

GOVT 1101.105: Public Opinion, Mass Media, and Post-9/11 U.S. Foreign Policy

Fall 2016 | MW 8:40-9:55am | Uris Hall, Room 498
Stephen Roblin | sgr52@cornell.edu
Office hours: MW 10:00am-11:00am by appointment

Course Description

September 11, 2001 is widely considered “the day that changed everything.” One of the most consequential changes that has occurred since the terrorist attacks on that day has been the dramatic escalation of American military activity conducted abroad. Indeed, the United States has waged two wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, embraced more coercive methods of counterterrorism like torture and extraordinary rendition, participated in a multilateral intervention in Libya, and launched drone strikes in countries throughout the Middle East, South Asia, North Africa, and the Horn of Africa. This course seeks to understand post-9/11 U.S. foreign policy by investigating the complex relationship among American use of force, public opinion, and the mass media. In doing so, we will investigate three overarching questions throughout the course:

1. How has U.S. foreign policy changed since 9/11?
2. What factors influence American public opinion and the mass media's coverage of U.S. use of force?
3. What influence do public opinion and the mass media have on U.S. foreign policy-making?

Writing assignments will ask students to grapple with these questions in the context of a particular controversy over U.S. military activity conducted abroad.

Learning Outcomes

The aims for this course are for students to develop a deeper, more empirically-informed understanding of U.S. foreign policy, public opinion, and the mass media, to be able to construct well-reasoned arguments in written form, and to develop writing skills which will help students in their professional careers and in participating in democratic debate over contemporary policy issues.

Assigned Readings

Books available on two-hour reserve at Uris Library. All other readings available on Blackboard.

- Matthew Evangelista, *Law, Ethics, and the War on Terror* (Cambridge, UK: Polity, 2008).
- Jonathan Steele, *Defeat* (Berkeley: Counterpoint, 2009).
- Joseph Margulies, *What Changed When Everything Changed* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

Requirements

To pass this course, students are required to attend class meetings, complete all assigned reading, turn in all written work in a timely manner, and actively participate in all in-class activities. Absences are only allowed with a legitimate medical excuse or in case of an emergency. Unexcused absences will result in a lowered grade for the course (½ grade for each unexcused absence), down to and including an F. Students are also expected to attend office hours at least twice during the semester. Writing

assignments will be due to Blackboard on the dates and time indicated. Except in emergencies and with prior written permission, writing assignments turned in after their due dates will result in the paper being marked late and the grade lowered accordingly (one letter grade for each day late). Students should keep in mind that all writing for this class is public and may be read by other members of the course.

Grades

Paper 1 ungraded
Paper 2 10%
Paper 3 20%
Paper 4 20%
Paper 5 25%
Participation 20%
Presentation 5%

Writing Assignment Requirements

All papers must conform to the following standards: a) 12 point Times New Roman, b) double-spaced, c) one-inch margins. d) paginated, e) word count stated on first page (underneath name, date of submission, and title), f) Chicago style footnotes and bibliography. Additional requirements, as they apply, will be discussed with the introduction of each assignment.

Academic Integrity and University Policies

All submitted work must be original work written by you for this course, with sources appropriately credited. Plagiarism and academic dishonesty will not be tolerated and will result in a failing grade. Please consult the university's Academic Integrity Code (cuinfo.cornell.edu/aic.cfm) for more details. Additional questions can be raised with the instructor during office hours.

This instructor respects and upholds University policies and regulations pertaining to the observation of religious holidays; assistance available to the physically handicapped, visually, and/or hearing impaired student; plagiarism; sexual harassment; and racial or ethnic discrimination. All students are advised to familiarize themselves with the respective regulations and are encouraged to bring any questions or concerns to the attention of the instructor.

Participation

While attendance is required—and unexcused absences will reduce your grade substantially—it is only one part of your participation grade. You are expected to contribute to class discussions in a *consistent* and *substantive* manner. By consistent, I mean participating every class. Do not take days off. By substantive, I mean directly engaging with the readings and raising comments, critiques, or questions on the readings and your colleagues' perspectives. If you are uncomfortable participating in class, please schedule a meeting with me immediately so that we can discuss strategies for increasing your participation.

Technology Policy

The use of laptops, tablets, cell phones, and other electronic devices is not permitted during class. You are required to bring hard-copies of the readings and/or detailed notes that you have taken on the readings.

ASSIGNMENTS

Paper 1: Writing Diagnostic

Due on Monday, August 29 by 9pm

Where: Upload onto Blackboard

Length: 2-3 pages double-spaced

Grade: ungraded

Write an essay where you provide an answer to the following questions: Do you believe the American public influences U.S. foreign policy in any meaningful way? Or do presidents and their administrations design policies with no consideration given to the public? Explain why.

This assignment is diagnostic. It is designed to assess (1) your writing skills (e.g. grammar, organization, style), and (2) your ability to craft an argument. It is NOT designed to assess your knowledge of U.S. foreign policy or its relationship to the media and public opinion.

Paper 2: Controversy Summary

First Draft due on Monday, September 19 at 9pm

Revised Draft due on Monday, October 4 at 9pm

Where: Upload onto Blackboard

Length: 5-6 pages double-spaced

Grade: 10%

Assignment Overview

The “Controversy Summary” assignment asks you to identify a specific controversy involving post-9/11 U.S. militarism and summarize the various positions taken on it. The purpose of this assignment is NOT for you to develop and defend your own position. Here, you are asked ONLY to summarize the arguments of others.

Rationale

The first goal of this assignment is to acquaint students with some of the most influential informational and analytical sources on U.S. foreign policy. The second goal is for students to learn more about their controversy. The third goal is for students to become familiar with the landscape of debate on their controversy and U.S. foreign policy issues more broadly. In other words, my hope is that students not only encounter the range of positions taken on their controversy, but also gain an understanding of the more general analytical frameworks that inform these positions.

Learning Outcomes

In terms of writing, the rationale behind this assignment is to improve on two skills we have covered in class:

- writing engaging introductions and conclusions
- evaluating arguments in light of claims, reasons, evidence, and warrants
- properly citing sources

Topics

Below are some broad topics from which to identify a specific controversy. These topics themselves do NOT qualify as specific controversies. You may select a topic that does not fall within these categories (pending my approval).

- Afghanistan war
- Iraq war
- Libya intervention
- Somalia crisis
- Targeted killing
- Mass surveillance
- Torture
- Financial “war on terror”
- Extraordinary rendition
- Politicization of humanitarian aid
- ISIS

Requirements

This assignment will proceed in the following steps:

1. Email notification of your controversy. Due on **Sunday, September 4 at 9pm**. You will write me an email that provides a one paragraph description of your controversy and a one paragraph explanation for why chose it.

2. Submit works cited. Due on **Friday, September 9 at 9pm**. You will identify at least 10 sources. In order to give you a broad overview of perspectives on your controversy, your works cited must included sources from the following:

- News reports, editorials or op-eds from major U.S. newspapers (e.g. *The New York Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Wall Street Journal*)
- Sources from non-U.S. newspapers (e.g. *Guardian*, *Al Jazeera*, and *Der Spiegel*)
- Political magazines that cover U.S. foreign policy issues (e.g. *Foreign Affairs*, *The Weekly Standard*, *The Atlantic*, *The New Yorker* and *Economist*)
- Foreign policy think tanks. Here is a brief list of influential think tanks: Council on Foreign Relations, Heritage Foundation, American Enterprise Institute, Freedom House, Brookings Institute, Center for American Progress, Foreign Policy In Focus, and Cato Institute. For more think tanks, see the following links: <http://www.state.gov/s/p/tt/> and <http://www.thebestschools.org/features/most-influential-think-tanks/>.
- Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, or another international legal organization.
- I encourage you to choose conservative (“right”) and progressive (“left”) sources.
 - Conservative: The National Review, Fox News, Heritage Foundation, American Enterprise Institute.
 - Progressive: Truthout, DemocracyNow!, Foreign Policy In Focus, Counterpunch
- Academic sources (i.e. peer-reviewed journal articles or books)

3. Submit first draft of controversy summary (with works cited). Due on **Monday, September 19 at 9pm**. Your paper should do the following:

- Introduce the controversy and identify its major fault lines. Pay attention to the different analytical frameworks used to evaluate the controversy, in particular U.S. strategic interests (the “national interest”), international law, ethics, etc
- Provide a detailed background on the controversy.
- Summarize in detail the different positions on the controversy. Be sure to discuss the evidence used to justify particular positions.
- Compare and contrast the different positions.
- Provide a conclusion that briefly summarizes the paper's main points and discusses the broader significance of your controversy. In other words, try to answer the question, “so what?”

4. Submit revision of controversy summary. Due on **Monday, October 4 at 9pm**.

Paper 3: Op-Ed

First Draft due on Monday, October 17 at 9pm

Revised Draft due on Monday, October 24 at 9pm

Where: Upload onto Blackboard

Length: 1,000-1,100 words (approximately 4 pages) double-spaced

Grade: 20%

Assignment Overview

The “op-ed,” or opinion piece “opposite the editorial page,” is a classic form of essay by which members of the public engage wide audiences on important matters. Op-eds appear in virtually all leading newspapers, and their form is a precursor to the now common blog entry. Op-eds are meant to express well-informed, well-articulated opinions for publication in the editorial pages of newspapers, alongside the newspaper staff's editorials and letters to the editor.

For this assignment, you will build from your previous assignment, in which you identified a specific controversy involving post-9/11 U.S. militarism and described the various positions taken on it. The previous assignment was designed for you to summarize the arguments of others, without inserting your own position. In the op-ed assignment, you will now present your own position and defend it against potential critics.

Rationale

Having become familiar with the debate surrounding their controversy, students will develop and defend their own position in this assignment.

Learning Outcomes

In terms of writing, the rationale behind this assignment is to improve several skills we have covered in class:

- developing coherent and evidence-based arguments
- writing with clarity and concision
- editing for grammar and organization

Requirements

This assignment will proceed in two steps:

1. Submit your first draft of the op-ed. Due on **Monday, October 17 at 9pm**. Your op-ed should do the following:

- Describe the controversy
- Indicate your position on the controversy
- Identify shortcomings with opposing positions (do not merely “pick a side”)
- Defend your position with reason and evidence
- Make a recommendation about what policy should be pursued
- Don't forget to write an effective conclusion that recaps your argument

2. Submit your revised op-ed. Due on **Monday, October 24 at 9pm**. Revise your original op-ed by striving to meet the following goal: *Reduce the word count, while preserving the substance of your argument in its entirety*. Do NOT amputate crucial parts of your argument, for instance, by deleting a paragraph of supporting evidence or by providing fewer reasons for why your position is sound. In other words, the goal is to trim the fat off, not the meat. This assignment is designed to improve your ability to write more concisely. By that, I mean presenting a clear and well-supported argument in as few words as possible.

Paper 4: Letter to Your Representative

First Draft due on Monday, November 7 by 9pm

Revised Draft due on Monday, November 14 by 9pm

Where: Upload onto Blackboard

Length: First Draft - no more than 500 words; Revised Draft - no more than 1,000 words

Grade: Revised Draft 20%

Assignment Overview

Writing letters to political representatives is a common form of communicating individual and organizational positions on specific policies and pressuring representatives to adopt or defend these positions. For paper 4, you will write a letter to a United States Senator or Congressperson who has either taken a clear stance on your controversy or remains undecided. Write a letter to her/him that argues for *changing* her/his position on the controversy. Arguing for a change in position means that you can not select a representative with whom you agree wholeheartedly and argue for her/him to simply stay the course. This assignment is designed to improve your ability to cater your writing to a specific audience and write persuasively.

Rationale

Having developed their position on the controversy, students will attempt to persuade a political representative to change their stance on the controversy in this assignment.

Learning Outcomes

In terms of writing, the rationale behind this assignment is improve skills we have covered in class:

- persuading a specific audience through writing

- editing to enhance audience appeal
- offering, receiving and integrating peer review

Requirements

This assignment will proceed in two steps:

1. You will submit a first “draft” on **Monday, November 7 by 9pm**. This draft should be **no more than 500 words**. For this “draft,” you will provide short answers to the following three questions:

- (a) What is your representative's position (voting and rhetorical) on the controversy? (Remember the evaluating arguments exercise.)
- (b) How does your representative's position compare to other representatives from her/his party and the opposition? How does her/his position compare to other relevant political actors, namely government agencies (e.g. Department of Defense, State Department, CIA and NSA), interest groups, and public opinion?
- (c) What are your representative's core constituencies? Is her/his position consistent or inconsistent with their interests/preferences?

2. You will submit a revised draft of the letter on **Monday, November 14 by 9pm**. This version should be **no more than 1,000 words**. The final version should do the following:

- (a) Explain why you are writing.
- (b) Provide a brief overview of the policy issue (including identifying any relevant legislation and your representative's voting record).
- (c) Identify and explain the problems with her/his position.
- (d) Argue for a specific change in her/his policy position.
- (e) Explain how adopting your recommendations will be in the political interest of your representative.

Here are some helpful online resources:

- To identify your representative and obtain her/his contact information, visit USA.gov or whoismyrepresentative.com
- For Congressional voting records, see Washington Post's U.S. Congress Vote Database or GovTrack.us
- For public opinion data, see Gallup, Pew, and Cornell's Roper Center
- To learn more about your representative (e.g. industry and individual campaign contributors, PACs, and voting record), see OpenSecrets.org

Presentation: Where do we go from here?

Due on Monday, November 28 or Wednesday, November 30 during class

Grade: 5%

You will give a 5 minute presentation during which you will discuss the following questions:

- What is your position on the controversy? Why (i.e. what reasons and evidence do you find most compelling)?
- What policy changes would you like to see?
- How do you think the election of Donald Trump will impact the controversy?
- What can members of the public, like yourself, do to create the change you would like to see or prevent harmful changes from occurring?

Rationale

Having become experts on their controversy, students will explain the implications of the incoming Trump administration on the controversy to an audience of non-experts.

Learning Outcomes

In terms of writing, the rationale behind this assignment is improve skills we have covered in class:

- Writing for oral communication

Paper 5: Final Paper

Due on December 7 by 11:30am

Where: Upload onto Blackboard

Length: 1,500 words (approximately 5 pages) – not including footnotes and works consulted

Grade: 25%

Under what conditions, if any, does the American public influence U.S. foreign policy? Do you believe the public exerts too much or too little influence over foreign policymaking? What changes must occur to achieve the right balance? Be sure to engage readings from the syllabus in a thoughtful manner. Also be sure to discuss the role of the media and refer to concrete cases of U.S. foreign policy in your response.

Rationale

Having examined the major controversies surrounding post-9/11 U.S. foreign policy, students will make an argument about the proper balance between public opinion and foreign policymaking.

Learning Outcomes

In terms of writing, the rationale behind this assignment is improve upon all the writing skills we have covered during the course.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Wednesday, August 24: Course Introduction

PART I: POST-9/11 U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Monday, August 29: The “War on Terror,” pt. 1

- Jeremy Scahill, *Dirty Wars* (New York: Nation Books, 2013), A Note to the Reader and chapter 1, pp. xxiii-xxiv, 3-30
- Margulies, *What Changed When Everything Changed*, ch. 6, pp. 117-133

Monday, August 29 by 9pm: Paper 1 Due

Wednesday, August 31: The “War on Terror,” pt. 2

- Evangelista, *Law, Ethics, and the War on Terror*, introduction and ch. 2, pp. 1-5, 23-54
- Seth Jones, “[The Accelerating Spread of Terrorism](#),” *The Wall Street Journal*, June 3, 2014
- John Mueller and Mark Stewart, “[Terrorism Poses No Existential Threat to America](#),” *The Guardian*, February 24, 2015

Sunday, September 4 by 9pm: “Controversy” Email Due

NO CLASS: Labor Day | Monday, September 5

Wednesday, September 7: The Afghanistan War

- Nir Rosen, *Aftermath* (New York: Nation Books, 2010), ch. 11, pp. 439-519

Friday, September 9 by 9pm: Works Cited Due

Monday, September 12: The Iraq War, pt. 1

- Steele, *Defeat*, introduction and ch. 1, pp. 1-6, 7-24

Wednesday, September 14: The Iraq War, pt. 2

- Steele, *Defeat*, ch. 3 and 4, pp. 49-70, 71-107

Monday, September 19: The Iraq War, pt. 3

- Steele, *Defeat*, ch. 6, pp. 137-157
- Scott Anderson, “[Fractured Lands: How the Arab World Came Apart](#),” *The New York Times Magazine*, August 2016, preface, Khulood al-Zaidi (sections 5, 7, 10, 20, 31), Wakaz Hassan (sections 6, 23, 27, 29, 32), and epilogue

Monday, September 19 by 9pm: Paper 2 Due

Wednesday, September 21: Torture

- Evangelista, *Law, Ethics, and the War on Terror*, ch. 3, pp. 55-90
- Alfred W. McCoy, "[The History of U.S. Torture](#)," *The Asia Pacific Journal*, vol. 4, no. 0 (December 2, 2006)
- Charles Krauthammer, "The Truth About Torture," *The Weekly Standard*, December 5, 2005, pp. 21-25
- David Cole, "[Guantánamo: Ten Years and Counting](#)," *The Nation*, January 23, 2012

Monday, September 26: Targeted Killing and Extraordinary Rendition

- Evangelista, *Law, Ethics, and the War on Terror*, ch. 3, pp. 90-102
- *Globalizing Torture: CIA Secret Detention and Extraordinary Rendition*, Open Society Justice Initiative, 2013, section 1-3, pp. 11-28
- Daniel Byman, "Why Drones Work: The Case for Washington's Weapon of Choice," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2013, pp. 32-43
- Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Why Drones Fail: When Tactics Drive Strategy," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2013, pp. 44-54
- Sarah Kreps, "[Drone Proliferation: What We Have to Fear](#)," *The Hill*, June 25, 2014

Wednesday, September 28: The Somalia Crisis

- Scahill, *Dirty Wars*, pp. 118-129, 191-209, 219-229, 270-273, 294-299, 301-302, 393-397, 490-1, 494
- Allison Kilkenny, "[Al-Barakaat: The Little Charity That Could Have Saved Somalia](#)," *Huffington Post*, May 16, 2009
- Robyn Dixon, "[Report: Nearly 260,000 Died in Somalia Food Crisis](#)," *Los Angeles Times*, May 2, 2013
- Ken Menkhaus, "No Access: Critical Bottlenecks in the 2011 Somali Famine," *Global Food Security* (2012), pp. 32-34

Monday, October 3: The 2011 Libyan Intervention

- Micah Zenko, "[The Big Lie About the Libyan War](#)," *Foreign Policy*, March 22, 2016
- Alex de Waal, "African roles in the Libyan conflict of 2011." *International Affairs*, vol. 89, no. 2 (March, 2013): 365-379
- Alex de Waal, "[The African Union and the Libyan Conflict of 2011](#)," December 19, 2012
- Anne-Marie Slaughter, "[Why Libya Sceptics Were Proved Badly Wrong](#)," *Financial Times*, August 24, 2011
- Nicholas Kristof, "[Thank You, America!](#)," *The New York Times*, August 31, 2011
- Stephen Zunes, "[Lessons and False Lessons from Libya](#)," *Huffington Post*, August 31, 2011
- Stephen Walt, "[Is America Addicted to War?](#)" *Foreign Policy*, April 4, 2011
- Glenn Greenwald and Murtaza Hussain, "[What Happened to the Humanitarians Who Wanted to Save Libyans with Bombs and Drones?](#)," *The Intercept*, November 11, 2014

- Benjamin Friedman, “[No, the Libyan Intervention Wasn't a Humanitarian Success](#),” *The National Interest*, April 7, 2016

Monday, October 4 by 9pm: Paper 2 Revision Due

Wednesday, October 5: Post-9/11 American Identity, pt. 1

- Margulies, *What Changed When Everything Changed*, ch. 7-8, pp. 134-182

NO CLASS: Fall Break | Saturday, October 8 – Tuesday, October 11

Wednesday, October 12: Post-9/11 American Identity, pt. 2

GUEST LECTURE: To be determined

- Margulies, *What Changed When Everything Changed*, ch. 9-12, pp. 183-285

PART II. PUBLIC OPINION, THE MASS MEDIA, & POLITICAL ELITES

Monday, October 17: Power and Public Opinion

- Walter Lippmann, *Public Opinion* (New York: The Free Press, 1922), ch. 15, pp. 150-158
- Edward Bernays, *Propaganda* (New York: Horace Liveright, 1928), ch. 1, pp. 9-18
- E. H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939* (London: Macmillan and Company Limited, 1939), excerpt from ch. 8, pp. 132-145

Monday, October 17 by 9pm: Paper 3 Due

Wednesday, October 19: Causes of Media Coverage

- Lance Bennett, et al, “The Semi-Independent Press: A Theory of News and Democracy,” in *When the Press Fails* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007), ch. 2, pp. 46-71
- Edward Herman and Noam Chomsky, “[A Propaganda Model](#),” excerpt from *Manufacturing Consent* (1988)

Recommended (not required)

- George Orwell, “[The Freedom of the Press](#),” preface to *Animal Farm* (1945)

Monday, October 24: Political Elites, the Mass Media, and Public Opinion

- Robert Entman, *Projections of Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004, ch. 1 & appendix to ch. 1, pp. 1-28

Monday, October 24 by 9pm: Paper 3 Revision Due

Wednesday, October 26: Media Influence Over Foreign Policy

- Entman, *Projections of Power*, ch. 5, pp. 95-122
- Piers Robinson, "Media as a Driving Force in International Politics," *Global Policy*, October 8, 2013

Monday, October 31: Public Influence Over Foreign Policy

- Jacobs, Lawrence, R. and Benjamin I. Page. 2006. "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *American Political Science Review* 99 (February): 107-123
- Matthew Baum and Philip Potter, *War and Democratic Constraint* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015), ch. 2, pp. 14-52

PART III. PUBLIC OPINION AND THE IRAQ WAR

Wednesday, November 2: Inflating Threats and Selling War

- Chaim Kaufmann, "Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas: The Selling of the Iraq War," in *American Foreign Policy and the Politics of Fear* (New York: Routledge, 2009), pp. 97-116

Monday, November 7: Rally-Round-the-Flag

- Baum, Matthew A. and Tim Groeling, "Reality Asserts Itself: Public Opinion on Iraq and the Elasticity of Reality," *International Organization*

Monday, November 7 by 9pm: Paper 4 Due

Wednesday, November 9: American Casualties and Military Success

- Christopher Gelpi, et al, "Individual Attitudes Toward the Iraq War, 2003-2004, in *Paying the Human Costs of War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), ch. 5, pp. 125-166
- John Mueller, "The Iraq Syndrome," *Foreign Affairs*, Issue 6 November/December 2005

Monday, November 14: The Anti-War Movement

- Phyllis Bennis, "[February 15, 2003. The Day the World Said No to War](#)," *Institute for Policy Studies*, February 15, 2013
- Ishaan Tharoor, "[Why Was the Biggest Protest in World History Ignored?](#)," *Time*, February 15, 2013
- Michael Heaney and Fabio Rojas, "The Partisan Dynamics of Contention: Demobilization of the Antiwar Movement in the United States, 2007-2009," *Mobilization* vol. 16, no. 1 (2011): 45-64.

- Anthony DiMaggio, “There Are No Protestors Here: Media Marginalization and the Antiwar Movement,” in *When the Media Goes to War* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2009), excerpt from ch. 2, pp. 63-82

Monday, November 14 by 9pm: Paper 4 Revision Due

Wednesday, November 16: Media Coverage of War

- Bennett, et al, “None Dare Call It Torture: Abu Ghraib and the Inner Workings of Press Dependence,” in *When the Press Fails*, ch. 3, pp. 72-107, 115-121

Monday, November 21: Civilian Casualties of U.S. Wars

- Eric Larson and Bogdan Savych, *Misfortunes of War: Press and Public Reactions to Civilian Deaths in Wartime* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2006), pp. xvii-xxiv
- John Tirman, *The Death of Others* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), excerpts from ch. 7 & 9, pp. 192-193, 243-267, 302-315

Recommended (not required)

- George Orwell, “[Notes on Nationalism](#),” 1945

NO CLASS: Thanksgiving Break | Wednesday, November 23 – Sunday, November 27

Monday, November 28: Where Do We Go From Here?, pt. 1

Student presentations

Wednesday, November 30: Where Do We Go From Here?, pt. 2

Student presentations

Wednesday, December 7 by 11:30am: Paper 5 Due