INTL 4207H: Advanced Political Simulations (Honors)
University of Georgia, Department of International Affairs

Course Instructor Information
Dr. Andrew Owsiak
Email: aowsiak@uga.edu
Drop-in Hours: Tues/Thurs 8:15-9:15am & by appt.

Course Meeting Information
Spring 2024
Tues/Thurs 9:35-10:50am
214 Candler Hall

Course Description

Courses in the life sciences frequently contain labs, which permit students to experience course concepts (and practice the skills related to them) directly. Courses in the social sciences, in contrast, often remain theoretical, hypothetical, and (therefore) abstract. Our course addresses this prevailing imbalance. Organized around multiple games (or simulations), the course functions as a (pseudo-)laboratory for international affairs (i.e., political science) students. Each game covers a key historical moment—a time when decision-makers debated major political issues (e.g., constitutional design and its inherent normative tensions, the role of religion within the state, how and where to draw interstate boundaries, how to create an international institution, and so on). Within a given game, each student plays the role of a historical character (e.g., Gandhi around the time of India's independence, or US President Wilson at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919). These characters have policy positions on the major issues of the time (some firm, some flexible) and must work together—not only to accomplish a critical task (e.g., drafting the peace treaty that ends World War I), but also to achieve their character's own goals (i.e., win the game).

Although the games we play focus heavily on history (and its details), they also indirectly engage the political science discipline in two ways. First, political scientists often use history as data. Many political science scholars, for example, study national independence movements, civil resistance, constitutional design, post-war settlement negotiations, or the democratic peace, among other topics. The historical "moments" during which our games occur would constitute one data point for these broad research areas. Scholars then aggregate these data points and use them to develop and evaluate political science theories. Second, game authors (often unknowingly) bake many political science concepts into their games—through game design decisions, characters' policy positions, and the student experience (e.g., requiring multilateral negotiations). To make the connections to political science more explicit, the instructor connects each game's events to relevant political science concepts and theories *in real time,* or as the student experience them. This helps students make sense of what they experience, suggests strategic game moves for students to try, and underscores the broad value of political science to everyday life.

Course Objectives

At this conclusion of this course, students will be (better) able to:
- Define, explain, and apply various key concepts that international affairs courses frequently use;
- Express an informed, research-based opinion (in speech and writing) on several international affairs topics and debates, using both theoretical arguments and evidence;
- Collaborate with others to achieve short- and long-term objectives;
- Connect their personal experiences to concepts and theories in international affairs;
- Teach one or more international affairs concepts (or theories) to others via a prominent, active learning strategy (i.e., games, or simulations); and
- Appreciate the complexity of international events, as well as how experts research and interpret them.

Course Reading Material

The required textbook for this course is:

- Embree, Ainslie T., and Mark C. Carnes. (2022) *Defining a Nation: India on the Eve of Independence, 1945.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

The instructor makes all other required readings—i.e., anything *not* in the textbook listed above—available electronically through the course's eLearning Commons (eLC) website (log-in using UGA Single Sign On credentials at: https://uga.view.usg.edu).

For the course to function smoothly, students should complete all assigned reading *before* the class meeting for which it is assigned. If students are not prepared for and contributing to class discussions, the instructor reserves the right to add unannounced quizzes to the participation portion of the course grade.

Course Requirements:

The requirements for this course, and the percentage that each contributes to the final grade, are:

1. Participation (10%): The instructor will evaluate students on their (i) (in-person) attendance, (ii) preparation for our in-class activities and discussions, and (iii) contributions to our in-class discussions and activities (both quality and quantity). Each of these is *required*. In other words, students who attend class—but are neither prepared for nor joining into our in-class discussions and activities—will score poorly on this part of the course grade. *There is no extra credit for low participation.*

2. India on the Eve of Independence (40%, as divided below)
    a. Quiz (10%): Students complete a quiz that covers the required reading for this game. The quiz occurs in class on January 30.
    b. Role-Specific Assignments (20%): Students receive a character role to play within the simulation game. Each role outlines specific assignments that the student-character needs to complete— along with due dates for those assignments. Students must complete these assignments as their character role demands, following any additional parameters that the instructor sets in class. Students submit their assignments via the appropriate eLC assignment dropbox (for grading), *in addition* to distributing them as their character role requires.
    c. Reflection (10%): Students write a 2 to 3-page paper that connects their experience in the game to concepts and theories in international affairs. The instructor will provide the reflection prompt and further instructions in class. This assignment is due February 29 via the associated eLC assignment dropbox.

3. The Peace Conference at Versailles (40%, as divided below)
    a. Quiz (10%): Students complete a quiz that covers the required reading for this game. The quiz occurs in class on March 19.
    b. Role-Specific Assignments (20%): Students receive a character role to play within the simulation game. Each role outlines specific assignments that the student-character needs to complete— along with due dates for those assignments. Students must complete these assignments as their character role demands, following any additional parameters that the instructor sets in class. Students submit their assignments via the appropriate eLC assignment dropbox (for grading), *in addition* to distributing them as their character role requires.
    c. Reflection (10%): Students write a 2to 3-page paper that connects their experience in the game to concepts and theories in international affairs. The instructor will provide the reflection prompt and further instructions in class. This assignment is due April 11 via the associated eLC assignment dropbox.

4. Adaption of a Pre-Set Game (10%, as noted below): Students in the seminar work collectively to write a game addendum that adapts the Versailles game we play. The adaptation's purpose is to allow (future) players to engage directly with more international affairs concepts, theories, and content.
   a. Research. After forming committees to research various aspects of the addendum's content, the seminar assigns each committee specific tasks. Students work in committee to complete these tasks. We have in-class time for committee work on April 4, 16, 18, & 23.
   b. Preparation of Game Materials (10%). The seminar prepares a game manual addendum for the gamemaster and players. At a minimum, this manual contains and explains (i) any background information needed for the addendum's inclusion (e.g., concepts and their importance, extra historical context, and so on), (ii) any changes to the game's mechanics (e.g., committee agendas or how players interact), and (iii) any changes to characters (e.g., new characters and/or edits to existing characters' objectives, victory conditions, strategy advice, and so on). The final version of this manual addendum is due April 29 at 11:59pm.

Course Policies

1. *Respectful Learning Environment.* All participants in the course will treat one another—as well as their ideas and comments—with respect. It is normal to make mistakes with difficult material, as well as to disagree in an academic setting. This disagreement, however, will occur respectfully in our class discussions. Towards the goal of creating a respectful, inclusive classroom environment, students will: (i) use language that does not insult others or their point of view, (ii) keep cell phones *turned off and put away* during our class meetings, and (iii) use laptops for educational purposes *only*. Any student that does not follow these guidelines may be asked to leave the classroom and/or to remove the distracting technology.

2. *Gameplay Advisory.* Throughout the course, students play various historical characters. These characters often hold views with which the student, class, and/or contemporary society disagrees; to achieve their character's objectives, however, the student has no choice but to play-act those views (e.g., in writing or speech). Therefore, when we are in (or between) active "Game Sessions" (see syllabus schedule), we will refer to one another by our characters' names *and* not attribute what a student says/writes in character to the actual student portraying that character.

3. *Course Material Copyright/Recording Policy.* The course material—including (but not limited to) all documents provided in the eLC course website, quizzes, graded assignments, handouts, and in-class lectures—are copyrighted. Students may therefore *not* record lectures (audio or video), distribute course materials, or post any content from the course online *without the instructor's express, written permission*. For the sake of student privacy, students may also *not* record our class sessions or meetings (audio or video). The instructor will automatically make exceptions to this policy for any student that obtains an accommodation to record course meetings through the Disability Resource Center. These exempted students, however, agree not to distribute the recordings (including online) *and* to destroy the recordings immediately after the course concludes.

4. *Attendance.* Class attendance is required for this course, particularly because some activities cannot be replicated (e.g., game sessions).

5. *Missing Class.* Students who are unable to attend a class meeting (i) will not receive credit for participating in that meeting and (ii) are responsible for obtaining any notes for that meeting from another student. The instructor will not provide slides or notes for class meetings.

6. *Assignment Due Dates and Late Penalties.* Assignments are due on the dates given at the *beginning* of the regular class period for which they are assigned. Late assignments receive a penalty of one full letter grade (10 percentage points) for the first day—as well as an additional half-letter grade (5 percentage points) for each additional day—that they are late. After 10 days, students may submit a late

assignment for half-credit until the final class meeting (April 25 at 9:35am). Note that it is inappropriate to arrive late to class on assignment due dates; anything submitted after the beginning of class may not earn full credit.

7. *Make-Up/Extension Policy.* Make-up quizzes or assignment extensions *may* be offered, but *only* with the approval of the instructor—generally for documented, emergency situations. The instructor will administer any approved make-up quizzes during the course's regularly scheduled, semester final exam period—on Thursday, May 2 at 8:00am.

8. *Assignment Grade Appeal.* If a student believes that the instructor inaccurately graded an assignment, they may appeal that assignment's grade. To initiate an appeal, the student must—within two weeks of receiving the graded assignment—submit both the (originally) graded assignment *and* a written memo to the instructor. In this memo, the student should explain *in detail* why they believe the assignment grade should be different than the one originally assigned. The instructor will then review the memo, re-read the assignment, and issue a new grade. The new grade may be lower, equal to, or higher than the original grade and will not be subject to additional appeal under this policy.

9. *Academic Honesty.* As a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to follow the University's academic honesty policy ("A Culture of Honesty") and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards contained in "A Culture of Honesty," including policies that cover plagiarism and unauthorized assistance. Students are responsible for informing themselves about these standards before performing and submitting any academic work. They may direct specific questions they have regarding the policy—or its application to course assignments—to the instructor. Please note that all suspected violations of this policy will be handled according to the guidelines set forth within the policy.

10. *Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tools.* Students may <u>not</u> use word-mixing or artificial intelligence-based software, such as ChatGPT, to generate any part of the assignments required in this course. Those who do not adhere to this policy will receive a zero on the assignment in question and/or a failing grade in the course.

11. *Accommodations.* The University of Georgia strives to create an inclusive learning environment. Students that require a potential accommodation (i) must register with the Disability Resource Center on campus (706-542-8719, http://www.drc.uga.edu), and (ii) should discuss the accommodation with the instructor at the outset of the course.

12. *Exceptions and Modifications to Policies.* Any exceptions or modifications to the above rules (or more broadly, the syllabus) are given at the instructor's discretion, but only with *prior approval* and only under *extenuating* circumstances. Any exception/modification requires appropriate documentation from the student. (Note: In the case of illness, "appropriate documentation" means a doctor's note indicating an illness, rather than a medical visit verification form. Please schedule routine medical visits around the course schedule.)

Grade Distribution

A	93.00-100.00	C	73.00-76.99
A-	90.00-92.99	C-	70.00-72.99
B+	87.00-89.99	D+	67.00-69.99
B	83.00-86.99	D	63.00-66.99
B-	80.00-82.99	D-	60.00-62.99
C+	77.00-79.99	F	Below 60.00

Course Schedule

The following pages contain a *general* plan for the course. Please note:

- The instructor may, if necessary, announce deviations to the schedule *in class*.
- All readings are required unless otherwise noted.
- Students should complete anything listed under a given date *before* class starts on that day.
- The schedule occasionally says "Reading A" (or similar). The instructor assigns the required reading to fill such slots as the course develops, largely based on how the game(s) and course unfold(s). A *non-exhaustive* list of *potential* readings appears at the end of this syllabus.

I. Course Introduction
   a. What is Reacting to the Past? (January 9)

II. Game: India on the Eve of Independence
   a. What is a "nation"? (January 11)
      i. Read: Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (pp. 5-7 & 83-111)
      ii. Read: Gamebook, "The Train to Simla" (pp. 1-7)

   b. Hinduism and Islam: An introduction (January 16)
      i. Read: Gamebook, Appendices A & B (pp. 50-69)
      ii. Read: *Bhagavad Gita,* Books (or Chapters) 1-4 & 11

   c. Historical context: From the Mughals to the British Raj and beyond (January 18)
      i. Read: Gamebook, "Unfinished Journey" (pp. 13-31), "Basic Game Rules" (pp. 45-47), "Chronology" (pp. 9-10), and "Maps" (pp. 11-12)
      ii. In class: Governor-General assigned

   d. Indian thinkers (January 23)
      i. Read: Gamebook, Appendix C (pp. 70-89)
      ii. In class: Distribute all roles
      iii. **Begin to research and write first character assignment**

   e. Preparation of roles and factions (January 25)
      i. Read: Character role sheet and *role-specific material* (see also Gamebook, Appendix D)
      ii. In class: Instructor meetings with factions and/or individual characters

   f. Final preparatory tasks (January 30)
      i. **Quiz (in class) on required readings to date**
      ii. In class: Governor-General's Welcome

   g. Game session #1 (February 1)
      i. *If not presenting today and assigned,* read: Reading A
      ii. In class: Sikh, Nizam (Hyderabad), Maharaja (Kashmir) and communists present
      iii. **Some character papers due (check role sheet)**

   h. Game session #2 (February 6)
      i. *If not presenting today and assigned,* read: Reading B
      ii. In class: Dr. Ambedkar, Hindy Mahasabha, and Gandhi adherent presentations
      iii. **Some character papers due (check role sheet)**

i. Game session #3 (February 8)
    i. *If not presenting today and assigned,* read: Reading C
    ii. In class: INC and Muslim League presentations
    iii. **Some character papers due (check role sheet)**

j. Game session #4 (February 13)
    i. *If not the Governor-General and assigned,* read: Reading D
    ii. In class: Discussion about draft recommendations
    iii. **Governor-General draft recommendations due**

k. Game session #5 (February 15)
    i. *If no paper due today and assigned,* read: Reading E
    ii. **Some character papers due (check role sheet)**

l. Game session #6 (February 20)
    i. *If no paper due today and assigned,* read: Reading F
    ii. **Some character papers due (check role sheet)**

m. Postmortem: Making sense of what happened (February 22)
    i. Read: Reading G
    ii. In class:
        1. New government outlines its plans for the future
        2. Historical outcome, connections to political science

n. Postmortem (continued; February 27)
    i. Read: Reading H
    ii. In class: Connections to political science

o. Postmortem (continued; February 29)
    i. Read: Reading I
    ii. In class: Connections to political science
    iii. **Reflection paper due**

****Spring Break. No class March 5 & 7****

III. Peacemaking 1919: The Peace Conference at Versailles (March 12)
    a. World War I: the background to, onset of, and conduct within the war
        i. Read: Gamebook, pp. 9-39 & 56-83
        ii. In class: Distribute all roles

    b. World War I: the armistice and peace conference foundations (March 14)
        i. Read: Gamebook, pp. 84-149 & character role sheet
        ii. In- class: Instructor meetings with factions and/or individual characters

    c. Final preparatory tasks (March 19)
        i. Read: Character *role-specific material*
        ii. **Quiz (in class) on game-related required reading**

    d. Game Session #1 (March 21)
        i. Read: Character role-specific material
        ii. In class: Opening statements & Council announces the composition of committees
        iii. **Some character paper/speeches due (check role sheet)**

e. Game Session #2 (March 26)
    i.   *If no paper due and assigned,* read: Reading J
    ii. In class: League of Nations Covenants
    iii. **Some character position papers due (check role sheet)**

f. Game Session #3 (March 28)
    i.   *If no paper due and assigned,* read: Reading K
    ii. In class: League of Nations Covenants & Committee work begins
    iii. **Some character position papers due (check role sheet)**

g. Game Session #4 (April 2)
    i.   *If no paper due and assigned,* read: Reading L
    ii. In class: Committee work
    iii. **Some character position papers due (check role sheet)**

h. Addendum Work Day (April 4)
    i.   Brainstorm content and committees for possible political science addendum to game

i. Game Session #5 (April 9)
    i.   *If no paper due and assigned,* read: Reading M
    ii. In class: Committees submit final recommendations to Council of Four
    iii. **Some character position papers due (check role sheet)**
    iv. **WITHIN 24 HOURS OF CLASS END: Council of Four posts the draft treaty for all delegations to review.**

j. Game Session #6 (April 11)
    i.   Read: Council of Four's draft treaty (and prepare feedback/comments/suggestions)
    ii. In class: Discussion of changes to draft treaty, German response, and final signatures
    iii. **Some character position papers due (check role sheet)**

k. Postmortem: Making sense of what happened (April 16)
    i.   Read: Reading N
    ii. **Reflection paper due**

IV. Creating a Game Addendum
    a. Day #1 (April 18)
        i.   Read: Reading O or committee related research (as directed)

    b. Day #2 (April 23)
        i.   Read: Reading P or committee related research (as directed)

    c. Day #3 (April 25)
        i.   Read: Reading Q or committee related research (as directed)

    d. **Game addendum due April 29 at 11:59pm**

Sample Reading List (for Flexible Component of Syllabus)
As each game unfolds, the instructor connects game events to related research in the international affairs discipline. This requires a somewhat flexible syllabus, in which the syllabus's advance schedule (above) shows "placeholders" for required readings that the instructor fills on-the-fly. A (non-exhaustive) list of potential readings to fill these various placeholders appears below. A reading's appearance in the list (or not) does *not* indicate that the instructor accepts/endorses an author's position (or not); rather, the list

seeks (i) to balance foundational and recent works, (ii) to avoid content that students encounter in other courses, and (iii) to diversify the authors and perspectives it includes.

Topic	Reading
Nationalism	• Anderson, Benedict. (2006) *Imagined Communities,* revd. edn. London: Verso. • Druckman, Daniel, and Steve Wood. (2022) "Scaling Up, Down, and Across." In *Negotiation, Identity, and Justice*, by Daniel Druckman. New York: Routledge. • Horowitz, Donald L. (2000) *Ethnic Groups in Conflict,* 2nd edn. Berkeley: University of California Press. • Olson, Mancur. (1993) "Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development." American Political Science Review 87(3): 567-576.
State-making	• Gutiérrez, José A. (2023) "Process and Effect in Tilly's Analytical Toolbox: A Brief Discussion of Charles Tilly's State-Making and War-Making Model." *Civil Wars* 25(2-3): 562-568. • Kasperson, Lars Bo, and Jeppe Strandsbjerg, eds. (2017) *Does War Make States?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Stewart, Megan A. (2018) "Civil War as State-Making: Strategic Governance in Civil War." *International Organization* 72(1): 205-226. • Taylor, Brian D., and Roxana Botea. (2008) "Tilly Tally: War-Making and State-Making in the Contemporary Third World." *International Studies Review* 10(1): 27-56.
Constitutional design	• Elkins, Zachary. (2019) "On the Paradox of State Religion and Religious Freedom." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics,* edited by William R. Thompson. • Gates, Scott, Benjamin A.T. Graham, Yonatan Lupu, Håvard Strand, and Kaare W. Strøm. (2016) "Power Sharing, Protection, and Peace." *Journal of Politics* 78(2): 512-526. • Ginsburg, Tom, ed. (2012) *Comparative Constitutional Design.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Territorial conflict	• Fazal, Tanisha M. (2007) *State Death.* Cornell: Cornell University Press. • Goddard, Stacie E. (2006) *Indivisible Territory and the Politics of Legitimacy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Hathaway, Oona A., and Scott J. Shapiro. (2017) *The Internationalists.* New York: Simon & Schuster. • Zacher, Mark W. (2001) "The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force." *International Organization* 55(2): 215-250.
Rivalry	• Paul, T.V., ed. (2009) *The India-Pakistan Conflict: An Enduring Rivalry.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Rider, Toby J., and Andrew P. Owsiak. (2015) "Border Settlement, Commitment Problems, and the Causes of Contiguous Rivalry." *Journal of Peace Research* 52(4): 508-521.
Alliance-building	• Morrow, James D. (2000) "Alliances: Why Write Them Down?" *Annual Review of Political Science* 3: 63-83.
Civil resistance	• Chenoweth, Erica. (2023) "The Role of Violence in Nonviolent Resistance." *Annual Review of Political Science* 26: 55-77. • McAdam, Doug. (1983) "Tactical Innovation and the Pace of Insurgency." *American Sociological Review* 48(6): 735-754. • Schock, Kurt. (2013) "The Practice and Study of Civil Resistance." *Journal of Peace Research* 50(3): 277-290.
Repression	• deMeritt, Jacqueline H.R. (2016) "The Strategic Use of State Repression and Political Violence." In the *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics,* edited by William R. Thompson. Oxford: Oxford University Press. • Ritter, Emily H., and Courtenay R. Conrad. (2016) "Preventing and Responding to Dissent: The Observational Challenges of Explaining Strategic Repression." *American Political Science Review* 110(1): 85-99. • Young, Joseph K. (2012) "Repression, Dissent, and the Onset of Civil War." *Political Research Quarterly* 66(3): 516-532.

Paris (Versailles) Peace Conference (and its aftermath)	• Gerwarth, Robert. (2021) "The Sky beyond Versailles: The Paris Peace Treaties in Recent Historiography." *Journal of Modern History* 93(4): 896-930. • Macmillan, Margaret. (2001). *Paris 1919*. New York: Random House. • Macmillan, Margaret. (2005) "Making War, Making Peace: Versailles, 1919." *Queen's Quarterly* 112(1): 8-19. • Schmitt, Bernadotte E. (1960) "The Peace Treaties of 1919-1920." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 104(1): 101-110.
Negotiation process	• Druckman, Daniel, and Lynn M. Wagner. (2016) "Justice and Negotiation." *Annual Review of Psychology* 67: 387-413. • Hopmann, P. Terrence. (1996) *The Negotiation Process and the Resolution of International Conflicts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. • Walter, Barbara F. (1997) "The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement." *International Organization* 51(3): 335-364.
Democratic peace	• Kant, Immanuel. ([1795]2016). *Perpetual Peace*, transl. Mary C. Smith. Project Gutenberg. Online: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/50922/50922-h/50922-h.htm. • McDonald, Patrick J. (2015) "Great Powers, Hierarchy, and Endogenous Regimes: Rethinking the Domestic Causes of Peace." *International Organization* 69(3): 557-588. • Russett, Bruce, and John R. Oneal. (2001) *Triangulating Peace*. New York: W.W. Norton
Designing international institutions	• Abbott, Kenneth W., Robert O. Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Duncan Snidal. (2000) "The Concept of Legalization." *International Organization* 54(3): 401-419. • Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. (2001) "The Rational Design of International Institutions." *International Organization* 55(4): 761-799.
Self-determination (or the lack thereof)	• Carter, David B., and H.E. Goemans. (2011) "The Making of the Territorial Order: New Borders and the Emergence of International Conflict." *International Organization* 65(2): 275-309. • Crampton, Jeremy W. (2006) "The Cartographic Calculation of Space: Race Mapping and the Balkans at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919." *Social & Cultural Geography* 7(5): 731-752. • Smith, Leonard V. (2018) *Sovereignty at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. • Spanu, Maja. (2020) "The Hierarchical Society: The Politic of Self-Determination and the Constitution of New States after 1919." *European Journal of International Relations* 26(2): 372-396.