

GOV 337M/LAS 337M
Unique 38830/40385
MWF 11-12 pm, MEZ B0.306

Kurt Weyland
4.126 BAT

INTERNATIONAL POLITICS OF LATIN AMERICA

How do the strong treat the weak, and how do the weak deal with the strong? Has the powerful, “advanced” U.S. treated its Latin American neighbors fairly and generously, or has U.S. influence had problematic motivations and deleterious outcomes? Have the “developing countries” of Latin America been more the beneficiaries of international assistance and support or the victims of political domination and economic exploitation by advanced industrialized countries, especially the U.S.? What are the opportunities and constraints that the international political and economic system creates for Latin American countries, and how do these countries try to enhance their political autonomy and economic development? How have these opportunities and constraints changed after the end of the Cold War, and how has the rise of a number of “new” issues—such as human rights, immigration, drugs, and environmental protection—affected U.S. - Latin American relations over the course of the last few decades?

The course addresses these questions through a wide-ranging overview of the international politics of Latin America. We will focus on the role of the most important external actor in the region, namely the United States: Why has the U.S. intervened so frequently and forcefully in Latin American countries? Are these interventions justified? Have they attained their goals? Have they helped Latin American nations or hindered their development? The course will also analyze economic issues, especially the activities of transnational corporations and the efforts at regional economic integration. Finally, we will assess the future of Latin America's international position after the end of the Cold War. We will explore the gamut of new issues that both Latin America and the U.S. have to deal with at this moment, such as the drug traffic, international migration, and environmental problems. What new opportunities and challenges do these complicated issues create for both sides?

- The books for this course are on reserve at PCL & available for purchase in the Co-op store:
- Michael Grow, *U.S. Presidents and Latin American Interventions*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2008 / paperback edition 2012.
 - Robert A. Pastor, *Exiting the Whirlpool*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 2001. [pls make sure that you buy this edition!]
 - Russell Crandall, *The United States and Latin America after the Cold War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

In addition to these books, we will read a number of book chapters and journal articles, many of which are available as a yellow spiral-bound course packet from the Coop. But since some publishers demanded exorbitant copyright fees or denied permission for reproducing certain articles, twelve (12) more articles are on electronic reserve on Blackboard, under “Course documents.” The readings reproduced in the course packet AND those on E-reserve are required for this course; please make sure you have access to E-reserves.

The readings complement, but cannot substitute for the lectures and class discussions – and vice versa. It is essential that you both do the readings carefully (before the week for which they are assigned) and attend the lectures and participate in class discussion. Two quizzes and two (cumulative) exams will measure your progress. You will also address questions handed out by the instructor in an interpretive essay of 6-7 double-spaced pages for which no additional research is expected. Specific guidelines for these requirements will be explained in class. Keep in mind that I want to assess your depth of understanding and your knowledge of the issues discussed in the readings and in class. The paper and the two exams count 25% each towards the final grade; the quizzes 7.5% each; and active participation in class discussion counts 10%.

UT's Undergraduate Writing Center has a number of very useful handouts on different aspects of writing: Pls. consult <http://www.uwc.utexas.edu/handouts> .

Please note: Grading is on a 100-point scale (100-93.01=A; 93-90.01=A-; 90-87.01=B+; 87-83.01=B; 83-80.01=B-; 80-77.01=C+; 77-73.01=C; 73-70.01=C-; 70-67.01=D+; 67-63.01=D; 63-60.01=D-; 60-0=F). Failure to take an exam or quiz (without an immediately announced & quickly submitted powerful, water-tight, well-documented, written excuse from an official authority attesting to an unpredictable, life-threatening emergency) will automatically result in 0 points -- whereas even an “unsuccessful” exam usually wins some points.

Attendance in class is mandatory and you are responsible for signing the attendance sheet that I will pass around. Unexcused absences will result in deductions of participation points on a progressive scale—and 0 points in participation will reduce your course grade by a full letter grade. Furthermore, whoever accumulates 12 (twelve) or more unexcused absences will automatically receive an “F” in the course, regardless of their performance on the assignments.

UT's honor code governs all work in this course. For example, quotes in papers have to be marked clearly by “...” and credited properly; paraphrased arguments need to be credited as well; etc. Students are encouraged to discuss the issues analyzed in this course among each other and to study together before exams, but are not allowed to cooperate with anybody or to receive any kind of outside help when taking exams and when outlining and writing the paper. Please re-read the honor code carefully and ask the TA or me in case of any doubt. Violations, which are not that difficult to detect, will be sanctioned *rigorously*...

Students with disabilities may request appropriate academic accommodations from UT's Services for Students with Disabilities, 471-6259, www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/. I will follow all rules established by SSD (eg 5 business days prior notice for accommodations) strictly.

Advanced M.A. student Alejandro Márquez will serve as the TA for this course. My office hours will be in 4.126 BAT on Monday and Friday, 12:00 noon – 1:30 pm; and Wed. 3:00 – 5:00 pm; or by appointment (2-7253). I will be happy to talk to you about any aspect related to the course; your studies at UT in general; or your plans for the future.

Schedule

I. U.S. INTERVENTION IN LATIN AMERICA: ASSISTANCE OR DOMINATION?

Theoretical Perspectives

Wednesday - Wednesday, January 16 - 23:

Abraham Lowenthal, 'Liberal', 'Radical,' and 'Bureaucratic' Perspectives on U.S. Latin American Policy (course packet)

Samuel P. Huntington, American Ideals versus American Institutions (E-reserve = electronic reserve on Blackboard – under “Course Documents”)

Sergio Bitar, Economics and Security (course packet)

Joseph S. Nye and Robert O. Keohane, Transnational Relations and World Politics (course packet)

The History of U.S. Interventionism

Friday, January 25:

Federico Gil, Latin American – United States Relations, chap. 4: The Interventionist Era, 1904-1933 (electronic reserve)

The U.S. in Mexico, Bolivia, and Guatemala

Monday – Friday, January 28 - February 1 [Pls note: The Wed. 1/30 lecture is officially re-scheduled to Monday, Jan. 28, 7:00 pm, in WAG 420]:

Cole Blasier, Mexico & Bolivia: Reconciliation, chap. from The Hovering Giant (course packet)

Michael Grow, *U.S. Presidents and Latin American Interventions*, pp. ix-xiv, 1-27.

Wednesday, January 30: First quiz (15 minutes)

The U.S. in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Chile

Monday - Friday, February 4 - 8:

Grow, *U.S. Presidents*, pp. 28-56, 75-113.

Paul Sigmund, Crisis Management: Chile and Marxism (course packet)

Peter Kornbluh, Declassifying U.S. Intervention in Chile (course packet)

U.S. Foreign Policy after "Vietnam": Carter, Reagan, and Bush (Sr.)

Monday - Wednesday, February 11 - 13:

Robert A. Pastor, *Exiting the Whirlpool*, pp. 17-107.

Friday, February 15: First Exam

Whirlpools? The U.S. in Grenada and Central America

Monday - Friday, February 18 - 22:

Robert A. Pastor, *Exiting the Whirlpool*, pp. 177-199, 257-270.

Grow, *U.S. Presidents*, pp. 114-158.

Russell Crandall, *The United States and Latin America after the Cold War*, pp. 135-144.

More Whirlpools? The U.S. in Panama, Cuba, and Haiti

Monday - Friday, February 25 - March 1:

Grow, *U.S. Presidents*, pp. 159-194.

Pastor, *Exiting the Whirlpool*, pp. 243-255.

Crandall, *United States and Latin America*, pp. 162-212.

U.S. Foreign Policy after the Cold War

Monday - Friday, March 4 – 8:

Crandall, *United States and Latin America*, pp. 1-53.

Pastor, *Exiting the Whirlpool*, pp. 109-134.

William LeoGrande, A Poverty of Imagination: George W. Bush's Policy in Latin America (E-reserve)

II. THE QUESTION OF EXTERNAL ECONOMIC DEPENDENCY

“Dependency:” Concept and Theory; The Controversy about Transnational Corporations

Monday - Friday, March 18 - 22:

Osvaldo Sunkel, Big Business and 'Dependencia' (course packet)

Manuel Castells and Roberto Laserna, The New Dependency (E-reserve)

Gary Gereffi, Rethinking Development Theory (E-reserve)

John Stopford, Multinational Corporations (E-reserve)

Crandall, *United States and Latin America*, pp. 70-84.

Questions for the interpretive essay will be distributed on Wednesday, March 20, in class.

Regional Economic Integration: NAFTA, FTAA -- & ALBA

Monday-Friday, March 25 – 29:

Pastor, *Exiting the Whirlpool*, pp. 270-282.

Crandall, *United States and Latin America*, pp. 54-69.

Jackie Sieppert & William Rowe, *In the Wake of NAFTA: Economic & Social Outcomes of Free Trade* (course packet)

Pia Riggiozzi, *Region, Regionness and Regionalism* (course packet)

Interpretive essay is due on Monday, April 1, in class (no joke – and no silly excuses, pls! KW)

III. CURRENT ISSUES IN U.S. - LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

The Promotion of Democracy

Monday - Friday, April 1 - 5:

Howard J. Wiarda, *Can Democracy Be Exported?* (course packet)

Dexter Boniface, *The OAS's Mixed Record* (E-reserve)

Crandall, *United States and Latin America*, pp. 119-134.

J. Mark Ruhl, *Honduras Unravels* (course packet).

Juan Carlos Hidalgo, *It Wasn't a 'Coup'* (course packet).

Human Rights

Monday - Wednesday, April 8 - 10:

Alison Brysk, *Human Rights and the Role of International Actors* (course packet)

Tricia Olsen, Leigh Payne & Andrew Reiter, *The Justice Balance: When Transitional Justice Improves Human Rights & Democracy* (course packet)

Naomi Roht-Arriaza, *Universal Jurisdiction: Steps Forward, Steps Back* (course packet)

Immigration

Friday – Monday, April 12 – 15:

Raúl Delgado Wise, *Migration and Imperialism: The Mexican Workforce in the Context of NAFTA* (course packet)

Marc Rosenblum, *U.S. Immigration Policy Since 9/11* (course packet)

Bill Ong Hing, *Thinking Broadly about Immigration Reform by Addressing Root Causes* (course packet)

Monday, April 15: Second quiz (15 minutes)

The Drug Traffic, Environmental Problems, and Indigenous Issues

Wednesday - Monday, April 17 - 22:

Peter Reuter, *Assessing U.S. Drug Policy* (course packet)

Stephen Rolles, *An Alternative to the War on Drugs* (course packet)
Julien Mercille, *Violent Narco-Cartels or US Hegemony? The Political Economy of the “War on Drugs” in Mexico* (course packet)
Scott Swinton & Germán Escobar, *Poverty & Environment in Latin America* (course packet)
Salvador Martí i Puig, *The Emergence of Indigenous Movements in Latin* (course packet)
Beth Conklin and Laura Graham, *The Shifting Middle Ground: Amazonian Indians and Eco-Politics* (course packet)

New Regional Powers? Brazil and Mexico

Wednesday – Friday, April 24 – 26:

Crandall, *United States and Latin America*, pp. 145-161, 213 – 243.
Peter Hakim, *Two Ways to Go Global* (course packet)

The Future of Latin America's International Relations

Monday-Wednesday, April 29 – May 1:

Julia Buxton, *Forward into History: Understanding Obama’s Latin American Policy* (course packet)
Cynthia Watson, *The Obama Administration, Latin America, and the Middle Kingdom* (course packet).
R. Evan Ellis, *Emerging Multi-Power Competitions in Latin America* (course packet).
Roberto Russell & Juan Gabriel Tokatlian, *Beyond Orthodoxy: Asserting Latin America’s New Strategic Options Toward the United States* (course packet).

Friday, May 3: Second Exam

NO FINAL EXAM

If any student is approved for a make-up quiz or exam, it will be held on the day & time our final exam would be scheduled, i.e., Tuesday, May 14, 9:00 am (no exceptions).

STUDY QUESTIONS – TO GUIDE YOUR READING & OUR CLASS DISCUSSIONS

Theoretical Perspectives

- 1) What are the main differences and similarities among the approaches discussed by Lowenthal? What are the analytical advantages and problems of these different approaches? Which approach do you consider most valid? Why?
- 2) What are the two different viewpoints that Huntington tries to synthesize? What are the main characteristics of these theories, and what are their similarities and differences? In your view, how convincing is Huntington's synthesis?
- 3) What theoretical viewpoint(s) underlie(s) Bitar's analysis? How does it compare to Huntington's discussion? In your view, how persuasive is Bitar's article?
- 4) Which of the other readings is Nye and Keohane's basic argument closest to? How persuasive is their criticism of state-centric views? Have governments ceased to dominate international relations? Is the complexity that Nye & Keohane stress enlightening or confusing?
- 5) How would you systematically compare and classify the theoretical viewpoints expressed in the readings? Along what dimensions do these theories differ, along what dimensions are some of them similar?
- 6) At this point, which one of these theoretical viewpoints do you find most persuasive? Why?
- 7) How do our authors assess the legitimacy and success of U.S. efforts to influence and intervene in less powerful and less developed countries? What is your own viewpoint on this issue?

The History of U.S. Interventionism & the U.S. in Mexico, Bolivia, and Guatemala

- 1) Why did the U.S. in the early 20th century intervene so often in circum-Caribbean countries? What were the main motivations and the main goals of U.S. interventions? Did the U.S. reach these goals? Why or why not?
- 2) In your view, what was the most important reason for U.S. hostility towards reformist and revolutionary governments in Mexico, Bolivia, and Guatemala – business interests, concerns of national security, or some (what?) other factor?
- 3) In your view, why did the U.S. seek and achieve reconciliation with the leaders of the Mexican Revolution, despite the challenges that the Constitution of 1917 and the oil nationalization of 1938 posed to U.S. interests? What does this reconciliation imply for the relative importance of economic vs. political-strategic interests in U.S. foreign policy?
- 4) Why did the U.S. pay attention to Bolivia, a poor & “weak” country that is so far away? And why did the U.S. seek and achieve reconciliation with the Bolivian revolutionaries?
- 5) Why did the U.S. treat Guatemala's revolutionaries in a much more hostile fashion than their Mexican and Bolivian counterparts? Specifically, what role did business interests--especially the United Fruit Co.--play, in your view?
- 6) In your view, was U.S. support for the overthrow of Arbenz justified? Why or why not?
- 7) In your view, how apt was the U.S. reaction to the reformist and revolutionary movements of Mexico, Bolivia, and Guatemala? Did the U.S. pursue its interests and goals in a reasonable and effective way? In what cases was U.S. foreign policy most successful? How should the U.S. have (re-)acted?

The U.S. in Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Chile

- 1) In your view, did the U.S. drive Cuba into the arms of the Soviets, or was deep conflict between Castro and the U.S. inevitable and irreconcilable?
- 2) In what ways did both the U.S. and Castro learn from the Guatemalan experience? How did this learning affect actions and outcomes?
- 3) To what extent did U.S. ideals shape—i.e., drive or restrain—U.S. policies towards Guatemala and Cuba?
- 4) How would you evaluate U.S. actions towards revolutionary Cuba? How well did they serve U.S. interests? What policies would you have advocated?
- 5) In your view, did the U.S. face a real, serious threat to its interests and principles in the Dominican Republic? Why did the U.S. use its own military forces to spearhead this intervention?
- 6) In terms of international law, was the U.S. justified in intervening in the Dominican Republic? Why or why not?
- 7) In your view, what was the main reason for U.S. hostility towards the Allende government in Chile? In particular, what role did business interests and national security interests play?
- 8) In your view, to what extent (if any) was the U.S. responsible for the overthrow of the Allende government?
- 9) Do the new sources discussed by Kornbluh change your views on these issues? Why or why not?

U.S. Foreign Policy after "Vietnam:" Carter, Reagan, and Bush Sr.

- 1) How does the U.S. get itself into "whirlpools" in Latin America? What are the underlying problems of U.S. foreign policy towards the region that cause such trouble?
- 2) Why did President Carter initially embrace human rights as a major "cause" in his foreign policy, and why did he change emphasis later on?
- 3) How successful was Carter's human rights policy, in your view? Should the U.S. adopt such an "idealistic" foreign policy? Why or why not?
- 4) How would you evaluate President Reagan's emphasis on the Communist threat in the Caribbean Basin, and how apt and successful were his efforts to combat this threat?
- 5) In what ways did President Bush shift the emphasis of U.S. foreign policy towards Latin America, and how successful were his policies?
- 6) What were the main motives and goals of President Bush's Latin America policy?
- 7) What are the underlying assumptions (about politics, conflict vs. consensus, etc.) that inform Pastor's account? Which one of our theoretical approaches is Pastor closest to? Do you find Pastor's theoretical account persuasive? Why or why not?

The U.S. in Grenada and Central America

- 1) Which one of the cases that we analyzed earlier is Pastor's analysis of the U.S. response to the "revolution" in Grenada closest to? What is the theoretical approach that Pastor draws on? How convincing do you find his analysis?
- 2) What were the Reagan administration's motivations and goals—both in the domestic and international arena—in sending U.S. troops to Grenada? In the eyes of the American public,

did this successful invasion re-legitimize the use of military force by the U.S.? Why or why not?

- 3) Did the U.S. "lose" Nicaragua in the late 1970's and early 1980's, or was hostility between the Sandinistas and the U.S. government largely inevitable?
- 4) Why did the Sandinistas in Nicaragua never become as antagonistic towards the U.S. and as closely aligned with the USSR as Castro did in Cuba?
- 5) Why did President Reagan never launch a U.S. military expedition against the Sandinistas?
- 6) To what extent did the mediation efforts of Latin American and European governments, to what extent did strong U.S. pressure (e.g., the *contras*) contribute to the pacification of Central America?
- 7) In your view, under what conditions (if any) should the U.S. use military force to advance its interests and principles? What does your answer imply for the status of the U.S. as a super-power?

The U.S. in Panama, Cuba, and Haiti

- 1) Why did the U.S. invade Panama? To what extent did international vs. domestic or even personal considerations (e.g., the "wimp factor") influence this decision?
- 2) In your view, was this invasion necessary to depose Noriega, or could continued sanctions have done the job? And was this intervention justified, in your opinion?
- 3) Communism has been greatly weakened on the global scene; for two decades at least, it has not constituted a realistic threat for the U.S. in the Western hemisphere. Why, then, has U.S. hostility toward Cuba persisted nevertheless?
- 4) In your view, has the U.S. economic embargo against Cuba served its purpose, been useless, or—as critics charge—has it actually had a counterproductive effect by allowing Castro to strengthen his political position by whipping up nationalism and blaming the U.S. for Cuba's longstanding economic difficulties?
- 5) In your view, should the U.S. try to improve relations with Communist Cuba? Why or why not? How would the U.S. best treat Cuba? For instance, how hard should the U.S. press Cuba to enact domestic political liberalization?
- 6) To what extent can "traditional" motives of U.S. interventions in Latin America, especially business and security interests, account for U.S. relations with Haiti? What new factors and motives have come into play, and which one among them do you regard as most important?
- 7) In the eyes of some observers, Haiti has long teetered at the brink of "state failure." What (if anything) can and should the U.S. and the international community do about that?

U.S. Foreign Policy after the Cold War

- 1) According to Crandall, what role – and how much of a role – have traditional motives of U.S. foreign policy toward Latin America played after the Cold War?
- 2) Have new goals – and if so, what new goals – come to replace or to complement these traditional motives?
- 3) After the end of the Cold War, has the U.S. managed to design and pursue a coherent foreign

- policy toward Latin America? If so, what are its main goals and guiding principles? If not, would such a coherent policy be desirable and feasible? Why or why not?
- 4) In your view, how important are the tensions stressed in Pastor's "psychological" analysis of U.S. - Latin American relations?
 - 5) In your view, how reasonable and promising is Pastor's proposal to redefine sovereignty, especially through collective initiatives and multilateral mediation? What are the underlying theoretical assumptions? Would this proposal permit the U.S. to advance its legitimate interests, but also respect and further Latin American needs, goals, and sensibilities?
 - 6) What were the guiding principles and main goals of Pres. G. W. Bush's foreign policy toward Latin America? Did the Bush administration manage to design a coherent policy toward the region? How promising and successful were the Bush administration's initiatives, in your view? What does all of this say about question 3?
 - 7) LeoGrande does not look like a big fan of ex-President Bush's. In your view, is his analysis fair and convincing? Why or why not?

External Dependency and the Role of Transnational Corporations

- 1) How would you summarize and depict the basic argument of dependency theory, as explained by Sunkel?
- 2) What do you think about Sunkel's claim that the industrialized countries (including prominently the USA) were at least in part responsible for the underdevelopment of the Third World--and that they prospered at the cost of the Third World?
- 3) What are the main characteristics of the "new dependency" examined by Castells and Laserna? What are the main similarities and what are the principal differences between Sunkel's version of dependency and this new dependency? Does the new version open up more opportunities for Latin American countries to enhance their development? Why or why not?
- 4) What elements of dependency theory does Gereffi (1994) retain, and where does he diverge from this approach?
- 5) If Gereffi is correct, what are the effective development chances of Latin American countries? In particular, to what extent does the international economic system bolster or hinder their development?
- 6) What factors do dependency theory and its sequels elucidate well? What factors do they neglect?
- 7) In your view, do the activities of transnational corporations (TNCs, also called multinational corp., MNC) create more benefits or disadvantages for the Third World? Why?
- 8) What theoretical approach is Stopford's essay closest to? Are his arguments convincing?
- 9) What could Latin American countries do to enhance the contributions that external economic linkages (particularly TNCs) make to their development? How difficult would it be to enact these changes?

Regional Economic Integration: FTAA & NAFTA

- 1) What are the main reasons for the recent move towards economic integration in the Americas? Specifically, what role have economic and political factors and motivations played?
- 2) For what reasons did the U.S. initiative of a FTAA not advance? What role did factors on the U.S.

- side and on the Latin American side play?
- 3) In your view, how promising or problematic is economic integration among countries that are at such different levels of development?
 - 4) How do the experiences of NAFTA speak to the preceding question? On balance, has NAFTA brought more benefits or more problems for Mexico – to the extent that it has had any measurable impact at all?
 - 5) What makes it so difficult to assess and measure the economic and social effects of NAFTA, both on Mexico and the U.S.?
 - 6) Among the theoretical approaches that we have studied, which one is the paper by Sieppert and Rowe closest to? How convincing is their analysis, in your view?
 - 7) What are the main goals of ALBA and UNASUR? Which integration scheme holds more promise for Latin America, in your view? Why?
 - 8) In your view, how likely is ALBA to achieve the goals that its member countries, especially Venezuela's Hugo Chávez, have set? Will ALBA make a significant difference in international relations in the Western hemisphere? Why or why not?
 - 9) Some Latin American integration schemes have included the U.S., others not. In your view, which type is more beneficial for Latin America? Why? And which type is more likely to attain a lasting impact? Why?

The Promotion of Democracy

- 1) What are the assumptions underlying Wiarda's criticism of U.S. efforts to promote democracy in Latin America? Do you agree? Why or why not?
- 2) In your view, how effective is the OAS in its efforts to protect & promote democracy in Latin America? What types of threats can it combat, what types of challenges has it difficulty dealing with? Overall, how successful has this international organization been?
- 3) What role has the protection of democracy played in U.S. relations with Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, espec. under Pres. G. W. Bush? How does the Boniface chap. speak to this issue?
- 4) In your view, did the Honduran events of June 2009 constitute a coup, i.e., an illegitimate destruction or interruption of democracy? Why or why not?
- 5) In your view, which side holds more of the blame for these events? Why? What was the impact of specific actors and of structural and institutional constraints?
- 6) In your view, did the U.S. government respond properly to these events? Why or why not? What should the U.S. have done?
- 7) In your own view, should the U.S. seek to promote democracy in Latin America? Why or why not?
- 8) Assuming the U.S. chooses to promote democracy in Latin America, what type of democracy should it promote, in your view? How can it protect & promote (this type of) democracy most effectively, given espec. the issues raised by Boniface & Crandall?
- 9) In your view, what are the most promising means for promoting democracy in Latin America? In particular, what role should “coercion” play (e.g., sanctions, use of force)?

Human Rights

- 1) According to Brysk, what have been the main effects of globalization on human rights in Latin America? How effective have international actors been in promoting human rights?
- 2) According to Olsen, Payne & Reiter, what mechanisms of transitional justice enhance democracy? What are the main reasons for this?

- 3) In your view, how convincing is the analysis by Olsen, Payne & Reiter? Are their main arguments well-supported?
- 4) Do you regard a “maximalist” or a “minimalist” position on transitional justice as more promising? Why?
- 5) According to Roht-Arriaza, can the transnational prosecution of human rights violators be a viable alternative to domestic courts, whose hands are frequently tied by amnesty laws, etc? Why or why not?
- 6) In terms of [central factors highlighted by] our theoretical approaches, how do you interpret the increasing difficulties facing the transnational prosecution of human rights violators?
- 7) In your own view, should a former dictator like Pinochet be prosecuted outside his own country? Why or why not?

Immigration

- 1) In your view, why has immigration turned into such a controversial issue in U.S. politics and U.S. - Latin American relations? What changes in the nature of immigration have contributed to this?
- 2) According to Delgado Wise and Ong Hing, how has economic integration between Mexico and the U.S. affected migration?
- 3) Which theoretical approach does Delgado Wise embrace, in your view? How convincing do you find his analysis?
- 4) According to Rosenblum and Ong Hing, what are the main political forces that advocate immigration reform, and those that resist – and for what main reasons?
- 5) Do you agree a) with Ong Hing’s assessment of established immigration rules & procedures, and b) with the reform proposals that he develops? Why or why not?
- 6) What are the principal obstacles that hinder immigration reform in the U.S.? Specifically, what roles do the distribution of political interests and the set-up of U.S. institutions play?
- 7) In your view, what is the likelihood that these obstacles can be overcome under the Obama administration? What could be done to overcome these obstacles?
- 8) In your view, how restrictive or open, i.e., “receptive,” *should* U.S. immigration policies be? Why?

Drugs, the Environment, and Indigenous Issues

- 1) According to Reuter, what are the main features of the U.S. approach to combating the drug problem? What are the theoretical assumptions underlying this approach?
- 2) Among the downsides and problems raised by Reuter, which one(s) do you regard as most important? Why?
- 3) Do you regard the alternative approach outlined by Rolles as promising? Why or why not?
- 4) Which one of the theoretical approaches that we have discussed is Mercille’s article closest to? Do you find his main argument convincing? Why or why not?
- 5) Does Mercille outline a promising strategy for resolving the problems that he highlights? If not, can you think of a feasible, realistic approach for resolving these problems?
- 6) What are the most important environmental problems plaguing Latin America? Which ones of these problems have attracted a good deal of international attention, which ones have been

neglected?

- 7) How could these problems be successfully addressed? Is the approach outlined by Swinton et al. promising? Why or why not?
- 8) What are the main benefits that indigenous groups have received from transnational attention & international support, and what are the main limitations and problems?
- 9) Compare and contrast the main thrust of Martí i Puig's vs. Conklin & Graham's analyses: Are there more similarities or more differences?
- 10) Which analysis do you find more convincing? Why?
- 11) In your own view, should transnational actors engage with indigenous groups (& promote environmental issues), or do you prefer national autonomy and sovereignty? Why? To the extent that the international community does get involved, what forms would this involvement best take?

U.S. Relations with Brazil and Mexico

- 1) Overall, has the move to greater integration with the U.S. during the last two decades done more to benefit Mexico or to restrict its development prospects? Why?
- 2) What do you see as the single most significant problem or issue in U.S. – Mexico relations? Do important actors in both countries agree on what this priority issue is?
- 3) How, in your view, could this (and other) problem(s) best be addressed?
- 4) Given the tremendous asymmetry in power, development levels, etc. between the U.S. and Mexico, what would a fair partnership between the two countries look like?
- 5) In your view, has Brazil traced a better “way to go global” than Mexico? Why or why not? Also, does Mexico have any choice or is it condemned by geography to close integration with the U.S.?
- 6) Given its ambition to acquire more power and a higher status in global politics, do you see Brazil as an emerging rival to the U.S. or do you think the opportunities for cooperation are more important?
- 7) What are the main obstacles that Brazil's international ambitions face? How likely is it that the country can overcome these obstacles?
- 8) Specifically, what do you regard as the main issues in U.S. relations with Brazil? How serious are the disagreements, how much opportunity for cooperation exists?
- 9) What do you see as the main guidelines of Brazilian foreign policy toward the rest of Latin America, especially South America? Which theoretical approach can best explain Brazil's foreign policy approach?

The Future of Latin America's International Relations

- 1) Which one of our theoretical approaches is Buxton's assessment of President Obama's LA policy closest to?
- 2) In your view, has the Obama administration brought significant change to U.S. – Latin America relations or has it largely maintained continuity? Why?
- 3) In what areas of U.S. – Latin American relations should President Obama pursue significant change, in your view? And what kind of change (if any)?

- 4) U.S. presidents face a multitude of complex, pressing issues, both in domestic politics and in foreign policy. In your view, how much attention *should* they really pay to contemporary Latin America? To ask bluntly, does the region deserve priority attention? Why or why not?
- 5) Many observers advocate a better “partnership” between the U.S. and Latin America. But realistically speaking, can there be a real partnership between countries that are so unequal in development levels and, especially, in degrees of economic clout and political influence? Why or why not?
- 6) What do China’s main interests in Latin America seem to be? What theoretical approach seems to inspire/drive China’s activities in the region?
- 7) In your view, do China’s increasing activities in Latin America pose more opportunities or more problems & potential threats for the U.S.? Why?
- 8) What will be the main features of the emerging multi-power competition in Latin America? And to what extent will it displace previously predominant U.S. influence (what some observers call “U.S. hegemony”)?
- 9) In your view, does the emerging multi-power competition in Latin America offer the region the opportunity to change its relationship to the U.S. significantly? In particular, will it allow for a decrease in the region’s “dependency”? Why or why not?
- 10) In your view, which one of the five “models of foreign policy” and which one of the three “strategic options” examined by Russell & Tokatlian holds the greatest promise? Why?