

SIS 201: The Making of the 21st Century
Winter 2009

Professor Scott Radnitz
225A Thomson Hall
srad@u.washington.edu
206-543-2467

Lectures MWF 1130-1220, Kane 130
Sections T/Th

Final: Wed., March 18, 230-420 pm, Kane 130

Office hours: Thursdays, 1:30-3:00

Course website: <http://faculty.washington.edu/srad/sis201/>

This is an historic moment. We have in this past year made great progress in ending the long era of conflict and cold war. We have before us the opportunity to forge for ourselves and for future generations a new world order -- a world where the rule of law, not the law of the jungle, governs the conduct of nations. When we are successful -- and we will be -- we have a real chance at this new world order, an order in which a credible United Nations can use its peacekeeping role to fulfill the promise and vision of the U.N.'s founders.

--George Bush Sr., 1991

At the end of the Cold War, many people had high hopes that the world could overcome the divisions of the past and usher in a new era of peace and prosperity. The so-called New World Order would be led by the U.S. and facilitated by a relatively new phenomenon that captured people's imaginations in the 1990s—globalization. This world would be defined by the unrivalled dominance of capitalism and liberal democracy. It seemed possible to many at the time. Yet this vision did not work out as planned, and today we are trying to make sense of the international system after 9/11/2001.

The 1990s was not the only period in the 20th century in which world leaders had hoped to transcend the strife, tension, and suffering of a previous era; it also happened in the aftermath of World Wars I and II. And both times, as in the past decade, the situation turned out differently from the optimistic designs of the era's visionaries. This is not necessarily because history is destined to repeat itself. In fact, the *reason* for the failure of that vision was in each case unique and unexpected. What happened was that reality intruded; the world is complicated and defies the application of simplistic universal models. This was a lesson we should have learned from the failure of utopian ideologies in the 20th century.

This course is about the evolution of the international system in the 20th century, with the purpose of providing some tools to help students make sense of the world and its complications. In particular, we will focus on two phenomena that have shaped the character of the international system: power and ideas. How power is distributed in the international system—who has it and who lacks it—is the single most important variable in shaping outcomes of war/peace and poverty/prosperity in the world. But ideas also matter, and throughout the 20th century, various “isms” have been proposed and put into

practice. Many of these failed, but even misguided ideas, when combined with power, can have major consequences.

As we observe the world in 2008, we can see that history did not begin anew in 1990 or on September 11, 2001. The international system may change, but it never presents us with a clean slate. The pressing issues of today—poverty, global warming, ethnic and religious conflict, changing balances of power in Eurasia and the Middle East, authoritarianism, and international terrorism, to name a few—cannot be addressed without understanding where they came from. This course is an effort to do that.

The requirements for this course are:

- Three short (~3 page) response papers
- One longer (6-8-page) research paper
- Reading approximately 100-150 pages per week
- Participation in biweekly discussion sections
- Reading of the New York Times daily

Grades will be determined as follows:

Three response papers: 15%
Section participation: 15%
Research paper: 40%
Final exam: 30%

Response Papers

Students will choose three weeks in which to write short papers (~3 pages; double-spaced, 12 pt type, one-inch margins) that respond to an argument or idea in the reading for that week. Students must write three types of papers, *one of each of the following types*: evaluation, analysis of primary documents, and association with current events.

In each case, the paper should be your own argument, not simply a description or summary of the reading. It should have a thesis statement, usually in the first paragraph. Please follow these guidelines when writing each kind of paper:

- 1) Evaluation: Is the argument convincing and/or plausible? What evidence does the author bring to support it? What are the author's assumptions or possible biases? If a claim seems problematic or unsubstantiated, how could it be corrected or further investigated? What additional evidence would strengthen the argument?
- 2) Analysis of primary documents: Select one or more of the primary documents assigned for one week. Explain how the document(s) relate to the issues and/or events discussed in that week. Who produced the document and what is its purpose? What is the historical background that gave rise to it? How do the speaker/author's point of view and policy/opinion shed light on larger political/historical developments? With the benefit of hindsight, what do we

know today that, if the speaker/author also had also known, might have changed his/her point of view?

- 3) Connections to current events: How does the reading shed light on some issue in the news today or in the recent past? Can we see continuities between the events described in the reading and those of today? What happened in the interim? How could this reading inform policy makers as they deal with this issue? Examples of current issues might include some aspect of the current economic crisis, the coordination of policy within the European Union, the “war on terror,” or Russia’s foreign policy. Be as specific as possible in linking the reading to an issue.

The papers are due at the beginning of your Thursday section. You cannot write a paper the first week and must write all three papers by the ninth week. *No papers will be accepted in the 10th week.*

Long paper

Students will write an analytical research paper that seeks to *explain* an outcome in recent world history (i.e. the 20th or 21st century). It requires gathering sources that include physical books and will go through several drafts. Choose a question that deals with the part of the world you know/like best. If you don’t have a favorite region or country, adopt one.

The paper will be organized around a substantive puzzling question to which the answer is non-obvious, and will usually begin with the word *why*. For example: Why did Lenin take Russia out of World War I? Why did the independence of India and Pakistan result in massive violence? Why did Israel and the PLO agree to peace negotiations in the early 1990s? Why did the US push for the expansion of NATO after the Cold War?

The paper should state the puzzle at the beginning, letting the reader know what the argument is. The bulk of the paper will be devoted to expanding on your argument and providing supporting evidence for it. You should try to eliminate extraneous details—all information in the paper should go toward supporting the argument and persuading the reader. The paper must include at least *two primary documents*.

Because this is a difficult assignment, you will work on it in stages. In the fourth week, you must submit in your Tuesday section a one-paragraph summary of your *why* question and a preliminary argument or hypothesis. The argument need not be set in stone, and will probably change as you do your research.

Peer review: In the sixth week, students will form groups of 4-5 and provide feedback on the papers of everyone in the group. You will also turn in a detailed outline of your paper, including a list of references, to your TA.

The final draft is due in the ninth week of the course.

There will be a required library workshop during one of your sections.

Due dates for stages of the analytical paper:

- One-paragraph summary: January 27 in section
- First draft of paper to be posted online for peer review: Sunday, February 8, 11:59pm
- Detailed outline to TA: February 10 in section
- Comments to peer group completed and posted online: February 13, 11:59 pm
- Final draft: March 3 in section

Newspaper

Students are required to read the New York Times every day for at least 15 minutes. It can be online or the print edition. Students who thirst for more knowledge are encouraged to read the BBC online (www.bbc.co.uk) and/or subscribe to *The Economist*.

Quizzes

Over the course of the quarter, there will be two pop quizzes on random Fridays in lecture. They will consist of questions on news with international implications that have appeared recently in the newspaper. Students who read the NYT daily will have no trouble. There will be no make-up quizzes. Performance on the quizzes will be incorporated into the participation grade.

Final

The final exam will have two parts: short answer identifications and essays. The first part will ask you to identify and explain the significance of events, people, places, or concepts covered in the course. The second part will consist of essays that will require applying concepts from the course, synthesizing information you have read, and making your own argument. A study guide of possible questions will be made available in advance.

Extra Credit

There may be opportunities for extra credit throughout the quarter.

Penalties for late papers

For either draft of the research paper, students will be penalized 0.1 of their grade on the paper for each day it is late. UW policies on courses/grading/academic conduct are attached.

Reading

Readings consist of four books, primary documents, and some journal articles. Students should complete the reading for the week by the Tuesday section (with the exception of Week 1). These books are on sale at the UW bookstore.

Jeffrey A. Frieden *Global Capitalism* (W.W. Norton, 2006)

John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War: A New History* (Penguin, 2005)

Steven M. Walt, *Taming American Power* (W.W. Norton, 2006)

Fareed Zakaria, *The Future of Freedom* (W.W. Norton, 2004)

Week 1: January 5, 7, 9—Introduction: the International System

- Frieden: Chapters 1-2 (13-55)
- Zakaria: Introduction (13-27)
- “Finding Primary and Secondary Sources,” UW Libraries
<http://www.lib.washington.edu/subject/history/historyday/pri.html>

Week 2: January 12, 14, 16—World War I and the Interwar Period

- Zakaria: 29-69
- Frieden: Chs. 6-8 (127-194)

Documents

President Wilson’s Fourteen Points

http://wwi.lib.byu.edu/index.php/President_Wilson%27s_Fourteen_Points

Adolf Hitler’s Speech at the 1927 Nuremburg Rally

<http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/rpt27c.htm>

President Roosevelt’s Fireside Chat, May 7, 1933

<http://www.mhric.org/fdr/chat2.html>

Week 3: January 21, 23—World War II and its Aftermath

- Frieden: Chs. 9-11 (195-277)
- Gaddis: Ch. 1 (1-47)

Documents

Atlantic Charter, <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/wwii/atlantic.asp>

UN Declaration of Human Rights, December 10, 1948

<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>

Winston Churchill’s Iron Curtain Speech, March 5, 1946

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/churchill-iron.html>

Week 4: January 26, 28, 30—Competing Systems Emerge

- Frieden: Ch. 12 (278-300)
- Gaddis: Chs. 2-4 (48-155)

Documents

NATO Treaty, April 4, 1949, <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm>

NSC-68, Conclusions and Recommendations

<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/nsc-68/nsc68-4.htm>

Week 5: February 2, 4, 6—The Cold War and the Third World

- Gaddis: Ch. 5 (156-194)
- Frieden: Ch. 13-15 (301-360)

Documents

Final Communique of the Asian-African Conference, Bandung, 24 April, 1955
http://www.openspaceforum.net/twiki/tiki-read_article.php?articleId=291

President Johnson's Message to Congress, August 5, 1964
<http://www.hbci.com/~tgort/johnson.htm>

Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, August 7, 1964
<http://www.hbci.com/~tgort/tonkin.htm>

Week 6: February 9, 11, 13—The End of Bipolarity

- Gaddis: Chs. 6-7, Epilogue (195-266)
- Frieden: Ch. 16 (363-391)

Documents

Brezhnev Doctrine: <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1968brezhnev.html>

Ronald Reagan, "Remarks at the Brandenburg Gate," June 12, 1987
<http://www.reaganfoundation.org/reagan/speeches/wall.asp>

Mikhail Gorbachev, "Address to the 43rd General Assembly," December 7, 1988
http://www.writespirit.net/inspirational_talks/mikhail_gorbachev_talks/united_nations_address/

Week 7: February 18, 20—Triumphalism and the Ill-defined 1990s

- Frieden: Ch. 17-18 (392-434)
- Zakaria: 69-87
- Walt: Chs. 1-2 (29-108)
- Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History" *The National Interest* 16 (Summer 1989)
<http://www.wesjones.com/eoh.htm>

Documents

George H. W. Bush "Toward a New World Order," September 11, 1990
<http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/war/bushsr.htm>

Bill Clinton, Second Inaugural Address, January 20, 1997
<http://www.bartleby.com/124/pres65.html>

Week 8: February 23, 25, 27—Interruptions to Utopia

- Frieden: Chs. 19-20 (435-72)
- Zakaria: Chs. 3-4 (89-160)
- Walt: Ch. 3 (109-179)

- Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993
<http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19930601faessay5188/samuel-p-huntington/the-clash-of-civilizations.html>

Documents

“The IMF at a Glance,” <http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/facts/glance.htm>

Joseph Stiglitz, Excerpt from “What I Learned at the World Economic Crisis”
<http://www.whirledbank.org/ourwords/stiglitz.html>

Michel Camdessus, “A Commentary,” response to Joseph Stiglitz
<http://www.imf.org/external/np/vc/2002/091202.htm>

Week 9: March 2, 4, 6—9/11 and Iraq

- Zakaria: Afterword (257-64)
- “A Special Report on al-Qaeda,” *The Economist*, July 19, 2008. Available from Electronic Journals through UW Libraries website.

Documents

“Statement of Principles,” Project for a New American Century
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm>

Osama bin Laden, “Letter to the American people,” ~November 17, 2002
<http://www.globalsecurity.org/security/library/report/2002/021120-ubl.htm>

“The National Security Strategy of the United States of America,” September 2002.
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>

Executive Summary from the Iraq Study Group Report, December 6, 2006
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6586565>

Week 10: March 9, 11, 13—The International System Today

- Frieden: Conclusion (473-76)
- Zakaria: Ch. 6 & Conclusion (199-256)
- Walt: Ch. 5 (218-47)
- “Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World,” US National Intelligence Council: Chs. 1, 6, 7 (1-17, 81-99)
http://www.dni.gov/nic/PDF_2025/2025_Global_Trends_Final_Report.pdf

**UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON
JACKSON SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES**

INFORMATION FOR STUDENTS*

COURSES, GRADING, ACADEMIC CONDUCT

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is defined as the use of creations, ideas or words of publicly available work without formally acknowledging the author or source through appropriate use of quotation marks, references, and the like. Plagiarizing is presenting someone else's work as one's own original work or thought. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional. The University of Washington takes plagiarism very seriously. Plagiarism may lead to disciplinary action by the University against the student who submitted the work. Any student who is uncertain whether his or her use of the work of others constitutes plagiarism should consult the course instructor for guidance before formally submitting the course work involved. (*Sources: UW Graduate School Style Manual; UW Bothell Catalog; UW Student Conduct Code*)

Incompletes

An incomplete is given only when the student has been in attendance and has done satisfactory work until within two weeks of the end of the quarter and has furnished proof satisfactory to the instructor that the work cannot be completed because of illness or other circumstances beyond the student's control. (*Source: UW General Catalog Online, "Student Guide/Grading"*)

Grade Appeal Procedure

A student who believes he or she has been improperly graded must first discuss the matter with the instructor. If the student is not satisfied with the instructor's explanation, the student may submit a written appeal to the director of the Jackson School with a copy of the appeal also sent to the instructor. The director consults with the instructor to ensure that the evaluation of the student's performance has not been arbitrary or capricious. Should the director believe the instructor's conduct to be arbitrary or capricious and the instructor declines to revise the grade, the director, with the approval of the voting members of his or her faculty, shall appoint an appropriate member, or members, of the faculty of the Jackson School to evaluate the performance of the student and assign a grade. The Dean and Provost should be informed of this action. Once a student submits a written appeal, this document and all subsequent actions on this appeal are recorded in written form for deposit in a School file. (*Source: UW General Catalog Online, "Student Guide/Grading"*)

* *Adapted from material prepared by the UW Department of History and used with permission.*

Concerns About a Course, an Instructor, or a Teaching Assistant

If you have any concerns about a Jackson School course or your instructor, please see the instructor about these concerns as soon as possible. If you are not comfortable talking with the instructor or not satisfied with the response that you receive, you may contact the chair of the program offering the course (names available from the Office of Student Services, Thomson Hall 111).

If you have any concerns about a teaching assistant, please see the teaching assistant about these concerns as soon as possible. If you are not comfortable talking with the teaching assistant or not satisfied with the response that you receive, you may contact the instructor in charge of the course. If you are still not satisfied with the response that you receive, you may contact the chair of the program offering the course (names available from the Office of Student Services, Thomson Hall 111), or the Graduate School at G-1 Communications Building (543-5900).

For your reference, these procedures are posted on a Jackson School bulletin board in the Student Services Office, Room 111 Thomson Hall.

POLICIES, RULES, RESOURCES

Equal Opportunity

The University of Washington reaffirms its policy of equal opportunity regardless of race, color, creed, religion, national origin, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, disability, or status as a disabled veteran or Vietnam-era veteran in accordance with University of Washington policy and applicable federal and state statutes and regulations.

Disability Accommodation

The University of Washington is committed to providing access, equal opportunity and reasonable accommodation in its services, programs, activities, education and employment for individuals with disabilities. For information or to request disability accommodation contact: Disabled Students Services (Seattle campus) at (206) 543-8924/V, (206) 543-8925/TTY, (206) 616-8379/Fax, or e-mail at uwdss@u.washington.edu; Bothell Student Affairs at (425) 352-5000/V; (425) 352-5303/TTY, (425) 352-5335/Fax, or e-mail at uwbothel@u.washington.edu; Tacoma Student Services at (253) 552-4000/V, (253) 552-4413/TTY, (253) 552-4414/Fax.

Sexual Harassment

Sexual harassment is defined as the use of one's authority or power, either explicitly or implicitly, to coerce another into unwanted sexual relations or to punish another for his or her refusal, or as the creation by a member of the University community of an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or educational environment through verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature.

If you believe that you are being harassed, seek help—the earlier the better. You may speak with your instructor, your teaching assistant, the director of student services (111

Thomson), or the director of the Jackson School (406 Thomson). In addition, you should be aware that the University has designated special people to help you. They are: University Ombudsman and Ombudsman for Sexual Harassment (for complaints involving faculty members and teaching assistants) Lois Price Spratlen, 301 Student Union, 543-6028; and the University Complaint Investigation and Resolution Office, 616-2028. (*Sources: UW Graduate School, CIDR, Office of the President*)

Office of Scholarly Integrity

The Office of Scholarly Integrity is housed in the Office of the Vice-Provost. The Office of Scholarly Integrity assumes responsibility for investigating and resolving allegations of scientific and scholarly misconduct by faculty, students, and staff of the University of Washington. The Office of Scholarly Integrity coordinates, in consultation and cooperation with the Schools and Colleges, inquiries and investigations into allegations of scientific and scholarly misconduct. The Office of Scholarly Integrity is responsible for compliance with reporting requirements established by various Federal and other funding agencies in matters of scientific or scholarly misconduct. The Office of Scholarly Integrity maintains all records resulting from inquiries and investigations of such allegations. University rules (Handbook, Vol. II, Section 25-51, Executive Order #61) define scientific and scholarly misconduct to include the following forms of inappropriate activities: intentional misrepresentation of credentials; falsification of data; plagiarism; abuse of confidentiality; deliberate violation of regulations applicable to research. Students can report cases of scientific or scholarly misconduct either to the Office of Scholarly Integrity, to their faculty adviser, or the department chair. The student should report such problems to whomever he or she feels most comfortable. (*Sources: UW web page (<http://www.grad.washington.edu/OSI/osi.htm>); minutes of Grad School Executive Staff and Division Heads meeting, 7/23/98*)