

Government 368 International Environmental Politics
Spring 2022
Wednesdays 2:00-4:30
ICC 101

Andrew Bennett
Georgetown University
BennettA@Georgetown.edu
Office Hours Wed. 12:30-1:30 pm
ICC 667

Course Description

This is an undergraduate seminar, which means that students will take an active role not just in learning and research but in leading our discussions. The course is designed to give an overview of the subject and to enable in-depth research on environmental politics.

Course Goals

In addition to increasing students' substantive and theoretical knowledge of environmental politics, the course seeks to strengthen research, writing, and presentational skills.

Course Overview

Environmental issues are a “perfect storm” of challenges for governance: they involve market failures (externalities, public goods, common pool resources); require coordinated action on local, state, federal, and transnational and international scales; involve complex scientific, economic, and social issues and uncertainties; engage the core economic interests of self-interested groups; emerge on time scales in which near term actions can have consequences for hundreds or even thousands of years; evoke competing ethical or moral claims; and involve personal choices by and also affect the livelihoods and quality of life of every person on the planet. Climate change has garnered much of the attention on the environmental agenda, but other problems include air pollution (particulates, toxins), water pollution and shortages, ozone depletion, overfishing, deforestation, biodiversity loss, habitat loss, and plastics and other wastes and toxins on land and in the oceans.

International negotiations have had some successes in addressing these problems, particularly on protecting the ozone layer, but on others (particularly climate change) negotiations have not yet resulted in policy changes that scientists judge to be sufficient to prevent major damage to the global environment and human society. At the same time, rapid improvements in the science, technology, and economics of energy and the climate are creating opportunities to markedly reduce the possible future damage done by greenhouse gases and other pollutants, and to do so at modest economic costs, provided that political institutions can adapt to take advantage of these opportunities.

While this is not a course in climate science or environmental economics, we begin with a brief discussion of these topics as important background for understanding environmental politics and possible futures. We will then explore the role of path dependent politics on energy transitions, environmental and energy politics in the US (public opinion, framing, agenda-setting, fossil fuel and environmental groups and lobbying, federal, state, and local institutions and environmental politics), environmental politics in countries and groups of countries outside the US,

international environmental negotiations and institutions, the politics of environmental problems other than climate change, the resource curse, and environmental problems and international and civil conflict.

Course Requirements

--Prepare One Powerpoint Slide on your Favorite Infographic, photo, or Factual Listicle on Environmental or Energy Science for our first session as part of your self-introduction.

Choose something that helps explain your interest in environmental issues, perhaps something that relates to your personal encounter with environmental issues or outdoor activities as you were growing up.

--Lead the Discussion in one Session (20% of course grade). Students will have some voice in choosing a topic/week to lead our discussion, but we also have to ensure there is at least one student (at times there may be two) leading the discussion each week. This will consist of a 10-15 minute summary and critique of the assigned readings from that week (and perhaps also brief summary of some of the additional listed readings, and other relevant readings the student finds on their own). This can include (but does not require) powerpoints for information best conveyed visually. I encourage students to consult with me in office hours a week prior to leading the discussion. Following their presentation (during which other students and I might interject with questions), the leading student(s) will help facilitate the discussion that follows, drawing on discussion questions they have devised and additional discussion questions suggested by other students.

--Write Discussion Questions for two sessions (10% of course grade each, for 20% total). Students should write and post on Canvas by two days prior to class four discussion questions to add to those I have outlined below for each session. If you want you can make one of these two sets of questions for the day you lead the class discussion. Make sure your questions are discussable – ie, they are not easily answered and they invite different perspectives or tradeoffs. Discussion questions can focus on apparent disagreements among the readings, questions the readings raise but do not address, policy dilemmas evident in the readings, or theoretical or methodological critiques of the readings.

--Write One Short paper (20% of the course grade). Students are required to submit one short paper (about 750 words) on the weekly topic and readings for one week *other than the week in which they are leading the discussion*. Students will sign up for which week they want to do for their short papers – it is OK for some weeks to have more students than others but we don't want the distribution to be too uneven. The paper can focus on the assigned or optional readings from a week, but it can also address one or more readings on the week's topic other than the readings listed in the syllabus. The paper must go beyond summary – it should read like a short book or article review, highlighting the key themes of the chosen readings and discussing their strengths and weaknesses. Papers can focus on one reading or on a common theme or two across several readings. Possible critiques can include a discussion of questions raised but unanswered by the readings; comparison of the readings; your agreements and disagreements with the readings; and alternative research approaches that that readings could have employed or that future research can use. A creative option here is to fashion your short paper into a policy-relevant piece for

outlets like The Monkey Cage in the *Washington Post* (with the usual semi-obligatory clickbait title like “Five myths about X” or “Four Things Policy Makers Should know about Y.” If students want to orient their short papers as possible submissions for TMC or elsewhere, I will provide advice for doing so. Papers are due on Canvas under the “Discussions” link by two days prior to class.

--Write a Research paper (50% of the course grade), about 3,000-4,000 words (longer is OK if you touch base with me first). Research papers should identify a research question or puzzle that is theoretically interesting and/or policy-relevant, situate this question in the relevant literatures, formulate alternative hypotheses, develop an argument, and test the argument using qualitative or quantitative evidence. A one-page topic proposal/preliminary abstract is due on Canvas by Monday February 7; all students should read these abstracts and we will offer constructive feedback in class February 9. An outline and preliminary bibliography, 1-2 pages long, is due on Canvas Monday February 21 – again, all students should read these and be prepared to critique them in class. Students will present their papers for constructive critiques by each other and by me in the final two weeks of the course. Students should post their paper on Canvas the Friday before we will discuss it so everyone can read it before class and be prepared to discuss it.

Grading Scale

100 to 95	A
94 to 91	A-
90 to 87	B+
86 to 83	B
82 to 79	B-
78 to 75	C+
74 to 71	C
70 to 67	C-

Books for the Course

I have not ordered books at the bookstore, but they are available for purchase or rent (sometimes in ebook form) from Amazon or other sources. Other readings (journal articles) are available online through Lauinger. I will post some short book excerpts on Canvas.

Here are the three books you should purchase:

Keohane and Olmsted, *Markets and the Environment* (second edition), available here as either paperback or e-textbook:

https://www.amazon.com/Markets-Environment-Foundations-Contemporary-Environmental/dp/1610916077/ref=dp_ob_title_bk

Leah Stokes, [*Short Circuiting Policy: Interest Groups and the Battle Over Clean Energy and Climate Policy in the American States*](#) (2020)

Matto Miltenberger, [*Carbon Captured: How Business and Labor Control Climate Politics*](#) (2020)

Course Schedule

Jan. 19	Introduction and Overview
Jan. 26	Environmental Economics
Feb. 2	The Big Picture: The Politics of Path Dependence and Energy Transitions
Feb. 7	One page paper topic/abstract (or brief outline of several possible research topics you are considering) due on Canvas “Discussions” link.
Feb. 9	Class discussion of paper topics. The Politics of Framing and Agenda-Setting, American Public Opinion on Environmental issues, and (de)polarizing Environmental Politics
Feb. 16	Fossil Fuel and Environmental Groups, Lobbies, and Social Movements
Feb. 21	Paper outline and preliminary bibliography due on Canvas “Discussions” link.
Feb. 23	Class discussion of paper outlines. US Energy Politics and Institutions: The Federal Government
Mar. 2	US Energy Politics and Institutions: State and Local Governments
Mar. 9	Spring Break
Mar. 16	Energy Politics of other Key Countries: China, India, Russia, and the EU
Mar. 23	International Environmental Negotiations and Institutions
Mar. 30	Environmental Issues Other than Carbon and the Climate
April 6	Resource Curses: Economics, Democracy, Rights of Women and People of Color, Civil and International Conflicts
April 13	Topic TBD with student input
April 20	Student Paper Presentations
April 27	Student Paper Presentations

Additional possible topics for papers include but are not limited to:

International and domestic environmental law and the courts as an avenue to environmental policy (un)making; climate refugees and immigration policies and international norms and law; climate justice; the politics (and science and economics) of carbon capture, geoengineering, and climate adaptation; environmental politics in the 2022 and 2024 presidential, Senate, House, and state and local campaigns and elections.

Journals to search on Google Scholar for relevant research for your papers:

Annual Review of Environment and Resources
Environmental Politics
Global Environmental Politics
Global Environmental Change
Review of International Political Economy
Journal of Environment and Development
Climate Policy
International Organization
European Journal of International Relations
British Journal of Political Science

Schedule of Readings

Jan. 19 Introduction and Overview

Jessica Green, David Konisky, Megan Mullin, Stacy VanDeveer, and Johannes Urpelainen, [Changing the Atmosphere in Political Science: Ten Key Political Questions about Climate Change](#), Duck of Minerva blog post.

Jessica Green and Thomas Hale, [Reversing the Marginalization of Global Environmental Politics in International Relations](#), PS April 2017, 473-479; focus especially on the three research agendas on pages 476-477.

Bill McKibben, "Global Warming's Terrifying New Math," *The Rolling Stone*, July 19, 2012. <https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/global-warmings-terrifying-new-math-188550/>

Rockstrom, J., et al. "A Safe Operating Space for Humanity." *Nature*, 2009, 472-475. <https://www.nature.com/articles/461472a>

The Hamilton Project and EPIC (2017), “Twelve Economic Facts on Energy and Climate Change;” read the short web page overview [here](#) and look into any of the twelve facts that surprises you.

Discussion Questions

What are different dimensions (scientific, economic, political, ethics and justice, etc) of climate change and other environmental issues?

What are different ways to frame these issues, and what are the implications of these different framings?

What are the most active areas of research on environmental politics?

What are new or cutting edge areas of research on environmental politics?

What issues or dimensions of environmental politics have been neglected by political scientists, and why might this be?

Optional additional readings:

IPCC (2018), Global Warming of 1.5°, “Summary for Policymakers” pp 3-26

Climate Action Tracker (2020), Paris Agreement turning point

Yangyang Xu, Veerabhadran Ramanathan, and David Victor (2018), “Global warming will happen faster than we think,” *Nature* 564

Jan. 26 Environmental Economics

Nathaniel Keohane and Sheila Olmstead, *Markets and the Environment* (Island Press, 2007). Read chapter 2 (marginal analysis; pp. 11-30), skim chapter 3 (cost-benefit analysis, pp. 31-52), read chapter 5 (market failures, pp 65-81), read chapter 8 (Coase theorem and regulating price vs. quantity, pp. 139-167).

Discussion Questions

In what ways are climate issues a public goods or collective action problem, and how might the different ways of providing the public good of environmental sustainability be supplied (action by one or a few powerful actors, creation of institutions that lower transactions costs, naming and shaming free riders and honoring actors who contribute)?

What are the limits and challenges of each of these paths to providing the public good of environmental sustainability?

How is the social cost of carbon typically calculated, why do estimates range so widely, and what are the limits of the standard ways of calculating the social cost of carbon?

How is the price (per ton of CO₂ reduced) of carbon reduction technology calculated, and why do estimates vary?

How does the choice of a discount rate for policy making purposes affect environmental policy?
What considerations should enter into choosing the “right” discount rate for environmental policy?

What are the pros and cons of a carbon tax versus a cap and trade system?

Why have political leaders in many countries favored subsidies and regulatory limits rather than either a carbon tax or a cap and trade system?

Of the countries that have done a carbon tax or cap and trade system, why did they choose one or the other?

How should we think about technological and environmental uncertainty when we make economic tradeoffs between economic growth and environmental sustainability?

How is the growth of renewable energy capacity and the declining cost of renewable energy changing the short-run and long-run prices of fossil fuels? Are the gyrations of fossil fuel prices in recent years due in part to changes in renewable energy economics? In energy politics?

How does OPEC work, why does it sometimes reduce oil exports and at other times expand them, and how does it make decisions (this goes beyond the assigned readings, but you might look at a short explainers [here](#) , [here](#) and [here](#))?

Optional:

Danny Cullenward and David Victor (2020), Making Climate Policy Work, Polity

Matto Mildenerger and Leah Stokes (2020), “The Trouble with Carbon Pricing,” Boston Review, September 24

Feb. 2 The Big Picture: Energy Transitions and Path Dependent Politics

[M Aklin, J Urpelainen](#), “[Political competition, path dependence, and the strategy of sustainable energy transitions](#),” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2013 (for those interested in a more recent and detailed version of this argument, see [Aklin and Urpelainen 2018](#), *Renewables: The Politics of a Global Energy Transition*, MIT Press 2018. (electronic copy online through Lauinger)

Breetz, H., Mildenerger, M., & Stokes, L. (2018). The political logics of clean energy transitions. *Business and Politics*, 20(4), 492-522. Online Lauinger.

Also, choose one of the following two articles to read:

Jeff Colgan, Jessica Green, and Thomas Hale, “Asset Revaluation and the Existential Politics of Climate Change,” *International Organization* (2020): 1-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000296>;

Michael Aklin and Matto Mildenerger, “Prisoners of the Wrong Dilemma: Why Distributional Conflict, Not Collective Action, Characterizes the Politics of Climate Change,” *Global Environmental Politics*, 20:4 (November 2020): 4-27.

Discussion Questions

What are the general political, economic, and technological mechanisms that cause path dependence?
What are the specific causal mechanisms, both economic and political, behind past energy transitions?
How do these causal mechanisms apply to the current ongoing transition to renewable energy?
On what time scales, ranging from short term to long term to very long term, do the causes of climate change occur?
On what time scales do the effects of greenhouse gasses occur?
What are the possible positive feedback effects of global warming (in this context, “positive feedback” means the stronger warming gets, the stronger some causes of warming get, not positive or good for human society)? What are potential limiting factors to warming?
What are the positive feedback effects and limiting factors for political trends for or against making major policy changes to address climate change?

Optional:

Paul Pierson, “Power and Path Dependence,” chapter 5 pp. 123-146; in James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen, eds., *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis* (Cambridge, 2015). On Canvas.

Paul Pierson, “Big, Slow Moving, and Invisible: Macro-Social Processes in the Study of Comparative Politics,” in Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, *Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences* (Cambridge, 2003). On Canvas.

Scott Page, [Path dependence](#). Quarterly Journal of Political Science, 2006

Kathryn Hochstetler (2020), *Political Economies of Energy Transition: wind and solar power in Brazil and South Africa*, Cambridge University Press

Feb. 9 The Politics of Framing and Agenda-Setting, American Public Opinion on Environmental issues, and (de)polarizing Environmental Politics

Patrick Egan and Megan Mullin, “Climate Change: US Public Opinion,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 20:209-227 (Volume publication date May 2017). [Egan and Mullin 2017](#)

[Elite cues, media coverage, and public concern: an integrated path analysis of public opinion on climate change, 2001–2013, JT Carmichael, RJ Brulle](#) - Environmental Politics,

[Agenda-setting and climate change](#), SB Pralle - Environmental Politics, 2009 – (applies Kingdon’s model to climate change)

Yale maps on climate opinion: <https://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us/>

Discussion Questions

How has US public opinion on climate change evolved over time? How do elite cues, movement advocacy efforts, weather, scientific communications, and structural economic factors affect public opinion on climate change?

Do people who personally experience extreme weather events (fires, floods, hurricanes) that climate scientists believe are generally more frequent and severe due to climate change, are they more persuaded of the reality of climate change and the importance of addressing it? If not, why not?

How does the US public's attitudes on environmental issues compare to those in other countries? What explains differences in national views on climate issues?

What ways of framing energy and environmental issues do and do not help persuade voters who either do not believe climate change is happening or do not believe it can be addressed at acceptable cost?

Optional:

[Reflections on climate change communication research and practice in the second decade of the 21st century: what more is there to say?](#), [SC Moser](#) - Wiley Interdisciplinary

Reviews: *Climate Change*, 2016

Feb. 16 Fossil Fuel and Environmental Lobbies, Groups and Social Movements

Hadden, J. Explaining Variation in Transnational Climate Change Activism, *Global Environmental Politics*, 2014, 7-25.

McAdam, D. Social Movement Theory and the Prospects for Climate Change Activism in the United States. *Annual Rev. Polit. Sci.* 2017.20:189-208.

Adelle Thomas and Rueanna Haynes (2020), "Black Lives Matter: the link between climate change and racial justice," *The Climate Analytics Blog* June 22

Take a look at the web sites of and about the Nature Conservancy, Natural Resources Defense Council, 350.org, Environmental Defense Fund (and its sub-group, Defend Our Future), Clean Air Task Force, Carbon 180, and the Sunrise movement.

Look at the web sites of and about pro-fossil fuel organizations like the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Heartland Institute, the American Petroleum Institute, and others listed [here](#)

Discussion Questions

What are the evident strategies, tactics, resources, and limitations of the environmental advocacy groups listed above for influencing climate change policies?

What are the strategies, tactics, resources, and limitations of the organizations listed above advocating on behalf of the fossil fuel industry?

Why are there so many environmental policy public interest groups instead of one or a few big ones (or are there just a few big ones when it comes to funding and membership?)? In what ways is that good or bad for defending the public's interests in climate and energy policies?

Despite having a lot of funding, environmental advocacy groups have lost many key political battles in the US against the fossil fuel lobby, such as the fight over energy and climate legislation in 2009. Why have they not been more successful in political fights against the fossil fuel lobby?

What social movements have had successes on environmental policy, and which ones have failed, and why? Given these past experiences and the lessons they hold, will the Sunrise movement achieve lasting success and influence? Why or why not?

Optional:

Thomas Hale, "Transnational Actors and Transnational Governance in Global Environmental Politics" *Annual Review of Political Science* 23 (2020): 203-220.

Busby, Joshua and Jennifer Hadden. 2015. "Non-State Actors in the Climate Arena." Stanley Foundation. 1-10.

https://stanleycenter.org/publications/working_papers/StanleyNonState_BusbyHadden.pdf

[Oreskes and Conway 2011](#), *Merchants of Doubt*, chapter on global warming pp. 169-215.

David Schlosberg and Lisette Collins (2014), "From environmental to climate justice: climate change and the discourse of environmental justice," *WIREs Climate Change*

Justin Farrell (2016), "Corporate funding and ideological polarization about climate change," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113:1

Feb. 23 American Power (Grid) Politics: Federal Politics

<https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/green/news/2010/10/12/8569/anatomy-of-a-senate-climate-bill-death/>

Matto Mildenberger, Carbon Captured: How Business and Labor Control Climate Politics 2020

https://www.amazon.com/Carbon-Captured-Business-Comparative-Environmental/dp/0262538253/ref=pd_sbs_14_1/136-9517111-9292343?_encoding=UTF8&pd_rd_i=0262538253&pd_rd_r=d98b8b42-e7ee-430c-8ac5-d14d72665a09&pd_rd_w=e7sKx&pd_rd_wg=nZZcq&pf_rd_p=7cd8f929-4345-4bf2-a554-7d7588b3dd5f&pf_rd_r=CC2NMCQJ6HEV2VPSVKKP&psc=1&refRID=CC2NMCQJ6HEV2VPSVKKP pages TBD

Discussion Questions

What institutional features of the US federal government have made it difficult to achieve progress against climate change?

What potential institutional changes might open the way for more progress on climate issues?

Optional:

“Pivotal politics” in US energy and climate legislation

T Skodvin - **Energy Policy**, 2010 – Elsevier

Federalism as a Double-Edged Sword: The Slow Energy Transition in the United States

R Karapin - *The Journal of Environment & Development*, 2020

Mar. 2 American Power (Grid) Politics: State and Local Governments and Institutions

New Best Friends: GOP Governors and Renewables

<https://www.eenews.net/stories/1060056498>

Renewable Energy Push is Strongest in the Reddest States

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/06/06/climate/renewable-energy-push-is-strongest-in-the-reddest-states.html>

Leah Stokes, *Short Circuiting Policy: Interest Groups and the Battle Over Clean Energy and Climate Policy in the American States* 2020 https://www.amazon.com/Short-Circuiting-Policy-Political-Development/dp/0190074264/ref=pb_sbs_14_1/136-9517111-9292343?_encoding=UTF8&pd_rd_i=0190074264&pd_rd_r=6732b072-9a10-4d9c-ac4e-44a27029b6f4&pd_rd_w=8gZpd&pd_rd_wg=e3Iuo&pf_rd_p=7cd8f929-4345-4bf2-a554-7d7588b3dd5f&pf_rd_r=H4F1ZHVZPA9FWFQBF962&psc=1&refRID=H4F1ZHVZPA9FWFQBF962 Pages TBD

https://www.amazon.com/Short-Circuiting-Policy-Political-Development/dp/0190074264/ref=pb_sbs_14_1/136-9517111-9292343?_encoding=UTF8&pd_rd_i=0190074264&pd_rd_r=6732b072-9a10-4d9c-ac4e-44a27029b6f4&pd_rd_w=8gZpd&pd_rd_wg=e3Iuo&pf_rd_p=7cd8f929-4345-4bf2-a554-7d7588b3dd5f&pf_rd_r=H4F1ZHVZPA9FWFQBF962&psc=1&refRID=H4F1ZHVZPA9FWFQBF962 Pages TBD

Look at the following maps of US installations of solar

([https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solar_power_in_the_United_States#/media/File:U.S._utility-scale_fixed-](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solar_power_in_the_United_States#/media/File:U.S._utility-scale_fixed-tilt_solar_photovoltaic_electricity_generating_capacity_in_2017_(44840888834).png)

[tilt_solar_photovoltaic_electricity_generating_capacity_in_2017_\(44840888834\).png](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Solar_power_in_the_United_States#/media/File:U.S._utility-scale_fixed-tilt_solar_photovoltaic_electricity_generating_capacity_in_2017_(44840888834).png))

and wind (<https://windexchange.energy.gov/maps-data/321>)

power generation by state. Compare it to maps of wind potential

(https://www.nrel.gov/gis/images/100m_wind/awstwsdpd100onoff3-1.jpg) and solar potential

(https://www.nrel.gov/gis/images/solar/solar_ghi_2018_usa_scale_01.jpg) by state. Consider the following questions:

Discussion Questions

How/through what tactics and strategies have fossil fuel lobbyists exerted influence over state and local policies? When and why have they lost political battles at the state or local level?

Which states seem to be exceeding their natural capacity for wind and/or solar renewables?

Which states are falling short compared to their natural capacities?

What political and institutional reasons might explain the outcomes thus far in these states?

Optional:

The politics of niche-regime conflicts: distributed solar energy in the United States

DJ Hess - Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions, 2016

Optional, for those interested in electrical grid technology:

David Roberts, Clean Energy Technologies Threaten to Overwhelm the Grid. Here is how it can Adapt. Vox, Nov 2018, updated Nov. 2019

<https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2018/11/30/17868620/renewable-energy-power-grid-architecture>

Optional, for those interested in the role of administrative law and environmental litigation:

Taking Stock of NEPA at 48

T Russo - Natural Gas & Electricity, 2018

Mar. 16 Environmental Politics Outside the US: Developing Countries and BRICs (especially China, India), Fossil Fuel Exporters (Russia, Saudi Arabia, etc), EU countries (esp. Germany, France, Britain), Others (Australia, Canada, Japan, etc)

Choose **one** of the following countries (or the EU as a group) and do the reading listed below on that country: China, India, Russia (or if you want to look at and report on another country's climate and energy policies, check with Professor Bennett and propose a reading). For whichever country you choose, be prepared to discuss their climate and energy policies and politics.

For those choosing to read about Russia:

Thane Gustafson, *Klimat: Russia in the Age of Climate Change* (Harvard, 2021; choose a few chapters to read)

For those choosing to read about China:

Joanna Lewis, "[China's Capabilities and Ambitions in Clean Energy Technologies](#)." Testimony before the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, June 7, 2019.

For those choosing to read about India:

The politics of climate change in India: narratives of equity and cobenefits

NK Dubash - Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: **Climate** Change, 2013

For those choosing to read about the EU:

Climate policy in European Union politics

T Delreux, F Ohler - Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics, 2019

Discussion Questions

What are the key drivers of environmental and energy policies in China, India, Russia, and the EU?

What is public opinion in each of these countries or groups on environmental issues?

What institutional features of each of these governments or groups affect environmental policies?

Optional:

“China’s Low Carbon Energy Strategy and Implications for International Climate Diplomacy.” Chapter 2 in *Greening East Asia: The Rise of the Eco-Developmental State*. Edited by Ashley Esarey, Mary Alice Haddad, Joanna I. Lewis and Stevan Harrell (Seattle: University of Washington Press) November 2020.

Hochstetler and Milkoreit 2014, **Emerging Powers in the Climate Negotiations: Shifting Identity Conceptions**, *Political Research Quarterly* 67:1 (2014).

Political Economy of Climate and Clean Energy in China: Opportunities and Limits of International Influence on the Chinese Emissions Pathway Lauri Myllyvirta, Shuwei Zhang, Xinyi Shen, and Yunqing Bi, Published by the Heinrich Böll Foundation, December 2020

Mar. 23 International Environmental Negotiations and Institutions

Keohane, Robert, and David G. Victor. 2011. The Regime Complex for Climate Change. *Perspectives on Politics* 9 (1): 7–23.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/41622723?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents

Toward a club of carbon markets

N Keohane, A Peterson, A Hanafi - **Climatic Change**, 2017

Busby, Joshua. 2016. “After Paris: Good Enough Climate Governance,” *Current History*, 3-9
http://www.currenthistory.com/Busby_CurrentHistory.pdf

<https://www.rollingstone.com/politics/politics-news/the-secret-deal-to-save-the-planet-57275/>

Overview of Glasgow conference issues:

[Guardian Guide to Glasgow COP26](#)

Summary of what was agreed to at Glasgow:

<https://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-56901261>

Discussion Questions

What are the formal and informal rules for decision-making by the Conference of Parties process?

What are the pros and cons of a smaller group of powerful high income states, such as the US, the EU, Canada, and Japan, forming a “carbon club” and pushing more ambitious environmental policies? How might such a group get buy-in by other states?

What did the Glasgow COP achieve?

On what issues did the Glasgow COP achieve less progress than might have been expected, and why?

Optional:

[The fragmentation of global governance architectures: a framework for analysis](#)

F Biermann, P Pattberg, H Van Asselt, F Zelli

Global Environmental Politics 9 (4), 14-40

Robert Putnam, 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games
World Politics

Robert O. Keohane and David Victor (2016), “Cooperation and discord in global climate policy,” *Nature Climate Change*

Mar. 30 The Politics of Environmental Problems (and Planetary Boundaries) other than Climate Change and Energy Alternatives beyond Wind and Solar: Biodiversity loss, Nitrogen, Ocean protection and Fisheries Management Freshwater Politics, Ozone Depletion, Atmospheric Aerosols, Plastics, Chemical Pollution, Nuclear Energy, Cement and Steel, Land Use and Deforestation, Carbon Capture, Geoengineering, Geothermal Energy

There are a lot of issues to discuss here – choose any two of the following articles (or of the clusters of shorter articles) to discuss in class. As some background, Project Drawdown provides an analysis for how different policy solutions would affect carbon, but many of these would also help with other environmental problems as well:

<https://www.drawdown.org/solutions/table-of-solutions>

Biodiversity loss

Sheikh, Pervaze and M. Lynne Corn. “The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES): Background and Issues,” Congressional Research Services, 2008, 1-14. <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/RL32751.pdf>

Gehring, Thomas and Eva Ruffing. 2008. "When Arguments Prevail Over Power: The CITES Procedure for the Listing of Endangered Species," *Global Environmental Politics*. 8(2),123-148.

Biogeochemical processes (i.e., nitrogen and phosphorous)

[Confronting the nitrogen challenge: Options for governance and target setting](#)
[P Morseletto](#) - *Global environmental change*, 2019

Ocean acidification, ocean habitat protection, and Fisheries Management

[Making waves: The science and politics of ocean protection](#)
[J Lubchenco](#), [K Grorud-Colvert](#) - *Science*, 2015

Tim S. Gray, editor. [The politics of fishing](#) – 2016 Introductory chapter. Partial text here:

https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3zq_DAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR10&dq=politics+fisheries&ots=T8GwGOiqz0&sig=B7Ng8rNTbWVazX_5j8dLVtKtSBo#v=onepage&q=politics%20fisheries&f=false

Freshwater Politics

[The political dimensions of water](#) [K Conca](#), [E Weinthal](#) - *The Oxford Handbook of Water Politics ...*, 2018 Available here:

https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=D_BIDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA3&dq=conca+politics+water&ots=CK6y5W8u8d&sig=4TiejAv_FxneA8MUOB8Pe3Bcpo0#v=onepage&q=conca%20politics%20water&f=false

Ozone depletion

Skjaereth, Jon Birger. 2012. "International ozone policies: effective environmental cooperation." *International Environmental Agreements: An Introduction*. Steinar Andresen, Elin Lerum Boasson, and Geir Hønneland eds. Routledge, 38-48.

Peter M. Haas (1992) Banning Chlorofluorocarbons: Epistemic Community Efforts to Protect Stratospheric Ozone. *International Organization*. 46(1)Winter, 187–224

Karen T. Litfin (1995) Framing Science: Precautionary Discourse and the Ozone Treaties. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 24(2), 251–277

Atmospheric aerosols

Rolf Lidskog and Goran Sundqvist (2002) The Role of Science in Environmental Regimes: The Case of LRTAP. *European Journal of International Relations*., 77–101

Henrik Selin and Noelle Eckley (2003) Science, Politics, and Persistent Organic Pollutants: The Role of Scientific Assessments in International Environmental Co-Operation. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*. 3(1), 17–42

Plastics

[Reducing marine pollution from single-use plastics \(SUPs\): A review](#)

REJ Schnurr, V Alboiu, M Chaudhary, RA Corbett... - *Marine pollution ...*, 2018

Politics and the plastic crisis: A review throughout the plastic life cycle

[Tobias D. Nielsen](#), [Jacob Hasselbalch](#), [Karl Holmberg](#), [Johannes Stripple](#)

Chemical pollution/Toxic Waste

Jonathan Krueger and Henrik Selin (2002) Governance for Sound Chemicals Management: The Need for a More Comprehensive Global Strategy. *Global Governance*. 8, 323–342

Pamela S. Chasek, David Leonard Downie, and Janet Welsh Brown (2010) The Development of Environmental Regimes: Air Pollution, Hazardous Wastes, and Toxic Chemicals. In Chasek, Downie and Brown *Global Environmental Politics*, 117–162

Nuclear Energy

The Chase for Fusion Energy (Nature): <https://www.nature.com/immersive/d41586-021-03401-w/index.html>

[NYT Nuclear Fusion Edges Toward the Mainstream](#)

Sharon Squassoni, The incredible shrinking nuclear offset for climate change, **Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists** Volume 73, 2017

https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00963402.2016.1264208?casa_token=CaZlsnCABywAAAAA%3AM-VQDle_CNgPmlPOFIx48lotY0HPTZ4ePF4pY7sszUQM-wQxCocHXe9VU3OcbDV6AnAWpG0armwejQ

Robert H. Socolow and Alexander Glaser (2009) Balancing Risks: Nuclear Energy & Climate Change. *Daedalus*. 138(4), 31–44

Cement and Steel Production

David Roberts, Vox, This Climate Problem is Bigger than Cars and Harder to Solve,

<https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2019/10/10/20904213/climate-change-steel-cement-industrial-heat-hydrogen-ccs>

Land-use and Deforestation

[The politics of Avoided Deforestation: Historical context and contemporary issues](#)

D Humphreys - International Forestry Review, 2008

REDDuced: From sustainability to legality to units of carbon—The search for common interests in international forest governance

CL McDermott - Environmental Science & Policy, 2014

Carbon Capture

IPCC study of carbon capture and sequestration (read pp. 2-15, and executive summaries for Chapter 3, p. 107, and Chapter 8, pp. 341-342):

https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/srccs_wholereport-1.pdf

Short and non-technical explainers are here:

<https://www.lse.ac.uk/granthaminstitute/explainers/what-is-carbon-capture-and-storage-and-what-role-can-it-play-in-tackling-climate-change/>

<https://climate.mit.edu/explainers/carbon-capture>

Geoengineering

Bob Henson, “What is Geoengineering, and Why it is a Break Glass Plan,” Yale Climate Connections

<https://yaleclimateconnections.org/2021/10/what-is-geoengineering-and-why-its-a-break-glass-plan/>

Geothermal Energy

Resources for the Future Overview:

<https://www.rff.org/publications/explainers/geothermal-energy-101/>

Conserve Energy Future on the pros and cons of geothermal energy:

<https://www.conserve-energy-future.com/pros-and-cons-of-geothermal-energy.php>

Discussion Questions

What are the key environmental challenges in each of the areas highlighted above?

What are the most promising potential policies in each of the areas highlighted above?

April 6 Resource Curses: Economics, Democracy, Womens’ and Minority Rights, Civil and International Conflicts

Ross, M. L. (2015). What have we learned about the resource curse? *Annual Review of Political Science*, **18**, 239– 259. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-052213-040359>

Adger, W.N., et al: Human security. In: *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (Field, C.B et al, eds.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, NY, USA, read pp. 771-775. https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/WGIIAR5-Chap12_FINAL.pdf

Josh Busby, Blogpost on “The State of the Field in Climate and Conflict”
<https://climateandsecurity.org/2018/03/20/the-state-of-the-field-in-climate-and-conflict/>

Choose one of the following three articles to read:

[Oil, Autocratic Survival, and the Gendered Resource Curse: When Inefficient Policy Is Politically Expedient](#)

[YM Liou](#), [P Musgrave](#) - *International Studies Quarterly*, 2016

[Oil and international cooperation](#)

[ML Ross](#), [E Voeten](#) - *International Studies Quarterly*, 2016

[Fueling the fire: Pathways from oil to war](#)

[JD Colgan](#) - *International Security*, 2013

Discussion Questions

How does dependency on natural resource exports (fossil fuels, timber, diamonds, etc) affect the economies of countries, both in terms of growth and in income inequality?

How does dependency on natural resource exports affect a country’s level of democracy or authoritarianism?

How does dependency on natural resource exports affect the rights of women and minorities (marginalized racial, ethnic, or other groups)?

How does dependency on natural resource exports affect the likelihood, severity, and duration of civil and international conflicts?

Optional:

[Cold war geopolitics and the making of the oil curse](#)

[CS Hendrix](#) - *Journal of Global Security Studies*, 2018

Solomon M. Hsiang, Marshall Burke, Edward Miguel (2015), "Quantifying the Influence of Climate on Human Conflict, *Science* 341(6151).

[PDF] **[THE FIELD OF CLIMATE AND SECURITY: A SCAN OF THE LITERATURE](#)**
[J BUSBY](#) - 2019 - apo.org.au

Additional Resources

energytransitionshow.com great set of podcasts on energy and climate issues

Inside Climate News <https://insideclimatenews.org/newsletter/>,

Environmental Health News <https://www.ehn.org/>

Society of Environmental Journalists <https://www.sej.org/>

E&E News <https://www.eenews.net/>

Energy News Network <https://energynews.us/>

Clean Technica <https://cleantechnica.com/>

Climate Central <https://www.climatecentral.org/>

Skeptical Science <https://skepticalscience.com/>

MIT Press also has a blog on articles on EP in their journals.¹ Another great resource is the list of environmental treaty texts and data sources created by Ron Mitchell of the University of Oregon;² Mitchell has also posted his syllabus and even his PowerPoint lecture notes.³ In addition, many EP scholars, policy makers, and activists are prolific on twitter.

People to follow on Twitter on climate issues, in no particular order:

Leah Stokes @leahstokes,
Naomi Oreskes @NaomiOreskes,
Peter Gleick @PeterGleick,
Justin Gillis @JustinHGillis,
Robert Rohde @RARohde,
Ed Hawkins @ed_hawkins,
Katherine Hayhoe @KHayhoe,
Alan Noguee @alannogee,
David Konisky @DavidKonisky,
Dave Roberts @drvox,
Jessica Green @greenprofgreen,
Megan Mullin @mullinmeg,
Thomas Hale @thomasnhale,
Stacy VanDeveer @StacyDVanDeveer,
Johannes Urpelainen @jurpelai,
Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse @SenWhitehouse,
Matto Mildenberger @mmildenberger,

¹ MIT Press.

https://www.feedspot.com/infiniteress.php?_src=feed_title&followfeedid=4703001&q=site:https%3A%2F%2Fwww.mitpressjournals.org%2Faction%2FshowFeed%3Fjc%3Dglep.

² Ron Mitchell, Data Sources for International Environmental Politics.

<https://rmitchel.uoregon.edu/data1>.

³ Mitchell, PS477/577: International Environmental Politics. <https://rmitchel.uoregon.edu/iep/>.

Michael Mann @MichaelEMann,
Michael Ross @MichaelRoss7,
Josh Busby @busbyj2,
Bill McKibben @billmckibben,
Bill Nye @BillNye,
Jeff Colgan @JeffDColgan,
Michael Aklin @MichaelAklin

Additional Optional Readings/Resources for Papers on Weekly Topics

Environmental Economics

- Robert H. Socolow and Stephen W. Pacala (2006) A Plan to Keep Carbon in Check. *Scientific American*. 295(3), 50–57 , ISSN 00368733
- Simone Pulver (2007) Making Sense of Corporate Environmentalism. *Organization & Environment*. 20(1), 44–83

Dave Roberts, Vox, June 2019, The Five Most Important Questions about Carbon Taxes, Answered, <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2018/7/20/17584376/carbon-tax-congress-republicans-cost-economy>

Dave Roberts, Vox, The Global Energy Transition in 12 charts, <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2019/6/18/18681591/renewable-energy-china-solar-pv-jobs>

The Myth of the Tragedy of the Commons
<https://climateandcapitalism.com/2008/08/25/debunking-the-tragedy-of-the-commons/>

Matto Mildenerger’s epic twitter thread on Russell Hardin’s misreading of the tragedy of the commons (and Hardin’s racism), and responses to it, here:

<https://twitter.com/mmildenerger/status/1102604887223750657>

Ostrom, Elinor. 1999. “Coping with Tragedies of the Commons.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 2(1): 493–535.

Ostrom, Elinor. 2003. “How Types of Goods and Property Rights Jointly Affect Collective Action.” *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 15(3):239–270.

Routledge Handbook of Global Environmental Politics

<https://books.google.com/books?id=aY9mAQAAQBAJ&pg=PA65&lpg=PA65&dq=syllabus+mitchell+international+politics+environment&source=bl&ots=noC6w9FiLD&sig=ACfU3U2kNuK6CFnw9QH7F40inAB4rre1Ew&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwiblrK1kJbgAhXwrIMKHYSWD>

[MU4ChDoATAHegQIBRAB#v=onepage&q=syllabus%20mitchell%20international%20politics%20environment&f=false](https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=mg3Gy0ZuPukC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=international+politics+environment&ots=1_lc_MhY8k&sig=9rMnOfsspZ1JeN4fsIwsOTL9zPo#v=onepage&q=international%20politics%20environment&f=false)

Ron Mitchell book: Int'l politics and the envmt

https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=mg3Gy0ZuPukC&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=international+politics+environment&ots=1_lc_MhY8k&sig=9rMnOfsspZ1JeN4fsIwsOTL9zPo#v=onepage&q=international%20politics%20environment&f=false

The Big Picture: Energy Transitions and Path Dependent Politics

James Mahoney, "Path Dependence in Historical Sociology," *Theory and Society* 29 (2000) pp. 507-548. Online through Lauinger.

Scott Page, "Path Dependence," *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2006, 1: 87-115.

Jacob Hacker, Paul Pierson and Kathleen Thelen, "Drift and Conversion: Hidden Faces of Institutional Change," chapter 7, pp. 180-210, in James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen, eds., *Advances in Comparative Historical Analysis* (Cambridge, 2015).

Unruh, G.C. "Understanding Carbon Lock-in." *Energy Policy* 2000, 817-30.

[Implementing long-term climate policy: Time inconsistency, domestic politics, international anarchy](#), J Hovi, DF Sprinz, A Underdal - *Global Environmental Politics*, 2009

[Lessons for effective renewable electricity policy from Denmark, Germany and the United Kingdom](#), J Lipp - *Energy policy*, 2007 - Elsevier

Table 1 Summary of three types of carbon lock-in and their key characteristics

Lock-In type	Key characteristics
Infrastructural and technological	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Technological and economic forces lead to inertia ■ Long lead times, large investments, sunk costs, long-lived effects ■ Initial choices account for private but not social costs and benefits ■ Random, unintentional events affect final outcomes (e.g., QWERTY)
Institutional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Powerful economic, social, and political actors seek to reinforce status quo that favors their interests ■ Institutions are designed to stabilize and lock in ■ Beneficial and intended outcome for some actors ■ Not random chance but intentional choice (e.g., support for renewable energy in Germany)
Behavioral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Lock-in through individual decision making (e.g., psychological processes) ■ Single, calculated choices become a long string of noncalculated and self-reinforcing habits ■ Lock-in through social structure (e.g., norms and social processes) ■ Interrupting habits is difficult but possible (e.g., family size, thermostat setting)

Table 1 is from Karen Seto et al. (2016), "Carbon Lock-In: Types, Causes, and Policy Implications," *Annual Review of Environmental Resources*

The Politics of Framing and Agenda-Setting, American Public Opinion on Environmental issues, and (de)polarizing Environmental Politics

[The spatial distribution of Republican and Democratic climate opinions at state and local scales, M Mildenberger, JR Marlon, PD Howe, A Leiserowitz](#) - Climatic change, 2017 (geographic variation on climate change beliefs among Democrats and Republicans)

Dunlap et al, “The Political Divide on Climate Change: Partisan Polarization Widens in the U.S.,” in Riley E. Dunlap, Aaron M. McCright & Jerrod H. Yarosh, *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, Vol. 58, pp. 4-23, 2016.

[How will climate change shape climate opinion?, PD Howe, JR Marlon, M Mildenberger...](#) - Environmental ..., 2019 – (meta-analysis/literature review)

[A Research Agenda for Climate Change Communication and Public Opinion: The Role of Consensus Messaging and Beyond, J Druckman, R Bayes, T Bolsen](#) - ipr.northwestern.edu

[A Watershed Moment: Climate Change and Election Outcomes, MD Nieman](#) - 2019 - marknieman.net (shows Republican vote share decreasing in coastal communities)

[A Partisan and Polarized Issue in the United States, R Palm, T Bolsen](#) - Climate Change and Sea Level Rise in South Florida, 2020 (good summary of the literature)

[Influence and seepage: An evidence-resistant minority can affect public opinion and scientific belief formation, S Lewandowsky, TD Pilditch, JK Madsen, N Oreskes...](#) - Cognition, 2019 (uses agent based modeling to show the effects of an evidence-resistant minority)

Aklin and Urpelainen, “Perceptions of Scientific Dissent Undermine Public Support for Environmental Policy,” *Environmental Science and Policy* 2014, 173-177.

[Political polarization and environmental attitudes: a cross-national analysis, S Birch](#) - Environmental Politics, 2019 - rsa.tandfonline.com

Jamie Druckman, Toby Bolsen and Fay Lomax Cook. 2015. “Citizens', Scientists', and Policy Advisors' Beliefs about Global Warming,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 658: 271-295.

[Does Global Warming Increase Public Concern about Climate Change?](#)

[P Bergquist, C Warshaw](#) - The Journal of Politics, 2019 - journals.uchicago.edu

[Enduring extremes? Polar vortex, drought, and climate change beliefs](#)

BA Lyons, A Hasell, NJ Stroud - Environmental Communication, 2018

After disaster: Agenda setting, public policy, and focusing events

TA Birkland - 1997

The role of social and decision sciences in communicating uncertain climate risks, N Pidgeon, B Fischhoff - Nature Climate Change, 2011 - nature.com

Scientists aren't really the best champions of climate science, at

<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/climate-lab>

Why humans are so bad at thinking about climate change, at

<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/climate-lab>

MM Miller, BP Riechert - Interest group strategies and journalistic norms: news media framing of environmental issues, in Barbara Adam, Stuart Allan, Cynthia Carter, eds, Environmental Risks and the Media, 2013.

Paul Bain, Matthew Hornsey, Renata Bongiorno, and Carla Jeffries, Promoting pro-environmental action in climate change deniers *Nature Climate Change* volume 2, pages 600–603 (2012).

PG Bain, MJ Hornsey, R Bongiorno, C Jeffries - Nature Climate Change, 2012

2017

Climate change is one among the most partisan issues for the American public (Dunlap et al, The Political Divide on Climate Change: Partisan Polarization Widens in the U.S., Riley E. Dunlap, Aaron M. McCright & Jerrod H. Yarosh *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, pp. 4-23, 2016. The polarization trend is particularly striking considering that only thirty years ago, climate change emerged as a bipartisan issue. The emergence of such a large gap over a short time period creates opportunities to examine the dynamics of polarization within a single issue area. We know that polarization occurs through feedbacks between the behavior of elites and ordinary voters (McCarty, Poole, and Rosenthal 2016; Levendusky 2013). With respect to climate change, climate denialism originated from elites, sowing doubt as the public was still developing views on climate change. Industry and think tanks have played a role in climate skepticism (Brulle 2014 Institutionalizing delay: foundation funding and the creation of U.S. climate change counter-movement organizations, *Climatic Change, Feb. 2014, Vol 122*

Oreskes and Conway 2011 [see below]), raising broader questions about the extent to which this process applies to other polarized issues. Future work could compare climate change to other issues that have been on the public agenda for longer, and comparative work could more closely examine why climate change induces greater polarization in some polities, but not others.

[And: why the heck is American public opinion such a global outlier on climate issues (or is it/was it?). What explains variation in public opinion on climate and other environmental issues

over time and across countries? What explains variation within countries by political and demographic variables (such as age)? How does this relate to studies of variation in public opinion on, for example, science, cloning, genetically modified products, self-reported religiosity, individualism, capitalism, (lack of) trust in government, etc.?)

Peter M. Haas (1992) Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization*. 46(1, Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination) Winter, 1–35, ISSN 00208183 • Marybeth Long Martello (2001) A Paradox of Virtue?: "Other" Knowledges and Environment-Development Politics. *Global Environmental Politics*. 1(3), 114–141, ISSN 15263800 • Frank Biermann (2002) Institutions for Scientific Advice: Global Environmental Assessments and Their Influence in Developing Countries. *Global Governance*. 8, 195–219 • Karin Backstrand (2003) Civic Science for Sustainability: Reframing the Role of Experts, Policy-Makers and "Citizens in Environmental Governance. *Global Environmental Politics*. 3(4), 24–41 Further • Emanuel Adler and Peter M. Haas (1992) Conclusion: Epistemic Communities, World Order, and the Creation of a Reflective Research Program. *International Organization*. 46(1), 367–390 • Peter M. Haas (1990) Obtaining International Environmental Protection through Epistemic Consensus. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*. 19(3), 347–363

Michele M. Betsill, Kathryn Hochstetler and Dimitris Stevis, eds. 2014. *Advances in International Environmental Politics*, 2e. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.* (Referred to as BHS in the reading list) Ken Conca and Geoff Dabelko, eds. 2015. *Green Planet Blues: Critical Perspectives on Global Environmental Politics*. Boulder: Westview Press

Anthony Leiserowitz, principal investigator, "American Opinions on Global Warming: A Yale University/Gallup/ClearVision Institute Poll," 2007.

[Yale Opinion Report](#)

Fossil Fuel and Environmental Lobbies, Groups and Social Movements

[Brulle 2014](#) Institutionalizing delay: foundation funding and the creation of U.S. climate change counter-movement organizations, *Climactic Change*, Feb. 2014, Vol 122

[Carbon Captured: How Business and Labor Control Climate Politics](#)

M Miltenberger

MIT Press Due out February 2020

1. What is the role of business in politics?

The fossil fuel industry is often identified as a key obstacle to progressive climate policy ([Layzer 2012](#)). Yet, political scientists could shed light on the causal mechanisms connecting these efforts to political agendas, mass opinion shifts, and policy outcomes. This work could build on the rich tradition in American politics of studying business influence through campaigns and elections ([Powell and Grimmer 2016](#)), Congressional lobbying ([Hall and Deardorff 2006](#)), and rulemaking ([Yackee and Yackee 2006](#)). It also could leverage the tools of American Political

Development or take a comparative approach, analyzing past instances where industry has resisted large economic transitions.

Works on psychology of misinformation

Naomi Oreskes, "Behind the Ivory Tower: The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change," *Science* 306, no.5702 (Dec. 2004): 1686.

<http://www.sciencemag.org>

News articles on Exxon court case.

Environmental Interest Groups: Why not more united, effective, and international?

Social movements literature

Green tea: clean-energy conservatism as a countermovement

DJ Hess, KP Brown - *Environmental Sociology*, 2017

DeSombre, Elizabeth. 2006. *Global Environmental Institutions*. London: Routledge. 1-41.
Busby, Joshua. 2010. "International Organization and Environmental Governance" in R. A. Denmark, eds., *The International Studies Encyclopedia* (New York: Wiley-Blackwell), 12-14.
Reread these pages. Siebenhüner, Edited by Frank Biermann and Bernd. 2009. *Managers of Global Change: The Influence of International Environmental Bureaucracies*. Cambridge: MIT Press. 1-11.
Najam, Adil. 2003. "The Case Against a New International Environmental Organization," *Global Governance* 9: 367-381.
Young, Oran R. 2008. "The Architecture of Global Environmental Governance: Bringing Science to Bear on Policy." *Global Environmental Politics* 8 (1):14-32.
Esty, Dan. 2006. "Global Environmental Governance," in Colin Bradford and Johannes Linn, eds., *Global Governance Reform* (Washington, DC: Brookings Press). 108-114.

McCormick, John. *The Role of Environmental NGOs in International Regimes*. In *The global environment : institutions, law, and policy*, edited by Regina S. Axelrod, Stacy D. VanDeveer, and David Leonard Downie, 3rd:192–212. Vol. 3rd. Washington, DC: CQ Press. 92-109.
Keck, Margaret and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders*. 1-38.
Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, Mette, and Teale N. Phelps Bondaroff. 2014. *From Advocacy to Confrontation: Direct Enforcement by Environmental NGOs*. *International Studies Quarterly* 58 (2): 348–361.
Green, Jessica, 2014. *Rethinking Private Authority*. Princeton U. Press. 1-25.
Potoski, Matthew, and Aseem Prakash. 2005. *Green Clubs and Voluntary Governance: ISO 14001 and Firms' Regulatory Compliance*. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (2): 235–248.
Cashore, Benjamin. 2002. *Legitimacy and the Privatization of Environmental Governance: How Non-State Market-Driven (NSMD) Governance Systems Gain Rule-Making Authority*. *Governance* 15 (4): 503–529.

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. "Transnational Advocacy Networks in International Politics." *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (Cornell: Cornell University Press) Chapter 4, 121-164.

Llewelyn Hughes and Johannes Urpelainen. 2015. "Interests, institutions, and climate Policy: Explaining the choice of policy instruments for the energy sector." *Environmental Science and Policy* Vol. 54, Pages 52 to 63.

4. How do domestic interest groups affect international cooperation?

Climate change is a useful test case for the relationship between domestic politics and international cooperation ([Milner 1997](#)). As national governments negotiate, implement, and enforce agreements, their behavior both shapes and is constrained by domestic politics. Governments' international commitments are not credible if they cannot be implemented because of domestic political constraints, but the very implementation of these commitments also influences the nature of domestic politics ([Putnam 1988](#)).

Domestic energy policies are shaped by interest group politics under varying international conditions, as winners and losers from clean energy sources vie for influence ([Aklin and Urpelainen 2013](#)). Domestic political institutions, such as regime type and electoral system, affect governments' responsiveness to calls for climate mitigation ([Bättig and Bernauer 2009](#) [Are democracies better at climate change policy? They talk a better game rhetorically, but actual policy commitments are lacking due to democratic responsiveness to free rider desires]). Since the Paris Agreement allows countries to set their own climate targets, domestic considerations are now at the forefront of international cooperation. Climate can therefore provide a useful comparison to other contentious issues such as trade or migration, where domestic politics provide a hard constraint on international cooperation.

5. How do global and subnational actors interact?

Climate change scholarship has documented the massive growth in subnational actors' interaction over the last two decades ([Betsill and Bulkeley 2006](#); [Krause 2012](#)). Since the 1990s, there has been an explosion of network-based organizations created to connect cities on mitigation and, more recently, adaptation policy ([Shi, et.al. 2016](#)). Municipal leaders — often in partnership with private foundations, firms, governmental agencies, and NGOs — have constructed institutions to undertake a variety of governance functions ([Bulkeley et. al 2014](#); [Hoffmann 2011](#)). The proliferation of these networks is an example of a general phenomenon driving the transnationalization of policymaking ([Slaughter 2004](#)).

The growth of transnational policy networks illustrates that international relations scholars trying to understand multilevel and transnational governance have much in common with American and comparative politics scholars grappling with processes, outcomes and changes in federalist and quasi-federalist states and societies ([Selin & VanDeveer 2012](#)). Mayors, urban professionals and city councilors now attend national and global events, seeking to influence policymaking across a host of climate change related issues. Climate change thus provides an excellent opportunity to understand the effects of the increased blurring of levels of governance, and the lines between public and private ([Steinberg & VanDeveer 2012](#)).

9. How do non-state actors and social movements shape governance?

The new forms of governance in the climate change regime can help inform broader discussions within international relations about “governance without government,” ([Rosenau and Czempiel 1992](#)). Climate change is a useful case to engage long-standing questions such as: under what conditions do non-traditional governance arrangements arise ([Green 2014](#); [Johnson 2014](#))? What are the mechanisms through which they exert influence ([Wong 2012](#); [Hadden 2015](#))? When and why are they effective at achieving their goals ([Stroup and Wong 2017](#))? How and when does scientific and technical information shape politics or policy ([Haas 2016](#))?

More broadly, there is ample research on the effects of domestic environmental social movements on national environmental policy, often working in combination with international actors and institutions, in nations such as Brazil ([Hochstetler & Keck 2007](#)), Ecuador ([Lewis 2016](#)) and India ([Khagram 2004](#); [Kashwan 2017](#)). This research suggests that climate change should not be seen as minor “niche” issues for a few voters or activists. Rather, these actors can play a key role in reshaping national political institutions related to democracy, public participation, resource allocation and constitutional rights ([Gellers 2017](#)), potentially “greening” states and societies in political processes comparable to the emergence and growth of the welfare state ([Meadowcroft 2012](#); [Death 2016](#)).

Mid-Century Strategies: pathways to a low-carbon future?

[Narayan Gopinathan, Narayan S. Subramanian & Johannes Urpelainen](#)

Pages 1088-1101 (looks at post-Paris mid-century plans and finds major political changes needed, and including domestic stakeholders in making plans is a double-edged sword)

[BOOK] [Environmental NGOs in world politics: linking the local and the global](#)

M Finger, T Princen - 2013 - books.google.com

[Cited by 993](#)

[Defeating Kyoto: The conservative movement's impact on US climate change policy](#)

[AM McCright](#), [RE Dunlap](#) - Social problems, 2003

[Advocacy organizations in the US political process](#)

[KT Andrews](#), [B Edwards](#) - Annu. Rev. Sociol., 2004 - annualreviews.org

[Tilting at windmills? The environmental movement and the emergence of the US wind energy sector](#)

[WD Sine](#), [BH Lee](#) - Administrative Science Quarterly, 2009

[The politicization of climate change and polarization in the American public's views of global warming, 2001–2010](#)

[AM McCright](#), [RE Dunlap](#) - The Sociological Quarterly, 2011

American Power (Grid) Politics: Federal, State, and Local Governments and Institutions

6. How do national institutions affect domestic politics and policy?

Climate change is an important case for comparativists trying to understand the impacts of variation in political parties, type and degree of democracy, constitutional structures, and political culture. More generally it can shed light on how national institutions shape policy outcomes and discourses. For example, how can we understand the gaps between EU-level climate policies and domestic policies of its member states without reference to national level institutions ([Selin & VanDeveer 2015](#))? Or, what can we learn about the influence of domestic institutions by comparing U.S., Canadian and Australian climate politics and policy outcomes?

Climate change can also advance understanding about how institutions operate within nations. In the United States, for example, climate change is a high priority for the environmental interest groups tied to the Democratic party network ([Grossmann and Dominguez 2009](#)), but the issue has not been prioritized by party leaders ([Guber and Bosso 2013](#)). Climate change could provide a lens for understanding the influence of different coalition members on party agendas ([Bawn et al. 2012](#)). The rise of the climate justice movement, the growth of the renewable energy industry, and the increasing willingness of scientists and the media to link extreme weather and natural disasters with climate change all indicate pathways for the creation of new climate coalitions.

[Senate representation and coalition building in distributive politics](#)

[FE Lee](#) - American Political Science Review, 2000 - cambridge.org

[The determinants of wind energy growth in the United States: Drivers and barriers to state-level development](#)

[K Schumacher, Z Yang](#) - Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 2018

[\[PDF\] In the pocket: energy regulation, industry capture, and campaign spending](#)

[KP Brown](#) - Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy, 2016

[\[HTML\] Cooler coalitions for a warmer planet: A review of political strategies for accelerating energy transitions](#)

[DJ Hess](#) - Energy Research & Social Science, 2019

[Politics in the US energy transition: Case studies of solar, wind, biofuels and electric vehicles policy](#)

[LC Stokes, HL Breetz](#) - Energy Policy, 2018

[Trendy solutions: why do states adopt sustainable energy portfolio standards?](#)

[J Chandler](#) - Energy Policy, 2009

[It is all about political incentives: democracy and the renewable feed-in tariff](#)

[P Bayer, J Urpelainen](#) - The Journal of Politics, 2016

[HTML] [Red states, green laws: ideology and renewable energy legislation in the United States](#)

DJ Hess, QD Mai, KP Brown - *Energy Research & Social Science*, 2016

David Roberts, Vox, Time to Build a national grid August 2018 <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2018/8/3/17638246/national-energy-grid-renewables-transmission>

David Roberts, Load Flexibility Key to the Grid Oct. 2019 <https://www.vox.com/energy-and-environment/2018/8/3/17638246/national-energy-grid-renewables-transmission>

Rabe chapter in Vig and Kraft book, pp 37-66

[Bargaining in bicameral legislatures: When and why does malapportionment matter?](#)

S Ansolabehere, JM Snyder, MM Ting - *American Political Science ...*, 2003

[PDF] [Malapportionment, gasoline taxes, and the United Nations framework convention on climate change](#)

HTML] [Energy security and climate change concerns: Triggers for energy policy change in the United States?](#)

G Bang - *Energy policy*, 2010 - Elsevier

[US presidents and the failure to ratify multilateral environmental agreements](#)

G Bang, J Hovi, DF Sprinz - *Climate policy*, 2012 -

Vig and Kraft chapters on President, Congress, Courts, EPA

Yael Wolinsky Nahmias, ed, 2015, *Changing Climate Politics*. Chapters on state, local, cities, courts, ballot initiatives, social movement

https://books.google.it/books?hl=en&lr=&id=dGAXBAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=wolinsky+nahmias&ots=orR-ag1D_H&sig=LN-4hh6VFGIBjooBGsyinn1RUx8&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=wolinsky%20nahmias&f=false

Kraft, *Environmental Policy and Politics*, 7th ed. Broad public policy overview of institutions, budgets, politics, interest groups, etc.

Kraft, Michael E. "Making Environmental Policy." Chapter 3 in Michael E. Kraft, *Environmental Policy and Politics*, 5th ed. New York: Pearson.

[The SO₂ Allowance Trading System: The Ironic History of a Grand Policy Experiment](#)

R Schmalensee, RN Stavins - *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2013

Additional Readings on Climate Change Politics Outside the US and on Climate Justice

[BOOK] **The European Union in international climate change politics: still taking a lead? Introduction pp. 3-20 (also has chapters on individual countries)**

RKW Wurzel, J Connelly, D Liefferink - 2016

EU environmental policy in times of crisis

C Burns, P Eckersley, P Tobin - Journal of European Public Policy, 2020

Environmental politics in China: An issue area in review

F Wu - Journal of Chinese Political Science, 2009

Who drives China's renewable energy policies? Understanding the role of industrial corporations

W Shen - Environmental Development, 2017

Paris accord and China's climate change strategy: Drivers and outcomes

A Godbole - India Quarterly, 2016 - journals.sagepub.com

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/14/opinion/china-environmental-policies-wrong.html>

<https://cleantechnica.com/2019/09/16/china-is-doing-a-lot-better-on-climate-action-than-most-people-realize/>

Elizabeth Economy, Why China is no Climate Leader, Politico June 12, 2017

<https://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2017/06/12/why-china-is-no-climate-leader-215249>

Old problems and new dilemmas: the conundrum of environmental management reform in China

B Wen - Journal of Environmental Policy & Planning, 2020

Transnational movements and NGOs

Lewis and Gallagher chapter in Vig and Kraft on Energy and Environment in China

Najim chapter in Vig and Kraft, The View from the South

3. How do emerging economies affect the configuration of global power?

Climate change is reconfiguring state power. The rise of emerging economies notably China, India and Brazil, provides them with new structural power with respect to climate politics ([Hochstetler and Milkoreit 2014](#), **Emerging Powers in the Climate Negotiations: Shifting Identity Conceptions**, *Political Research Quarterly* 67:1 (2014)). Recently, China has sought to position itself as a leader in climate politics, filling the vacuum left by the US announcement that it will withdraw from the Paris Agreement.

Industrial policy is also a key part of the reconfiguration of power ([Hughes and Meckling 2017](#)). Emerging economies challenge the status quo by investing in development of renewables industries, often raising barriers to trade in the process ([Lewis 2014](#)). Yet at the same time, some, like China, continue to finance coal-fired power generation under the One Belt, One Road initiative ([Zhang et al 2017](#)). These structural shifts provide opportunities for political scientists to see how the consumption and provision of natural resources create structural power and shape prospects for cooperation.

7. What are the effects of inequality?

Climate change exacerbates existing inequalities and creates new ones. Historically, developing nations have contributed negligibly to greenhouse gas emissions, yet they will bear the brunt of the impacts ([Ciplet et al 2015](#)). Moreover, these inequalities will affect migration patterns in the future, with potentially profound geopolitical consequences ([Koubi et al. 2016](#)).

At the national and subnational levels, disadvantaged communities are disproportionately affected by climate change. These impacts are both a function of historical patterns of settlement that leave some communities exposed to more risk and political choices that can diminish resilience and ability to adapt. Recent work on spatial distributions of populations ([Cho, Gimpel and Hui 2013](#); [Nall 2018](#)) can provide insights into how the differential impacts of climate change are in part, a function of citizens spatial self-sorting along racial, economic and partisan lines. In turn, the residential patterns that result may influence provision of public goods that can protect communities from harm ([Trounstine 2016](#)).

Development (137 Pages) • Ranjit Dwivedi (2001) Environmental Movements in the Global South. *International Sociology*. 16(1), 11–31 • Sylvia Karlsson (2002) The North-South Knowledge Divide: Consequences for Global Environmental Governance. In Daniel C. Esty and Maria H. Ivanova, editors *Global Environmental Governance: Options and Opportunities*. New Haven, CT: Yale School of Forestry & Environmental Studies, ISBN 0970788223, 53–76 • Adil Najam et al. (2002) From Rio to Johannesburg: Progress and Prospects. *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*. 44(7), 26–38, ISSN 0013–9157 • Gabriela Kutting (2003) Globalization, Poverty and the Environment in West Africa: Too Poor to Pollute? " *Global Environmental Politics*. 3(4), 42–60, ISSN 15263800 • Paul Wapner (2003) World Summit on Sustainable Development: Toward a Post-Jo'burg Environmentalism. *Global Environmental Politics*. 3(1), 1–10, ISSN 15263800 • Ambuj D. Sagar and Stacy D. VanDeveer (2005) Capacity Development for the Environment: Broadening the Scope*. *Global Environmental Politics*. 5(3), 14–22 • Marc Williams (2005) The Third World and Global Environmental Negotiations: Interests, Institutions and Ideas. *Global Environmental Politics*. 5(3), 48–69 • Adil Najam (2005) Developing Countries and Global Environmental Governance: From Contestation to Participation to Engagement. *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics*. 5(3), 303–321

Climate Change: the Chinese Position Heggelund, Gorild, Steinar Andresen, and Inga Fritzen Buan. "Chinese Climate Policy: Domestic Priorities, Foreign Policy, and Emerging Implementation." 2010

Climate Change: the Russian/Post-Communist Position Henry, Laura A. 2010. "Between transnationalism and state power: the development of Russia's post-Soviet environmental movement." *Environmental Politics* 19: 756ff

Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of Climate Change. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Additional Readings on International Climate Negotiations

DeSombre, Elizabeth. 2006. *Global Environmental Institutions*. London: Routledge. 42-68, 97-128.

Jennifer Clapp and Eric Helleiner (2012), "International political economy and the environment: back to the basics?" *International Affairs* 88

Manjana Milkoreit (2019), "The Paris Agreement on Climate Change – Made in the USA?" *Perspectives on Politics* 17:4

Noah M. Sachs (2019), "The Paris Agreement in the 2020s: Breakdown or Breakup?" *Ecology Law Quarterly*

Jen Iris Allan (2019), "Dangerous Incrementalism of the Paris Agreement," *Global Environmental Politics* 19:1

McNeill, J. R. 2001. *Something New Under the Sun: An Environmental History of the Twentieth Century World* (New York: Norton), 50-83.

Jinnah, Sikina. 2014. *Post-Treaty Politics*. MIT Press. Chapter 7. 147-178.

Mitchell, RB, and Keilbach, PM. Situation Structure and Institutional Design: Reciprocity, Coercion, and Exchange. *International Organization* 2001: 891-917.

Helm, Dieter, Hepburn, Cameron, and Ruta, Giovanni. 2012. Trade, Climate Change, and the Political Game Theory of Border Carbon Adjustments. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 28 (2):368–394. [Google Scholar](#)

Putnam, two level games

[Domestic politics and climate change: international public goods in two-level games](#)
[S Kroll, JF Shogren](#) - Cambridge Review of International Affairs, 2008

Fritz Mayer, two level games and domestic side payments

Pattberg, P. & Widerberg, O. (2015). Theorising Global Environmental Governance: Key Findings and Future Questions. *Millennium*,43(2), 684-705.

The club approach: a gateway to effective climate co-operation?
J Hovi, DF Sprinz, H Sælen... - British Journal of Political ..., 2019

Lax and Sebenius, The Manager as Negotiator

Ronald B. Mitchell (2010) Explaining International Environmental Politics. In Mitchell International Politics and the Environment. chapter 1, 1–19

Navigating the Anthropocene: improving earth system governance

F Biermann, K Abbott, S Andresen, K Bäckstrand, S Bernstein, MM Betsill, ...
Science 335 (6074), 1306-1307 (makes a case for majority voting rather than consensus in international environmental institutions)

Speth, James Gustave and Peter Haas. 2006. Global Environmental Governance (New York: Island Press). Chapter 3, 52-81, From Stockholm to Johannesburg: First Attempt at Global Environmental Governance..

Barrett, Scott. 2003. Environment and statecraft: the strategy of environmental treaty-making (Oxford: Oxford University Press). Chapter 2, 19-48.

Andresen, Steinar, Elin Lerum Boasson, and Geir Hønneland, 2012. "Chapter 1, Introduction: Governing the International Environment." International Environmental Agreements: An Introduction. Routledge, 3-20.

Mitchell, Ronald. 2010. International Politics and the Environment (Los Angeles: Sage). Chapter 2, 21-47. Mitchell, Ronald. 2010. International Politics and the Environment (Los Angeles: Sage). Chapter 3, 48-79.

Zürn, Michael. 1998. "The Rise of International Environmental Politics: A Review of Current Research." World Politics 50 (4): 617-649.

Biermann, Frank and Philipp Pattberg. 2008. "Global Environmental Governance: What Can We Learn from Experience?" Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 33: 277-289.

Mitchell, Ronald. 2002. "International Environment" in Thomas Risse, Beth Simmons, and Walter Carlsnaes, eds., Handbook of International Relations (Los Angeles: Sage Publications), 500- 516.

Downie, David Leonard. 2010. "Global Environmental Policy: Governance through Regimes." The Global Environment: Institutions, Law, and Policy, 3rd Edition. Axelrod et al, 70-91.

Mitchell, Ronald. 1994. "Regime Design Matters: Intentional Oil Pollution and Treaty Compliance" International Organization 48:3: 425-458.

Chasek, Pamela S. and Lynn M. Wagner. 2012. The Roads from Rio: Lessons We Learned from Twenty Years of Multilateral Environmental Negotiations, 1-16.

Susskind, Lawrence E. and Saleem H. Ali. 2015. Environmental Diplomacy, 9-44.

Victor, David G. and Lesley A. Coben, 2005. "A Herd Mentality in the Design of International Environmental Agreements?" *Global Environmental Politics*, 5, 24-57.

Raustiala, Kal. 2005. Form and Substance in International Agreements. *The American Journal of International Law* 99 (3): 581–614.

Busby, Joshua. 2010. "International Organization and Environmental Governance" in R. A. 4 Denmark, eds., *The International Studies Encyclopedia* (New York: Wiley-Blackwell), 1-18.

Falkner, Robert. 2005. "American Hegemony and the Global Environment." *International Studies Review*. 7, 585–599.

[Busby](#), Joshua. 2015. "A Green Giant? Inconsistency and American Environmental Diplomacy," chapter in an edited volume *The United States, China, and World Order*, edited by John Ikenberry, Zhu Feng, and Wang Jisi, Palgrave. 245-274.

DeSombre, Elizabeth R. 2011. The United States and Global Environmental Politics: Domestic Sources of U.S. Unilateralism. In *The global environment : institutions, law, and policy*, edited by Regina S. Axelrod, Stacy D. VanDeveer, and David Leonard Downie, 3rd:192–212. Vol. 3rd. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Haas, Peter M. 1992. Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization* 46 (1): 1–35.

Lidskog, Rolf and Goran Sundqvist. 2015. When Does Science Matter? *International Relations Meets Science and Technology Studies*. *Global Environmental Politics* February 2015, Vol. 15, No. 1: 1–20.

Hoffman, Matthew J. 2011. *Climate Governance at the Crossroads*. Oxford. 27-58.

DeSombre, Elizabeth. 2006. *Global Environmental Institutions*. London: Routledge. 155-174.

Biermann, Frank and Klaus Dingwerth. 2004. Global Environmental Change and the Nation State. *GEP* 4(1): 1-22.

Wapner, Paul. 2014. "The Changing Nature of Nature: Environmental Politics in the Anthropocene," *Global Environmental Politics*. 36-54.

[Reinvigorating international climate policy: A comprehensive framework for effective nonstate action](#)

..., [P Pattberg](#), [P Pauw](#), C Ramstein, [O Widerberg](#) - *Global ...*, 2015

[HTML] [Cities to the rescue? Assessing the performance of transnational municipal networks in global climate governance](#)

[JS Bansard](#), [PH Pattberg](#), [O Widerberg](#) - ... Agreements: Politics, Law and

Biermann, Frank. 2014. The Anthropocene: A governance perspective. *The Anthropocene Review*. 57-61. Biermann, Frank. 2012. Navigating the Anthropocene: Improving Earth System Governance. *Science*. 1306-1307.

Biermann and Pattberg, *Global Env't'l governance reconsidered*, 2012

Peter M. Haas (2004) Addressing the Global Governance Deficit. *Global Environmental Politics*. 4(4), 1–15

Pamela S. Chasek, David Leonard Downie, and Janet Welsh Brown (2010) Actors in the Environmental Arena. In Chasek, Downie and Brown *Global Environmental Politics*. chapter 2, 53–115 •

Ronald B. Mitchell (2003) International Environmental Agreements: A Survey of Their Features, Formation, and Effects. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*. 28(1)November, 429–461

Kate O'Neill (2009) State-Led Global Environmental Governance: International Cooperation and Regime Formation. In O'Neill *The Environment and International Relations*. chapter 4, 71–103 •

Kate O'Neill (2009) The Impacts and Effectiveness of Environmental Treaty Regimes. In O'Neill *The Environment and International Relations*. chapter 5, 104–134 •

Carsten Helm and Detlef Sprinz (2000) Measuring the Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 44(5), 630–652 , ISSN 00220027

• Jon Hovi and Detlef F. Sprinz (2006) The Limits of the Law of the Least Ambitious Program. *Global Environmental Politics*. 6(3), 28–42

• Ronald B. Mitchell (2006) Problem structure, institutional design, and the relative effectiveness of international environmental agreements. *Global Environmental Politics*. 6(3)August, 72–89

David Leonard Downie (2010) Global Environmental Policy: Governance through Regimes. In Axelrod, VanDeveer and Downie *The Global Environment: Institutions, Law, and Policy*. chapter 4, 70–91

Ronald B. Mitchell (2002) A Quantitative Approach to Evaluating International Environmental Regimes. *Global Environmental Politics*. 2(4), 58–83 , ISSN 15263800 •

Oran R. Young (2001) Inferences and Indices: Evaluating the Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes. *Global Environmental Politics*. 1(1), 99–121

Kate O'Neill (2009) Conclusions: The Environment and International Relations in the Twenty-First Century. In O'Neill The Environment and International Relations. chapter 8, 197–211 •

Adil Najam, Ioli Christopoulou, and William R. Moomaw (2004) The Emergent “System” of Global Environmental Governance. *Global Environmental Politics*. 4(4)November, 23–35 •

Ronald B. Mitchell (2010) The Future of International Environmental Politics. In Mitchell *International Politics and the Environment*. chapter 7, 181–206

Negotiating the Environment: Impediments Mitchell, Ronald. “Negotiating Solutions to International Environmental Problems.”

“Looking for Leaders: Perceptions of Climate Change Leadership among Climate Change Negotiation Participants.” *Global Environmental Politics* 11:1, 89-107.

Eckersley, Robin. 2012. “Moving Forward in the Climate Negotiations: Multilateralism or Minilateralism?” *Global Environmental Politics* 12:2, 24-42.

Multi-level Reinforcement: Explaining EU Leadership in Climate Change Mitigation.” *Global Environmental Politics* 7: 19-46.

O'Neill, Kate. 2009. *The Environment and International Relations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Mathew Paterson, *Theoretical Perspectives on International Environmental Politics*, in BHS, pp. 54-81

Abbott, Kenneth W., Jessica F. Green, and Robert O. Keohane. 2016. “Organizational Ecology and Institutional Change in Global Governance.” *International Organization* 70 (2): 1–31.

Aldy, Joseph E. and Robert N. Stavins. 2012. “The Promise and Problems of Pricing Carbon Theory and Experience.” *Journal of Environment & Development* 21 (2): 152–80. doi:10.1177/1070496512442508.

Barkin, J. Samuel and Elizabeth R. DeSombre. 2013. *Saving Global Fisheries: Reducing Fishing Capacity to Promote Sustainability*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Beck, Ulrich. 1992.

Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. London: Sage Publications.

Biermann, Frank, Philipp Pattberg, Harro van Asselt, and Fariborz Zelli. 2009. “The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis.” *Global Environmental Politics* 9 (4): 14–40.

[Leadership in the North American environmental sector: Values, leadership styles, and contexts of environmental leaders and their organizations](#)

CP Egri, S Herman - Academy of Management journal, 2000 - journals.aom.org

Boardman, Robert. 1981. *International Organizations and the Conservation of Nature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bodansky, Daniel. 2010. *The Art and Craft of International Environmental Law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. Bulkeley, Harriet, Liliana Andonova, Michele M. Betsill, Daniel Compagnon, Thomas Hale, Matthew J. Hoffmann, et al. 2014.

Transnational Climate Change Governance. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cao, Xun, Helen V. Milner, Aseem Prakash, and Hugh Ward. 2013. "Research Frontiers in Comparative and International Environmental Politics: An Introduction." *Comparative Political Studies* (December). doi:10.1177/0010414013509567.

Colgan, Jeff D. 2016. "Where Is International Relations Going? Evidence from Graduate Training." *International Studies Quarterly*: First View. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqv017>.

FAO, *The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture: Opportunities and Challenges* (FAO, 2014), available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3720e.pdf>.

Green, Jessica F. 2014. *Rethinking Private Authority: Agents and Entrepreneurs in Global Environmental Governance*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 46 (1): 1–35.

Haas, Peter, Robert O. Keohane, and Marc A. Levy (eds.). 1993. *Institutions for the Earth: Sources of Effective International Environmental Protection*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hadden, Jennifer. 2015. *Networks in Contention: The Divisive Politics of Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hale, Thomas N. and David Held. 2011. *Handbook of Transnational Governance: Institutions and Innovation*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hale, Thomas N., David Held, and Kevin Young. 2013. *Gridlock: Why Global Cooperation Is Failing When We Need It Most*. Boston: Polity.

Hicks, Robert L., B. Parks, T. Roberts, and MJ Tierney. 2008. *Greening Aid? Understanding the Environmental Impact of Development Assistance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Javeline, Debra. 2014. The Most Important Topic Political Scientists Are Not Studying: Adapting to Climate Change. *Perspectives on Politics* 12 (02): 420–434. PS • April 2014 479

- Jinnah, Sikina. 2014. *Post-Treaty Politics: Secretariat Influence in Global Environmental Governance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Johnson, Tana and Johannes Urpelainen. 2012. "A Strategic Theory of Regime Integration and Separation." *International Organization* 64 (2): 645–77.
- Keohane, Robert O. 2015. *The Global Politics of Climate Change: Challenge for Political Science*. PS: Political Science and Politics. 48 (01): 19–26.
- Klein, Naomi. 2015. *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Litfin, Karen. 1994. *Ozone Discourses: Science and Politics in Global Environmental Cooperation*. *New Directions in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lloyd, Ian D. and Michael Oppenheimer. 2014. "On the Design of an International Governance Framework for Geoengineering." *Global Environmental Politics*, 14 (2): 45–63.
- Mitchell, Ronald Bruce. 2016. *International Environmental Agreements (IEA) Database Project*. University of Oregon. Available at: <http://iea.uoregon.edu>. Accessed September 1, 2016.
- Mitchell, Ronald Bruce, William Clark, David Cash, and Nancy Dickson (eds.). 2006. *Global Environmental Assessments: Information and Influence*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Oreskes, Naomi. 2007. "The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change: How do we know we're not wrong?" In Joseph DiMento and Pamela Doughman, eds. *Climate Change: What it means for us, our children and our grandchildren*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Orsini, Amandine. 2013. "Multi-Forum Non-State Actors: Navigating the Regime Complexes for Forestry and Genetic Resources." *Global Environmental Politics* 13 (3): 34–55.
- Ostrom, Elinor. 2010. "Polycentric Systems for Coping with Collective Action and Global Environmental Change." *Global Environmental Change*, 20th Anniversary Special Issue, 20 (4): 550–57.
- Parson, Edward A. and Lia N. Ernst. 2013. "International Governance of Climate Engineering." *Theoretical Inquiries in Law* 14: 307–337.
- Phelps, Jacob, Edward L. Webb, and Arun Agrawal. 2010. "Does REDD+ Threaten to Recentralize Forest Governance?" *Science* 328 (5976): 312–13.
- Raustiala, Kal and David G. Victor. 2004. "The Regime Complex for Plant Genetic Resources." *International Organization* 58 (2): 277–309.

Rockstrom, Johan, Will Steffen, Kevin Noone, Asa Persson, F. Stuart Chapin, Eric F. Lambin, et al. 2009. "A Safe Operating Space for Humanity." *Nature* 461 (7263): 472–5.

Sands, Philippe and Jacqueline Peel. 2012. *Principles of International Environmental Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Steinberg, P. F. and S. D. VanDeveer. 2012. *Comparative Environmental Politics: Theory, Practice, and Prospects* (Cambridge, MIT Press).

Urpelainen, Johannes. 2012. "Geoengineering and Global Warming: A Strategic Perspective." *International Environmental Agreements: Politics, Law and Economics* 12 (4): 375–89.

Victor, David G. 2015. "Climate Change: Embed the Social Sciences in Climate Policy." *Nature* 520 (7545): 27–9.

Webster, D. G. 2008. *Adaptive Governance: The Dynamics of Atlantic Fisheries Management*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Zelli, Fariborz. 2011. "The Fragmentation of the Global Climate Architecture." *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change* 2 (2): 255–70.

Thomas Hale (2020), "Catalytic Cooperation," *Global Environmental Politics* 20:4

Robert O. Keohane and Michael Oppenheimer (2016), "Paris: Beyond the Climate Dead End through Pledge and Review?" *Politics and Governance*, 4 6

Jon Hovi, Detlef Sprinz, Hakon Saelen, and Arild Underdal (2016), "Climate Change Mitigation: a role for climate clubs?" Palgrave Communications.

Federica Genovese (2019), "Sectors, Pollution, and Trade: How Industrial Interests Shape Domestic Positions on Global Climate Agreements," *International Studies Quarterly*

Jason Bordoff (2020), "Everything you think you know about the geopolitics of climate change is wrong," *Foreign Policy*

Additional Readings on Problems other than Climate Change

John M. Deutch and Ernest J. Moniz (2006) *The Nuclear Option*. *Scientific American*. 295(3), 76–83 , ISSN 00368733

John M. Deutch and Ernest J. Moniz, et al, *The Future of Nuclear Power: An MIT Interdisciplinary Study* 2003, summary pp 1-16.

<https://web.mit.edu/nuclearpower/pdf/nuclearpower-summary.pdf>

[Can nuclear power help save us from climate change? - C&EN](#)

<https://www.ucsusa.org/resources/nuclear-power-global-warming>

Additional Readings on the Resource Curse(s)

Ross, Michael L. "The political economy of the resource curse." *World politics* 51.02 (1999): 297-322.

Francesco Caselli and Guy Michaels (2013), "Do Oil Windfalls Improve Living Standards? Evidence from Brazil," *American Economic Review* 5:1

JF Mercure et al. (2018), "Macroeconomic impact of stranded fossil fuel assets," *Nature Climate Change* 8

Umair Irfan (2019), "Fossil fuels are underpriced by a whopping \$5.2 trillion," *Vox*, May 17.

Paasha Mahdavi, Cesar B. Martinez-Alvarez, and Michael L. Ross (2020), "Why Do Governments Tax or Subsidize Fossil Fuels?" Working paper

Michael Ross (2012), *The Oil Curse: how petroleum shapes the development of nations*, Princeton University Press

[Political foundations of the resource curse](#)

[JA Robinson](#), [R Torvik](#), T Verdier - *Journal of development Economics*, 2006

[BOOK] [Escaping the resource curse](#)

[M Humphreys](#), [JD Sachs](#), [JE Stiglitz](#), G Soros... - 2007

[Do natural resources fuel authoritarianism? A reappraisal of the resource curse](#)

[S Haber](#), [V Menaldo](#) - *American political science Review*, 2011

[The big oil change: A closer look at the Haber–Menaldo analysis](#)

[JJ Andersen](#), [ML Ross](#) - *Comparative Political Studies*, 2014

Additional Readings on Climate Change and Violent Conflicts

[Climate Change and Conflict | Annual Review of Political ...](#)
www.annualreviews.org > doi > abs > annurev-polisci-050317-070830
by V Koubi - 2019 [in Lauinger Stacks but not available online]
2019 [in Lauinger Stacks but not available online]

([Hendrix and Saleyhan 2012](#)) conflict correlated with rainfall

Oil, domestic politics, and international conflict

JD Colgan - Energy Research & Social Science, 2014

Henk-Jan Brinkman and Cullen S. Hendrix, 'Food Insecurity and Conflict Dynamics: Causal Linkages and Complex Feedbacks,' *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development* 2.2 (2013): 1-18.

Michael Ross, 'How Do Natural Resources Influence Civil War? Evidence from Thirteen Cases,' *International Organization* 58.1 (2004): 35-67.

Michael Ross, 'What Do We Know About Natural Resources and Civil War?,' *Journal of Peace Research* 41.3 (2004): 337-356.

Theisen, O.M., N.P. Gleditsch, and H. Buhaug, 2013: Is climate change a driver of armed conflict? *Climatic Change*, 117(3), 613-625.

Slettebak, R. T. (2012). 'Don't Blame the Weather! Climate-Related Natural Disasters and Civil Conflict.' *Journal of Peace Research*, 49.1 (2012): 163-176.

Jon Barnett and Neil Adgerb, 'Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict,' *Political Geography* 26 (2007): 639-655.

Peter H. Gleick, 'Water, Drought, Climate Change and Conflict in Syria.' *American Meteorological Society* 6.1 (2014): 331-340.

Hsiang, S. M., Meng, K. C., & Cane, M. A., 'Civil Conflicts are Associated with the Global Climate.' *Nature*, 476 (2011): 438-441.

Marc Cohen and Per Pinstруп-Andersen, 'Food Security and Conflict,' *Social Research* 66.1 (1999): 375-416.

Paul J. Magnarella, "The Background and Causes of the Genocide in Rwanda," *Journal of International Criminal Justice* 3.4 (September 2005): 801-822.

Vita Roy, 'Managing Resource-Related Conflict: A Framework of Lootable Resource Management and Post-Conflict Stabilization,' *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 1 (2016): 1-28.

Mark Giordano et al, 'International Resource Conflict and Mitigation,' *Journal of Peace Research* 42.1 (2005): 47-65.

EF Dukes, 'What We Know About Environmental Conflict Resolution,' *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 22.1 (2004): 191-220.

Meredith Giordano and Aaron Wolf, 'Sharing Waters: Post-Rio International Water Management,' *Natural Resources Forum* 27 (2003): 163-171.

D. Deudney (1990) The Case against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*. 19(3), 461–476 •

Thomas F. Homer-Dixon (1994) Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases. *International Security*. 19(1)Summer, 5–40 •

Nils Petter Gleditsch (1998) Armed Conflict and the Environment: A Critique of the Literature. *Journal of Peace Research*. 35(3), 381–400 , ISSN 00223433 •

Sandra L. Postel and Aaron T. Wolf (2001) Dehydrating Conflict. *Foreign Policy*.(126)September-October, 60–67 , ISSN 00157228 •

Christopher T. Timura (2001) "Environmental Conflict" and the Social Life of Environmental Security Discourse. *Anthropological Quarterly*. 74(3)July, 104–113 , ISSN 00035491

Thomas F. Homer-Dixon (1991) On the Threshold: Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict. *International Security*. 16(2), 76–116 , ISSN 01622889 •

Colin H. Kahl (1998) Population Growth, Environmental Degradation, and State-Sponsored Violence: The Case of Kenya, 1991-93. *International Security*. 23(2)Autumn, 80–119

Khagram, Sanjeev and Saleem Ali. "Environment and Security." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* no. 31 (2006): 395-411.

10. What causes violent conflict?

There is considerable scholarly consensus that climate change likely raises the risks of violent conflict by amplifying many of its well-documented drivers – and that it is likely to impact the national security policies of most states ([Adger et al 2014](#) pp. 771-775). In comparison to other questions outlined in this paper, political scientists have done comparatively more research on the relationship between violent conflict and climate change. Debate about possible relationships between violent conflict and climate change dates back to the 1990s ([Homer-Dixon 1999](#); [Gleditsch & Urdal 2002](#)), but has grown rapidly in the last decade, expanding from reliance on case studies to use of quantitative assessment ([Swain and Ojendal 2018](#)). *Handbook on Environmental Conflict and Peacebuilding*

Yet work on climate and security extends beyond the issue of conflict to security more broadly construed ([Busby 2018](#)). Recent work on climate change and conflict identifies myriad pathways: reduced precipitation lowers agricultural yields contributing to large and small-scale political conflicts ([Hendrix and Saleyhan 2012](#)); slower economic growth resulting from climate change may increase competition among groups, depending on the political system ([Koubi et al. 2012](#)). Disentangling causal factors and the pathways that link climate change to violent conflict could provide important contributions to the larger literature on conflict.

OTHER READINGS FROM SYLLABI I HAVE COLLECTED

Week 1 (Jan 28–Feb 1) – Overview Required: • Coase, Ronald. 1960. “The Problem of Social Cost.” *Journal of Law and Economics* 3:1–44. • Stern, David I. 2004. “The Rise and Fall of the Environmental Kuznets Curve.” *World Development* 32(8):1419–1439. Week 2 (Feb 4–8) – Characteristics of Environmental Problems Required: • Hardin, Garrett. 1968. “The Tragedy of the Commons.” *Science* 162(3859):1243–1248. 3 • Barkin, J. Samuel, and George E. Shambaugh. 1996. “Common-pool resources and international environmental politics.” *Environmental Politics* 5(3):429–447. • Allcott, Hunt, and Cass R. Sunstein. 2015. “Regulating Internalities.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 34(3):698–705. Recommended: • Hayes, Tanya M. 2006. “Parks, People, and Forest Protection: An Institutional Assessment of the Effectiveness of Protected Areas.” *World Development* 34(12):2064–2075. • Anderson, Soren T., and James M. Sallee. 2016. “Designing Policies to Make Cars Greener.” *Annual Review of Resource Economics* 8(1):157–180. • Barkin, J. Samuel, and Yuliya Rashchupkina. 2017. “Public Goods, Common Pool Resources, and International Law.” *American Journal of International Law* 111(2):376–394. Week 3 (Feb 11–15) – Problem Definition; Role of Science Required: • Haas, Peter M. 1992. “Epistemic communities and international policy coordination.” *International Organization* 46(1):1–35. • Haas, Peter M. 1992. “Banning chlorofluorocarbons: epistemic community efforts to protect stratospheric ozone.” *International Organization* 46(1):187–224. • Kahan, Dan M., Ellen Peters, Maggie Wittlin, Paul Slovic, Lisa Larrimore Ouellette, Donald Braman, and Gregory Mandel. 2012. “The polarizing impact of science literacy and numeracy on perceived climate change risks.” *Nature Climate Change* 2(10):732–735. • Harrison, Tom, and Genia Kostka. 2014. “Balancing Priorities, Aligning Interests: Developing Mitigation Capacity in China and India.” *Comparative Political Studies* 47(3):450–480. • Tranter, Bruce, and Kate Booth. 2015. “Scepticism in a changing climate: A crossnational study.” *Global Environmental Change* 33:154–164. 4 Recommended: • Peterson, M. J. 1992. “Whalers, cetologists, environmentalists, and the international management of whaling.” *International Organization* 46(1):147–186. • Fuentes-George, Kemi. 2013. “Neoliberalism, Environmental Justice, and the Convention on Biological Diversity: How Problematizing the Commodification of Nature Affects Regime Effectiveness.” *Global Environmental Politics* 13(4):144–163. • Newell, Ben R., Rachel I. McDonald, Marilynn Brewer, and Brett K. Hayes. 2014. “The Psychology of Environmental Decisions.” *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 39(1):443–467. Week 4 (Feb 18–22) – Demand for Environmental Protection Required: • Abou-Chadi, Tarik, and Mark A. Kayser. 2017. “It’s not easy being green: Why voters punish parties for environmental policies during economic downturns.” *Electoral Studies* 45:201–207. • Bechtel, Michael M., Federica Genovese, and Kenneth F. Scheve. 2017. “Interests, Norms and Support for the Provision of Global Public Goods: The Case of Climate Co-operation.” *British Journal of Political Science* 1–23. • Mildenerger, Matto, and Anthony Leiserowitz. 2017. “Public opinion on climate change: Is there an economy-environment tradeoff?” *Environmental Politics* 26(5):801–824. • Fairbrother, Malcolm. 2017. “When Will People Pay to Pollute? Environmental Taxes, Political Trust and Experimental Evidence from Britain.” *British Journal of Political Science* 1–22. • Kim, Sung Eun, and Johannes Urpelainen. 2018. “Environmental Public Opinion in U.S. States, 1973–2012.” *Environmental Politics* 27(1): 89–114. Recommended: • McCright, Aaron M., Chenyang Xiao, and Riley E. Dunlap. 2014. “Political Polarization on Support for Government Spending on Environmental Protection in the USA, 1974–2012.” *Social Science Research* 48:251–260. • Dalton, Russell J. 2015. “Waxing or Waning? The Changing Patterns of Environmental Activism.” *Environmental Politics*

24(4):530–552. 5 • Egan, Patrick J., and Megan Mullin. 2017. “Climate Change: US Public Opinion.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20(1):209–227. Week 5 (Feb 25–Mar 1) – Government Responses 2/25 One-page research proposal due (5pm) Required: • Betsill, Michele M., and Harriet Bulkeley. 2004. “Transnational Networks and Global Environmental Governance: The Cities for Climate Protection Program.” *International Studies Quarterly* 48(2):471–493. • Duit, Andreas. 2016. “The four faces of the environmental state: environmental governance regimes in 28 countries.” *Environmental Politics* 25(1):69–91. • Gough, Ian. 2016. “Welfare states and environmental states: a comparative analysis.” *Environmental Politics* 25(1):24–47. • Andonova, Liliana B., Thomas N. Hale, and Charles B. Roger. 2017. “National Policy and Transnational Governance of Climate Change: Substitutes or Complements?” *International Studies Quarterly* 61(2):253–268. • Genovese, Federica, Florian G. Kern, and Christian Martin. 2017. “Policy Alteration: Rethinking Diffusion Processes When Policies Have Alternatives.” *International Studies Quarterly* 61(2):236–252. Recommended: • Sprinz, Detlef, and Tapani Vahtoranta. 1994. “The Interest-Based Explanation of International Environmental Policy.” *International Organization* 48(1):77–105. • Gilley, Bruce. 2012. “Authoritarian environmentalism and China’s response to climate change.” *Environmental Politics* 21(2):287–307. • Stokes, Leah C., and Hanna L. Breetz. 2018. “Politics in the U.S. energy transition: Case studies of solar, wind, biofuels and electric vehicles policy.” *Energy Policy* 113:76–86. Week 6 (Mar 4–8) – Private Sector Responses Required: 6 • Dechezlepretre, Antoine, Eric Neumayer, and Richard Perkins. 2015. “Environmental regulation and the cross-border diffusion of new technology: Evidence from automobile patents.” *Research Policy* 44(1):244–257. • Meckling, Jonas, and Steffen Jenner. 2016. “Varieties of market-based policy: Instrument choice in climate policy.” *Environmental Politics* 25(5):853–874. • Hsueh, Lily. 2017. “Transnational Climate Governance and the Global 500: Examining Private Actor Participation by Firm-Level Factors and Dynamics.” *International Interactions* 43(1):48–75. • Meckling, Jonas, and Llewelyn Hughes. 2017. “Globalizing Solar: Global Supply Chains and Trade Preferences.” *International Studies Quarterly* 61(2):225–235. • Costa-Campi, M.T., J. Garcia-Quevedo, and E. Martinez-Ros. 2017. “What are the determinants of investment in environmental R&D?” *Energy Policy* 104:455–465. Recommended: • Potoski, Matthew, and Aseem Prakash. 2013. “Green Clubs: Collective Action and Voluntary Environmental Programs.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16(1):399–419. • Prakash, Aseem, and Matthew Potoski. 2014. “Global Private Regimes, Domestic Public Law: ISO 14001 and Pollution Reduction.” *Comparative Political Studies* 47(3):369–394. • Chrun, Elizabeth, Nives Dolsak, and Aseem Prakash. 2016. “Corporate Environmentalism: Motivations and Mechanisms.” *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 41(1):341–362. Week 7 (Mar 11–15) – Community and NGO Responses 3/15 Midterm exam due (5pm) Required: • Raustiala, Kal. 1997. “States, NGOs, and international environmental institutions.” *International Studies Quarterly* 41(4):719–740. • Agrawal, Arun, and Clark C. Gibson. 1999. “Enchantment and Disenchantment: The Role of Community in Natural Resource Conservation.” *World Development* 27(4):629–649. 7 • Wolf, Johanna, W. Neil Adger, Irene Lorenzoni, Vanessa Abrahamson, and Rosalind Raine. 2010. “Social capital, individual responses to heat waves and climate change adaptation: An empirical study of two UK cities.” *Global Environmental Change* 20(1):44–52. • Coleman, Eric A., and Scott S. Liebertz. 2014. “Property Rights and Forest Commons.” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 33(3):649–668. • Dolsak, Nives, and Aseem Prakash. 2017. “Join the Club: How the Domestic NGO Sector Induces Participation in the Covenant of Mayors Program.” *International Interactions* 43(1):26–47. Recommended: • Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, Mette, and Teale N. Phelps

Bondaroff. 2014. "From Advocacy to Confrontation: Direct Enforcement by Environmental NGOs." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(2):348–361. • Bloomfield, Michael John. 2014. "Shame campaigns and environmental justice: corporate shaming as activist strategy." *Environmental Politics* 23(2):263–281. Spring recess (Mar 18–22) Week 8 (Mar 25–29) – Environment and Domestic Institutions 3/26 Research paper draft due (in class) Required: • Li, Quan, and Rafael Reuveny. 2006. "Democracy and Environmental Degradation." *International Studies Quarterly* 50(4):935–956. • Battig, Michele B., and Thomas Bernauer. 2009. "National Institutions and Global Public Goods: Are Democracies More Cooperative in Climate Change Policy?" *International Organization* 63(2):281–308. • Aklin, Michael, and Johannes Urpelainen. 2014. "The Global Spread of Environmental Ministries: Domestic-International Interactions." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(4):764–780. • Ward, Hugh, Xun Cao, and Bumba Mukherjee. 2014. "State Capacity and the Environmental Investment Gap in Authoritarian States." *Comparative Political Studies* 47(3):309–343. 8 • Cao, Xun, and Hugh Ward. 2015. "Winning Coalition Size, State Capacity, and Time Horizons: An Application of Modified Selectorate Theory to Environmental Public Goods Provision." *International Studies Quarterly* 59(2):264–279. Recommended: • Neumayer, Eric. 2003. "Are left-wing party strength and corporatism good for the environment? Evidence from panel analysis of air pollution in OECD countries." *Ecological Economics* 45(2):203–220. • Bernauer, Thomas, and Vally Koubi. 2009. "Effects of political institutions on air quality." *Ecological Economics* 68(5):1355–1365. Week 9 (Apr 1–5) – Environment and International Institutions Required: • Mitchell, Ronald B. 2006. "Problem Structure, Institutional Design, and the Relative Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements." *Global Environmental Politics* 6(3):72–89. • Dinar, Shlomi, Ariel Dinar, and Pradeep Kurukulasuriya. 2011. "Scarcity and Cooperation along International Rivers: An Empirical Assessment of Bilateral Treaties." *International Studies Quarterly* 55(3):809–833. • Zawahri, Neda A., Shlomi Dinar, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2011. "Facilitating Treaty Formation to Govern International Rivers." *International Studies Quarterly* 55(3):803–807. • Baccini, Leonardo, and Johannes Urpelainen. 2014. "Before Ratification: Understanding the Timing of International Treaty Effects on Domestic Policies." *International Studies Quarterly* 58(1):29–43. • Anderson, Brile, Thomas Bernauer, and Aya Kachi. 2018. "Does international pooling of authority affect the perceived legitimacy of global governance?" *Review of International Organizations* 1–23. Recommended: • Mitchell, Ronald B. 2003. "International Environmental Agreements: A Survey of Their Features, Formation, and Effects." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 28(1):429–461. 9 • Lemos, Maria Carmen, and Arun Agrawal. 2006. "Environmental Governance." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 31(1):297–325. • Andonova, Liliana B. 2010. "Public-Private Partnerships for the Earth: Politics and Patterns of Hybrid Authority in the Multilateral System." *Global Environmental Politics* 10(2):25–53. Week 10 (Apr 8–12) – Trade and Environment Required: • Prakash, Aseem, and Matthew Potoski. 2006. "Racing to the Bottom? Trade, Environmental Governance, and ISO 14001." *American Journal of Political Science* 50(2):350–364. • Zeng, Ka, and Josh Eastin. 2007. "International Economic Integration and Environmental Protection: The Case of China." *International Studies Quarterly* 51(4):971–995. • Perkins, Richard, and Eric Neumayer. 2012. "Does the 'California effect' operate across borders? Trading- and investing-up in automobile emission standards." *Journal of European Public Policy* 19(2):217–237. • Bastiaens, Ida, and Evgeny Postnikov. 2017. "Greening up: the effects of environmental standards in EU and US trade agreements." *Environmental Politics* 26(5):847–869. • Gamso, Jonas. 2017. "Trade Partnerships and Environmental Performance in Developing Countries." *The Journal of*

Environment and Development 26(4):375–399. Recommended: • Chichilnisky, Graciela. 1994. “North-South Trade and the Global Environment.” *American Economic Review* 48(4):851–874.

• Cao, Xun, and Aseem Prakash. 2010. “Trade Competition and Domestic Pollution: A Panel Study, 1980–2003.” *International Organization* 64(3):481–503. • Cao, Xun, and Aseem Prakash. 2012. “Trade Competition and Environmental Regulations: Domestic Political Constraints and Issue Visibility.” *Journal of Politics* 74(1):66–82. • Prakash, Aseem, and Matthew Potoski. 2017. “The EU effect: does trade with the EU reduce CO2 emissions in the developing world?” *Environmental Politics* 26(1):27–48. 10 Week 11 (Apr 15–19) – Investment and Environment 4/16 Students’ research presentations; revised draft due (in class) Required: • Prakash, Aseem, and Matthew Potoski. 2007. “Investing Up: FDI and the Cross-Country Diffusion of ISO 14001 Management Systems.” *International Studies Quarterly* 51(3):723–744. • Perkins, Richard, and Eric Neumayer. 2009. “Transnational linkages and the spillover of environment-efficiency into developing countries.” *Global Environmental Change* 19(3):375–383. • Zeng, Ka, and Joshua Eastin. 2012. “Do Developing Countries Invest Up? The Environmental Effects of Foreign Direct Investment from Less-Developed Countries.” *World Development* 40(11):2221–2233. • Saikawa, Eri, and Johannes Urpelainen. 2013. “Environmental standards as a strategy of international technology transfer.” *Environmental Science and Policy* 38:92–206. • Solarin, Sakiru Adebola, Usama Al-Mulali, Ibrahim Musah, and Ilhan Ozturk. 2017. “Investigating the pollution haven hypothesis in Ghana: An empirical investigation.” *Energy* 124:706–719. Recommended: • Gallagher, Kevin P. 2009. “Economic Globalization and the Environment.” *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 34(1):279–304. Week 12 (Apr 22–26) – Climate Change Required: • Bernauer, Thomas. 2013. “Climate Change Politics.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 16(1):421–448. • Tingley, Dustin, and Michael Tomz. 2014. “Conditional Cooperation and Climate Change.” *Comparative Political Studies* 47(3):344–368. • Michaelowa, Katharina, and Axel Michaelowa. 2017. “Transnational Climate Governance Initiatives: Designed for Effective Climate Change Mitigation?” *International Interactions* 43(1):129–155. 11 • Kousser, Thad, and Bruce Tranter. 2018. “The influence of political leaders on climate change attitudes.” *Global Environmental Change* 50:100–109. • Genovese, Federica, and Endre Tvinnereim. 2018. “Who opposes climate regulation? Business preferences for the European emission trading scheme.” *Review of International Organizations* 1–32. Recommended: • Harrison, Kathryn, and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom. 2007. “The Comparative Politics of Climate Change.” *Global Environmental Politics* 7(4):1–18. • McLean, Elena V., and Randall Stone. 2012. “The Kyoto Protocol: Two-Level Bargaining and European Integration.” *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1):99–113. • Underdal, Arild. 2017. “Climate Change and International Relations (After Kyoto).” *Annual Review of Political Science* 20(1):169–188. Week 13 (Apr 29–May 3) – Sustainable Development Required: • Arrow, Kenneth, Partha Dasgupta, Lawrence Goulder, Gretchen Daily, Paul Ehrlich, Geoffrey Heal, Simon Levin, Karl-Goran Maler, Stephen Schneider, David Starrett, and Brian Walker. 2004. “Are We Consuming Too Much?” *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18(3):147–172. • Daly, Herman E., Brian Czech, David Trauger, William Rees, Mansi Grover, Tracy Dobson, and Stephen Trombulak. 2007. “Are We Consuming Too Much—For What?” *Conservation Biology* 21(5):1359–1362. • Moriarty, Patrick, and Damon Honnery. 2011. “Is there an optimum level for renewable energy?” *Energy Policy* 39(5):2748–2753. • Buntaine, Mark T., and William A. Pizer. 2015. “Encouraging clean energy investment in developing countries: what role for aid?” *Climate Policy* 15(5):543–564. • Kim, Jung Eun. 2019. “Sustainable energy transition in developing countries: the role of energy aid donors.” *Climate Policy* 19(1):1–16. Recommended: • Parris, Thomas M., and Robert W. Kates.

2003. "Characterizing and measuring sustainable development." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 28(1):559– 586. 12 • Jakob, Michael, and Ottmar Edenhofer. 2014. "Green growth, degrowth, and the commons." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 30(3):447–468. • Jacques, Peter J., and Rafaella Lobo. 2018. "The Shifting Context of Sustainability: Growth and the World Ocean Regime." *Global Environmental Politics* 18(4):85–106. Week 14 (May 6–10) – Environment and Security Required: • Gleditsch, Nils Petter. 2012. "Whither the Weather? Climate Change and Conflict." *Journal of Peace Research* 49(1):3–9. • Wood, Reed M., and Thorin M. Wright. 2016. "Responding to Catastrophe: Repression Dynamics Following Rapid-Onset Natural Disasters." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60(8):1446–1472. • Hummel, Sarah. 2017. "Relative Water Scarcity and Country Relations along CrossBoundary Rivers: Evidence from the Aral Sea Basin." *International Studies Quarterly* 61(4):795–808. • Kikuta, Kyosuke. 2018. "Postdisaster Reconstruction as a Cause of Intrastate Violence: An Instrumental Variable Analysis with Application to the 2004 Tsunami in Sri Lanka." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. • Bell, Curtis, and Patrick W. Keys. 2018. "Conditional Relationships Between Drought and Civil Conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 14(1):1–23. Recommended: • Hsiang, Solomon M., Marshall Burke, and Edward Miguel. 2013. "Quantifying the influence of climate on human conflict." *Science* 341(6151). • Martin-Shields, Charles P., and Wolfgang Stojetz. 2018. "Food security and conflict: Empirical challenges and future opportunities for research and policy making on food security and conflict." *World Development*.

Allcott, Hunt, and Michael Greenstone. 2012. "Is There an Energy Efficiency Gap?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26 (1): 3-28. Allcott, Hunt and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2010. "Behavior and Energy Policy" *Science* 327 (5970): 1204-1205. Roe, Brian. Mario F. Teisl, Alan Levy, Matthew Russell. 2001. US consumers' willingness to pay for g

Water Insecurity

Eccleston, Charles H. and Frederic March. 2011. "Chapter 10: Coming Water Wars" in *Global Environmental Policy*, CRC Press. [Provided on Canvas] Nikhil Anand. 2011. "Pressure: The Politechnics of Water Supply in Mumbai" *Cultural Anthropology* 26 (4): 542-564. Herrera, Veronica and Alison E. Post. 2014. "Can Developing Countries Both Decentralize and Depoliticize Urban Water Services? Evaluating the Legacy of the 1990s Reform Wave" *World Development* 64, Pages 621-641,

USGCRP, 2016: The Impacts of Climate Change on Human Health in the United States: A Scientific Assessment. Crimmins, A. et. al. Eds. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC, 312 pp (You are responsible for only the "Executive Summary" available through this link: <https://health2016.globalchange.gov/downloads>) Greenstone, Michael, and Rema Hanna. "Environmental regulations, air and water pollution, and infant mortality in India." *The American Economic Review* 104.10 (2014): 3038-3072.

Week of January 25: National Institutions Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones. 1993. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapters 1-

6. Evan J. Ringquist, Milena I. Neshkova, and Joseph Aamidor. 2013. "Campaign Promises, Democratic Governance, and Environmental Policy in the U.S. Congress," *Policy Studies Journal* 41(2): 365-387. Charles R. Shipan and William R. Lowry. 2001. "Environmental Policy and Party Divergence in Congress," *Political Research Quarterly* 54(2): 245-263. Brandice Canes-Wrone. 2003. "Bureaucratic Decisions and the Composition of the Lower Courts," *American Journal of Political Science* 47(2): 205-214. B. Dan Wood. 1988. "Principals, Bureaucrats, Responsiveness in Clean Air Enforcements," *American Political Science Review* 82(1): 213-234. Week of February 8: Regulation and Regulatory Approaches David Vogel. 2012. *The Politics of Precaution: Regulating Health, Safety, and Environmental Risks in Europe and the United States*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Chapters 1-2, 4-5, 7-9. Soren Winter and Peter May. 2001. "Motivation for Compliance with Environmental Regulations," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 20(4): 675-698. Wayne B. Gray and Jay P. Shimshack. 2011. "The Effectiveness of Environmental Monitoring and Enforcement: A Review of the Empirical Evidence," *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 5(1): 3-24. Matthew Potoski and Aseem Prakash. 2005. "Green Clubs and Voluntary Governance: ISO 14001 and Firms' Regulatory Compliance," *American Journal of Political Science* 49(2): 235-248. Week of February 22: Environmental Federalism Charles M. Tiebout. 1956. "A Pure Theory of Local Expenditures," *Journal of Political Economy* 64(5): 416-424. Daniel C. Esty. 1996. "Revitalizing Environmental Federalism," *Michigan Law Review* 95(3): 570-653. Neal D. Woods. 2006. "Primacy Implementation of Environmental Policy in the U.S. States," *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 36(2): 259-276. David M. Konisky. 2007. "Regulatory Competition and Environmental Enforcement: Is There a Race to the Bottom?" *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 853-872. David M. Konisky. 2008. "Regulator Attitudes and the Environmental Race to the Bottom Argument," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 18(2): 321-344. Barry Rabe. 2011. "Contested Federalism and American Climate Policy," *Publius: The Journal of Federalism* 41(3): 494-521. David M. Konisky and Neal D. Woods. 2012. "Measuring State Environmental Policy," *Review of Policy Research* 29(4): 544-569. Week of March 7: Collaborative Approaches Ansell and Gash. 2008. "Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice." *Journal of Public Administration Research & Theory* 18(4): 543-571. Mark Lubell, Adam Douglas Henry, and Mike McCoy. 2010. "Collaborative Institutions in an Ecology of Games," *American Journal of Political Science* 54(2): 287-300. Mark Lubell. 2013. "Governing Institutional Complexity: The Ecology of Games Framework," *Policy Studies Journal* 41(3): 537-559. Tyler Scott. 2015. "Does Collaboration Make Any Difference? Linking Collaborative Governance to Environmental Outcomes," *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 34(3): 537-566. John T. Scholz and Cheng-Lung Wang. 2006. "Cooptation or Transformation? Local Policy Networks and Federal Regulatory Enforcement," *American Journal of Political Science* 50(1): 81-97. Christopher M. Weible. 2007. "An Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach to Stakeholder Analysis: Understanding the Political Context of California Marine Protected Area Policy," *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17(1): 95-117. Week of March 21: Local Government and Sustainability Megan Mullin. 2009. *Governing the Tap: Special District Governance and the New Local Politics of Water*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Kent E. Portney. 2013. *Taking Sustainable Cities Seriously: Economic Development, the Environment, and Quality of Life in American Cities*, Second Edition, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Manuel P. Teodoro. 2009. "Bureaucratic Job Mobility and the Diffusion of Innovations," *American Journal of Political Science* 53(1): 175-189. Elaine Sharp, Dorothy M Daley, and Michael Lynch. 2011. "Understanding Local Adoption and Implementation of Climate Change Mitigation

Policy,” *Urban Affairs Review* Vol. 47 (3): 433- 4557. Week of April 4: Environmental Justice Evan J. Ringquist. 2005. “Assessing Evidence of Environmental Inequities: A Meta-Analysis,” *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 24(2): 223-247. Paul Mohai and Robin Saha. 2006. “Reassessing Racial and Socioeconomic Disparities in Environmental Justice Research,” *Demography* 43(2): 383-399. Paul Mohai and Robin Saha. 2015. “Which Came First, People or Pollution? A Review of Theory and Evidence from Longitudinal Environmental Justice Studies,” *Environmental Research Letters* 10. Manuel Pastor, Jr., James L. Sadd, and Rachel Morello-Frosch. 2004. “Waiting to Inhale: The Demographics of Toxic Air Release Facilities in 21st - Century California,” *Social Science Quarterly* 85(2): 420-440. David M. Konisky and Christopher Reenock. 2013. “Compliance Bias and Environmental (In)Justice,” *Journal of Politics* 75(2): 506-519. David M. Konisky and Christopher Reenock. 2016. “Regulatory Enforcement, Riskscape, and Environmental Justice,” Working Paper. Week of April 18: Public Opinion Deborah Lynn Guber. 2003. *The Grassroots of a Green Revolution*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Stephen Ansolabehere and David M. Konisky. 2014. *Cheap and Clean: How Americans Think About Energy in the Age of Global Warming*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Robert J. Brulle, Jason Carmichael, and J. Craig Jenkins. 2012. “Shifting Public Opinion on Climate Change: An Empirical Assessment of Factors Influencing Concern over Climate Change in the U.S, 2002-2010.” *Climatic Change* 114(2): 169-188.

Frank Ackerman and Lisa Heinzerling. 2005. *Priceless: On Knowing the Price of Everything and the Value of Nothing*. The New Press. Christopher McGrory Klyza and David Sousa. 2013. *American Environmental Policy: Beyond Gridlock*. Updated and Expanded Edition. MIT Press. David M. Konisky. 2015. *Failed Promises: Evaluating the Federal Government’s Response to Environmental Justice*. MIT Press.

Matto Mildenberger

1 Course Description Many of the most serious environmental challenges facing humanity today are global in scope. Issues like climate change, long-range air pollution, biodiversity loss, ocean acidification, water shortages, ozone layer depletion, overfishing and deforestation all transcend borders. Addressing these environmental threats will involve different regions and governments working together. Yet, many efforts to coordinate global environmental policies remain stunted. For instance, twenty years of global climate negotiations have produced few successes; carbon pollution continues to be dumped into the global atmosphere by countries around the world. How can we understand differences between countries in the timing and content of their environmental policies? Why have well-resourced environmental advocacy movements emerged in some countries? Why do environmentalists in others face threats to their life? Why do business interests have a stronger say on environmental policymaking in some countries as opposed to others? How does this change policy outcomes? Why do cities located in the same area have wildly different air pollution standards? These are all questions asked by comparative environmental politics researchers. This course will explore the political dimension of environmental policy action and inaction. Our explicit focus will be understanding differences between countries in their domestic politics of the environment. However, we will also use this understanding to shed light on 1 the international politics of the environment. We will discuss how domestic political conditions serve as a critical building block for international

environmental negotiations. We will explore how ideas, interests, and institutions shape national environmental politics. We will evaluate whether current political incentives are sufficient to solve such serious environmental threats as dangerous, human-caused climate change. The course is divided into two parts. The first section will introduce students to the diverse theoretical perspectives used by political scientists to understand the politics of the environment. The second section will explore what comparative politics specifically can teach us about cross-national differences in environmental politics. By the end of this course, you will have a sophisticated understanding of how domestic political conflict across the world shapes the ability of the United States and all other countries to manage regional and global environmental risks. During lectures, we will pay particular attention to climate change; however, we will also discuss hazardous waste management, deforestation, chemicals pollution, energy policy, water conservation and biodiversity loss. The course has a waitlist for students who have not been able to enrol to date. Students on the waitlist should attend classes during the first week to preserve their place on the waitlist. If additional spaces become available, accommodation may be made for students who can demonstrate high priority need.

2 Course and Contact Information

The syllabus, assignments, and other handouts will all be available from the course Gauchospace site. My lecture slides largely consist of images and figures in support of lecture content; they do not summarize the important points from lecture in any systematic way. As a result, while I may post some slides to Gauchospace, lecture attendance and taking good notes during lecture are the keys to success in this class. The best way to contact me is either to come to my office hours or to send me an e-mail. Office hours: My office hours are Mondays 2:30-4:00 or by appointment, in Ellison Hall 3706. E-mail: I will respond within twenty-four hours to e-mails that I receive during business hours on Mondays through Thursdays. I will try to answer e-mails received prior to midafternoon on Friday by 5:00 p.m. but may not manage to respond until Monday.

3 Requirements

Your course grade will be a function of one set of lecture notes (5%), two response papers (10% each), one take-home final exam (30%), one 10-page research paper (25%) and section participation (20%). Late assignments will accumulate a penalty of 10% per day, up to a maximum of 4 days. Assignments received more than four days after the deadline will receive a grade of 0. Any requests for extensions as a result of minor or major emergencies should be directed to the course TA in advance of the deadline, and will require documentation. Extension requests received after the deadline will not be considered.

- Practice lecture notes 5%
- Response papers 10% + 10%
- Research paper 25%
- Take-home final exam 30%
- Section participation 20%

Students must complete all written assignments alone. Consider this your only warning about plagiarism. Plagiarism includes inappropriate or missing use of quotation marks and/or citations. Here is what the Campus Regulations say about plagiarism: "Representing the words, ideas, or concepts of another person without appropriate attribution is plagiarism. Whenever another person's written work is utilized, whether it be a single phrase or longer, quotation marks must be used and sources cited. Paraphrasing another's work, i.e., borrowing the ideas or concepts and putting them into one's 'own' words, must also be acknowledged." You may absolutely not submit any written work for this class that you have previously written for other classes, or that you plan on submitting as part of your coursework in other classes. Any student caught in an act of plagiarism or any form of cheating will receive an automatic F in the class. They will also be referred to the administration for further punishment. If you ever have questions about appropriate citation practices, you are responsible to consult with the course TA before submitting any course assignments.

Practice Lecture Notes

Taking effective lecture notes is key to success in this course. Good lecture notes touch on key concepts and debates we discuss

during lecture, and also provide some relevant empirical examples that we cover. They do not need to be verbatim transcripts of lecture. On Tuesday 17 January, we will be discussing theories of collective action in class. Your first assignment is simply to upload a digital copy of your lecture notes to Gauchospace (either as a word document or a scan of handwritten notes) no later than midnight. Your TAs will then be able to provide general feedback on your notes. Response Papers Two response paper prompts will be released at the end of class on Thursday 26 January and on Thursday 9 February. Hard copies of your response papers must be handed in before class on Tuesday 31 January and Tuesday 14 February respectively. Response papers handed in during or after class will be considered one-day late. For this response paper, you will write a 500 word written reflection on readings and lecture material. These will generally not require any outside research. Full details will be provided in the prompt. Research Paper Every student will submit a research paper of between 2500 and 3000 words. This paper is due by 5pm on Friday, March 3rd. You will choose your paper topic from a list of six potential topics distributed during Week 3. For the final paper, you will need to consult class readings, lecture material, and outside resources, including academic articles, books, and print journalism. I will place a selection of books that are relevant to the six paper topics in the library's short-term reserves. For each topic, you will either be asked to compare the history of a particular environmental policy across two more more countries; or contrast the political history of two environmental issues in a single country or institutional context. This final paper will be an opportunity to consolidate your understanding of class material, and 3 apply what you have learned to the task of analyzing real-world environmental challenges and outcomes. Take-home Final A 48-hour take-home mid-term will be posted to Gauchospace during the exam period at 9:30am on Tuesday 21 March. (This is the scheduled start time for our class' exam slot). Your final must be uploaded to Gauchospace by 4:00 pm no later than Thursday, 23 March. The exam format will be similar to the response papers, but may involve additional final specific readings. Additional details will be provided in class. Section During sections, you will discuss the week's readings, and their relationship with each week's lecture material. Collectively, participation in sections is worth 20% of your final grade. Half (10%) of this grade will come from section attendance and participation. The second half (10%) of your section grade will come from in-section presentations on particular national environmental policies. The schedule for and content of these presentations will be discussed during your section. You will also receive a section syllabus from your TA with full details on section expectations and grading. 4 Required Reading Materials There are no required books or course readers for this class. Instead, readings will be available for download through the UCSB library system or will be posted to the class Gauchospace website. Any assigned video or interactive content is freely available at the indicated links. 5 Required Technology Some of the class readings will be in the form of virtual reality videos. (Mostly, these will be small clips that allow you to experience particular forms of environmental change around the world). To view these videos you will need a Google Cardboard viewer. These can be purchased on Amazon or other online retailers for \$15 dollars or less. Links to videos and instructions for how to view them will be posted to Gauchospace. 6 Lecture and Reading Schedule Readings may be subject to slight changes, all announced at least one week in advance, and posted to Gauchospace on schedule. Readings will be posted by the end of the day each Friday for the following week. You should complete each week's readings before attending section. As engagement with the readings will also be important for the course's written assignments, I would encourage you to take basic notes as you go along. 4 Week 1 M: Introduction and Course Overview W: Environmental Problems as Political Problems • Paul Steinberg and Stacy VanDeveer. 2012.

“Comparative environmental politics in a global world.” Chapter 1 in Paul Steinberg and Stacy VanDeveer, eds. *Comparative Environmental Politics: Theory, Practice, Prospects*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp 3-28.

Week 2 M: Environment Politics as a Collective Action Problem W: Environment Politics as a Distributive Conflict Problem • Garrett Hardin. 1969. “The tragedy of the commons.” *Science*. 162(3859): 1243- 1248. • Lecture delivered by Elinor Ostrom at Cornell University on 17 September 2009. “Collective Action and the Commons: What Have We Learned?” Available to watch online at: <http://www.cornell.edu/video/elinor-ostrom-collective-action-and-the-commons>. • Australian Broadcasting Corporation. 2006. “The Greenhouse Mafia.” Documentary available to watch online (apologies for poor quality): <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MV05ZXFb6Y4>

Week 3 M: Environment Politics as an Ideational Conflict Problem W: Why Problem Definitions Matter • Jennifer Clapp and Peter Dauvergne. 2011. “Peril or prosperity? Mapping worldviews of global environmental change.” Chapter 1 in *Paths to a Green World: The Political Economy of the Global Environment*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp 1-18. • Bruce Tranter and Kate Booth. 2015. “Scepticism in a changing climate: A crossnational study.” *Global Environmental Change*. 33: 154-164. • James Scott. 1998. “Nature and space.” Chapter 1 in *Seeing Like a State*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. • Sharon Harlan, David Pellow and J. Timmons Robert with Shannon Bell, William Holt and Joane Nagel. 2015. “Climate justice and inequality.” Chapter 5 in Riley Dunlap and Robert Brulle, eds. *Climate Change and Society*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 5

Week 4 M: Comparative Origins of Environmentalism W: Environmental Movements Across Countries • Miranda Schreurs. 2002. “The birth of environmental movements and programs.” Chapters 2 in *Environmental Politics in Japan, Germany, and the United States*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. • Kate O’Neill. 2012. “The comparative study of environmental movements.” Chapter 5 in Paul Steinberg and Stacy VanDeveer, eds. *Comparative Environmental Politics: Theory, Practice, Prospects*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp 115-142. • John Dryzek et al. 2003. “Patterns of movement inclusion and exclusion in the four countries.” Chapter 2 in John Dryzek et al. *Green States and Social Movements: Environmentalism in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany and Norway*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. • Short online documentary about the divestment movement. Al Jazeera English. 2015. “earthrise - take the power back.” Available online at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rwjmF9vxKV4> • Three short online videos about the Pacific Climate Warriors group. – https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vqixK_V1DS8 – <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QS193BRhDIY> – <https://vimeo.com/109360466>

Week 5 M: Environment and Institutions W: The Distribution of Power • Excerpts from Matthew Crenson. 1971. *The Un-politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decisionmaking in the Cities*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press. • David Vogel. 1993. “Representing diffuse interests in environmental policymaking.” in R. Kent Weaver and Bert Rockman, eds. *Do Institutions Matter? Government Capabilities in the United States and Abroad*, pp 237-271. • Play the online game: “Law of the Jungle: The Game of Social Rules.” Available at: http://www.rulechangers.org/?page_id=1214. This free game was designed by a comparative environmental politics professor at Harvey Mudd College, Paul Steinberg, to help his students learn about environmental institutions

6 Week 6 M: Economic Institutions and Environmental Policy W: Environmental Policy and the Global Trade Regime • Lyle Scruggs. 2003. “Pluralism, corporatism and environmental performance.” Chapter 5 in *Sustaining Abundance: Environmental Performance in Industrialized Democracies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 122-161. • Janne Hukinen. 1995. “Corporatism as an impediment to ecological

sustenance: the case of Finnish waste management.” *Ecological Economics*. 15(1): 59-75. • Eric Nuemayer. 2003. “Are left-wing party strength and corporatism good for the environment? Evidence from panel analysis of air pollution in OECD countries.” *Ecological Economics*. 45(2): 203-220. Week 7 M: Comparative Climate Policy W: Comparative Forestry Policy • Kathryn Harrison and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom. 2010. “Introduction: Global Commons, Domestic Decisions.” & “Conclusion.” Chapter 1 and Chapter 9 in Kathryn Harrison and Lisa McIntosh Sundstrom, eds. *Global Commons, Domestic Decisions: The Comparative Politics of Climate Change*. 1-22; 261-286. • World Bank. 2015. *State and Trends of Carbon Pricing 2015*. Washington, DC: World Bank. • Explore the “CAIT Climate Data Explorer” prepared by the World Resources Institute (WRI). Available online at: <http://cait.wri.org/indc/#/map>. This map summarizes each countries “intended nationally determined contributions” (INDC) – commitments to take action to prevent climate change. • Benjamin Cashore and Michael Stone. 2014. “Does California need Delaware? Explaining Indonesian, Chinese, and United States support for legality compliance of internationally traded products.” *Regulation and Governance*. 8(1): 49-73. Week 8 M: Comparative Energy Policy W: Comparative Waste Policy • Johannes Urpelainen and Llewelyn Hughes. 2016. “Interests, institutions, and climate Policy: Explaining the choice of policy instruments for the energy sector.” Forthcoming in *Environmental Science and Policy*. 7 • Kate O’Neill. 2000. “Hazardous waste trading among OECD countries: A comparative approach.” Chapter 1 in Kate O’Neill. *Waste Trading Among Rich Nations: Building a New Theory of Environmental Regulation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. • Excerpts from John Wargo. 2009. *Green Intelligence: Creating Environments that Protect Human Health*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. • Watch the documentary by Slawomir Grunberg. “Chelyabinsk: The Most Contaminated Spot on the Planet.” Available online at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LYmGCIG9O6Y> Week 9 M: Environmental Politics in Emerging Economies W: Environmental Politics in Authoritarian Countries • Global Witness. 2014. *Deadly environment: The dramatic rise in killings of environmental and land defenders*. London, UK. • Paul Steinberg. 2003. “Understanding policy change in developing countries: The spheres of influence framework.” *Global Environmental Politics*. 3(1): 11-32. • *Under the Dome*, a documentary film by Chinese journalist Chai Jing. Available to watch online with subtitles at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=T6X2uwlQGQM> • Leah Stokes, Amanda Giang, and Noelle Selin. 2016. “Splitting the South: Explaining China and India’s divergence in international environmental negotiations.” Forthcoming in *Global Environmental Politics*. • Bruce Gilley. 2012. “Authoritarian environmentalism and China’s response to climate change.” *Environmental Politics*. 21(2): 287-307. Week 10 M: Environment and Violence W: The Future of Environmental Politics • Thomas Homer-Dixon. 1994. “Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases.” *Environmental Security*. 19(1): 5-40. • Daniel Deudney. “Environmental Security: A Critique?” Chapter 8 in Daniel Deudney and Richard Matthew, eds. *Contested Grounds: Security and Conflict in the New Environmental Politics.*, pp 187-223. • Solomon Hsiang, Kyle Meng and Mark Crane. 2011. “Civil conflicts are associated with the global climate.” *Nature*. 476: 438-441. • Peter Gleick. 2014. “Water, drought, climate change, and conflict in Syria.” *Weather, Climate and Society*. 6(3): 331-340.

Additional Readings and Topics in Environmental Economics

Geoffrey Heal (2017), “The Economics of the Climate,” *Journal of Economic Literature* 55(3) [somewhat technical discussion of discount rates, damage models, uncertainty, costs of substitutes, energy storage problem]

Kenneth Gillingham and James H. Stock (2018), “The Cost of Reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 32:4 [discusses costs of alternative GHG reduction policies (fuel efficiency standards, gas tax, renewables mandates for electricity, etc). Distinguishes static vs. dynamic costs (which factor in learning by doing, economies of scale, positive externalities like elec car charging stations) and argues that some actions are high on one and low on the other and vice versa. So dynamic effects can justify over the long run investments that have high up-front static costs]

Gilbert Metcalf (2020), “How to set a price on carbon pollution,” *Scientific American*

Ole Martin Laegreid and Marina Povitkina (2018), “Do Political Institutions Moderate the GDP-CO2 Relationship?” *Ecological Economics* 145

Karen Seto et al. (2016), “Carbon Lock-In: Types, Causes, and Policy Implications,” *Annual Review of Environmental Resources*

Elinor Ostrom et al. (1999) *Revisiting the Commons: Local Lessons, Global Challenges. Science*. 284 (5412), 278–282. Online through Lauinger

--additional readings on carbon tax vs. cap and trade vs. subsidies

--additional readings on cost-benefit analysis (chapter in Rosenbaum book)

Olmstead chapter in Vig and Kraft on applying economics to environmental issues

Sandler, Todd. 2004. *Global collective action* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Chapters 2 and 3, 17-44 and 45-74, 212-234.

Barrett, Scott. 2007. *Why Cooperate? The Incentive to Supply Global Public Goods*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 1-21, 74-102.

Tietenberg and Lewis, *Envt'l and natural resource economics*

Harris and Roach, *Envt'l and natural resource economics: A contemporary approach* 4th ed

Field and Field, *Envt'l economics*

Kolstad, *Envt' l Economics*

Stavins, *Economics of the Envmt: Selected Readings*

Thomas Homer-Dixon (1991) Cornucopians and Neo-Malthusians. In Art and Jervis International Politics, 539–541

• [The Meaning, Prospects, and Future of the Commons: Revisiting the Legacies of Elinor Ostrom and Henry George](#)

Obeng-Odoom, Franklin, American Journal of Economics and Sociology, March 2016, Vol.75(2), pp.372-414

• Ronald B. Mitchell (2010) chapter 2, 20–47 Defining and Distinguishing International Environmental Problems; chapter 3, 48–79 Sources of International Environmental Problems. In Mitchell International Politics and the Environment.

• Susan J. B. Cox (1985) No tragedy on the Commons. Environmental Ethics. 7(1), 49–61

8. Does the proliferation of institutions promote international cooperation?

Climate change is a paradigmatic case of institutional proliferation, with the expansion of multilateral fora and growing number of transnational and subnational efforts and actors

([Ostrom 2010](#), Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems, Elinor Ostrom, American Economic Review, Vol. 100, no. 3, June 2010, pp. 641-672.

[Green 2014](#)). Rethinking Private Authority: *Agents and Entrepreneurs in Global Environmental Governance*

The growth in the number and types of institutions involved in international cooperation has been an active area of research in international relations; climate change can contribute to a better understanding of the causes and consequences of the institutional proliferation.

In general, climate scholars are sanguine about proliferation, which can promote innovation and learning, enhance accountability, and provide scale-appropriate solutions to the diversity of problems that constitute climate change ([Ostrom 2010](#), [Jordan et al 2018](#) *Governing Climate Policy: Polycentricity in Action?* Cambridge). By contrast, works in other issue areas suggest that institutional complexity is less benign. It favors powerful states with the resources to navigate multiple venues, and select those with favorable rules. Thus, climate change can provide more data for assessing the *effects* of this proliferation across a variety of issues in world politics. ([Drezner 2009](#), The Power and Peril of International Regime Complexity, Perspectives on Politics, vol. 7 Issue 1 (March 2009) 65-71.

More readings on Common Pool Resources:

Watson, Reg, Dirk Zeller, and Daniel Pauly. “Primary Productivity Demands of Global Fishing Fleets.” Fish and Fisheries (2013): 1–9. DeSombre, Elizabeth. 2006. Global Environmental Institutions. London: Routledge. 69-98. Vincent, Amanda C J, Yvonne J Sadovy de Mitcheson, Sarah L Fowler, and Susan Lieberman. “The Role of CITES in the Conservation of Marine Fishes Subject to International Trade.” Fish and Fisheries (2013): 1-25. Stokke, Olam. 2012. “International fisheries politics: from sustainability to precaution.” International Environmental

Agreements: An Introduction. Steinar Andresen, Elin Lerum Boasson, and Geir Hønneland. Routledge, 97-116. Seilen, Alan B. 2013. "The Devolution of the Seas: The Consequences of Oceanic Destruction." *Foreign Affairs*. 1-7. Mitchell, Ronald. 1998. "Discourse and Sovereignty: Interests, Science, and Morality in the Regulation of Whaling" *Global Governance* 4 (3), 275-293.

Readings for Other Topics

International and Domestic Environmental Law

Bodansky, Brunnee, and Rajamani *International Climate Change Law*

Salzman and Thompson, *Env't law and Policy* 4th ed. Market failures, regulatory approaches, law, enforcement, air, water, toxics, land, energy, impact statements

Legalization vs. Rights Conca, Ken. 2005. "Environmental Governance After Johannesburg: From Stalled Legalization to Environmental Human Rights?" *Journal of International Law and International Relations* 1: 121-138.

All of This Machinery... Does It Work? How Would We Know? Mitchell, Ronald. "Evaluating the Effectiveness of International Environmental Institutions."

Environmental Science

NOAA. 2015. Climate Change: Global Temperature. <https://www.climate.gov/news-features/understanding-climate/climate-change-globaltemperature> EPA. 2015.

Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data.
<http://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/global.html>

J. Cook, et al, "Consensus on consensus: a synthesis of consensus estimates on human caused global warming," *Environmental Research Letters* Vol. 11 No. 4, (13 April 2016); DOI:10.1088/1748-9326/11/4/048002

Patrick J. Egan and Megan Mullin. 2016. "Recent improvement and projected worsening of weather in the United States". *Nature* 532, 357–360 (21 April 2016).

Additional sources From Michael Ross's syllabus:

Thomas Bernauer (2013), "Climate Change Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science*

Thomas Bernauer and Liam McGrath (2016), "Simple reframing unlikely to boost public support for climate policy," *Nature Climate Change* 6:7

John Cook et al. (2019), *America Misled: how the fossil fuel industry deliberately misled Americans about climate change*, George Mason University Center for Climate Change Communication.

Patrick Egan and Megan Mullin (2017), "Climate Change: US Public Opinion," *Annual Review of Political Science*, 20:209-227.

Moira Fagan and Christine Huang (2019), "A look at how people around the world view climate change," *FactTank News in the Numbers*, Pew Research

Fergus Green (2018), "Anti-fossil fuel norms," *Climatic Change* 150

Jessica Green (2017), "Don't link carbon markets," *Nature* 543.

Garrett Hardin (1968), "The Tragedy of the Commons," *Science* (162).

Peter Howe, Jennifer Marlon, Matto Mildenerger, and Brittany Shield (2019), "How will climate change shape public opinion?" *Environmental Research Letters* 14

Colin P. Kelley, Shahrzad Mohtadi, Mark A. Cane, Richard Seager, and Yochanan Kushnir (2015), "Climate change in the Fertile Crescent and implications of the recent Syrian drought," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112 (11): 3241-3246.

Michael F. Maniates (2001), "Individualization: Plant a Tree, Buy a Bike, Save the World?" *Global Environmental Politics* 1(3).

Jonas Meckling, Nina Kelsey, Eric Biber, and John Zysman (2015), "Winning coalitions for climate policy," *Science*, 349 (6253).

Matto Mildenerger (2019), "The Tragedy of 'the Tragedy of the Commons,'" *Scientific American*.to

Jesse D. Jenkins (2014), "Political economy constraints on carbon pricing policies: What are the implications for economic efficiency, environmental efficacy, and climate policy design?" *Energy Policy* 69:467-477

Edward Parson (2017), "Climate policymakers and assessments must get serious about climate engineering," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(35):9227- 9230. 8

Dave Roberts (2016), "This one weird trick will not convince conservatives to fight climate change," *Vox*.

Will Steffen, Wendy Broadgate, Lisa Deutsch, Owen Gaffney and Cornelia Ludwig (2015), "The trajectory of the Anthropocene: The Great Acceleration," *The Anthropocene Review*, 2(1):81-98.

Endre Tvinnereim and Michael Mehling (2018), " Carbon pricing and deep decarbonisation,"
Energy Policy 121: 185-189