COURSE INFORMATION
CRN 50356
Time: T and R 12:45-2:00
Location: Gov 101

INSTRUCTOR
Prof. Cynthia McClintock
Office: Monroe 407
Tel: (202) 994-6589
E-mail: mcclin@gwu.edu
Office hours: W 2:30-4:45 (and by appointment)

COURSE DESCRIPTION
This course focuses on the trajectory of the relationships among the Latin American countries and the United States. First, we explore the tensions between Latin American countries and the United States during the Cold War; we ask if similar tensions will erupt if the Trump administration seeks to implement its campaign positions towards the region. Second, we consider the evolution of power in the hemisphere in the twenty-first century; we assess the roles of China and of possible “middle powers”—Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and (until recently) Venezuela. Third, we ask whether or not Latin American countries and the U.S. are achieving goals on key issues in the hemispheric agenda: border stability, economic development, the control of drugs and organized crime, democratization, climate change, and immigration.

We address various theoretical questions. First, why did the U.S. frequently intervene in Latin American domestic politics during the Cold War? Although the U.S. government said that its policies in Latin America reflected U.S. security concerns about the Soviet Union, most analysts believe that these concerns were exaggerated and some argued that U.S. policies reflected U.S. economic interests. We will examine to what extent U.S. policies reflected security threats, economic interests, democracy concerns, and/or features of the U.S. policy-making process.

Second, in the twenty-first century, what is “power”? Has the nature of power changed? Is the hemisphere unipolar, with the U.S. as the only “pole”? Or, is it bipolar, with China a second “pole”? Or, multipolar, with several Latin American countries and multinational organizations wielding clout? Or is power yet more diffuse? Finally, is the Trump administration likely to increase or decrease U.S. power in Latin America?

LEARNING OBJECTIVES
As a result of completing this course, students will:

1. Be able to engage critically in scholarly and policy debates about the international relations of Latin America.
2. Be able to assess the utility and limitations of the dominant theoretical approaches to the international relations of the hemisphere.
3. Increase their ability to build a cogent argument—to advance a position with sound logic, supported by robust evidence.
4. Gain factual knowledge about the international relations of Latin America.
5. Enhance their writing and communication skills.

GRADE COMPUTATION
1. Quiz (15%)
2. Critical essay (20%) (See below for guidelines.)
3. Research paper (25%) (See below for guidelines.)
4. Final exam (35%) In accord with GWU policy, the final exam will be on the officially scheduled date, not during the last week of the semester.
5. Class attendance and participation (5%). (Class discussions will not be graded, but they are an opportunity for extra credit.)

Extra Credit
Students who attend regularly and make positive contributions to our structured small-group discussions or to regular class discussion will receive an additional 1 to 8 points on their final grade for the course. Positive contributions show knowledge of the readings for the course and hone in on key questions relevant to the class session.

I will assign numerical grades, which will become a final letter grade as follows: 94-100=A, 90-93=A-, 87-89=B+, 84-86=B, 80-83=B-, 77-79=C+, 74-76=C, 70-73=C-, 60-69=D, 0-59=F.

MINIMUM AMOUNT OF OUT-OF-CLASS LEARNING PER WEEK
A minimum of 5 hours of out-of-class independent learning is required per week.

PLEASE NOTE AS YOU CHOOSE TOPICS FOR YOUR CRITICAL ESSAY AND RESEARCH PAPER THAT SIGNIFICANT OVERLAP BETWEEN EITHER OF THESE PAPERS OR WITH YOUR ESSAYS IN YOUR FINAL EXAM IS NOT PERMITTED.

GUIDELINES: CRITICAL ESSAY
Each student will submit to the professor a hard copy of the essay, which is to be a maximum of 1,000 words or about 3 pages—excluding bibliography, tables, and figures. Excessive length will be penalized. The essay is due in class on March 2. Each student should define and analyze relevant concepts, make an argument, and include evidence (which might be data about military projection, foreign direct investment, trade, a company’s profits, votes in international organizations, or soft power). Graphs and figures are welcome. Further guidelines will be provided closer to the date. You may choose one of the following topics:

1) Describe U.S. policy towards any two or three of the following countries when leftist movements or governments emerged: Mexico (1910-20 and 1934-40), Guatemala (early 1950s), Bolivia (early 1950s), Cuba (1958-1961), Chile (1964-
73), Nicaragua (1979-1990), El Salvador (1979-1990). Then discuss why, in your view, the U.S. government pursued the policies that it did. Do you believe that security theory or dependency theory better explains U.S. policy? Is security theory or dependency theory sufficient? Or, are other explanations (specify primarily explanations discussed in PSC 2484) necessary to understand U.S. policy?

2) Jorge Dominguez wrote: “[During the Cold War] the United States came to exaggerate systematically the nature of the threat to its interests and began to incur costs well beyond what rational calculations of the relationship between ends and means would suggest.” Do you agree (in whole or in part)? If so, why did the U.S. exaggerate the threat? What kind of threat was posed by the USSR at the particular intervals that you discuss in your essay? Support your argument with evidence from two or more of the cases in question 1. (Of course, “costs” are not primarily a matter of dollars and cents for Dominguez.).


GUIDELINES: RESEARCH PAPER
Each student will submit to the professor BOTH a hard copy and, via Safe Assign, an electronic copy of the paper, which is to be a maximum of 1,700 words or 5 pages, excluding bibliography, which responds to one of the questions under a class heading in the syllabus. Excessive length will be penalized. Keep in mind that PSC 2484 focuses on international relations, not a country’s domestic politics. The paper should not overlap with your critical essay. The deadline for students who do not present their paper in the relevant class is April 27.

The student is to address the question as specifically as possible; detailed historical background is not to be provided. The “/” mark in the questions indicates that students can choose either or both options. If a student would like to modify the question, s/he should consult the professor. The paper does not need to make a blanket yes/no argument; the argument may be nuanced. Counter-arguments should be addressed.

To make a cogent analytical argument, the paper should include empirical data (survey data, economic data, etc). Data that vary by source should be cited. The paper is to be carefully researched and documented. Usually, about 50% of cited works should be required or recommended readings from PSC 2484; all relevant readings in the syllabus should be cited. But, the appropriate ratio of PSC 2484 readings versus outside readings varies according to the amount of PSC 2484 materials relevant to the topic. If you submit the paper on the final day of the semester, it should incorporate the relevant class discussion of the topic. For assistance, visit the Writing Center at http://www.gwu.edu/~gwriter.
Also, through the April 11 class but not subsequently, students may choose to submit and present their paper to the class on the relevant date (when we are discussing the topic) and, if so, will receive 5 extra points for the paper. (If a paper topic spans more than one date, consult the professor on which is “the relevant date.”) The professor is especially likely to reward students who present early in the semester and reserves the right to limit the number of presentations in any one class to 3.

1) E-mails the professor between 9:00 am and 7:00 pm two days before the relevant class to let the professor know that he/she will be presenting his/her paper.
2) E-mails the paper to the professor by 4:00 pm the day before the class.
3) Summarizes his/her paper before the class for a total of 3 minutes and responds to questions on the topic. Amount of time for the student’s response to questions will be at the professor’s discretion.

GUIDELINES: CLASS DISCUSSIONS #1-6
During five or six sessions (one discussion might be omitted due to a guest speaker), students will divide into groups, exchange views about the indicated question, and after about 10 minutes report their findings to the entire class. By defending your view and countering other views, you will enhance your critical thinking skills. It is hoped too that the discussions will foster the presentation of multiple perspectives in class.

CLASS POLICIES
Paper submission: All written work must be given to the professor in hard copy and must be typed double-spaced, using a 12-point font and one inch margins and include proper citations. If for any reason you do not personally hand your paper in to the professor, you MUST both email it to her as soon as possible and put a hard copy in her box in the PSC department office (Monroe 440). Please ask the office to stamp the paper with the time of its submission. It is your responsibility to check that the professor received it.
Late work: 3 points will be subtracted from a grade for the first hour that a paper is late; after one day, an additional 3 points will be subtracted for every 24 hours that a paper is late.
Religious holidays: Please notify the professor if you must be absent due to a religious holiday.
Power points and hard-copy handouts: Will not be available on Blackboard. It is hoped that this policy will provide an incentive for class attendance.
Computer use: Except for students with disabilities, laptop computers are banned from class. To facilitate taking notes without a laptop, hard copies of the professor’s PPTs will be distributed.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
Not only direct quotes but also paraphrased text and ideas taken from a source must be cited. Do not take more than 2 sentences wholesale or paraphrased from one source. Academic honesty policies (http://www.gwu.edu/~ntegrity/code.html) will be enforced.

SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM
Any student who due to a disability may need an accommodation should contact Disability Support Services at 202 994-8250. Visit http://gwired.gwu.edu/dss/ for information. For assistance with personal, career, or study-skills problems, contact the
University Counseling Center at 202 994-5300, available 24/7 or visit http://gwired.gwu.edu/counsel/CounselingServices/AcademicSupportServices.

TEXTS


Americas Quarterly, winter 2015 issue (AQ in syllabus).

Current History, February 2017 issue (CH in syllabus).

ADDITIONAL READINGS
Required book chapters and articles not available through google are available on "Electronic Reserves" on Blackboard (BB). Note that, for some items, you are not required to read all of the pages that are available.

Recommended materials on “Electronic Reserves” are indicated by “BB.” Other recommended articles are available through Gelman e-journals. Some titles are abbreviated: AQ=Americas Quarterly; FP=Foreign Policy; FA=Foreign Affairs; WP=World Politics. Recommended books are at the Reserve Desk in Gelman.

Also, students should be up-to-date. Valuable sources available through Gelman include The New York Times (NYT), The Economist, and newspapers from Latin American countries. Valuable materials are available on the websites of the Inter-American Dialogue, the International Crisis Group, Americas Society-Council of the Americas, the Washington Office on Latin America, and the Center for Economic and Policy Research.

JAN. 17 INTRODUCTION

The syllabus!
Smith, pp. 4-9 (esp. p. 5, definition of “hegemony”).

PART ONE
U.S.-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

JAN. 19 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON POWER AND POLICY AND APPLICATIONS TO U.S. POLICY TOWARDS MEXICO DURING WWI AND WW2

RESEARCH PAPER: Why overall was U.S. policy toward Mexico relatively effective during the period of WWI/ WW2? OR Why was the U.S. able to achieve the support of all Latin American nations save Argentina during WW2?

Nau, H.R. Perspectives on International Relations, pp. 20-33.
Molineu, H., *U.S. Policy Toward Latin America*, pp. 135-140.

Recommended:
Vasquez, J.A., *Classics of International Relations*, Chs. 16, 17 (Morgenthau, Wolfers) BB

**JAN. 24**


**RESEARCH PAPER:** Why did the U.S. choose accommodation with Bolivia? OR why did the U.S. choose covert intervention against Guatemala? OR why did the U.S. choose accommodation with Bolivia but covert intervention against Guatemala?

Smith, pp. 117-131 and 152-155.

Recommended:
Kennan, G., “Latin America as a Problem in U.S. Foreign Policy,” in *Neighborly Adversaries*, pp. 123-126. BB
“Bitter Fruit: The Untold Story of the American Coup in Guatemala,” in *Neighborly Adversaries*, pp. 149-158. BB
Rabe, S.O., *Eisenhower and Latin America*, pp. 55-64. BB

**JAN. 26, 31, & FEB. 2**


A. THE CASE OF CUBA, 1958-1962

Jan. 31: **CLASS DISCUSSION #1 AND RESEARCH PAPER:** In 1961, was Fidel Castro’s Cuba a “dagger in the heart” or a “thorn in the side”? (In other words, what kind of security threat did the Castro government/the USSR’s role in Cuba represent?) AND/OR In January 1961, what policies might the Kennedy administration have pursued to try
to defuse the threat? OR (for class discussion only) How much did JFK’s leadership matter to the outcomes of the Bay of Pigs/Cuban missile crisis?

Smith, pp. 131-133 and 155-158.
Molineu, *U.S. Policy Toward Latin America*, pp. 63-76.
google

Recommended:
Grow, M., *U.S. Presidents and Latin American Interventions*, Ch. 2. F1418.G83


**RESEARCH PAPER:** What kind of threat did the Allende government/ the USSR’s role in Chile represent? AND/OR Why did the Nixon administration pursue the policies that it did towards Chile in 1970-73? AND/OR Between 1970 and 1973, what policies should the Nixon administration have pursued in Chile?

Smith, pp. 138-148 and 161-166.

Recommended:

**FEB. 7 & 9** THE U.S., THE USSR, AND LATIN AMERICA AFTER VIETNAM

**RESEARCH PAPER:** The Carter administration's human-rights policy did/did not facilitate the taking of power by the Sandinistas in Nicaragua in 1979 AND/OR What policies should the Carter administration have pursued in Nicaragua?


Recommended:


**RESEARCH PAPER:** What kind of security threat did the FSLN government/the USSR’s role in Nicaragua represent? AND/OR What kind of security threat might an FMLN government/the USSR’s role in El Salvador have represented? AND/OR What policies do you believe the Reagan administration should have pursued in Nicaragua/El Salvador?


Recommended:
Arnson, C., *Crossroads: Congress, the President, and Central America, 1976-1993*, 2nd ed., Conclusion. F14136.8UA76
Carothers, T., *In the Name of Democracy*, pp. 78-110. BB
McClintock, C., *Revolutionary Movements in Latin America*, pp. 48-56. BB

**FEB. 14 THE AFTERMATH OF THE COLD WAR: THE TRAJECTORY OF MARKET REFORM AND ARGENTINA’S 2001 FINANCIAL COLLAPSE**

**RESEARCH PAPER:** The blame for Argentina’s 2001 financial crisis lies primarily on the international financial community/Argentina’s governments.

Smith, pp. 205-225.

Recommended:

FEB. 16 QUIZ

CLASS DISCUSSION #2: What theoretical perspective or combination of explanations for U.S. policy toward Latin America during the Cold War do you find most persuasive? OR As we explored U.S.-Latin American relations during the Cold War, what struck you as the biggest difference with current relations?

PART TWO

LATIN AMERICA IN THE GLOBAL ARENA IN THE 21ST CENTURY


RESEARCH PAPER: Is China's relationship with Latin American countries threatening/not threatening to the U.S.? OR Is China an opportunity/challenge to Latin American countries [specify country or countries]?

Conceptualization of Power and the Evolution of U.S. Power
D & F, Ch. 1.
AQ, article by Drezner.
“The once and future bully,” The Economist 10/8/16 p. 34. google

Recommended:
D & F, Chs. 6 and 8.
www.securityassistance.org and foreignassistance.gov for figures on U.S. aid to LA.

_Focusing on China_

Smith, pp. 283-286.

Myers, M., “China’s Advance in Latin America and the Caribbean,” Testimony, U.S. House Committee on Foreign Affairs 9/10/15.


“Nicaragua’s Canal,” _The Economist_ 12/20/14 p. 52.


Recommended:

*/"What Chávez Taught China,” at www.fletcherforum.org/2013/01/18/myers*


**FEB. 28- MAR. 2**

**COOPERATION, CONFLICT, & REGIONAL ORGANIZATION**

Mar. 2: Critical essay is due in class.

**RESEARCH PAPER:** _Cooperation among the nations of Latin America is/is not more robust in [select the year: 2014 or 2017] than it was in [select the year: 1980 or 2000]. (You may consider the OAS, CELAC, UNASUR, MERCOSUR, ALBA, and/or the Pacific Alliance and base your argument on the evolution of one or more of these organizations.)_

Smith, pp. 351-352.

AQ, “Re-Thinking the OAS: A Forum.”

AQ, article by Bons.


Recommended:

“Consensus eludes heads of state as Summit confronts crunch,” LAWR 4/19/12 pp. 1-2.


If you are not familiar with the OAS, Wikipedia’s entry is helpful.
MAR. 7-
MAR. 9
THE PAST AND PRESENT OF ASPIRING “MIDDLE POWERS”:
BRAZIL, VENEZUELA, AND ARGENTINA

RESEARCH PAPER: In [specify year], Brazil/Venezuela/Argentina was/was not a “middle power.” (Consider conventional criteria for “power” and also alliances and policy goals.)

Brazil
AQ, article by Trinkunas.
D & F, Ch. 5.
“Rousseff….Convince Colombia to Look South,” LAW 10/10/15 p. 8.
“Brazil’s Trade Policy,” The Economist 1/14/12, pp. 35-36.
“Brazil’s Long Shadow Vexes Some Neighbors,” NYT 11/15/11.
Recommended:

Venezuela
Review articles on China and Venezuela for Feb. 21-23.
Smith, pp. 279-282.
AQ, article by Mijares.
D & F, Ch. 9.
Recommended:
AQ, articles by Negroponte.

Argentina
AQ, article by Stolper.
D & F, Ch. 4.
Recommended:

MAR. 14-16
SPRING BREAK

MAR. 21-23
ACHIEVING GOALS: STABILITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT WITH CLOSE NEIGHBORS (FOCUS ON MEXICO)

CLASS DISCUSSION #3 AND RESEARCH PAPER: The effect of NAFTA on Mexico has been positive/negative OR If the Trans-Pacific
Partnership (TPP) had been approved by the U.S., it was likely to have been positive/negative for Mexico/Peru/Chile OR In the context of the first months of the Trump administration, relations between Mexico and the U.S. appear likely to [specify] during the last year of the Peña Nieto administration and the first years of the Mexican president elected in 2018.

Smith, pp. 274-276.
D & F, Ch. 2 and pp. 133-137 and 187-193.
AQ, article by Fernández de Castro.
“U.S.-Mexico Trade: In the shadow of the wall,” The Economist 10/15/16 pp. 31-32. google
Dayen, D., “Fast Track to the Corporate Wish List,” The American Prospect (Summer 2015), pp. 56-61.

Recommended:

MAR. 28 ACHIEVING GOALS: MITIGATING CLIMATE CHANGE

RESEARCH PAPER: The U.S./China/LA nations (one or more LA nation may be specified) bear/do not bear a considerable part of the blame for the failure to date to negotiate a binding international agreement for a reduction in carbon emissions AND/OR failure to reduce their own emissions OR The Lula/Rousseff government(s) played a positive/negative role in international/Brazil’s efforts to reduce emissions.

AQ, article by Edwards & Roberts.
“The Amazon Today,” AQ (Fall 2015), pp. 24-43 & 54-57.
“Climate deal salvaged after marathon talks in Durban,” The Guardian 12/10/11.
“As Mexico Addresses Climate Change…” NYT 11/30/14 p. 10.
“Nicaragua’s Canal,” The Economist 12/20/14 p. 52. (review)
“Deal on climate change salvaged,” LAW 12/18/14 p. 8.
Recommended:
“Rain Forest for Ransom,” *Time* 2/6/12 pp. 36-39. BB

**MAR. 30 ACHIEVING GOALS: FAIR, HUMANE IMMIGRATION**

**CLASS DISCUSSION #4 AND RESEARCH PAPER:** U.S. immigration policy is/is not fair/humane; accordingly, valuable recommendations for the improvement of U.S. immigration policy are [specify] (Be sure to clarify criteria for “fairness” and “humaneness.”) AND/OR The Obama administration’s proposals for “comprehensive immigration reform” were appropriate/inappropriate (You may specify some components that you believe appropriate and others inappropriate.)

D & F, Ch. 12 and relevant sections of Ch. 10.
*Wash. Post* editorial opposing unilateral action by Pres. Obama on immigration and NYT editorial endorsing it.

**APR. 4, 6, & 11 ACHIEVING GOALS: CURBING DRUGS AND VIOLENCE IN MEXICO, THE NORTHERN TRIANGLE, AND COLOMBIA**

*Guest Lecturer, Apr. 6, Maureen Meyer, Senior Associate, Washington Office on Latin America (focus on Mexico)*

**CLASS DISCUSSION #5:** Given the limited success of U.S. drug policy to date, the best U.S./Latin American policy on drugs would be [specify] OR The most effective U.S. policy for improvements in security in Colombia/Mexico/the Northern Triangle would be [specify].

**RESEARCH PAPER:** The drug policy/The citizen-security policy of the Santos government/the Peña Nieto government/any Northern Triangle government has/has not been successful [specify the criteria for success] OR The Obama administration/other international actors [specify] have/have not been helping Colombia achieve peace by [specify] OR The Obama administration helped/did not help Mexico/any Northern Triangle country achieve citizen security by [specify].

Focusing on *U.S. Policy and Overall Trends in LA*
Smith, Ch. 14 & pp. 308-330 and 349-351.
D & F, Ch. 7.

“The wars don’t work,” The Economist 5/2/15 p. 10.
“What happens when drugs aren’t illegal?” Time 11/2/15 p. 10.
“How to stop the drug wars,” The Economist, 3/7/09, pp. 15-16, 30-36.

Recommended:

Focusing on Colombia
D & F, Ch. 7.
“Peace, Land and Bread,” The Economist 11/24/12, p. 44.
Recommended:
Tate, W., Drugs, Thugs, and Diplomats: U.S. Policymaking in Colombia.

Focusing on Mexico
Recommended:

Focusing on the Northern Triangle
“Fact Sheet: The United States and Central America” (on the Alliance for Prosperity) 1/14/16 at whitehouse.gov.

APR. 13, 18, & 20

ACHIEVING GOALS: DEMOCRATIZATION, WITH PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO VENEZUELA AND CUBA

GROUP DISCUSSION #6 AND RESEARCH PAPER: After the 2009 coup in Honduras, Obama administration policy/OAS policy was appropriate/inappropriate because [specify] OR The Obama administration’s efforts to promote democratization in Venezuela were appropriate/inappropriate because [specify] OR China’s support for the Venezuelan government appears to be significant/insignificant to its
survival OR The Obama administration’s 2014 rapprochement with Cuba increased/decreased the prospects for democracy in Cuba OR The policy that the U.S./other Latin American countries should pursue to promote democracy in Venezuela/Cuba is [specify].

**Overview**


Bunce, V. and Wolchik, S., Review of Advancing Democracy Abroad, Perspectives on Politics (Sept. 2010), pp. 923-925.

**Haiti and Peru**

Smith, pp. 297-300.


**Honduras**

Smith, pp. 266-268.


“Honduras’s presidential election: Voting to move onwards and upwards,” The Economist 12/5/09 pp. 43-44.

**Venezuela**

D & F, Ch. 9 (review).

“Obama administration says Venezuela court interfered with election results,” Miami Herald 1/14/16 google

“A Looming Clash in Venezuela,” NYT 8/15/16 google

“The Venezuela Test,” The Economist 6/18/16 google

Recommended:

“Neighbors Stand Up to Venezuela,” NYT 7/11/16 google

Ellis, Frederick B., “Mixed Message at the OAS,” Venezuelan Analysis 6/26/16 google

Serbin, A. and Serbin Pont, A.,”UNASUR and the Venezuelan hot Potato,” AU Blog/7/6/16 google

**Cuba**

Smith, p. 349.

D & F, Ch. 3 and relevant sections of Ch. 10.


“Cuba dissident takes message on rare trip abroad,” Wash. Post 6/1/16 google

Recommended:

Biddle, E., “Decoding the Digital War,” AQ (Spring 2015), pp. 93-97 google


“Next steps in Havana,” The Economist 8/15/15, p. 27.

“Lots of diplomacy, not many dollars,” The Economist 12/12/16, p. 36.

“Secretive Road to Raising the U.S. Flag in Cuba,” at nytimes.com 8/14/15.

Domínguez, J.I., “Cuban Foreign Policy,” in Tulchin, J.S. and Espach, R.H., Latin America in the New International System, Ch. 7. BB

APR. 25-27 CONCLUSION

April 27: Research papers are due (if not presented previously).