PO8007: International Politics

Michaelmas Term 2017
Arts Building C6.002, Monday 10:00–12:00

Constantine Boussalis
Email: boussalc@tcd.ie
Office hours: Monday, 4-6 PM
Office: 4.07, 3 College Green
Department of Political Science
Trinity College Dublin

1 Description & Objectives

This graduate seminar offers an overview of major theories and analytical approaches in the field of international relations. Each week we will cover a particular theoretical lens or approach through which scholars have sought to make sense of the international environment. The readings in this module reflect research that aims to provide logically consistent and empirically supported explanations of outcomes in world politics. The overarching objective of the seminar is for students to become acquainted with scientific approaches to the study of international relations on a wide range of issue areas. My hope is for this module to also serve as a solid foundation for the development of dissertation research questions and design.

2 Module Requirements and Policies

2.1 Class Discussion (15%)

Student participation in class discussion and debate on the readings is a central element of the seminar. Students are expected to have read all required readings and to have acquired detailed knowledge and developed informed critiques of the readings prior to the class meeting. The objective of class discussion will be to critically assess the readings and offer insights on what direction new research could and should proceed in the field. Students will be evaluated on the quality of their input in class discussion and debate. Those who are deemed to be falling behind in class participation may be asked to submit additional response papers.

Some questions to keep in mind while reading: What are the central theories discussed in the study? Are the assumptions of the theory consistent or do they contradict each other? If the study seeks to test a theory with evidence, what are the findings? How would you rate the quality of the test, e.g. do the data adequately measure the theoretical concepts; is the design strong enough to adequately test the theory? Are there cases that the author has overlooked? How would you go about re-designing the test to overcome any limitations? Can the study be extended to cover other issue areas; if so, which ones?

2.2 Oral Presentation (5%)

Students will be required to give a 10 minute oral presentation of one response paper during the term. This means that if you are presenting in a given week, you must submit a response paper by the Sunday before the meeting. A sign-up sheet will be circulated during the first meeting. Presentations will be evaluated based on the quality of content and execution: organization, demonstrated subject knowledge, effective use of visual aids, engagement with audience, eye contact, and elocution. For some tips on effective execution of an oral presentation, see: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1857815/.

2.3 Response Papers (30%): 3 required + 2 extra

Students will be required to submit three (3) response papers over the duration of the term. Students also have the opportunity to submit up to two (2) extra response papers. The final grade will count the highest three submitted response papers.

Response papers are not mere descriptions or summaries of the readings, but rather offer critiques and/or provide connections with studies from other weeks' readings. Examples might include a critical evaluation of research design and suggestions for overcoming limitations, discussion on the assumptions of a theoretical approach, possible extensions of a theory, and/or critical evaluation of an empirical analysis. Response papers must engage with the required readings from the week, but may also include the suggested readings as well. Submitted response papers may be circulated in class to add to the discussion.

The required length of the response papers is between 600-800 words, double-spaced pages. The deadline for submission on turnitin.com is ***6 PM on the Sunday before class***. Late submissions will not be accepted. You may not submit more than one response paper per week. Submission of response papers must comply with the following schedule:

- One paper due between weeks 2-5
- One paper due between weeks 6-9
- One paper due between weeks 10-12

2.4 Policy Brief (20%)

Taking the role of policy analyst, your task is to prepare a concise and structured policy brief advising the head of a government agency (e.g. U.S. Department of State, Russian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, U.K. Department for International Development, etc.), an intergovernmental organization (e.g., UNICEF), or a transnational advocacy network (e.g., Greenpeace, Human Rights Watch, etc.) on why and how existing policy regarding a current world affairs issue should be changed and/or what new policy should be implemented. The objective of the policy brief is to encourage you to apply the theoretical frameworks and analytic approaches discussed in class to practical use. This brief should not be just a summary of the issue (assume that the reader watches the news), but rather a theoretically informed and evidence based analysis of current policy effectiveness and advice on new policy.

The length of the policy brief is between 1,000-1,500 words, double-spaced pages. The policy brief must also include an executive summary of up to 200 words (does not count to overall word count). Be sure that the brief makes a clear argument, that it is focused, and that it is supported by theory and existing research in the literature. The deadline for submission on turnitin.com is ***6 PM on Monday, November 13th.***

2.5 Research Proposal (30%)

Students will be required to submit a long paper at the end of the term. The objective of the paper is to lay out a research design for a larger empirical project which seeks to explain variation in any outcome related to world politics. The paper must formulate a clear research question, connect a theory or theories covered in class to the outcome to be studied, derive a set of hypotheses which will be tested empirically, discuss how the test will be conducted (as well as how concepts will be measured and how the relevant data will be collected), and offer an informed discussion on the expected results of the test. The ultimate goal of the paper is to provide a solid foundation for the development of your dissertation.

The length of the paper should be between between 2,750 and 3,250 words (including reference list, footnotes, and title page), double-spaced pages. The deadline for submission on turnitin.com is ***6 PM on Monday, December 18th.***

2.6 Written Work Submission Guidelines

All written assignments are to be submitted through http://www.turnitin.com. The class ID is **16367113** and the password is **po8007** (case-sensitive). Also, you will be required to register for turnitin.com by ***6pm on Friday 29 September 2017***.

2.6.1 Academic & Professional Ethics

Please do not plagiarize. Academic dishonesty is a serious matter, with serious consequences that can result in receiving no credit for an assignment, a failing grade for the module, and even expulsion from the programme. It is never permissible to turn in any work that contains others' ideas without proper acknowledgment. It is your responsibility to make sure that your work meets the standard of academic honesty set forth in the College Calendar (see http://tcd-ie.libguides.com/plagiarism/calendar). If you are paraphrasing, cite the source. If you are quoting, use quotation marks and appropriate citation. Remember that academic integrity is a reflection of one's character. In addition, we strongly recommend that you visit http://www.plagiarism.org/ for more information on what *is* and *is not* plagiarism. Lastly, students are required to only submit "new work" in each module, which means work that has not been submitted previously in any other university module. Students who wish to use previously submitted work as part of a new project will need the approval of the lecturer.

2.7 Syllabus Modification Rights

I reserve the right to reasonably alter the elements of the syllabus at any time. More often than not this will mean adjusting the reading list to keep pace with the course schedule, although I may add reading assignments as well.

3 Readings

All required readings and suggested readings will be available on the Blackboard site of the course. This class does not have a textbook. Readings consist of peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and articles from journals intended for wider audiences. Excellent introductions to the scientific study of international politics include the following:

- Bueno de Mesquita, B. (2013). *Principles of international politics.* CQ press.
- Frieden, J. A., Lake, D. A., & Schultz, K. A. (2013). *World politics: interests, interactions, institutions.* New York: WW Norton. 2nd Edition.

4 Course Outline

5 Course Schedule

Week 1. Introduction to the Field

Required:

1. Frieden, J. A., & Lake, D. A. (2005). "International relations as a social science: rigor and relevance." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 600(1), 136-156.
2. Nye Jr, J. S. (2008). "International Relations: The Relevance of Theory to Practice."
3. Walt, S. M. (1998). "International relations: one world, many theories." *Foreign policy*, 29-46. Also, Snyder, J. (2004). "One world, rival theories." *Foreign Policy*.
4. Singer, J.D. (1961) "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations" *World Politics*, 14(1): 77-92.
5. "A Medieval Sociology of International Relations", http://www.gotterdammerung.org/humor/medieval-ir.html

Week 2. The Realist School

Required:

1. Thucydides, "Melian Dialogue", *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Book 5, sections 84-116 (pp. 301-307).
2. Morgenthau, H. J. (1985). *Politics Among Nations*, Revised by Kenneth W. Thompson, pp. 4-16.
3. Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of international relations.* Reading, Mass.: Addison-Webley, cc. 5,6,& 8.
4. Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics.* WW Norton & Company. cc. 1-2.
5. Bueno de Mesquita, B. (2006). *Principles of international politics.* CQ press. pp. 564-585, skim "Bipolairty and Stability: A Second Look".

Suggested:

- Waltz, K. N. (2001). *Man, the state, and war: a theoretical analysis.* Columbia University Press. cc. 4,6,&8.
- Legro, J. W., & Moravcsik, A. (1999). Is anybody still a realist?. International Security, 24(2), 5-55.
- Ashley, R. K. (1984). "The poverty of neorealism." *International Organization*, 38(02), 225-286.
- Milner, H. (1991). "The assumption of anarchy in international relations theory: a critique." *Review of International Studies*, 17(1), 67-85.

Audiovisual:

- Kenneth Waltz in conversation with James Fearon (2011) [59:06]
- John Mearsheimer (2015) "The Causes and Consequences of the Ukraine Crisis" [1:14:15]

Week 3. Power Parity Perspective

Required:

1. Organski, A. F. K., & Kugler, J. (1980). *The War Ledger.* University of Chicago Press, pp. 13-63.
2. Lemke, D., & Werner, S. (1996). "Power parity, commitment to change, and war." *International Studies Quarterly*, 235-260.
3. Efird, B., Kugler, J., & Genna, G. (2003). "From war to integration: Generalizing power transition theory." *International Interactions*, 29(4), 293-313.
4. Bussmann, M., & Oneal, J. R. (2007). "Do hegemons distribute private goods? A test of power-transition theory." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51(1), 88-111.

Suggested:

- Lemke, D. (2002). *Regions of war and peace* (Vol. 80). Cambridge University Press. Chs. 3&5.
- De Soysa, I., Oneal, J. R., & Park, Y. H. (1997). "Testing power-transition theory using alternative measures of national capabilities." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 41(4), 509-528.
- DiCicco, J. M., & Levy, J. S. (1999). "Power Shifts and Problem Shifts The Evolution of the Power Transition Research Program." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 43(6), 675-704.

Audiovisual:

- Jacek Kugler (2014) "Ukraine, EuroAsia and Global Restructuring" [22:45]

Week 4. Rationalist Perspective

Required:

1. Lake, D. A. (2011). "Two cheers for bargaining theory: Assessing rationalist explanations of the Iraq War." *International Security*, 35(3), 7-52.
2. Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. "Applications of game theory in support of intelligence analysis." *Intelligence Analysis: Behavioral and Social Scientific Foundations*: 57-82.
3. Schelling, T. C. (1967). *Arms and Influence.* Yale University Press. cc. 1-2.
4. Freedman, L., & Karsh, E. (1991). "How Kuwait Was Won: Strategy in the Gulf War." *International Security*, 5-41.

Suggested:

- Lake, D. A., & Powell, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Strategic choice and international relations.* Princeton University Press. cc. 1-3.
- Fearon, J. D. (1994). "Domestic political audiences and the escalation of international disputes." *American Political Science Review*, 88(3), 577-592.
- Fearon, J. D. (1995). "Rationalist explanations for war." *International organization*, 49(03), 379-414.
- Bueno de Mesquita, B. (1988) "The Contribution of Expected Utility Theory to the Study of International Conflict." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18(8): 629-652.

Audiovisual:

- Robert McNamara on misunderstandings and the Vietnam War, excerpt from *The Fog of War* [2:40]
- Frontline (24 March 2008) "Bush's War" [2:25:32]
- Bruce Bueno De Mesquita (2009) "On Iran's Future" [20:08]

Week 5. International Institutions

Required:

1. Keohane, R. O. (1998). "International institutions: Can interdependence work?". *Foreign Policy*, 82-194.
2. Keohane, R. O. (2005). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy.* Princeton University Press. cc. 1, 4-6.
3. Goldstein, J. L., Rivers, D., & Tomz, M. (2007). "Institutions in International Relations: Understanding the Effects of the GATT and the WTO on World Trade." *International Organization*, 61(1), 37-67.
4. Milgrom, P. R., & North, D. C. (1990). "The role of institutions in the revival of trade: The law merchant, private judges, and the champagne fairs." *Economics & Politics*, 2(1), 1-23.
5. Downs, G. W., Rocke, D. M., & Barsoom, P. N. (1996). "Is the good news about compliance good news about cooperation?." *International Organization*, 50(03), 379-406.

Suggested:

- Martin, L. L., & Simmons, B. A. (1998). "Theories and empirical studies of international institutions." *International Organization*, 52(4), 729-757.
- Koremenos, B., Lipson, C., & Snidal, D. (2001). "The rational design of international institutions." *International organization*, 55(4), 761-799.
- Grieco, J. M. (1988)."Anarchy and the limits of cooperation: a realist critique of the newest liberal institutionalism." *International organization*, 42(3), 485-507.
- Phelan, W. (2012). "What Is *Sui Generis* About the European Union? Costly International Cooperation in a Self-Contained Regime." *International Studies Review*, 14(3), 367-385.
- Von Stein, J. (2005). "Do treaties constrain or screen? Selection bias and treaty compliance." *American Political Science Review*, 99(4), 611-622.

Audiovisual:

- Robert Keohane (2004) "Conversations with History" [57:00]

Week 6. Domestic Groups and State Behavior

Required:

1. Moravcsik, A. (1997). "Taking preferences seriously: A liberal theory of international politics." *International organization*, 51(4), 513-553.
2. Putnam, R. D. (1988). "Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games." *International organization*, 42(3), 427-460.
3. Kaufmann, C. D., & Pape, R. A. (1999). "Explaining costly international moral action: Britain's sixty-year campaign against the Atlantic slave trade." *International Organization*, 53(4), 631-668.
4. Allison, G. T. (1969). "Conceptual models and the Cuban missile crisis." *American political science review*, 63(3), 689-718.
5. Oakes, A. (2006). "Diversionary war and Argentina's invasion of the Falkland Islands." *Security Studies*, 15(3), 431-463.

Suggested:

- Frieden, J. A. (1991). Invested interests: the politics of national economic policies in a world of global finance. *International Organization*, 45(04), 425-451.
- Scheve, K. F., & Slaughter, M. J. (2001). What determines individual trade-policy preferences?. *Journal of International Economics*, 54(2), 267-292.
- Mansfield, E. D., & Mutz, D. C. (2009). Support for free trade: Self-interest, sociotropic politics, and out-group anxiety. *International Organization*, 63(03), 425-457.
- Hiscox, M. J. (2002). Commerce, coalitions, and factor mobility: Evidence from congressional votes on trade legislation. *American Political Science Review*, 96(03), 593-608.
- Krasner, S. D. (1972). "Are bureaucracies important? (or Allison Wonderland)." *Foreign Policy*, 159-179.
- Levy, J. S., & Vakili, L. I. (1992). "Diversionary action by authoritarian regimes: Argentina in the Falklands/Malvinas case." In *The internationalization of communal strife* (ed. Midlarsky, M. I.), New York: Routledge, pp. 118-46.
- Gartner, S. S., & Segura, G. M. (1998). "War, casualties, and public opinion." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 42(3), 278-300.

Audiovisual:

- Andrew Moravcsik "Liberal Theory" [9:48]
- Robert McNamara on the Cuban Missile Crisis, excerpts from *The Fog of War*, Part 1 [9:41]; Part 2 [1:34]

Week 8. Domestic Institutions and State Behavior

Required:

1. Rogowski, R. (1999). Institutions as constraints on strategic choice. *Strategic choice and international relations*, 115-136.
2. Milner, H. V., & Kubota, K. (2005). "Why the move to free trade? Democracy and trade policy in the developing countries." *International organization*, 59(1), 107-143.
3. Henisz, W. J., & Mansfield, E. D. (2006). "Votes and vetoes: the political determinants of commercial openness." *International Studies Quarterly*, 50(1), 189-212.
4. Ehrlich, S. D. (2007). "Access to protection: Domestic institutions and trade policy in democracies." *International Organization*, 61(3), 571-605.
5. De Mesquita, B. B., & Siverson, R. M. (1995). War and the survival of political leaders: A comparative study of regime types and political accountability. *American Political Science Review*, 89(04), 841-855.

Suggested:

- Person, T., & Tabellini, G. (2004). Constitutions and economic policy. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 75-98.
- Evans, C. L. (2009). A protectionist bias in majoritarian politics: An empirical investigation. *Economics & Politics*, 21(2), 278-307.
- Kennedy, P. M. (1981). "Strategy versus finance in twentieth-century Great Britain." *The International History Review*, 3(1), 44-61.
- Bernhard, W., & Leblang, D. (1999). "Democratic institutions and exchange-rate commitments." *International Organization*, 53(1), 71-97.
- Cuervo-Cazurra, A. (2006). "Who cares about corruption?" *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 807-822.
- MacIntyre, A. (2001). "Institutions and investors: The politics of the economic crisis in Southeast Asia." *International Organization*, 55(1), 81-122.
- De Soto, H. (2003). *Mystery of capital: why capitalism triumphs in the West and fails everywhere else.* Basic books.
- Broz, J. L. (2002). Political system transparency and monetary commitment regimes. *International Organization*, 56(04), 861-887.

Audiovisual:

- PBS (2002) *Commanding Heights: Episode 3, The New Rules of the Game* [1:56:55]

Week 9. Democratic Peace

Required:

1. Russett, B. (1994). *Grasping the democratic peace: Principles for a post-Cold War world.* Princeton University Press. cc. 1-2.
2. Doyle, M. W. (1986). "Liberalism and world politics." *American Political Science Review*, 80(4), 1151-1169.
3. Russett, B. M., & Oneal, J. R. (1999). "The Kantian peace: the pacific benefits of democracy, interdependence, and international organizations, 1885-1992." *World Politics*, 52(1), 1-37.
4. Farber, H. S., & Gowa, J. (1997). "Common interests or common polities? Reinterpreting the democratic peace." *The Journal of Politics*, 59(2), 393-417.
5. Rosato, S. (2003). "The flawed logic of democratic peace theory." *American Political Science Review*, 97(4), 585-602.

Suggested:

- Rummel, R. J. (1983). "Libertarianism and international violence." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 27(1), 27-71.
- Bueno de Mesquita, B., Morrow, J. D., Siverson, R. M., & Smith, A. (1999). "An institutional explanation of the democratic peace." *American Political Science Review*, 791-807.
- Hegre, H., Ellingsen, T., Gates, S., & Gleditsch, N. S. (2001). "Toward a democratic civil peace? Democracy, political change, and civil war, 1816-1992." *American Political Science Review*, 33-48.
- Lemke, D., & Reed, W. (1996). "Regime types and status quo evaluations: Power transition theory and the democratic peace." *International Interactions*, 22(2), 143-164.
- Schultz, K. A. (1999). Do democratic institutions constrain or inform? Contrasting two institutional perspectives on democracy and war. *International Organization*, 53(2), 233-266.

Audiovisual:

- US Presidents and Democratic Peace Theory [2:20]

Week 10. Ideas, Culture, and Identity

Required:

1. Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (2001). "Taking stock: the constructivist research program in international relations and comparative politics." *Annual review of political science*, 4(1), Read 391-404, review rest.
2. Finnemore, M. (1996). *National interests in international society.* Cambridge Univeristy Press. pp. 1-33.
3. Haas, M. L. (2005). *The ideological origins of great power politics, 1789-1989.* Cornell University Press. pp. 1-39.
4. Huntington, S. P. (1993). "The clash of civilizations?." *Foreign affairs*, 22-49.
5. Henderson, E. A., & Tucker, R. (2001). "Clear and present strangers: the clash of civilizations and international conflict." *International Studies Quarterly*, 45(2), 317-338.

Suggested:

- Wendt, A. (1992). "Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics." *International organization*, 46(02), 391-425.
- Wendt, A. (1999). *Social theory of international politics.* Cambridge University Press. cc. 3&6.
- Ruggie, J. G. (1998). "What makes the world hang together? Neo-utilitarianism and the social constructivist challenge." *International organization*, 52(4), 855-885.

Audiovisual:

- Kathryn Sikkink on 'The role of agency in constructivism'
- Samuel Huntington on the 'Clash of Civilizations' [22:05]

Week 11. The Environment and International Politics

Required:

1. Clapp, J., & Helleiner, E. (2012). International political economy and the environment: back to the basics? *International Affairs*, 88(3), 485-501.

2. Keohane, R. O., & Victor, D. G. (2011). "The regime complex for climate change." *Perspectives on politics*, 9(1), 7-23.

3. Hovi, J., Sprinz, D. F., & Underdal, A. (2009). "Implementing long-term climate policy: Time inconsistency, domestic politics, international anarchy." *Global Environmental Politics*, 9(3), 20-39.

4. Koubi, V., Spilker, G., Böhmelt, T., & Bernauer, T. (2014). Do natural resources matter for interstate and intrastate armed conflict? *Journal of Peace Research*, 51(2), 227-243.

5. Victor, D. G., Morgan, M. G., Apt, J., Steinbruner, J., & Ricke, K. (2009). "The geoengineering option: a last resort against global warming?." *Foreign Affairs*, 64-76.

Suggested:

- Steffen, W., Grinevald, J., Crutzen, P., & McNeill, J. (2011). "The Anthropocene: conceptual and historical perspectives." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 369(1938), 842-867.

- Newell, P. (2008). The political economy of global environmental governance. *Review of International Studies*, 34(3), 507-529.

- Victor, D. G. (2011). *Global warming gridlock: creating more effective strategies for protecting the planet.* Cambridge University Press. cc. 2-4.

- Bernauer, T. (1995). "The effect of international environmental institutions: how we might learn more." *International Organization*, 49(2), 351-377.

- Helm, C., & Sprinz, D. (2000). "Measuring the effectiveness of international environmental regimes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 44(5), 630-652.

- McCright, A. M., & Dunlap, R. E. (2003). "Defeating Kyoto: The conservative movement's impact on US climate change policy." *Social Problems*, 50(3), 348-373.

Audiovisual:

- David Victor (2014) "Getting serious about international cooperation on climate change: What have we learned?" [1:03:30]

- David Keith (2012) "Hard Talk with David Keith" [24:30]

Week 12. International Norms and Transnational Networks

Required:

1. Keck, M. E., & Sikkink, K. (1998). *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics* (Vol. 35). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. cc. 1-3.
2. Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). "International norm dynamics and political change." *International organization*, 52(04), 887-917.
3. Tannenwald, N. (1999). "The nuclear taboo: The United States and the normative basis of nuclear non-use." *International Organization*, 53(03), 433-468.
4. Moravcsik, A. (2000). "The origins of human rights regimes: Democratic delegation in postwar Europe." *International Organization*, 54(02), 217-252.
5. Neumayer, E. (2005). "Do international human rights treaties improve respect for human rights?." *Journal of conflict resolution*, 49(6), 925-953.

Suggested:

- Hathaway, O. A. (2002). "Do human rights treaties make a difference?." *Yale Law Journal*, 1935-2042.
- Hathaway, O. A. (2007). "Why do countries commit to human rights treaties?." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51(4), 588-621.
- Hafner-Burton, E. M. (2005). "Trading human rights: How preferential trade agreements influence government repression." *International Organization*, 59(3), 593-629.

Audiovisual:

- Isao Hashimoto "1945-1998" [14:24]
- George Perkovich (2014) "Taboo or Not Taboo: That is not the question"
- Oona Hathaway on US intervention in Syria [10:02]