



DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE
FACULTY OF ARTS

**POLI 681.01: Advanced Analysis of
International Relations
Fall 2019**

INSTRUCTOR: J. F. Keeley
TELEPHONE: 403-220-6555
OFFICE: Social Sciences 802
EMAIL: keeley@ucalgary.ca
OFFICE HOURS: TBA
COURSE DAY/TIME: Wednesdays 9:00-noon
COURSE LOCATION: SS 729

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

This is a seminar course in International Relations theory. Its intention is to introduce students to a variety of theoretical issues, problems, schools and approaches in the study of international relations, and to encourage critical thinking about these.

COURSE OBJECTIVES & LEARNING OUTCOMES:

The course introduces students to a variety of substantive, epistemological and ontological themes and problems with the discipline of International relations, and to a selection of broad schools and approaches. It is intended to give students a basis for a critical acquaintance with the various schools and issues discussed, and to provide an initial grounding for PhD students preparing for their candidacy examinations. In this respect, however, the course is not a substitute for more extensive study of the appropriate reading list developed by the Department. It merely opens up the discipline. Note that the FYI readings, though purely voluntary for this course, could also be helpful in this regard.

To the degree permitted by the theoretical orientation of the course, it is also intended to allow students to pursue theoretical issues arising in their theses, dissertations and research projects.

By the end of the course, students should have a basic familiarity with various significant issues, themes, controversies and schools in the discipline of International Relations, and with various authors. They should be able to demonstrate an ability to understand, assess and employ different approaches studied, and to assess these critically. One strong undercurrent in the course is the overlap and intersection among many themes, questions, and schools: these are not (the impression left by the “debates” approach notwithstanding) hermetically sealed from each other. Thus, issues addressed here, and the readings themselves, will need to be considered not only in themselves but

also in the context of other readings and the course as a whole.

REQUIRED TEXTBOOK(S):

The course is composed of readings drawn from a variety of sources, which will be on reserve in through online journals or in collections in the library. Some material on reserve will be personal.

The text for the course is: Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

Students should also obtain a copy of: Teresa Pelton Johnson, "Writing for *International Security*" *International Security*, Vol. 16, No. 2 (Sept 1991), pp. 171-180. This is available online through the Library.

The material for the course will generally be available in the following sources:

1. The text (Reus-Smit and Snidal);
2. Articles available through the University of Calgary Library (in hard copy or online);
3. Books from the Library's collection placed on Reserve, and indicated by **R**;
4. Personal items which the instructor has placed on Reserve, indicated by **P**;
5. In some cases, the Library also has an electronic or Internet version of books; this is indicated by **ONLINE**. Note that some books marked "**R**" may also be available through the Library as e-books.
6. **NB: In some cases the Library may substitute electronic for physical copies. As well, the books are listed on reserve under their authors, NOT the author of the chapter.**
7. **If necessary, I will email material otherwise unavailable to students.**

In addition, students may wish to draw on a variety of other books for general purposes. Some of these may also be used in the course. They will be of particular interest for students preparing for comprehensive exams or wanting to look at extensive surveys of the field.

Ken Booth and Steve Smith, *International Relations Theory Today*, and the more recent edition, Ken Booth and Toni Erskine (eds.), *International Theory Today* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2016).

Walter Carlsnaes et al., *Handbook of International Relations*. (NB there are 2 editions of this, with considerable but not complete overlap in their contents)

Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, *New Thinking in International Relations Theory*.

Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (eds.), *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*.

Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane, *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*.

Robert O. Keohane (ed.), *Neorealism and its Critics*.

Martin Griffiths, *Fifty Key Thinkers in International Relations*. (Useful for its brief discussions

but also for its bibliographies.

Ivor B. Neumann and Ole Wæver, *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making*. (Articles examining a number of IR scholars.)

Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*.

Jennifer Sterling-Folker (ed.), *Making Sense of International Relations Theory*.

Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*.

Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane and Stephen D. Krasner (eds.), *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Also as *International Organization*, Autumn 1998.

Scott Burchill et al., (eds.), *Theories of International Politics*, (various editions).

Nicolas Guilhot (ed.), *The Invention of International Relations Theory*

Nicolas Guilhot, *After the Enlightenment: Political Realism and International Relations in the Mid-Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017).

Brian C. Schmidt and Nicolas Guilhot (eds.), *Historiographical Investigations in International Relations*. (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019).

For older sources providing general summaries and collections of the then-state of the discipline, see, e.g.: James N. Rosenau (ed.), *International Politics and Foreign Policy* (1968); and Fred J. Greenstein and Nelson W. Polsby (eds.), *Handbook of Political Science* (1975). Vol. 8 deals specifically with International Politics, but the volume on Strategies of Inquiry will also be of interest. Bear in mind that the discipline did not begin when you began university, and that older materials may still be of very great value (sometimes the wheel has been rediscovered many times!).

In addition, students should be aware of the wide range of journals in the field. *International Organization*, *International Studies Review*, *World Politics*, *International Security* and *International Studies Quarterly* are leading North American journals. *The American Political Science Review* and other broader Political Science journals in North America will also be significant. A more European perspective will be found in journals such as *Millennium*, *Review of International Studies*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *Review of International Political Economy*, *International Politics, Cooperation and Conflict*, and *International Theory*.

Students should also be aware of Columbia International Affairs Online (www.ciaonet.org), which links to a vast array of research institutes, papers and journals. Papers presented at the International Studies Association annual meetings may be available on their website (www.isanet.org); ISA membership may be required!

The International Studies Association has now developed a large *Compendium*, which is avail-

able here online, consisting of review essays on a range of topics. To get access to the *Compendium* via the University of Calgary library system, follow these steps:

1. Go to the Library via the main U of C website (<http://www.ucalgary.ca>) and click on “Libraries at the University” under the heading “Academics”.
2. Click on “Search Collections,” and then “Databases by Subject or Name”.
3. Click on “Political Science”.
4. Click on “International Studies Online”.
5. Click on “Contents – Full Subscriber Access”.

The ISA has recently replaced its Compendium with the Oxford Research Encyclopaedia of International Relations. This may complicate access to this resource.

The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (<http://plato.stanford.edu>) may also be of interest.

COURSE COMPONENT WEIGHTS AND DUE DATES:

COMPONENT	WEIGHTING	DUE DATES
Class Participation		
■ To end of October:		
Presentations	5%	
Discussion	5%	
■ For the remainder of the course:		
Presentations	10%	
Discussion	5%	
Paper Proposal	15%	October 16
Proposal Critique	5%	October 23
Research Paper	35%	November 27
Final Exam (open-book take-home)	20%	Distributed December 4, due December 9
Total	100%	

ALL WRITTEN ASSIGNMENT(S)

Written assignments are often required in Political Science courses, including this one, and the quality of writing skills, including but not limited to such elements as grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, clarity, citation, and organization, will be taken into account in the determination of grades. Students are encouraged to make use of the services offered through Writing Support Services in the Student Success Centre (3rd floor of the Taylor Family Digital Library) or at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/ssc/writing-support>.

You are expected and required to demonstrate a level of competence in spelling, grammar, composition, and citation practice appropriate for a university. I will penalize you for unacceptable performances in these areas. This applies to ALL written work in the course.

PLEASE NOTE: DO NOT SUBMIT PROPOSALS, CRITIQUES, RESEARCH PAPERS OR FINAL EXAMS TO ME VIA D2L!! USE EITHER HARD COPY OR SEND TO MY EMAIL ADDRESS. IF YOU SEND TO MY EMAIL, YOU SHOULD RECEIVE AN ACKNOWLEDGEMENT IN SHORT ORDER (A DAY OR TWO – PERHAPS THREE ON A WEEKEND) – OTHERWISE, CONTACT ME TO MAKE SURE I HAVE RECEIVED IT!!

Paper Proposal: Students are encouraged to begin thinking about and working on their research papers early in the term. The paper proposal requirement is intended to provide a stimulus in this direction, as well as an opportunity for relatively early feedback. None the less, the general topic and approach should be discussed with me before beginning work on the proposal. *In general, students should feel free to discuss their proposals and research papers with me at any point throughout the term.*

The proposal itself should be seen as presenting an opportunity to put forward some ideas which are reasonably thought-out and worked through, but which are still at a relatively preliminary stage. There is no expectation or requirement that students be bound hard and fast to the exact terms of their proposals. The proposal (with my response) should serve you as an initial statement of your thinking, and as a sensitizing device as you continue your research, alerting you especially to the implications of your further research for your thinking on the topic. *It should not be a strait-jacket*, but significant departures should be discussed with me beforehand.

The proposal should be 7-10 pages (typed, double-spaced) not including bibliography. It should indicate the general topic area, provide a brief (!) rationale for it, and then should indicate the specific topic, line of approach, and organization intended. There should be some preliminary discussion of sources. *An indication of where the paper might be headed for a conclusion is fine, but you should be open to the possibility that you might come across something unexpected or change your mind in the course of your research (otherwise it would not be a learning experience).* Treat this as an opportunity to set out and think through some initial ideas and to get an initial response before committing yourself irrevocably to a line of thought. Further information concerning the proposal will be provided in class.

The proposal is due on October 16, 2019. It is worth 15% of the final grade. Since another student will be asked to provide a critique, a copy of the proposal should also be provided to the assigned student at that time, as well as to the instructor.

Proposal Critique: Students will each be assigned a paper proposal from another student in the class, and will write a brief critique – about 4-5 pages – based on it. The critique should engage *the basic substantive elements of the proposal as noted above.* Though it is reasonable to offer some brief response on matters of writing style and clarity, this should not be a significant focus. *The critique should focus on issues of substance and approach, conceptualization, theoretical issues, possible sources, etc., rather than merely stylistic matters.* If you think of some suggestions for material, etc. relevant to the proposal, that might also be welcome.

The critique should be provided to the instructor, and another copy to the other student, 1 week after the proposal is submitted (thus, due October 23). The critique is worth 5 % of the final grade.

ESSAYS/RESEARCH PAPER(S)

The research paper is intended to allow the close examination of a *theoretical* issue of interest to a student. *It should not, therefore, be an empirical paper, though some limited reference to an empirical application or (better) an empirical problem leading to the theoretical issue may be permissible.* I consider it legitimate for students to use the research paper as an opportunity to do some initial work relevant to theoretical aspects of thesis or dissertation topics. There is no requirement that students restrict themselves in the paper to specific topics, issues, or schools explicitly included in the course outline.

In the research paper, students are expected to present a competent development and employment of material applicable to their topic, with appropriate citation and referencing style.

The research paper should be not less than 25 pages (typed, double-spaced) and generally not more than 35 pages long – roughly 7500-10,000 words, not including footnotes or endnotes and bibliography. It is worth 35% of the final grade. It is due on November 27, 2019.

PARTICIPATION

The participation grade is divided into 2 segments, with 2 components each. The first segment, to be assigned at the end of October, is 5% for presentations and 5% for participation in discussions. For the second segment, assigned at the end of the course, is 10% for presentations in November and December, and 5% for discussion in the same period. The greater weight for presentations in the later segment is based on the presumption that students will have experience by then in doing presentations.

A written assessment will be provided, covering each component. The basis for the assessment will be as follows:

For the presentations: These presentations should not be mere summaries of the material but rather should contain substantial elements of analysis and critique: you should engage with the material, not simply report it or paraphrase it. Do not bother with summaries of the author(s)' background or other work (unless this latter is vital to understanding the assigned reading). Points to consider include the nature and content of the argument, how the topic is approached, the conclusions offered and the evidence supporting it, how the reading might (explicitly or implicitly) engage themes in other readings, in other schools of thought, and in the broader issues and problems examined in the course. These presentations should be brief and to the point – maybe 10 minutes – though you may provide handouts if you wish (please provide copies to everyone, and to the instructor in advance). **PowerPoint presentations, however, are not welcome!** The presentations are intended to begin the discussion, not to end it. If you are assigned a reading, you are expected to be a significant discussion leader as the conversation proceeds.

Regarding discussion: Students are expected to take an active part in discussions from week to week. This will entail being familiar with all the readings, even when not responsible for a formal presentation, and being able and willing to engage each other and the instructor in informed and critical consideration of them. Bear in mind, however, that merely talking a lot will not do much for you: I would rather have a few well-chosen thoughts than several relatively weak statements.

Handling the Readings:

It is intended that most readings after the initial classes will be assigned to specific students for presentations. **NOTE, HOWEVER, THE FOLLOWING:**

1. **Everyone** is expected to do **all** the readings (except those in the “FYI” sections) and to contribute to discussions of them.
2. **ALL READINGS THAT WILL BE ASSIGNED ARE INDICATED BY AN ASTERISK.**

In some cases 2 or more students may be asked to work on a set of readings as a group.

NOTE: I have listed additional readings in an “FYI” section for each week. These are an attempt to indicate, however briefly, some other possible authors and themes generally related to the week’s topic, as well as to indicate some additional sources (journals, books) worth looking at. These are not assigned readings, and students are not responsible for them. They are merely intended to provide some additional sources for those who are interested, and for doctoral students seeking some further information. The other contents in Reus-Smit and Snidal, in Carlsnaes, Risse and Simmons, and in other books used in the course will repay examination. There is some overlap between readings in this course (and the FYI sections) and the Political Science Department’s reading list for IR PhD students. Some of these reference older works, which may still be of some value or interest.

FINAL EXAMINATION

The final exam will be an open-book, take-home exam, distributed on the last day of class (December 4, 2019). It will be due by 4:30 PM on Monday, December 9, 2019. The exam will consist of three broad questions drawing on the material in the course. Students will answer one question. It is worth 20% of the final grade.

GRADE SCALE. The following grading scale will be used:

A+ honorific	B+ 3.15-3.39	C+ 2.20-2.50	D+ 1.20-1.49
A 3.75-4.00	B 2.80-3.14	C 1.80-2.19	D 0.81-1.19
A- 3.40-3.74	B- 2.51-2.79	C- 1.50-1.79	F ≤ 0.80

LATE PENALTIES

Late proposals, critiques and papers may be accepted if not long delayed and if advance warning and agreement have been given and obtained. Late penalties may be assessed in cases of poor planning or abuse of my good nature. Normally (i.e. without advance notice and agreement) they shall be 1 notch (e.g. B+ to B) for every week late. Beyond 2 weeks, they will normally **not be accepted** without **some sort of prior covering agreement**. If you anticipate difficulties, you are encouraged to tell me sooner rather than later.

COURSE SCHEDULE & TOPICS: The schedule is tentative and may change as the need arises.

The course is organized into a number of sections, each focussing on a particular task. The **Introduction** sets out some questions and issues regarding the purpose and the history of the discipline. The second section, **Basic Questions**, covers a variety of themes that have affected the discipline. The third section, **Schools**, focuses on a variety of more specific groups of theories; *although Liberalism and Realism are natural points of emphasis here, the intent is both to broaden the scope of the student’s awareness to include other groups of theories, and also to highlight the complex natures of each group, its entanglement with the themes noted in Basic Questions, and the overlaps and differences among the groups.* One of the plagues of the discipline is a tendency to “debate” among schools in terms of statements of basic principles often presented as mutually-exclusive. *One objective of the course is to move students beyond such a mind-set.* Thus two underlying themes of the course are: (1) recognition that each school or specific approach within a school only captures parts of the larger phenomenon that is International Relations; and (2) schools and positions that present themselves as mutually-opposed often may overlap more than one might think, or at least are more complex in their positions than the “debate” tendency in the discipline might encourage us to think. The course, in short, aiming at arriving at a more complex understanding of the discipline. One may debate in order to “win” (i.e., score points against someone else); one may debate in order to try to persuade someone else or alter their position; but one may also debate in order to think more deeply about one’s own position, too.

DATE	TOPICS AND READINGS
September 11	Section 1: Introduction
	<p style="text-align: center;">Some Basic Themes</p> <p>Reus-Smit and Snidal argue that IR as a “practical discourse” is focused around the question “how should we act?”, and thus presents an empirical and a normative face. We might want to consider also a third face: policy-applicable theory. What distinguishes these three faces? How do they entangle and interact with each other? Thompson’s 1955 essay is also of interest here. We will also draw on Robert Jervis on systems theory (everybody uses the term “system”, but what does it mean?). As well, I will suggest Keohane and Nye’s Transnational Relations model as a general way to try to organize our thinking about various theories and schools, to try to project and understand the contents and concerns of various theories, and thus also to understand some of their differences and similarities. Kristensen provides an interesting overview of groups and interconnections in the field, especially helpful to PhD students.</p> <p>Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, “Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of International Relations,” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 3-37.</p> <p>Kenneth W. Thompson, “Toward a Theory of International Politics,” <i>The American Political Science Review</i>, Vol. 49, No. 3 (Sept. 1955), pp. 733-746.</p>

Robert Jervis, *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), Chapter 1, pp. 3-12, 16-28.
ONLINE

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, "Introduction," *Transnational Relations and World Politics* (initially a special issue of *International Organization*, (Summer 1971): **look for the journal.**

Peter Marcus Kristensen, "International Relations at the End: A Sociological Autopsy," *International Studies Quarterly*, 2018.

FYI: Another theme worth noting, though not addressed in this section of the course, is the need to expand our horizons beyond a largely Eurocentric focus. To some degree, this has been done with some attention to China's history. See as well Amitav Acharya, "Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 28, (2014), pp. 647-659, and John A. Pella, "International Relations in Africa before the Europeans," *The International History Review*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2015), pp. 99-118.

For an earlier perspective on policy-relevant theory, see various works by Alexander L. George: George, Hall and Simon, *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*; Alexander George and Richard Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy*; "Knowledge for Statecraft: The Challenge for Political Science and History," *International Security*, (Summer 1997); *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy*. Also Alexander George *Finding Common Ground*. See also: Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*; two books edited by J. Lepgold and M. Ninic, *Being Useful*, and *Beyond the Ivory Tower*; and some of the articles in *International Studies Review*, Vol. 13, No. 1, (March 2011). See also Henry Nau's chapter in Reus-Smit and Snidal.

On ethics, see, e.g., Molly Cochrane, "IR Theory as an Ethical Pursuit," in Ken Booth and Toni Erskine (eds.), *International Theory Today* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2016), pp. 85-96. See also the journal, *Ethics and International Affairs*.

Note that "systems theory" or "general systems theory" should *not* be confused with David Easton's system theory in Political Science! For early work on general systems theory, see, e.g., Ludwig van Bertalanffy, Herbert Simon's *The Sciences of the Artificial*, and Walter Buckley (ed.), *Modern Systems Research for the Behavioral Scientist*. Early systems theory in IR is well-represented by the work of Morton Kaplan, *System and Process in International Politics*, and Richard Rosecrance, *Action and Reaction in World Politics* (see also Waltz's attack – October 11). Do not forget, however, Karl W. Deutsch, *The Nerves of Government*, Oran Young, *Systems of Political*

	<p><i>Science</i>, and also John Steinbruner, <i>The Cybernetic Theory of Decision</i>. For a recent application of evolutionary theory and complexity to economics, see Eric D. Beinhocker, <i>The Origin of Wealth: Evolution, Complexity and the Radical Remaking of Economics</i>. See also W. Brian Arthur, “Complexity Economics: A Different Framework for Economic Thought,” <i>Santa Fe Institute Working Paper</i>: 2013-04-12. Other recent works include John H. Miller and Scott E. Page, <i>Complex Adaptive Systems</i> (which adopts an agent-based models approach) and Paul Cilliers, <i>Complexity and Postmodernism</i>, and the work of the Santa Fe Institute (https://www.santafe.edu). See also J. Stephen Lansing, “Complex Adaptive Systems,” <i>Annual Review of Anthropology</i>, Vol. 32, (2003), pp. 183-204. One can contrast agent-based models with equation-based models (see Jay Forrester, <i>Principles of Systems</i>, for an early modelling approach to system dynamics – and, e.g., the Club of Rome’s early modelling efforts). Robert C. North and Nazli Choucri, <i>Nations in Conflict</i>, developed a “lateral pressure” model of the 19th century international system. Barry Buzan and Richard Little, <i>International Systems in World History</i>, is a recent effort to develop the concept of the international system, though not on a quantitative/computer model basis.</p>
<p>September 18</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">History of the Field</p> <p>The history of IR has generally been presented in terms of “great debates.” Recent historiography of the discipline, however, has called into question the existence, much less the content, of especially the so-called “first debate” between Liberals and Realists. Regardless of this, the notion of “debates” as marking key points in the evolution of the discipline persists. The number and content of more recent “great debates” has also been a matter of differences of opinion (doctoral candidates should note this!). We will consider, among other things, the places of these various debates – real or not – in the development of the discipline, and the utility of the debate notion as an organizing device for understanding and shaping the discipline.</p> <p>Brian C. Schmidt, “On the History and Historiography of International Relations,” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons eds., <i>Handbook of International Relations</i> (London: Sage, 2012), pp. 3-28. R</p> <p>Nicolas Guilhot, “The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory,” in Nicolas Guilhot (ed.), <i>The Invention of International Relations Theory</i> (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), pp. 128-161. R</p> <p>Yosef Lapid, “The Third Debate: on the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> 33, 13 (1989): 235-25.</p> <p>Ole Wæver, “The Rise and Fall of the Inter-Paradigm Debate,” in Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski (eds.), <i>International Theory: Positivism and Beyond</i>, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp.</p>

	<p>149-185. R</p> <p>FYI: On general historiography of the field, see, e.g.: Brian C. Schmidt, <i>The Political Discourse of Anarchy</i>; Nicolas Guilhot, <i>After the Enlightenment: Political Realism and International Relations in the Mid-Twentieth Century</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); other chapters of Nicolas Guilhot (ed.), <i>The Invention of International Relations Theory</i>; and Brian C. Schmidt and Nicolas Guilhot (eds.), <i>Historiographical Investigations in International Relations</i>. (Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019). See also: Nicholas Onuf, “Five Generations of IR Theory,” in Booth and Erskine (eds.), <i>International Relations Theory Today</i>; Miles Kahler, “Inventing International Relations: International Relations Theory after 1945,” in Doyle and Ikenberry (eds.), <i>New Thinking in International Relations Theory</i>. For the behaviouralist-traditionalist debate (the second debate), see, e.g., Klaus Knorr and James N. Rosenau (eds.), <i>Contending Approaches to International Politics</i>. Joseph Grieco “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 42 (1988), pp. 485-507 (see later in this course) is the opening salvo of the “neo-neo” debate, documented especially in David A. Baldwin’s <i>Neorealism and Neoliberalism</i>, and Robert Jervis, “Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate,” <i>International Security</i>, (Summer 1999). The Keohane et al.-Mearsheimer debate in <i>International Security</i> is also worth looking at. Robert O. Keohane, “International Institutions: Two Approaches,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol. 32 (1988), pp.379-396 marks the “[r]ationalist-reflectivist” divide; see R.B. J. Walker, “History and Structure in the Theory of International Studies,” <i>Millennium: Journal of International Studies</i>, Vol. 18 (1989), pp.163-183 (also in his <i>Inside/outside</i>) for a response. See also Waever, “Still a Discipline After All These Debates?” in Dunne, Kurki and Smith <i>International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity</i> (2016). Amitav Acharya’s ISA Presidential Address, “Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds: A New Agenda for International Studies,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol. 58 (2018) gives an interesting set of suggestions for future lines of development of the discipline, including moving beyond a Euro-centric focus.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">Section II: Basic Questions</p> <p>A number of basic issues or themes emerge as we think about various schools in IR. Here we flag and discuss some of these in terms of the implications they have for the various schools and for the discipline as a whole. Different schools may tend to take different approaches to each theme or set of issues, but there may also be overlap among them at certain points. As well, basic problems in our understanding of each theme will have important effects on our use of IR theories.</p>
<p>September 25</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Science and Methods</p>

The controversy between “traditionalists” and “scientists” was supposedly the second “great debate” in the discipline. Like all of the others, it was not resolved. What does it mean to be “scientific” or (more narrowly) “positivistic”? What controversies – included but not limited to the post-positivist and post-modern attacks – surround the notion of science in IR? What dangers and limits lurk in our thinking? What about qualitative methods of study? Note: the emphasis here is not on quantitative methods as such.

James Scott, *Seeing Like A State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998): 11-24. **ONLINE**

Colin Wight, “Philosophy of Social Science and International Relations,” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage Publications, 2012), pp. 29-56. **R**

Ruth Lane “Positivism, Scientific Realism and Political Science: Recent Developments in the Philosophy of Science,” *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, Vol. 8, no. 3 (1996): 361–82.

John Vasquez, ‘The Post-Positivist Debate: Reconstructing Scientific Enquiry and International Relations after Enlightenment’s Fall’, in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today*, (University Park, Penn.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 217–40. **R (NB THIS IS THE 1995 EDITION!)**

Peter J. Katzenstein and Rudra Sil, “Eclectic Theorizing in the Study and Practice of International Relations,” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 109-130.

Derek Beach and Rasmus Brun Pedersen, *Process-Tracing Methods: Foundations and Guidelines* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2019), Chapter 2, pp. 29-52. **THE 2014 EDITION IS AVAILABLE ONLINE.**

Andrew Bennett and Colin Elman, “Qualitative Research: Recent Developments in Case Study Methods,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, (2006): 455-476.

Marc Trachtenberg, *History and Strategy*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), Chapter 7, pp.261-286. **R**

FYI: For more on qualitative research, see also John Gerring, “Qualitative Methods,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 20 (2017) pp. 15-36. For the behaviouralist-traditionalist debate (the second debate), see, e.g.,

Klaus Knorr and James N. Rosenau (eds.), *Contending Approaches to International Politics*. For works on the philosophy and history of science, see Sir Karl Popper, also Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, and Imre Lakatos, “Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programs” in Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Stephen Toulmin has also done some interesting work in evolutionary epistemology. Alexander Wendt “Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics,” *International Organization* Vol. 46 (Spring 1992): 391-425 and David Dessler “What’s at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate?” *International Organization*, 43 (Summer 1989) are of interest re scientific realism. Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (eds.), *Progress in International Relations Theory*, applies a Lakatosian frame to assessing the discipline, but also provides guides to research in various schools. Gary King, Robert O. Keohane and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*, is another recent very influential work on methods. Responses such as Brady and Collier (see the IR reading list) are a standard but see also James Mahoney, “After KKV: The New Methodology of Qualitative Research,” *World Politics*, Vol. 62, No 1 (2010): 120-147. Hollis and Smith (*Explanation and Understanding in International Relations*) is another cut at science and its issues, but see also R.B.J. Walker, *Inside/outside*, and James Der Derian and Michael J. Shapiro (eds.), *International/Intertextual Relations*, particularly the chapters by Ashley and Connelly. Note also David Patrick Houghton, “Positivism ‘vs’ Post-modernism: Does Epistemology Make a Difference?” *International Politics*, Vol. 45 (2008): 115-128. See elsewhere in Reus-Smit and Snidal (Part IV) on methods, and Hamati-Ataya in Ken Booth and Toni Erskine, *International Relations Theory Today*. Fred Chernoff has done interesting work on the philosophy of science in the social sciences as well. For more on post-modernism, see the essay by Burke in Reus-Smit and Snidal. Abraham Kaplan, *The Conduct of Inquiry*, and Paul Diesing, *Patterns of Discovery in the Social Sciences*, are old but worth looking at. Marc Trachtenberg’s *The Craft of International History* is worth looking at. See also Christopher Darnton, “Archives and Inference,” *International Security*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (Winter 2017-2018), pp. 84-126, for more on archival research. On process-tracing, see also Jeffrey T. Checkel, “It’s the Process, Stupid! Process Tracing in the Study of European and International Politics,” Working Paper No. 26, October 2005, Centre for European Studies, University of Oslo (www.arena.uio.no or check www.ciaonet.org). For a general source on methodology in Political Science, see Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

From a systems theory perspective, we will note agent-based models below. Some interesting thinking about the nature of empirical theory and suitable methods from a systems perspective can be found in Alan Beyerchen, “Clausewitz, Nonlinearity and the Unpredictability of War,” *International Security* Vol. 17, No. 3 (Winter 1992-1993), pp. 59-90. See also Carl von

	<p>Clausewitz, <i>On War</i>, especially Book II on the Theory of War.</p>
<p>October 2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PRESENTATIONS BEGIN THIS WEEK!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Levels of Analysis, the Agent-Structure Problem, and More</p> <p>While these have developed as themes at different points in the history of the discipline, they also connect, and connect also with our choices of and perceptions of actors, and about the explanation of decisions and actions. The issues surrounding levels of analysis touch on a variety of things, including the relationship between systems and structures on the one hand and units on the other (thus the agent-structure question but also questions raised by emergent properties in systems theories, and, in e.g. neo-realism, the effects of systems on unit behavior and on outcomes). Problems of tracing system effects down, and aggregating actor behavior up, are considerable. See e.g. Arrow's Theorem and voting cycles, the ecological fallacy (inferring characteristics of units from characteristic of the groups in which those units are found) and the fallacy of composition (assuming that characteristics of a unit are also the characteristic of a group to which the unit belongs), and the desire of some rational action theorists to derive "macro-behaviour from micro-foundations." Cross-level analysis raises the issues of how domestic and international factors interact (see, e.g., neo-classical realism, and sociological and institutional approaches, etc.</p> <p>Robert Jervis, <i>System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life</i>, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), pp. 12-16. ONLINE</p> <p>*Barry Buzan, "The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations Reconsidered," in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds.), <i>International Relations Theory Today</i>, (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 198- 216. R (NB THIS IS THE 1995 EDITION)</p> <p>*Kenneth N. Waltz, "Reductionist and Systemic Theories," in Robert O. Keohane (ed.), <i>Neorealism and Its Critics</i> (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp. 47-69. R and ONLINE</p> <p>*D. Dessler, "What's at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate?" <i>International Organization</i>, 43 (Summer 1989).</p> <p>*Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, <i>Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition</i>, (New York: Harper Collins, 1989): Chapter 2 (pp.23-37). R</p> <p>*Mathias Albert, Barry Buzan and Michael Zurn, "Introduction: differentiation theory and international relations", in Matias Albert, Barry Buzan and Michael Zurn (eds.) <i>Bringing Sociology to International Relations: World</i></p>

	<p><i>Politics as Differentiation Theory</i>, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 13-34. R</p> <p>*Robert D. Putnam, “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 42, Summer 1988, pp. 427-460.</p> <p>*Jonathan Bendor and Jacob N. Shapiro, “Historical Contingencies in the Evolution of States and their Militaries,” <i>World Politics</i>, Vol. 71, No. 1 (January 2019), pp. 126-161.</p> <p>FYI: Kenneth Waltz’s <i>Man, the State, and War</i>, and J. David Singer’s essay in Klaus Knorr and Sidney Verba (eds.), <i>The International System: Theoretical Essays</i>, are classic starting-points for the level-of-analysis issue. See also Peter Gourevitch, “Domestic Politics and International Relations,” in Carlsnaes, Risse and Simmons, 2002, and the essay by Kenneth Schultz in the 2012 edition. The foreign policy literature in general will also be of interest: see, e.g., Valerie Hudson, <i>Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory</i>. See also Colin Wright, <i>Agents, Structures and International Relations</i>, the essays by Anthony Giddens and Ira Cohen in Anthony Giddens and Jonathan Turner (eds.), <i>Social Theory Today</i>, and Audie Klotz, “The Forum: Moving Beyond the Agent-Structure Debate,” <i>International Studies Review</i>, (June 2006). For more on two-level games and the domestic-international connection, see, e.g. Peter B. Evans, Harold K. Jacobson and Robert D. Putnam (eds.), <i>Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics</i> (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Peter J. Katzenstein, “International Relations and Domestic Structures: Foreign Economic Policies of Advanced Industrial States,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 30, (Winter 1976); see also Gilbert R. Winham, “Practitioners’ Views of International Negotiation,” <i>World Politics</i>, Vol. 32, No. 1 (October 1979) pp. 111-135. Wendt’s “The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 41, No. 3 (Summer 1987), pp. 335-370 also discusses system-level theories (Waltz and Wallerstein) and scientific realism.</p>
<p>October 9</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Actors</p> <p>While a focus that takes state action as its primary concern, and takes states as dominant actors, is long-established in the discipline, more attention is now being paid to the wide variety of actors at play in IR and how they interact. Note that this will strongly overlap with levels of analysis and with theories of foreign policy (bear this in mind also when we get to Neoclassical Realism!). (We will also consider the TNR model as a general way of projecting and understanding the contents and concerns of various theories, and thus also of understanding some of their differences and similarities.)</p>

	<p>*David Lake “The State and International Relations” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 41-61.</p> <p>*Sean Fleming, “Artificial persons and attributed actions: How to interpret action-sentences about states,” <i>European Journal of International Relations</i>, Vol. 23, No. 4 (2017) pp. 930-950. (NB his argument will hold as well for other artificial persons, too, and can deal with the problem of the same real persons belonging to many artificial ones.)</p> <p>*Thomas Risse, “Transnational Actors and World Politics,” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (eds.), <i>Handbook of International Relations</i> (London: Sage Publications, 2012), pp. 426-452. R</p> <p>*Juliet Kaarbo, “A Foreign Policy Analysis Perspective on the Domestic Politics Turn in IR Theory,” <i>International Studies Review</i>, Vol. 17 (2015), pp. 189-216.</p> <p>FYI: The original TNR model may be found in Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, <i>Transnational Relations and World Politics</i> (initially a special issue of <i>International Organization</i>, (Summer 1971)). For a revival of the concept, see Thomas Risse-Kappan (ed.), <i>Bringing Transnational Relations Back In</i> (including the essay by Stephen Krasner as a rebuttal, eerily like Robert Gilpin’s response in Keohane and Nye.). On the development of the concept of the state, see, e.g., Quentin Skinner, “The State,” in Terence Ball, James Farr and Russel L. Hanson (eds.), <i>Political innovation and conceptual change</i>, and for the actual state, Hendrik Spruyt, <i>The Sovereign State and Its Competitors</i>. Peter M. Haas (ed.), <i>Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination</i> combines (albeit not necessarily telling us this) aspects of transnational relations, domestic policy-making, and constructivism (policy ideas/epistemic communities). See also Janice E. Thomson, “State Sovereignty in International Relations: Bridging the Gap between Theory and Empirical Research,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol. 39, No. 2 (June 1995).</p>
<p>October 16</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSALS DUE</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Accounting for Decisions/Actions: Rational Action, Constructivism, and Psychology and Agent-Based Models</p> <p>Regardless of our choice or level of actor for our theories, we find ourselves trying to explain their actions and decisions. While historical narrative is still a primary means of doing so, Rational Action/Rational Choice and Constructivism have developed as dominating <i>theoretical</i> approaches to this task. Note that these two are not really theories of IR as such: rather they are broader approaches that have been applied within IR. More recently, more</p>

psychological approaches such as prospect theory and behavioural economics have challenged particularly classic, Economics-informed rational choice thinking. Note that there are implications here as well for how we aggregate processes across levels (e.g. the “micro-foundations for macro-events” matter) so think in terms of levels, etc. as well. Finally, computational models, such as agent-based models, offer a different take on approaching actions and results.

*Bryan D. Jones, “Bounded Rationality,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, (1999): 297-321.

*Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, “Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 4 (2001): 391-416

*James Fearon and Alexander Wendt, “Rationalism vs. Constructivism: A Skeptical View,” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage Publications, 2002), pp. 52-72. **NOTE THAT THIS IS THE FIRST EDITION OF CARLSNAES ET AL.!! ONLINE**

*J. Samuel Barkin, “Realist Constructivism,” *International Studies Review*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (September 2003): 325-342.

*Emilie Hafner-Burton, Stephan Haggard, David A. Lake and David G. Victor, “The Behavioural Revolution and International Relations,” *International Organization, Supplement*, 2017, S1-S31.

*Nigel Gilbert, *Agent-Based Models, Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*, No. 07-153 (Los Angeles: Sage Publications, 2008), pp. 1-20. **ONLINE**

FYI: NOTE THAT although Alexander Wendt’s *Social Theory of International Politics* is NOT assigned here, it is a very important text for North American constructivism though somewhat suspect among European constructivists), and Stefano Guzzini and Anna Leander (eds.), *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and his Critics*. See also work by Maya Zehfuss, Antje Wiener (including her recent work on norm contestation, which can lead into “critical constructivism”), John G. Ruggie, Nicholas Onuf (e.g., *World of Our Making*), and Friedrich Kratochwil (e.g. his *Rules, Norms and Decisions*). These last two in particular were early proponents of constructivism, but have tended to be unjustly overlooked in North America in favour of Wendt. See also Swati Srivastava, “Varieties of Social Construction,” *International Studies Review*, (2019).

Herbert A. Simon, “Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science”, *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 79, No. 2 (June 1985): 293-304. Miles Kahler, “Rationality in International Relations”

	<p><i>International Organization</i> Vol. 52, no. 4 1998: 919-941. James G. March, “The War is Over, the Victors have Lost,” <i>Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory</i>, Vol. 2, No. 3 (July 1992): 225-231. Bryan D. Jones, <i>Politics and the Architecture of Choice: Bounded Rationality and Governance</i>, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001). On game theory, the work of Thomas Schelling is old but useful. On rational choice, Hans J. Morgenthau, <i>Scientific Man versus Power Politics</i>, was an early attack, but see also, more recently, Stephen Walt, “Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies,” <i>International Security</i>, Vol. 23 (1999) and the responses. There has also been an extensive, more recent literature on “the rational choice controversy” (e.g., Donald Green and Ian Shapiro, <i>Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory</i>, and Jeffrey Friedman (ed.), <i>The Rational Choice Controversy</i>). On psychology and on prospect theory, see e.g. Janet Gross Stein, “The Micro-Foundations of International Relations Theory: Psychology and Behavioral Economics,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol 71 (supplement, (2017), pp. S249-S263; Rose McDermott, “The Psychological Ideas of Amos Tversky and Their Relevance for Political Science,” <i>Journal of Theoretical Politics</i>, Vol. 13, No. 1(2001): 5-33; Jonathan Mercer, “Prospect Theory and Political Science,” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i>, (2005): 1-21; J.M. Goldgeier and P. E. Tetlock, “Psychology and International Relations Theory,” <i>Annual Review of Political Science</i>, (2001): 67-92. On norm diffusion, see also the essay by Fabrizio Gilardi in Carlsnaes et al., (2012). For Barkin, see also his <i>Realist Constructivism: Rethinking International Relations Theory</i> (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).</p> <p>On agent-based modelling, see also, e.g. Lars-Erik Cederman, “Emergent Polarity: Analyzing State-Formation and Power Politics,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol. 38, No. 4 (December 1994), pp. 501-533; Robert Axelrod, <i>The Complexity of Cooperation: Agent-Based Models of Competition and Collaboration</i> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997); John H. Miller and Scott E. Page, <i>Complex Adaptive Systems: An Introduction to Computational Models of Social Life</i> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); and Scott De Marchi and Scott E. Page, “Agent-Based Modeling,” in Janet M. Box-Steffensmeier, Henry E. Brady and David Collier (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology</i> (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 71-93.</p>
<p>October 23</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSAL CRITIQUES DUE!</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Anarchy and Society</p> <p>Anarchy is perhaps the dominant motif in thinking about IR, but what does it really mean and imply? In particular, what should we make of that particular presentation of anarchy, Thomas Hobbes’ “state of war”? Is even a Hobbesian anarchy at least potentially a “society”, however limited or “defective” in comparison to a well-ordered domestic society or the long-lasting solution sought by Hobbes in <i>Leviathan</i>?</p>

*Noel Malcolm, *Aspects of Hobbes*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), pp. 441-466. **R and ONLINE**

*Jack Donnelly, "The discourse of anarchy in IR," *International Theory*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (November 2015): 393-425.

*Jack Donnelly, "The Elements of the Structures of International Systems," *International Organization*, Vol. 66 (Fall 2012), pp. 609-643.

*Helen Milner, "The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique," *Review of International Studies* Vol. 17, No. 1 (January 1991), pp. 67-85.

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

*Meghan McConaughey, Paul Musgrave and Daniel H. Nexon, "Beyond anarchy: logics of political organization, hierarchy, and international structure," *International Theory*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (2018), pp. 181-218.

FYI: Malcolm attacks many early invocations and discussions of Hobbes in IR. More recently, IR scholars have taken a more sophisticated look at Hobbes' work. See, e.g., work by Michael Williams ("The Hobbesian theory of international relations: three traditions," in Beate Jahn (ed.), *Classical Theory in International Relations* (see this for Locke as well); and "Hobbes and international relations: a reconsideration." *International Organization* (Spring 1996). See also Donald Hanson, "Thomas Hobbes' 'highway to peace'", *International organization*, (Spring 1984). For more on Hobbes by political theorists and historians, see, e.g.: Sheldon Wolin, *Politics and Vision*; Quentin Skinner, *Visions of Politics, Vol. III: Hobbes and Civil Science*; Michael Oakeshott, "Introduction to Leviathan," in Oakeshott, *Rationalism in Politics and Other Essays*. The Lockean alternative to the Hobbesian state of nature seems to have received at lot less attention, at least from IR scholars (a sign of Realists setting the tone?). See, however, e.g.: John Simmons, "Locke's state of nature," *Political Theory*, Vol. 17 (1989), pp. 449-470; Lee Ward, "Locke on the Moral Basis of International Relations," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (July 2006), pp 691-705; M. W. Doyle and G. S. Carlson, "Silence of the laws? Conceptions of international relations and international law in Hobbes, Kant, and Locke," *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law*, Vol. 46, No. 3 (2008), pp. 648-666; Brian Smith, "Friends in the State of Nature: John Locke and the Formation of Security Communities," *Polity*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (July 2017), pp. 379-407. Wendt suggests a "Lockean" international culture as one hypothetical state in his *Social Theory of International Politics*, along with Hobbesian and Kantian alternatives. For a counterpoint to Wendt on anarchy, see Joseph Grieco, "Anarchy

	<p>and Identity,” <i>International Organization</i> (Spring 1995). Barry Buzan and Richard Little, “Reconceptualizing Anarchy: Structural Realism Meets World History,” <i>European Journal of International Relations</i>, Vol. 2, No. 4 (1996): 403-438. For an attempt to combine anarchy and hierarchy (seen as opposing ends of a continuum by Waltz), see Jack Donnelly, “Sovereign Inequalities and Hierarchy in Anarchy: American Power and International Society,” <i>European Journal of International Relations</i>, (2006). James N. Rosenau and Ernst-Otto Czempiel (eds.), <i>Governance without Government</i>, presents a take on international society that could also overlap to a degree with regime theory (see particularly K. J. Holsti’s chapter on the Concert of Europe!). For more on hierarchy in anarchy, see, e.g., Dani K. Nedal and Daniel H. Nexon, “Anarchy and Authority: International Structure, the Balance of Power, and Hierarchy,” <i>Journal of Global Security Studies</i>, Vol. 4, No. 2 (2019), pp. 169-189. There is an extensive literature on international order, including, of course, the English School. See also G. John Ikenberry, “Constitutional Politics in International Relations,” <i>European Journal of International Relations</i>, Vol. 4, No. 2, (1998), pp. 147-177.</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;">Section III: Schools</p> <p>Here we discuss a variety of schools – by no means all – in IR. Although much of the stress will be on varieties of Liberalism and Realism, do not be deceived into thinking that the others are inconsequential.</p>
<p>October 30</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Liberalisms</p> <p>Liberalism appears in a variety of flavours, including Kantian (Democratic Peace Theory), economic interdependence, and Neoliberal Institutionalism (on the system level). (NB: do <i>not</i> confuse Keohane’s Neoliberal Institutionalism with neoliberal <i>economic</i> arguments, which are a mixture of conservative political ideology and monetarist/post-Keynesian (Friedmanite) economic analysis.)</p> <p>*Mark W. Zacher and Richard A. Matthews, “Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent Strands?” in Charles W. Kegley (ed.), <i>Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge</i> (New York: St. Martin’s 1995), pp. 107-150. R</p> <p>*Brian C. Rathbun, “Is Anybody Not an (International Relations) Liberal?” <i>Security Studies</i>, Vol. 19, No. 1 (2010): 2-25.</p> <p>*Andrew Moravcsik, “The New Liberalism,” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 234-254.</p>

	<p>*Arthur A. Stein “Neoliberal Institutionalism,” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 201-221.</p> <p>*Joseph Grieco “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 42 (1988), pp. 485-507.</p> <p>FYI: See the FYI section for Anarchy re John Locke. Michael Doyle (also in Kegley, or his “Liberalism and World Politics” <i>American Political Science Review</i> (1986)) is important for the initiation of <u>Democratic Peace Theory</u>, though Immanuel Kant’s <i>Perpetual Peace</i> is the classic reference point for this line of thinking. See also F. S. Hinsley, <i>Power and the Pursuit of Peace</i>, and Michael Howard, <i>War and the Liberal Conscience</i>, for early (including 19th century) liberalism. See also the readings on Democratic Peace Theory in the IR reading list. On Neoliberal Institutionalism and related regime theory, see Robert O. Keohane, <i>After Hegemony</i>. For initial statements on regime theory, see the special issues of <i>International Organization</i> in 1975 (“International Responses to Technology”) and 1982. For later liberal institutionalism, see also the special issues of <i>International Organization</i> on legalization (Summer 2000) and rational design of institutions (Autumn 2001). See also G. John Ikenberry, <i>After Victory</i>. Broader early looks at regime theory (in some cases leading into Constructivist thinking and Realist thinking) are found in Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield (eds.), <i>International Organization: A Reader</i>; Andreas Hasenclever, Peter Mayer and Volker Rittberger, <i>Theories of International Regimes</i>, and Volker Rittberger and Peter Mayer (eds.), <i>Regime Theory and International Relations</i>. Recall also Rosenau and Czempiel (week of October 18). Oran Young has done a great deal of work on environmental regimes. See also the special issue of <i>World Politics</i> Vol. 38, No. 1 (October 1985) edited by Kenneth Oye. The “neo-neo” debate is further documented in David A. Baldwin’s <i>Neorealism and Neoliberalism</i> (including concluding pieces by Grieco and Keohane), and Robert Jervis, “Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate,” <i>International Security</i>, (Summer 1999). The Keohane et al.-Mearsheimer debate in <i>International Security</i> is also worth looking at.</p>
<p>November 6</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Realisms</p> <p>Likewise note the various flavours of realism: Classical (especially Morgenthau, but note Carr and others), structural or Neorealism (especially Waltz), and Neoclassical, and others.</p> <p>*William C. Wohlforth, “Realism”, in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 131-149.</p>

*Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Sixth edition (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), chapters 1 & 2. **R**

*Kenneth N. Waltz, "Political Structures," and "Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power," in Robert O. Keohane (ed.) *Neorealism and Its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp. 70-130. **R**

*Steven E. Lobell et al., *Neoclassical Realism, The State, and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) Chapter 1. **R and ONLINE**

*J.W. Legro and A. Moravcsik, "Is Anyone Still a Realist?" *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1999), pp. 5-55.

*Jack Donnelly, "Differentiation: type and dimension approaches," in Matthias Albert, Barry Buzan and Michael Zurn (eds.) *Bringing Sociology to International Relations: World Politics as Differentiation Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 104-124. **R**

*Robert Jervis, *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), Chapter 3, pp. 92-124. **ONLINE**

FYI: See also Stuart J. Kaufman, "The fragmentation and consolidation of international systems," *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Spring 1997), pp. 173-208. Recall Guilhot from September 13. Aside from E. H. Carr (*The Twenty Years' Crisis*) and Morgenthau, see also Raymond Aron, *Peace and War* (and the tribute issue of *International Studies Quarterly*, March 1985) for Classical Realism, and Jack Snyder, "Tensions Within Realism: 1954 and After," in Nicolas Guilhot (ed.), *The Invention of International Relations Theory*, and Guilhot, *The Invention of International Relations Theory* more generally. See also Nicolas Guilhot, *After the Enlightenment: Political Realism and International Relations in the Mid-Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017). Henry Kissinger would also count as a Classical Realist. John Mearsheimer's *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* is an "offensive realism" variant of neorealism. See also Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, "Security Seeking under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Revisted," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Winter 2000-2001), pp. 128-161 See Barry Buzan, Charles Jones and Richard Little, *The Logic of Anarchy* for a general critique and development beyond Waltzian "structural realism." See John G. Ruggie, "Continuity and Transformation in the World Polity: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis," *World Politics*, 35 (January 1983), also in Robert O. Keohane, ed., *Neorealism and its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), for a response to Waltz. Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, offers an alternative cut at realism, generally overlooked in the dominance of neorealism. William C. Wohlforth, "Realism and the End of the Cold War," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Winter

	<p>1994-1995): 91-129 notes other strands of Realist theory, while addressing the charge that Realists failed to anticipate the end of the Cold War. See also his “Gilpinian Realism and International Relations,” <i>International Relations</i>, Vol. 25, No. 4 (2011), pp. 499-511. See also <u>power transition theory</u> (A.F.K. Organski, and Organski and Kugler), See Barkin, <i>Realist Constructivism</i>, for a further development of his thinking. Jennifer Sterling-Folker is also an interesting current Realist. For interest, see also Daniel Bessner and Nicolas Guilhot, “How Realism Waltzed Off: Liberalism and Decisionmaking in Kenneth Waltz’s Neorealism,” <i>International Security</i>, (Fall 2015). For more on Neoclassical Realism, see Brian Rathbun, “A Rose by Any Other Name: Neoclassical Realism as the Logical and Necessary Extension of Structural Realism.” <i>Security Studies</i>, (2008). See also Kenneth Waltz, “Structural Realism after the Cold War,” <i>International Security</i>, Vol. 25, No.1 (Summer 2000), pp. 5-41 (and Keohane’s comment, Vol. 25, No. 3, Winter 2000-1, pp. 204-5); Joseph Parent and Joshua M. Baron, “Elder Abuse: How the Moderns Mistreat Classical Realism,” <i>International Studies Review</i>, Vol. 13 (2011), pp. 193-213. Gideon Rose, “Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy,” <i>World Politics</i>, (1998),pp. 144-172.</p>
<p>November 13</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">READING WEEK</p>
<p>November 20</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Critical Theory, Feminism and the English School</p> <p>A few of the schools outside of and often critical of, the North American mainstream (Realism and Liberalism), mostly Critical Theory, Feminism, and the English School.</p> <p>*Robert W. Cox, “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory,” in Robert O. Keohane (ed.), <i>Neorealism and Its Critics. Critics</i> (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986). R</p> <p>*Nicole Dietelhoff and Harald Muller, “Theoretical Paradise: Empirically Lost? Arguing with Habermas,” <i>Review of International Studies</i>, Vol. 31, No. 1 (January 2005): 167-179.</p> <p>*Laura Sjoberg and J. Ann Tickner, “Feminist Perspectives on International Relations,” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (eds.), <i>Handbook of International Relations</i>, (London: Sage Publications, 2012) pp.170-194. R</p> <p>*Hedley Bull, <i>The Anarchical Society: a Study of Order in World Politics</i> (London: Macmillan, 1977), chaps 1-3 (pp. 3-76). R and ONLINE</p> <p>*Andrew Linklater and Hidemi Suganami, <i>The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Assessment</i> (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2006) Chap. 2 (pp. 43-80). R</p> <p>FYI: Jim George, <i>Discourses of Global Politic</i> is another critical theorist. See also Andrew Linklater, “The Changing Contours of Critical International</p>

	<p>Relations Theory,” in Richard Wyn Jones (ed.), <i>Critical Theory and World Politics</i>. See also N. Rengger and B. Thirkell-White, <i>Critical International Relations after 25 Years</i>. Barry Buzan, Richard Little, Adam Watson (check the bibliography in Linklater and Suganami) and others cover a lot of the English School. Check the bibliographies in Reus-Smit and Snidal, and Carlsnaes, for Feminism, but see also: V. Spike Peterson, “Feminist Theories Within, Invisible To, and Beyond IR,” <i>Brown Journal of World Affairs</i>, Vol. 10, No. 2 (Winter/Spring 2004), and the article and bibliography in Scott Burchill et al., <i>Theories of International Relations</i>. For more re post-modernism, see e.g., Tony Porter, “Postmodern Political Realism and International Relations Theory’s Third Debate,” in Claire Turenne Sjolander and Wayne S. Cox (eds.), <i>Beyond Positivism: Critical Reflections on International Relations</i>.</p>
<p>November 27</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>NBNBNB: RESEARCH PAPER DUE NOVEMVER 29!!</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Sociological, Institutional and Complex System Approaches</p> <p>Here also, issues of cross-level analysis and action abound.</p> <p>*Friedrich Kratochwil, “Sociological Approaches,” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 444-461.</p> <p>*George Lawson, “The Promise of Historical Sociology in International Relations,” <i>International Studies Review</i> (September 2006).</p> <p>*Orfeo Fioretos, “Historical Institutionalism in International Relations,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 65, No. 2 (Spring 2011), pp. 367-399.</p> <p>*James G. March and Johan P. Olsen, “The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Autumn 1998).</p> <p>*Alastair Iain Johnston, “Treating International Institutions as Social Environments,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol. 45 (2001), pp. 487-515.</p> <p>*Antoine Bosquet and Simon Curtis, “Beyond models and metaphors: complexity theory, systems thinking and international relations,” <i>Cambridge Review of International Affairs</i>, Vol. 24, No. 1 (March 2011).</p> <p>FYI: S. Hobden and J. Hobson (eds.), <i>International Relations and Historical Sociology</i>. See also the work of Michael Mann (<i>The Sources of Social Power</i>, 4 vols.); a discussion of Mann’s work in John A. Hall and Ralph Schroeder (eds.) <i>An Anatomy of Power</i>, may also be of interest. On institutions, see,</p>

	<p>e.g., G. John Ikenberry, <i>After Victory</i>; and the regime theory literature, including the chapter by Beth Simmons and Lisa Martin in Carlsnaes et al. (2002), and by Martin and Simmons in <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Autumn 1998). More generally, see, e.g., R. A. W. Rhodes, Sarah A. Binder, and Bert A. Rockman (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of Political Institutions</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006). On complex adaptive systems, see the FYI section for the introductory week.</p>
<p>December 4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">FINAL EXAM DISTRIBUTED</p> <p style="text-align: center;">International Political Economy</p> <p>International Political Economy traditions can intersect with some classic (and some later) schools in IR theory: Mercantilism with Realism, Keynesianism (“embedded liberalism” in Ruggie’s terms) and other forms of economic Liberalism with Neoliberal Institutionalism, and Marxist critiques of capitalism and imperialism with elements of Critical Theory. Note also a tendency of North American IPE to be somewhat narrowly rational-actor, quantitative and economistic, while more European IPE can tend to be “anything but Liberalism and Realism” (and non-quantitative). The recent surge in “populism” in national politics in the US and Europe, and the resulting interplay of foreign and domestic politics is interesting from an IPE perspective, including in its effects on more classic security politics issues. Thinking about IPE should also consider, e.g., the implications of the Keohane-Nye complex interdependence model, and thus the issue of cross-level action.</p> <p>*John Ravenhill, “International Political Economy,” in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), <i>The Oxford Handbook of International Relations</i>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 539-557.</p> <p>*Susan Strange, “Political Economy and International Relations,” in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds.), <i>International Relations Theory Today</i>, (University Park, Penn.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), pp. 154-174. R (NB THIS IS THE 1995 EDITION!)</p> <p>*Ngairé Woods, “Economic Ideas and International Relations: Beyond Rational Neglect,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i>, Vol.39, No.2, (June 1995) pp. 161-180.</p> <p>*Jonathan Kirshner, “The Study of Money,” <i>World Politics</i>, Vol. 52, No. 2 (April 2000): 407-436.</p> <p>*Michael Mastanduno, “Economics and Security in Statecraft and Scholarship,” <i>International Organization</i>, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Autumn 1998). Concentrate on the discussions of IR scholarship.</p> <p>FYI: See also Susan Strange, <i>States and Markets</i>; in general, Strange’s works</p>

	<p>in the field of IPE are well worth reading. For Dependency Theory, see the special issue of <i>International Organization</i> (Winter 1978) as well as work by Andre Gunder Frank, Osvaldo Sunkel, etc. More Leninist theories of imperialism are found in Anthony Brewer, <i>Marxist theories of imperialism</i> (see also Wolfgang Mommsen, <i>Theories of Imperialism</i>). Richard N. Cooper's <i>The Economics of Interdependence</i> is an oldie but goodie. See also Jeffrey A. Frieden, <i>Global Capitalism</i>, and basic introductions to IPE such as Thomas H. Oatley's <i>International Political Economy</i>. The essays on international trade and on international finance in Carlsnaes et al. (2002 and 2012) may also be helpful. Note the intersection of IPE with economic interdependence, the Liberal resurgence of the late 1960s (and in Neoliberal Institutionalism later), the Transnational Relations model, and Critical Theory. Note also that the literature on European integration (and integration theory in general) seems to be treated as quite distinct for some reason. There is also an intersection between IPE (among many other issues) with Peter Haas's <i>Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination</i>, with possible constructivist/ideas overtones, and a literature on the spread of Keynesianism.</p>
--	--

INSTRUCTOR GUIDELINES

Students requiring assistance are encouraged to speak to the instructor during class or their office hours. Should you wish to meet outside of office hours, please telephone or email to make an appointment. It is to the student's advantage to keep such appointments.

Email is a common form of communication but it is not always the most effective way of answering student questions. If you cannot make office hours, please request a one on one meeting outside of these hours. I may be generally available outside of my teaching schedule, but this cannot be guaranteed, so depending on that will not necessarily work. For e-mail, please contact me directly at keeley@ucalgary.ca.

Students are welcome to use laptops and other electronic note-taking devices in this course. Please be considerate of others and switch off all cell phones when you enter the classroom. Sending/receiving texts and browsing the Web is extremely disruptive to others and will not be tolerated. **Students are also cautioned that lectures and materials produced by an instructor in a course are the intellectual property of the instructor. Any distribution of these materials – including hard copy and online – without the instructor's written approval, constitutes a breach of copyright law and an act of academic misconduct. All such offences will be taken seriously and Faculty of Arts policy requires that all offences be reported. Recording of lectures is permitted for individual private study, only at the discretion of the instructor. Any other use of recording constitutes Academic Misconduct and may result in suspension or expulsion. Both the student and the instructor must sign the appropriate Release Form to facilitate recording lectures.**

IMPORTANT POLICIES AND INFORMATION

Supporting Documentation and the Use of a Statutory Declaration

As stated in the University Calendar:

Students may be asked to provide supporting documentation for an exemption/special request. This may include, but is not limited to, a prolonged absence from a course where participation is required, a missed course assessment, a deferred examination, or an appeal. Students are encouraged to submit documentation that will support their situation. Supporting documentation may be dependent on the reason noted in their personal statement/explanation provided to explain their situation. This could be medical certificate/documentation, references, police reports, invitation letter, third party letter of support or a statutory declaration etc. The decision to provide supporting documentation that best suits the situation is at the discretion of the student. Students cannot be required to provide specific supporting documentation, such as a medical note.

Students can make a Statutory Declaration as their supporting documentation (available at ucalgary.ca/registrar). This requires students to make a declaration in the presence of a Commissioner for Oaths. It demonstrates the importance of honest and accurate information provided and is a legally binding declaration. Several registered Commissioners for Oaths are available to students at no charge, on campus. For a list of locations to access a Commissioners for Oaths, visit ucalgary.ca/registrar).

Falsification of any supporting documentation will be taken very seriously and may result in disciplinary action through the Academic Discipline regulations or the Student Non-Academic Misconduct policy.

This statement is accessible at: <https://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/m-1.html>

Please note that while the form of supporting documentation provided is at the discretion of the student, the instructor has the discretion not to accept the supporting documentation if it does not corroborate the reason(s) given for the exemption/special request.

Absence From a Mid-term Examination:

Students who are absent from a scheduled term test or quiz for legitimate reasons are responsible for contacting the instructor via email within 48 hours of the missed test to discuss alternative arrangements. A copy of this email may be requested as proof of the attempt to contact the instructor. Any student who fails to do so forfeits the right to a makeup test.

Deferral of a Final Examination:

Deferral of a final examination can be granted for reasons of illness, domestic affliction, and unforeseen circumstances, as well as to those with three (3) final exams scheduled within a 24-hour period. Deferred final exams will not be granted to those who sit the exam, who have made travel arrangements that conflict with their exam, or who have misread the examination timetable. The decision to allow a deferred final exam rests not with the instructor but with Enrolment Services. Instructors should, however, be notified if you will be absent during the examination.

The Application for Deferred Final Exam, deadlines, requirements and submission instructions can be found on the Enrolment Services website at <https://www.ucalgary.ca/registrar/exams/deferred-exams>.

Appeals:

If a student has a concern about the course or a grade they have been assigned, they must first discuss their concerns with the instructor. If this does not resolve the matter, the student then proceed with an academic appeal. The first step in an academic appeal is to set up a meeting with the Department Head. Appeals must be requested within 15 days of receipt of the graded assignment.

University Regulations:

Students are responsible for familiarizing themselves with the University policies found in the Academic Regulations sections of the Calendar at www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/academic-regs.html.

Student Accommodations:

Students seeking an accommodation based on disability or medical concerns should contact Student Accessibility Services; SAS will process the request and issue letters of accommodation to instructors. For additional information on support services and accommodations for students with disabilities, visit www.ucalgary.ca/access/.

Students who require an accommodation in relation to their coursework based on a protected ground other than disability should communicate this need in writing to their Instructor.

The full policy on Student Accommodations is available at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/student-accommodation-policy.pdf>.

Plagiarism And Other Forms Of Academic Misconduct:

Academic misconduct in any form (e.g. cheating, plagiarism) is a serious academic offence that can lead to disciplinary probation, suspension or expulsion from the University. Students are expected to be familiar with the standards surrounding academic honesty; these can be found in the University of Calgary calendar at <http://www.ucalgary.ca/pubs/calendar/current/k.html>. Such offences will be taken seriously and reported immediately, as required by Faculty of Arts policy.

Copyright Legislation:

As stated in the University of Calgary Calendar, Academic Regulations, “students are required to read the University of Calgary policy on Acceptable Use of Material Protected by Copyright and requirements of the copyright act to ensure they are aware of the consequences of unauthorised sharing of course materials (including instructor notes, electronic versions of textbooks etc.). Students who use material protected by copyright in violation of this policy may be disciplined under the Non-Academic Misconduct Policy.”

<https://www.ucalgary.ca/policies/files/policies/acceptable-use-of-material-protected-by-copyright.pdf> and <https://laws-lois.justice.gc.ca/eng/acts/C-42/index.html>

Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy (FOIP):

FOIP legislation requires that instructors maintain the confidentiality of student information. In practice, this means that student assignment and tests cannot be left for collection in any public

place without the consent of the student. It also means that grades cannot be distributed via email. Final exams are kept by instructors but can be viewed by contacting them or the main office in the Department of Political Science. Any uncollected assignments and tests meant to be returned will be destroyed after six months from the end of term; final examinations are destroyed after one year.

Evacuation Assembly Points:

In the event of an emergency evacuation from class, students are required to gather in designated assembly points. Please check the list found at www.ucalgary.ca/emergencyplan/assemblypoints and note the assembly point nearest to your classroom.

Faculty of Arts Program Advising and Student Information Resources:

For program planning and advice, visit the Arts Students' Centre in Social Sciences 102, call 403-220-3580 or email artsads@ucalgary.ca. You can also visit arts.ucalgary.ca/advising for program assistance.

For registration (add/drop/swap), paying fees and assistance with your Student Centre, contact Enrolment Services at (403) 210-ROCK [7625] or visit their office in the MacKimmie Library Block.

Important Contact Information:

Campus Security and Safewalk (24 hours a day/7 days a week/365 days a year)
Phone: 403-220-5333

Faculty of Arts Undergraduate Students' Union Representatives
Phone: 403-220-6551
Email: arts1@su.ucalgary.ca, arts2@su.ucalgary.ca, arts3@su.ucalgary.ca,
arts4@su.ucalgary.ca
Students' Union URL: www.su.ucalgary.ca

Graduate Students' Association
Phone: 403-220-5997
Email: askgsa@ucalgary.ca
URL: www.ucalgary.ca/gsa

Student Ombudsman
Phone: 403-220-6420
Email: ombuds@ucalgary.ca

Campus Mental Health Resources:

SU Wellness Centre: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/wellnesscentre/>
Campus Mental Health Strategy: <https://www.ucalgary.ca/mentalhealth/>