them.

*Final paper*: The final paper should present your puzzle (the introduction and contextual section), explain how competing scholars understand the phenomenon in question (the literature review), and analyze the competing explanations to identify the roots of disagreement and to assess why one or more perspectives are right and the other(s) wrong. You should start your analysis by explaining what distinguishes the perspectives you described in your literature review from one another (e.g. different causes, different reasoning, different evidence). You should then make a case as to which perspective (or combination thereof, or a new one of your own) comes closest to the truth as you see it (by, e.g, describing new evidence, reinterpreting evidence, describing a missed mechanism or cause). I will grade the paper according to the quality of your discussion of how your problem has been and/or might be explained by scholars from different perspectives, the quality of your analysis of what fundamentally unites and distinguishes the competing perspectives that you address, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis (including improvements in the material drawn from the earlier parts of your paper). Your paper, including any of the earlier parts recycled in it, should be about 3,500 well-chosen words; much shorter and you’re probably oversimplifying your project by leaving out relevant literature or analyzing it too hastily or by picking a problem about which there’s not much to say; much longer and you’re probably overcomplicating your project by including too much tangentially relevant literature or by picking a problem that’s much too complicated to begin with.

*Final paper rewrite*:I will return your graded papers with comments as quickly as possible, so that you may improve your paper according to my suggestions and your own further reflection upon it. Your grade on the rewrite will be no lower than your grade on the original paper, provided you turn it in.

*Individual presentation*:Your presentation should address your paper project. You should present your puzzle and your analysis of it in ten to twelve minutes, focusing on the most compelling parts of your story and findings. After each presentation, others in the class will have a chance to ask questions; the quality of these questions is included as a component of the presentation grade, along with your effectiveness in presenting your argument in a clear way to the class and your facility and thoughtfulness in answering questions about your work.

***Attendance and lateness policy***

To avoid a penalty for missing a test or paper deadline, you must ask the campus clinic (in a health emergency) or the dean of students or other relevant campus official (in other types of emergencies) to send me an excuse on your behalf.

I will lower the grade on work submitted late by 1% of the maximum grade per hour late (thus, a paper that would have earned a 3.0 (a B) will earn a 2.96 (a lower B) if one hour late, a 2.84 (a high B-) if four hours late). Work submitted late *that meets the minimum expectations of the assignment* will receive at least a D regardless of lateness, so you should submit all assignments even if you are extremely late. However, I will not accept any work after 3pm on the last day of the block.

To drop on the 15th day, you *must* complete every assignment due by the end of the 14th day of class and attend class regularly and attentively. In other words, if you are likely to sleep through class on more than one occasion, you should drop now, because you will not be able to do so later.

***Academic honesty***

Cornell College expects all members of the Cornell community to act with academic integrity. An important aspect of academic integrity is respecting the work of others. A student is expected to explicitly acknowledge ideas, claims, observations, or data of others, unless generally known. When a piece of work is submitted for credit, a student is asserting that the submission is her or his work unless there is a citation of a specific source. If there is no appropriate acknowledgement of sources, whether intended or not, this may constitute a violation of the College’s requirement for honesty in academic work and may be treated as a case of academic dishonesty. The procedures regarding how the College deals with cases of academic dishonesty appear in The Catalogue, under the heading “Academic Honesty."