

Global Governance and International Organizations: Crisis or Catharsis?

PA388K Summer 2011
Wednesday & Thursday, June 8-14
5:45 – 9:00 pm

UT Archer Center
1901 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 700
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Kate Weaver
cweaver@austin.utexas.edu
Cell: 512.934.7425
Office Hours: by appointment

Course Description

International governmental organizations (IOs) are the heart of global governance. Since the mid-20th century, IOs have played a central role in defining, implementing and enforcing rules and norms to resolve international collective action problems and provide public goods ranging from peace and security to financial stability and growth. Many policy students aspire to work for an IO one day. Yet many of the oldest and most prominent IOs in the world today are in crisis: their relevance, legitimacy and effectiveness constantly under fire by actors spanning the political spectrum. Why are these IOs in crisis? What is the nature of these crises? What is being done to reform these organizations, and to what end?

The course will begin with a broad historical and theoretical overview of the birth and growth of IOs in the world. Specifically, we will examine (1) why states create and work through IOs (2) how we understand the design and the delegation of functions to IOs; (3) the sources and exercise of IO authority and power, and (4) the often dysfunctional or pathological behavior of IOs. We will then focus specifically on the sources and nature of current crises and reform strategies. Our primary goal throughout the course will be to understand the complex politics within and surrounding these multilateral organizations, unpacking the dynamics of IO behavior and change both from the vantage of “high politics” and from a perspective of “life within” their walls.

We will specifically focus our attention on United Nations and Bretton Woods Institutions, who play prominent role in leading major areas of global policy, including peacekeeping (the UN DPKO), humanitarian and refugee assistance (the UNHCR), global development (the World Bank), international finance (the IMF), and world trade (the WTO). We will take advantage of being in Washington, D.C. and our proximity to New York to visit these IOs, hear directly from their staff and management, and to speak with many experts in the U.S. government and activist communities who have been advocating IO reform.

Weekly Current Events Suggested Sources:

Economist. <http://www.economist.com>

Financial Times of London. (electronic subscriptions highly recommended). <http://www.ft.com>

New York Times. <http://www.nytimes.com>

Washington Post. <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

International Herald Tribune. <http://www.ihf.org>

International Monetary Fund News: <http://www.imf.org/external/news.htm>

United Nations Development Program News Bulletin: <http://www.undp.org/dpa/journalists/subscribe.html>

World Bank Press Reviews, Development News, and Research Bulletins:

<http://www.worldbank.org/news>

On Academic Integrity:

Students are expected to respect the LBJ School's standards regarding academic dishonesty. You owe it to yourself, your fellow students, and the institution to maintain the highest standards of integrity and ethical behavior. A discussion of academic integrity, including definitions of plagiarism and unauthorized collaboration, as well as helpful information on citations, note taking, and paraphrasing, can be found at the Office of the Dean of Students web page. http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/acint_student.php and the Office of Graduate Studies (<http://www.utexas.edu/ogs/ethics/transcripts/academic.html>). The University has also established disciplinary procedures and penalty guidelines for academic dishonesty, especially Sec. 11.304 in Appendix C of the Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities section in UT's General Information Catalog.

Assignments:

I. Blackboard Discussion (20%) and In-Class Participation (20%)

Your participation score will be determined by your performance in two arenas: in-class discussion and weekly written contributions to the Blackboard online discussion board. For the online discussion, I would like you, at a minimum, to pose at least one well-developed question or comment related to the readings or topic for the first nine sessions of the course (June 8 – July 7). Your contribution should be at least one full two full, well-developed (and edited!) paragraphs. If you pose a question, explain why you think this is an important question for the class discussion and how you think the readings do or do not adequately answer the question. If you pose a comment, please explain why this is an important comment in the context of the readings and topic for the week. You may use this opportunity to react to current events or things you read in the news that are relevant to our course. Your questions or comments may be in reaction to the contributions of other students in the class.

Minimal participations for classroom discussion requires that you read, think about, and bring to class the assigned reading materials; be prepared to discuss the reading materials; and show respect for other participants as well as the instructor. The discussion evaluation guideline attached to the end of this syllabus differentiates contributors in the following areas: mastery of material, quality of ideas, effectiveness of argumentation, respectful and active engagement of others in the discussion, and general impression. Positive and constructive class participation is not based on a quantitative measure of how many times you speak in class or how many questions and comments you pose each week on BB (above the one question/comment requirement). Rather, good participation entails actively staying engaged during class by asking questions, making useful comments, and posing an argument relevant to the topic at hand. A willingness to play devil's advocate is encouraged. Classroom participation will also be based upon the quality of your questions and comments poised to our guest speakers.

II. Group Presentation: Snapshot of IOs in Crisis (30% written brief and 15% oral presentation)

Teams of two students each will prepare a 10-page report on an IO of their choice. The point of the report is to identify **one** key challenge facing the chosen organization related to its governance, operations, external relations, funding, staffing, etc. These reports can be on one of the IOs we have studied in this course (as long as the focus of the report differs substantially from our prior discussions), or a different IO or NGO.

Reports should be based on primary and secondary material, drawing from the IO's own sources as well as scholarly work by think tanks, academic scholars and activities. Each team is encouraged, but not required, to draw upon interviews or conversations with staff in these IOs (either in person, by Skype, email or phone). The reports should provide the necessary background on the IO, an analysis of the policy problem, and a discussion of possible policy responses (targeted at both internal organizational management as well as the IO's principal member states). The reports should be well documented and include a bibliography. Each research team should prepare a one-page proposal for this report by Thursday, June 23. Each proposal should be discussed with and approved by Dr. Weaver.

Full drafts of the reports are due by Sunday, July 10 by 5:00 pm and should be posted on Blackboard under the Discussion Board site. Research teams should then prepare a 15 minute presentation (including visual aids). The report presentations will be in class on Wednesday, July 13 and Thursday, July 14. Final drafts of the written report will be due on Monday, July 18 by 5:00 pm (by email).

III. Group Presentation Discussant (15%)

Each student in the class will be assigned as a discussant to one of the team reports (that means there will be two discussants for each report). The role of the discussant is to provide a constructive evaluation of the report, focusing both on the analysis of the identified problem facing the IO and the policy prescriptions offered by the report authors. Each discussant should prepare 5-8 minutes worth of discussion. The two discussants should coordinate with each other to avoid unnecessary repetition. Discussant should provide written comments to the report authors at the conclusion of the presentation. The feedback will be used by the report authors to revise the report for final submission on Monday, July 18.

Every member of class is expected to read each report and participate in the Question & Answer period. This will count towards your in-class participation grade.

READING SCHEDULE

Wednesday, June 8: Crisis and Change in IOs

Discussion Questions:

- Why study crisis and change in international organizations?
- Without getting too far into the weeds, what are some of the crises or challenges facing IOs today? How can start to generalize about the problems of global governance?

Required Reading:

Stewart Patrick. 2010. "Irresponsible Stakeholders? The Difficulty of Integrating Rising Powers," *Foreign Affairs*, November / December 2010. [BB]

Listen/Watch/Read one of the following:

Listen to the MP3: "Reforming the World Bank and IMF: A Conversation with Nancy Birdsall," 13 October 2009. Available at <http://www.acus.org/event/reforming-world-bank-and-imf>.

Watch the Webcast or Read the Transcript of the United States House of Representatives Briefing on The United Nations: Urgent Problems that Need Congressional Actions, 25 January 2011, Serial No.112-3. Available at http://www.internationalrelations.house.gov/hearing_notice.asp?id=1203

Recommended Reading:

European Union Institute for Security Studies. 2010. *Global Governance 2025: At a Critical Juncture*. Available at http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Global__Governance_2025.pdf

In-Class Exercise:

Framing the Problem: Typology of Crises and Challenges in IOs Today

Thursday, June 9: History and Architecture of Global Governance

Discussion Questions:

- Why do states create IOs?
- When are IOs created by other IOs?
- What are the types; functions; and varying structures of staffing and decision-making in IOs?
- How do we understand the evolution of IOs over the past two centuries?
- What does the current architecture of global governance look like? How is the landscape of IOs changing? Who are the emerging actors?

Required Readings:

Inis Claude, Jr. 1971 (2nd ed). *Swords into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*. New York: Random House. Pp.1-80. [BB]

Kenneth W. Abbott and Duncan Snidal. 1998. "Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(1): 3-32.

In-Class Exercise: Visualizing Global Governance

Wednesday, June 15: Understanding IO Behavior and Change

Discussion Questions:

- How can we understand how states delegate autonomy, authority and tasks to IOs?
- How do IOs attain and exercise influence and power?
- What are the various drivers of IO behavior?
- What causes IO dysfunction or pathologies?
- How can we explain the dynamics of IO behavior and processes of organizational change?
- Can change be engineered in these IOs? What tools of IO reform can be derived from the rationalist principal-agent model and the sociological constructivist model of IOs?

Required Readings:

Darren G. Hawkins, David A. Lake, Daniel L. Nielson, and Michael J Tierney, eds. 2006. *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Ch.1. [BB]

Michael Barnett & Martha Finnemore. 2004. "International Organizations as Bureaucracies," in *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, Ch.2. [BB]

In-Class Exercise: Designing a Toolkit for IO Reform

Thursday, June 16: United Nations Peacekeeping

Discussion Questions:

- How can we summarize trends of UN peacekeeping over the past 60 years?
- What explains UN success or failure in peacekeeping?
- Can the UN learn from its peacekeeping successes and failures?
- What is being done to reform UN peacekeeping?
- Does the New Partnership Agenda (aka New Horizon Initiative) demonstrate organizational learning? How has current peacekeeping reform progressed?
- What progress or challenges can we identify, particularly from the first progress report on the New Horizon Initiative or from the *2010 Annual Review of UN Peacekeeping Operations*?

Recommended Background Reading:

Background on UN Peacekeeping: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/>

History of Peacekeeping: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/history.shtml>
Peacekeeping Reform: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/reform.shtml>
Brahimi Report: http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/
United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Year in Review, 2010. Available at
<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/publications/yir/yir2010.pdf>

Required Reading:

Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 2004. "Genocide and the Peacekeeping Culture at the United Nations," in *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, ch.5. [BB]

Thorsten Benner and Philipp Rotmann. 2008. "Learning to Learn? UN Peacebuilding and the Challenges of Building a Learning Organization," *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 2(1): 43-62. Available at http://www.gppi.net/fileadmin/gppi/Benner_Rotmann_2008_Learning_to_Learn.pdf
[Note: this essay is based upon a longer research paper by Thorsten Benner, Andrea Binder, and Philipp Rotmann. 2007. "Learning to Build Peace? United Nations Peacebuilding and Organizational Learning: Developing a Research Framework." GPPi Research Paper Series No.7.] [BB]

New Horizon Progress Report No.1, 2010. Available at
http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/newhorizon_update01.pdf

Wednesday, June 22: Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect?

Discussion Questions:

- What are the most pertinent aspects of the history of humanitarian intervention and refugee assistance that can help us to understand the challenges to the UNHCR today?
- Under what conditions can the UN intervene in humanitarian crisis? Under what conditions should the UN intervene in humanitarian crises?
- What is the Responsibility to Protect (R2P)? Whose responsibility is it? Who is to be protected, and by whom?

Guest Speaker:

Recommended Background Readings:

On the UNHCR: <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home>
UNHCR RefWorld: <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/>
On R2P: <http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/> (International NGO coalition to promote R2P)

Required Readings:

Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 2004. "Defining Refugees and Voluntary Repatriation at the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees," in *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, ch.4. [BB]

Read one of the following:

Edward Luck. 2008. "The United Nations and the Responsibility to Protect," Stanley Foundation Policy Analysis Brief, August 2008. Available at
www.humansecuritygateway.com/documents/TSF_theUNandR2P.pdf

Serena K. Sharma. 2010. "Toward a Global Responsibility to Protect: Setbacks on the Path to Implementation," *Global Governance* 16: 121-138. [BB]

Skim these short news articles and policy briefs:

“UNHCR 2011 Regional Operations Profile – North Africa.” Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49e485f36.html>

“Protection Considerations with Regard to People Fleeing from Libya – UNHCR’s Recommendations.” 29 March 2011. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/4d67fab26.html>

“UNCHR Seeks US\$32 Million for Libya Emergency,” 7 March 2011. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/4d7513e49.html>.

“Hundreds Return to Libya in Desperate Bid to Reach Europe by Boat,” UNHCR Briefing Note, 17 May 2011. Available at <http://www.unhcr.org/4dd244ac9.html>

Irwin Cotler and Jared Genser. 2011. “Libya and the Responsibility to Protect,” *New York Times*, 28 February 2011. Available at http://www.nytimes.com/2011/03/01/opinion/01iht-edcotler01.html?_r=1

Ian Williams. 2011. “Libya, the UN and the R2P Debate,” *The Guardian*, 24 March 2011. Available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2011/mar/24/libya-unitednations/print>

Thursday, June 23: Reforming the UN

Discussion Questions:

- What are the major reform challenges facing the United Nations? Specifically, what are the key pressures for reform with respect to the UN Human Rights Council and the UN Security Council?
- What are the key obstacles to reform, either internal or external to the UN bureaucracy?
- Applying the theoretical tools used in this class, to what extent do you think the challenges of reforming the UN represent delegation (PA) problems or problems related to the UN’s bureaucratic culture?

Guest Speaker: Paul Foldi. Senior Aide, Senate Foreign Relations Committee

Note: this session will be held in the Senate Foreign Relations Hearing Room, Dirken Bldg.

Background Reading:

Website on Strengthening the UN: <http://www.un.org/en/strengtheningtheun/index.shtml>

Required Readings:

Mark Malloch Brown. 2008. “Can the UN Be Reformed?” *Global Governance*, 14: 1-12. [BB]

Vriens, Lauren. 2009. “Troubles Plague UN Human Rights Council,” *Council on Foreign Relations*, 13 May 2009. Available at <http://www.cfr.org/un/troubles-plague-un-human-rights-council/p9991>.

Luisa Blanchfield. 2011. “The United Nations Human Rights Council: Issues for Congress.” Congressional Research Service, RL33608, 26 January 2011. Available at <http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33608.pdf>

Ian Hurd. 2008. “Myths of Membership: The Politics of Legitimation in UN Security Council Reform,” *Global Governance* 14: 199-217. [BB]

Friday, June 24: Day Visit to the United Nations in New York City (optional)

Guided tour of the UN

Meetings with Pedro Conceicao and Leo Phathanothai, UNDP Africa Bureau. (TBC)

Meeting with Danila Boneva, UNDP and IATI (TBC)

Wednesday, June 29: Renewing the IMF?

Discussion Questions:

- What are the primary purposes of the IMF?
- How is the IMF governed?
- How is the IMF funded?
- What are some of the challenges facing the IMF today?
- How well did the IMF learn from previous financial crises? How has this affected the way it does business and fulfills its mandates?
- What are some of the major proposals for reforming the IMF?

Guest Speakers:

John Hicklin, former Senior Economist at the IMF and Deputy Director at the IMF Independent Evaluation Office.

Recommended Background Reading:

About the IMF: <http://www.imf.org/external/about.htm>

IMF's site on Reforming the International Financial System:
<http://www.imf.org/external/np/exr/key/quotav.htm>

Randall W. Stone. 2011. *Controlling Institutions: International Organizations and the Global Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, Ch. 4 & 10. [BB]

Pedro Malan, et al. 2007. *Report of the External Review Committee of Bank-Fund Collaboration*. Final Report, February 2007. Available at <http://www.imf.org/external/np/pp/eng/2007/022307.pdf>

Read two of the following:

Jack Boorman. 2008. "An Agenda for Reform of the International Monetary Fund (IMF)," Dialogue on Globalization, Occasional Paper No.38, January 2008. Available at www.nuso.org/upload/fes_pub/boorman.pdf

Bretton Woods Project. 2010. "Rethinking the IMF Again: But Will It Do Any Good?" Bretton Woods Project Update 70, 15 April 2010. Available at <http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/art.shtml?x=566119>.

Martin Weiss. 2008. "CRS Report for Congress: The Global Financial Crisis: the Role of the International Monetary Fund," RS22976, 30 October 2008. Available at <http://openocrs.com/document/R40578/2009-08-10/download/1005/>

Jo Marie Griesgraber. 2009. "Reforms for Major New Roles of the International Monetary Fund? The IMF Post-G-20 Summit," *Global Governance* 15: 179-185. [BB]

Read one of the following evaluations published by the IMF Independent Evaluation Office:

IEO. 2011. *IMF Performance in the Run-Up to the Financial and Economic Crisis: IMF Surveillance in 2004-2007*. Available at <http://www.ieo-imf.org/eval/>

IEO. 2008. *Governance at the IMF: An Evaluation*. Available at <http://www.ieo-imf.org/eval/>

In addition, I would encourage you all to closely follow the *Economist*, *Financial Times* or other news sources as the leadership drama unfolds at the IMF.

Thursday, June 30: Modernizing the World Bank

Note: class will meet at 5:30 at the Visitors' Entrance to the World Bank (18th Street, between G and H Streets). Bring a photo ID.

Discussion Questions:

- What are the major issues driving contemporary debates regarding the World Bank? What are the key issues for Bank reform, according to the Zedillo Commission and the World Bank's reform strategy, as outlined in the 2010 Post-Crisis Directions report?
- What are the main concerns regarding the governance of the World Bank?
- What does Robert Zoellick, President of the World Bank, mean when he argues that we need to "democratize development economics"? Why now?
- What are the opportunities and obstacles (internal and external) to reforming the World Bank?
- What can we say about the differences between reform challenges and strategies at the IMF and World Bank?

Guest Speaker:

Navin Girishankar, World Bank Independent Evaluation Group (lunch time session – day TBC)

Jeff Chelsky, Lead Economist, International Policy and Partnerships Group, Office of the Vice President and Head of Network, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Network at the World Bank Group; former Senior Economist at the IMF Independent Evaluation Office and the IMF European Department. (Evening session, starting at 5:30 at the World Bank)

Recommended Background Readings:

From the World Bank:

<http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/0,,pagePK:50004410~piPK:36602~theSitePK:29708,00.html>

Catherine Weaver. 2007. "The World's Bank and the Bank's World," *Global Governance*, 13(4): 493-512.

Katherine Marshall. 2008. *The World Bank: From Reconstruction to Development to Equity*. London: Routledge.

World Bank website on reform: <http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/worldbankreform/>

Zedillo Commission Report. 2010. *Repowering the World Bank for the 21st Century*. See <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/NEWS/Resources/WBGovernanceCOMMISSIONREPORT.pdf>

Required Readings:

Catherine Weaver. 2010. "Reforming the World Bank," in Jennifer Clapp and Rorden Wilkenson, eds, *Global Governance, Poverty and Inequality*. London: Routledge, pp. 112-131. [BB]

World Bank. 2010. "New World, New World Bank Group: Post-Crisis Directions," Background paper (DC2010-0003) for the Development Committee Meeting, 20 April 2010. Available at [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/22553954/DC2010-0003\(E\)PostCrisis.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/22553954/DC2010-0003(E)PostCrisis.pdf)

Bretton Woods Project. 2010. "Secret World Bank Shake-Up?" Bretton Woods Project, Update 70, 16 April 2010. Available at <http://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/art.shtml?x=566127>

Robert B. Zoellick. 2010. "Democratizing Development Economics." Speech delivered to Georgetown University, 29 September 2010. Available at <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/NEWS/0,,contentMDK:22716997~menuPK:34472~pagePK:34370~piPK:34424~theSitePK:4607,00.html>

World Bank. 2011. "Modernizing the World Bank Group: An Update," Background paper prepared for the Development Committee meeting, 16 April 2011. Available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DEVCOMMINT/Documentation/22885417/DC2011-0005%28E%29Modernization.pdf>

Recommended Readings:

World Bank. 2010. "New World, New World Bank Group" The Internal Reform Agenda," Background paper (DC2010-0004) for the Development Committee Meeting, 20 April 2010. Available at [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBkQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsiteresources.worldbank.org%2FDEVCOMMINT%2FDocumentation%2F22553917%2FDC2010-0004\(4\)InternalReform.pdf&rct=j&q=New%20World%2C%20New%20World%20Bank%20Group%E2%80%9D%20The%20Internal%20Reform%20Agenda&ei=dyHbTdCDDcHd0QH80_ToDw&usg=AFQjCN_Eg7aVYNI_h8_zBpEk_sLVcGdqumw&cad=rja](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBkQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsiteresources.worldbank.org%2FDEVCOMMINT%2FDocumentation%2F22553917%2FDC2010-0004(4)InternalReform.pdf&rct=j&q=New%20World%2C%20New%20World%20Bank%20Group%E2%80%9D%20The%20Internal%20Reform%20Agenda&ei=dyHbTdCDDcHd0QH80_ToDw&usg=AFQjCN_Eg7aVYNI_h8_zBpEk_sLVcGdqumw&cad=rja)

World Bank. 2010. "Strengthening Governance and Accountability: Reviews, Results and Roadmap." Background paper (DC2010-0007) for the Development Committee Meeting, 20 April 2010. Available at [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CB8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsiteresources.worldbank.org%2FDEVCOMMINT%2FDocumentation%2F22555129%2FDC2010-0007\(E\)Governance.pdf&rct=j&q=Strengthening%20Governance%20and%20Accountability%3A%20Reviews%2C%20Results%20and%20Roadmap&ei=tyHbTfC4Han20gHlzOXhDw&usg=AFQjCNGcAFnaf9oI_hsy5P6FvK-NI9XNfCg&cad=rja](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CB8QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsiteresources.worldbank.org%2FDEVCOMMINT%2FDocumentation%2F22555129%2FDC2010-0007(E)Governance.pdf&rct=j&q=Strengthening%20Governance%20and%20Accountability%3A%20Reviews%2C%20Results%20and%20Roadmap&ei=tyHbTfC4Han20gHlzOXhDw&usg=AFQjCNGcAFnaf9oI_hsy5P6FvK-NI9XNfCg&cad=rja)

World Bank. 2010. "World Bank Group Voice Reform: Enhancing Voice and Participation of Developing and Transition Countries in 2010 and Beyond." Development Committee Meeting, 19 April 2010, prepared by the Office of the Corporate Secretary (SECV). Available at [http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsiteresources.worldbank.org%2FDEVCOMMINT%2FDocumentation%2F22553921%2FDC2010-0006\(E\)Voice.pdf&rct=j&q=World%20Bank%20Group%20Voice%20Reform%3A%20Enhancing%20Voice%20and%20Participation%20of%20Developing%20and%20Transition%20Countries%20in%202010%20and%20Beyond&ei=0CHbTaGcAcX40gGI243fDw&usg=AFQjCNGJdIPL_E8OdY2X6nMA0SnDL9nrhQ&cad=rja](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&cd=1&ved=0CBYQFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fsiteresources.worldbank.org%2FDEVCOMMINT%2FDocumentation%2F22553921%2FDC2010-0006(E)Voice.pdf&rct=j&q=World%20Bank%20Group%20Voice%20Reform%3A%20Enhancing%20Voice%20and%20Participation%20of%20Developing%20and%20Transition%20Countries%20in%202010%20and%20Beyond&ei=0CHbTaGcAcX40gGI243fDw&usg=AFQjCNGJdIPL_E8OdY2X6nMA0SnDL9nrhQ&cad=rja)

Wednesday, July 6: U.S. Congressional and Civil Society Pressures for IMF and World Bank Reform

Discussion Questions:

- How do non-governmental organizations attempt to influence the policies and behavior of the IMF and World Bank? What are their key tactics?
- To what extent have NGOs and CSOs been successful in influencing the IMF and World Bank?
- How does the US Congress influence these institutions? Who in the US Congress has been at the forefront of pushing for reform of the IMF and World Bank, and what are the specific agendas?
- How do NGOs and CSOs interact with Congress to push for change at these institutions?
- To what extent do you think external pressures matter in influence the behavior and change of the IMF and World Bank?

Guest Speakers: Nilmini Gunaratne Rubin, Professional Staff Member, Senate Foreign Relations Committee and Daniel McGlinchey, Senior Advisor to Rep. Barney Frank, Ranking Member, U.S. House Financial Services Committee.

Recommended Background Reading:

Sarah Babb. 2009. "The Banks and Civil Society," in *Behind the Development Banks: Washington Politics, World Poverty, and the Wealth of Nations*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 180-205. [BB]

Jan Aart Scholte. 2009. "IMF Interactions with Member Countries: The Civil Society Dimension." 7 December 2009. Available at http://www.ieo-imf.org/eval/complete/eval_01202010.html. Read pp.1-42 plus one of the country reports in the Annex.

United Nations Commission of Financial Experts. 2010. *The Stiglitz Report: Reforming the International Monetary and Financial Systems in the Wake of the Global Crisis*. Read Ch.4. [BB]

Required Readings:

Bank Information Center. (no date). *Tools for Activists: An Information and Advocacy Guide to the World Bank Group*. See <http://www.bicusa.org/en/Page.Toolkits.aspx>

"The International Financial Institutions: A Call for Change." Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate, 10 March 2010. Available at http://www.senate.gov/cgi-bin/exitmmsg?url=http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=111_cong_senate_committee_prints&docid=f:55285.pdf
See also the YouTube videos at <http://lugar.senate.gov/issues/foreign/ifi/>

Thursday, July 7: WTO – WTF?

Discussion Questions:

- What are the goals of the WTO?
- How does the WTO work?
- Who has power (or not) at the WTO?
- What has happened to the WTO over the last 12 years?
- Why is the Doha Round widely seen as a failure? What is the nature of the WTO's crisis today?
- What are the prospects for reviving the Doha Round and reinvigorating the WTO?

Background:

http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/whatis_e.htm

For cheesy, shameless self-promotion with a horrible soundtrack (but nonetheless a decent overview of the WTO today), see http://www.wto.org/library/flashvideo/video_e.htm?id=8&display=long

Required Readings:

Paul Blustein. 2008. "The Nine-Day Misadventure of the Most Favoured Nations: How the WTO's Doha Round Negotiations Went Awry in July 2008," Brookings Institution, 5 December 2008. http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/articles/2008/1205_trade_blustein/1205_trade_blustein.pdf

Ann Capling and Richard Higgott. 2009. "Introduction: The Future of the Multilateral Trade System – What Role for the World Trade Organization?" *Global Governance*, 15: 313-325.

Susan Schwab. 2011. "After Doha: Why the Negotiations Are Doomed and What We Should Do About It," *Foreign Affairs*, May / June 2011: 104-117.

"Dead Man Talking," *The Economist*, 28 April 2011. [BB]

Wednesday, July 13: Student Presentations

Thursday, July 14: Student Presentations and Wrap-Up

Monday, July 18: Final essays/reports due

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PARTICIPATION

“A” Contributor

- Contributions in class and on the BB discussion board reflect exceptional preparation as evidenced by frequent authoritative and/or creative use of textual/material evidence.
- Ideas offered are always substantive (i.e., unusually perceptive, original, and/or synthetic) and provide one or more major insights as well as direction for the class.
- Agreements and/or disagreements are well substantiated and persuasively presented.
- *If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished markedly.*

“B” Contributor

- Contributions in class and on the BB discussion board reflect thorough preparation as evidenced by competent and occasionally authoritative and/or creative reference to textual/material evidence.
- Ideas offered are usually substantive, provide good insights and sometimes direction for the class.
- Agreements and/or disagreements are fairly well substantiated and/or sometimes persuasive.
- *If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished.*

“C” Contributor

- Contributions in this class reflect satisfactory preparation as evidenced by at least some acquaintance with textual/material evidence.
- Ideas offered are sometimes substantive, provide generally useful insights, but seldom offer a new direction for discussion.
- Sometimes disagreements and agreements are voiced with little to no substantiation.
- *If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished somewhat.*

“D-F” Contributor

- Contributions in class reflect inadequate preparation.
- Ideas are seldom substantive, provide few if any insights, and never a constructive direction for the class.
- Integrative comments and effective challenges are absent.
- *If this person were not a member of the class, valuable air-time would be saved.*

Non-Participant

- Little or nothing contributed in class; hence, there is not adequate basis for evaluation.
- If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would not be changed.
- Said persons need to leave this category and move into a contributor category.

This document is a modified version of a guide credited to John Tyler (Brown University), Richard Murnane (Harvard), and Kristine Bruss (University of Kansas). (http://www.brown.edu/Departments/Italian_Studies/dweb/pedagogy/partic-assessm.shtml).

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR GROUP REPORTS

Group Written Report Evaluation Criteria

<u>Score</u>	<u>Characteristics</u>
9-10	Well-organized, concise, and engaging summary of a major issue facing the particular international organization or NGO. The report is not “overly comprehensive” and selects the most relevant and interesting issues to discuss. The report highlights key statistics, uses tables and graphs appropriately, and provides sufficient analysis. The report ends with a concise list of feasible policy prescriptions. Writing is engaging, and free of spelling and grammar errors, and the report is visually stimulating and well organized.
7-8	Report is somewhat disorganized and may lack some elements of conciseness and comprehensiveness. The report manages to convey the major points in a clear fashion, but is not as engaging as it could be. Limited use, overuse, or unclear use of visual charts, graphs, maps, etc. Brief offers some policy prescriptions, but they are limited or impractical. Spelling and grammar errors are minimal.
5-6	Brief attempts to convey the major elements of the nature of the problem, but lacks organization and clarity and seems to be missing major elements. Style is un-engaging and suffers from obvious lack of attention to spelling and grammar. Policy prescriptions are ill-conceived or infeasible given financial, political or cultural constraints. Graphs are difficult to read and/or irrelevant.
≤4	All elements of an excellent brief are absent or weakly executed.

Group Presentation Evaluation Criteria

<u>Score</u>	<u>Characteristics</u>
9-10	Presentation is well-organized and clearly conveys all the major points of the written report. Visual presentation is well-timed, clear, uncluttered, and makes excellent use of graphs, tables, charts, photos, etc. Oral presentation does not read off of powerpoint or rely excessively on written notes (look at the audience when you talk!). Visual and oral presentation make good use of examples, “humanizing” the narrative. Policy prescriptions are clearly listed, with the oral presentation offering analyses about the feasibility / challenges facing the prescribed policies. Groups members present the material fluidly, without awkward transitions or confusion about who is leading each part of the discussion.
7-8	Presentation is well-organized and manages to convey the major points of the written brief, but is somewhat visually cluttered or confusing and does not make the best use of visuals. Oral presentation suffers from a bit too much reliance on written notes or reading off the slide and does not make an effort to make the visual or oral presentation engaging to the audience. Group dynamics are not as well managed.
5-6	Presentation lacks clear organization and does not adequately convey the major points of the written brief. The powerpoint is visually confusing, insofar as the slides have too much text or there are too many slides for the time period allotted. The oral presentation is stilted, unengaging, and relies almost entirely on written notes or reading from the slide. Group dynamics almost completely break down.
≤4	The visual and oral presentation lack all the above elements.