INTL 6200: Preseminar in International Relations
University of Georgia, Department of International Affairs

Course Instructor Information:
Dr. Andrew Owsiak
Email: aowsiak@uga.edu
Office: 325 Candler Hall
Office Hours: 9:30-10:30am & 3:30-4:30pm Tuesday
(or by appointment)

Course Meeting Information:
Spring 2018
Tuesdays, 12:30-3:15pm
117 Candler Hall
https://www.elc.uga.edu

Course Description
This seminar provides an introduction to the study of international relations – most notably, by surveying the broad theories and debates that serve as a foundation for other international relations graduate courses. We begin with a discussion of the importance of theory and how to appraise it. How, for example, do we know when a theory supplies useful or meaningful insights? By what criteria do we make that judgment? Then, we visit each of the grand theoretical perspectives within the field – to understand and critique their arguments, as well as to extend their logic to related areas of research (for example, the subfields of international conflict, international cooperation, or international political economy). For many decades, scholars attempted to create a grand theory from these theoretical perspectives – that is, a parsimonious explanation for much of international relations – and some scholars still do. Reviewing these grand theories gives us insight into the large concepts they lend mid-range theories and an understanding of their use as shorthand within the scholarly and policy-making communities. Finally, most scholars have increasingly eschewed the creation of grand theories in favor of mid-range – or more narrow, conditional – theories. We touch briefly upon a number of these mid-range theoretical topics throughout the semester, including the interplay between domestic and international politics, how and why states build international institutions, and the role issues play in international conflict behavior. These latter topics sit closer to the seminar topics that you will experience in future semesters.

Course Caveats
I believe in truth in advertising, so it is important for you to know what this course is and what it is not. First, the seminar's main purpose is to introduce students to the field of international relations – to understand the lay of the disciplinary landscape, how to consume scholarly literature, and how to think like a political scientist. Our seminar will therefore by be primarily *theoretical*, asking students to distill, explain, diagram, and critique theories of international relations. Second, as a survey course, we will not cover any particular subtopic in great depth. Other courses in the curriculum will accomplish that. The idea is to expose students to the full field – so that they are knowledgeable experts. Third, although many of us are interested in current politics, this is not a course on current events. We *will* use contemporary examples in our discussions, but when we do, we will focus these discussions on scholarly research and debates, as well as the theoretical arguments implied by scholars and policy-makers. Finally, this is not a policy course – in the sense that we will not be learning how to write policy in response to a given goal or challenge. Despite this caveat, we *will* confront and challenge the policy implications of the work we study.

Learning Objectives
At the conclusion of this course, students should be able to:

- Identify and explain the various grand and mid-range theories that define the field of international relations, including how they relate to one another;

- Discuss the development of the field of international relations;
- Synthesize a given body of international relations research;
- Critically evaluate theoretical and empirical arguments made in the scholarly literature;
- Construct a theoretical argument about some facet of international relations and present it in both oral, diagrammatic, and written form;
- Identify potential avenues of future research, and;
- Access numerous, specific tips about how to improve one's academic writing.

Course Reading Material:
We will read large sections of the following books, which I therefore recommend for purchase:

- Branch, Jordan. 2014. *The Cartographic State.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Graff, Gerald, and Cathy Birkenstein. 2014. *They Say, I Say*. New York: WW Norton.
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2011. *Liberal Leviathan.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Keohane, Robert O., ed. 1986. *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Morrow, James D. 2014. *Order within Anarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vasquez, John A., and Colin Elman, eds. 2003. *Realism and the Balancing of Power: A New Debate*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Any assigned readings beyond the required textbooks listed above will be made available electronically from the instructor – via the eLearning Commons (eLC) website (log-in using UGA MyID at: https://uga.view.usg.edu/). If the library owns a copy of the required books listed above, they have also been placed on reserve at the library for the semester.

Course Requirements
Participation (20% of final grade):
As with any graduate course, attendance and participation are critical and required. My goal is to have you directly engage the course material, rather than passively hear about it. Therefore, I will conduct each class meeting as an open-ended discussion of the material assigned for that day, rather than a traditional lecture. Students should prepare for class by reading the assigned material before we meet, preparing any assignments listed for the week, and being ready to contribute actively to the discussion in class. I will grade participation based on the following factors: (a) attendance, (b) frequency with which a student participates in discussion (i.e., quantity), (c) extent to which student comments contribute positively to the discussion (i.e., quality), (d) the extent to which a student identifies key points and raises appropriate questions, and (e) the extent to which comments demonstrate that the student has thought about and processed the readings. Appropriate questions include those that critique, extend, or request clarification of readings, as well as those that connect various readings to one another.

Models (15% for each paper; 45% total): Throughout the semester, students will write three (3) short papers (approximately 5-7 pages each) that summarize and evaluate at least three (3) related readings listed in the syllabus (note: related readings appear within the same week on the syllabus schedule below). When writing these critical essays, students should: a) not spend more than 1.0-1.5 pages in pure summary, b) compare and contrast the readings along a key dimension, and c) evaluate the readings. What are the strengths and weaknesses? Do authors leave certain questions unanswered? Do arguments contain flaws in logic, and if so, can those flaws be corrected?

Ultimately, I am looking for you to make a clear, developed critique. Your paper will therefore need to contain a clear, strong thesis, be well-written, and be highly critical of our authors' work. It also needs to explain your position thoroughly and throughout the paper. As an illustration, one could argue that Waltz's balance of power thesis is theoretically flawed. An excellent critique would identify this weakness; then *argue*,

explain, and *illustrate* the way(s) in which it is theoretically flawed, and; finally, incorporate other research/readings along the way. Simply stating the initial, critical sentence without further elaboration would result in a significantly weaker paper.

A few guidelines:

- Be concise and clear in your writing. Edit to help me understand your argument/position.
- The critique should not merely reiterate the positions other authors take. I am instead looking for *your* unique insight. You might consider things such as: a) an argument's logic, b) an argument's usefulness (i.e., theory appraisal), c) further implications of an argument (i.e., what has not yet been tested, but is consistent with the argument's logic and could help resolve debate), d) argument adjustments in light of criticisms raised (i.e., tests that shed light on the value of criticisms and whether the argument holds up to them), and e) the merits of an argument relative to other arguments (i.e., a way to distinguish the argument's predictions from others—e.g., testing alternative hypotheses).
- Students may not work together on these assignments and will sign up for topics at the outset of the course. Each student's individual papers will be evenly spaced throughout the semester.
- Papers are due on or before the start of the class period in which we cover the paper's topic.
- Students will present their critique(s) to the class as part of our class discussion. This will be part of your assignment grade.
- Non-presenting students will still be expected to participate actively in class discussion.

Writing Resources Online Quizzes (10%):
During the semester (see syllabus schedule), students will read the following two resources, complete an online quiz about the resource's content, and attend a writing professionalization workshop. Students may take the online quiz three times, and the highest score earned will be the grade for this component of the course.

- Graff, Gerald, and Cathy Birkenstein. (2017) They Say, I Say: The Moves that Matter in Academic Writing 3rd edn. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Strunk, William, and E.B. White. 2000. The Elements of Style. New York: Longman.

I cannot overstate the importance of writing skills. Whether you will work in academia or the public or private sphere, writing is an essential skill. We all need practice and help to improve our writing—myself included. The assignments for this course supply one form of practice, and my feedback on them should offer you advice on how to improve. Beyond this advice, I carefully selected the resources covered by the online quiz as ones I think will be of high value to you for writing generally, as well as for academic papers in particular (e.g., capstones, theses, and dissertations). The following additional resources have also helped my colleagues, my students, or me to improve their/my writing. These resources are not required for the course.

- Zinsser, William. 2006. On Writing Well. New York: HarperCollins.
- Becker, Howard S. 1986. Writing for Social Scientists. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamott, Anne. 1995. Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life. New York: Anchor.

Final Exam (25% of final grade):
The course will conclude with an exam consisting of 1-2 questions, amounting to about 8-10 pages of writing, and drawing upon material covered throughout the entire semester. I will distribute this exam in class on Tuesday, April 24, 2018. Students will turn in a hard-copy of the exam to the instructor by 5:00pm on Tuesday, May 1, 2018—to 325 Candler Hall.

Collaborative Research:

I will discuss and foster opportunities for collaborative research projects—both with your peers and with me—which can be moved ultimately toward a conference paper and/or published product. Although these projects are not part of the course requirements, I strongly encourage you to participate in and take advantage of them. Whatever your final career goal, graduate education transitions students from being consumers to producers of knowledge, and research is how you do the latter. Employers in academia, the policy community, inter-/non-governmental organizations, and private business expect those with graduate degrees to be able to research and write well.

Special Events:
Throughout the semester, the department, school, and university will have special lectures and presentations. These events constitute a key facet of graduate education, and I therefore encourage students to attend if they can. I will inform students about such events as I learn of them, and additional advertisements generally travel via the SPIA graduate student listserv.

Course Policies
We will abide by two general policies throughout this course. First, as a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to follow the University's academic honesty policy ("A Culture of Honesty'") and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards contained in "A Culture of Honesty" (including policies that cover plagiarism; for more information, see: http://www.uga.edu/honesty). Students are responsible for informing themselves about these standards before performing any academic work and should direct any specific questions they have regarding the policy (or its application to course assignments) to the instructor or the Academic Honesty office.

Second, it should go without saying that we will treat everyone in the class—and their comments—with respect. It is normal to disagree in an academic setting. In fact, many of the scholars that we will read regularly disagree with one another. This disagreement, however, must occur respectfully. Towards the goal of creating a respectful classroom environment, students are expected to: (a) use language that does not insult others or their point of view, (b) keep cell phones turned off and put away during class meetings, and (c) use laptops brought to the classroom for educational purposes only (though note that my preference is to omit them altogether). Any student that does not follow these guidelines may be asked to leave the classroom.

Course Schedule
The following pages contain a general plan for the course—although deviations may be necessary and will be announced in class by the instructor if they occur. Please note that the goal of this class is to familiarize students with theoretical and empirical developments in the field of international relations; the inclusion (or omission) of readings in the course syllabus therefore does not constitute an endorsement (or rejection) of those readings' positions and arguments.

Week One: What Is Theory? How Do We Appraise It? (January 9)

- Mears, Ashley. 2017. Puzzling in Sociology: On Doing and Undoing Theoretical Puzzles. *Sociological Theory* 35(2):138-146.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. "Laws and Theories." In Keohane 1986.
- Healy, Kieran. 2017. Fuck Nuance. *Sociological Theory* 35(2):118-127.
- Mahoney, James. 2012. The Logic of Process Tracing Tests in the Social Sciences. *Sociological Methods and Research* 41(4):570-597.
- Mahoney, James, and Rachel S. Vanderpoel. 2015. Set Diagrams and Qualitative Research. *Comparative Political Studies* 48(1):65-100.

- Vasquez, John A. 1995. The Post-Positivist Debate: Reconstructing Scientific Enquiry and International Relations Theory After Enlightenment's Fall. In *International Relations Theory Today*, edited by Ken Booth, and Steve Smith, 217-40. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Bynam, Daniel, and Matthew Kroenig. 2016. Reaching Beyond the Ivory Tower. *International Security* 25(2):289-319.

Additional reading:

- Bull, Hedley. 1966. International Theory: The Case for the Classical Approach. *World Politics* 18 (3):361-77.
- Hesli, Vicki L., Jae Mook Lee, and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell. (2012) Predicting Rank Attainment in Political Science: What Else Besides Publications Affects Promotion. *PS*: *Political Science & Politics* 45(3):475-492.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1996. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakatos, Imre. 1970. Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes. In *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, edited by Imre Lakatos, and Alan Musgrave, 91-196. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lapid, Yosef. 1989. The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era. *International Studies Quarterly* 33 (3):235-54.
- Maliniak, Daniel, Susan Peterson, Ryan Powers, and Michael J. Tierney. 2014. TRIP 2014 Faculty Survey. Williamsburg, VA: Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations. Available at https://trip.wm.edu/charts/.
- Singer, J. David. 1969. The Incompleat Theorist. In *Contending Approaches to International Politics*, edited by Klaus Knorr, and James N. Rosenau, 62-86. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Singer, J. David. 1969. The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations. In *The International System: Theoretical Essays*, edited by Klaus Knorr, and Sidney Verba, 77-92. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Vasquez, John. 2003. Kuhn versus Lakatos? The Case for Multiple Frames in Appraising International Relations Theory. In *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*, edited by Colin Elman, and Miriam Fendius Elman, 419-54. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Week Two: Realist Theories of International Relations (January 16)

- Thucydides. 1972. The Melian Dialogue. In *History of the Peloponnesian War*, by Thucydides. New York: Penguin, pp. 400-408.
- Carr, E.H. (1981) *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. New York: Palgrave, Chapters 8-9.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. 1993. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill, Chapter 1.
- Waltz, "Reductionist and Systemic Theories" & "Political Structures." In Keohane 1986.
- Snyder, Glenn H. 2002. Mearsheimer's World—Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security. *International Security* 27(1):149-173.
- Rose, Gideon. 1998. Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy. *World Politics* 51(1):144-172.

Additional Reading:

- Carr, E.H. 1981. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. New York: Palgrave.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Week Three: Foreign Policy (January 23)

- Allison, Graham T., and Morton H. Halperin. 1972. Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications. *World Politics* 24:40-79.
- Rosenau, James N. 1966. Pre-Theories and Theories of Foreign Policy. In *Approaches to Comparative and International Politics*, edited by R. Barry Farrell, 27-93. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Abbreviated version on reserve.)
- Christensen, Thomas J., and Jack Snyder. 1990. Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity. *International Organization* 44 (2):137-68.
- Schroeder, Paul. 1994. Historical Reality vs. Neo-Realist Theory. *International Security* 19 (1):108-48.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 1966. *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale University Press, Chapters 1, 2, & 4.

Additional Reading:

- Mueller, John. 1988. The Essential Irrelevance of Nuclear Weapons: Stability in the Postwar World. *International Security* 13 (2):55-79.
- Rosenau, James N. 1971. The Premises and Promises of Decision-Making Analysis. In *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*, edited by James N. Rosenau, 189-211. New York: Free Press
- Schweller, Randall L. 1994. Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In. *International Security* 19 (1):72-107.
- Snyder, Richard C., H.W. Bruck, and Burton Sapin. 1962. *Foreign Policy Decision-Making: An Approach*. New York: The Free Press.
- Walt, Stephen M. 1987. *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Walt, Stephen M. 1999. Rigor or Rigor Mortis?: Rational Choice and Security Studies. *International Security* 23 (4):5-48.

Week Four: Critiques and Defenses of the (Neo)Realist Agenda (January 30)

- Ruggie, John G. "Community and Transformation in the World Polity." In Keohane 1986.
- Koehane, Robert O. "Theory of World Politics." In Keohane 1986.
- Cox, Robert W. "Social Forces, States and World Orders." In Keohane 1986.
- Ashley, Richard K. "The Poverty of Neorealism." In Keohane 1986.
- Gilpin, Robert G. "The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism." In Keohane 1986.
- Wagner, R. Harrison. 2007. *War and the State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapter 1.

Additional Reading:

- Brooks, Stephen G. 1997. Dueling Realisms. *International Organization* 51 (3):445-77.
- Legro, Jeffrey W., and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. Is Anybody Still a Realist? *International Security* 24 (2):5-55.
- Vasquez, John A. 2002. *The Power of Power Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. "Reflections on *Theory of International Politics*." In Keohane 1986.

Week Five: Appraising the Balance of Power Thesis (February 6)

- Vasquez, John A. & Colin Elman. *Realism and the Balancing of Power*, Chapters 2-9 & 11-12.
- Haas, Ernst B. 1953. The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept, or Propaganda. *World Politics* 5 (4):442-77.
- Brooks, Stephen G., and William C. Wohlforth. 2005. Hard Times for Soft Balancing. *International Security* 30 (1):72-108.

Week Six: The Anarchy Problematique (February 13)

- Bull, Hedley. 1977. *The Anarchical Society*. New York: Columbia University Press, Chapters 1-3.
- Milner, Helen. 1991. The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique. *Review of International Studies* 17:67-85.
- Jervis, Robert. 1978. Cooperation under the Security Dilemma. *World Politics* 30(2):167-214.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 6.

Additional Reading:

- Alker, Hayward R. 1996. *Rediscoveries and Reformulations: Humanistic methodologies for International Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 11.
- Buzan, Barry, Charles Jones, and Richard Little. 1993. *The Logic of Anarchy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. "Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power." In Keohane 1986.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1992. Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization* 46(2):391-425.

Week Seven: Hierarchical Orders (February 20)

- Lake, David A. 1996. Anarchy, Hierarchy, and the Variety of International Relations. *International Organization* 50(1):1-33.
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2011. *Liberal Leviathan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Additional Reading:

- Ikenberry, G. John. 2000. *After Victory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Lake, David A. 2011. *Hierarchy in International Relations*. Cornell: Cornell University Press.

Week Eight: Cooperation, Not Conflict (February 27)

- Axelrod, Robert. 1981. The Emergence of Cooperation among Egoists. *The American Political Science Review* 75(2):306-18.
- Keohane, Robert O. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, Chapters 1 & 4-6.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics. *International Organization* 51(4):513-53.
- Powell, Robert. 1991. Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory. *The American Political Science Review* 85(4):1303-20.

Additional Reading:

- Axelrod, Robert. 1984. *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Axelrod, Robert, and Robert O. Keohane. 1985. Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions. *World Politics* 38(1):226-65.
- Powell, Robert. 1994. Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate. *International Organization* 48(2):313-44.

Week Nine: Constructing World Politics (March 6)

- Wendt, Alexander. 1995. Constructing International Politics. *International Security* 20(1):71-81.
- Ruggie, John Gerard. 1998. What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge. *International Organization* 52(4):855-85.

- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization* 52(4):887-917.
- Barnett, Michael N., and Martha Finnemore. 2004. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, Chapters 1-2.
- Finnemore, Martha. 2009. Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity. *World Politics* 61(1):58-85.
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. 1996. International Law in a World of Liberal States. *European Journal of International Law* 6(3):503-538.

Additional Reading:

- Symposium on Wendt's *Social Theory of International Politics*. 2000. *International Security*. 26(1).
- Finnemore, Martha. 2003. *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Katzenstein, Peter J. , ed. 1996. *The Culture of National Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week Ten: Institutions (March 20)

- Morrow, James D. 2014. *Order within Anarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Abbott, Kenneth W., and Duncan Snidal. 1998. Why States Act through Formal International Organizations. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42 (1):3-32.

Additional Reading:

- Downs, George W., David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom. 1996. Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation? *International Organization* 50 (3):379-406.
- Duffield, John S. 2003. The Limits of 'Rational Design'. *International Organization* 57 (2):411-30.
- Grieco, Joseph M. 1988. Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism. *International Organization* 42 (3):485-507.
- Hawkins, Darren G. , David A. Lake, Daniel L. Nielson, and Michael J. Tierney, eds. 2006. *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2001. *After Victory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. The Rational Design of International Institutions. *International Organization* 55 (4):761-99.
- Lipson, Charles. 1984. International Cooperation in Economic and Security Affairs. *World Politics* 37 (1):1-23.
- Martin, Lisa L., and Beth A. Simmons. 1998. Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions. *International Organization* 52 (4):729-57.
- Mearsheimer, John J. 1994/1995. The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security* 19 (3):5-49.
- Snidal, Duncan. 1991. Relative Gains and the Pattern of International Cooperation. *The American Political Science Review* 85 (3):701-26.
- Stein, Arthur A. 1982. Coordination and Collaboration: Regimes in an Anarchic World. *International Organization* 36 (2):299-324.

Week Eleven: Democratic Peace (March 27)

- Maoz, Zeev, and Bruce Russett. 1993. Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986. *The American Political Science Review* 87(3):624-38.

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace. *The American Political Science Review* 93(4):791-807.
- Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory. *The American Political Science Review* 97(4):585-602.
- Peceny, Mark, Caroline C. Beer, and Shannon Sanchez-Terry. 2002. Dictatorial Peace? *American Political Science Review* 96(1):15-26.
- McDonald, Patrick J. 2015. Great Powers, Hierarchy, and Endogenous Regimes: Rethinking the Domestic Causes of Peace. *International Organization* 69(3):557-588.
- Gibler, Douglas M. 2007. Bordering on Peace: Democracy, Territorial Issues, and Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 51(3):509-532.
- Owsiak, Andrew P. 2017. Foundations for Integrating the Democratic and Territorial Peace Arguments. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, forthcoming.

Additional Reading:

- Doyle, Michael W. 1986. Liberalism and World Politics. *American Political Science Review* 80(4):1151-69.
- Gibler, Douglas M. 2012. *The Territorial Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel. 1957. *Perpetual Peace*. New York: Liberal Arts Press.
- Mansfield, Edward D., and Jack Snyder. 1995. Democratization and War. *Foreign Affairs* 74(3):79-97.
- Ray, James Lee. 2003 A Lakatosian View of the Democratic Peace Research Program. In *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*, edited by Colin Elman, and Miriam Fendius Elman. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Russett, Bruce, and John Oneal. 2001. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Week Twelve: International Political Economy (April 3)

- Ravenhill, John. 2008. International Political Economy. In *The Oxford Handbook of International Political Economy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Milner, Helen V. and Keiko Kubota. 2005. Why the Move to Free Trade? Democracy and Trade Policy in the Developing Countries. *International Organization* 59(1):157-193.
- Peters, Margaret. 2015. Open Trade, Closed Borders: Immigration Policy in the Era of Globalization. *World Politics* 67(1):114-154.
- Lake, David A. 1993. Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy: Naked Emperor or Tattered Monarch with Potential? *International Studies Quarterly* 37(4):459-489.
- Skalnes, Lars S. 1998. Grand Strategy and Foreign Economic Policy. *World Politics* 50(4):582-616.
- Simmons, Beth A., and Zachary Elkins. 2004. The Globalization of Liberalization: Policy Diffusion in the International Political Economy. *American Political Science Review* 98(1):171-189.

Additional Reading:

- Barbieri, Katherine. 1996. Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict? *Journal of Peace Research* 33(1):29-49.
- Cohen, Benjamin J. 2009. A Grave Case of Myopia. *International Interactions* 35(4):436-44.
- Frieden, Jeffry A., and Lisa L. Martin. 2003. International Political Economy: Global and Domestic Interactions. In *Political Science: The State of the Discipline*, edited by Ira Katznelson, and Helen V. Milner. New York: W.W. Norton, pp. 118-146.
- Gartzke, Erik. 2007. The Capitalist Peace. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1):166-91.
- Helleiner, Eric. 2011. Understanding the 2007-2008 Global Financial Crisis: Lessons for Scholars of International Political Economy. *Annual Review of Political Science* 14:67-87.

- Mansfield, Edward D., Helen V. Milner, and B. Peter Rosendorff. 2000. Free to Trade: Democracies, Autocracies, and International Trade. *The American Political Science Review* 94 (2):305-21.
- Milner, Helen V. 1999. The Political Economy of International Trade. *Annual Reviews of Political Science* 2:91-114.
- Mosley, Layna, and David A. Singer. 2015. Migration, Labor and the International Political Economy. *Annual Review of Political Science* 18:283-301.
- Rogowski, Ronald. 1989. *Commerce and Coalitions*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Simmons, Beth A. 1994. *Who Adjusts? Domestic Sources of Foreign Economic Policy During the Interwar Years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Week Thirteen: Psychological Approaches (April 10)

- Levy, Jack S. 1992. Prospect Theory and International Relations: Theoretical Applications and Analytical Problems. *Political Psychology* 13(2):283-310.
- Berejikian, Jeffrey D. 2002. A Cognitive Theory of Deterrence. *Journal of Peace Research* 39(2):165-83.
- Jervis, Robert. 1968. Hypotheses on Misperception. *World Politics* 20(3):454-79.
- Simon, Herbert A. 1985. Human Nature in Politics: The Dialogue of Psychology with Political Science. *American Political Science Review* 79(2):293-304.
- Levy, Jack S. 1994. Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield. *International Organization* 48(2):279-312.
- Leng, Russell J. 1983. When Will They Ever Learn? Coercive Bargaining in Recurrent Crises. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 27(3):379-419.

Additional Reading:

- Huddy, Leonie, David O. Sears, and Jack S. Levy. 2013. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, 2nd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jervis, Robert. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Week Fourteen: Domestic Politics (April 17)

- Putnam, Robert D. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games. *International Organization* 42(3):427-60.
- Fearon, James D. 1994. Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes. *The American Political Science Review* 88(3):577-92.
- Weeks, Jessica L. 2008. Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve. *International Organization* 62(1):35-64.
- Schultz, Kenneth A. 1998. Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises. *The American Political Science Review* 92(4):829-44.
- Brewster, Rachel. 2004. The Domestic Origins of International Agreements. *Virginia Journal of International Law* 44(2):501-44.
- Chiozza, Giacomo, and H.E. Goemans. 2004. International Conflict and the Tenure of Leaders: Is War Still *Ex Post* Inefficient? *American Journal of Political Science* 48(3):604-619.

Additional Reading:

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Randolph M. Siverson, and Gary Woller. 1992. War and the Fate of Regimes: A Comparative Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 86(3):638-46.
- Dai, Xinyuan. 2007. *International Institutions and Domestic Policies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Finnemore, Martha. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Gates, Scott, and Brian D. Humes. 1997. *Games, Information, and Politics*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapter 2.
- Gourevitch, Peter. 1978. The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics. *International Organization* 32(4):881-912.
- Knopf, Jeffrey W. 1998. *Domestic Society and International Cooperation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Milner, Helen V. 1997. *Interests, Institutions, and Information*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Powell, Robert. 2006. War as a Commitment Problem. *International Organization* 60(1):169-203.

Week Fifteen: Conclusion (April 24)

- Branch, Jordan. *The Cartographic State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lake, David A. 2011. Why "isms" Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress. *International Studies Quarterly* 55 (2):465-80.

Additional Reading:

- Elman, Colin, and Miriam Fendius Elman. 2002. How Not to be Lakatos Intolerant: Appraising Progress in IR Research. *International Studies Quarterly* 46(2):231-62.
- Frieden, Jeffry A. 1999. Actors and Preferences in International Relations. In *Strategic Choice and International Relations*, edited by David A. Lake, and Robert Powell. Princeton: Princeton University Press., pp. 39-76
- Jervis, Robert. 1998. Realism in the Study of World Politics. *International Organization* 52(4):971-91.
- Lake, David A., and Robert Powell. 1999. International Relations: A Strategic Approach. In *Strategic Choice and International Relations*, edited by David A. Lake and Robert Powell. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Maliniak, Daniel, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael J. Tierney. 2011. International Relations in the US Academy. *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2):437-464.
- Nau, Henry R. 2011. No Alternative to "Isms". *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2):487-91.
- Sil, Rudra, and Peter J. Katzenstein. 2011. De-Centering, Not Discarding, the "Isms": Some Friendly Amendments. *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2):481-5.
- Sullivan, Michael P. 2005. 'That dog won't hunt': the cottage industry of realist criticism, or must you play that Waltz again? *Journal of International Relations and Development* 8:327-54.