

## **POS 3931: Broward Hall Seminar in International Affairs**

### **Dr. Paul Hensel**

phensel@garnet.acns.fsu.edu  
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/  
Phone: 644-7318  
Office: 563 Bellamy Bldg.  
Office Hours: M & W 3:30-4:45  
(& F 1:00-2:00 in Broward)

### **Fall 2005**

Mondays, 5:15-6:15 PM  
201 Diffenbaugh Building  
**T.A.: Mr. Bill Davis**  
Office: 219 Bellamy  
Office Hours: TTh 11-12:30  
Email: wd03@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

### **Course Description**

The Broward Hall Public Affairs Living-Learning Community is made up of 132 residents who have an interest in public and international affairs. The purpose of this course is to provide a forum for these students to investigate and discuss critical issues in international affairs, such as the war on terrorism, weapons of mass destruction, international trade policy, and global warming; a similar course in the spring semester will focus on critical issues in domestic public affairs. We will read several articles with opposing viewpoints on each issue, and will then discuss the issue in class.

Like the Broward Hall Program more generally, this course is nonpartisan in nature and will not be guided by any single political perspective or agenda. There will be an emphasis on serious consideration of each side of the issue, with the goal of developing a more complete understanding of its complexities and possible consequences (rather than blindly accepting something that we heard from a friend, relative, or politician). Keeping this in mind, students must come to class prepared to discuss the readings, and must participate constructively in the class discussion. Please keep your comments and discussion civil, giving your classmates' views the same respect and consideration that you expect them to give to your own views.

### **Required Texts**

One book is required for this course. It should be available at either the FSU Bookstore or any Bill's Bookstore location, as well as at online bookstores such as amazon.com and half.com:

- Gregory M. Scott, Randall J. Jones Jr., and Louis S. Furmanski (2004). *21 Debated Issues in World Politics*, 2nd edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall.

### **Course Requirements**

(1) **Preparation and Attendance:** Students are expected to complete the assigned readings before class and participate actively in class discussion. Equally important, though, is maintaining a civil environment where students can discuss the issues like mature adults, without being interrupted by their colleagues' behavior or being criticized for holding unpopular views. If you do not feel that you can handle this level of discussion, please do not attend class and ruin the environment for those who really want to be here.

(2) **Examinations:** Two noncumulative exams are required. The first exam will be given during the regular class period on **Monday, October 17**; the second exam will be given in the regular class room on **Wednesday, December 14, from 5:30-7:30 PM** (the assigned time for the course's final exam). Each exam will be worth 1/3 of the course grade.

(3) **Attendance at Broward Hall Events:** One of the central components of the Broward Hall program is the series of events and activities that are available only to Program participants. Roughly 8-12 events are held each semester, including three speakers in the Broad International Lecture Series; the events cover a variety of topics related to public and international affairs, and many will be held inside Broward Hall itself. Students in this course are required to attend four of these events during the semester, which counts for 1/3 of the course grade; attendance will be measured by a sign-up sheet at each event. To give students additional incentive to attend events beyond the first four, extra credit will be offered for every event attended beyond the first four (with each additional event counting for 2% extra credit toward the overall course grade).

### **Course Rules**

(1) Make-up examinations are given only with **prior** instructor approval and with appropriate documentation, and take place only during final exam week. Note that the documentation must indicate why you could not be in class *at the exact time of the test*. (Also note that standard Thagard notes explicitly state that they are not valid class excuses.)

(2) Failure to complete any paper assignment or failure to take any exam will result in a failing grade for the entire course; a passing grade requires completion of all course requirements. Note that no assignments, documentation, or other items will be accepted after the course's final exam.

(3) Students are required to keep an extra copy of each assignment until the instructor has returned the graded copy of that assignment. Students are also required to keep graded, returned copies of all exams and writing assignments. Failure to do so will invalidate any potential question or protest about assignment or course grades.

(4) All students must treat both the instructor and the other students with respect. This includes showing respect for alternative opinions and points of view, listening when either the instructor or a fellow student is speaking to the class, and refraining from insulting language and gestures.

(5) All students must treat the classroom setting with respect. This includes arriving on time and staying for the entire class (or notifying the instructor in advance if this will not be possible), turning off cell phones and similar devices during class, and refraining from reading, passing notes, talking with friends, and any other potentially disruptive activities.

(6) Failure to abide by these policies will be dealt with in an appropriate manner, which may include a reduction in the course grade.

(7) Any exceptions to these rules are given at the instructor's discretion, only with **prior** approval

where possible, and only under extraordinarily pressing and well-documented circumstances.

(8) The instructor's late paper policies, grading policies, and similar policies and expectations are available at <<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/teaching.html>>. Failure to visit that web site does not constitute a valid excuse for ignorance of these policies.

(9) All students must have an FSU email account on the Garnet server. Group email will be used to provide updates and reminders concerning the course and the Broward Hall Program, so all students must be accessible in this way. If you use a non-FSU email account, you must set up your FSU account to forward messages to the other account.

### **Americans with Disabilities Act**

Students with disabilities needing academic accommodations must (1) register with and provide documentation to the Student Disability Resource Center (SDRC), and (2) bring a letter to the instructor from SDRC indicating that you need academic accommodations. This must be done within the first week of class.

### **FSU's Academic Honor Code**

*"The academic honor system of The Florida State University is based on the premise that each student has the responsibility: (1) To uphold the highest standards of academic integrity in the student's own work, (2) To refuse to tolerate violations of academic integrity in the University community, and (3) To foster a high sense of integrity and social responsibility on the part of the University community."*

Students must bring possible violations of this honor code to the attention of the instructor as soon as possible, so that the violations -- if any -- may be stopped quickly. Violations include (but are not limited to) the use of unauthorized information on course assignments or examinations, representing another's work or any part thereof (published or unpublished) as one's own, assisting another student in obtaining unauthorized information for course assignments or examinations, and attempting to commit such an offense. A more complete listing of violations can be found in the FSU Student Handbook.

Violation of this honor code will be dealt with in an appropriate manner, consistent with FSU guidelines. Academic penalties may include (but shall not be limited to) a requirement of additional work to provide evidence that the student knows and understands the course material; a lower or failing grade on the assignment or examination in question; and a lower or failing grade for the course. The University may also enforce further disciplinary penalties, such as a formal reprimand, probation, or suspension or dismissal from the University.

### **Instructor's Web Site**

The instructor maintains a web site at <<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/>> with -- among other things -- teaching policies, solutions to common writing problems, and numerous Internet resources for students of international relations. Students are strongly encouraged to become familiar with this web site during the semester. The online version of this syllabus can be found at <<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/Teaching/pos3931.html>>.

## Course Schedule

### 1. Monday, Aug. 29: Overview of Course

### 2. Monday, Sept. 5: NO CLASS (Labor Day)

### 3. Monday, Sept. 12: Missile Defense: Vital for Security, or Provocative and Unreliable?

*Book:* Issue 14 (pp. 217-227)

*Discussion:* The U.S. is currently in the early stages of deploying a limited national missile defense system. Think about the costs and benefits of such a system, as argued by the assigned readings. Are the proponents right that the potential costs of leaving ourselves vulnerable are so great that missile defense is vital to U.S. security? Are the opponents right that we shouldn't rely on a system that has been so unreliable so far, and that the risks of provoking an arms race or a preemptive strike are too great to justify deploying this system? Which other countries or groups should be the most concerned if the U.S. does deploy a complete missile defense system?

### 4. Monday, Sept. 19: Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs): What Can and Should Be Done? (and by whom?)

*Book:* Issue 15 (pp. 228-239)

*Discussion:* An important justification that was offered for the recent war with Iraq was Saddam Hussein's alleged pursuit of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons programs, which could be used to threaten neighboring states in the region. Other countries are believed to have similar programs, including Iran and North Korea (and Libya has only recently abandoned its programs). Only a few states admit to having nuclear weapons: the U.S., Russia, Britain, France, China, India, and Pakistan (Israel and perhaps North Korea also have some).

Think about both the need to contain or reverse the proliferation (spread) of these weapons, and about the best ways to do this (if needed). From the perspective of the current WMD "haves," do the risks of having more WMD-armed countries justify international action (of some type) to prevent proliferation? From the perspective of the current "have-nots," is it fair for outsiders to prevent them from taking steps they consider necessary for their own security? Finally, can diplomacy, carrots (bribes), or sticks (threats or sanctions) work to stop proliferation, or is a preventive war the best solution?

### 5. Monday, Sept. 26: Should Great Powers Intervene Abroad? (When and Why?)

*Book:* Issue 5 (pp. 65-81)

*Discussion:* International debates have raged throughout the past decade over whether the U.S. and other great powers have a right (or even an obligation) to intervene abroad to help avoid humanitarian or other disasters. For example, during the mid-1990s, the great powers largely stood idly by as hundreds of thousands were massacred in Rwanda and Burundi and as fighting raged between Russia and Chechnyan separatists, but the U.S. and its allies intervened militarily to protect Bosnians and Albanians who were being threatened by ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia; today the primary debate involves possible intervention to prevent genocide in the

Sudan.

Think about whether the U.S. -- and/or other great powers -- should use their great military and economic power to prevent disasters around the world, particularly when the targets are too weak to defend themselves. Should the great powers spend their own money (and risk their own soldiers' lives) halfway around the planet, in places that most of their citizens have never heard of? If so, should this be done everywhere, or only in certain situations (and if so, which situations are those?)

## **6. Monday, Oct. 3: The War in Iraq**

*Book:* No assigned readings

*Web:* President George W. Bush's 3/17/2003 and 3/19/2003 speeches on Iraq  
<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030317-7.html>>  
<<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/03/20030319-17.html>>

*Web:* 2003 Congressional Research Service report: "Iraq: Divergent Views on Military Action"  
<<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/19443.pdf>>

*Discussion:* The U.S. and a few allies (only the United Kingdom, Australia, and Poland supplied combat troops) invaded Iraq in March 2003 and overthrew the government of Saddam Hussein. Among other things, President Bush and his supporters argued that Iraq's weapons of mass destruction (which Iraq had previously used against both Iran and its own people) and its ties to international terrorism made Iraq a serious threat to international security, and they argued that replacing Hussein's government with a democracy would help promote peace and stability in the Middle East. Subsequent events have shown, though, that Iraq no longer had any weapons of mass destruction, and that there were no ties between Iraq and al Qaeda. A deadly insurgency has also emerged since the end of the war, killing hundreds of Americans and thousands of Iraqis associated with the new government.

Think about the current situation in Iraq, in light of the original goals and more recent developments. Should the U.S. reduce its presence in Iraq or withdraw entirely, and if so, what will the likely consequences be? Should the U.S. keep its current involvement in Iraq or even increase its troop levels, and if so, what will the likely consequences be? If the U.S. shouldn't withdraw right away, when -- if ever -- should the U.S. troops eventually be withdrawn? While thinking about these questions, be careful to consider which objectives may or may not be achieved, and what the (domestic or international) consequences of these actions might be. (Please be respectful of others' opinions on this topic -- this is a very important issue to many Americans, and many people may disagree strongly with each other for very good reasons.)

## **7. Monday, Oct. 10: Unilateralism: Should the U.S. Go It Alone?**

*Book:* Issue 4 (pp. 48-64)

*Discussion:* Another topic that has come up during the war with Iraq is the question of whether the U.S. should pursue its interests overseas by itself if necessary, or whether it should attempt to coordinate policies with other major powers, the United Nations, or other actors. The U.S. pursued the war in Iraq with support from a few allies -- the United Kingdom and some smaller states -- but against the opposition of most of the other major powers. During the war and its immediate aftermath, U.S. relations with most other allies and with many other states suffered,

and more than a year later these relations have not returned to their prewar levels.

Think about how important it is for the U.S. to get its way at all costs, even if this means antagonizing most of its allies. As a general principle, should the U.S. be worried about offending its major allies? Does having strong alliances increase U.S. security more than getting our way on an issue halfway around the world? Should U.S. security always come first, regardless of what our so-called friends think in Europe or elsewhere? Or should the U.S. pick and choose, with certain issues being worth paying the costs ourselves (and which ones should this include)?

## **8. Monday, Oct. 17: MIDTERM EXAMINATION**

### **9. Monday, Oct. 24: The International Criminal Court: Anti-War Crimes, or Anti-American?**

*Book:* Issue 9 (pp. 140-151)

*Discussion:* After massive war crimes and ethnic cleansing led to the creation of specific international tribunals to investigate and punish war crimes in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda (and drawing from the example of the Nuremberg war crimes court after World War II), an international effort led to the creation of the International Criminal Court in 2003. The U.S. has opposed this ICC because of the fear that it could be used to prosecute American soldiers or peacekeepers out of political motivations, and has signed "immunity agreements" with dozens of countries that protect U.S. nationals from ICC prosecution for alleged incidents on their territory. U.S. opposition to the ICC has become even more controversial after it became clear that U.S. soldiers had been involved in the torture of foreign prisoners in Afghanistan and in Iraq, most notably in the Abu Ghraib prison scandal.

Think about the need for a standing international court to deal with war crimes in general, as well as the U.S. objections to this particular court. Will a standing court help to deter war crimes, or at least punish offenders? Will it matter if the world's most powerful country refuses to cooperate with this court? Would such a court pose a serious threat to U.S. interests, and if so, is there any way that this threat could be overcome?

### **10. Monday, Oct. 31: Globalization and the World Economy: Who Should Care?**

*Book:* Issue 1 (pp. 1-11), Issue 17 (pp. 248-258)

*Discussion:* Many in the developed world (the "rich" or industrialized countries) worry about globalization (the ever-increasing flow of individuals, products, and ideas across national borders), because of the fear that foreign competition will steal American (or German, Japanese, etc.) jobs. This led many in both the Republican and Democratic parties to oppose the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which cut trade barriers with Canada and Mexico, and it has led to repeated calls to protect certain American industries from lower-cost foreign workers and cheaper foreign products. Yet many others see free trade as the best path to economic wealth and political security.

Many in the developing world (the "Third World" or "less developed countries", such as most states in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East) fear globalization even more than the developed states do, because these states have not (yet) been able to build up strong economies

or competitive industries that would allow them to succeed in a world of free trade. As a result, most developing states (and their supporters in the developed world) oppose free trade, and launch significant protests against meetings of organizations that promote free trade and globalization -- like the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Think about both the benefits and the costs of globalization, from the perspectives of both developing and developed states. Should this be a matter of concern for the developed ("rich") states of the world, for the less developed or developing states, or both? Is globalization likely to produce winners and losers within a given country, such as the U.S., and if so who are they? In short, should the U.S. and other developed states keep pushing for freer trade worldwide, or is it time to step back and start thinking more carefully? On the other hand, think about the impact of free trade or the WTO on developing states. Do organizations like the WTO only benefit large multinational corporations, at the expense of developing states and the environment? Are there any possible ways to reach a happy medium, that benefits both rich and poor and that preserves the environment? If these different priorities can not all be reconciled at the same time, which should take precedence, and why?

### **11. Monday, Nov. 7: Economic Sanctions: A Useful Policy Tool?**

*Book:* Issue 6 (pp. 82-103)

*Discussion:* In a world where the daily news from Iraq reminds us of the costs (in dollars and lives) and uncertainties of using military force to accomplish political objectives, economic sanctions appear to be a useful policy tool. Sanctions have been employed in dozens of situations in recent years, ranging from economic pressures on Saddam Hussein to comply with UN weapons inspection teams to the U.S. economic embargo on Cuba to remove Fidel Castro from power.

Think about the value of sanctions for achieving foreign policy goals. Do the lower costs of sanctions outweigh their uncertain outcomes (since they often drag on for years without producing the desired results)? Do they punish the leaders of the targeted country, or are their costs usually passed on to the common person on the street while leaders stay in power and continue lavish lifestyles? Are there certain types of situations where sanctions are most (or least) useful, such as certain types of policy goals or certain types of targeted countries?

### **12. Monday, Nov. 14: The Arab-Israeli Conflict: What Should the U.S. Do?**

*Book:* Issue 7 (pp. 104-115)

*Discussion:* The Middle Eastern conflict between Arabs and Israelis has caused tension and bloodshed almost nonstop since the 1930s (and periodically even before then). Throughout most of this time, the United States has been a big supporter of Israel, which it sees as the most stable democracy in the region. To the Arab states and their supporters, this makes the U.S. a biased party, which they see as blocking a long-term peace settlement by encouraging Israel to pursue unilateral solutions and to reject compromises. Yet the U.S. was actively involved in promoting the peaceful solution of Israel's problems with both Egypt and Jordan, suggesting a potential positive role for the U.S. (and for other interested parties).

Think about the Arab-Israeli conflict from the perspective of outsiders such as the United States. Would U.S. interests be served better by a compromise that ended the Arab-Israeli

violence than by the current conflict, or is it more important to support the strong U.S. ally of Israel and to keep it from making concessions that could weaken its own security? Should the U.S. be involved actively in the Middle East peace process, or should it remain outside? If it does attempt to promote Middle East peace, should the U.S. try to push both sides to make concessions for peace (such as the Israeli withdrawal of both soldiers and settlers from occupied territory along with Palestinian actions to stop terrorism and to guarantee Israeli security), or should it be more concerned with making sure that Israel remains secure? Along these lines, can the U.S. ever be seen as a relatively neutral third party in resolving the conflict, and should it try to do so?

### **13. Monday, Nov. 21: The Clash of Civilizations**

*Book:* No assigned readings

*Web:* Samuel P. Huntington (1993). "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72, 3 (Summer): 22-49.

<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/Teaching/pos3931c.pdf>

*Discussion:* Huntington's article on civilizations (and the followup book where he expands on the same basic points) has been described as the single most influential article in the post-Cold War world. It has spawned a huge debate in the academic and policy communities, particularly in the aftermath of 9/11. Many in the U.S. see the 9/11 attacks as a civilizational attack by Muslims against the West, while some in the Muslim world (encouraged by extremists like Osama Bin Laden) see the U.S. "war on terrorism" as an attack by the West on the entire Muslim world.

Think about Huntington's basic points as descriptions of international relations overall, as well as considering their value for understanding 9/11 and its aftermath. Does Huntington seem to be correct that the world is increasingly seeing fundamental conflicts between members of different civilizations, rather than within civilizations? Is this argument likely to be even more accurate in the future? What (if anything) might be done to reverse or at least slow down this predicted growth in civilizational conflict? Also, what about 9/11, Afghanistan, and Iraq -- do any of these events provide support for Huntington's argument, and if so, which one(s)?

### **14. Monday, Nov. 28: Global Warming and Kyoto: What Can/Should the U.S. Do?**

*Book:* Issue 20 (pp. 294-319)

*Web:* President George W. Bush's June 2001 speech on climate change

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/06/20010611-2.html>

*Web:* U.S. State Department's July 2005 news release "U.S. Joins Asia-Pacific Partnership on Clean Energy Technologies":

<http://usinfo.state.gov/gi/Archive/2005/Jul/28-965096.html>

*Optional:* Official web site for UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (see especially the "Essential Background" and "Parties and Observers" sections)

<http://unfccc.int/>

*Discussion:* Our final topic of the semester concerns the controversy over global warming, and over one attempt that has been made to fight it. Most experts agree that human actions are contributing in some way to global climate change, although there is less agreement on the extent

of this contribution relative to other natural causes. While many political leaders accept that humans are contributing in some way and that the long-term consequences could be devastating, they often find it difficult to agree on the best possible solution. Several of today's readings present challenges to the Kyoto Protocol, which has been the most successful effort so far -- but which still has not gotten enough support to take effect, for reasons that are detailed in several of today's assigned readings.

Think about the problem of global warming, as well as about the Kyoto Protocol and the 2005 alternative as two possible ways to combat it. Should today's leaders be concerned about global warming, if its exact path is uncertain and its most serious effects may not be felt for many decades (or even centuries)? Who should be the most concerned -- the developed countries, which release the most greenhouse gases simply because of the massive size of their economies; the developing countries, which tend to use less efficient (and thus more polluting) technologies; or both? If there is to be a solution, who should pay for it, and how can an agreement be found that will please (almost) everybody?

### **15. Monday, Dec. 5: Course Wrapup**

*Discussion:* There will not be any assigned readings for the final meeting of the course. We will spend this time wrapping up the course, preparing for the final exam, and looking ahead to next semester.

### **16. Wednesday, Dec. 14: FINAL EXAM, 5:30 - 7:30 PM (in the regular classroom)**