**Politics 333, International Organizations  
Sixth Block, 2018-2019  
David Yamanishi**

**Syllabus**

***Contact information***

Classroom: South Hall 302, except as announced

Office: South Hall 308, available as announced

Email: [dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu)

Moodle: moodle.cornellcollege.edu (contains handouts, assignment submission links)

Consulting librarian: Meghan Yamanishi, Cole Library 308, x4143,   
 [myamanishi@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:myamanishi@cornellcollege.edu)   
 Hours: 8:30-5.

Writing consultants: Jennifer Haigh, Cole Library 315, x4812  
 [jhaigh@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:jhaigh@cornellcollege.edu)  
 Laura Farmer, Cole Library 315, x4509,   
 [lfarmer@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:lfarmer@cornellcollege.edu)  
 Studio hours: Monday-Thursday, 8am-11pm;   
 Friday, 8am-5pm; Sunday, 1-11pm.

Quantitative reasoning consultant: Jessica Johanningmeier, Cole Library 322, x4222,   
 [jjohanningmeier@cornellcollege.edu](mailto:jjohanningmeier@cornellcollege.edu)  
 Studio hours: Monday-Thursday, 8am-5pm and 7-11pm;  
 Friday, 8am-4:30pm; Sunday, 3-5pm and 7-11pm.

***Overview***

The course addresses the history, present characteristics, and future prospects of efforts to establish international order through global and regional integration and governance, the development of international law, the activity of internationally-oriented non-state actors and social movements, and resistance thereto. We will examine a wide range of international organizations, and focus especially upon the United Nations’ effort to control and end conflict in and around the Democratic Republic of the Congo in recent years. We will also simulate a deliberation in the United Nations Security Council regarding a crisis to be announced.

This class is intended to advance Cornell’s educational priorities and objectives: knowledge (you will engage with scholarly work on international organizations in its own right and in the context of the broader liberal arts), inquiry (you will engage in an substantial independent research project that will let you practice research skills), reasoning (your project will require weighing competing understandings of your explanandum through analysis of evidence and critical thinking), communication (you will engage in class discussion as well as more formal written and oral presentation of your research findings), intercultural literacy (we will work together to understand the emergence of cooperation via organization in a variety of cultural and cross-cultural settings), citizenship (learning about international politics and political constraints upon American and other states’ behavior will help you engage in more informed discussion of and influence upon global politics), and vocation (we will discuss academic and career possibilities that could follow upon this class). Specific individual research projects may touch upon ethical issues, in addition to the above.

***Accommodations***

If you are eligible for accommodations on papers or exams, please let me know as soon as possible. Accommodations must be on file with the college.

***Feedback***

I am very interested in your suggestions for improvement of this class and my teaching generally. Please email comments to me as you think of them or share them with me at my office, if you would like to see your thoughts have immediate effect. I also pay very close attention to course-end evaluations, especially if you offer detailed, written remarks in addition to the numbers.

***Books to buy***

The following books are available at the bookstore in the Commons.

Ian Hurd (2017), *International Organizations: Politics, Law, Practice* (3rd ed.), Cambridge. ISBN 978-1-316-63445-5.

G. John Ikenberry (2001), *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*, Princeton. ISBN 978-0-691-05091-1.

Séverine Autesserre (2014), *Peaceland: Conflict Resolution and the Everyday Politics of International Intervention*, Cambridge. ISBN 978-1-107-63204-2.

Seth A. Johnston (2017), *How NATO Adapts: Strategy and Organization in the Atlantic Alliance since 1950*, Johns Hopkins. ISBN 978-1-4214-2198-8.

***Readings and assignments***

Abbott & Snidal is on Moodle. The rest of our readings are in the books listed above.

**Summary schedule:**

**Week Monday Tuesday Wednesday Thursday Friday**

**1 930-11, 1-3 1-3 1-3 1-3 930-12  
2 1-3 1-3 1-3 930-12 1-3  
3 1-3 1-3 1-3 930-12, 1-3 930-12, 1-3  
4 930-12 930-11, 1-3 1030-12**

*Italicized events are selected things that are happening on campus this block. If you attend a starred entry, you may submit an extra journal entry by email for extra credit (or to replace a missed reading journal).*

Monday, February 11 930a Introductions, administrivia

1p Kenneth W. Abbott & Duncan Snidal (1998), “Why   
 States Act through Formal International   
 Organizations,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42:1:3-32  
 (29 pages)

Tuesday, February 12 1p Hurd, Chapters 1-2 (41 pages)

Ikenberry, Chapter 1 (18 pages)

Wednesday, February 13 1p Ikenberry, Chapters 2-3 (59 pages)

**Organization obligations post due by Thursday**

Thursday, February 14 *1115a All-Campus Convocation, King Chapel*

1p Ikenberry, Chapters 4-7 (assigned in groups) and 8   
 (everybody) (variable pages)

United Nations simulation prep: overview, country  
 assignments

Friday, February 15 930a Source identification session with Meghan Yamanishi

Saturday, February 16 **2p Paper introduction and factual section due**

Monday, February 18 1p Hurd, Chapters 3-4, 7 (67 pages)

**11p UN simulation country description paper due**

Tuesday, February 19 1p Hurd, Chapters 5-6 (83 pages)

Wednesday, February 20 1p Hurd, Chapters 8-10 (93 pages)

**Organization compliance post due by Thursday**

*730p “Food from the Radical Center” talk by Gary Nabhan  
 (Commons Hall-Perrine)*

Thursday, February 21 930a **First test**

**\****1110a “Experiential Learning on the Hilltop (and beyond)” talk   
 by Sam Hebel and others, Humanities and Arts Interest   
 Group talk, (Commons Hedges)*

Friday, February 22 *12p Humanize My Hoodie artist event with Andre  
 Wright (Commons OC)*

1p Autesserre, pp. 20-96 (77 pages)

Saturday, February 23 **2p Paper revisions + literature review due**

Monday, February 25 1p Autesserre, pp. 97-193 (97 pages)

**11p UN simulation crisis response paper due**

*730p Music Mondays: Rod Pierson Big Band featuring  
 Craig Boche (King Chapel)*

Tuesday, February 26 *11a On-Campus Career Expo (Commons Smith Dining)*

1p Autesserre, pp. 194-288 (95 pages)

Wednesday, February 27 1110a “Faith and Social Justice for Sustaining the Peace in  
 Liberia” talk by Rev. William Tolbert (in Commons  
 Hall-Perrine)

115p “From the Heart: Sharing and Answering Questions   
 about Liberia and Cornell” talk by Rev. William   
 Tolbert (in Commons Hall-Perrine)

**Organization enforcement post due by Thursday**

Thursday, February 28 930a United Nations simulation

\**1110a “Critically Endangered or Over-Abundant Pest?” talk by   
 Tammy Mildenstein, Science Interest Group talk (Law   
 203)*

1p Johnston, chs. 1-4 (73 pages)

*730p Ascension dance concert (Kimmel)*

Friday, March 1 930a United Nations simulation

1p Johnston, chs. 5-8 (103 pages)

*730p Ascension dance concert (Kimmel)*

Saturday, March 2 **2p Research paper due**

*730p Ascension dance concert (Kimmel)*

*Sunday, March 3 2p Ascension dance concert (Kimmel)*

Monday, March 4 **930a Second test**

**11p UN simulation reflection paper due**

Tuesday, March 5 **930a Individual presentations**

**1p Individual presentations**

Wednesday, March 6 **1030a Individual presentations**

**3p Research paper rewrite due**

***Recommended reading***

*International Security*, *International Politics, World Politics, International Organization,* and *International Studies Quarterly* are some of the more respected scholarly journals that focus upon international relations and often address the activities of international organizations. These are peer-reviewed, scholarly journals, and articles found in them are likely to be useful for your papers. More general journals such as the *American Political Science Review*, *American Journal of Political Science*, *British Journal of Political Science*, and the *Journal of Politics* also contain IO articles, albeit less frequently. These titles are available in JSTOR, Project Muse, Ebscohost, or other databases available through the library.

If your project is related to America at all, a truly excellent resource available at Cole Library in the reference section is the two-volume *American Foreign Relations since 1600*. This is an annotated bibliography of primary and secondary literature on foreign policy issues from the founding of the American colonies to 2003. The collection is indexed by time period and by theme, making it very easy to find a selection of great sources for any topic you might choose to address in your paper (provided it happened before 2003!). The library has a few other useful references on foreign policy and international relations, also.

Naturally I also recommend keeping up with events. The *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, and the *International Herald Tribune* are available online for free (on the same day, at any rate), and have excellent coverage of foreign affairs and foreign policymaking. If you prefer a slightly slower pace of news intake, I strongly recommend the *Economist*, a weekly news magazine published in the UK but available at our library and online. It’s advisable to get your news on foreign policy from more than one source, and especially to find out how people abroad view our choices.

***Assessment***

Participation in class 15%   
Journals 10% (including organizational posts, which count double)  
Tests 25% (15% for the higher score, 10% for the lower)  
UN simulation description paper 3%   
UN simulation response paper 3%   
UN simulation participation 5%   
UN simulation reflection paper 4%   
Research paper problem statement 2%   
Research paper outline/bibliography 3%   
Research paper 15%   
Research paper rewrite 8%   
Individual presentation 7%

Note: failure to turn in the final paper will result in a grade of no higher than D+, regardless of the formula above.

While the particular things I’m looking for vary to some degree by assignment, in general an A on an assignment means that your work is outstanding in terms of:

* addressing the assigned question and avoiding digression,
* having a well-structured argument,
* expressing your argument clearly and effectively,
* making appropriate and properly cited use of material on the syllabus and other well-selected sources,
* and demonstrating thoughtful integration and interpretation of the course material and discussions.

Lower grades mean that you have not done all of these things or have done one or more of them less well that you could have. The order of items on the above list should not be taken to indicate their order of importance in determining your grade on an assignment, nor should you suppose that the items will carry equal weight on an assignment or invariant weight across assignments. Moreover, I expect your work to improve during the course and across courses.

To simplify communication about grades, I grade all assignments using the same marks that appear on your academic transcripts: letter grades. When I combine assignment grades to produce your course grade, I will do so using the same numbers that the college uses to determine your GPA (A = 4.0, A- = 3.7, B+ = 3.3, etc.). I will always round-up from the midpoint between grades (for example, a 3.85 rounds to an A, while a 3.84 does not). I may raise grades from what the raw numbers indicate in deserving cases, but I will never change the rank order of students’ grades in the class in doing so.

***Instructions for assignments***

*Participation*: Participation includes oral participation, write-to-learn exercises in class, and (possibly) unannounced quizzes. If you punctually attend every class, *appear to me to be paying attention*, and never make a contribution to our common discussion, you will receive a C for oral participation. To get a grade higher than a C for oral participation, you must participate out loud. I assess oral participation more by thoughtfulness and attentiveness to the flow of the conversation than by quantity of oral communication. I do, however, expect you to contribute regularly. Office visits will help your oral participation grade, but are not a substitute for class attendance and participation. If it seems to me that the class needs encouragement to do the readings, there may also be unannounced quizzes that address basic factual points from the readings.

*Journals*: Each session of the course for which we have readings, you should submit a journal entry on Moodle. You might consider one or more of the reading note questions that I’ve distributed, or reflect upon how the readings for the day relate to earlier material and/or current events in the news. Feel free to offer your personal reactions to each piece, but I do want you to offer some interpretation or analysis of some kind in each journal entry. Asking a question is another good approach. Your entries should be 300 or more words per normal reading day, and 500 or more words per organization post. Journals will be graded according to (thoughtful) completion. That is to say: if you finish all of them and take them reasonably seriously, you will receive an A for the journal component of the course grade. The organizational posts referred to in the schedule will count double. This assignment corresponds to the educational priorities of Inquiry and Communication.

*United Nations simulation*: Each of you will roleplay as the Security Council representative for a member state of the United Nations Security Council. Together, we will face a crisis. Before the general nature of the crisis is announced, you will write a 750 or more word paper describing your country’s participation in the Security Council and its diplomatic goals in general. After the general nature of the crisis is announced and before the simulation itself, you will write a 750 or more word paper outlining your country’s likely response to the crisis and its goals in the Security Council negotiations that will follow. During the simulation, you will collectively produce a UN response to the crisis. After the simulation, you will write a 750 or more word paper on what you learned from the simulation and how it reinforces or questions other lessons in the class. This assignment corresponds to the educational priorities of Knowledge, Inquiry, Reasoning, Communication, and Citizenship.

*Tests*: The test questions will draw upon the readings and our class discussions. I may hand out test questions in advance, if doing so doesn’t appear to damage participation by reducing the incentive to do the readings. The test questions will mainly be interpretive, but there may be some identification questions. This assignment corresponds to the educational priorities of Knowledge, Inquiry, Reasoning, and Communication.

*Paper, generally*: You should choose a question related to the activities of one or more international organizations, about which scholars have disagreed. You might address the structure of an organization, its effectiveness relative to its goals in a particular incident or set of incidents, or the relative effectiveness with respect to their goals of two or more organizations operating in the same area. Your research paper should have five parts: an introduction, a contextual section, a literature review, an analysis, and a conclusion. To wit:

* Your introduction should state your problem clearly in the first sentence, briefly describe your overall conclusion, and outline the structure of your argument. It’s also helpful to suggest why your topic should interest readers.
* Your contextual section should flesh out your question by describing the facts that you mean to explain. You should not draw any conclusions in this section.
* Your literature review should relate how other scholars have explained the facts that you just described in the contextual section. You should not criticize or analyze their views in this section.
* Your analysis should advance your own argument based on the facts. You should begin by explicitly addressing the views of other scholars that you’ve described in the literature review. You should build your own argument on the pros and cons that you find in others’ arguments.
* Your conclusion should restate your question and briefly summarize the logic of your analysis. If you would like to offer suggestions for further work or other flowery thoughts, this is the place.

This assignment corresponds to the educational priorities of Knowledge, Inquiry, Reasoning, and Communication.

*Paper introduction and context*: Your paper’s introduction and context should indicate what puzzle you will address and make the terms of your question and their context clear. You should let readers know why your topic is important, and you should outline the rest of your paper. You should avoid answers to your question and explanation of causes (though these will appear in the outline in this part of your final paper). I will grade this assignment according to the quality of your statement of your central puzzle, the quality of the selection and presentation of facts that you offer to make the context of your puzzle clear, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis. We will select problems in class so as to avoid duplication. This assignment is mostly equivalent to the first two of the five parts of the overall paper, so you should write it as a coherent paper, not a set of bullet points. Your introduction and context should be about 1,000 well-chosen words; much shorter and you’ll have left something out; much longer and you’re probably trying to answer your question as well as ask it.

*Rewrite of the paper introduction and context plus literature review*: In the second week, you will rewrite your work from the first part of the paper based on my comments and your further reflections, then add your literature review. Your literature review should describe how other scholars have answered your question as well as how they’ve critiqued each other’s answers. The goal is to describe the most important answers out there in the scholarly conversation about your question, as well as to trace the development of the conversation if you can. For each source that you review, you should describe its conclusion (what causes the effect), its reasoning (how the cause causes the effect), and its evidence (how the author knows she’s right). It can make the shape of the scholarly conversation clearer to your audience if you group scholars who take a similar approach to your question. It’s also helpful to readers to offer a summary of the perspectives about your question before and after the paragraphs in which you describe the sources in detail to help your readers know what you want them to retain. I will grade the rewritten introduction and context according to the previous criteria (you should remember to update your outline to cover the literature review). I will grade the literature review according to the quality and representativeness of your sources and the quality of your descriptions of their conclusions, reasoning, and evidence. Your paper should be up to about 2,500 well-chosen words at this point; much shorter and you’ll probably have left out relevant literature; much longer and you may be getting carried away with the sources or have moved on prematurely to critiquing them.

*Final paper*: In the third week, you will rewrite the first three parts of your paper based on my comments and your further reflections, then add your analysis and conclusion to make up your final paper. The final paper should present your puzzle (the introduction and contextual section), explain how competing scholars understand the phenomenon in question (the literature review), and analyze the competing explanations to identify the roots of disagreement and to assess why one or more perspectives are right and the other(s) wrong. You should start your analysis by explaining what distinguishes the perspectives you described in your literature review from one another (e.g. different causes, different reasoning, different evidence). You should then make a case as to which perspective (or combination thereof, or a new one of your own) comes closest to the truth as you see it (by, e.g, describing new evidence, reinterpreting evidence, describing a missed mechanism or cause). I will grade the paper according to the quality of your discussion of how your problem has been and/or might be explained by scholars from different perspectives, the quality of your analysis of what fundamentally unites and distinguishes the competing perspectives that you address, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis (including improvements in the material drawn from the earlier parts of your paper). Your paper, including any of the earlier parts recycled in it, should be about 4,000 well-chosen words; much shorter and you’re probably oversimplifying your project by leaving out relevant literature or analyzing it too hastily or by picking a problem about which there’s not much to say; much longer and you’re probably overcomplicating your project by including too much tangentially relevant literature or by picking a problem that’s much too complicated to begin with.

*Final paper rewrite*:I will return your graded papers with comments as quickly as possible, so that you may improve your paper according to my suggestions (and perhaps your own further reflection upon it). Your grade on the rewrite will be no lower than your grade on the original paper, provided you turn it in. If you make only cosmetic changes or none at all, your grade will be the same as the original grade. If you fail to turn in your rewrite, you will receive a grade one grade lower than on the third stage (from a B+ to a B, for example). I may also distribute a set of survey questions regarding your paper for completion at the same time.

*Individual presentation*:Your presentation should address your paper project. You should present your puzzle, the competing perspectives that you have discovered about it, and your analysis of their advantages and shortcomings in about 10 minutes. After each presentation, I will select another student (or students) in the class to serve as a discussant who will briefly summarize the presentation and ask one or more critical questions about it. After the discussant speaks, other students may ask questions and make comments (which will count as ordinary class participation, not part of the presentation grade). Your presentation grade will depend on your effectiveness in presenting your argument in a clear way to the class and your facility and thoughtfulness in answering questions about your work, as well as quality of your formal discussion of another student’s presentation. This assignment corresponds to the educational priorities of Knowledge, Inquiry, Reasoning, and Communication.

***Attendance, lateness, and 15th day drop policy***

To avoid a penalty on your participation grade for missing class, you must let me know in advance that you will miss class due to illness or emergency. In cases where documentation is available (either from a medical professional or campus official), please provide it.

I will lower the grade on work submitted late by 1% of the maximum grade per hour late. However, work submitted late *that meets the minimum expectations of the assignment* will receive at least a D regardless of lateness, so you should submit all assignments even if you are extremely late. I will not accept any work after 3pm on the last day of the block.

To drop on the 15th day, you *must* complete every assignment due by the end of the 14th day of class and meet the attendance condition noted above (that is to say, you must miss no more than one class without a documented excuse). In other words, if you are likely to sleep through class on more than one occasion, you should drop now, because you will not be able to do so later.

***Academic honesty***

“Cornell College expects all members of the Cornell community to act with academic integrity. An important aspect of academic integrity is respecting the work of others. A student is expected to explicitly acknowledge ideas, claims, observations, or data of others, unless generally known. When a piece of work is submitted for credit, a student is asserting that the submission is her or his work unless there is a citation of a specific source. If there is no appropriate acknowledgment of sources, whether intended or not, this may constitute a violation of the College's requirement for honesty in academic work and may be treated as a case of academic dishonesty. The procedures regarding how the College deals with cases of academic dishonesty appear in *The Compass*, our student handbook, under the heading ‘Academic Policies – Honesty in Academic Work.’”