

POLI 5523

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY 1: ORDER, CONFLICT, AND CHANGE



Class meetings: Wednesdays, 10:35-1:25pm, LSC Biol&Earth Building, Rm B812

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

Office: HHAAB 355 (tel: 494-6629)

Office hours: Tuesdays, 10:00am-noon

Introduction

The department offers two survey courses on International Relations theory, POLI 5523X and POLI 5524Y. POLI 5523X explores classic and contemporary work on the nature of the international system, war and peace, and the bases for order and change. POLI 5524Y looks at cooperation, institutions, and international political economy.

The aim, in both courses, is to develop a sound understanding of the basic premises, expectations, 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 theoretically-grounded research.

Note that while these courses were originally designed as “core courses” for graduate students in Political Science, well-prepared, fourth-year undergraduates may be admitted with special permission from the course instructor.

Assignments and assessment

Assignment	Due date	Share of final grade
Class participation	<i>every week...</i>	15%
Discussion paper/presentation #1	see below	5%
Discussion paper/presentation #2	see below	5%
Discussion paper/presentation #3	see below	5%
Major paper #1 (book review)	October 16	35%
Major paper #2 (research paper)	December 4	35%

Class participation

This class will feature 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. Attendance is mandatory. Students that miss more than two classes (without a valid reason—e.g., serious illness) will get a zero for the “class participation” portion of their grade.

Before each class, every student should: 1. carefully read all of the required readings assigned for the given week; 2. carefully read the discussion papers for the given week (see below); and 3. 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 or questions for further discussion.

Over the course of the semester, each student will take special responsibility for leading part of the discussion in three classes. For each of those three classes, the student will prepare a short discussion paper (500-750 words), summarizing a particular reading, explaining how it relates to other readings from that week, and offering his or her own comments and criticisms of that assigned reading. And for each of those three classes, the student will also make a short, in-class presentation (5-8 minutes), reprising their assessment of the assigned reading, and suggesting potentially-fruitful avenues for further discussion.

Discussion papers will be due at least 48 hours before the class which will tackle the relevant readings (i.e., 10:30am on the Monday before your assigned class). Each student will send his or her discussion paper to everyone in the class (including the professor) through the OWL email system. Because these discussion papers are supposed to be an important part of all students’ seminar preparation, late papers (without a valid excuse) will be severely penalized.

Major Papers

For both of the two papers, students will choose their own topics/questions, but each will be a different kind of essay. 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.

BOOK REVIEW (5000 words): The first paper (due October 24) will be a publishable-quality review of a recent book on any aspect of International Relations. Please choose something with a solid theoretical core, rather than an atheoretical current-events book. Reviews should: 1. Give a brief summary of what questions the book poses, what kinds of answers it rejects, and what kind of answer it supports; 2. Explain how the book fits into a larger literature on a particular subject or cluster of subjects; 3. Be sure to make it clear which IR theories are in play, and how the author’s main arguments “fit” (or don’t “fit”) with various theories; and 4. Be presented in a way that is lively and interesting, so that it would be appealing to a wide (academic) audience. Obviously, students will need to read more than just one book in order to write a good review. Each student should try to make him- or herself an expert on both the theoretical debates and the real-world subject matter covered in the

book they are reviewing, and that will require background reading that is both broad and deep; students should get started on this right from the first week of the semester. With the submission of the review, each student should be sure to attach a brief note (or send a brief email) outlining his or her plans to pursue publication of the review: What journals would be appropriate venues, and which one do you plan to approach? What further edits do you think you might need to make, in order to make the review suitable for that journal?


RESEARCH PAPER (10,000 words): The second paper (due December 6) will be a research paper, which will use a particular historical case or small number of related cases (e.g., a historical event or trend, like WWII or decolonization, or a set of events, like a comparison of the Gulf War and the Iraq War) 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?” The idea here is not that the paper will revolutionize our understanding of the historical episode(s) itself/themselves, or that it will decisively confirm or defeat any of the theoretical perspectives, but rather that the student will show that he or she understands what’s involved in applying and evaluating the theories empirically. All students are strongly encouraged (but not strictly required) to discuss their research paper ideas with the professor 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 discussion 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 violation of academic ethics, and will be taken seriously in this class. Information on what plagiarism is, how to avoid it, and the penalties for not doing so, is available at: <http://academicintegrity.dal.ca/index.php>

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. These items are marked below with “.

There were a number of readings which were not available on-line or through Dalhousie's libraries; these items have been put together as a course reader. The readers are available from Julia's Copy Services, on the corner of LeMarchant and Cobourg (in the ground level of the apartment building there). Items in the reader are marked with "📖."

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.

Class Schedule

WEEK ONE	Introduction
Class meeting:	September 11
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of course, orientation, etc. • Historical development of I.R.
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Jack Snyder, "One World, Rival Theories" <u>Foreign Policy</u> 145 (2004): 53-62. 📖 2. Martin Hollis and Steve Smith, <u>Explaining and Understanding International Relations</u> (Clarendon, 1990), chs. 1-2. 📖 3. Stanley Hoffman, "An American Social Science: International Relations" (orig. publ. 1977), in Robert M. Crawford and Darryl Jarvis, eds., <u>International Relations: Still an American Social Science?</u> (SUNY, 2000). 📖 4. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, "Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of International Relations," in Reus-Smit and Snidal, editors, <u>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</u> (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 3-40. 📖
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngaire Woods, "The Uses of Theory in the Study of International Relations" in Ngaire Woods, <u>Explaining International Relations Since 1945</u> (Oxford, 1996). • Brian Schmidt, "On the History and Historiography of International Relations", in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth Simmons, editors, <u>Handbook of International Relations</u> (London: Sage, 2002), 3-22. • Barry Eichengreen, "Dental Hygiene and Nuclear War: How International Relations Look from the Perspective of Economics"

	<p><u>International Organization</u> 52 (1998): 993-1012.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barry Buzan and Richard Little, "Why International Relations Has Failed as an Academic Project, and What to Do about It" <u>Millennium: Journal of International Studies</u> 30 (2001): 19-39.
--	--

WEEK TWO	REALISM(S)
REMINDER:	Choose discussion papers and presentation dates – September 23
Class meetings:	September 18
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "Classical" Realism Structural Realism (aka "Neorealism") Internal and external critiques of realism(s)
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> E.H. Carr, <u>The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to International Relations</u> (Palgrave, 2001), chs. 1-3, 5-7, 9. 📖 John Vasquez, <u>Classics of International Relations</u> (3rd ed., Prentice-Hall, 1996): Thucydides; Machiavelli; Niebuhr; Kennan. 📖 Hans J. Morgenthau, <u>Politics Among Nations</u> (6th ed., Knopf, 1985), chs. 1-4. 📖 Kenneth N. Waltz, <u>Theory of International Politics</u> (Addison-Wesley, 1979), chs. 4-6. 📖 Charles Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," <u>International Security</u> 19 (1994/95): 50-90. 📖
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kenneth N. Waltz, <u>Man, the State, and War</u> (Columbia, 1959), esp. chs. 1-2, 4, 6. Arnold Wolfers, <u>Discord and Collaboration</u> (Johns Hopkins, 1967), chs. 6, 8. Robert Gilpin, <u>War and Change in World Politics</u> (Cambridge, 1981), esp. chs. 4-5. Charles Glaser, "The Security Dilemma Revisited," <u>World Politics</u> Vol. 50 (1997): 171-201. Robert Gilpin, "The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism" in Robert O. Keohane, ed., <u>Neorealism and Its Critics</u> (Columbia, 1986). Kenneth N. Waltz, "Structural Realism after the Cold War" <u>International Security</u> 25 (2000): 5-41. John J. Mearsheimer, "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War" <u>Atlantic Monthly</u> 266 (1990): 35-50.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John J. Mearsheimer, <u>The Tragedy of World Politics</u> (Norton, 2001), esp. chs. 1-2. • Michael W. Doyle, <u>Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, Socialism</u> (Norton, 1997), part 1.
--	--

WEEK THREE	LIBERALISM(S)
Class meeting:	September 25
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Classical” Liberalism • Neoliberalism • Internal and external critiques of liberalism(s)
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Michael W. Doyle, “Liberalism and World Politics” <u>American Political Science Review</u> 80 (1986): 1151-1169. 📖 2. Robert O. Keohane, “Neoliberal Institutionalism: A Perspective on World Politics” in <u>International Institutions and State Power</u> (Westview, 1989). 📖 3. Mark Zacher and Richard Matthew, “Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent Strands” in Charles W. Kegley, ed., <u>Controversies in International Relations Theory</u> (St. Martin’s, 1994). 📖 4. Andrew Moravscik, “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics” <u>International Organization</u> 51 (1997): 513-554. 📖 5. Christian Reus-Smit, “The Strange Death of Liberal IR Theory,” <u>European Journal of International Law</u> 12 (2001): 573-593. 📖
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Owen, “How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace” <u>International Organization</u> 19 (1994): 87-125. • Bruce Russett and John Oneal, “The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992,” <u>World Politics</u> 52 (1999): 1-37. • Sebastian Rosato, “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,” <u>American Political Science Review</u> 97 (2003): 585-602. • Robert O. Keohane, <u>After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy</u> (Princeton, 1984), esp. ch. 3. • Robert Axelrod and Robert Keohane, “Achieving Cooperation in Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions” in Kenneth A. Oye, ed.,

	<p><u>Cooperation Under Anarchy</u> (Princeton, 1986).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lisa Martin, “Interests, Power, and Multilateralism” <u>International Organization</u> 46 (1992): 765-792. • Robert Powell, “Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations” in David A. Baldwin, ed., <u>Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate</u> (Columbia, 1993). • Robert Jervis, “Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate” <u>International Security</u> 24 (1999): 42-63. • Kenneth W. Abbott and Duncan Snidal, “Hard and Soft Law in International Governance” <u>International Organization</u> 54 (2000): 421-456. • Jennifer Sterling-Folker, “Realist Environment, Liberal Process, and Domestic-Level Variables” <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 41 (1997): 1-25.
--	---






WEEK FOUR	CONSTRUCTIVISM (AND THE ENGLISH SCHOOL)
Class meeting:	October 2
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Constructivism as critique of “rationalist” theories • Constructivism as a research project • The English School—a precursor to contemporary constructivism?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics” <u>International Organization</u> 46 (1992): 391-425. 📖 2. Timothy Dunne, “The Social Construction of International Society” <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 3 (1995): 367-390. 📖 3. Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change,” <u>International Organization</u> 52 (2005): 887-917. 📖 4. Jennifer Mitzen, “Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma” <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 12 (2006): 341-370. 📖
Strongly recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dale C. Copeland, “The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay” <u>International Security</u> 25 (2000): 187-212. • Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner,





	<p>“International Organization and the Study of World Politics” <u>International Organization</u> 52 (1998): 645-686.</p>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hedley Bull, <u>The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics</u> (Columbia, 1977), chs. 1-2. • Gerrit Gong, <u>The Standard of ‘Civilization’ in International Society</u> (Clarendon, 1984), esp. chs. 1-3. • Alexander Wendt, <u>Social Theory of International Politics</u> (Cambridge, 1990), esp. chs. 1-2. • John Gerard Ruggie, “What Makes the World Hang Together?” <u>International Organization</u> 52 (1998): 855-885. • Thomas Risse, “‘Let’s Argue!’: Communicative Action in World Politics” <u>International Organization</u> 54 (2000): 1-40. • Alexander Wendt, “Driving with the Rearview Mirror: On the Rational Science of Institutional Design,” <u>International Organization</u> 55 (2001): 1019-1049. • Emanuel Adler, “Constructivism in International Relations” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons, eds., <u>Handbook of International Relations</u> (Cambridge, 2002). • Jennifer Sterling-Folker, “Competing Paradigms or Birds of a Feather?” <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 44 (2000): 97-120 • Vincent Pouliot, “Subjectivism: Towards a Constructivist Methodology” <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 51 (2007): 359-384.

WEEK FIVE	OUTSIDERS: MARXIST, FEMINIST, & CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES
Class meeting:	October 9
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feminist critiques and theories • Marxist and neo-Marxist theories • Critical theory and interpretivism
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Miles Kahler, “Inventing International Relations: International Relations after 1945” in Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, eds., <u>New Thinking in International Relations</u> (Westview, 1997).  2. J. Ann Tickner, “You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and I.R. Theorists” <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 41 (1997): 611-632.  3. Robert W. Cox, “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond




	<p>International Relations Theory” in Robert O. Keohane, ed., <u>Neorealism and its Critics</u> (Columbia, 1986). 📖</p> <p>4. Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit, “Dangerous Liaisons: Critical International Theory and Constructivism” <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 4 (1998): 259-294. 📖</p>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anthony Brewer, <u>Marxist Theories of Imperialism</u> (Routledge, 1980). • Stephen Gill and David Law, “Global Hegemony and the Structural Power of Capital” in Gill, ed., <u>Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations</u> (Cambridge, 1993). • Justin Rosenberg, <u>The Empire of Civil Society: A Critique of Realist Theory of International Relations</u> (Verso, 1994), chs. 1, 5-6. • V. Spike Peterson, “What’s at Stake in Taking Feminism Seriously” in Peterson, ed., <u>Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory</u> (Lynne Rienner, 1993). • Marysia Zalewski, “Feminism and/in International Relations: An Exhausted Conversation?” in Frank Harvey and Michael Brecher, eds., <u>Evaluating Methodology in International Studies</u> (Michigan, 2002). • Yosef Lapid, “The Third Debate” <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 33 (1989): 235-254. • Mark Neufeld, “Interpretation and the ‘Science’ of International Relations” <u>Review of International Studies</u> 19 (1993): 39-61. • Chris Brown, “Turtles All the Way Down” <u>Millennium: Journal of International Studies</u> 23 (1994): 213-236.

WEEK SIX	DECISION-MAKING
Class meeting:	October 16
REMINDER:	FIRST PAPER DUE TODAY
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perceptions and psychology • Bureaucratic politics, organizational routines • Domestic political structures
Required reading:	<p>1. Graham Allison, “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis” <u>American Political Science Review</u> 63 (1969): 696-718. 📖</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Jack S. Levy, "Organizational Routines and the Causes of War"  3. James D. Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War" <u>International Organization</u> 49 (1995): 379-414.  4. Peter Katzenstein, "Conclusions: Domestic Structures and Strategies of Foreign Economic Policy" <u>International Organization</u> 31 (1977).  5. Jack Snyder, <u>Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition</u> (Cornell, 1992), chs. 1, 4. 
Strongly recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" <u>International Organization</u> 42 (1988): 427-460. 
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Jervis, <u>Perception and Misperception</u> (Princeton, 1976), chs. 1-3. • Stephen D. Krasner, "Are Bureaucracies Important?" <u>Foreign Policy</u> 7 (1972): 159-179. • Robert Jervis, "Perceiving and Coping with Threats" in Robert Jervis, Richard Ned Lebow, and Janice Gross Stein, eds., <u>Psychology and Deterrence</u> (Johns Hopkins, 1985). • Jack S. Levy, "Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations" <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 41 (1997): 87-112. • Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and David Lalman, <u>War and Reason</u> (Yale, 1992), esp. chs. 1-2. • Stephen R. David, "Explaining Third World Alignment" <u>World Politics</u> 43 (1991): 233-256. • Thomas J. Christensen, "Perceptions and Alliances in Europe, 1865-1940" <u>International Organization</u> 51 (1997): 65-97. • Helen V. Milner, <u>Interests, Institutions, and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations</u> (Princeton, 1997). • Ronald Rogowski, <u>Commerce and Coalitions: How Trade Affects Domestic Political Alignments</u> (Princeton, 1989), chs. 1-6. • Randall Schweller, "Domestic Structure and Preventive War: Are Democracies More Pacific?" <u>World Politics</u> 44 (1992): 235-269. • Helen V. Milner and Tingley, "Who Supports Global Economic Engagement?: The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy" <u>International Organization</u> 65 (2011): 37-68.

WEEK SEVEN	NON-STATE / TRANSNATIONAL ACTORS
Class meeting:	October 23
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When/why are non-state actors able to influence state policies? • What are transnational actors, and why might they be important? • Does the intensification of transnational politics seriously undercut the value of traditional (state-centric) theories?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Stephen D. Krasner, <u>Defending the National Interest: Raw Materials Investments and US Foreign Policy</u> (Princeton, 1978), chs. 1, 8.  2. Matthew Evangelista, "The Paradox of State Strength: Transnational Relations, Domestic Structures, and Security Policy in Russia and the Soviet Union" <u>International Organization</u> 49 (1995): 1-38.  3. Margaret E. Keck & Kathryn R. Sikkink, <u>Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy in International Politics</u> (Cornell, 1998), ch. 1.  4. Robert O. Keohane, "The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the 'Liberalism of Fear'" <u>Dialog-IO</u> (2002): 29-43. 
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robert Gilpin, <u>US Power and the Multinational Corporation</u> (Basic Books, 1975), esp. chs. 1-2, 4-6. • Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, Jr., <u>Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition</u> (Little, Brown, 1977), esp. chs. 1-3. • David A. Welch, "The Organizational Process and Bureaucratic Politics Paradigms: Retrospect and Prospect" <u>International Security</u> 17 (1992): 112-146. • Peter M. Haas, "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination" <u>International Organization</u> 46 (1992): 1-35. • Jeffrey W. Knopf, "Beyond Two-Level Games: Domestic-International Interaction in the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Negotiations" <u>International Organization</u> 46 (1993): 599-628. • Richard Price, "Reversing the Gun-Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Landmines" <u>International Organization</u> 52 (1998): 613-644. • Kathryn Sikkink, "Transnational Politics, International Relations Theory, and Human Rights" <u>Political Science and Politics</u> 31 (1998): 516-523. • David Bach and Abraham L. Newman, "Transgovernmental Networks and Domestic Policy Convergence: Evidence from Insider Trading





	Regulation” <u>International Organization</u> 64 (2010): 505-528.
--	---

WEEK EIGHT	THEORY AND METHOD IN I.R.
Class meeting:	October 30
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A very quick and relatively painless overview of the logic and techniques behind multivariate regression analysis • Qualitative vs Quantitative, Formal vs “Informal”
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bear F. Braumoeller and Anne Sartori, “Empirical-Quantitative Approaches to the Study of International Relations” in Detlef Sprinz and Yael Wolinsky-Nahmias, eds., <u>Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations</u> (Michigan, 2004).  2. Jack Levy, “Qualitative Methods in International Relations” in Frank Harvey and Michael Brecher, eds., <u>Evaluating Methodology in International Studies</u> (Michigan, 2002).  3. Stephen M. Walt, “Rigor or Rigor Mortis?: Rational Choice and Security Studies” <u>International Security</u> 23 (1999): 5-48. 
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Martin Hollis and Steve Smith, <u>Explaining and Understanding International Relations</u> (Clarendon, 1990), chs. 3-4. • Hedley Bull, “International Theory: The Case for the Classical Approach” in John Vasquez, ed., <u>Classics of International Relations</u> (3rd ed., Prentice-Hall, 1996). • Miles Kahler, “Rationality in International Relations” <u>International Organization</u> 52 (1998): 919-941. • Gary King, Robert Keohane, and Sidney Verba, <u>Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research</u> (Princeton, 1994). • Symposium, “The Qualitative-Quantitative Disputation: King, Keohane, and Verba’s Designing Social Inquiry” <u>American Political Science Review</u> 89 (1995): 454-474. • Barry O’Neill, “Weak Models, Nil Hypotheses, and Decorative Statistics: Is There Really No Hope?” <u>Journal of Conflict Resolution</u> 39 (1994): 731-748. • Andrew Bennett, “Causal Inference in Case Studies: From Mill’s Methods to Causal Mechanisms” Paper presented to APSA, 1999. http://www.georgetown.edu/faculty/bennetta/APSA99.html • Frank Harvey, “Rigor Mortis or Rigor, More Tests?” <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 42 (1999): 675-707.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James D. Fearon, "Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science" <u>World Politics</u> 43 (1991): 169-195. • Ian Lustick, "History, Historiography, and Political Science" <u>American Political Science Review</u> 90 (1996), pp. 605-618.
--	--






WEEK NINE	FROM THEORY TO RESEARCH: REALISM VS LIBERALISM
Class meeting:	November 6
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who's winning, Realism or Liberalism? • Relative vs absolute gains • Trade or war: does conquest pay? • Democratic Peace
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Robert Gilpin, "The Theory of Hegemonic War" <u>Journal of Interdisciplinary History</u> 18 (1988): 591-613. 📖 2. Michael Mastanduno, "Do Relative Gains Matter?: America's Response to Japanese Industrial Policy" <u>International Security</u> 16 (1991): 73-113. 📖 3. Peter Liberman, "The Spoils of Conquest" <u>International Security</u> 18 (1993): 125-153. 📖 4. Christopher Layne, "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace" <u>International Security</u> 19 (1994): 5-49. 📖
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • John Gerard Ruggie, "Continuity and Transformation in the World Polity: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis" in Robert O. Keohane, ed., <u>Neorealism and Its Critics</u> (Columbia, 1986). • Peter Liberman, "Trading with the Enemy: Security and Relative Economic Gains" <u>International Security</u> 21 (1996): 147-175. • Robert B. McCalla, "NATO's Persistence after the Cold War" <u>International Organization</u> 50 (1996): 442-472. • Fareed Zakaria, <u>From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role</u> (Princeton, 1998). • Joseph S. Nye, "Transnational Relations and Interstate Conflicts: An Empirical Analysis" <u>International Organization</u> 28 (1974): 961-996. • Susan Macmillan, "Interdependence and Conflict" <u>Mershon International Studies Review</u> 41 (1997): 31-48. • David E. Spiro, "The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace" <u>International</u>




	<p><u>Security</u> 19 (1994): 50-86.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, “Democratization and the Danger of War” <u>International Security</u> 19 (1995): 5-38. • Eric Voeten, “The Political Origins of the UN Security Council’s Ability to Legitimize the Use of Force,” <u>International Organization</u> 59 (2005): 527-557.
--	---

WEEK TEN	FROM THEORY TO RESEARCH: RATIONALISM VS CONSTRUCTIVISM
Class meeting:	November 13
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How do we get from saying that “ideas matter” to showing that ideas matter, and showing how they matter? • Can’t we all just get along?
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Geoffrey Garrett and Barry R. Weingast, “Ideas, Interests, and Institutions: Constructing the European Community’s Internal Market” in Goldstein and Keohane, eds., <u>Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change</u> (Cornell, 1993).  2. Nina Tannenwald, “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use” <u>International Organization</u> 53 (1999): 433-468.  3. Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, “Power, Globalization, and the End of the Cold War: Re-evaluating a Landmark Case for Ideas” <u>International Security</u> 25 (2000-2001): 5-53.  4. James D. Fearon and Alexander Wendt, “Rationalism vs Constructivism: A Skeptical View” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons, eds., <u>Handbook of International Relations</u> (Cambridge, 2002). 
Strongly recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michael C. Desch, “Culture Clash: Assessing the Importance of Ideas in Security Studies” <u>International Security</u> 23 (1998). • Michael C. Horowitz, “Long Time Going: Religion and the Duration of Crusading,” <u>International Security</u> 34 (2009): 162-193.
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neta Crawford, “Decolonization as an International Norm: The Evolution of Practices, Arguments, and Beliefs” in Laura W. Reed and Carl Kaysen, eds., <u>Emerging Norms of Justified Intervention</u> (Cambridge, 1993).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alastair Iain Johnston, “Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Strategy in Maoist China” in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., <u>The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics</u> (Columbia, 1996). • Richard Price, “A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo” <u>International Organization</u> 49 (1995): 73-103. • Peter J. Katzenstein, <u>Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Post-War Japan</u> (Cornell, 1996), chs. 1-3. • Elizabeth Kier, <u>Imagining War: French and British Military Doctrine between the Wars</u> (Princeton, 1997), esp. ch. 1. • Christian Reus-Smit, <u>The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations</u> (Princeton, 1999), esp. chs. 1-2. • David Lumsdaine, <u>Moral Vision in International Politics: The Foreign Aid Regime, 1949-89</u> (Princeton, 1993), esp. ch. 1. • Frank Schimmelfennig, “The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union” <u>International Organization</u> 55 (2001): 47-80. • Chaim Kaufman and Robert Pape, “Explaining Costly International Moral Action: Britain’s Sixty-Year Campaign Against the Atlantic Slave Trade” <u>International Organization</u> 53 (1999): 631-668. • Michael C. Williams, “Why Ideas Matter in International Relations: Hans Morgenthau, Classical Realism and the Construction of Power Politics,” <u>International Organization</u> 58 (2004): 633-655. • Emanuel Adler, “The Spread of Security Communities: Communities of Practice, Self-Restraint, and NATO’s Post-Cold War Transformation,” <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 14 (2008): 195-230.
--	---

WEEK ELEVEN	THE NEW REALISM: RE-INVENTION OR SELF-DESTRUCTION?
Class meeting:	November 20
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Classical” vs “Structural” vs “Neoclassical” • Progressive vs degenerative research agendas • How much can you add to Realism before it stops being Realism?
Required	1. Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, “Is Anybody Still a Realist?”

<p>reading:</p>	<p>International Security 24 (1999): 5-55. </p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Patrick Jackson, "Bridging the Gap: Toward A Realist-Constructivist Dialogue," International Studies Review 6 (2004): 337-352.  3. Brian Rathbun, "A Rose by Any Other Name: Neoclassical Realism as the Logical and Necessary Extension of Structural Realism," Security Studies 17 (2008): 294-321.  4. Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, Stephen E. Lobell, and Norrin Ripsman, "Introduction" in Lobell, et al, eds., Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy (Cambridge University Press, 2009).  5. William Wohlforth, "Gilpinian Realism and International Relations," International Relations 25 (2011): 499-511. 
<p>Strongly recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity" International Organization 44 (1990): 137-168. • Stephen G. Brooks, "Dueling Realisms" International Organization 51 (1997): 445-477. • Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," World Politics 51 (1998): 144-172.
<p>Recommended reading:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen M. Walt, "Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power" International Security 9 (1985): 3-41. • Richard Ned Lebow, "The Long Peace, the End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism" International Organization 48 (1994): 249-277. • William Wohlforth, "Realism and the End of the Cold War" International Security 19 (1994/95): 91-129. • Stefano Guzzini, "Structural Power: The Limits of Neorealist Power Analysis," International Organization 47 (1993): 443-478. • John Vasquez, "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs" American Political Science Review 91 (December 1997): 899-912. • Jennifer Sterling-Folker, "Realism and the Constructivist Challenge," International Studies Review 4 (2002): 73-97. • Robert A. Pape, "Soft Balancing Against the United States," International Security 30 (2005): 7-45. • Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, "State Building for Future Wars: Neoclassical Realism and the Resource-Extractive State," Security Studies 15 (2006): 464-495.

WEEK TWELVE	WHAT'S THE POINT?
Class meeting:	November 27
REMINDER:	SECOND PAPER DUE DECEMBER 6
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I.R. theory and the policy relevance question
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Joseph Lepgold, "Is Anyone Listening? International Relations Theory and the Problem of Policy Relevance" <u>Political Science Quarterly</u> 113 (1998): 43-63.  2. Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "Scholars on the Sidelines" <u>Washington Post</u>, April 13, 2009.  3. Daniel Drezner, "So You Want to be Policy Relevant?" <u>Foreign Policy</u> blog, February 18, 2010. 
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter Katzenstein and Rudra Sil, "Eclectic Theorizing in the Study and Practice of International Relations," in Reus-Smit and Snidal, editors, <u>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</u> (Oxford, 2008), 109-131. • Robert W. Cox, "The Point Is not Just to Explain the World but to Change It," in Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds, <u>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</u> (Oxford, 2008), 84-93.