**Political Science 53**

**Contemporary Global Order and the Fate of the Sovereign State**

**Spring 2011**

**Jonathan T. Chow and Pavel Machala**

**Class Time:** Thursdays 2:00 PM – 4:30 PM

**Class Location:** 100Clark House

**E-mail:** jchow@amherst.edu; pmachala@amherst.edu

**Course Website:**

**Office Hours:**

1. Prof. Chow – Wednesdays 3:00 PM – 5:00 PM w/ Prof. Chow in 203 Keefe Health Center and by appointment
2. Prof. Machala –Thursdays 4:30 – 5:30 PM in 201 Clark House and by appointment

**Virtual Office Hours (with Prof. Chow):** Add **jchowoffice@gmail.com** to your Google Talk chat list (you can access Google Talk by getting a free Gmail account at <http://www.gmail.com>). Alternatively, if you use AOL Instant Messenger, you can add **jchowoffice** to your buddy list (AIM can be downloaded for free at <http://www.aim.com>). I will be online Wednesdays from 8:00 PM to 9:00 PM.

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

The sovereign state, the basic building block of modern international politics, is eroding. Or is it?  While the principle of the state as supreme within its territory remains, the practice of sovereignty faces growing challenges from above (in the form of nascent global governance structures), from below (in the form of transnational non-state actors), and possibly even from the "side" (that is, from states that might seek to overthrow the Westphalian system and establish a more hierarchical order in its place). In this course, we will examine the nature of the state in contemporary international politics and various challenges to the traditional Westphalian conception of state sovereignty.

**REQUIREMENTS**

1. **Full attendance at all classes.** You cannot have a good discussion if people miss entire classes or parts of classes on a regular basis. This is especially true for a small discussion-intensive course like this one. We allow two free absences during the semester to account for sleeping in, etc. Beyond that, we will dock your grade by 5% for every absence (i.e. five unexcused absences will wipe out your participation grade), though we will excuse you for *documented* emergencies (e.g. a doctor’s note).
2. **Active discussion participation (15% of your final grade).** This means not only talking but also actively listening to your colleagues, taking intellectual risks, asking questions and contributing to the collective task of understanding the course material. It means treating your colleagues with respect, refraining from personal attacks, engaging with your colleagues’ contributions, and knowing when to hold back and let other people contribute. It also means reading the talking points sent by your colleagues (see below) and responding to them with questions, observations and other remarks. Discussion is a team exercise, so you should learn the names of your teammates and call them by their names during discussion.
3. **Discussion leadership (20% of your final grade).** Over the course of the semester you will be responsible for twice co-leading discussion with one or more of your colleagues. The purpose of this is to help you get used to speaking before an audience for an extended period and facilitating a discussion, both of which will be critical in graduate/professional school and beyond. Discussion leadership involves several tasks.

* 1. A joint meeting with your discussion partner(s) and Professor Chow in office hours prior to the class for which you will lead discussion. The meeting is intended to help you organize and structure your presentation. Please come to office hours having already done the readings.
	2. Each discussion leadership team must e-mail to the class a set of talking points (no more than 2 pages) outlining your presentation by 9:00 PM Wednesday evening. The purpose of these talking points is twofold: 1.) to help you organize your talk, and 2.) to give your colleagues advance preparation so that they can come up with thoughtful responses to your remarks (particularly if you, say, highlight a certain passage from the readings as meriting particular scrutiny). Please respect your colleagues’ time. Talking points sent out at 3 in the morning are not likely to be read and will hurt your presentation grade.
	3. A short presentation (approx. 10-15 minutes for the discussion leadership team) on major themes in the readings to be delivered at the beginning of class. The content of the presentation is flexible. You can focus primarily on a few of the readings but it’s a good idea to at least make a mention of the other readings for that week. You can (and should) link readings to previous weeks’ assignments and discussions. You should also pose questions to your colleagues.

Discussion leadership will be graded based on the quality of your presentation in terms of its content, the clarity of your delivery style, and the clarity (and timeliness) of your talking points.

1. **Response papers (25% of your grade).** You will be required to write three 2-3 page response papers over the course of the semester dealing with some themes covered in the readings for that week. This is your chance to reflect a bit on the readings and the themes covered in class. Maybe there is a question from the readings that you want to explore. Or perhaps you noticed a connection between some of the readings and a point raised in discussion last week. This is your opportunity to do that. **If you are scheduled to lead discussion for that week, you may NOT submit a response paper**. **E-mail your response papers to Professors Chow and Machala by 8:00 AM on Thursday and then bring them to class so that you can refer to them in discussion.**

Response papers will be graded on the extent to which you ground your observations in evidence and the readings (avoid making impressionistic statements like “I thought his writing was pretty boring.”), the extent to which you play around with ideas as opposed to simply summarizing the readings, and writing mechanics (an occasional typo is tolerable; lots of grammatical errors or incoherent prose is not).

1. **Final paper (40% of your grade)** – The final assignment for this course will be an essay of 12 to 15 pages in which you will write on a theme to be announced later in the class. More information on how the paper will be graded will be provided at that time.

**PREREQUISITES**

This course is geared mainly toward students who have had some prior exposure to international relations or comparative politics. Thus, we STRONGLY recommend having taken an international relations or comparative politics course. Students who have not and wish to remain in the course may do so with the permission of the instructors. This course is only open to sophomores, juniors and seniors.

**REQUIRED TEXTS (books can be purchased at Amherst Books)**

1. Course Reader (once you “officially order” this Reader, you will be able to picked it up at the Political Science Department office in Clark House).

ALL of the readings for PS 53 (excluding those in the purchased books) are available on the e-Reserves accessible from the PS 53 website on MyAmherst. In addition, you have the option of purchasing a multilith with ALL of those same readings in it from the Political Science Department. The cost of printing the readings on your own is about the same as purchasing a multilith, so for the sake of those in line behind you waiting to print out their thesis drafts in the library, please purchase one if you want a hard copy. You can order this Course Reader from the Political Science Department website. Click on the "Multilith Order Form for Course Materials" link on the left column. There does not appear to be content at the moment, but that should be updated within the next couple of days. Deadline for submitting a request for purchasing the Reader: **February 2.**

1. Required Books: You may purchase these books at Amherst Books (on the corner of Main and South Pleasant Street). In the syllabus they are identified as (P).

Hedley Bull. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics, 3rd ed.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002).

Joseph Stiglitz. *Globalization and Its Discontents* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002).

**POLICY ON ACADEMIC HONESTY**

We are committed to upholding the College Honor Code, including the Statement on Academic Responsibility. Plagiarism and cheating are theft, plain and simple. It is one thing to build upon the ideas of other people, but another to present those same ideas as one’s own. Doing so is unethical, unfair to the people who worked hard to come up with those ideas, and beneath the dignity of an Amherst College student.

We have zero tolerance for plagiarism and other forms of dishonesty and will report students who engage in such activities to the Dean for Student Conduct. Students who are found to have violated the Honor Code can expect to fail the class.

Examples of plagiarism and dishonesty include (but are by no means limited to): neglecting to enclose direct quotes in quotation marks or use footnotes, verbatim or near-verbatim “paraphrasing”, getting someone else to write your paper under your name (this includes so-called “term paper mills”), using another student’s argument in your paper and attempting to pass it off as your own, or knowingly allowing someone to copy your paper, illicitly obtaining paper topics before they have been distributed, etc. **Know the standards for citation and use them. Carelessness and ignorance are NOT valid excuses for plagiarism! Ask if you have any questions. For standards of citation, visit** [**https://www.amherst.edu/library/ research/citation**](https://www.amherst.edu/library/%20research/citation)**.**

A bad grade lessens in importance over time. Even the best students do poorly on an exam or a paper every now and again. You can recover from a bad grade, but being marked as a cheater will haunt you for the rest of your career. If you are encountering difficulty in the class, do not despair! Come talk to either of us and we will be more than happy to help you out. **There is ALWAYS a better alternative to cheating!**

**POLICY ON LATE PAPERS**

Extensions will only be granted under emergency circumstances and then on a case-by-case basis. Otherwise, we will dock your assignment grade by one letter grade (e.g. A to A-) for each day that it is late, starting immediately after the time it is due. **Per College policy, all work for the class MUST be submitted by 5:00 PM on the last day of classes (May 7, 2010) or it will not count for credit.**

**Class Schedule**

Readings marked with the computer symbol  can be found on E-reserves. E-reserves can be accessed by visiting the E-reserves section on the course website. Readings marked with a \*\*\* can only be found in the reader.

**Part I: Foundations of the Contemporary International Order**

In the first few weeks of the semester, we will focus on trying to get a handle on the concepts of the state and international order. We will examine, in particular, the events that led to the establishment of an international order that was predominated by the United States in the twentieth century. This will provide us with a reference point from which to examine challenges to the global order in Parts II, III and IV.

**Week 1: Introductions and a Brief Refresher of Basic IR Theory (1/27)**

Welcome to Political Science 53! Today we will go over the syllabus and class policies. We will also begin sign-ups for discussion leadership. Start learning your colleagues’ names. Today will also be the first and last time that your professors will lecture to you. We will go over the basics of Neorealism, neoliberal institutionalism, and constructivism. Don’t be alarmed if it all makes your head spin a bit. The point is to familiarize you with some basic vocabulary that may crop up in discussion. (84 pages)

Stephen M. Walt. “International Relations: One World, Many Theories”, *Foreign Policy* 110 (Spring 1998) 29-46. (18 pages)

Jack Snyder. “One World, Rival Theories”, *Foreign Policy* 145 (Nov.-Dec. 2004), 52-62. (11 pages)

Daniel Deudney and John Ikenberry. “The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order”, *Review of International Studies* 25:2 (1999), 179-96 (18 pages)

Ted Hopf. “The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory”, *International Security* 23:1 (Summer 1998), 171-181 and 186-196 ONLY. (22 pages)

Stephen Hobden and Richard Wyn Jones. “Marxist Theories of International Relations”, in John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 144-58. (15 pages)

**Week 2: Origins of the Modern State (2/3)**

We begin by defining our terms. What is a state? What is international order? Why is it that the international system is made up of states rather than, say, coalitions of feudal lords? This week, we discuss the origins of the modern Westphalian state. With the establishment of the Westphalian state comes the question of how to manage relations among them. Thus, we will explore the notion of international order and, in particular, the concept of *international society*. (132 pages)

Daniel Philpott. “Sovereignty: An Introduction and Brief History”, *Journal of International Affairs* 48:2 (1995), 353-68. (16 pages)

\*\*\*Charles Tilly. *Coercion, Capital, and European States: AD 990-1992* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1992), Ch. 2 (38-66). (28 pages)

\*\*\*Charles Tilly. “War-Making and State-Making as Organized Crime”, in Peter Evans et al. (ed.), *Bringing the State Back In* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 169-186. (17 pages)

Hedley Bull. *The Anarchical Society*, Chs. 1-3 (3-73; 71 pages) (P) (Frost Reserve)

**PART II: Challenges from Above – Global Governance and State Sovereignty**

In his classic work, *The Anarchical Society*, the political scientist Hedley Bull defined international order as “a pattern of activity that sustains the elementary or primary goal of the society of states”. Here, Bull argued that the international system was driven by states, but maintained that it was more than just a system; instead, he argued, it was a *society* driven by norms, rules and institutions.

The idea of state sovereignty exists in tension with the notion of an international society of states, particularly as that society becomes increasingly interdependent. For example, to manage trade relations among themselves, states created the World Trade Organization, which has the power to legitimize retaliatory trade sanctions against members found to have engaged in protectionist practices. In another example, the Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court gives the latter the authority to prosecute “crimes against humanity” as well as war crimes when individual states are unable or unwilling to do so. This includes powers of subpoena and arrest that can supersede the authority of individual states. The very existence of such categories of crime by itself suggests limitations on state sovereignty. Across the Atlantic, the European Union continues to pose a significant challenge to Westphalian ideas even as the economic weakness of member states like Greece and Ireland have raised fears that the Euro zone might collapse and with it, the dream of a unified European economy.

How do the rules, norms and institutions of international society affect the state? What limitations, if any, do they impose? Why do states consent to the rule of international law if it constrains their freedom of action? And what does the proliferation of international governance structures mean for the concept of sovereignty?

**Week 3: International Organizations – What’s All the Fuss About? (2/10)**

International organizations represent one of the key means by which states achieve cooperation. Yet some organizations can limit or otherwise shape the degree to which states can act. Why would states allow themselves to be bound by the decisions of these organizations? To what extent do such institutions erode state sovereignty, and how does it matter, if at all? (161 pages)

Hedley. *The Anarchical Society,* Ch. 6 (122-155). (23 pages) (P) (Frost Reserve)

Nigel White. *The United Nations System: Toward International Justice* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2002), Ch. 1 (3-21). (19 pages)

John Mearsheimer. “The False Promise of International Institutions”, *International Security* 19:3 (1994), 5-49. (45 pages)

Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore. “The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations”, *International Organization* 53:4 (1999), 699-732. (34 pages)

Joseph Stiglitz. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002), Chs. 1-2 (3-52). (50 pages) (P) (Frost Reserve)

**Week 4: Economic Globalization and the Consequences for Sovereignty (2/17)**

The International Monetary Fund and the World Trade Organization constitute two of the most important international economic institutions in contemporary international society. While governed by states, the IMF’s policies of conditionality and the WTO’s trade dispute settlement process can impose significant constraints on states’ freedom of action. How are the IMF and WTO shaping international economic transactions and the conduct of state sovereignty? (175 pages)

Joseph Stiglitz. *Globalization and Its Discontents*. (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002), Chs. 3-5 (53-165). (113 pages) (P) (Frost Reserve)

Kenneth Rogoff. “An Open Letter to Joseph Stiglitz” (2002). <http://www.imf.org/external/np/vc/2002/070202.HTM>

Jeffrey Sachs. “How to Run the International Monetary Fund”, *Foreign Policy* 143 (Jul-Aug. 2004), 60-64. (5 pages)

Pamela Blackmon. “Rethinking Poverty Through the Eyes of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank”, *International Studies Review* 10 (2008), 179-202. (24 pages)

Pascal Lamy. “The WTO’s Contribution to Global Governance”, in Gary P. Sampson (ed.) *The WTO and Global Governance* (Tokyo and New York: United Nations University Press, 2008), 39-56. (18 pages)

Dani Rodrik. “Globalization, Trade and Developing Countries”, in Gary P. Sampson (ed.) *The WTO and Global Governance* (Tokyo and New York: United Nations University Press, 2008), 202-216 (15 pages)

**Week 5: How Long Is the Arm of the Law? The Prosecution of War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity (2/24)**

The advent of international courts designed to try cases against those accused of committing war crimes or crimes against humanity remains highly controversial. The idea that the systematic and egregious violation of civilian human rights (e.g. genocide, mass rape, or ethnic cleansing) can be subject to international jurisdiction raises important questions about the limits of state sovereignty. (126 pages)

\*\*\*Jack Donnelly. *Universal Human Rights in Theory and Practice, 2nd ed.* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), Chs. 1, 2, and 8-10 ((pp. 7-37 and 127-81). (86 pages)

Payam Akhavan. “The International Criminal Court in Context: Mediating the Global and Local in the Age of Accountability”, *The American Journal of International Law* 97:3 (Jul. 2003), 712-21. (10 pages)

Henry Kissinger. “The Pitfalls of Universal Jurisdiction”, *Foreign Affairs* 80:4 (Jul./Aug. 2001), 86-96. (11 pages)

Kenneth Roth. “The Case for Universal Jurisdiction”, *Foreign Affairs* 80:5 (Sep./Oct. 2001), 150-54. (5 pages)

John R. Bolton. “The Risks and Weaknesses of the International Criminal Court from America’s Perspective”, *Law and Contemporary Problems* 64:1 (2001), 167-80. (14 pages)

**Part III: Challenges from the “Side”? Competing National Visions of Global Order**

Despite the descriptions of the United States as a “hyper-power”, no one expects it to conquer the world or overthrow the sovereign state system anytime soon. However, as some of our readings will argue, the Westphalian system, despite its resilience, is historically contingent. It follows that the Westphalian system may not last forever. For instance, David Kang, a scholar of East Asian politics, has argued that for most of its history China conducted itself as an empire among tributary states rather than as a sovereign state among equals. While this hardly means that China is likely to overthrow the Westphalian system given the chance, it could very well attempt to modify the balance of power *within* that system or reshape it into a different form. A world in which Chinese power, Chinese norms and Chinese rules form the bedrock of international society would probably differ from a world defined by American power, American norms and American rules. We will spend some time looking at potential state challengers to the current global order and attempt to glean from some of their actions what their preferred visions of global order might be.

**Week 6: What China Wants (3/3)**

In contemporary geopolitics, China is the elephant in the room. This week, we will discuss differing visions of what China’s rise means for global order. On the one hand, some arguments hold that China is fundamentally a status quo power while others warn of China’s desire to alter patterns of global order to better suit its ambitions. Based on its actions, what can we infer about how China seeks to shape global order? (121 pages)

G. John Ikenberry. “The Rise of China and the Future of the West”, *Foreign Affairs* Jan/Feb. 2008, 23-37. (15 pages)

”Friend or Foe? A Special Report on China’s Place in the World”, *The Economist* (Dec. 4, 2010), 3-16. (14 pages)

Gregory Chin and Eric Helleiner. “China as a Creditor: A Rising Financial Power?” *Journal of International Affairs* 62:1 (Fall/Winter 2008), 87-99.

Chris Alden. “China in Africa”, *Survival* 47:3 (Autumn 2005), 147-64. (18 pages)

Emilian Kavalski. “Shanghaied into Cooperation: Framing China’s Socialization of Central Asia”, *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 45:2 (2010), 131-45. (15 pages)

Chengqiu Wu. “Sovereignty, Human Rights, and Responsibility: Changes in China’s Response to International Humanitarian Crises”, *Journal of Chinese Political Science* 15 (2010), 71-97. (27 pages)

Gregory Chin and Ramesh Thakur. “Will China Change the Rules of Global Order?” *Washington Quarterly* 33:4 (2010), 119-38. (19 pages)

**Week 7: Flying BRICs! (You might want to duck) (3/10)**

The BRIC countries are Brazil, Russia, India and China. The acronym was made famous by Goldman Sachs economist Jeffrey O’Neill in his 2003 paper, “The World Needs Better Economic BRICs”. In it, he argued that the combined economic power of the BRICs was growing such that by the middle of the twenty-first century they would constitute the world’s dominant economies, rivaling or exceeding the U.S., Japan and Germany. This week, we will discuss the BRICs and what their emergence might mean for international order. Is it useful to think of the BRICs as a group? (143 pages)

Richard N. Haass, “The Age of Nonpolarity: What Will Follow U.S. Dominance?” *Foreign Affairs* 87:3 (May/June 2008), 44-56 (13 pages).

Andrew Hurrell. “Hegemony, Liberalism and Global Order: What Space for Would-Be Great Powers?” *International Affairs* 82:1 (2006), 1-19. (19 pages)

Leslie Elliott Armijo. “The BRICs Countries as Analytical Category: Mirage or Insight?” *Asian Perspective* 31:4 (2007), 7-42. (36 pages)

“The Trillion-Dollar Club”, *The Economist* (Apr. 15, 2010). <http://www.economist.com/world/international/displaystory.cfm?story_id=15912964>

Deborah Welch Larson and Alexei Shevchenko. “Status Seekers: Chinese and Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy”, *International Security* 34:4 (Spring 2010), 63-95. (33 pages)

Paulo Sotero and Leslie Elliott Armijo. “Brazil: To Be or Not To Be a BRIC?” *Asian Perspective* 31:4 (2007), 43-70. (28 pages)

Amrita Narlikar. “All That Glitters Is Not Gold: India’s Rise to Power”, *Third World Quarterly* 28:5 (2007), 983-996. (14 pages)

**Week 8: No class! Enjoy your spring break! (3/17)**

**Part IV: Challenges from Below – Non-State Actors and Global Order**

The sovereign state is not only challenged by nascent international society but also by non-state actors. Terrorists, drug dealers, transnational advocacy networks and computer viruses all operate from within states but don’t always appear to be bound by them. The proliferation of Internet access lowered the costs of obtaining information and communicating across vast distances, facilitating the formation of transnational networks that could do everything from agitating for debt relief for the world’s poorest countries to hijacking an airliner. The “super-empowered” individual or network represents a relatively new wrinkle for international order and poses a challenge to any state that seeks to control them. To what extent do such actors pose a challenge to the state and what might they mean for the Westphalian system?

**Week 9: Sovereignty on the Brink – Weak and Failed States (3/24)**

In general, states don’t “die” very frequently, at least not on paper. But there is a very broad continuum of sovereignty. A state can have full political control over its territory and the human and material resources in it and yet not be recognized by other states. On the other hand, a state may be recognized as a state by others and yet be unable to maintain control of its own territory. Such a state may lack, as Max Weber famously described it, a monopoly on the legitimate means of coercive force. They may also lack the ability to provide governmental services, leaving a void that could be filled by competitors, such as NGOs, terrorists, or crime syndicates. Such states are often referred to as “weak” or “failed” states. (~145 pages)

Robert D. Kaplan. “The Coming Anarchy”, *The Atlantic* (Feb. 1994). <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1994/02/the-coming-anarchy/4670/>

Robert I. Rotberg. “Failed States in a World of Terror”, *Foreign Affairs* 81:4 (Jul.-Aug. 2002), 127-40. (14 pages)

Robert H. Jackson and Carl G. Rosberg. “Why Africa’s Weak States Persist: The Empirical and the Juridical in Statehood”, *World Politics* 35:1 (Oct. 1982), 1-24. (25 pages)

Jon Lee Anderson. “The Most Failed State”, *New Yorker* 85:41 (Dec. 14, 2009), 64-75. (12 pages)

Seth Kaplan. “Rethinking State-Building in a Failed State”, *Washington Quarterly* 33:1 (2010), 81-97. (19 pages)

Pierre Englebert and Denis M. Tull. “Postconflict Reconstruction in Africa: Flawed Ideas about Failed States”, *International Security* 32:4 (Spring 2008), 106-39. (34 pages)

Hedley Bull. *The Anarchical Society*, Ch. 11 (248-71). (24 pages) (P) (Frost Reserve)

*Optional:*

Sarah Lister. “Changing the Rules? State-Building and Local Government in Afghanistan”, *Journal of Development Studies* 45:6 (Jul. 2009), 990-1009. (20 pages)

Tomas Kellner and Francesco Pipitone. “Inside Mexico’s Drug War”, *World Policy Journal* (Spring 2010), 29-37. (9 pages)

Robert Bonner. “The New Cocaine Cowboys”, *Foreign Affairs* 89:4 (Jul./Aug. 2010), 35-47. (13 pages)

**Week 10: Sovereignty Outsourced - Of Mercenaries and Multinationals (3/31)**

One of the most significant developments in state sovereignty has been the increasing role of private companies in taking on functions historically reserved for the state. This is not entirely new—the Dutch East India Company of the 17th and 18th centuries established and administered colonies and trading posts around the Indian Ocean. What is new is the *proliferation* of private companies. Much has been made of private militaries like Blackwater or Executive Outcomes and the role they play in providing (or undermining) security in weak states. But in some countries, private corporations also build infrastructure, maintain order, and provide social welfare services for the communities where they work. How are private corporations shaping the nature of state sovereignty? (128 pages)

Herbert W. Howe. “Private Security Forces and African Stability: The Case of Executive Outcomes”, *Journal of Modern African Studies* 36:2 (June 1998), 307-331. (25 pages)

Robert Mandel. “The Privatization of Security”, *Armed Forces and Society* 28:1 (2001), 129-151. (23 pages)

Peter W. Singer. “Can’t Win With ‘Em, Can’t Go To War Without ‘Em: Private Military Contractors and Counterinsurgency”, (Washington D.C.: Brookings, 2007). (28 pages)

Rita Abrahamsen and Michael C. Williams. “Security Beyond the State: Global Security Assemblages in International Politics”, *International Political Sociology* 3:1 (March 2009), 1-17. (18 pages)

John M. Kline. “MNCs and Surrogate Sovereignty”, *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 13:1 (Fall/Winter 2006), 123-133. (11 pages)

Dennis A. Rondinelli. “Transnational Corporations: International Citizens or New Sovereigns?” *Business and Society Review* 107:4 (December 2002), 391-413. (23 pages)

**Week 11: Taming the Wild Web – The Internet and the Sovereign State (4/7)**

In the early days of widespread internet usage, back when 56k modems were considered state-of-the-art and “google” was just a homonym for a really big number, the World Wide Web was hailed as a freewheeling realm of blissful anarchy where the government was simply too clumsy to wield sovereign power. Cyberspace, like the seas of yore, was believed to be beyond the reach of the state. Whether or not this was ever actually true, the reality today is far more complex. From assigning domain suffixes to censoring material to using the Internet in the service of foreign policy, states are working hard to exert control over the Web, though they face stern opposition from a wide range of actors from businesses to “hacktivists”. This week, we will examine some of the conflicts over how the Web is governed. (~110 pages)

John Perry Barlow. “A Declaration of the Independence of Cyberspace” (1996).

Daniel W. Drezner. “The Global Governance of the Internet: Bringing the State Back In”, *Political Science Quarterly* 119:3 (2004), 477-498. (23 pages)

Patrick W. Franzese. “Sovereignty in Cyberspace: Can It Exist?” *Air Force Law Review* 64 (2009), 1-42. (42 pages)

Clive Thompson. “Google’s China Problem (and China’s Google Problem)”, *New York Times Magazine* (April 23, 2006). (15 pages)

Seymour M. Hersh. “The Online Threat: Should We Be Worried about a Cyber War?” *New Yorker* (Nov. 1, 2010).

Raffi Khatchadourian. “No Secrets: Julian Assange’s Mission for Total Transparency”, *New Yorker* (Jun. 7, 2010).

Ron Deibert et al. “Room for Debate: What Has WikiLeaks Started?” *New York Times* (Dec. 10, 2010). (Read all five of the essays). <http://www.nytimes.com/roomfordebate/2010/12/09/what-has-wikileaks-started>

TED. “Why the World Needs WikiLeaks” (Video interview with Wikileaks founder Julian Assange), Jul. 2010. <http://www.ted.com/talks/julian_assange_why_the_world_needs_wikileaks.html>

**Week 12: A Small World After All? Transnational Advocacy Networks and Social Change**

**(4/14)**

In 1985, if a student activist in Berkeley wanted to organize a march to criticize, say, the United States’ treatment of developing countries, it would have taken weeks to organize a single large protest in Berkeley. Today, that student could do it in a matter of days or even hours with e-mail listservers, Facebook, and Twitter. She could coordinate with other protest leaders to have simultaneous demonstrations around the country or even around the world. She could film the protest and upload it to YouTube where posters from around the world could comment about it. In the aftermath of the protest, bloggers around the world could write about it and generate buzz that might be picked up by national news agencies, helping to move the issue toward the front of states’ political agenda.

Changes in technology have revolutionized the way in which non-state actors have been able to mobilize and voice their interests. With added clout comes added political influence. This week, we will examine transnational advocacy networks and how they have been able to influence international cooperation and state policies. (144 pages)

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change”, *International Organization* 54:4 (1998), 887-917. (31 pages)

Richard Price. “Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines”, *International Organization* 52:3 (Summer 1998), 613-44. (32 pages)

\*\*\*Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), Ch. 1 and Ch. 3 (1-38, 79-120) (81 pages)

*Optional:*

Joshua Busby. “Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics”, *International Studies Quarterly* 51 (2007), 247-75. (29 pages)

**Week 13: Shadowy Networks – Transnational Terrorism and the Limits of Sovereignty (4/21)**

Networks are simply connections among different actors and as such, they can be used for good or ill. This week, we will look at transnational terrorism and how its agents are able to exploit weaknesses in sovereign control. As terrorist networks become more sophisticated, they are able to keep a step ahead of authorities who can be constrained by the boundaries of state sovereignty and the problems of international cooperation. (151 pages)

Audrey Kurth Cronin. “Behind the Curve: Globalization and International Terrorism”, *International Security* 27:3 (Winter 2002-03), 30-58. (29 pages)

Richard K. Betts. “The Soft Underbelly of American Primacy: Tactical Advantages of Terror”, *Political Science Quarterly* 117:1 (Spring 2002), 19-36. (18 pages)

Robert A. Pape. “The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism”, *American Political Science Review* 97:3 (Aug. 2003), 343-361. (19 pages)

\*\*\*David Benjamin and Steven Simon. *The Age of Sacred Terror* (New York: Random House, 2002), 134-166. (33 pages)

\*\*\*Rohan Gunaratna. *Inside Al Qaeda: Global Network of Terror* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001), 54-94. (41 pages)

Richard Matthew and David Shambaugh. “The Limits of Terrorism: A Network Perspective”, *International Studies Review* 7:4 (2005), 617-27. (11 pages)

*Optional:*

\*\*\*Gabriel Weimann. *Terror on the Internet: The New Arena, The New Challenges* (Washington DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2006), Ch. 4 (111-145). (35 pages)

**Week 14: The “Return” of Religion and the Challenge to Global Order (4/28)**

The 9/11 attacks dramatically raised the profile of religion in international politics. Long disregarded by international relations as irrelevant, there is growing recognition that religion is indeed an important force in international politics. Yet, at the same time, scholars remain unsure about the exact linkages between religion and international politics. This week, we will examine some recent scholarship on religion as a motivating force in international politics. (176 pages)

Scott M. Thomas. “A Globalized God: Religion’s Growing Influence in International Politics”, *Foreign Affairs* (Nov./Dec. 2010), 93-101 (9 pages)

\*\*\*Jonathan Fox and Shmuel Sandler. *Bringing Religion into International Relations* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 9-61 (53 pages)

\*\*\*R. Scott Appleby. “Violence as a Sacred Duty: Patterns of Religious Extremism”, “Religion and Conflict Transformation”, and “The Promise of Internal Pluralism: Human Rights and Religious Mission” in *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation* (Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), 81-120, 207-280. (114 pages)

**Week 15: Whither Global Order? (5/5)**

In this last class, we will take a step back and consider what the challenges to state sovereignty we have discussed this semester might mean for the future of the Westphalian state system. Our discussions early in the semester demonstrated that the sovereign state is a construction of history and not entirely a natural outgrowth of feudalism or other forms of order. That said, the state remains the most important unit of political organization today. Is the idea of sovereignty evolving or has it remained fairly static? What might the trajectory of sovereignty mean for the future of global order? (139 pages)

 Hedley Bull. *The Anarchical Society*, Chs. 12-14 (272-308). (37 pages) (P) (Frost Reserve)

\*\*\*Mark Zacher. “The Decaying Pillars of the Westphalian Temple: Implications for International Order and Governance”, in James Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel(ed.), *Governance Without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 58-101. (44 pages)

Stephen D. Krasner. “Think Again: Sovereignty”, *Foreign Policy* (Jan/Feb. 2001), 21-29. (9 pages)

Eric K. Leonard. “Seeking Sovereignty: Gaining Understanding Through Critical Analysis”, *New Political Science* 23:3 (2001), 407-28. (22 pages)

Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri. *Empire* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2001), xi-xvi.(6 pages)

G. John Ikenberry. “The Liberal International Order and Its Discontents”, *Millennium* 38:509 (2010), 509-521. (13 pages)

Ian Clark. “Bringing Hegemony Back In: The United States and International Order”, *International Affairs* 85:1 (2009), 23-36. (14 pages)