

Graduate Seminar on International Institutions
Political Science (PSCI) 7043
Spring 2014

Professor:

Moonhawk Kim
Office: Ketchum 122A
E-mail: moonhawk.kim@colorado.edu
Phone: (303) 492-8601
Office Hours: By appointment

Course Description:

Day/Time: Tuesdays 11:00AM – 1:30PM
Location: Ketchum 116

This is a PhD-level seminar on the study of international institutions. The course introduces students to this field of research by exposing students to some seminal and classical works as well more contemporary works. Students should have had significant exposure to IR theories prior to taking this seminar. The course has three main objectives:

1. familiarize students with the extant literature on international institutions format them to be able to engage scholarly works on the topic;
2. professionalize students to skillfully devise and present critiques of scholarly works and to present their own research projects; and
3. guide students to devise their own research projects and complete a full research paper by the end of the semester.

Course Requirements:

1. Short papers (30% of your grade): Between week 2 and week 14, each student will write *eight* short papers. You may choose one of two styles for each paper you write.
 - Write a critical analysis of the papers/chapters assigned for the week. You should address *all* the readings, and your central criticism should have a theme that addresses the set as opposed to one that is targeted at a particular reading. Writing these papers will help you think critically about the readings and prepare for active discussion in class. Think of these as mini comprehensive exam style essays.
 - Write a brief research proposal. This proposal should be longer than the abstracts you wrote for Data I/Scope and Methods but shorter than a full-length research design. Identify a research question that emerges from the readings assigned for the week. While a full literature review is not needed, you should discuss why the question is important and interesting to pose based on the readings. Advance a potential argument and sketch out a research design that can help you answer the research question posed. Explore potential data sources and operationalizations.

The papers should be approximately 1,000–1,250 words. The papers are due by Monday at 3PM each week. Please e-mail me your paper as a PDF document, named with *your last name* and the number of your paper, e.g. Smith1.pdf, Smith2.pdf, etc.

2. Discussant presentations (20% of your grade): Throughout the semester, students will have opportunities to serve as a discussant in two different settings.
 - Between week 2 and week 14, each student will serve *three times* as a discussant on the week's readings.
 - On the last day of the seminar, students will present their research paper. Each student will serve as a discussant for another student's presentation.

Specific guidelines for serving as a discussant are at the end of the syllabus.

3. Research paper (50% of your grade): Every student will write a full research paper, addressing a research question dealing with some aspect of international institutions. The paper should contain a literature review, a well developed argument and full quantitative and/or qualitative analysis, even if preliminary. I will discuss my expectations about the paper assignment further throughout the semester. Research presentation at the end of the semester will constitute 25% of the grade for the assignment.

Readings:

- All readings can be obtained electronically online on the NB course web site.
- Karns, Margaret P. and Karen A. Mingst (2010) *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. 2nd edition. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers. This is a semi-optional textbook that you should consult for basic but specific empirical information about what international institutions are and what they do. You can use the textbook to get ideas about your possible research as well.

Schedule of Readings:

Part I: What are (international) institutions?

Week 1: Introduction (January 14)

- Shanks, Cheryl, Harold K Jacobson, and Jeffrey H. Kaplan (1996) Inertia and Change in the Constellation of International Governmental Organizations, 1981-1992. *International Organization*. 50(4), 593–627.
- Martin, Lisa L. and Beth A. Simmons (1998) Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions. *International Organization*. 52(4), 729–757.

Week 2: Conceptualizing Institutions (January 21)

- Duffield, John (2007) What Are International Institutions? *International Studies Review*. 9(1)Spring, 1–22.

- Kratochwil, Friedrich V. and John Gerard Ruggie (1986) International Organization: A State of the Art on an Art of the State. *International Organization*. 40(4)Autumn, 753–778.
- Goldstein, Judith and Robert O. Keohane (1993) Ideas and Foreign Policy: An Analytical Framework. In *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change*. Edited by Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. chapter 1, 3–30.
- Greif, Avner (2006) *Institutions and the Path to the Modern Economy: Lessons from Medieval Trade*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 2.

Part II: What do international institutions do?

Week 3: Information Provision (January 28)

- Mitchell, Ronald B. (1998) Sources of Transparency: Information Systems in International Regimes. *International Studies Quarterly*. 42(1), 109–130.
- Dai, Xinyuan (2002) Information Systems of Treaty Regimes. *World Politics*. 54(4)July, 405–436.
- Thompson, Alexander (2006) Coercion through IOs: The Security Council and the Logic of Information Transmission. *International Organization*. 60(1)January, 1–34.
- Stasavage, David (2004) Open-Door or Closed-Door? Transparency in Domestic and International Bargaining. *International Organization*. 58(4)Fall, 667–703.

Week 4: Commitment Device (February 4)

- Keohane, Robert O. (1984) *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, Chapter 6.
- Fearon, James D. (1998) Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation. *International Organization*. 52(2), 269–305.
- Goldstein, Judith and Joanne Gowa (2002) US National Power and the Post-War Trading Regime. *World Trade Review*. 1(2), 153–170.
- Milner, Helen V. (2006) Why Multilateralism? Foreign Aid and Domestic Principal-Agent Problems. In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*. Edited by Darren G. Hawkins et al.. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. chapter 4, 107–139.

Week 5: Socialization (February 11)

- Finnemore, Martha (1993) International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy. *International Organization*. 47(4)Autumn, 565–597.
- Johnston, Alastair Iain (2001) Treating International Institutions as Social Environments. *International Studies Quarterly*. 45(4)Dec, 487–515.
- Checkel, Jeffrey T. (2001) Why Comply? Social Learning and European Identity change. *International Organization*. 55(3), 553–588.

- Bearce, David H. and Stacy Bondanella (2007) Intergovernmental Organizations, Socialization, and Member-State Interest Convergence. *International Organization*. 61(4)Fall, 703–733.

Part III: What are the consequences of international institutions?

Week 6: International Security (February 18)

- Chapman, Terrence L. (2009) Audience Beliefs and International Organization Legitimacy. *International Organization*. 63(4)Fall, 733–764.
- Leeds, Brett Ashley (2003) Do Alliances Deter Aggression? The Influence of Military Alliances on the Initiation of Militarized Interstate Disputes. *American Journal of Political Science*. 47(3)July, 427–439.
- Tir, Jaroslav and Douglas M. Stinnett (2012) Weathering climate change: Can institutions mitigate international water conflict? *Journal of Peace Research*. 49(1)January, 211–225.
- Allee, Todd L. and Paul K. Huth (2006) Legitimizing Dispute Settlement: International Legal Rulings as Domestic Political Cover. *American Political Science Review*. 100(2)May, 219–234.
- Kydd, Andrew (2001) Trust Building, Trust Breaking: The Dilemma of NATO Enlargement. *International Organization*. 55(4)Autumn, 801–828.

Week 7: International Economy (February 25)

- Stone, Randall W. (2008) The Scope of IMF Conditionality. *International Organization*. 62(4)Fall, 589–620.
- Steinberg, Richard (2002) In the Shadow of Law or Power? Consensus-Based Bargaining and Outcomes in the GATT/WTO. *International Organization*. 56(2), 339–374.
- Kim, Moonhawk (2012) Disguised Protectionism and Linkages to the GATT/WTO. *World Politics*. 64(3)July, 426–475.
- Pelc, Krzysztof J. (2013) Googling the WTO: What Search Engine Data Tell Us About the Political Economy of Institutions. *International Organization*. 67(3)July, 629–655.

Week 8: International Environment (March 4)

- Mitchell, Ronald B. (1994) Regime Design Matters: International Oil Pollution and Treaty Compliance. *International Organization*. 48(3), 425–458.
- Stein, Jana von (2008) The International Law and Politics of Climate Change: Ratification of the United Nations Framework Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 52(2)April, 243–268.
- Böhmelt, Tobias (2012) A Closer Look at the Information Provision Rationale: Civil Society Participation in States' Delegations at the UNFCCC. *Review of International Organizations*. 8(1)March, 55–80.

- Baccini, Leonardo and Johannes Urpelainen (2013) Before Ratification: Understanding the Timing of International Treaty Effects on Domestic Policies. *International Studies Quarterly*. Forthcoming, 1–15

Week 9: Human Rights (March 11)

- Moravcsik, Andrew (2000) The Origins of Human Rights Regimes: Democratic Delegation in Postwar Europe. *International Organization*. 54(2)Spring, 217–252.
- Hafner-Burton, Emilie M. (2008) Sticks and Stones: Naming and Shaming the Human Rights Enforcement Problem. *International Organization*. 62(4)Fall, 689–716.
- Lupu, Yonatan (2013) Best Evidence: The Role of Information in Domestic Judicial Enforcement of International Human Rights Agreements. *International Organization*. 67(3)Summer, 469–503.
- Murdie, Amanda M. and David R. Davis (2012) Shaming and Blaming: Using Events Data to Assess the Impact of Human Rights INGOs. *International Studies Quarterly*. 56(1)March, 1–16.

Part IV: When international institutions go awry

Week 10: Accountability and Legitimacy (March 18)

- Hawkins, Darren G. et al., editors (2006) *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Buchanan, Allen and Robert O. Keohane (2006) The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions. *Ethics and International Affairs*. 20(4)December, 405–437.
- Keohane, Robert O., Stephen Macedo, and Andrew Moravcsik (2009) Democracy-Enhancing Multilateralism. *International Organization*. 63(1)Winter, 1–31.
- Esty, Daniel (2002) The World Trade Organization’s Legitimacy Crisis. *World Trade Review*. 1(1), 7–22.

Week 11: Accountability and Organizational Pathologies (April 1)

- Barnett, Michael N. and Martha Finnemore (1999) The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. *International Organization*. 53(4), 699–732.
- Vaubel, Roland (2006) Principal-Agent Problems in International Organizations. *Review of International Organizations*. 1(2)June, 125–138.
- Cortell, Andrew P. and Susan Peterson (2006) Dutiful Agents, Rogue Actors, or Both? Staffing, Voting Rules, and Slack in the WHO and WTO. In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*. Edited by Darren G. Hawkins et al.. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. chapter 9, 255–280.
- Gould, Erica R. (2003) Money Talks: Supplementary Financiers and International Monetary Fund Conditionality. *International Organization*. 57(3), 551–586.

Part V: Design and Changes in international institutions

Week 12: Design of international institutions (April 8)

- Mearsheimer, John J. (1994-1995) The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security*. 19(3), 5–49.
- Downs, George W., David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom (1996) Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation? *International Organization*. 50(3), 379–406.
- Abbott, Kenneth W. et al. (2000) The Concept of Legalization. *International Organization*. 54(3)Summer, 401–419.
- Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal (2001) The Rational Design of International Institutions. *International Organization*. 55(4)Autumn, 761–799.

Week 13: Evolution of international institutions (April 15)

- March, John G. and Johan P. Olsen (1998) The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders. *International Organization*. 52(4)Autumn, 943–969.
- Downs, George W., David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom (1998) Managing the Evolution of Multilateralism. *International Organization*. 52(2), 397–419.
- Ruggie, John Gerard (1982) International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order. *International Organization*. 36(2)Spring, 379–415.
- Smith, James (2004) Inequality in International Trade? Developing Countries and Institutional Change in WTO Dispute Settlement. *Review of International Political Economy*. 11(3)August, 542–573.
- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink (1998) International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*. 52(4)Autumn, 887–917.

Part VI: The State and the Future of IO

Week 14: PEIO Papers (April 22)

- Select pieces from PEIO 2014 conference

Week 15: Wrap-Up (April 29)

- Student presentations

Short Paper Template (Style #1):

Being able to provide a succinct and argumentative summary of readings is a critical skill for graduate students to develop. The best way to approach this assignment is to pretend that you are the discussant on a conference panel that consists of papers assigned for a class. Below is a general template for the papers and presentations. As you begin to feel more comfortable, you may choose to deviate from this format. However, keep in mind that the main objective is to provide an argumentative summary of the readings.

1. Your paper should cover *all* of the assigned readings for the week, even if you focus more on a subset of the readings for #7.
2. What is the research question that authors pose in their research? (There may be more than one related questions.) What is the phenomenon of interest (i.e. the dependent variable)?
3. Why do we/should we care about this question? The reasons we care may be normative as well as positive.
4. What are the answers to the research question that the authors advance? What is their argument? i.e. What are their explanatory or independent variable?
5. What is the methodology they use to examine their argument?
6. What is the theme or connection across the works that you are addressing?
7. (The most critical component) Given what the authors do, what are your assessments of the works? What do they do well and what do they do not so well? How would you do it—make the argument, carry out the analysis, etc.—differently?

Despite the short length, the papers of this style should be written in a “paper format”—with an introduction summarizing your argument, a body that addresses the questions above, and a conclusion.

Discussant Presentation Template:

Being able to provide a succinct and argumentative summary and critique of academic works is a critical skill for young scholars to develop. The objective of the discussant presentation assignment is to help students develop this skill. The best way to think of the assignment is to imagine yourself serving as the discussant on a panel at a professional conference. Below is a general template for discussant presentations. If you feel more comfortable, you may choose to deviate from this format. However, keep in mind that the main objective is to provide an *argumentative critique* of the readings.

1. Your presentation should cover at least two readings on a week’s reading list. The idea is to provide a summary/review that is a synthesis. You may cover as many readings as you would like within the time constraints of the assignment and if you can do so without straining your argument.
2. Summary
 - What is the research question that authors pose in their research? (There may be more than one related questions.) What is the phenomenon of interest (i.e. the dependent variable)?
 - What are the answers to the research question that the authors advance? What is their argument? i.e. What are their explanatory or independent variables?
 - What is the methodology they use to examine their argument?
 - What is/are their finding(s)?
3. Critique

- What do they do well and what do they do not so well? What is your overarching argument about the pieces you are reviewing? You should avoid listing a series of disparate comments and critiques.
- What is the basis for your critique (e.g. empirical, logical, etc.)?
- What would you do differently and how if you were to redo their research?
- What questions would you pose to the authors?

Your presentations should be about 12 minutes maximum. About two students per week will be presenting. You may use the laptop projector should you wish. Alternatively, you may prepare concise handouts for the class with any helpful visual aids—e.g. charts, diagrams, etc.

Research Presentation Template:

I will discuss this further in class, but you should refer to this presentation slides template (direct PowerPoint file download link) by Marc Busch.