

PSci 685(4) Non-State Actors in Global Governance

University of Waterloo and Balsillie School of International Affairs, Winter 2010

Professor Kathryn Hochstetler

Hagey Hall 354, 519-888-4567, ext. 38892, khochstetler@balsillieschool.ca

Office Hours: Mondays 2:30-4:30 and by appointment

Course Description and Objectives: Non-state actors is a broad political category that includes everything from ordinary citizens – in social movements, non-governmental organizations, and networks of various kinds – to economic actors like multinational corporations and labor unions to criminal and terrorist networks. This is a course about the roles they play in global governance. To talk of global governance almost presumes the importance of these kinds of actors, as otherwise one could simply study governments of various kinds. As we will see, however, there is an equally wide range of interpretations of non-state actors, which are grounded in different understandings of the nature of the modern world and the contours of authority and power in it. We begin with a pair of sessions that examines these interpretations in the abstract, drawing on literatures from sociology and economics as well as political science. The next major part of the course introduces the large literature that takes on basic descriptive questions such as how non-state actors organize themselves, the purposes of their participation in global governance, and their strategies for influence. A final section uses two main categories to evaluate the participation of non-state actors in global governance. Effectiveness is measured through both successful and unsuccessful cases. The ability of non-state actors to hold others accountable is matched with questions about to whom and whether non-state actors are themselves accountable. The course is meant to give students an overview of this category of actors and their impact, but the assignments allow them to develop deeper knowledge of particular actors and their participation in global governance.

Course Format: Weekly seminar on Mondays 12:30-2:20, in Hagey Hall 124

Requirements:

1. Seminar participation (15% of the final grade). Since this is a seminar, your thoughtful participation in class is critical for the course's success. You are expected to complete all readings and attend all seminars. If you are not on track to receive full credit for this part of the course, I will let you know by the time of the term break.

2. Paper #1 (15% of the final grade) For this 5-page double-spaced paper, choose a pair of scholarly articles and/or book chapters about a specific non-state actor (e.g., Amnesty International, the Carter Center) or a fairly specific category of non-state actors (e.g., international human rights organizations, non-state election monitors) – approved by me. *Comparatively* review the articles with respect to the following dimensions: what is the nature, purpose, and rationale of the research; what kind of evidence is presented; what is the overall argument about the non-state actor and how well is it developed and supported by the evidence provided? Overall, what are the strengths and weaknesses of the pieces and how would you reconcile any conflicting claims? This paper is due on **January 25**, at the beginning of class. Late papers will receive penalties of 3% per day, including weekends.

This paper is meant to help you begin thinking and researching about the non-state actors you will research for subsequent assignments. It also introduces the mode of analysis you should be using for all readings you do for the course.

3. Paper #2 (35% of the final grade) For the second paper (ten double-spaced pages) select an international problem, issue, or event in which a number of kinds of international actors are involved. (Ideally this should be related to the one you used for Paper #1; see me if you are changing focus.) Survey the actual interactions of NGOs, states, IGOs, and any other actors on that issue. Who are the major actors? What is the nature of their activity? What are their goals and how do they pursue them? What structures, norms, rules, or practices constrain their action? Who is influential, effective, or not? What theories might be appropriate to begin to explain the outcome? This assignment is due in my drop box or email by 5 p.m. on Thursday, **February 25**. Late papers will receive penalties of 3% per day, including weekends, and may receive fewer comments.

This assignment will require you to become familiar with both the secondary literature on your topic and with primary sources. You will probably need to do some original process tracing.

4. Paper #3 (35% of the final grade) The third paper (ten double-spaced pages) will be a theoretical analysis of activity in the issue area that you surveyed for the second paper. Choose one of the approaches that we have studied in class. How would this theory be applied to your case? How well does the theory explain the interactions and outcomes in your case? In this paper, you may also need to speculate on what theory still needs to do to address your question – or what new empirical work would help to further evaluate the theory. Please turn in the second paper with the first one. This paper will be due **April 8** at 5 p.m., by email or in my drop box. There is no late penalty for this assignment, but late papers will receive fewer comments.

This assignment asks you to apply an appropriate theoretical framework to your topic and then evaluate how useful that theory is for your topic. You should do some additional readings on the particular theoretical framework you choose to apply.

Academic Integrity:

Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. [Check <http://www.uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/> for more information.]

Discipline: A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about “rules” for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under Policy 71 – Student Discipline. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students should refer to Policy 71 - Student Discipline, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy71.htm>. For typical penalties check Guidelines for the Assessment of Penalties, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/guidelines/penaltyguidelines.htm>.

Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, <http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy70.htm>. When in doubt please be certain to contact the department’s administrative assistant who will provide further assistance.

Appeals: A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under Policy 70 Student Petitions and Grievances (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline if a ground for an appeal can be established. Read Policy 72 - Student Appeals,

<http://www.adm.uwaterloo.ca/infosec/Policies/policy72.htm>.

Academic Integrity website (Arts): http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html

Academic Integrity Office (UW): <http://uwaterloo.ca/academicintegrity/>

Accommodation for Students with Disabilities:

Note for students with disabilities: The Office for Persons with Disabilities (OPD), located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the OPD at the beginning of each academic term.

DATES, TOPICS, AND SPECIFIC READINGS:

Readings: Most of the readings can be obtained electronically through the University of Waterloo's electronic journals system and/or will be available through its "eReserves" system:

<http://www.ereserves.uwaterloo.ca/ereservesSearch.cfm>. They are listed under the course number.

1. Contending Theoretical Perspectives on Non-State Actors in Global Governance

January 5 Course introduction

Introduction to the course – no readings.

January 11 Viewing Non-State Actors through IR Theory

Krasner, Stephen D. 1995. Power Politics, Institutions, and Transnational Relations. In *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In: Non-State Actors, Domestic Structures and International Institutions*, ed. T. Risse-Kappen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 257-279.

Nye, Jr., Joseph S. and Robert O. Keohane. 1971. Transnational Relations and World Politics: A Conclusion. *International Organization* 25(3): 721-748.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1994. Ideas do not Float Freely: Transnational Coalitions, Domestic Structures, and the End of the Cold War. *International Organization* 48(2): 185-214.

Barnett, Michael and Raymond Duvall. 2005. Power in International Politics. *International Organization* 59(1): 39-75.

Kahler, Miles. 2009. Networked Politics: Agency, Power, and Governance. Kahler, Ch. 1.

January 18 Global Civil Society, Social Movements, and International Contention

Wapner, Paul. 1995. Politics Beyond the State: Environmental Activism and World Civic Politics. *World Politics* 47(3): 311-340.

Clark, Ann Marie, Elisabeth J. Friedman, and Kathryn Hochstetler. 1998. The Sovereign Limits of Global Civil Society. *World Politics* 51(1): 1-38.

Price, Richard. 2003. Review: Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics. *World Politics* 55(4): 579-606.

Smith, Jackie. 2008. Contested Globalizations. Smith, Ch. 1.

Tarrow, Sidney. 2001. Transnational Politics: Contention and Institutions in International Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 1-20.

2. Transnational Organization, Purposes, and Action

January 25 Principled Networks – Paper #1 due

Keck, Margaret E. and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

February 1 Strategic Framing and its Power Dimensions

Busby, Joshua William. 2007. Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics. *International Studies Quarterly* 51(2): 247-275.

Sell, Susan K. and Aseem Prakash. 2004. Using Ideas Strategically: The Contest Between Business and NGO Networks in Intellectual Property Rights. *International Studies Quarterly* 48(1): 143-175.

Lake, David A. and Wendy H. Wong. The Politics of Networks: Interests, Power, and Human Rights Norms. Kahler, Ch. 7.

Berkovitch, Nitza and Neve Gordon. 2008. The Political Economy of Transnational Regimes: The Case of Human Rights. *International Studies Quarterly* 52(4): 881-904.

Ron, James, Howard Ramos, and Kathleen Rodgers. 2005. Transnational Information Politics: NGO Human Rights Reporting, 1986-2000. *International Studies Quarterly* 49(3): 557-588.

February 8 Economic Globalization: Contending Agent Networks

Smith, Jackie. 2008. *Social Movements for Global Democracy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. Chs. 2-6, 9-10.

February 15 “Spring” Break – no class

February 22 Economic Globalization: Structural Power of Economic Non-State Actors

Glen Biglaiser, and Karl DeRouen, Jr. 2007. Sovereign Bond Ratings and Neoliberalism in Latin America. *International Studies Quarterly* 51(1): 121-138.

Mosley, Layna and David Andrew Singer. 2008. Taking Stock Seriously: Equity-Market Performance, Government Policy, and Financial Globalization. *International Studies Quarterly* 52(2): 405-425.

Wibbels, Erik. 2006. Dependency Revisited: International Markets, Business Cycles, and Social Spending in the Developing World. *International Organization* 60(2): 433-468.

Cashore, Benjamin. 2002. Legitimacy and the Privatization of Environmental Governance: How Non-State Market-Driven (NSMD) Governance Systems Gain Rule-Making Authority. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions* 15(4): 503-529.

Jochnik, Chris. 1999. Confronting the Impunity of Non-State Actors: New Fields for the Promotion of Human Rights. *Human Rights Quarterly* 21: 56-79.

Thursday, February 25 – Paper # 2 due

March 1 Clandestine Non-State Actors: Challenges for Activists, Authority, and Research

Kenney, Michael. 2009. Turning to the “Dark Side”: Coordination, Exchange, and Learning in Criminal Networks. Kahler, Ch, 5.

Kahler, Miles. 2009. Collective Action and Clandestine Networks: The Case of al Qaeda. Kahler, Ch. 6.

Loveman, Mara. 1998. High-Risk Collective Action: Defending Human Rights in Chile, Uruguay,

and Argentina. *American Journal of Sociology* 104(2): 477-525.

Kovats-Bernat, J. Christopher. 2002. Negotiating Dangerous Fields: Pragmatic Strategies for Fieldwork amid Violence and Terror. *American Anthropologist* 104(1): 1-15.

3. Assessing Non-State Actors and their Role in Global Governance

March 8 Conditions of Effective Mobilization (As Shown by Success)

Hawkins, Darren. 2004. Explaining Costly International Institutions: Persuasion and Enforceable Human Rights Norms. *International Studies Quarterly* 48(4): 779-804.

Yanacopulos, Helen. 2009. Cutting the Diamond: Networking Economic Justice. Kahler, Ch. 4.

Joachim, Jutta. 2003. Framing Issues and Seizing Opportunities: The UN, NGOs, and Women's Rights. *International Studies Quarterly* 47(2): 247-274.

True, Jacqui and Michael Mintrom. 2001. Transnational Networks and Policy Diffusion: The Case of Gender Mainstreaming. *International Studies Quarterly* 45(1): 27-57.

Dimitrov, Radoslav S. 2003. Knowledge, Power, and Interests in Environmental Regime Formation. *International Studies Quarterly* 47(1): 123-150.

March 15 Conditions of Effective Mobilization (As Shown by Failure or Absence)

Barnett, Michael. 2009. Evolution Without Progress? Humanitarianism in a World of Hurt. *International Organization* 63(4): 621-663.

Carpenter, R. Charli. 2007. Studying Issue (Non-)Adoption in Transnational Advocacy Networks. *International Organization* 61(3): 643-667.

Keck, Margaret E. 1998. Planaforo in Rondônia: The Limits of Leverage. In *The Struggle for Accountability: The World Bank, NGOs, and Grassroots Movements*, ed. J.A. Fox and L.D. Brown. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 181-218.

Sundstrom, Lisa McIntosh. 2005. Foreign Assistance, International Norms, and NGO Development: Lessons from the Russian Campaign. *International Organization* 59(2): 419-449.

Hochstetler, Kathryn. 2002. After the Boomerang: Environmental Movements in the La Plata River Basin. *Global Environmental Politics* 2(4): 35-57.

March 22 Accountability

Stein, Janice Gross. 2009. The Politics and Power of Networks: The Accountability of Humanitarian Organizations. Kahler, Ch. 8.

Nelson, Paul. 1997. Deliberation, Leverage, or Coercion? The World Bank, NGOs, and Global Environmental Politics. *Journal of Peace Research* 34(4): 467-470.

Scholte, Jan Aarte. 2004. Civil Society and Democratically Accountable Global Governance. *Government and Opposition* 39(2): 211-233.

Cooley, Alexander and James Ron. 2002. The NGO Scramble: Organizational Insecurity and the Political Economy of Transnational Activism. *International Security* 27(1): 5-39.

Cowhey, Peter and Milton Mueller. 2009. Delegation, Networks, and Internet Governance. Kahler, Ch. 9.

March 29 Accountability: Connecting Down

Hertel, Shareen. 2006. *Unexpected Power: Conflict and Change Among Transnational Activists*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Thursday, April 8 – Paper #3 due