



INTERNATIONAL DIPLOMACY: INSTITUTIONS AND PRACTICES

(POLITICAL SCIENCE 4581-5581)

Class Time and Room: Wednesdays, 10:35am – 12:55pm, McCain 2021
Instructor: **Prof. Brian Bow** brian.bow@dal.ca
Instructor's Office: Henry Hicks Academic Administration Building, Room 355
Office Hours: Mondays, 10:00 – 12:00am, or by appointment

Introduction

This is an advanced seminar on the historical evolution of diplomacy. Our core concern is the development of diplomacy as a social institution which governs interactions between communities, with particular attention to the emergence of the sovereign national state in the early modern period (1600s-1800s), and its partial displacement during the late modern period (1900s-2000s). Among the themes covered in the course readings are the variety of diplomatic institutions and practices in different times and places, the evolving meaning and importance of state sovereignty, the emergence and effects of international institutions and law, and the future of global governance.

The course builds on concepts and theories developed in two other courses—World Politics (POLI 2520) and Diplomacy and Negotiation (POLI 3581)—but doesn't require them as formal prerequisites, and should be accessible to students with little or no prior course-work in Political Science. This is nonetheless a Political Science course, and reflects the field's interest in theory development and systematic, empirical testing of theories and concepts based on historical cases. However, while the course relies primarily on theory and research by Political Scientists, it does tend to draw from the outer margins of the International Relations literature, featuring themes and ideas which are usually more prominent in other fields, such as History, Sociology, and Law.

This is a seminar course, and seminar courses work differently than standard lecture-discussion courses. There will be little or no lecturing in this course. Instead, each class will be a three-hour conversation between professor and students (and among students) which will move in a loosely-structured way across a wide range of connected themes and problems. For some students, this is what university is supposed to be all about, and can be enormously rewarding; for others, it can be intimidating and/or boring, especially when they are not properly prepared. The reading is extensive and challenging. The quality of the discussion depends entirely on students' preparation and enthusiasm. And active participation in discussion is absolutely required—i.e., a poor seminar participation grade can mean the difference between an 'A' and a 'C' in one's overall grade...

The course features an in-class negotiation simulation, a term paper on the explanation of a particular historical episode, and a final exam which calls for synthesis of themes and debates running through the course.

Assignments / assessment – POLI 4581

Seminar discussion/participation	20%	every week, all semester
Simulation participation	10%	November 28
Simulation report	10%	December 4
Term paper 1	30%	October 22
Term paper 2	30%	December 10

Assignments / assessment – POLI 5581

Seminar discussion/participation	20%	every week, all semester
Simulation participation	5%	November 28
Simulation report	10%	December 4
Term paper 1	25%	October 22
Term paper 2	25%	December 10
Term paper 3	15%	December 10

Seminar discussion/participation

Your class participation grade will be based on the quantity and quality of your contributions to class discussion. By “quality,” I mean contributions to discussion which reflect thorough preparation and reflection, and help to move the discussion forward, by effectively summarizing a problem; explaining an author’s arguments or synthesizing the ideas of multiple authors; clearly presenting a thoughtful opinion on a question of theory, method, or real-world practice; and/or raising interesting new questions for further discussion. “Quantity” is pretty straightforward, but keep in mind that I’m not just looking for you to fill up class time with a lot of hot air; quantity without quality is worse than nothing.

Given that this is a class driven by student discussion, it goes without saying—and yet for some reason I feel compelled to say it anyway—that attendance is mandatory. If you miss more than two classes (without a valid reason—e.g., serious illness) you will get a zero for the seminar participation portion of your grade.

Before each class, you should: 1. carefully read all of the required readings assigned for the given week; 2. carefully read the discussion papers for the given week; and 3. make a few preparatory notes for discussion—e.g., a few sentences on the main ideas from each reading, plus a few ideas you thought were especially useful, ideas you strongly disagreed with, or ideas you didn’t understand...

Each student will also have responsibility for relating to the rest of the class the main ideas in a specific recommended reading, both in a short discussion paper and in a brief in-class presentation. The evaluation of your discussion paper and presentation will be part of your overall seminar participation grade. There are three main things you have to do for this part of the grade:

1. Before the second class meeting (September 19), look through the syllabus and find the “disc/pres reading” items listed for each week, choose three or four of those readings which might work for you, and rank them. In choosing a short-list of disc/pres readings, think about both what interests you and your own schedule for the term.

2. About a week before your disc/pres reading is to be discussed, read it carefully, and write up a brief discussion paper, to be shared with me and your classmates. The papers should give not only a clear and effective summary of the assigned reading, but also offer your own insights and opinions on the relevant issues, especially where that involves making creative connections to other readings and/or debates. Discussion papers should be very direct and concise (i.e., average 500 words, absolute maximum 750 words). Just to be clear, your classmates will not have read the Disc/pres reading you are discussing, so you have to explain it “from scratch.” **48 hours before the class in which your disc/pres reading will be discussed, send it to me and to all of your classmates using the “mail” function in the course website.** Because these discussion papers are supposed to be an important part of all students’ seminar preparation, late papers (without a valid excuse) will be severely penalized.
3. On the day in which your Disc/pres reading is up for discussion, come to class prepared to give a brief presentation (i.e., average 5 minutes, absolute maximum 10 minutes). Keep it concise and to-the-point. Your presentation should not just be a reading of your discussion paper. (Remember, we’re all supposed to have read it already...) Instead, you should just quickly summarize your main points, and suggest some provocative questions or problems for discussion. You should do a quick rehearsal of the presentation (at least once) before class, to make sure that you can keep it within the time limit.

If you have any questions about how the discussion papers and presentations are supposed to work, please email for clarification.

Simulation participation and simulation report

This year we will be trying out a new simulation exercise, based on the interlocking negotiations surrounding the development and distribution of the Alberta oil sands (i.e., Keystone and Northern Gateway pipelines). Each student will take on an assigned role, with specific goals and priorities, and try to shape the bargaining agenda to best serve those ends. The simulation will take place during regular class time on November 28, and we will do a review of the simulation at the beginning of the final seminar, on December 5.

General instructions for the simulation exercise will be posted on the OWL/BbLearn site in late September. **On November 21, I will post additional information on the simulation**, including the basic game scenario, specific role assignments and personal instructions for each player, and some more practical, logistical information. During the one-week period between the posting of this information and the exercise (i.e., November 21-28), you will be allowed to contact some of the other players, to talk about cooperative strategies, make “pre-game” demands/threats, etc.

Your simulation participation grade will be based on the quality of your participation in the role-playing exercise, particularly as it reflects your preparation and strategic planning. **Simulation-related email traffic should be done through the OWL/BbLearn system, and should be cc’ed to me**, since review of email traffic will be part of how I assess your efforts (and as another check to make sure that players don’t misunderstand the game instructions...). You should play your role as accurately and effectively as you can, but remember that you don’t necessarily have to “win the game” to do well on this assignment.

After the simulation exercise, you will reflect on what happened in a **simulation report**. This will be a **short essay** (approx. 1200-1500 words), summarizing what happened in the simulation,

and why you think it turned out the way it did: What advantages did you have at the outset? What disadvantages? What obstacles to effective communication did you experience, and how did you respond to them? What outcome did you expect, and how did that differ from the actual outcome? Etc.

In your simulation reports, try to look at what happened both from your own “first-person” perspective and, as much as possible, from the same kind of objective, “bird’s-eye-view” perspective that we usually take when we look back on real historical events. Make explicit connections to some of the general theoretical perspectives that we have talked about in class wherever you can.

Simulation reports are due December 4, and must be submitted on-line, through the OWL/BbLearn site. After they have been graded, the reports will be posted on the course website; if you don’t want your simulation report posted, you must be sure to let me know that when you submit it.

Term Papers

There are two papers for this course, weighted equally (i.e., each 30% of course grade), but requiring different kinds of research and writing. (Graduate students will write a third paper—see below; grade distribution for the graduate section of the course is outlined above.)

The first paper will require more reflection and more synergizing of theories and concepts from the course readings, and the second will require more independent thinking in coming up with a research question and more empirical research.

For the **first paper** (due October 22), students must write a relatively concise theoretical essay which answers one of the following sets of questions:

1. **Medieval-modern-postmodern:** Some have argued that international diplomacy in the twenty-first century is turning out to be more like that of the early modern period (17th and 18th centuries) than like that of the late modern period (late 19th and 20th centuries). In what ways do you think there are useful similarities and contrasts there? In what ways do these comparisons and contrasts break down? Explain, with reference to (at least two) theories from the course and (at least two) specific historical examples.
2. **Power and principles:** What really governs the process and outcomes of international negotiation, power or principles? How does power limit the “weight” of principles? How do principles limit the “weight” of power? Explain, with reference to (at least two) theories from the course and (at least two) specific historical examples.

For the **second paper** (due December 10), students will advance their own interpretation of a particular historical episode, and explain what it can tell us about the process and outcomes of international diplomacy. Each student will decide which aspects of the case to discuss, and which theoretical literatures to engage with, but all students should be attentive in some way to: 1. the question of that which is universal (i.e., characteristic of diplomacy in all places and times) and that which is particular (i.e., specific to particular states and/or time periods and/or issue-areas); and 2. the question of structure (i.e., outcomes brought about by circumstances, configurations of

interests) versus agency (i.e., outcomes brought about by choice, insight, free will). **All students should discuss their ideas for this term paper with the professor, at least once.**

For each term paper, each student is required to submit two copies of the essay: a hard copy, which should be handed in to my mailbox, in the Political Science department office, and a digital copy, which should be submitted via the course website (see below). Both versions are due by 4pm on the due date.

Each essay should be **between 2000 and 2500 words**, which generally works out to be **9-10 pages**, double-spaced, with normal fonts and margins. **Papers that go beyond 2500 words will not be accepted, except with the professor's specific, explicit permission.**

Graduate students will do a third paper for this course (i.e., for POLI 5581). For this third paper, each graduate student will choose his or her own topic and format: e.g., book review, multiple-article review, discussion of a particular theory or concept, historiography for a particular case study, etc. The third, graduate-only paper is due on December 16, and must be submitted to the professor by email.

Additional information about the format and other requirements for the term papers will be made available through the OWL/BbLearn site.

General policies concerning assignments, deadlines, and grades

The University Calendar makes plain that "[s]tudents are expected to complete class work by the prescribed deadlines. Only in special circumstances (e.g. the death of a close relative) may an instructor extend such deadlines." **Late term papers will be assessed a penalty of one mark (out of 30) per day.** If you miss the term paper deadline on account of illness, you must hand it in within one week of your return to class, with a copy of a medical certificate, per academic regulations in the Dalhousie Calendar.

Essays not submitted directly to me must be submitted in person to the Political Science office (if the office is open, hand the paper to the secretary, and ask to have it stamped with date and time; if the office is not open, put the paper in the after-hours drop-box). Neither the professor nor the Department can assume responsibility for papers submitted by mail, fax, or email. Do not submit papers to teaching assistants.

Plagiarism (intentionally or unintentionally representing other people's ideas as your own) is a serious violation of academic ethics, and will be taken very seriously in this class. You can (and should) get information on what plagiarism is, how you can avoid it, and what the relevant university and departmental policies are, at <http://academicintegrity.dal.ca/>. Please also take note of the formal notice of university policy with respect to academic integrity posted on the course website.

The grading thresholds for this course are:

90-100 = A+	85-89.9 = A	80-84.9 = A-	77-79.9 = B+	73-76.9 = B
70-72.9 = B-	65-69.9 = C+	60-64.9 = C	55-59.9 = C-	50-54.9 = D

Resources

There is no textbook for this course. All required readings will be made available through the course website.

The course website can be accessed through OWL/BbLearn: <https://dalhousie.blackboard.com/>. Login using the same ID and password that you use for your Dalhousie email.

In addition to course readings, the OWL/BbLearn site also has a downloadable copy of the course syllabus and general instructions and advice for the term papers. Powerpoint slides from the lectures will be posted there (usually—but not necessarily always—in advance...).

The OWL/BbLearn website is a crucial resource for this course. **Students are expected to check the OWL/BbLearn site for announcements and updates at least once per week.**

Disclaimer

This syllabus is intended as a general guide to the course. The instructor reserves the right to reschedule or revise assigned readings, assignments, lecture topics, etc., as necessary.

Lectures and readings

SECTION ONE	Introduction: Classical Diplomacy and the Shape of the Field
Class meetings:	September 12
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Different ways of studying diplomacy: History and IR • Scope and purposes of this course
Everybody reads:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thucydides, “Debate at Sparta” and “The Melian Dialogue,” in <u>History of the Peloponnesian War</u> (Penguin, 1954, or other edition/translation). 2. Laurie M. Johnson Bagby, “The Use and Abuse of Thucydides in International Relations,” <u>International Organization</u> 48 (1994): 131-153. 3. Christian Reus-Smit, “Ancient Greece,” in <u>The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity and Institutional Rationality in International Relations</u> (Princeton, 1999).

SECTION TWO	Pre-modern diplomacy, 1: the pre-modern world
Class meetings:	September 19
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The relationship between political institutions and diplomatic practices • Continuities and changes; the universal and the particular
Everybody reads:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raymond Cohen, "The Great Tradition: The Spread of Diplomacy in the Ancient World," <u>Diplomacy & Statecraft</u> 12 (2001): 23-38. 2. Niccolò Machiavelli, <u>The Prince</u> (any edition), entire book. 3. Bjornar Sverdrup-Thygeson, "A Neighborless Empire?: The Forgotten Diplomatic Tradition of Imperial China," <u>Hague Journal of Diplomacy</u> 7 (2012): 245-267.
Disc/pres readings:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. George Modelski, "Kautilya: Foreign Policy and International System in the Ancient Hindu World," <u>American Political Science Review</u> 58 (1964): 549-560. 5. Stephen Forde, "Hugo Grotius on Ethics and War," <u>American Political Science Review</u> 92 (1998): 639-648.
Other recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garrett Mattingly, <u>Renaissance Diplomacy</u> (Courier/Dover, 1988). • Francois de Callieres, <u>On the Manner of Negotiating with Princes</u> (Notre Dame, 1963). • Michael C. Williams, "Hobbes and International Relations: A Reconsideration," <u>International Organization</u> 50 (1996): 213-236.

SECTION THREE	Pre-modern diplomacy, 2: from medieval to modern
Class meetings:	September 26
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The collapse of the medieval order and empires • Westphalia and the rise of the sovereign state • Nation-states as diplomatic actors
Everybody reads:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Charles Tilly, "War Making and State Making as Organized Crime," in Peter Evans, et al., eds., <u>Bringing the State Back In</u> (Cambridge, 1985). 2. Kalevi Holsti, "Münster and Osnabrück, 1648: Peace by Pieces," in

	<p><u>Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order, 1648-1989</u> (Cambridge, 1991).</p> <p>3. Hendrik Spruyt, "The End of Empire and the Extension of the Westphalian System," <u>International Studies Review</u> 2 (2000): 65-92.</p> <p>4. Daniel Philpott, "The Religious Roots of Modern International Relations," <u>World Politics</u> 52 (2000): 206-245.</p>
Disc/pres readings:	<p>5. John Gerard Ruggie, "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations," <u>International Organization</u> 47 (1993): 139-174.</p> <p>6. Andreas Osiander, "Sovereignty, International Relations and the Westphalian Myth," <u>International Organization</u> 55 (2001): 251-287.</p>
Other recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Krasner, "Westphalia and All That," in Judith Goldstein & Robert Keohane, eds., <u>Ideas and Foreign Policy</u> (Cornell, 1993). • Hendrik Spruyt, "The Origins, Development, and Possible Decline of the Modern State," <u>Annual Review of Political Science</u> 5 (2002): 127-149. • Benno Teschke, <u>The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics and the Making of Modern International Relations</u> (Verso, 2003). • Christopher Chase-Dunn & Peter Grimes, "World Systems Analysis," <u>Annual Review of Sociology</u> 21 (1995): 387-417. • Dominic Lieven, "Dilemmas of Empire, 1850-1918: Power, Territory, Identity," <u>Journal of Contemporary History</u> 34 (1999): 163-200.

SECTION FOUR	Modern diplomacy, 1: the "new" diplomacy
Class meetings:	October 3
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationalism and diplomacy • Democracy and diplomacy • Ideologies and diplomacy
Everybody reads:	<p>1. Henry Kissinger, "The Concert of Europe" and "The New Face of Diplomacy," in <u>Diplomacy</u> (Simon & Schuster, 1990).</p> <p>2. Harold Nicholson, "The Transition between the Old Diplomacy and the New," in <u>The Evolution of the Diplomatic Method</u> (Greenwood, 1977), ch. 4.</p> <p>3. John Breuilly, "Nationalism and the State," in Philip Spencer and</p>

	<p>Howard Wollman, ed., <u>Nations and Nationalism: A Reader</u> (Rutgers University Press, 2000).</p> <p>4. Kal Holsti, "Exceptionalism in American Foreign Policy: Is It Exceptional?" <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 17 (2011): 381-404.</p>
Disc/pres reading:	<p>5. Sasson Sofer, "Old and New Diplomacy: A Debate Revisited," <u>Review of International Studies</u> 14 (1998): 195-211.</p> <p>6. Strobe Talbott, "Self-Determination in an Interdependent World," <u>Foreign Policy</u> 118 (2000): 152-163.</p>
Other recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adam Watson, <u>Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States</u> (Methuen, 1982), Preface and ch. 1. • James Mayall, <u>Nationalism and International Society</u> (Cambridge, 1990).

SECTION FIVE	Modern diplomacy, 2: Relations between Strong and Weak
Class meetings:	October 10
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American hegemony, during and after the Cold War • Interdependence and influence in asymmetry
Everybody reads:	<p>1. Robert O. Keohane, "The Big Influence of Small Allies," <u>Foreign Policy</u> 2 (1971): 161-182.</p> <p>2. G. John Ikenberry, "Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order," <u>Perspectives on Politics</u> 7 (2009): 71-87.</p> <p>3. Leonard J. Schoppa, "The Social Context in Coercive International Bargaining," <u>International Organization</u> 53 (1999).</p> <p>4. Ellen Hallams & Benjamin Schreer, "Towards a 'Post-American' Alliance?: NATO Burden-Sharing after Libya," <u>International Affairs</u> 88 (2012): 313-327.</p>
Disc/pres reading:	<p>5. Robert O. Keohane, "The Theory of Hegemonic Stability and Changes in International Economic Regimes, 1967-77," in Ole R. Holsti, et al, <u>Change in the International System</u> (Westview, 1980).</p> <p>6. G. John Ikenberry, "The Rise of China and the Future of the West," <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 87 (2008): 23-32.</p>
Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., <u>Power and</u>

recommended reading:	<p><u>Interdependence: World Politics in Transition</u> (Little Brown, 1977).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael Barnett & Raymond Duvall, “Power in International Politics,” <u>International Organization</u> 59 (2005): 39-75. • Thomas Risse-Kappen, <u>Cooperation among Democracies: The European Influence on US Foreign Policy</u> (Princeton, 1995).
----------------------	---

SECTION SIX	Modern diplomacy, 3: Power, Balancing, Order
Class meetings:	October 17
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balance of power as a recurring phenomenon, as a strategy, and as a problem to be overcome
Everybody reads:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hans J. Morgenthau, “Balance of Power,” in <u>Politics among Nations</u> (7th ed., McGraw-Hill, 1985). 2. Stephen Walt, “Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power,” <u>International Security</u> 9 (1985): 3-43. 3. Victoria Tin-Bor Hui, “Toward a Dynamic Theory of International Politics: Insights from Comparing the Ancient Chinese and Early Modern European Systems,” <u>International Organization</u> 58 (2004): 175-205. 4. William C. Wohlforth, “US Strategy in a Unipolar World,” in G. John Ikenberry, <u>America Unrivaled: The Future of the Balance of Power</u> (Cornell, 2002).
Disc/pres reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. John J. Mearsheimer, “Balancing versus Buck-Passing,” in <u>The Tragedy of Great Power Politics</u> (WW Norton, 2001). 6. Stephen M. Walt, “Alliances in Unipolarity,” <u>World Politics</u> 61 (2009): 86-120.
Other recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ernst Haas, “Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept or Propaganda?” <u>World Politics</u> 5 (1953): 442-477. • John J. Mearsheimer, “Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War,” <u>The Atlantic Monthly</u> 266 (1990): 35-50. • Thomas J. Christenson, “China, the US-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia,” <u>International Security</u> 23 (1999): 49-80. • David C. Kang, “Stability and Hierarchy in East Asian International Relations,” in Stuart J. Kaufman, et al, eds., <u>The Balance of Power in World History</u> (Palgrave Macmillan, 2007).

SECTION SEVEN	Modern diplomacy, 4: the human rights revolution
Class meetings:	October 24
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human rights as a challenge to state sovereignty • Humanitarian intervention, Responsibility to Protect doctrine
Everybody reads:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Martha Finnemore “Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention,” in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., <u>The Culture of National Security</u> (Cornell, 1996). 2. David Wippman, “The International Criminal Court,” in Christian Reus-Smit, ed., <u>The Politics of International Law</u> (Cambridge, 2004). 3. Miles Kahler, “Legitimacy, Humanitarian Intervention and International Institutions,” <u>Politics, Philosophy and Economics</u> 10 (2011): 20-45. 4. Stewart Patrick, “A New Lease on Life for Humanitarianism,” <u>Foreign Affairs</u> (March 24, 2011).
Disc/pres reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Christopher Clapham, “Degrees of Statehood,” <u>Review of International Studies</u> 24 (1998): 143-157. 6. Christian Reus-Smit, “Human Rights and the Social Construction of Sovereignty,” <u>Review of International Studies</u> 27 (2001): 519-538. 7. Aidan Hehir, “The Responsibility to Protect: Sound and Fury, Signifying Nothing?” <u>International Relations</u> 24 (2010): 218-239.
Other recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nicholas J. Wheeler, <u>Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society</u> (Oxford, 2000). • Neta Crawford, <u>Argument and Change in World Politics: Ethics, Decolonization and Humanitarian Intervention</u> (Cambridge, 2002). • Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “Smart Power and the War on Terrorism,” <u>Asia-Pacific Review</u> 15 (2008): 1-8.

SECTION EIGHT	Modern diplomacy, 5: The modern system under stress
Class meetings:	October 31
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International institutions

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International law • Supranationalism (esp. Europe)
Everybody reads:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stephan Haggard & Beth Simmons, "Theories of International Regimes," <u>International Organization</u> 41 (1987): 491-517. 2. Richard H. Steinburg, "In the Shadow of Law or Power: Consensus-Based Bargaining and Outcomes in the GATT/WTO," <u>International Organization</u> 56 (2002): 339-374. 3. Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore, "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations," <u>International Organization</u> 53 (1999): 699-732. 4. Miles Kahler and David Lake, "Economic Integration and Global Governance: Why So Little Supranationalism?" in Walter Mattli and Ngaire Woods, eds., <u>The Politics of Global Regulation</u> (Oxford, 2009).
Disc/pres reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Andrew Moravcsik, "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach," <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u> 31 (2008): 473-524. 6. Alexander Wendt, "Why a World State is Inevitable," <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 9 (2003): 491-542.
Other recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert O. Keohane, <u>After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy</u> (Princeton, 1994). • Richard Rosecrance, "The Rise of the Virtual State," <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 75 (1996): 45-62. • Alistair Iain Johnston, "Treating International Institutions as Social Environments," <u>International Organization</u> 45(2001): 487-515. • Joseph S. Nye, "Globalization's Democratic Deficit: How to Make International Institutions More Accountable," <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 80 (2001): 2-23. • Christian Reus-Smit, "Politics and International Legal Obligation," <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 9 (2003): 591-625.

SECTION NINE	Modern diplomacy, 6: How-to
Class meetings:	November 7
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Practitioners & theorists • General "how-to" advice for negotiators

<p>Everybody reads:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Geoffrey R. Martin, "The 'Practical' and the 'Theoretical' Split in Negotiation Literature," <u>Negotiation Journal</u> 4 (1988): 45-54. 2. Roger Fisher & William Ury, "The Method" (Part II), in <u>Getting to Yes: Negotiating an Agreement without Giving In</u> (2nd ed., Random House, 1996). 3. Jeffrey Z. Rubin & Frank E.A. Sander, "Culture, Negotiation, and the Eye of the Beholder," <u>Negotiation Journal</u> 7 (1991): 249-254. 4. Richard C. Holbrooke, "Peace in a Week" and "Showdown," in <u>To End a War</u> (Modern Library, 1999).
<p>Disc/pres reading:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Sasson Sofer, "The Diplomat as Stranger," <u>Diplomacy & Statecraft</u> 8 (1997): 179-186. 6. Gilbert R. Winham, "Negotiation as a Management Process," <u>World Politics</u> 30 (1977): 87-114. 7. Nigel Quinney, "US Negotiating Behavior," <u>United States Institute of Peace Special Report</u> 94 (October 2002).
<p>Other recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Winston Churchill, <u>The Second World War, Vol. 2: The Gathering Storm</u> (Mariner, 1986). • Robert S. McNamara, <u>In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam</u> (Vintage, 1996). • Allan Gotlieb, <u>The Washington Diaries, 1981-1989</u> (McClelland & Stewart, 2007).

<p>SECTION TEN</p>	<p>Post-modern diplomacy, 1:</p>
<p>Class meetings:</p>	<p>November 14</p>
<p>Topics/themes:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transnational relations • Transgovernmental networks • Global governance
<p>Everybody reads:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anne-Marie Slaughter, "The Real New World Order," <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 76 (1997): 183-197. 2. Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, "Transnational Advocacy Networks in International Politics: Introduction," in Keck and Sikkink, <u>Activists Beyond Borders: Transnational Advocacy Networks in International Politics</u> (Cornell, 1998). 3. Crister Jönsson, et al., "Negotiations in Networks in the European

	<p>Union,” <u>International Negotiation</u> 3 (1998): 319-344.</p> <p>4. Rodney Bruce Hall and Thomas Biersteker, “The Emergence of Private Authority in the International System,” in Hall and Biersteker, eds., <u>The Emergence of Private Authority in the International System</u> (Cambridge, 2002).</p>
Disc/pres reading:	<p>5. Raymond Vernon, “The Multinational Enterprise: Power versus Sovereignty,” <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 49 (1971).</p> <p>6. Phil Williams, “Transnational Organized Crime and the State,” in Rodney Bruce Hall and Thomas Biersteker, eds., <u>The Emergence of Private Authority in the International System</u> (Cambridge, 2002).</p>
Other recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Strange, <u>Casino Capitalism</u> (2nd ed., Blackwell, 1997). • Alexander Benard, “How to Succeed in Business,” <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 91 (2012). • Peter Andreas, “Illicit Globalization: Myths, Misconceptions and Historical Lessons,” <u>Political Science Quarterly</u> 126 (2011). • Peter Van Ham, “The Rise of the Brand State,” <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 80 (2001). • Michele M. Betsill and Elisabeth Corell, “Introduction to NGO Diplomacy,” in Betsill and Corell, eds., <u>NGO Diplomacy</u> (MIT, 2008). • Kal Raustiala, “The Architecture of International Cooperation,” <u>Virginia Journal of International Law</u> 43 (2002).

SECTION ELEVEN	Post-modern diplomacy, 2:
Class meetings:	November 21
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The power of ideas • Global norms
Everybody reads:	<p>1. Radoslav Dimitrov, “Inside Copenhagen: The State of Climate Governance,” <u>Global Environmental Politics</u> 10 (2010): 18-24.</p> <p>2. Peter G. Peterson, “Public Diplomacy and the War on Terrorism,” <u>Foreign Affairs</u> 81 (2002): 74-94.</p> <p>3. Michael W. Doyle, “International Ethics and the Responsibility to Protect,” <u>International Studies Review</u> 13 (2011): 72-84.</p> <p>4. Ole Jacob Sending, “United by Difference,” <u>International Journal</u> 66 (2011): 643-662.</p>

<p>Disc/pres reading:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Darryl Copeland, "New Rabbits, Old Hats," <u>International Journal</u> 60 (2004-05). 6. David Held, "The Transformation of Political Community," in Ian Shapiro & Casiano Hacker-Cordon, eds., <u>Democracy's Edges</u> (Cambridge, 1999). 7. "Expert Roundtable: Will Wikileaks Hobble US Diplomacy?" Council on Foreign Relations, December 1, 2010.
<p>Other recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Smart Power and the War on Terrorism," <u>Asia-Pacific Review</u> 15 (2008): 1-8. • Hillary Rodham Clinton, "On Internet Rights and Wrongs: Choices and Challenges in a Networked World," presentation given at George Washington University, Washington DC, February 15, 2011.

<p>SIMULATION EXERCISE: Pipeline Diplomacy</p>	
<p>Class meetings:</p>	<p>November 28</p>

<p>SIMULATION REVIEW & WRAP-UP</p>	
<p>Class meetings:</p>	<p>December 5</p>
<p>REMINDER</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">SIMULATION REPORT DUE DECEMBER 4 SECOND TERM PAPER DUE DECEMBER 10 THIRD TERM PAPER (POLI 5581) DUE DECEMBER 16</p>
<p>Topics/themes:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of simulation exercise • Last-minute advice on (second) term papers • Course evaluations