

INTL 8210: International Organizations

Wednesdays, 6:30 pm - 9:15 pm

Candler Hall 117

Fall 2019

Dr. Amanda Murdie
327 Candler Hall
Email: murdie@uga.edu
Office Hours: 1:00 pm - 3:00 pm Wednesdays and other times by appointment

Course Description and Objectives

Why do states cooperate? What does international cooperation look like? Hundreds of international organizations have been created in the last century. In this class, we will focus on the genesis, design, operations, effectiveness, change, and death of international organizations. The focus of the course will primarily be on formal intergovernmental organizations, although some attention will be paid to informal governance arrangements and non-governmental organizations. After outlining the major life-cycle of organizations, our attention will turn to issue areas where international cooperation may be needed. The focus on this part of the course will be on current academic research and research classics within each issue area.

This is a graduate course designed to make students both consumers and producers of state-of-the-art research in this area. As such, the focus will be on the social scientific study of these phenomena. The course is **not** a history class or a class on current events. Though current and historical events will be discussed, your grade will not depend on your rote memorization or discussion of these events. Instead, the focus will be on understanding the potential for international cooperation and the problems that can complicate the effectiveness of international organizations. At the end of this course, students should be prepared for comprehensive exam questions relating to the topic and/or to begin dissertation or thesis level work on the topic. Students will produce first drafts of empirical papers that could be submitted to academic journals or be incorporated into their dissertations/theses.

Grading

Your course grade is calculated from the following components:

- **45%** - Practice Take-Home Comps - 7 page maximum, 4 opportunities, you will choose 2
- **25%** - Research Paper -Opportunity for Co-Authored Work
- **10%** - Active Participation
- **20%** - Outside Presentations - at least one of each - 10 minute outside reading presentation and 10 minute outside dataset presentation

Practice Take-Home Comps

The goal of the exams in this class is to offer you a low-cost way to prepare for comprehensive exams. I will provide 4 opportunities for mini take-home comps; you will complete two of these on your own in the time period before the next class meeting. For each opportunity, you will be given a choice of two questions for which you will craft one 5-7 page response. A rubric is provided. Your response to this question should demonstrate that you grasp the basic arguments of the readings and are able to synthesize and critique the social scientific literature we've gone over. Further, your response should demonstrate that you are able to apply these arguments to new situations. No outside reading is required.

Research Paper

Peer-reviewed publications are increasingly required to get an academic (or even non-academic) job after a PhD. They are also becoming common in applications from MA/MIP/MPA students wanting think-tank work. In order to improve the likelihood of you having a publication when you finish your degree, I'm going to require you to prepare a 3,500 to 8,000 word (~15 pages - ~25 pages) empirical paper draft this semester. These papers can be similar to the requirements of a "Research Note" at *IO* or at *ISQ*. This final project will be due December 4th at 11:59 pm, emailed to murdie@uga.edu.

The project can be on any topic related to international organizations and has to include: (1) a 150-200 word abstract, (2) statement of the research question, (3) a brief review of the existing literature on the topic, (3) your theoretical argument, (4) at least one hypothesis that flows from this argument, (5) an empirical evaluation of this hypothesis (quantitative or qualitative), (6) a conclusion that states how your project adds to what we know about the topic. I am not teaching this course as a methods course, but I do expect you to consult with me as to your choice of methods and your data sources, etc. We'll have some small meetings throughout the semester during the last 30 minutes of class so you can get some feedback.

Most work in political science is coauthored. Coauthored work also typically gets placed in higher research outlets. As such, I am fine with your research paper being coauthored. The overall level of the final product must meet a slightly higher standard, reflective of the joint effort.

Please note: if you are using this paper for another class or if this paper comes from something you worked on in another class, please let me know so we can discuss options. Since the goal is to have something that could be sent out for peer review, I want to see a semester's worth of progress, BUT I am ok with you continuing on with a project that fits the class topic.

To ensure that you don't procrastinate in this process, on the following dates, you are required to **email me** with information as to your research paper. I will offer you feedback at each of these junctures. Feel free to come see me or email me your concerns prior to these dates as well.

- September 11: A general topic (1 to 2 sentences is fine) - *Review of International Organizations*, *International Organization*, or *International Studies Quarterly* are great journals to look in for topics
- October 9: A research question (this is actually the hardest part) (1 to 2 sentences is fine)
- October 30: A general statement of your theoretical argument and hypotheses (2 paragraphs for your theoretical argument, a couple of sentences for each hypothesis)
- November 13: A brief statement on how you will empirically evaluate your hypotheses (identify the dependent and independent variables, list how you will measure these variables and the method to be used)
- December 4: Final Project Due by 11:59 pm to murdie@uga.edu

I will provide feedback but not grade the content at each of these steps. Your final project grade will be graded solely on your completed research proposal, in accordance with the rubric.

Active Participation

I have also allotted 10% of your grade to *participation*. To receive full credit for the participation component of this grade, simply come to class after having completed **all** the required readings for the week and offer your insights and questions during the class. You will receive full credit for this portion of your grade if it is clear that you actually read and reflected on the readings. Offering tangential or off-topic comments will harm your grade. Feel free to come see me as to your participation grade.

A note on participation:

Your active participation is very important. Always feel free to state your opinions in a way that invites discussion. No outside knowledge of international relations or political science scholarship, of history, or of current events will be necessary for effective class participation. Discussion of other scholarship, history, and current events will certainly be welcome when they are relevant, but **careful reading** of the materials assigned for this course and **concentrated thinking** about the ideas raised in class will be a sufficient basis from which to contribute profitably to class discussion. The first step toward participating in class is attending class.

Outside Presentations

There is simply too much great research to become an expert on this topic reading just five articles a week for a semester. In order to help all of us grasp more material each week in an efficient manner, there will be (at least) two outside presentations each week. One of these presentations will be on a recommended reading from the recommended reading list for each week. The other presentation will be on a dataset or data-source that relates to that week's topic. You are required to do **at least** one of each of these presentation types during the semester.

For the recommended reading presentation, you will (1) present an outline of one of the RECOMMENDED readings (each student presents one reading), (2) provide the class with typed notes (1-2 pages) on the reading, and (3) offer discussion questions for the class that connect the reading to what we have all read for that week's class. Your presentation cannot be more than 10 minutes and doesn't require any audio-video aids. There are three goals for these presentations: (1) practice coming up with the main idea of articles and presenting that idea to others, (2) practice presenting with a **strict** time limit, (3) engage with a larger set of literature than you could have read by yourself for the week. This should help in preparing for comprehensive exams.

For the dataset presentation, you will (1) present a general overview of a dataset chosen from the related datasets section of the course reading list, (2) provide the class with typed notes (1-2 pages) that outline the source, coverage, and overview of the dataset, and (3) provide your general overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the dataset. The goal of this assignment is to increase familiarity with common datasets used in this area of research. Of course, you are welcome to use whatever methodology you want in your work. Nonetheless, a passing familiarity with extant large-N datasets is now necessary for all researchers.

We will get a calendar of presentations together during the first class.

Grading Scale:

Your final grade will be calculated on the following scale:

- 94 to 100 - A
- 90 to 93.9̄ - A-
- 87 to 89.9̄ - B+

- 84 to 86.9̄ - B
- 80 to 83.9̄ - B-
- 77 to 79.9̄ - C+
- 74 to 76.9̄ - C
- 70 to 73.9̄ - C-
- 60 to 69.9̄ - D
- 59 and below - F

Useful Information and University Policies

Attendance and Missing Class

I realize you are adults with rich and full lives outside of class. As such, I do not have an attendance policy, *per se*. You are solely responsible for getting any materials you miss. However, it's **very** hard to get the participation points if you aren't in class.

University Honor Code and Academic Honesty Policy

The following is taken verbatim from <https://curriculumsystems.uga.edu/curriculum/courses/syllabus>:

“As a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to abide by the University’s academic honesty policy, “A Culture of Honesty,” and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards described in “A Culture of Honesty” found at: <https://ovpi.uga.edu/academic-honesty/academic-honesty-policy>. Lack of knowledge of the academic honesty policy is not a reasonable explanation for a violation. Questions related to course assignments and the academic honesty policy should be directed to the instructor.”

Changes to the Syllabus Could Occur

The following is taken verbatim from <https://curriculumsystems.uga.edu/curriculum/courses/syllabus>:

“The course syllabus is a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary.”

Disability Services

The following is taken verbatim from https://drc.uga.edu/content_page/sample-access-statements:

“If you plan to request accommodations for a disability, please register with the Disability Resource Center. They can be reached by visiting Clark Howell Hall, calling 706-542-8719 (voice) or 706-542-8778 (TTY), or by visiting <http://drc.uga.edu>”

The following is taken verbatim from <https://online.uga.edu/documents/ugasyllabusguidelines.pdf>:

“Students with disabilities who require reasonable accommodations in order to participate in course activities or meet course requirements should contact the instructor or designate during regular office hours or by appointment.”

Useful Campus Resources

There are many campus resources that can help you with your academic performance and assist you during the semester. I urge you to check out the Division of Academic Enhancement and the Writing Center.

Some material in this course contains references to violence. I urge you to take your mental health seriously. There are campus resources to help.

Course Readings

No book purchases are necessary for this class. All of the readings come from academic journal articles and book chapters. If the readings cannot be easily downloaded from Google Scholar on campus, readings can be found on the eLearningCommons page for this course. I expect you to have completed the readings **before** coming to each week's class. When doing all of your readings, it works best to identify each reading's research question, theory, hypotheses, empirical analysis, and conclusion. Also, try to identify one or two problems or questions you have with the work. I remember readings best when I've actually taken the time to write out some notes; it might work for you, too. If nothing else, it will definitely help in preparing for comprehensive exams.

Class Outline

August 14: Introduction to Course and Course Set Up

Recommended Readings:

- Pevehouse, J. and von Borzyskowski, I., 2016. International organizations in world politics. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Organizations*.
- Karns, M.P., Mingst, K.A. and Stiles, K.W., 2015. The Challenges of Global Governance. In *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance*. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienner, pp.3-34.
- Reinalda, B., 2013. International organization as a field of research since 1910. In *Routledge handbook of international organization* (pp. 27-50). Routledge.

August 21: Anarchy and Cooperation

Required Readings:

- Axelrod, R. and Keohane, R.O., 1985. Achieving cooperation under anarchy: Strategies and institutions. *World Politics*, 38(1), pp.226-254.
- Oye, K.A., 1985. Explaining cooperation under anarchy: Hypotheses and strategies. *World Politics*, 38(1), pp.1-24.
- Mearsheimer, J.J., 1994. The false promise of international institutions. *International Security*, 19(3), pp.5-49.
- Keohane, R.O. and Martin, L.L., 1995. The promise of institutionalist theory. *International Security*, 20(1), pp.39-51.
- Krasner, S.D., 1991. Global communications and national power: Life on the Pareto frontier. *World Politics*, 43(3), pp.336-366.

Recommended Readings:

- Grieco, J.M., 1988. Anarchy and the limits of cooperation: a realist critique of the newest liberal institutionalism. *International Organization*, 42(3), pp.485-507.
- Snidal, D., 1985. Coordination versus prisoners' dilemma: Implications for international cooperation and regimes. *American Political Science Review*, 79(4), pp.923-942.
- Reiter, D., 2015. Should we leave behind the subfield of international relations?. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 18, pp.481-499.
- Lake, D.A., 2007. Escape from the state of nature: Authority and hierarchy in world politics. *International Security*, 32(1), pp.47-79.

Related Datasets:

- Quality of Governance (A Good Starting Point for Any Research Project):
 - <https://qog.pol.gu.se/data/datadownloads/qogstandarddata>

August 28: Rational Design of Institutions

Required Readings:

- Voeten, E., 2019. Making Sense of the Design of International Institutions. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 22, pp.147-163.
- Koremenos, B., Lipson, C. and Snidal, D., 2001. The rational design of international institutions. *International Organization*, 55(4), pp.761-799.
- Abbott, K.W. and Snidal, D., 1998. Why states act through formal international organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(1), pp.3-32.
- Fearon, J.D., 1998. Bargaining, enforcement, and international cooperation. *International Organization*, 52(2), pp.269-305.
- Vabulas, F. and Snidal, D., 2013. Organization without delegation: Informal intergovernmental organizations (IIGOs) and the spectrum of intergovernmental arrangements. *The Review of International Organizations*, 8(2), pp.193-220.

Recommended Readings:

- Duffield, J.S., 2003. The limits of "Rational design". *International Organization*, 57(2), pp.411-430.
- Lake, D.A., 1996. Anarchy, hierarchy, and the variety of international relations. *International Organization*, 50(1), pp.1-33.
- Rosendorff, B.P. and Milner, H.V., 2001. The optimal design of international trade institutions: Uncertainty and escape. *International Organization*, 55(4), pp.829-857.
- Koremenos, B., 2005. Contracting around international uncertainty. *American Political Science Review*, 99(4), pp.549-565.
- Wendt, A., 2001. Driving with the rearview mirror: On the rational science of institutional design. *International Organization*, 55(4), pp.1019-1049.

Related Datasets:

- Formal Intergovernmental Organizations:
 - <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0022343308096159>
 - <https://www.volgy.org/projects-and-data>
- COW IGO Dataset:
 - <http://www.correlatesofwar.org/>
 - <http://www.correlatesofwar.org/data-sets/IGOs>
- UN Treaty Collection:
 - <https://treaties.un.org/>

September 4: Compliance

Handout Take-Home Comp 1

Required Readings:

- Chayes, A. and Chayes, A.H., 1993. On compliance. *International Organization*, 47(2), pp.175-205.
- Downs, G.W., Rocke, D.M. and Barsoom, P.N., 1996. Is the good news about compliance good news about cooperation?. *International Organization*, 50(3), pp.379-406.
- Simmons, B.A., 2000. International law and state behavior: Commitment and compliance in international monetary affairs. *American Political Science Review*, 94(4), pp.819-835.
- Von Stein, J., 2005. Do treaties constrain or screen? Selection bias and treaty compliance. *American Political Science Review*, 99(4), pp.611-622.
- Simmons, B.A. and Hopkins, D.J., 2005. The constraining power of international treaties: Theory and methods. *American Political Science Review*, 99(4), pp.623-631.

Recommended Readings:

- Carnegie, A., 2014. States held hostage: Political hold-up problems and the effects of international institutions. *American Political Science Review*, 108(1), pp.54-70.
- Grieco, J.M., Gelpi, C.F. and Warren, T.C., 2009. When preferences and commitments collide: the effect of relative partisan shifts on international treaty compliance. *International Organization*, 63(2), pp.341-355.
- Hurd, I., 1999. Legitimacy and authority in international politics. *International Organization*, 53(2), pp.379-408.
- Gilligan, M.J., 2006. Is enforcement necessary for effectiveness? A model of the international criminal regime. *International Organization*, 60(4), pp.935-967.

Related Datasets:

- The Continent of International Law:
 - <http://www.isr.umich.edu/cps/coil/>
- PA-X Peace Agreement Database and Dataset Version 1
 - <https://datashare.is.ed.ac.uk/handle/10283/3298>

September 11: Institutions as Organizations

Take-Home Comp 1 Due

Required Readings:

- Barnett, M.N. and Finnemore, M., 1999. The politics, power, and pathologies of international organizations. *International Organization*, 53(4), pp.699-732.
- Johnson, T., 2013. Institutional design and bureaucrats' impact on political control. *The Journal of Politics*, 75(1), pp.183-197.
- Nielson, D.L. and Tierney, M.J., 2003. Delegation to international organizations: Agency theory and World Bank environmental reform. *International Organization*, 57(2), pp.241-276.
- Bauer, M.W. and Ege, J., 2016. Bureaucratic autonomy of international organizations' secretariats. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 23(7), pp.1019-1037.
- Lall, R., 2017. Beyond institutional design: Explaining the performance of international organizations. *International Organization*, 71(2), pp.245-280.

Recommended Readings:

- Farrell, H. and Newman, A., 2016. The new interdependence approach: theoretical development and empirical demonstration. *Review of International Political Economy*, 23(5), pp.713-736.
- Kleine, M., 2013. Trading control: national fiefdoms in international organizations. *International Theory*, 5(3), pp.321-346.
- Hanrieder, T., 2014. Gradual change in international organisations: Agency theory and historical institutionalism. *Politics*, 34(4), pp.324-333.
- Johnson, T. and Urpelainen, J., 2014. International bureaucrats and the formation of intergovernmental organizations: Institutional design discretion sweetens the pot. *International Organization*, 68(1), pp.177-209.

Related Datasets:

- AidData:
 - <http://aiddata.org/>
- World Bank Governance Indicators:
 - <https://datacatalog.worldbank.org/dataset/worldwide-governance-indicators>

September 18: Institutional Change and Death

Required Readings:

- Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, M., 2018. Death of international organizations. The organizational ecology of intergovernmental organizations, 1815–2015. *The Review of International Organizations*, pp.1-32.
- von Borzyskowski, I. and Vabulas, F., 2019. Hello, goodbye: When do states withdraw from international organizations?. *The Review of International Organizations*, pp.1-32.
- Abbott, K.W., Green, J.F. and Keohane, R.O., 2016. Organizational ecology and institutional change in global governance. *International Organization*, 70(2), pp.247-277.
- Gray, J., 2018. Life, death, or zombie? The vitality of international organizations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(1), pp.1-13.
- Kim, Y. and Nieman, M.D., Leaving the Party: Power Asymmetries and Membership Discontinuity within International Organizations. Working Paper. Available at: <http://static1.1.sqspcdn.com/static/f/1468252/27917>

Recommended Readings:

- von Borzyskowski, I. and Vabulas, F., 2019. Credible commitments? Explaining IGO suspensions to sanction political backsliding. *International Studies Quarterly*, 63(1), pp.139-152.
- Dijkstra, H., 2019. Who gets to live forever? An Institutional Theory on the Life and Death of International Organizations. ECPR Joint Sessions. available at: https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Hylke_Dijkstra/publications/who-gets-to-live-forever-An-Institutional-Theory-on-the-Life-and-Death-of-International-Organizations.pdf
- Walter, S., 2018, March. The mass politics of international disintegration. In presentation at the International Relations research seminar, Harvard University, available at: <http://www.stefaniewalter.de/app/download/9391>

Related Datasets:

- IMF Datasets:
 - <http://data.imf.org/?sk=388DFA60-1D26-4ADE-B505-A05A558D9A42>
- KOF Globalization Index:
 - <https://kof.ethz.ch/en/forecasts-and-indicators/indicators/kof-globalisation-index.html>

September 25: International Non-Governmental Organizations & IGOs

Required Readings:

- Johnson, E. and Prakash, A., 2007. NGO research program: A collective action perspective. *Policy Sciences*, 40(3), pp.221-240.
- Tallberg, J., Dellmuth, L.M., Agné, H. and Duit, A., 2018. NGO influence in international organizations: Information, access and exchange. *British Journal of Political Science*, 48(1), pp.213-238.
- Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., Squatrito, T. and Jönsson, C., 2014. Explaining the transnational design of international organizations. *International Organization*, 68(4), pp.741-774.

- Cheng, H., Ma, P., Murdie, A., and Wang, Y. 2019. “Communities and Brokers: How the Transnational Advocacy Network Simultaneously Provides Social Power and Exacerbates Global Inequalities” Working Paper.- current copy provided by Dr. Murdie as date approaches
- Reimann, K.D., 2006. A view from the top: International politics, norms and the worldwide growth of NGOs. *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(1), pp.45-67.

Recommended Readings:

- Dellmuth, L.M. and Tallberg, J., 2017. Advocacy strategies in global governance: Inside versus outside lobbying. *Political Studies*, 65(3), pp.705-723.
- Murdie, A., 2014. The ties that bind: A network analysis of human rights international nongovernmental organizations. *British Journal of Political Science*, 44(1), pp.1-27
- Bloodgood, E.A. and Clough, E., 2017. Transnational Advocacy Networks: A Complex Adaptive Systems Simulation Model of the Boomerang Effect. *Social Science Computer Review*, 35(3), pp.319-335.
- Steffek, J., 2013. Explaining cooperation between IGOs and NGOs—push factors, pull factors, and the policy cycle. *Review of International Studies*, 39(4), pp.993-1013.

Related Datasets:

- Transnational Social Movement Organization Dataset:
 - <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/studies/33863>
- Yearbook of International Organizations:
 - <https://uia.org/yearbook>

October 2: UN Security Council

Handout Take-Home Comp 2

Required Readings:

- Bueno de Mesquita, B. and Smith, A., 2010. The pernicious consequences of UN Security Council membership. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 54(5), pp.667-686.
- Shepherd, L.J., 2008. Power and authority in the production of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325. *International Studies Quarterly*, 52(2), pp.383-404.
- Binder, M. and Heupel, M., 2015. The legitimacy of the UN Security Council: Evidence from recent General Assembly debates. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(2), pp.238-250.
- Voeten, E., 2005. The political origins of the UN Security Council’s ability to legitimize the use of force. *International Organization*, 59(3), pp.527-557.
- Dreher, A., Sturm, J.E. and Vreeland, J.R., 2009. Development aid and international politics: Does membership on the UN Security Council influence World Bank decisions?. *Journal of Development Economics*, 88(1), pp.1-18.

Recommended Readings:

- Prantl, J., 2005. Informal groups of states and the UN Security Council. *International Organization*, 59(3), pp.559-592.
- Chapman, T.L. and Reiter, D., 2004. The United Nations Security Council and the rally'round the flag effect. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 48(6), pp.886-909.
- Voeten, E., 2001. Outside options and the logic of Security Council action. *American Political Science Review*, 95(4), pp.845-858.
- Thompson, A., 2006. Coercion through IOs: The Security Council and the logic of information transmission. *International Organization*, 60(1), pp.1-34.
- Allen, S.H. and Yuen, A.T., 2014. The politics of peacekeeping: UN Security Council oversight across peacekeeping missions. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(3), pp.621-632.

Related Datasets:

- UN General Assembly Voting Data:
 - <https://dataverse.harvard.edu/dataset.xhtml?persistentId=hdl:1902.1/12379>
- Global Peace Operations Review Data:
 - <https://peaceoperationsreview.org/featured-data>

October 9: Military Alliances

Take-Home Comp 2 Due

Required Readings:

- Leeds, B.A., 2003. Do alliances deter aggression? The influence of military alliances on the initiation of militarized interstate disputes. *American Journal of Political Science*, 47(3), pp.427-439.
- Benson, B.V. and Clinton, J.D., 2016. Assessing the variation of formal military alliances. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 60(5), pp.866-898.
- Conrad, J., 2017. How Democratic Alliances Solve the Power Parity Problem. *British Journal of Political Science*, 47(4), pp.893-913.
- Kinne, B.J., 2018. Defense Cooperation Agreements and the Emergence of a Global Security Network. *International Organization*, 72(4), pp.799-837.
- Reiter, D., 1994. Learning, realism, and alliances: the weight of the shadow of the past. *World Politics*, 46(4), pp.490-526.

Recommended Readings:

- Johnson, J.C., 2015. The cost of security: Foreign policy concessions and military alliances. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(5), pp.665-679.
- Warren, T.C., 2016. Modeling the coevolution of international and domestic institutions: Alliances, democracy, and the complex path to peace. *Journal of Peace Research*, 53(3), pp.424-441.

- Fang, S., Johnson, J.C. and Leeds, B.A., 2014. To concede or to resist? The restraining effect of military alliances. *International Organization*, 68(4), pp.775-809.
- Chiba, D., Johnson, J.C. and Leeds, B.A., 2015. Careful commitments: Democratic states and alliance design. *The Journal of Politics*, 77(4), pp.968-982.
- Gibler, D.M. and Wolford, S., 2006. Alliances, then democracy: An examination of the relationship between regime type and alliance formation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 50(1), pp.129-153.

Related Datasets:

- COW Formal Alliances:
 - <http://www.correlatesofwar.org/data-sets/formal-alliances>
- The Alliance Treaty Obligations and Provisions (ATOP) Dataset:
 - <http://www.atopdata.org/>

October 16: Nuclear Cooperation

Required Readings:

- Adler, E., 1992. The emergence of cooperation: national epistemic communities and the international evolution of the idea of nuclear arms control. *International Organization*, 46(1), pp.101-145.
- Fuhrmann, M., 2009. Spreading temptation: proliferation and peaceful nuclear cooperation agreements. *International Security*, 34(1), pp.7-41.
- Bluth, C., Kroenig, M., Lee, R., Sailor, W.C. and Fuhrmann, M., 2010. Civilian nuclear cooperation and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. *International Security*, 35(1), pp.184-200.
- Fuhrmann, M. and Lupu, Y., 2016. Do arms control treaties work? Assessing the effectiveness of the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(3), pp.530-539.
- Colgan, J.D. and Miller, N.L., 2019. Rival Hierarchies and the Origins of Nuclear Technology Sharing. *International Studies Quarterly*, 63(2), pp.310-321.

Recommended Readings:

- Fuhrmann, M., 2009. Taking a walk on the supply side: The determinants of civilian nuclear cooperation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53(2), pp.181-208.
- Adler-Nissen, R. and Drieschova, A., 2019. Track-Change Diplomacy: Technology, Affordances, and the Practice of International Negotiations. *International Studies Quarterly*. forthcoming.
- Bas, M.A. and Coe, A.J., 2018. Give peace a (Second) chance: A theory of nonproliferation deals. *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(3), pp.606-617.
- Brown, R.L. and Kaplow, J.M., 2014. Talking peace, making weapons: IAEA technical cooperation and nuclear proliferation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 58(3), pp.402-428.
- Fuhrmann, M. and Berejikian, J.D., 2012. Disaggregating Noncompliance: Abstention versus Predation in the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 56(3), pp.355-381.

Related Datasets:

- Nuclear Cooperation Agreement (NCA) Dataset:
 - <http://www.matthewfuhrmann.com/datasets.html>
- The international technological nuclear cooperation landscape: A new dataset and network analysis:
 - <http://pure.iiasa.ac.at/id/eprint/15756/>
- IAEA Databases:
 - <https://www.iaea.org/resources/databases>

October 23: Trade Cooperation

Handout Take-Home Comp 3

Required Readings:

- Büthe, T. and Milner, H.V., 2008. The politics of foreign direct investment into developing countries: increasing FDI through international trade agreements?. *American Journal of Political Science*, 52(4), pp.741-762.
- Davis, C.L. and Wilf, M., 2017. Joining the Club: Accession to the GATT/WTO. *The Journal of Politics*, 79(3), pp.964-978.
- Rose, A.K., 2004. Do we really know that the WTO increases trade?. *American Economic Review*, 94(1), pp.98-114.
- Tomz, M., Goldstein, J.L. and Rivers, D., 2007. Do we really know that the WTO increases trade? Comment. *American Economic Review*, 97(5), pp.2005-2018.
- Rose, A.K., 2007. Do we really know that the WTO increases trade? Reply. *American Economic Review*, 97(5), pp.2019-2025.
- Kucik, J. and Pelc, K.J., 2016. Do International Rulings Have Spillover Effects?: The View from Financial Markets. *World Politics*, 68(4), pp.713-751.

Recommended Readings:

- Kerner, A., 2009. Why should I believe you? The costs and consequences of bilateral investment treaties. *International Studies Quarterly*, 53(1), pp.73-102.
- Johns, L. and Wellhausen, R.L., 2016. Under one roof: Supply chains and the protection of foreign investment. *American Political Science Review*, 110(1), pp.31-51.
- Kucik, J. and Reinhardt, E., 2008. Does flexibility promote cooperation? An application to the global trade regime. *International Organization*, 62(3), pp.477-505.
- Chaudoin, S., Kucik, J. and Pelc, K., 2016. Do WTO disputes actually increase trade?. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(2), pp.294-306.
- Kucik, J., 2012. The domestic politics of institutional design: Producer preferences over trade agreement rules. *Economics & Politics*, 24(2), pp.95-118.

Related Datasets:

- WTO Data:
 - <https://data.wto.org/>
- WTO Dispute Settlement Database:
 - <https://datacatalog.worldbank.org/dataset/wto-dispute-settlement-database>
- PTA Design Data:
 - <https://sites.google.com/site/jeffreycucik/pta-data>

October 30: Environment

Take-Home Comp 3 Due

Required Readings:

- Bättig, M.B. and Bernauer, T., 2009. National institutions and global public goods: are democracies more cooperative in climate change policy?. *International organization*, 63(2), pp.281-308.
- Bernauer, T., 2013. Climate change politics. *Annual review of political science*, 16, pp.421-448.
- Bechtel, M.M., Genovese, F. and Scheve, K.F., 2017. Interests, norms and support for the provision of global public goods: the case of climate co-operation. *British Journal of Political Science*, Forthcoming.
- Köppel, M. and Sprinz, D.F., 2019. Do Binding Beat Nonbinding Agreements? Regulating International Water Quality. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Forthcoming.
- Allan, B.B., 2017. Producing the climate: States, scientists, and the constitution of global governance objects. *International Organization*, 71(1), pp.131-162.

Recommended Readings:

- Von Stein, J., 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), pp.243-268.
- Shim, J.M. and Shin, E., 2019. Drivers of ratification rates in global biodiversity governance: local environmentalism, orientation toward global governance, and peer pressure. *Environmental Politics*, Forthcoming.
- Böhmelt, T. and Spilker, G., 2016. The interaction of international institutions from a social network perspective. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*, 16(1), pp.67-89.

Related Datasets:

- Climate Change Cooperation Index:
 - https://www.researchgate.net/publication/257588235_National_climate_policies_in_international_comparison
- International Environmental Agreements (IEA) Database Project:
 - <https://iea.uoregon.edu/>
- Environmental Treaty Status Data Set:
 - <https://sedac.ciesin.columbia.edu/data/set/entri-treaty-status-2012>

November 6: Democratization

Required Readings:

- Mansfield, E.D. and Pevehouse, J.C., 2008. Democratization and the varieties of international organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52(2), pp.269-294.
- Nygård, H.M., 2017. The role of international organizations in regime transitions: How IGOs can tie a dictator's hands. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 34(4), pp.406-430.
- Torfason, M.T. and Ingram, P., 2010. The global rise of democracy: A network account. *American Sociological Review*, 75(3), pp.355-377.
- Poast, P. and Urpelainen, J., 2013. Fit and feasible: Why democratizing states form, not join, international organizations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 57(4), pp.831-841.
- Libman, A. and Obydenkova, A., 2013. Informal governance and participation in non-democratic international organizations. *The Review of International Organizations*, 8(2), pp.221-243.

Recommended Readings:

- Poast, P. and Urpelainen, J., 2015. How international organizations support democratization: preventing authoritarian reversals or promoting consolidation?. *World Politics*, 67(1), pp.72-113.
- Dorussen, H. and Ward, H., 2008. Intergovernmental organizations and the Kantian peace: A network perspective. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52(2), pp.189-212.
- Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T. and Squatrito, T., 2016. Democratic memberships in international organizations: Sources of institutional design. *The Review of International Organizations*, 11(1), pp.59-87.
- Kahn-Nisser, S., 2018. Linkage leverage democratization and liberalization: is promoting democracy the same as promoting human rights?. *Policy Studies*, 39(1), pp.90-107.

Related Datasets:

- Organizing Democracy dataset:
 - <http://www.paulpoast.com/organizing-dem-replication/4589453272>
- V-dem dataset:
 - <https://www.v-dem.net/en/data/data-version-9/>

November 13: Humanitarian/Human Rights International Law

Handout Take-Home Comp 4

Required Readings:

- Morrow, J.D., 2007. When do states follow the laws of war?. *American Political Science Review*, 101(3), pp.559-572.
- Hillebrecht, C., 2012. Implementing international human rights law at home: Domestic politics and the European Court of Human Rights. *Human Rights Review*, 13(3), pp.279-301.

- Wallace, G., 2012. Regulating conflict: Historical legacies and state commitment to the laws of war. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 8(2), pp.151-172.
- Lupu, Y. and Wallace, G.P., 2019. Violence, Nonviolence, and the Effects of International Human Rights Law. *American Journal of Political Science*, 63(2), pp.411-426.
- Lupu, Y., 2013. Best evidence: The role of information in domestic judicial enforcement of international human rights agreements. *International Organization*, 67(3), pp.469-503.

Recommended Readings:

- Wallace, G.P., 2012. Welcome Guests, or Inescapable Victims? The Causes of Prisoner Abuse in War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 56(6), pp.955-981.
- Valentino, B., Huth, P. and Croco, S., 2006. Covenants without the sword international law and the protection of civilians in times of war. *World Politics*, 58(3), pp.339-377.
- Wallace, G.P., 2019. Condemning or Condoning the Perpetrators? International Humanitarian Law and Attitudes Toward Wartime Violence. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 44(1), pp.192-226.
- Wallace, G.P., 2014. Martial law? Military experience, international law, and support for torture. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(3), pp.501-514.
- Vreeland, J.R., 2008. Political institutions and human rights: Why dictatorships enter into the United Nations Convention Against Torture. *International Organization*, 62(1), pp.65-101.

Related Datasets:

- The database of human rights agreements:
 - <http://politicsir.cass.anu.edu.au/research/projects/human-rights/un-human-rights-agreements/data/agreements>

November 20: Dr. Murdie in Brussels for Research Foundation -Flanders (FWO) Research Panels

Take-Home Comp 4 Due - EMAILED TO murdie@uga.edu

*In lieu of class, Dr. Murdie will set up individual appointments with all students as to their final papers

November 27: UGA Holiday - Thanksgiving

December 4: Final Paper Emailed to murdie@uga.edu

Research Paper Rubric

Component	Performance Description	Performance Level	Comments on Component
Motivation/Introduction	<p>paper's opening presents a "puzzle" or story that helps with the identification of the research question and states the importance of the project</p> <p>4= a full introduction is provided are there but underdeveloped</p> <p>3 = introduction is missing key parts necessary for published work</p> <p>2 = the paper's topic is unclear or muddled</p> <p>1 = complete failure at a social science introduction</p>		
Statement of the Research Question	<p>5 = clearly identifies a research question that is consistent with the identified topic, research question is concise and insightful</p> <p>4 = acceptably identifies a research question consistent with topic</p> <p>3 = somewhat difficult to identify what the research question is and/or how it relates to the identified topic</p> <p>2 = significant failure to state a research question</p> <p>1 = complete failure to state a research question</p>		
Literature Review (can be combined with theoretical argument section)	<p>5 = outlines the existing social scientific literature on the topic, using at least 10 different academic sources, shows how question has or has not be addressed in the existing literature, discusses the literature in a coherent, integrated, and connected manner</p> <p>4 = uses the required source materials but treatment somewhat lacks connection and integration (ie literature review could be provided only in a chronological way, major connections are inadequately addressed)</p> <p>3 = does not use the required number of academic sources but does attempt to connect the literature</p> <p>2 = uses the required source materials but complete lack of connection and integration</p> <p>1 = complete failure to provide a coherent literature review with the required number of sources</p>		
Theoretical Argument	<p>5 = provides a clear and logical theoretical argument that could be used to justify an answer to the research question, connections are made to existing literature and potential counterarguments are anticipated and addressed</p> <p>4 =theoretical argument presented but underdeveloped</p> <p>3 = theoretical argument is provided but justifications are weak and unclear</p> <p>2 = significant failure to justify the hypothesis provided</p> <p>1 = complete failure to justify the hypothesis provided</p>		
Hypotheses	<p>5= fully provides testable and falsifiable statements of empirical expectation(s) which are consistent with the theoretical argument provided it is easy to determine a dependent variable and an independent variable from all hypotheses, NOTE: only 1 hypothesis is required</p> <p>4 = adequately provides statements of empirical expectation(s) consistent with theoretical argument</p>		

- 3 = provides empirical expectation(s) but not clear how expectations are consistent with theoretical argument
- 2 = significant failure to provide empirical expectation(s)
- 1 = complete lack of empirical expectation(s)

Empirical Research Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 = clearly and completely outlines a quantitative or qualitative way to evaluate each hypothesis 4 = adequately outlines a quantitative or qualitative way to evaluate hypotheses 3 = a research design is attempted but incomplete 2 = serious weaknesses in an incomplete research design 1 = complete failure in providing a research design
Empirical Research Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 = empirics conducted in a reasonable way and presented in line with discipline standards 4 = empirics show some serious flaws 1 = complete failure in providing empirics
Mechanics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 = writing style adds to the overall quality of the paper, citation style is consistent, between 3500-8000 words 4 = minor problems with citation, spelling, grammar, or sentence structure, between 3500-8000 words 3 = writing mechanics detract from the quality of the paper, between 3500-8000 words 2 = serious writing and citation errors 1 = writing and citation errors too numerous for college work
Followed all steps for feedback during semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 = Yes 1 = No

Additional Comments:

Final Grade:

Take Home Mini Comp Rubric

Components	Unacceptable 0 Points	Acceptable	Good	Excellent Full Credit
Answers Questions Posed for the Essay (5 points)	fails to provide an answer to all questions 0 POINTS	attempts to answer the majority of the questions, but missing at least one answer 2 POINTS	answers all questions but little attention to at least one question 4 POINTS	answers all questions posed in the essay prompt 5 POINTS
Argument (5 points)	presentation of opinion 0 POINTS	argument with weak sources 2 POINTS	argument with sources provided, not all logical links provided 4 POINTS	clear thesis statement, logical and well support argument 5 POINTS
Conceptualization (4 points)	does not demonstrate course knowledge 0 POINTS	concepts presented only in basic literature review format 1.5 POINTS	integrated concepts 2.5 POINTS	concepts presented with innovative content/discussion 4 POINTS
Content & Vocabulary (3 point)	vocabulary for course missing 0 POINTS	vocabulary for course only "name-dropped" 1 POINT	vocabulary presented but not discussed sufficiently 2 POINTS	vocabulary presented in a coherent manner 3 POINTS
Organization (2 points)	disorganized presentation 0 POINTS	a general flow can be seen but is not consistent or coherent 1 POINT	relatively coherent organization, some paragraphs out of place 1.5 POINTS	paper's organization helps in the presentation of the argument 2 POINTS
Mechanics (1 point)	distracting errors and/or completely too long or too short 0 POINTS	a few overlooked errors 0.33 POINTS	writing style could improve and/or slightly too long or too short 0.66 POINTS	well-written and correct length 1 POINT