

University of Georgia
International Affairs 6200, Fall 2007
International Relations Field Seminar

Prof. Maurits van der Veen

Class

Wednesday 6:50 pm – 9:50 pm
Location: 117 Candler Hall
Office hours: Wed. 2-4pm & by appt.

Office

324 Candler Hall
542-3357
maurits@uga.edu

Course description

This course is an introductory graduate seminar to the field of international relations. The main focus is on understanding and evaluating the main theoretical currents in the field. In order to do so, we will read a number of seminal papers in the field, as well as some papers that have attempted to provide empirical verification of different theories.

The field of international relations, a subfield of political science, is theoretically quite diverse. Some of the fundamental debates, such as that between realists and liberals, date back centuries, and show no signs of being resolved. The purpose of this course is three-fold:

- To provide students with an overview of the dominant theoretical approaches in the field
- To introduce students to some of the research problems that are the focus of cutting-edge work in the field, so they can observe and analyze how empirical research is conducted, and how it informs theory development
- To assist students in preparing for the departmental examination in the subfield. (Note: this does not mean that simply reading the works on the syllabus will suffice as preparation!)

Course policies & requirements

Since this is a seminar, I expect you to have done all the reading prior to class, and to arrive prepared to contribute intelligently to the class discussion. Part of your grade is based on class participation, which will be judged in terms of the quality, not the quantity, of your contributions.

The course will be structured as a series of panel presentations, of the kind you would expect to encounter at professional conferences. For each week there are 6 articles on the syllabus, divided into two groups. We will discuss the first 3 articles the first half of each session, take a brief break, and then discuss the second 3 articles. Each article will have one student whose job it is to present that article as though it were his or her own. In other words, this student will try to put the argument of the article forward as convincingly as possible. A fourth student will serve as the discussant for all three papers in the group. As a discussant, this student's task is to comment on similarities and differences between the papers, strengths and weaknesses of each, as well as

make suggestions for improvement. Following the discussant's comments we will open the discussion to include the rest of the class.

I strongly suggest that those of you responsible for a particular paper write an analytical summary of the paper, which will serve 2 purposes: 1) it will help you organize your own panel presentation; and 2) you can share these summaries with your fellow students and accumulate them over the course of the semester, resulting in an invaluable study tool for the comprehensive exam in international relations.

Your written work for the course will have two components. First, each of you will write three response papers, analyzing half of the readings for a particular week. These should be in a format similar to book reviews in academic journals. This means they need to achieve the following tasks: briefly summarize the argument(s), highlight the strengths and weaknesses, and suggest improvements or further research. The response papers ought to be quite similar to the comments you would make as a discussant, and as such I recommend you choose to write them in weeks where you perform the role of discussant. Your choice of weeks in which to write the response papers is free, however. Each of these response papers should be 5-7 pages (double-spaced) in length. They must be turned in on Wednesday morning, the day of the class in question, by 10am at the latest.

In addition, as the final product for the course, each of you will produce a research design addressing a particular question of your choosing in international relations. This research design, which should be about 15 pages in length, should present a theoretical or empirical puzzle, review the relevant literature on the subject, develop some hypotheses, and lay out a methodology for testing those hypotheses. You do not need to perform the actual research necessary to do the hypothesis-testing. The hope is that you will be able to use the research design you develop here in a later project, such as the master's thesis.

In order to make sure you do not postpone the research design until the very end of the semester, you are asked to submit a 3-5 page first concept (basic puzzle, some idea of the relevant literature) after we have completed the first section of the course, on October 17.

Handouts providing more details on the response papers and the research design will be provided in the first class session. Sign-ups for the presenter and discussant slots will be posted on my door (324 Candler Hall) on Monday, August 20th. At this point I will also indicate how many slots you need to sign up for (this will depend, for obvious reasons, on the number of students taking the course).

The overall grade breakdown is as follows:

- Participation: 20%
- Response papers: 10% each
- Research design concept: 10%
- Research design: 40%

Office hours &c

My office hours are Wednesdays, 2-4pm and by appointment. Please do come see me if you have any questions on or problems with the reading material, the writing assignments, or the course in general. If you need to reach me to make an appointment, I am most easily reached by e-mail.

Readings

The following 3 books are required for purchase. Unfortunately, the UGA bookstore lost my book order, so the books are not available there. However, the books are readily available through Amazon.com or Barnes&Noble (bn.com), and you may also be able to get a used copy through Amazon or from one of the second-year students, as the same books were used last year.

- Lake, David A., and Robert Powell, eds. 1999. *Strategic Choice in International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Elman, Colin, and Miriam Elman, eds. 2003. *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mearsheimer, John. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*.

All additional readings are available online through UGA's electronic journals subscriptions, or at the URLs indicated.

Calendar

I. Introduction & Basic Approaches

Wed. Aug. 22 *Introduction; overview of the course*

Refresher overview of IR theory:

- Walt, Stephen M. 1998. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories", *Foreign Policy*, Spring.
- Snyder, Jack. 2004. "One World, Rival Theories." *Foreign Policy*, Nov-Dec 2004.
- Walt, Stephen M. 2005. "The Relationship Between Theory and Policy in International Relations." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8.

Recommended

- Dunn, Frederick. 1949. "The Present Course of International Relations Research." *World Politics* 2(1):80-95.
- Fifield, Russell H. 1948. "The Introductory Course in International Relations." *American Political Science Review* 42(6):1189-1196.

Wed. Aug. 29 **Realism**

- Mearsheimer, John. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*.
- a Chapter 2.
 - b Chapter 5.
 - c Rose, Gideon. 1998. “Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy.” *World Politics* 51(1):144-172.
-
- a Legro, Jeffrey W. and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” *International Security* 24(2):5-55.
 - b Responses to Legro & Moravcsik in *International Security* 25(1).
 - c Schweller, Randall. “Neorealism’s Status Quo Bias” *Security Studies* 5(3):90-121.

Recommended

- Thucydides. *The Pelopponesian War*. (Especially Book 1:66-88 and Book 5:84-116)
- Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*. (Especially chapters 13-17).

Wed. Sep. 5 **Liberalism**

- a Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*, 51(4):513-553.
 - b Deudney, Daniel, and G. John Ikenberry. 1999. “The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order.” *Review of International Studies* 25:179-196.
 - c Owen, John. 1994. “How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace.” *International Security* 19(2).
-
- a Rogowski, Ronald. 1987. “Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade.” *American Political Science Review* 81(4):1121-1137.
 - b Keohane, Robert O. 1988. “International Institutions: Two Approaches.” *International Studies Quarterly* 32 (December).
 - c Goldstein, Judith, Miles Kahler, Robert O. Keohane, and Anne-Marie Slaughter. 2000. “Introduction: Legalization and World Politics.” *International Organization* 54(3): 385-400.

Wed. Sep. 12 **Rational choice approaches**

- a Powell & Lake: Chapter 1 in Lake & Powell
 - b Frieden: Chapter 2 in Lake & Powell
 - c Morrow: Chapter 3 in Lake & Powell
-
- a Rogowski: Chapter 4 in Lake & Powell
 - b Kahler: Chapter 6 in Lake & Powell
 - c Stein: Chapter 7 in Lake & Powell

Wed. Sep. 19 ***Rational choice & game theory: applications & challenges***

- a Fearon, James D. 1995. “Rationalist Explanations for War.” *International Organization* 49(3):379-414.
 - b Reiter, Dani. 2003. “Exploring the Bargaining Model of War.” *Perspectives on Politics* 1(1):27-43.
 - c Powell, Robert. 2004. “The Inefficient Use of Power: Costly Conflict with Complete Information.” *American Political Science Review* 98(2).
-
- a Walt, Stephen M. 1999. “Rigor or rigor mortis? Rational choice and security studies” *International Security* 23(4):5-48.
Responses to Walt, *International Security* 24(2):56-130
 - b Bueno de Mesquita & Morrow; Martin
 - c Niou & Ordeshook; Powell

Recommended

- Axelrod, Robert, and Keohane, Robert O. 1985. “Achieving Cooperation Under Anarchy.” *World Politics*, 38:226-254.
- Jervis, Robert. 1988. “Realism, Game theory, and Cooperation. *World Politics* 40:317-349.
- Fearon, James. 1994. “Signaling versus the Balance of Power and Interests.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38(2).

Wed. Sep. 26 ***Constructivism***

- a Wendt, Alexander. 1992. “Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics.” *International Organization* 46:391-425.
 - b Ruggie, John Gerard. 1998. “What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge.” *International Organization* 52(4):855-885.
 - c Dryzek, J.S., M.L. Clark, and G. McKenzie. “Subject and System in International interaction.” *International Organization* 43(3):475-503.
-
- a Checkel, Jeffrey. 1998. “The Constructivist Turn in IR Theory” *World Politics* 50(2):324-348.
 - b Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” *International Organization* 52(4):887-917.
 - c Price, Richard. 1998. “Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines.” *International Organization* 52 (3):613-644.

Recommended

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Wed. Oct. 3 ***Psychological & Cognitive Approaches***

- a Jervis, Robert. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Chapter 3 (pick up & copy from 324 Candler).
 - b Van Evera, Stephen. 1984. “The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War.” *International Security* 9(1).
 - c Rosen, Stephen P. 2005. *War and Human Nature*. Chapter 1 (pick up & copy from 324 Candler)..
-
- a Jervis, Robert. 1988. “War and misperception *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4).
 - b Levy, Jack S. 1993. “Prospect Theory and International Relations: Theoretical Applications and Analytical Problems.” *Political Psychology* 13:283-310.
 - c Mercer, Jonathan. 2005. “Rationality and Psychology in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59:77-106.

Recommended

- Gaenslen, Fritz. 1986. “Culture and Decision-Making in China, Japan, Russia and the United States,” *World Politics* October:73-103.
- Rosen. *War and Human Nature* (rest of the book)
- Johnston, Alastair Iain. 1995. “Thinking about Strategic Culture,” *International Security* 19(4):32-64.

Wed. Oct. 10 ***The Development of the Field: Progress or Not?***

- Elman & Elman, chapters 1 & 2.
 - a Keohane & Martin: chapter 3 in E&E
 - b Moravcsik: chapter 5 in E&E
 - c Schweller: chapter 9 in E&E
-
- a DiCicco & Levy: chapter 4 in E&E
 - b Ray: chapter 6 in E&E
 - c Jervis: chapter 8 in E&E

Recommended

- Hirschman, Albert. 1970. “The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding.” *World Politics* 22(3):329-343.
- Eichengreen, Barry. 1998. “Dental Hygiene and Nuclear War: How International Relations Looks from Economics.” *International Organization* 52(4):993-1012.

III. Topics

Wed. Oct. 17 *Domestic Political Roots of IR*

- a Fearon, James. 1994. "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes." *American Political Science Review* 88(3):577-592.
- b Layne, Christopher. 1994. "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19(2):5-49.
- c Cederman, Lars-Erik. 2001. Modeling the Democratic Peace as a Kantian Selection Process. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45 (4):470-502.

- a Bailey, Michael, Judith Goldstein, and Barry Weingast. 1997. "Institutional Roots of American Trade Policy" *World Politics* 309-338.
- b Milner, Helen V. 1988. "Trading Places: Industries for Free Trade." *World Politics* 40(3):350-376.
- c Chwieroth, Jeffrey. 2007. "Neoliberal Economists and Capital Account Liberalization in Emerging Markets," *International Organization* 61(2):443-463.

Recommended

- Graham Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *American Political Science Review* 63 (September 1969), pp. 689-718.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics." *International Organization* 42(3):427-461.
- Spiro, David E. 1994. "The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace." *International Security* 19(2):50-86.
- Levy, Jack S. "Domestic Politics and War." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4)
- James D. Fearon, "Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations," *Annual Review of Political Science* (1998) 1, pp. 289-313.

Wed. Oct. 24 *IR Roots of Domestic Politics*

- a Gourevitch, Peter. 1978. "The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics." *International Organization* 32(4):881-912.
- b Rogowski, Ronald. 1987. "Trade and the Variety of Democratic Institutions." *International Organization* 41:203-223.
- c Colaresi, Michael. 2004. "When Doves Cry: International Rivalry, Unreciprocated Cooperation, and Leadership Turnover." *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3):555-570.

- a Garrett, Geoffrey, and Peter Lange. 1991. "Political Responses to Interdependence: What's "Left" for the Left?," *International Organization* 45(4):539-564.
- b Frieden, Jeffrey, and Ronald Rogowski. "The Impact of the International Economy on National Policies: An Analytical Overview," chapter 2 in Keohane & Milner, eds. *Internationalization and Domestic Politics*.
(pick up & copy from outside 324 Candler Hall)
- c Friedberg, A. 1992. "Why Didn't the U.S. Become a Garrison State?" *International Security* 16(4):109-142.

Wed. Oct. 31 **War: Deterrence & Alliances**

- a Powell, Robert. 1985. "The Theoretical Foundations of Strategic Nuclear Deterrence." *Political Science Quarterly* 100(1):75-96.
 - b Smith, Alastair, and Allan C. Stam. 2004. "Bargaining and the Nature of War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(6):783-813.
 - c Huth, Paul. 1988. "Extended Deterrence and the Outbreak of War." *American Political Science Review* 82:423-444.
-
- a Morrow, James D. 1993. "Arms versus Allies: Trade-Offs in the Search for Security." *International Organization* 47(2):207-233.
 - b Schroeder, Paul. 1994. "Historical Reality vs. Neorealist Theory." *International Security* 19(1):108-148.
 - c Christensen, Thomas, and Jack Snyder. 1990. "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity" *International Organization* 44:137-168.

Recommended

- Waltz 1998. "The origins of War in Neorealist Theory." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4)

Wed. Nov. 7 **War: Terrorism and Private Military Actors**

- a Kydd, Andrew H., and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. "The Strategies of Terrorism," *International Security* 31(1):49-80.
 - b Abrahms, Max. 2006. "Why Terrorism Does Not Work," *International Security* 31(2):42-78.
 - c de Nevers, Renée. 2007. "NATO's International Security Role in the Terrorist Era." *International Security* 31(4):34-66.
-
- a Percy, Sarah V. 2007. "Mercenaries: Strong Norm, Weak Law." *International Organization* 61(2):367-398.
 - b Marten, Kimberly. 2006. "Warlordism in Comparative Perspective." *International Security* 31(3):41-73.

- c. Singer, Peter W. 2001. “Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry and Its Ramifications for International Security.” *International Security* 26(3):186-220.

Recommended

- Bueno de Mesquita, Ethan. 2007. “Politics and the Suboptimal Provision of Counterterrorism.” *International Organization* 61(1):9-36.

Wed. Nov. 14 ***International Cooperation***

- a Milner, Helen V. 1991. “The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique.” *Review of International Studies* 17(1):67-86.
- b Grieco, Joseph. 1988. “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism.” *International Organization* 42(3):485-507.
- c Powell, Robert. 1991. “Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory.” *American Political Science Review* 85(4):1303-1320.

- a Keohane, Robert O. 1986. “Reciprocity in International Relations.” *International Organization* 40(1).
- b Jervis, Robert. 1978. “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma.” *World Politics* 30(2).
- c Bendor, Jonathan, and Piotr Swistak. 1997. “The Evolutionary Stability of Cooperation” *American Political Science Review* 91(2):290-307.

Wed. Nov. 21 ***International institutions***

- a Martin, Lisa L., and Beth Simmons. 1998. “Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions.” *International Organization* 52(4):729-757.
- b Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. “The Rational Design of International Institutions.” *International Organization* 55(3):761-800.
- c Wendt, Alexander. 2001. “Driving with the Rearview Mirror: On the Rational Science of Institutional Design.” *International Organization* 55(4):1019-1049.

- a Mearsheimer, John J. 1990. “Back to the Future: Instability of Europe after the Cold War” *International Security* 15:5-57.
- b Downs, George, David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom. 1996. “Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation?” *International Organization* 50:379-406.
- c Goldstein, Judith L., Douglas Rivers, and Michael Tomz. 2007. “Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade.” *International Organization*, 61(1):37-68.

Recommended

- Downs, George W., David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom. 1998. “Managing the Evolution of Multilateralism.” *International Organization* 52(2):397-419.

Wed. Nov. 28 ***Empire, Hegemony, and Trade***

- a Gowa, Joanne, and Edward D. Mansfield. 1993. “Power Politics and International Trade.” *American Political Science Review* 87(2):408-420.
- b Stein, Arthur. 1984. “The Hegemon’s Dilemma.” *International Organization* 38(2):355-386.
- c Lake, David A. 1993. “Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy: Naked Emperor or Tattered Monarch with Potential?” *International Studies Quarterly* 37:459-489.

- a Kupchan, Charles A. 1989. “Empire, Military Power, and Economic Decline.” *International Security* 13(4):36-53.
- b Frieden, Jeffrey. 1994. “International Investment and Colonial Control: A New Interpretation.” *International Organization* 48(4):559-593.
- c Papayoanou, Paul. 1997. “Economic Interdependence and the Balance of Power” *International Studies Quarterly* 41:113-140.

Recommended

Olson, Mancur. 1982. *The Rise and Decline of Nations*

Wed. Dec. 5 ***Nationalism, ethnicity, religion***

- a Fearon, James, and David D. Laitin. 2000. “Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity.” *International Organization* 54:845-877.
- b Van Evera, Stephen. 1994. “Hypotheses on Nationalism and War.” *International Security* 18(4):5-39.
- c Saideman, Stephen. 1997. “Explaining the International Relations of Secessionist Conflicts.” *International Organization* 51(4):721-753.

- a Mueller, John. 2000. “The Banality of ‘Ethnic War’” *International Security* 25(1):42-70.
- b Huntington, Samuel. 1993. “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs* 72(3).
- c Toft, Monica Duffy. 2007. Getting Religion? The Puzzling Case of Islam and Civil War.” *International Security*, 31(4):97-131.

Recommended

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*.