

Professor Darren Hawkins
Office: 722 SWKT
Telephone: 422-5526
e-mail: dhawkins@byu.edu
Office Hours: TTh, 3-4

Political Science 375
Winter 2008
12-12:50 MWF
346 MARB
Syllabus

NOTE: If you can't make my office hours, I'm happy to meet with you another time. I want to help you succeed and I like to meet with you.

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Although the international arena is formally characterized as anarchy (i.e., the absence of a centralized governing authority), attempts to order and to govern international affairs are in reality quite numerous. The United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU) first spring to mind, but intergovernmental organizations now number in the thousands. Numerous treaties, conventions, agreements, institutionalized practices, norms, and non-state actors also characterize the international arena. This course will define international organizations broadly, and look at a wide range of institutions established by states and individuals in an attempt to bring order to international affairs.

Objectives

You should be able to define important concepts in the study of international organizations, and illustrate those concepts with particular and specific examples.

You should be able to summarize key information about selected international institutions of great importance, such as the United Nations, the global trading regime, and international human rights norms.

You should be able to understand, articulate, and apply different theoretical views of international institutions.

You should be able to explain why international institutions are created, and be able to explain their effects, if any. You should also be able to identify and analyze key characteristics of those institutions.

You should be able to comprehend the complex nature of current events relating to international institutions, to analyze the benefits and costs of these institutions to the United States and to the world, and to debate the desirability of international institutions in a sophisticated way.

You should develop critical thinking skills, analytical skills, and writing skills, especially as they apply to international politics. Critical thinking and analytical skills involve the ability to identify patterns in specific facts, to compare and contrast patterns and concepts, to identify the implications of a particular argument, and to understand at least two different positions on each issue. Writing skills involve the ability to construct a persuasive argument by using logic, evidence, and good mechanics.

You should develop the desire to continue learning about international affairs through regular exposure to high-quality information.

You should partially fulfill the injunction in Doctrine and Covenants 88:77-80, in which we are to “be instructed” in “. . . things which are abroad; the wars and the perplexities of the nations . . . and a knowledge also of countries and of kingdoms. . . .”

Requirements

Reading Responses	15 percent
IO Briefing Paper	25 percent
Exam 1	20 percent
Exam 2	20 percent
Exam 3	20 percent

Reading Responses – You should come prepared to every class session with a one-half page, single-spaced reading response. See the information later in the syllabus. I will not always collect these, but you should always be prepared.

Exams – These will consist of a mixture of identifications and short answer questions. They will all occur in our classroom on the dates noted below. NOTE: I respect university policy and DO NOT give early final exams for any reason. If you cannot make this exam time, you should take a different class. Please do not ask me to help you violate this policy. If you must take an exam late, a penalty of 20-30 percent will be imposed in all cases save emergencies.

IO Briefing Paper – See separate assignment sheet, later in syllabus.

Workload – Consistent with department standards, I expect you will work an average of two hours outside of class for every hour inside class. This amounts to 6 hours outside class each week plus 3 hours in class. Generally, you will be required to read one scholarly article or two shorter policy articles for each class session.

Note on Email Addresses – I will sometimes use email to contact you in between class sessions. I will use your official BYU email address. If you use a different one, please use Route Y tools to forward the BYU address to the one you commonly use.

I always invite and appreciate any feedback you have on any aspect of this course.

Readings

The following books are required and are available for purchase at the bookstore:

Lang, Anthony F., ed. 2003. *Just Intervention*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.

Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Across Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Doyle, Michael W. and Nicholas Sambanis. 2006. *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

A readings packet with all of the articles may be purchased in the JFSB copy center on the basement floor of the JFSB, west hallway. The articles in there will also be posted to Blackboard. Due to the number of articles, most students find the packet easier and cheaper than reading or printing out all the articles on Blackboard.

Also be prepared to discuss current events in class by paying attention to high-quality sources of international news. Although few in number, these include nytimes.com, washingtonpost.com, economist.com, ft.com/world (*Financial Times*) and National Public Radio (90.1 FM; news from 6-9 am and 3-7 pm). You can also get a free copy of the *New York Times* at the Kennedy Center.

Course Schedule

You should read the assignment before coming to class each day.

Four theoretical questions run throughout this course:

- 1-Why do states and others create international institutions?
- 2-How and why do states design and control international institutions as they do?
- 3-How and why do international institutions change?
- 4-What influence do international institutions have? Why do states comply, or not, with their rules?

Two policy questions run throughout this course:

- 1-What should US be doing about international institutions?
- 2-What should international institutions be doing?

Two normative questions are interrelated with all of the above questions:

- 1-Are international institutions good, desirable, and beneficial or fundamentally flawed and antagonistic to good values?
- 2-Do international institutions help those deserving of help and harm those deserving punishment? To what extent do they accomplish these goals?

I. What is the United Nations? How does it Function? What are its powers and limitations?

7 Jan. Varieties of Institutions

9 Jan. UN Structure and Function

UN Charter, <http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/index.html>

UN in Brief, <http://www.un.org/Overview/uninbrief/> (just read the main pages using the “next page” button on the right and follow some hyperlinks at your pleasure)

Response Question: Does the structure of the UN System make sense? That is, does it seem a rational response to something? Does it seem to be appropriate or helpful in some way? The

“UN in Brief” is admittedly a public-relations website, but what can we learn about the UN and how it sees itself from this? What main questions do you have about the UN?

11 Jan. UN Structure and Function

UN Millenium Development Goals, <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/> (list of goals on left hand side)

UN Millenium Development Goals Report 2007, <http://www.un.org/millenniumgoals/pdf/mdg2007.pdf>

Materials on the 2005 World Summit, <http://www.un.org/summit2005/> (look at some of the main documents under the “documents” link)

Response Question: Do these strike you as the right sorts of activities for the UN to engage in? Why or why not? If not, what other activities would be better? Is the UN the right sort of organization to engage in these activities? Would a different organization, or no organization, be more helpful?

14 Jan. UN Reform

UN Reform Highlights since 1997, <http://www.un.org/reform/highlights.shtml>

In Larger Freedom, <http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/>

Response Question: Do the Goals and Methods laid out in Parts I, II and III of the “Larger Freedom” report strike you as helpful and productive and appropriate? Which of the reforms listed in the Highlights or in the “Larger Freedom” report would you prioritize as the most important? Why?

II. UN Peace Operations: Explaining Success and Failure

16 Jan. Background

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 1-26, 334-351

Response Question: The text discusses different “generations” of peacekeeping. Why do you think the UN has changed and evolved in this way? What factors would you suspect as the causes? Why?

18 Jan. Theories of Civil War

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 27-49

Response Question: Are possible explanations of civil war left unexplored? Do any explanations seem unclear or unlikely? Do any seem more likely or more important? Why?

21 Jan. No Class; MLK Holiday

23 Jan. Theorizing and Modeling UN Intervention

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 49-86

Response Question: Are possible explanations of the success of UN interventions unexplored? Do any explanations seem unclear or unlikely? Do any seem more likely or more important?

Why? Are all the concepts measured adequately? Can you think of other or better possible measures?

25 Jan. Generally, What Works?

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 86-132

Response Question: How persuasive is this evidence? Are you skeptical in any way? Why? What additional evidence do you want to see? Are there other interpretations possible of the evidence presented? Are all concepts measured adequately? Are there other or better possible measures?

28 Jan. Making War

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 144-196

Response Question: How good is the UN at waging war? Why? Are other IOs or states likely to do a better job? Why? What difficulties might others face that the UN does not face?

30 Jan. Peacebuilding Successes

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 197-256

1 Feb. Peacebuilding Failures

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 257-302

4 Feb. Designing Better Strategies

Doyle and Sambanis, pp. 303-333

6 Feb. Explaining International Reactions to Bosnia and Rwanda

Power, "Srebrenica"

Barnett, in the Lang volume

Response Question: Compare and contrast the authors' arguments for why states and the UN became involved (or not, actually) in Bosnia and Rwanda in the mid-1990s.

8 Feb. Exam in Class

III. Normative Perspectives on Humanitarian Intervention

11 Feb. What is our Duty? The case for intervention

Evans and Sahnoun, "The Responsibility to Protect," Readings Packet

Nardin, in Lang Volume

Response Question: Compare and contrast the authors' justifications for intervention and the criteria that they apply to cases to determine whether intervention is justified. Are some criteria more compelling to you than others? Would Iraq in 2003 have qualified for humanitarian intervention, ignoring the question of WMD?

13 Feb. The Role of NGOs

Weiss, in the Lang volume
Pasic and Weiss, in the Lang volume

15 Feb. Problems in Humanitarian Intervention

Caplan, in the Lang volume
Cook, in the Lang volume
Mertus, in the Lang volume

IV. Why Create IOs? Benefits and Costs

19 Feb. Functional Benefits for All
(Note: This is a Tuesday; no class on 18 Feb.)

Abbott and Snidal, "Why states act through formal international organizations."
Response Question: Are the benefits articulated by Abbott and Snidal likely to be more pronounced in some issues or geographical areas? Why or why not?

20 Feb. Benefits and Costs for the US

Ikenberry, "State power and the institutional bargain."
Response Question: Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has sought Security Council approval for multilateral military action. Does Ikenberry's theory explain why? What are the implications for US action in Iraq that has not been institutionally endorsed?

22 Feb. The Dangers of IOs

Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," pp. 5-27, 47-49
Response Question: Are there other costs to institutions that Mearsheimer does not articulate?

25 Feb. 1945

Ikenberry, "The Settlement of 1945"

27 Feb. 1991

Ikenberry, "After the Cold War"

29 Feb. Critiquing and Defending Bush Administration Policy

Ikenberry, "America's Imperial Ambition."
Powell, "A Strategy of Partnerships."
Response Question: Should the United States engage more or engage less in multilateral institutions? What form should that engagement take? Why?

V. Do IOs Change? How? Why?

3-5 March Legalization

Goldstein, et. al., "Introduction: Legalization and World Politics."

Abbott, et. al. "The concept of legalization."

Abbott and Snidal, "Hard law and soft law in international governance."

7-10 March Legalizing the Trade Regime: The World Trade Organization

Jones, *Who's Afraid of the WTO?*, pp. 66-124

12 March Protecting Democracy

Hawkins, "Protecting Democracy in Europe and the Americas"

14 March Exam 2, in class

VI. Can States Control Institutions?

17 March Principal-Agent Issues

Hawkins, Lake, Nielson, and Tierney, "Delegation under Anarchy."

19 March State Control: World Bank

Nielson and Tierney, "Delegation to International Organizations."

Response Question: Nielson and Tierney argue that the World Bank didn't listen to its critics until powerful states all agreed on the same policy. Why not? What factors make the World Bank likely to be deaf to NGOs? Are all IOs also likely to be deaf? What about domestic bureaucracies? What about BYU's bureaucracy? That is, which are the most likely to be responsive to non-principals and why?

21 March Agent Expertise: International Monetary Fund

Barnett and Finnemore, "Expertise and Power at the International Monetary Fund."

Response Question: Of the IOs we've studied, which are the most likely to follow the IMF's lead in using expertise to increase the agent's power? Why?

VII. Do International Institutions Have Independent Influence on States? How? Why?

24 March International Incentives: Shaping Eastern Europe

Schimmelfennig, "Strategic calculation and international socialization."

Response Question: For Schimmelfennig, words also matter, but for different reasons than for Risse and Sikkink. Which analysis is more persuasive to you? Alternatively, are words likely to matter anywhere outside Europe, in Schimmelfennig's perspective?

26 March Socialization: Shaping Human Rights Practices

Risse and Sikkink, "The socialization of international human rights norms into domestic practices."

Response Question: Risse and Sikkink suggest that words matter. Can you think of examples where they don't? Why might they sometimes matter and sometimes not?

28 March Video: Chile: A Force More Powerful

No readings

31 March Incentives and Socialization Interacting with Domestic Politics: Human Rights in Eastern Europe

Kelley, "International Actors on the Domestic Scene"

She is really very little different from Schimmelfennig; maybe I should do something different here.

Also, put Schimmelfennig after Risse and Sikkink. And I think I meant to use the other Schimmelfennig article on drivers and brakemen and framing. In fact, I'm sure I did.

VIII. Human Rights and Transnational Networks

2-4 April The Role of Transnational Networks

Keck and Sikkink, Chs. 1-2

7 April Women's Networks

Keck and Sikkink, Ch. 5

9 April The International Criminal Court

Fehl, "Explaining the International Criminal Court"

11 April Normative Dimensions of International Courts

Kissinger, "The Pitfalls of Universal Jurisdiction"

Bass, "Epilogue: Do War Crimes Tribunals Work?"

14 April No Class; Finish Papers

**Briefing Paper DUE in 745 SWKT (political science department)
Monday, 14 April, 4:30 pm**

FINAL EXAM, Tuesday, April 22, 11-2, in our regular classroom

General Policies

Academic dishonesty in all forms will be penalized. All forms of academic dishonesty, including cheating and intentional plagiarism, are immoral acts and most are also violations of the honor code. Inadvertent plagiarism is a form of academic dishonesty that does not constitute a violation of the honor code, but will be penalized appropriately, usually by deducting points from the paper's grade. I find that inadvertent plagiarism is a common problem, and reflects ignorance, laziness, or an attitude of not caring. Inadvertent plagiarism is defined as "inappropriate, but nondeliberate, use of another's words, ideas, or data without proper attribution."

While all students sign the honor code, there are still specific skills most students need to master over time in order to correctly cite sources, especially in this new age of the internet; as well as deal with the stress and strain of college life without resorting to cheating. Please know that as your professor I will notice instances of cheating on exams or plagiarizing on papers. General information about the honor code can be found at honorcode.byu.edu. Details about Academic Honesty at the Honor Code site can be found by moving your mouse over "Honor Code" in the second grey bar and then move down then right and click on "Other Clarifications", then move your mouse down and click on "Academic Honesty."

Writing submitted for credit at BYU must consist of the student's own ideas presented in sentences and paragraphs of his or her own construction. The work of other writers or speakers may be included when appropriate (as in a research paper or book review), but such material must support the student's own work (not substitute for it) and must be clearly identified by appropriate introduction and punctuation and by footnoting or other standard referencing.

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in an educational program or activity that receives federal funds. The act is intended to eliminate sex discrimination in education. Title IX covers discrimination in programs, admissions, activities, and student-to-student sexual harassment. BYU's policy against sexual harassment extends not only to employees of the university but to students as well. If you encounter unlawful sexual harassment or gender based discrimination, please talk to your professor; contact the Equal Employment Office at 422-5895 or 367-5689 (24-hours); or contact the Honor Code Office at 422-2847.

Brigham Young University is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere which reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you have any disability which may impair your ability to complete this course successfully, please contact the Services for Students with Disabilities Office (422-2767). Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified documented disabilities. Services are coordinated with the student and instructor by the SSD office. If you need assistance or if you feel you have been unlawfully discriminated against on the basis of disability, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures. You should contact the Equal Employment Office at 422-5895, D-282 ASB.

Reading Responses

Purpose

"I am never so clear about any matter as when I have just finished writing about it."

-- James Van Allen

These assignments will cause you to reflect on the information you are reading, organize it in different ways, and articulate your reactions to it. They will help you understand the material, think analytically, and develop better writing skills. Additionally, they will prepare you for class discussion, thereby enriching the time you spend in class, and help you truly learn and retain the material, thereby avoiding test-taking methods that rely on cramming and regurgitation.

Description of the Assignment

For each class day, you should bring a written response to the readings assigned for that day. Where readings are assigned for two days, do some of the readings one day, and some of them another day.

The response should first summarize in two to three sentences the main points of the reading. They should then respond to the reading in some way. I ask "response questions" in the syllabus during some parts of class to get you used to this assignment and my particular approach. Feel free to focus on these or to choose your own theme. Your responses should include original analyses of information presented in the readings ("the readings suggest we might conceptualize international institutions as varying on three basic dimensions") and/or arguments about important causal factors or normative issues ("the major reason why international institutions don't work well is lack of US support" or "the US should do more to support international institutions"). You should use logic and evidence (perhaps drawn from current events or information from other classes or the readings themselves) to support your views.

I will not always collect these and I will drop two low scores, so you get two free days. I will accept a paper emailed to me as an attachment before class if you simply cannot make class. Please use this as a last resort.

Format/Style

No longer than one half-page single-spaced, computer-generated or very legibly written.

Grading

Collectively, this assignment is worth 15 percent of your grade in this course. Each response paper I collect is worth 10 points. I will deduct points for responses that demonstrate inaccurate summaries of the readings, deficiencies in logic or evidence, lack of *specific* information concerning the readings and related issues, or difficulties communicating your meaning (including grammar and spelling problems). Do not try to make too many points; usually a response with one or two main points, developed in a few sentences, is sufficient.

Research Paper

Political Science 375, Winter 2008

- Purpose** To develop your critical reading, thinking and writing skills. To develop a deeper understanding of one important international organization.
- General Assignment** The paper should provide a sophisticated analysis of an important intergovernmental organization (NOT an INGO). Choose any IGO except one of the UN principal organs. Choose one of the following issues as your main line of analysis:
- Why the IGO was established.
 - How and why the IGO has changed over time.
 - The extent to which states control the IGO and how they control it.
- Component Parts** In the course of your argument about the proper role between your chosen country and your IGO, you must accomplish the following:
- Describe the structure (who has power) and function (what does it do) of the IGO. Do this briefly, in a page or two; just hit the highlights. Remember how I introduced the principal organs of the UN or the structure of other IOs. Stuff that doesn't matter doesn't get mentioned. Stuff that sort of matters merits a sentence.
 - Assess the IGO on three of the following five dimensions: centralization, independence, obligation, precision, and delegation. Explicitly compare it to other IGOs we have studied this semester on these scales. Assume I know what these terms mean, so you don't need to define them.
- In all of this, you should *make sure that you incorporate theoretical ideas* from the readings this semester. For example, you may want to discuss Abbott and Snidal if you are arguing that your IGO is useful for “laundering” purposes.
- Research** One source should be the web site of the IGO itself and the various documents produced by the IGO and available at that website. Don't just rely on the publicity-oriented prose easily available at the website. Do some digging and carefully examine the official documents produced by that IGO or by the states who govern it. You should also find some secondary sources about that IGO, either in books, academic journals, or newspapers and magazines. These secondary sources should help you interpret the information you are finding from primary sources at the website. I expect your bibliography to include the specific titles of several IGO-produced documents as well as a few to several secondary sources, depending on their nature. NOTE: Evidence of thorough research, as demonstrated by breadth and depth of bibliography and citations in the paper, is essential to a good grade.
- Format** The assignment should be about seven double-spaced, computer-generated pages. Use Turabian citation style as taught in Political Science 200. Cite web documents individually; don't simply tell me a web site covering multiple

documents.

- Due Dates** The paper is due on the last day of class, Monday, April 14, by 4:30 pm in 745 SWKT. I am happy to read drafts of the paper before then, if you take the time to visit with me about them so I can provide oral rather than written feedback. A late penalty of 10 percent of the total points per day will be imposed.
- Style** Write to an educated audience interested in the issue but who know nothing about the particular IGO (such as senators who will need to vote on support for the IGO).
- Grading**
- A: The paper has a clear thesis statement in the first paragraph or two in which you summarize your major arguments. You don't straddle fences; you tell me clearly how, to what extent, and why your country should support or not your IGO. You clearly articulate answers to the issues I ask you to deal with. You give specific reasons to back up your position, well-founded in logic and *specific* evidence. You make frequent reference to articles we've read this semester and tie theoretical arguments to your empirical evidence. The paper employs good grammar and spelling, is elegantly written, and is well-organized. The logic of the paper is sound and well-developed, offering evidence of original thought. The arguments are sophisticated and not obvious.
- B: Thesis statements are not as sophisticated, not well-developed, or somewhat unclear. In some cases, the thesis is discovered near the end of the paper. The logic is sometimes flawed, the evidence discussed does not clearly support the argument, or important evidence is missing. Often times, the paper does a nice job summarizing the nature of the IGO, but is less successful at employing analytical frames and terms. The paper is relatively well-written and organized, with a low frequency of errors, but some awkwardness detracts.
- C: The thesis statement is unclear, vague, or too simple. The logic is quite underdeveloped or somewhat contradictory. A discussion of empirical evidence is missing or contradicts the argument. The paper has frequent errors in word choice, grammar, etc. Often, the paper is largely descriptive, simply summarizing IGO information without clear analysis.
- D: The thesis is largely missing. The paper is disorganized and/or illogical. Frequent grammatical errors detract significantly.

List of Articles

In the order in which we read them.

Power, Samantha. 2002. "Srebrenica," in *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide*. New York: Basic Books.

Evans, Gareth and Mohamed Sahnoun, "The responsibility to protect," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 6: 99-110. Nov/Dec. 2002.

Abbott, Kenneth W. and Duncan Snidal. 1998. Why states act through formal international organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42, no. 1 (February): 3-32.

Ikenberry, G. John. 2003. "State power and the institutional bargain," in Rosemary Foot, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *US Hegemony and International Organizations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 49-70.

Measheimer, John. 1994/95. "The False Promise of International Institutions." *International Security* 19, no. 3: 5-26; 47-49.

Ikenberry, "The Settlement of 1945" in *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. 2000. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ikenberry, "After the Cold War" in *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. 2000. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ikenberry, G. John. 2002. "America's Imperial Ambition," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 81, no. 5, September/October, pp. 44-60.

Powell, Colin L. 2004. "A Strategy of Partnerships," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 83, no. 1, January/February, pp. 22-34.

Goldstein, Judith, Miles Kahler, Robert O. Keohane, Anne-Marie Slaughter, "Introduction: Legalization and World Politics," *International Organization* 54, no. 3: 385-393.

Abbott, Kenneth W., Robert O. Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Duncan Snidal. 2000. The concept of legalization. *International Organization* 54, no. 3: 401-419.

Abbott, Kenneth W. and Duncan Snidal. 2000. Hard law and soft law in international governance. *International Organization* 54, no. 3: 421-456.

Jones, Kent. 2004. *Who's Afraid of the WTO?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawkins, Darren. 2008. "Protecting Democracy in Europe and the Americas" Forthcoming, *International Organization*.

Hawkins, Darren, David Lake, Daniel Nielson, Michael Tierney. Forthcoming 2006. "Delegation under Anarchy: States, International Organizations, and Principal-Agent

Theory.” In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, Darren Hawkins, David Lake, Daniel Nielson, and Michael Tierney, eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nielson, Daniel and Michael Tierney. 2003. “Delegation to international organizations: Agency theory and World Bank environmental reform.” *International Organization* 57, no. 2: 241-276.

Barnett, Michael, and Martha Finnemore. 2004. “Expertise and Power at the International Monetary Fund,” Ch. 2 of *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2005. Strategic calculation and international socialization: Membership incentives, party constellations, and sustained compliance in Central and Eastern Europe. *International Organization* 59 (4):827-860.

Risse, Thomas and Kathryn Sikkink. 1999. The socialization of international human rights norms into domestic practices: Introduction. In *The power of human rights: International norms and domestic change*, ed. Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink:1-38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, Judith. 2004. International actors on the domestic scene: Membership conditionality and socialization by international institutions. *International Organization* 58 (3):425-457.

Fehl, C. 2004. Explaining the International Criminal Court: A 'practice test' for rationalist and constructivist approaches. *European Journal of International Relations* 10 (3):357-394.

Kissinger, Henry A. 2001. "The Pitfalls of Universal Jurisdiction." *Foreign Affairs* 80, no. 4: 86-96.

Bass, Gary Jonathan. 2000. “Epilogue: Do War Crimes Tribunals Work?,” in *Stay the Hand of Vengeance: The Politics of War Crimes Tribunals*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.