

Trinity 350
Scarcity, Sustainability, and the Future of International Relations
WINTER 2023

Instructor: Dr. Mark Nieman, mark.nieman@utoronto.ca

Time and Location: F 12–2pm, Sidney Smith 1071

Student Hours: Schedule through <https://nieman.youcanbook.me>,
Location: Zoom Office

Teaching Assistant: Jose Martini Costa, jose.martinicosta@mail.utoronto.ca

Office Hours: W 4–5 and meet via Zoom Office.

Teaching Assistant: Jesslene Lee, jesslene.lee@mail.utoronto.ca

Office Hours: Schedule through <http://jesslene.youcanbook.me> and meet via Zoom Office

Overview and Objectives

International Relations are changing, and changing quickly. Major challenges in global affairs, including the interrelated problems of climate change, resource scarcity, great power competition, and changes in mass politics will shape our future in uncertain and possibly dangerous ways. This course seeks to evaluate the effect of these interconnected issues on our world today, and their implications for the future. Through a series of case studies, students will be encouraged to identify future international challenges and work to develop sustainable and innovative solutions to the problems that will confront our world in the next decades and beyond.

Learning Outcomes

At the end of this course, students should be able to:

- Describe analytical approaches to studying international relations.
- Critically read and evaluate scholarly work.
- Synthesize arguments and summarize empirical evidence for policy evaluation.

Required Text

There is no required textbooks for this class. All readings are available on Quercus. Articles can also be accessed through the university library. To find articles, search the article title and verify it is correct with the author's name.

Grading

Grades are based on a three take-home assessments and class contribution. The first two assessments—a policy critique and a policy brief—require students to pose an evidence-based policy evaluation, based on the assigned readings. For Assessment 1, students write a policy critique of an actual policy proposal (which became a recently passed law) advanced by a consortium of major Canadian non-governmental environmental groups. Students are expected to critically evaluate the proposed policy’s benefits and costs for key stakeholders and use this to make an overall assessment of the policy’s prospects for success. Next, for Assessment 2, students draft their own objective policy brief advising the Canadian government of its foreign policy agenda in a strategic environment of major power competition. Students are asked to provide a set of policy options available to the Canadian government (recent white papers from the foreign ministries of the US and China are provided), describe the benefits and costs of each policy option, and make a recommendation regarding the most effective strategy to take. Both the policy critique and policy brief follow standard formats seen in foreign policy ministries (outlined in the Policy Critique and Policy Brief handouts). The sequencing of writing a policy critique prior to that of a policy brief familiarizes students with public policy writing and critical evaluation before formulating an original policy brief of their own.

The third assessment is an essay covering all topics from class, with an emphasis on the topic from the final section of the course. The assignment is broken into two parts: the first part asks students a series of questions about part 3 of the course, while the second question allows students to choose to answer a series of questions about either part 1 or part 2 of the course. Both parts require that students demonstrate a mastery of the material covered in the assigned readings, lecture, and tutorials.

The class contribution component is dependent on a student’s attendance and positive, thoughtful contribution to weekly tutorials. Students who wish to earn high marks will have completed the week’s assigned readings prior to tutorial, be able to describe each reading’s theory and findings, and critically discuss all readings.

Assessments are assigned two weeks before they are due. Assessments should be uploaded to Quercus by the start of class on their due dates; late assessments (without a prior agreement with the instructor) are deducted 2.5 percentage points of their value per day; assignments more than 7 days late (including weekends) are not accepted. The course follows the standard university grading scale. Final grade percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Marking Scheme

Assessment	Percentage
Take-home Assessment 1: Climate Policy Critique	25
Take-home Assessment 2: Major Power Competition Policy Brief	25
Take-home Assessment 3: Comprehensive Final Essay	40
Discussion	10
Total	100

Schedule

Section 1: Climate Change

January 13: Introduction

Hardin, Garrett. 1968. The Tragedy of the Commons. *Science* 162(3859): 1243–1248.

Haas, Peter M. 1989. Do Regimes Matter? Epistemic Communities and Mediterranean Pollution Control. *International Organization* 43(3): 377–403.

von Stein, Jana. 2008. The International Law and Politics of Climate Change: Ratification of the United Nations Framework Convention and the Kyoto Protocol. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(2): 243–268.

January 20: Economic Impacts

Burke, Marshall, Solomon M. Hsiang, and Edward Miguel. 2015. Global Non-linear Effect of Temperature on Economic Production. *Nature* 527(7577): 235–239.

Duan, Lei, Juan Moreno-Cruz, and Ken Caldeira. 2020. Balancing Climate and Development Goals. *Environmental Research Letters* 15(12): 124057. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/abbe46>.

Blackburn, Christopher J., Mallory E. Flowers, Daniel C. Matisoff, and Juan Moreno-Cruz. 2020. Do Pilot and Demonstration Projects Work? Evidence from a Green Building Program. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 39(4): 1100–1132.

January 27: Climate Change and Resource Wars

Hendrix, Cullen S. and Idean Salehyan. 2012. Climate Change, Rainfall, and Social Conflict in Africa. *Journal of Peace Research* 49(1): 35–50.

Hendrix, Cullen S., Sarah M. Glaser, Joshua E. Lambert, and Paige M. Roberts. 2022. Global Climate, El Niño, and Militarized Fisheries Disputes in the East and South China Seas. *Marine Policy* 143: 105137.

Daoudy, Marwa. 2021. Rethinking the Climate–Conflict Nexus: A Human–Environmental–Climate Security Approach. *Global Environmental Politics* 21(3): 4–25.

February 3: Attitudes Towards Climate Change

Assessment 1: Climate Policy Critique issued.

Bergquist, Parrish and Christopher Warshaw. 2019. Does Global Warming Increase Public Concern about Climate Change? *Journal of Politics* 81(2): 686–691.

Baccini, Leonardo and Lucas Leeman. 2021. Do Natural Disasters Help the Environment? How Voters Respond and What That Means. *Political Science Research and Methods*. 9(3): 468–484.

Stokes, Leah C. 2014. Electoral Backlash against Climate Policy: A Natural Experiment on Retrospective Voting and Local Resistance to Public Policy. *American Journal of Political Science* 60(4): 958–974.

Aklin, Michaël, and Matto Mildemberger. 2020. Prisoners of the Wrong Dilemma: Why Distributive Conflict, Not Collective Action, Characterizes the Politics of Climate Change. *Global Environmental Politics* 20(4): 4–27.

February 10: Optimism, Pessimism, and Prospects for the Future

Brown, Patrick T., Juan Moreno-Cruz, and Ken Caldiera. 2020. Break-even Year: A Concept for Understanding Intergenerational Trade-offs in Climate Change Mitigation Policy. *Environmental Research Communications* 2(9): 095002.

Rickels, Wilfried, Martin F. Quaas, Katharine Ricke, Johannes Quaas, Juan Moreno-Cruz, and Sjak Smulders. 2020. Who Turns the Global Thermostat and by How Much? *Energy Economics* 91: 104852.

Colgan, Jeff D., Jessica F. Green, and Thomas N. Hale. 2021. Asset Revaluation and the Existential Politics of Climate Change. *International Organization*. 75(2): 586–610.

Section 2: Major Power Competition

February 17: Power Transition

Assessment 1: Climate Policy Critique due.

Kugler, Jacek and A.F.K. Organski. 1993. The Power Transition: A Retrospective and Prospective Evaluation. In Midlarsky, Manus I., ed. 1993. *Handbook of War Studies*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gilpin, Robert. 1988. The Theory of Hegemonic War. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*. 18(4): 591–613.

Levy, Jack S. and William R. Thompson. 2010. Balancing on Land and at Sea. *International Security* 35(1): 7–43.

February 24: No Class–Reading Week

March 3: Political Orders and Competition

Assessment 2: Major Power Competition Policy Brief issued.

Lake, David A. 2007. Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics. *International Security* 32(1): 47–79.

Norrlof, Carla and William C. Wohlforth. 2019. *Raison de l'Hégémonie* (The Hegemon's Interest): Theory of the Costs and Benefits of Hegemony. *Security Studies* 28(3): 422–450.

Nieman, Mark David, Carla Martinez Machain, Olga Chyzh, and Sam Bell. 2021. An International Game of Risk: Troop Placement and Major Power Competition. *Journal of Politics*. 83(4): 1307–1321.

March 10: US Decline and the End of the Liberal Order?

Layne, Christopher. 2018. The US–Chinese Power Shift and the End of the Pax Americana. *International Affairs*: 89–111.

Norrlof, Carla. 2014. Dollar Hegemony: A Power Analysis. *Review of International Political Economy* 21(5): 1042–1070.

Mousseau, Michael. 2019. The End of War: How a Robust Marketplace and Liberal Hege-
mony are Leading to Perpetual World Peace. *International Security* 44(1): 160–196.

Section 3: Mass Politics and Populism

March 17: What is Populism?

Assessment 2: Major Power Competition Policy Brief due.

Canovan, Margaret. 1999. Trust the People! Populism and the Two Faces of Democracy. *Political Studies* 47(1): 2–16.

Peters, B. Guy and Jon Pierre. 2020. A Typology of Populism: Understanding the Different
Forms of Populism and Their Implications. *Democratization* 27(6): 928–946.

Hawkins, Kirk A. 2009. Is Chávez Populist? Measuring Populist Discourse in Comparative
Perspective. *Comparative Political Studies* 42(8): 1040–1067.

March 24: Roots of Populist Support

Miller, Steven. 2017. Economic Threats or Societal Turmoil? Understanding Preferences
for Authoritarian Political Systems. *Political Behavior* 39(2): 457–478.

Inglehart, Ronald F. and Pippa Norris. 2016. Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism:
Economic Have-nots and Cultural Backlash. *HKS Working Paper* No. RWP16-026.

Federico, Christopher M., Emily L. Fisher, and Grace Deason. 2017. The Authoritarian
Left Withdraws from Politics: Ideological Asymmetry in the Relationship between Author-
itarianism and Political Engagement. *Journal of Politics* 79(3): 1010–1023.

March 31: Effects of Populism

Assessment 3: Comprehensive Final Essay issued on March 27.

Piazza, James A. 2020. Political Hate Speech and Domestic Terrorism. *International Inter-
actions* 46(3): 431–453.

Huber, Robert A. and Christian H. Schimpf. 2017. On the Distinct Effects of Left-Wing
and Right-Wing Populism on Democratic Quality. *Politics and Governance* 5(4): 146–165.

Wehner, Leslie E. and Cameron G. Thies. 2020. The Nexus of Populism and Foreign Policy:
The Case of Latin America. *International Relations* 35(2): 320–340.

April 7: No Class—University Holiday (Good Friday)

April 11–29: Final Assessment

Assessment 3: Comprehensive Final Essay due: April 14.

Course Policies

Student Responsibilities in the Learning Process: Students are expected to complete all required readings on a topic prior to completing that topic's assessment and complete all assessments on time. This means accessing the materials with sufficient time to complete assessments prior to deadlines. In the event that a student has questions concerning the material, they should formulate specific questions to ask via office hours or email with sufficient time for a response prior to assessment deadlines (i.e. questions should be sent at least 24 hours prior to a deadline, excluding weekends).

Classroom Conduct: Students are expected to participate in class in a thoughtful and respectful manner while in the pursuit of knowledge accumulation. Generally, this means engaging with one another's ideas and treating others as one would like to be treated, as well as *not* treating others how one would *not* like to be treated. Please see university policies on freedom of speech and discrimination and harassment.

Grade Appeals: In the event that a student believes that the grade of an assessment is inaccurate, based on the rubric and assignment instructions, and would like their assessment re-graded, they may appeal their assignment score. Decisions on appeals are the the discretion of the instructor. To make an appeal, a student must submit a written memo to the instructor explaining the specific discrepancy, and recommend an appropriate recourse (e.g., an appropriate mark in their view) within one week of receiving the graded assignment. Once the instructor receives confirmation of an appeal and the written memo (email is fine), they will open the student's assessment and re-grade the *entire* assignment by applying the rubric that was attached; that is, all aspects of the assessment will be evaluated, not only specific sections or parts. This will then be the new, final score on the assessment; an important caveat is that the score may stay the same, go up, or go down.

Accommodations: Please discuss any special needs with the instructor start of the semester, for example to request reasonable accommodations if an academic requirement conflicts with religious practices and/or observances. Those seeking accommodations based on disabilities should complete the appropriate documentation with Student Life Programs and Services.

Academic Misconduct: All acts of dishonesty in any work constitute academic misconduct; please see the University's guidelines—including ways to avoid inadvertent misconduct—and rules of procedures regarding misconduct. The Student Disciplinary Regulations will be followed in the event of academic misconduct.

A special note on plagiarism. Plagiarism is the act of representing, directly or indirectly, another person's work as one's own. It can involve presenting someone's speech, wholly

or partially, as your own; quoting without acknowledging the true source of the material; copying and handing in another person's work with your name on it; and similar infractions. Even indirect quotations, paraphrasing, etc., can be plagiarism unless sources are properly cited.

Copyright: Course materials, including recorded lectures and slides, are the instructor's intellectual property covered by the Copyright Act, RSC 1985, c C-42. Course materials posted on Quercus are for registered students only and may not be posted to other websites or media without the express permission of the instructor. Unauthorized reproduction, copying, or use of online recordings will constitute copyright infringement.

The instructor reserves the right to modify the syllabus to reflect the pace of the course.