PSC 8270 Fall 2026

International Political Economy

W 5:20–7:20PM

https://elearning.villanova.edu/ Bartley Hall 038

Instructor: Ryan Weldzius, Ph.D.
Office: SAC 257
Office hours: W 2:30–4:30PM (sign-up here) and by appointment
E-mail: ryan.weldzius@villanova.edu
Webpage: http://ryanweldzius.com

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Economics is the study of the production, distribution, and consumption of scarce resources. *Political economy* considers the role that the state plays in such production, distribution, and consumption. *International political economy* considers the flows of production, distribution, and consumption across national borders, recognizing that not just national governments play a role, but foreign governments and international institutions must also be taken into account.

This is a seminar, and it has three purposes: to give you command of the major theoretical models in IPE—not familiarity, command, meaning you can reproduce the mechanics at a whiteboard without notes; to teach you to read empirical political science critically, at speed, and in volume; and to make you capable of taking a theoretical claim out into the world and testing it against evidence you gathered yourself.

The course is organized around the Open Economy Politics research program and its discontents. We start from the workhorse framework—interests, institutions, interaction—and spend the semester pressuring it: with identity and psychology, with firms and supply chains, with authoritarian regimes, with financial cycles no domestic coalition chose, and with the political backlash all of this has produced.

Please note that this seminar is open to both M.A. students and seniors completing the senior seminar requirement. Expectations, readings, deadlines, and grading standards are identical for everyone in the room. You are all here to do the same work.

Core Topics

1. Trade: institutions, coalitions, preferences, and shocks
2. Firms, foreign direct investment, and global value chains
3. Immigration

4. International monetary relations and financial crises
5. The globalization backlash

LEARNING METHODOLOGY:

We have two hours. Each seminar will run the same unless otherwise specified:

1. **Entry ticket** (5 minutes). Handwritten, in the room, on that week's readings.
2. **Mechanics and Case** (20 minutes). A three-person team, five minutes each: the mechanics of one model at the whiteboard, a real case on slides, then a prepared critique.
3. **Framing lecture** (20 minutes). I supply the economics and situate the week in the field's development.
4. **Discussion** (the remaining 75 minutes). All four readings, all of you.

Note the proportions. Nearly two thirds of our time together is open discussion, which only works if everyone has done the reading. I expect every reading to be read by everyone, every week, before class. "Read," in a seminar, means you can state the puzzle, the argument, the identification or evidentiary strategy, the key finding, the principal weakness, and what the paper's existence implies about what the field believed before it was published.

READINGS:

There is no textbook to purchase. Every assigned reading is a journal article, and all of them are posted on Brightspace.

The theoretical scaffolding for each week corresponds to a chapter or two of Thomas Oatley's *International Political Economy* (6^{th} Edition), free through Falvey's course reserves. It is not assigned. If a lecture concept is unfamiliar, read the chapter; if it isn't, don't.

I also recommend you sign up for the *Financial Times*' free *Trade Secrets* newsletter. Villanova provides free FT access here.

REQUIREMENTS:

Entry tickets and seminar participation	15%
Mechanics and Case presentations (two, at 7.5% each)	15%
Midterm: field dispatch and presentation	15%
Final: field reportage, presentation, and defense	35%
Oral examination (finals week)	20%
Total	**100%**

A note on why this course is assessed the way it is. I want you to finish this semester as masters of this material—not conversant with it, not able to summarize it, but in command of it. Two convictions shape every graded item below.

The first is that mastery comes from use, not exposure. You do not know a model because you have read about it. You know it when you can build it from its assumptions, apply it to a case nobody has handed you, and say precisely where it breaks. So this course assesses you often and in varied ways: a written response every week, two model-and-case presentations, two pieces of original reporting, and an oral examination over the whole syllabus. Frequent, applied assessment is not busywork. It is the only reliable route to retention.

The second is that you should leave here comfortable thinking out loud in front of other people. Most of you will spend your careers explaining something technical to a room that has not read what you read—in a seminar, a courtroom, a client meeting, a policy briefing, a job talk. That is a skill, it is learned by repetition, and it is learned faster in a room of 10+ people than anywhere else you will be. So you will present, you will be questioned, and you will question each other, starting in the third week and continuing until the last day. By December none of this will frighten you (which is the point).

- **Entry tickets and seminar participation (15%):** Every seminar opens with five minutes of handwritten response to a question I pose on the spot about that week's readings. No devices, no notes. These are graded check-plus / check / check-minus and exist for one reason: to make preparation a weekly obligation rather than an end-of-semester cram session. Your two lowest tickets are dropped, which covers illness, travel, and the week everything went wrong. Beyond that, a missed seminar is a missed ticket.

  Participation is graded on the quality of your engagement with the readings and with each other, not on volume of speech. Coming to a seminar unprepared is conspicuous and I will grade it as such.

- **Mechanics and Case (15%; two graded turns at 7.5% each):** Each week a **three-person team** opens the seminar. The twenty minutes are divided evenly—**five minutes each**, plus time for questions. I will demonstrate the format myself in Weeks 1 and 2 before anyone is on the hook.

  The three roles are distinct, graded separately, and none of them can be prepared in a vacuum:

  1. Mechanics *(whiteboard; no slides, no notes).* Take the week's model and show us how it works. Not what it concludes—how it *works*. Draw the diagram. Define the terms. Walk us from the assumptions to the result. Then name the assumption doing the heavy lifting and tell us what happens to the conclusion when you relax it. If you cannot do this without notes, you do not yet know the model, and finding that out in September is the entire point of scheduling this early.

  2. Case *(slides, four maximum).* Show the model your teammate just built operating—or failing to operate—in a real episode. A tariff action, a plant closing, a currency intervention, a visa rule change, an IMF program, an export control, a port dispute. What did the model predict? What actually happened? Is the fit good?

  3. Critique *(no slides).* Take the case apart. Where does the model fail here, and

why? What is the strongest competing explanation? What evidence would decide between them? Close with one open question, which is where our discussion starts. **This role is not the easy one.** It is the closest thing in the course to what the oral examination will ask of you, and it is graded on the quality of the objection, not on politeness.

A case where the model fails is a better presentation than one where it succeeds—for all three of you—provided you can say precisely where it breaks.

The team prepares together and slides are due to me by 5:00PM the day before. Expect questions from me and from the seminar; handling them is part of the grade.

How turns are allocated. You present **twice**, and both turns are graded at 7.5%.

First round. In Week 1 you choose **two weeks** from Weeks 3 through 11—three students per week, first come first served. Pick topics you care about and weeks that fit the rest of your term. That fills all twenty-four first-round slots exactly, so sign up early: the last person to the sheet takes what is left.

Roles are mine to assign. Once the weeks are set I assign who does Mechanics, who does Case, and who does Critique, and I post the full schedule by the end of Week 2. You will not be given the same role twice, so everyone leaves the first round having done two of the three jobs. Roles are not negotiable.

Second round: the replacement weeks. The last two seminars—**Weeks 12 and 13**—are held back. Once the first round is complete I open their six slots for voluntary sign-up, first come first served, with priority for anyone who has not yet done Mechanics.

Note: a third turn is not extra credit. It *replaces* your lower score, and it replaces it in whichever direction it falls: if the third turn goes worse than the mark it replaces, you keep the worse one. Take it because you want another attempt at a role you did not get, or because you know you can do better than you did. Do not take it because it looks free.

- **Midterm: field dispatch and presentation (15%):** An individual, small-scale piece of reported writing, due at the start of seminar on **October 21**, with presentations that day. See page 6. Memo 10%, presentation and questions 5%.

- **Final: field reportage, presentation, and defense (35%):** A paired, institutionally grounded reportage project with original fieldwork, presented and defended in the last seminar on **December 9**. See page 7. Fieldwork dossier 8%, written piece 15%, presentation and defense 12%.

- **Oral examination (20%):** Twenty minutes, one-on-one. Our examination period is **Wednesday, December 16, 5:20–7:50PM**, which holds seven of us; anyone who does not fit will sign up for a slot elsewhere in finals week. Everyone sits the same exam under the same conditions, and I will circulate the sign-up sheet in Week 13. I publish a bank of twenty questions in Week 3 covering the entire syllabus; on the day you draw three at random. You may bring one 5×8 index card, handwritten.

The questions are not recall prompts. They ask you to put two readings against each other, to say what evidence would settle a dispute between them, to reproduce a mechanism and then break it.

Because you draw at random from the full bank, there is no subset you can safely skip. That is deliberate: it is the only exam format I know that makes studying *everything* the rational strategy.

You will have had a great deal of practice by then—thirty Mechanics and Case turns watched, two or three given, and two rounds of presentation-plus-questions on your own reporting. We will also work through the question bank together in class, so you will know exactly what the exam feels like before you sit for it.

GRADE DISTRIBUTION:

Everyone in this seminar is assessed against the same standards and the same rubrics: 94-100, A; 90-93, A-; 88-89, B+; 84-87, B; 80-83, B-; . . . 0-60, F.

Grade Appeals. If you believe you received an incorrect grade, you may formally appeal it to me within one week. The appeal consists of a one-page typed explanation identifying the problem and presenting a reasoned argument for the proposed change.

LAPTOPS, PHONES, AND NOTE-TAKING

Laptops, tablets, and phones stay closed and put away during seminar. Take your notes by hand.

The reason is not that I distrust you. It is that writing by hand is slower than typing, and the slowness is the point. You cannot transcribe longhand, so you are forced to decide what matters and put it into your own words—and that decision is where most of the learning happens. A typed record of what was said proves you were in the room; it is not evidence that you understood it.

I will not post my slides. They exist to structure the conversation we have in that room, not to substitute for it. If you miss a seminar, get notes from someone who was there and bring me what is still unclear.

Exceptions. The Case presenter uses the classroom display and the two presentation sessions—October 21 and December 9—are obviously device days.

If you have an accommodation through the Office of Disability Services that involves a device, it applies here in full. You do not need to explain it to me or to anyone else in the room—just have the letter on file.

If I am going too fast, raise your hand and say so. Please do. In a room this small the temptation is to nod and sort it out later, and later rarely comes. It is not an interruption and it is not an admission of anything—it is the most useful thing you can do for yourself

and for whoever else is quietly lost. Tell me to slow down, to say it again, to define the term, to redraw the figure on the board. Two extra minutes is always the better trade.

AI POLICY

Generative AI may not be used to produce any text you submit in this course: not the entry tickets, not the midterm dispatch, not the final reportage, not the analytic appendix. This includes outlining, paraphrasing, summarizing, editing, and revising. It also expressly includes using an AI tool to summarize an assigned reading in place of reading it—which the entry tickets are designed to detect and which the oral examination will make obvious.

You may use AI tools for two narrowly bounded purposes, and you must disclose both in a paragraph appended to the relevant assignment: (1) locating publicly available data or documents; (2) transcribing your own interview audio, provided you have the interviewee's consent to record and you correct the transcript against the audio yourself.

Everything else is prohibited. Violations receive a zero and are referred under the College Academic Integrity policy.

I will be straightforward with you about the reasoning. Most of what you are graded on here happens in a room with me in it, so the opportunity to substitute a machine for your own thinking is small. Where it exists—in the two written pieces—it is checked against a fieldwork record you assembled and against your ability to answer questions about your own reporting on your feet. A document you cannot defend live will be graded on the defense.

LEARNING SUPPORT, ACADEMIC INTEGRITY, AND ABSENCES:

Office of Disabilities (ODS) and Learning Support Services (LSS): It is the policy of Villanova to make reasonable academic accommodations for qualified individuals with disabilities. All students who need accommodations should go to Clockwork for Students via myNOVA to complete the Online Intake or to send accommodation letters to professors. Go to the LSS website (http://learningsupportservices.villanova.edu) or the ADS website (https://www1.villanova.edu/university/student-life/ods.html) for registration guidelines and instructions. If you have any questions please contact LSS at 610-519-5176 or learning.support.services@villanova.edu, or ADS at 610-519-3209 or ods@villanova.edu. If the oral examination or the whiteboard presentation requires accommodation, come see me early in the semester and we will arrange it.

Academic Integrity: All students are expected to uphold Villanova's Academic Integrity Policy and Code. Any incident of academic dishonesty will be reported to the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences for disciplinary action. See the Academic Integrity Gateway.

Absences for Religious Holidays: Villanova University makes every reasonable effort to allow members of the community to observe their religious holidays. Students who expect to miss a class or assignment due to the observance of a religious holiday should discuss the matter

with their professors as soon as possible, normally at least two weeks in advance. See the Provost's policies on religious holidays.

MIDTERM: FIELD DISPATCH (15%)

The assignment. Individually, interview one person about how the international political economy has touched their life or work, and write a 1,200-word dispatch about it. Present it to the seminar on **October 21**: five minutes, followed by five minutes of questions from me.

Keep the access easy. This is deliberately a small assignment with a nearby subject—a local business owner, a worker, a neighbor, a relative, someone at your own job. Do not spend this assignment on a hard-to-reach institutional contact. You will need those for the final project, and burning one here would be a waste. **Your dispatch subject may not overlap with your final project subject.**

Do not ask theory questions. Your interviewee is not a political scientist and will give you worse answers if you ask them to be one. Ask about experience: What changed? When did you notice? What did you do? Who did you call? What did it cost? What would you want from Washington if you could have one thing? The theory is your job.

What the dispatch contains. Roughly 1,000 words of reported narrative—a scene, a person, a voice, direct quotation—and roughly 200 words of analysis naming *one* model from the course and stating honestly whether what you found supports it, contradicts it, or is simply silent on it. **Contradiction is a result.** A dispatch reporting that a worker's preferences do not track her factor endowment, and saying what they track instead, is better than one that manufactures a tidy fit.

The presentation. Five minutes: who you talked to, what you found, which model you brought to bear, and where it held or failed. Then five minutes of questions from me—about the reporting, the model, and what you would do differently. Slides optional.

Why this exists. Three reasons, in ascending order of importance. It is practice for the final project's writing. It is practice for the oral examination's questioning. And it forces you to discover in October, while there is still time, that reporting is harder than it looks and that people do not return your first email.

Deadline. Memo submitted at the start of seminar, **Wednesday, October 21**. Late memos are not accepted; you are presenting that day. Note that fall break falls in between—do not plan to do the reporting over the break, because the person you want to talk to may be away too.

FINAL: FIELD REPORTAGE, PRESENTATION, AND DEFENSE (35%)

The assignment. In teams of two, produce a 3,000–3,500 word piece of analytical reportage, grounded in original fieldwork, about how the international political economy operates at a specific site—and defend it before the seminar on **December 9**.

This differs from the midterm dispatch in three respects: your subject must be **institutionally situated**, you must **go somewhere**, and you must bring your own **documentary or quantitative evidence** alongside the interviews.

Requirements.

1. **At least one in-person field visit.** Not a phone call. Go where the thing happens and describe it. Philadelphia is one of the best-situated cities in the country for this: PhilaPort and the Packer Avenue Marine Terminal move more perishable cargo than almost anywhere in the hemisphere; the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia is a twenty-minute train ride; Washington is ninety minutes on the Northeast Regional.
2. **At least two interviews with institutionally situated actors**—people who occupy a position in the system, not merely people affected by it. Candidates: port and terminal operators; ILA Local 1291; customs brokers and freight forwarders; a Philadelphia Fed economist; the Chamber of Commerce's international business staff; Pennsylvania's Office of International Business Development; a trade association or a firm's government-affairs office; congressional or executive-branch staff in Washington; an embassy economic officer; an immigration attorney; a commercial bank's FX or trade-finance desk; an IMF or World Bank staffer.
3. **One body of evidence you assembled yourself.** Port tonnage or container data, Comtrade or Census trade figures, lobbying disclosures, Federal Register comment dockets, SEC filings, USTR exclusion requests, visa issuance statistics—something you pulled, cleaned, and can be questioned about. Present it as a figure or table.
4. **Sustained engagement with at least three course readings** from at least two different weeks.

The analytic appendix. Separate from the reportage, a 1,000-word appendix doing what the reportage shouldn't: state precisely which theoretical claims your evidence bears on, what each predicted, what you found, and whether the fit is confirming, disconfirming, or underdetermined. An appendix honestly reporting that Frieden's sectoral model does not organize the preferences you encountered at the port is worth more than one that forces a fit.

The fieldwork dossier (8%). A dated contact log—every outreach attempt, including the ones that failed—plus field notes, question protocols, a record of consent for each interview, and any photographs or documents gathered. Due **November 18**.

Ethics. Identify yourself as a Villanova student doing coursework, every time, up front. Do not record without explicit permission. Offer pseudonymity to anyone whose employment could be affected, and honor it absolutely. Do not approach anyone whose immigration or legal status could be jeopardized by your questions—if a conversation drifts there, stop and come see me. If you plan to approach a federal employee or a foreign mission, talk to me first about making the request properly. Coursework of this kind is not human-subjects research

requiring IRB review, but if you may want to develop the project further, see me early and we will handle it correctly from the start.

The presentation and defense (12%), December 9. Twenty minutes per team: an eight-minute presentation, then twelve minutes of questions from me. Slides are permitted for your data. **You may not use notes when answering questions.** I will ask what your evidence would have looked like had your argument been wrong, and I will ask each of you individually about parts of the project your partner led.

Deliverables and deadlines.

- **Target list and access plan** (2 pages) — **Wednesday, September 23**. Three candidate sites in priority order, named contacts, how you will reach them, what evidence each would yield, and your fallback.
- **Field visit completed; fieldwork dossier submitted — Wednesday, November 18**. *(8%)*
- **Full draft circulated to the seminar — Wednesday, December 2**.
- **Final reportage and analytic appendix; presentation and defense — Wednesday, December 9**, at the start of seminar. *(15% + 12%)*

Start early. The most common failure mode is discovering in November that nobody at the port answers email in October. Your access plan is due in September for exactly that reason.

COURSE SCHEDULE:

*Subject to change. All readings posted on Brightspace.

The seminar meets fourteen times. We do not meet on October 14 (fall break) or November 25 (Thanksgiving).

WEEK 1 (*W 08/26*) — Fields and Frameworks: What Is IPE, and Whose?

Read:

1. Cohen, Benjamin J. 2007. "The transatlantic divide: why are American and British IPE so different?" *Review of International Political Economy* 14(2): 197–219.
2. Lake, David A. 2009. "Open economy politics: A critical review." *The Review of International Organizations* 4(3): 219–244.

WEEK 2 (*W 09/02*) — Trade Agreements and International Institutions

Read:

1. Rodrik, Dani. 2018. "What Do Trade Agreements Really Do?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 32(2): 73–90.
2. Goldstein, Judith L., Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz. 2007. "Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade." *International Organization* 61(1): 37–67.
3. Davis, Christina L. 2004. "International Institutions and Issue Linkage: Building Support for Agricultural Trade Liberalization." *American Political Science Review* 98(1): 153–169.
4. Goldstein, Judith, and Robert Gulotty. 2021. "America and the Trade Regime: What Went Wrong?" *International Organization* 75(2): 524–557.

WEEK 3 (*W 09/09*) — Factors, Sectors, and Coalitions

Read:

1. Rogowski, Ronald. 1987. "Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade." *American Political Science Review* 81(4): 1121–1137.
2. Scheve, Kenneth F., and Matthew J. Slaughter. 2001. "What determines individual trade-policy preferences?" *Journal of International Economics* 54(2): 267–292.
3. Hiscox, Michael J. 2002. "Commerce, Coalitions, and Factor Mobility: Evidence from Congressional Votes on Trade Legislation." *American Political Science Review* 96(3): 593–608.
4. Kim, Sung Eun, and Yotam Margalit. 2021. "Tariffs as Electoral Weapons: The Political Geography of the US–China Trade War." *International Organization* 75(1): 1–38.

Oral examination question bank distributed.

WEEK 4 (*W 09/16*) — Preferences Without Interests? Identity and Psychology

Read:

1. Mansfield, Edward D., and Diana C. Mutz. 2009. "Support for Free Trade: Self-Interest, Sociotropic Politics, and Out-Group Anxiety." *International Organization* 63(3): 425–457.
2. Betz, Timm, David Fortunato, and Diana Z. O'Brien. 2021. "Women's Descriptive Representation and Gendered Import Tax Discrimination." *American Political Science Review* 115(1): 307–315.
3. Rho, Sungmin, and Michael Tomz. 2017. "Why Don't Trade Preferences Reflect Economic Self-Interest?" *International Organization* 71(S1): S85–S108.
4. Brutger, Ryan, and Alexandra Guisinger. 2021. "Labor Market Volatility, Gender, and Trade Preferences." *Journal of Experimental Political Science* 9(2): 189–202.

WEEK 5 (*W 09/23*) — Trade Shocks and Voting

Read:

1. Autor, David, David Dorn, Gordon Hanson, and Kaveh Majlesi. 2020. "Importing Political Polarization? The Electoral Consequences of Rising Trade Exposure." *American Economic Review* 110(10): 3139–3183.
2. Colantone, Italo, and Piero Stanig. 2018. "The Trade Origins of Economic Nationalism: Import Competition and Voting Behavior in Western Europe." *American Journal of Political Science* 62(4): 936–953.
3. Broz, J. Lawrence, Jeffry Frieden, and Stephen Weymouth. 2021. "Populism in Place: The Economic Geography of the Globalization Backlash." *International Organization* 75(2): 464–494.
4. Baccini, Leonardo, and Stephen Weymouth. 2021. "Gone For Good: Deindustrialization, White Voter Backlash, and US Presidential Voting." *American Political Science Review* 115(2): 550–567.

DUE: Final project target list and access plan.

WEEK 6 (*W 09/30*) — The State: Industrial Policy and Economic Statecraft

Read:

1. Allan, Bentley B., and Jonas Nahm. 2025. "Strategies of Green Industrial Policy: How States Position Firms in Global Supply Chains." *American Political Science Review* 119(1): 420–434.
2. Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L. Newman. 2019. "Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion." *International Security* 44(1): 42–79.

3. Juhász, Réka, Nathan Lane, and Dani Rodrik. 2024. "The New Economics of Industrial Policy." *Annual Review of Economics* 16: 213–242.
4. Kalyanpur, Nikhil. 2023. "An Illiberal Economic Order: Commitment Mechanisms Become Tools of Authoritarian Coercion." *Review of International Political Economy* 30(6): 2021–2043.

WEEK 7 (*W 10/07*) — Immigration

Read:

1. Mayda, Anna Maria. 2006. "Who Is Against Immigration? A Cross-Country Investigation of Individual Attitudes toward Immigrants." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(3): 510–530.
2. Peters, Margaret E. 2015. "Open Trade, Closed Borders: Immigration in the Era of Globalization." *World Politics* 67(1): 114–154.
3. Hainmueller, Jens, and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2014. "Public Attitudes Toward Immigration." *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 225–249.
4. Alrababa'h, Ala', Andrea Dillon, Scott Williamson, Jens Hainmueller, Dominik Hangartner, and Jeremy Weinstein. 2021. "Attitudes Toward Migrants in a Highly Impacted Economy: Evidence from the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Jordan." *Comparative Political Studies* 54(1): 33–76.

Your midterm dispatch is due in two weeks and fall break is one of them. The interview should be done or scheduled before you leave this room.

(*Oct 12–16*) — FALL BREAK: no seminar

WEEK 8 (*W 10/21*) — MIDTERM: Field Dispatch Presentations

DUE at the start of seminar: the 1,200-word dispatch.

12 presentations: five minutes each, followed by five minutes of questions from me.

WEEK 9 (*W 10/28*) — Development, Foreign Investment, and the Firm

Read:

1. Doner, Richard F., Bryan K. Ritchie, and Dan Slater. 2005. "Systemic Vulnerability and the Origins of Developmental States: Northeast and Southeast Asia in Comparative Perspective." *International Organization* 59(2): 327–361.
2. Jensen, Nathan M. 2003. "Democratic Governance and Multinational Corporations: Political Regimes and Inflows of Foreign Direct Investment." *International Organization* 57(3): 587–616.
3. Osgood, Iain, Dustin Tingley, Thomas Bernauer, In Song Kim, Helen V. Milner, and Gabriele Spilker. 2017. "The Charmed Life of Superstar Exporters: Survey Evidence on Firms and Trade Policy." *The Journal of Politics* 79(1): 133–152.
4. Bauerle Danzman, Sarah, and Sophie Meunier. 2024. "The EU's geoeconomic

turn: from policy laggard to institutional innovator.' *JCMS: journal of common market studies* 62(4): 1097–1115.

WEEK 10 (*W 11/04*) — Monetary Politics I: Society-Centered Approaches

Read:

1. Frieden, Jeffry A. 1991. "Invested Interests: The Politics of National Economic Policies in a World of Global Finance." *International Organization* 45(4): 425–451.
2. Broz, J. Lawrence, and Jeffry A. Frieden. 2001. "The Political Economy of International Monetary Relations." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 317–343.
3. Walter, Stefanie. 2010. "Globalization and the Welfare State: Testing the Microfoundations of the Compensation Hypothesis." *International Studies Quarterly* 54(2): 403–426.
4. Broz, J. Lawrence, Zhiwen Zhang, and Gaoyang Wang. 2020. "Explaining Foreign Support for China's Global Economic Leadership." *International Organization* 74(3): 417–452.

WEEK 11 (*W 11/11*) — Monetary Politics II: States, Regimes, and the Euro

Read:

1. Steinberg, David A., and Krishan Malhotra. 2014. "The Effect of Authoritarian Regime Type on Exchange Rate Policy." *World Politics* 66(3): 491–529.
2. McNamara, Kathleen R. 2008. "A rivalry in the making? The euro and international monetary power." *Review of International Political Economy* 15(3): 439–459.
3. Binder, Carola Conces. 2021. "Political Pressure on Central Banks." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 53(4): 715–744.
4. Copelovitch, Mark, Jeffry Frieden, and Stefanie Walter. 2016. "The Political Economy of the Euro Crisis." *Comparative Political Studies* 49(7): 811–840.

WEEK 12 (*W 11/18*) — Capital Flows, Sovereign Debt, and the IMF

Read:

1. Rey, Hélène. 2015. "Dilemma not Trilemma: The Global Financial Cycle and Monetary Policy Independence." NBER Working Paper 21162.
2. Copelovitch, Mark S. 2010. "Master or Servant? Common Agency and the Political Economy of IMF Lending." *International Studies Quarterly* 54(1): 49–77.
3. Ballard-Rosa, Cameron, Layna Mosley, and Rachel L. Wellhausen. 2021. "Contingent Advantage? Sovereign Borrowing, Democratic Institutions and Global Capital Cycles." *British Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 353–373.
4. Nelson, Stephen C. 2014. "Playing Favorites: How Shared Beliefs Shape the IMF's Lending Decisions." *International Organization* 68(2): 297–328.

Mechanics and Case: **replacement week** — slots open by voluntary sign-up after the first round.

DUE: Field visit completed; fieldwork dossier submitted (8%).

(*Nov 25*) — THANKSGIVING BREAK: no seminar

WEEK 13 (*W 12/02*) — Crisis, Inequality, and the Backlash

Read:

1. Funke, Manuel, Moritz Schularick, and Christoph Trebesch. 2016. "Going to Extremes: Politics after Financial Crises, 1870–2014." *European Economic Review* 88: 227–260.
2. Walter, Stefanie. 2021. "The Backlash Against Globalization." *Annual Review of Political Science* 24: 421–442.
3. Rodrik, Dani. 2021. "Why Does Globalization Fuel Populism? Economics, Culture, and the Rise of Right-Wing Populism." *Annual Review of Economics* 13: 133–170.
4. Milner, Helen V. 2021. "Voting for Populism in Europe: Globalization, Technological Change, and the Extreme Right." *Comparative Political Studies* 54(13): 2286–2320.

Mechanics and Case: **replacement week** — slots open by voluntary sign-up after the first round.

DUE: Full draft of the reportage circulated to the seminar.

Last 15 minutes: oral examination logistics and a walk through the question bank.

WEEK 14 (*W 12/09*) — Final Reportage: Presentations and Defense

DUE at the start of seminar: final reportage and analytic appendix (15%).

Six teams, twenty minutes each: an eight-minute presentation, then twelve minutes of questions from me. Slides for data; no notes when answering. *(12%)*

FINALS WEEK — ORAL EXAMINATIONS (20%)

Scheduled examination period: Wednesday, December 16, 5:20–7:50PM, Bartley 038.

Twenty minutes each, one-on-one. The scheduled block accommodates seven examinations; anyone beyond that will be scheduled by appointment at another time during finals week. Sign-ups circulate in Week 13—first come, first served, and I will do my best to accommodate travel plans if you tell me early.

Three questions drawn at random from the bank distributed in Week 3. One handwritten 5×8 index card permitted. Nothing else.