

STUDY GUIDE FOR POLITICAL SCIENCE 102 Spring 2003

As explained in the syllabus, Political Science 102 involves not only the usual lectures, reading, midterms, and final, but also case studies, papers, and quizzes. The purpose of this study guide is to provide an explanation of these exercises and to offer some suggestions about how to prepare for them and to get the most out of them.

1. The Role of Case Studies and Discussion Sections

Seven times during the semester, as indicated in the schedule in the syllabus, Political Science 102 divides into discussion sections. These sections meet to analyze particular case studies drawn from recent history.

The aim of a case study is to present briefly the facts of a particular situation. It is then up to you to discover what these facts mean. What do they suggest about how the world does or should work? As you read and study these case studies in preparation for discussion sections, therefore, think carefully about what important issues might be raised by the case, what principles or lessons the case suggests, and how the case relates to other readings and lectures. Understanding the facts of what happened is important, but it is not sufficient: we are interested not simply in knowing what happened, but why it happened and what it means for our lives and for how we should behave. Our purpose in studying events in the Falkland/Malvinas Islands, the Congo, Thailand, or Somalia, for example, is not to make us experts on these particular topics -- though this would not be a bad outcome -- but to begin to uncover general patterns that may be relevant in a variety of international situations. While you read the cases, therefore, keep asking yourself what you are learning about how international politics works: are there insights here that will be useful to you 20 years from now, when you are an Assistant Secretary of State, the head of an overseas office of a major international corporation, an activist with "Greenpeace" or "Doctors Without Borders," a UN official, or an average American taxpayer?

Before you read each case, take a look at the study questions provided in this handout. These point out some of the issues raised by the case study and may be useful to you in organizing your thinking. Come to discussion section ready to present and defend your ideas about the case, particularly about what the case may illustrate about the subjects discussed in lectures. Some of the cases are quite complex, and some of the case studies present a great deal of information. Part of the challenge in preparing for a case discussion, as in so many other tasks in life, is to separate the wheat from the chaff -- that is, to identify which pieces of information are critical in helping you to understand the central issues at stake and which are of secondary importance. Memorization of facts is unlikely to prove a satisfactory substitute for hard, careful, self-conscious thinking. Again: the point of studying and discussing these cases is not (simply) to learn what happened in a particular situation but to begin to develop theories or generalizable explanations of why it happened and to force us to think about whether better choices or outcomes were possible.

Discussion sections are a key part of Political Science 102. It has been our experience that the best way fully to understand the material presented in lecture and in the assigned readings is to investigate how those ideas actually apply - or fail to apply -- in real historical cases. It is difficult, if not impossible, to develop a satisfactory grasp on the material of this course without participating in the give-and-take of section discussion of the case studies. In fact, we have found that it can be very useful for you also to discuss the cases in informal study groups, where you can "hash out" the issues and arguments raised by the case in even greater depth.

Discussion sections are for discussion. They are useful only if you come prepared. Being prepared means: (1) that you have read the case carefully; (2) that you have thought about the case and what it illustrates about the operation of international politics; and (3) that you are ready and willing to share your ideas with the other members of your discussion group. "Passive participation" in discussion sections is not real participation at all. Nor is uninformed participation acceptable. Discussion sections involve the sharing of ideas and the exchange of arguments. To get the most out of discussion sections and to understand the course material, it is essential that you be prepared to work with other members of your group in exploring the issues raised by the case and the implications of those issues for

understanding world politics.

Discussion sections are not a substitute for lectures, nor are they intended to be review sessions. Section discussions assume that you have attended lectures and kept up with course readings and are designed to permit you to synthesize and apply concepts developed in those lectures and in readings.

1a. Study Questions for "Falklands/Malvinas (A)" -- February 5/February 7.

1. To which state -- Britain or Argentina -- do the Falklands/Malvinas rightly belong? Why? On what basis do states claim sovereignty over particular pieces of territory? Whose legal claim -- Britain's or Argentina's -- do you find more convincing? Why? On what basis do you think conflicting claims like this one ought to be resolved? What principles do you think should be used to decide whether a piece of territory "belongs" to one state or another?

2. What does sovereignty mean in this case? Can sovereignty be compromised? Explain the "leaseback" idea.

3. What is "colonialism"? Are the Argentines right to see the Falklands as a remnant of colonialism? Is colonialism a bad thing, and should it be eliminated? Why or why not?

4. To which nation do the "kelpers" see themselves belonging? Why is the fate of the Malvinas an important "national" issue to Argentines?

5. What is at stake for the Argentine state? What is at stake for the British state?

6. Why are the Malvinas an important issue for the Argentine government? That is, what is at stake for Galtieri and the junta? Is it possible to distinguish between the interests of the Argentine state, the interests of the Argentine nation, and the Argentine government? Similarly, why are the Falklands an important issue for the British government? Do you think that the interest of each government in controlling the islands is disproportionate to the real value (in terms of economic and military significance) of the islands to each state? Why might this be the case?

7. In democracies, what is the relationship between ordinary people and the state? What is the impact of public opinion on the Argentinian government? On the British government?

8. Why hasn't the Falklands/Malvinas dispute been peacefully resolved? What can (or should) two sovereign states do to settle an argument like this one? To whom can or should they appeal for a fair ruling?

9. Why does Argentina occupy the Falklands/Malvinas in April 1982? How should Britain respond? Can war be avoided? What concessions should each side be willing or unwilling to make? If war occurs, whose fault is it? Who bears the moral responsibility?

**** Think about this case from various perspectives. How do you think about the situation if you are Galtieri? Another member of the military junta? Costa Mendez? An average Argentine? Thatcher? Carrington? Ridley? A conservative MP? An average Briton? A "kelper"?

1b. Study Questions for "Containing the Chaos: The US-UN Intervention in the Congo, 1960-1965" -- February 19/February 21.

1. What does "sovereignty" mean in a situation like the one that existed in the Congo in the early 1960s, where state institutions are weak and the legitimacy of various individuals who claim the right to control these state institutions is subject to question? What is the *de jure* (that is, "in law," or legal) relationship between the Congolese state, other states, foreign corporations, and international organizations such as the United Nations? What is the *de facto* (that is, "in fact," or actual) relationship?

2. Why does the ability of the Congolese state to rule over its subjects, to provide security, and to enforce public order virtually collapse in the weeks and months immediately following Congolese independence? Why does Katanga secede? What is Belgium's role in the virtual collapse of the Congolese state and in Katangan secession? What is the role of the United States and the Soviet Union? To what degree, and in what ways, is the involvement of other states helpful, and how is it unhelpful? What motivates the involvement of these outside powers?

3. Imagine that it is 1960 and you are an advisor to President Eisenhower. Outline for him the pros and cons of: (1) treating Congolese affairs as purely an internal matter of another sovereign state; (2) regarding this as an apolitical humanitarian issue and supporting UN efforts to help a fledgling state restore order within its borders; and (3) viewing the Congo as a battlefield in an undeclared war between the United States and Soviet Union.

4. Is assassination a legitimate tool of statecraft? Or is it murder -- an immoral and criminal activity? Are there circumstances under which the leader of a foreign state or government can or should be targeted "for elimination"? (For example, would killing Hitler have been morally, politically, and/or legally acceptable? Stalin? Castro? Saddam Hussein? If your answer is that assassination is sometimes acceptable, where, if anywhere, would you draw the line, and on what grounds? Would it be legitimate for a foreign government to try to assassinate President Bush if it disagreed with American foreign policy? Who decides? What would be the short- and long-term consequences if your stance on assassination were generally accepted?) What responsibility does the United States have for the death of Lumumba? Should government officials that connive to achieve the death of foreign leaders be held accountable (as "crime bosses" are, when they put out "hits" on other "crime bosses")? Should there be some sort of international court or tribunal to sit in judgment of such crimes? Or should national courts try such cases?

5. What rights, responsibilities, and duties does the international community have in cases like the Congo? What is the justification for UN involvement in Congolese affairs? What political calculations affected the UN decision to intervene? In your view, what role should the UN have played? Be prepared to make the strongest possible case that UN intervention was morally and politically justified, and to make the strongest possible case that it was not.

6. In the struggles between the various factions and elements in Congolese politics -- for example, Lumumba and his followers, allies, and successors (the "Lumumbists"); Tshombe and Katangan separatists; President Kasvubu and those around him; and Mobutu -- how can one evaluate the legitimacy of each group's claim to political power? Who is the rightful government of the Congolese state? On what basis do you reach this conclusion?

7. Should Katanga have been allowed to declare independence? Why or why not?

8. Make a list of all the ways the United States intervened in Congolese affairs in the period between Congo's independence and Mobutu's seizure of power. Did the U.S. intervene too much? Did it intervene too little? On what basis do you reach this conclusion?

9. Evaluate the claim that the Congo, far from being a sovereign state, came to be a puppet of the United States and its Western allies. To the extent that you think this claim is correct, do you think that this was a good thing or a bad thing? Be prepared to explain what criteria you are using. What does this imply about how we think about global politics?

1c. Study Questions for "The Problems of Doing Good: Somalia as a Case Study in Humanitarian Intervention" and George W. Bush, "West Point Address, 1 June 2002" -- February 26/February 28.

1. Do states have a right -- or perhaps even an obligation -- to intervene in other nations' affairs for humanitarian purposes when gross human rights abuses are taking place? Or should sovereignty be inviolable? What is the relationship between humanitarian intervention and interventions aimed at "nation-building"?

2. What is, and what should be, the role of international organizations, such as the United Nations, in humanitarian intervention and nation-building? How effective is the United Nations in such tasks? Why? What are the

UN's resources and capabilities, and how does it go about tasks like Somalia? Given the Somalia experience, should the organizational structure of the United Nations be changed and its resources increased? What are the arguments against such an "improvement" in UN capabilities? What is the relationship between the United States and the United Nations in the Somali intervention?

3. How and why does U.S. and UN involvement in Somalia evolve and grow over time? What are the key steps or stages in this process? Why is each step taken? How does the United States end up in an undeclared war against Somali warlord Aideed?

4. What is your answer to the question about U.S. intervention in Somalia: "Was it worth it?" Be prepared to explain and defend your conclusion, and to explain the assumptions about humanitarian obligations, sovereignty, U.S. national interests, and the nature of world politics that you are making.

5. Explain the key differences between what Alberto Coll describes as "interest-driven realists" and "value-driven globalists." Is international "order" possible? If so, how is it to be achieved or created, and what is the role of the United States -- the world's sole remaining superpower -- in this process?

6. In his West Point speech, President Bush laid the rhetorical foundation for a global, American-led crusade against tyrants and terrorism, asserting that "Our nation's cause has always been larger than our nation's defense. We fight, as we always fight, for a just peace -- a peace that favors human liberty. We will defend the peace against threats from terrorists and tyrants. We will preserve the peace by building good relations among the great powers. And we will extend the peace by encouraging free and open societies on every continent.... We cannot defend America and our friends by hoping for the best. We cannot put our faith in the word of tyrants, who solemnly sign non-proliferation treaties, and then systemically break them. If we wait for threats to fully materialize, we will have waited too long.... Some worry that it is somehow undiplomatic or impolite to speak the language of right and wrong. I disagree.... Different circumstances require different methods, but not different moralities.... Moral truth is the same in every culture, in every time, and in every place.... There can be no neutrality between justice and cruelty, between the innocent and the guilty. We are in a conflict between good and evil, and America will call evil by its name.... By confronting evil and lawless regimes, we do not create a problem, we reveal a problem. And we will lead the world in opposing it." Where does President Bush fit on the spectrum from "interest-driven realists" to "value-driven globalists"? Explain your conclusion.

7. President Bush's West Point address seems to suggest that it is possible to move beyond the great-power competition that has been a central feature of the Westphalian sovereign-state system. He says: "As we defend the peace, we also have an historic opportunity to preserve the peace. We have our best chance since the rise of the nation state in the 17th century to build a world where the great powers compete in peace instead of prepare for war. The history of the last century, in particular, was dominated by a series of destructive national rivalries that left battlefields and graveyards across the Earth. Germany fought France, the Axis fought the Allies, and then the East fought the West, in proxy wars and tense standoffs, against a backdrop of nuclear Armageddon.... Competition between great nations is inevitable, but armed conflict in our world is not. More and more, civilized nations find ourselves on the same side -- united by common dangers of terrorist violence and chaos. America has, and intends to keep, military strengths beyond challenge -- (applause) -- thereby, making the destabilizing arms races of other eras pointless, and limiting rivalries to trade and other pursuits of peace." Critics have suggested that what President Bush is really implying in this passage is that the United States will use its "military strengths beyond challenge" in order to act as an imperial ruler, imposing its will -- and peace -- on the rest of the world. Is this what he is saying? Would it be a good idea?

NOTE: See 2a, below, for the paper assignment for this week.

1d. Study Questions for "The Coming of the Cold War" -- March 12/March 14.

1. What are Soviet objectives and interests in 1945 and 1946? What are U.S. objectives and interests? Why does tension develop between the two states? Could this tension have been avoided? If so, how?

2. How able is the United States to influence Soviet behavior -- that is, how much coercive power does the

United States possess vis a vis the Soviet Union? What power resources does the United States rely on?

3. Does the anarchic character of the international system affect how the United States and the Soviet Union view each other? To what degree, or in what ways, are the United States and Soviet Union caught in a security dilemma? If you see a security dilemma, what steps do you see that might help relieve it?

4. Does the United States have a moral obligation to Poland and the rest of Eastern Europe to ensure that democratic governments are established there? Does it have a national interest in seeing them established? How would you evaluate the morality of the ends of U.S. policy? The means? The probable consequences? What about the morality of Soviet behavior?

5. To what degree are the United States and the Soviet Union part of a common international "society" as well as part of a common international "system"? What kind of international regimes would the United States like to see established? How would the Soviet Union feel about them? How much power does the United States have to see that these regimes are established? To what extent are the United States and the Soviet Union struggling over "hegemony" in Europe? What would "hegemony" entail?

6. How does Truman go about deciding what U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union should be? If he had used a different decision-making process or listened to different advisors, do you think he would have chosen a different policy? Why does Truman conclude that "the Soviet Union was a 'world bully' that would expand its sphere of influence with little regard to international agreements unless confronted by firmness from the West"?

7. How do domestic political pressures affect the decisions of the Truman government? What is the role of public opinion in a democracy?

8. Does it matter that the United States is a capitalist democracy and that the Soviet Union is a communist totalitarian state? Why or why not? Would the Cold War still have developed if both states were capitalist democracies? Communist totalitarian states? Be prepared to argue your position.

9. Imagine it is February 27, 1947 and that you are a U.S. senator. Having reviewed the history leading to the deterioration of U.S.-Soviet relations and heard Secretary Marshall's assessment, what would you recommend the President do?

*** Imagine a debate between Harry Truman, George Kennan, Henry Wallace, and Joseph Stalin over the cause of the Cold War. How would each of them explain the breakdown of cooperation between the United States and the Soviet Union?

1e. Study Questions for "Kennedy and the Bay of Pigs" -- April 2/April 4.

1. How would you answer President Kennedy's question: "How could I have been so stupid, to let them go ahead?"

2. Was overthrowing Castro "in the national interest"? What national interests were at stake for the United States? Evaluate the Bay of Pigs operation in moral terms. Be prepared to justify your position.

3. What domestic political pressures influenced President Kennedy's decisions regarding the Bay of Pigs operation?

4. How did bureaucratic politics affect planning for the Bay of Pigs operation? How was decision-making factored? How did standard operating procedures come into play? Did different actors and organizations see different faces of the issue and advocate different policies? How were their views and actions reconciled into a single coherent policy?

5. Did American planners suffer from premature cognitive closure as they planned the Bay of Pigs operation? Did decision-makers seek to impose cognitive consistency? Were any decisions affected by stress?

6. Was American policy leading up to the Bay of Pigs fiasco "irrational"? Or were decision-makers simply unlucky? If you think the decisions were clearly unwise or ill-advised, do you think mistakes like this are "normal" in state policy-making or do you think the Bay of Pigs was an unusual case?

7. If you were advising a new president, what would you do to prevent her or him from stumbling into a disaster like this?

***Imagine a discussion between CIA Director Allen Dulles, UN Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, and Admiral Arleigh Burke. How would each define the "national interest"? What would each conclude went wrong with the Bay of Pigs operation? How do you account for their different views?

NOTE: See 2b, below, for paper assignment for this week.

1f. Study Questions for "Shell in Nigeria: Corporate Responsibility and the Ogoni Crisis" -- April 16/April 18.

1. What is the relationship between oil companies and the Nigerian state? In what sense is the Nigerian state "sovereign"? Is the Nigerian state a "failed state"? If so, why did it fail, given the vast resources potentially at its disposal? Why does MOSOP present its demands to the oil companies when it fails to get satisfaction from the Nigerian state? Why do ordinary people and local leaders cajole and pressure Chevron?

2. If the Nigerian state fails to provide the services that states are expected to provide (preeminently, security; but also basic welfare, health, education, and economic development services), and if, in order to cost-effectively pump petroleum from the ground, Shell steps into this vacuum, what other obligations and responsibilities does Shell assume?

3. During the trial of the Ogoni Nine, Shell argued "that it would be 'dangerous and wrong' for Shell to 'intervene and use its perceived 'influence' to have the judgment overturned,' stating that 'a commercial organisation like Shell cannot and must never interfere with the legal processes of any sovereign state.'" Be prepared to debate both sides of this proposition. Should corporations use their leverage to ensure states behave in the "right" way? If so, who decides what is "right"?

4. What responsibilities, if any, should corporations have toward their workers, toward the communities in which they operate, and toward the environment? If corporations do have these sorts of responsibilities, who decides what they are, who makes sure that these responsibilities are met, and who imposes penalties if they are not (or provides rewards if they are)? Corporations are subject to the laws of the states in which they operate. Transnational corporations, however, can move their operations elsewhere, giving them considerable leverage. Is there a need for some sort of international or global authority to regulate transnational corporate behavior? If national standards are weak, should transnational corporations be held to (higher) international standards?

1g. Study Questions for "The Economic Crisis in Asia" -- April 23/April 25.

1. Was the 1997 economic crisis in Asia a "security" issue for the United States? Explain your view. What is the nature of "security" in today's "globalized" world? When you think of "security," whom or what do you envision as being kept "secure," and from what? What role should the state play in providing this "security"? Be prepared to argue this question from both sides -- that is, think of the strongest arguments you can that the U.S. state should be involved in providing economic security and the strongest ones you can that it should not.

2. What causes a "run" on a currency, like the one on the Mexican peso in 1994? What can be done -- and by whom -- to prevent it, or to stop it once it begins? What happens when a currency drops suddenly in value? Who suffers? How does it affect people in neighboring countries?

3. In what senses are crises like the Mexican financial crisis of 1994 and the Asian economic crisis of 1997 political issues rather than purely economic ones? Make a list of political causes, consequences, and solutions of the Mexican and Asian crises.

4. Why did the United States become involved in the earlier Mexican financial crisis? Explain the U.S. "national interest" in helping Mexico resolve the crisis. Why was the "bailout" politically unpopular in the United States? Do you think President Clinton was right to ignore public opinion and to evade Congressional actions designed to prevent the U.S. loaning Mexico money? Given the degree of economic interconnectedness between America and Mexico, was the Mexican bailout a matter of foreign policy or domestic policy?

5. One of the features of the Asian debt crisis was a process of competitive currency devaluations. Do competitive devaluations represent a prisoner's dilemma? Explain why or why not. If you see a prisoner's dilemma, what does this imply about possible solutions?

6. As the 1997 crisis revealed, in today's world the economic problems experienced by one country have the capacity to spill across borders, creating hardship for people in other nations. Does this imply the need for international institutions, empowered to try to solve problems that escape or exceed the ability of any single sovereign state to manage? How much power should international institutions, like the International Monetary Fund, have? For example, should the IMF have the authority to tell a sovereign state like Thailand or South Korea (or the United States) what kind of exchange rate or interest rate it should set? If so, to whom should international institutions like the IMF be accountable, and how should they enforce their decisions? If not, what is to be done when crises in one country threaten to undermine the entire global economic system?

7. What is the relationship between the United States and international institutions like the IMF and the World Bank? Has the United States surrendered its sovereignty to these organs of "world government" as some critics worry? Or are these organizations simply tools of the United States, protecting the interests of American corporations and investors, as other critics complain?

8. What is "moral hazard," and why do states sometimes protect banks and businesses from paying the price for their foolish or risky decisions? Should states insure investors against losing their money when a bank or business goes bankrupt? And if states do provide such insurance, does this give them a right (or duty?) to monitor or interfere in the daily decisions of these banks or businesses, to make sure that these corporations are not gambling wildly or unwisely with their investors' money? Given the global nature of investment and trade in today's world, and given the global consequences when banks and businesses fail, should international institutions monitor these corporations? Or should states and international institutions stay uninvolved, and let banks and businesses fail when times are hard? How would you feel if it were your bank that failed, and your life savings that disappeared? How would you feel if it were your tax dollars that were being spent to prop up a failing bank?

2. The Paper Assignments.

As indicated in the syllabus, you are required to write two short papers for this class. Each of these papers will take the form of a policy memo, based on the assigned readings for the discussion section. Using this material and any other information or knowledge you might have, you will act as an advisor to a major decision-maker. You may do additional reading if you choose, but you are not obligated to do so: you can write these papers based on what you have learned in class and from the assigned readings. Your memo will answer particular questions that the policy-maker might have and will provide her with advice on specific issues she has raised.

The quality of your writing is important. In this class and on these papers, as in life more generally, your ability to express your ideas clearly, concisely, and effectively is critical. In the end, the only way to become a skillful writer is to write a great deal. There are some helpful short-cuts, however. One is to read well-written material and to study how these authors have achieved their effect. Another is to get advice from good writers. In this regard, let me recommend a

very slim, but very useful book: William Strunk, Jr. and E.B. White, *The Elements of Style*. It is available in most book stores and is well worth the hour or two it takes to read.

Some general pieces of advice relevant not only to these papers but to any writing assignment:

1. Read the assignment carefully. Do not skim it. Read every word. Read it slowly. Read it out loud if that will help. Be sure you understand what the assignment asks you to do. Do not simply assume you know what is being asked of you.

2. Read the assignment a second time. Study it. Think about it. The chances are high that you misunderstood it the first time, or that you missed part of what the assignment was driving at. Time spent studying the question being asked is very seldom wasted.

3. Do what the assignment asks. An assignment is not a general "hunting license." It has an objective and requests something specific. Do not write about whatever you feel like, or about what you think the instructor should have asked. Write about what he has actually asked.

4. Do everything the assignment asks. The conjunction "and" means you have to do everything listed. Doing one part of the assignment very well will not make up for not doing another part at all.

5. Think through your answer. What will your position be? What will your answer be? What arguments will you need to make? What counter-arguments do you need to anticipate? What evidence do you need to present? Equally important, what arguments and pieces of evidence are unnecessary, given the question asked and the overall design of your answer? A paper is not simply a concatenation of facts or a listing of everything you know: it is a marshalling of ideas and material to make a specific point.

6. Outline your answer. Before you begin to write your answer, make a list of the points you will make and the order in which you will make them. Each of these points should, in general, be a paragraph in your paper.

7. Observe the length limits on the assignment. Can you write the paper you have just outlined without violating the length limit? If not, think carefully about what points are necessary and what points are superfluous to your answer. Then rewrite your outline.

8. Do not begin to write your paper until you have done all of the above.

9. Write carefully. Stick to your outline. Do not go off on tangents. Observe the rules of grammar. Make sure the words you use have the meaning you want. Don't use big words in an effort to impress. Use them only if they have a different, more appropriate meaning than a smaller word. Spell correctly -- if you have any doubt, check the word in the dictionary. Do not be lazy.

10. Revise your paper. Is your answer convincing? Read the assignment again. Does your paper answer the question posed in the assignment? Have you included all the arguments and evidence necessary? Is everything you have included necessary, or could items be cut without weakening your answer? Have you remained within the length limits? Are your arguments and evidence presented in an optimal sequence, or would they be stronger and clearer if presented in a different order? Are there grammatical mistakes? Are some sentences too long or awkward? Are some words wrong? Do not be afraid to make changes.

11. Proofread your final paper. Correct all typing errors.

2a. First Paper Assignment: "Sovereignty vs. Global Obligations" -- Due in Section February 26/February 28.

You have just been hired by President Bush as his confidential national security assistant. Knowing you studied international relations at Rutgers and counting on you to use what you learned in Political Science 102 in tackling this assignment, the president turns to you for advice. He is very proud of his West Point speech, but he has also heard

considerable criticism of it, especially from observers who fear that, under the guise of pursuing humanitarian objectives, the president actually has in mind trying to establish what is essentially a global American empire, eroding the sovereignty of nation-states, and attempting to create a new international system in which America imposes its values and culture on everyone else. The president's own knowledge of history and of the world outside America's borders is a little sketchy, so he relies on you to analyze the foreign policy he has outlined and the criticisms of it. He asks you to write him a memorandum of no more than three double-spaced pages, with normal margins, drawing on what you have learned in Political Science 102. Specifically, in your memo he would like you to do five things.

First, he wants you to put together as strong a case as possible that America's national security requires that it wage the global war on tyrants and terrorism that he outlined at West Point. Second, he wants you to put together as strong a case as possible that the United States has a moral obligation -- a humanitarian obligation to the people of the world -- to fight a global war against tyrants and terrorism. Third, he wants you to put together as strong a case as possible that America's national security does NOT require this global war on tyrants and terrorism. Fourth, he wants you to put together as strong a case as possible that the United States does NOT have a moral obligation to fight this fight. *Knowing that it is human nature to argue the side one agrees with strongly, and to create a weak or "straw" argument on the opposing side, the president bluntly tells you that he will fail you on this assignment and fire you if you do not argue both sides with equal intelligence, creativity, and vigor.* Fifth, the president would like you to explain which of the arguments you have advanced you find the most convincing and to explain why.

2b. Second Paper Assignment: "Stumbling Into Disaster" -- Due in Section April 2 and April 4.

It is May 1961. In the aftermath of the Bay of Pigs debacle, President Kennedy has asked you to answer the question that has been worrying him: "How could I have been so stupid, to let them go ahead?" He would like you to use what you have learned in Political Science 102, including the readings you have done for that course, and to write him a memo of no more than three double-spaced pages, with normal margins, to help him understand what led to what was, in retrospect, obviously unwise behavior by the United States. In particular he wants you to do five things.

First, he would like you to analyze how "organizational behavior" (for example, the factoring of problems, reliance on standard operating procedures, etc.) may or may not have contributed. Second, he would like you to analyze how "governmental politics" (for example, the parochial concerns and political infighting between various members of the government -- "players in positions" -- with different views of the problem) may or may not have contributed. Third, he would like you to analyze how psychological factors, such as cognitive consistency and decisional conflict, may or may not have contributed. In each of these first three parts of your memo, he would like you to use specific examples drawn from the case material to illustrate your point, if possible. Fourth, he would like you to assess which, if any, of these problems played a critical role in causing the debacle. Fifth, based on what you conclude in the fourth part of the memo, he would like you to suggest practical steps that his administration, and subsequent administrations, could take to prevent a disaster like this from happening again.

3. The Geography Quizzes.

There will be five quizzes on geography over the course of the semester: on September 17, October 1, October 15, October 29, and November 12. In addition, you will be tested on the material from all five quizzes on the final exam.

On the quizzes and final exam, you will be expected to be able to locate the following states on a map. We will not spend class time preparing for geography quizzes. You are expected to learn this material on your own. The testing procedure will be straightforward. You will be given a blank map and be expected to identify the names of the states shown.

Atlases are available at libraries, and I have asked bookstores to stock an inexpensive atlas. For those who prefer to study on-line, reference maps can be found at:
<http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/docs/refmaps.html>

3a. Geography of the Americas -- Quiz on January 31.

Argentina
Belize
Bolivia
Brazil
Canada
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Cuba
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
El Salvador
Falkland Islands/Malvinas
French Guiana
Guatemala

Guyana
Haiti
Honduras
Jamaica
Mexico
Nicaragua
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Puerto Rico
Surinam
United States
Uruguay
Venezuela

3b. Geography of Africa and the Middle East -- Quiz on February 14.

Algeria
Angola
Bahrain
Burundi
Chad
Egypt
Eritrea (formerly part of Ethiopia)
Ethiopia
Ghana
Iran
Morocco
Mozambique
Namibia
Nigeria
Oman
Qatar
Rwanda
Saudi Arabia
Sierra Leone
Somalia
South Africa
Sudan

Iraq
Israel
Ivory Coast (Cote d'Ivoire)
Jordan
Kenya
Kuwait
Lebanon
Liberia
Libya

Syria
Tanzania
Togo
Tunisia
Uganda
United Arab Emirates (UAE)
Yemen
Zaire (renamed the Congo in 1997)
Zambia
Zimbabwe

3c. Geography of Eastern Europe -- Quiz on March 7.

Albania
Armenia (formerly Armenian SSR)
Azerbaijan (formerly Azerbaijan SSR)
Belarus (formerly Byelorussian SSR)
Bosnia-Herzegovina (formerly part of Yugoslavia)
Bulgaria
Croatia (formerly part of Yugoslavia)
Cyprus
Czech Republic (formerly part of Czechoslovakia)

Estonia (formerly Estonian SSR)
Georgia (formerly Georgian SSR)
Greece
Hungary
Latvia (formerly Latvian SSR)
Lithuania (formerly Lithuanian SSR)
Macedonia (formerly part of Yugoslavia)
Moldova (formerly Moldavian SSR)
Poland

Romania
Russia
Slovakia (formerly part of Czechoslovakia)
Slovenia (formerly part of Yugoslavia)

Turkey
Ukraine (formerly Ukrainian SSR)
Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

3d. Geography of Western Europe -- Quiz on March 28.

Austria
Belgium
Denmark
Finland
France
Germany
Great Britain/United Kingdom
Iceland
Ireland

Italy
Luxemburg
Malta
Netherlands
Norway
Portugal
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland

3e. Geography of Asia -- Quiz on April 11.

Afghanistan
Bangladesh
Bhutan
Burma/Myanmar
Cambodia/Kampuchea
China
Hong Kong
India
Indonesia
Iran
Japan
Kazakhstan (formerly Kazakh SSR)
Kyrgyzstan (formerly Kirgiz SSR)
Laos
Malaysia

Mongolia
Nepal
North Korea
Pakistan
Philippines
Singapore
South Korea
Sri Lanka/Ceylon
Taiwan
Tajikstan (formerly Tadjhik or Tadjik SSR)
Thailand
Turkmenistan (formerly Turkmen SSR)
Uzbekistan (formerly Uzbek SSR)
Vietnam