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| ***Real Story* Podcast #1**  (due April 16) | **Title:** *Should we be afraid of TikTok?* | **In this box, write a one-paragraph summary of the podcast. Your summary should include the following: 1) a statement of the topic; 2) the names of the discussants as well as a brief description of their respective stances on the topic; and 3) a brief explanation of what makes the topic timely.**  In this podcast episode, Celia Hatton discusses the implications of a U.S. bill that might lead to a TikTok ban with experts Jeremy Goldkorn, Lindsay P. Gorman, and Louise Matsakis. Jeremy Goldkorn explains that the Chinese government could prevent ByteDance from selling TikTok and expresses concerns about the internet dividing into isolated segments. Lindsay P. Gorman supports the bill, arguing it addresses important security concerns about ownership and potential Chinese influence on U.S. elections, especially significant in an election year. Louise Matsakis criticizes the bill, warning that it might harm American technology companies and encourage other countries to enact similar bans, threatening the global unity of the internet. This topic is timely due to the ongoing discussions about national security, technology, and international influence in a digitized world. |
| **In this box, write a substantive response to the podcast, exploring what you found interesting about it and reflecting how it connects to our course theme of global citizenship.**  The podcast discussion highlights an important issue about privacy and the regulation of big tech companies, which Louise emphasizes. What stood out to me is her point about the focus on TikTok potentially overshadowing broader issues within the tech industry, especially regarding privacy laws. This connects to our course theme of global citizenship by illustrating the necessity for international cooperation on tech governance. It suggests that instead of targeting individual companies based on their country of origin, there should be a unified approach to how personal data is handled by all tech companies worldwide which as Lindsey mentioned might be a legal challenge as well. |
| **Debate #1**  (due April 18) | **Title:** *Is Nationalism A Force For Good?* | In the debate on whether "Nationalism is a Force for Good," participants Colin Dueck and Prerna Singh argued in favor of the resolution, highlighting historical examples of inclusive nationalism promoting equality and solidarity among diverse communities. They emphasized the potential of nationalism to foster social welfare policies and freedom movements. On the opposing side, Andrew Keen and Elif Shafak presented cases of nationalism leading to intolerance and violence, citing examples from various countries such as the United States, India, and Hungary. |
| In my opinion, the side against the resolution, led by Andrew Keen and Elif Shafak, ultimately won the debate. Their arguments painted a vivid picture of the dangers of nationalism, especially when it fosters exclusion and intolerance. By providing examples from various parts of the world, they effectively highlighted the divisive and violent consequences of nationalist movements. They emphasized how nationalism can lead to discrimination, and xenophobia, as seen in instances like the violent attacks fueled by nationalist sentiments in Germany and the United States. Whereas, the opposing side made compelling points about the historical role of nationalism in liberation movements and the promotion of national identity. They showcased how nationalism can serve as a unifying force and empower people to demand their rights and freedoms. This point is important to consider because it acknowledges that nationalism is not inherently negative and can, be a catalyst for positive social change. |
| ***Real Story***  **Podcast #2**  (due April 23) | **Title:** *Feeding Gaza: Why isn't more aid getting in?* | **In this box, write a one-paragraph summary of the podcast. Your summary should include the following: 1) a statement of the topic; 2) the names of the discussants as well as a brief description of their respective stances on the topic; and 3) a brief explanation of what makes the topic timely.**  The podcast discusses the severe humanitarian crisis in Gaza. In this episode, Mark Lowen speaks with James Landale, BBC’s Diplomatic Correspondent, who recently participated in an aerial aid delivery, detailing the challenges faced as Israel blocks traditional aid routes, attributing this to Hamas. Landale's report highlights the stark reduction in aid, with current aerial drops, supported by countries like Jordan, Egypt, and France, insufficient compared to the previous 500 truckloads a day. Ghada Ouda, a Palestinian journalist living in Rafah, shares her firsthand experience of surviving on this dwindling aid. She talks about how the aid is distributed and what kind of nutrition are most people surviving on. They talk about how the matter has gotten worse due to the recent deaths of seven aid workers, killed in a missile strike. |
|
| **In this box, write a substantive response to the podcast, exploring what you found interesting about it and reflecting how it connects to our course theme of global citizenship.**  What stood out was the immense logistical and political hurdles that impede the flow of essential supplies, such as the shift from truck deliveries to air drops due to blockades. This situation highlights the vital role of international cooperation, as evidenced by multiple countries collaborating to mitigate the crisis. The narrative aligns with the theme of global citizenship by emphasizing our collective responsibility to respond to human suffering, regardless of national boundaries. |
|
| **Debate #2**  (due April 25) | **Title:** *Is It Time To Redistribute Wealth?* | **In this box, write a one-paragraph summary of the debate. Your summary should include the following: 1) the names of the participants; and 2) a brief description of the major arguments put forward by both sides.**  In the debate moderated by John Donvan, participants Robert Reich and Yanis Varoufakis argued for the motion that it's time to redistribute the wealth, while Allison Schrager and Larry Summers argued against it. Reich and Varoufakis contended that vast wealth disparities lead to unequal political power and societal stagnation, emphasizing the need for systemic changes to redistribute wealth more equitably to bolster democracy and social stability. On the opposing side, Schrager and Summers cautioned against the economic consequences of aggressive wealth redistribution, arguing that it could discourage investment and innovation, and suggested more targeted fiscal reforms like higher capital gains taxes and closing tax loopholes as more effective alternatives. They stressed that wealth creation by entrepreneurs often benefits society and that penalizing success could undermine economic growth and efficiency. |
| **In this box, write a substantive paragraph explaining: 1) which side won the debate in your view and why; and 2) what you think the strongest point made by the other side was and why it is something important to consider.**  In the debate on wealth redistribution, the side arguing against the motion, represented by Allison Schrager and Larry Summers, I believe, presented a stronger case. They convincingly argued that drastic wealth redistribution could deter investment and innovation, crucial for economic progress, advocating instead for targeted fiscal reforms. However, Robert Reich and Yanis Varoufakis made a compelling point about the negative impact of concentrated wealth on democracy, emphasizing the need to address the political power that comes with great wealth, which is crucial for maintaining a fair and democratic society. |
| ***Pod Save the World***  (due April 30) | **Title:**  *Gaza Protests Roil College Campuses* | **In this box, write a one-paragraph summary of the podcast. Your summary should include the following: 1) a statement of the topic; 2) the names of the discussants as well as a brief description of their respective stances on the topic; and 3) a brief explanation of what makes the topic timely.**  Hosts Ben Rhodes and Tommy Vietor discuss several international issues in this podcast. They focus on the U.S. House approving $26 billion in military aid to Israel despite ongoing conflict in Gaza, the resignation of Israel's intelligence chief, a report dismissing allegations of broad terrorist ties within UNRWA, and student protests against the war in Gaza across U.S. campuses. Tthey also touch on topics including supplemental funding for Ukraine, reactions from Russian officials, and alleged promises of a presidential pardon to Trump's aide. |
| **In this box, write a substantive response to the podcast, exploring what you found interesting about it and reflecting how it connects to our course theme of global citizenship.**  The episode effectively illustrates the complexities of U.S. foreign policy and its global impact, especially regarding military aid to Israel. It highlights the challenges of ethical decision-making in international relations and underscores the influential role of youth activism in shaping public discourse on global issues. This discussion serves as a reminder of the responsibilities that come with global citizenship and the impact of national decisions on global justice and peace. |
| **Debate #3**  (due May 2) | **Title:** *Can Humans Adapt To Climate Change?* | **In this box, write a one-paragraph summary of the debate. Your summary should include the following: 1) the names of the participants; and 2) a brief description of the major arguments put forward by both sides.**  In the debate hosted by John Donvan on whether humans can adapt to climate change, Kaveh Madani and Michele Wucker argued that adaptation alone is insufficient without significant efforts to mitigate the causes of climate change. They stressed the need for aggressive measures to reduce greenhouse gases due to the unpredictable and severe nature of climate impacts. On the other hand, Matthew Kahn and Bjorn Lomborg advocated for the effectiveness of human adaptability, citing historical resilience and the potential of technological advancements to manage environmental challenges. The discussion highlighted a clear division between prioritizing immediate adaptive strategies versus long-term mitigation solutions. |
| **In this box, write a substantive paragraph explaining: 1) which side won the debate in your view and why; and 2) what you think the strongest point made by the other side was and why it is something important to consider.**  In my view, Kaveh Madani and Michele Wucker were more convincing in the debate as they argued that simply adapting to climate change is not enough without substantial efforts to mitigate the causes. They stressed the imporance of addressing the root causes of climate change to prevent even worse scenarios, which seems essential for long-term global health and safety. On the other hand, Matthew Kahn and Bjorn Lomborg presented a strong case about the resilience and adaptability of humans, highlighting that our capacity to innovate can lead to practical solutions to climate challenges. This point is important because it emphasizes the potential for positive change through technological and social advances, which can be crucial in both mitigation and adaptation strategies. |
| **Film #1** | **Title:** *Amélie*  **Director:** Jean-Pierre Jeunet  **Release date:** April 25, 2001  **Original language:** French | **In this box, write one paragraph concisely describing the setting and summarizing the plot of the film.**  Set in Paris's Montmartre area, Amélie follows a young woman named Amélie Poulain. She discovers a box of toys in her apartment and decides to secretly improve the lives of people around her, hoping to bring them joy. While she helps others, Amélie also seeks her own happiness and love. The story captures her quirky adventures in making others happy and her quest for personal fulfillment. |
| **In this box, write a substantive paragraph explaining what you learned about the filmmaker’s culture from watching this film and why you think the film was or wasn’t successful.**  Amélie showcases French appreciation for art, beauty, and personal connections, depicting everyday life in Paris with charm and whimsy. The film was widely successful because it touched on universal themes like love and the impact of small acts of kindness. I think it alo brought back a nostalgic feeling of being a carefree child. Its visual style and engaging storytelling helped it resonate globally, making it a beloved portrayal of Paris as a city of romance and enchantment. This appeal contributed significantly to its international acclaim and popularity. |
| **Film #2** | **Title:** *Parasite*  **Director:** Bong Joon-ho  **Release date:** May 30, 2019  **Original language:** Korean | **In this box, write one paragraph concisely describing the setting and summarizing the plot of the film.**  Parasite is set in modern-day Seoul, South Korea, and intricately portrays the stark contrast between the lives of the wealthy and the impoverished. The film follows the Kim family, who live in a cramped, basement apartment and struggle daily to make ends meet. Their lives become entangled with the wealthy Park family when the Kim children cleverly secure jobs as tutors and art therapists in the Parks' luxurious home. The plot thickens as both families' lives spiral into a dark and suspenseful series of events. |
| **In this box, write a substantive paragraph explaining what you learned about the filmmaker’s culture from watching this film and why you think the film was or wasn’t successful.**  Parasite offers a profound insight into the deep-seated class divisions that pervade South Korean society and the lengths to which people go to climb the social ladder. The film's success is evident not only in its box office earnings, surpassing $263 million worldwide, but also in its historic win at the Oscars, where it became the first non-English language film to win Best Picture. Its universal themes of economic disparity and human desperation resonate globally, making it a critical and commercial success while highlighting the impacts of societal structure on individual lives and relationships. |
| **Film #3** | **Title:** *RRR*  **Director:** S.S. Rajamouli  **Release date:** March 25, 2022  **Original language:** Telugu | **In this box, write one paragraph concisely describing the setting and summarizing the plot of the film.**  RRR is an action drama set in the 1920s pre-independent India, under British colonial rule. The film follows two legendary revolutionaries, Komaram Bheem and Alluri Sitarama Raju, from their early years to their fight against British colonizers. Their journey starts separately but their paths cross, leading to a fierce friendship and partnership in a larger rebellion to free India from British oppression. The film combines intense action sequences, rich visuals, and emotional depth to explore themes of friendship, freedom, and resistance. |
| **In this box, write a substantive paragraph explaining what you learned about the filmmaker’s culture from watching this film and why you think the film was or wasn’t successful.**  RRR achieved significant box office milestones, grossing over $140 million worldwide and setting records as one of the highest-grossing Indian films of all time. It reflects the rich cultural heritage and historical context of India’s struggle for independence, using powerful visual storytelling and character development. The film’s success stems from its ability to merge traditional Indian values with high-octane action and universal themes of oppression and rebellion. The portrayal of real historical figures in a fictionalized narrative resonated with audiences, contributing to its massive box office success globally. |