

**World Politics  
POLIS/ SIS 426  
Winter 2023**

---

**Instructor:** Aseem Prakash  
**Class Time:** Tuesday and Thursday, 1:30-3:20 p.m.  
**Class:** Miller 301  
**E-mail:** aseem@uw.edu  
**Office hours:** On request  
**Teaching Assistant:** Christianna Parr ([parr182@uw.edu](mailto:parr182@uw.edu))  
**TA Office Hours:** Tuesday, 11:00am – 1:00pm in Gowen 24

---

## **Objectives**

Harold Lasswell, one of the most famous political scientists, described politics as who gets what, when, and how. World Politics is no different. We see conflict and cooperation in every sphere. We signal our politics in elections and in conversations. The choices we make as consumers are also political choices. Thus, we need to think of a more expansive notion of politics. Therefore, you will read and explore topics such as the Ukraine crisis, migration, climate change, trade politics, NGOs, foreign aid, and energy politics.

By the end of the course, I hope all of you will develop a more nuanced understanding of world politics and feel empowered to contribute to policy debates. Remember, participation by informed citizens in policy deliberation is essential for sustaining our democracy. Further, I hope this course and the broader UW experience will motivate you to think of politics and public service as your career.

## **Readings**

We do not have any textbooks. I will use articles only. I will either provide their URL in the syllabus or upload these articles on Canvas.

### **This is a Device-Free Class**

Research suggests that the use of electronic devices in class can be distracting for you and for your colleagues. Therefore, to enhance your learning experience, during the class you are not allowed to use phones, tablets, laptops, or any Internet connectable devices. Please take notes using a pen and a notebook.

## Grades

You will be graded on the following:

### ***(Reflection) Paper #1***

(1 page of text; references on page 2, single-spaced; please upload on Canvas by **January 19, 10:00** am PST).

*Late papers will be penalized by 1/2 point (on the 4.0 scale) for each day late. For example, a paper that otherwise would have been a 3.5 becomes a 3.0 if it is one day late. The clock for lateness begins at the time for submission, with a ten-minute grace period to account for potential connectivity problems.*

As informed individuals, we must develop skills to convey our ideas to multiple audiences. This skill is sometimes lacking even (or particularly) among the educated. There are several platforms for excellent public scholarship, including *Foreign Policy*, *the Wall Street Journal*, *the New York Times*, *Washington Post's Monkey Cage*, *The Conversation*, or *Persuasion*. Please pick any blog/Commentary/Op-ed published on this platform since January 1, 2022 (except on Afghanistan, Iran, and Ukraine). This blog should pertain to an issue with implications for world politics. For example, you can read a blog on Brexit and comment on its implication for global politics. If you focus on a US-centric issue, the onus is on you to demonstrate that it has implications for world politics. Your reflection piece (paper) should have three sections:

- Section 1: What is the core argument/thesis?
- Section 2: Did you find the evidence/argument persuasive? Why or why not?
- Section 3: What are the implications for the study of world politics?

Most blogs typically have embedded links to other articles. In writing your reflection piece, please read **any two** embedded articles (news stories are also ok) and link them to the blog you are reflecting on. Thus, you will read the blog and two articles (or news stories) that this blog has referenced.

### Grading Criteria for Paper 1:

#### **A (3.9-4.0)**

This paper clearly identifies and succinctly describes the core argument. The author asserts a position either in support or against the evidence described in the article and supports their position with reason. The paper includes links to two additional articles. This paper exemplifies strong and able writing, with appropriate language, clarity, organization, grammar, and flow. This paper is easy to read yet challenges the reader to think.

#### **A- (3.8-3.5)**

This paper is similar to an 'A' paper, but it is missing at least one of the elements found in an 'A' paper. The author asserts a position either in support or against the evidence described in the article and supports their position with reason. This paper, however, is

weakened by either mechanics (organization, spelling, grammar, syntax, and flow) and/or clarity.

**B+ (3.4-3.2)**

This paper includes all required elements and asserts a position in response to the article, but the reasoning in support of the position is at times unclear. For example, ideas are slightly muddled, but in general, there is a satisfactory level of understanding. This paper is strong in writing.

**B (3.1-2.9)**

This paper is similar to a B+ paper. It illustrates a similar comprehension of the article and takes a position in response to the article. This paper, however, differs from a B+ paper because the reasoning is weaker or because it is missing another required element. This paper also needs some improvement in writing.

**B- (2.8-2.5)**

This paper lacks a clear position in response to the article. While it attempts to identify the core argument of the article, it is overly simplistic in its explanation. This paper demands attention to writing mechanics.

**C (2.4-1.9)**

This paper is vague. This paper is not able to identify the core argument or take a position in response to the article. Writing mechanics are poor.

**Below C**

This paper does not respond to the prompt. It does not identify the core argument or take a position in response to the article. The paper is also missing additional required elements. Writing mechanics are poor.

***Paper #2***

(5 pages of text; single-spaced; references on the 6<sup>th</sup> page; Please upload on Canvas by February 9, 10:00 am, PST).

Late papers will be penalized by 1/2 point (on the 4.0 scale) for each day late. For example, a paper that otherwise would have been a 3.5 becomes a 3.0 if it is one day late. The clock for lateness begins at the time for submission, with a ten-minute grace period to account for potential connectivity problems.

The Biden administration is renegotiating a nuclear deal with Iran. The global community continues to debate how to respond to Iran's alleged interest in developing and potentially acquiring nuclear weapons. Many, especially in Israel and Saudi Arabia, believe a "strong" response is required to prevent this development, and the lifting of the sanctions by the Obama Administration was a big mistake (and welcomed when the Trump administration reimposed the sanctions). Others, especially in Europe and in Russia, are less favorable towards the idea of a strong response to dissuade Iran from pursuing its nuclear ambitions. Complicating the issue is the ongoing conflicts in Syria,

Yemen, and Iraq that have turned the Iran sanctions into a wider subject of Middle Eastern politics.

Why do actors advocate different policy choices (i.e., support or oppose reimposing of sanctions) on how to respond to Iran's nuclear program? Identify the specific policy options advocated by Israel, the Biden Administration, and France. What objectives do these actors wish to achieve? How might these actors think of the benefits and costs of their preferred option as well as the options offered by the other two actors? Make sure that you relate how domestic, regional, or international considerations influence the perceptions of benefits and costs of various options.

Your paper should be directed toward an academic audience. You are expected to undertake research on this subject by carefully reading and referencing 7-10 articles that are not included in the syllabus; <scholar.google.com> can help you to identify published work on this subject. Newspaper articles and encyclopedia references do not constitute such sources. Wikipedia is not an appropriate source for this either.

#### Grading Criteria for Paper 2:

##### **A (3.9-4.0)**

This paper asserts a very clear thesis and supports the central argument with evidence. The paper illustrates a thorough understanding of this policy issue. It is able to identify the specific policy options advocated by the three actors and the objectives these actors wish to achieve. This paper offers an insightful analysis of the benefits and costs of each policy option from the perspectives of the three actors. All points are relevant and sufficiently developed. This paper exemplifies strong and able writing, with appropriate language, clarity, organization, grammar, and flow. This paper is easy to read yet challenges the reader to think. The paper addresses the academic audience and uses the appropriate number of references (7-10 articles).

##### **A- (3.8-3.5)**

On the whole, this paper presents a clear argument and is able to support it with evidence. This paper is similar to an 'A' paper, but it is missing at least one of the elements found in an 'A' paper. In content, this paper illustrates policy options from the perspectives of three actors and offers a good analysis of these actors' positions on these policies. This paper, however, is weakened by either mechanics (organization, spelling, grammar, syntax, and flow) and/or clarity.

##### **B+ (3.4-3.2)**

This paper has a central argument that is presented and engages the required number of articles, but at times it is weak in argumentation and/or using supporting evidence. This paper does engage sufficiently with the policy options proposed by these actors. It is sometimes unclear or vague on the position of the three actors' on different policy options. Ideas are slightly muddled, but in general, there is a satisfactory level of understanding. This paper is strong in writing.

**B (3.1-2.9)**

This paper is similar to a B+ paper. It illustrates a similar level of accuracy and understanding of the literature. This paper, however, differs from a B+ paper because it illustrates a weaker display of effective argumentation. Ideas are at times muddled, and argumentation may not always be effective and/or well supported, and the central argument is either unclear or argued inconsistently. This paper also needs some improvement in writing.

**B- (2.8-2.5)**

This paper lacks a clear central argument. While it attempts to identify policy options and the actors' positions on them, it is overly simplistic in its explanation. This paper demands attention to writing mechanics.

**C (2.4-1.9)**

This paper has a strikingly vague argument. This paper is not able to identify policy options or the actors' positions on them. The paper minimally engages with the relevant literature. Writing mechanics are poor.

**Below C**

This paper does not respond to the question. It lacks a central argument. Ideas are strikingly muddled and vague. It does not engage with the literature. Writing mechanics are poor.

***Paper #3***

(5 pages of text, single-spaced; References on the 6<sup>th</sup> page; Please upload on Canvas by February 28, 10:00 am PST).

Late papers will be penalized by ½ point (on the 4.0 scale) for each day late. For example, a paper that otherwise would have been a 3.5 becomes a 3.0 if it is one day late. The clock for lateness begins at the time for submission, with a ten-minute grace period to account for potential connectivity problems.

Many commentators have employed the Vietnam analogy to describe America's predicament in Afghanistan. Did Afghanistan turn out to be America's Vietnam? Examine the validity of the Vietnam analogy to Afghanistan in terms of three dimensions: entry, commitment, and exit. Given the above assessments, what insights from the Vietnam War can be applied to the Afghanistan situation? How have America's domestic politics and international commitments influenced America's policy choices in both wars? Your paper should be directed toward an academic audience.

You are expected to conduct research on this subject (carefully read and reference five articles each on both wars for a minimum of ten articles; again, <scholar.google.com> will help you identify the published work. Also, these articles should not be included in the syllabus). Newspaper articles and encyclopedia references do not constitute such sources. Wikipedia is not an appropriate source for this either.

### Grading Criteria for Paper 3:

#### **A (3.9-4.0)**

This paper answers the question by asserting a very clear thesis and supporting the central argument with evidence. This paper considers how others might respond to this assessment. All points are relevant and sufficiently developed. This paper exemplifies strong and able writing, with appropriate language, clarity, organization, grammar and flow. This paper is easy to read yet challenges the reader to think. The paper addresses the academic audience and uses the appropriate number of references (minimum 10).

#### **A- (3.8-3.5)**

On the whole, this paper presents a clear argument and is able to support it with evidence. This paper is similar to an A paper, but it is missing at least one of the elements found in an A paper. This paper, however, is weakened by either mechanics (organization, spelling, grammar, syntax, and flow) and/or clarity.

#### **B+ (3.4-3.2)**

This paper has a central argument that is presented and presents the evidence, but at times it is weak in argumentation and/or using supporting evidence. Ideas are slightly muddled, but in general, there is a satisfactory level of understanding. This paper is strong in writing mechanics.

#### **B (3.1-2.9)**

This paper is similar to a B+ paper. It illustrates a similar level of accuracy and the use of evidence. This paper, however, differs from a B+ because it illustrates a weaker display of effective argumentation and/or use of supporting evidence. Ideas are at times muddled, and evidence may not always be effective and/or well supported, and the central argument either lacks clarity or is argued inconsistently. This paper also needs some improvement in writing mechanics.

#### **B- (2.8-2.5)**

This paper lacks a clear central argument and argumentation. It demands attention to writing mechanics.

#### **C (2.4-1.9)**

This paper has a strikingly vague argument. The paper only minimally provides supporting evidence. Writing mechanics are poor.

#### **Below C**

This paper does not respond to the question. It lacks a central argument. Ideas are strikingly muddled and vague. It does not provide evidence to support the argument. Writing mechanics are poor.

## **Group project**

(A single, jointly authored, 5-page report; single-spaced; references on the 6<sup>th</sup> page  
Please upload on Canvas by March 9, 10:00 am PST).

Late papers will be penalized by 1/2 point (on the 4.0 scale) for each day late. For example, a paper that otherwise would have been a 3.5 becomes a 3.0 if it is one day late. The clock for lateness begins at the time for submission, with a ten-minute grace period to account for potential connectivity problems.

You will participate in a group project (2 students per group) that will examine issues such as democracy recession, the rise of China, and climate change. Christianna will assign you to specific groups.

Please examine questions such as: how did the problem emerge, and how has the country/industry been affected by it? What specific steps has it taken to respond to it? Has the response been perceived as being successful? From the industry perspective, ask similar questions: how is this problem affecting the industry in the short run, and how might it affect it in the long run?

Each team will present its perspective in the class and also turn in a written report. We expect each team to survey the relevant literature (including newspaper articles) on the subject. Your group will present to the class for 10 minutes, possibly followed by a brief Q&A. You can use PowerPoint. Here are some ideas:

- Be specific on how the problem in question affected your country.
- What are the short-term consequences for say public health and the economy?
- What might be the long-term consequences?
- Ensure that you have a maximum of 5 slides and not more than 5 bullet points per slide.

## Logistics

Make sure that you are checking your uw email; typically, students use @uw email address to coordinate activities with their group members. In previous classes, some group members have also shared phone numbers to facilitate texting – but given the privacy issue, this is something you need to decide for yourself.

If you are having “issues” with your group members, please contact Christianna at least a week prior to your presentation date.

## **Class discussions and Unannounced Quizzes**

I want students to actively participate in class discussions, including discussions following guest lectures, student presentations, and documentaries. To create incentives for your active participation, we will have unannounced quizzes. Please ensure that you

attend every session because you will not be allowed to write make-up quizzes. If for some reason you are unable to attend the class, please take Christianna's permission prior to the class. For example, if you are ill, please email us prior to the class. We will make reasonable accommodations such as allowing you to turn in your paper at a later date or not penalizing you for missed quizzes.

### **Extension Policy**

In cases of illness and other extenuating circumstances, the instructor will consider requests for a paper deadline extension, so long as a student makes the request ahead of time. The instructor will not look favorably upon requests received after a deadline has passed.

In cases where a student encounters an emergency within four hours of a deadline and needs to ask for an extension, the student's request will include (as an attachment) the work they have completed so far, which could include notes, an outline, and/or a draft.

### **Evaluation**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Due Date</b>	<b>Points</b>
Paper 1	January 19	20
Paper 2	February 9	25
Paper 3	February 28	25
Group Project	March 9	20
Class Participation		10
Total		100

### **Please Note:**

- This course qualifies for the W (writing) credit.
- I reserve the right to change or modify the syllabus without prior notice.
- I will follow UW's policy on plagiarism:  
<http://depts.washington.edu/grading/issue1/honesty.htm#plagiarism>
- Privacy: This course will be recorded and will be available for later playback only to students taking the course. Sharing recordings outside of class without the written consent of every student is a violation of FERPA.

### **Religious Accommodation**

Washington state law requires that UW develop a policy for the accommodation of student absences or significant hardship due to reasons of faith or conscience, or for organized religious activities. The UW's policy, including more information about how to request an accommodation, is available at Religious Accommodations Policy (<https://registrar.washington.edu/staffandfaculty/religious-accommodations-policy/>). Accommodations must be requested within the first two weeks of this course using the Religious Accommodations Request form (<https://registrar.washington.edu/students/religious-accommodations-request/>).



## **Class Schedule**

### **Session 1**

**Tuesday, January 3**

#### *Introduction*

- Juul, A whole new world.
- Friedman, This Is Putin's War. But America and NATO Aren't Innocent Bystanders.
- McTague, Putin Has Made America Great Again
- Johnson, 6 Steps the West Must Take to Help Ukraine Right Now
- Gessen, Was it inevitable? A short history of Russia's war on Ukraine

### **Session 2**

**Thursday, January 5**

#### *World Politics*

- CNN Cold War documentary, The Wall, Episode 9  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VVX-iOKty9k&list=PLmFpuLsumHidmOqHk37Pfb4NCR7G7mtbd&index=8>
- Walt. 1998. International Relations: One World, Many Theories. Foreign Policy, Spring, 29-44. Canvas
- Layne, 2009. The Waning of U.S. Hegemony – Myth or Reality. International Security, 34(1): 147-172
- Diamond. 2015. Facing Up to the Democratic Recession. Journal of Democracy 26 (1): 141-155.
- Douthat, Vladimir Putin's Clash of Civilizations
- Stockman, This Is the Russia-China Friendship that Nixon Feared

### **Session 3**

**Tuesday, January 10**

#### *State Building*

- Afghanistan After Us, Season 3, Episode, 13, VICE on HBO.  
<https://www.hbo.com/vice/season-03/13-afghanistan-after-us-and-la-haine>
- Fukuyama, 2004. The Imperatives of State Building. Journal of Democracy. 5(2).
- Ahmad. 2014. The Security Bazaar. International Security. 39, 3, 89-4.

### **Session 4**

**Thursday, January 12**

#### *Refugees and Statelessness*

- Escape to Europe, Season 4, Episode, 38, VICE on HBO  
<https://www.hbo.com/vice/season-04/2-escape-to-europe-and-circle-of-terror>
- Emily Schulthesis and Kirshandev Calamur, 2018. A Nonbinding Migration Pact Is Roiling Politics in Europe. The Atlantic.
- Chris McKenna and Brennan Hoban. 2017. Problems and solutions to the international migrant crisis. Brookings Now.
- Tim McDonnell. 2019. Climate change creates a new migration crisis for Bangladesh. National Geographic.

- Neli Esipova, Anita Pugliese and Julie Ray. 2018. More Than 750 Million Worldwide Would Migrate If They Could. Gallup.

## **Session 5**

**Tuesday, January 17**

### *Populism*

- Weyland, Kurt. “Latin America’s authoritarian drift: the threat from the populist left.” *Journal of Democracy* 24, no. 3 (2013): 18-32.
- What Is a Populist? And is Donald Trump one?, Uri Friedman, February 27, 2017
- Populism Is Meaningless. By reducing the term to a political pejorative, we risk rendering it worthless. Yasmeen Serhan, January 14, 2020.
- Can the climate movement survive populism? Lessons from ‘yellow vest’ protests. *The Hill*, December 6, 2018.
- Douthat, Ross. Will the Ukraine War End the Age of Populism? January 16, 2022.

## **Session 6 (Paper 1 is due)**

**Thursday, January 19**

### *Climate Change*

- Why the Energy Transition Will Be So Complicated  
<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2021/11/energy-shock-transition/620813/>
- Palm Oil Was Supposed to Help Save the Planet. Instead It Unleashed a Catastrophe. *The New York Times*, November 20, 2018.
- Could Russian sanctions hobble U.S. clean energy push?  
[https://www.politico.com/news/2022/02/24/could-russian-sanctions-hobble-u-s-clean-energy-push-00011392?utm\\_content=Top+news%3A&utm\\_source=Sightline%20Institute&utm\\_medium=web-email&utm\\_campaign=Sightline%20News%20Selections](https://www.politico.com/news/2022/02/24/could-russian-sanctions-hobble-u-s-clean-energy-push-00011392?utm_content=Top+news%3A&utm_source=Sightline%20Institute&utm_medium=web-email&utm_campaign=Sightline%20News%20Selections)
- How Russia Wins the Climate Crisis, *The New York Times*, December 20, 2020

## **Session 7**

**Tuesday, January 24**

### *Nuclear Energy and Climate Change*

Guest Speaker, Dr. Jim Conca

- U.S. CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Rise As Nuclear Power Plants Close, *Forbes.com*, January 16,
- Any Green New Deal Is Dead Without Nuclear Power, *Forbes.com*, January 21
- Why Are We So Afraid of Nuclear? *Forbes.com*, Jan 16
- Nuclear Waste Disposal -- Isn't Science Supposed To Reduce The Uncertainty?, *Forbes.com*, May 14

## **Session 8**

**Thursday, January 26**

### *State of Democracy*

G1: South Korea

G2: Thailand

G3: Iraq

G4: Indonesia

G5: Singapore  
G6: Nigeria

### **Session 9**

**Tuesday, January 31**

*Trade Politics*

- Fashion Victims,  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Dku\\_VWCsMY&has\\_verified=1](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Dku_VWCsMY&has_verified=1)
- Lim and Prakash. 2016. Do Economic Problems at Home Undermine Worker Safety Abroad?: A Panel Study, 1980-2009, World Development
- Thea Riofrancos. The Security–Sustainability Nexus: Lithium Onshoring in the Global North. Global Environmental Politics 2022

### **Session 10**

**Thursday, February 2**

*State of Democracy*

G7: Hungary

G8: Peru

G9: Mexico

G10: France

G11: South Africa

G12: Kenya

### **Session 11**

**Tuesday, February 7**

*NGO Politics*

- John Oliver, <https://www.esquire.com/entertainment/tv/news/a37208/john-oliver-christian-tv-evangelists/>
- Salamon. 1994. The Rise of the Non-Profit Sector. Foreign Affairs, 73(4).
- Dolsak and Prakash, 2022, Will hurling tomato soup on Van Gogh's Sunflowers advance climate policy?. Forbes.com, October 19.
- How UN staff are reshaping African cities  
<https://www.economist.com/middle-east-and-africa/2021/10/30/how-un-staff-are-reshaping-african-cities>
- Dupuy, Ron and Prakash. Across the globe, governments are cracking down on civic organizations. This is why. Washington Post/Monkey Cage July 5, 2017

### **Session 12 (Paper 2 is due)**

**Thursday, February 9**

*Ukraine War*

G13: Czech Republic

G14: Turkey

G15: France

G16: India

G17: China

G18: Saudi Arabia

### **Session 13**

**Tuesday, February 14**

*The Rise of China*

G19: Argentina

G20: Vietnam

G21: Iran

G22: Kazakhstan

G23: Kenya

G24: Ecuador

### **Session 14**

**Thursday, February 16**

*Food Politics*

- Meathooked & End of Water, Season 4, Episode 5, VICE  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QkPBam3qO34&t=637s>
- Zerbe (2004). Feeding the famine? American food aid and the GMO debate in Southern Africa. *Food Policy*, 29(6), 593-608.
- Fuchs & Kalfagianni (2010). The causes and consequences of private food governance. *Business and Politics*, 12(3).
- How Much Food Do We Waste? Probably More Than You Think, *The New York Times*, December 12, 2017

### **Session 15**

**Tuesday, February 21**

*Foreign Aid*

- Afghan Money Pit. Season 2, Episode 11, VICE  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_CvWJVtEkUE&t=1012s&has\\_verified=1](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_CvWJVtEkUE&t=1012s&has_verified=1)
- Easterly and Pfitze. 2008. Where Does the Money Go? Best and Worst Practices in Foreign Aid. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(2).
- Kuziemko, Ilyana, and Eric Werker. 2006. How much is a seat on the Security Council worth? Foreign aid and bribery at the United Nations." *Journal of Political Economy* 114(5): 905-930.
- Foreign Aid Is Having a Reckoning. *The New York Times*, February 14, 2021,  
<https://www.nytimes.com/2021/02/13/opinion/africa-foreign-aid-philanthropy.html?ction=click&module=Well&pgtype=Homepage&section=Editorials>

### **Session 16**

**Thursday, February 23**

*Climate Change*

G25: Malaysia

G26: Australia

G27: Bangladesh

G28: Pakistan

G29: Egypt

G30: Vietnam

## **Session 17 (Paper 3 is due)**

**Tuesday, February 28**

Regional Organizations in world politics

Guest Speaker: Christianna Parr

- Thakur and Van Langenhove. 2006. Enhancing Global Governance Through Regional Integration. *Global Governance*, 12 (3)
- Libman and Obydenkova. 2018. Understanding Authoritarian Regionalism. *Journal of Democracy*, 29 (4)
- ASEAN Struggles on in an Uncertain Age, *The Diplomat*, Nov 7th 2022, <https://thediplomat.com/2022/11/asean-struggles-on-in-an-uncertain-age/>
- A seat for Africa at the G-20 – integrating the African Union, *DevEx*, July 19 2022, <https://www.devex.com/news/opinion-a-seat-for-africa-at-the-g-20-integrating-the-african-union-103664>
- Biden calls for African Union to become permanent member of G20, *France24*, Dec 15th 2022, <https://www.france24.com/en/africa/20221215-biden-calls-for-african-union-to-become-permanent-member-of-g20>

## **Session 18**

**Thursday, March 2**

*Climate Change*

G31: Uganda

G32: Brazil

G33: Poland

G34: Congo (DRC)

G35: South Africa

G36: Mexico

## **Session 19**

**Tuesday, March 7 (over zoom)**

*What Roles Diplomats Play in Foreign Affairs*

A Conversation with Ambassador Damir Kusen

## **Session 20 (Group Report is due)**

**Thursday, March 9**

Future of World Politics

- CNN Cold War, *The Wall Comes Down*, Episode 23.
- Fukuyama. 2022. More Proof That This Really Is the End of History. *The Atlantic*, <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2022/10/francis-fukuyama-still-end-history/671761/>
- Walter Russell Mead. 2021. The End of the Wilsonian Era: Why Liberal Internationalism Failed. *Foreign Affairs*.