

The University of Texas at Austin
Government 360N (38600)
International Relations Theory
Fall 2010, MWF 9:00-10:00
PAR 301

Patrick J. McDonald
BAT 4.136
512.232.1747
pjmcDonald@austin.utexas.edu
Office hours: M 11-12, 1-2; W 11-12

DESCRIPTION

This undergraduate course provides an overview of the field of international relations theory. We will survey various ways in which it has been organized over the past thirty years: levels of analysis (individual, societal, international); subfields (international security, international political economy, international organization, foreign policy); and the paradigm debate (realism, liberalism, neoliberal institutionalism, constructivism). We will then move to a broad discussion of the sources of international political order to examine how such factors as globalization, nuclear weapons, democracy, empire, international organizations, the distribution of military power among states, transnational activists, and terrorists shape how governments interact with each other.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

There will be two main requirements for this course. First, you will be expected to attend class, keep up with the assigned readings, participate in our discussions, and complete regular written assignments. Second, you will write three papers (1500 to 2000 words each)—two due during the semester (October 6 and November 8) and the other due during our assigned final time (December 9 at 11 a.m.). The topic of each of these essays will be distributed a week in advance of the due date.

Attendance, participation, and quizzes	25%
Paper 1	20%
Paper 2	25%
Final Paper	30%

READING MATERIALS

The reading material for this course will be made available through two primary formats. First, our course blackboard site will contain electronic copies of our assigned article readings. Second, the following required text is available at the University Co-op bookstore.

R. Harrison Wagner. 2007. *War and the State: The Theory of International Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

COURSE GOALS

Our focus in this class will be on the abstract or what some people might call the view of international politics from 30,000 feet. I want to get you thinking (i.e. criticizing, applying, extending) about explanatory “models” of international politics that generate intellectual leverage, or quite simply can explain broad patterns of social behavior with just a few variables or concepts. This might be new for many of you. This is not going to be a class designed to get you to memorize a bunch of facts about international relations so that you can succeed on a multiple choice exam. It is not about giving you the answers. I instead I will raise challenging questions that have been debated (sometimes quite ineffectively) for centuries and then teach one style by which you can generate your *own* answers. In short, you will be graded on the effectiveness of your original written arguments, not on whether you can regurgitate what you have read or what I have said.

Build on this broad teaching approach, here is a set of more specific goals for our semester.

1. Enhance your understanding of the big questions in the study of international politics. Drawing on a variety of theoretical approaches, we will explore such questions as why do states go to war? How does globalization shape political relations between states? Did the age of imperialism ever end? How effective are international organizations, like the United Nations? Is terrorism altering the structure of international politics?
2. Enhance your ability to think in the abstract i.e. theoretically. All of our discussions and your written assignments will be oriented around this.
3. Sharpen your reading skills. The goal of your reading should not be to finish the article or the chapter. Instead it should be to prepare yourself to think critically and originally about the questions, theoretical claims, evidence, and implications of the material you have read. To this end, you will complete a series of short writing assignments designed to get you ready to participate actively in class discussions on our readings.
4. Sharpen your writing skills. You will get to practice this often—both in short assignments of (200 to 300 words) and longer essays (1500 to 2000 words). You will be asked to follow the basic format (handout will be given on this) that most political scientists now utilize to present their arguments.

COURSE POLICIES

This will be a discussion-intensive class. You will be given repeated opportunities to engage with me and your fellow classmates over the issues we cover. I strongly believe that students take more away from this class when granted such opportunities for active learning. In short, you should come to class having read *and* thought about the materials to be discussed for the day. And you should expect to be called upon to present your thoughts and ideas.

This format necessarily creates mutual obligations among students to come to class prepared to discuss both the readings and the lecture materials. If only a few people in a group or the class are regularly doing the reading, our discussions will stumble as the bulk of students rely on a minority to carry them. Such a situation risks penalizing those students doing the readings as they then are pushed to shoulder more responsibility in class. To avoid this situation while

fostering a stimulating and productive intellectual environment in class, I have established the following rules to ensure that all students meet these obligations to each other.

Attendance and participation... will be tracked daily throughout the semester with multiple mechanisms—sign-in sheets, the quality of your classroom participation, and short writing assignments. These shorting writing assignments will often be what I call a *reading journal*. These are 100-150 word summaries that should do the following: identify the key question that the author is trying to answer, the primary theoretical argument by the author(s), and a sample of the most important empirical evidence the author offers for his/her claims. Your summary of the theoretical argument should include the independent (or causal) variable, what the dependent (or thing to be explained is), and the causal mechanism(s) that link the independent and dependent variables. Even though they will not be collected every class, these summaries should be typed and ready to be turned in at every class. If you do not have the assignments with you to be turned in when they are collected, you will not receive credit for that portion of the attendance and participation grade. *I will hand out these short assignments (which will often mean just me saying “do a reading journal” for the next class) in the class prior to which they are due.*

You will be expected to *participate* in class discussions and demonstrate that you have done the readings by performing such tasks as summarizing the main arguments, critiquing an author’s claims, drawing out policy implications, suggesting how an author’s argument may apply to another issue area, or highlighting similarities and differences with other readings.

Attendance and participation points cannot be made up under any circumstances, including excused absences. However, each student in the class will receive a one time bonus at the end of the semester of two times the average daily points for this component of your grade. For example, if there are 150 attendance and participation points for the semester and these points were checked on 25 class days, then the average daily point total is six. All students would receive a bonus of 12 points to account for excused and unexcused absences.

“*Scholastic dishonesty...* includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, collusion, falsifying academic records, and any act designed to give unfair academic advantage to the student (such as, but not limited to, submission of essentially the same written assignment for two courses without prior permission of the instructor, providing false or misleading information in an effort to receive a postponement or an extension on a test, quiz, or other assignment), or the attempt to commit such an act” (Section 11-802 (b), *Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities*).

If you have any questions about what constitutes scholastic dishonesty, you should consult with me and the following website (<http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/academicintegrity.html>). Any student that violates this policy will fail this course and have the details of the violation reported to Student Judicial Services.

Grade appeals... This process must be initiated by your written explanation of why the decisions behind the assignment of your grade should be revisited. You will have one week after an assignment has been handed back to submit this written explanation. After that period, all grades will be considered final and any discussion that we might have will be restricted to how you can do better on the next assignment. Once you have submitted your written request, I will decide whether to regrade your entire assignment.

Please keep in mind that your past performance in other classes taken here at the University is not germane to any grading decisions made in my class. Consequently, if receiving a D in my class

places you on academic probation, this does not constitute a viable justification for requesting the regrading of any assignment.

Grade appeals also cannot be made on the basis of being “close” to a letter grade. Cutoffs between letter grades will be strictly observed according to guidelines listed below. Note: these already include appropriate rounding:

92.5-100 A; 89.5-92.5 A-; 86.5-89.5 B+; 82.5-86.5 B; 79.5-82.5 B-; 76.5-79.5 C+; 72.5-76.5 C; 69.5-72.5 C-; 66.5-69.5 D+; 62.5-66.5 D; 59.5-62.5 D-; 0-59.5 F

Changes to the syllabus... I may make minor changes to the syllabus. These will be announced at least a week in advance.

Late papers... will be penalized up to a full letter grade for every day they are late.

Students with disabilities may request appropriate academic accommodations from the Division of Diversity and Community Engagement, Services for Students with Disabilities, 471-6259, <http://www.utexas.edu/diversity/ddce/ssd/>.

CLASS SCHEDULE

Wednesday, 8/25

Introduction to International Relations Theory

Friday, 8/27

No class

Brian Schmidt. 2002. On the History and Historiography of International Relations. In Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage), 3-22.

I. Thinking Theoretically

Monday, 8/30

Thinking theoretically in IR

Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, ch. 1

II. Anarchy: separating IR from the rest of political science

Wednesday, 9/1

Anarchy 1

Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, pp. 79-128.

Friday, 9/3

No class

Read the following to be discussed on Monday 9/13

John Ravenhill. 2010. International Political Economy. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 539-557.

Michael Byers. 2010. International Law, In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 612-631.

Monday, 9/6

Labor Day—no class

Wednesday, 9/8

Anarchy 2

Helen V. Milner. 1991. The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory. *Review of International Studies* 17: 67-85.

Friday, 9/10

Anarchy 3

Alexander Wendt. 1992. Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization* 46: 391-425.

III. Organizing the Field of International Relations

IIIa. By subfield

Monday, 9/13

Big questions in International Security, International Political Economy, International Organization, and Foreign Policy

Review readings assigned for 9/3 and

Robert Ayson. 2010. Strategic Studies. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 558-575.

IIIb. Levels of Analysis

Wednesday, 9/15

The third level of analysis

Robert Jervis. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, pp. 13-31.

Stephen D. Krasner. 1976. State Power and the Structure of International Trade. *World Politics* 28: 317-343.

Friday, 9/17

The second level of analysis

John M. Owen. 1994. How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace. *International Security* 19(2): 87-125.

Monday, 9/20

The first level of analysis

Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. A New Statecraft? Supranational Entrepreneurs and International Cooperation. *International Organization* 53(2): 267-306.

IIIc. The paradigms

Wednesday, 9/22

Realism

William C. Wohlforth. 2010. Realism. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 131-149.

Friday, 9/24

Liberalism

Andrew Moravcsik. 2010. The New Liberalism. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 234-254.

Monday, 9/27

Constructivism

Ian Hurd. 2010. Constructivism. 2010. Constructivism. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 298-316.

Wednesday, 9/29

Neoliberal Institutionalism

Arthur A. Stein. 2010. Neoliberal Institutionalism. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 201-221.

Friday, 10/1

Critiquing realism

Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. Is Anybody Still a Realist? *International Security* 24(2): 5-55.

Monday, 10/4

Critiquing the paradigm debate

Wagner, *War and the State*, ch. 1

Wednesday, 10/6

Paper 1 due

IV. An alternative way to organize study of international relations: sources of international political order

IVa. International political order as a self-enforcing bargain

Friday, 10/8

Domestic political orders

Robert V. Bates. 2008. *When Things Fell Apart: State Failure in Late-Century Africa*, pp. 3-32.

Wagner, *War and the State*, ch. 2

Monday, 10/11

Violence and the emergence of political order

Wagner, *War and the State*, ch. 3

Wednesday, 10/13

Bargaining and war

Wagner, *War and the State*, ch. 4

Friday, 10/15

Commitment problems as an impediment to peaceful bargains

Wagner, *War and the State*, ch. 5

Monday, 10/18

Sustaining international settlements I: three interlocking bargains

Wagner, *War and the State*, ch. 6

Wednesday, 10/20

Sustaining international settlements II: three interlocking bargains (ctd)

Patrick J. McDonald. 2011. Complicating Commitment: Free Resources, Power Shifts, and the Fiscal Politics of Preventive War. *International Studies Quarterly* 55(4): forthcoming.

Friday, 10/22

Sustaining international settlements III: three interlocking bargains (ctd)

David A. Lake. 2007. Escape From the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics. *International Security* 32(1): 47-79.

IVb. Sources of variation in international bargains (international political order)

Monday, 10/25

Globalization I

David M. Rowe. 2005. The Tragedy of Liberalism: How Globalization Caused the First World War. *Security Studies* 14(3): 407-447.

Wednesday, 10/27

Globalization II

Immanuel Wallerstein. 1974. The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 387-415.

Friday, 10/29

Technology I

Kenneth N. Waltz. 1990. Nuclear Myths and Political Realities. *American Political Science Review* 84(3): 731-745.

Monday, 11/1
Technology II

Robert Powell. 2003. Nuclear Deterrence Theory, Nuclear Proliferation, and National Missile Defense. *International Security* 27(4): 86-118.

Wednesday, 11/3
Democracy

David A. Lake. 1992. Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War. *American Political Science Review* 86: 24-37.

Friday, 11/5
Distribution of power I

Glenn Snyder. 1984. The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics. *World Politics* 36(4): 461-495.

Monday, 11/8
Paper 2 due

Wednesday, 11/10
Distribution of power II

Robert Jervis. 2009. Unipolarity. *World Politics* 61(1): 188-213.

Friday, 11/12
Distribution of power III

John Ruggie. 1982. International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order. *International Organization* 36(2): 379-415.

Monday, 11/15
Empire 1

Jeffrey Frieden. 1994. International Investment and Colonial Control: A New Interpretation. *International Organization* 48: 559-593.

Wednesday, 11/17
Empire 2

James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 2004. Neotrusteeship and the Problem of Weak States. *International Security* 28(4): 5-43.

Friday, 11/19

International Organizations 1

Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 1999. The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. *International Organization* 53(4): 699-732.

Monday, 11/22

International Organizations 2

Erik Voeten. 2005. The Political Origins of the UN Security Council's Ability to Legitimize the Use of Force. *International Organization* 59(3): 527-557.

Wednesday, 11/24

International Organizations 3

Robert O. Keohane, Stephen Macedo, and Andrew Moravcsik. 2009. Democracy-Enhancing Multilateralism. *International Organization* 63(1): 1-31.

Friday, 11/26

No class—Thanksgiving break

Monday, 11/29

New actors I: transnational activists

Richard Price. 2003. Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics. *World Politics* 55(4): 579-606.

Wednesday, 12/1

New actors II: Terrorism

Audrey Kurth Cronin. 2006. How al Qaida Ends: The Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups. *International Security* 31(1): 7-48.

Friday, 12/3

New actors (collectives) III: networks

Emilie M. Hafner-Burton, Miles Kahler, and Alex H. Montgomery. 2009. Network Analysis for International Relations. *International Organization* 63: 559-592.