Research Seminar in Global Environmental Politics and Justice

Political Science 623

Fall 2015

Mondays 1:30-4:20pm

Classroom: Beering B206

***Updated September 30, 2015***

**Instructor**

Dr. Kimberly Marion Suiseeya

Office: BRNG2226

Phone: (765) 496-3921 (on campus: 63921)

Email: kmarions@purdue.edu

Office Hours: Tuesdays 3:30 – 5:00 pm, Thursdays 11:00 am – 12:00 pm, or by appointment

Although it is not required, you can book an appointment during scheduled office hours to avoid waiting in line: <https://calendly.com/kimberly-marion/>. You may schedule up to 14 days in advance. To schedule an appointment outside of office hours, please email me.

**Course Description**

As the global community has struggled to address global environmental problems including climate change, forest loss and degradation, and biodiversity loss, they have increasingly recognized the need for just solutions—solutions that not only recognize the disproportionate impacts that environmental policies may have on diverse stakeholders but solutions that actively seek to prevent and mitigate injustice. In other words, justice is increasingly understood as a necessary condition for effective environmental governance.

The course specifically considers the intersection of global environmental governance, international politics, and justice in the context of the global commons. It seeks to examine the production of justice and injustice across multiple scales of governance, including an assessment of the role of regimes, states, non-state actors, and transnational advocacy networks in response to global environmental challenges. The course is divided into three main parts: first, we begin with an examination of the institutions, actors, and architecture in global environmental governance that seek to address global environmental challenges from global to local contexts. Then we move on to examining the problem of justice in global environmental governance drawing from empirical studies primarily in the political ecology literature. In the third section of the course, we examine the explanations for and responses to justice and injustice in global environmental governance. Throughout the course we will direct our attention to these dynamics within two global commons: forests and biodiversity—commons that transcend scales of governance and are integral to the livelihoods of more than one billion people in the Global South. We draw from the literature in global environmental politics, conservation and development, and environmental justice.

This graduate seminar will be of interest to students in environmental policy, international relations, and political ecology. It is of particular importance for those students wishing to understand the complexities of politics and policies in their pursuits to effectively and justly address some of our planet’s most pressing environmental challenges. Course requirements include contribution to discussion, short review assignments, peer review, presentation, and an original analytical or research paper.

**Required Texts**

The following books are recommended for purchase:

1. Biermann, Frank, and Philipp H. Pattberg, eds. *Global environmental governance reconsidered*. MIT Press, 2012.
2. Brechin, Steven R., et al., eds. *Contested nature: promoting international biodiversity with social justice in the twenty-first century*. SUNY Press, 2003. (Available online through Purdue Libraries)
3. Death, Carl, ed. *Critical environmental politics.* Abindgon: Routledge. 2013.
4. Jinnah, Sikina. *Post-treaty politics: Secretariat influence in global environmental governance*. MIT Press, 2014.
5. O'Neill, Kate. *The environment and international relations*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
6. Schlosberg, David. *Defining environmental justice: Theories, movements, and nature*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
7. Singh, Sarinda. 2012. *Natural Potency and Political Power: Forests and State Authority in Contemporary Laos.* University of Hawai’i Press. (Available online through Purdue Libraries)

Many of the required readings are journal articles, which are available to you online via Purdue’s electronic journal holdings. Readings not available in your books or online will be posted to the course Blackboard site.

**Course Requirements and Assessments**

This course is organized as a PhD-level seminar course and, as such, students are expected to come to class fully prepared each day by having read the assigned readings before class.

1. **Participation**: Active and thoughtful participation—including the ability to listen—are an essential part of this seminar and will count for 25% of the grade.
2. **Review Essays**: Students will write **two** short review essay of 5-8 pages (maximum length of 2,000 words of text including footnotes, but not including references). The essay should synthesize and critically discuss the core readings. Papers should be analytical and not descriptive. Focus on the core theoretical arguments, methodological strategies, and empirical evidence brought to bear on a research area and discuss the accomplishments of the literature critically. These essays should be circulated to course participants no later than **8 am on the morning of our class session.** **Please submit a preliminary version of your essay to me by Friday evening.** I will only grade the final version submitted to the entire class. These papers will count for 15% of the grade.
3. **Class Moderation**: Each student will **lead** the class discussion for two sessions, either alone or with a partner. You should do this for the weeks for which you prepare a review essay. Please plan to discuss the strategy to lead discussion with the instructor before the session. This requirement will count for 10% of the grade.
4. **Data Report**: Each student will write one brief report (around 1,000 words) that seeks to identify and evaluate data sources for assessing claims of justice in global conservation governance (e.g. forest and biodiversity governance). You should identify potential data sources, discuss their reliability and validity, assess the coverage of the data, and identify potentially fruitful areas for future empirical work. If appropriate, you may include some examples of where datasets have been used and identify whether there are controversies related to the quality and/or use of the data. This will count for 10% of the grade. **Due in-class 10/5.**
5. **Book Review**: Each student will write one book review from the list of suggested books provided under each topic. These reviews should not overlap with your topical essay reviews. You should summarize the core argument, methodology, and rival explanations. Your review should be targeted at a specific journal in the GEP or GEG subfields and follow that journal’s guidelines. Book reviews should be circulated to course participants no later than **8am on the morning of our class session to which the book pertains**. 10% of grade. In lieu of a book review, you may also opt to write a second review essay but you must inform the instructor no later than **August 31**.
6. **Final Paper**: Each student will prepare a final analytical paper, either an original empirical analysis or a literature review that identifies a **problem-driven** research question related to the content of our course. Each student must submit a **short memo** (3-5 pages) that describes your proposed question and highlights the main issues you will discuss. The memo is due **October 19.** The final paper should be 20-25 pages and follow standard formatting and referencing guidelines. It is due **December 12.** The final paper will count for 30% of the grade.

All written work for this class must be done individually. You may discuss each paper’s topic and your ideas in advance with your peers, provided you acknowledge them individually in your papers.

Overview of Global Environmental Politics

Week 1 (Monday, 8/24): What are some of the central puzzles in global environmental politics? How do scholars study global environmental governance? What are the questions, approaches, central concepts, and the gaps that shape our inquiries?

1. O’Neill Chapters 1 and 2
2. Hardin, Garrett. 1968. "The Tragedy of the Commons." Excerpts in Chapter 3 in *Green Planet Blues* edited by K. Conca and G. Dabelko.
3. Biermann and Pattberg Chapter 1
4. O'Neill et al (2013). "Methods and Global Environmental Governance." *Annual Review of Environmental and Resources* 38(1).
5. Death Chapters 2, 7, and 3

Architecture for Global Environmental Governance

In this first part of our course, we will examine the architecture for global environmental governance—the institutions, actors, and mechanisms—to understand how international actors attempt to address global commons challenges across multiple scales of governance. We will also examine the problems, conflicts, and principles that constitute global environmental governance.

Week 2 (Monday 8/31) Institutions: Why do certain institutional designs dominate GEG? How are these institutions designed to solve global environmental problems? How effective are the existing institutions in solving global environmental problems? What makes some global environmental problems more amenable to international cooperation over others?

1. Bernstein, Steven, et al. "God gave physics the easy problems: adapting social science to an unpredictable world." *European Journal of International Relations* 6.1 (2000): 43-76.
2. O’Neill Chapters 4-6
3. Biermann and Pattberg Chapters 5-8, 10, and 11
4. Brechin Chapter 10
5. Death Chapters 11-13
6. Dimitrov, R. (2005). Hostage to Norms: States, Institutions, and Global Forest Politics. *Global Environmental Politics 5*(4): 1-24.

*Recommended:*

1. Mitchell, Ron. 2006. Problem Structure, Institutional Design, and the Relative Effectiveness of International Environmental Agreements. *Global Environmental Politics* 6(3): 72-89.
2. Dias Guerra, Flavia et al. 2015. “Mapping the institutional architecture of global forest governance.” Technical Report R-15/04. IVM Institute for Environmental Studies.
3. Overdevest, C., & Zeitlin, J. (2014). Assembling an experimentalist regime: Transnational governance interactions in the forest sector. *Regulation & governance*, *8*(1), 22-48.

Book Review Options:

* Conca, Ken. 2015. *An unfinished foundation: the United Nations and global environmental governance.* Oxford University Press.
* Okereke, Chukwumerije. 2008. *Global Justice and Neoliberal Environmental Governance: Ethics, Sustainable Development, and International Cooperation.* Routledge.
* Steinberg, Paul. 2015. *Who Rules the Earth: How Social Rules Shape Our Planet and Our Lives*. Oxford University Press.

**LABOR DAY – NO CLASS Monday 9/7**

Week 3 (Monday 9/14) Actors: Under what conditions can different groups of actors gain access and influence in GEG? What strategies do they use to exert influence? What is the role of the state in GEG? How have they engaged in GEG and to what effect? How does global environmental politics challenge, expand, and/or contradict traditional international relations scholarship on the role of non-state actors in international cooperation? In other words, which actors matter and why? Who is not represented in GEG?

1. Wapner, Paul. "Politics beyond the state environmental activism and world civic politics." *World Politics* 47.03 (1995): 311-340.
2. Jinnah – entire book
3. Witter, Rebecca, et al. "Moments of influence in global environmental governance." *Environmental Politics* (2015): 1-19.
4. O’Neill Chapters 3 and 7
5. Biermann and Pattberg Chapters 2, 3, 11
6. Newell, Peter, Philipp Pattberg, and Heike Schroeder. "Multiactor governance and the environment." *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* 37.1 (2012).
7. Orsini, Amandine. "Multi-Forum Non-State Actors: Navigating the Regime Complexes for Forestry and Genetic Resources\*." *Global Environmental Politics* 13.3 (2013): 34-55.

*Recommended:*

1. Death Chapters 17, 24, 25
2. Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Cornell University Press, 2014.
3. Boström, Magnus and Kristina Tamm Hallström. 2010. NGO Power in Global Social and Environmental Standard-Setting. *Global Environmental Politics* 10(4): 36-69.
4. Bernauer, Thomas, Tobias Böhmelt, and Vally Koubi. "Is there a democracy–civil society paradox in global environmental governance?." *Global Environmental Politics* 13.1 (2013): 88-107.
5. Böhmelt, Tobias. "A closer look at the information provision rationale: Civil society participation in states’ delegations at the UNFCCC." *The Review of International Organizations* 8.1 (2013): 55-80.
6. Falkner, Robert. "Private environmental governance and international relations: exploring the links." *Global Environmental Politics* 3.2 (2003): 72-87.

*Book Review Options:*

1. Stevenson, Hayley and John S. Dryzek. 2014. *Democratizing Global Climate Governance,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2. Green, Jessica. 2015. *Rethinking Private Governance: Entrepreneurs in Global Environmental Governance*.
3. Ferguson, James. 1994. *The Anti-politics Machine*.

Week 4 (Monday 9/21) Politics of Knowledge: How does knowledge shape our approaches to global environmental governance? What forms of knowledge are integrated into GEG? What forms of knowledge are excluded? To what effect? How does knowledge gain traction in global environmental politics? Who produces knowledge and what strategies do they use to diffuse this knowledge in GEG?

1. Haas, Peter. 2004. “When does power listen to truth? A constructivist approach to the policy process.” *Journal of European Public Policy* 11(4): 569-92.
2. Cash, D. W., Clark, W. C., Alcock, F., Dickson, N. M., Eckley, N., Guston, D. H., ... & Mitchell, R. B. (2003). Knowledge systems for sustainable development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *100*(14), 8086-8091.
3. Jasanoff, Sheila. 1993. “Skinning scientific cats.” *New Statesman and Society*, 29-30.
4. Agrawal, A. (2002). Indigenous knowledge and the politics of classification. *International Social Science Journal*, *54*(173), 287-297.
5. Gadgil, M., Berkes, F., & Folke, C. (1993). Indigenous knowledge for biodiversity conservation. *Ambio*, *22*(2/3), 151-156.
6. Cash, D. W., Adger, W. N., Berkes, F., Garden, P., Lebel, L., Olsson, P., & Young, O. (2006). Scale and cross-scale dynamics: governance and information in a multilevel world. *Ecology and society*, *11*(2), 8.
7. Bäckstrand, Karin, and Eva Lövbrand. "Planting trees to mitigate climate change: Contested discourses of ecological modernization, green governmentality and civic environmentalism." *Global Environmental Politics* 6.1 (2006): 50-75.
8. Scott, James C. *Seeing like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998. (Available online through Purdue Libraries). **Chapters 1, 8, and 9.**
9. Biermann and Pattberg Chapter 4
10. Death Chapter 22
11. Bryant, R. L. (2002). Non‐governmental organizations and governmentality:‘consuming’ biodiversity and indigenous people in the Philippines. *Political studies*, *50*(2), 268-292.

*Recommended:*

1. Goldman, Michael. 2005. “Producing green science inside headquarters.” Chapter 3 in *Imperial Nature*. Yale University Press.

*Book Review Options:*

1. Whitt, Laurelyn. *Science, colonialism, and indigenous peoples: The cultural politics of law and knowledge*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
2. Jasanoff, Sheila. *Earthly politics: local and global in environmental governance*. MIT Press, 2004.
3. Haas, Peter M. *Saving the Mediterranean: the politics of international environmental cooperation*. Columbia University Press, 1990.

Justice Claims in Global Conservation Governance

In this section of the course, we examine the empirical literature that documents and analyzes the justice claims that emerge in the context of global forest and biodiversity conservation. We turn our attention to the Global South, where more than one billion people worldwide are “forest peoples” who rely on forest resources for their wellbeing. Drawing primarily from case studies, we will analyze how and when justice claims emerge by engaging with environmental justice theory, global justice theory, and theories of institutional emergence and change.

Week 5 (Monday 9/28) Challenges in Global Conservation Governance: What are the nature and structures of the problems in global conservation governance? How have these evolved over time and in response to global efforts to reduce deforestation, forest degradation, and biodiversity loss? What are core conflicts in global conservation governance?

1. Rands, M. R., Adams, W. M., Bennun, L., Butchart, S. H., Clements, A., Coomes, D., ... & Vira, B. (2010). Biodiversity conservation: challenges beyond 2010. *Science*, *329*(5997), 1298-1303.
2. Singh (entire book)
3. Peluso, N. L. (1993). Coercing conservation?: The politics of state resource control. *Global environmental change*, *3*(2), 199-217.
4. Ross, M. L. (1999). The political economy of the resource curse. *World politics*, *51*(02), 297-322.
5. Dowie, M. 2005. Conservation refugees: When protecting nature means kicking people out. *Orion online* . November-December: 1-12. <https://orionmagazine.org/article/conservation-refugees/>
6. Li, Tania Murray. 2007. “Politics in Contention.” Chapter 5 in *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics.* Duke University Press.
7. Death Chapters 28, 19, 21
8. Brechin et al Chapters 4, 5, 6

*Recommended:*

1. Agrawal, A., & Redford, K. (2009). Conservation and displacement: an overview. *Conservation and Society*, *7*(1), 1.
2. Blaikie, P., & Muldavin, J. (2014). Environmental justice? The story of two projects. *Geoforum*, *54*, 226-229.
3. Ribot, J. C., & Peluso, N. L. (2003). A Theory of Access\*. *Rural Sociology*, *68*(2), 153-181Death Chapter 8, 5, 6,
4. Cernea, Michael. 2006. “Re-examining ‘Displacement’: a redefinition of concepts in development and conservation policies.” *Social Change* 36(1): 8-35.
5. Preece, L. D. (2013). “Factors influencing conservation action.” Chapter 3 in *Strategies for biodiversity conservation in the Lower Mekong.* Effectiveness. (KMS has PDF).
6. Preece, L. D. (2013). “Threats and conservation actions.” Chapter 4 in *Strategies for biodiversity conservation in the Lower Mekong.* Effectiveness. (KMS has PDF).
7. Baird, Ian G., and Bruce Shoemaker. "Unsettling experiences: Internal resettlement and international aid agencies in Laos." *Development and change* 38.5 (2007): 865-888.
8. Vandergeest, P. (2003). Land to some tillers: development‐induced displacement in Laos\*. *International Social Science Journal*, *55*(175), 47-56.
9. Barrett, G., Brooks, S., Josefsson, J., & Zulu, N. (2013). Starting the conversation: land issues and critical conservation studies in post-colonial Africa. *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, *31*(3), 336-344.

*Book Review Options:*

1. Hall, Derek, et al. *Powers of exclusion: land dilemmas in Southeast Asia*. NUS Press, 2011.
2. Goldman, Michael. *Imperial Nature: the World Bank and Struggles for Social Justice in the Age of Globalization*. Yale University Press. 2005.
3. Dowie, M. (2011). *Conservation refugees: The hundred-year conflict between global conservation and native peoples*. MIT Press.
4. Li, Tania Murray. 2007. *The Will to Improve: Governmentality, Development, and the Practice of Politics.* Duke University Press.
5. Forsyth, Tim and Andrew Walker. *Forest Guardians, Forest Destroyers: the Politics of Environmental Knowledge in Northern Thailand.* University of Washington Press. 2008.

Week 6 (Monday 10/5) Theories of Justice Global Environmental Justice: What is environmental justice? Global environmental justice? How do scholars theorize and operationalize concepts of environmental justice in the GEG literature and how does this link to theories of global justice? How do scholars study global environmental justice and how does this affect how we think about addressing justice problems in forest communities?

1. Schlosberg (entire book).
2. Fraser, N. (2010). Injustice at intersecting scales: On ‘social exclusion’ and the ‘global poor’. *European journal of social theory*, *13*(3), 363-371.
3. Young, Iris. “Five faces of oppression.” Chapter 1. SUNY Albany. 2014. (KMS - PDF).
4. Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*, *25*, 25.
5. Honneth, Axel. "Recognition and justice outline of a plural theory of justice." *Acta Sociologica* 47.4 (2004): 351-364.
6. Fraser, N. (1998). From redistribution to recognition? Dilemmas of justice in a “post-socialist” age. *Feminism and politics*, 430-460.
7. Nussbaum, M. (2003). Capabilities as fundamental entitlements: Sen and social justice. *Feminist economics*, *9*(2-3), 33-59.
8. Lake, Marilyn. “Women, black, indigenous: recognition struggles in dialogue.” Chapter 6 in *Recognition struggles and social movements: contested identities, agency, and power*. Cambridge University Press. 2003. (scanned).
9. Mohai, P., Pellow, D., & Roberts, J. T. (2009). Environmental justice. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources*, *34*, 405-430.

*Recommended:*

1. Okereke, C., & Dooley, K. (2010). Principles of justice in proposals and policy approaches to avoided deforestation: towards a post-Kyoto climate agreement. *Global Environmental Change*, *20*(1), 82-95.
2. Schlosberg, D., & Carruthers, D. (2010). Indigenous struggles, environmental justice, and community capabilities. *Global Environmental Politics*, *10*(4), 12-35.

*Book Review Options:*

1. Carmin, J., & Agyeman, J. (Eds.). (2011). *Environmental inequalities beyond borders: local perspectives on global injustices*. MIT Press.
2. Shrader-Frechette, K. (2002). *Environmental justice: Creating equity, reclaiming Democracy*. Oxford University Press.
3. Sovacool, B. K., & Dworkin, M. H. (2014). *Global Energy Justice*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Holland, Breena. 2014. *Allocating the Earth: a Distributional Framework for Protecting Capabilities in Environmental Law and Policy*. Oxford University Press.
5. Okereke, C. (2007). *Global justice and neoliberal environmental governance: ethics, sustainable development and international co-operation*. Routledge.

**FALL BREAK –NO CLASS Monday 10/12**

Week 7 **(Wednesday, 10/14 – make-up from 11/30):** Theories -- Global Environmental Justice, part II: What is environmental justice? Global environmental justice? How do scholars theorize and operationalize concepts of environmental justice in the GEG literature and how does this link to theories of global justice? How do scholars study global environmental justice and how does this affect how we think about addressing justice problems in forest communities?

1. Death Chapters 14, 4
2. Brechin et al Chapters 1, 2, 3, 15
3. Dobson, Andrew. 1998. Chapters 1, 3, and 5 in *Justice and the Environment: Conceptions of Environmental Sustainability and Theories of Distributive Justice.* Oxford University Press.
4. Walker, G. (2009). Beyond distribution and proximity: exploring the multiple spatialities of environmental justice. *Antipode*, *41*(4), 614-636.
5. Martin, A., & Rutagarama, E. (2012). Just deliberation: Can communicative rationality support socially just environmental conservation in rural Africa?. *Journal of Rural Studies*, *28*(3), 189-198.
6. Suiseeya, K. R. M. (2015). A Retreat from Justice in Global Forest Governance: REDD+ and the ‘Do No Harm’ Principle.
7. Holland, Breena. 2014. “A capabilities approach to environmental valuation.” Chapter 4 in *Allocating the Earth: a Distributional Framework for Protecting Capabilities in Environmental Law and Policy*. Oxford University Press.
8. Martin, A., McGuire, S., & Sullivan, S. (2013). Global environmental justice and biodiversity conservation. *The Geographical Journal*, *179*(2), 122-131.
9. Sikor, T., Martin, A., Fisher, J., & He, J. (2014). Toward an Empirical Analysis of Justice in Ecosystem Governance. *Conservation Letters*, *7*(6), 524-532.

*Recommended:*

1. Schlosberg, D. (2013). Theorising environmental justice: the expanding sphere of a discourse. *Environmental Politics*, *22*(1), 37-55.
2. Vanderheiden, Steve. 2014. “Justice” Chapter in GEP Handbook. (scan).
3. Carmin, J., & Bast, E. (2009). Cross-movement activism: a cognitive perspective on the global justice activities of US environmental NGOs. *Environmental Politics*, *18*(3), 351-370.
4. Walker, Gordon. Chapters 2 and 3 in *Environmental Justice: Concepts, Evidence, and Politics*. Routledge. 2012.
5. Sikor, Thomas, ed. 2013. *The Justice and Injustices of Ecosystem Services*. Earthscan (Routledge).
6. Walker, G. (2010). Environmental justice, impact assessment and the politics of knowledge: The implications of assessing the social distribution of environmental outcomes. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *30*(5), 312-318.

*Book Review Options:*

1. Ciplet, D., Roberts, J. T., & Khan, M. R. (2015). *Power in a Warming World*. MIT Press.
2. Vanderheiden, S. (2008). *Atmospheric justice: a political theory of climate change*. Oxford University Press.
3. Chasek, Pamela, and Lynn M. Wagner, eds. *The roads from Rio: Lessons learned from twenty years of multilateral environmental negotiations*. Routledge, 2012. (Available online through Purdue Libraries)

Week 8 (Monday 10/19): Operationalizing and Contesting Justice in Global Conservation Governance: How do different actors institutionalize and pursue justice in global conservation governance? How do these approaches map onto theories of justice? How can we analyze and evaluate these justice approaches? What modes of resistance do different actors deploy to contest notions of justice?

1. Brechin et al Chapters 11, 12, 13, 14
2. Pickering, J., Vanderheiden, S., & Miller, S. (2012). “If Equity's In, We're Out”: Scope for Fairness in the Next Global Climate Agreement. *Ethics & International Affairs*, *26*(04), 423-443.
3. Schroeder, D., & Pogge, T. (2009). Justice and the convention on biological diversity. *Ethics & International Affairs*, *23*(3), 267-280.
4. Okereke, C. (2006). Global environmental sustainability: Intragenerational equity and conceptions of justice in multilateral environmental regimes. *Geoforum*, *37*(5), 725-738.
5. Schlosberg, David. 1999. Chapters 5 and 6 in *Environmental Justice and the New Pluralism.* Oxford University Press.
6. Auld, G., Renckens, S., & Cashore, B. (2015). Transnational private governance between the logics of empowerment and control. *Regulation & Governance*.
7. Branch, Jordan. 2011. Mapping the sovereign state: technology, authority, and systemic change. *International Organization 65*(1): 1-36.
8. Epp, R. (2001). At the Wood’s Edge: Toward a Theoretical Clearing for Indigenous Diplomacies in International Relations. *International Relations-Still an American Social Science? Toward Diversity in International Thought*, 299-324. (KMS PDF)
9. Clayton, Susan. 1992. “The experience of injustice: some characteristics and correlates.” *Social Justice Research* 5(1): 71-91.

*Recommended:*

1. Atela, J. O., Quinn, C. H., Minang, P. A., & Duguma, L. A. Implementing REDD+ in the context of integrated conservation and development projects: leveraging empirical lessons. *Land Use Policy*.

*Book Review Options*

1. Pellow, D. N. (2007). *Resisting global toxics: Transnational movements for environmental justice*. MIT Press
2. May, J. R., & Daly, E. (2014). *Global Environmental Constitutionalism*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Schiele, Susan. 2014. *Evolution of International Environmental Regimes: the Case of Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Allam et al. 2015. *International Environmental Law and the Global South.* Cambridge University Press.

**READINGS from 10/26 on TBD**

Week 8 (Monday 10/26): Linking global to local institutions

1. Crawford, S. E., & Ostrom, E. (1995). A grammar of institutions. *American Political Science Review*, *89*(03), 582-600.
2. Atela, J. O., Minang, P. A., Quinn, C. H., & Duguma, L. A. (2015). Implementing REDD+ at the local level: Assessing the key enablers for credible mitigation and sustainable livelihood outcomes. *Journal of environmental management*, *157*, 238-249.
3. Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2004). Solutions when the Solution is the Problem: Arraying the Disarray in Development. *World development*, *32*(2), 191-212.
4. Bartley, T., K. Andersson, et al. 2008. The contribution of institutional theories to explaining decentralization of natural resource governance. *Society and natural resources* 21 (2): 160-174.
5. Cashore, Benjamin and Glenn Calloway. 2010. “Ability of institutions to address new challenges.” Chapter 23 in *Forests and Society – Responding to Global Drivers of Change*. (PDF from KMS).
6. Berkes, F. (2004). Rethinking community-based conservation. *Conservation biology*, 18(3), 621-630.
7. Ovodenko, A., & Keohane, R. O. (2012). Institutional diffusion in international environmental affairs. *International Affairs*, *88*(3), 523-541.
8. Marion Suiseeya, Kimberly R. (2014). “Justice Metanorm”, chapter from unpublished dissertation, *The Justice Gap in Global Forest Governance,* Duke University.
9. Simmons, B. (2010). Treaty compliance and violation. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *13*, 273-296.
10. Young, O. R. (2002). Institutional interplay: the environmental consequences of cross-scale interactions. *The drama of the commons*, 263-291.
11. Ostrom, E. (1996). Crossing the great divide: coproduction, synergy, and development. *World development*, *24*(6), 1073-1087.

*Book Review Options:*

1. Li, T. M. (2014). *Land’s end: Capitalist relations on an indigenous frontier*. Duke University Press.
2. Poteete, A. R., Janssen, M. A., & Ostrom, E. (2010). *Working together: collective action, the commons, and multiple methods in practice*. Princeton University Press.

Week 9 (Monday 11/2): Justice for Wellbeing

1. Levy, M., S. Babu, and K. Hamilton. (2005). “Ecosystem Conditions and Human Well-being.” Chapter 5 in *Millennium Ecosystem Assessment* Volume 1: Current State and Trends*.* Available online: http://www.millenniumassessment.org/documents/document.274.aspx.pdf
2. Ballet, J., Koffi, J. M., & Pelenc, J. (2013). Environment, justice and the capability approach. *Ecological Economics*, *85*, 28-34.
3. UN. 2009. “Poverty and Well-being.” Chapter 1 in *State of the World’s Indigenous Peoples*. Available online: <http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/SOWIP/en/SOWIP_chapter1.pdf>
4. Fisher, J. A., Patenaude, G., Meir, P., Nightingale, A. J., Rounsevell, M. D., Williams, M., & Woodhouse, I. H. (2013). Strengthening conceptual foundations: analysing frameworks for ecosystem services and poverty alleviation research. *Global Environmental Change*, *23*(5), 1098-1111.
5. Popova, U. (2013). Conservation, Traditional Knowledge, and Indigenous Peoples. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 0002764213495043.
6. Daniel, T. C., Muhar, A., Arnberger, A., Aznar, O., Boyd, J. W., Chan, K. M., ... & von der Dunk, A. (2012). Contributions of cultural services to the ecosystem services agenda. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *109*(23), 8812-8819.
7. Wollenberg, E., & Springate-Baginski, O. (2009). *Incentives+: how can REDD improve well-being in forest communities?* (No. CIFOR Infobrief no. 21, p. 8p). Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia.
8. Dawson, N. (2013). *An assessment of multidimensional wellbeing in rural Rwanda: impacts of and implications for rural development and natural resource conservation* (Doctoral dissertation, University of East Anglia). **Chapter 4 ONLY.** <https://ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk/48085/1/Neil_Dawson_UEA_PhD_Thesis_Dev_2013.pdf>
9. Lebel, L., Wattana, S., & Talerngsri, P. (2015). Assessments of ecosystem services and human well-being in Thailand build and create demand for coproductive capacity. *Ecology and Society*, *20*(1), 12.
10. Mazor, J. (2010). Liberal justice, future people, and natural resource conservation. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *38*(4), 380-408.
11. Savaresi, A. (2013). REDD+ and human rights: addressing synergies between international regimes. *Ecology and Society*, *18*(3), 5.

The Justice Gap

In this section of the course, we are seeking to understand and define the justice gap in global environmental governance. How have different actors responded to justice claims and to what extent have these alleviated justice concerns? We will examine justice obligations, rights, mechanisms, norms, institutions, and actors, etc. We will also consider how other scholars are studying and answering questions related to global environmental justice and analyze how they are defining the problem of justice in global environmental governance.

Week 10 (Monday 11/9): To what extent is justice a necessary condition for effective global environmental governance?

1. Brechin, Steven R., et al., eds. *Contested nature: promoting international biodiversity with social justice in the twenty-first century*. SUNY Press, 2003.
2. Agrawal, A. (2003). Sustainable governance of common-pool resources: context, methods, and politics. *Annual review of anthropology*, 243-262.
3. Buchanan, A., & Keohane, R. O. (2006). The legitimacy of global governance institutions. *Ethics & international affairs*, *20*(4), 405-437.
4. Goertz, G. (2006). Assessing the trivialness, relevance, and relative importance of necessary or sufficient conditions in social science. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, *41*(2), 88-109.
5. Ragin, C. C., & Sonnett, J. (2005). Between complexity and parsimony: Limited diversity, counterfactual cases, and comparative analysis. In *Vergleichen in der Politikwissenschaft* (pp. 180-197). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
6. Collier, D. (2011). Understanding process tracing. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, *44*(04), 823-830.
7. Hardy, C., Harley, B., & Phillips, N. (2004). Discourse analysis and content analysis: Two solitudes. *Qualitative Methods*, *2*(1), 19-22.
8. Scoones, I. (1998). Sustainable rural livelihoods: a framework for analysis.
9. Bernstein, S. (2004). Legitimacy in global environmental governance. *J. Int'l L & Int'l Rel.*, *1*, 139.

*Recommended:*

1. Mahoney, J. (2012). The logic of process tracing tests in the social sciences. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 0049124112437709.
2. Bennett, A. (2010). “Process tracing and causal inference.” Chapter 10 in *Rethinking Social Inquiry.*

*Book Review Options:*

Goldman, M. (2006). *Imperial nature: The World Bank and struggles for social justice in the age of globalization*. Yale University Press.

Week 11 (Monday 11/16): What is the justice gap in global environmental governance? Norms, Norm Diffusion, and Institutional Change

1. Hall, P. & Taylor, R. (1996) Political science and the three new institutionalisms, *Political Studies* 44: 936–957.
2. Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International organization*, *52*(04), 887-917.
3. Gurowitz, Amy. "The diffusion of international norms: Why identity matters." *International Politics* 43.3 (2006): 305-341.
4. Cortell, A. P., & Davis Jr, J. W. (2000). Understanding the domestic impact of international norms: A research agenda. *International Studies Review*, *2*(1), 65-87.
5. Acharya, Amitav. "How ideas spread: whose norms matter? Norm localization and institutional change in Asian regionalism." *International organization* 58.02 (2004): 239-275.
6. Greif, A. (1998). Historical and comparative institutional analysis. *American Economic Review*, 80-84.
7. Marion Suiseeya, KR. 2014. Chapter 3 from *The Justice Gap in Global Forest Governance*.
8. Buchanan, Allen. 2002. “Social moral epistemology.”
9. Conca, Ken. 2006. Chapter 3 in *Governing Water*.

Week 12 (Monday 11/23): How and to what extent have different actors in global environmental governance addressed injustice? : Duties, Rights, Agents, and Principals of Global Environmental Justice

1. Forsyth, T., & Sikor, T. (2013). Forests, development and the globalisation of justice. *The Geographical Journal*, *179*(2), 114-121.
2. Okereke, C. (2008). Equity norms in global environmental governance. *Global Environmental Politics*, *8*(3), 25-50.
3. Chayes, A., & Chayes, A. H. (1993). On compliance. *International organization*, *47*(02), 175-205.
4. Carpenter, C., Duygulu, S., Montgomery, A. H., & Rapp, A. (2014). Explaining the Advocacy Agenda: Insights From the Human Security Network. *International Organization*, *68*(02), 449-470.
5. Barnett, M. N., & Finnemore, M. (1999). The politics, power, and pathologies of international organizations. *International organization*, *53*(04), 699-732.
6. REQUIRED: Each student should identify and submit at least one article, policy brief, agreement, or treaty that identifies how justice claims are currently being addressed in global conservation governance. DUE Wednesday, November 18.

Week 13 (Monday 11/30): NO CLASS (moved to 10/14)

Week 14 (Monday 12/7): In-class writing critiques and peer review

*(Dr. Marion Suiseeya will be out of town at the UNFCCC COP21 negotiations)*