THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
(A.K.A. THE CORE)

Professor Ronald R. Krebs   *Class*: Tuesday, 11 am – 12:55 pm,
1233 Social Sciences Building   Location: 1383 Social Sciences
rkrebs@umn.edu   *Office Hours*: Wednesday, 9 am – 11 am,
tel.: 612-624-4356   and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

As its title suggests, this course is an introduction to contemporary theories, debates, and major scholarly traditions in international relations (IR). As the "core" course offered in this field, or field survey, the intention is to provide a general, but not elementary, overview. It is intended primarily for graduate students in the Department of Political Science, though others are welcome to attend, with the instructor's permission. While it is impossible to cover the enormous IR literature comprehensively in a one-semester survey, the class will introduce students to many of the central theories, authors, and debates.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

The class format will place a premium on discussion. It is expected that everyone will come prepared to discuss the assigned materials in an informed and critical manner.

1. *Readings and Participation*.
   a. *Read everything every week*. This is not a course for the faint of heart! The literature in IR is huge, and it grows daily. I've tried to separate the wheat from the chaff, but even so, the reading load in this class is heavy. Students are expected to come to seminar prepared to discuss the required readings for that week. A large portion of your grade is based on class participation: if you fail to do the readings or fail to speak up in class, you will do poorly. Moreover, students are strongly encouraged to start with ''internal'' critiques of the readings for each week (i.e., analyses that take the readings seriously and operate within their approach to theory) before moving on to "external" critiques.

   b. *Submit every week 3-4 discussion questions based on the reading.* These questions should be distributed by email before 9 am, Tuesday morning.

   c. *Lead class discussion **three** times (or more, or less, often depending on size of class)*.
      • Discussion leaders will kick off class with 5-7 minutes of prepared commentary addressing one or more of the questions he or she has proposed.
      • Seminar members will be asked at the beginning of the term to commit to leading discussion on given weeks.

   d. Class participation will account for 20% of your grade.

2. *Three Short Essays (≤ 5 pp;, double-spaced; 12-point font; min. 1 inch margins)*.
   The essays should critically examine a hypothesis, theory, question, concept, or controversy contained in one or more readings in a single week. The essay may address only a subset of the readings, but it should not simply summarize the assigned texts. A copy of the essay must be e-mailed to me as an attachment (.doc, .docx, or .pdf) by 9 am on the Tuesday of the relevant class meeting. The three essays will be graded and will, combined, account for 40% of your total grade. **NB: Length & style requirements will be strictly enforced.**

3. *Take-home final*.
   This final is meant to simulate the take-home portion of the IR prelims. Most basic rules of the preliminary exam will be followed: students will write on one out of two questions (which will *not* be made available in advance); the exam is open book and open notes; final essays may not exceed 5000 words. Rather than a week, students will have four days to write their answer (no need to prolong the agony!). Previous prelims, on file with the department, may prove useful in giving students a sense of the kinds of questions that I will ask. The final will be distributed via email on the *Thursday of the penultimate week of classes*, by 12 pm, and will be due back via email on the following *Tuesday (of the last week of classes)*, by 12 pm. The take-home final will account for 40% of your total grade.

4. *Optional: Final Paper*. (15-20 double spaced pages)
   This option is available *only* to graduate students who are *not* in the Political Science Department. These students are welcome to write the take-home final instead, if they so choose. The paper may take any number of forms, but it must engage creatively with several schools of thought in international relations. One option would be to "test" two or three major theories by examining one or more empirical cases. Students who wish to pursue this option must submit a 1 p. paper proposal to the instructor by the end of the eighth class meeting; students are encouraged to meet with the instructor before that date to discuss preliminary ideas. Only papers based on approved proposals will be accepted. The final paper will account for 40% of your total grade.

Note: Short essays submitted late (after 9 am on Tuesday) will be penalized one-third of a letter grade per hour. Questions distributed late (after 9 am on Tuesday) will be accepted, but their tardiness will factor into the class participation grade. Incompletes will not be given for this course unless there is a documented emergency.

GRADING
   Class Participation (incl. presentations and memos)   20%
   Short Essays (3)   40%
   Take-Home Final (or Optional Final Paper)   40%

READINGS
   No books have been ordered for purchase at the University bookstore. The following books are recommended for purchase (because we are reading enough from them), but purchase is not required. All the books below have been placed on reserve at Wilson Library. Other readings may be found in the "POLS 8401 readings" folder on the department's Shared drive.

   • David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Revised Edition (University of Minnesota Press, 1998).
   • E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939* (Harper & Row, 1964 [1939]).
   • Michael W. Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (Norton, 1997).
   • G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order* (Princeton UP, 2011),
   • Charles Lipson, *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace* (Princeton UP, 2003).
   • John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (Norton, 2001).
   • Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford UP, 2008).

• Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War* (Modern Library edition, 1982).
• Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (McGraw Hill, 1979).
• Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge UP, 1999).

BACKGROUND READINGS
The boundary between international relations theory and diplomatic history was once very fine. A good grasp of the history of great power politics remains valuable for students of international politics in general and IR theory in particular. Useful background works include:

• William H. McNeill, *The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force, and Society since A.D. 1000* (University of Chicago Press, 1982).
• Michael Howard, *War in European History* (Oxford UP, 1976).
• Edward Vose Gulick, *Europe's Classical Balance of Power* (W.W. Norton, 1955).
• Paul W. Schroeder, *The Transformation of European Politics, 1763-1848* (Oxford UP, 1994).
• A.J.P. Taylor, *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, 1848-1918* (Oxford UP, 1992 [1954]).
• William R. Keylor, *The Twentieth Century World: An International History* (Oxford UP, 1984).
    -------------, *A World of Nations: The International Order Since 1945* (Oxford UP, 2003).
• Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (Penguin Press, 2005).
• Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, 3 vols. (Cambridge UP, 2010).
• Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (Simon & Schuster, 1994).
• Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (Random House, 1987).

CLASS SCHEDULE AND READING ASSIGNMENTS

* = required reading
§ = highly recommended reading (<u>translation</u>: I would have assigned it if I were not already assigning you too much. But if you have not read it yet, you definitely should before prelims, if not sooner.)
NB: Many of the other recommended readings are valuable as well and are included here for students with strong interests in a given week's topic. These bibliographic lists are of course not meant to be comprehensive.

<u>Guide to Journal Abbreviations</u>

AJPS	*American Journal of Political Science*	*ISQ*	*International Studies Quarterly*
ARPS	*Annual Review of Political Science*	*ISR*	*International Studies Review*
APSR	*American Political Science Review*	*IT*	*International Theory*
EJIL	*European Journal of International Law*	*JCR*	*Journal of Conflict Resolution*
EJIR	*European Journal of International Relations*	*JCWS*	*Journal of Cold War Studies*
FA	*Foreign Affairs*	*PoP*	*Perspectives on Politics*
FP	*Foreign Policy*	*RIS*	*Review of International Studies*
IO	*International Organization*	*SS*	*Security Studies*
IS	*International Security*	*WP*	*World Politics*
ISP	*International Studies Perspectives*		

September 3
What is IR? What is IR Theory?

* Brian C. Schmidt, "On the History and Historiography of IR," in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Sage, 2002), 3-22.

An American Social Science? Is it still?
* Stanley Hoffmann, "An American Social Science: International Relations," *Daedalus* 106 (1977): 41-59.
* Steve Smith, "The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: 'Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline,'" *ISR* 4:2 (summer 2002): 67-86.
§ Ole Waever, "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations," *IO* 52:4 (1998): 687-727.
Ido Oren, "The Enduring Relationship Between the American (National Security) State and the State of the Discipline," *PS: Political Science & Politics* 37/1 (January 2004): 51-55.

What, in the name of God, is International Relations? (with apologies to Henry Kissinger)
   Or, the Levels of Analysis: Is there a problem?
* J. David Singer, "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations," *WP* 14:1 (October 1961): 77-92. Classic statement.
* Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (McGraw Hill, 1979), chaps. 2-4 (skim chaps. 2-3, but read pp. 18-27, 35-37, 39-41; and read all of chap. 4 carefully). The primacy of systemic theorizing.
* Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton UP, 1976), 13-31. Why and when the first-image matters.
§ Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State, and War* (Columbia UP, 1954). The "three images." In many ways a richer statement than Waltz' later, and more influential, *Theory*.
§ Arnold Wolfers, "The Actors in International Politics," in his *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics* (Johns Hopkins UP, 1962), chap. 1. Can we analogize the international system to a "house on fire"?
Nicholas Onuf, "Levels," *EJIR* 1:1 (March 1995), 35-58. The universal attractiveness of levels in theorizing.

What do we study in IR?
* David A. Lake, "The State and International Relations," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chap. 2 (41-61). Defending and advancing state-centric theorizing.
* Michael Barnett and Kathryn Sikkink, "From International Relations to Global Society," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chap. 3 (62-83). How the field has broadened.

How do we study it? What is a (good) theory of IR? Can we do better than Potter Stewart?
* Martin Hollis and Steve Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (Clarendon, 1990), 1-9, 45-91, 196-216. Two traditions of social-scientific theorizing.
* Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (McGraw Hill, 1979), chap. 1. What theory is good for? Prediction, explanation, and getting a few big things right…
* Gabriel Almond and Stephen Genco, "Clouds, Clocks and the Study of Politics," *WP* 29:4 (July 1977), 277-291. Can we have a predictive theory of politics? Would we even want one?
Hans J. Morgenthau, "The Intellectual and Political Functions of Theory," in his *Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade, 1960-1970* (Praeger, 1970), 248-261. "Fruitful theory" as deeply tied to "the political problems of the day"; in contrast to "theorizing about theories," which is merely "an innocuous intellectual pastime."

September 10
Classical Realism

> Is there a classical realist tradition? Can one identify its principal elements? If so, how does it relate to power, ethics, the sources of war and peace, the relationship between domestic and international politics? Read Thucydides and Carr and reflect on these questions *before* you engage with Doyle and the rest. Then ask: doth the assigned subversive re-readings of the classical realists protest too much?

* Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War* (Modern Library edition, 1982), Book I, chaps. 1-88 (pp. 1-50); Book V, chaps. 84-116 (the Melian dialogue) [pp. 349-357].
* E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939* (Harper & Row, 1964 [1939]), chaps. 1-7, 13 (skim chaps. 8-9).

* William C. Wohlforth, "Realism," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chap. 7 (131-149). An excellent brief introduction to the realist tradition and its many theories. Compare to Doyle.
* Michael Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (Norton, 1997), 41-201 (can skim 175-191). Realism*s*, yet also identifying realism's "hard core." Compare to Wohlforth.

* Michael C. Williams, *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* (Cambridge UP, 2005), 1-9, 128-137, 145-168 (recommended: all). A re-reading of classical realist thinkers—Hobbes, Rousseau, Morgenthau—as "willful realists" skeptical of the Enlightenment project, focused on the constitution of political order, and articulating a vision of politics as a struggle not only for material power but over fundamental values.
* Richard Ned Lebow, "Thucydides the Constructivist," *APSR* 95:3 (September 2001): 547-560. Re-reading Thucydides as the founding father of constructivist IR.

* Jack Donnelly, "The Ethics of Realism," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chap. 8 (150-162). An ethical critique of the realist tradition.

The Classical Realists

Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 7th ed., rev. by Kenneth W. Thompson and W. David Clinton (McGraw Hill, 2006 [1948]), esp. chaps. 1-3, 8-14, 16.
Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society: A Study in Ethics and Politics* (Scribner, 1932).
Raymond Aron, *Peace and War : A Theory of International Relations* (Doubleday, 1966).
Arnold Wolfers, *Discord and Collaboration: Essays on International Politics* (Johns Hopkins UP, 1962), esp. chaps. 1-11.
George Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (University of Chicago Press, 1951).
Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State, and War* (Columbia UP, 1954).
John Herz, *Political Realism and Political Idealism* (University of Chicago Press, 1957).
Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War*, 3rd ed. (Free Press, 1988 [1973]).

Commentary on the Classical Realists

Michael C. Williams, ed., *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans Morgenthau in International Relations* (Oxford UP, 2008).
§ Richard Ned Lebow, *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests, and Orders* (Cambridge UP, 2003), esp. chaps. 3-4 (on Thucydides) and chap. 7. See also Lebow, "Classical Realism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (Oxford UP, 2007), 52-69.
Charles Jones, *E.H. Carr and International Relations: A Duty to Lie* (Cambridge UP, 1998).

Jonathan Haslam, *The Vices of Integrity: E.H. Carr, 1892-1982* (Verso, 2000).

Andrew Linklater, "The Transformation of Political Community: E.H. Carr, Critical Theory, and International Relations," *RIS* 23 (1997): 321-338.

Stefano Guzzini, *Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy: Continuing Story of a Death Foretold* (Routledge, 1998).

§ Jonathan Haslam, *No Virtue Like Necessity: Realist Thought in International Relations since Machiavelli* (Yale UP, 2002).

Martin Wight, *Four Seminal Thinkers in International Theory* (Oxford UP, 2005), chap. 1, on Machiavelli.

§ William E. Scheuerman, "The (classical) Realist vision of global reform," *IT* 2:2 (2010): 246-282.

Thucydides Revisionism

Daniel Garst, "Thucydides and Neo-Realism," *ISQ* 33 (March 1989): 3-28.

Laurie Johnson Bagby, "The Use and Abuse of Thucydides," *IO* 48:1 (Winter 1994): 131-153.

Peter J. Ahrensdorf, "Thucydides' Realistic Critique of Realism," *Polity* 30:2 (Winter 1997): 231-265.

Steven Forde, "International Realism and the Science of Politics: Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Neorealism," *ISQ* 39:2 (June 1995): 141-60.

Nancy Kokaz, "Moderating Power: A Thucydidean Perspective," *RIS* 27 (2001): 27-49.

David A. Welch, "Why International Relations Theorists Should Stop Reading Thucydides," *RIS* 29:3 (July 2003): 301-320.

Jonathan Monten, "Thucydides and Modern Realism," *ISQ* 50:1 (March 2006): 3-26.

September 17
Structural Realism

> * Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (McGraw Hill, 1979), chaps. 5-6, 8. Still the standard punching bag.
> * John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (Norton, 2001), chaps. 1, 2, 5. Skim chaps. 3 (but read 57-60), 8, 9. A newer (offensive-realist) punching bag.
> * Robert Jervis, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma," *WP* 30:2 (January 1978): 167-214. The power of simple game-theoretic models.
> * Kenneth A. Oye, "Explaining Cooperation Under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies," in Oye, ed., *Cooperation Under Anarchy* (Princeton UP, 1986), 1-24. Extending Jervisian logic.
> * Robert O. Keohane, *International Institutions and State Power* (Westview, 1989), chaps. 1, 5, 7 (pp. 1-20, 101-131, 158-179) [recommended: chaps. 3, 6]. Modified structural realism, in motion.
> * Robert Jervis, "Realism, Game Theory, and Cooperation," *WP* 40 (April 1988): 317-349.
>
> * Ido Oren, "The Unrealism of Contemporary Realism: The Tension Between Realist Theory and Realists' Practice," *PoP* 7:2 (June 2009): 283-301. Why realists should be less scientific (in a naturalist way) if they wish to be activists and policy advocates.

Structural Realism: Neo- and Otherwise
> § Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge UP, 1981). The classic statement of "hegemonic realism." A must read.
> § Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (Random House, 1987). Hegemonic realism applied by a top-notch historian. Another must read.
> Glenn Snyder and Paul Diesing, *Conflict Among Nations* (Princeton UP, 1977). The power of simple game-theoretic models, expanded.
> Barry R. Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine* (Cornell UP, 1984). Neorealism applied to foreign policy.
> R. Harrison Wagner, "The Theory of Games and the Balance of Power," *WP* 38:4 (July 1986): 546-576.
> § R. Harrison Wagner, "What was Bipolarity?" *IO* 47:1 (winter 1993): 77-106.
> § Paul W. Schroeder, "Historical Reality Versus Neo-Realist Theory," *IS* 19:1 (1994): 108-148. States can do a lot more than just balance: a historian decries the poverty of neorealism.
> Victoria Tin-Bor Hui, "Toward a Dynamic Theory of International Politics: Insights from Comparing Ancient China and Early Modern Europe," *IO* 58:1 (winter 2004): 175-205. Explaining the failure to balance in ancient China.
> Kenneth N. Waltz, "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory," in Robert Rothstein, ed., *The Evolution of Theory in International Relations* (University of South Carolina Press, 1991). A succinct statement of the purpose of theory, neorealist logic, and its relationship to the realist tradition.
> Colin Elman, "Horses for Courses: Why Not Neorealist Theories of Foreign Policy?" *SS* 6:1 (autumn 1996): 7-53. And Waltz' reply, "International Politics is not Foreign Policy," *SS* 6:1 (autumn 1996) 54-57, and Elman's rebuttal, 58-61.
> James D. Fearon, "Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations," *ARPS* 1 (1998): 289-313; especially relevant here are pp. 292-298.
> § Robert Jervis, "Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma," *JCWS* 3 (Winter 2001): 36-60. Or, how do we know a security dilemma when we see one in real life?
> § Stacie Goddard and Daniel H. Nexon, "Paradigm Lost? Structural Realism and Structural Functionalism," *EJIR* 11:1 (2005): 9-61. Neorealism as Talcott Parsons applied to IR.

Defensive and Offensive Realism
> § Stephen G. Brooks, "Dueling Realisms," *IO* 51:3 (summer 1997): 445-77.

§ Charles L. Glaser, "The Security Dilemma Revisited," *WP* 50:1 (October 1997): 171-201. Emending, and further complicating, Jervis 1978.

Charles L. Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," *IS* 19:3 (winter 1994/1995).

Charles L. Glaser, "Political Consequences of Military Strategy: Expanding and Refining the Spiral and Deterrence Models," *WP* 44:4 (July 1992): 497-538. Emending Jervis, *Perception and Misperception*, chap. 3.

§ Randall Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In," *IS* 19:1 (summer 1994): 72-107.

Fareed Zakaria, "Realism and Domestic Politics: A Review Essay,"*IS* 17:1 (summer 1992).

Keir A. Lieber, "The New History of World War I and What It Means for International Relations Theory," *IS* 32:2 (fall 2007): 155-191. Correspondence by Jack Snyder and rebuttal by Lieber in *IS* 33:1 (summer 2008): 174-194.

Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, "Security Seeking Under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Revisited," *IS* 25:3 (winter 2000/2001): 128-161.

Colin Elman, "Extending Offensive Realism: The Louisiana Purchase and America's Rise to Regional Hegemony," *APSR* 98:4 (November 2004): 563-576.

The Neo-Neo Debate (or Synthesis?)

§ Stephen Krasner, ed., *International Regimes* (Cornell UP, 1983), esp. essays by Krasner, Stein, Keohane (a concise theoretical statement of 'neoliberal' logic), Jervis (why effective regimes are less likely in security), Ruggie (the origins of 'embedded liberalism'), and Strange (a brilliant critique of regime theory in American IR).

§ Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton UP, 1984), chaps. 4, 6. The original statement of neoliberal institutionalism or modified structural realism, as it was known (and properly so) early on.

Robert O. Keohane, ed., *Neorealism and Its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986).

§ David A. Baldwin, ed., *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate* (Columbia UP, 1993), esp. chaps. by Lipson (on cooperation in the economic and security arenas), Grieco (a realist critique of Keohane et al.), Milner (a good critique of neorealist conceptions of anarchy), Snidal and Powell and Krasner (on relative gains), and then the concluding essays by Keohane and Grieco.

Helen Milner, "International Theories of Cooperation Among Nations: Strengths and Weaknesses," *WP* 44 (April 1992): 466-96.

§ John Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *IS* 19:3 (Winter 1994/95): 5-49.

§ Robert O. Keohane and Lisa L. Martin, "The Promise of Institutionalist Theory," *IS* 20:1 (Summer 1995): 39-51.

Robert Powell, "Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate," *IO* 48:2 (Spring 1994): 313-44.

§ James Fearon, "Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation," *IO* 52:2 (spring 1998): 269-305.

§ Robert Jervis, "Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate," *IS* 24:1 (Summer 1999): 42-63.

§ Ole Waever, "The Rise and Fall of the Inter-Paradigm Debate," in Steve Smith et al eds., *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Cambridge UP, 1996).

Lisa L. Martin and Beth Simmons, "Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions," *IO* 52 (Autumn 1998): 729-57.

Structural Realism and the End of the Cold War

§ John Lewis Gaddis, "International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War," *IS* 17:3 (Winter 1992/93): 5-58.

§ William C. Wohlforth, "Realism and the End of the Cold War," *IS* 19:3 (Winter 1994/95): 91-129.

§ Richard Ned Lebow, "The Long Peace, the End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism," *IO* 48:2 (spring 1994): 249-277.

William C. Wohlforth, "Reality Check: Revising Theories of International Politics in Response to the End of the Cold War," *WP* 50:4 (July 1998): 650-679.

Randall L. Schweller and William C. Wohlforth, "Power Test: Evaluating Realism in Response to the End of the Cold War," *SS* 9:3 (Spring 2000): 60-108.

§ Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "Power, Globalization, and the End of the Cold War: Reevaluating a Landmark Case for Ideas," *IS* 25:3 (winter 2000/01): pp. 5-53. And the exchange between Robert D. English and Brooks & Wohlforth in *IS* (spring 2002) 70-111.

Robert G. Herman, "Identity, Norms, and National Security: The Soviet Foreign Policy Revolution and the End of the Cold War," in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).

Jeremy Suri, "Explaining the End of the Cold War? A New Historical Consensus," *JCWS* 4:4 (fall 2002): 60-92.

Nina Tannenwald and William Wohlforth, eds., *Ideas, International Relations, and the End of the Cold War*, special issue of *JCWS* 7:2 (spring 2005).

September 24
The Realist Turn to the Unit Level: Voyage of the Damned or Stairway to Heaven?

    * Jack Snyder, *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition* (Cornell UP, 1991), chaps. 1-2 [recommended: an empirical chapter of your choice].
    * Colin Dueck, *Reluctant Crusaders: Power, Culture, and Change in American Grand Strategy* (Princeton UP, 2006), 1-43 [recommended: an empirical chapter of your choice].
    * Randall Schweller, *Unanswered Threats: Political Constraints on the Balance of Power* (Princeton UP, 2006), 1-68.

    * Jeffrey Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *IS* 24:2 (fall 1999): 5-55; and correspondence in *IS* 25:1 (summer 2000): 457-474.
    * Brian Rathbun, "A Rose by Any Other Name: Neoclassical Realism as the Logical and Necessary Extension of Structural Realism," *SS* 17:2 (April 2008): 294-321.
    * Steven E. Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, eds., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge UP, 2009), chap. 1 (Taliaferro et al.).

Who says Realists are Structuralists?
    Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Cornell UP, 1987), chap. 2.
    Stephen M. Walt, *Revolution and War* (Cornell UP, 1996).
    Stephen Van Evera, *The Causes of War* (Cornell UP, 1999).
    Thomas Christenson and Jack Snyder, "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Behavior in Multipolarity," *IO* 44:2 (spring 1990): 137-169.
    Christopher Layne, *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* (Cornell UP, 2006).
    Fareed Zakaria, *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role* (Princeton UP, 1998).
    William C. Wohlforth, *The Elusive Balance: Power and Perceptions During the Cold War* (Cornell UP, 1993).
    § Randall Schweller, "Neorealism's Status-Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma?" *SS* 5:3 (spring 1996) 90-121.
    § Randall Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In," *IS* 19:1 (summer 1994): 72-107.
    Randall Schweller, *Deadly Imbalances: Tripolarity and Hitler's Strategy of World Conquest* (Columbia UP, 1998).

Assessing the Turn
    § Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," *WP* 51 (October 1998) 144-172.
    § John Vasquez, "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative vs. Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition," *APSR* 91:4 (December 1997) 899-912; and responses 913-35.
    Colin and Miriam Fendius Elman, eds., *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* (MIT Press, 2003).

October 1
Liberalism (I)

* Bruce Russett, "Liberalism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 2nd ed. (Oxford UP, 2010), 95-113. A standard short statement of the triad—democracy, international trade, and international organizations.
* Michael W. Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (Norton, 1997), 205-311.
* Andrew Moravcsik, "The New Liberalism," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chapter 13. An updating (and more clearly written version) of Moravcsik's much debated (and, in some quarters, much pilloried) reworking of liberalism for scientific IR.
* Diana Panke and Thomas Risse, "Liberalism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (Oxford UP, 2007), 89-106. A different way of slicing up the tradition, incorporating constructivist theorizing.
* G. John Ikenberry, "Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order," *PoP* 7:1 (March 2009): 71-87. The varieties of IR liberalism.
* Miles Kahler, "The Causes and Consequences of Legalization," *IO* 54:3 (summer 2000): 661-683. A synoptic take on the phenomenon, crossing levels of analysis.

* Deborah Boucoyannis, "The International Wanderings of a Liberal Idea, or Why Liberals Can Learn to Stop Worrying and Love the Balance of Power," *PoP* 5:4 (December 2007): 703-727. Reconsidering the boundaries between realism and liberalism.
* Daniel W. Drezner, "The Power and Peril of International Regime Complexity," *PoP* 7:1 (March 2009): 65-70. A realist take on regime complexity.
* Christian Reus-Smit, "The Strange Death of Liberal International Relations Theory," *EJIL* 12:3 (2001): 573-593. How the scientific turn has gutted liberal IR theory.

What is Liberal IR Theory?
Mark Zacher and Richard Matthews, "Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent Strands," in Charles Kegley, ed., *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the NeoLiberal Challenge* (St. Martin's, 1995), 107-150. A comprehensive exposition and review—assimilating both the English School and constructivism into institutional liberalism.
James L. Richardson, "Contending Liberalisms – Past and Present," *EJIR*, 3:1 (March 1997): 5-34.
Robert Keohane, "International Liberalism Reconsidered," in John Dunn, ed., *The Economic Limits to Modern Politics* (Cambridge UP, 1990), 165-194. Liberalism as a complement to Marxist and realist structural analysis.
§ Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *IO* 51:4 (Autumn 1997): 513-554. The standard citation: recasting liberalism as a *scientific theory*.
§ Brian C. Rathbun, "Is Anybody Not an (International Relations) Liberal?" *SS* 19:1 (2010): 2-25.

Brian C. Schmidt, *The Political Discourse of Anarchy: A Disciplinary History of International Relations* (SUNY Press, 1998), esp. chaps. 6-7. Debunking the usual history of the first "great debate" between "realism" and "idealism."
Lucian M. Ashworth, "Where are the Idealists in Interwar International Relations?" *RIS* 32:2 (April 2006): 291-308. In short, they never existed.
Andreas Osiander, "Rereading Early Twentieth-Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited," *ISQ* 42:3 (Sept. 1998): 409-432. Reclaiming interwar "idealism," or debunking Carr's narrative of naïveté. The idealists as sensitive to historical change, not beholden to visions of inexorable progress.
Martin Wight, *Four Seminal Thinkers in International Theory* (Oxford UP, 2005), ch. 2-3 (Grotius and Kant).
Gerry Simpson, "The Ethics of the New Liberalism," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chapter 14.

Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War* (Columbia UP, 1954), 80-158. Classic statement of what's wrong with second-image theorizing. Review also Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*.

Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War* (Free Press, 1988 [1973]), 3-32. Brilliant, if heavy-handed, realist critique of social and commercial liberalism.

Institutional Liberalism: Visions of Global Governance

§ Bruce M. Russett and John R. Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (Norton, 2001): 157-196, 212-218. How IOs make peace.

§ Karen Alter and Sophie Meunier, "The Politics of International Regime Complexity," *PoP* 7:1 (March 2009): 13-24. A balanced look at the effects of regime complexity, with findings from multiple policy domains. (From the same special issue as the Drezner piece above.)

§ Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 2nd ed. (Scott, Foresman, 1989 [1977), 3-37, 245-267. Complex interdependence: compare to the neoliberal Keohane.

§ Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, eds., *Power in Global Governance* (Cambridge UP, 2005).

Michael Zürn, "From Interdependence to Globalization," in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Sage, 2002), 235-254.

Peter M. Haas, "Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination," *IO* 46:1 (winter 1992): 1-35. Lead article in special issue on "Knowledge, Power, and International Policy Coordination."

§ Anne-Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order* (Princeton UP, 2004), 1-103, 131-165, 216-230. [recommended: all] Networks, networks everywhere: the foundation of global governance.

§ Emilie M. Hafner-Burton, Miles Kahler, and Alexander H. Montgomery, "Network Analysis for International Relations," *IO* 63:1 (summer 2009).

Institutional Liberalism: Legalization

Anne-Marie Slaughter, "International Law in a World of Liberal States," *EJIL* 6:4 (1995): 503-539. International law from a liberal perspective.

Jack Goldsmith and Eric Posner *The Limits of International Law* (Oxford UP, 2005). A realist take on international law.

§ "Legalization and World Politics," special issue, *IO* 54:3 (summer 2000), especially Judith Goldstein, et al., "Introduction: Legalization and World Politics"; Robert O. Keohane, et al., "The Concept of Legalization"; Kenneth W. Abbott and Duncan Snidal, "Hard and Soft Law in International Governance"; Robert O. Keohane, et al., "Legalized Dispute Resolution: Interstate and Transnational"; and Miles Kahler, "The Causes and Consequences of Legalization."

§ Martha Finnemore and Stephen J. Toope, "Alternatives to 'Legalization': Richer Views of Law and Politics," *IO* 55:3 (summer 2001): 743-758 [response by Keohane et al., 759-760]. Critique of the 2000 *IO* special issue.

Commercial Liberalism: Trade, Investment, and the Origins of War and Peace

§ Bruce M. Russett and John R. Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (Norton, 2001) 125-156, 218-228. A now classic statement.

§ Dale Copeland. "Economic Interdependence and War: A Theory of Trade Expectations," *IS* 20:4 (spring 1996) 5-41. A realist twist on commercial liberalism: turning the theory on its head…

§ Patrick J. McDonald, *The Invisible Hand of Peace: Capitalism, the War Machine, and International Relations Theory* (Cambridge UP, 2009). Not just any old kind of trade, but *free* trade.

§ Stephen G. Brooks, *Producing Security: Multinational Corporations, Globalization, and the Changing Calculus of Conflict* (Princeton UP, 2005). Not trade, but foreign direct investment and the globalization of production, produces peace.

§ Peter Liberman, *Does Conquest Pay?* (Princeton UP, 1996). According to this realist, yes—even in the age of nationalism and industrialized warfare.

Richard Rosecrance, *The Rise of the Trading State: Commerce and Conquest in the Modern World* (Basic Books, 1986).

Edward Mansfield, *Power, Trade, and War* (Princeton UP, 1994).

Katherine Barbieri, *The Liberal Illusion: Does Trade Promote Peace?* (University of Michigan Press, 2002).

Barry Buzan, "Economic Structure and International Security: The Limits of the Liberal Case," *IO*, 38:4 (autumn 1984): 223-254.

David Rowe, "The Tragedy of Liberalism: How Globalization Caused the First World War," *SS* 14:3 (spring 2005).

October 8
Liberalism (II): Republican Liberalism (the Democratic Peace)

* John M. Owen, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace," *IS* 19:2 (fall 1994): 87-125 [also reprinted in Brown, ed., *Debating the Democratic Peace*(1996)]. The normative explanation.
* Charles Lipson, *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace* (Princeton UP, 2003), 1-16, 47-111, 139-168. The rationalist explanation.
* Jarrod Hayes, "Securitization, Social Identity, and Democratic Security: Nixon, India, and the Ties that Bind," *IO* 66:1 (Jan. 2012): 63-93. Democratic peace, via the logic of legitimation.
* Beate Jahn, "Kant, Mill, and Illiberal Legacies in International Affairs," *IO* 59:1 (winter 2005): 177-208. Warlike democracies: Mill and the failure of imperial liberalism.

* Sebastian Rosato, "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *APSR* 97:4 (Nov. 2003): 585-602. A realist broadside.
* Jack Snyder and Erica D. Borghard, "The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound," *APSR* 105:3 (Aug. 2011): 437-456. An excellent theoretical critique of the audience cost logic, with examination of historical evidence from crisis bargaining.
* Alexander Downes and Todd Sechser, "The Illusion of Democratic Credibility," *IO* 66:3 (July 2012): 457-489. A data-based critique of the rationalist account.
* Ido Oren, "The Subjectivity of the 'Democratic' Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany," *IS* 20:2 (fall 1995): 147-184 [also reprinted in Brown, ed., *Debating the Democratic Peace* (1996)]. Democracy is what threats make of it.
* Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, "The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization," *EJIR* 5:4 (December 1999): 403-434. A critical take on the democratic peace.

Overviews
§ Michael W. Doyle, "Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs," parts I and II, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12:3 & 12:4 (summer & fall 1983) [also reprinted in Michael Brown, ed., *Debating the Democratic Peace* (MIT Press, 1996) 3-58]. The seminal work that sparked the contemporary Democratic Peace literature. Still very much worth reading.
James Lee Ray, "Does Democracy Cause Peace?" *ARPS* 1 (1998): 27-46.
Miriam Fendius Elman, "Introduction: The Need for a Qualitative Test of the Democratic Peace Theory," in Elman, ed., *Paths to Peace: Is Democracy the Answer?* (MIT Press, 1997): 1-57, especially 7-42.
Levy, "The Causes of War," pp. 267-270.

The Democratic Peace: Yes!
§ Kenneth Schultz, "Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform?" *IO* 53:2 (spring 1999): 233-266. Another rationalist statement.
§ Bruce M. Russett and John R. Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations* (Norton, 2001), chap. 2-3.
Bruce Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World* (Princeton UP, 1993). An early and important synthetic statement.
Bruce Bueno de Mesquita et al., "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace," *APSR* 93:4 (December 1999) pp. 791-807.
Bruce Russett and John R. Oneal, "The Classical Liberals Were Right: Democracy, Interdependence, and Conflict, 1950-1985," *ISQ* 41:2 (1997): 267-294.
§ James D. Fearon, "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes," *APSR* 88:3 (September 1994): 577-592.
Kenneth A. Schultz, "Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises," *APSR* 92:4 (December 1998): 829-844.

Kenneth A. Schultz, *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

John M. Owen, *Liberal Peace, Liberal War* (Cornell UP, 1997).

Miriam Fendius Elman, ed., *Paths to Peace: Is Democracy the Answer?* (MIT Press, 1997).

Randall Schweller, "Domestic Structure and Preventive War," *WP* 44 (January 1992): 235-269.

Michael C. Williams, "The Discipline of the Democratic Peace: Kant, Liberalism, and the Social Construction of Security Communities," *EJIR* 7:4 (2001): 525-553.

The Democratic/Liberal Peace: The Skeptics Reply

§ Walter Lippmann, *Essays in the Public Philosophy* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1955), chapters 1-2 (pp. 3-27).

§ George F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy* (University of Chicago Press, 1951).

§ Brown, ed., *Debating the Democratic Peace* (MIT Press, 1996), essays by Layne, Spiro, and Farber and Gowa.

§ William R. Thompson, "Democracy and Peace: Putting the Cart Before the Horse?" *IO* 50:1 (winter 1996): 141-174.

§ Azar Gat, "The Democratic Peace Theory Reframed: The Impact of Modernity," *WP* 58:1 (2005): 73-100. It's the Industrial Revolution, stupid!

§ Erik Gartzke, "The Capitalist Peace," *AJPS* 51:1 (January 2007): 166-191. It's capitalism, stupid!

Erik Gartzke, "Kant We All Just Get Along? Motive, Opportunity, and the Origins of the Democratic Peace," *AJPS* 42:1 (1998): 1-27; "Preferences and the Democratic Peace," *ISQ* 44:2 (June 2000): 191-212. The origins of the peace: the lack of conflicting interests.

§ Michael Mousseau, "The Social Market Roots of Democratic Peace," *IS* 33:4 (spring 2009): 52-86.

Joanne Gowa, *Ballots and Bullets: The Elusive Democratic Peace* (Princeton UP, 2000).

John MacMillan, "A Kantian Protest Against the Peculiar Discourse of the Inter-Liberal Peace," in Linklater, ed., *International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, Vol. III (Routledge, 2000), 1021-1034.

Rebuttals by the Believers

§ Charles Lipson, *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace* (Princeton UP, 2003), 17-46.

Responses to Rosato by Kinsella, Slantchev et al., and Doyle, with a reply by Rosato, *APSR* 99:3 (August 2005): 453-472.

The Democratic Peace, With a Twist

§ Jack L. Snyder, *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict* (Norton, 2000).

§ Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War," *IO* 56:2 (spring 2002): 297-338. Democracy good, democratization bad.

Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," *IS* 20:1 (summer 1995): 5-38. An earlier statement.

Isabella Alcañiz, "Democratization and Multilateral Security," *WP* 64:2 (April 2012). Democratizing states are joiners, not fighters.

Jennifer Lind, "Democratization and Stability in East Asia," *ISQ* 55 (2011): 409–436. When democratization leads to war.

§ Lars-Erik Cederman, "Back to Kant: Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace as a Macrohistorical Learning Process," *APSR* 95:1 (March 2001): 15-31. Everyone learns that war does not pay. Democracies just learn a bit better and faster.

§ Daniel Deudney, "The Philadelphian System: Sovereignty, Arms Control, and Balance of Power in the American States-Union, ca. 1787-1861," *IO* 49:2 (spring 1995): 1-55. Liberalism vs. republicanism.

§ Scott Silverstone, "Federal-Democratic Peace: Domestic Institutions and International Conflict in the Early American Republic," *SS* 13:3 (spring 2004): 48-102.

Michael D. Ward and Kristian S Gleditsch, "Democratizing for Peace," *APSR* 92:1 (1998): 51-61.

Fareed Zakaria, *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy at Home and Abroad* (Norton, 2003).

Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, eds., *Democracy, Liberalism, and War* (Lynne Rienner, 2001).

Errol A. Henderson, "Disturbing the Peace: African Warfare, Political Inversion and the Universality of the Democratic Peace Thesis," *BJPS* 39 (2009) 25-58. Why politically open African states are more likely to fight each other and why the democratic peace does not hold outside the West.

§ Piki Ish-Shalom, "Theory as a Hermeneutical Mechanism: The Democratic-Peace Thesis and the Politics of Democratization," *EJIR* 12 (December 2006): 565-598. Why theorists must take responsibility for what is done with their theories.

Frank Sauer and Niklas Schörnig, "Killer Drones: The 'Silver Bullet' of Democratic Warfare?", *Security Dialogue* 43 (August 2012): 363-380. How democracies do wage war today.

The Debate on Audience Costs

§ James D. Fearon, "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes," *APSR* 88:3 (September 1994): 577-592.

§ Kenneth A. Schultz, "Looking for Audience Costs," *JCR* 45:1 (February 2001): 32-60.

§ Michael Tomz, "Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach," *IO* 61:4 (fall 2007): 821-840.

§ Jessica L. Weeks, "Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve," *IO* 62:1 (winter 2008), pp. 35-64. Democracies have no signaling advantage over most kinds of autocratic regimes.

Jonathan N. Brown and Anthony S. Marcum, "Avoiding Audience Costs: Domestic Political Accountability and Concessions in Crisis Diplomacy," *SS*, 20:2 (2011): 141-170. Autocratic leaders may be more accountable. Counterintuitive to a fault?

§ Marc Trachtenberg, "Audience Costs: A Historical Analysis," *Security Studies* 21:1 (2012): 1-42. More evidence, from a distinguished historian.

§ *Security Studies* symposium on audience costs, 21:3 (June 2012). Bringing together rationalists and their critics. Illuminating.

October 15
Constructivism (I)

    * David Dessler, "What's at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate?" *IO* 43:3 (summer 1989): 441-473.
    * Charlotte Epstein, "Theorizing Agency in Hobbes's Wake: The Rational Actor, the Self, or the Speaking Subject?," *IO* 67:2 (2013): 287-316. Toward a non-individualist agency.

    * Nicholas Onuf, "Constructivism: A Users' Manual," in Vendulka Kubalkova, Nicholas Onuf and Paul Kowert, eds., *International Relations in a Constructed World* (M.E. Sharpe, 1998), 58-78.
    * Ian Hurd, "Constructivism," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chapter 17 (298-316).
    * John Gerard Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge," *IO* 52:4 (autumn 1998): 855-885.
    * Richard Price, "Moral Limit and Possibility in World Politics," *IO* 62:2 (spring 2008): 191-220. What "is" has to say about "ought."

    * Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge UP, 1999), chaps. 1,3,4,6.
    * Jonathan Mercer, "Anarchy and Identity," *IO* 49:2 (1995): 229-252.
    * Jack Snyder, "Anarchy and Culture," *IO* 56:1 (2002): 7-46.

Agency and Structure
    § Colin Wight, *Agents, Structures, and International Relations* (Cambridge UP, 2006).
    § Alexander Wendt, "The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory," *IO* 41:3 (1987): 236-370.
    § Patrick Thaddeus Jackson and Daniel H. Nexon, "Relations Before States: Substance, Process and the Study of World Politics," *EJIR* 5:3 (1999): 291-332.
    Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Aporia: A Critical Exploration of the Agent-Structure Problematique in IR Theory," *EJIR* 3:3 (1997): 365-392.

The Constructivist Worldview
    § Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Anchor Books, 1996).
    § Ian Hacking, *The Social Construction of What?* (Harvard UP, 1999), chaps. 1-2.
    § Nicholas Onuf, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations* (University of South Carolina Press, 1989).
    § Friedrich Kratochwil and John Ruggie, "International Organization: A State of the Art on an Art of the State," *IO* 40:4 (autumn 1986): 753-775.
    Hayward Alker. "The Presumption of Anarchy in World Politics," in his *Rediscoveries and Reformulations: Humanistic Metholodogies for International Studies* (Cambridge UP, 1996).
    § Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics," *ARPS* 4 (2001): 391-416.
    § Emanuel Adler, "Constructivism and International Relations," in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Sage, 2002), 95-119.
    § Michael Desch, "Culture Clash: Assessing the Importance of Ideas in Security Studies," *IS* 23:1 (summer 1998): 141-170. And his critics: "Culturalism versus Realism in Security Studies," *IS* 24:1 (summer 1999): 156-180.

Wendt and his Critics
    Dale Copeland, "The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay," *IS* 25 (fall 2000): 187-212.
    Forum on Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, in *RIS* 26 (Jan. 2000) 125-180: comments by Keohane, Krasner, Doty, Alker, and Smith, and a reply from Wendt.

October 22
Constructivism (II): Norms, Identity, Talk, and Practice

* Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *IO* 52:4 (autumn 1998): 887-917.
* Richard Price, "Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics," *WP* 55:4 (2003): 579-606.
* Stacie E. Goddard, "Brokering Change: Networks and Entrepreneurs in International Politics," *IT* 1:2 (2009): 249-281. *When* agents can do their thing.
* Ted Hopf, "The Logic of Habit in International Relations," *EJIR* 16:4 (2010), 539-561. Have constructivists overemphasized change?
* Mark Laffey and Jutta Weldes, "Beyond Belief: From Ideas to Symbolic Technologies," *EJIR* 3:2 (June 1997): 193-238. An excellent critique that has withstood the test of time.

* Rawi Abdelal et al., "Identity as a Variable," *PoP* 4:4 (December 2006): 695-711.

* Thomas Risse, "`Let's Argue!': Communicative Action in International Relations," *IO* 54:1 (winter 2000) 1-40. What happens when a critical theorist (Habermas) is appropriated (abducted?) by a conventional constructivist.
* Neta C. Crawford, "*Homo Politicus* and Argument (Nearly) All the Way Down," *PoP*, 7:1 (March 2009): 103-124.
* Ronald R. Krebs and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The Power of Political Rhetoric," *EJIR* 13:1 (March 2007): 35-66.

* Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot, "International Practices," *IT* 3:1 (2011): 1-36.

Ideas and Norms
§ John Kurt Jacobsen, " 'Duelling Constructivisms': A Post-Mortem on the Ideas Debate in Mainstream IR/IPE," *RIS* 29:1 (January 2003): 39-60.
§ Friedrich Kratochwil, *Rules, Norms and Decisions* (Cambridge UP, 1989), esp. 6-12, 21-68, 95-129.
§ Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane, "Ideas and Foreign Policy: An Analytical Framework," in Goldstein and Keohane, eds., *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions, and Political Change* (Cornell UP, 1993) 3-30.

§ Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society* (Cornell UP, 1996).
Audie Klotz, *Norms in International Relations: The Struggle Against Apartheid* (Cornell UP, 1995).
§ Ronald L. Jepperson et al., "Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security," and Paul Kowert and Jeffrey Legro, "Norms, Identity, and their Limits: A Theoretical Reprise," in Peter J. Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* (Columbia UP, 1996), 33-75 and 451-497. Recommended: empirical material, chaps. 8-11.
Chaim D. Kaufmann and Robert A. Pape, "Explaining Costly International Moral Action: Britain's Sixty-year Campaign Against the Atlantic Slave Trade," *IO* 53:4 (autumn 1999): 631-668.
Jeffrey W. Legro, "Which Norms Matter? Revisiting the 'Failure' of Internationalism," *IO* 51:1 (1997) 31-63. See also Legro, *Rethinking the World* (Cornell UP, 2005).
Andrew P. Cortell and James W. Davis, "When Norms Clash: International Norms, Domestic Practices, and Japan's Internalization of the GATT/WTO," *RIS* 31:1 (January 2005) 3-26. Norm entrepreneurs driven by economic interest.

§ Nina Tannenwald, *The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons Since 1945* (Cambridge UP, 2007).

§ Neta C. Crawford, *Argument and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge UP, 2002).

§ Martha Finnemore, *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force* (Cornell UP, 2003).

§ Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders* (Cornell UP, 1998).

§ Richard Price, "Reversing the Gun Sights: Transnational Civil Society Targets Land Mines," *IO* 52:3 (summer 1998) 575-612.

Matthew Evangelista, *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War* (Cornell UP, 1999).

Christoph O. Meyer, "Convergence Towards a European Strategic Culture? A Constructivist Framework for Explaining Changing Norms," *EJIR* 11:4 (2005) 523-549.

§ Michael Barnett, "Evolution without Progress? Humanitarianism in a World of Hurt," *IO* 63:4 (fall 2009): 621-663. The limits of change.

Identity

§ Lars-Erik Cederman and Christopher Daase, "Endogenizing Corporate Identities: The Next Step in Constructivist IR Theory," *EJIR* 9:1 (2003): 5-35.

§ Arash Abizadeh, "Does Collective Identity Presuppose an Other? On the Alleged Incoherence of Global Solidarity," *APSR* 99:1 (February 2005): 45-60.

§ *RIS* special forum on "states are people too," 30:2 (April 2004): 255-316—articles by Neumann, Wight, Jackson, Wendt.

§ Iver Neumann, "Self and Other in International Relations," *EJIR* 2:2 (June 1996): 139-174.

§ Charles Tilly, "International Communities, Secure or Otherwise," in Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, eds., *Security Communities* (Cambridge UP, 1998).

Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999* (Cornell UP, 2004).

Rodney Bruce Hall, *National Collective Identity: Social Constructs and International Systems* (Columbia UP, 1999).

Talk: Persuasion, Communicative Action, and Rhetorical Coercion

Rodger E. Payne, "Persuasion, Frames and Norm Construction," *EJIR* 7:1 (March 2001): 37-61.

Harald Müller, "Arguing, Bargaining, and All That: Communicative Action, Rationalist Theory, and the Logic of Appropriateness in International Relations," *EJIR* 10:3 (Sept. 2004): 395-436.

Marc Lynch, "Why Engage? China and the Logic of Communicative Engagement," *EJIR*, 8:2 (June 2001): 187-230.

§ Nicole Deitelhoff and Harald Müller, "Theoretical Paradise—Empirically Lost? Arguing with Habermas," *RIS* 31:1 (January 2005) 167-180. Habermas without "actor-orientations"?

Nicole Deitelhoff, "The Discursive Process of Legalizaton: Charting Islands of Persuasion in the ICC Case," *IO* 63:1 (winter 2009): 33-66. When/how persuasion works: how NGOs and small/middle powers can shape the setting of negotiations to approach the Habermasian ideal.

§ Jennifer Mitzen, "Reading Habermas in Anarchy: Multilateral Diplomacy and Global Public Spheres," *APSR* 99:3 (August 2005) 401-417. Habermas in IR (take 2).

Frank Schimmelfenig, *The EU, NATO, and the Integration of Europe: Rules and Rhetoric* (Cambridge UP, 2004).

Ian Hurd, "The Strategic Use of Liberal Internationalism: Libya and the UN Sanctions, 1992-2003," *IO* 59:3 (summer 2005): 495-526.

§ Janice Bially Mattern, "The Power Politics of Identity," *EJIR* 7:3 (Sept. 2001) 349-397. Representational force.

§ Stacie E. Goddard, "Uncommon Ground: Indivisible Territory and the Politics of Legitimation," *IO* 60:1 (2006): 35-68. Rhetorical deployments reshape networks.

Markus Kornprobst, "Argumentation and Compromise: Ireland's Selection of the Territorial Status Quo Norm," *IO* 61:1 (winter 2007): 99-144.

Christian Grobe, "The power of words: Argumentative persuasion in international negotiations," *EJIR* 16 (March 2010): 5-29. A theory of rational persuasion.

Diana Panke, "Why discourse matters only sometimes: effective arguing beyond the nation-state," *RIS* 36:1 (Jan. 2010), 145-168. The need for common yardsticks in argumentation.

Charlotte Epstein, "Who Speaks? Discourse, the Subject, and the Study of Identity in International Politics," *EJIR* 17:2 (2011): 327-350.

§ Tine Hanrieder, "The False Promise of the Better Argument," *IT* 3:3 (Nov. 2011): 390-415.

Practice

§ Vincent Pouliot, "The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities," *IO* 62:2 (spring 2008) 257-288.

Vincent Pouliot, *International Security in Practice: The Politics of NATO-Russia Diplomacy* (Cambridge UP, 2010).

§ Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot, eds., *International Practices* (Cambridge UP, 2011).

§ Michael Williams, *Culture and Security: Symbolic Power and the Politics of International Security* (Routledge, 2007).

Frédéric Mérand, "Pierre Bourdieu and the Birth of European Defense," *SS* 19 (2010), 342-374.

Socialization

§ Special issue on socialization, *IO* 59:4 (2005), esp. the introductory essay by Checkel and the concluding essay by Johnstone.

§ Alastair Iain Johnston, *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000* (Princeton UP, 2008).

§ Iver B. Neumann and Vincent Pouliot, "Untimely Russia: Hysteresis in Russian-Western Relations over the Past Millennium," *SS* 20:1 (2011): 105-137. The limits of socialization: why Russia has not been, and will not be, socialized.

§ Ted Hopf, "Common-sense Constructivism and Hegemony in World Politics," *IO* 67:2 (April 2013), 317-354. Limits to socialization: resistance from below.

Frank Schimmelfenig, "International Socialization in the New Europe: Rational Action in an Institutional Environment," *EJIR* 6:1 (2000): 109-139.

Trine Flockhart, "Complex Socialization': A Framework for the Study of State Socialization," *EJIR* 12:1 (2006): 89-118.

Judith Kelley, "International Actors on the Domestic Scene: Membership Conditionality and Socialization by International Institutions," *IO* 58:3 (summer 2004): 425-458.

Brian Greenhill, "The Company You Keep: International Socialization and the Diffusion of Human Rights Norms," *ISQ* 54:1 (March 2010): 127-145. Do IGOs, even those that have nothing to do with human rights, promote human rights?

§ Ann Towns, "Norms and Social Hierarchies: Understanding International Policy Diffusion 'From Below,'" *IO* 66:2 (April 2012): 179-209.

§ Charlotte Epstein, "Stop Telling Us How to Behave: Socialization or Infantilization?" *ISP* 13 (2012): 135-145.

Legitimacy

§ Ian Hurd, "Legitimacy and Authority in International Politics." *IO* 53:2 (spring 1999): 379-408.

§ Ian Hurd, *After Anarchy: Legitimacy and Power in the UN Security Council*. Princeton University Press, 2007.

§ Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "International Relations Theory and the Case Against Unilateralism," *PoP* (September 2005): pp. 509-524.

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

§ Stephen Hopgood, "Moral Authority, Modernity and the Politics of the Sacred," *EJIR* 15:2 (2009): 229-255. How to claim authority to speak in an antiauthoritarian global culture.

Mlada Bukovansky, *Legitimacy and Power Politics: The American and French Revolutions in International Political Culture* (Princeton UP, 2001).

"Force and Legitimacy in World Politics," special issue of *RIS* 31 (December 2005).

Jens Steffek, "The Legitimation of International Governance: A Discourse Approach," *EJIR* 9:2 (June 2003): 249-276.

Shane Mulligan, "The Uses of Legitimacy in International Relations," *Millennium* 34:2 (2006): 349-375.

Krzysztof J. Pelc, "Constraining Coercion? Legitimacy and Its Role in U.S. Trade Policy, 1975-2000," *IO* 64:1 (winter 2010): 65-96.

Ontology, Epistemology, and Method in "Conventional Constructivism"

§ Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism," *EJIR* 4:3 (1998) 259-294.

§ Ted Hopf, "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," *IS* 23:1 (summer 1998) 171-200.

David Dessler, "Constructivism within a Positivist Social Science," *RIS* 25:1 (January 1999) 123-138.

Vincent Pouliot, "'Sobjectivism': Toward a Constructivist Methodology," *ISQ* 51 (June 2007) 359-384.

Audie Klotz and Cecelia Lynch, *Strategies for Research in Constructivist International Relations* (M.E. Sharpe, 2007).

October 29
Hierarchy and Order in International Politics

* G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order* (Princeton UP, 2011), 1-117.
* Ahsan Butt, "Anarchy and Hierarchy in International Relations: Examining South America's War-Prone Decade, 1932-1941," *IO* 67:3 (July 2013): 575-607.
* David A. Lake, "Rightful Rules: Authority, Order, and the Foundations of Global Governance," *ISQ* 54:3 (Sept. 2010): 587-613. A contractarian approach to global governance as a form of hierarchy.
* Daniel H. Nexon and Thomas Wright, "What's at Stake in the American Empire Debate," *APSR* 101:2 (2007): 253-271.

Hierarchy & Anarchy
§ Michael W. Doyle, *Empires* (Cornell UP, 1986).
§ G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars* (Princeton UP, 2001).
G. John Ikenberry and Charles Kupchan, "Socialization and Hegemonic Power," *IO* 44:3 (1990): 283-315.
Alexander Wendt and Daniel Friedheim, "Hierarchy under Anarchy: Informal Empire and the East German State," *IO* 49:4 (1995): 689-721.
§ David A. Lake, *Hierarchy in International Relations* (Cornell UP, 2009).
David A. Lake, "Anarchy, Hierarchy and the Variety of International Relations," *IO* 50:1 (1996): 1-30.
David A. Lake, "Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics," *IS* 32:1 (2007): 47-79. And subsequent debate with Paul K. MacDonald, "The Role of Hierarchy in International Politics" *IS* 32:4 (2008): 171-180.
Edward Keene, "A Case Study of the Construction of International Hierarchy: British Treaty-Making Against the Slave Trade in the Early Nineteenth Century," *IO* 61:2 (2007): 311-339.
John M. Hobson and J.C. Sharman, "The Enduring Place of Hierarchy in World Politics: Tracing the Social Logics of Hierarchy and Political Change," *EJIR* 11:1 (2005): 63-98.
Alexander Cooley, *Logics of Hierarchy* (Cornell UP, 2005).

Unipolarity, and Forecasting Global Politics after the Cold War
John J. Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War," *IS* 15:1 (summer 1990).
Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, chap. 10.
Stephen Van Evera, "Primed for Peace," *IS* 15:3 (Winter 1990/91): 7-57.
Kenneth Waltz, "The Emerging Structure of International Politics," *IS* 18:2 (Fall 1993): 44-79.
Kenneth N. Waltz, "Structural Realism after the Cold War," *IS* 25:1 (Summer 2000): 5-41.
Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion: Why Great Powers Will Rise," *IS* 17:4 (Spring 1993): 5-51.
§ William C. Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World," *IS* 24:1 (Summer 1999): 4-41.
§ Robert Pape, "Soft Balancing Against the United States," *IS* 30:1 (summer 2005): pp. 5-49.
§ Keir Lieber and Gerard Alexander, "Waiting for Soft Balancing: Why the World is not Pushing Back," *IS* 30:1 (summer 2005): pp. 109-139.
§ Special issue of *World Politics* on unipolarity, January 2009.
§ Nuno Monteiro, "Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful," *IS* 36:3 (winter 2011/12): 9-40.

November 5
International Society, Systems, and Change

* Barry Buzan and George Lawson, "Rethinking Benchmark Dates in International Relations," *EJIR* (forthcoming, OnlineFirst). What different approaches to IR consider to be significant change— and thus key "benchmark dates."

* Tim Dunne, "The English School," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chapter 15 (267-285).
* Christian Reus-Smit, "Struggles for Individual Rights and the Expansion of the International System," *IO* 65:2 (spring 2011), 207-242. How the international system expands, but why it keeps returning to states.
* Jordan Branch, "Mapping the Sovereign State: Technology, Authority, and Systemic Change," *IO* 65:1 (Jan. 2011), 1-36. How new mapping technologies made territoriality and thus sovereignty.

* Alastair Iain Johnston, "What (If Anything) Does East Asia Tell Us About International Relations Theory?" *ARPS* 15 (2012): 53-78.
* Erik Ringmar, "Performing International Systems: Two East-Asian Alternatives to the Westphalian Order," *IO* 66:1 (January 2012): 1-25.

* Etel Solingen, "Of Dominoes and Firewalls: The Domestic, Regional, and Global Politics of International Diffusion," *ISQ* 56:4 (Dec. 2012): 631-644.

The English School
§ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, 2ⁿᵈ ed. (Columbia UP, 1995 [1977]). The seminal statement.
§ Martha Finnemore, "Exporting the English School?" *RIS* 27:3 (2001) 509-513. A self-consciously (and friendly) American take on the English School and especially its methodological silences.
§ Christian Reus-Smit, *The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations* (Princeton UP, 1999), 3-39, 122-154 (recommended: all). Explaining variation in how international societies are organized ("fundamental institutions"), or what happens when you marry the English School to Habermas, refracted through Cornell.
Barry Buzan, *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalization* (Cambridge UP, 2004) 15-26, 90-138 (skim), 161-204, 228-270. A critique, reformulation, and extension.
Andrew Linklater and Hidemi Suganami, *The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment* (Cambridge UP, 2006) chaps. 1-4.
Tim Dunne, *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School* (Macmillan, 1998).
Richard Little, "The English School's Contribution to the Study of International Relations," *EJIR* 6:3 (September 2000) 395-422.
Barry Buzan, "From International System to International Society: Structural Realism and Regime Theory Meet the English School," *IO* 47:3 (Summer 1993) pp. 327-352.
Christian Reus-Smit, "Imagining Society: Constructivism and the English School," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 4:3 (2002) 487-509.
"Forum: Barry Buzan's From International to World Society?" *Millennium* 34:1 (2005).
"Forum on the English School," *RIS* 27:3 (July 2001) 465-519.
Gerrit Gong, *The Standard of `Civilization' in International Society* (Oxford UP, 1984).
Adam Watson, *The Evolution of International Society* (Routledge, 1992).
§ Barry Buzan and Richard Little, *International Systems in World History: Remaking the Study of International Relations* (Oxford UP, 2000).
Dale C. Copeland, "A Realist Critique of the English School," *RIS* 29:3 (July 2003) 427-442.
Ian Clark, "Towards an English School Theory of Hegemony," *EJIR* 15:2 (June 2009): 203-228.

November 12
Concepts: Power and Rationality

Power
Power is one of the oldest and most basic concepts of international politics, yet also among the least understood. How has power been conceptualized? How is it most usefully conceptualized (and for what purposes)?

* David Baldwin, "Power and International Relations," in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Sage, 2002), 177-191. From power as property to power as relation.
* Robert Art, "American Foreign Policy and the Fungibility of Force," *SS* 5:4 (summer 1996): 7-42. A realist retorts: military resources are the key because force is highly fungible.
* Exchange between David Baldwin and Robert Art, *SS* 8:4 (summer 1999): 173-189. Debating the fungibility of force.
* Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, "Power in International Politics," *IO* 59:1 (winter 2005): 39-75. Making sense of the multiple meanings of power.

§ Albert O. Hirschman, *National Power and the Structure of Foreign Trade* (University of California Press, 1945).
Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, *Power and Society: A Framework for Political Inquiry* (Yale UP, 1950).
§ Robert Dahl, "The Concept of Power," *Behavioral Science* 2:3 (1957): 201-215.
§ David Baldwin, *Paradoxes of Power* (Basil Blackwell, 1989).
§ Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz, "Two Faces of Power," *APSR* 56:4 (1962): 947-952.
Peter Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (Wiley, 1964).
§ Steven Lukes, *Power: A Radical View* (Macmillan, 1975).
Steven Lukes, ed. *Power* (NYU Press, 1986).
§ Dennis Wrong, *Power: Its Forms, Bases, and Uses* (University of Chicago Press, 1988).
Nicholas B. Dirks, Geoff Eley, and Sherry B. Ortner, eds., *Culture/Power/History: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory* (Princeton UP, 1994) Part One.
§ Joseph S. Nye, *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power* (Basic Books, 1990).
Joseph S. Nye, *The Power to Lead* (Oxford UP, 2008).
John Vasquez, *The Power of Power Politics* (Cambridge UP, 1998).
Stefano Guzzini, "The Use and Misuse of Power Analysis in International Theory," in Ronen Palan, ed., *Global Political Economy: Contemporary Theories* (Routledge: 2000), 53-66.
Stefano Guzzini, "Structural Power: The Limits of Neorealist Power Analysis," *IO* 47:3 (1993): 443-478.
G. John Ikenberry and Charles A. Kupchan, "Socialization and Hegemonic Power," *IO* 44:3 (1990): 283-315.
Rodney B. Hall, "Moral Authority as a Power Resource," *IO* 51:4 (autumn 1997): 591-622.
Daniel W. Drezner, "Military Primacy Doesn't Pay (Nearly as Much as You Think)," *IS* 38:1 (summer 2013): 52-79.

Rationality
What is rationality? Individuals do not make decisions in ways that rationality would prescribe, but is the assumption of rationality nevertheless useful for theory-building? What choice do we have?

    * Jon Elster, *Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences* (Cambridge UP, 1989), 22-29. What is meant by "rational action," in a nutshell.

    * Jack S. Levy, "Political Psychology and Foreign Policy," in David O. Sears et al., eds., *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology* (Oxford UP, 2003), 253-284.

    * Andrew Kydd, "Methodological Individualism and Rational Choice," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chapter 25. A thoughtful review.

    * Paul K. MacDonald, "Useful Fiction or Miracle Maker: The Competing Epistemological Foundations of Rational Choice Theory," *APSR* 97:4 (Nov. 2003): 551-565. Can we ground theory in empirically implausible assumptions?

    * James Fearon and Alexander Wendt, "Rationalism vs. Constructivism: A Skeptical View," in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Sage, 2002), 52-72. Contra fundamental divides. But can we really just get on with the pragmatic work of building a common IR house?

    * Jonathan Mercer, "Rationality and Psychology in International Politics," *IO* 59 (winter 2005): 77-106. Why political psychology can stand on its own two feet and why rationality cannot.

Duncan Snidal, "Rational Choice and International Relations," in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Sage, 2002), 73-94.

Miles Kahler, "Rationality in International Relations," *IO* 52:4 (autumn 1998): 919-942.

Helen V. Milner, "Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics," *IO* 52:4 (autumn 1998): 759-786.

§ David Lake and Robert Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice and International Relations* (Princeton UP, 1999) esp. chap. 1, for a good introduction to the strategic-choice approach.

§ Jon Elster, *Ulysses and the Sirens: Studies in Rationality and Irrationality* (Cambridge UP, 1979).

§ Amartya Sen, "Rational Fools: A Critique of the Behavioral Foundations of Economic Theory," *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 6 (1977): 317-344.

§ Thomas Schelling, "What is Game Theory?" in his *Choice and Consequence: Perspectives of an Errant Economist* (Harvard UP, 1984), 213-229, 238-242. Strategic interaction explained.

§ Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, "Social Preferences, *Homo Economicus*, and *Zoon Politikon*," in Robert E. Goodin and Charles Tilly, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis* (Oxford UP, 2006), 172-186. Empirical evidence of other-regarding, process-oriented, and endogenous preferences—yet the rational-action model lives.

Kristen R. Monroe, ed., *The Economic Approach to Politics* (HarperCollins, 1991).

Donald Green and Ian Shapiro, *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science* (Yale University Press, 1994). Throwing down the gauntlet.

§ Jeffrey Friedman, ed., *The Rational Choice Controversy: Economic Models of Politics Reconsidered* (Yale UP, 1996). Critics and defenders spar.

Michael E. Brown et al., eds., *Rational Choice and Security Studies: Stephen Walt and His Critics* (MIT Press, 2000). Formalization: rigor or rigor mortis?

§ Alexander Wendt, "Driving with the Rearview Mirror: On the Rational Science of Institutional Design," *IO* 55:4 (autumn 2001): 1019-1049.

Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton UP, 1976).

Rose McDermott, *Political Psychology and International Relations* (University of Michigan Press, 2004).

"The Rational Deterrence Debate: A Symposium," *WP* 41:2 (January 1989): 143-237.

November 19
Marxist Traditions and [Modernist? Western Marxist?] Critical Theory

* Michael Doyle, *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (Norton, 1997), 315-
   380. Classical Marxism.
* Benno Teschke, "Marxism," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chapter 9 (163-187). From Marx to Hardt
   & Negri – a comprehensive introduction.
* Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World-System," in Steve Smith,
   Ken Booth and Marysia Kalewski, eds., *International Theory: Positivism & Beyond* (Cambridge
   UP, 1996), 87-107. Structural Marxism.
* Robert W. Cox, "Gramsci, Hegemony and International Relations: As Essay in Method,"
   Millennium 12:2 (summer 1983) 162-175. Gramsci-inspired critical theory (1).
* Stephen Gill, "Globalization, Market Civilization, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism," *Millennium*
   24:2 (summer 1995). Gramsci-inspired critical theory (2).

* Richard Shapcott, "Critical Theory," in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, chapter 19 (327-345).
* Richard Wyn Jones, "Introduction: Locating Critical International Relations Theory," in Wyn
   Jones, ed., *Critical Theory and World Politics* (Lynne Rienner, 2001), 1-19. Critical theor*ies:* no
   shared ontology or epistemology; and divergent lineages.
* Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory,"
   Millennium 10:2 (summer 1981): 126-155. Seminal article on problem-solving vs. critical theory.

* Richard Devetak, "The Project of Modernity and International Relations Theory," *Millennium* 24:1
   (1995) 27-51. The inescapable Enlightenment.
* Nicholas J. Rengger, "Negative Dialectic?" in Richard Wyn Jones, ed., *Critical Theory and World
   Politics* (Lynne Rienner, 2001) 91-109. Perils of emancipatory theory, or in praise of Adorno.
* Michael C. Williams, "The Potential and Perils of Opposition," in Shannon Brincat, Laura Lima,
   and João Nunes, eds., *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies: Interviews
   and Reflections* (Routledge, 2012), 197-205.
* John M. Hobson, "Is Critical Theory Always for the White West and for Western Imperialism?
   Beyond Westphilian Towards a Post-Racist Critical IR," *RIS* 33: S1 (2007): 91-116.

§ Mark Rupert, "Marxism and Critical Theory," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, eds.,
   International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity (Oxford UP, 2007), 148-165.
Mark Rupert and Hazel Smith, eds., *Historical Materialism and Globalization* (Routledge, 2002).
Andre Gunder Frank, "The Development of Underdevelopment," in Linklater, *International
   Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, Vol. III, 1149-59.
Fred Halliday, "A Necessary Encounter: Historical Materialism and International Relations," in
   Linklater, *International Relations: Critical Concepts in Political Science*, Vol. III, 1184-1206.
§ "International Relations and the New Inequality," special issue of *ISR* 4:2 (Summer 2002).
§ Martin Shaw, "War, Imperialism and the State System: A Critique of Orthodox Marxism for the
   1980s," in Shaw, ed., *War, State, and Society* (MacMillan, 1984), 47-70.
Andrew Linklater, "Class and State in International Relations," in his *Beyond Realism and Marxism*
   (MacMillan, 1990), 140-172.
V. Kubalkova and A. A. Cruickshank, *Marxism and International Relations* (Oxford UP, 1985).
§ Stephen Gill, ed., *Gramsci, Historical Materialism, and International Relations*, Cambridge UP,
   1993).
Stephen R. Gill, *American Hegemony and the Trilateral Commission* (Cambridge UP, 1990).
§ Robert W. Cox, *Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*
   (Columbia UP, 1987).

§ Chris Brown, "Turtles All the Way Down?: Anti-Foundationalism, Critical Theory and International Relations," *Millennium* 23:2 (1994): 213-236.

§ Mohammed Ayoob, "Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case for Subaltern Realism," *ISR* 4:3 (Fall 2002): 27-48.

§ Michael Barnett, "Radical Chic? Subaltern Realism: A Rejoinder," *ISR* 4:3 (Fall 2002): 49-62.

§ Roland Barthes, *Mythologies* (Hill and Wang, 1972), 11-12, 109-159.

Richard Wyn Jones, ed., *Critical Theory and World Politics* (Lynne Rienner, 2001), especially essays by Linklater, Hutchings (especially 80-85, on how neo-Gramscian and normative critical theory differs from postmodern critical work), Brown.

Steven C. Roach, ed., *Critical Theory and International Relations* (Routledge, 2008).

James Der Derian, *Critical International Relations – An Introduction: From the Barbarian to the Cyborg* (Routledge, 2009).

Steven C. Roach, *Critical Theory of International Politics* (Routledge, 2009).

Jenny Edkins and Nick Vaughan-Williams, eds., *Critical Theorists and International Relations* (Routledge, 2009).

Mark Hoffman, "Critical Theory and the Inter-paradigm Debate," *Millennium* 16:2 (1987) 213-249. To what substantive theories of IR can or cannot a critical perspective be productively conjoined?

Andrew Linklater, "The Achievements of Critical Theory," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Kalewski, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Cambridge UP, 1996) 279-298.

§ Forum on Habermas and IR, *RIS* 31:1 (2005) 127-209, especially essays by Diez and Steans and by Deitelhoff and Müller.

§ *Critical International Relations Theory after 25 Years*, special issue of *RIS* 33: Supplement 1 (April 2007).

Shannon Brincat, Laura Lima, and João Nunes, eds., *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies: Interviews and Reflections* (Routledge, 2012).

§ Daniel J. Levine, *Recovering International Relations: The Promise of Sustainable Critique* (Oxford UP, 2012).

Nov. 26
Post-structuralism, Post-modernism, and Feminism

* David Campbell, "Poststructuralism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (Oxford UP, 2007), 203-228.
* Richard K. Ashley, "The Poverty of Neorealism," *IO* 38:2 (spring 1984): 225-286.
* David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, Revised Edition (University of Minnesota Press, 1998), 1-90, 133-168, 191-205 [intro., chaps. 1-4, 6, 8].

* J. Ann Tickner and Laura Sjoberg, "Feminism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (Oxford UP, 2007), 185-202.
* Robert O. Keohane, "Beyond Dichotomy: Conversations Between International Relations and Feminist Theory," *ISQ* 42 (1998): 193-198. How feminist IR should become "serious"—i.e. what it needs to do if it wants the discipline to take it "seriously."
* J. Ann Tickner, "What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions," *ISQ* 49:1 (March 2005): 1-22. Why feminists have not embraced, and will not embrace, Keohane's research agenda, but why they still have a lot to say to the field.
* R. Charli Carpenter, "Gender Theory in World Politics: Contributions of a Nonfeminist Standpoint?" *ISR* 4 (fall 2002): 153-165. Why one can—and the field should—study gender without a commitment to feminism and to feminist methodologies.
* Laura Sjoberg, "Gendered Realities of the Immunity Principle: Why Gender Analysis Needs Feminism," *ISQ* 50 (December 2006): 889-910. A rebuttal of Carpenter.
* Laura Sjoberg, "Gender, Structure, and War: What Waltz Couldn't See," *IT* 4:1 (March 2012): 1-38.

§ John Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *IS* 19:3 (winter 1994/95), section on "critical theory"—to see how "mainstream" IR scholars misunderstand their Others.
§ John A. Vasquez, "The Post-Positivist Debate: Reconstructing Scientific Enquiry and International Relations Theory After Enlightenment's Fall," in Ken Booth and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theory Today* (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1995), 217-240.
D.S.L. Jarvis, *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism: Defending the Discipline* (University of South Carolina Press, 2000).
Michael J. Shapiro, *Violent Cartographies: Mapping Cultures of War* (University of Minnesota Press, 1997).
James Der Derian and Michael J. Shapiro, eds., *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics* (Lexington Books, 1989).
James Der Derian, *Antidiplomacy: Spies, Terror, Speed and War* (Blackwell, 1992).
James Der Derian, ed., *International Theory: Critical Investigations* (NYU Press, 1995).
Francis A. Beer and Robert Hariman, eds., *Post-Realism: The Rhetorical Turn in International Relations* (Michigan State University Press, 1996.
Jim George and David Campbell, "Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations," *ISQ* 34:3 (1990): 269-293.
§ Richard K. Ashley and R.B.J. Walker, "Reading Dissidence/Writing the Discipline: Crisis and the Question of Sovereignty in International Studies," *ISQ* 34:3 (1990): 367-416.
Richard K. Ashley, "The Geopolitics of Geopolitical Space: Toward a Critical Social Theory of International Politics," *Alternatives* 12:4 (1987): 403-434.
Richard K. Ashley, "The Achievements of Post-Structuralism," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Kalewski, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Cambridge UP, 1996), 254-278.

Richard K. Ashley, "Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique," *Millennium* 17:2 (summer 1998): 227-262.

R.B.J. Walker, "Sovereignty, Identity, Community: Reflections on the Horizons of Contemporary Political Practice," in R.B.J. Walker and Saul Mendlovitz, eds., *Contending Sovereignties: Redefining Political Community* (Lynne Rienner, 1990), 159-185.

Heikki Patomaki and Colin Wight, "After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism," *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (June 2000): 213-237.

§ J. Ann Tickner, *Gendering World Politics: Issues and Approaches in the Post-Cold War Era* (Columbia UP, 2001).

§ Laura Sjoberg, *Gendering Global Conflict: Towards a Feminist Theory of War* (Columbia University Press, 2013).

Laura Sjoberg, ed., *Gender and International Security: Feminist Perspectives* (Routledge, 2009).

§ Robert O. Keohane, "International Relations Theory: Contributions of a Feminist Standpoint," *Millennium* 18:2 (summer 1989): 245-253. Keohane's first foray into this field.

Cynthia Weber, "Good Girls, Little Girls, and Bad Girls: Male Paranoia in Robert Keohane's Critique of Feminist International Relations," *Millennium* 23:2 (summer 1994).

§ J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagement Between Feminists and IR Theorists," *ISQ* 41 (1997): 611-632.

§ Jean Bethke Elshtain, "Feminist Inquiry and International Relations," in Michael Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, *New Thinking in International Relations Theory* (Westview, 1997), 77-90.

Birgit Locher and Elisabeth Prügl, "Feminism and Constructivism: Worlds Apart or Sharing the Middle Ground?" *ISQ* 45:1 (2001): 111-129.

Kimberly Hutchings, "Speaking and Hearing: Habermasian Discourse Ethics, Feminism, and International Relations," *RIS* 31:1 (2005): 155-165.

Georgina Waylen, "You Still Don't Understand: Why Troubled Engagements Continue Between Feminists and (critical) IPE," *RIS* 32:1 (January 2006): 145-164.

Craig Murphy, "Seeing Women, Recognizing Gender, and Recasting International Relations," *IO* 50:3 (summer 1996): 513-538. A review of recent literature on what it means for IR.

V. Spike Peterson, ed. *Gendered States: Feminist Re-visions of International Relations Theory* (Lynne Reinner, 1992).

Jill Stearns, *Gender and International Relations* (Rutgers UP, 1998).

Christine Sylvester, *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era* (Cambridge UP, 1994). Re-reading IR's debates through feminist lenses: a discipline by men and for men.

Lori Buck, Nicole Gallant, and Kim Richard Nossel, "Sanctions as a Gendered Instrument of Statecraft: The Case of Iraq," *RIS* 24:1 (January 1998): 69-84.

§ R. Charli Carpenter, "Women and Children First: Gender, Norms, and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans, 1991-95," *IO* 57:4 (October 2003): 661-694.

§ Joshua S. Goldstein, *War and Gender* (Cambridge UP, 2001).

§ Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Women and War* (New York: Basic Books, 1995 [1987]).

§ Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (University of California Press, 1990).

Cynthia Enloe, *Does Khaki Become You? The Militarization of Women's Lives* (South End Press, 1983).

Mark A. Boyer, et al., "Gender and Negotiation: Some Experimental Findings from an International Negotiation Simulation," *ISQ* 53:1 (March 2009): 23-47. Research in the "woman are different" tradition.

Valerie M. Hudson et al., "The Heart of the Matter: The Security of Women and the Security of States," *IS* 33:3 (winter 2009): 7-45.

December 3
The Future of IR Theory

> Have paradigmatic debates been productive? contributed to disciplinary progress? Can we all just put the paradigms aside, live together in a big tent, and get on with our research?

* David A. Lake, "Why 'isms' Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress," *ISQ* 55:2 (June 2011): 465-480.
* Rudra Sil and Peter J. Katzenstein, "Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics: Reconfiguring Problems and Mechanisms across Research Traditions," *PoP* 8:2 (June 2010): 411-431.
* Henry R. Nau, "No Alternative to 'Isms'," *ISQ* 55:2 (June 2011): 487-491.
* Patrick Thaddeus Jackson and Daniel H. Nexon, "Paradigmatic Faults in International-Relations Theory," *ISQ* 53:4 (2009): 907-930.
* review Fearon and Wendt on "rationalism vs. constructivism"
* review Legro and Moravcsik on the loneliness of the paradigmatic realist

December 5 – Final exam to be distributed via email, by 12 pm

December 10 @ 12 pm – Final exam due back via email

December ?? @TBD – Grab a beer at Republic. First round's on Ron!