

# Course Manual Specialization Module

## International Relations

---

**Course Catalogue Number**  
7324C002LY

**Credits**  
12 EC

### Registration

Students of the MSc in *International Relations* can register for this course using their course registration form. More information about this course registration form can be obtained from their programme managers. It is not possible for IR degree candidates to register for this course through Studieweb or Blackboard. Students in the MSc *PoliticoLogie/Internationale Betrekkingen* can indeed register through SIS.

### Lecturer

Ursula Daxecker  
Office: REC B 8.08  
Office hours: Wednesday 16-17:00, Friday 13-14:00

### Location

Please see: <https://rooster.uva.nl>  
Select “Add timetable”, than “Add course timetable” and search for either the course title or the course catalogue number.

### Aims and Expectations

This course is the core International Relations module within the IR track of the MSc degree programme in Political Science. The course will consider the historical origins and development of the discipline of International Relations, convey and reflect the current diversity of theories, epistemological and methodological approaches, and explore the principal substantive areas of research focus in the field. Our main aim is to develop students’ command of the approaches to international governance, political economy, and conflict and security, in order to enhance your capacity to begin doing your own research in the field. We also examine the linkages between the theory and praxis of international relations in order to problematize the contribution of scholarship to political practice.

Our secondary aim is to prepare you for the diverse range of specialist instruction that our colleagues at the UvA offer in both the IR coursework and research supervision components of the MA. In order to do so, we begin with an image of the common ground where IR research begins and then fan out towards the principal axes of division, lines of debate and frontiers of research. IR as a field is united around common questions – specifically a concern with how order is produced under conditions of anarchy. However, efforts to deal with this core problem have generated major disagreements regarding a) the forms of political order that should attract our attention; and b) the theories, concepts and methods we should use to understand and/or resolve them. By drawing linkages between what unites and divides IR, the course will provide you with the ability to explain how your understanding and research relates back to a more general scholarly audience and set of governance problems as each of you branch off into more specialist fields and modes of inquiry.

This specialization module (SpecMod for short) is an advanced course. We expect that our students will already be familiar with the principal theories of International Relations and their proponents in the literature. For example, you need to be able to explain in your own words the meaning of labels such as realism, liberalism, constructivism, Marxism and post-positivism(s). You should also be familiar with the general history of the discipline, its major themes and domains of empirical enquiry, the most important issues relevant to the field, and the main methods employed in IR research. The course also assumes that you follow world news and can place major events in the context of the discipline of IR.

The course will not only require knowledge of the landscape of IR research and debates relevant to the topic at hand but also the capacity for independent thinking and for expressing your position orally and in writing at an advanced level of skill. Through the lectures, in class discussion, a series of formal debates, and written work, students will be challenged to develop the analytical tools and critical skills to foster their own theoretical and policy positions in explicit relation to competing views. The value added of this course should be to provide you with the resources to more keenly understand what defines IR as a scholarly discipline, to prepare you for doing your own research in the thesis stage of your degree, to develop an awareness of the breadth of approaches to research design in IR and to understand more about the connection between the academic discipline of IR and the praxis of world politics. The course thus represents a clear progression from the BA-level of building sound comprehension and a knowledge base towards finding out what “doing” IR research entails.

SpecMod is also an intensive course and it is for this reason that you do not undertake any other coursework during this eight-week block. There is a substantial amount of reading to be done in advance of each session. Rather than textbook materials, the readings consist of texts published for scholarly audiences and so will necessarily require some interpretation and imagination. Keeping up with the reading alone will consume a lot of time and energy. On top of that, we meet three times a week and have a series of assignments. We recognize that this will be a challenge for many students. At the same time, we are confident that there is a pay-off involved in such an intense learning process. In particular, mirroring the design of short courses, we aim to help students rapidly generate expertise in their sub-disciplinary specialization. We advise students to tackle this course with this aim in mind and to deal with the workload by reading in advance, and planning and preparing for assignments.

In sum, the course provides students with an opportunity a) to advance to the MSc level and beyond in their understanding of the main issues, findings, debates, types of theory and methods that constitute the contemporary state of the art in the field of International Relations; b) to enable students to reflect critically on these, to formulate and communicate their own scholarly argument; c) to shape their choices of the topics and approaches they will focus on for the rest of the year including their thesis; and d) to understand how International Relations as a field relates to the broader field of political science, its key concepts and methods, approaches, and central issues.

### **Instruction language**

English

### **Time Period(s)**

Semester 1, block 1

### **Information Exchange**

This course has a Blackboard site that you must learn to use. Some of the course readings and a range of general course information will be available via the site. Announcements and communication will take place through Blackboard. The site is divided between the ‘main’ course site and a separate ‘content area’ for each seminar group. Only announcements and information of interest to *all* students registered in the course can be found on the main site. Most of the site content of specific interest to this group can be found under your seminar group’s content area. As each seminar will be taught in a slightly different way, students should refer first and foremost to the content area dedicated to their specific seminar group.

### **Course Readings**

There is no reader or textbook for this course. Pdf versions of the readings for each session will be made available via Dropbox.

### **Planning, preparation, and concentrated learning**

This should relate to your starting point: some of you have the advantage of having completed a BA degree in political science/international relations, while others have less background in the field. You need to assure yourself that you are ‘up to speed’ as the course progresses.

**Specialization Module International Relations 2015-16 at a Glance**

<b>Week</b>	<b>Lecture</b>	<b>Seminar</b>	<b>Seminar/Debate</b>
1. 31 Aug – 4 Sep IR Theory: Order & Anarchy	The Anarchy Problematique	The State of the Mainstream	Seminar: Critical Approaches to IR
2. 7 Sep – 11 Sep International Cooperation & Institutions	Games, Cooperation & Regimes	The Three New Institutionalisms	Debate: Judicialization of International Trade
3. 14 Sep – 18 Sep Conflict & Security	International Conflict	Civil War	Debate: Humanitarian Intervention
4. 21 Sep – 25 Sep International Political Economy	States & Markets in Global Context	International Finance, Trade, and Production	Debate: Global Financial Governance in a Post- Crisis World
5. 28 Sep – 2 Oct Mid-term	MA Planning Meeting	<b>No Classes – Mid-term Week</b>	
6. 5 Oct – 9 Oct Globalization and Domestic Politics	Globalization and Domestic Politics	Globalization and Environmental Protection	Debate: Labor Protection
7. 12 Oct – 16 Oct IR and the Global South	Non-Western IR	The State and International Development	Debate: The Politics of Aid
8. 19 Oct – 23 Oct Take Home Exam	<b>No Classes – Exam Week</b>		

**Course Format**

In total, there will be six weeks of contact teaching. Each of these weeks will be devoted to a specific theme:

1. IR Theory
2. International Cooperation and Institutions
3. Conflict and Security
4. International Political Economy
5. Globalization and Domestic Politics
6. IR and the Global South

Each week will feature three classes. The first week will consist of a lecture and two seminars. Every subsequent week will consist of a lecture, seminar and debate.

Each Monday we meet in plenary to for a lecture outlining the main concepts and issues for discussion for that week. Drawing on the range of expertise we have in our teaching group, these lectures will be given by specialists in the theme of that week. Our aim here is to provide both an introduction to the sub-fields of IR and a chance for you to gain a sense of whether this might be a field of research you would like to pursue further in your MA studies at the UvA.

The seminars and debates will be held in 6 parallel groups of approximately 25 students. The seminars will consist of a range of teaching processes. Here we may provide brief introductory lectures, ask you to engage in small group work, hold mini-debates, host open discussions, invite short student presentations and conduct Q&A sessions on the material and course assessment and administrative issues.

The debates are a more structured learning format which is described in detail at the ends of this document. In short, each of you will be asked to participate in a debate on one of the 5 chosen topics, with the remainder of the class playing the role of a critical audience. This forms a major part of our assessment and has proven to be one of the most lively and positively assessed parts of the course.

### **Wednesday Lecture Series**

This course runs parallel to and is an integral part of the MSc in Political Science lecture series in Transnational Politics held on Wednesday afternoons. IR students are required to attend all four lectures. Students will be expected to answer a question pertaining to the content of the lectures in their take home exam. A brief description and agenda for the Lecture Series follows:

#### **Series Description**

What is common to, and distinctive about, the Political Science Programme at UvA, in all its diversity, is its focus on transnational politics: investigating how ongoing transnational transformations – social, economic, political – affect governance at local, national, European and global levels.

In four lectures aimed at all Political Science Masters students across the different programs and tracks, concrete contemporary political issues and key political science concepts will be explored through the lens of transnational politics. The lectures will consider (1) transnational governance through the issue of deforestation; (2) social movements and protest through contemporary occupations; (3) the role of gender and ethnicity in contemporary politics; and (4) the politics of migration through the boat people crises in the Mediterranean.

Together, these lectures will illuminate how contemporary trends like globalization and individualization raise questions for the democratic accountability, representative quality and legitimacy of contemporary governance; and demonstrate the ways in which transnational politics can be theorised and empirically researched. Furthermore, this series of lectures and discussions functions as a meeting ground for students and staff across different specializations.

**Format:** 45 minute lecture followed by 45 minutes of Q&A

**Assessment:** An assignment will be set in relation to the lectures in the framework of your specialization module class.

**Time:** Wednesdays evenings, from 17:00 to 18:30, followed by drinks in CREA cafe

**Location,** please see your course schedule at <https://rooster.uva.nl/>

**Dates:** 16-09; 30-09; 7-10; 14-10

**16 September:** Prof. Jonathan Zeitlin: “Who Governs the Forest? Assembling an Experimentalist Regime?”

**30 September:** Prof. Marlies Glasius: “Tahrir Square to the Maagdenhuis: Social Movement Theory and Contemporary Protests”

**7 October:** Dr. Liza Mügge: “Pathways to Power: Gender and Ethnicity in Political Representation”

**14 October:** Dr. Polly Pallister-Wilkins: “The Humanitarian Policing of 'Our Sea'”

#### **Manner & Form of Assessment and Assessment Requirements & Criteria**

Course assessment for the module consists of the following elements. First, a short mid-term essay (1800-2000 words, min-max) evaluates your understanding of the groundwork laid in the first four weeks of the course. Second, the skillful and scholarly representation of your chosen viewpoint in one of the class debates plus participation in the others as a ‘critical audience’ is a further criterion for evaluation. Third, a take-home final examination assessing your knowledge of the course as a whole is due at the end of week 8. The final consists of questions that together cover the breadth of the course, including the general Political Science lecture series that runs parallel to the seminars (4,500-5,000 words, min-max, to be completed within a week). Finally, you must complete the required course readings in advance of each session; an evaluation of your preparation for and participation in class discussion forms part of your final grade.

- Mid-term essay: 25%
- Debate presentation: 20%
- Take-home exam: 35%
- Participation (attendance and constructive involvement in class discussion, including as ‘audience’ in the debates in which you do not role-play): 20%

To receive a grade, students must successfully complete and submit on time all elements of course assessment as specified in this course outline. You must also pass the final examination to receive a grade in the course. Material submitted after the deadlines specified above is not eligible for a re-sit.

#### **Deadlines:**

- Midterm essay: Friday, October 2, 23.59
- Take-home final exam: Friday, October 23, 23.59  
In case of late submission of either assignment, 1 full point will be subtracted in the first 24 hours; 1 full point for every 24 hours of lateness thereafter.

#### **Contingency rules:**

- The take-home exam can only be re-taken in case of an overall failure of the course, or if it was missed for a legitimate and documented reason (e.g. medical, compassion).
- Except in cases of legitimate and documented excuse, students who miss a debate presentation receive a zero for this element of course assessment. There can be no compensation or substitute assignment.
- Prepared participation in all meetings is obligatory. Missing more than two course meetings results in failing the course unless there are exceptional and documented circumstances.

#### **Inspection of exams/assignments, feedback**

You will receive written feedback on the debates, the essay and the take-home exam.

#### **Rules regarding Fraud and Plagiarism**

Both the essay and the take-home exam must be submitted through the Ephorus system on the Blackboard, which detects plagiarism from published sources, from the Internet, and from fellow-students. In case of suspected plagiarism, the MSc Examinations Committee will be informed. This could result in failing the course and hence the programme.

Academic dishonesty is considered a serious offence. The definition of fraud/plagiarism is to be found in the *Studiegids*, and may be translated as follows: “To plagiarise is to take the work or an idea of someone else and pass it off as one's own. This means that if you copy, paraphrase or translate materials from websites, books, magazines or any other source in your work submitted for assessment without giving full and proper credit to the original author(s), you are committing plagiarism.” The fair and transparent use of evidence from primary and secondary sources is the basis of academic discourse. The abuse of this fairness and accountability to peers undermines the very nature of scholarly research. Plagiarism is essentially a form of theft and fraud. If you find yourself in doubt about quotation or correct use of a source, it is always a good idea to provide full information. Presenting other people’s work from whatever source (including that of other students and the Internet) as your own will be sanctioned in terms of the grade received and by the Examination Commission. You must attribute any work or idea you have made use of in the course of writing to its original author, or you are guilty of plagiarism. All direct citations must also be correctly attributed. Concerning collaboration with fellow students, this is encouraged and can help you to learn from each other, but there are limits: unless you are specifically instructed to work in a group context and to submit a collectively authored assignment, each student must submit their *own* work and two or more students may not hand in the same assignment. You may not submit for assessment to this course material previously submitted for (partial) credit in a course at the UvA or any other university. Once again, students are responsible for understanding regulations in this regard; if you do not understand the rules on fraud/plagiarism then please ask your lecturer.

**Date Final Grade**

The essay will be graded during the course and the grade communicated to students in a timely fashion. The grade for the take-home exam and final grade for the course will be communicated to the students by 10<sup>th</sup> of November.

## PROGRAMME AND LITERATURE: WEEK-BY-WEEK

### WEEK 1: IR THEORY: ORDER AND ANARCHY

Good research begins with good questions. To the extent that the field of IR plays host to a series of intriguing and compelling theoretical conversations, it is due to the fact that it has shared a common concern with a particular type of puzzle: how is order produced in conditions of anarchy? This became a troubling question in the early twentieth century as governments struggled to address the problems of seemingly recessive conflict amongst European states. How could we create a lasting peace when governments continually sought to resolve their disagreements through resort to armed force? The World Wars were the first of a series of urgent problems that seemed fraught by the absence of a global government and that demanded means of encouraging states to choose competition over collaboration. Efforts to build international organizations, create common markets, reduce global poverty and inequality and meet the urgent threats to our shared environment have each required practices, norms, rules and institutions that could ameliorate the absence of a global governing force. As such, they have become core concerns of this expanding field.

The anarchy problematique serves as a useful portrait of 20<sup>th</sup> century IR in the United States. As the discipline has globalised and as we moved into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, various groups of scholars began to question whether anarchy constituted the best organising principle for a common research agenda on global politics. Indeed, some have asked whether the field of IR can be meaningfully conceived as sharing a focal point of inquiry any more.

This week aims to provide you with the materials to both pose and begin to answer these broad questions about the nature, purpose and evolution of the field. The lecture will demonstrate how the concept of anarchy was used to frame intellectual inquiries into a variety of global political problems and then discuss the theoretical conversation this helped to generate. More specifically, we will explore how conversations amongst the ‘mainstream’ paradigms of IR – neorealism, neoliberalism and constructivism – rested on a common acceptance of a problematic described most systematically by Kenneth Waltz. The seminar will then offer a portrait of the contemporary mainstream. We will particularly focus on the way rationalism and constructivism have become established as the two main and relatively enduring approaches to IR, and on emerging attempts to synthesise insights from the two fields. Finally, the last section looks to developments which, depending on your perspective, might be alternately seen as the disciplinary ‘fringe’ or its cutting edge. Here we look at critical, feminist and post-structuralist critiques of the anarchy problematique and their efforts to re-frame the questions that we ask about world politics.

#### WEEK 1 AGENDA

#### Lecture: Monday 31 August – The Anarchy Problematique

Waltz, K.N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. (Chapters 4 & 5)

Wendt, A. (1992) "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics", *International organization*, 46 (2): 391-425.

#### Seminar 1: The State of Mainstream Theory: Rationalism, Constructivism and Synthesis

Snidal, D. (2013). "Rational choice and International Relations". In: Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T. and Simmons, B.A. (Eds) *Handbook of International Relations*, 85-111. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Adler, E. (2013). "Constructivism in International Relations". In: Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T. and Simmons, B.A. (Eds) *Handbook of International Relations*, 112-144. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Checkel, J.T. (2013). "Theoretical Pluralism in IR: Possibilities and Limits". In: Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T. and Simmons, B.A. (Eds) *Handbook of International Relations*, 220-241. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

#### Seminar 2: Critical Approaches: The Fringe or the Cutting Edge?

Cox, R. (1981). "Social forces, states and world orders", *Millennium*, 10 (2): 126-155.

Tickner, J. (2005). "What is your research program? Some feminist answers to international relations methodological questions", *International Studies Quarterly*, 49 (1): 1-22.

Ashley, R.K. (1988). "Untying the sovereign state: a double reading of the anarchy problematique", *Millennium*, 17 (2): 227-262.

## **WEEK 2: INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AND INSTITUTIONS**

During the Cold War, little attention was paid to international institutions, and cooperation of sovereign states was deemed to occur only under the guidance of a hegemon like the USA in the Western hemisphere. However, when US dominance declined with the beginning of the 1980s, it turned out that international cooperation persisted and even increased. In an age of growing economic interdependence, nation states needed to cooperate in an anarchic environment in order to produce collective goods like global free trade. Regime theory – or Rationalism, how it is sometimes called – shares many assumptions of Realism, but it assumes that states aim to maximise absolute instead of relative gains. Accordingly, international cooperation is much more likely to occur than it is assumed by Realism. Whenever sovereign states want to cooperate in order to provide collective goods, they face cooperation problems. Regime theory uses classic game constellations in order to categorise these cooperation problems. In order to overcome collective action problems and to facilitate cooperation, nation states may establish international institutions. Thus, the member states of an international organization act as principals, which establish an international agent to fulfil specific tasks for them. However, once they are set up, such agents become actors with own interests and own resources to gain influence. The result is a classic principal-agent-problem, wherein the principals need to balance potential agency losses against the costs of tighter control.

Regime theory can be seen as a pioneer of rational institutionalism. According to this theory, member states set up institutions instrumentally in order to meet functional needs. Rational institutionalism has been widely used in order to analyse the institutional design of and policy-making within the EU. However, it has soon become challenged by two different kinds of institutionalism. Historical institutionalism argues that (international) institutions are not established on a tabula rasa, but that their set up is always influenced by previously existing institutions. The result is a general path-dependency of institutional developments. Sociological institutionalism goes even further and argues that institutions do not only constrain actors' behaviour, but that they also constitute actors and their interests. Thus, the influence of institutions on international politics is much more fundamental than it is assumed by rationalism.

One very important instrument of member states to commit themselves to cooperation and implementation is the judicialization of international agreements like in the WTO. Here, the member states subordinate themselves to the rulings of dispute settlement bodies or international courts. It is generally assumed that such judicialization improves the implementation of agreements and 'civilises' the anarchic international system to some degree. However, the other side of the coin is that judicialization also fundamentally restricts the member states in their future action. They cannot adopt any arbitrary policies anymore, but they are bound by international treaties and the rulings of international bodies. This loss of sovereignty becomes an issue for democratic legitimacy, if the rulings of dispute settlement mechanisms oppose the majority will of a particular society – as it happened with the WTO ruling against the EU's de facto ban of genetically modified food.

### *WEEK 2 AGENDA*

#### **Lecture: Games, Cooperation and Regimes**

Axelrod, R. (1984). *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books. (Chapter 1)

Keohane, R.O. (1984). *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Chapter 4)

Levy, M.A., Young, O.R. and Zürn, M. (1995). "The Study of International Regimes", *European Journal of International Relations*, 1 (3): 267-330.

#### **Seminar: The Three New Institutionalisms**

Aspinwall, M.D. and Schneider, G. (2000). "Same Menu, Separate Tables: The Institutional Turn in Political Science and the Study of European Integration", *European Journal of Political Research*, 38 (1): 1-36.

March, J.G. and Olson, J.P. (1998). "The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders", *International Organization*, 52 (4): 943-969.

Pierson, P. (1996). "The Path to European Integration: A Historical Institutional Analysis" *Comparative Political Studies*, 29 (2): 123-163.

### **Debate: The Judicialization of International Trade**

Why do member states agree on the delegation of important competencies to international dispute settlement mechanisms? How can judicialization improve the compliance with WTO rules? How does judicialization affect the democratic legitimacy of policies? Consider the example of gen-food and the WTO decision on the de facto EU ban.

Participants: Kenneth Abbott, Robert Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter & Duncan Snidal; Martha Finnemore & Stephen Toope; Mark Pollack & Gregory Shaffer; Bernhard Zangl, Host No. 1

Abbott, K.W., Keohane, R.O., Moravcsik, A., Slaughter, A.M. and Snidal, D. (2000). "The Concept of Legalization", *International Organization*, 54 (3): 401-419.

Finnemore, M.J. and Toope, S. (2001). "Alternatives to Legalization: Richer Views of Law and Politics", *International Organization*, 55 (3): 743-758.

Pollack, M.A. and Shaffer, G.C. (2009). *When Cooperation Fails: The Law and Politics of Genetically Modified Food*. Oxford: University Press. (Chapter 5)

Zangl, B. (2008). "Judicialisation Matters! A Comparison of Dispute Settlement under GATT and the WTO", *International Studies Quarterly*, 52 (4): 825-854.

### **WEEK 3: CONFLICT AND SECURITY**

This week introduces students to the study of international conflict and civil war. Referring back to the question of order, scholars of international conflict and security aim to understand the causes of war and peace in an anarchic international system. Motivated by a desire to prevent war's occurrence, reduce its frequency, or mitigate its consequences, scholars have long tried to understand why leaders or groups choose the use of force instead of other strategies to achieve their goals. The week aims to cover the substantial variation in theoretical orientation, methodological approach, ontological assumptions, and empirical domain in the study of security and conflict.

While scholarship on security has historically focused on interstate war and conflict, the increasing prevalence of civil war and its economic, political and social costs contributed to increasing attention to the causes and consequences of civil wars and ethnic conflicts since the end of the Cold War. Reflecting these changes, the week begins with a lecture focused on theoretical explanations of international conflict. Realism, rational choice, the democratic peace, and psychological theories provide us with alternative accounts for why large-scale violence between states occurs. The lecture concludes with a discussion of whether and how these explanations can be useful for understanding political violence within states. The seminar examines civil war and ethnic conflicts, focusing on prominent accounts for the occurrence of civil war, the incidence of violence within such wars, and how interventions by outside actors influence the dynamics of civil conflicts. The debate further engages an important international dimension of civil war – should the international community intervene in civil wars to try and reduce the violence and suffering caused by intrastate conflict? In particular, was the Libyan intervention in 2011 justifiable, and if so, what does it mean for interventions in other conflicts, such as Syria?

#### *WEEK 3 AGENDA*

#### **Lecture: International Conflict**

Fearon, J.D. (1995). "Rationalist explanations for war." *International Organization* 49 (3): 379-414.

Bueno de Mesquita, B., Smith, A., Siverson, R.M. and Morrow, J.D. (2003). *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge: MIT Press. (Chapter 6)

Jervis, R. (1988). "War and Misperception", *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18 (4): 675-700.

### Seminar: Civil War

- Cederman, L., Wimmer, A. and Min, B. (2010). "Why Do Ethnic Groups Rebel? New Data and Analysis", *World Politics*, 62 (1): 87-119.
- Kalyvas, S. (2003). "The Ontology of Political Violence: Action and Identity in Civil Wars", *Perspectives on Politics*, 1 (3): 475-494.
- Autesserre, S. (2009). "Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention", *International Organization*, 63 (2), 249-280.

### Debate: Humanitarian Intervention

Was NATO's intervention in Libya in 2011 justifiable? What does this imply for Syria or other internal conflicts? More generally, is humanitarian intervention a proper objective of foreign policy or international order?

Participants: Alex Bellamy and Paul Williams; Alan Kuperman, Robert Pape, Charles Ziegler, Host No. 2

- Bellamy, A. and Williams, P. (2011). "The New Politics of Protection? Côte d'Ivoire, Libya and the Responsibility to Protect", *International Affairs*, 87 (4): 825–850.
- Kuperman, A. (2012). "A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO's Libya Campaign", *International Security*, 38 (1): 105-136.
- Pape, R.A. (2012). "When duty calls: A pragmatic standard of humanitarian intervention", *International Security*, 37 (1): 41-80.
- Ziegler, C.E. (2014). "Contesting the Responsibility to Protect", *International Studies Perspectives*, 1-23.

## WEEK 4: INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

Historically grounded and interdisciplinary in nature, IPE is a field of enquiry that seeks to understand the past, present, and future dynamics of the global political economy. From its origins with Smith and Marx, classical political economy began with the premise that the political, economic, and social domains are integrated as a whole, and therefore must be understood, theorized, and analyzed accordingly. Yet the rise of economics as a standalone discipline and the post-WWII settlements relegated classical political economy to the intellectual margins, and it was only with the breakdown of the Bretton Woods system in the late 1960s and early 1970s—involving a series of developments that were inexplicable from either a purely economic *or* political vantage point—that IPE in its contemporary guise emerged to again seriously grapple with the messy relationship between politics and economics on the global stage.

As the global economy has increased in both scale and complexity, and technological transformations have brought states and a multitude of other significant non-state actors into interdependent relationships with one another, the original image of IPE as concerned with the relations between a small number of the world's largest economies is now far outdated. States, international organizations, club forums, market actors, non-governmental actors, and everyday actors now jostle across different transnational arenas in order to determine who gets what, when, and why from global economic processes. The proliferation of actors, their interests, and their behaviours has inevitably affected how scholars go about studying them. IPE has accordingly come to embody a number of different approaches and perspectives towards *ontology*, *epistemology*, and *methodology*. We explore these different approaches in an ecumenical fashion and examine how they not only lead to differing conclusions about existing questions, but also enable us to expand the scope of inquiry and challenge the nature of the questions themselves.

This means that the subject matter of IPE is as varied as the ways in which it is practiced. Although the study of IPE is also closely involved with other important global issue-areas such as migration, climate change, trafficking, tourism, overseas aid, and labour, in this week's seminar we concentrate on how these different perspectives explored in the lecture operate in the traditional 'core' areas of IPE—global finance, trade, and production. Our focus revolves around questions such as:

- What leads states to pursue certain forms of trade agreement, or to pursue trade agreements at all?

- How and why is stability pursued in transnationally integrated financial markets?
- How does the international monetary system operate and for whose benefit?
- Why is modern production multinational, and what are the implications of such transnational production processes?

Having laid some historical, theoretical, and empirical foundations for the study of the global political economy, this week's debate then prompts us to adopt a normative position on the current state of global economic governance in a post-crisis world.

#### WEEK 4 AGENDA

##### **Lecture: States & Markets in Global Context**

- Cerny, P. (1995). "Globalization and the Changing Logic of Collective Action", *International Organization*, 49 (4): 595-625.
- Katzenstein, P. and Nelson, S. (2013). "Reading the Right Signals and Reading the Signals Right: IPE and the Financial Crisis of 2008", *Review of International Political Economy*, 20 (5): 1101-1131.
- Underhill, G.R.D. (2000). "State, Market, and Global Political Economy: Genealogy of an (Inter-?) discipline", *International Affairs*, 76 (4): 791-810.

##### **Seminar: International Finance, Trade, and Production**

- Helleiner, E. (2011). "The Evolution of the International Monetary and Financial System". In: Ravenhill, J. (Ed.) *Global Political Economy*, 215-244. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Milner, H. (2013) "International Trade". In: Carlsnaes, W., Risse, T. and Simmons, B.A. (Eds) *Handbook of International Relations*, 720-746. London: Sage Publications..
- Thun, E. (2011). "The Globalization of Production". In: Ravenhill, J. (Ed.) *Global Political Economy*, 215-244. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

##### **Debate: Global Financial Governance in a Post-Crisis World**

Seven years following the outbreak of the crisis, to what extent can we claim that global financial governance is effective? Who are the winners and losers from the crisis? And how should we seek to improve the global financial system and mechanisms of global financial governance?

Participants: Daniel Drezner, Randall Germain, Eric Helleiner, Robert Wade, Host No. 3

- Drezner, D. (2014). "The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession", *World Politics*, 66 (1): 123-164.
- Germain, R. (2010). *Global Politics and Financial Governance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. (chapters 6 & 7)
- Helleiner, E. (2014). *The Status Quo Crisis: Global Financial Governance After the 2008 Meltdown*. New York: Oxford University Press. (chapters 1 & 2)
- Wade, R. (2011). "Emerging World Order? From Multipolarity to Multilateralism in the G20, the World Bank, and the IMF", *Politics and Society*, 39 (3): 347-378.

----- WEEK 5 MID-TERM WRITING WEEK – ONLY CLASS: MONDAY PLANNING MEETING -----

#### **WEEK 6: GLOBALIZATION AND DOMESTIC POLITICS**

Studies in International Relations (IR) have traditionally focused on explaining international political phenomenon: e.g., outbreak of war, trade and financial liberalization, creation of various international organizations. Explaining domestic politics (i.e., political phenomenon taking place "within" a state) is often considered as the realm of Comparative Politics. Many have challenged the divide, however, and called for bridging the gap between the two subfields in Political Science. IR scholars are increasingly exploring how international/transnational political phenomenon shape domestic politics, not just vice versa.

In Week 6, we examine the effect of economic globalization on domestic politics, especially in the issue area of environmental and labor protection. What would be the consequences of the global level specialization in

production on countries' environmental and labor protection policies? How much policy autonomy do national governments still have in these traditionally domestic issue areas? Would similar pressures from the international economy lead to a greater similarity between countries in their environmental and labor protection policies?

#### WEEK 6 AGENDA

##### **Lecture: Globalization and Domestic Politics**

Gourevitch, P. (1978). "The second image reversed: the international sources of domestic politics", *International Organization*, 32 (04): 881-912.

Berger, S. (2000). "Globalization and politics", *Annual Review of Political Science*, 3 (1): 43-62.

Drezner, D.W. (2001). "Globalization and policy convergence", *International Studies Review*, 3 (1): 53-78.

##### **Seminar: Globalization and Environmental Protection**

Vogel, D. (1997). "Trading up and governing across: transnational governance and environmental protection", *Journal of European public policy*, 4 (4): 556-571.

Jänicke, M. (2005). "Trendsetters in environmental policy: the character and role of pioneer countries", *European environment*, 15 (2): 129-142.

Beeson, M. (2010). "The coming of environmental authoritarianism", *Environmental politics*, 19 (2): 276-294.

##### **Debate: Globalization and Labor Protection**

"Should developed country governments use their economic leverage to pressure developing country governments to adopt stricter labor standards?"

Participants: Terry Collingsworth, J. William Goold & Pharis J. Harvey; Jagdish Bhagwati; Anita Chan; Naila Kabeer, Host No. 4

Collingsworth, T., Goold, J.W. and Harvey, P.J. (1994). "Labor and free trade: time for a global new deal", *Foreign Affairs*, 73 (1): 8-13.

Bhagwati, J. (1995). "Trade liberalization and 'fair trade' demands: addressing the environmental and labour standards issues", *The World Economy*, 18 (6): 745-759.

Chan, A. (2003). "Racing to the bottom: international trade without a social clause", *Third World Quarterly*, 24 (6): 1011-1028.

Kabeer, N. (2004). "Globalization, labor standards, and women's rights: dilemmas of collective (in) action in an interdependent world", *Feminist Economics*, 10 (1): 3-35.

#### **WEEK 7: INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS FROM THE 'SOUTH'**

The discipline of International Relations has been dominated by the Anglo-American academy and has been implicitly framed from the perspective of scholars and practitioners in Europe and North America. There are two ways in which the Western dominance of IR manifests itself. First, the vast majority of influential sources in IRT come from the Western cannon of philosophy, political theory and history. The second is the Eurocentric framing of world history, in which Africa, Asia and Latin America are rendered as peripheral components of the main storyline and/or aberrations to dominant European norms of statehood and international organization. This has left IR particularly poorly equipped to address some of the principal lines of division in contemporary world politics. While originally this was merely thought to be a failure to adequately reflect and theorise the massive cultural and economic gaps between the developed and developing worlds, this has now emerged as a failure to adequately comprehend emerging poles of economic and military power.

This week seeks to partially correct this imbalance. The lecture will discuss the following questions: Why is there no non-western IR? How desirable is it to develop non-western International Relation theories? If it is desirable, is it also feasible within the current world order. This compels us to destabilize our theoretical assumptions and ask to what extent IR's characteristic frameworks of inquiry help to shed light on developments outside the Euro-American core. In the seminar we move on to consider the problem of

global economic inequality, examining contemporary debates on how best to achieve growth and prosperity. Here, our focus is on the role that institutions have played in determining the course of economic development on the continent of Africa. Finally, in the debate, we question the utility of development aid, asking whether this inter-state model of economic assistance is capable of addressing the problem of global poverty.

#### WEEK 7 AGENDA

##### **Lecture: Non-Western IR: Different perspectives**

- Qin, Y. (2010). "Why is there no Chinese International Relations Theory?" In: Acharaya, A. and Buzan, B. (Eds) *Non Western International Relations Theory*, 26-50. New York: Routledge.
- Tadjbakhsh, S. (2010). "International Relations Theory and the Islamic worldview". In: Acharaya, A. and Buzan, B. (Eds) *Non Western International Relations Theory*, 174-196. New York: Routledge.
- Waever, O. (1998). "The Sociology of a not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations", *International Organization*, 52 (4): 687-727.

##### **Seminar: The State and International Development**

- Acemoglu, D. and Robinson, J.A. (2010). "Why is Africa Poor", *Economic History of Developing Regions*, 25 (1): 21-50.
- Chang, H. (2002). "Breaking the mould: an institutionalist political economy alternative to the neo-liberal theory of the market and the state", *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 26 (5): 539-559.
- Leftwich, A. (1995). "Bringing Politics Back In: Towards a Model of the Developmental State", *Journal of Development Studies*, 31 (3): 400-425.

##### **Debate: International Development Assistance**

Does development aid actually produce economic and social development? Are the currently agreed levels of development assistance sufficient? Are there ethical obligations to provide international assistance? If so, whose responsibility is engaged and who should 'do' aid?

Participants: Paul Collier, William Easterly, Dani Rodrik, Jeffrey Sachs, Host No. 5
--

- Collier, P. (2007). *The Bottom Billion: why the poorest countries are failing and what can be done about it*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Chapters 1 & 11)
- Easterly, W. (2003), "Can Foreign Aid Buy Growth?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17 (3): 23-48.
- Rodrik, D., Subramanian, A. and Trebbi, F. (2004). "Institutions Rule: The Primacy of Institutions over Geography and Integration in Economic Development", *Journal of Economic Growth*, 9 (2): 131-165.
- Sachs, J., McArthur, J.W., Schmidt-Traub, G., Kruk, M., Bahadur, C., Faye, M. and McCord, G. (2004). "Ending Africa's Poverty Trap", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1, 117-240. Issue 1; debaters taking this role and their opponents may want to look at the longer version by Sachs, J. (2005), *The End of Poverty*. Penguin Press (search online).

----- WEEK 8 EXAM WRITING WEEK – NO CLASSES -----

## **The Debates**

### *How they work:*

The following points are important when preparing your presentation:

- 1) Become your author by exploring their work beyond the article required for your 'audience'. You represent the person you have chosen and should defend their position as vehemently as they would themselves. Feel free to address the other debaters directly, but they may not respond to you at this point.
- 2) Your task is to persuade your audience. Make your presentation as clear and persuasive as you can! Make the most of your rhetorical skills. Provide evidence and good examples to support your arguments. Simplify and bring things down to the level of concrete implications. It is much better to get just the basics across well than to lose your audience in abstractions and esoteric detail. Preempt and/or attack the other participants' viewpoints and criticisms of you. Make clear why you are right and they are not!
- 3) Don't waste time on abstract positions. Everyone is supposed to have read the text. The text is only one expression of your views. Defend your underlying assumptions and the way you see the world. Explain what sort of policy advice you would give in contemporary situations, based on your views. You want the audience to wish that you were their foreign minister.
- 4) The analyst/chair has the job of summing up where the debaters actually disagree and try to unearth the underlying causes of the disagreement. For example, the debaters may be talking past each other to some extent. How so? The analyst has to take a bird's eye view of the debate and see where the faultlines lie and point them out for the audience
- 5) Open up the to the general audience as soon as possible. Debaters must respond to questions and comments from the audience and may also respond to each other (and to the analyst). Votes may be called to get an idea of whose position is most persuasive or popular. In the very end, debaters may also "drop their masks", that is say what they really think, but only after voting is over!

### *How to prepare (general points):*

You prepare both individually, for your individual roles, and also as a team. Under the guidance of your analyst/chair, you make sure that the different debaters do not talk past each other but address a manageable number of shared questions, i.e. you agree on what to disagree about. You also prepare one presentation together. A powerpoint, prezzi or another form of visual support program must be used to support your debate, but remember, time flies so be succinct and rehearse for length.

Try to prepare visual diagrams of your arguments to make their logic clear. Each disagreement will be partly about evidence (what are the relevant facts? who gets the facts straight?) and partly about theory (what can we assume about the nature of the subject matter? How can we make sense of the evidence?) Show where the debate is theoretical and where it focuses on evidence, and how theory and evidence are used together to make each debater's case. Debaters should present evidence for their viewpoints and attack the others' evidence.

### *How to prepare as a debater:*

Read carefully all the texts assigned for the debate. Read especially carefully the text(s) that represent your own position. Try to fully understand your own position by also looking at who you are (the bio of the author) and what else you have written (summaries of other work, book-length treatment of the same issue). Put your position and the arguments you make in the assigned text(s) into simple words and prepare your speech carefully. Understand your rivals' positions and find ways to respond to them. You must be prepared to defend yourself against them. Keep in mind that you must persuade your audience. This is only possible if they, first of all, can follow you (so keep things simple) and, second, find your arguments, evidence, and presentation more persuasive than the others'. This means that you need to be able to apply your theoretical views to concrete policy problems and challenges, i.e. to talk about how you would advise policy-makers to act on crucial contemporary issues in international politics. Note: While others (other debaters, analyst, and audience members) are speaking, it is important to take notes, so that you can remember what you should respond to later. Every criticism you fail to respond to weakens your position!

### *How to prepare as an analyst/chair:*

As an analyst/chair you must read all the texts assigned for the debate carefully. Then identify the basic faultlines. What is it the debaters are ultimately disagreeing on? What are the underlying causes of their

disagreement? Perhaps the debaters fall into identifiable camps? Further, think about the implications of their disagreement? Is it important for real-world issues? If so, why and how? Since you have only max. 10 minutes, focus on the most important observations you can make. Then, while the debaters present, listen carefully and take notes. You will likely need to adjust your prepared presentation a little to take into account what happens during the actual debate.

A second, important task of the analyst is to be the chair of the debate. This means you coordinate the preparation of the debaters (at least once all participants in the debate should meet to prepare and put together one presentation), give the floor to each of them, and enforce the time limits. You are also responsible for keeping the audience interested, by asking questions, inviting feedback, or arranging for intermezzo (media) elements.

*How to prepare as a member of the general audience:*

Make sure to read all assigned readings carefully. This is very important because it is not the debaters' job to tell you what's in the texts. They will assume you already know that and take off from there. You should also prepare one challenging question (regarding e.g. theoretical inconsistencies or problems with real-world implications) for each of the debaters and bring it with you to class – the debaters or analyst/chair can call upon you any time to present your questions. Note: You are strongly advised to take notes during the presentations, so that you can remember questions you might want to ask and comments you might want to make and also for your own benefit during the take-home exam.