

Introduction to International Studies: Identities, Interests, and Community  
(INTL 113-01 and 113-02) Fall 2011, 4 credits

Instructor: Nadya Nedelsky

Time: MWF 12:00-1:00 (01) and 1:10-2:10 (02)

Place: Carnegie 404

Office: Carnegie 413

Phone: 696-6479

Email: [nedelsky@macalester.edu](mailto:nedelsky@macalester.edu) (please note: I may not check email on weekends)

Office hours: Mondays, 2:30-4:00, and Fridays 10:00-11:00

**Course topics and objectives:**

This course develops a base of knowledge, concepts, and analytical skill for engaging with International Studies' multi-dimensional concerns. Ranging across disciplines but with an emphasis on social science, we study global theories of interaction and conflict between human groups and explore sites and implications of increasing encounter. Focusing on culture, people flows, nationalism and ethnicity, democratization, contending interests, security, religious fundamentalism, gender, and models of community integration, we examine how particular cases reflect broader processes.

The course also seeks to strengthen your skills in understanding, analyzing, applying, synthesizing, and evaluating arguments critically and with an open mind and making clear, strong arguments, in writing and speech.

**Texts:**

- Ian Buruma, *Murder in Amsterdam: Liberal Europe, Islam, and the Limits of Tolerance*, New York: Penguin, 2007.
- Sheila Croucher, *Globalization and Belonging: The Politics of Identity in a Changing World*, Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003.
- Unni Wikan, *In Honor of Fadime: Murder and Shame*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008.
- Further readings will be available via Moodle.

**Assignments:**

Overview

1. Four short response papers (your choice of readings and dates): ungraded but count toward participation
2. Case study: 10%
3. Participation: 20%
4. "Clash of Civilizations" paper (Monday, October 3<sup>rd</sup>): 25%
5. Participation in the "Islam in Europe" debate (November 16<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup>): 5%
6. Final paper: 12 pages (December 12<sup>th</sup>): 30%
7. Global mega-quiz (Monday, October 17<sup>th</sup>; Minimum passing grade is B, or 44/55 correct): 10%

### 1. Response papers:

You will write four one-page (single-spaced) papers responding to a reading (or readings) of your choice. They are due in class the day we discuss that reading. You should begin by identifying two things. First, what is the **problem** that the piece is addressing/trying to solve? And second, in a sentence of your own words, what is the **conclusion** of the author's argument (what the author is trying to convince you of, ultimately)? Identifying the conclusion should always be the first step in analyzing an argument. Thereafter, you may respond as you wish, looking, for example, at the strengths and weaknesses of its premises, its implications, its relationships to other readings, and so on. Sometimes, I will give you a question to consider when reading a piece, so one option would be responding to that. You should end the response paper with the question that most troubles or intrigues you, at the end of the day, about that reading.

The purpose of the response papers is to engage with the readings and to help you develop your own voice regarding the course's issues. This pre-class thinking and writing will also enhance our discussions (and make things easier for those who have difficulty speaking up in class). They are ungraded, and therefore low-stakes, but contribute to your participation grade.

### 2. Case Studies:

Across the semester, we will devote several class periods to examining course concepts and theories in the context of specific cases. The purpose is to explore and compare and how our core concepts, theories, and issues play out in situations around the world.

There will be two cases studies per case study day, each presented by a team of students (usually two, but possibly sometimes three). The team will be responsible for providing background on the case and then leading class discussion/analysis of it.

A. Background: Each team will be responsible for researching and providing information about both the case and its broader context.

i. The specific case: The team members should familiarize themselves with the assigned case and, **two days before** the case study day, provide the class with one or two news articles or short pieces about it (not more than 10 pages), beyond the one provided in the syllabus.

ii. Broader context: The team should become broadly familiar with the country where the case occurred, including geographic location, population, major historical events of the past century, type of political system, demographic make-up, and level of economic development. The team will share this research with the class by providing, **two days before** the case study day, a 3-5 page written overview of this broad context. Make sure to include the elements of context that seem particularly relevant to the case at hand (for example, if a conflict has an ethnic component, how did the groups end up in the same state, what are the main distinguishing elements between the groups, do they differ socio-economically, and what has their political relationship been like over time?). You should draw on at least one scholarly source.

B. Discussion leadership: Each team will also lead class discussion of their case for half the class period (30 minutes) through which you will help us relate the course concepts and theories to your case. You will begin by offering a very brief overview of the case (5-10 minutes) to set up for discussion. The purpose of the discussion is not to present your own analysis, but to lead the class in analyzing the case. You will prepare questions for class discussion, which should have conceptual, comparative and theoretical elements. You can move between the types of analysis as you see fit.

i. Conceptual analysis: The case studies will help us look at how well our core course concepts capture reality. You may ask the class, which course concepts can you identify as playing a role in this case? What role do they play in the problem/issue? How do the concepts, as defined in the literature, compare to on-the-ground reality? Do they capture it accurately/adequately, or does the case raise complications for the way certain concepts are defined?

ii. Comparative analysis: You should invite the class to compare your case to others discussed in the course. Particularly interesting comparisons highlight commonalities in cases that are otherwise very different, and differences in cases that are otherwise very similar. These can raise questions that the theoretical element of the analysis may help address. They can also raise further questions about how well core concepts capture reality in diverse situations.

iii. Theoretical analysis: Here, you will invite the class to consider how well the theories we learn about in the course apply to real situations. How might Author X explain a particular aspect of your case? How well does that explanation work? If it is not satisfactory, why not? Does the case validate or raise problems for the theory, and if the latter, what are they? Might another author explain it better? How? What would be the policy implications of a particular author's viewpoint when applied to your case?

Each team should email me a list of at least five discussion questions (which, in one way or another, should cover all three types of analysis), that you plan to ask by **noon the day before** the case study day.

C. Finally, each team will hand in a 1-2-single-spaced page rationale for the way their approach to the class discussion. This should offer the central questions asked and explain what you were trying to get at by asking them, and offer brief thoughts on how you would answer those questions. Due on your case study day. (Discussion leadership + rationale: 10%)

### 3. Participation:

This is not a lecture course. Discussion is central and important because it requires active thinking and articulation of positions, and it helps clarify difficult issues via questions,

challenges, and rethinking. None of the issues in this course have easy answers; everyone can contribute something. If you have trouble speaking up (a common issue), some pointers:

- As with many anxieties and phobias, a way of overcoming this is by gradually exposing yourself to your own voice in the classroom until you get used to it (and keep in mind that what you say doesn't have to be brilliant). It simply gets easier the more you do it.
- For better or worse, people tend to remember what they themselves said, and much less what others said. People don't tend to scrutinize what you said nearly as much as you do.
- That some people are more at ease with speaking up doesn't mean that they generally have better or more thoughtful things to say than those less at ease. Your contribution is important.
- The response papers are a good place to get your thoughts clear and ready yourself to make points and/or ask questions comfortably.

If you continue over time to feel uncomfortable speaking in class, please come talk to me about it and we'll consider strategies. Attendance and response papers also count toward participation. (20%)

4. Paper 1: The Clash of Civilizations? We will watch a documentary titled *We Are All Neighbors*, which documents the disintegration of social trust between Bosnian Catholic and Muslim neighbors over the course of a few weeks in 1993. You will then write a 6-to-8-page-paper in which you consider the extent to which the film supports Samuel Huntington's arguments about the "clash of civilizations," the extent to which it supports the contending arguments of either John Bowen or Faoud Ajami, and the extent to which it raises problems for both Huntington and his critics. A more detailed prompt will be handed out in class. (25%)

5. Islam in Europe Debate: In this exercise, each student will be assigned a short reading by an author who participated in the debate ignited by Ian Buruma's *Murder in Amsterdam*. In your own words, you will represent your author's position in the debate to the class. (5%)

6. Paper 2: (30%) In this 12-page-paper, you will engage with the case-study-based texts we read in Part 4 of the class. A more detailed prompt will be handed out in class.

7. Global mega-quiz: You will receive a study guide, filled with background knowledge relevant to International Studies (and beyond). You are responsible for studying for it outside of class. Given Monday, October 17. Minimum passing grade is a B (44/55 correct). You can retake as many times as necessary, but highest grade credited for a retake will be a B. (10%)

**Grading scale:**

100-94: A	89-86: B+	79-76: C+	69-60: D
93-90: A-	85-83: B	75-73: C	59-55: D-
	82-80: B-	72-70: C-	

**Note: Plagiarized work** will **not** be accepted and will incur significant penalties. If you are using someone else's ideas, words, or research, you **MUST** cite them properly.

The Macalester Academic Excellence (MAX) Center, located in Kagin Commons, has peer tutors available for assisting students in all stages of their writing.

I am committed to providing assistance to help you be successful in this course. Accommodations are available for students with documented disabilities. Contact the Associate Dean of Students, Lisa Landreman, at 696-6220 to make an appointment. Students are encouraged to address any accommodations with me as soon as you become aware of your needs. Additional information regarding the accommodations process for students with disabilities can be found at: [www.macalester.edu/studentaffairs/disabilityservices/](http://www.macalester.edu/studentaffairs/disabilityservices/)

**Schedule** (subject to change as necessary)

## **Introduction**

Wed, September 7: Welcome to the class

### **Part 1: Key concepts, theoretical approaches, and actors, defined**

\*\*\*We begin by looking at the dominant form of political community today—the state—as well as the organizations that increasingly vie with it for influence. We also explore conceptualizations of nationhood and ethnicity, and at theories that seek to explain their role as sources of identity, community, and conflict.

Friday, September 9: Sheila Croucher, Chapter 1: “Globalization, Belonging and the State”

Monday, September 12: Croucher, Chapter 4 “Constructed Ethnicities, Global Contingencies”; Clifford Geertz: “Primordial Ties” and Walker Conner, “Beyond Reason: The Nature of the Ethnonational Bond”

Wednesday, September 14: Croucher, Chapter 3: “Nation-shaping in a Postmodern World”

- guest speaker: Dave Collins from the library, on doing research for your case studies

Friday, September 16: Croucher, Chapter 2: “Reconfiguring Citizenship”

Monday, September 19: Case study day

Israel: “Which Converted Jews Deserve Israeli Citizenship?”  
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128752988>

Nigeria: “Christians, Muslims at War with One Another,”  
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=124531034>

Optional interesting opinion piece: Ivory Coast: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-africa-12336269>

Wednesday, September 21: Writing workshop (samples will be provided)

## **Part 2: Concepts and theories, applied globally**

\*\*\*Here, we look at how the concepts and theories explored in Part 1 were applied in some of the most influential “big theories” on the nature of, and prospects for, global interaction. Developed in the years after the Cold War’s end, they ask: what are the likely current and future sources of human conflict? Their answers are based on different notions of identity and what motivates behavior.

Friday, September 23: Samuel Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?”

Monday, September 26: Film, *We Are All Neighbors*;

Background: Bosnia-Herzegovina timeline:

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country\\_profiles/1066981.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/country_profiles/1066981.stm)

Wednesday, September 28: Fouad Ajami, “The Summoning,” and John R. Bowen, “The Myth of Global Ethnic Conflict”

Friday, September 30: Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History?”

Monday, October 3: Benjamin Barber, “Jihad vs. McWorld”; **Paper 1 due**

Wednesday, October 5: Case study day

Egypt: “Egypt News: Revolution and Aftermath,”

<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/egypt/index.html?scp=1-spot&sq=egypt&st=cse>

Greece: “Fears of Far-Right Rise in Crisis-Hit Greece,”

<http://apnews.excite.com/article/20110801/D9ORFJ6O0.html>

## **Part 3: Concepts and theories, applied regionally: European countries of immigration**

\*\*\*In this section, we continue of examination of the concepts and theoretical frameworks developed in Parts 1 and 2 by grounding our investigation in Europe as a continent of substantial immigration. We look at how people flows are unsettling notions of identity and community and producing conflicts over particular interests. We explore different models of integration (or coexistence) and some of the problems they raise in liberal democracies, asking: what are the implications for national identity, gender equality, free speech, religious tolerance, and equal citizenship? And how can the models be improved?

Friday, October 7: Immigration: Should Countries Liberalize Immigration Policies? James F. Hollifield, “Yes,” and Philip Martin, “No”

Monday, October 10: Kwame Anthony Appiah, “The Case for Contamination”

Wednesday, October 12: Irene Bloemraad, Anna Korteweg, and Gökçe Yurdakul, “Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State,” (excerpt), Eren Tatari, “Theories of State Accommodation of Islamic Religious Practice in Western Europe” (excerpt)

Friday, October 14: **No Class** – Macalester International Roundtable

Monday, October 17: **Global mega-quiz!**

Wednesday, October 19: Amartya Sen, “The Uses and Abuses of Multiculturalism: Chili and Liberty”

Friday, October 21: Susan Moller Okin, “Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?” and Martha Nussbaum, “A Plea for Difficulty”

Monday, October 24: Case study day

South Korea: “South Korea Tackles Multiculturalism,”  
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=91819092>

Bolivia: “Multiculturalism in Bolivia,”  
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=1036117>

Wednesday, October 26: Film (TBA)

Friday, October 28: **No class – fall break!**

Monday, October 31: Anna Korteweg and Gökçe Yurdakul, “Islam, gender, and immigrant integration: boundary drawing in discourses on honour killing in the Netherlands and Germany”

Wednesday, November 2: Bhikhu Parekh, “The Rushdie Affair: Research Agenda for Political Philosophy”

Friday, November 4: Tariq Modood, “The liberal dilemma: integration or vilification?” and Flemming Rose, “Why I Published Those Cartoons”

Monday, November 7: Angela Merkel declares death of German multiculturalism (links on Moodle)

Wednesday, November 9: Case study day

Canada: “Sharia law in Canada, almost,”  
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/blog/2008/feb/08/sharialawincanadaalmost>

Saudi Arabia: “Pope Meets Saudi King to Discuss Christian Worship in Muslim Kingdom,” <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-492052/Pope-meets-Saudi-king-discuss-Christian-worship-Muslim-kingdom.html>

Optional, on how foreigners should approach life in Saudi Arabia: British Embassy Riyadh, “Living in Saudi Arabia,” <http://ukinsaudiarabia.fco.gov.uk/en/help-for-british-nationals/living-in-saudi-arabia/>

#### **Part 4. Case Studies: The Murders of Theo van Gogh and Fadime Sahindal, and the Debate over “Islam in Europe”**

\*\*\* In this last section, we tie course themes together by looking in depth at two cases: the 2004 murder of filmmaker Theo van Gogh in Amsterdam, engaging with the international debate it ignited, and the 2002 “honor killing” in Sweden of Fadime Sahindal. We ask, what role do globalizing cultural, economic, and political trends (introduced in Part 1) play in these cases? How are (often contending) notions of identity, community, and interests involved (particularly as mobilized in the state policies we studied in Part 3)? And what insight do the theories concerning the sources of human conflict (surveyed in Parts 1 and 2) bring to the questions?

Terrorism and Security: Is International Terrorism a Significant Challenge to National Security? Intro, and Scott Atran, “Yes,” and John Mueller, “No”

Friday, November 11: Ian Buruma, *Murder in Amsterdam*; also Weston, “Oral Arguments”

Monday, November 14: *Murder in Amsterdam*, continued

Wednesday, November 16: “Islam in Europe” debate

Friday, November 18: The debate, continued

Monday, November 21: The debate, expanded

Wednesday, November 23: Film (TBA)

Friday, November 25: THANKSGIVING BREAK! (no class!)

Monday, November 28: case study day

Norway: “Anders Behring Breivik,”  
[http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/anders\\_behring\\_breivik/index.html?scp=1-spot&sq=breivik&st=cse](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/anders_behring_breivik/index.html?scp=1-spot&sq=breivik&st=cse)

Switzerland: “Minaret result seen as ‘turning point,’”  
[http://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/Specials/Islam\\_and\\_Switzerland/Minaret\\_vote/Minaret\\_result\\_seen\\_as\\_turning\\_point.html?cid=7793740](http://www.swissinfo.ch/eng/Specials/Islam_and_Switzerland/Minaret_vote/Minaret_result_seen_as_turning_point.html?cid=7793740)

Wednesday, November 30: *In Honor of Fadime: Murder and Shame*, Parts 1 and 2

Friday, December 2: *Fadime*, Parts 3 and 4

Monday, December 5: *Fadime*, Parts 5-7

Wednesday, December 7: Peer review work on papers

Friday, December 9: Final case study day: students' choice of cases

Monday, December 12: LAST DAY OF CLASS! Final paper due