

POLI 4523/5523

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY 1: ORDER, CONFLICT, AND CHANGE

Seminar: Mondays, 1:30-4:30pm, McCain 1170

Professor Brian Bow (brian.bow@dal.ca)

Office: HHAAB 301A (tel: 494-6629)

Office hours: Tuesdays, 10:00-noon



POLI 4523/5523 is a graduate-level seminar course on theoretical perspectives on International Relations. Normally the department offers two such courses—POLI 4523/5523 and POLI 4524/5524—the first on core theories and security and the second focused on the problem of cooperation and International Political Economy. This year we are only offering one grad-level IR theory seminar, which will combine themes from the usual versions of both courses.

The reading list for this course includes some of the “classics” in the field and some of the best of contemporary IR/IPE scholarship. (It’s a big field of study, of course, and we’ll only be seeing the tip of the proverbial iceberg...) Our purpose here is to develop a sound understanding of the basic assumptions and recommendations of the various theoretical perspectives, to assess them logically and empirically, and to think about how we might incorporate them into our own research.

Assignments and assessment

Assignment	Due date	Share of final grade
Class participation	every week...	20%
Review paper/presentation #1	see below	5%
Review paper/presentation #2	see below	5%
Major paper #1	October 21	35%
Major paper #2	December 2	35%

Class participation

I will do some small-scale lecturing from time to time, but this is a (graduate-level) seminar class, and all students are expected to contribute to the discussion. Your class participation grade will be based on the quantity and quality of your contributions to class discussion. It goes without saying—and yet for some reason I feel compelled to say it anyway—that attendance is absolutely mandatory. If you miss more than two classes without a valid reason (e.g., serious illness), you will get a zero for the class-participation portion of your grade.

Before each class, you should: 1. carefully read all of the required readings assigned for the given week; 2. make a few preparatory notes for discussion—e.g., a few sentences on the main ideas from

each reading, plus a short list of ideas you thought were especially useful, arguments you disagreed with, or concepts you didn't understand; and 3. carefully read and think about the review paper(s) for the given week (see below).

Over the course of the semester, there will be two scheduled times when you will have extra responsibility for leading class discussion. For each of these, you will do two things: First, you will prepare a short review paper, to be sent out to me and to the other students before class. Second, you will give a very brief presentation in class which summarizes your review paper and relates its main points to themes that came up in the class discussion.

For the review papers, you will begin by choosing two of the RECOMMENDED readings from future weeks of the course. It's up to you to pick the readings yourself, but I'm happy to give you some suggestions, if you like. (General advice: Don't choose a very short reading with few ideas to work through.) Review papers should be very direct and concise (i.e., each average 500 words, absolute maximum 750 words). The papers should give not only a clear and effective summary of the selected reading, but also offer your own insights and opinions on the relevant issues, especially where that involves making creative connections to other readings and/or debates. We will do the official choosing of readings for the review papers at the beginning of the second seminar, on September 19.

Review papers will be due at least 48 hours before the class which will tackle the relevant readings (i.e., 1:30pm on the Saturday before the class for which your chosen reading was recommended). You'll send the finished review paper to me and to all of the students in the class, by email. Because these review papers are supposed to be an important part of all students' seminar preparation, late papers (without a valid excuse) will be severely penalized.

Your in-class presentation should also be brief and to-the-point (i.e., average 5 minutes, absolute maximum 8 minutes). Your presentation should NOT just be a reading of your review paper. Just quickly summarize your main points, and then focus on trying to make connections to themes raised in the class discussion that day (and, where appropriate, in previous seminars).

Major Papers

For both of the two major papers, you will choose your own topic/question, but each will be a different kind of essay. Each of the two papers should be about 5000 words. Presentation is important here, in the sense of having clear and correct prose, careful editing, and proper citations, but also in the sense of being methodical, well-organized, and concise.

The first paper (due October 21) will be a comment on a contemporary theoretical innovation or debate, with specific attention to specific, recently-published books or articles. There are a variety of forms that this could take; I will suggest three here, just to get you started:

- i. an explainer, in which you discuss what has been said about a particular concept or theory, clear away some common misunderstandings, and clarify for non-specialist readers the

- meaning of the concept or theory, and what is at stake in understanding it properly (e.g., what's at stake in the growing popularity of experiments as tests of theory?);
- ii. a typology, in which you identify and explain different types of phenomena under study, conceptualizations of a phenomena or concept, and/or theoretical perspectives, and help readers understand what's out there by a complex subject into a small number of categories or types (e.g., what are the three main kinds of constructivism?); or
 - iii. a periodization, in which you explain the evolution of a debate over time, highlighting different historical phases within that evolution (e.g., where did "neoclassical realism" come from?).

You could try to combine more than one of these elements in your paper, but don't let it get too complicated. The important thing here is to find something in contemporary theoretical debates that seems interesting to you, and potentially confusing/controversial to others, figure out what you think about that thing, and present your ideas in a way that could be interesting to a broader audience.

The second paper (due December 2) will be a case study paper, in which you will use a particular historical case (e.g., a historical event or trend, like World War II or decolonization), or possibly a pair of comparable cases, as an empirical "test" for competing IR theories: e.g., "Which theoretical perspective best accounts for Gorbachev's decision to make unilateral cuts to the USSR's nuclear arsenal in the late 1980s—Realism, Liberalism, or Constructivism?" My expectation is that you will do extensive empirical research on your selected case or cases, and be prepared to argue with other scholars with some expertise on that case or cases, about what it/they can tell us about a larger theoretical debate. However, I do not expect that you will revolutionize our understanding of the historical episode itself, or that your paper will decisively confirm or defeat any of the theoretical perspectives. Rather, the point is to show that you understand what's involved in applying and evaluating the theories empirically. (Though of course you would also like to be interesting and innovative where possible...)

You are strongly encouraged (but not strictly required) to discuss your research paper ideas with me as soon as they are reasonably solid. (This should really happen at least two weeks before the paper is due, but I will give feedback on proposals or outlines right up until a few days before the due date...)

General policies concerning assignments, deadlines, and grades

The University Calendar makes plain that "[s]tudents are expected to complete class work by the prescribed deadlines. Only in special circumstances (e.g. the death of a close relative) may an instructor extend such deadlines." Late essays will be assessed a penalty at the instructor's discretion. Students who miss the deadline for a review paper or major paper on account of illness are expected to hand the assignment in within one week of their return to class, with a medical certificate in hand, per academic regulations in the Dalhousie Calendar.

Plagiarism (intentionally or unintentionally representing other people's ideas as your own) is a serious violation of academic ethics, and will be taken seriously in this class. For info on what plagiarism is, how to avoid it, and the penalties for not doing so, see:

http://www.dal.ca/dept/university_secretariat/academic-integrity.html

Resources

In order to keep the cost of readings down, on-line readings have been used wherever possible. Most of these are available through the university library's subscriptions to on-line indexes like JSTOR and ProQuest.

Disclaimer

This course syllabus is intended as a general guideline. The instructor reserves the right to reschedule or revise assigned readings, assignments, lecture topics, etc., as necessary.

Course schedule and reading list

WEEK ONE	INTRODUCTION / REVIEW
Class meeting:	September 12
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the main dividing lines in IR theory debates? • What questions do those draw out? What questions are ignored?
Required reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jack Snyder, "One World, Rival Theories," <i>Foreign Policy</i> 145 (2004).

WEEK TWO	REALISM VS LIBERALISM
Class meeting:	September 19
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The philosophical roots of realism and liberalism • Realism and liberalism as paradigms/theories • Cooperation as a theoretical problem • The end of the realism vs liberalism debate?

<p>Required reading:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. E.H. Carr, <i>The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to International Relations</i> (any edition), chs. 1-3, 5-6. 2. Robert Axelrod and Robert Keohane, "Achieving Cooperation in Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions" <i>World Politics</i> 38 (1985): 226-254. 3. Robert Powell, "Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations" <i>American Political Science Review</i> 85 (1991): 1303-1320. 4. Robert Jervis, "Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate" <i>International Security</i> 24 (1999): 42-63.
<p>Recommended reading:</p>	<p><u>Realisms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kenneth N. Waltz, <i>Man, the State, and War</i> (Columbia, 1959), esp. chs. 1-2, 4, 6. • Arnold Wolfers, <i>Discord and Collaboration</i> (Johns Hopkins, 1967), chs. 6, 8. • Hans J. Morgenthau, <i>Politics Among Nations</i> (6th ed., Knopf, 1985), chs. 1-4. • Kenneth N. Waltz, <i>Theory of International Politics</i> (Addison-Wesley, 1979), chs. 4-6. • Robert Gilpin, <i>War and Change in World Politics</i> (Cambridge, 1981), esp. chs. 4-5. • John J. Mearsheimer, <i>The Tragedy of World Politics</i> (Norton, 2001), esp. chs. 1-2. <p><u>Liberalisms</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael W. Doyle, <i>Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, Socialism</i> (Norton, 1997), part 1. • John Owen, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace" <i>International Organization</i> 19 (1994): 87-125. • Bruce Russett and John Oneal, "The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992," <i>World Politics</i> 52 (1999): 1-37. • John Gerard Ruggie, "International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order," in Krasner, ed., <i>International Regimes</i> (Cornell, 1983).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Krasner, “Regimes and the Limits of Realism: Regimes as Autonomous Variables,” in Krasner, ed., <i>International Regimes</i> (Cornell, 1983). • Robert O. Keohane, <i>After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy</i> (Princeton, 1984), esp. ch. 3. • Stephen Krasner, “Global Communications and National Power: Life on the Pareto Frontier,” <i>World Politics</i> 43 (1991). • Jennifer Sterling-Folker, “Realist Environment, Liberal Process, and Domestic-Level Variables” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 41 (1997): 1-25. • G. John Ikenberry, “Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order,” <i>International Security</i> 23 (1998/99).
--	--

WEEK THREE	CONSTRUCTIVISM VS RATIONALISM
Class meeting:	September 26
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructivism’s philosophical and (meta)theoretical challenges to rationalism • Constructivism’s empirical challenges to rationalism • What constructivist research looks like • What now?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics” <i>International Organization</i> 46 (1992): 391-425. 2. Andrew Moravcsik, “Is Something Rotten in the State of Denmark? Constructivism and European Integration” <i>Journal of European Public Policy</i> 6 (1999). 3. Alexander Wendt & James Fearon, “Rationalism vs Constructivism: A Skeptical View,” in Walter Carlsnaes, et al., eds., <i>Handbook of International Relations</i> (Sage, 2001). 4. Debora Welch Larson, “How Identities Form and Change: Supplementing Constructivism with Social Psychology,” in Vaughn P. Shannon & Paul A. Kowert, eds., <i>Psychology and Constructivism in International Relations: An Ideational Alliance</i> (University of Michigan Press, 2012).

<p>Recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexander Wendt, <i>Social Theory of International Politics</i> (Cambridge, 1990), esp. chs. 1-2. • Timothy Dunne, "The Social Construction of International Society" <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 3 (1995): 367-390. • John Gerard Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together?" <i>International Organization</i> 52 (1998): 855-885. • Michael Barnett & Martha Finnemore, "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations," <i>International Organization</i> 53 (1999). • Dale C. Copeland, "The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay" <i>International Security</i> 25 (2000): 187-212. • Jennifer Sterling-Folker, "Competing Paradigms or Birds of a Feather?" <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 44 (2000): 97-120. • Mark Blyth, "Structures Do Not Come with an Instruction Sheet: Interests, Ideas, and Progress in Political Science," <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 1 (2003). • Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," <i>International Organization</i> 52 (2005): 887-917. • Jennifer Mitzen, "Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma," <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 12 (2006): 341-370. • Vincent Pouliot, "Subjectivism: Towards a Constructivist Methodology," <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 51 (2007): 359-384. • Vaughn P. Shannon & Paul A. Kowert, eds., <i>Psychology and Constructivism in International Relations: An Ideational Alliance</i> (University of Michigan Press, 2012). • Emanuel Adler, "Constructivism in International Relations: Sources, Contributions, and Debates," <i>Handbook of International Relations</i> 2 (2013): 112-144. • Karin M. Fierke and Knud Erik Jorgensen, eds., <i>Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation</i> (Routledge, 2015). • Vendulka Kubáľková, ed., <i>International Relations in a Constructed World</i> (Routledge, 2015).
-----------------------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benno Teschke & Christian Heine, "A Critique of Social Constructivism," in <i>Historical Materialism and Globalisation: Essays on Continuity and Change</i> (2016).
--	---

WEEK FOUR	CRITICAL THEORY(IES) VS “MAINSTREAM”
Class meeting:	October 3
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What sets critical theory(ies) apart from mainstream ones? • What holds critical theories together as a grouping? • Are these different views of theory and research incommensurable? • Where do we go from here?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Robert W. Cox, “Social Forces, States and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory,” <i>Millennium</i> 10 (1981). 2. Mark Neufeld, “Interpretation and the ‘Science’ of International Relations” <i>Review of International Studies</i> 19 (1993): 39-61. 3. Richard Price & Thomas Reus-Smit, “Dangerous Liaisons?: Constructivism and Critical Theory,” <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 1 (1996). 4. Brooke Ackerly and Jacqui True, "Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations," <i>International Studies Review</i> 10 (2008).
Recommended reading:	<p><u>Marxist and post-Marxist critiques/approaches</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anthony Brewer, <i>Marxist Theories of Imperialism</i> (Routledge, 1980). • Stephen Gill and David Law, “Global Hegemony and the Structural Power of Capital” in Gill, ed., <i>Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations</i> (Cambridge, 1993). • Justin Rosenberg, <i>The Empire of Civil Society: A Critique of Realist Theory of International Relations</i> (Verso, 1994), chs. 1, 5-6. • Stephen Gill, "Globalisation, Market Civilisation and Disciplinary Neoliberalism," <i>Millennium</i> 24 (1995). • Benno Teschke, "IR Theory, Historical Materialism, and the False Promise of International Historical Sociology," <i>Spectrum: Journal of Global Studies</i> 6 (2014): 1-66.

Post-positivist critiques/approaches

- Yosef Lapid, "The Third Debate" *International Studies Quarterly* 33 (1989): 235-254.
- Chris Brown, "Turtles All the Way Down" *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23 (1994): 213-236.
- Geeta Chowdhry & Sheila Nair, "Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations," in *Reading Race, Gender and Class* (Routledge, 2002).
- Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics* (Routledge, 2010).
- Srdjan Vucetic, "Genealogy as a Research Tool in International Relations," *Review of International Studies* 37 (2011): 1295-1312.
- Jef Huysmans & Claudia Aradau, "Critical Methods in International Relations: The Politics of Techniques, Devices and Acts," *European Journal of International Relations* (2013).

Feminist critiques/approaches

- J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and I.R. Theorists" *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (1997).
- Annick T.R. Wibben, "Feminist International Relations: Old Debates and New Directions," *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 10 (2003).
- J. Ann Tickner, "What is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions," *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (2005).
- Paul Kirby, "How is Rape a Weapon of War?: Feminist International Relations, Modes of Critical Explanation and the Study of Wartime Sexual Violence," *European Journal of International Relations* 19 (2013).
- Rose McDermott, "A Feminist Scientific Approach to the Analysis of Politics and Gender." *Politics & Gender* 9 (2015): 110-115.

OCTOBER 10 – THANKSGIVING – NO SEMINAR

WEEK FIVE	DOMESTIC POLITICS, FOREIGN POLICY, AND I.R.
Class meeting:	October 17
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic political structures as drivers of foreign policy • Domestic electoral politics as drivers of foreign policy • Domestic politics vs/with international pressures
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peter A. Hall, "Policy Innovation and the Structure of the State," <i>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences</i> 466 (1983). 2. Jack Snyder, <i>Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition</i> (Cornell, 1992), chs. 1, 4. 3. David A. Lake, "Legitimizing Power: The Domestic Politics of US International Hierarchy," <i>International Security</i> 38 (2013): 74-111. 4. Stephen Chaudoin, Helen V. Milner, and Xun Pang, "International Systems and Domestic Politics: Linking Complex Interactions with Empirical Models in International Relations," <i>International Organization</i> (2015).
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Katzenstein, "Conclusions: Domestic Structures and Strategies of Foreign Economic Policy" <i>International Organization</i> 31 (1977). • Stephen D. Krasner, <i>Defending the National Interest: Raw Materials Investments and US Foreign Policy</i> (Princeton, 1978), chs. 1, 8. • James Kurth, "The Political Consequences of the Product Cycle," <i>International Organization</i> 33 (1979). • Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," <i>International Organization</i> 42 (1988). • Randall Schweller, "Domestic Structure and Preventive War: Are Democracies More Pacific?" <i>World Politics</i> 44 (1992): 235-269. • Helen V. Milner, <i>Interests, Institutions, and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations</i> (Princeton, 1997). • Michael Barnett, "Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change: Israel's Road to Oslo." <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 5 (1999): 5-36.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Juliet Kaarbo, "Foreign Policy Analysis in the Twenty-First Century: Back to Comparison, Forward to Identity and Ideas." <i>International Studies Review</i> 5 (2003): 155-202. • Valerie M. Hudson, "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations," <i>Foreign Policy Analysis</i> 1 (2005): 1-30. • Bruce Bueno de Mesquita & Alastair Smith, "Domestic Explanations of International Relations," <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 15 (2012): 161-181. • Steven Bernstein & Benjamin Cashore, "Complex Global Governance and Domestic Policies: Four Pathways of Influence," <i>International Affairs</i> 88 (2012): 585-604. • Thomas U. Berger, <i>War, Guilt, and World Politics after World War II</i> (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
--	---

WEEK SIX	DECISION-MAKING
Class meeting:	October 24
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When and how does the decision-making structure of the state have an important impact on foreign policy choices? • When and how do individual leaders have an important impact on foreign policy choices? • How should we think about the way people make decisions?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. David A. Welch, "The Organizational Process and Bureaucratic Politics Paradigms: Retrospect and Prospect" <i>International Security</i> 17 (1992). 2. Daniel Byman and Kenneth Pollack, "Let Us Now Praise Great Men (and Women): Bringing the Statesman Back in," <i>International Security</i> 25 (2001). 3. Jonathan Mercer, "Human Nature and the First Image: Emotion in International Politics," <i>Journal of International Relations and Development</i> 9 (2006). 4. Duncan Bell, "Beware of False Prophets: Biology, Human Nature and the Future of International Relations Theory," <i>International Affairs</i> 82 (2006).

Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Graham Allison, “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 63 (1969): 696-718. • Robert Jervis, <i>Perception and Misperception</i> (Princeton, 1976), chs. 1-3. • Robert Jervis, “Perceiving and Coping with Threats” in Robert Jervis, Richard Ned Lebow, and Janice Gross Stein, eds., <i>Psychology and Deterrence</i> (Johns Hopkins, 1985). • James D. Fearon, “Rationalist Explanations for War” <i>International Organization</i> 49 (1995): 379-414. • Jack S. Levy, “Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 41 (1997): 87-112. • James M. Goldgeier and Philip E. Tetlock, "Psychology and International Relations Theory," <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 4 (2001). • Jonathan Mercer, "Rationality and Psychology in International Politics," <i>International Organization</i> 59 (2005). • Michael A. Hogg, "Social Identity Theory," <i>Contemporary Social Psychological Theories</i> 13 (2006). • Helen V. Milner and Tingley, “Who Supports Global Economic Engagement?: The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy” <i>International Organization</i> 65 (2011): 37-68. • Frank P. Harvey, “President Al Gore and the 2003 Iraq War: A Counterfactual Critique of Conventional ‘Wisdom,”” <i>Canadian Journal of Political Science</i> 45 (2012): 1-32
----------------------	---

WEEK SEVEN	THE NEW REALISM(S)
Class meeting:	October 31
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How has realism evolved in response to the criticisms of it after the end of the Cold War? • Do the new realisms constitute theoretical progress or disintegration?
Required reading:	1. Gideon Rose, “Review Article: Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy,” <i>World Politics</i> 51 (1998).

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Jeffrey W. Legro & Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" <i>International Security</i> 24 (1999): 5–55. 3. J. Samuel Barkin, "Realist Constructivism" <i>International Studies Review</i> 5 (2003): 325-342. 4. Brian Rathbun, "A Rose by Any Other Name: Neoclassical Realism as the Logical and Necessary Extension of Structural Realism," <i>Security Studies</i> 17 (2008): 294-321.
<p>Recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barry Buzan, "From International System to International Society: Structural Realism and Regime Theory Meet the English School," <i>International Organization</i> 47 (1993): 327-352. • Richard Ned Lebow, "The Long Peace, the End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism," <i>International Organization</i> 48 (1994): 249-277. • John A. Vasquez, "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs," <i>American Political Science Review</i> 91 (1997): 899-912. • Kenneth Waltz, "Evaluating Theories," <i>The American Political Science Review</i> 91 (1997): 913-917. • Patrick Thaddeus Jackson & Daniel H. Nexon, "Constructivist Realism or Realist-Constructivism?" <i>International Studies Review</i> 6 (2004): 337-341. • Samuel Barkin, "Realism, Prediction, and Foreign Policy," <i>Foreign Policy Analysis</i> 5 (2009): 233-246. • William C. Wohlforth, "Gilpinian Realism and International Relations." <i>International Relations</i> 25 (2011): 499-511. • Colin Dueck, "Neoclassical Realism and the National Interest," in <i>The Realism Reader</i> (2014). • Juliet Kaarbo, "A Foreign Policy Analysis Perspective on the Domestic Politics Turn in IR Theory," <i>International Studies Review</i> 17 (2015): 189-216. • Samuel Barkin, "Constructivism, Realism, and the Variety of Human Natures," in <i>Human Beings in International Relations</i> (2015). • Norrin M. Ripsman, Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, and Steven E. Lobell, <i>Neoclassical Realist Theory of International Politics</i> (Cambridge University Press, 2016).

NOVEMBER 7 – FALL BREAK – NO SEMINAR

WEEK EIGHT	PARADIGMS AND PROGRESS
Class meeting:	November 14
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What’s wrong with battle-of-the-paradigms? • What would IR look like without battle-of-the-paradigms? • Are there still important functions for paradigms to perform?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner, “International Organization and the Study of World Politics” <i>International Organization</i> 52 (1998): 645-686. 2. John J. Mearsheimer & Stephen M. Walt, "Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing is Bad for International Relations," <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 19 (2013): 427-457. 3. David A. Lake, “Theory is Dead, Long Live Theory: The End of the Great Debates and the Rise of Eclecticism in International Relations," <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 19 (2013): 567-587. 4. Christine Sylvester, "Experiencing the End and Afterlives of International Relations Theory," <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 19 (2013): 609-626.
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • David A. Lake, “Why ‘isms’ Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 55:2 (June 2011), 465-480. • Rudra Sil & Peter J. Katzenstein, "De-Centering, Not Discarding, the “Isms”: Some Friendly Amendments," <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 55 (2011): 481-485. • Jeffrey T. Checkel, “Theoretical Pluralism in IR: Possibilities and Limits," <i>Handbook of International Relations</i> (2012): 220-242. • Dan Reiter, "Should We Leave Behind the Subfield of International Relations?" <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 18 (2015): 481-499.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jennifer Sterling-Folker, "All Hail to the Chief: Liberal IR Theory in the New World Order," <i>International Studies Perspectives</i> 16 (2015): 40-49. • Jeff D. Colgan, "Where Is International Relations Going? Evidence from Graduate Training." <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> (2016).
--	---

WEEK NINE	IPE 1: TRADE AND FINANCE/MONEY
Class meeting:	November 21
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What drives patterns of cooperation on trade in the system? • What drives individual states' trade policies? • What drives patterns of cooperation on finance in the system? • What drives individual states' financial/monetary policies? • How are trade and finance linked to national security?
Required reading:	<p><u>Trade</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Richard Steinburg, "In the Shadow of Law or Power?: Consensus Based Bargaining and Outcomes in the GATT/WTO," <i>International Organization</i> 56 (2002). 2. Paul A. Papayoanou and Scott L. Kastner, "Sleeping with the (Potential) Enemy: Assessing the US Policy of Engagement with China," <i>Security Studies</i> 9 (1999). <p><u>Finance/money</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. John B. Goodman and Louis Pauly, "The Obsolescence of Capital Controls: Economic Management in an Age of Global Markets," <i>World Politics</i> 46 (1993). 4. Robert Wade, "The Global Slump: Deeper Causes and Harder Lessons," <i>Challenge</i> 52 (2009).
Recommended reading:	<p><u>Trade</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Krasner, "State Power and the Structure of International Trade," <i>World Politics</i> 28 (1976). • Jock A. Finlayson and Mark W. Zacher, "The GATT and the Regulation of Trade Barriers: Regime Dynamics and Functions," <i>International Organization</i> 35 (1981).

- Ronald Rogowski, *Commerce and Coalitions: How Trade Affects Domestic Political Alignments* (Princeton, 1989), chs. 1-6.
- David Lake, "Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy" *International Studies Quarterly* 37 (1993).
- Sylvia Ostry, *The Post-Cold War Trading System: Who's on First?* (Chicago, 1997).
- Gilbert R. Winham, "Explanations of Developing Country Behavior in the GATT Uruguay Round Negotiation," *World Competition* 21 (1998).
- Lloyd Gruber, *Ruling the World: Power Politics and the Rise of Supranational Institutions* (Princeton, 2000), chs. 4-5.
- Michael J. Hiscox, "Class versus Industry Cleavages: Inter-Industry Factor Mobility and the Politics of Trade," *International Organization* 55 (2001).
- Michael J. Hiscox, "International Capital Mobility and Trade Politics: Capital Flows, Political Coalitions, and Lobbying," *Economics and Politics* 16 (2004).
- Charlene Barshevsy, "With or Without Doha," *Foreign Affairs* 84 (2005).
- Helen V. Milner and Keiko Kubota, "Why the Move to Free Trade?: Democracy and Trade Policy in the Developing Countries," *International Organization* 59 (2005).
- Judith Goldstein, Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz, "Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade," *International Organization* 61 (2007).
- Edward D. Mansfield & Helen V. Milner, "The Domestic Politics of Preferential Trade Agreements in Hard Times," *Princeton Working Paper*, 2014.

Finance/money

- Susan Strange, *Casino Capitalism* (Manchester, 1986).
- Barry Eichengreen, *Golden Fetters: The Gold Standard and the Great Depression, 1919-1939* (Oxford, 1996).
- Jonathan Kirshner, *Currency and Coercion* (Princeton, 1996), chs. 1-2.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benjamin J. Cohen, “Phoenix Risen: The Resurrection of Global Finance,” <i>World Politics</i> 48 (1996). • Eric Helleiner, <i>States and the Re-Emergence of Global Finance: From Bretton Woods to the 1990s</i> (Cornell, 1997), ch. 1, 7-9. • Kathleen McNamara, <i>The Currency of Ideas: Monetary Politics in the European Union</i> (Cornell, 1998), chs. 1-2. • Jonathan Kirshner, ed., <i>Monetary Orders: Ambiguous Economics, Ubiquitous Politics</i> (Cornell, 2003), ch. 1. • Benjamin J. Cohen, “Monetary Governance in a World of Regional Currencies,” in Miles Kahler and David A. Lake, eds., <i>Governance in a Global Economy: Political Authority in Transition</i> (Princeton, 2003). • Zachary Elkins, Andrew T. Guzman, and Beth A. Simmons, “Competing for Capital: The Diffusion of Bilateral Investment Treaties, 1960-2000,” <i>International Organization</i> 60 (2006): 811-846. • Jacqueline Best, “How to Make a Bubble: Towards a Cultural Political Economy of the Financial Crisis,” <i>International Political Sociology</i> 3 (2009): 461-465.
--	---

WEEK TEN	IPE 2: DEVELOPMENT AND GLOBALIZATION
Class meeting:	November 28
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What determines whether states’ economic development efforts are successful, international structures or domestic ones? • What drives changes in the way we think about what development strategies work best? • What is globalization? • How has it impacted the autonomy and functions of the state, and what are the implications for IR/IPE? Developed vs developing states?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Robert Wade, “East Asia’s Economic Success: Conflicting Perspectives, Partial Insights, Shaky Evidence,” <i>World Politics</i> 44 (1992). 2. Susan Strange, <i>The Retreat of the State: The Diffusion of Power in the World Economy</i> (Cambridge, 1996), chs. 1-2.

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, "Globalization: What's New? What's Not? (And So What?)," in David Held, et al., <i>Global Transformations</i> (2nd ed., Polity, 2003). 4. Brian Burgoon, "Globalization and Backlash: Polanyi's Revenge?" <i>Review of International Political Economy</i> 16 (2009).
<p>Recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alexander Gershenkron, <i>Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective</i> (Belknap/Harvard, 1962), ch. 1. • Stephen D. Krasner, <i>Structural Conflict: The Third World against Global Liberalism</i> (University of California Press, 1985), ch. 1. • Michael J. Piore and Charles Sabel, <i>The Second Industrial Divide</i> (HarperCollins, 1990), pp. 1-18, 165-193. • Stephan Haggard, <i>Pathways from the Periphery: The Politics of Growth in the Newly Industrializing Countries</i> (Cornell, 1990), ch. 1. • Graham Bird, "The International Monetary Fund and Developing Countries: A Review of the Evidence and Policy Options," <i>International Organization</i> 50 (1996). • Herman Schwartz, "Small States in Big Trouble," <i>World Politics</i> 46 (1996). • Louis Pauly and Simon Reich, "National Structures and Transnational Corporate Behavior: Enduring Differences in the Age of Globalization" <i>International Organization</i> 51 (1997). • Louis Pauly, <i>Who Elected the Bankers?: Surveillance and Control in the World Economy</i> (Cornell, 1997). • Stephen G. Brooks, "The Globalization of Production and the Changing Benefits of Conquest," <i>Journal of Conflict Resolution</i> 43 (1999). • Robert Gilpin, <i>Global Political Economy: Understanding the International Economic Order</i> (Princeton, 2001), ch. 7. • Daniel Drezner, "Globalization and Policy Convergence," <i>International Studies Review</i> 3 (2001). • Mark Blyth, <i>Great Transformations: Economic Ideas and Political Change in the Twentieth Century</i> (Cambridge, 2002).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nita Rudra, "Globalization and the Strengthening of Democracy in the Developing World," <i>American Journal of Political Science</i> 49 (2005). • Nancy Birdsall, Dani Rodrik, and Arvind Subramanian, "How to Help Poor Countries," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 84 (2005). • Justin Rosenberg, "Globalization Theory: A Post Mortem," <i>International Politics</i> 42 (2005): 2-74. • Jonathan Kirshner, <i>Globalization and National Security</i> (Routledge, 2014). • Yeung, Henry Wai-chung Yeung, "Governing the Market in a Globalizing Era: Developmental States, Global Production Networks and Inter-Firm Dynamics in East Asia," <i>Review of International Political Economy</i> 21 (2014): 70-101. • Saskia Sassen, <i>Losing Control?: Sovereignty in the Age of Globalization</i> (Columbia University Press, 2015).
--	--

WEEK ELEVEN	RE-THINKING THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM
Class meeting:	December 5
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the growth of non-state actors undermine the importance of states in IR? • Do transnational and transgovernmental networks represent an important new form of governance? • Is the Westphalian state system giving way to alternative forms of political authority? • Is there a better model for world politics?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Anne-Marie Slaughter, "The Real New World Order," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 76 (1997). 2. Alexander Wendt, "Why a World State is Inevitable," <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 9 (2003): 491-542. 3. Philip G. Cerny, "Reframing the International," <i>European Review of International Studies</i> 1 (2014): 9-17.
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Gilpin, <i>US Power and the Multinational Corporation</i> (Basic Books, 1975), esp. chs. 1-2, 4-6.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., <i>Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition</i> (Little, Brown, 1977), esp. chs. 1-3. • Peter M. Haas, “Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination” <i>International Organization</i> 46 (1992): 1-35. • Kathryn Sikkink, “Transnational Politics, International Relations Theory, and Human Rights,” <i>Political Science and Politics</i> 31 (1998). • Matthew Evangelista, <i>Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War</i> (Cornell, 1999), chs. 1-2, 16. • Kenneth Abbott and Richard Snidal, “Hard and Soft Law in International Governance,” <i>International Organization</i> 54 (2000). • Burkard Eberlein and Edgar Grande, “Beyond Delegation: Transnational Regulatory Regimes and the EU Regulatory State,” <i>Journal of European Public Policy</i> 12 (2005). • Jörg Friedrichs, "Global Governance as the Hegemonic Project of Transatlantic Civil Society," in <i>Criticizing Global Governance</i> (Palgrave Macmillan, 2005). • David Bach and Abraham L. Newman, “Transgovernmental Networks and Domestic Policy Convergence: Evidence from Insider Trading Regulation” <i>International Organization</i> 64 (2010). • A. Claire Cutler, “The Privatization of Authority in the Global Political Economy,” in Stephen McBride and Gary Teeple, eds., <i>Relations of Global Power: Neoliberal Order and Disorder</i> (University of Toronto Press, 2011). • John S. Dryzek, "Global Civil Society: The Progress of Post-Westphalian Politics," <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 15 (2012): 101-119.
--	--

WEEK TWELVE	THEORY, RESEARCH, AND POLICY
Class meeting:	December 6 (TBC)
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do academic experts on IR have any influence on policy-makers? • Should they?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joseph Lepgold, “Is Anyone Listening? International Relations Theory and the Problem of Policy Relevance,” <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> 113 (1998): 43-63. 2. Stephen M. Walt, “The Relationship between Theory and Policy in International Relations,” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i> 8 (2005): 23-48.

	<p>3. Paul C. Avey & Michael C. Desch, "What Do Policymakers Want from Us? Results of a Survey of Current and Former Senior National Security Decision Makers," <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 58 (2014): 227-246.</p>
<p>Recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Mearsheimer & Stephen Walt, "The Israeli Lobby: Does it Have Too Much Influence on U.S. Foreign Policy?" <i>London Review of Books</i> 28 (2006). • Bruce W. Jentleson & Ely Ratner, "Bridging the Beltway–Ivory Tower Gap." <i>International Studies Review</i> 13 (2011): 6–11. • Bradley C. Parks & Alena Stern, "In-and-Outers and Moonlighters: An Evaluation of the Impact of Policy-making Exposure on IR Scholarship," <i>International Studies Perspectives</i> 15 (2014): 73-93.