Goals and Requirements of IR 384

This course’s main objective is to provide you with a comprehensive portrait of Asian international relations from the perspective of security, defined broadly to include not only military security—although military security is certainly crucial—but also economic security, political security, societal security, cultural security, and environmental security. We will survey the entire Asian region, including Northeast Asia (China, Japan, the Koreas, and Taiwan), Southeast Asia (the ASEAN countries, particularly Burma, Thailand, Vietnam, the Philippines, Indonesia, Singapore, and Malaysia), and South Asia (particularly India and Pakistan). These three regions form distinct “security complexes,” but especially given the rise of China—which borders all three—and the US’s assertion of an interest in all three regions, the security complexes of Asia are ultimately linked together.

China’s rise, India’s increasing strength, and Russia’s recent resurgence combine also to draw Central Asia into the complex mix—a development reinforced by the terror threat from Afghanistan; from outside powers’ framing of that threat; and from intensified competition for the world’s dwindling carbon-based energy reserves. Beyond these traditional military and economic concerns, the new challenges to national identity presented by globalization, and to ecological stability by China’s rise (and India’s), combine to make Asia an intricate space in which many critical variables are changing all at once. This can sometimes make the continent’s security affairs seem bewildering and baffling, its overall trajectory impossible to predict with satisfying accuracy. But Asia’s weight in world politics interacts with its (ultimately) pleasing complexity to suggest why trying to comprehend it is so important.

This can only be possible if we all do a better job cultivating our capacity to understand Asian security affairs from the perspectives of Asians themselves. We wouldn’t want simply to replace a naïve Western-centric perspective with an equally-
naïve and overgeneralized Asia-centric perspective. That kind of approach would only lead to distortions, delusions, and ultimately disasters of a different kind. In truth, there can't BE a coherent Asia-centric perspective, shared Asia-wide, because there isn't a coherent Asia. It is far too vast a region and far too diverse in terms of language, ethnicity, religion, gender relations, distribution of natural resources, experiences with the West, and so on, for sweeping generalizations to withstand critical scrutiny.

To help you appreciate the complexity, not only will we devote the entire first half of the semester to surveying the distinctive security situations facing 15-20 different Asian countries (with some receiving closer attention than others); but in addition, everyone in the class will be asked to select a country they don't know much about already and follow its developments in a focused and systematic way using mainly online news sources—all the way from early February until the end of the term. Then during class discussions, your task (or one of them, at least) will be to keep the rest of us updated on how "your" particular country is being affected (or not) by whatever the security issue is we happen to be focusing on that day. With so many different students specializing in such a large variety of countries—following developments closely and sharing their discoveries and insights—we can all start developing a more textured and nuanced appreciation for the complexity of Asian security affairs.

I will ask you to turn in a 1-2 paged proposal on what country you would like to cover, and why, on Tuesday, February 1st. The TA will grade that proposal and the result will count 2 percent toward your final course grade. The reason we will grade it is because I want you to think very carefully about what country to choose, coming up with a reason other than that the country is large and powerful. I don't want everyone focusing on China, India, and Japan. I want to see as many different countries included as possible, including the likes of Mongolia, Sri Lanka, and East Timor. I will look favorably upon students who propose to follow a relatively low-profile country. Of course we will also need SOME students to follow the more prominent ones. But I would like it to be people who can produce creative and thoughtful explanations for precisely why those countries need following.

Every time we meet, I’ll do a mix of lecturing and leading discussion. During the first half of the term, when we’re surveying the 15-20 countries, I’ll lecture more and leave less time for discussion. But then after the midterm, the format will change, so that I’ll lecture less and we (all) discuss more—focusing on the distinctive security situations facing “your” particular country. At the end of the term—on Monday, May 2nd—I’ll ask you to hand in a short (4-5 paged) assessment of what you learned from the experience of closely following a single country. You should concentrate in the paper on elucidating your sense of how, and why, perceptions of security threats differed in your country from those of other countries; where there were nevertheless similarities (and why); and what the implications are (i.e., what lessons we should take away from your findings).

Here, then, is the way final course grades will be calculated:

Country selection justification (due Tuesday, February 1st): 02 percent
Midterm exam (in-class on Tuesday, March 8th): 30 percent
Final exam (in class on **Wednesday, May 11th, from 2 to 4 pm**): 35 percent
Attendance and participation: 12 percent
Demonstration of “expertise” in the country you specialize in: 16 percent
Map quizzes: 05 percent

(The 16 percent is calculated from both in-class performance *directly related to discussing “your” country*, and the quality of the 4-5 paged memo due **Monday, May 2nd, by 5 pm**.)

**EXTRA CREDIT:** There are three (and only three) ways to receive extra credit in IR 210: (1) participate in TIRP; (2) participate in the JEP Peace Games; or (3) attend three pre-approved public talks sponsored by on-campus units, after each of which you would write up (within about 24 hours) a 2-paged summary and analysis. Choosing any of these options will—assuming you do a good job—result in the participation component of your final course grade being raised by one notch (for example, from a B+ to an A-). *But you can only pursue one option for extra credit; your main energies should be focused on mastering the materials in the readings and lectures and participating intelligently in discussions.*

**COURSE ADMINISTRATION:** TA Katherine Chu (katherkc@usc.edu) is primarily responsible for first-line IR 384 administrative matters so please go to her initially when administrative issues arise. You should also go to Katherine first in the unlikely event that you don’t understand why you received a certain grade. TAs almost always have a very good reason for assigning particular grades, so please make sure that you understand Katherine’s rationale before coming to me about a grade concern. Over the years, I have found it to be extremely rare that a TA would fundamentally misgrade an exam. When they do make minor mistakes (e.g. arithmetical), they always readily admit it and adjust the grade(s) accordingly. TAs want you to learn; they’re not aiming to cause you any trouble (unless you *really* deserve it!).

**POLICY ON RECOMMENDATION LETTERS:** I will consider—and usually consent to—writing letters of recommendation for any student who (a) completes two of my courses, (b) earns an A- or better in both courses, and (c) never uses their computer in class for anything other than taking notes. I’ll even write a letter for someone who gets a B+ in the first course and an A- or higher in the second one, because I like to see improvement.

**CHECKING EMAIL, FACEBOOK, THE NEWS, WHATEVER, IN CLASS:** It’s immature and rude to do this; you’re not learning anything; and you annoy your fellow students. Therefore, **NEVER DO IT** in IR 384. The same thing goes for text-messaging. It’s all easy to spot, both by me and by the TA—who will be watching from the back of the room. If we catch you doing it, **we will reduce the participation component of your final course grade by up to 50% and invalidate all extra credit.**

**USC Statement on Academic Integrity**

USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others,
the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one’s own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another’s work as one’s own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. *Scampus*, the Student Guidebook, contains the Student Conduct Code in Section 11.00, while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A:

http://www.usc.edu/dept/publications/SCAMPUS/gov/

Students suspected of academic dishonesty will be referred to the Office of Student Judicial Affairs and Community Standards. The inquiry process is explained at:

http://www.usc.edu/student-affairs/SJACS/

**USC Statement for Students with Disabilities**

Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to the professor or your TA as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. The phone number is (213) 740-0776.

**Books Ordered and Placed on Library Reserve**


**Course Schedule**

11 January (T):  Approaches to Understanding Security Problems in Asia (1)

13 January (Th): The Complex and Abiding Impacts of Western Imperialism (2)


18 January (T): The Cold War and Competing Development Strategies in Asia (3)


20 January (Th): The US in Asia (4)

   a. Walter LaFeber, “The Tension between Democracy and Capitalism during the American Century,” Diplomatic History 23(2), Spring 1999, pp. 263-84. (Blackboard)


25 January (T): China (5)


27 January (Th): Taiwan (6)

   a. Daniel C. Lynch, Rising China and Asian Democratization (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006), chapters on “Taiwan: Democratization as De-Sinification” (pp. 150-180); and “Threats to the Consolidation of Taiwanese Democracy” (pp. 181-206).

   b. A recent article to be named later. (Blackboard)
1 February (T): Japan (7)


c. A recent article to be named later. (Blackboard)

3 February (Th): South Korea (8)


b. Terence Roehrig, “History as a Strategic Weapon: The South Korean and Chinese Struggle over Koguryo,” paper delivered in August 2007 at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association. (Blackboard)


8 February (T): North Korea (9)


d. A recent article to be named later. (Blackboard)

10 February (Th): India and Pakistan (10)


15 February (T): Russia and Central Asia (11)


17 February (Th): Indonesia (12)


b. A recent article to be named later. (Blackboard)
22 February (T):  Malaysia and Singapore (13)


c. Recent articles to be named later. (Blackboard)

24 February (Th):  Thailand and Burma (14)

a. Daniel C. Lynch, Rising China and Asian Democratization (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006), chapters on “Buddhism and the Siamese Alacrity toward Global Culture(s)” (pp. 23-52); and “Deepening Thai Democracy: The 1990s and Beyond” (pp. 53-87).


1 March (T):  Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia (15)


3 March (Th):  The Philippines / Summarizing Southeast Asian Changes (16)


8 March (T):  Midterm EXAM
PLEASE REMEMBER TO BRING BLUE BOOKS!


~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ SPRING BREAK ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~

22 March (T): Realist Approaches to the Problem of Order (18)

24 March (Th): The Benefits and Risks of Economic Interdependence (19)

29 March (T): Regional Institution Building and Its Inherent Limitations (20)


31 March (Th):  Military Security (21)


5 April (T):  Nuclear Power and Weapons Proliferation (22)


7 April (Th):  Energy and Resource Nationalism (23)

a. Aaron L. Friedberg, “‘Going Out’: China’s Pursuit of Natural Resources and Implications for the PRC’s Grand Strategy,” *NBR Analysis* 17(3), September 2006. (Blackboard)


12 April (T):  Environmental Destruction (24)
14 April (Th): Sickness, Health, and Demographics (25)


19 April (T): Internal Security (26)


21 April (Th): Civil Society Development and Prospects for Democracy (27)


b. Muthiah Alagappa, “Civil Society and Democratic Change: Indeterminate Connection, Transforming Relations,” in Muthiah Alagappa, ed., Civil Society and Political Change in Asia: Expanding and Contracting


d. Daniel C. Lynch, “Chinese Thinking on the Future of International Relations: Realism as the Ti, Rationalism as the Yong?” The China Quarterly, No. 197, March 2009. (Blackboard)

28 April (Th): The Struggle to Shape the Future (29)


2 May (M): The short (4-5 paged) paper due (by 5 pm)

11 May (Wed): FINAL EXAM (2 pm - 4 pm)

PLEASE REMEMBER TO BRING BLUE BOOKS!