

School of International And Public Affairs
Columbia University
INAF U6570
Spring 2009, Tue 6:10-8:00pm

“Challenging Sovereignty in the Post-Communist States”

Alexander Cooley
414 Lehman Hall (Barnard College Library)
Tel: (212) 854-9544
e-mail: ac210@columbia.edu
Office Hours: Tuesdays 10:30am-12:15pm and by appointment.

Program Credit Distribution: This course is listed under the Program in Economic and Political Development (EPD), but also counts for elective credit for the International Security Policy (ISP) concentration. The course also fulfills a social science requirement for Harriman Institute certificate candidates.

Course Description: The assumption that states maintain control over their sovereign affairs is still widely held in international relations theory and practice, yet in international politics today a variety of intergovernmental and private actors regularly violate state sovereignty. This course explores the many ways in which the traditional political, economic and security functions of states are being undermined and reconfigured by contemporary external actors including international organizations and non-state actors. In some cases, states quite willingly choose to cede their sovereignty, whereas others have conditions and policies externally imposed upon on them. The course assesses the implications of these new sovereign influences for international policymakers. Regionally, we will focus on developments in the former Communist states of East Europe and the former Soviet Union, however the topics and concepts explored in the course are applicable to other regions and all students are welcomed.

The first part of the course examines the political pressures on the post-Communist countries exerted by EU membership conditionality, Western NGOs, external democracy promotion programs and international legal regimes and arbitrators. The second part of the course concentrates on sovereignty and security including the rise of new forms of limited sovereignty arrangements and neo-trusteeships to govern post-conflict states, the emergence of the so-called Kosovo effect and its possible influence on other unrecognized states, the politics of overseas military bases and the impact of new private security actors.

Attendees should also be aware of the Harriman Institute-sponsored seminar series “Limited Sovereignty and Soft Borders in Southeastern Europe and the Former Soviet States: The Challenges and Political Consequences of Future Changes in Legal Status.” New meetings of the series will be held throughout the semester and will be publicized. Your attendance at these external seminars is optional, but please be aware that the sessions will explicitly address many of the themes and policy debates that we cover in

class.

Course Format: Each class session will be comprised of a mix of lecture and class discussion. Students are expected to actively participate in class discussion having read the assigned materials for each class session.

Course Requirements: Attendance at all sessions is expected and will be figured into a class participation evaluation. Students are expected to have carefully completed the assigned reading for each week prior to class meetings and to actively participate in class discussions and debates. Additional out-of-class lectures and events relating to the course's topics may be brought to the attention of the class.

In addition, all students must complete:

1. One midterm 8-9 page paper (2,000-2,500 words) due on Week 7, topics handed out Week 5.
2. One final 13-15 page paper (3,500-4,000) due on Week 14, topics handed out Week 11.

Grading: Final grades will be calculated accordingly as follows:

Midterm Paper: 30% (8-10 pages)

Final Paper: 50% (13-15 pages)

Class Participation: 20%

Course Readings: The following books are required and are available for purchase at the Columbia University bookstore:

Required:

Milada Vachudova, *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage & Integration After Communism*. New York: Oxford University Press 2005.

Simon Chesterman, *You, the People: The United Nations, Transitional Administration, and State-Building*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Alexander Cooley, *Base Politics: Democratic Change and the US Military Overseas*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Recommended:

Stephen Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 1999.

The rest of the readings are available on Library Reserve at Lehman Library and through Courseworks. Readings are also available on-line through the E-Journals tab on Columbia University's LibraryWeb. To find an article, simply type in the journal title and follow the appropriate link based on your citation information (volume, date). Students are encouraged to download and keep personal copies of these readings. In some cases, articles might be directly available on-line: please follow the given URL. If you still

have problems obtaining the readings even after you've followed these procedures, please let me know ASAP.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY STATEMENT: The School of International & Public Affairs does not tolerate cheating and/or plagiarism in any form. Those students who violate the Code of Academic & Professional Conduct will be subject to the Dean's Disciplinary Procedures. The Code of Academic & Professional Conduct can be viewed online at:

http://sipa.columbia.edu/resources_services/student_affairs/academic_policies/deans_discipline_policy.html

Please familiarize yourself with the proper methods of citation and attribution. The School provides some useful resources online; we strongly encourage you to familiarize yourself with these various styles before conducting your research:

http://sipa.columbia.edu/resources_services/student_affairs/academic_policies/code_of_conduct.html

Violations of the Code of Academic & Professional Conduct should be reported to the Associate Dean for Student Affairs.

Week 1 (Jan 20): Introduction: Themes and Overview

Overview of course expectations and topics. What is the difference between “classical” sovereignty and juridical sovereignty? Why is juridical sovereignty so important for weaker states in the international system? Do states passively accept foreign influence into their internal affairs? How can policymakers use external challenges to their sovereignty for political gain?

Recommended: Stephen Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton: Princeton U. Press, 2000. Selections.

Challenges to Political and Legal Sovereignty

Week 2 (Jan 27): The Rise of NGOs and Transnational Networks

What distinguishes transnational networks of global governance? Are NGOs different than other forms of political organization in their normative motivations? Why or why not? What determines the effectiveness of NGO influence on state policies? What are the hidden material incentives that may drive NGO behavior?

Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, “Transnational Advocacy Networks in International and Regional Politics,” *International Social Science Journal* Vol. 51, No. 159 (March 1999), 89-101.

Alexander Cooley and James Ron, "The NGO Scramble: Organizational Survival and Transnational Action," *International Security* Vol. 27, No. 1 (Summer 2002), 5-39.

Clifford Bob, "Merchants of Morality," *Foreign Policy* No. 129 (Mar/Apr 2002), 36-45.

Recommended:

Charli Carpenter, "Setting the Advocacy Agenda: Theorizing Issue Emergence and Nonemergence in Transnational Advocacy Networks," *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 51, No. 1 (March 2007), 99-120.

Week 3 (Feb 3): Western Promotion of Postcommunist Democratization

Were the colored revolutions in Georgia, Ukraine and Kyrgyzstan the results of Western efforts, domestic civil society mobilization or just emulations of previous revolutions (modular phenomena)? Given that Western efforts to promote democracy have now initiated a backlash against pro-democracy NGOs in Russia and other former-Communist states, does the Western model of democracy promotion need to be modified? What actions are some Eurasian countries taking at the moment to undermine the influence of Western democracy-promoting NGOs and IOs?

Valerie Bunce and Sharon Wolchik, "International Diffusion and Postcommunist Revolutions," *Communist and Postcommunist Studies* Vol. 39, No. 3 (September 2006), 283-304.

Mark Beissinger, "Structure and Example in Modular Political Phenomena: The Diffusion of the Bulldozer/Rose/Orange/Tulip Revolutions," *Perspectives on Politics*. Vol. 5, No. 2 (June 2007), 259-275.

Sarah Henderson, "Selling Civil Society: Western Aid and the Nongovernmental Sector in Russia," *Comparative Political Studies* Vol. 35, No. 2(2002), 139-167.

Thomas Carothers, "The Backlash Against Democracy Promotion," *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 85, No. 2 (Mar/Apr 2006), 55-68.

Week 4 (Feb 10): The European Union and Membership Conditionality

Why has the EU been so effective in encouraging institutional reform in candidate states? Have these reforms come about as the result of strict conditions or have former Communist countries become "socialized" into EU patterns of behavior? Do the EU and NATO have any other instruments for promoting political reforms in countries that are not candidates for membership? Given current "expansion fatigue," what happens now?

Milada Vachudova, *Europe Undivided: Democracy, Leverage & Integration After Communism*. Oxford University Press, 2005. Chaps. 1-2 and 5-8.

Ronald Asmus, "Europe's Eastern Promise: Rethinking NATO and EU Enlargement," *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 87:1 (January-February 2008), 95-106.

Recommended:

Alexandra Gheciu, "Security Institutions as Agents of Socialization: NATO and the "New Europe," *International Organization* Vol. 59:4 (Fall 2005), pp. 973-1012.

Frank Schimmelfennig, "The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union," *International Organization* Vol. 55:1 (Winter 2001), pp. 47-80.

Judith Kelley, "International Actors on the Domestic Scene: Membership Conditionality and Socialization by International Institutions," *International Organization* Vol. 58:3 (Fall 2004), pp. 425-457.

Week 5 (Feb 17): The Politics of Sovereign Rankings, Ratings and Blacklisting

This week we will examine the politics that informs the emerging practice of ranking and blacklisting countries across four different issue areas: risk of sovereign debt default (credit rating agencies like Moodys and Standards and Poors), level of democratization (FreedomHouse), corruption in governance (Transparency International) and harmful tax practices (OECD). What do credit-rating agencies do and why do some commentators view them as private regulators of international financial markets? What are the consequences of a ratings downgrade and what criteria do agencies use to assess measures of risk? Why has Transparency International acquired the authority to rate the level of corruption in countries? Are the ratings of democratization in FreedomHouse based on objective criteria or influenced by U.S. foreign policy considerations? Why was blacklisting such an effective instrument when used by the OECD against tax havens? How have these rankings and ratings, often made by private actors, been institutionalized in global governance?

Christopher Brunner and Rawi Abdelal, "To Judge Leviathan: Sovereign Credit Ratings, National Law, and the World Economy," *Journal of Public Policy*. Vol. 25, No. 2 (August 2005), 191-207.

Jason Sharman, "The Bark is the Bite: International Organizations and Blacklisting," draft article, Department of Political Science. Griffith University.

Hongying Wang and James Rosenau, "Transparency International and Corruption as an Issue of Global Governance," *Global Governance* Vol. 7, No. 1 (2001), pp. 25-50.

FreedomHouse, *Freedom in the World 2008*. Browse the Introduction, Methodology, Tables and Charts and the Introductory essay by Paddington.

Available on-line at: <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=130&year=2008>

Recommended:

Dieter Kerwer, "Holding Global Regulators Accountable: The Case of Credit Rating Agencies," *Governance* Vol. 18, No. 3 (July 2005), pp. 453-475.

Michael C. Webb, "Defining the Boundaries of Legitimate State Practice: Norms, Transnational Actors and the OECD's Project on Harmful Tax Competition," *Review of International Political Economy* Vol. 11, No. 4 (Oct 2004), pp. 787-827.

Mlada Bukovansky, "The Hollowness of Anti-Corruption Discourse," *Review of International*

Political Economy Vol. 13, No. 2 (May 2006), 181-209

Midterm paper topics handed out – due in two weeks, Week 7

Week 6 (Feb 24): Legal Challenges: International Arbitration and War Crimes Tribunals

This week we will examine new global legal challenges to state sovereignty in the areas of both commercial and criminal law. Why has international arbitration been rising as a means of resolving commercial disputes among firms and between states and investors? How are private arbitration awards against states enforced? What are the various ways in which arbitration clauses can be invoked by overseas investors? In the realm of global justice, must we choose between the competing “logics of appropriateness” and the “logics of consequences”? What are the important lessons from the international criminal tribunals for the future of the international criminal court?

Gus Van Harten, “Private Authority and Transnational Governance: The Contours of the International System of Investor Protection,” *Review of International Political Economy* Vol. 12, No. 4: (2005), pp. 600-623.

Walter Mattli, “Private Justice in the Global Economy: From Litigation to Arbitration,” *International Organization* Vol. 55, No. 4 (Autumn 2001), pp. 919-947.

Christopher Rudolph, “Constructing an Atrocities Regime: The Politics of War Crimes Tribunals,” *International Organization* Vol. 55, No. 3 (Summer 2001), pp. 655-691.

Jack Snyder and Leslie Vinjamuri, “Trials and Errors: Principle and Pragmatism in Strategies of International Justice,” *International Security* Vol. 28, No. 3 (Winter 2003/04), pp. 5-44.

Week 7 (Mar 3): The Role of International Political Consultants

All Midterm Papers due at the Beginning of Class!

No Assigned Reading for today. We will watch the documentary *Our Brand is Crisis* (2005), directed by Rachel Boynton. Place TBA.

Current Challenges to Security and Sovereignty

Week 8 (Mar 10): The Rise of Neo-trusteeship and Transitional Sovereignty

This week we will analyze the various ways in which international or third party actors can legally administer sovereignty. We will assess the strengths and weaknesses of international transitional administration as a new mechanism for managing post-conflict governance. How can transitional administrators promote democratic state-building,

while remaining an effective governing force? To whom are transitional administrators accountable? What types of arrangements does Krasner refer to in his proposal that weak or collapsed states should “share sovereignty” with external actors?

Simon Chesterman, *You, the People: The United Nations, Transitional Administration, and State-Building*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004. Selections.

David Chandler, “Back to the Future? The Limits of Neo-Wilsonian Ideals of Exporting Democracy,” *Review of International Studies* Vol. 32, No. 3 (2006), 475-494.

Recommended:

Stephen Krasner, “Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 2 (Fall 2004), pp. 85-120.

March 17, Spring Break.

Week 9: (Mar 24) The Kosovo Effect? Self-Determination, Precedent and Sovereign Recognition

What, if anything, makes the Kosovo case unique? Was asserting the lack of a Kosovo precedent the only available argument for advocates of Kosovo’s independence? Were there other workable sovereign formulas available besides independence? Did the West’s recognition of Kosovo undermine international law? How has Moscow interpreted the “Kosovo precedent?”

Martti Ahtisaari, “The Comprehensive Proposal for Kosovo Status Settlement.” United Nations Office of the Special Envoy for Kosovo.”

Available at: <http://www.unosek.org/unosek/en/statusproposal.html>

Sumantra Bose, “Kosovo to Kashmir: The Self-Determination Dilemma.”

Available at: <http://www.opendemocracy.net/node/44686/pdf>

Vladimir Kozin, “Five Lessons from Kosovo’s Independence.” *International Affairs (Moscow)*, Vol. 54, No. 4 (2008), pp. 124-135.

Available at: <http://dlib.eastview.com/sources/article.jsp?id=19363688>

Recommended:

Sherrill Stroschein, “Making or Breaking Kosovo: Applications of Dispersed State Control,” *Perspectives on Politics* Vol. 6 No.4 (December 2008), pp. 655-74.

Week 10 (March 31): Unrecognized States and the Thawing of Georgia’s Frozen Conflicts

Charles King, “The Benefits of Ethnic War: Understanding Eurasia’s Unrecognized States,” *World Politics*. Vol. 53, No. 4 (July 2001), pp. 524-552.

Alexander Cooley and Lincoln Mitchell, “No Way to treat our Friends: Recasting Recent U.S.-Georgian Relations,” *Washington Quarterly* Vol. 32, No. 1 (January 2009), pp. 27-41.

TBA Reading on legal challenges of Abkhazia and S. Ossetia

Week 11 (Apr 7): The Politics of Overseas Military Bases

What are underlying issues of sovereignty involved when a host country grants overseas military basing rights? What benefits might host countries derive from hosting a foreign military presence beyond a security guarantee? What is a Status of Forces Agreement and how do the criminal jurisdiction provisions of a SOFA relate to a host country's legal system? Why did the government of Uzbekistan evict U.S. forces from the K2 facility in July 2005 and what lessons might the episode hold for current US policy planners? How do these political dynamics compare with the enduring presence of Russian bases in countries such as Ukraine and the breakaway territories of Georgia?

Alexander Cooley, *Base Politics: Democratic Change and the U.S. Military Overseas*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008). Chapters 1-3, 7-8. Skim the other case studies.

Recommended:

Alexander Cooley, "Base Politics," *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 84, No. 6 (Nov-Dec 2005), pp. 79-92.

Final paper topics handed out – due Week 14

Week 12 (Apr 14): The Privatization of State Security

What are the reasons behind the emergence of commercial actors that provide security services? What is the range of services offered on the domestic and international market? What are the governance, accountability and oversight problems associated with PSCs? Ultimately, do PSCs strengthen or weaken the states that contract for their services? If Russia's "power ministries" are now effectively commercialized, can they ever be effectively reformed? What was the role of MPRI in the Bosnian conflict?

Peter Singer, "Corporate Warriors: the Rise of the Privatized Military Industry and its Ramifications for International Security," *International Security* Vol. 26, No. 3 (Winter 2001/02), pp.186-220.

Deborah Avant, "The Implications of Marketized Security for IR Theory: The Democratic Peace, Late State-Building, and the Nature and Frequency of Conflict," *Perspectives on Politics*. Vol. 4, No. 3 (Sept. 2006), 507-528.

Vadim Volkov, "Between Society and the State: Private Security and Rule-Enforcement in Russia," *Politics and Society*, (December 2000), Vol. 28 No 4, pp. 483-501.

Week 13 (Apr 21): Optional Individual Conferences about Papers

Meet in my office.

Week 14 (Apr 28): Final Meeting and Course Conclusions

Final papers due; no incompletes without a documented medical emergency!