

POL 2103B Fall 2006 Prof. Roland Paris

ESSAY ASSIGNMENT

Course webpage: http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/POL2103.html

Due date: Due at the lecture on Thursday, November 23.

Length: Maximum 3,000 words total.

Format: Double-spaced; single-sided; normal font and margins; numbered pages; with

your name and student number on the first page.

Policies:

Lateness: No extensions to the due date will be granted without a doctor's note or its

equivalent. Late essays will be graded down one point (e.g., a grade of "C" will automatically become a "C-") **per day** of lateness. Essays submitted more than seven days late will receive a zero or "F" grade.

• Fraud: This is an individual assignment, not a group assignment. Plagiarizing

from another student, or from any other source including the Internet, will not be tolerated. Full academic penalties will be applied in cases of suspected fraud. Please familiarize yourself with the university's

plagiarism policies: www.uottawa.ca/plagiarism.pdf

Assistance: You are welcome and encouraged to visit the professor or your T.A. during office

hours (or by appointment) to discuss this assignment.

Additional assistance is available from the UOttawa Writing Centre:

http://www.writingcentre.uottawa.ca/.

You may also find this assignment calculator useful: http://www.biblio.uottawa.ca/assign-calc/index-e.php

The Assignment:

Thomas Friedman's *The World Is Flat* and Tarak Barkawi's *Globalization and War* offer quite different perspectives on the relationship between globalization and the Westphalian state. Your essay should be divided into three parts, as follows:

PART 1 –Globalization and the State (approximately 1/2 of total essay length):

Compare and contrast (i.e., identify the similarities and differences) in Friedman and Barkawi's view of (a) the role <u>played by</u> the state in the current era of globalization, and (b) the impact of globalization <u>on</u> the state. In your answer, refer directly to relevant sections of each book (including page numbers).

TIPS: Try to understand the nuances of each author's arguments, focusing on how they each conceive of "globalization" and its relationship to the state. There is no single section in either book where the author's present his views on globalization and the state. It is necessary to read both of these books in their entirety, and to draw out each author's position from what you have read. You may quote directly from the authors but please keep these quotations short (no longer than one sentence each). Better yet, paraphrase the author's arguments and provide specific page numbers (footnotes or in-text references are fine, but please be consistent in your referencing format).

PART 2 – Theoretical Foundations (approximately 1/4 of essay length):

Identify the theory of international relations that best represents each author's position on the relationship between globalization and the state.

TIPS: In preparing to write this part of the essay, think about the key points of each theory that we are studying in the course, and consider how these theories align (or do not align) with each author's argument and assumptions. Then, choose the theory that comes *closest* to Friedman's argument, and the theory that comes *closest* to Barkawi's argument. In writing the essay, name the theory that you have selected for each author, and then explain how this theory aligns with the author's approach. If there are differences between the theory and the author's approach, be sure to describe these differences, too. (You may, if you wish, argue that an author's argument is best reflected by a combination of *more than one* theory.)

PART 3 – Critique (approximately 1/4 of essay length):

Critique (i.e., identify the principal strengths and weaknesses of) each author's position on the relationship between globalization and the state. Be as specific as possible.

TIPS: In what ways is it convincing, and in what ways is it not convincing? In developing your critique, think about the authors' use of logic and evidence: e.g., Is the logic sound? Is it based on valid assumptions? Does the evidence they present support their position? Have they ignored or misconstrued something important?

Sources:

This is not a research essay – it is a comparative analysis of Friedman's and Barkawi's arguments on the relationship between globalization and the state. You are not expected to do additional research. That said, any ideas or language drawn from another person or source must be clearly referenced in the essay. (See the policy on academic fraud, above.)

Reminder:

You will also need to be familiar with both these books for the final examination.

Grading:

Each section of the essay will be graded according to the following criteria:

Part 1, Globalization and the State (50% of total essay grade)

- Demonstrates strong understanding of both authors' views on the relationship between globalization and the state.
- Compares and contrasts the authors' views on the relationship between globalization and the state.
- Answers <u>both</u> part (a) and part (b) of the question.
- Makes reference to relevant sections of each book, without wasting space with lengthy quotations.
- Presents a clear and thoughtful analysis, well organized and written.
- Uses good grammar and spelling.

Part 2, Theoretical Foundations (25% of essay grade)

- Describes, with specific references to both books, how each author's view of globalization and the state can be connected to a theory or theories of IR.
- Addresses any <u>differences</u> between the theory or theories selected and the author's view.
- Displays a strong understanding of the theory or theories selected.
- Presents a clear and thoughtful analysis, well organized and written.
- Uses good grammar and spelling.

Part 3, Critique (25% of essay grade)

- Analyzes <u>both</u> the strength <u>and</u> the weaknesses of <u>each</u> author's position on the relationship between globalization and the state.
- Presents an analysis that is focused and specific, not vague and general.
- Displays strong analytical skills, including the ability to scrutinize and challenge the authors' arguments, logic and/or evidence.
- Uses good grammar and spelling.