***POLS 540***

## *International Relations Theory*

***Spring 2021***

***Meltem Müftüler-Bac***

**Course schedule**: T 16:40-19:30

**Office hours:** Th 10:40-12:30 pm, or by appointment

***Course Description*:** This course aims at providing the political science graduate students with a thorough analysis of international relations theory. The course will do so by analyzing the evolution of the international relations as a discipline. The course will focus on major approaches and paradigms in international relations theory, namely realism, neorealism, liberalism, neoliberal institutionalism, and constructivism. By differentiating between multiple theories and paradigms of international relations, the course will provide graduate students with a background in major debates in IR theory. The course aims to furnish the students with advanced theoretical skills on international relations that would enable them to further their studies in this area of political science.

# *Expectations and Requirements*

There are three course requirements.

1. All students will write a research paper, 40% of the final grade. The paper constitutes of two different submissions; first by the end of Week 10, a short essay of about 2,000 words constituting the empirical part of the paper is due. Second, by the end of the term, the full paper of about 5,000-6,000 words constituting an sound analysis of the empirical data from a theoretical angle needs to be submitted.
2. All students will take a final exam, 30% of the final grade.
3. All students will write a take home essay on a synthesis of two different theories we cover in class, with around 2,000 words, worth 20% of the final grade.
4. Participation in class discussions is an essential part of the course, and counts 10% of the final grade.

All students need to complete these assignments, and failure to do so will result in N/A final grade. All course lectures will be recorded via Zoom.

**Readings:** A collection of readings could be placed through the online databases of the information center and the SuCourse. Those interested in international relations could also check the following websites: International Studies Association: <http://www.isanet.org>

European Consortium for Political research: <http://www.ecprnet.org>, Another good place to check for IR related work is [Duck of Minerva](http://duckofminerva.com/).

***Schedule of Readings:***

**February 23:** Theory, Images and International Relations, introduction to IR theory, the evolution of international relations as a discipline.

* Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, Ch.1, pp.1-19.
* E.H.Carr, The Twenty years’ crisis, Palgrave, 1981, Ch.1,2 and 3, pp.3-42.
* Brian Schmidt, ‘Anarchy, World Politics and the Birth of a Discipline’, International Relations, vol.16, no.1, 2002, pp.9-31.

Recommended Readings:

* Kenneth Waltz, “International Politics is not Foreign Policy”, Security Studies, 1996, vol.6, pp.54-57.
* Barry Buzan and George Lawson, ‘The Global Transformation’, International Studies Quarterly vol.57, no.3, 2013, pp.620-634.

**March 2:** Theoretical debates, is there a science of international relations? The grand debate in international relations theory over methods and the emergence of the great divides.

* John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, ‘Leaving theory behind: Why simplistic hypothesis testing is bad for International Relations’, European Journal of International Relations, vol. 19, no.3, September 2013, pp**.**427-457
* J.Rosenau, “Thinking Theory Thoroughly” in Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, pp.19-26, reprint The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy, Frances Pinter, 1980.
* Steve Smith, “The USA and Discipline of International Relations: Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic discipline”, International Studies Review, vol.4, no.2, Summer 2002, pp. 67-87.
* Thomas C. Walker, “The Perils of Paradigm Mentalities: Revisiting Kuhn, Lakatos, and Popper”, in Viotti and Kauppi, pp. 27-36.

Recommended readings:

* James Fearon, “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis testing in political science”, World Politics, vol. 43, no.2, 1991, pp.169-195.
* Kenneth Waltz, “Evaluating Theories”, American Political Science Review, vol.91, no.4, 1991, pp.913-17.
* Kenneth Thompson, Schools of Thought in International Relations, Louisiana State University, 1996.
* John Vasquez, “Kuhn versus Lakatos: The Case for multiple Frames in International relations theory”, Progress in International relations: appraising the field, 2003.
* John Gunnell, “Social Scientific Inquiry and meta-theoretical fallacy: the Case of International Relations”, Review of International relations, vol.37, no.4, October 2011, 1447-1469.

**March 9:** History and international relations, the emergence of the Westphalian order

* Mathias Albert and Barry Buzan, ‘On the subject matter of International Relations’, Review of International Studies, vol.43, no.5, December 2017, pp.898-917.
* George Lawson, “The Eternal Divide: History and International relations”, European Journal of International Relations, vol.18, no.2, June 2012, 203-226.
* Benjamin De Carvalho et al., “Big Bang of IR: The Myths that your teachers still tell you about 1648 and 1919”, Millenium, vol.39, no.3, May 2011, pp.735-758.
* Barry Buzan and George Lawson, ‘Theory, History and the global transformation’, International Theory, vol.8, no.3, November 2016, pp.502-522.

Recommended readings:

* Matthew Weinert, “[Bridging the Human Rights—Sovereignty Divide: Theoretical Foundations of a Democratic Sovereignty”](http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/viewarticle?data=dGJyMPPp44rp2%2fdV0%2bnjisfk5Ie46bJLsau0Srak63nn5Kx95uXxjL6orUmwpbBIrq6eSriotlKyp55Zy5zyit%2fk8Xnh6ueH7N%2fiVauork22rq9PsKiuPurX7H%2b72%2bw%2b4ti7ebfepIzf3btZzJzfhruoski3ra9MsZzkh%2fDj34y73POE6urjkPIA&hid=9), Human Rights Review, January 2007, Vol. 8 Issue 2, pp.5-32.
* Evgeny Roshchin. “[The Concept of Friendship: From Princes to States”](http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/viewarticle?data=dGJyMPPp44rp2%2fdV0%2bnjisfk5Ie46bJLsau0Srak63nn5Kx95uXxjL6orUmwpbBIrq6eSriotlKyp55Zy5zyit%2fk8Xnh6ueH7N%2fiVauork22rq9PsKiuPurX7H%2b72%2bw%2b4ti7ebfepIzf3btZzJzfhruosU%2b1q7NJtJzkh%2fDj34y73POE6urjkPIA&hid=9), European Journal of **International** Relations, December 2006, Vol. 12 Issue 4, pp.599-624
* John Williams and P.Hayman, “[Westphalian Sovereignty: Rights, Intervention, Meaning and Context”,](http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/viewarticle?data=dGJyMPPp44rp2%2fdV0%2bnjisfk5Ie46bJLsau0Srak63nn5Kx95uXxjL6orUmwpbBIrq6eSriot1Kypp5Zy5zyit%2fk8Xnh6ueH7N%2fiVauork22rq9PsKiuPurX7H%2b72%2bw%2b4ti7ebfepIzf3btZzJzfhruosFGurrdOtJzkh%2fDj34y73POE6urjkPIA&hid=108) Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary **International** Relations, October 2006, Vol. 20 Issue 4, pp.521-541.
* Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, “Popes, Kings and Endogenous Institutions: The Concordat of worms and the origins of Sovereignty”, International Studies Review, special issue on the Westphalian order, 2000, pp.93-118. (Blackwell online)
* David Blaney & Naeem Inayatullah, “The Westphalian Deferral”, International Studies Review, special issue on the Westphalian order, 2000, pp.28-64. (Blackwell online)

**March 16**:The emergence of the 2nd grand debate: Idealism vs. realism, Realism in political philosophy and classical discourse on power.

* Thucydides, “the Melian Dialogue” in Viotti and Kauppi, pp.83-88,
* Stefan Tolgert, “Thucydides, amended, religion, narrative and IR theory in Peloponnesian crisis”, Review of International Studies, vol.38, no.3, July 2012, pp.661-682.
* Machiavelli, “On Princes and the Security of Their States”, in Viotti and Kauppi, pp.88-90,
* Hobbes, “Of the Natural Condition of Mankind”, pp.108-110, in Viotti and Kauppi, pp.90-93
* E.H.Carr, The Twenty years’ crisis, Palgrave, 1981, Ch.8, pp.97-135.
* Joseph Parent and Joshua Baron, “Elder Abuse: How the moderns mistreat the Classics”, International Studies Review, vol.13, no.2, June 2011, pp.193-213.

Recommended readings:

* Paul Kennedy, The rise and fall of Great powers, New York: Random house, 1987.
* Michael Williams ‘Why Ideas Matter in IR: Morgenthau, Classical Realism, and the Moral Construction of Power Politics’, International Organization, vol.58, no.4, 2004, pp: 633-665.
* R.B.J.Walker, “Realism, Change and International Political Theory”, International Studies Quarterly, vol.31, March 1987.
* Lucian M Ashworth, “Where are the Idealists in the Interwar International relations?”, Review of International Studies, vol.32, no.2, April 2006, pp.291-308.

**March 23**:Classical realism, Balance of power and states interests,

* Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, Ch.2, pp.39-54,
* E.H.Carr, The Twenty years’ crisis, Palgrave, 1981, Ch.5, pp.62-83.
* Lucian Ashworth, ‘‘Halford Mackinder, Geopolitics and the Reality of the League of Nations’, European Journal of International Relations,vol.17, no.2, 2011, pp.279-301.
* Richard Jervis, “Realism in the Study of World Politics”, International Organization. 1998, vol.52.
* Tye Solomon, “Human nature and the Limits of Self; Hans Morgenthau on Love and power”, International Studies review, vol.14, no.2, June 2012, pp.201-224.

Recommended readings:

* Inis Claude, Power and International Relations, New York: Random house, 1962.
* Fareed Zakaria, “Realism and domestic politics”, International Security, vol.17, no.1, 1997, pp.162-183.
* Michael Joseph Smith, Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger, Baton Rouge, Louisiana State university, 1986.
* Stanley Hoffman, Contemporary Theory in International Relations, London, Routledge, 1960.
* Joseph Jonathan, “Is Waltz a Realist?, International Relations, vol.24, no.4, December 2010, pp.478-493.
* Hans Morgenthau, Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace, Macgraw Hill, 1948.

**March 30:** Structural realism, Neorealism, Systemic determinants of state behaviour.

* Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, Ch.2, pp.54-83.
* William Wolhforth, “Gilpinian Realism and International Relations”, International Relations, vol.25, no.4, December 2011, pp.499-511.
* Kenneth Waltz, ‘The Virtue of Adversity’, International Relations, vol.23, no.3, September 2009, pp.498-502.
* Kenneth Waltz, “Explaining War”, reprint from Man, State and War, in Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, pp.96-109.

Recommended readings:

* Kenneth Waltz, Theory of International Politics, New York: McGraw Hill, 1979.
* Francis Beer and Robert Harriman, Post-Realism: The rhetorical turn in International Relations, Michigan state univ.press, 1996.
* David Baldwin, Neorealism and neoliberalism: The Contemporary debate, Columbia University press, 1993.
* Robert Powell, “Absolute and Relative Gains in International relations theory”, American Political Science Review, vol.85, 1991, pp.1303-1320.
* Barry Buzan et al, Logic of Anarchy: Neorealism to Structural Realism, NY: Columbia University press, 1993.

**April 6:** Neorealism as the framework and its key applications

* Kenneth Waltz, ‘Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory’, Journal of International Affairs vol.44, 1990, pp. 21-37.
* John Mearsheimer, ‘Benign Hegemony’, International Studies Review, vol.18, no.1, March 2016, pp.147-169.
* Conversation with Kenneth Waltz: http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people3/Waltz/waltzcon0.html
* Humpherys, Adam, “Another Waltz, Methodological Rhetoric and practice in International relations”, International Relations, vol.26, no.4, December 2012, pp.389-404.
* Joseph Parent and Sebastian Rosato, ‘Balancing in Neorealism’, International Security, vol.40. no.2, Fall 2015, pp.51-86.

Recommended readings:

* John Mearsheimer, The Tragedy of Great Power Politics, New York: Norton, 2001.
* Stefano Guzzini, “Structural power: the Limits of Neorealist power analysis”, International Organization, 1993, vol.47, no.3, pp.443-78.
* Kenneth Waltz, ‘Structural Realism after the Cold War’, International Security vol.25, no.1, 2000, pp.5-41.
* Gideon Rose, ‘Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy’, World Politics vol.51, no.1, 1998, pp.144-172.

**Take home Exam Due on April 9-questions posted on SU Course under assignments**

**April 13:** Liberalism, and its variants, cooperation and variants of liberalism

* Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, Ch.3, pp.129-144.
* Joseph Nye, “Neorealism and neoliberalism”, World Politics, vol.40, no.2, 1988, pp.235-51.
* Stephen Krasner, “Regimes and limits of realism: regimes as autonomous variables”, International Organization, 1982, vol.36, no.2, pp.497-510.
* Robert Jervis, “Realism, Neoliberalism and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate”, International Security, vol.24, no.1, 1999, pp.42-63.

Recommended readings:

* Robert Keohane, After hegemony, Princeton University press, 1984.
* Robert Axelrod, “The Emergence of Cooperation among egoists”, American Political Science Review, vol.75, no.2, 1981, pp.306-318.
* John Gerard Ruggie, Multilateralism matters: The Theory and Praxis of Institutional Form, NY: Columbia univ.press, 1993.
* Charles Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," International Security vol. 19, Winter 1994-95, pp.50-90.
* Robert Keohane, Power and Governance in a Partially globalized world, London, Routledge, 2002.
* Stephen Krasner, Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy, New Jersey: Princeton University press, 1999.

**April 20:** The role of institutions, neorealism vs neoliberalism, how anarchy is managed.

* Robert Powell, “Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neo-realist-Neo-Liberal Debate”, International Organization, vol.48, no.2, 1994, pp.313-344.
* Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, Ch.3, pp.144-152.
* John Gerard Ruggie, “Multilateralism: the Anatomy of an Institution”, pp.331-341, in Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory.
* Robert Keohane, “International Institutions: Two Approaches”, International Studies Quarterly, vol. 32, no.4, 1988, pp.379-96.
* Keohane, “Beyond the Tragedy of Commons” in Viotti and Kauppi, pp.176-180.
* John Mearsheimer, “The False Promise of International Institutions”, International Security, vol.19, no.3, 1994, pp.5-49.

Recommended readings:

* Barry Buzan, “From International System to International society: structural realism and regime theory meet the English School”, International Organization, vol.47, no.3, summer 1993, pp.327-352.
* Allen Buchanan, and Robert **Keohane,** “[The Legitimacy of Global Governance Institutions”,](http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/viewarticle?data=dGJyMPPp44rp2%2fdV0%2bnjisfk5Ie46bJLsau0Srak63nn5Kx95uXxjL6orUmvpbBIrq6eT7imrlKvr55Zy5zyit%2fk8Xnh6ueH7N%2fiVbSvsEy0rLNQtJzqeezdu33snOJ6u9e3gKTq33%2b7t8w%2b3%2bS7SrCvt1G1rrM%2b5OXwhd%2fqu37z4uqM4%2b7y&hid=3) Ethics & International Affairs, 2006, Vol. 20 Issue 4, pp.405-437.
* Joseph Grieco, “Anarchy and the limits of Cooperation: A Realist critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism”, International Organization, vol.42, no.3, 1988, pp.485-507.

**April 27:** Linkages between domestic and foreign policy, democratic peace theory

* Michael Doyle, “Liberalism and World Politics”, American Political Science Review, vol.80, no.4, 1986, pp.1151-1169, reprinted in Viotti and Kauppi, International Relations Theory, pp.233-246
* Maov Zaev and Bruce Russett, “Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace”, American Political Science Review, vol.87, 1993, pp.624-38.
* William Thompson and Richard Tucker, “A Tale of Two: Democratic Peace Critiques”, Journal of Conflict Resolution, vol.41, no.3, 1997, pp.428-454.
* Joanne Gowa, “Democratic states and international disputes”, International Organization, vol. 49, no.3, 1995, pp.511-22.

Recommended Readings:

* William Dixon, "Democracy and the Peaceful Settlement of Conflict", American Political Science Review, vol.88, no.1, 1994, pp.14-32.
* William Thompson, “Democracy and peace: putting the cart before the horse”, International Organization, vol.50, no.1, 1996, pp.141-74.
* Erik Gartzke, “Preferences and Democratic Peace”, International Studies Quarterly, vol.44, no.2. 2000, pp.191-212.
* Bruce Russett, Grasping the Democratic Peace, NJ, Princeton University press, 1993.
* Bruce Russett, ‘Logic of Democratic Peace Theory”, American Political Science Review, vol.97, no.4, 2003, pp.585-602

**May 4:** Domestic determinants of foreign policy making, two level games

* Andrew Moravcsik, “Taking preferences seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics”, International Organization, vol.51, no.4, 1997, pp.513-553.
* Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and domestic politics, the logic of two-level games", International Organization, vol.42, no.3, 1988, pp.427-660.
* James Fearon, “Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes”, American Political Science Review, vol.88, no.3, 1994, pp.577-592.
* Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Randolph Silverson, “War and the Survival of the Political Leaders: A Comparative study of regime types and political accountability”, American Political Science Review, vol.89, no.4, 1995, pp.841-855.

Recommended Readings:

* P.Evans, Robert Putnam, H.K.Jacobson, Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics, Berkley, Univ.of California Press, 1993.
* Jongryn Mo, "Domestic Institutions and international bargaining", American Political Science Review, vol.89, no.4, 1995, pp.914-24.
* Keisuke Iida, “When and how do domestic constraints matter? Two-level games with uncertainty”, International Studies Quarterly, vol.37, 1993, pp.403-426.
* Bruce Russett, “Reintegrating the subdisciplines of international and comparative politics”, International Studies Review, vol.5, no.4, December 2003, pp.9-13.(Blackwell)
* James Fearon, “Rationalist explanations for war”, International Organization, vol.49, no.3, 1995, pp.379-414.

**May 10-19: Semester Break/Ramazan Bayrami**

**May 18:** Sociological approaches in IR theory, Constructivism, cooperation beyond rational interests

* Alexander Wendt, ‘Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics’, International Organization vol.46, no.2, 1992, pp. 391-426.
* Friedrich Kratochwil, ‘Constructing a New Orthodoxy?’ Millennium vol.29, no.1, 2000, pp.73-101.
* John Gerard Ruggie, “What makes the world hang together: Neo-utilitarianism and the social constructivist challenge”, International Organization, vol.52, no.4, 1998, pp.855-885

Recommended Readings:

* Alexander Wendt, “Agent-Structure problem in International Relations Theory”, International Organization, vol.41, no.3, 1987, pp.384-96.
* Ann Tickner, “You just don’t understand: Troubled engagements between Feminist and IR theorists”, International Studies Quarterly, vol. 41, no.4, 1997, pp.611-32.
* Marrianne Marchand, “Different Communities”, International Studies Quarterly, vol.42, no.1, 1998, pp.198-210.
* Nicholas Onuf , World of Our Making Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

**May 25:** International relations theory and global south

* Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan, ‘Why is there no non-Western International relations Theory: Ten years on’, International relations of the Asia-Pacific, vol.17, no.3, September 2017, pp.341-370.
* Christian Reus-Smith, “International relations Irrelevant: Don’t Blame the Theory”, Millenium, vol.40, no.3, June 2012, pp.525-540.
* Andrew Moravscik, “Are Dialogue and Synthesis possible in International relations”, International Studies Review, vol.5, no.1, 2003, pp.123-153.
* The debate at the Duck of Minerva: <http://www.whiteoliphaunt.com/duckofminerva/tag/ejir-special-issue-symposum>.

Recommended Readings:

* Ching Cheng Chen, “The Im/possibility of Building indigenous Theories in a Hegemonic Discipline: The Case of Japanese international relations”, Asian Perspective, vol. 36, no.3, 2012, pp.463-492.
* Steve Yetiv, “History, International relations and Integrated Approaches”, International Studies Perspectives, vol.12, no.2, May 2011, pp.94-118.
* Emilian Kavalski, “Waking IR up from its Deep Newtonian Slumber”, Millenium, vol.41, no.1, September 2012, pp.137-150.