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International relations deals with some of the most pressing issues facing humanity – war and peace, global political and economic governance, poverty, injustice, and environmental degradation. As international relations scholars we are motivated to take up these and other pressing global issues in our research and teaching. Nevertheless, we hold very different views on our responsibility with respect to: 1) political advocacy and policy analysis and our relationships to the centers and peripheries of various power structures; 2) whether our research should be motivated by policy oriented problem solving within existing political structures or structurally transformational; 3) how we represent and reproduce our discipline and our world through our teaching; and 4) our national citizenship responsibilities which sometimes conflict with our multiple political loyalties and identifications, the findings of our internationally oriented research, or the insights generated by an empathetic teaching style. (con’t pg.2)

ISA IPE Section Call for Papers

By Ruth Reitan, Ph.D. IPE Section Chair
Dear IPE members,

The deadline for panel and paper submissions is just 4 weeks away, by June 1. Our section was allocated 66 panels for the upcoming conference. ISA’s President Ann Tickner also encourages each section to design and submit as many themed panels as appropriate. Given the conference theme, (con’t page 4)
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- What then are the appropriate boundaries of such identifications and practices?
- How should we address the ethical dilemmas they often create?
- How, as internationally-oriented individuals and communities, should we better define, address, and perhaps satisfy, our scholarly responsibilities vis-à-vis such political issues and public policies?

The theme of the 2007 conference takes up these questions. We invite participants to explore the various dimensions and boundaries of scholarly responsibility. At certain times and in certain places, scholars have had an important and direct influence on policymaking. Yet, in the present era of unprecedented global challenges to human security, many scholars find their influence shrinking, a trend which has been viewed positively by some and negatively by others. For example, in the United States where certain ideas originating in the academy - often those most in accord with current national policy preferences - do get picked up in the policy world, the university is in danger of becoming less important for public policy-making than think tanks and corporations which pursue their own in-house research with all too predictable results.

- How much involvement with the policy world is possible or desirable?
- To what extent are scholars who choose not to enter the policy world responsible for how their ideas are used in that world?
- If our theories and/or interpretations have moral implications, can these implications be acceptable to policy-makers and are these implications tainted by political compromise?

At times of heightened security there is more pressure on political conformity and more censorship of critical ideas.
- At such times, do scholars have a special responsibility to stand up for academic freedom?
- When research findings do not accord with national policy preferences, do those of us in the academy have a special mission to protect the arena of debate and dissent?

While certain scholars are committed to incremental policy improvement through direct engagement with policy research, for others disengagement and dissent are preferable. Still others believe we are all implicated in policy making and implementation whether we like it or not.

- Whatever our convictions about the problems and possibilities of independent or “value-neutral” research, do we make responsible choices about what we choose to study?
- Do we pick research topics because they are familiar, fashionable, offer job security, or because data are readily available?
- Do we choose research questions that are readily answerable and are we driven by methodologies that are conventionally taught in graduate schools?
- What about the research questions that are rarely asked and the voices that are rarely heard?
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Often answering such questions requires training beyond traditional methodological and other disciplinary boundaries.

- Is our field open to a variety of scholarly approaches and disciplines other than political science?
- How do we exercise responsibility in judging the scholarship of others, particularly when it falls outside what is conventionally defined as within disciplinary boundaries?
- What are our responsibilities to our research subjects for whom we profess to speak but whose voices we may co-opt?
- What are the consequences of hegemonic scholarship for those in the peripheries or for those whose lives are not part of the construction of conventional knowledge about world politics?
- Does our scholarship reinforce existing power structures and existing political, social and economic inequalities?
- Is Western international relations neutral with regard to scholarly and policy practices in areas outside the West?
- What are some of the political and cultural boundaries of spreading academic knowledge across the world?
- What implications does the presence of such boundaries carry for cross-cultural dialogue and knowledge cumulation?
- Western social science scholarship has been profoundly secular and rationalist.

- Do we have a responsibility to understand religious and cultural traditions other than our own whose commitment to other forms of knowledge may be seen as equally or more valid by their proponents?

As teachers we have a special responsibility to our students, many of whom take courses in international relations because they want to make a difference in the world. We bear responsibility for constructing the framework within which our students learn to understand the world and we are accountable for how we name the world, whose voices get heard, and whose are left out. All too often, what is claimed as universal knowledge is, in reality, knowledge about the West, particularly western, predominantly white, frequently male, elites. How can we include other subjects and other knowledge traditions in our teaching and research, given the silences, lack of data, and problems of translation both linguistic and cultural?

And our responsibilities extend well beyond the policy and academic worlds - to a variety of different communities where our actions and scholarship also have meaningful consequences.

Do we as scholars bear responsibility for how our ideas are understood and used outside our immediate social and academic contexts? Do the boundaries of our responsibilities as citizens extend beyond national borders? Certain of us prefer to see ourselves as scholar/activists while others search for scientific detachment. To what extent should we express and advocate, through our teaching and scholarship, concerns of groups and individuals outside academia, such as governments, international organizations, grass-roots organizations and those on the margins of world politics? At the 2007 annual conference (con’t page 6)
“Politics, Policy and Responsible Scholarship,” we should be able to submit quite a few. So if your panel or paper speaks directly to that topic, check both boxes for ‘conference theme’ and ‘IPE’.

At the program chair meeting in San Diego, Tom Volgy stressed that we should strive for 4 papers per panel (not the much-rumored 5), with a balance between North Americans (US, Canada and Mexico) and international participants; among scholars at the senior, junior and graduate student level; and from diverse institutions. I forget whether he mentioned gender balance, but let’s assume that he did. Regarding the 4 vs. 5 paper number, it seems that you can submit either, but unlike what many seem to believe, the ISA organizers think that 4 panels is the ideal. The consensus was, however, that panel chairs need to be very disciplined with the timing if there are 5 papers, so as to provide at least 40 minutes for Q & A & C at the end.

If you are in search of panel members, you might want to put a posting on this blog, run by Patrick T. Jackson and students at American University:
http://isapannels.blogspot.com/

Finally, something new that our section has been designated to experiment with at this year’s ISA is different formats. ISA’s Director of Academic Development, Andrea Gerlak, is waiting for us to propose “innovative and experimental panel formats for the 2007 meetings”, in her words, so whoever’s idea this was, we are now supposed to put our social forum thinking-caps on. For anyone who has ever complained about or fell asleep in or fled from a dreadfully boring ISA panel, now’s your chance to be the change that you seek:

Since we are in uncharted waters here, I am thinking that the best thing to do is to submit a regular panel proposal or a roundtable, but then, somewhere in your description of it, indicate how this would be an ‘alternative format’. Also, e-mail me (r.reitan@miami.edu) with your ideas on the alternative format and letting me know what your proposed panel title is, just to give me a ‘head’s up’ that this is one of our innovative panel proposals, so that I can put you on our ‘experimental’ list.

Here are some ideas as to what alt-formats could include:

1) ‘The Jerry Springer’: Short panel presentations and audience discussions about a particularly timely or controversial IPE topic, run by a facilitator who, talk-show host style, runs around the room with a microphone and asks provocative questions. (If we could actually bring two scholars to blows, that would indeed be innovative!)
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2) ‘The House of Commons’: A debate format, where scholars stake out particular views and defend them.

3) ‘The Confessional’: Bring together leading scholars from all walks of IPE life to speak and discuss candidly about some topic, for example, the conference theme: that is, how they view the proper role between scholarship, on the one hand, and politics, policy, and responsibility on the other. Should scholars be concerned about the potential policy applications of their work? Is there such as thing as ‘responsible’ scholarship in a normative sense, beyond a commitment to good science and university/academic honor codes? And is it possible to study politics without to some degree participating in politics? This should allow time for question and answer from the audience, as well.

4) ‘The New Englander’: Policy or action-oriented forums, perhaps in a ‘town-hall’ meeting style, as was tried this year in San Diego.

5) ‘The Real World, Elite version’: Invite experts from outside academia--be they policy-makers, IGOs, NGOs, business leaders, activists--to join with a scholar or two in discussions on a particular problem or theme.

6) ‘The Real World, mass version’: Invite or involve students or community members from Chicago in a similar panel.

7) ‘The Revolution Will Be Televised’: Use internet technology to communicate with or broadcast a session.

Look forward to hearing from you with your alt ideas,

Ruth Reitan
r.reitan@miami.edu

Need to make an announcement or suggestion for the IPE Newsletter? Please forward your item(s) to Hasmet Uluorta:

hasmet@workingalternatives.net
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we wish to explore all of these questions. We encourage papers which express a wide variety of opinions on these topics.

Guidelines for Participants at ISA Annual Conventions: The Professional Rights and Responsibilities Committee has prepared this document in response to concerns that recently have been voiced about the obligations assumed by participants at the annual ISA convention.

I. Composition of the Program

1. Panels may be organized according to a variety of formats, ranging, for example, from the traditional oral presentation of research papers to poster presentations to more innovative means of presentation that utilize computer software, film, or demonstrations of teaching techniques.

2. The numbers of roundtables on the program should not be increased at the expense of the number of panels.

3. Chairs of roundtables are encouraged to assign titles to participants' topics and to request discussion papers. To facilitate applications for institutional travel funds, chairs need to send letters to roundtable participants inviting them to "prepare a paper on topic X for discussion at session Y."

4. Panel proposals from ISA sections are subject to review by the program chair(s) using the same standards of quality and suitability that are applied to other proposals.

5. Joint panels and roundtables organized collaboratively by two ISA sections are particularly encouraged and should be given special consideration by the program chair(s). Rationale: Scholars can participate in the program in a variety of ways: by chairing a panel or roundtable, by delivering a formal paper or prepared remarks on a given topic, or by serving as a discussant. The primary purpose of program activities is to encourage the full presentation and active discussion of theories and research findings, as well as to explore topics of interest from a wide range of disciplinary and theoretical perspectives. The specific format used in panels and roundtables to accomplish these goals may vary as deemed appropriate by panel chairs and the program chair(s).

II. Composition of Panels

1. The program chair(s) should maintain flexibility in order to accommodate the various scholarly aims of different types of panels. Those panels seeking to debate contending views on a topic are generally well served by a structure of two papers and two discussants. Other panels may range between three and four papers, and might have a single discussant. Only under the most extraordinary circumstances should a panel have more than four papers or a roundtable have more than six participants.

2. Regardless of the composition of panels, thirty minutes should be reserved for discussion from the floor and among the panelists. The panel chair has the right and responsibility to enforce
this norm.

3. Panel organizers should strive for a good mix of participants. The best panels often include scholars from different countries, a range of institutions, and different career stages. The best discussants are often scholars with significant experience in the field. In general, graduate students should not fill this role.

**Rationale:** There is no ideal composition for the panels. The number of formal papers and the time allocated for their presentation should be based on the scholarly objectives of the panel. In all cases, including roundtables, adequate time should be reserved for a full and active discussion after the formal presentations.

**III. Responsibility of Panel and Roundtable Chairs** By proposing and accepting responsibility for chairing a panel or roundtable, the chair accepts these obligations:

1. To inform the program chair(s) of all changes in the composition of the panel or roundtable prior to the publication of the final program. And, similarly, to inform all other participants of such changes well before the meetings begin.

2. To inform the program chair(s) of any panelist who fails to attend the panel without providing advance notification of those extenuating circumstances preventing their participation.

3. If chairing a roundtable, to circulate a detailed memo regarding the issues to be discussed by the participants well in advance of the meeting.

4. If chairing a panel, to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the discussants receive advance copies of papers, even in draft form. Five working days prior to the commencement of the meetings is the absolute minimum acceptable lead-time.

5. To hold participants to agreed-upon time limits for their presentations, so that at least thirty minutes are available for general discussion.

6. ISA will provide an overhead projector and screen for your panel. If your panelists require PowerPoint hookups, film projectors, or other A/V equipment, they must arrange this with the hotel at their own expense.

**Rationale:** Stimulating scholarly interchange requires that panelists attend their panels and roundtables, and that adequate time be set aside for discussion among panelists and the audience. The purpose of these guidelines is to provide accurate information about the nature and composition of a particular panel or roundtable and to provide sufficient time for the participants and audience to interact.

**IV. Responsibility of Panelists and Roundtable Participants** By proposing and accepting formal par-
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ticipation, participants accept these obligations:

1. To inform the panel chair, discussant of your paper, and program chairs(s) at the earliest possible date of any changes in the status of your work, your availability, or travel funding which will or is likely to prevent your participation. Failure to show up for your panel without having previously notified the panel chair, discussant, and program chairs(s) could adversely affect the likelihood of your being included on the program in future years.

2. If giving a prepared paper, to circulate copies to discussants and other panelist in advance of the meetings, and at least five working days before the commencement of the meetings. Paper presenters are also responsible for providing copies of their paper to other attendees and for uploading their paper to the online paper archive.

3. If serving as a discussant, to read carefully each of the papers that you receive at least five days prior to the conference and comment upon these papers in a constructive manner.

4. To abide by the panel chair's stipulations regarding the length of presentation and comments.

5. Unless you are a co-author and the other author(s) are presenting your paper, you have an obligation to attend and fulfill the responsibility for which you applied. This year, like last, we had far more people applying than we had space for in the program, and literally hundreds of worthy applicants were turned away. In turn, ISA's Governing Council imposed a deadline of no later than December 1st, by which time you could still cancel your participation (and the program chair could substitute another worthy participant); of if you failed to cancel your professional obligation by that date, you would be penalized by not allowing you on the program for future conferences.

6. If you are a co-author, and you are not planning on attending, and your co-author is presenting your work, please notify us immediately so we may plan for this and not spend resources unnecessarily. You can notify us at isa@u.arizona.edu.

7. ISA will provide an overhead projector and screen for your use. If you require PowerPoint hookups, film projectors, or any other A/V equipment, you must arrange this with the hotel at your own expense.

**Rationale:** The quality of scholarly interaction among panelists and the audience increases when panelists receive copies of papers in advance of the meeting and when members of the audience have access to the papers. Panelists have a professional responsibility to make copies of their papers available to convention attendees.

**V. Participation of Scholars from outside North America**

1. Panel and roundtable chairs are encouraged to invite the participation of relevant scholars outside of North America.

2. Letters confirming the participation of scholars from outside North America should be sent by the program chair(s) at the earliest possible date and, whenever possible, in advance of the publica-
tion of the preliminary program.

3. If participation of a scholar from outside North America is contingent on funding from ISA or other sources, that fact should be made clear when the proposal is submitted. Rationale: The participation of scholars from outside North America is in keeping with the purposes of the Association. Their participation is most effective if North American members have ample opportunities to interact with them as panelists and discussants and vice versa. Early indication of the need for funding will allow the program chair(s) and section organizers to provide the potential participant with the appropriate application.

VI. Frequency of Appearances

1. Participants should appear on no more than two panels or roundtables. A participant may present only one paper, except in the case of co-authorship.

2. The limitation on the number of appearances will be waived for participants serving on a panel that is honoring an ISA member, for participants from outside North America, or for other exceptional circumstances identified by the program chair(s). Rationale: Minimizing the number of appearances by any one participant increases the opportunities for participation by others.

VII. Proposal Submission

1. Scholars who submit more than one panel, roundtable or paper proposal must inform the program chair(s) and the relevant section organizers of these multiple submissions. In addition, they must indicate the order in which they wish the proposals to be considered.

2. Scholars who submit proposals for panels or roundtables must not place an individual on the proposed panel or roundtable without his or her consent.

3. Scholars wishing to participate in the program must adhere to the submission deadline. Proposals received after the deadline stipulated by the program chair(s) are unlikely to be included in the program. 

Rationale: The fact that some scholars submit multiple proposals without informing the program chair(s) and other appropriate personnel creates serious difficulties in preparing the program. Accurate information on multiple submissions will assist the program chair(s) in making the most efficient use of available sections. Adherence to the submission deadline facilitates timely completion of the program.

VIII. Notification of Unsuccessful Proposals

1. It is the responsibility of the program chair(s) and section organizers to ensure that scholars who cannot be accommodated on the program are notified by letter of that fact prior to the publication of
the preliminary program. Acceptance letters and notifications for those who submitted proposals will be sent out by e-mail from ISA starting the last week in September. Rationale: Not informing scholars that their proposals are unsuccessful until publication of the preliminary program is a professional discourtesy and a source of some bitterness.

IX. Registration and Membership

1. Pre-registration is required for all participants to be listed in the program.
2. Membership in ISA is not required for participation in the annual meetings. Nonetheless academic participants are strongly encouraged to join the Association.
3. Over the last few years, we have discovered that non-ISA members constituted about 90 percent of those who—after committing to being on the program—failed to show for their participation, and denied hundreds of other worthy applicants an opportunity to participate. As a result, the Governing Council has instituted a new policy whereby non-ISA members must preregister earlier than ISA members; otherwise they will be removed from the program. Therefore, non-ISA members will need to preregister by October 20th; ISA members will need to preregister by November 30th.

X. Travel Grants
ISA provides an annual budget for the disbursement of travel grants to needy scholars and senior graduate students, regardless of whether or not they are ISA members. Please note that these grants are not meant to cover the entire cost of attending the conference, but are meant to supplement additional resources. Normally, ISA receives five to six times the number of requests as there is budget capacity. Please note as well: if you wish to receive a travel grant, you must apply by the deadline established for the grant. Applicants requesting a grant after the deadline are extremely unlikely to receive any funding. The deadline is typically before people are notified of their admission to the program. This is done so that quickly after acceptance on the program, people will know whether or not they will receive a travel grant and accept (or reject) their participation accordingly. The deadline for travel grant applications, along with the application form, is available online at: http://www.isanet.org/travel-guideline.html.

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PROPOSALS: 1 JUNE 2006

Proposals may be submitted online using the following links:

Paper Proposals: http://www.isanet.org/ChicagoSubmit/PaperSubmit.htm
Panel Panel: http://www.isanet.org/ChicagoSubmit/PanelSubmit.htm

For more information on the 2007 Annual Convention please see:
<http://www.isanet.org/chicago2007> or e-mail <isa2007@sfsu.edu>
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**IPE Section Chair:** Barry Gills

**Program Chair:** Ruth Reitan

**At Large IPE Council Members:** Julie Muller & Phil Cerny

**Distinguished Scholar Award Committee:** Chris May

**Webmaster:** Jeffrey Hart

**Newsletter Editor & Secretary:** Hasmet Uluorta

---

**IPE Newsletter Submissions:**

Please note that submissions and suggestions should be directed to Hasmet Uluorta at hasmet@workingalternatives.net
Call For Papers

*Studies in Comparative International Development* (SCID) has recently moved from Berkeley to the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University. One of the leading journals of development studies, SCID publishes articles on issues concerning political, social, economic, and environmental change at the local, national, and international levels. In addition to original research articles on all world regions, SCID occasionally publishes reviews that summarize and assess significant, thematically linked bodies of literature and methodological essays that evaluate and/or make an original contribution to debates about the conduct of social science research.

Please consider submitting your work to SCID if you have an article that fits our profile. We plan to make the review process a speedy one, so as to provide a shorter time between submission and decision. The list of scholars who make up the Editorial Collective that manages the journal at Brown, the external Editorial Board, and the guidelines for article submission can all be found at our web site:

http://watsoninstitute.org/ped/scid/

Need to make an announcement or suggestion for the IPE Newsletter? Please forward your item(s) to:

hasmet@workingalternatives.net
Teivo Tevainen, the IPE Section Chair, called the meeting to order and described the tasks on the agenda.

Re-chartering
- Teivo Tevainen reported that the IPE Section has successfully completed its 5-year re-chartering with the help of Rene Marlin-Bennett.

Finances and Support
- **Finances**: The sections finances are great with $6002 now available.
- **Global Scholar Support**: Teivo Tevainen reports that the ISA Governing Council is considering ways to better support scholars from the global south and those that are underprivileged. Money is available for travel grant support.
- **Global Participation Initiative**: Joachim Rennstich was nominated and approved to form a committee to facilitate better participation from the global south in IPE sessions, including possibly using teleconferencing communications technology. Chris Chase-Dunn volunteered to help with this.
- **Childcare**: Jim Mittleman reported that money is available from the ISA for workshops and for childcare.

Awards
- **IPE Distinguished Scholar Award Report**: Claire Cutler chaired the IPE distinguished scholar award committee this year. She reported that Stephen Gill was given the award this year.
- **IPE Section Junior Scholar Award**: Jim Roberts chaired the IPE section Junior Scholar Award. The award is given to a graduate student who has presented a paper on an IPE session at the ISA conference. The award this year was given to Hironori Onuki for his paper on shrimp aquaculture in Thailand.
- **Outstanding Public Scholarship Award**: Barry Gills noted that next year's general theme will be public scholarship and he proposed that the IPE section should establish an award for outstanding public scholarship. Robin and Phil were approved to be on a committee to draft a proposal to establish this award.
Acknowledgements

- **Lynne Reinner Publishers Acknowledgement: Teivo Tevainen** proposed that the IPE section should organize a session or event to recognize the contributions that Lynne Reinner and her publishing firm has made to the section over the years. Rene will organize this with help from Pete Dubrowsky and ____________.

2007 ISA Conference

- **2007 Session Agreements: Randy Persaud**, this year's IPE Program Chair, reported that IPE organized 85 sessions this year. He urged the next program chair to get very clear agreements with other sections regarding joint sponsorships of sessions.

- **World Historical Systems (WHS) Subsection Report: Joachim Rennstich**, the chair of the WHS subsection of the IPE section reported that the WHS subsection intends to organize 3 panels at next year’s ISA meetings in Chicago on:
  1. Environmental Degradation in World History, Science and Technology: Past and Present
  2. Empires: Past Present and Future
  3. Golden Ages of Globalization

- The WHS subsection is also planning to submit a proposal to the Toda Foundation for a conference on Globalization and History.

IPE Section Publication Initiatives

- **Bob Denemark** spoke about the project to publish an international studies encyclopedia that he is heading up. The project will consult with ISA sections and Clair Cutler, Teivo Tevainen and Kimberley Weir volunteered to work on this for the IPE section.

- **IPE Yearbook**: A report was given on the IPE yearbook series published by Lynne Rienner.
Election of Officers

- **Program Chair:** Randy Persaud reported that it is customary for the Program Chair to be elected to become the Section Chair, but Randy said he is not able to take on the responsibilities of the Section Chair this year and so he nominated Barry Gills, who had served at the Program Chair in 2004. Barry Gills was approved by the meeting and will serve as the IPE section Chair for 2006-2007.

- **Distinguished Scholar Award Chair:** Teivo Tevainen nominated Chris May to be the chair of the Distinguished Scholar Award committee and this was approved by the membership present.

- **Program Chair:** Bob Denemark nominated Ruth Reitan to be the Program Chair for 2006-2007 and this was approved.

- **Newsletter Editor & Secretary:** Hasmet Uluorta volunteered to serve as the Newsletter Editor and Secretary.

- **Webmaster:** Jeffrey Hart wished to continue as Webmaster and this was approved.

- **At-Large Members:** Two At-large IPE Council Members were nominated and approved: Julie Muller and Phil Cerny.

---
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