

PSCI 487: International Relations Theory

Fall 2013

AL 210, Thursdays, 1:30-4:20

Instructor: Dr. William Flanik

Email Address: bflanik@uwaterloo.ca

Office Location: Hagey Hall 351

Office Hours: Thursdays, 4:30-6:00 PM or by appointment

Contact Policy: I'll respond to emails within 24 hours (48 hours on weekends). When appropriate, I'll ask that we meet during office hours. If you can't come to my regularly scheduled office hours, contact me to arrange a meeting before class on Thursdays.

Course Description: This course surveys most of the major schools of International Relations (IR) theory. During our theoretical investigations, we'll explore issues of gender, militarism, international conflict and cooperation, global political economy, and foreign policymaking. To acquaint you with the breadth of the field, we'll give equal attention to "positivist" and "post-positivist" theories. The course considers the following questions: Who are the key actors in world politics? How do they understand themselves, their world, and moral action within it? What do they want? How do these actors make decisions? Where, how, and why do they interact? What systems emerge from their interaction, and how do those systems shape actors' characteristics, decisions, and behavior? Is IR a "science," and what does it mean to describe it as such? Finally, how do we *know* if and when we've answered these questions satisfactorily? This is a fourth-year seminar, so expect a good deal of reading, writing, and discussion. A background in IR, as well as sharp communication and critical thinking skills, will prove helpful.

Pre-Requisites: PSCI 281 or 282; Level at least 4A.

Course Objectives:

By the end of this course, students should:

- Be able to explain and critique, orally and in writing, the main tenets of each school of IR theory
- Be able to compare and contrast positivist and post-positivist approaches to IR
- Be able to apply IR theory to analyze substantive topics in world politics
- Be able to build persuasive written and oral arguments, supported by evidence

Texts:

All texts are available as PDF e-readings, accessible via LEARN.

Course Requirements and Assessment:

***** Please see course website for full details of assignments and assessment rubrics *****

1) Seminar Participation: 25%

Seminar courses rely on active, discussion-based learning between you and your peers. To promote high-quality discussion, I've allocated a full quarter of the final mark to participation.

You'll be assessed in part on your level of preparation. You are expected to come to class ready to discuss the current week's mandatory readings ("recommended" readings are helpful but wholly optional). Good preparation requires a careful reading of the required articles or chapters—note that it may be necessary to read the texts more than once. You're also expected to bring the week's assigned readings to class for reference.

In addition to preparation, you'll be assessed on the regularity and persuasiveness of your comments, your contribution to a positive group dynamic (including respect for alternative points of view, turn-taking, active listening, and encouraging, referencing, and building on others' comments), as well as your ability to critically analyze and integrate the readings into the discussion.

Attendance is not *itself* a component of the participation mark. That said, if you don't come to class, your participation mark will suffer: you can't participate if you're not there. It's impossible to get a passing grade on this portion of your final mark by simply showing up to all classes without contributing.

Please see the course website for the rubric I'll use to assess students' class participation.

2) Research: 40%

Students will write a 12-15 page research paper applying one or more IR theories to a world politics topic of their choice. You should draw on a mixture of empirical material on your chosen topic and IR theory literature from our syllabus. Use theory to identify and analyze your issue's nature, causes, and probable outcomes, as well as the actors involved. To hone your critical thinking and writing skills, you'll both give and receive constructive feedback on the research project.

- a) Research Proposal: **HARDCOPY due 26 September, in class.** This is a 1-2 page document outlining your research question, provisional thesis, tentative supporting evidence, as well as the general types of theoretical and empirical literature you plan to use. The proposal isn't marked, but I won't grade your Revised Proposal and Annotated Bibliography until I've received and approved it.
- b) Revised Research Proposal and Annotated Bibliography: 10% **HARDCOPY due 24 October, in class.**
- c) Draft for Peer Review: there is no mark, but if you don't submit the draft, then you can't participate in the peer review. **Due Monday, 25 November, by 5:00 PM. Upload your draft to the appropriate dropbox on the course website. If you can't upload your draft paper, then you must bring it to class in HARDCOPY on 21 November. No late draft papers will be accepted.**
- d) Peer review of a student's paper. Not submitted or inadequate = -2% on final; adequate = neutral on final; superior = +2% on final. **Two HARDCOPIES due Thursday, 28 November, in class. No late peer reviews will be accepted.**
- e) Final Research Paper: 30% **Due Friday, 6 December, by 11:59 PM. Upload your paper to the appropriate dropbox on the course website.**

Please see the course website for full details of the research paper, as well as the rubrics I'll use to assess the proposal and research paper.

3) Concept Memo and Briefing: 10%

Each student will write a two-page memo explaining the concepts necessary for understanding that week's readings. The student will also prepare a 10-15-minute presentation based on the memo at the beginning of that week's class. (If you're presenting with another student, you'll present jointly but each submit separate memos.)

Dates will be assigned the first week of class. Your memo is due at 10 AM on your assigned presentation day. Upload your memo as a .doc or .docx attachment to the appropriate section of the discussion forum named "Concept Memos and Discussion." No late concept memos will be accepted. If you miss your presentation date without a valid excuse, you will be penalized 50% for this assignment, even if you upload your memo on time.

4) Take-home Assignment: 25%

I'll distribute the take-home assignment in class on Thursday, 28 November. It's due 5 PM Friday, 29 November. Please upload the assignment to the appropriate dropbox of the course website. If your work is late, it will be penalized by 5% per *hour* from the time it arrives in the dropbox. I'll grant extensions only in extenuating circumstances, which should be discussed with me in advance when possible.

Late Policy:

Because these course components are time-sensitive, I will *not* accept late concept memos, late drafts of your paper for peer review, and late peer reviews of your colleagues' research papers. Additionally, if you miss your concept memo briefing date, you cannot make it up.

When accepted, late assignments should be uploaded as a .doc or .docx attachment to the appropriate dropbox on the course website. Late assignments are subject to a 5% per day late penalty, *including* weekend days (5% *per hour* in the case of the take-home exam).

Extension Policy:

If you require an extension or other accommodation, you must contact me as soon as possible. I'll grant extensions *only* in extenuating circumstances, and *only* with proper documentation from Accessibility/Counseling Services, or with a Verification of Illness Form.

Extenuating circumstances include court appearances, medical emergencies, *exceptional* academic demands (e.g., three other take-home exams to write in the case of the take-home exam), and accommodations for students registered with AccessAbility Services.

Extenuating circumstances *don't* include extra-curricular activities, travel arrangements, heavy course workloads, computer/printer/internet problems, and unfamiliarity with upload procedure for our course website. I strongly advise you to backup your work regularly, and to ensure that you have access to an internet connection and/or a working printer in advance of all deadlines.

University Regulations:

Academic Integrity:

Academic Integrity: In order to maintain a culture of academic integrity, members of the University of Waterloo are expected to promote honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

Discipline: A student is expected to know what constitutes academic integrity, to avoid committing academic offences, and to take responsibility for his/her actions. A student who is unsure whether an action constitutes an offence, or who needs help in learning how to avoid offences (e.g., plagiarism, cheating) or about "rules" for group work/collaboration should seek guidance from the course professor, academic advisor, or the Undergraduate Associate Dean. When misconduct has been found to have occurred, disciplinary penalties will be imposed under Policy 71 – Student Discipline. For information on categories of offenses and types of penalties, students

should refer to Policy 71 - Student Discipline, [Student Discipline](http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-71)
<http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-71>.

Grievance: A student who believes that a decision affecting some aspect of his/her university life has been unfair or unreasonable may have grounds for initiating a grievance. Read Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances, Section 4, [Student Petitions](http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70) <http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-70>. In addition, consult [Student Grievances](http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/student-grievances-faculty-arts-processes) <http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/student-grievances-faculty-arts-processes> for the Faculty of Arts' grievance processes.

Appeals: A student may appeal the finding and/or penalty in a decision made under Policy 70 - Student Petitions and Grievances (other than regarding a petition) or Policy 71 - Student Discipline if a ground for an appeal can be established. Read Policy 72 - Student Appeals, [Student Appeals](http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-72) <http://uwaterloo.ca/secretariat/policies-procedures-guidelines/policy-72>.

Academic Integrity website (Arts): [Academic Integrity](http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html)
http://arts.uwaterloo.ca/arts/ugrad/academic_responsibility.html

Academic Integrity Office (uWaterloo): [Academic Integrity Office](http://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/)
<http://uwaterloo.ca/academic-integrity/>

Accommodation for Students with Disabilities:

Note for students with disabilities: The AccessAbility Services (AS) Office, located in Needles Hall, Room 1132, collaborates with all academic departments to arrange appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities without compromising the academic integrity of the curriculum. If you require academic accommodations to lessen the impact of your disability, please register with the AS Office at the beginning of each academic term.

Weekly Schedule:

12 September: Welcome and Course Overview

Students will sign up for concept memo/presentation days.

19 September: History, Historiography, and Practice of IR

Everyone reads:

Brian C. Schmidt. 2012. On the History and Historiography of International Relations. In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2d ed., 2-28. Edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons. London: Sage.

David A. Lake. 2011. Why 'Isms' Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress. *International Studies Quarterly* 55:465-480.

Stephen M. Walt. 2005. The Relationship between Theory and Policy in International Relations. *Annual Review of Political Science* 8:23-48.

Steve Smith. 2004. Signing Our World into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11. *International Studies Quarterly* 48:499-515.

I highly recommend that students skim the following:

Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael J. Tierney. 2011. International Relations in the US Academy. *International Studies Quarterly* 55:437-464.

26 September: Metatheoretical Debates

Everyone reads:

Milka Kurki and Colin Wight. 2013. International Relations and Social Science. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 14-35. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

Alexander Wendt. 1998. On Constitution and Causation in International Relations. *Review of International Studies* 4 (5):101-118.

Steven Bernstein, Richard Ned Lebow, Janice Gross Stein, and Steven Weber. 2000. God Gave Physics the Easy Problems: Adapting Social Science to an Unpredictable World. *European Journal of International Relations* 6 (1):43-76.

Read one of:

David Dessler. 1989. What's at Stake in the Agent-Structure Debate? In *International Organization: A Reader*, 328-341. Edited by Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield. New York: HarperCollins.

or

Alexander Wendt. 1987. The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory. *International Organization* 41 (3):335-370.

Recommended for a general overview of causation:

Peter Hedström. 2009. Dissecting the Social. In *Theories of Social Order: A Reader*, 2d ed. 13-16. Princeton, N.J.: Stanford University Press.

Thomas F. Homer-Dixon. 1998. Appendix: The Causal Role of Environmental Scarcity. In *Environment, Scarcity, and Violence*, 105-106. Princeton University Press.

Recommended for a more in-depth introduction to meta-theory:

Colin Wight. 2002. Philosophy of Social Science and International Relations. In *Handbook of International Relations*, 23-51. Edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons. London: Sage.

HARDCOPY of Research Proposal due in class.

3 October: Normative Theory

Everyone reads:

Toni Erskine. 2013. Normative International Relations Theory. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 36-58. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

Debra Satz. 2005. What Do We Owe The Global Poor? *Ethics & International Affairs* 19 (1):47-55.

Hedley Bull. 1966. The Grotian Concept of International Society. In *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*, 51-73. Edited by Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight. London: George Allen & Unwin.

David C. Hendrickson. 1997. In Defense of Realism: A Commentary on *Just and Unjust Wars*. *Ethics & International Affairs* 11:19-53.

10 October: Classical Realism and Classical Liberalism

Everyone reads:

Richard Ned Lebow. 2012. Classical Realism. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 59-76. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

David A. Welch. 2003. Why International Relations Theorists Should Stop Reading Thucydides. *Review of International Studies* 29:301-319.

Bruce Russett. 2013. Liberalism. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 94-113. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

Stanley Hoffmann. 1968. "The Uses and Limits of International Law." [Note: This brief essay is from *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. 1992. Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis, eds. New York: HarperCollins.]

G. John Ikenberry and Charles A. Kupchan. 2004. Liberal Realism: The Foundations of a Democratic Foreign Policy. *The National Interest* (Fall 2004):38-49.

17 October: The "Neo-Neo Debate"

Everyone reads:

Robert Jervis, "Offense, Defense and the Security Dilemma;" Stephen M. Walt, "Alliances: Balancing and Bandwagoning;" and Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Anarchic Structure of World Politics." [Note: These brief essays are from *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. 1992. Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis, eds. New York: HarperCollins.]

John J. Mearsheimer. 2013. Structural Realism. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 77-93. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

Robert O. Keohane. 1984. "A Functional Theory of Regimes." [In *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues*. 1992. Robert J. Art and Robert Jervis, eds. New York: HarperCollins.]

Robert Powell. 1994. Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate. *International Organization* 48 (2):313-344.

24 October: Rational Choice

Everyone reads:

Robert Axelrod. 1984. The Evolution of Cooperation. In *Theories of Social Order: A Reader*, 2d ed., 175-185. Edited by Michael Hechter and Christine Horne. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Social Sciences.

Martin Hollis and Steve Smith. 1990. Games Nations Play (I). In *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*, 118-142. Oxford University Press.

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

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

Recommended for a basic introduction to rational choice:

Michael Nicholson. 1992. Rationality and Conflict. In *Rationality and the Analysis of International Conflict*, 45-62. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

HARDCOPY of Revised Research Proposal and Annotated Bibliography due in class.

31 October: Psychology, Decisionmaking, and Collective Behavior

Everyone reads:

Janis G. Stein. 2012. Psychological Explanations of International Decisionmaking and Collective Behavior. In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2d ed., 195-219. Edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons. London: Sage.

Jack S. Levy. 2000. Loss Aversion, Framing Effects, and International Conflict: Perspectives from Prospect Theory. In *Handbook of War Studies II*, 193-221. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Jonathan Mercer. 2010. Emotional Belief. *International Organization* 64 (1):1-31.

James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin. 2000. Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity. *International Organization* 54 (4):845-877.

7 November: Constructivism

Everyone reads:

Emmanuel Adler. 1997. Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics. *European Journal of International Relations* 3 (3):319-363.

Alexander Wendt. 1992. Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics. In *International Organization: A Reader*, 77-94. Edited by Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield. New York: Harper Collins.

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization* 52:887-918.

Peter Howard. 2004. Why Not Invade North Korea? Threats, Language Games, and U.S. Foreign Policy. *International Studies Quarterly* 48:805-828.

14 November: Marxism and Critical Theory

Everyone reads:

Mark Rupert. 2013. Marxism. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 153-170. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

Robert W. Cox. 1981. Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. In *International Organization: A Reader*, 343-364. Edited by Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield. New York: Harper Collins.

Stephen Gill. 1995. Globalization, Market Civilization, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism. *Millennium* 24 (3):399-423.

Ray Kiely. 2006. United States Hegemony and Globalization : What Role for Theories of Imperialism? *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 19 (2):205-221.

21 November: Feminism, Gender Studies, and Postcolonialism

Everyone reads:

J. Ann Tickner and Laura Sjoberg. 2013. Feminism. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 205-222. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

J. Ann Tickner. 1997. You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists. *International Studies Quarterly* 41:611-632.

R. Charli Carpenter. 2002. Gender Theory in World Politics : Contributions of a Non-feminist Standpoint? *International Studies Review* 4 (3):153-165.

Siba N. Grovogui. 2013. Postcolonialism. In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, 247-265. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford University Press.

Julie Bindel. 2013. Meet the Middle-aged Women who are Britain's Female Sex Tourists. *New Statesman*. 29 August. Available at <<http://www.newstatesman.com/2013/08/rastitutes-and-milk-bottles>>. Accessed 9 September 2013.

HARDCOPY of Draft Research Paper Due (if you cannot upload it on 25 November)

28 November: Poststructuralism and Discursive Approaches

Everyone reads:

Lene Hansen. 2006. Discourse Analysis, Identity, and Foreign Policy. In *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*, 35-52. London: Routledge.

Yoshiko M. Herrera and Bear F. Braumoeller. 2004. Symposium: Discourse and Content Analysis. *Qualitative Methods* 2 (1):15-39. [Read **only** contributions by Hardy, Harley, and Phillips; Laffey and Weldes; Hopf; and Fierke.]

Jennifer Milliken. 1999. The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods. *European Journal of International Relations* 5:225-254.

Carol Cohn. 1986. Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals. *Signs* 12 (4):687-718.

TWO HARDCOPIES of peer review due in class.