Sociology 6017

Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment

Spring 2016

Mondays 3:00 – 5:30

Professor: Liam Downey, Ph.D.

Office/Phone: Ketchum 313, 303-492-8626

E-mail: Liam.Downey@colorado.edu

**Office Hours**: Tu 2:15-3:15 and by appointment

**IF YOU MISS MORE THAN TWO CLASSES YOU WILL FAIL THE COURSE**

**\*\*\*THERE WILL BE NO COMPUTER OR OTHER ELECTRONICS USE IN THE CLASSROOM\*\*\***

**Course description and goals:** I developed this course because of my overriding interest in the relationship between inequality, democracy, and the environment and because I believe that environmental sociology and environmental studies students should develop a strong structural understanding of environmental issues. In order to develop such an understanding, this course examines the relationship between a) inequality and democratic decision making in the United States (political and economic decision making), b) undemocratic decision making and U.S. and corporate food and energy policy, c) food and energy policy on the one hand and global environmental degradation, terrorism, and war on the other, and d) undemocratic corporate and U.S. decision making on the one hand and developing nation democracy and state failure on the other. These factors are all structurally inter-related, and one of the things I would like to do this semester is to work as a class to develop new theoretical models that tie these factors together in new ways.

In addition, I would like to spend some time addressing the following questions: What are the basic building blocks of society? How do they fit together? What kind of society would we like to live in? How can we achieve such a society? How can we overcome or drastically reduce the serious environmental problems we face? Are the types of solutions proposed by mainstream environmentalists likely to succeed? If not, why not and what should be done instead?

This is clearly a lot of ground to cover and as a result we will be doing a lot of reading this semester. Some of this reading will be drawn from environmental studies and environmental sociology, but much of it will be drawn from other sociological and non-sociological subfields. For example, we will spend a week learning about the sociology of markets and a couple of weeks learning about political sociology. It is my contention that we cannot understand environmental problems, nor develop solutions to these problems, without a firm grounding in these seemingly non-environmental sociological subfields. It is also my contention that for environmental sociologists to succeed professionally, they have to develop a firm grounding in non-environmental sociological subfields such as these.

Finally, I am very excited about teaching this class and hope that we all have a great semester!!!

**Required Readings:** The required readings are listed below. We will be reading 2 books (available at the book store) as well as journal articles and book excerpts. You can find links to the journal articles, book excerpts, and articles on Desire2Learn.

**Desire2Learn (D2L)**

You can find on-line readings and an electronic copy of the syllabus on D2L. To log on to D2L (1) go to <https://learn.colorado.edu/>, (2) login using your CU Login Name and IdentiKey password; (3) after login, click on the link for [SOCY:6017001 Inequality Democracy Env](https://learn.colorado.edu/d2l/lp/ouHome/home.d2l?ou=157444); (4) click on the content tab to find the readings, etc. If the reading is sideways, press the shift and control keys and the plus or minus key to rotate the reading.

**Adobe Reader:** In order to read most of the on-line readings, you need to have Adobe Reader installed on your computer. If it is not installed, you can download it from: http://get.adobe.com/reader/

**You have to purchase the following books at the UMC bookstore!**

Downey, Liam. 2015. *Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment*. New York: New York University Press.

**The following book can be found on-line at:** http://www.natcap.org/sitepages/pid20.php

Hawken, Paul, Amory Lovins, and L. Hunter Lovins. 1999. *Natural Capitalism: Creating the Next Industrial Revolution*. New York: Back Bay Books.

After you get to the ‘Natural Capitalism’ website, click on the phrase ‘more info’ that is associated with the chapter you want to read. Then, on the new web page, click on the ‘download the entire chapter’ link. The chapter will download for you. You can then save it by clicking on the download icon. **Download and save the appropriate chapters immediately!!!**

**Evaluation:** Your grade in this course will be based upon the following:

 Due Date % of Grade

1. Weekly article summaries Mondays, 10:00 a.m. 30%

 (I might change when these are due)

2. Class Participation All semester 20%

3. Final Assignment Monday, April 25, 3:00 p.m. 50%

**Adaptation of Grading Guidelines as Recommended by the Department’s Graduate Committee:**

**A**: Consistently performs well above expectations.

**A-**: Performs above expectations.

**B+**: Meets expectations.

**B**: Occasionally performs below expectations.

**B- to C**: Consistently performs below expectations.

**C- to F**: Unsatisfactory work. Serious concerns regarding student progression toward degree.

**Weekly article summaries:** Each week, each student will be responsible for writing a ***brief*** summary of all the readings (1-2 pages, double spaced, total) and a brief set of comments or questions about the readings (1/2-1 page, double spaced, total). You must submit a paper copy of this to me, **in my office mailbox**, by 10:00 a.m. on the Monday before class (I might change when these are due). **I will not accept late summaries!**

**Class participation:** Class participation is crucial in a graduate seminar. Participation involves taking part in class discussions and asking and answering questions in class in such a way as to indicate to me that you have done the reading and are actively engaged with the material. To receive participation credit you must contribute to class discussion regularly throughout the semester (without dominating the discussion) and your comments must be thoughtful and insightful. In other words, quality is just as important as quantity.

**Final Assignment:** The final assignment will be a take home assignment in which I will ask you one or two questions that will allow you to synthesize the material we have covered during the semester. For your answers, I will ask you to write a total of between 15 and 20 pages, double spaced, and I may give you the option of developing one of your own assignment questions. The assignment will be due on Monday, April 25, 3:00 p.m. I will give you the assignment questions on April 11th. You must turn in a paper version of your final assignment. **I will not print your completed assignment for you.**

**Additional course requirements:**

1. Students are responsible for *reading all the assigned books, book excerpts, and articles*.
2. *Class attendance* is **mandatory** **each week** and expected of all students.
3. *Class participation* is expected. Class participation makes up 20% of your grade.

**Weekly Topics and Readings**

**Week1 (Jan. 11): Course introduction**

**Week 2 (Jan. 18): The issues**

Important questions:

1. What are the most important global environmental problems?
2. What different forms can inequality take? How much inequality exists in this country and around the world?
3. What are the basic building blocks of society? How do they fit together? What kind of society would we like to live in? How can we achieve such a society?
4. How can we overcome or drastically reduce inequality and the serious environmental problems we face?

# **Readings:**

Environmental Problems:

Speth, James Gustave. 2004. *Red Sky at Morning: America and the Crisis of the Global Environment*. New Haven: Yale University Press. Pp. 13-the bottom of 25.

Downey, Liam. 2015. *Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment*. Pp. 1-4, 117-123, 170-174.

Foster et al. 2010. *The Ecological Rift*. **Read pp. 13-19.**

Magdoff and Foster. 2011. *What Every Environmentalist Needs to Know about Capitalism*. Read pp. 3-9.

Myers et al. 2013. “Human Health Impacts of Ecosystem Alteration.” **Read pp. 18753-first five lines of 18757**.

Inequality and Stratification:

Kerbo, Harold R. 2012. *Social Stratification and Inequality*. New York: McGraw-Hill. **Read Pp. 19-50 & 473-483.**

Anderson, Sarah and John Cavanagh. 2000. *Top 200: The Rise of Corporate Global Power*. Washington, DC: Institute for Policy Studies. **Read key findings and the tables**.

The Kassandra Report, **Read** pp. 3-4, **Skim** pp. 54-60 and 63-65.

White, D. Steven.2012. The Top 175 Global Economic Entities, 2011.

The U.N. Human Development Report 1997, **Read Pp. 15-20**.

The U.N. Human Development Report 2013, **Skim pp. 21-41 &141-161 (there are other tables you can look at too).**

**\*\*If you are interested in knowing more about how the UNHDR indicators are calculated go to** [**http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/**](http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/) **and on the upper left-hand side of the page, click on the indicator you want to learn about.**

**Week 3 (Jan. 25): Theoretical Approaches within Environmental Sociology**

Important questions:

1. Does environmental sociology do a good job of describing the forces responsible for environmental degradation? Does it point to any reasonable solutions to the problems of environmental degradation? What solutions does it point to? Are reasonable solutions good solutions, or are the only good solutions unreasonable?
2. How are the various theoretical approaches set forth in the readings different from each other? How are they related? What are the strengths and weaknesses of each?
3. What is missing from environmental sociology theorizing?
4. Do these theoretical approaches help us understand environmental problems and the structural forces causing these problems?
5. Based on the reading, what will it take to overcome the looming environmental catastrophe?

# **Readings:**

General Overview:

Dunlap, Riley E. and Brent K. Marshall. 2007. “Environmental Sociology,” pp. 329-340 in Clifton D. Bryant and Dennis L. Peck (eds.), *21st Century Sociology: A Reference Handbook, Vol. 2*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. **Read pp. 329 and 333-339**

Ecological Modernization Theory:

Mol, Arthur P.J. 1997. “Ecological Modernization: Industrial Transformations and Environmental Reform,” pp. 138-149 in Redclift, Michael and Graham Woodgate (Eds.) *The International Handbook of Environmental Sociology*.” Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar. **Read pp. 139-142.**

Fisher, Dana and William Freudenburg. 2001. Ecological Modernization and Its Critics: Assessing the Past and Looking Toward the Future. *Society and Natural Resources*. Vol. 14: 701-709. **Read 701 to bottom of 702**.

York, Richard and Eugene A. Rosa. 2003. “Key Challenges to Ecological Modernization Theory.” *Organization & Environment* 16(3): 273-288.

The Treadmill of Production:

Gould, Kenneth A., David N. Pellow, and Allan Schnaiberg. 2004. “Interrogating the Treadmill of Production: Everything you Wanted to Know About the Treadmill but were Afraid to Ask.” *Organization & Environment* 17(3): 296-316.

World Systems Theory:

Chirot, Daniel and Thomas D. Hall. 1982. “World-System Theory”. *Annual Review of Sociology*. Vol. 8: 81-106. **Read 81-84**.

Bradshaw, York W. and Michael Wallace. *Global Inequalities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press. **Read pp. 39-51.**

Kerbo, Harold. 2006. *World Poverty*. New York: McGraw Hill. **Read pp. 62-65**.

Jorgensen, Joseph G. 1978. “A Century of Political Economic Effects on American Indian Society, 1880-1980”. *The Journal of Ethnic Studies*. Vol. 6(3). **Read** **pp. 1-5**.

Roberts, J. Timmons and Peter E. Grimes. 2002. “World-System Theory and the Environment: Toward a New Synthesis”, pp. 167-194 in Dunlap et al. (Eds.), *Sociological Theory and the Environment: Classical Foundations, Contemporary Insights*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. **Read** **pp. 167-168 and 172-184**.

Rice, James. 2009. “The Transnational Organization of Production and Uneven Environmental Degradation and Change in the World Economy.” *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 50:215-236.

**Week 4 (Feb. 1): Environmental Economics / Technology & Markets**

Important questions:

1. What is the purpose of the economy? What should its purpose be? Is our economy really efficient? Does it produce/create what humans and societies really need? What would an ideal/efficient economy look like? What would it produce? What is environmental/ecological economics?
2. What is Hawken et al.’s technology and markets approach? What are its strengths and weaknesses?
3. What solutions to the environmental crisis do the authors discuss (technological, economic bookkeeping, etc.)? How feasible are these solutions? Are feasible solutions based on overly simplified and/or inaccurate understandings of society, economics, markets, and politics?

# **Readings:**

Technology & Markets Approach (aka Ecological Modernization, sort of…):

Hawken, Paul, Amory Lovins, and L. Hunter Lovins. 1999. *Natural Capitalism: Creating the Next Industrial Revolution*. New York: Back Bay Books. **Read pp. 1-11, 22-29, 48-61, 62-73, 82-94, 156-169, & 176-179 (OPTIONAL pages: 170-176, 288-296 & 300-302).**

Environmental/Ecological Economics:

Daly, Herman. 1996. *Beyond Growth: The Economics of Sustainable Development*. Boston: Beacon Press. **Read** **Pp. 27-37.**

Costanza et al. 1997. “The Value of the World’s Ecosystem Services and Natural Capital”, *Nature*. Vol. 387, **Quickly Skim** pp. 253-260.

Cobb, Clifford, Ted Halstead, and Jonathon Rowe 1995. “If the GDP is Up, Why is America Down?” *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 276(4): 59-73 (attached charts OPTIONAL).

Talberth, John et al. 2007. “The Genuine Progress Indicator 2006: Executive Summary.” **Read pp. 1-3**.

**(OPTIONAL)** Talberth, John et al. 2007. “The Genuine Progress Indicator 2006.” [The Full Report]

**(OPTIONAL)** Costanza et al. 2009. “Beyond GDP: The Need for New Measures of Progress.”

Critiques of Environmental Economics, Technological Fixes, and Cap & Trade

Downey, Liam. *Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment*, Chapter 1.

The Corner House. 2001. “Democracy or Carbocracy? Intellectual Corruption and the Future of the Climate Debate.” **Read pp. 1-8.** (Some of the numbers in this report are out of date).

York, Richard. 2012. “Do Alternative Energy Sources Displace Fossil Fuels?” **Skim pp. 1-3**.

Anderson, Kevin and Alice Bows. 2011. “Beyond Dangerous Climate Change: Emission Scenarios for a New World.” **Read the Introduction (pp. 20-21) and Conclusion (pp. 39-42)**.

Anderson, Kevin and Alice Bows. 2012. “A New Paradigm for Climate Change,” Vol. 2: 639-640.

Anderson, Kevin. 2013. “Coaxing the mitigation phoenix from the ashes of the EU ETS.” Short blog.

Anderson, Kevin. 2013. “Why carbon prices can’t deliver the 2°C target.”

**Week 5 (Feb. 8): (a) Sociology of Markets & (b) Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment.**

Important questions:

1. Given what we know about the structure of markets and the forces and institutions that structure markets, is it likely that the proposals set forth by Hawken et al. and environmental economists will be adopted? If they are adopted, will they reduce or eliminate environmental degradation?
2. What are economic and political democracy? What is the purpose of democracy? What should its purpose be? What is the purpose of social theory? What should its purpose be? Is it merely a guide to understanding the world? Or should it provide us with guidance on how to achieve our economic and democratic goals?
3. What do *social structures of accumulation* have to do with the environment?
4. What is power? What is the relationship between the economy, civil society, and the state?
5. Isn’t Mann incredible!!! What is his theory? What does his theory imply about social change and about how to effect social change? What does this imply about why we have so many serious social and environmental problems and how we need to go about solving them?

# **Readings:**

Sociology of Markets:

Sunstein, Cass R. 2004. *The Second Bill of Rights: FDR’s Unfinished Revolution and Why We Need it More than Ever Before*. New York: Basic Books. **Read** **Roosevelt’s Bill of Rights and pp. 17-25**.

Fligstein, Neil. 2001. *The Architecture of Markets: An Economic Sociology of Twenty-First-Century Capitalist Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. **Read pp. 3-28, from the bottom of 32– 47, 56-62, 64-66**.

Gordon, David M., Richard Edwards, and Michael Reich. 1982. “Segmented Work, Divided Workers.” New York: Cambridge University Press. **Read pages 1-4, 8-13, 22-32.**

Hurt, Shelley. 2011. “The Military’s Hidden Hand.” Chapter 2

Block, Fred and Matthew Keller. “Where Do Innovations Come From.” Chapter 8, read pp. 154-155 and 158-167.

Democracy:

Pateman, Carole. 1970. *Participation and Democratic Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press. Pp. 22-27, and 42-43.

Downey, Liam. “A Very Simple (Simplistic?) Definition of Democracy.”

Political Sociology 1

Mann, Michael. *The Source of Social Power Volume 1: A History of Power from the Beginning to A.D. 1760*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. **Read pp. 1-33.**

**Week 6 (Feb. 15): Political Sociology**

Important questions:

1. What is power? What is the relationship between the economy, civil society, social classes, and the state? What is the relationship between economic and political inequality? What does political sociology imply about democracy in the United States? Who rules in the United States? Was Weber right or Marx?
2. What do any of the political sociology theories and readings have to do with the environment?
3. Can state structures shape environmental outcomes?
4. What role might economic and political elites play in shaping environmental outcomes?
5. Why do so few Americans believe global warming is a serious problem? Who is to blame?

**(The Readings Are Listed On The Next Page)**

# **Readings:**

Pluralism:

Neubeck, Kenneth J. and Davita Silfen Glasberg. *Sociology: Diversity, Conflict, and Change*. New York: McGraw Hill. **Read pp. 334-337**.

State Autonomy Theory:

Skocpol, Theda. 1985. **Professor Downey’s notes to** “Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research”, pp. 3-37 in Evans, Peter and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (Eds.) *Bringing the State Back In*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Neo-Marxist Approaches to the State:

Skocpol, Theda. 1980. **Professor Downey’s notes to** “Political Response to Capitalist Crisis: Neo-Marxist Theories of the State and the Case of the New Deal”. *Politics and Society* 10(2): 155-201.

Domhoff”s Power Structure Research (what Skocpol calls Instrumentalism)

Domhoff, G. William. *The Class Domination Theory of Power*.

Domhoff, G. William. *The Power Elite and the State: How Policy is Made in America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter. **Read pp. xiii-xix, 20-24, 26-28, 37-40, and 257-264.**

Domhoff, G. William. *The Power Elite and the State: How Policy is Made in America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter. **Read pp. 107-138, 144-147, 153-166, 181-186.**

Lipton, et al. 2013. “Business Groups See Loss of Sway Over House G.O.P.

State Theory and the Environment

McCright, Aaron M. and Riley E. Dunlap. 2003. “Defeating Kyoto: The Conservative Movement’s Impact on U.S. Climate-Change Policy.” *Social Problems* 50(3): 348-373.

Bonds, Eric. 2007. “The Knowledge Shaping Process.” **Read pp. 429-431 & 441-443**.

**Week 7 (Feb. 22): (a) More Political Sociology & (b) The World Bank and International Monetary Fund**

Important questions:

1. What does the Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment (IDE) approach add to environmental sociology? How does it relate to the previous readings we have done?
2. Is globalization beneficial? Is globalization inevitable? Is the form globalization takes inevitable? Does the degree to which it is beneficial depend on the form it takes?
3. What do this week’s readings on international institutions have to do with the environment?
4. What is the relationship between domestic and global inequality and global environmental degradation, terrorism, war, underdeveloped and developed nation democracy, and state failure? What are the structural links between economic and political actors around the world? How do international trade agreements and international financial institutions affect people, communities, and the environment?

# **Readings:**

Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment:

Downey, Liam 2015. *Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment*. Chapter 2.

International Trade and Finance Institutions:

Peet, Richard. 2003. “Reading on World Bank, IMF, and WTO.” **Read pp. 56-57 and 111-113**.

Bello, Walden. 1999. *Dark Victory: The United States and Global Poverty*. Oakland: Pluto Press. **Read pp. 7-9 & 18-35 (OPTIONAL: pp. 51-71 and appendices)**.

**(Additional Readings Are Listed On The Next Page)**

Chang 2008, **Read pp. 19-23 and 40-60**.

Vreeland, James. 2007. *The International Monetary Fund: Politics of Conditional Lending*. New York: Routledge. **Read pp. 20-36, 73-94 (chapter 4), 95-100, and 106-111.**

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. 2000. *The Least Developed Countries 2000 Report*. **Read Chapter 4 (pp. 101-130).**

The World Bank in Action:

Harrison, Graham. 2004. *The World Bank and Africa: The Construction of Governance States*. New York: Routledge. **Read Chapter 1 (pp. 3-22) and pp. 39-42, 71-75, 82-94, and 111-114.**

Goldman, Michael. 2005. *Imperial Nature*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. **Read pp. 1-12 & 46-52.**

**Week 8 (Feb. 29): International Trade and Banking Organizations**

Important questions:

1. What is the relationship between domestic and global inequality and global environmental degradation, terrorism, war, underdeveloped and developed nation democracy, and state failure? What are the structural links between economic and political actors around the world? How do international trade agreements and international financial institutions affect the environment?
2. Is globalization beneficial? Is globalization inevitable? Is the form globalization takes inevitable? Does the degree to which it is beneficial depend on the form it takes?
3. How does Goldman’s research help us to understand the World Bank and how it shapes developing nations? How does the World Bank affect the way people think about development and the environment? How does it affect people, organizations, and governments in the developing world? What networks and organizations is the World Bank tied to? What role has it played in creating these networks?
4. What role do inequality, restricted decision making, organizational networks, and institutional mechanisms play in (a) creating and enforcing international treaties, (b) creating international trade and banking institutions, and (c) enforcing the rules these organizations impose on nations?
5. How might we extend Downey’s argument to the WTO?

# **Readings:**

The World Bank in Action in Asia:

Goldman, Michael. 2005. *Imperial Nature*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. **Read pp. 151-194.**

Putting it All Together:

Downey, Liam. Chapter 3.

The WTO:

Peet, Richard. 2003. “Reading on World Bank, IMF, and WTO.” **Read pp. 146-147 and 153-158**.

Wallach, Lori and Patrick Woodall. 2004. *Whose Trade Organization: A Comprehensive Guide to the WTO*. **Read pp. 239-253, 19-30, 36-45**.

Brack and Gray. 2003. “Multilateral Environmental Agreements and the WTO.” **Read pp. 4-7 & 18-22.**

Public Citizen. 2015. “Fatally Flawed WTO Dispute System Fact Sheet.”

Narlikar, Amrita. 2001. “WTO Decision Making and Developing Countries.” **Read pp. 1-13**

Kwa, Aileen. 2002. “Power Politics in the WTO.” **Skim pp. 41-end of 67**.

**(Additional Readings Are Listed On The Next Page)**

Narlikar and van Houten 2010. “Uncertainty and Deadlock in the WTO.” **Read pp. 142-143.**

Narlikar, Amrita. 2012. “Collective Agency, Systemic consequences.” **Read pp. 184-186 and 189-bottom of 197**.

**Week 9 (March 7): International Trade and Banking Organizations, Privatization, and Property Rights Law**

Important questions:

1. How are local, state, and national governments and world and regional trade organizations and agreements related to each other? How will the erosion of prevailing property rights law affect people around the world? Should things like water and genetic codes be privatized? Was Marx right about the eventual commodification of everything? How do international trade agreements affect the environment? Are U.S. citizens in a similar structural position vis a vis corporations, governments, and international organizations as are citizens of other nations?
2. What role do inequality, restricted decision making, organizational networks, and institutional mechanisms play in (a) creating and enforcing international treaties, (b) creating international trade and banking institutions, and (c) enforcing the rules these organizations impose on nations?

# **Readings:**

Property Rights:

Drahos, Peter. 2003. “Expanding Intellectual Property's Empire: the Role of FTAs.” **Read pp. 1-13.**

Shiva, Vandana and Radha Holla-Bhar. 1996. “Piracy by Patent: The Case of the Neem Tree”. Pp. 146-159 in Mander, Jerry and Edward Goldsmith (Eds.) *The Case Against the Global Economy*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.

NAFTA, Property Rights, and the Environment:

Greider, William. 2001. “The Right and U.S. Trade Law: Invalidating the 20th Century”. *The Nation*.

Public Citizen 2005 (NAFTA Report), **Read pp. viii-xi (Don’t look at earlier pages).**

Public Citizen 2010 (NAFTA Chapter 11 Cases). **Quickly Skim the tables to get a sense of whether you agree with the claims of activist organizations.**

Dreiling, Michael. 2001. *Solidarity and Contention: The Politics of Security and Sustainability in the NAFTA Conflict*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. **Read pp. 87-111**.

Other Free Trade Agreements (FTAs)

Public Citizen 2015. “Prosperity Undermined.” **Read pp. 1, 8-12, 16-24, 29-30**.

Public Citizen 2015. “Investor State Attacks Case Studies.” **Read pg. 1 and skim 2 or 3 of the short case studies from different parts of the report.**

U.S. Trade Representative’s Office 2015. “Summary of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.” **Read pp. 1-2 and look at the headings of the rest of the document, which indicate the issues covered by the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.**

Carter, Zach. 2013. “TPP Secrecy.”

Correa, Carlos. 2015. “Intellectual Property in the TPP.” **Read pp. 7-14.**

Public Citizen 2015c. “Initial Analyses of Key TPP Chapters.” **Read 3-top of 5, 6-top of 8, 22-23**.

Public Citizen 2013. “Top 10 TAFTA Threats.” **Quickly skim this document**.

**(Additional Readings Are Listed On The Next Page)**

Water Privatization:

The Center for Public Integrity. Feb. 3, 2003. “Promoting Privatization.” <http://www.publici.net/water/report.aspx?aid=45>

Barlow 2010 (Our Right to Water), pp. 4-14 and 21-22

Goldman, Michael. 2005. *Imperial Nature*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. **Read pp. 221-266.**

**Week 10 (March 14): Agriculture**

Important questions:

1. What are the social and environmental consequences of agriculture? Can the social and environmental problems brought about by agriculture be overcome with technological change or changes in consumer behavior, or are more deep-reaching structural changes necessary? In other words, how easy will it be to change corporate and consumer behavior?
2. How is the agricultural industry structured? How does its structure affect farmer, consumer, and corporate behavior? How does corporate, consumer, and government behavior affect the structure of agriculture? Are farmer, consumer, and corporate behavior so determined by the structure of the agricultural industry that the entire structure has to change before consumer and farmer behavior can change? If so, how do we get this structure to change?
3. How does the structure of the agricultural industry tie us to farmers and consumers around the world? Does it put the average U.S. citizen in a position of being an exploiter (in the Marxist sense) of underdeveloped nation labor?
4. What is the relationship between chemical companies, seed companies, agricultural processors, and the U.S. government? Do this week’s readings do a good job of documenting these relationships?
5. How does agro-imperialism affect agriculture and developing nations?

# **Readings:**

The Structure of the Agriculture Industry:

Downey, Liam. Chapter 4

Hauter, Wenonah. 2012. *Foodopoly*. **Read pp. 11-24.**

Carolan, Michael. 2011. *The Real Cost of Cheap Food*. **Read pp. 12-20, 57-66, 140-145**.

IATP. 2008. “The Global Food Price Crisis.”

IATP 2011. “Feeding the World?”

AAI. 2009. “A Question of Governance.” **Read pp. 1-6, bottom of 11-13 and 21**.

Agro-Imperialism:

Rice, Andrew. 2009. “Is There Such a Thing as Agro-Imperialism?” *New York Times Sunday Magazine*.

GRAIN. 2008. “Seized: The 2008 Land Grabbers for Food and Financial Security.”

Braun, Joachim von and Ruth Meinzen Dick. 2009. “Table for the IFPRI Report.” **Quickly skim the table**.

Democracy Now Interview with Bill Quigley. Read it on D2L or listen to it at: <http://www.democracynow.org/2008/4/24/the_us_role_in_haitis_food>

(**Optional**). Grain 2008. “Table for the GRAIN Report.” **This Table is more detailed than the IFRPRI Table.**

(**Optional**). Wallach, Lori and Patrick Woodall. 2004. *Whose Trade Organization*. Chapter 7.

**Week 11 (March 21): Spring Break, No Classes**

**Week 12 (March 28): Forest Certification, Armed Violence, Resource Wars, & Mining**

Important questions:

1. What role did foundations play in creating forest certification programs? Does Bartley’s article support or contradict Domhoff’s argument? How does Bartley’s article help us to think about the role that inequality, social networks, and social movement activity play in producing environmental outcomes?
2. How are wars, military preparedness, and structural adjustment related to natural resource extraction?
3. What is the relationship between resource scarcity, war, and environmental degradation?
4. How do elite-controlled mechanisms interact to produce the social and environmental harm we are reading about this week?
5. What does Bunker and Ciccantell’s theory add to our understanding of environmental degradation? How is their theory related, if it all, to the Treadmill of Production theory, Ecological Modernization Theory, or the arguments that Fligstein makes?
6. According to Bunker and Ciccantell, what is the relationship between technology, social institutions, economic power, exploitation, and environmental devastation?

**Readings:**

Forest Certification:

Bartley, Tim. 2007. “How Foundations Shape Social Movements: The Construction of an Organizational Field and the Rise of Forest Certification.” *Social Problems* 54(3): 229-255.

Resource Wars:

Klare, Michael T. 2001. *Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict*. New York: Metropolitan Books. **Read pp. 118-123, 131-136, 190-226.**

Mining:

Bunker, Stephen and Paul Ciccantell. 2005. *Globalization and the Race for Resources*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press. **Read Chapter 1.**

Downey, Liam. *Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment*. Chapter 5.

**Week 13 (April 4): Blood & Oil / Possible Solutions to the Environmental Crisis**

First Set of Important Questions:

1. How is petroleum used in modern industrial societies?
2. How likely are we to overcome our petroleum addiction? Is it simply a matter of changing consumer preferences and behavior, of getting prices right, or of corporations adopting new technologies? Or are we dependent on oil because important elites want us to continue using oil? Or is oil simply too deeply embedded in our social structure to remove without causing major disruptions?
3. What are the social and environmental consequences of war and militarism?
4. Why did the U.S. invade Iraq? What role did elites and elite-controlled organizations, institutions, and networks play in shaping the decision to invade Iraq? How democratic was this decision?
5. How important are inequality and weak democratic institutions in perpetuating war, global dependence on oil, human misery, and environmental devastation?
6. Can we stop fighting resource wars? How likely is it that the U.S. will drastically reduce its armed power and forsake military intervention in order to reduce environmental devastation? Will the U.S. do this in response to consumer or voter preferences?
7. What is the relationship between domestic and global inequality and environmental degradation, terrorism, war, underdeveloped nation democracy, and state failure? What is the relationship between resource scarcity, war, and environmental degradation?

**(The Readings Are Listed On The Next Page)**

**Readings:**

Blood and Oil

Klare, Michael T. 2004. *Blood and Oil: The Dangers and Consequences of America’s Growing Dependency on Imported Petroleum*. New York: Metropolitan Books.

**Read Chapter 2 and pp. 132-145**

Downey, Liam, Chapter 6**.**

Berschinski, Robert. 2007. “AFRICOM’s Dilemma.” **Read pp. v-vi and 1-11**.

Branch, Adam. 2011. “AFRICOM: Militarizing Peace.” Chapter 7 in *Displacing Human Rights*.

Turse, Nick. 2015. Chapters 1, 3, and 5, and pp. 59-68 from *Tomorrow’s Battlefield*.

Skim through the following webpage and the web links associated with this page: <http://www.africom.mil/what-we-do>

U.S. Departments of Defense and State. 2012(?). “Foreign Military Training: Report to Congress, Volumes 1 and 2.” **In Volume 1, Quickly skim pp. II-1 to II-7 and sections III-1 and IV-1**. **In Volume 2 (which is in the same pdf as Volume 1), quickly skim Section 1**.

U.S. Department of State (I believe). “Report to Congress on Direct Commercial Sales Authorizations FY 2013.” **Just search for the authorization and shipment totals for a handful of African nations, including Algeria, Benin, Botswana, Cameroon, Djibouti, Morocco, and Nigeria**. **Also look up Saudi Arabia and Israel**.

Second Set of Important Questions

A. What will it take to overcome the looming environmental catastrophe?

B. What solutions to the looming environmental catastrophe do this week’s readings offer? What are

 the strengths and weaknesses of these solutions? Do these solutions have a reasonable chance of

 success? Why? Why not? Are more reasonable solutions likely to solve the environmental crisis?

C. Does environmental sociology do a good job of explaining the forces responsible for environmental

 degradation? Does it point to any reasonable solutions to the problems of environmental degradation?

 What does it leave out?

D. Does the ‘Inequality, Democracy, and the Environment’ approach do a good job of explaining the

 forces responsible for environmental degradation? What does this approach leave out? What are its

 strengths and weaknesses?

E. Does the IDE approach point to any reasonable solutions to environmental degradation? Can Erik Olin

 Wright’s approach for promoting social empowerment be used to develop a better set of ‘IDE’

 solutions?

**Readings:**

Downey, Liam, Chapter 7**.**

Wright, Erik Olin. 2010. *Envisioning Real Utopias*.

 \*Everyone will read pp. 150-154 and 191-194.

 \*6 Groups readings: pp. 155-167, 167-179, 204-222, 222-234, 234-246, 252-265

**Week 14 (April 11): Solutions and Theory**

\*I will hand out a small group assignment at the end of our Week 13 class that you will work on instead of doing any reading for this week (though you will want to refamiliarize yourselves with the readings you have already done this semester). We will spend this week’s class talking about the small group assignment, the semester’s course material, and the final assignment, which I will hand out toward the end of class.

**Week 15 (April 18): Preparing for the Final Assignment**

\*Instead of holding a regular class session, I will hold office hours during the first hour or two of class to discuss the exam with you.

**Week 16 (April 25): Final Assignment Due**

\*Early evening potluck at Professor Downey’s house (assuming my wife agrees).

**University Policies**

**ACCOMODATION:**

Disability, Religious & Activity Accommodations:

1. If you qualify for an accommodation due to a disability, please submit to the instructor a letter from Disability Services that details the appropriate accommodations by the end of the second week of class. Disability Services determines accommodations based upon documented disabilities. For more information call 303-492-8671, or visit their office at N200 Center for Community, or go to their website <http://disabilityservices.colorado.edu/>.

2. Campus policy regarding religious observances requires that faculty make every effort to reasonably and fairly deal with all students who, because of religious obligations, have conflicts with scheduled exams, assignments or required attendance. If the observance of a religious holiday or activity conflicts with the course requirements, please make the dates of the conflict(s) known to the instructor in writing by the end of the second week of class. <http://www.colorado.edu/policies/observance-religious-holidays-and-absences-classes-andor-exams>.

3. If participation in a university-supported activity (athletic competitions, artistic performances, etc.) conflicts with the course requirements, please make the dates and nature of the conflicts known to the instructor in writing by the end of the second week of class. Students will be asked to provide evidence of participation for any exceptions.

**HONOR CODE:**

All students of the University of Colorado at Boulder are responsible for knowing and adhering to the academic integrity policy of this institution. Violations of this policy may include: cheating, plagiarism, aid of academic dishonesty, fabrication, lying, bribery, and threatening behavior. All incidents of academic misconduct shall be reported to the Honor Code Council (honor@colorado.edu; 303-735-2273). Students who are found to be in violation of the academic integrity policy will be subject to both academic sanctions from the faculty member and non-academic sanctions (including but not limited to university probation, suspension, or expulsion). Other information on the Honor Code can be found at <http://www.colorado.edu/policies/student-honor-code-policy>.

**LEARNING ENVIRONMENT:**

Students and faculty each have responsibility for maintaining an appropriate learning environment. Students who fail to adhere to behavioral standards may be subject to discipline. See polices at

<http://www.colorado.edu/policies/student-classroom-and-course-related-behavior> and at

<http://www.colorado.edu/studentaffairs/studentconduct/code.html>

**DISCRIMINATION AND HARRASSMENT:**

The University of Colorado at Boulder Discrimination and Harassment Policy and Procedures, the University of Colorado Sexual Harassment Policy and Procedures, and the University of Colorado Conflict of Interest in Cases of Amorous Relationships policy apply to all students, staff, and faculty. Any student, staff, or faculty member who believes s/he has been the subject of sexual harassment or discrimination or harassment based upon race, color, national origin, sex, age, disability, creed, religion, sexual orientation, or veteran status should contact the Office of Discrimination and Harassment (ODH) at 303-492-2127 or the Office of Student Conduct (OSC) at 303-492-5550.

Information about the ODH, the above referenced policies, and the campus resources available to assist individuals regarding discrimination or harassment can be obtained at: <http://www.colorado.edu/policies/discrimination-and-harassment-policy-and-procedures>.