This course provides an introduction to some strands of contemporary international relations theory.

Writing requirements (approximately 60 percent). Three five page papers on the assigned readings, due in class on the day of the discussion (late papers will not be accepted). Alternatively, you may write a single, 15-20 page review essay that deals with the assigned and background readings for a particular session in greater depth. “Background” readings include important or exemplary statements on a particular issue, provide more on the history of a given debate, or suggest cognate areas of inquiry that we cannot explore in depth (or even at all).

Seminar participation (approximately 40 percent). In addition to active participation in the discussion, students will be responsible for initiating one or two seminars—depending on class size—through a brief (10-15 minute) presentation. The presentation will simply outline some of the most important questions that arise out of the readings.

The following books have been ordered for purchase.


Recommended


Katzenstein, Keohane, and Krasner, eds., Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics, articles by Katzenstein, Keohane, and Krasner; Wœver; Ruggie; and Jervis.

Background


The field has seen several waves of debate about the issue of “science,” initially over “behavioral” vs. “traditional” approaches and most recently around the question of formal modeling. See Klaus Knorr and James Rosenau, ed., Contending Approaches to International Politics (1969); Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, “Toward a Scientific Understanding of International Conflict: A Personal View,” International Studies Quarterly 29, 2 (1985) and the comments by Jervis and Krasner; and Steven Walt, “Rigor or Rigor Mortis: Rational Choice and Security Studies,” International Security 23, 4 (Spring 1999) and the responses in IS 24, 2 (Fall 1999).

The relationship between IR theory and historical scholarship is also an uneasy one, although there are professional efforts afoot to bridge the gap through an organized APSA section on International History and Politics. See for example John Lewis Gaddis, “History, Science and the Study of International Relations,” in Ngaire Woods, ed. Explaining International Relations since 1945 (1996); Robert Jervis’ comments on the debate over the balance of power and concert approaches to the 19th century system, “A Political Science Perspective on the Balance of Power and the Concert,” American Historical Review 97, 3 (1992); Aaron Friedberg, The Weary Titan: Britain and the Experience of Relative Decline, 1895-1905 and Fareed Zakaria, From Wealth to Power (1999).

II. April 7. Models of the International System I: Basic Choices and the Problems They are Supposed to Solve.


Waltz, Theory of International Politics, chapters 1-6.


Background.


Systems theory rose and fell out of favor, but Robert Jervis, System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life (1997) revives it, for example in his discussion of feedback (ch. 4).


For models of the international system that emphasize its hierarchical dimension, see Wolfgang Mommsen, Theories of Imperialism (University of Chicago Press, 1977) for a compact summary of classic theories of imperialism; Immanuel Wallerstein, The Modern World System I (New York: Academic Press) and his many other writings on the “world systems” approach; Robert W. Tucker’s realist account, The Inequality of Nations (New York, Basic Books 1977); Michael W. Doyle, Empires (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986); and Robert W. Cox, Production, Power and World Order (1987); and Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri’s incomprehensible Empire (2000). Inequality has been a central theme in the outpouring of work on “globalization” but the links have not been made to international politics; a useful exception is Andrew Hurrell and Ngaire Woods eds. Inequality, Globalization and World Politics (1999).

Samuel Huntington sees the international system in terms of The Clash of Civilizations: Remaking of World Order (1996).


Background


IV. April 21. An Application: Some Approaches to War


Background


V. April 28. Theories of International Institutions

Kenneth Abbot et. al., “The Concept of Legalization” and Kenneth Abbot and Duncan Snidal, “Hard and Soft Law in International Governance,” and Judith Goldstein, Miles Kahler, Robert O. Keohane, and Anne-Marie Slaughter, eds., *Legalization and World Politics*, chapters by Abbott et al., Abbott and Snidal, Kahler. [Also available in *International Organization* 54, 3 (Summer 2000)]

Background

An important precursor to the early-1970s revival in the study of international institutions was work on national and regional integration, including particularly Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication* (1953) and Ernst Haas, *The Uniting of Europe* (1958). The study of European integration, including its legal components, remains vital and important; Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe* (1998) provides an historical introduction. See also the debates in the pages of *IO* on the Court of Justice, which touches on central issues of the meaning of the community: Anne-Marie Burley and Walter Mattli, “Europe Before the Court: A Political Theory of Legal Integration,” *IO* 47 1 (1993): 41-76; the “Dissent and debate” between Garrett and Slaughter and Mattlie in *IO* 49, 1 (1995): 171-190; and the symposium with articles by Geoffrey Garrett, R. Daniel Keleman and Heiner Schulz; Karen Alter; and Mattli and Slaughter in *IO*, 52, 1 (1998). Helen Milner and Ed Mansfield provide a broader overview of recent theoretical work on regionalism in *The Political Economy of Regionalism* (1997).


The process through which the study of international law was squeezed out of American international relations is outlined in Miles Kahler, “Inventing International Relations.” Many introductory textbooks provide an introduction, and if you have an interest in international institutions you should take the time to scan one; for example, Mark Janis and John Noyes, *International Law: Cases and Commentary* (2001).


**VI. May 5. Strategic Interaction under Conditions of Interdependence of Different Sorts: Markets, Networks, Transnational Relations**


Miles Kahler, “Modeling Races to the Bottom,” at http://www2-irps.ucsd.edu/faculty/mkahler/papers.html.

Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), chs. 1, 2 and 6, and either 3, 4 or 5.


**Background**

Work in international political economy has developed around particular issue areas: trade, money and finance, foreign direct investment, and increasingly the movement of peoples and international environmental issues as well. This literature is reviewed in Lawrence Broz’s IPE seminar and his syllabus


VII. May 12. The Domestic Sources of State Behavior I: Outlines of the Current Rationalist Synthesis

Jeffry Frieden, “Actors and Preferences in International Relations” and Ronald Rogowski, “Institutions as Constraints on Strategic Choice,” in Lake and Powell, eds., Strategic Choice, pp. 115-136
Milner, Interests, Institutions, and Information, chapters 1-4, 9 and one of the remaining chapters (5-8)

Kenneth Schultz, Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy (2001), chs. 2 and 3.

Background


VIII. May 19. The Domestic Sources of State Behavior II: Institutions, Credible Commitments and Decision-Making Processes


IX. May 26. No Class.

X. May 19. The Domestic Sources of State Behavior III: Democracy, Coalitions, and Culture


**Background**


**XI. June 9. Rationality and Cognitive Processes: Does It Make a Difference How the Brain Works?**

Miles Kahler, “Rationality in International Relations,” in Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner, eds. *Exploration and Contestation.*


