

PSC 566: International Relations Field Seminar I

Prof. Bethany Lacina

Mondays, 2–4:40

Harkness 329

Goals of the Field Seminars

This is the first of two international relations field seminars for graduate students. This pair of courses has three goals:

1. To give students a brief introduction to the large academic literature on international politics, preparing for the synthesis and analysis required for a dissertation prospectus.
2. To introduce students to research problems that animate current work in the field, so they can see and evaluate examples of ongoing research in addition to commenting on classic works.
3. To gain practical experience in elaborating a theoretical argument, drawing out empirical implications, analyzing relevant evidence, and presenting before colleagues. For some students this may entail producing a first draft of a third-year paper.

Goals of this course

The first course in the sequence is organized chronologically. This progression highlights the discontinuities in the development of international relations as field.

- **Mid-19th century to 1945:** International relations began as a field in conjunction with the beginnings of political science. Little of the work produced in this period is read or cited today.
- **1945 to mid-1990s:** After World War II, the discipline became organized into philosophical schools (aka, “The Isms”). Normative and political theory had larger roles in the discipline than they do today. Most graduate courses covering the IR canon begin with this era.
- **Mid-1990s to present:** In the US and UK, contemporary IR is organized by topic and gives priority to empirical research. The most prevalent type of “IR theory” applies rational choice or microeconomic concepts to empirical questions. “Critical IR theory” applies interpretivist and constructivist concepts to disciplinary and public policy debates. Other forms of political and normative theory are less prominent.

This course traces these eras, including examples of contemporary research on some topics. The full range of topics covered in contemporary IR is beyond the scope of this seminar.

The second course in the sequence focuses on rationalist and empirical approaches to international relations. These are the tools you will most likely use in your dissertation. That course touches on multiple research topics with a focus on (a) rational choice approaches to answering these questions and (b) state of the art empirical work on these questions.

Instructor

Bethany Lacina

Email: blacina@ur.rochester.edu

Office hours: By appointment

Course Requirements

1. Students must attend every class. A student who misses class must get in touch with me within 24 hours of the start of the missed class period and then complete a make-up assignment.
2. Reading for the week must be completed by all students before class. I will get in touch with you outside of class if I have concerns about your preparation for class or participation.
3. Four short papers, 3-4 pages in length, which critically examine a given weeks readings. Students will sign up for weeks to do these papers at the first meeting, and each weeks papers will be due by email to me by 5:00pm on the Sunday before class meets. The papers should address some aspect of the weeks readings, such as by:
 - critically examining a set of arguments,
 - appraising a controversy in the literature, and/or
 - discussing the strengths and weaknesses of the research tools employed.

While the content of these papers is flexible, what I do not want is a blow-by-blow summary of each reading for a week.

4. A final project which can take one of the following forms:
 - a take-home final exam of 10 pages;
 - a 12-15 page critical review essay covering the theoretical and empirical literature on a discrete question in the study of international relations. The idea is to trace the development of work on the chosen problem over the last several decades with an eye to understanding what we have learned (if anything), what theoretical innovations and/or research strategies have been productive, and what puzzles remain unresolved; or
 - a 12-15 page research proposal that draws some hypotheses from the theoretical literature and lays out an empirical strategy for testing them.

Each student should plan on having a conversation with me early in the semester to determine which of these final projects would be most useful to them at this stage.

Evaluation

Every assignment, including the final assignment, is equally weighted in your final grade, with some leniency if you improve over the semester.

Late work will receive half credit. Short papers not handed in by the start of class will receive a zero. The final assignment will receive a zero if it is handed in one week late or more.

Readings

- *I recommend doing the week's reading in the order it is listed in the syllabus.*
- Most of the journal articles and book chapters in the syllabus are available through links below.
- Readings marked with a dagger (†) are available as electronic books from the Rochester library.
- Readings marked with a double dagger (‡) are available in a course Dropbox folder.
- You should purchase the following books:
 1. *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, by Thucydides, translated by Richard Crawley. This work is not copyrighted and many publishers sell it. You MUST find the translation by Richard Crawley.
 2. Thomas C. Schelling. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict*. The reprints of this book have a new preface but are otherwise the same as the first edition.
 3. Kenneth N. Waltz. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. This book has had multiple printings. They are all the same text as the first edition. You can buy any of them.
 4. Robert Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press. There is a 2005 reprint of this with a new preface, otherwise unchanged.
 5. Stephen M. Saideman. 2001. *The Ties that Divide: Ethnic Politics, Foreign Policy, and International Conflict*. Columbia University Press.

Academic honesty

Students and faculty at the University must agree to adhere to high standards of academic honesty in all of the work that we do. The College Board on Academic Honesty provides further information on our policies and procedures: www.rochester.edu/college/honesty.

In this course the following additional requirements are in effect: You are encouraged to discuss course readings and assignments with your fellow students. However, all written work must be done independently and not in collaboration with another. All written work must properly format quotations, use citations, and include a bibliography where necessary. Cases of plagiarism will be referred to the Academic Honesty Board.

Class schedule

Sept 9: Introduction to the course

Sept 16: Origins of the field of international relations

Reading for the week:

David Long and Brian C. Schmidt, eds. 2005. *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*. SUNY Press. Selections. ‡

Quincy Wright. 1942/1983. *A Study of War*. Abridged by Louise Leonard Wright. Midway. Selections. ‡

Hans Morgenthau. 1948. *Politics among Nations*. 1st ed. Knopf. Selections. ‡

Kenneth N. Waltz. 1962. *Man, the State, and War*. 2nd ed. Columbia University Press. Selections. ‡

Sept 23: Realism

Reading for the week:

John H. Herz. 1963. *International Politics in the Atomic Age*. Columbia University Press. Selections. ‡

Kenneth N. Waltz. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley. Chapters 4–9.

Stephen Walt. 1987. *The Origins of Alliances*. Cornell University Press. Pp. 1-49. <http://tinyurl.com/y5dz8efg> †

Charles Glaser. 1994. "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-help." *International Security* 19(3): 50–91. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2539079>

Sept 30: The found classics of realist IR

Reading for the week:

Thucydides. 431 B.C.E./1874. *The History of the Peloponnesian War*, translated by Richard Crawley. Book I.

Mary Beard. 2010. "Which Thucydides Can You Trust?" *The New York Review of Books* September 30. <https://www.nybooks.com/articles/2010/09/30/which-thucydides-can-you-trust/>

Niccoló Machiavelli. Selections.

Oct 7: Liberalism I: The international system as rules and institutions

Reading for the week:

Immanuel Kant. 1795/1996. "Toward Perpetual Peace," translated by Mary J. Gregor. Published in *Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*. Cambridge University Press. ‡

Michael Doyle. 1986. "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151-1169. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1960861>

Robert Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton University Press. Parts I, II and IV.

Oct 14: Fall break is October 14–15

Oct 21: Liberalism II: Political economy and international organizations

Reading for the week:

David A. Lake. 1984. "Beneath the Commerce of Nations: A Theory of International Economic Structures." *International Studies Quarterly* 28(2): 143–170. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2600693>

Rogowski, Ronald. 1987. "Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade." *American Political Science Review*, 81(4): 1121-1137. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1962581>

Edward D. Mansfield, Helen V. Milner, and B. Peter Rosendorff. 2000. "Free to Trade: Democracies, Autocracies and International Trade." *American Political Science Review* 94(2): 305–22. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2586014>

Andrew K. Rose. 2004. "Do We Really Know That the WTO Increases Trade?" *American Economic Review* 94(1): 98-114. www.jstor.org/stable/3592771

Michael Tomz, Judith L. Goldstein, and Douglas Rivers. 2007. "Do We Really Know That the WTO Increases Trade? Comment." *American Economic Review* 97(5): 2005–2018. <http://doi.org/10.1257/aer.97.5.2005>

David A. Lake. 2009. "Open Economy Politics: A critical review." *The Review of International Organizations* 4(3): 219–244. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-009-9060-y>

Oct 28: Liberalism III: "Second image" explanations for international politics

Reading for the week:

David A. Lake. 1992. "Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War." *American Political Science Review* 86(1): 24–37. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1964013>

Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett. 1993. "Normative and structural causes of the democratic peace, 1946–1986." *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 624–638. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2938740>

Schultz, Kenneth. 1998. "Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises." *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 829–44. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2586306>

Hein Goemans and Giacomo Chiozza. 2003. "Peace Through Insecurity: Tenure and International Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47(4): 443–467. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002703252975>

Weeks, Jessica. 2008. "Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve." *International Organization* 62(1): 35–64. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40071874>

Nov 4: Constructivism

Alexander Wendt. 1992. "Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46(2): 391–425. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706858>

Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 1999. "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations." *International Organization* 53(4): 699–732. <http://doi.org/10.1162/002081899551048>

Ward Thomas. 2000. "Norms and Security: The Case of International Assassination." *International Security* 25(1): 105–133. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2626775>

Stephen C. Nelson. 2014. "Playing Favorites: How Shared Beliefs Shape the IMF's Lending Decisions." *International Organization* 68(2): 297–328. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818313000477>

Catherine Weaver. 2008. *Hypocrisy Trap: The World Bank and the Poverty of Reform*. Princeton University Press. Chapter 2. <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rochester/detail.action?docID=664579> †

Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen. 2009. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 7 (Pp. 187–225). <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/rochester/detail.action?docID=461087> †

Nov 11: Reactionary international relations theory

Reading for the week:

Christopher Joseph MacKay and David LaRoche. 2018. "Why Is There No Reactionary International Theory?" *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(2): 234–244. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqx083>

Jennifer Welsh. 2003. "I is for Ideology: Conservatism in International Affairs", *Global Society* 17(2): 165–185. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1360082032000069073>

Guy Ben-Porat. 2005. "Netanyahu's Second Coming: A Neoconservative Policy Paradigm?" *Israel Studies* 10(3): 225–245. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/30245773.pdf>

John J. Mearsheimer. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. W. W. Norton and Company. Selections.‡

Samuel P. Huntington. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72(3): 22–49. www.jstor.org/stable/20045621

Kari Roberts. 2017. "Understanding Putin: The politics of identity and geopolitics in Russian foreign policy discourse." *International Journal* 72(1): 28–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702017692609>

Nov 18: Rationalism versus realism

Thomas C. Schelling. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Harvard University Press. Parts I and III.

Robert Jervis. 1978. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 30(2): 167–214. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2009958>

James D. Fearon. 1995. "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization* 49(3): 379–414. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706903>

Nov 25: Burying The -Isms

Reading for the week:

John A. Vasquez. 1997. "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition." *American Political Science Review* 91(4): 899–912. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2952172>

Kenneth N. Waltz. 1997. "Evaluating Theories." *American Political Science Review* 91(4): 913–917. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2952173>

Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravscik. 1999. "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24(2): 5–55. <https://doi.org/10.1162/016228899560130>

Peter D. Feaver, et al. 2000. "Brother Can You Spare a Paradigm? (Or Was Anybody Ever a Realist?)" *International Security* 25(1): 165–193. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2626777>

James D. Fearon and Alexander Wendt. 2002. "Rationalism and constructivism in international relations theory." In Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons (eds.) *Handbook of International Relations*. Sage Publications. ‡

Patrick Thaddeus Jackson and Daniel H. Nexon. 2013. "International Theory in a Post-Paradigmatic Era: From Substantive Wagers to Scientific Ontologies." *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 543-65. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1354066113495482>

David A. Lake. 2013. "Theory is dead, long live theory: The end of the Great Debates and the rise of eclecticism in International Relations." *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3): 567-587. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066113494330>

Michael C. Williams. 2013. "In the beginning: The International Relations enlightenment and the ends of International Relations theory." *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 647-665. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066113495477>

Dec 2: Contemporary IR: Topics-based and empirical

This week's reading illustrates the features of high-profile contemporary IR with readings from the literature on border disputes.

Reading for the week:

Simmons, Beth A. 2005. "Rules Over Real Estate: Trade, Territorial Conflict, and International Borders as Institutions." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(6): 823-48. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002705281349>

Stephen M. Saideman. 2001. *The Ties that Divide: Ethnic Politics, Foreign Policy, and International Conflict*. Columbia University Press. Chapters 1, 3, 4, and 6.

Douglas M. Gibling, Marc L. Hutchison, and Steven V. Miller. 2012. "Individual Identity Attachments and International Conflict: The Importance of Territorial Threat." *Comparative Political Studies* 45(12): 1655-1683. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414012463899>

Scott Abramson and David Carter. 2016. "The Historical Origins of Territorial Disputes." *American Political Science Review* 110(4): 675-698. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055416000381>

Nadav G. Shelef. 2016. "Unequal Ground: Homelands and Conflict." *International Organization* 70(1): 33-63. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818315000193>

Hein Goemans and Kenneth Schultz. 2017. "The Politics of Territorial Claims: A Geospatial Approach Applied to Africa." *International Organization* 71(1): 31-64. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818316000254>

Dec 9: Is it time to revive macro-theorizing in international relations?

Reading for the week:

Christopher Layne. 2012. "This Time It's Real: The End of Unipolarity and the 'Pax Americana.'" *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1): 203-213. www.jstor.org/stable/41409832

Joseph S. Nye. 2012. "The Twenty-First Century Will Not Be a 'Post-American' World." *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1): 215-217. www.jstor.org/stable/41409833

William C. Wohlforth. 2012. "How Not to Evaluate Theories." *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1): 219-222. www.jstor.org/stable/41409834

Alexander Cooley and Daniel Nexon. Forthcoming. *Exit from Hegemony: The Unravelling of American Global Order*. Oxford University Press. Chapter 1. <http://www.dhnexon.net/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/Chapter-1-Exit-from-Hegemony.pdf>

Staniland, Paul. 2018. "Misreading the Liberal Order: Why We Need New Thinking in American Foreign Policy." *Lawfare Blog*. <https://www.lawfareblog.com/misreading-liberal-order-why-we-need-new-thinking-american-foreign-policy>

John J. Mearsheimer. 2010. "The Gathering Storm: China's Challenge to US Power in Asia." *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 3(4): 381-396. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjip/poq016>

Jessica Chen Weiss. 2019. "A World Safe for Autocracy? China's Rise and the Future of Global Politics," *Foreign Affairs* July/August. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002705281349>

Dec 18: Final assignment due by 5pm