

The University of Texas at Austin
Government 388K (38945)
Study of International Relations
Fall 2012, T Th 9.30-11, BAT 1.104

Patrick J. McDonald
BAT 4.136
512.232.1747
pjmcDonald@austin.utexas.edu
Office hours: T 11-12, 2-4

DESCRIPTION

This graduate course on the study of international relations will survey some of the most prominent contributions to the field during the past thirty years. It is designed to help you prepare to take the Ph.D. preliminary exams for the IR subfield in the Government Department and to help you prepare to execute your own original research projects. To these ends, the course will provide a broad theoretical overview of the field of international relations and introduce you to some research design fundamentals as they have been applied in the field of international relations. The substance of the course is conceptually organized around the question of how social order is constructed and sustained in the international system. Our discussions of theory will focus on the following sources of order: balance of power, hegemony, technology, ideas, norms, international organizations, globalization, territory, and domestic regime type. Throughout the semester, we will take numerous research design “sidebars” in which we discuss some of the challenges associated with executing quality research that test these theoretical insights.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

There will be three key requirements for this course. First, you will be expected to attend class, keep up with the assigned readings, and participate in our discussions. Second, you will maintain a regular reading journal that will be randomly collected throughout the semester. Third, you will also complete a comprehensive in-class final exam during the assigned exam period. Your final grade will be tabulated as follows:

Class participation	20%
Reading journal (collected at least three times during the semester)	35%
Final Exam	45%

READING MATERIALS

The reading material for this course will be made available through two primary formats. First, our blackboard site will contain electronic versions of all readings that cannot be found online through the library's electronic journal subscriptions (<http://courses.utexas.edu>). Second, the following books can be ordered through such online sites as bn.com and amazon.com. Note: I have ordered some of the books through the University Coop.

Kenneth N. Waltz. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. McGraw-Hill.

Martha Finnemore. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

David A. Lake and Robert Powell, eds. 1999. *Strategic Choice and International Relations*. Princeton University Press.

Alexander Wendt. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

R. Harrison Wagner. 2007. *War and the State: The Theory of International Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Beth A. Simmons. 2009. *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

READING JOURNAL

Your principal assignment for the semester will be to maintain a regular reading journal that includes an entry for every assigned reading. The goals behind this assignment are numerous. First, it is designed to be a future resource for you—both in preparation for comprehensive exams and to provide a means to assess your intellectual evolution as a graduate student. Second, these journals are designed to prepare you to be an active participant in our class discussions. Given limited class time to cover a huge amount of material, I want to ensure that our class time is spent largely on debating the larger implications of our readings and not on simply rehashing or summarizing what a scholar wrote. This means that you need to devote significant time before class figuring out what you think about the readings. The journal should help in this. Third, the journal is designed to facilitate a direct written dialogue between me and you. You should use it to sound out all sorts of ideas that are just beginning to develop.

Apart from summarizing a reading and offering some sort of comment on all required readings, I want to keep the rules associated with these journals to a minimum. Please write in complete sentences but do not worry about building complete paragraphs. Do not spend a bunch of time editing your entries.

More specifically, these assignments could be directed toward answering some of the following questions:

What is the author's argument? (**Note:** this question should be answered in every entry.)

How is the argument tested? (**Note:** this question should be answered in every entry.)

What is an interesting theoretical extension of these claims?

Are there any logical inconsistencies in the construction of the key hypotheses?

What are the key theoretical influences on this work?

To what literatures is the author attempting to address? Is the challenge/revision effective?

What new work has this research helped generate?

Evaluate the concepts that are missing from the analysis. How might they change theoretical expectations?

What hidden or unstated assumptions does the author make? How do they shape the analysis?

How would you characterize the author's world view or ontology?

Do you agree with the conclusions? Why or why not?

Evaluate the quality of the empirical work.

Are the tests appropriate for the hypotheses?

What other empirical implications of the theory did the author fail to test?

Could you design an alternative (better) way to test the primary hypotheses?

What other issues areas could the theory be applied to?

Your journals will be collected randomly throughout the semester. At the start of every Thursday class (beginning on Thursday, September 13), I will announce a group of names of people whose journals are due that day. These people should email me their journal (which includes entries for the readings from the time your journal was last collected until that Thursday on which they were due) by 12.30 p.m. that day. Please email the journal as a .doc or docx file so I can use track changes to make comments on your journal.

I will not accept late journals. Just email what you have completed at that time. You should anticipate though being docked some points if you do not keep up with the entries.

CLASS DISCUSSION

Our class time will be a mix of lecture and discussion. As already noted, please make sure you have already spent a significant amount of time thinking about the readings before coming to class. Please do not finish the readings five minutes before class and do not just read the assigned readings to finish them. Much of our class time will be devoted to exploring the very general questions that I suggested you could address in your journals. Most importantly, our class time will be devoted to pushing you to develop your own theoretical worldview. Expect to have your claims challenged and expect your own ideas to evolve throughout the semester.

FINAL EXAMINATION

The final examination will be designed to replicate the comprehensive exam process in the department. This means you will take the final on a clean computer (no notes, no pre-writing) in a room (without internet access) with your colleagues. There will be one exception though to this testing protocol. You will be given a candidate list of questions on the last day of the class. The exam will be comprised from this list.

OTHER COURSE POLICIES

“Scholastic dishonesty...includes, but is not limited to, cheating, plagiarism, collusion, falsifying academic records, and any act designed to give unfair academic advantage to the student (such as, but not limited to, submission of essentially the same written assignment for two courses without prior permission of the instructor, providing false or misleading information in an effort to receive a postponement or an extension on a test, quiz, or other assignment), or the attempt to commit such an act” (Section 11-802 (b), Institutional Rules on Student Services and Activities).

If you have any questions about what constitutes scholastic dishonesty, you should consult with me and the following website (<http://deanofstudents.utexas.edu/sjs/academicintegrity.html>). Any student that violates this policy will fail this course and have the details of the violation reported to Student Judicial Services.

Students with disabilities... please have a representative from the Office of the Dean of Students contact me as early as possible in the semester. All accommodations must be coordinated through this office.

Changes to the syllabus... I may make minor changes to the syllabus. These will be announced at least a week in advance.

Religious holidays: By UT Austin policy, you must notify me of your pending absence at least fourteen days prior to the date of observance of a religious holy day. If you must miss a class, an examination, a work assignment, or a project in order to observe a religious holy day, you will be given an opportunity to complete the missed work within a reasonable time after the absence.

Emergency evacuation: In the event of a fire or other emergency, it may be necessary to evacuate a building rapidly. Upon the activation of a fire alarm or the announcement of an emergency in a university building, all occupants of the building are required to evacuate and assemble outside. Once evacuated, no one may re-enter the building without instruction to do so from the Austin Fire Department, University of Texas at Austin Police Department, or Fire Prevention Services office.

Students should familiarize themselves with all the exit doors of each room and building

they occupy at the university, and should remember that the nearest exit routes may not be the same as they way they typically enter buildings.

Students requiring assistance in evacuation shall inform their instructors in writing during the first week of class. Faculty members must then provide this information to the Fire Prevention Services office by fax (512-232-2759), with "Attn. Mr. Roosevelt Easley" written in the subject line.

Information regarding emergency evacuation routes and emergency procedures can be found at <http://www.utexas.edu/emergency>.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Thursday, August 30

Course overview

Class cancelled because of APSA, we will meet over lunch on Tuesday, Aug 28 instead

I. METATHEORETICAL ISSUES

Tuesday, September 4

History/Sociology of the field of International Relations and its relationship with other disciplines

Barry Eichengreen. 1998. Dental Hygiene and Nuclear War: How International Relations Looks from Economics. *International Organization* 52(4): 993-1012.

Ole Waever. 1998. The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations. *International Organization* 52(4): 687-727.

Brian Schmidt. 2002. On the History and Historiography of International Relations. In Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage), 3-22.

Benjamin J. Cohen. 2007. The Transatlantic Divide: Why are American and British IPE so Different? *Review of International Political Economy* 14(2): 197-219.

Robert Jervis. 2009. International Politics and Diplomatic History: Fruitful Differences. Keynote Address, Proceedings of the First Williams/H-Diplo Conference on New Scholarship in American Foreign Relations.
Available at: <http://www.h-net.org/~diplo/roundtables/PDF/Williams-Jervis-Keynote.pdf>

David Ekbladh. 2011/12. Present at the Creation: Edward Mead Earle and the Depression-Era Origins of Security Studies. *International Security* 36(3): 107-141.

Recommended:

Martha Finnemore. 1996. Norms, Culture, and World Politics: Insights from Sociology's Institutionalism. *International Organization* 50(2): 325-347.

Lisa L. Martin and Beth A. Simmons. 1998. Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions. *International Organization* 52(4): 729-757.

Michael Mastanduno. 1998. Economics and Security in Statecraft and Scholarship. *International Organization* 52(4): 825-854.

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

Steve Smith. 2002. The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: 'Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline.' *International Studies Review* 4(2): 67-86.

Michael Barnett and Kathryn Sikkink. 2008. From International Relations to Global Society. In Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 62-83. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robert W. Cox. 2008. The Point is not Just to Explain the World but to Change It. In Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 84-93. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Daniel Maliniak and Michael J. Tierney. 2009. The American School of IPE. *Review of International Political Economy* 16: 6-33.

David A. Lake. 2009. Open Economy Politics: A Critical Review. *Review of International Organization* 4(3): 219-244.

Thursday, September 6 **The Agent Structure Debate**

Alexander Wendt. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*, pp. 1-39.

Kenneth Waltz. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*, pp. 60-101.

Thomas Oatley. 2011. The Reductionist Gamble: Open Economy Politics in the Global Economy. *International Organization* 65(2): 311-341.

Recommended:

David Dessler. 1989. What's at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate? *International Organization* 43(3): 441-473.

Robert Jervis. 1998. *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Levels of Analysis

Robert Jervis. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*, pp. 13-31.

Kenneth N. Waltz. 1954. *Man, the State, and War*. Columbia University Press.

J. David Singer. 1961. The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations. *World Politics* 14: 77-92.

Robert D. Putnam. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games. *International Organization* 42(3): 427-460.

Tuesday, September 11

Agent-Structure II: Two views on process and its role in international political structure

Robert O. Keohane. 1988. International Institutions: Two Approaches. *International Studies Quarterly* 32(4): 379-396.

Alexander Wendt. 1992. Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization* 46(2): 391-425.

Barry Buzan. 1995. From International System to International Society: Structural Realism and Regime Theory Meet the English School. *International Organization* 47(3): 327-352.

David A. Lake and Robert Powell. 1999. International Relations: A Strategic-Choice Approach. In Lake and Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice and International Relations*, 3-38. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

James D. Morrow. 1999. The Strategic Setting of Choices: Signaling, Commitment, and Negotiation in International Politics. In Lake and Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice and International Relations*, 77-114. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Recommended:

Andrew H. Kydd. 2008. Methodological Individualism and Rational Choice. In Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 425-444. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Friedrich Kratochwil. 2008. Sociological Approaches. In Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 444-461. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

John Gerard Ruggie. 1998. What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge. *International Organization* 52(4): 855-885.

Miles Kahler. 1998. Rationality in International Relations. *International Organization* 52(4): 919-941.

Thursday, September 13

Agent-Structure III: Who are the key agents? What do they want?

Kathryn Sikkink. 1993. Human Rights, Principled Issue-Networks, and Sovereignty in Latin America. *International Organization* 47(3): 411-441.

Andrew Moravcsik. 1997. Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics. *International Organization* 51(4): 513-553.

Michael N. Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 1999. The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. *International Organization* 53(4): 699-732.

Jeffrey Frieden. 1999. Actors and Preferences in International Relations. In Lake and Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice and International Relations*, 39-76. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

John Gerard Ruggie. 2004. Reconstituting the Global Public Domain—Issues, Actors, and Practices. *European Journal of International Relations* 10(4): 499-531.

David A. Lake. 2008. The State and International Relations. In Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 41-61. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Edward D. Mansfield and Diana C. Mutz. 2009. Support for Free Trade: Self-Interest, Sociotropic Politics, and Out-Group Anxiety. *International Organization* 63(3): 425-458.

Recommended

Peter M. Haas. 1992. Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination. *International Organization* 46(1): 1-35.

Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. A New Statecraft? Supranational Entrepreneurs and International Cooperation. *International Organization* 53(2): 267-306.

Stephen Krasner. 1978. *Defending the National Interest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Pp. 1-34, 55-90.

Fareed Zakaria. 1998. *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Pp. 3-43, 181-192.

Richard Price. 2003. Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics. *World Politics* 55(4): 579-606.

Audrey Kurth Cronin. 2006. How al Qaida Ends: The Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups. *International Security* 31(1): 7-48.

Daniel L. Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack. 2001. Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing Statesmen Back In. *International Security* 25(4): 107-146.

Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Activists Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Ole Jacob Sending and Iver B. Neumann. 2006. Governance to Governmentality: Analyzing NGOs, States, and Power. *International Studies Quarterly* 50(3): 651-672.

Tuesday, September 18

Agent-Structure IV: material v. ideational composition of political structure

Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, pp. 92-138

Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, pp. 102-128.

Immanuel Wallerstein. 1974. The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 387-415.

Thursday, September 20 (class made up over lunch on Friday, September 21)

Causal theory

Wagner, *War and the State*, pp. 1-52

Elster, *Explaining Social Behavior: More Nuts and Bolts for the Social Sciences*, p. 7-66

Tuesday, September 25

Constitutive Theory

Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, pp. 47-91

Martha Finnemore. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 1-33, 69-88, 128-150.

II. IR THEORY AND THE SOURCES OF ORDER IN INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

II-A. War, the State, and the States System

Thursday, September 27

The order generating properties of war

Wagner, *War and the State*, pp. 52-130.

Jeffrey Herbst. 1990. War and the State in Africa. *International Security* 14(4): 117-139.

Recommended:

Charles Tilly. 1990. *Coercion, Capital and European States: AD 990-1992*. Blackwell.

Henrik Spruydt. 1994. *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Brian Downing. 1992. *The Military Revolution and Political Change: Origins of Democracy and Autocracy in Early Modern Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tuesday, October 2

Bargaining and war I

Wagner, *War and the State*, pp. 131-172

James D. Fearon. 1995. Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49: 379-414.

Dan Reiter. 2003. Exploring the Bargaining Model of War. *Perspectives on Politics* 1(1): 27-43.

Recommended:

Robert Jervis. 1970. *The Logic of Images in International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Geoffrey Blainey. 1988. *The Causes of War*. 3rd Edition. New York: Simon and Schuster.

James D. Fearon. 1997. Signaling Foreign Policy Interests. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(1): 68-90.

Erik Gartzke. 1999. War is in the Error Term. *International Organization* 53(3): 567-587.

Robert Powell. 2002. Bargaining Theory and International Conflict. *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 1-30.

Branislav Slantchev. 2003. The Power to Hurt: Costly Conflict with Completely Informed States. *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 123-133.

Mark Fey and Kristopher Ramsay. 2007. Mutual Optimism and War. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 738-754.

Branislav L. Slantchev and Ahmer Tarrar. 2011. Mutual Optimism as a Rationalist Cause of War. *American Journal of Political Science*:

Thursday, October 4 Bargaining and War II

Wagner, *War and the State*, pp. 173-196

Robert Powell. 2006. War as a Commitment Problem. *International Organization* 60(1): 169-203.

Recommended:

Thomas Schelling. 1966. *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 35-91.

Barbara F. Walter. 1997. The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement. *International Organization* 51(3): 335-364.

Charles Lipson. 2003. *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bahar Leventoglu and Branislav Slantchev. 2007. The Armed Peace: A Punctuated Equilibrium Theory of War. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(4): 775-771.

Dustin H. Tingley. 2011. The Dark Side of the Future: An Experimental Test of Commitment Problems in Bargaining. *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2): 521-544.

Patrick J. McDonald. 2011. Complicating Commitment: Free Resources, Power Shifts, and the Fiscal Politics of Preventive War. *International Studies Quarterly* 55(4): 1095-1120.

Tuesday, October 9

War settlements and the construction of postwar orders

John Ruggie. 1982. International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order. *International Organization* 36(2): 379-415.

G. John Ikenberry. 2001. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 3-79.

Dan Reiter. 2009. *How Wars End*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 1-50.

Recommended:

Marc Trachtenberg. 1999. *A Constructed Peace: The Making of the European Settlement, 1945-1963*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Thursday, October 11

Research Design I: Intro to Research Design and methodological choices

Application: War Termination

King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*, p. 3-33

Brady and Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, 2d ed., p. 13-64

James Mahoney and Gary Goertz. 2006. A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research. *Political Analysis* 14(3): 227-249.

Dan Reiter, *How Wars End*, pp. 51-62

II-B. The Balance of Power

Tuesday, October 16

Research Design II: Causal Inference

Application: Balance of Power

Research Design

King, Keohane, and Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry*, pp. 75-114.

Brady and Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, pp. 161-200

Balance of Power

Review Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, ch. 6

Paul Schroeder. 1994. Historical Reality vs. Neo-realist Theory. *International Security* 19(1): 108-148.

R. Harrison Wagner. 1986. The Theory of Games and the Balance of Power. *World Politics* 38(4): 546-576.

Recommended:

Stephen M. Walt. 1985. Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power. *International Security* 9(4): 3-43.

Edward D. Mansfield. 1992. The Concentration of Capabilities and the Onset of War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36(1): 3-24.

R. Harrison Wagner. 1993. What was Bipolarity? *International Organization* 47(1): 77-106.

Robert Powell. 1996. Stability and the Distribution of Power. *World Politics* 48(2): 239-267.

Michael W. Doyle. 1997. *Ways of War and Peace*. New York: Norton. Pp. 161-193.

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.

Gideon Rose. 1998. Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy. *World Politics* 51(1): 144-172.

Randall L. Schweller. 2004. Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing. *International Security* 29(4): 159-201.

Robert A. Pape. 2005. Soft Balancing Against the United States. *International Security* 30(1): 7-45.

Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth. 2005. Hard Times for Soft Balancing. *International Security* 30(1): 72-108.

T.V. Paul. 2005. Soft Balancing in the Age of U.S. Primacy. *International Security* 30(1): 46-71.

II-C. Hegemony and hierarchy

Thursday, October 18

Stephen D. Krasner. 1976. State Power and the Structure of International Trade. *World Politics* 28: 317-343.

David A. Lake. 1996. Anarchy, Hierarchy, and the Variety of International Relations. *International Organization* 50(1): 1-33.

William C. Wohlforth. 1999. The Stability of a Unipolar World. *International Security* 21(1): 1-36.

Daniel H. Nexon and Thomas Wright. 2007. What's at Stake in the American Empire Debate. *American Political Science Review* 101(2): 253-271.

Recommended:

Robert Gilpin. 1981. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

David A. Lake. 1983. International Economic Structures and American Foreign Policy, 1887-1934. *World Politics* 35: 517-543.

Duncan Snidal. 1985. The Limits of Hegemonic Stability Theory. *International Organization* 39: 579-614.

Michael W. Doyle. 1986. *Empires*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

David A. Lake. 1993. Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy: Naked Emperor or Tattered Monarch with Potential. *International Studies Quarterly* 37(4): 459-489.

Jeffrey A. Frieden. 1994. International Investment and Colonial Control: A New Interpretation. *International Organization* 48(4): 559-593.

David A. Lake. 1999. *Entangling Relations: American Foreign Policy in Its Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

David A. Lake. 2009. *Hierarchy in International Relations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

David A. Lake. 2010. Rightful Rules: Authority, Order, and the Foundations of Global Governance. *International Studies Quarterly* 54(3): 587-613.

G. John Ikenberry. 2011. *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

II-D. Technology

Tuesday, October 23

Nuclear Weapons and the Offense-Defense Balance

Robert Jervis. 1978. Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma. *World Politics* 30(2): 168-214.

Kenneth N. Waltz. 1990. Nuclear Myths and Political Realities. *American Political Science Review* 84(3): 731-745.

Sean M. Lynn-Jones. 1995. Offense-Defense Theory and Its Critics. *Security Studies* 4(4): 660-691.

Robert Powell. 2003. Nuclear Deterrence Theory, Nuclear Proliferation, and National Missile Defense. *International Security* 27(4): 86-118.

Recommended readings:

Steven Van Evera. 1984. The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War. *International Security* 9: 58-108.

Thomas Christenson and Jack Snyder. 1990. Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Behavior in Multipolarity. *International Organization* 44(2): 137-169.

Daniel Deudney. 1993. Dividing Realism: Structural Realism Versus Security Materialism on Nuclear Security and Proliferation. *Security Studies* 2: 7-36.

Richard Price and Nina Tannenwald. 1996. Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Taboos. In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, ed. Peter Katzenstein, 114-152. New York: Columbia University Press.

Charles L. Glaser and Chaim Kaufman. 1998. What is the Offense-Defense Balance and Can We Measure It? *International Security* 22(4): 44-82.

Stephen Van Evera. 1998. Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War. *International Security* 22(4): 5-43.

Keir Lieber. 1998. Grasping the Technological Peace: The Offense-Defense Balance and International Security. *International Security* 25(1): 71-104.

Nina Tannenwald. 2005. Stigmatizing the Bomb: Origins of the Nuclear Taboo. *International Security* 29(4): 5-49.

Keir Lieber and Daryl Press. 2006. The End of MAD? The Nuclear Dimension of US Primacy. *International Security* 30(4): 7-44.

Keir Lieber. 2007. The New History of World War I and What it Means for International Relations Theory. *International Security* 32(2): 155-191.

Thursday, October 25

Research Design III: Case studies, expected utility theory, and case selection Application: Rational Deterrence Theory

Case studies:

John Gerring. 2004. What is a Case Study and What Is It Good for? *American Political Science Review* 98(2): 341-354.

Rational Deterrence Theory

Christopher H. Achen and Duncan Snidal. 1989. Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies. *World Politics* 41(2): 143-169.

Alexander L. George and Richard Smoke. 1989. Deterrence and Foreign Policy. *World Politics* 41(2): 170-182.

Robert Jervis. 1989. Rational Deterrence: Theory and Evidence. *World Politics* 41(2): 183-207.

Recommended:

Paul Huth and Bruce Russett. 1984. What Makes Deterrence Work? Cases from 1900-1980. *World Politics* 36: 496-526.

Richard Ned Lebow and Janice Gross Stein. 1989. Rational Deterrence Theory: I Think, Therefore I Deter. *World Politics* 41(2): 208-224.

Richard Ned Lebow and Janice Gross Stein. 1990. Deterrence: The Elusive Dependent Variable. *World Politics* 42(3): 336-369.

Paul Huth and Bruce Russett. 1990. Testing Deterrence Theory: Rigor Makes a Difference. *World Politics* 42(4): 466-501.

II-E. Domestic Politics

Tuesday, October 30

Imperialist coalitions and the Democratic Peace

Michael W. Doyle. 1986. Liberalism and World Politics. *American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151-1169.

Jack Snyder. 1991. *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 1-65.

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791-807.

Jarrod Hayes. 2012. Review Article: The Democratic Peace and the New Evolution of an Old Idea. *European Journal of International Relations*: forthcoming.

Recommended:

David A. Lake. 1992. Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War. *American Political Science Review* 86: 24-37.

John M. Owen. 1994. How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace. *International Security* 19(2): 87-125.

James D. Fearon. 1994. Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes. *American Political Science Review* 88: 577-592.

Christopher Layne. 1995. Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace. *International Security* 19(4): 5-49.

Ido Oren. 1995. The Subjectivity of the “Democratic” Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany. *International Security* 20(2): 147-184.

Henry S. Farber and Joanne Gowa. 1995. Politics and Peace. *International Security* 20(2): 123-146.

Bruce Russett. 1996. Why Democratic Peace?. In *Debating the Democratic Peace*, eds. Michael E. Brown, Sean M. Lynn-Jones, and Steven E. Miller, 82-115. Cambridge: MIT Press. (R)

Thomas Risse-Kappen. 1996. Collective Identity in a Democratic Community: The Case of NATO. In Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, 357-399. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kenneth A. Schultz. 1998. Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises. *American Political Science Review* 92: 829-844.

Kenneth A. Schultz. 1999. Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform? Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War. *International Organization* 53: 233-266.

Bruce Russett and John Oneal. 2001. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: Norton.

Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder. 2002. Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War. *International Organization* 56(2): 297-337.

Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam. 2002. *Democracies at War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sebastian Rosato. 2003. The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory. *American Political Science Review* 97(4): 585-602.

Thursday, November 1

Research design IV: Regression basics and typical quantitative design choices in IR Application: The democratic peace

Regression basics

Joshua David Angrist and Jorn-Steffen Pischke. 2009. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 1-67 (maybe to 50)

Quantitative design basics in IR

D. Scott Bennett and Allan C. Stam. 2000. Research Design and Estimator Choices in the Analysis of Interstate Dyads: When Decisions Matter. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(5): 653-685.

Applications:

James Lee Ray. 1998. Does Democracy Cause Peace? *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 27-46.

John Oneal and Bruce M. Russett. 1997. The Classical Liberals Were Right: Democracy, Interdependence, and Conflict, 1950-1985. *International Studies Quarterly* 41(2): 267-294.

Recommended:

Edward D. Mansfield and Jon Pevehouse. 2008. Quantitative Approaches. In Reus-Smit and Snidal, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 481-498. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tuesday, November 6

Research design V: Typical regression challenges in IR—Time-series cross-sectional (TSCS) designs, endogeneity and instrumental variable (IV) estimation, omitted variable bias, sample selection

Application: Democratic Peace

Donald P. Green, Soo Yeon H. Kim, and David Yoon. 2001. Dirty Pool. *International Organization* 55(2): 441-468.

Nathaniel N. Beck and Jonathan Katz. 2001. Throwing Out the Baby with the Bath Water: A Comment on Green, Kim, and Yoon. *International Organization* 55(2): 487-495.

Erik Gartzke. 2007. The Capitalist Peace. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1): 166-191.

Allan Dafoe. 2011. Statistical Critiques of the Democratic Peace: Caveat Emptor. *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2): 247-262.

Patrick J. McDonald. 2012. Great Power Bargaining and the Post-World War I Emergence of the Democratic Peace. Typescript.

Recommended:

Douglas M. Gibbler. 2007. Bordering on Peace: Democracy, Territorial Issues, and Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 51(3): 509-532.

Christopher H. Achen. 2005. Let's Put Garbage-Can Regressions and Garbage-Can Probits Where They Belong. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 22(4): 327-339.

David B. Carter and Curtis S. Signorino. 2010. Back to the Future: Modeling Time Dependence in Binary Data. *Political Analysis* 18(3): 271-292.

Allison J. Sovey and Donald P. Green. 2011. Instrumental Variables Estimation in Political Science: A Readers' Guide. *American Journal of Political Science* 55(1): 188-200.

Thursday, November 8

Research Design VI: process tracing, measurement/concept refinement, and conditional relationships

Application: Extensions on the democratic peace

Bear F. Braumoeller. Hypothesis Testing and Multiplicative Interaction Terms. *International Organization* 58(4): 807-820.

Jessica L. Weeks. 2008. Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve. *International Organization* 62(1): 35-64.

Andrew Bennett. 2010. Process Tracing and Causal Inference. In Brady and Collier, eds., *Rethinking Social Inquiry*, pp. 207-220.

Jack Snyder and Erica D. Borghard. 2011. The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound. *American Political Science Review* 105(3): 437-456.

II-F. International Institutions

Tuesday, November 13

Robert Keohane. 1982. The Demand for International Regimes. *International Organization* 36(2): 325-355.

Robert Jervis. 1982. Security Regimes. *International Organization* 36(2): 357-378.

James D. Fearon. 1998. Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation. *International Organization* 52(2): 269-305.

Barbara Koremenos, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. The Rational Design of International Institutions. *International Organization* 55(4): 761-800.

Alastair Iain Johnston. 2001. Treating International Institutions as Social Environments. *International Studies Quarterly* 45(4): 487-516.

Recommended

John Mearsheimer. 1994/95. The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security* 19(3): 5-49.

Lisa L. Martin and Beth A. Simmons. 1998. Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions. *International Organization* 52(4): 729-757.

Avner Greif. 2006. *Institutions and the Path to the Modern Economy: Lessons from Medieval Trade*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Randall W. Stone. 2011. *Controlling Institutions: International Organizations and the Global Economy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Thursday, November 15

Research design issues VII: Selection bias

Applications: International Institutions

George W. Downs, David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom. 1996. Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation? *International Organization* 50(3): 379-406.

Beth A. Simmons. 2000. International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs. *American Political Science Review* 94(4): 819-835.

Jana Von Stein. 2005. Do Treaties Constrain or Screen? Selection Bias and Treaty Compliance. *American Political Science Review* 99(4): 611-622.

Beth A. Simmons and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2005. The Constraining Power of International Treaties: Theory and Methods. *American Political Science Review* 99(4): 623-631.

II-G. Territory

Tuesday, November 20

Stephen G. Brooks. 1999. The Globalization of Production and the Changing Benefits of Conquest. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43(5): 646-670.

Mark W. Zacher. 2001. The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force. *International Organization* 55(2): 215-250.

Branislav Slantchev. 2005. Territory and Commitment: The Concert of Europe as a Self-Enforcing Equilibrium. *Security Studies* 14(4): 565-606.

Stacie Goddard. 2006. Uncommon Ground: Indivisible Territory and the Politics of Legitimacy. *International Organization* 60: 35-68.

Wagner, *War and the State*, pp. 197-234.

Recommended:

Beth A. Simmons. 2005. Rules over Real Estate: Trade, Territorial Conflict and International Borders as Institutions. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(6): 823-848.

David B. Carter and H.E. Goemans. 2011. The Making of the Territorial Order: New Borders and the Emergence of Interstate Conflict. *International Organization* 65(2): 275-309.

Monica Duffy Toft. 2002. Indivisible Territory, Geographic Concentration, and Ethnic War. *Security Studies* 12(2): 82-119.

II-H. Culture

Tuesday, November 27

Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, pp. 139-191, 246-312.

II-I. Globalization

Thursday, November 29

David M. Andrews. 1994. Capital Mobility and State Autonomy: Toward a Structural Theory of International Monetary Relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 38: 193-218.

David M. Rowe. 2005. The Tragedy of Liberalism: How Globalization Caused the First World War. *Security Studies* 14(3): 407-447.

Beth A. Simmons and Zachary Elkins. 2004. The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy. *American Political Science Review* 98(1): 171-189.

Recommended:

James Kurth. 1979. The Political Consequences of the Product Cycle: Industrial History and Political Outcomes. *International Organization* 33(1): 1-34.

Ronald Rogowski. 1987. Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade. *American Political Science Review* 81(4): 1121-1137.

Michael W. Doyle. 2000. A More Perfect Union? The Liberal Peace and the Challenge of Globalization. *Review of International Studies* 26: 81-94.

Beth Simmons. 2001. International Politics of Harmonization: The Case of Capital Market Regulation. *International Organization* 55(3): 589-621.

Scott J. Basinger and Mark Hallerberg. 2004. Remodeling the Competition for Capital: How Domestic Politics Erases the Race to the Bottom. *American Political Science Review* 98(2): 261-276.

Harold James. 2006. *The Roman Predicament: How the Rules of International Order Create the Politics of Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin, and Geoffrey Garrett. 2006. Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism. *International Organization* 60(4): 781-810.

Zachary Elkins, Andrew T. Guzman, and Beth Simmons. 2006. Competing for Capital: The Diffusion of Bilateral Investment Treaties, 1960-2000. *International Organization* 60(4): 811-846.

II-J. International Law

Tuesday, December 4 Human Rights

Beth A. Simmons. 2009. *Mobilizing for Human Rights: International Law in Domestic Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-157, one empirical chapter

Recommended

Judith O. Goldstein, Miles Kahler, Robert Keohane, and Anne-Marie Slaughter. 2000. Introduction: Legalization and World Politics. *International Organization* 54(3): 385-399.

Kenneth O.W. Abbott, Robert Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Duncan Snidal. The Concept of Legalization. *International Organization* 54(3): 401-419.

Emilie M. Hafner-Burton. 2005. Trading Human Rights: How Preferential Trade Agreements Influence Government Repression. *International Organization* 59(3): 593-629.

Jeffrey K. Staton and Will H. Moore. 2011. Judicial Power in Domestic and International Politics. *International Organization* 65(3): 553-587.

III. METATHEORETICAL ISSUES REDUX

Thursday, December 6 The Paradigm Debate

Yosef Lapid. 1989. The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era. *International Studies Quarterly* 33(3): 235-254.

David A. Lake. 2011. Why “isms” Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress. *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2): 465-480.

Rudra Sil and Peter J. Katzenstein. 2011. De-Centering, Not Discarding, the “Isms”: Some Friendly Amendments. *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2): 481-485.

Henry R. Nau. 2011. No Alternative to “Isms.” *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2): 487-491.

Recommended

Jeffrey Legro and Andrew Moravcsik. 2000. Is Anybody Still a Realist? *International Security* 24(2): 5-55.

James Fearon and Alexander Wendt. 2002. Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View. In Carlsnaes et al, eds., *Handbook of International Relations*, pp. 52-72. Sage.

Patrick Thaddeus Jackson and Daniel H. Nexon. 2009. Paradigmatic Faults in International Relations Theory. *International Studies Quarterly* 53(4): 907-930.

Brian Rathbun. 2010. Is Anybody Not an (International Relations) Liberal? *Security Studies* 19(1): 2-25.

APPENDIX—What goes through my mind when grading comprehensive exams...

Prior to taking comprehensive exams, students generally meet with their examiners to get some sense of how to prepare and write quality exam answers. I know that students are often frustrated by the variation they observe across faculty responses to these questions. I am also aware of the frustration created by different evaluation standards among faculty that then can create very different grades on the same question in an exam. I am afraid I cannot do much of anything about variation across faculty standards. These often stem from honest disagreements about the state of the field and how we should train students. While these can accentuate your anxieties, I believe that these differences ultimately create intellectual opportunities for you and us. I can though perhaps reduce some of this uncertainty by increasing the transparency with respect to how I grade exams. The rest of this note details what I look for and the questions I ask myself when reading an exam and attaching a grade to it.

1. Make sure you answer the question. One of the first things I ask myself after reading the exam is “did the student answer the question?” If he/she or didn’t, I then think hard about the failing student for the following reasons. First, perhaps the student did not know how to directly answer the question and was hoping that a list of scholarly literature (often organized around some form of the paradigm debate) loosely related to the question (and often more relevant for others) would be sufficient to hide this. Second, the student might have been trying to subtly redefine the question into something he/she could answer, which simultaneously suggests that he/she did not how to answer the question he/she wrote. This brings me to my third point. You have choices about which questions to write on. I assume that you have chosen the question that will allow you to write the best response. If you write on a question that you do not how to answer directly, this also means that you did not know how to answer the other options, which in turn opens larger doubts about your command of the field. In short, answer the question you choose to write. If you feel the question is worded ambiguously, note this ambiguity, mention alternative ways to answer the question, and briefly justify your decision to answer it in the fashion you have.

2. Build an argument in your essay. I hope this is relatively straightforward. I am looking to assess your progress in the program by whether or not you have begun to build and refine your own theoretical worldview. Part of demonstrating your knowledge of the literature (and, as a consequence, demonstrating readiness to write a dissertation) is showing that you can do more than summarize it and have begun to think both independently and creatively about it.

There is also a presentational aspect to this issue in your essay. Don’t let your argument emerge over the course of the essay and then just state it as an afterthought in the final paragraph. Given the time constraints associated with writing these essays, it is ok if your ideas and thus argument changes/emerges some over the course of writing the essay. But if this occurs, make sure you go back and revise that introduction so it is clear there.

3. Demonstrate breadth of knowledge of the relevant literature. I recognize that we, as a faculty, cannot ask you to do something that we are incapable of doing, namely keeping with all the relevant literature. However, I do look for a pattern of significant omissions that I think should be included across your essay. I use the word “pattern” to distinguish from a few oversights here because there is always going to be disagreement on whether a reading was relevant and I understand that you simply don’t have time to be comprehensive in your discussion. However, if I can identify a series of literatures and/or important articles/books that have been omitted, a red flag goes up. This warning draws more of my attention if the relevant readings were assigned in a graduate class here.

Finally, let me point out that there are two components to this criterion—breadth and ability to think in an integrative fashion. While I want to see that you have recognized that there are multiple attempts to approach this question in the literature, I also want to see that you can recognize the connections within the literature. In other words, don’t just include a series of one-sentence summaries of all the literature that you think is relevant for the question. *This is known as a literature dump and I do not want my discussion here to be seen as a call for one in your answer.* You tell me that you have not done a literature dump by being able to talk about the connections within the literature. These connections include pointing out how scholars’ ideas have progressed or evolved over time, how they have engaged in a dialogue with each other, and perhaps most importantly, how you think they should be engaged in a dialogue with each other and with you. An identification of such connections tells me that you have not only just memorized the literature, but have also begun to think about it in an integrative fashion. I often talk about this as seeing the forest rather than the individual trees. If you can demonstrate to me that you see the forest, I pass the exam.

4. Be very careful in using the paradigm debate to organize your response to any, or worse yet, all questions. There is a strong proclivity by graduate students to start here with their essays. It provides the comfort of the familiar in an uncertain and stressful environment. People have been doing this for decades. But you should know that there is more to IR theory than the debate between Keohane and Waltz. Seriously. Now if a question explicitly asks for the neo-neo debate, by all means answer it. Otherwise, be careful. There are many ways to organize debates or literatures outside of the confines of paradigm clash. You should have had plenty of exposure to these alternative frames in your classes here.

5. Are there any apparent contradictions in your argument? I always look these as I go through essays. They tell me a lot about your depth of understanding of the literature and your ability to think about and draw implications from any argument.

6. Take some time at the beginning of your day to plan your answers. I would encourage you to incorporate the outline of a tentative argument and a list of relevant literatures/scholars in this planning process. At some point of the day, you are likely to feel the pressures of the time crunch. I found that when I was writing my comprehensive exams, this outline provided some security to me throughout the day that its end (when I

was already mentally tired) wouldn't be further complicated by time pressures that could hinder any search for new ideas to incorporate in my essays.