

PS 205: Introduction to International Relations

Ronald Mitchell

Professor of Political Science and Environmental Studies

Time: T-Th 8:30-9:50	Office Hours: PLC-921, Tues/Thurs 10-11:30, by signup and appt.
rmitchel@uoregon.edu ; 541-346-4880	Course website on Canvas

COURSE DESCRIPTION

Why does international conflict occur? How can nations resolve it? From the Trojan and Peloponnesian Wars in ancient Greece through the wars among Native American tribes before European contact to recent conflicts in Sudan, Iraq, and Afghanistan, nations have gone to war. Historians record acts of war, describing in detail the who, what, when, where, and how of international conflict. As political scientists and public citizens, however, we want to understand *why* nations go to war and how to make it less likely. Does war arise because some people are evil? Is war inevitable because of the structure of nation-states and the international system? Even if *conflict* among states is inevitable, is *war* inevitable? What alternatives to resolving conflict by force? How effective are they?

If security concerns are central to contemporary international relations, so too are economic issues, human rights, and environmental protection. In an increasingly interconnected and interdependent world, we need to understand how states regulate—and why they often fail to successfully regulate—themselves, their citizens, and the multinational corporations that increasingly control the flows of goods, capital, information, and people around the world. The European Union, NAFTA, and other regional trade blocs are lowering their barriers to trade, influencing not only what we can buy but all aspects of people's lives. The news media and the Internet make us increasingly aware of violations of human rights around the world, yet we know little about how to prevent these all-too-common atrocities. Scientists make us increasingly aware of how we degrade the natural environment. What obstacles does the international system pose to efforts to protect the globe from such problems as climate change and what strategies exist to overcome them?

This course introduces students to some of the answers to such questions—and more important, to ways to think about answering such questions—by reviewing theories of the factors that cause international conflict and that strategies that states can use to resolve them. We will examine themes of continuity and of change. We will examine whether lessons from the Peloponnesian War help us understand why countries develop nuclear weapons today. We will examine how increasing economic, informational, and ecological interdependence will change and reshape international relations in the future. The course will help you develop theoretical and empirical understandings of such questions and provide you with tools that foster a causal understanding of many social problems and their resolution.

REQUIRED TEXTS AND I-CLICKER

The course book is on sale at the UO Bookstore (to save money, you may buy an earlier edition, which should be adequate for the course). A few copies will be on reserve at Knight Library.

- Joseph S. Nye and David A. Welch Understanding Global Conflict and Cooperation: 10th Edition (New York: Longman, 2013). Syllabus refers to as Nye. Either eTextbook or Looseleaf edition is fine.
- Most required readings are available via the Course Canvas Site. Referred to as **Online Reading**.
- Daily reading of the *New York Times* is strongly recommended! Read online, in the library or check the UO Bookstore.
- For required quizzes, you will need to have an I>clicker. You can buy your own or borrow one from a friend. Make sure to register it on the Canvas site.
- The course Canvas site will help you succeed in the class. *Check the website every 2 or 3 days* for class news, lecture notes will usually be posted before class; links for relevant news articles, online surveys, etc.

EXPECTED LEARNING OUTCOMES

- Understand key theories used by scholars to explain why conflict is common among countries and how, despite the pressures for conflict, countries sometimes are able to cooperate.
- Recognize both similarities and differences in how states interact in the issue areas of national security, international trade, human rights, and environmental protection.
- Demonstrate critical thinking and communication skills, including the use of counterfactuals, by using insights from various theoretical perspectives to explain empirical variation across issue areas and across problems within issue areas.

ESTIMATED STUDENT WORKLOAD / HOW GRADES WILL BE DETERMINED

Student workload involves 120 hours for this 4-credit course. Time and percent for components are detailed below.

Class component	Percentage	Hours
Class attendance: required. No points. May influence your participation grade.	0%	30
Reading: required/no points All class elements and your grade depend on staying on top of the readings. Readings are intended as additional to (rather than redundant with) class lectures. Please raise questions about readings in class or in section.	0%	30
Plagiarism assignment: required/no points. Read Canvas assignment links, my plagiarism policy (below), and ask questions.	0%	1
Pop quizzes (best 2 of 3): 3 class sessions will start with 10-minute unannounced quizzes of 10-15 questions on readings and lectures. There will be no makeups. Only top two scores will count: missing a quiz will not affect your grade; those who take all three will have their low score dropped. Quizzes will end at 10:10 sharp.	10% (5% each)	3 total (1 each prep)
Midterm exam (in-class): Will include both essay and short-answer questions.	30%	10
Discussion section assignments: Attend and actively participate in discussion section each week. Discussion sections will clarify issues from lectures and also allow time for discussion related to two case studies. Case study materials and the requirements for the two written assignments will be provided on Canvas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case #1 writing assignment (~1,000 words) • Case #2 writing assignment (~1,000 words) 	10% (5% each)	16 (8 each)
Participation: Participation is expected in section and, also, in lecture. Speak up in class, ask questions, request clarification, or state your views.	5%	10 (section attendance)
Final exam: Will include essay, medium, and short-answer questions.	45%	20
Extra credit: The ONLY extra credit for this course will be 3 online surveys during the course of the term. Survey answers will be confidential and ungraded. Filling out each survey prior to the deadline (noted in syllabus) will receive 1/3 of 1% for each survey. Deadline reminders will not be provided.	1/3% each (1% total)	5 min each (15 total)

Assignment of final grades

Students will receive grades based on the following criteria:

- A+: if given at all, given to those few students whose performance stood out as significantly stronger than all other students in the course
- A: all assignments completed in ways that demonstrate a particularly strong and nuanced understanding of almost all course concepts and the ability to clearly connect theories from the course to empirical evidence
- B: all assignments completed in ways that demonstrate solid understanding of most course concepts and the ability to adequately connect theories from the course to empirical evidence
- C: completed assignments demonstrate only a basic understanding of course concepts and/or one or more assignments missing
- D: many assignments are missing and completed assignments demonstrate little understanding of material
- F: assignments completed account for less than 80% of total grade.

Expected distribution of grades: ~20% As, ~35% Bs, ~35% Cs, ~7% Ds, ~3% Fs.

COURSE POLICIES

Late assignments

Help me help you pass the course by turning in all assignments on time. Late assignments lose 2 points/day: assignments received before midnight of the 1st day after being due lose 2 of 100 points, before midnight of the 2nd day 4 points, etc. Turn in all assignments, even if late. Missing ANY assignment makes passing this course difficult.

Grade complaints

Contested grades will first be read by a second GTF. If the second GTF assigns the same grade, no grade change will occur. If the second GTF assigns either a higher or lower grade, the professor will read the assignment and independently assign the final grade, which can be either higher or lower.

Academic Integrity, Plagiarism, Fabrication, Cheating, and Misconduct:

By enrolling in this course, you agree to abide by the University's Student Conduct Code. You must read the three webpages linked on Canvas for Assignment #1. Understanding these documents is a course REQUIREMENT that you MUST complete by the end of week 1. Everything in your assignments must be your own work. Neither ignorance of these policies nor the lack of an intention to cheat or plagiarize will be considered a legitimate defense. Raise questions you have with the professor before problems arise. I will flunk all students who plagiarize and will report them to University authorities. Unfortunately, I have done so two or three times in the past few years.

Creating an environment conducive to learning

Civility and tolerance: My primary goal as a faculty member is to create an inclusive learning environment in which *everyone* feels safe to express their views, whatever they may be, so long as they do so in ways that are respectful of others. In light of the divisions that became visible in the 2016 election, I seek to create a learning environment in which those who voted for our current President and those who did not can BOTH feel free to express their political opinions. One cannot identify a person's political views by race, religion, attire, gender, favorite music, or type of skateboard: in 2016, at least 1 in 10 (and often 3 in 10) of *every demographic group* voted differently than the rest of that group <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2016/11/08/us/politics/election-exit-polls.html>

Being the faculty member for a class gives one considerable power (directly over grades and in more subtle ways). Therefore, I will try to be cautious in how I express my views and in how I respond to students expressing theirs. I will try my best to keep my own political biases in check so as to help everyone in the class feel safe expressing their views, regardless of which side of the political aisle they stand on. My biases will come through at points – I apologize for that and *encourage you to call me out* (in a respectful way) when they do. I invite each of you to express your political views, whatever they may be, in a way that is respectful of all people, whether they are in our classroom or not. I encourage you to disagree with me and to challenge me to separate relatively-objective theories and facts from more-subjective values. In my view, democracy works when differences of opinion are expressed with enough clarity and respect that I change my mind and, perhaps, I also change the minds of others. *I ask for your help in creating a learning environment in which mutual and inclusive respect extends to all people regardless of who they are or what their political views are, so long as those views are expressed respectfully.*

Disabilities: Both I as a professor and the University of Oregon are committed to creating inclusive learning environments. Please notify me if any aspects of my instruction methods or course design result in barriers to your participation. If you have a preferred gender pronoun, please let me know what it is. If you have a disability, I encourage you to contact Accessible Education Center in 164 Oregon Hall at 346-1155 or uoaec@uoregon.edu If you have already been in contact with Accessible Education Center and have a notification letter, please provide me with a statement from Accessible Education Center during the first week of class so that we can make appropriate arrangements. University policy requires that students present a notification letter from AEC to receive testing accommodations (see <http://aec.uoregon.edu/students/current.html>).

Prohibited Discrimination and Harassment Reporting

I personally strongly support the University's policy on discrimination and harassment, as reflected in the following statement from the University of Oregon at <https://titleix.uoregon.edu/syllabus>

The instructor of this class, as a Student Directed Employee, will direct students who disclose sexual harassment or sexual violence to resources that can help and will only report the information shared to the university administration when the student requests that the information be reported (unless someone is in imminent risk of serious harm or a minor). The instructor of this class is required to report all other forms of prohibited discrimination or harassment to the university administration.

Any student who has experienced sexual assault, relationship violence, sex or gender-based bullying, stalking, and/or sexual harassment may seek resources and help at safe.uoregon.edu. To get help by phone, a student can also call either the UO's 24-hour hotline at 541-346-7244 [SAFE], or the non-confidential Title IX Coordinator at 541-

346-8136. From the SAFE website, students may also connect to Callisto, a confidential, third-party reporting site that is not a part of the university.

Students experiencing any other form of prohibited discrimination or harassment can find information at respect.uoregon.edu or aaeo.uoregon.edu or contact the non-confidential AAEO office at 541-346-3123 or the Dean of Students Office at 541-346-3216 for help. As UO policy has different reporting requirements based on the nature of the reported harassment or discrimination, additional information about reporting requirements for discrimination or harassment unrelated to sexual assault, relationship violence, sex or gender based bullying, stalking, and/or sexual harassment is available at <http://aaeo.uoregon.edu/content/discrimination-harassment>. Specific details about confidentiality of information and reporting obligations of employees can be found at titleix.uoregon.edu.

Mandatory Reporting of Child Abuse: UO employees, including faculty, staff, and GEs, are mandatory reporters of child abuse. This statement is to advise you that your disclosure of information about child abuse to a UO employee may trigger the UO employee's duty to report that information to the designated authorities. Please refer to the following links for detailed information about mandatory reporting: <https://hr.uoregon.edu/policies-leaves/general-information/mandatory-reporting-child-abuse-and-neglect>.

COURSE SCHEDULE AND ASSIGNMENTS

Introduction and Basic Concepts

The Syllabus designates readings that you should have read before coming to class that day. For example, you should have read Nye (ch.1), Thucydides, Crawford, and Aristophanes BEFORE the Week 1-Thursday class.

Tuesday, Week 1: Introduction

- Introduction to class. No readings assigned.

Thursday, Week 1: The history of international relations

Assignment #0: Absolutely required plagiarism/cheating readings. By enrolling in this course, you agree to abide by the University's Student Conduct Code. You must read the websites linked via the course Canvas site by this day and understand what they imply about your conduct in this class. Raise any questions you have with the professor. You will be assumed to have read and fully understood what plagiarism is and how to avoid it.

- Nye, Ch. 1.
- Skim: Thucydides. 1982. The Peloponnesian War. New York: Modern Library. Read only pp. 266-274.
- Skim: Crawford, N. C. 1994. A security regime among democracies: cooperation among Iroquois Nations. *International Organization* 48(3): 345-385. n
- Skim: Aristophanes. 1961. Lysistrata. New York: Harper & Row. Read only 1-25. Note: You may want to watch Spike Lee's 2015 film *Chi-raq*, which is the Lysistrata story set in current-day Chicago.

Major Theories of International Relations

Tuesday, Week 2: Realism

Prisoners' Dilemma Game will be conducted in section – see web page for instructions and come prepared.

- Nye, Ch. 2.
- Holsti, O. R. 2004. Theories of international relations. *Unpublished paper*
- Both these articles reflect the realist view that politics matter less in foreign policy than national interests.
 - Feaver, P. and I. Popescu. 2012. Is Obama's foreign policy different to George W. Bush's? E-International Relations. 3 August (accessed: 20 February 2014). URL on Canvas.
 - Donnelly, T. and W. Kristol. 2018. The Obama-Trump Foreign Policy. *The Weekly Standard*. 9 February 2018 (accessed: 17 March 2019). <https://www.weeklystandard.com/thomas-donnelly-and-william-kristol/the-obama-trump-foreign-policy>

Thursday, Week 2: Institutionalism

- Keohane, R. O. 1998. International institutions: can interdependence work? *Foreign Policy*(110): 82-96.
- Wendt, A. 1992. Anarchy is what states make of it. *International Organization* 46(2): 391-425.

Tuesday, Week 3: Disenfranchised theory

- Keohane, R. O. 1989. International relations theory: contributions of a feminist standpoint. *Millennium* 18(2): 245-253.
- Weber, C. 1994. Good girls, little girls and bad girls: male paranoia in Robert Keohane's critique of feminist international relations. *Millennium* 23(2): 337-349.
- Le Melle, T. J. 2009. Race in international relations. *International Studies Perspectives* 10(1): 77-83.
- Htun, M. and S. L. Weldon. 2012. The civic origins of progressive policy change: combating violence against women in global perspective, 1975-2005. *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 548-569.

The Use of Force

Thursday, Week 3: Terrorism and cybersecurity; GUEST LECTURE: Kevin O'Hare

- Gordon, P. H. 2007. Can the war on terror be won? *Foreign Affairs* 86(6): 53-66.
- Tickner, J. A. 2002. Feminist perspectives on 9/11. *International Studies Perspectives* 3: 333-350.
- Nye, J. S. 2016/2017. Deterrence and dissuasion in cyberspace. *International Security* 41(3): 44-71.
- Botti, D., et al. 2019. Cyberconflict: Why the Worst is Yet to Come (interview with David Sanger). *New York Times*. 4 January 2019 (accessed: 4 January 2019). <https://www.nytimes.com/video/players/offsite/index.html?videoId=100000006126247>
- Sanger, D. E., et al. 2019. In 5G Race With China, U.S. Pushes Allies to Fight Huawei. 26 January 2019 (accessed: 17 March 2019). <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/01/26/us/politics/huawei-china-us-5g-technology.html>

Tuesday, Week 4: Game theory

- Jervis, R. 1978. Cooperation under the security dilemma. *World Politics* 30(2): 167-214.
- This class session will build on the Prisoners' Dilemma game played in section in week 2.

Thursday, Week 4: The Two World Wars

Case #1 Writing Assignment - due on Canvas by Friday of Week 4, 12 noon

- Nye, Ch. 3 and Ch. 4.

Tuesday, Week 5: Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction

Survey on Nuclear Weapons (Survey #1) on Web. DUE BEFORE CLASS BEGINS

- Nye, Ch. 5.
- Sanger, D. E. and W. J. Broad. 2018. A Cold War Arms Treaty Is Unraveling: But the Problem Is Much Bigger. *New York Times*. 9 December 2018 (accessed: 17 March 2019). <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/12/09/us/politics/trump-nuclear-arms-treaty-russia.html>
- Tannenwald, N. 1999. The nuclear taboo: the United States and the normative basis of nuclear non-use. *International Organization* 53(3): 433-468.
- Posen, B. R. 2006. A nuclear-armed Iran. *Century Foundation Report*

Thursday, Week 5

MIDTERM EXAM

International Political Economy

Tuesday, Week 6: Globalization and Development

"Hunger Game" to be played in class (used by permission of, Dr. Carolyn Shaw, Wichita State University, 2005)

- Watch one video at: Gapminder Website. 2010. Gapminder videos showing development. URL on Canvas.
- Milner, H. V. 2005. Globalization, development, and international institutions: normative and positive perspectives. *Perspectives on Politics* 3(4): 833-854.
- Micklethwait, J. and A. Wooldridge. 2001. The globalization backlash. *Foreign Policy*(126): 16-26.

Thursday, Week 6: Intro to International Political Economy (IPE)

- GUEST LECTURE by Katie Tangman, Director, Global Customs & Trade, Columbia Sportswear
- Nye, Ch. 8.
- Ghemawat, P. 2007. Why the world isn't flat. *Foreign Policy*(159): 54-60.
- Irwin, D. A. 2016. The truth about trade: what critics get wrong about the global economy. *Foreign Affairs* 95(4): 84-95.
- Lagarde, C. 2019. National Public Radio Interview with Christine Lagarde, Managing Director of the IMF. 8 March 2019 (accessed: 9 March 2019). <https://www.npr.org/2019/03/08/701409797/lagarde-keeps-an-eye-out-for-dark-clouds-on-the-economic-horizon>

Tuesday, Week 7: European Union

- Grieco, J. M. 1995. The Maastricht Treaty, economic and monetary union and the neo-realist research programme. *Review of International Studies* 21(1): 21-40.
- Putnam, R. D. 1988. Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games. *International Organization* 42(3): 427-460.
- Hunt, A. and B. Wheeler. 2019. Brexit: All you need to know about the UK leaving the EU. *BBC News*. 31 January 2019 (accessed: 19 March 2019). <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-32810887>

International Institutions

Thursday, Week 7: International Institutional Theory

Survey on Human Rights (Survey #2) on Web for extra credit points. DUE BEFORE CLASS BEGINS

- Nye, Ch. 6
- Young, O. R. and G. Osherenko. 1993. Testing theories of regime formation: findings from a large collaborative research project. *Regime theory and international relations*, edited by V. Rittberger: 223-251. New York: Oxford University Press. Read only 223-238.
- Mearsheimer, J. 1995. The false promise of international institutions. *International Security* 19(3): 5-49.

Human Rights

Tuesday, Week 8: Human Rights

- Nye, Ch. 9.
- Donnelly, J. 2008. Human rights: both universal and relative (a reply to Michael Goodhart). *Human Rights Quarterly* 30(1): 194-204.
- Keck, M. M. and K. Sikkink. 1999. Transnational advocacy networks in international and regional politics. *International Social Science Journal* 51(159): 89-101.

Thursday, Week 8: Civil War

Case #2 Writing Assignments - due on Canvas by Friday of Week 8, 12 noon

- Kingston, L. N. 2015. Protecting the world's most persecuted: the responsibility to protect and Burma's Rohingya minority. *The International Journal of Human Rights* 19(8): 1163-1175. Routledge
- Anonymous. 2018. Responses by the United States to Attacks on the Rohingya in Burma. *American Journal of International Law* 112(2): 322-326. Cambridge University Press
- Nordby, L. 2018. Gender-based violence in the refugee camps in Cox Bazar: A case study of Rohingya women's and girls' exposure to gender-based violence. Master's Degree Uppsala, Sweden: International Humanitarian Action and Conflict, Uppsala University

The Environment

Tuesday, Week 9: The International Environment

Survey on Environmental Issues (Survey #3) on Web for extra credit points. DUE BEFORE CLASS BEGINS

- Hardin, G. 1968. The tragedy of the commons. *Science* 162(3859): 1243-1248.
- Sprinz, D. F. and T. Vahtoranta. 1994. The interest-based explanation of international environmental policy. *International Organization* 48(1): 77-105.
- Mitchell, R. B. 2013. International environment. *Handbook of International Relations, 2nd ed.*, edited by W. Carlsnaes, T. Risse and B. Simmons: 801-826. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Thursday, Week 9: Climate Change

- Keohane, R. O. 2015. The global politics of climate change: challenge for political science. *PS; Political Science and Politics* 48(1): 19-26.
- Dimitrov, R. S. 2016. The Paris Agreement on Climate Change: Behind Closed Doors. *Global Environmental Politics* 16(3): 1-11.
- Manjoo, F. 2019. Pretend It's Aliens: A neat mental trick to understand the climate battle ahead. *New York Times*. 13 February 2019 (accessed: 17 March 2019). <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/13/opinion/aliens-climate-change.html>
- Allen, J. R. and D. G. Victor. 2019. Despite What Trump Says, Climate Change Threatens Our National Security. *New York Times*. 7 March 2019 (accessed: 17 March 2019). <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/03/07/opinion/climate-change-national-security.html>

Summary and Conclusions

Tuesday, Week 10: Morality in international relations

- Nye, Ch. 10.
- Walzer, M. 1977. Just and unjust wars: a moral argument with historical illustrations. New York: Basic Books. Read only 21-33.
- Zakaria, F. 2008. The rise of the rest. *Newsweek*. URL on Canvas.

Thursday, Week 10: Wrap-up and review

FINAL EXAM REVIEW SESSION

Final Exam Will Be Given on the Day Scheduled by the University for Classes held at this Day/Time

See: http://registrar.uoregon.edu/calendars/final_exam

To: PS205 Students
From: Ronald B. Mitchell
Subject: Case study assignments

Discussion section will focus on Case #1 before the midterm and Case #2 after the midterm. In both cases, you will write a paper (less than 1,000 words) to address the questions identified.

Case Study #1: Assessing Claims about the Causes of War

This case study seeks to get you to evaluate different theoretical claims about why states go to war. The basic structure of the assignment is to ask you to select 6 wars and determine the extent to which they appear to be caused by a set of “the usual suspects” that are alleged to be causes of war. We will provide a long list of wars, including links to Wikipedia (or wikipedia-type) descriptions of them. You will select 6 of those wars and your paper will assess which of several factors usually claimed to be causes of war were at play in each of these wars.

Reading on some important theories of the causes of war

- Goldstein, Joshua S. 2004. International relations (brief 2nd ed). Washington, DC: American University Press.

Assignment:

- By now, you should already have selected 6 wars for study
- Fill in the table (available on next page) with relevant quotes from Wikipedia pages OR note that “Wikipedia page provided no evidence of this explanation.” That table has one example to give you a sense of what is expected. Do NOT use that war as one of your 6 please.
- Write an essay of 1,000 words or less that examines the evidence in your table. Use headings and structure your paper by explanations NOT by the wars (I will deduct 10 points from all papers that structure by wars). Look at each explanation (column), in sequence, and evaluate whether evidence from your 6 wars support the claim of that explanation being an important cause of the wars you evaluated. One factor might be present for all 6 cases, suggesting it’s a common and powerful cause of war. Another factor might not be present in any of your 6 cases, suggesting it is not a common or powerful cause of war. And other factors might be present in some cases but not others, suggesting it’s a cause of war but not particularly powerful or common. There may even be evidence that a specific factor is NOT present: for example, in Rwanda, more than 90% of both Hutu and Tutsi are Christian, so religion was likely NOT a factor in the Rwandan Civil War.
- Link your argument to some of the explanations you have read about in course materials. Reference course readings to support your argument. And avoid plagiarism by citing appropriately!
- Your assignment must include your table AND your paper. Provide one document that includes both.
- Here is an analogy that may be helpful. If it is confusing, disregard it.

	PS205 analysis	Analogy
Research question	Why do states go to war?	Why are some people rich?
Usual causal suspects	territorial disputes; control of government; economics; ethnicity & race; religion; ideology	well-educated; hard-working; born to rich parents; race; religion
Cases	6 wars	6 rich people (Beyonce, Macklemore, etc.
Evidence	read wikipedia pages and see whether “usual explanations” show up in descriptions of each war	read wikipedia pages and see whether “usual explanations” show up in descriptions of why each person is rich

On “why are some people rich,” your “preferred” belief (bias) might be that people get rich through hard work. But your analysis of the 6 specific rich people you selected might show that wikipedia does not describe any of them as hard working: the wikipedia pages might even say 4 of them have never worked a day in their lives. So, your analysis suggests that working hard is NOT the cause of why people are rich. Note: this does NOT prove that working hard doesn’t make people rich; it just shows that working hard was not the cause of these 6 people being rich.

War (dates)	Potential Explanations/Factors					
	Territorial border disputes	Control of national government	Economics (trade, money, natural resources, etc)	Ethnicity & Race	Religion	Ideology
Uganda-Tanzania War (1978-1979)	“Uganda declared a state of war against Tanzania, and sent troops to invade and annex part of the Kagera region of Tanzania, which Amin claimed belonged to Uganda”	“20,000 refugees fleeing Amin's attempts to wipe out opposition”, “a group of exiles based in Tanzania attempted, unsuccessfully, to invade Uganda and remove Amin”	Wikipedia page provided no evidence of this explanation.	Wikipedia page provided no evidence of this explanation.	Wikipedia page provided no evidence of this explanation.	“Amin seized power in a military coup in 1971”, “The Tanzanian army remained in Uganda to maintain peace while the UNLF (the political wing of the UNLA) organized elections to return the country to civilian rule”
Case #1 19xx-19yy						
Case #2 19xx-19yy						
Case #3 19xx-19yy						
Case #4 19xx-19yy						
Case #5 20xx-20yy						
Case #6 20xx-20yy						

Case Study #2: Assessing Claims about Why States Take the Negotiating Positions they do on Climate Change

This case study asks you to evaluate different theoretical claims about why states take the negotiating positions they do in international environmental negotiations, using the case of countries positions during the 2015 Paris Climate Change negotiations. The assignment requires you to select 6 countries, collect data on their actual negotiating position (their INDC, as described below) and data on the factors that scholars usually use to explain the positions countries take in negotiations. Your paper will then assess how well the theories of negotiating positions fit with the actual positions taken by the countries you selected.

Readings:

Theories of why states take the positions they do and examples of scholars using them to explain the positions of states.

- Mitchell, R. B. 2010. International politics and the environment (ch. 5). London: Sage Publications
- Sprinz, D. F. and T. Vaahoranta. 1994. The interest-based explanation of international environmental policy. *International Organization* 48(1): 77-105. Explains why states take particular negotiating positions.
- Hochstetler, K. and M. Milkoreit. 2015. Responsibilities in Transition: Emerging Powers in the Climate Change Negotiations. *Global Governance* 21: 205-226.
- Background information on INDCs (Intended Nationally Determined Contributions):
 - Wikipedia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intended_Nationally_Determined_Contributions
 - World Resources Institute: <http://www.wri.org/indc-definition>
- **Recommended but not required:** Bernauer, Thomas. 2013. "Climate change politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 16:13.1-.28.

Assignment:

- Select 6 countries from the list provided on the website
 - Identify their specific INDC and their "ranking" by Climate Action Tracker as in the example below: <http://climateactiontracker.org/indcs.html> If you want more detail go to <http://climateactiontracker.org/countries.html>
 - Important note: Chile, China, India, and Singapore are not committing to reducing emissions but to reducing emissions *intensity* (total GHG emissions per unit of GDP). If you choose one of those countries, make sure you understand the difference and take it into account in your analysis.
- You must create a table (as below) and fill in the "cells" with relevant quotes from national INDC reports OR from the websites provided OR note that says "no evidence of this explanation was available from the evidence on the websites provided."
 - For ecological vulnerability, go to: <http://index.gain.org/ranking/vulnerability>
 - Level of human development: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_Development_Index
 - Abatement costs (Abatement potential table at end of this document). See notes below chart.
 - Sidepayments: <https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2015/cop21/eng/109.pdf> -- read the Paris Agreement on Climate Change. As a simple rule, assume that countries that are NOT members of the OECD will receive "sidepayments" of money, technology transfer, or capacity enhancements while members of OECD will be the countries paying those sidepayments. For a list of OECD members, see <http://www.oecd.org/about/membersandpartners/list-oecd-member-countries.htm>
 - Normative factors: quickly scan your countries' INDC statements for normative language at: <http://www4.unfccc.int/submissions/indc/Submission%20Pages/submissions.aspx>
- Write an essay of no more than 1,000 words that examines the evidence in your table. Use headings and structure your paper by explanations NOT by countries (I will deduct 10 points from all papers that structure by countries). Look at each explanation, in sequence, and evaluate whether evidence from your 6 countries support the argument of that explanation being an important cause of the negotiating positions those countries took. One factor might be present for all 6 countries, suggesting it's a common and powerful cause of negotiating position. Another factor might not be present in any of your 6 countries, suggesting it is not a common or powerful cause of negotiating position. And other factors might be present in some cases but not others, suggesting it's a cause of negotiating positions but not particularly powerful or common.

- Link your argument to some of the explanations you have read about in the course materials. Make sure to reference course readings to support your argument. And avoid plagiarism by citing appropriately!

Abatement Costs

Exhibit A.V.1

Country/region split – BAU emissions and abatement potential

GtCO₂e per year

Region Cluster	Country/region	BAU Emissions			Abatement potential	
		2005	2020	2030	2020	2030
North America	Canada	0.6	0.8	0.9	0.2	0.4
	United States*	6.8	7.7	8.3	2.0	4.7
Western Europe	France	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.3
	Germany	1.0	1.1	1.1	0.2	0.4
	Italy	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.2
	United Kingdom	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.2
	Rest of EU27	2.2	2.4	2.6	0.7	1.6
	Rest of OECD Europe	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.1	0.3
Eastern Europe	Russia	2.4	2.9	3.0	0.7	1.5
	Rest of Eastern Europe	0.7	0.9	0.9	0.2	0.5
OECD Pacific	Japan	1.3	1.5	1.4	0.3	0.6
	Rest of OECD Pacific	1.1	1.3	1.4	0.4	0.8
Latin America	Brazil	2.7	3.1	3.3	1.9	2.4
	Mexico	0.5	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.4
	Rest of Latin America	1.7	2.3	2.7	0.8	1.7
Rest of developing Asia	Rest of developing Asia	6.8	7.9	8.6	3.9	5.7
Africa	South Africa	0.4	0.6	0.7	0.2	0.5
	Rest of Africa	2.7	3.2	3.5	1.3	2.4
China	China	7.6	13.9	16.5	3.5	8.4
India	India	1.8	3.3	5.0	1.0	2.7
Middle East	Middle East	1.6	2.6	3.2	0.6	1.4
Global Air & Sea Transport	Global Air & Sea Transport	1.8	2.6	3.3	0.3	0.8
Total		45.9	61.2	69.9	18.9	38.0

* Difference of 0.4 GtCO₂e to 2005 baseline value of 7.2 GtCO₂e reported in McKinsey's US cost curve report is due to accounting of air and sea transport emissions (accounted for at the global level in this report). Other differences impacting also 2020 and 2030 numbers are due to the fact that carbon sink effects in Forestry are not accounted for in the baseline in this report according to international policy principles. Also, the external baseline used for this report (IEA WEO 2007) has somewhat lower emission forecasts than the US report sources (EIA, DOE).

Source: Global GHG Abatement Cost Curve v2.0

- For abatement costs for your table, use Abatement Potential 2020 column
- If you can't find a country you have chosen, use the numbers for the "Rest of ..." for the region your country is part of.

Source: McKinsey & Company. 2009. Pathways to a Low Carbon Economy: Version 2 of the Global Greenhouse Gas Abatement Cost Curve. Washington DC: McKinsey & Company.

<http://www.mckinsey.com/~media/McKinsey/Business%20Functions/Sustainability%20and%20Resource%20Productivity/Our%20Insights/Impact%20of%20the%20financial%20crisis%20on%20carbon%20economics%20Version%2021/Impact%20of%20the%20financial%20crisis%20on%20carbon%20economics%20Version%2021.ashx>

Countries	Negotiating position (INDC and how aggressive it is) Example: <i>Medium</i> : reduce <i>emissions</i> by <i>50%</i> from <i>1990</i> by <i>2030</i>	Will benefit if climate change avoided (ecological vulnerability)	More concerned with economic development	Face high costs to reduce emissions (abatement costs)	Will receive benefits from other countries it contribute (sidepayments)	Normative factors (“right thing to do”)
Country 1						
Country 2						
Country 3						
Country 4						
Country 5						
Country 6						