To: PS205 Students
From: Ronald B. Mitchell
Subject: Discussion Section Requirements and Credit

Part of the discussion sections for the class will focus on two case studies. Each section will be divided into seven "countries" consisting of 3, 4, or 5 people each. Each group will be assigned to represent a different country. You have two assignments as part of each of the two case studies.

Group Assignment:

Come to class prepared to negotiate on behalf of your country or interest group; that is, with a proposal for your preferred outcomes and an idea about where you would be willing to compromise, and what other outcomes you would view as acceptable. Consider how much negotiating power you have, and what kind of arguments you can use to sway others to your side. It is essential that you evaluate how much of a priority the issue (Iranian nuclear weapons or climate change) is for your country, what domestic constraints and opportunities exist in your country on this issue, and what distribution of the costs and benefits of action would be supported by your constituents. Feasibility should be important to your discussions; you do not want to waste time, and mastering the art of politics involves choosing the best of those alternatives *likely to be enacted*.

You must *create and present* a group position paper (of no more than 1000 words) answering the following two questions:

What position will your country take with respect to supporting the international issue at hand (responding to Iran's nuclear test or preventing climate change)?

Your goal is to do the best you can to understand what position you would take if you really were a government decision maker in the country you represent. This means giving up, for the purposes of the case study, your personal concerns, values, and priorities in order to better understand the concerns, values, and priorities of people from another country. This will require that you 1) read the materials posted on the website for the case, and 2) undertake such additional research as seems necessary to support your position (this should not be too extensive, don't overdo it). You should attempt to identify what position your country has actually taken on the issue at hand, or similar issues. The web pages will have more information regarding some countries' positions than others. If your group has questions that cannot be answered from the packet of materials, seek assistance from your GTF, a librarian, other students, or Professor Mitchell.

What justification will your country give for the position it takes?

How would you justify the position you take and convince other country's representatives to support that position? For example, if your country supports Iran's right to have nuclear weapons or opposes international efforts to prevent climate change, what arguments might you make to, at least, convince other states not to punish your country for these positions and, perhaps, to convince other states to join your country in its position? What arguments would you make to convince other countries to support your state's position? In particular, you should identify what your country believes is/are the cause(s) and consequences of Iran's recent actions (or the benefits and costs of taking action to prevent climate change), and the solution(s) that you believe would best alleviate the situation. Moreover, indicate what your country's most desired outcome would be, as well as the minimum outcome that your country would be willing to accept.

Individual Assignment:

You must *write* an individual analysis paper (of no more than 500 words) answering the following question:

What are the analytic and theoretical reasons why you think your country has taken the position it has?

For this paper, try to apply the theories you have learned in the course to understand why the country has taken the position it has. In contrast to question #2 of the group assignment (which you should approach as if you were a diplomat), this question requires you to think like a political scientist who wants to really know why a country did what it did, rather than why it *said* it did what it did. This means bringing theories about anarchy, system structure, security dilemmas, power, interests, realism and institutionalism, interdependence, dependency theory, feminist theory, etc. to bear on the case information you have. There are several ways to build a good argument. You will be evaluated on the theoretical sophistication of the

argument you choose to construct, which includes knowledge of the theory (or theories) invoked and ability to apply them to the facts at hand. Be sure to consider how your government will mediate security and economic interests, as well as ethnic, religious and other social divisions within the country or differences with other countries. Moreover, keep in mind that your country may seek to form or maintain external alliances. This is hard but important work.

Schedule

The schedule for discussion section meetings will be as follows:

- Students will be assigned to different country groups for the two different cases. Country assignments will be posted on the course website.
- Weeks 2 and 3: Discussion of materials in course, including issues and topics delineated by the GTF to assist you in understanding the course material. During section, briefly go over any questions related to understanding the case and case assignments. OUTSIDE OF SECTION: Develop response to Iran Nuclear Case - this will require meetings of people in your country group outside of section time.
- Week 4: Discussion of Iran Nuclear Weapons Case. Your group position paper and individual analysis papers are due at the beginning of your section for week 4.
- Week 5: Review for midterm exam.
- Week 6 and 7: Discussion of materials in course, including issues and topics delineated by the GTF to assist you in understanding the course material. OUTSIDE OF SECTION: Develop response to Global Climate Change Case - this will require meetings of people in your country group outside of section time.
- Week 8: Discussion of Climate Change Case. Your group position paper and individual analysis papers are due at the beginning of your section for week 9.
- Week 9 – all sections canceled because of Thanksgiving holiday.
- Week 10: Discussion of course material and review for final exam.

Attending and actively participating in discussion sections is a required component of the class and constitutes 15% of your overall grade. This portion of your grade will be based on the following five elements:

- Iran Nuclear Weapons Case (Case #1) 1000 word GROUP position paper 2.5% of grade (Due at beginning of discussion section meeting in week #4)
- Iran Nuclear Weapons Case (Case #1) 500 word INDIVIDUAL position paper 2.5% of grade (Due at beginning of discussion section meeting in week #4)
- Climate Change Case (Case #2) 1000 word GROUP position paper 2.5% of grade (Due at beginning of discussion section meeting in week #8)
- Climate Change Case (Case #2) 500 word INDIVIDUAL position paper 2.5% of grade (Due at beginning of discussion section meeting in week #8)
- GTF evaluation of your participation in and contribution to the class 5% of grade

Both individual and group papers must be typed, no longer than the assigned limits, and include a wordcount. Obviously, with these word limits, the goal is not to cover everything but rather to highlight those points that most usefully answer the questions being asked and demonstrate your ability to use the knowledge you are gaining in the course to describe what position your country would have been likely to take and to analyze why your country would have taken that position.

In preparing for the in-class exercise, groups should identify one member to summarize your group's responses for the entire class. Each group should have one spokesperson who will have 3 minutes to present the position of their country. Additional information about the discussion section and the case writing requirements will be made available during the course of the term in section, in the main class, and via the course website.

CASE ONE: IRAN ACQUIRES NUCLEAR WEAPONS

RONALD B. MITCHELL, © 2009

Overview

October 23rd, 2014: The tensions between Iran and Afghanistan that had been brewing since the death of several Iranian diplomats at the hands of Afghanistan soldiers in 2010 (after international peacekeepers had left the country) finally erupted in war in 2013. Tensions have been simmering for years and increasingly intense fighting has occurred at various points along the border between the two countries. Prior to the outbreak of war, Afghan newspapers reported that Iran had been supporting Afghani rebel groups and that Tehran had been continuing its efforts to hasten the US departure from Afghanistan and secure its own influence in the area. Iran further complicated relations by refusing Kabul's pleas to delay the return of Afghani refugees. The tremendous influx of refugees had a destabilizing effect and began to strain relations between previously supportive religious groups between the two countries. Religious differences between the Shiite Muslims of Iran and the Sunni Muslims of Afghanistan (and discrimination against minorities of the other sects within each country) have led to regular fighting over the past two years with significant losses on both sides. Over the past two years, Iranian forces have incurred severe losses in personnel and material resources in the course of their battles with the Afghanis.

This has aggravated the tense domestic competition between nationalist-minded president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and his allies in the Iranian Parliament and the Afghanistan President Hamid Karzai, whose ability to govern effectively is hampered by continuing factionalism within Afghani politics. As a consequence, the international community is experiencing increasing uncertainty over the intentions of Iran. For instance, Iraq recently accused the Iranian government of funneling arms to aid the Iraqi Kurds in their ongoing rebellion, which has sent growing numbers of refugees across the border into Iran. The regional rivalry between Iraq and Iran is as fierce as always, raising concerns about the possibility of another war between the two countries. Iran's recent troubles serve as a microcosm for regional tensions, as border clashes have erupted between Israel and Lebanon with increasing frequency, and at increasing cost.

Last week, Iran announced that it had tested its first nuclear device. Both American and Russian intelligence sources confirmed that the Iranian government had detonated a small nuclear device underground in a remote portion of the northeastern section of the country. The official Iranian statement declared that, "We have developed nuclear weapons to deter other nations from taking aggressive action against us. We have no intention of using our newly-acquired capacity to threaten other nations. However, if threatened, we reserve the right to defend our security and our sovereignty by any means at our disposal."

The Iranian nuclear program received considerable help from the Russian government, which is concerned about maintaining good relations with its neighbors and seeking hard currency and oil rights, among other things. Russian funding and personnel were crucial to Iranian programs to mining and refining the uranium, building the Bushehr and Gorgan nuclear power reactors, and training nuclear technicians. China also provided assistance with fuel fabrication, uranium enrichment technologies, and fuel reprocessing for plutonium separation. Not all of these facilities were under IAEA safeguards.

The United States and Israel opposed this aid, leading some to fear that Israel may wish to preemptively strike Iran's nuclear facilities much as it did with Iraq's Osirak reactor in the 1980s. Israel created such a plan that was leaked to the press in January of 2009. Nuclear physicists trained at top American and European universities work for Iran's Physics Research Center, which developed the centrifuge process for refining highly enriched uranium from ore mined in the eastern regions of Iran with Chinese assistance. Much of the manufacturing equipment related to their nuclear program came from Japanese, Czech, German, British, American, and Swiss firms "dual-use" equipment that can be used for legitimate, non-nuclear manufacturing as well as for nuclear programs. In some cases these sales were approved by their governments because of their non-nuclear uses but in others they were undertaken without the relevant government's knowledge.

Although the exact size, weight, and other specifications of the Iranian nuclear weapon are not yet known, during the 1990s, the Iranians purchased SCUD missiles from North Korea (in its effort to gain hard currency) with a range of 300 miles and SS-4 missiles from Russia with a range of 1,200 miles and have delivered conventional explosives using both types of missiles extensively in their war with Afghanistan.

[Case continues on next page...]

Policy Options

The United Nations will be holding a vote tomorrow on how to respond to the Iranian nuclear test. The major options currently being discussed by different countries are as follows:

- A United Nations General Assembly resolution condemning the Iranian test and calling for them to recommit themselves to the Nonproliferation Treaty and to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- An economic boycott of all imports going into and exports coming out of Iran
- Military attacks against the site where the nuclear tests were conducted, against the nuclear reactors in Bushehr and Gorgan, and against the Physics Research Center facilities.
- Efforts, similar to those undertaken with North Korea in the 1990s, to offer Iran new light-water nuclear reactors (that cannot be used to produce weapons-grade uranium) and to provide much-needed food aid to a country that has been ravaged by a drought since 2005 (a drought that some climatologists are suggesting is an already-visible effect of climate change).
- Of course, all countries have retained the right to respond unilaterally as well as in cooperation with other states.

Many states also are likely to decide to do very little, if anything, and some have expressed varying degrees of support for Iran's technical achievement and its development of a second "Islamic bomb," (the first having been Pakistan's).

Your Country's Response

As the major ministerial representatives selected to advise the president of your country, you must decide, as a group, how your country should respond to this latest development and provide appropriate justification for the action you plan to take for a speech that will be made at the United Nations.

In your second (but equally important and individual) role, you must try to use existing theories of international relations to explain why your country is taking the position it is in response to the Iranian action.

CASE TWO: CLIMATE CHANGE

RONALD B. MITCHELL, © 2009

In December 1997 in Kyoto, Japan, member nations of the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) adopted a protocol to the Convention which committed "Annex I" countries (basically, developed/industrialized countries plus the post-Soviet "economies in transition" like Poland, the Czech Republic, etc.) to reducing their greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions by at least 5% from their 1990 levels by the period 2008-2012. The protocol allows the Annex I states to trade emission reductions, to "purchase" emission reductions through "joint implementation" (JI) agreements for projects undertaken by other Annex I countries and a similar "clean development mechanism" (CDM) for joint emission reduction projects undertaken in non-Annex I (developing) countries but paid for by Annex I countries. With Russia's membership formalized in November 2004, the Protocol became international law on February 26, 2005. As of August 2009, the Protocol has been ratified by 188 countries, notably excluding the United States and Australia. Major negotiations are underway that will commence in an international conference that may produce the next climate change treaty -- that conference will take place in Copenhagen from December 7 - 18, 2009 - http://en.cop15.dk/.

If use of fossil fuels continues to increase at present rates, scientists estimate that by 2035 humans will add 12 billion tons of CO2 to the atmosphere annually, with about 50% from industrialized nations and about 50% from developing nations. The urgency of the problem was underscored recently by devastating storms and unusually hard monsoon rains in South Asia. Bangladesh has been among the countries particularly hard hit but many small island states (who have formed AOSIS, the Alliance of Small Island States) are worried that climate change will destroy their countries. Indeed, some island states have already begun moving their populations away from their coastlines due to more frequent storm surges. Global warming, if it occurs, will cause heating of ocean water (and hence its expansion) as well as melting of the Antarctic ice sheet that will raise average sea levels by several meters --a rise that will inundate island countries made up of atolls as well as low-lying countries like the Netherlands and Bangladesh (as well as cities like New Orleans). Besides these problems, evidence suggests that global weather patterns are already becoming increasingly erratic, with flooding and storms increasing in some regions, droughts increasing in others, glaciers receding, pests and diseases increasing in number, wildlife and habitat being lost, and coastal erosion increasing.

Over the past 9 years, climate change negotiations in the Hague, Marrakech, and Bali have focused on implementing the climate change convention and the Kyoto Protocol and on creating a post-2012 (the year that Kyoto expires) set of reduction targets. One of several important aspects of those negotiations that states are thinking about is how to make sure that enough states take large enough actions to avert climate change, and whether taking those steps is worth the cost. The debate regarding the costs of climate change and the costs of preventing climate change has recently been highlighted by a report by a British economist (Stern) who concluded that the costs of climate change in the future are greater than the costs of preventing climate change now. However, if countries wait to implement changes, the costs of stopping climate change will be too large and unmanageable for states to take appropriate action.

Another sticky issue has involved determining the different roles that industrialized and developing countries should play. One side of the debate contends that industrialized countries caused the climate change problem through their past emissions and that they, therefore, have a moral responsibility to fix it; these countries are also the only ones with the financial and technical resources to take action to prevent it. If developing countries are to match the progress of their industrialized counterparts, this argument runs, they need to be given financial incentives and technologies that will allow them to continue to develop in ways that do not contribute excessively to global climate change. Another view focuses on the fact that developing countries actually are already making significant contributions to the climate change problem and, more importantly, will become the dominant source of the problem in the future. The actions that industrialized countries, acting by themselves, can take will not be adequate to prevent significant, and perhaps devastating, climate change. Furthermore, this view argues that efforts by developing countries to secure funding from the industrialized world are inappropriate, suggesting that, since all countries will benefit by avoiding global climate change, all countries should share the costs required to protect against it. The issue of developing country responsibility was at the forefront of the agenda at Bali last year and will be a salient issue in this year's climate meeting, in which a successor to the Kyoto Protocol is expected to be developed. [Case continues on next page...]

The agenda setting committee is debating what resolutions to bring to the floor of the convention. The committee consists of representatives from several countries and a representative from Greenpeace has been invited to bring in additional scientific expertise and articulate their policy position. As representatives of these actors you need to decide on the following:

1. What targets and timetables, if any, should be set for non-Annex I (developing) countries regarding emission reductions? Use as a reference point their emissions in 1990. How, if at all, should non-Annex I country goals be linked to the requirements for Annex I countries? Does industrialized country compliance matter in whether or not developing states should take action?
2. What new targets (beyond the 5% by 2008-2012 targets of Kyoto) should industrialized countries commit to?
3. Should financial transfers or other incentives between governments become part of the post-2012 agreement? What form should those take?