

COURSE OUTLINE

Fall 2007

Political Science 1341
TR 9:55-11:20 am

The Individual in World Politics
Mary Ann Tétreault

Studying World Politics

World politics is adjusting to a new order in which the United States is overwhelmingly dominant militarily. Just a few years ago, the United States also was the premier economic power and the country most respected for its human rights activities. This no longer is the case. US debt has risen to astronomical levels, and US moral authority has dissipated, not only because of its decision to invade Iraq without a mandate from the United Nations, but also because of its poor human rights record since 2001 and its inattention to pacifying and reconstructing either Iraq or Afghanistan, prolonging the violence in both countries and inflicting misery and death on their civilian populations.

Other forces driving world politics include the acceleration of globalization, which has increased economic and social inequality within and between countries, global climate change and its effects on living systems, and growing competition between the United States and rival power centers, chiefly Russia but with China and the European Union waiting in the wings. Alert citizens should prepare for challenges from the rapidly developing “planetary political economy” and the likelihood of conflict arising from international quarrels, attacks on high-value targets by entrepreneurial groups like al-Qaeda, and the most deadly axis of conflict since the end of the Cold War: intergroup quarrels with their often genocidal aims and outcomes.

The topics we discuss join practical issues to moral problems. Thus, for example, the nature of war is examined structurally, historically, and as it affects citizens and their leaders whose subsequent political behavior shapes how, when, and where their countries will go to war again (or not, as the case may be). Along with academic writings, we’ll read and view materials from other observers and commentators. The objective is to help you see the larger dynamics of war and peace, secular trends in population growth and resource use, international and transnational social interactions, and how they are experienced and understood by the people involved.

Our primary text is a new book by British historian, Niall Ferguson. It is “about” the long cycle of twentieth-century wars which Ferguson sees as a direct result of three long-term

trends: the collapse of multinational empires; intergroup, especially inter-ethnic conflicts; and economic shocks. These three axes of conflict are related. Empires are by definition multicultural. Over time, members of different groups migrate from their home regions to become bureaucrats, soldiers, traders, and even marriage partners. The status of these minorities is regulated and protected. When empires dissolve, these persons and their descendants do not “return” to “homes” they never lived in. Rather, they remain to fight for political status in the new states — the parastates — that take shape as imperial authority and power decline. If bad economic times coincide with adjustment to a new political order, conflicts over economic resources will aggravate the struggle for political control. We’ll see an example of this when we read Philip Gourevitch’s book about the Rwandan genocide.

Our third text has gotten glowing reviews from nearly everyone outside of the Bush administration. *Field Notes from a Catastrophe* is about an aspect of security, global climate change, that has only begun to penetrate the closed world of mainstream news in the United States. Even though author Elizabeth Kolbert thinks we can’t return to what environmentalist Bill McKibben calls “Earth One,” the planet human beings and other now-living creatures evolved to survive on, she does have some useful things to say about how to start from where we are to do a better job as stewards of the earth so that your kids (well, maybe your grandchildren) can inherit a more stable world.

Some of our shorter readings focus on contemporary military conflicts and an aspect of modern warfare that burst into prominence during WWII, that is, targeting civilian populations. When states commit these acts they are called warfare (and, occasionally, war crimes: targeting civilians is illegal under the Geneva Conventions). When committed by non-state actors they are called terrorism. Under either designation, they are activities led by ruthless leaders and their closest associates. Today’s increase in civilian deaths in violent conflicts reflects a world where both organized and entrepreneurial violence is rising.

So is “structural violence,” the operation of “systems” that allow a few people to oppress, humiliate, and steal from many others. Some of these systems, such as the ones governing geology or the weather, are outside direct human control, yet tsunamis, hurricanes, droughts, and floods still inflict structural violence worldwide. Structural violence also comes from other aspects of globalization: how the economy works (or doesn’t), how people, weapons, information, germs, drugs, and even ideas can cross borders because boundaries are not effective at keeping them out. Structural violence is reflected in rising levels of poverty and disease, domestic repression, war, and even state collapse. It makes its victims angry, sometimes violently so. What people can do to reduce and ameliorate structural violence is addressed in many of our readings, including all three of the books listed under “uncommon readings.”

Our approach in the class

The approach we are taking in this class is unusual. World politics conventionally centers on the nation-state (a country and its government) as its **unit of analysis**, with differences among these nation-states (which I will call “states” from now on) measured in terms of strategic resources like soldiers and arms, and natural resources from oil deposits to workers to arable land. This is the standard IR (international relations) perspective. Its **level of analysis** is a system in which each state unit is imagined as a character in a bitterly competitive world where life is “solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” IR sees these dynamics as automatic, the result of “**anarchy**” or the absence of a world government strong enough to control states. It treats state decision makers generically, as rational actors deploying their states’ resources, but rarely as individuals riddled with altruism and ambition, much less good and evil. This perspective is called “**Realism.**”

There are other theoretical perspectives in IR. One is fairly venerable, associated with the philosopher Immanuel Kant and his intellectual successors. They think that states form a kind of international society and, like other societies, create institutions that regulate how they behave toward one another. This perspective is called “**Institutionalism,**” but Realists call its proponents “**Idealists**” to make us think they are impractical (not realistic!). A newer school of thought sees the world in even more complex terms, as a collection of agents and structures (à la Realism and part of Institutionalism). This view considers people as able to make change in the world (more Institutionalism), but it also regards structures and choices as shaping one another (the unique contribution of this school). This perspective is called “**Constructivism.**” **Post-structuralists** take this critique further by refusing to privilege particular structures (like states) or agents (like presidents or generals), looking at both agency and structure as operating from multiple locations and as mediated by language and performance.

All four perspectives help us understand world politics and each is useful depending on what you want to know (a post-structuralist perspective). Which is best under what circumstances will be up to you to judge. Each leaves more or less room to think about things that aren’t “political” in a conventional sense, like technologies that allow persons to operate more freely than before, liberated not only from partly voluntary associations such as corporations, churches, and neighborhoods, but also from mostly “involuntary” structures like families and states. The mobility and publicity that result from this liberation make people harder to control than they used to be (although easier to manipulate — think about it). Consequently, change is even more likely and its outcome even less predictable.

From this libertarian point of view, persons are more likely to be seen as autonomous, able to influence the world — not a Cold War perspective, for sure. But as you’ll also see throughout the semester, even the most active **agents** are constrained by the **structures** they

find themselves confronting. This may be why the new world politics seems less able to deal decisively — authoritatively — with events than the old politics. Part of the explanation lies in the decline of **state capacity**. This is the ability of states to do political things, a difficult prospect at the same time that “the market” has become an enormously powerful actor by itself. When your stocks tank and your national economy collapses, you really are going back to the future — long depressions and widespread misery are inherent in all poorly regulated markets. Then there’s “nature,” now liberally assisted by people and their various projects. “National security” means a lot more than guns and bombs, even though we’ll be concentrating on them more than any other source of national insecurity. But don’t get too comfortable: the new world politics is at least as scary as the old world politics, even if it’s scary in different ways.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:

To give you a broad overview of world politics in the twentieth century and to examine events and trends already evident in the twenty-first.

To get you started navigating the university library and finding sources on the Internet.

To develop further your writing and public speaking skills.

REQUIRED READING:

Your common reading for class consists in the Ferguson, Gourevitch, and Kolbert books and a series of chapters and articles most of which can be found in folders labeled with the dates they are due to be read on the N-drive of the university computer system. All the assignments are listed on the course calendar and should be read **prior to** the listing date. You also are required to **subscribe to and read the daily *New York Times***. It will be hard to complete this assignment adequately if you just scroll through the NYT on the Internet because you aren’t likely to find all the important stories. Having hard copies is both convenient and economical. More to the point, **every exam will include questions on current affairs** and your best preparation for those questions is to read your NYT every day. I do recommend that you split a subscription with one or two others in the class, another economical move.

You also have **one required uncommon text**. At our first class meeting we’ll set up three groups. Each group will read a different book about some aspect of world politics focusing on individuals. This semester, all the books are non-fiction. Members of each group will write individual essays on their book and, together, will prepare and execute a performance of the

book's thesis for the class. The dates when performances and papers are due are listed in the course calendar below.

Finally, we'll see five feature-length films together, on five Wednesday evenings during the semester. They also are listed in the course calendar.

COMMON REQUIRED TEXTS: we'll be reading most or all of these.

Niall Ferguson, *The War of the World: Twentieth-Century Conflict and the Descent of the West* (New York: Penguin, 2006).

Philip Gourevitch, *We Wish to Inform You that Tomorrow We Will be Killed With Our Families: Stories from Rwanda* (New York: Picador, 1998).

Elizabeth Kolbert, *Field Notes from a Catastrophe* (N.P.: Bloomsbury USA, 2006).

Daily *New York Times*. I would suggest sharing a subscription with one or two classmates — it's cheaper and then you'll have someone to talk to about what's going on (not to mention study with before exams).

UNCOMMON READING: BOOKS FOR ESSAYS AND GROUP PERFORMANCES: everyone will read one of these books. New or used paperback editions should be available for all three books and you can buy hard copies for half the price (or less) — check out Amazon.com for starters. The publication information given below refers to the hardcover edition.

Mary Ann Glendon, *A World Made New: Eleanor Roosevelt and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights* (New York: Random House, 2001).

Tracy Kidder, *Mountains Beyond Mountains: Healing the World: The Quest of Dr. Paul Farmer* (New York: Random House, 2003).

M. G. Lord, *Astro Turf: The Private Life of Rocket Science* (New York: Walker and Company, 2005).

Infrastructure: Here is how to get documents from the N-drive. Versions of all the supplementary readings are located there. You also can use the URLs given in the course calendar below if you want to view original versions (where available).

How to use the N: Drive.

You can access the N: drive from any computer on the campus network. If you do not live on campus, you will have to use your computer on the campus network or use a computer in the library or a lab. To set up the N: drive for use on your computer, please follow these directions:

On PCs: Read the directions provided by Information Technology Services at: <http://www.trinity.edu/departments/its/faqs/faq.asp?ID=55#netdrives>. Once you have set up the network drives as they specify, you will have access to the N: drive ("Class" folder).

On Macs: Read the directions provided by Information Technology Services at: <http://www.trinity.edu/departments/its/faqs/faq.asp?ID=56#browser>. Once you have connected to the server, you can access the N: drive ("Class" folder).

When you open the N: drive, look for the folder "MTetreau". Open this folder, then open the folder "PLSI 1341 - The Individual in World Politics". In this folder you will find many folders that correspond to the dates on your syllabus. In each folder are the readings that are to be completed for that day. So, if there are readings in the August 28 folder, for example, you should read them by class time on the 28th.

If you have questions, please email Katherine at TetreaultTA@gmail.com, and she will point you in the right direction.

GRADED WORK:

Exams: There will be **three in-class exams** during the semester. The lowest grade on these three exams will be dropped from the calculation of your exam average. There are **no make-up exams** — if you miss an exam you get a zero (hopefully your lowest grade). It may be possible for you to take an exam early, but you can't take it after it has been given to the rest of the class. If you know you are going to be away when an exam is scheduled, let's discuss what to do in advance.

There will be a final exam during the regularly scheduled final exam period. Anyone who passes all three in-class exams can choose to skip the final exam and have her or his exam average count for 50 percent of the final grade (otherwise the in-class exam average counts for 30 percent and the final exam counts for 20 percent).

Performances: Dramatic presentation of the thesis of your group project book to the class. **Each group** will prepare and execute **one performance** — dates are listed in the course calendar below. The performance should be from 20 to 30 minutes long. Prior to the performance, the group should outline briefly what the book is about and what the performance is intended to highlight. After the performance, the group will lead the class in discussion of the issues raised (including, should anyone ask, how these issues relate to earlier readings in the course).

Essays: **Each person will write an essay** of 4-8 pages that focuses on the group project book. You are not required to consult any additional sources other than those on the syllabus. You are expected to **include references to at least two additional readings from the syllabus** in your paper. Essays are due one week following your group performance. Late essays will be penalized one letter grade. A handout on essay writing will be distributed later in the semester.

EEs: Finally, you are **required to attend and comment on five outside enrichment experiences (EEs)**. These are events sponsored by various departments and programs at the university that bring in **live people from somewhere else** to talk about their work. Dates and times for these events will be announced in class or sent via email. After you attend an event, please write a brief summary of what went on and an assessment linking what you learned at the event to the concerns of this course. **These reports must be emailed to me within one week of the event to count for credit.** When you send your EE reports, please use this address: moontyger@earthlink.net.

COURSE CALENDAR:

23 August:

Introduction and distribution of the syllabus; assignment of uncommon books; discussion of the main theoretical frameworks we'll be using during the semester.

Discussion questions: Following most of your reading assignments, you will find a list of discussion questions. These are to guide you as you read and, if you can answer them, you know you will have understood the material. They also should be useful helping you prepare for exams.

28 August:

The agent-structure problem. **BE ALERT. THE READING FOR THIS ASSIGNMENT IS**

DIVIDED. Mrs. Roosevelt group reads: Nicholas Lemann, “The Quiet Man,” *New Yorker*, 7 May 2001, at http://newyorker.com/archive/content/?040906fr_archive06, and Jane Mayer, “The Hidden Power,” *New Yorker*, 3 July 2006, at *Truthout*, <http://www.truthout.org/cgi-bin/artman/exec/view.cgi/62/20925>. **Astro Turf group reads:** Nicholas Lemann, “Without a Doubt,” 14 October 2002, formerly at http://www.newyorker.com/fact/content/?021014fa_fact3; David Samuels, “Grand Illusions.” *Atlantic*. June 2007: 46-48, 50, 52-55, 58, 60, 62-64, 65, 68, 70, 72, 74, 76. **Paul Farmer group (Mountains) reads:** Ron Suskind, “Without a Doubt,” *New York Times Magazine*, 17 October 2004, at <http://brandon.multics.org/stuff/suskind2004without.html>; Jeffrey Goldberg, “The Believer,” *New Yorker*, 13 February 2006, at http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/02/13/060213fa_fact1.

Discussion questions: How much are people (agents) constrained by rules and resources (structures)? What are the relative contributions of agents and structures to White House politics from the beginning of the Bush administration? Please consult the rubric to prepare the analysis of your person. Your group will have time to coordinate at the beginning of class.

29 August:

FIRST FILM. *Wag the Dog*, (Barry Levinson, 1997). Please come to the regular classroom at 6 pm for the film. If you don't know anything about it, check this out: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0120885/>.

30 August:

Realism, Idealism, and Constructivism. Reading: Thomas **Hobbes**, *Leviathan*, chaps. 13, 17; Immanuel **Kant**, “Perpetual Peace”; Cindy **Weber**, *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2001), chap. 4, all on the university N-drive.

Discussion questions: How does each writer describe the process of international politics? Does anarchy look the same from each perspective? What is the “security dilemma,” and how does it look from each perspective? Is war rational or not — and according to whose definition of “rational”? (How) does “republicanism” reduce the likelihood of war? What about the golden rule? Or “public right”?

4 September:

Wars of the world. Reading: Niall **Ferguson**, *The War of the World* (hereafter *WOW*), introduction and chaps. 1-3.

Discussion questions:

How does Ferguson explain the wars of our world? What are the characteristics of empire that make ethnic warfare less likely than it is in nation-states? Are some ethnic groups more vulnerable than others to ethnic warfare? What does Ferguson mean by “fault lines”? What might be thought of as analogous fault lines in contemporary American society? (How) do these fault lines contribute to poisoned politics and conflict?

6 September:

Major wars: cycles, epicycles, or epiphenomena? Reading: **Ferguson**, *WOW*, chaps. 4-6; Robert **Gilpin**, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 199-210.

Discussion questions: Are wars fundamentally similar or are there kinds of wars just as there are kinds of political units and kinds of markets? What is hegemonic war? WWI is counted among the hegemonic wars — how closely does Ferguson's description of this war coincide with the kind of conflict Gilpin theorizes? When do we decide that a war is “hegemonic”? What could make the current Middle East war a hegemonic conflict?

11 September:

Unspeakable thoughts, despicable acts. Reading, **Ferguson**, *WOW*, chaps. 7-9; and please find, download, and read the 2002 version of the **Bush** strategic doctrine. The official date of publication is 20 September 2002.

Discussion questions: The arguments over the Iraq war focused heavily on “Munich” and “appeasement” as object lessons for current policy makers. Why then, is current US strategic doctrine criticized for its forthright embrace of the concept of preventive war? What is the relationship between declining power and the desire to retain prestige in the approach taken by Britain and France to Germany between the world wars? Is the same fear of falling visible in the Bush Doctrine? And who are the new Jews?

12 September:

SECOND FILM: *Control Room* (Noujaim 2004), and information on this film can be found at <http://www.imdb.com/find?s=all&q=control+room>.

13 September:

The democratic peace thesis. Reading: Ido **Oren**, “The Subjectivity of the ‘Democratic’ Peace,” *International Security* 20 (2) Fall 1995: 147-84 (available on JSTOR); Michael **Ignatieff**, “The Burden,” *New York Times Magazine*, 5 January 2003, at <http://faculty.washington.edu/nsingh/ignatieff.htm>; White House **Press Secretary**, “President Bush Discusses Freedom in Iraq and the Middle East,” press release, 6 November 2003, at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/new/releases/2003/11/print/20031106-2.html>; Gilbert **Achcar**, “Fantasy of a Region that Doesn’t Exist: Greater Middle East, the US plan,” *Le Monde Diplomatique*, April 2004 at <http://mondediplo.com/2004/04/04/04world>.

Discussion questions: If all the major states in Europe had been democratic before WWI, would they have gone to war? (If we will not have attacked Iran over the summer, what would be the most likely reason? What if we don’t attack Syria — would it be for the same reason?) What about going to war to bring democracy to the Middle East? Or isn’t bringing democracy what this is all about anyway?

18 September:

Wars of ideas (or was that ideologies. . . .) — dominoes, credibility, and the return of the repressed. Reading: Theodore **Draper**, “Falling Dominoes,” *New York Review*, 27 October 1983; Gil **Merom**, *How Democracies Lose Small Wars: State, Society, and the Failures of France in Algeria, Israel in Lebanon, and the United States in Vietnam* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003): 108-35; Matthew **Connolly**, “Rethinking the Cold War and Decolonization: The Grand Strategy of the Algerian War for Independence,” *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 33(2) May 2001: 221-45, available on JSTOR; Bill **Moyers**, interview with Marilyn Young, “Bill Moyers Journal,” PBS, aired 11 May 2007, at <http://www.pbs.org/moyers/journal/05112007/profile3.html>. You can read the transcript or watch the video, whichever.

Discussion questions: What is a “small war”? Who gets to choose to fight a “war of choice”? Which was the tail and which was the dog in Algeria, and what does this tell us about the Cold War paradigm? What were the human, material, and political costs of the wars in Viet Nam and Algeria, for France and the United States? And why are we having Viet Nam all over again in Iraq?

20 September:

Arms races and proliferation agents and structures in dangerous settings. Reading: Carol **Cohn**, “Nuclear Language and How We Learned to Pat the Bomb,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, 43(5), June 1987:

17-24, at www.thebulletin.org/pdf/temp/043_005_013.pdf; Niall **Ferguson**, *The Pity of War* (New York: Basic Books, 1999), 82-87; and Steve **Coll**, “The Atomic Emporium,” *New Yorker*, 7 August 2006, at http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/08/07/060807fa_fact_coll?printable=true.

Discussion questions: What logic drives arms races — well, what sort of thought processes define them? (How) are arms races realistic? Republican? Constructivist? Post-structuralist? When we think about nuclear war, do we imagine the scene Eden sets in ground-zero Washington? Why or why not? What is the impact of the current wave of nuclear proliferation — are nuclear weapons likely to be used in the next hegemonic war? (What about in non-hegemonic wars?) And why is A. Q Khan still alive and well and basking in the praises of his countrymen?

25 September: FIRST EXAM.

26 September:

THIRD FILM: *The Atomic Café*, (Loader and Rafferty, 1982). And here comes the IMDB fix for this film: <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0083590/>.

27 September:

FIRST PERFORMANCE: M. G. Lord, *Astro Turf*. The rest of the class should read Lynn **Eden**, *Whole World on Fire: Organizations, Knowledge, and Nuclear Weapons Devastation* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2004): 15-36; and Gilbert **Burnham** et al., “Mortality after the 2003 invasion of Iraq: a cross-sectional cluster sample survey,” *The Lancet*, published online 11 October 2006.

2 October:

International law. Reading: W. Michael **Reisman** and Chris T. Antoniou, *The Laws of War* (New York: Vintage, 1994), xvii-xxxii; Howard **Ball**, *Prosecuting War Crimes and Genocide: The Twentieth-Century Experience* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999), 49-61, 70-93; Garry **Wills**, “What is a Just War?” *New York Review*, 18 November 2004, at <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/17560>; Jamie **Mayerfeld**, “The Democratic Legacy of the International Criminal Court,” *Fletcher Forum of World Affairs* 28(2) Summer 2004: 147-56 at <http://fletcher.tufts.edu/forum/28-2pdfs/mayerfelda.pdf>.

Discussion questions: During the violent twentieth century, international law was extended far beyond the rules of war devised by patristic writers and medieval popes, and conventions worked out by Renaissance diplomats to include treaties like the Hague and Geneva Conventions and institutions like war-crimes tribunals, the UN Security Council, and the World Court. What is the role of the Nuremberg Tribunal in the development of international law? How should we read US reluctance to participate in the ICC culminating in the decision of the Bush administration to rescind the US signature to the Rome Treaty and to bully other signatories into signing bilateral treaties that guarantee impunity to Americans no matter what crimes they may commit? Does US behavior confirm Ferguson’s opinion that international law is of little value or not?

4 October:

Beginning the story of Rwanda. Reading: **Gourevitch**, *We Wish to Inform You that Tomorrow We Will be Killed With Our Families*. Please read up to p. 100, and find, download, and read the **Genocide Convention**. We’ll see a video in class, “The Triumph of Evil.”

Discussion questions: The *Frontline* editors who put “Triumph” together did not think much of the Clinton administration’s human rights policy. What do you think? How is genocide defined? If you had to construct a hierarchy of international responsibility based on this film and Gourevitch’s sketch of Rwanda’s colonial history, what and/or who would be your top three candidates for indictment? How about the top five?

9 October:

Rwanda, continued. Reading, **Gourevitch**, *We Wish to Inform You* — please read to p. 241.

Discussion questions: If you had to choose one turning point when a handful of people could have changed the situation in Rwanda, what would it be? What are some of the differences between the people who resisted the genocide and intervened to save others, and the ones who were bystanders or even active participants in the slaughter? Gourevitch says that we are all the children of Cain — is this hyperbole or is responsibility for genocide an oxymoron — are we all responsible? What about people like Paul Rusesabagina or Bonaventure? Or Paul Kagame? Why do some people act and others only watch?

11 October:

Moving on or getting stuck. Reading: Finish **Gourevitch**, *We Wish to Inform You*. Also, Michael **Ignatieff**, “Digging Up the Dead,” *New Yorker*, 10 November 1997: 84-93.

Discussion questions: Rwanda was poorly served by the ICTR and minimally served by its own legal institutions. Trials in local, “gicaca” courts are still going on, but the effort to separate the most responsible from the far less responsible *genocidaires* leaves much to be desired. What if Rwanda had created a Truth Commission — and why didn’t it? We can see a great deal of denial throughout the story of Rwanda — is there an “audience” for denial? If so, who are these people?

16 October:

Human Rights. Reading: the UN Declaration of Human Rights (find, download, and read);; Ghanim al-Najjar, “Human Rights in a Crisis Situation: The Case of Kuwait After Occupation,” *Human Rights Quarterly* 23 (2001): 188-209, available on JSTOR; Amitav **Ghosh**, “The Ghosts of Mrs. Gandhi,” *New Yorker*, 17 July 1995: 35-41; Margaret **Warner**, interview with Paul Rusesabagina, PBS “News Hour,” 12 April 2006, at http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/africa/jan-june06/darfur_4-12.html.

Discussion questions: Looking at Rwanda and Kuwait as examples, should we use “human rights” as the basis for intervention into the domestic affairs of another state — is it OK to violate a state’s sovereignty or go to war against an invading state on the basis of human rights violations? Ghanim al-Najjar and Amitav Ghosh argue explicitly that there is a direct connection between stress on a government and violations of human rights. Do you think this is true? Was it stress that led the government of Rwanda to orchestrate a genocide or the government of India to tolerate a pogrom against the Sikhs? Let’s revisit rescuers and consider the actions of Ghanim al-Najjar in Kuwait, Paul Rusesabagina in Rwanda, and the several examples noted in the Ghosh article — what distinguishes them from persons who do not rescue or who actually collaborate with governments engaged in gross human rights violations?

18 October:

SECOND PERFORMANCE. Mary Ann Glendon, *A World Made New*. The rest of the class should read Brian **Urquhart**, “Mrs. Roosevelt’s Revolution,” *New York Review*, 26 April 2001, on the N-drive.

23 October:

Trials (and tribulations!). We'll start watching *Judgment at Nuremberg* (Kramer, 1961). **Please start reading for the 30 October class this week.**

24 October: FOURTH FILM. We'll finish watching *Judgment*. And Happy UN Day!

25 October: SECOND EXAM.

30 October:

So what was that all about? Reading: **Ferguson**, *WOW*, chaps. 10-16.

Discussion questions: WW2 brought war to civilian populations, killing at least as many civilians as military members and perhaps even more, depending on the source (you can check this out on Google). How is rape used as a strategy of warfare and of genocide? Rape was not an official war crime until the ICTR issued the first indictments, and the ICTY the first convictions. — why did it take so long? How does Ferguson's narrative of the war explain the fury and the disgust the director of *Judgment at Nuremberg* demonstrates — against the allies? How does the director portray responsibility for the holocaust? How did Germany's leaders and population use the behavior of the allies to excuse their actions (and perhaps even model them)? How much of a triumph was the allied victory in WW II — and why does Ferguson say it was "tainted"? Looking back at Mrs. Roosevelt and the efforts of the United Nations in its early days, it is less of a mystery why they tried so hard to change the structure of international relations after WW II — why were their efforts resisted by so many? What was it all about, and what did anyone gain? (You could start with Matthew 16:26.)

1 November:

Happy All Saints Day! Environmental protection and public health are not luxuries. Reading: Robert G. **Webster** and Elizabeth Jane Walker, "Influenza," *American Scientist* 91, March-April 2003: 122-29. Elizabeth **Kolbert**, *Field Notes from a Catastrophe*, Chaps. 1-4. If you have time, check out an old *Atlantic* article by Bill **McKibben**, "A Special Moment in History," May 1998. If you Google the title, you can get a Microsoft Word version — no pictures, but you can't have everything.

Discussion questions: What makes germs and melting icebergs less compelling than war and gore to leaders and populations in large, rich countries? What is the influence of population on our current problems with germs and icebergs? What about the old problems of war and gore — would we have fewer of them if there were fewer of us?

6 November:

Globalization. Reading: Robert O. **Keohane** and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition* (Boston: Little Brown, 1977), 8-19; Johan **Galtung**, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *J. of Peace Research* 6(3) 1969: 167-91, available from JSTOR; Nigel **Harris**, *The Return of Cosmopolitan Capital: Globalization, the State and War* (London: I. B. Tauris, 2003), 125-41; Robert **Pape**, *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism* (New York: Random House, 2005), 27-60.

Discussion questions: What makes the United States sensitive to events occurring outside our borders? To which kinds

of events are we most sensitive? How much can we protect ourselves in a globalizing world? What kinds of economic activities and strategic decisions increase our vulnerability? How does structural violence affect the choices of states? Are some kinds of states more likely to be affected by structural violence than others? What about acute (regular) violence?

8 November:

THIRD PERFORMANCE: Tracey Kidder, *Mountains Beyond Mountains*. The rest of the class should read Helen **Epstein**, “The Lost Children of AIDS,” *New York Review*, 3 November 2005: 41-44, 46, available at <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/18399>.

13 November:

People and the environment. Reading: Don **Van Natta, Jr., and** Neela Banerjee, “Top G.O.P. Donors in Energy Industry Met Cheney Panel,” *New York Times*, 1 March 2002, A1, A15; Andrew C. **Revkin**, “Bush Aide Softened Greenhouse Gas Links to Global Warming,” *New York Times*, 8 June 2005, [http://www.nytimes.com/2005/06/08/politics/08climate.html?ex=1120968000&en=361be7ace58328d7&ei=5087&nl=ep&emc=ep&rd=hcmcp?p=048vcx048veW4LL3q012000mN8\\$2N8pw](http://www.nytimes.com/2005/06/08/politics/08climate.html?ex=1120968000&en=361be7ace58328d7&ei=5087&nl=ep&emc=ep&rd=hcmcp?p=048vcx048veW4LL3q012000mN8$2N8pw); **Kolbert**, *Field Notes*, chaps. 5-8.

Discussion questions: Is business as usual denial or corruption? Is denial corruption?

14 November: FIFTH FILM. Here’s an old classic to remind you that there are no easy answers: *The China Syndrome* (Bridges, 1979), information at <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0078966/>.

15 November:

Environmental activism. Reading: Finish **Kolbert** — and learn about amazing Burlington, Vermont! Bill **McKibben**, *Deep Economy: The Wealth of Communities and the Durable Future* (New York: Times Books, 2007), chap. 5.

Discussion questions: What can we (as in, we the people in this room) be doing right now about global climate change?

20 November: You have worked very hard. How about a day off?

22 November: HAPPY THANKSGIVING!

27 November: THIRD EXAM.

29 November: Things fall apart and they could fall apart even faster under the pressures of global climate change. Reading: Misha **Glenny**, “The Age of the Parastate,” *New Yorker*, 8 May 1995: 45-49, 52-53; James K. **Galbraith**, “The Predator State,” *Mother Jones*, May/June 2000, at

http://www.motherjones.com/commentary/columns/2006/05/predator_state.html. CLASS EXERCISE: You and your parastate.

4 December:

(New) world order. Reading: Tony **Judt**, “The New World Order,” *New York Review* 52(12) 14 July 2005, at <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/18113>; Václav **Havel**, “Kosovo and the End of the Nation-State,” *New York Review*, 10 June 1999; Hilary **Charlesworth and** Christine Chinkin, *The Boundaries of International Law: A Feminist Analysis* (New York: Juris Publishing, 2000), chap. 9.

Discussion questions: What is world order likely to resemble under the dual pressures created by the collapse of US leadership and the unfolding outcomes of global climate change? Havel is thinking about violence in his article, but is he correct that states are not the best place to look for protection for human beings? What else is there to protect us? How plausible is McKibben’s recipe for reorganizing communities? And how can we get from reflexive war to peaceful dispute resolution?

8 December: FINAL EXAM. This is a **Saturday** (ugh). Please come to the usual classroom at **2:00 pm** if you are taking the final.

GRADING

In-class exam average.30%
Final exam.20%
Performance.10%
Essay.30%
EEs.10%

And speaking of grades, here is a word from our sponsor:

All students are covered by a policy that prohibits dishonesty in academic work. The Academic Integrity Policy (AIP) covers all students who entered Trinity before the fall of 2004. The Academic Honor Code covers all those who entered the fall of 2004 or later.

The Integrity Policy and the Code share many features: each asserts that the academic community is based on honesty and trust; each contains the same violations; each provides for a procedure to determine if a violation has occurred and what the punishment will be; each provides for an appeal process.

The main difference is that the faculty implements the AIP while the Code is implemented by the Academic Honor Council. Under the Integrity Policy, the faculty member determines whether a violation has occurred as well as the punishment for the violation (if any) within certain guidelines. Under the Code, a faculty member will (or a student may) report an alleged violation to the Academic Honor Council. It is the task of the Council to investigate, adjudicate, and assign a punishment within certain guidelines if a violation has been verified.

Students who are under the Honor Code are required to pledge all written work that is submitted for a grade: “On my honor, I have neither given nor received any unauthorized assistance on this work,” followed by their signatures. The pledge may be abbreviated “pledged,” with a signature.