

DEPARTMENT OF GOVERNMENT

UNIVERSITY OF ESSEX

2011/12

**THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS**

GV-902

**Course Tutor:
Kristian Skrede Gleditsch**

**Room: 5.415
Tel: Ext. 2517
E-mail: ksg@essex.ac.uk**

Office hours: Thursday 12-14, or by appointment

GV-902: THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Course Description:

This course offers an introduction to theories of International Relations (IR). The principal aims of the course are: (a) to familiarize students with theories and conceptual tools used to analyze world politics, and (b) to explore how different theories and conceptual tools speak to contemporary debates and events.

The first part of the course focuses on key concepts, approaches to the study of IR, and trends in IR theory. We will explore enduring issues in both early theoretical contributions to the study of IR and contemporary research. We will also examine the relationship of International Relations as discipline to Political Science and the social sciences more broadly.

The second part of the course offers a theoretically informed examination of the analysis of specific issues and debates in contemporary international relations theory.

Course Eligibility:

This is the core course for the MA International Relations and required for all students in this MA program. The course is in principle open to students from other MAs, with the course supervisor's permission, and provided we have sufficient space to accommodate other students. Since this is an MA course I will assume a basic knowledge of IR theory and international history. More specifically, students are expected to have read something akin to one of the general undergraduate textbooks indicated under the reading list *prior* to the course. Students unfamiliar with material or concepts *must* consult one of these textbooks. The reading list provides references to alternative introductory text. However, these should be used as supplements, rather than replacements for the recommended textbooks.

Administration:

The course administrator is Mrs. Claire Chell. She can be found in the Graduate Office in 5B.314, tel. extension 2751, email: clchell@essex.ac.uk. The office is open Monday to Friday 10:00-13:00 and 14:00-16:00.

Course Objectives:

The objective of the course is to provide students with an overview of a wide and intellectually demanding range of IR literature and the ability to use this material to analyze world politics. The course aims to provide a sound basis for studying politics from different theoretical and methodological viewpoints. By the end of the course the students should: (i) have a strong understanding of the origins, historical evolution, and current debates and challenges of the discipline of International Relations, (ii) have an in-depth and systematic knowledge of IR scholarship, and be able to critically evaluate this scholarship and explore new insights and working hypotheses in the study of world politics, (iii) understand the relationship between theory and practice in world politics, (iv) be able to engage in current debates on the analysis world politics.

Key Skills:

This course will help students to develop the following skills: (i) Communication, presentation and argumentation skills, (ii) team-work skills in joint presentations and small discussion groups, (iii) writing and research skills through essays, assignments, and presentations, (iv) improving their own learning and performance by responding to comments, including criticism, (v) information technology skills through using research tools, (vi) self-direction and originality in tackling and solving problems, (vii) development of qualities and transferable skills necessary for employment, requiring the exercise of initiative and personal responsibility.

Course Assessment:

The course grade will be composed of four elements:

- an assignment on an hypothesis in International Relations, due in Week 4, worth 10%
- a review of the literature on a research question in International Relations. A brief statement of the topic (no more than half a page) must be submitted by Week 5 for approval. The review itself is due in Week 10, and worth 20%. The word limit is 2,500-3,000 words
- an essay assignment, due in Week 25, worth 20%. The word limit is 2,500-3,000 words.
- an unseen three-hour examination, in the Summer term, worth 50%. The examinations office will notify you of the precise time and location closer to the date itself.

Notes on Assignments:

(i) Students should hand in all assignments on time. Late submission of written work will be heavily penalized. In accordance with Department of Government rules, late assignments will incur a penalty of *3 marks for each working day they are late*. Since this is a Department-wide rule, it will be applied *without exception* in this course.

(ii) Extensions to the given deadlines will be granted only under *exceptional* circumstances and only *before the essay is due*. Requests must be made in writing (not by email) and supported by documented evidence, such as a letter from a doctor explaining the relevant circumstances. For further details on extensions, see the relevant sections of *Postgraduate Handbook*.

(iii) Essays are marked on the basis of their focus on the question/topic, argument, use of evidence, analysis, clarity, structure, command and use of literature, bibliographical research, imagination and originality.

(iv) Essays should be fully referenced, citing the source of ideas or facts contained in them. Students can use any established system of referencing used by a journal, but the references must be consistent.

(iv) Plagiarism is a serious academic offence. You commit plagiarism if you submit work in which text has been copied from another source, whether a book, an article, or another student, without acknowledging the source. The penalties for plagiarism are very severe. The *Postgraduate Handbook* provides more details on plagiarism.

Teaching Method & Expectations:

In general:

The course will be taught in 20 two-hour seminars. The seminars are based on students' active participation. It is essential that students read at least the core readings *before* each seminar.

On the Required Readings:

The readings attached to each topic are not exhaustive. Students are expected to use references and suggested supplementary readings to guide their own exploration of the literature.

Books for the Course:

Although students will be required to consult a range of sources, all students should consider purchasing the following texts:

- Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse, and Beth A Simmons, eds. 2002. *Handbook of International Relations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE, ISBN: 0761963057 (hereafter Carlsnaes et al.).
- Midlarsky, Manus I. 2000. *Handbook of War Studies II*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, ISBN: 0-472-06724-9.
- Pinker, Steven. 2011. *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. New York: Penguin, ISBN: 0670022953
- Vasquez, John A. 1996. *Classics of International Relations*. Upper Saddle, NJ: Prentice Hall, ISBN: 0131466488 (excerpts from classical texts. This is out of print according to the campus bookstore, but you may be able to find second hand copies on the internet.)

The following books are also recommended for purchase:

- Goldstein, Joshua. 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN: 0521001803.
- Goldstein, Joshua. 2011. *Winning the War on War: The Decline of Armed Conflict Worldwide*. Hialeah, FL: Dutton, ISBN: 978-0-525-95253-4
- Katzenstein, Peter J., Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner. 1999. *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, ISBN: 0262611449. Note that this is based on a special issue of *International Organization* (vol. 52, no. 4). This is available electronically from JSTOR.
- Pfaltzgraff, Robert L., and James E. Dougherty. 2001. *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey*. New York: Longman, ISBN: 0321048318.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, ISBN: 0075548526. (This book is certainly a classic, but due to the outrageous price demanded for this relatively short paperback you are probably better off borrowing a copy.)

You should also read, or be familiar with, ONE of the following textbooks:

- Frieden, Jeffrey A.; David A. Lake, & Kenneth A. Schultz. 2009. *World Politics: Interests, Interactions, Institutions*. New York: Norton

- Nicholson, Michael. 1996. *Causes and Consequences in International Relations: A Conceptual Study*. London, New York: Frances Pinter.
- Russett, Bruce; Harvey Starr, and David Kinsella. 2005. *World Politics: The Menu for Choice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.

Other texts that you may wish to consult include:

- Goldstein, Joshua S., and Jon C. Pevehouse. 2006. *International Relations, 7th ed.* New York: Pearson Longman.
- Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith. 1991. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Kegley, Charles. ed. 1995. *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995.
- Sprinz, Detlef and Yael Wolinsky-Nahmias, eds. 2004. *Models, Numbers, and Cases: Methods for Studying International Relations*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Viotti, Paul and Mark Kauppi. 1999. *International Relations Theory: Realism, Pluralism, Globalism and Beyond*. London: Allyn and Bacon.

Journals

For contemporary developments in the discipline you should pay particular attention to journals and periodicals. Some of the leading journals/periodicals you should review regularly include:

American Political Science Review
American Journal of Political Science
British Journal of Politics and International Relations
British Journal of Political Science
European Journal of International Relations
International Organization
International Security
International Studies Quarterly
International Studies Review
Journal of Conflict Resolution
Journal of Peace Research
Review of International Studies
World Politics

A number of these (and many other) journals are now available electronically. Please consult the library home page for details on connections from on and off campus.

Professional Associations

Graduate students may join the *International Studies Association*, the *British International Studies Association*, or the *Peace Science Society (International)* for a nominal charge. Membership entitles you to free copies of their journals, and many postgraduate students attend their annual conferences.

Lecture Topics and Readings:

1. Introduction to the Study of International Relations

Week 2: Introduction/organization + brief history of IR

Weekly objective: This session will provide an overview of the course, explaining assessments and administrative procedures to be followed. We will also review key varieties of international relations theory, the origins of the field, and the influence of some important historical events.

Required:

- Chan, Steve. 2002. "On Different Types of IR Scholarship", *Journal of Peace Research* 39(6):747-756.
- Kahler, Miles. 1997. "Inventing International Relations: International Relations Theory after 1945", In Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry. eds., *New Thinking in International Relations Theory*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 20-53.
- Schmidt, Brian C. "On the History and Historiography of International Relations" in Carlsnaes et al.

Supplementary:

- Katzenstein, Peter J.; Robert O. Keohane & Stephen D. Krasner "International Organization and the Study of World Politics" in Katzenstein et al.
- Knutsen, Thorbjørn. 1997. *A History of International Relations Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Wæver, Ole "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations" in Katzenstein et al.

Week 3: Explaining international events

Weekly objective: We will review the distinction between description and explanation, as well as central concepts such as puzzles, theory, mechanisms, and hypotheses, using the Peloponnesian war and Thucydides as an example.

Required

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 1985. "Toward a Scientific Understanding of International Conflict: A Personal View", *International Studies Quarterly* 29:121-54 (with comments).
- Thucydides "The Melian Dialogue", In Vasquez, or online (e.g., <http://www.wsu.edu:8001/~dee/GREECE/MELIAN.HTM>)
- Russett, Bruce M., and William Antholis. 1992. "Do Democracies Fight Each Other? Evidence from the Peloponnesian War". *Journal of Peace Research* 29 (4):415-434.
- At least one reading on theory and hypotheses, either Elster, Hempel, or Little

Supplementary:

- Davidson, James West & Mark Hamilton Lytle. 2000. *After the Fact: The Art of Historical Detection*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Elster, Jon. 1989. *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fearon James D. 1991. “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science”, *World Politics* 43(2):169-195.
- Goldstein, Chapter 2.
- Hempel, Carl G. 1966. *Philosophy of Natural Science*. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Little, Daniel. 1991. *Varieties of Social Explanation: An Introduction to The Philosophy of Science*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Njølstad, Olav. 1990. “Learning from History? Case Studies and the Limits to Theory-Building”, In *Arms Races: Technological and Political Dynamics*, edited by N. P. Gleditsch and O. Njølstad. London: Sage.
- Stern, Fritz. 1973. *The Varieties of History: From Voltaire to the Present*. New York: Vintage Books.

Week 4: Does sovereignty make international politics inherently distinct?

Weekly objective: Much of IR theory holds that international relations (or politics between states) is fundamentally different from politics within states, and emphasize the differences between IR and other areas of political science. We will review what is entailed by the concept of state sovereignty, the evolution of states and changing conceptions of sovereignty, as well as key arguments and counterarguments about the alleged distinctiveness of IR.

Required:

- Carneiro, Robert L. 1970. “A Theory of the Origin of the State”, *Science* 169:733—8.
- Biersteker, Thomas J. “State, Sovereignty and Territory” in Carlsnaes et al.
- Hobbes, Thomas “Of the Natural Condition of Mankind. . .”, in Vasquez
- Krasner, Stephen D. 1995/96. “Compromising Westphalia”, *International Security* 20(3): 115-151.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. “From *The Prince*” in Vasquez

Supplementary:

- Eichengreen, Barry “Dental Hygiene and Nuclear War: How International Relations Look from Economics” in Katzenstein et al.
- Goldstein, Joshua, pp. 1-34, 128-139, 183-194.
- Jackson, Robert H. 1987. “Quasi-States, Dual Regimes, and Neoclassical Theory: International Jurisprudence and the Third World”, *International Organization* 41(4):519-549.
- Milner, Helen K. “Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics” in Katzenstein et al.
- Spruyt, Hendrik. 1994. *The Sovereign State and its Competitors*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 1975. *The Formation of National States in Western Europe*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Vernon, Raymond. 1971. *Sovereignty at Bay: The Multinational Spread of U.S. Enterprise*. New York: Basic Books.

2. Theoretical Frameworks in the Study of International Relations

Week 5: Realism and structural theories of IR

Weekly objective: Realism emphasizes how inherent features of IR shape the behavior of states. We will explore what is meant by structural theories, review the main arguments set forward by realism on how system structure affects behavior, differences between common or possible system structures (e.g., bi-polarity vs. multi-polarity), and the concept of power as capabilities.

Required:

- Braumoeller, Bear. 2008. "Systemic Politics and the Origins of Great Power Conflict", *American Political Science Review* 102(1): 77-93.
- Kaplan, Morton "Some Problems of International Systems Research" in Vasquez OR "Balance of Power, Bipolarity and Other Models of International Systems" *American Political Science Review* 51(3): 684-695, 1957.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. "Political Power" and "A Realist Theory of International Politics" in Vasquez
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, excerpt in Vasquez or chs. 4, 5, and 6.

Supplementary:

- Baldwin, David. "Power and International Relations" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Buzan, Barry, Charles Jones, and Richard Little. 1993. *The Logic of Anarchy: Neorealism to Structural Realism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Carr, Edward Hallett. 1939. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919--1939*. London: Macmillan.
- Clausewitz, Carl von. 1831/1984. *On War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gullick, Edward V. 1955. *Europe's Classical Balance of Power*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Haas, Ernst B. 1953. "The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept, or Propaganda?" *World Politics* 5(4):442-477.
- Herz, John. 1950. "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma", *World Politics* 2(1):157-180.
- James, Patrick. 2002. *International Relations and Scientific Progress: Structural Realism Reconsidered*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O. 2001. *Neorealism and its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Legro, Jeffrey W. and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24(2):5-55.
- Mearsheimer, John. 2002. *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 1990. "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War". *International Security* 15:5-56.
- Schroeder, Paul W. 1972. *Austria, Great Britain and the Crimean War: The Destruction of the European Concert*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Week 6: Liberalism and world order

Weekly objective: This session provides an introduction to alternative views on international relations. Some identify particular fundamental challenges to peace and advance proposals to overcome these. Others point to limitations of the state centric view of IR.

Required

- Grotius “Prolegomena to The Law of War and Peace” OR Clark and Sohn “World Peace Through World Law” OR Claude “World Government” in Vasquez
- Simmons, BA. 2002. “Capacity, Commitment and Compliance: International Law and the Settlement of Territorial Disputes”. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(6):829-856.
- Wallensteen, Peter. 1984. “Universalism vs. Particularism: On the Limits of Major Power Order”. *Journal of Peace Research* 21(3): 243-257.
- Wilson, Woodrow “The World Must be Made Safe for Democracy” and “The Fourteen Points” OR Kant “Perpetual Peace” in Vasquez.

Supplementary:

- Angell, Norman. 1910. *The Great Illusion: A Study of the Relation of Military Power in Nations to Their Economic and Social Advantage*. London, Heinemann.
- Burley, Anne-Marie. 1993. “International Law and International Relations Theory”, *American Journal of International Law* 87 (2):205-39.
- Deutsch, Karl W. 1944. “Medieval Unity and the Economic Conditions for an International Civilization”. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* 10(1): 18-35.
- Deutsch, Karl W. 1954. *Political Community at the International Level: Problems of Definition and Measurement*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. 1989. *Power and Interdependence*. New York: Harper Collins (or Joseph S. Nye and Robert O. Keohane. 1971. “Transnational Relations and World Politics: An Introduction”. *International Organization* 25 (3):329-349).
- Milner, Helen. 1991. “The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations: A Critique”, *Review of International Studies* 17 (1):67-85.
- Jönsson, Christer. “Diplomacy, Bargaining, and Negotiation” in Carlsnaes et al.
- Zürn, Michael “From Interdependence to Globalization” in Carlsnaes et al.

Week 7: Theories of international regimes

Weekly objective: Is anarchy really as fundamental an obstacle to cooperation as realists insist? We will consider why many are more optimistic about the prospects for cooperation - even within the basic premises assumed by realists - based on the idea that the shadow of the future can help sustain cooperation.

Required:

- Axelrod, Robert. 1980. “Effective Choice in the Prisoner's Dilemma”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 24:3-25.
- Grieco, Joseph M., Robert Powell, and Duncan Snidal. 1993. “The Relative Gains Problem for International Cooperation”. *American Political Science Review* 87 (3):729-743.
- Keohane, Robert “From *After Hegemony*” in Vasquez
- Jervis, Robert. 1978. “Cooperation under the Security Dilemma”, *World Politics* 30:167-214.

Supplementary:

- Axelrod, Robert. 1997. *The Complexity of Cooperation: Agent-Based Models of Competition and Collaboration*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Binmore, Ken. 1994. *Game Theory and the Social Contract, Vol. 1: Playing Fair*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Grieco, Joseph M. 1988. "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism", *International Organization* 42:485-507.
- Keohane, Robert O. 1986. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Powell, Robert. 1993. "Guns, Butter, and Anarchy". *American Political Science Review* 87 (1):115-132.
- Kenneth A. Oye, ed. 1996. *Cooperation under Anarchy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Simmons, Beth and Lisa Martin "International Organizations and Institutions" in Carlsnaes et al.

Week 8: Decision theoretic approaches to IR

Weekly objective: Introduction to analysis of conflict focusing on pairs of states and greater emphasis on individual decision making in accounting for behavior. We will consider some simple formal treatments of the decision to resort to force and highlight their differences with structural realism.

Required

- Fearon, James D. 1995. "Rationalist Explanations for War", *International Organization* 49(3):379-414.
- Kahler, Miles "Rationality in International Relations" in Katzenstein et al. OR Morrow, James "The Ongoing Game-Theoretic Revolution" in Midlarsky OR c) Snidal, Duncan "Rational Choice and International Relations" in Carlsnes et al.
- Lake, David A. 2010/11. "Two Cheers for Bargaining Theory: Assessing Rationalist Explanations of the Iraq War", *International Security* 35(3): 7–52
- Walt, Steven. 1999. "Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies", *International Security* 23(4):5-48, see also responses by Martin, Niou and Ordeshook, and Zagare, and Walt's reply in *International Security* 24(2):74-130.

Students are also encouraged to skim the following article, now somewhat dates:

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 1980. "An Expected Utility Theory of International Conflict", *American Political Science Review* 74 (4):917-31.

Supplementary:

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph Siverson, and James D. Morrow. 2005. *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fearon, James. 1998. "Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation", *International Organization* 52(2):269-305.
- Lake, David and Robert Powell (eds.). 1999. *Strategic Choice and International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Powell, Robert. 1997. *In the Shadow of Power: States and Strategies in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Reiter, Dan. 2003. "Exploring the Bargaining Model of War", *Perspectives on Politics* 1 (1):27-43.

Week 9: Hierarchical and radical perspectives

Weekly objective: We will consider different theoretical perspectives that see the international system as a hierarchy rather than an anarchy, differences in their organizing principles, the variety of different relationship between actors within the system, and the forces for change in system structure over time.

Required:

- Kugler, Jacek and Douglas Lemke “The Power Transition Research Program: Assessing Theoretical and Empirical Advances” in Midlarsky et al
- Lake, David A. 1996. “Anarchy, Hierarchy, and the Variety of International Relations”, *International Organization* 50(1):1-34.
- Doran, Charles “Confronting the Principles of the Power Cycle: Changing Systems Structure, Expectations, and War” in Midlarsky et al. OR Rasler, Karen & William R. Thompson “Global War and the Political Economy of Structural Change” in Midlarsky
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1979. “The Rise and Future Demise of the World-Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis”, in *The Capitalist World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 387-415.

Supplementary:

- Brenner, Robert. 1977. “The Origins of Capitalist Development: A critique of Neo-Smithian Marxism”, *New Left Review* 104:25-92.
- dos Santos, Theodorico. 1970. “The Structure of Dependence”, *American Economic Review* 60:231-6.
- Gilpin, Robert. 1981. *War and Change in World Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Goldstein, Joshua S. 1988. *Long Cycles: Prosperity and War in the Modern Age*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Hobden, Steven and Richard Wynne Jones. 2001 “Marxist Theories of International Relations”, in *The Globalization of World Politics*, edited by John Baylis and Steve Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lake, David A. 1993. “Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy: Naked Emperor or Tattered Monarch with Potential?” *International Studies Quarterly* 37 (4):459-89.

Week 10: Psychological approaches to international politics

Weekly objective: Are decision makers really as rational as often assumed, or is rational choice theory too parsimonious? We will consider some of criticisms of rational choice and expected utility theory from a behavioral perspective, as well as some potential insights on decision making from experimental psychology.

Required:

- Johnson, Dominic. D.P. and Dominic Tierney. 2011. “The Rubicon Theory of War: How the Path to Conflict Reaches the Point of No Return”, *International Security* 36(1): 7-40.

- Levy, Jack S. “Loss Aversion, Framing Effects, and International Conflict: Perspectives from Prospect Theory” in Midlarsky OR Stein, Janice Gross “Psychological Explanations of International Conflict” in Carlsnes et al.
- Suedfeld, Peter and Philip Tetlock. 1977. “Integrative Complexity of Communications in International Crises” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 21(1): 169-184.
- Sylvan, Donald A.; Thomas M. Ostrom, and Katherine Gannon. 1994. “Case-Based, Model-Based, and Explanation-Based Styles of Reasoning in Foreign Policy”. *International Studies Quarterly* 38(1): 61-90.

Supplementary:

- Goldgeier, James M. and Phillip E. Tetlock. 2001. “Psychology and International Relations Theory”, *Annual Review of Political Science* 4:67-92.
- Goertz, Gary and Paul F. Diehl “(Enduring) Rivalries” in Midlarsky
- Jervis, Robert. 1968. “Hypotheses on Misperception” *World Politics* 20(3):454-79.
- Kowert, Paul A., and Margaret G. Hermann. 1997. “Who Takes Risks? Daring and Caution in Foreign Policy Making”. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41 (5):611-637.
- Levy, Jack S. 1997. “Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations”, *International Studies Quarterly* 41(1): 87-112.
- McDermott, Rose. 2004. *Political Psychology in International Relations*. Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Snyder, Richard C., H.W. Bruck, and Burton Sapin (eds.) with Valerie M. Hudson, Derek H. Cholleet, and James M. Goldgeier. 2002. *Foreign Policy Decision Making (Revisited)*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Stein, Arthur A. 1982. “When Misperception Matters”, *World Politics* 34(4):505-526.

Week 11: Norms and culture in global society

Weekly objective: Modern IR theory attributes much importance to preferences, but has little to say about where preferences come from, and tends to treat actors and ideas as given and fixed over time. We will consider contributions that treat actors/identity as malleable and socially constructed, as well as perspectives that consider the international system as a society in its own right.

Required:

- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change” in Katzenstein et al.
- Meyer, John W., John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. “World Society and the Nation-State”, *American Journal of Sociology* 103 (1):144-81.
- Mueller, John. 2004-5. “What Was the Cold War About? Evidence from Its Ending”, *Political Science Quarterly* 119(4): 609-631.
- Wendt, Alex. 1992. “Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics”, *International Organization* 46:391-425.

Supplementary:

- Adler, Emmanuel “Constructivism in International Relations” in Carlsnaes et al.
- Ashley, Richard. 1987. “The Geopolitics of Geopolitical space: Toward a Critical Social Theory of International Politics”. *Alternatives* 12 (3):403-434.

- Ashley, Richard K. & R. B. J. Walker. 1990. "Introduction: Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies" *International Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 259-268
- Buzan, Barry. 1993. "From International System to International Society: Structural Realism and Regime Theory Meet the English School". *International Organization* 47 (3):327-352.
- Der Derian, James, and Michael Shapiro. 1989. *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics*. New York: Lexington.
- Fearon, James and Alexander Wendt "Rationalism vs. Constructivism: A Sceptical View" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Goldstein, Joshua. 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, ISBN: 0521001803.
- Neufield, Mark. 1995. *The Restructuring of International Relations Theory*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ray, James Lee. 1989. "The Abolition of Slavery and the End of International War" *International Organization* 43 (3):405-439.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. 1997. "The Constitutional Structure of International Society and the Nature of Fundamental Institutions" *International Organization* 51 (4):555-89.
- Risse, Thomas "Transnational Actors and World Politics" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Ruggie, John Gerard "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge" in Katzenstein et al.
- Tickner, J. Ann "Feminist Perspective on International Relations" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.

SPRING TERM:

II. Controversies in International Relations Theory

Week 16: Alignment & Alliances

Weekly objective: Alliances are an important form of security cooperation, acknowledged even by scholars generally skeptical of the possibility of international cooperation. We will consider the rationale for alliances, theories of alliance formation, the commitment problem inherent in promises of military aid, and how formalization can help overcome problems of cooperation in alliances between allies.

Required:

- Christensen, Thomas J., and Jack Snyder. 1990. "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity", *International Organization* 44(2):137-68.
- Gartzke, Erik, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2004. "Regime Type and Commitment: Why Democracies are Actually Less Reliable Allies", *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (3):775-95.
- Morrow, James D. 1991. "Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances", *American Journal of Political Science* 35:904-33.

- Vasquez, John A. 1997. "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition (with Comments)". *American Political Science Review* 91 (4):899-912.

Supplementary

- Altfeld, Michael F. 1984. "The Decision to Ally: A Theory and Test", *Western Political Quarterly* 37:523-44.
- Conybeare, John A.C. 1994. "The Portfolio Benefits of Free Riding in Military Alliances", *International Studies Quarterly* 38:405-19.
- Gartzke, Erik, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2004. "Regime Type and Commitment: Why Democracies are Actually Less Reliable Allies", *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (3):775-95.
- Leeds, Brett Ashley, Andrew J. Long, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. 2002a. "Reevaluating Alliance Reliability: Specific Threats, Specific Promises", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44:686-99.
- Müller, Harald. "Security Cooperation" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Sandler, Todd, and Keith Hartley. 1995. *The Economics of Defense*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 2.
- Siverson, Randolph, and Harvey Starr. 1994. "Regime Change and the Restructuring of Alliances", *American Journal of Political Science* 38:145-61.
- Walt, Stephen M. 1987. *The Origin of Alliances*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Week 17: Domestic institutions and international behavior

Weekly objective: To what extent do domestic politics influence the international behavior of states? We will consider the role of domestic organization and public opinion on foreign policy formation, and evaluate to what the extent this may undermine the validity of the assumption of states as unitary actors. We will also consider how international forces may affect cleavages within societies.

Required:

- Allison and Halperin "Bureaucratic Politics" in Vasquez, OR Allison, Graham. 1969. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis", *American Political Science Review* 63:689-718.
- Christopher, Gelpi and Peter Feaver. 2002. "Speak Softly and Carry a Big Stick? Veterans in the Political Elite and the American Use of Force". *American Political Science Review* 96 (4):779-793.
- Putnam, Robert. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games", *International Organization* 42:427-60.
- Russett, Bruce M. and Thomas W. Graham. 1989. "Public Opinion and National Security Policy: Relationships and Impacts" in *Handbook of War Studies*, edited by Manus Midlarsky. London: Unwin Hyman, 1989 OR Gourevitch, Peter "Domestic Politics and International Relations" in Carlsnaes et al.

Supplementary:

- Aldrich, John, John L. Sullivan, and Eugene Borgida. 1989. "Foreign Affairs and Issue Voting: Do Presidential Candidates 'Waltz before a Blind Audience?'" *American Political Science Review* 83 (1):123-141.

- Almond, Gabriel A. 1960. *The American People and Foreign Policy*. New York: Praeger.
- Baum, Matthew A. 2003. *Soft News Goes to War: Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy in the New Media Age*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bendor, Jonathan and Thomas H. Hammond. 1992. "Rethinking Allison's Models", *American Political Science Review* 86(2):301-22.
- Gourevitch, Peter A. 1978. "The Second Image Reversed". *International Organization* 32 (4): 881-912
- Martin, Lisa L. 2000. *Democratic Commitments: Legislatures and International Cooperation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sanders, David, Hugh Ward, David Marsh, and Tony Fletcher. 1987. "Government Popularity and the Falklands War: A Reassessment". *British Journal of Political Science* 17 (3):281-313.

Week 18: A Liberal Peace?

Weekly objective: The democratic peace – or the empirical finding that no two democracies have ever fought one another – is increasingly regarded as an empirical fact, but there is little consensus on how democratic institutions may constrain the risk of war. We will consider explanations based on normative features and institutional characteristics, as well as the possible additional implications of arguments relating democracy and peace.

Required:

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace", *American Political Science Review* 93(4):791-807.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2004. "Conquest and Regime Change: An Evolutionary Model of the Spread of Democracy and Peace", *International Studies Quarterly* 48:603-29.
- Gartzke, Erik. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace", *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 166–191.
- Russett, Bruce M. and Harvey Starr "From Democratic Peace to Kantian Peace: Democracy and Conflict in the International System" in Midlarsky

Supplementary:

- Buzan, Barry. 1984. "Economic Structure and International Security: The Limits of the Liberal Case", *International Organization* 38(4):597-624.
- Fearon, James D. 1994. "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of Disputes". *American Political Science Review* 88 (43):577-592.
- Gartzke, Erik. 1998. "Kant We All Just Get Along? Opportunity, Willingness, and the Origins of the Democratic Peace". *American Journal of Political Science* 42 (1):1-27.
- Gartzke, Erik, Quan Li, and Charles Boehmer. 2001. "Investing in the Peace: Economic Interdependence and International Conflict", *International Organization* 55:391-438.
- Gleditsch, Kristian Skrede. 2002. *All International Politics is Local: The Diffusion of Conflict, Integration, and Democratization*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

- Levy, Jack S. 1989. "The Diversionary Theory of War: A Critique", In *Handbook of War Studies*, edited by Manus I. Midlarsky, 259-88. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Mansfield, Edward, and Jack Snyder. 1995. "Democratization and the Danger of War". *International Security* 20:5-38.
- Morgan, T. Clifton, and Valerie Schwebach. 1992. "Take Two Democracies and Call Me in the Morning: A Prescription for Peace?" *International Interactions* 19 (4):305-320.
- Oneal, John, and Bruce M. Russett. 2001. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: Norton.
- Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory". *American Political Science Review* 97 (4):585-602.
- Schultz, Kenneth A. 1998. "Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises". *American Political Science Review* 92 (4):829-44.
- Ward, Michael D., and Kristian S. Gleditsch. 1998. "Democratizing for Peace". *American Political Science Review* 92 (1):51-61.

Week 19: International organization and international law

Weekly objective: Many traditional IR approaches tend to argue that institutions are either completely effective or completely ineffective in fostering cooperation. We will consider differences among types of institutions, when we can expect them to be more or less effective, as well as the relationship between features of issues areas and the appropriate design of institutions.

Required:

- Boehmer, Charles, Erik Gartzke and Timothy Nordstrom. 2005. "Do Intergovernmental Organizations Promote Peace?" *World Politics* 57 (1):1-38.
- Downs, George, David Roake, and Peter Barsoom. 1996. "Is the Good News About Compliance Good News About Cooperation?" *International Organization* 50 (3):379-406.
- Raustiala, Kal and Anne-Marie Slaughter "International Law, International Relations, and Compliance" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Voeten, Erik. 2005. "The Political Origins of the UN Security Council's Ability to Legitimize the Use of Force", *International Organization* 59(3): 527-557.

Supplementary:

- Abbott, Kenneth W., Robert O. Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Duncan Snidal. 2000. "The Concept of Legalization", *International Organization* 54 (3): 401-419.
- Choi, Young Jong and James A. Caporaso "Comparative Regional Integration" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. "The Rational Design of International Institutions", *International Organization* 55(4):761-799.
- Morrow, James. 1994. "Modelling the Forms of International Cooperation: Distribution vs. Information", *International Organization* 48(3).
- Schmitz, Hans Peter and Kathryn Sikkink "International Human Rights" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Simmons, Beth A. 2000. "International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs", *American Political Science Review* 94(4).

- Sweet, Alec Stone and Thomas L. Brunnell. 1998. “Constructing a Supranational Constitution: Dispute Resolution and Governance in the European Community”, *American Political Science Review* 92 (1):63-81.

Week 20: Is intrastate conflict different?

Weekly objective: IR theory has traditionally assumed that conflict within states is qualitatively different from conflict between sovereign states. To what extent do generalizations about the risk of war between states that we have seen transfer to understanding conflict within states? What wider international security implications may arise out of conflicts within states?

Required:

- Cederman, Lars-Erik “Nationalism and Ethnicity” in Carlsnaes et al.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Nils B. Weidmann, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2011. “Horizontal Inequalities and Ethno-Nationalist Civil War: A Global Comparison”, *American Political Science Review*, forthcoming.
- Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 2003. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War”, *American Political Science Review* 97 (1):75-90.
- Ross, Michael. 2004. “What Do We Know About Natural Resources and Civil War?” *Journal of Peace Research* 41 (2):337-56.

Supplementary:

- Balch-Lindsay, Dylan, and Andrew Enterline. 2000. “Killing Time: The World Politics of Civil War Duration”. *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (4):615-642.
- Collier, Paul, and Anke Hoeffler. 2004. “Greed and Grievance in Civil War”, *Oxford Economic Papers - New Series* 56:563-95.
- de Figueiredo, Rui J. P., and Barry R. Weingast. 1999. “The Rationality of Fear: Political Opportunism and Ethnic Conflict”, In *Civil Wars, Insecurity and Intervention*, edited by B. Walter and J. Snyder. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Ghobarah, Hazem, Paul Huth, and Bruce M. Russett. 2003. “Civil Wars Kill and Maim People-Long after the Shooting Stops”. *American Political Science Review* 97 (2):189-202.
- Hegre, Håvard; Tanja Ellingsen, Scott Gates and Nils Petter Gleditsch, 2001. “Toward A Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War 1816-1992”, *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 16-33.
- Kalyvas, Stathis. 2003. “The Ontology of “Political Violence:” Action and Identity in Civil Wars”, *Perspectives on Politics* 1(3)475-494.
- Kalyvas, Stathis. 2006. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lake, David A. and Donald Rothchild 1996 “Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict”, *International Security* 21(2):41-75.
- Mason, T. David, and Patrick J. Fett. 1996. “How Civil Wars End: A Rational Choice Approach”. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40 (4):546-568.
- Reynal-Querol, Marta. 2002. “Ethnicity, Political Systems and Civil Wars”. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46 (1):29-54.
- Sambanis, Nicholas. 2004. “Using Case Studies to Expand Economic Models of Civil War”, *Perspectives on Politics* 2(2): 259-279.

Week 21: Conflict and cooperation in international trade and finance

Weekly objective: Many approaches to IR theory treat politics and economics as separate domains. We will consider whether problems of conflict and cooperation can be understood in terms of the general tools and concepts reviewed earlier in the course, focusing specifically on finance and trade.

Required:

- Alt, James E. and Michael Gilligan. 1994 “The Political Economy of Trading States: Factor Specificity, Collective Action Problems, and Domestic Political Institutions”, *Journal of Political Philosophy* 2 (2):165-92.
- Mansfield Edward, Helen Milner and B. Peter Rosendorff. 2000. “Free to Trade: Democracies, Autocracies and International Trade”, *American Political Science Review* 94 (2):305-322.
- Quinn, Dennis and Carla Inclan. 1997. “The Origins of Financial Openness: A Study of Current and Capital Account Liberalization”, *American Journal of Political Science* 41 (3):771-813.
- Rogowski, Ronald. 1987. “Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade”, *American Political Science Review* 81(4):1121-1137

Supplementary:

- Bernhard, William; J. Lawrence Broz, and William Roberts Clark, “The Political Economy of Monetary Institutions”, *International Organization* 56, 4 (Autumn 2002): 693–723.
- Clark, William Roberts and Mark Hallerberg. 2000. “Mobile Capital, Domestic Institutions, and Electorally Induced Monetary and Fiscal Policy”, *American Political Science Review* 94 (2):323-346.
- Cohen, Benjamin “International Finance” in Carlsnaes et al.
- Milner, Helen V. “International Trade” in Carlsnaes et al.
- Li, Quan and Adam Resnick. 2003. “Reversal of Fortunes: Democratic Institutions and Foreign Direct Investment Inflows to Developing Countries”, *International Organization* 57 (1): 175-211.
- Scheve, Kenneth F. and Matthew J. Slaughter. 2001. “What Determines Individual Trade-Policy Preferences?” *Journal of International Economics* 54 (3):267-92.
- Schonhardt-Bailey, Cheryl. 2003. “Ideology, Party, and Interests in the British Parliament of 1841-1847”, *British Journal of Political Science* 33 (3):581-605.

Week 22: Globalization, development, and the environment

Weekly objective: We will consider the concept of globalization, to what extent the current international system can be said to be “more globalized”. We will also consider the impact of globalization on the environment and development, and the possible implications for conflict and security.

Required:

- Fischer, Stanley. 2003. “Globalization and its Challenges”, *American Economic Review* 93 (2):1-30.

- Homer-Dixon, Thomas F. 1991. "On the Threshold: Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict", *International Security* 16:76-116.
- Neumayer, Erik, and Indra de Soysa. 2005. "False Prophet, or Genuine Savior? Assessing the Effects of Economic Openness on Sustainable Development, 1980-1999", *International Organization* 59 (3):731-72.
- Williamson, Jeffrey G. 1996. "Globalization, Convergence and History", *Journal of Economic History* 56 (2):277-306.

Supplementary:

- Raustiala, Kal. 1997. "States, NGOs, and International Environmental Institutions", *International Studies Quarterly* 41(4):719-740.
- Mitchell, Ronald B. "International Environment" in Carlsnaes et al.

Week 23: Peacemaking and Peacekeeping

Weekly objective: The end of the Cold War has given rise to a proliferation of peacekeeping efforts by the United Nations and other regional organizations. What (if any) is the theoretical rationale for these efforts, and what challenges may prevent them from succeeding in practice?

Required:

- Doyle, Michael W., and Nicholas Sambanis. 2000. "International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis", *American Political Science Review* 94 (4):779-801.
- Fearon, James D. and David D. Laitin. 2004. "Neotrusteeship and the Problem of Weak States", *International Security* 28(4): 5-43.
- Virginia Page Fortna and Lise Morje Howard. 2008. "Pitfalls and Prospects in the Peacekeeping Literature", *Annual Review of Political Science* 11:283-301.
- Mueller, John. 2003. "Policing the Remnants of War", *Journal of Peace Research* 40 (5):507-18.

Supplementary:

- Druckman, Daniel and Paul Stern. 1997. "Evaluating Peacekeeping Missions" *Mershon International Studies Review* 41: 151-165.
- Gilady, Lilach "Peace-making and Conflict Resolution" in Carlsnaes et al.
- Gilligan, Michael and Stephen Stedman. 2003. "Where Do Peacekeepers Go?" *International Studies Review* 5 (2003): 37-54.
- Greig, J. Michael. 2001. "Moments of Opportunity: Recognizing Conditions of Ripeness for International Mediation Between Enduring Rivals", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45:691-718.
- Kuperman, Alan J. 2000. "Rwanda in Retrospect", *Foreign Affairs* 79(1):94-118
- Mueller, John. 2004. *The Remnants of War*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Regan, Patrick M. 1999. "Substituting Policies during U.S. Interventions in Internal Conflicts: A Little of This, a Little of That", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44:90-106.
- Walter, Barbara F. 1997. "The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement", *International Organization* 51(3):335-364.
- Werner, Suzanne. 1999. "The Precarious Nature of Peace: Resolving the Issues, Enforcing the Settlement, and Renegotiating the Terms", *American Journal of Political Science* 43: 912-34.
- Wilkenfeld, Jonathan, Kathleen Young, Victor Asal, and David Quinn. 2003. "Mediating International Crises: Cross-National and Experimental Perspectives". *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47 (3):279-301.
- Zartman, I. William. 2000. "Ripeness: The Hurting Stalemate and Beyond" in Paul Stern and Daniel Druckman (eds.) *International Conflict Resolution After the Cold War*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, pp. 225-250.

Week 24: Assessing Progress in International Relations

Weekly objective: Much has changed in the study of international conflict since Thucydides. Yet, many IR theorists feel that little worthwhile has been added, and that much of current work in IR simply repackages old wine in new bottles. In this session, we will look retrospectively and consider what has been learned in the study of IR relative to different criteria of progress in science.

Required:

- Gaddis, John Lewis. 1992/93. "International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War", *International Security* 17:5-58.
- Ray, James Lee and Bruce Russett. 1996. "The Future as Arbiter of Theoretical Controversies: Predictions, Explanations and the End of the Cold War", *British Journal of Political Science* 26:441-70.
- Simowitz, Roslyn L. & Barry Price. 1986. "Progress in the Study of International Conflict: A Methodological Critique", *Journal of Peace Research* 23(1):29-40.
- Wight, Colin "Philosophy of Social Science and International Relations" in Carlsnaes et al

Supplementary:

- Beck, Nathaniel, Gary King, and Langche Zeng. 2000. "Improving Quantitative Studies of International Conflict: A Conjecture", *American Political Science Review* 94:21-36.
- Bennett, D. Scott, and Allan C. Stam. 2004. *The Behavioral Origins of War*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Hechter, Michael; Timur Kuran, Charles Tilly, Randal Collins, and Edgar Kieser. 1995. "Symposium on Prediction in the Social Sciences", *American Journal of Sociology* 100:1520-615.
- Orme-Johnson, David W.; Charles N. Alexander and John L. Davies. 1988. "International Peace Project in the Middle East: The Maharishi Technology of the Unified Field", *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 32:776-812 (with comments).

Week 25: Review & Open Session

No readings assigned