

Seton Hall University

eRepository @ Seton Hall

Diplomacy Syllabi

School of Diplomacy and International
Relations

Spring 2014

DIPL 6002 International Organizations

Martin S. Edwards PhD
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/diplomacy-syllabi>

Recommended Citation

Edwards, Martin S. PhD, "DIPL 6002 International Organizations" (2014). *Diplomacy Syllabi*. 99.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/diplomacy-syllabi/99>

DIPL 6002: International Organizations

Professor Martin S. Edwards
Email: martin.edwards@shu.edu
Office: 106 McQuaid
Office Phone: 973-275-2507
Office Hours: By appointment

Course Objectives:

International Organizations (be they IGOs or NGOs) are often poorly understood, but they serve very real and important functions in our world. International relations would be profoundly different if they did not exist. Our goal in this class is three fold. First, we will trace the evolution of studies that address why international organizations are created. Second, we will discuss the functions that international organizations serve and the factors that shape their effectiveness. Third, we will apply this theoretical knowledge to empirical research on international organizations in the fields of political economy, security, the environment, and human rights.

That having been said, it is worth stressing that this is a graduate level course in IO. As a result, we will not be reviewing the design/functioning/operation of individual IOs *per se*. Our concern is more general: to understand why IOs are created, why they look the way they do, and how we better understand (both theoretically and empirically) the influence that they have.

Course Materials:

One required textbook has been ordered for this course.

Robert O. Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (ISBN: 0-691-02228-3).

Note: Students have also found the following book a good source for background materials:

Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst, *International Organizations: The Politics and Process of Global Governance* Lynne Rienner, 2004. (ISBN: 1-55587-963-2)

Articles will be available for downloading through the Blackboard page for this course.

Evaluation:

Your grade in this class will be based on the following:

Policy Analysis Assignment (50% of grade, as follows)
Annotated Bibliography (5%)
Blogpost (15%)
Final Paper (25%)
Peer Evaluation (5%)
“Reverse-Engineered Research Designs” (2@ 10% each)
Take-home Final Examination (30%)

More information on each of these elements can be found on the last page of the syllabus.

Other Course Policies:

Late work will not be accepted in this class.

There is no grade in this course for participation. Participation is part of your job.

Cases of cheating or plagiarism will be handled according to procedures outlined in the Diplomacy School Academic Integrity Policy. Students found guilty of cheating or plagiarism will receive a failing grade for the course and will be prosecuted to the fullest extent permissible.

Students with disabilities should contact Disabilities Support Services for special accommodations.

Schedule of Assignments:

January 13

Week One: Introduction

J. Martin Rochester. 1986. The Rise and Fall of International Organization as a Field of Study. *International Organization* 40(4):777-813.

Keisuke Iida. 2004. Is WTO Dispute Settlement Effective? *Global Governance* 10(2): 207-225.

January 20 NO CLASS

January 27 NO CLASS

February 3

Week Three: Regime Theory

Stephen D. Krasner. 1982. Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables. *International Organization* 36(2): 185-205.

Arthur Stein. 1982. Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World. *International Organization* 36(2): 299-324.

Robert O. Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapters 1-6.

Recommended: Karns and Mingst, Chapter Two.

February 10

Week Four: From Regimes to Legalization

Kenneth Abbott, Robert Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Duncan Snidal. 2000. The Concept of Legalization. *International Organization* 54(3): 401-419.

Kenneth Abbott and Duncan Snidal. 2000. Hard and Soft Law in International Governance. *International Organization* 54(3): 421-456.

Gregory Shaffer and Mark A. Pollack. 2011. Hard vs. Soft Law in International Security. *Boston College Law Review* 52(4): 1147-2011.

February 17

Week Five: Building Institutions

Barbara Koremenos, Charles Lipson and Duncan Snidal 2001. The Rational Design of International Institutions *International Organization* 55(4): 761-800.

Kenneth Abbott and Duncan Snidal. 1998. Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(1):3-32.

Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 1999. The Power, Politics, and Pathologies of International Organizations *International Organization* 53(4):699-732.

Michael J. Gilligan. 2004. Is There A Broader-Deeper Tradeoff in International Multilateral Agreements? *International Organization* 58(3):459-484.

Recommended: Karns and Mingst, Chapters Four and Five.

February 24

Annotated Bibliography Due at the Start of Class

Week Six: Norms and IO

Martha Finnemore. 1993. International Organizations as Teachers of Norms. *International Organization* 47: 565-97.

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization* 52(4):887-917.

Ian Hurd. 2005. The Strategic Use of Liberal Internationalism: Libya and the UN Sanctions, 1992-2003. *International Organization*. 59:495-526.

March 3

Week Seven: Non-Governmental Organizations

Steve Charnovitz. 1997. Two Centuries of Participation: NGOs and International Governance. *Michigan Journal of International Law* 18(2): 183-286.

Alexander Cooley and James Ron. 2002. The NGO Scramble. *International Security* 27(1):5-39.

Anne Marie Clark and Elisabeth Friedman. 1998. The Sovereign Limits of Global Civil Society. *World Politics* 51:1-39.

Recommended: Karns and Mingst, Chapter Six.

March 10

SPRING BREAK

March 17**Week Eight: Role of Domestic Politics**

John Gerard Ruggie. 1982. International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order. *International Organization* 36(2):379-415.

Andrew P. Cortell and James W. Davis. 1996. How do International Institutions Matter? The Domestic Impact of International Rules and Norms. *International Studies Quarterly* 40:451-478.

Judith Goldstein and Lisa Martin. 2000. Legalization, Trade Liberalization, and Domestic Politics: A Cautionary Note. *International Organization* 54(3):603-632.

Robert D. Putnam. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics. *International Organization* 42(3):427-460.

March 24**Week Nine: The Problem of Compliance**

Beth Simmons. 1998. Compliance with International Agreements. *Annual Review of Political Science* 1:75-93.

Abram Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes. 1993. On Compliance. *International Organization* 47(2):175-205.

George Downs, David Rocke, and Peter Barsoom. 1996. Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation? *International Organization* 50:379-406.

Jeffrey Checkel. 2001. Why Comply? Social Learning and European Identity Change *International Organization* 55(3):553-588.

March 31 NO CLASS – Policy Analysis Assignment Due**April 7****Week Ten: IO & IPE**

Irfan Nooruddin and Joel W. Simmons. 2006. The Politics of Hard Choices: IMF Programs and Government Spending. *International Organization* 60(4):1001-1033.

Christina Davis. 2004. International Institutions and Issue Linkage: Building Support for Agricultural Trade Liberalization. *American Political Science Review* 98(1):153-169.

Erica Gould. 2003. Money Talks: Supplemental Financiers and IMF Conditionality. *International Organization* 57(3):551-586.

Beth Simmons. 2000. International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs. *American Political Science Review* 94(4):819-835.

Recommended: Karns and Mingst, Chapter Nine.

April 14**Week Eleven: IO & Security**

Beth Simmons. 2002. Capacity, Commitment, and Compliance: International Law and the Settlement of Territorial Disputes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(6): 829-856.

Ken Rutherford. 2000. The Evolving Arms Control Agenda: Implications of the Role of NGOs in Banning Antipersonnel Landmines. *World Politics* 53(1):74-114.

Alexander Thompson. 2006. Coercion through IOs: The Security Council and the Logic of Information Transmission. *International Organization* 60(1): 1-34.

Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis. 2000. International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 94(4):779-801.

Recommended: Karns and Mingst, Chapter Eight.

April 21 EASTER – NO CLASS**April 28****Week Twelve: IO and Environment**

Ronald Mitchell. 1994. Regime Design Matters. *International Organization* 48(3):425-458.

Kal Raustiala and David Victor. 2004. The Regime Complex for Plant Genetic Resources. *International Organization* 58(2):277-309.

Evan Ringquist and Tatiana Kostadinova. 2005. Assessing the Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements. *American Journal of Political Science* 49(1):86-102.

Daniel L. Nielson and Michael J. Tierney. 2003. Delegation to International Organizations: Agency Theory and World Bank Environmental Reform. *International Organization* 57(2):241-276

Recommended: Karns and Mingst, Chapter Eleven.

May 5**Week Thirteen: IO and Human Rights**

Andrew Moravcsik. 2000. The Origins of Human Rights Regimes: Democratic Delegation in Postwar Europe. *International Organization* 54(2):217-252

Emilie Hafner-Burton and Kiyoteru Tsutsui. 2005. Human Rights in A Globalizing World: The Paradox of Empty Promises. *American Journal of Sociology* 110(5):1373-1411.

Eric Neumayer. 2005. Do International Human Rights Treaties Improve Respect for Human Rights? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(6):925-953.

Martin S. Edwards, Kevin M. Scott, Susan Hannah Allen and Kate Irvin. Sins of Commission? Understanding Membership Patterns on the UN Human Rights Commission. *Political Research Quarterly* 61:3 (September 2008), 390-402.

Recommended: Karns and Mingst, Chapter Ten.

Particulars on Assignments:

Policy Analysis Assignment

The primary written assignment in this class is a 15 page (double-spaced with 1” margins and 12 point fonts) policy analysis that is due at 4pm EST on **March 31**. You will work in teams and be randomly assigned an international organization. In this paper you will accomplish the following tasks:

1. Identify a challenge that the international organization faces that is a barrier to its effectiveness
2. Develop at least two alternative strategies to address this problem
3. Outline the costs and benefits of each potential strategy
4. Advocate one and discuss how it can best be implemented

In order to help you begin in this process, you will submit an annotated bibliography of 20 sources. Valid sources include books, articles, news items, and scholarly reports. An ‘annotated’ bibliography means that each listed source is accompanied by a 150 word summary of the piece. Your annotated bibliography is due on **February 24** at the start of class.

The next piece of this assignment is an 800 word blogpost summarizing the findings of the larger paper. This assignment will be due on a rolling schedule over the last three weeks of class. We will build on last year’s course blog, which is at <https://reforminginternationalorganizations.wordpress.com/>.

The remaining 5% of your grade will be a peer evaluation. You will evaluate your partner’s contribution, and he or she, in turn, will evaluate you. This ensures that free riding is sanctioned. This evaluation will be disseminated on the last day of class.

Reverse-Engineered Research Designs

One essential skill to develop in graduate school is the ability to summarize arguments. In order to help you achieve this end, you will submit two short papers (2 pages maximum, double-spaced with 1” margins and 12 point fonts) that each address one article assigned for the weeks 10 through 13.

For each article, your job is to “reverse-engineer” the research design. This means answering the following questions for each article. Each question should be answered in a paragraph or two.

- 1) What is the outcome that the author is trying to explain?
- 2) What is the author’s argument?
- 3) What are the alternative explanations for this outcome?
- 4) If you could pose one question to the author dealing with how the study ought to be conducted, what would it be?

Take Home Final Exam

Each student will prepare a 15 page minimum final exam which will consist of essay questions based on course material. The final will be handed out in class on **May 5**, and will be due to me by 4pm on Monday **May 12**.

NOTE: For assignments that must be submitted online through Blackboard, instructions are at the following URL: http://blogs.shu.edu/techtips/files/safeassign_student.pdf