Instructor: Professor Emilie M. Hafner---Burton

This course exposes students to seminal research on the role of international laws, contracts and regulations in world politics. The first part of the course develops tools to classify and analyze variation in different types of international institutions. We will consider different collection action problems that generate the need for cooperation, the role domestic politics play in the cooperation and contracting process, variation in the design of international contracts as well as the process of (and problems associated with) delegating authority to international institutions. The second part of the course develops tools to evaluate the effectiveness of these efforts. We assess whether and how institutions engender compliance with agreements and explore the different ways in which they can have an effect on behavior. All students will participate in a six---week simulation designed to apply the lessons of the course to a real world problem that requires cooperation. The course emphasizes the development of critical thinking, analytical writing and formal presentational skills.
**Course requirements:** Attendance is mandatory. This is a large seminar: all students are required to come to class prepared to discuss the assigned readings and will be called on to share their views. Class participation, a group debate, an in-class presentation, a simulation and a final paper (10 double spaced pages) are required. This course is reading and speaking intensive; we will work to build your critical thinking skills and sharpen your analytical and presentational skills.

**Reading Assignments:** Approximately 150 pages per week. To help you focus your preparation for the in-class discussion, this syllabus lays out questions for every session. You should come to class prepared to discuss these and related questions.

**Course Materials:** All course materials are on reserve or are available electronically.

**Presentation:** All students MUST meet prior to giving their presentation with one of the teaching assistants and the professor to review their approach and method. Each student will participate in a team presentation and lead class discussion for approximately 15 minutes. Assignments for this task will be given out on the second week.

**Simulation:** All students will participate in a simulation of the negotiation of an international agreement on a current issue that requires international cooperation. Teams and roles will be assigned during the quarter. The simulation will require a substantial amount of time outside the classroom and is not optional. The final exam is a paper based on the simulation process and outcome as they relate to the course material.

**Grading:** Final grades will reflect class participation (30%), an in-class presentation (20%), an in-class debate (20%) and a final paper (in lieu of a final exam) reflecting on the experience of the class simulation (30%). Your efforts in the simulation will be reflected in the final paper grade.

**Debate:** Each student will also participate in a formal debate as part of an assigned team.

The final paper (10 double-spaced pages) is a paper explaining the process and result of the simulation. Papers are due on Tuesday, June 2nd, 2015, at 5:00pm to: s2carlson@ucsd.edu. There will be no late papers accepted as the class on Wednesday, June 3rd will cover some of the same topics discussed in the final papers.

Papers also need to be submitted to turnitin.com by 5:00pm the day it is due. Turnitin.com will not allow you to submit late papers.
UNIT ONE – UNDERSTANDING

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS

Wednesday, April 1st: Collective Action Under Anarchy


Discussion Questions:

1. What does it mean that international relations is “anarchic”? How does anarchy shape the possibility for international cooperation?

2. What is an international “regime” and why are there so many different regimes rather than a single overarching one?

3. Finish the following statement: there is no need for an international regime when....

4. What is the difference between a dilemma of common interest and a dilemma of common aversion? What are some examples of each type of dilemma? Why is this difference important and what does it tell us about international cooperation?

5. Is the prisoner’s dilemma a useful metaphor for understanding international cooperation? Why or why not? Give examples. What are its main lessons about cooperation? Its main limitations?

6. When actors confront mutual aversions but diverge in their assessments of what they prefer, coordination can still be accomplished in at least two different ways. How?

7. Stein argues that regimes arise because actors forgo independent decision making in order to deal with different dilemmas only when it is in their own self---interest. Is he correct that self interest is a necessary condition for cooperation to emerge? What are the implications if he is correct? Can you think of any cases when he may be wrong?

8. Instead of assuming that actors are caught in a collective action trap from which they cannot escape, Ostrom argues that the capacity of actors to extricate themselves from various types of dilemmas varies from situation to situation. What determines whether they break out of the trap?

9. What explains changes in institutions (“regimes”)?
Monday, April 6th: Two-Level Games


Case: the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement

Visit: Trans-Pacific Partnership


Discussion Questions:

1. What is a two-level game and how is it a metaphor for domestic--international interactions? In the real world, does this metaphor help to explain cooperation? How?

2. What is the importance of the ‘win set’ for international bargaining and cooperation? What determines the win set?

3. Do Levels I and II ever happen simultaneously? Would that change the outcome?

4. How does a two-level game help to explain the phenomenon of an involuntary defection? Can you think of an example? How does that differ from voluntary defection?

5. What roles do uncertainty and issue-linkage play in two-level games? Examples?

6. Can actors in two-level games try to change their bargaining situations? How? What constraints do they likely face?

7. What is the role of the chief negotiator in a two-level game?

8. What is the role of domestic politics in facilitating or constraining a government’s decision to participate in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP)?

9. In Japan, why does the opposition to the TPP encompasses a much broader segment of society than is predicted by trade theorems?

10. Will the US government get the TPP they want? Will the lack of trade promotion authority affect the deal?

11. Why have the TPP negotiations been held mainly in secrecy? What effect will that have on the agreement?
**Wednesday April 8th: Legalization**


Case 1: *North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)*


Case 2: *International Monetary Fund (IMF)*


**Discussion Questions:**

1. What are the three dimensions of ‘legalization’? What does it mean that some legalization is ‘hard’ with other legalization is ‘soft’? Does that distinction correlate with the distinction between law and politics? Why or why not?

2. Why don’t we define legalization in terms of effects?

3. What is meant by obligation? How do we know legal obligation when we see it? What are some examples of high and low obligation? What kinds of techniques do actors utilize to vary their legal obligations?

4. What is precision? How does it differ from obligation? How do we know legal precision when we see it? Does most international law tend to be precise or imprecise? Why?

5. What is meant by delegation? How do we know delegation when we see it? What is an example? Is delegation necessary for international law to be effective? Why or why not?

6. What are the nine forms of international legalization that Abbott, Keohane, Moravcsik, Slaughter and Snidal identify? Are they all equally likely in the real world? Which are most likely? Why?

7. What explains the preference for using hard law in international economic arrangements like NAFTA? Why is only a moderate level of authority delegated to NAFTA’s dispute settlement mechanism?

8. Why did governments commit themselves to use a single unified exchange---rate system, and to keep their current account free from restrictions?
Monday, April 13th: Hard and Soft Contracts


Case 1: Universal Declaration on Human Rights


Case 2: Rio Declaration on Environment and Development


Discussion Questions

1. Note that the Abbot and Snidal piece is part of the “legalization” framework for analysis (see April 4th). What are the differences—in obligation, precision, and delegation—between hard and soft law? Why is it useful to look at all three attributes of an agreement rather than just delegation to enforcement bodies?

2. Why would countries choose to use hard law? What is the difference between “contract” and “covenant”?

3. What is the problem of incomplete contracting; how does it affect legal design?

4. What are the main advantages of soft legalization? What are “sovereignty costs” and why do they command so much attention in the article?

5. How does the choice of soft law as a “compromise” affect how legal institutions evolve over time? Would you expect to see more fluid evolution with hard or soft law agreements?

6. Shelton is a lawyer. What is the “problem” of soft law? Traditionally, lawyers have viewed hard law as a much more effective and important form of law. Why might that be?

7. When it comes to human rights, which kind of laws – hard or soft – are most effective? Why? Are soft laws, such as the Universal Declaration on Human Rights (UDHR), ever effective for protecting human rights? Why? Are they more or less effective than hard laws, such as the UN treaty prohibiting torture?

8. When it comes to the environment, which kind of laws – hard or soft – are most effective? Why? Are soft laws, such as the Rio Declaration, ever effective? Why? Are they more or less effective than hard laws, such as the Kyoto Protocol?

SIMULATION ROLES HANDED OUT: SIMULATION BEGINS
Wednesday, April 15th: Flexibility and Geometry


Case 1: Derogation from the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights


Case 2: G---20


Discussion Questions

1. The Hafner---Burton et al article is an academic analysis of flexibility. What is the core argument of the authors?

2. States respond to different problem types and risks by selecting from a range of design and flexibility options to calibrate an overall level of international commitment. Think back to our early class discussions about problem type: why might countries that want to cooperate alter the flexibility of a treaty? When might they prefer to limit flexibility?

3. What are some different options for attaining flexibility when making commitments?

4. What is an “escape clause”? What are some of the benefits of using an escape clause? Drawbacks?

5. How might the flexibility of an agreement effect membership in that agreement? How might the flexibility of an agreement effect compliance with that agreement?

6. Does flexibility enhance or undermine the legitimacy of international law?

7. What is the argument about multilateralism that Kahler thinks is overblown or misleading? Why does he think that argument is too pessimistic?

8. Why would a hegemon be interested in building multilateral agreements rather than a series of bilateral or minilateral agreements that it could control more readily? Examples?

9. Where do you think Kahler’s evidence is strong and weak?

10. How can voting rules, delegation, and small group “brokers” within these multilateral institutions affect cooperation?
Monday, April 20th: Principle Agent Analysis


Case 1: The Global Environment Facility


Case 2: World Health Organization


Discussion Questions:

1. What is delegation? What is the principal---agent (PA) approach? How is it a challenge to so---called ‘Realist’ approaches?

2. Why do states delegate certain tasks and responsibilities to international organizations? What are some of the alternatives to delegation?

3. What are some of the benefits associated with delegation? What are some of the risks?

4. According to the Nielson and Tierney article, principals possess at least four tools to help them design self---enforcing contracts and mitigate ‘agency slippage’. What are they and how do they work?

5. What does it mean that there is a trade off between the gains from delegation and the agency losses that arise from the opportunistic behavior of the agent?

6. How do states control international organizations once they have delegated authority to them? Specifically, what mechanisms do states use to ensure their interests are served?

7. Are international organizations actors in their own right? Are states always, usually, sometimes or rarely successful in this effort to ensure their interests are served through delegation?

8. What organizations are the GEF an agent for? Is this an effective delegation mechanism? Do the power asymmetries associated with the GEF make it an ineffective institution? Why do you think countries created the GEF instead of relying on existing institutions (e.g., the World Bank) to perform GEF’s functions?

9. Is the World Heath Organization (WHO) a dutiful agent, rogue actor, or both?
**Wednesday, April 22nd: Cooperation without Legalization**


*Case 1: Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)*

Visit: The ASEAN Way and the Rule of Law. ASEAN.org. 3 September 2001

*Case 2: Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights*


**Discussion Questions:**

1. What is the main disagreement Finnemore and Toope have with the “legalization” approach?

2. What is the “richer view” that the authors advocate?

3. Finnemore and Toope argue that the legalization perspective has been too narrow and misses three major aspects of a richer view of law. What are they?

4. How would a broader view of how law works lead to a better understanding of how domestic groups are mobilized in support of law?

5. Why do you think the framers of the “legalization” approach adopted such a narrow perspective and focused on obligation, precision and delegation?

6. Why is the Asia Pacific much less legalized than Europe and North America?

7. What is the “ASEAN Way”? Is it more or less effective than its more highly legalized counterparts in Europe and North America?

8. How and why does ASEAN differ from APEC with regards to legalization?

9. Does the Asia Pacific region have a legalized future in store? Why or why not?

10. Why are the Guiding Principles not legally binding? Will they be effective?
Monday, April 27th: Simulation Day—First Round of In Class Formal Negotiations

In class negotiations: first round of negotiating sessions to produce a draft agreement and any alternative modes of governance. The negotiations may also include meetings of interest groups working across countries—for example, meetings of business and of environmental interest groups.

Simulation memo due Sunday April 26th by noon to (ilar@ucsd.edu). One page single--spaced. One memo per person stating your negotiation position and strategy, people you have met with, and any significant barriers to the cooperation process. If you are a member of an interest group your memo should also indicate whether there are particular alternative governing systems you favor or have helped to craft.
UNIT TWO – EVALUATING INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS: TOOLS FOR APPRAISAL

Wednesday, April 29th: Democratic Deficit


  *Debate 1: The UN Security Council will be more effective if made more democratic in membership.


  *Debate 2: The WTO will be more legitimate through public transparency and participation reforms.

Paterson, Bill. "Democratic Deficits and Manufacturing Legitimacy at the WTO.” 2010

Discussion Questions:

1. Antiglobalization protestors contend that international institutions are illegitimate because they are undemocratic. Are they correct?

2. Can international organizations be democratic? Why does Robert A. Dahl argue that they cannot? How is NAFTA an illustration of Dahl’s argument? Is he correct about NAFTA?

3. Is democracy necessarily a desirable quality for international organizations? Can international organizations be legitimate without democracy? Should we be wary of ceding the legitimacy of democracy to non-democratic systems?

4. What are some proposed solutions to the problem (including both substantive and procedural solutions)? Are they achievable according to Dahl? What is Dahl's evidence? Are they achievable according to Nye? What is Nye’s evidence?

5. Are there some alternative ways to solve problems (such as accountability) raised by the democratic deficit?

6. The UN Security Council, the WTO and the World Bank are all targets of the democratic deficit criticism. Are they equally in deficit? What would happen if these organizations were to become more democratic? Would they be more or less effective?

7. What is Deliberative Democracy? Is it a solution to the Democratic Deficit in international organizations?

8. Did deliberation on UN Resolution 1373 create more legitimacy?
Monday, May 4th: A Managerial Model of Compliance


Case 1: Protecting the Ozone Layer


Case 2: Greece and the Eurozone Crisis


Discussion Questions

1. Do Chayes and Chayes expect the level of compliance with international agreements to be high or low?

2. How do “efficiency,” “interests,” and “norms” explain levels of compliance?

3. What are the major reasons for noncompliance? For each, what could the designers of international legal agreements do to reduce that cause of noncompliance?

4. Do Chayes and Chayes offer evidence for their claims about compliance and the sources of noncompliance? What kind of evidence do they use and how compelling is it?

5. Why does the concept of “acceptable levels of compliance” matter?

6. What role, if any, do fairness and legitimacy play in the managerial model of compliance? What does this model leave out?

7. What are the implications of this model for enforcement?

8. The ozone layer is widely considered to be the most effective international environmental treaty. Why does Parson think the treaty was so effective? Did it have any influence?

9. How did the state of the science on the ozone layer affect the negotiations?

10. What was the position of the leading developing countries and what was done to engage them with the treaty?

11. How would Chayes and Chayes analyze the likely compliance with the ozone treaty and the sources of non-compliance?

12. Does the Chayes and Chayes model explain the case of Greece and the Eurozone crisis? Should Greece have been admitted? Are the causes of non-compliance ‘managerial’?
Wednesday, May 6th: Two Models of Influence


*Debate 1:* States comply with Article VIII of the International Monetary Fund because the legal commitment compels them to do so, not because of the conditions that led them to sign in the first place


*Debate 2:* States comply with the Kyoto Protocol because the legal commitment compels them to do so, not because of the conditions that led them to sign in the first place


Discussion Questions

1. What is Koh’s argument? Why is process so important in his model? Who is he arguing against?

2. Does Koh offer evidence for his claims about how norm internalization occurs? What kind of evidence do they use and how compelling is it?

3. What are the arguments that Goldsmith and Posner are arguing against?

4. Like Chayes and Chayes, Goldsmith and Posner assume that states know their interests and make rational choices. Yet unlike Chayes and Chayes, Goldsmith and Posner are more skeptical that states will have a “preference for complying with international law.” Why?

5. Posner and Goldsmith look at four models that, they say, explain the observed behaviors of international cooperation. What are they? What are the main differences, for example, between “coincidence of interest” and “coercion.” In which of these four kinds of behavior is the role for formal international legal institutions the greatest? The least?

Discussion Questions continue on next page
6. Why is this book widely read yet very unpopular among traditional international law professors?

7. Why are the debates about compliance with international law—with distinct viewpoints represented by Chayes & Chayes, Koh, and Goldsmith & Posner—important to resolve? Who is right and how would you know?
Monday, May 11th: Non-State Actors


*Case 1: Landmines Treaty*


*Case 2: Violence Against Women*


**Discussion Questions:**

1. What is a “transnational advocacy network (TAN)”? Why and how do TANs emerge?

2. What is the “boomerang pattern?”

3. How do advocacy networks work? Of the different types of politics that Keck and Sikkink discuss, which are most important?

4. Under what conditions can TANs be effective—that is, when are they most likely to achieve their goals? What are the different stages of network influence?

5. Do you think transnational relations are likely to be harder to analyze than inter-state relations? Why?

6. In the 1970s scholars studied transnational relations by looking at multinational corporations (MNCs) that could operate globally and thus circumvent governments. Keck and Sikkink argue that other transnational actors such as NGOs and TANs now play an important role. What do you think changed from the 1970s to the 1990s that made NGOs and TANs more important and why did earlier scholars largely ignore them?

7. In which kinds of countries are transnational actors most able to control policy outcomes?

8. One of the innovations in the Price article is his attention to HOW states are socialized to norms. What does that mean, and why is it so important to have a theory of how socialization occurs?

9. Who is “civil society” and why did civil society get focused on AP land mines? On Violence against women? What were the roles of networks and grafting in that process?

10. Price argues that governments changed their position NOT because of domestic political pressure, such as threat of losing elections. Why is that argument so important to his larger argument about HOW transnational relations work?
Wednesday, May 13th: Complexity


Case 1: Intellectual Property Regime (TRIPs)


Case 2: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)


Discussion Questions

1. What is regime complexity? What are the major reasons why institutions are overlapping in one issue—e.g., trade but not in another area (e.g., testing of nuclear weapons)?

2. The symposium that Alter/Meunier introduce is focused on how regime complexity affects international cooperation. What are some of the major possible impacts of complex and overlapping institutions on how international rules get implemented?

3. What is “chessboard politics?” What is forum shopping? Will these be more likely with regime complexity? Do you think these lead to more effective or less effective international institutions? Can you give some examples?

4. What are the implications of regime complexity for the design of international institutions? For example, one topic of keen interest to scholars who study the design of international agreements is the choice of “numbers”—how many countries (and which ones) are part of an institution? Does regime complexity favor large groups or small groups, and why?

5. Does competition between international organizations, NGOs and other actors lead to more or less complexity? More or less effective international cooperation?

6. If regime complexes are inevitable, what can be done to make that institutional outcome as effective as possible in promoting international cooperation?

Discussion Questions continue on next page
7. Do you think that regime complexity will empower many weaker and decentralized actors or simply make it easier for the big, powerful states to have even firmer control over international cooperation?

8. Why are standards for intellectual property (IP) set through decentralized mechanisms rather than a single, centralized international organization?

9. What are the chessboard politics that have played out between the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union’s (EU) European Security and Defense Policy (ESDP)? Has that made NATO more or less effective?
Monday, May 18th: Simulation—Second Round of In Class Formal Negotiations

*In class negotiations: final round of in class negotiating sessions to produce a draft agreement and any alternative modes of governance.*

Wednesday, May 20th: Private Authority


**Debate 1: Voluntary Regulation—or Corporate social responsibility (CSR)—Should Play a Central Role in Managing Climate Change Problems**


**Debate 2: Voluntary Regulation—or Corporate social responsibility (CSR)—Should Play a Central Role in Managing Human Rights Problems**

**Two-Faced Capitalism.** *The Economist* 22 January 2014.

**Discussion Questions**

1. What is “civil regulation?” Why would firms be interested in going “beyond compliance” and setting tougher standards for themselves?

2. Why would firms try to set these standards into “soft laws” rather than “hard laws?” What are the main mechanisms for accountability in these soft laws?

3. Vogel reviews a variety of different kinds of “codes”? What are the most important differences between these codes? Why do you think multi--stakeholder codes have attracted the most attention? Why do you think environmental codes have been highly effective in some areas (notably forestry) but not others (ozone--depleting substances)?

4. The apparel industry is an example of civil regulation related to labor standards. According to Locke et al, does private voluntary regulation prove to be an effective strategy for improving labor standards?

5. What steps has Nike take to enforce its Code of Conduct?

6. What are some problems with private voluntary regulation?

7. What is wrong with using the ILO to create enforcement mechanisms?

8. Can labor conditions improve and output increase at the same time?
Monday, May 25th: Memorial Day
No class

Wednesday, May 27th: Simulation—

Public Vetting and Ratification

*Presentation of the draft agreement by the Chairperson*

*Formal statements from the domestic interest groups of each country (1 minute each)—including unveiling of any alternative or linked governance agreements crafted by the interest groups. Public statement cast for or against the agreement.*

*Formal statements from ambassadors (1 minute each) and declaration of support (or not) for the agreement.*

*The agreement will only be adopted by countries that ratify the agreement. To pass, enough countries must ratify the agreement that together account for at least a certain percentage of the world's green house gas emissions. That percentage will be given out on the day the simulation begins.*
Monday, June 1st: Rising Powers


Case 1: Democracy Promotion


Visit: Atlantic Council Meeting Dossier

Case 2: Trade


Case 3: Development Assistance


Discussion Questions

1. What impact are the rising powers—Brazil, China, India, Turkey, South Africa—having on contemporary global political and economic governance? How are developing countries transforming the global economic landscape?

2. Rising economic powers are becoming more important players in international finance. They have increased holdings of foreign exchange reserves, established sovereign wealth funds, borrowed capital from international capital markets, and attracted substantial foreign investment. What effect will they have on the governance of finance?

3. Are the challenges posed by the rising powers to global governance likely to lead to a change in democracy and social justice for the majority of the world’s peoples? Why? Can you think of examples?

3. Burke---White argues that the rise of the BRICs over the past decade has caused a profound transformation of global politics, leading to a multi---hub structure for international law, distinct from past structures such as bipolarity and multipolarity. Do you agree? What are the possible effects of this transformation? Who stands to benefit from this transformation?
**Tuesday, June 2\(^\text{nd}\): FINAL PAPER**

*Due at 5:00pm to ilar@ucsd.edu and turnitin.com*

---

**Wednesday, June 3\(^\text{rd}\): Simulation**

**Debrief and Course Conclusion**

*No assignment: come to class prepared to discuss what happened in the simulation and to relate these events to the major lessons from this course. No late papers will be accepted.*
In Class Presentations

We will hold 16 in-class group presentations of approximately 15 minutes.

Monday, April 6th: Two-Level Games

Case: the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement

Wednesday April 8th: Legalization

Case 1: North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)
Case 2: International Monetary Fund (IMF)

Monday, April 13th: Hard and Soft Contracts

Case 1: Universal Declaration on Human Rights
Case 2: Rio Declaration on Environment and Development

Wednesday, April 15th: Flexibility and Geometry

Case 1: Derogation from the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
Case 2: G---20

Monday, April 20th: Principle Agent Analysis

Case 1: The Global Environment Facility
Case 2: World Health Organization

Wednesday, April 22nd: Cooperation without Legalization

Case 1: Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)
Case 2: Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights

Wednesday, May 4th: A Managerial Model of Compliance

Case 1: Protecting the Ozone Layer
Case 2: Greece and the Eurozone Crisis

Wednesday, May 11th: Non-State Actors

Case 1: Landmines Treaty Case

2: Violence Against Women
Monday, May 13th: Complexity

Case 1: Intellectual Property Regime (TRIPs)

Case 2: The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

Monday, June 1st: Rising Powers

Case 1: Democracy Promotion

Case 2: Trade

Case 3: Development Assistance

The purpose of these presentations is to apply theoretical concepts to specific cases and to hone your presentational and analytical skills. Students will be assigned to a presentation team.

The presentation should not be a summary of the assigned material and should NOT review the theoretical approach, which will already have been discussed by the professor. Rather, the presenters should outline how the case should be considered within the analytical approaches described in the unit’s theoretical readings and then pose a few central questions to lead a class discussion.

All presenters MUST see the teaching assistant and the professor in advance to discuss their assignment and approach. At the end of every presentation there will be a public debrief on style and content.

The grades are by team (not individuals).

Standards for Evaluation:

1. The presentation uses the case to directly engage main points from the class reading (20%)
2. The presentation poses simple, clear questions for class discussion (20%)
3. The presentation makes simple, clear ‘take home’ points related to the class reading (20%)
4. The presenters effectively engage the students in a dialogue (20%)
5. The presentation uses visual aids (if at all) effectively (20%)
In---Class Debating Procedures

The purpose of the debates is to explore multiple sides of a controversial issue and to hone your presentational and analytical skills. Some students might be debating positions opposite to their beliefs. This is an important skill for you to learn.

Students will be assigned randomly to a debate team. You will be with your team members for the duration of the course; there will be no switching teams for any reason. Each team will debate one to two times (depending on class size) and will serve in the audience for the others debates. The grades are by team (not individuals).

Debate Preparation

You should meet with your team prior to the debate to discuss the issues with your panel members and learn from one another.

During this time, you and your team members should develop a strategy to organize and coordinate your presentations. You should split up responsibilities (e.g., specific arguments and/or points) among the team, making sure that your presentations are linked to, while not being redundant with, one another. The team should be presenting a consistent argument based on the position you have been assigned (not on what you may personally believe).

In preparing for your panel presentation, you may find it helpful to do research and reading beyond that listed on the syllabus.

Procedures

Each of the two sides of the debate will present a summary of the arguments supporting its position. The “pro” side will start first, followed by the “con” side. Each side will be given approximately 2 minutes for the summary. Thus, you should prepare, practice, and time what you want to say beforehand. This preparation and practice will help you speak clearly while adhering to the time limit. It is much better to talk, in conversational style, from prepared notes, rather than to read verbatim from a script. If you talk (rather than read) it will be easier to listen to you and you will be more engaging and interesting. You may use power point or other visual aids only as needed—they are not required.

Both sides will then be given one minute to confer and prepare for their response. Each side will be given 1 minute for an initial response, starting with the “con” side and followed by the “pro” side.

Next, the audience will be asked to direct questions to each team. Questions from the audience must be concise and directed to particular teams or individuals. Answers must be given in 1 minute or less. At the discretion of the professor, there may be some additional back and forth time given during the question period.
Finally, each side will be given 1 minute for closing statements.

Everyone on the team must participate; it is for you to decide how.

Each debate will take about 15---20 minutes, followed by a short debrief.

**Role of Audience**

Each member of the audience should come prepared with at least two questions for each side. At the end of the debate, the audience will vote on the winner of the debate.

**Pointers**

Make your presentations clear, interesting, relevant, engaging, and within the time limit. Deliver your presentation to the audience, making a connection with them (e.g., talk to people, making eye---contact with them). State your argument as clearly and as interestingly as possible within the time limit. The keys are to (1) not be boring! (2) be knowledgeable and accurate, and (3) engaging ---- get the audience to listen to your presentation. In other words, know what you are talking about and present your knowledge and beliefs in a well--reasoned, interesting, attention---keeping rhetorical manner. It is often good to provide illustrative examples and/or ask (perhaps rhetorical) questions that are relevant to everyone.

It is essential that each team anticipate the arguments or points which will be made by the opposition. This will enable you to create a more effective argument. All speakers should dress appropriately (to their role).

**Grades**

The debates constitute 20% of your course grade. You will be graded as a team, not individually: all members of the team will receive the same grade. Thus, it is important to work together to prepare your presentations. Each team will be judged anonymously by your peers as well as by the professor.

**Grading Criteria for Debates**

1. Grasp of the issue and important related points. (20%)
2. Coherent and consistent message supporting your panel's position. (20%)
3. Ability to anticipate and/or counter opposing viewpoints. (20%)
4. Ability to see and challenge flaws in the opposition’s arguments and research. (20%)
5. Team coordination. (20%)
Simulation 2015
Governing Global Climate Change

Simulation roles will be given out in class on April 13th and informal discussions, negotiations, etc., should begin immediately thereafter.

Each student will be assigned a role by the professor. That role will be part of a team that represents a country. Roles may include ambassador who is the lead negotiator, acting on behalf of the government. Or the role might be one of several national interest groups. All participants should dress and act appropriate to their role during the formal simulation. Teaching instructors and the professor will play the roles of heads of state—thus any questions relating to your nation’s capital should be directed to them.

**Goal:** The end goal is to achieve a new agreement by the deadline—May 27th—that will replace the Kyoto Protocol on global warming, which will expire in 2020. In addition to creating a new treaty, governments and the various interest groups might create other kinds of agreements to complement or substitute for a new treaty—those arrangements might include industry agreements, partnerships between firms and environmental groups, or many other kinds of governance systems. The negotiators and their country—based interest groups may want to write the treaty or they may nominate the chairperson of the climate change talks to act as their agent.

**Scope:** The negotiations should cover (1) the tasks being agreed upon, (2) whether the agreement includes an enforcement mechanism (and with what penalties for non-compliance) and (3) whether the resolution should allow governments the flexibility to opt—out of certain obligations. The negotiators can add other aspects to the design of the resolution should they so choose—however, the simulation negotiations must cover these three aspects. A standard agreement in this context would be 2 to 3 pages long. While a climate treaty is a very complex agreement, the diplomatic talks should address at least each of these elements:

- What are the main obligations to control emissions (known as “mitigation”)?
- Which countries must implement mitigation obligations, and how are those obligations written into law—are they “targets and timetables” (e.g., cut 5% from 1990 levels by the year 2020) or are they more flexible to allow countries to adopt a variety of different national policies?
- What kinds of funding mechanisms, if any, will be included in the agreement? Who pays into the fund and who gets the money?
- Many countries fear that climate change will force them to adapt. Will your agreement include specific provisions on adaptation—for example, assistance from the countries that caused emissions for those nations that are likely to be most affected by climate change?
PART 1: Informal in---country and cross---national negotiations

The first part of the simulation will happen outside of class, while each country team meets as many times as necessary to develop a country negotiating position (i.e., to determine the national winset). Actors in any specific country may also want to meet with their counterparts in other countries in an effort to build coalitions. Those meetings must take place between April 13th and April 27th and result in a mandate for the lead negotiators.

Negotiators are the agents of the interest groups and the treaty will only pass if it gains enough political support at home. Thus, interest groups will have to inform their country’s negotiator of their interests and negotiators will have to work to ensure that the majority of interest groups within their countries will support the agreement they negotiate. If negotiators agree to a treaty that the majority of their interest groups oppose, the agreement will not be adopted.

Domestic interest groups have an interest in keeping abreast of the negotiations and working to build the coalitions they need to support, or undermine, their ambassador’s position both inside the country and with their international partners.

Each person must hand in a one page (single---spaced) memo by noon on Sunday, April 26th to s2carlson@ucsd.edu stating your negotiation position and strategy, people you have met with, and any significant barriers to the cooperation process. Be sure to indicate in the memo if there are any differences in opinion that have not been resolved.

PART 2: Formal in---country and cross---national negotiations

We will hold a formal in---class caucusing sessions on Monday April 27th. This session will be led by the Chairperson and serve as an opportunity for focused discussion and consensus building. During the caucusing, meetings of interest groups will also occur and various groups may form with the aim of designing governance mechanisms that rival or complement the formal government---to---government talks. The aim of caucusing is to achieve a successful agreement by the deadline: May 27th.

PART 3: Formal adoption of the treaty and other governing systems.

On Wednesday, May 27th, the agreement will go to a formal vote. The Chairperson will present the draft agreement. Country by country, every interest group will be given the floor for 1 minute and asked to cast a vote on the final agreement as well as to make a statement concerning any additional or alternative deals or agreement crafted in the negotiation process. They will be followed by the country ambassador who will be given 1 minute to make final remarks and register the country’s decision: if a majority of the interest groups vote in favor, the country will vote to ratify the agreement.

The agreement will only be adopted by countries that ratify the agreement. To pass, enough countries must ratify the agreement that together account for at least a certain percentage of the world’s green house gas emissions—to be revealed on the day the simulation begins.

The simulation will end that day at 10:50am.
PART 4: FINAL PAPER

The final paper, based on this simulation (and described in detail below) is due on Tuesday, June 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2015, at 5:00pm. In class on June 3\textsuperscript{rd}, we will debrief and discuss the simulation results and process in detail. Thus, no late papers will be accepted because the in class discussion on June 3\textsuperscript{rd} will revolve around those papers.

The final paper is a reflection on the preparation and outcome of the simulation. The paper has four parts, (1) a two to three paragraph executive summary, (2) a section summarizing your formal role in the simulation, including your position going into the exercise and (3) your analysis of the negotiation process and outcome.

Part 1: Executive Summary

Your executive summary should encapsulate your formal position in the simulation and the main arguments you are making in the paper about why the outcome of the simulation took the form it did. It should be concise and clearly written (no jargon). This is a roadmap to the arguments you will elucidate in Parts 2 and 3 of the paper. This section should be no longer than one double-‐-spaced page.

Part 2: Summary of Formal Role and Position

Briefly describe your position in the simulation and explain your position going into the simulation. What were your aims? And what were the outcomes you were trying to avoid? Explain why. This section should be approximately 1 to 2 double-‐-spaced pages.

Part 3. Analysis

Given your aims in Part 2 explain why the actual outcomes were consistent with or different from your goals. (a) Begin by stating, briefly, the outcome of the simulation. (b) Next, explain in detail the legalization design of the agreement if one was negotiated (even if it was not passed). The discussion of design should cover topics discussed in class, including enforcement and flexibility and explain why these choices were made. (c) Next, address your choice of two (or more) topics from the following list – nature of the cooperation problem, principal agent relationships, democratic deficit, domestic politics, non-‐state actors, and the mechanisms for promoting compliance – and explain how those topics affected the negotiation process and outcome of the simulation. This section should be approximately 8 double-‐-spaced pages.

The paper must include citations to all sources, including course materials and also secondary research materials that you read outside of class. Papers are due on Tuesday, June 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 2015, at 5:00pmt: ilar@ucsd.edu. Itmustnotexceed 10double-‐-spaced pages.
The paper is worth 30% of your course grade. Grading criteria include:

- Clarity of argument.
- Analytical rigor. Do not state your opinions. Rather, argue on the facts.
- Support for your argument, by way of evidence and examples.
- Proper attribution to your sources.
- Clarity of prose. Clean writing style (i.e., no spelling errors or sloppy mistakes)
- Clean organization of logic.