Politics 341, Latin American Politics
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David Yamanishi

Contact Information

Office hours: I am generally on campus from at least 9am to 4pm Monday to Friday, and tend to be in my office most of the time when I’m not with you, aside from lunch and meetings. If you don’t want to just take a stab at catching me in my office, let me know when you’d like to talk and we can set up an appointment. I strongly encourage you to visit me as often as you deem helpful and/or entertaining.

Office phone: 895-4300. A great way to figure out whether I’m there!

Email: dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu. The best way to reach me.

Consulting Librarian: Greg Cotton, Cole 315, 895-4454, gcotton@cornellcollege.edu. Greg can help you find resources for your paper, both in print and electronically.

Writing Studio: Cole 125, 895-4462. Hours: Monday-Thursday, 8am-11pm; Friday, 8am-5pm; Sunday, 1-11pm. I have discussed each assignment with Laura Farmer in particular, but Laura, Shawn, and the student consultants can all be help you learn to structure your paper and your writing effectively. The writing consultants can also offer advice on brainstorming, general organization, and study habits as they relate to written work.

I’m here to help, as are Greg and the Writing Studio folks. Please take advantage of us.

There is a Moodle site for this class that you can get to by logging in with your Cornell email account and password at http://moodle.cornellcollege.edu. I will post copies of all handouts and online readings there.

Overview

History, present characteristics, and future prospects of political systems in Central America, South America, and the Caribbean. Addresses decolonization, authoritarianism, democratization, human rights, the political effects of social institutions and economic crises, and foreign relations with the US and other powers.

Disabilities

If you have a disability registered with the college that will require special accommodations for the tests or other assignments, please let me know by Wednesday, February 3.

If you have a disability that is not registered with the college that will require special accommodations for any assignments, please register it (!) and then let me know by Wednesday, February 3.

Feedback

I am very interested in your suggestions for improvement of this syllabus and my teaching generally. Please email comments to me as you think of them or share them with me at my office.
**Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in class</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>5% daily by 7am (when there are new readings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First test</td>
<td>15% Thursday, February 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second test</td>
<td>15% Monday, February 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group presentation</td>
<td>10% one of Monday-Wednesday, February 8-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper proposal/bibliography</td>
<td>2% Monday, February 8, 9am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper outline</td>
<td>3% Sunday, February 14, 12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>20% Saturday, February 20, 12pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper rewrite</td>
<td>5% Wednesday, February 24, 5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual presentation</td>
<td>10% one of Monday-Wednesday, February 22-24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the particular things I’m looking for vary to some degree by assignment, in general an A on a written or oral assignment means that your work is outstanding in terms of:

- addressing the assigned question and avoiding digression,
- having a well-structured argument,
- expressing your argument clearly and effectively,
- making appropriate and properly cited use of material on the syllabus and other well-selected sources,
- and demonstrating thoughtful mastery of the course material and discussions.

Lower grades mean that you have not done all of these things or have done one or more of them less well that you could have. The order of items on the above list should not be taken to indicate their order of importance in determining your grade on an assignment, nor should you suppose that the items will carry equal weight on an assignment or invariant weight across assignments. Moreover, I expect your work to improve during the course and across courses.

To simplify communication about grades, I grade all assignments other than participation using the same marks that appear on your academic transcripts: letter grades. When I combine assignment grades to produce your course grade, I will do so using the same numbers that the college uses to determine your GPA (A = 4.0, A- = 3.7, B+ = 3.3, etc.). I will always round-up from the midpoint between grades (for example, a 3.85 rounds to an A, while a 3.84 does not). I may raise grades from what the raw numbers indicate in deserving cases, but I will never change the rank order of students’ grades in the class in doing so.

**Instructions for Assignments**

**Participation:** If you punctually attend every class, appear to me to be engaged, and never make a contribution to our common discussion, you will receive a C for participation. To get a grade higher than a C for participation, you must participate orally in our common discussion. I assess participation more by thoughtfulness and attentiveness to the flow of the conversation than by quantity of oral communication. I do, however, expect you to contribute regularly. Office visits will help your participation grade, but are not a substitute for class attendance and participation.

**Journals:** Each day of the course that we have readings you should submit a journal entry by 7am via email (plain text, no attachment, please). For journal entries that address readings, you might consider one or
more of the reading note questions that I’ve distributed, or reflect upon how the readings for the day relate to earlier material and/or current events in the news. Feel free to offer your personal reactions to each piece, but I do want you to offer some interpretation or analysis of some kind in each journal entry. Your entries should not exceed 250 words per day. Journals will be graded according to (thoughtful) completion. That is to say: if you finish all of them and take them reasonably seriously, you will receive an A for the journal component of the course grade. You may skip one journal entry at no penalty, or complete all of them for a bit of extra credit.

Tests: I will hand out reading notes for each day’s readings to give you an indication of what issues we will discuss at the next day’s class (although we may well address other topics as well, including those you suggest). The test questions will be similar to the more interpretive questions in the reading notes. I may hand out test questions in advance, if doing so doesn’t appear to damage participation by reducing the incentive to do the readings. Tests will generally address recent readings, but some questions may reach back to earlier material.

Group presentation: In groups of two or three, you will help the class to understand how the general themes that we will address in the class apply to the political, developmental, and social experience of six specific countries. Each group will have some additional reading not listed below on its country, and should use that material and the common material to offer the class an introduction to the politics of its country for about an hour. Each group should strive to demonstrate how its country illustrates general themes in Latin American politics or offers important lessons in its own right. The presentations should be about an hour in length, including time for discussion guided by the members of the group. Your grade will depend partly on the group’s performance and partly on your individual performance. I will base the group’s collective grade upon the thoughtfulness of the group’s division of labor and the integration of the parts of the presentation. I will base your individual grade upon your effectiveness in presenting your part of your group’s argument in a clear way to the class and your facility and thoughtfulness in answering questions and leading discussion about your part of the group’s work. I will meet with each group the day before its presentation to offer advice on the group’s plan. You should have your presentation worked out in advance of that meeting, along with your slides, outlines, or other visual aids.

Paper, generally: You should choose a topic related to the themes of the class that has been addressed by scholars in more than one way. In other words, you should ask a question that admits of more than one answer, and you should deal with the scholarly disagreement about your topic in your paper. Your topic may be historical or current. You may address a topic that has to do with domestic or international politics. You may write about a single country or make comparisons between two or more countries. The paper project will fall into four graded stages: proposal and bibliography, outline, the paper itself, and a rewrite. In identifying sources for your paper, you should primarily use scholarly (as opposed to journalistic or encyclopedic) work and be sure to look for scholarly responses to each piece that you identify in order to develop an overall understanding of the literature on your topic. Please submit each part of the paper by email as a Word or RTF attachment.

Paper proposal and bibliography: Your proposal should describe the puzzle that you plan to address in your paper and lay out the facts that you mean to explain. The proposal should not draw conclusions. I will grade this assignment according to three principal criteria: the quality of your statement of your central puzzle, the quality of the selection and presentation of facts that you offer to make the context of your puzzle clear, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis and make each part of your proposal make sense in terms of that thesis. You should write your proposal as a coherent essay, not a set of bullet points. Your bibliography should offer source annotations that briefly explain the central conclusion(s) and reasoning of each source and the role that it will play in your paper.
**Paper outline:** Your paper outline should describe the structure of your paper and the logic of your argument. You should shun bullet points in favor of brief explanations of the division of your paper and argument into sections and of the purpose of each section. You should not, however, simply begin to write your paper; the outline should describe the structure and logic of your argument, not actually begin to make your argument. I will grade your breakdown according to three principal criteria: the quality of your justification for dividing the sections of your paper and argument as you have, the quality of your explanations of the purpose of each section and part of your argument, and the quality of your selection and description of sources. Your breakdown should not exceed 1200 well-chosen words.

**Paper:** The paper should present your puzzle (building upon the proposal), explain how competing scholars understand the phenomenon in question, analyze the competing explanations to identify the roots of their disagreement, and assess why one or more perspectives are right and the other(s) wrong. I will grade the research paper according to three principal criteria: the quality of your discussion of how your problem has been and/or might be explained by scholars from different perspectives, the quality of your analysis of what fundamentally unites and distinguishes the competing perspectives that you address and your own effort to build upon the competing perspectives, and the coherence with which you establish a clear argument and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis. Your paper should not exceed 3000 well-chosen words.

**Paper rewrite:** I will return your graded papers with comments as quickly as possible, so that you may improve your paper according to my suggestions (and your own further reflection upon it). Your grade on the rewrite will be no lower than your grade on the original paper so long as you make a serious effort to address my comments; if you make merely cosmetic changes, your grade on the rewrite may be lower than the original grade. Your rewrite should not exceed 3000 well-chosen words.

**Individual presentation:** Your presentation should address your paper project. You should present your puzzle, the competing perspectives that you have found or developed about it, and your analysis of their advantages and shortcomings in about 15 minutes. After each presentation, I will select another student (or students) in the class to serve as a discussant who will briefly summarize the presentation and ask one or more critical questions about it. I may ask each of you to serve as a discussant more than once. After the discussant(s) speaks, other students may ask questions and make comments (which will count as ordinary class participation, not part of the presentation grade). Your presentation grade will depend on your effectiveness in presenting your argument in a clear way to the class and your facility and thoughtfulness in answering questions about your work, as well as quality of your formal discussion of another student’s presentation.

**Attendance and Lateness Policy**

To avoid a penalty on your participation grade for missing class, you must ask the campus clinic (in a health emergency) or the dean of students or other relevant campus official (in other types of emergencies) to send me an excuse on your behalf. You may miss no more than one class without providing a documented excuse.

I will lower the grade on work submitted late by one percent per hour late. Work submitted late that meets the minimum expectations of the assignment will receive at least a D regardless of lateness, so you should submit all assignments even if you are extremely late. I will not, however, accept any work after 5pm on Friday of block break.
Except in cases of documented disability or emergency, I will not, on grounds of fairness, offer an extension to one student without offering it to everybody, and given the tightness of the block plan calendar, I simply can’t afford to do that. Please do not experiment with my generosity.

To drop on the 15th day, you must complete every assignment due by the end of the 14th day of class and meet the attendance condition noted above (that is to say, you must miss no more than one class without a documented excuse). In other words, if you are likely to sleep through class on more than one occasion, you should drop now, because you will not be able to do so later.

**Books to Buy**

The following books are available at the bookstore in the Commons and are required for all students in the class.


**Reading and Assignment Schedule**

Readings not in the books may be found on the Moodle site for the class. I will offer reading notes for your consideration alongside each set of readings.


### Monday, February 1
9am Introductions, administrivia.

### Tuesday, February 2
9am Chasteen, chs. 1-5.

### Wednesday, February 3
9am Chasteen, chs. 6-10.

### Thursday, February 4


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Feb 5</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td>John M. Carey, “Presidentialism and Representative Institutions,” in Dominguez and Shifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rut Diamint, “The Military,” in Dominguez and Shifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Laurence Whitehead, “The Fading Regional Consensus on Democratic Convergence,” in Dominguez and Shifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mala Htun, “Political Inclusion and Social Inequality: Women, Afro-descendants, and Indigenous Peoples,” in Dominguez and Shifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Feb 8</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td>Paper topic and annotated bibliography due.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Argentina and Brazil group presentations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Levitsky, “Argentina: Democracy and Institutional Weakness,” in Dominguez and Shifter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>David Samuels, “Brazil: Democracy under Lula and the PT,” in Dominguez and Shifter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Feb 9</td>
<td>9am</td>
<td>Chile and Colombia group presentations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wednesday, February 10  9am  Mexico and Venezuela group presentations.

Denise Dresser, “Mexico: Dysfunctional Democracy,” in Dominguez and Shifter.

David J. Myers, “Venezuela: Delegative Democracy or Electoral Autocracy?” in Dominguez and Shifter.


1pm  First test.

Friday, February 12  9am  Peter F. Klaren, “Lost Promise: Explaining Latin American Underdevelopment,” in Klaren and Bossert.


Sunday, February 14  12pm  Paper outline due.

Monday, February 15  9am  Andre Gunder Frank, “The Development of Underdevelopment,” in Klaren and Bossert.

Celso Furtado, “Economic Development of Latin America,” in Klaren and Bossert.
Tuesday, February 16  9am  


Wednesday, February 17  9am  


Thomas J. Bossert, “The Promise of Theory,” in Klaren and Bossert.

Thursday, February 18  9am  
Weeks, chs. 1-4.

Friday, February 19  9am  
Weeks, chs. 5-7.

Saturday, February 20  12pm  
Paper due.

Monday, February 22  9am  
Weeks, chs. 8-11.

1pm  
Second test.

Tuesday, February 23  9am  
Presentations.

1pm  
Presentations.

Wednesday, February 24  9am  
Presentations.

3pm  
Paper rewrite due.

*Honesty in Academic Work (from the Compass)*

The College considers Cornell students to be responsible persons whose maturity will develop in a community that encourages free inquiry. The College expects the highest degree of personal integrity in all relationships. Any form of dishonesty is a violation of this spirit and of College rules.
A student is expected to explicitly acknowledge ideas, claims, observations, or data of others, unless generally known. When a piece of work is submitted for credit, a student is asserting that the submission is her or his work unless there is a citation of a specific source. If there is no appropriate acknowledgement of sources, whether intended or not, this may constitute a violation of the College's requirement for honesty in academic work and may be treated as a case of academic dishonesty.

Dishonesty in academic work includes both cheating and plagiarism.

*Cheating* refers to the use of unauthorized sources of information on examinations or any attempt by students to deceive the evaluator of an examination, paper, or project.

*Plagiarism* is the act of taking the work of another and presenting it as one's own, without acknowledgement of the original source.

There is not one set of rules for the acknowledgement of sources that is appropriate across all disciplines. For this reason, students are always encouraged to consult their professors and guidelines included in their syllabi. However, in general the appropriate acknowledgement of sources involves meeting the following requirements:

**Quotations and Paraphrasing.** All direct quotations, even if mingled with original words and ideas, must be placed within quotation marks and accompanied by a specific citation for the source of the quotation. Unless the information is generally known, all phrases that are not original to the author - even two or three words - must be placed in quotation marks and cited. If an existing idea is used but paraphrased or summarized, both the original author's words and sentence structure must be changed and a specific citation for the source must still be made. It is always the responsibility of the student to provide precise sources for all ideas, information, or data he or she has borrowed or adapted. Simply listing sources in a bibliography is not sufficient. Students who use information from the World Wide Web are expected to follow these same guidelines for the citation of sources.

Failure to cite sources properly constitutes academic dishonesty, whether the omission is intentional or not.

**Ideas and Data.** All students are required to acknowledge the ideas of others. Every student is expected to do her or his own work in the completion of an assignment or an examination unless either (a) the sources for these ideas are explicitly cited, or (b) the instructor explicitly allows such collaboration. In addition, a person giving unauthorized assistance to another on an examination is just as guilty of cheating as the person who accepts or solicits such aid.

Submitting revisions of academic work previously submitted, either in the current course or in previous courses, qualifies as academic dishonesty unless the student obtains the explicit permission of all of the instructors involved.

All data sources must be cited accurately. It is dishonest to fabricate or alter research data included in laboratory reports, projects, or other assignments.

A safe guide is to provide a full citation for every source consulted. Sources may include, but are not limited to, published books, articles, reviews, Internet sites, archival material, visual images, oral presentations, or personal correspondence. In addition, students should always keep previous drafts of their work in order to
provide documentation of their original work. Finally, due to disciplinary differences, students should consult their professor, a librarian, and/or the Teaching and Learning Center for specific instructions on properly providing citations for sources.

**Procedures for Dealing with Dishonesty in Academic Work (from the Compass)**

If an instructor judges that a student has violated the College’s policies on academic honesty, the student may be charged with academic dishonesty and assigned an F either for the particular examination, paper, report, or project, or for the course. The instructor shall notify the student in writing of the charge and the penalty and shall include a statement of the circumstances which precipitated the action. A copy of the instructor’s letter along with a copy of the paper shall be sent to the Registrar. The Registrar shall then advise the student in writing of the right to appeal. Within ten (10) days of notification, the student may appeal the charge and/or the penalty by submitting a letter to the Dean of the College requesting that he or she appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of three (3) faculty members, one of whom may be nominated by the student. The recommendation of this committee is advisory only and is not binding upon the instructor.

All material and information relative to the charge of academic dishonesty shall be kept by the Registrar in a special file during the period in which the student is enrolled at Cornell College, serving only as a statement of record if the student is charged a second time with academic dishonesty. In the case of an appeal after the first offense, the file shall be destroyed if the committee finds the student not guilty and the instructor concurs; otherwise, the recommendation of the committee shall be inserted into the special file. If there are no further charges, the file will be destroyed at the time of the student's graduation from Cornell.

Should a subsequent charge of academic dishonesty be brought against a student, the Registrar shall notify the Dean of the College who shall convene a committee consisting of the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, and the Chair of the Academic Standing Committee, who shall determine the status of the student. The normal penalty for a second offense is indefinite suspension from the College.