PROSEMINAR IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
PSCI 6319

Professor Paul F. Diehl
GR 3.214
pdiehl@udallas.edu

Online
Asynchronous
Fall 2020

Brief Description

This is the introductory or gateway course for graduate study in international relations. Conventionally, the course covers the major theoretical approaches to the subfield, such as realism, liberalism, and other "isms." Unlike other subfields of political science, international relations has been the subject of several "big picture" debates over the theoretical approaches used to understand international behaviors. These are not merely esoteric disagreements, but the selection of theoretical approach – explicit or implicit – drives choices of research questions and the answers to those questions.

The course begins with an overview of the concept and utility of theory as well as the parameters of the international relations field. This section also covers several of the most prominent ideas in international relations scholarship (e.g., anarchy), ones that will appear in various specific formulations covered in the course. At any given time, every subfield or discipline has some approaches that reflect more scholarship and adherents than others. In international relations (at least in the United States), these are currently realism, liberalism, and constructivism; the second section of the course is dedicated to them and interplay between them.

Following the examination of "core" theories is the third section that focuses on less common, but often increasingly prominent, theoretical approaches. The fourth section considers a set of research at a different level of analysis: foreign policy decision-making. The conclusion of the course looks forward to where international relations theory scholarship could and should go in the future.

Learning Objectives

The enrollment of this course includes both professional masters, dual degree, and doctoral students, and they also vary by program. Accordingly, the degree to which learning objectives – within and across the student body – are achieved will vary across the student population. Nevertheless, at the conclusion of this course, all students should, to varying degrees:

- Be familiar with multiple theoretical approaches and be able to articulate the assumptions, logics, and critiques of those approaches to others, such as to undergraduates in an introductory course.
- Be able to match theoretical approaches to policies, decisions, and statements of political elites.
- Be able to match theoretical approaches to arguments found in the scholarly literature on international relations.
- Be able to apply different theoretical approaches to generate different policy prescriptions or different empirical expectations to questions and problems in international relations.

Class Modalities

As an online course, this course does not meet synchronously at a set day and time every week. Nevertheless, there will be real time interactions between students, and also between the instructor and the students in certain components of the class. In general, students should expect to spend the equivalent of 3 hours per week in virtual interactions, similar to what would be the case for a face-to-face course.

Topical Overviews: These are overviews of the weeks' topics, including elements such as the intellectual history of the theory(ies) covered. This are prerecorded presentations by the instructor, available to students in advance of that week, and students are required to watch the presentations. For any given week, there might be more than one presentation, divided into shorter segments, but collectively lasting no more than 45 minutes to 1 hour. These presentations will be available on the eLearning course website (Blackboard). These are copyrighted by the instructor. You may download them and view these for your personal use in the course, but they are not allowed to post or distribute them elsewhere in any form.

Group Activities: During 12 weeks of the semester, students will work in small groups to develop theoretical formulations that will be applied to different scenarios in order to generate research ideas and policy implications. The group activity will occur in MS Teams at mutually agreeable dates and times among pre-assigned groups; the default time for the group meetings is Monday from 7:00-8:00 PM, US Central Time. The instructor will join a different group each week as an observer and a resource for consultation. One designated member of the group will be charged with submitting the written group report (sample template is on the course website) and making a 5-minute video presentation that is recorded in MS Teams. Both should be submitted to the instructor. One group report and video will be chosen each week as a posting on the website (Blackboard) discussion board on which other members of the class should comment and interact.

Worksheet Summaries: Students will be required to submit five worksheets on selected theoretical approaches. The instructor will integrate these and then record a brief session that goes over the theoretical approach at hand; he might also do this for other theoretical approaches for which worksheets are not assigned. Students are required to watch these recordings. These presentations will be available on the eLearning course website (Blackboard). These are copyrighted by the instructor. You may download them and view these for your personal use in the course, but they are not allowed to post or distribute them elsewhere in any form.

Office Hours and Instructor-Student Interaction

At this time, the instructor does not plan to hold face-to-face office hours during the semester. He will contact each student at least once a month for individual consultations over MS-Teams. Students are required to consult the instructor prior to beginning work on their papers. Of course, students are encouraged to arrange an individual meeting over MS-Teams with the instructor as desired during the semester; a date and time that is mutually agreeable will be arranged.

Required Book and Articles

Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).

All other readings, both required and optional, are available on the course website. Please read these online or make a single copy only for your personal use.

Supplemental: The following is not required, but if you have free access to this book or have sufficient funds to purchase it, you might find several chapters useful as another perspective on some of the major theoretical approaches.

Mark Kauppi and Paul Viotti, ***International Relations Theory***, 6th edition (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2020).

Requirements

All students must complete the required reading each week and participate in group exercise meetings (including taking turns reporting the results of group exercises). In addition, as well as the following:

1. *Group Presentations*: Approximately 3-4 times during the semester, each student will present the findings of group exercises in the form of a written group report and a video presentation of 5 minutes or less. This part of the course counts for 5% of the final grade.
2. *Discussion Postings*: Students are required to complete 12 discussion postings during the semester; grades on the best 10 of those postings will count. This part of the course counts for 10% of the final grade
3. *Worksheets*: Students are required to complete five worksheets on IR theories during the semester. This part of the course counts for 10% of the final grade

Beyond the requirements above, students have two options for completing other course requirements:

Option 1:

1. *Short Reports*: Complete three (3) one-page reports relating each of the core theoretical approaches (realism, liberalism, and constructivism) to a contemporary policy action or statement as reported in the news. Details on the assignment are given on the course website. This part of the course counts for 15% of the final grade.
2. *Paper*: Complete a 6-10 page paper that outlines a policy problem and provides policy prescriptions representing at least 3 different theoretical approaches. Details on the assignment are given on the course website. The paper is due by 12 noon on Tuesday, 24 November. This part of the course counts for 30% of the final grade.
3. *Exam*: Complete a take-home final exam on the intersection of theory and policymaking in international relations. The exam is due by 12 noon on Monday, 7 December and will be posted on the course website approximately 10 days in advance. This part of the course counts for 30% of the final grade.

Option 2: (doctoral students must select this option)

1. *Short Reports*: Complete three (3) one-page reports identifying each of the core theoretical approaches (realism, liberalism, and constructivism) in a scholarly article on international relations. Details on the assignment are given on the course website. This part of the course counts for 15% of the final grade.

2. *Paper*: Complete a 6-10 page paper that identifies a research question in international relations, generates hypotheses/expectations from at least 3 different theoretical approaches, and provides an overview of how these hypotheses/expectations might be tested. Details on the assignment are given on the course website. The paper is due by 12 noon Tuesday, 24 November. This part of the course counts for 30% of the final grade.
3. *Exam*: Complete a take-home final exam on issues in international relations theory. The exam is due by 12 noon on Monday, 7 December and will be posted on the course website approximately 10 days in advance. This part of the course counts for 30% of the final grade.

The following table summarizes the assignments and dates:

Week Beginning	**Worksheet**	**Short Report**	**Group Exercise**	**Discussion Posting**	**Other**
August 17				X	
August 24					
August 31			X		
September 7			X	X	
September 14	X		X	X	
September 21		X	X	X	
September 28	X		X	X	
October 5		X	X	X	
October 12	X	X	X	X	
October 19	X		X	X	
October 26			X	X	
November 2			X	X	
November 9	X		X	X	
November 16				X	
November 23					Paper
December 7					Exam

Schedule of Topics and Readings

Required readings are marked with an asterisk (*). After the required readings are several additional readings; doctoral students (present and future) are strongly urged to complete these as they could be included in field exams and are important for professional training in the discipline.

AN OVERVIEW OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THEORY

I. WHAT IS THEORY AND HOW DO WE EVALUATE IT? (week of August 17th)

The term "theory" is often used colloquially and as a substitute for "hypothesis," "estimate," "opinion," or even "guess." Even when used more closely to its correct meaning, theory is often confounded with "paradigm" or "world view." Further confusing things are the use of the terms "grand theory," and "middle-range theory." The first section of this course addresses what theory (in the context of international relations) is and is not. Following this is a

consideration of how to assess competing theories, elements of which appear in later evaluations and critiques of various theoretical approaches.

*Gabriel Abend, "The Meaning of 'Theory'," ***Sociological Theory***, 26 (2008): 173-199.

*Colin Elman and Miriam Elman, "Lessons from Lakatos," in Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (eds.), ***Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*** (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), pp. 21-68.

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

John Vasquez, ***The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism***. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), Chapter 1.

II. INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AS A FIELD OF STUDY (week of August 24th)

Theory is designed to explain specified phenomena, and thus an initial step is to understand the parameters of what constitutes international relations. The field is defined largely by what questions and issues are considered by scholars and policymakers. This has changed over time, with a notable shift from a concentration on issues of war and peace between states to a wide array of concerns and actors. This section of the course looks that history of this evolution and attempts to get a sense of where the international relations discipline stands today.

*Torbjorn Knutsen, "Cumulative Knowledge, Science, and the Emergence of International Relations," in William Thompson (ed.). ***The Oxford Encyclopedia of Empirical International Relations Theory***. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 394-411.

* Peter Marcus Kristensen, "International Relations at the End: A Sociological Autopsy," ***International Studies Quarterly***, 62 (2018): 245–259.

*Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael Tierney, "International Relations in the US Academy," ***International Studies Quarterly***, 55 (2011) 55, 437–464.

*Preliminary Program, Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, 2020.

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

III. THE VALUE AND LIMITATIONS OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY (week of August 31st)

Although the quest for grand theory has been at center of international relations for decades (or longer), there have been various tensions in that pursuit and it is not clear that the road has always been straight and narrow. Indeed, the title of one book – *The Elusive Quest* – sums up these efforts. How does the pursuit of theory map with the distinctiveness of international relations as a discipline? What is the effect of move toward behavioralism and social science? Does international relations theory inform policy-making? These are questions to ponder and ones that the course will return to at the conclusion when the focus is on the suitable steps in the future.

*Steve Smith, "Diversity and Disciplinarity in International Relations Theory," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 1-12.

*Milja Kurki and Colin Wright, "International Relations and Social Science," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 13-33.

* Stephen Saideman, The Apparent Decline of the IR Paradigms: Examining Patterns of Publications, Perceptions, and Citations," ***International Studies Review***, 20 (2018): 685–703.

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

*Quan Li, "The Second Great Debate Revisited: Exploring the Impact of the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide in International Relations" ***International Studies Review*** 21 (2019): 447–476.

Tim Dunne, Lene Hansen and Colin Wight, "The End of International Relations Theory?" ***European Journal of International Relations***, 19 (2013): 405-425.

Stanley H. Hoffmann, "International Relations: The Long Road to Theory," ***World Politics***, 11 (1959): 346-377.

IV. KEY THEORETICAL IDEAS AND CONCEPTS (week of September 7th)

Although there is great diversity in international relations theory, a number of core ideas and concepts reappear frequently: anarchy, power, agent-structure, to name a few. Disagreements or reconfigurations of these are the bases for theoretical disagreements and revisions of existing formulations. In effect, the core ideas and concepts are the battlefields among scholars and the centerpieces of differences among policymakers.

*Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, "Power in International Politics," ***International Organization***, 59, (2005): 39-75.

* Ernst B. Haas, "The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept, or Propaganda," ***World Politics***, 5 (1953): 442-477.

* Janice Bially Mattern and Ayse Zarakol, "Hierarchies in World Politics," ***International Organization,*** 70 (2016): 623–654.

*Helen Milner, "The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique," ***Review of International Studies***, 17 (1991): 67-85.

*David Baldwin, "The Concept of Security." ***Review of International Studies,*** 23 (1997): 5–26.

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

Alexander E. Wendt, "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics," ***International Organization***, 46 (1992): 391-425.

Robert Powell, "Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory," ***American Political Science Review***, 85 (1991): 1303-1320.

Nina Silove, "Beyond the Buzzword: The Three Meanings of "Grand Strategy," ***Security Studies***, 27 (2018): 27-57.

LEADING APPROACHES TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

V. CLASSICAL REALISM (week of September 14th)

Classical Realism, often referred to as *realpolitik* or power politics, might be the oldest international relations theory, with many dating it back to the writings of Thucydides. Its most

famous modern adherent was Hans Morgenthau, whose work has been enormously influential in shaping later theoretical formulations. Even those that develop new approaches often use classical realism as a baseline or as the subject of critique. Equally important, realist thinking has dominated foreign policy making across the globe. Indeed, realism is as much prescriptive ("what should be done") as it is purported to be explanatory ("why decisions were made").

*Richard Ned Lebow, "Classical Realism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 34-50.

*Jeffrey Legro and Andrew Moravscik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" ***International Security***, 24 (1999): 5-55.

Kevin Narizny, "On Systemic Paradigms and Domestic Politics: A Critique of the Newest Realism," ***International Security***, 42 (2017): 155–190.

John Vasquez, ***The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism***. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), Chapter 2.

VI. NEOREALISM (week of September 21st)

A revision of classic realist formulations, but retaining many of the assumptions, is neorealism, most identified with the work of Kenneth Waltz. The major difference is a shift in the level of analysis from the national to the systemic level. Debates over unipolarity, bipolarity, and multipolarity have their roots in conceptions of system structure and the distribution of power, with neorealism being the most prominent example.

*John Mearsheimer, "Structural Realism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 51-67.

*Stephen Brooks, "Dueling Realisms," ***International Organization*** 51 (1997): 445–477.

John Vasquez, "The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition." ***American Political Science Review***, 91 (1997): 899-912.

Patrick James, "Structural Realism and the Causes of War," ***Mershon International Studies Review***, 39 (1995): 181-208.

Daniel Nexon and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, ***Whiskey and IR Theory Podcast*** "Theory of International Politics (Waltz) – Parts I and II.

VII. LIBERALISM (week of September 28th)

The primary challenger to realist notions is liberalism. As with realism, it has explanatory and prescriptive elements. The rise of liberalism in international relations scholarship corresponds to changes in global politics including the expansion of trade. Most significantly, international relations theory needed to be able to accommodate cooperation beyond ephemeral types and in areas beyond security. Liberalism also accommodates the spread of democracy and the purported effects from the "democratic peace." Today, liberal and neoliberal policies are the subject of debate and are often the main target of critical theorists.

*Bruce Russett, "Liberalism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 68-87.

*Jennifer Sterling-Folker, "Neoliberalism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 88-106.

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

* Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, "The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order," ***Review of International Studies***, 25 (1999): 179-196.

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

* G. John Ikenberry, "Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order," ***Perspectives on Politics***, 7 (2009): 71-87.

Joseph Grieco,"Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism," ***International Organization***, 42 (1988): 485-507.

Robert Jervis, "Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate," ***International Security***, 24 (1999): 42–63.

Andrew Moravcsik, "Liberal International Relations Theory: An Empirical Assessment," in Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (eds.), ***Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*** (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), pp. 159-204.

VIII. CONSTRUCTIVISM (week of October 5th)

Constructivism began with dissatisfaction of realist and liberal approaches, and early formulations were not always distinct from critical or post-modern theory. Unlike most of those challengers though, constructivism developed to engage with realism and liberalism directly and it did not eschew social scientific methods. Accordingly, it has been widely adopted in international relations, with parallel inroads in other disciplines as diverse as geography, education, and even literary studies.

*K.M. Fierke, "Constructivism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 161-178.

* Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics," ***Annual Review of Political Science***, 4 (2001): 391-416.

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

*Alexander Wendt***, *Social Theory of International Politics***. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999): Chapter 6.

Jeffrey T. Checkel, "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory," ***World Politics***, 50 (1998): 324-348.

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," ***International Organization***, 52 (1998): 887-917.

Daniel Nexon and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, ***Whiskey and IR Theory Podcast*** "Wendt's World" – Parts I and II.

CHALLENGERS TO THE CORE APPROACHES

IX. ENGLISH SCHOOL (week of October 12th)

The English School is unique in that it arises primarily in one country, but has achieved prominence in part because of the importance of British universities in scholarship. This approach is a precursor to globalization studies, recognizing the roles of other actors (e.g., non-governmental organizations – NGOs) and transnational processes.

*Tim Dunne, "The English School," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 107-126.

*Barry Buzan, "The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR," ***Review of International Studies***, 27 (2001): 471-488.

*Richard Little, "The English School's Contribution to the Study of International Relations," ***European Journal of International Relations***, 6 (2000): 395-422.

*Dale Copeland, "A Realist Critique of the English School," ***Review of International Studies***, 29 (2003): 427-441.

Richard Little, "Neorealism and the English School: A Methodological, Ontological, and Theoretical Reassessment," ***European Journal of International Relations***, 1 (1995): 9-34.

Charlotta Parrat, "Change in International Society: How Not to Recreate the "First Debate" of International Relations," ***International Studies Review*** (forthcoming).

X. MARXISM AND OTHER CRITICAL APPROACHES (week of October 19th)

Another set of theoretical approaches explicitly reject the assumptions and processes of traditional formulations. These approaches share in common strong critiques of existing theory and policy; accordingly, they have a strong normative component. The oldest of these is Marxism, whereas others are relatively more recent. Many focus on economic concerns (either as critiques of liberalism or as the basis for defining international processes).

*Mark Rupert, "Marxism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 127-144.

*Steven Roach, "Critical Theory," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 145-160.

*Colin Hay, "International Relations Theory and Globalization," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 281-299.

*Carlos Martinez-Vela, "World Systems Theory." ***Internet Modern History Sourcebook***

David Campbell and Roland Bleiker, "Post-Structuralism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 196-218.

Toni Erskine, "Normative International Relations Theory," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 236-258.

XI. FEMINIST AND GENDER THEORY (week of October 26th)

Feminist approaches are established in many disciplines, but within political science they are perhaps most commonly found in the international relations subfield. Some feminist approaches are similar to constructivist or critical theory formulations, rejecting the status quo in both theory and policy. Others accept positivist methods, and focus on identifying research questions and processes that are ignored by mainstream approaches.

*J. Ann Tickner and Laura Sjoberg, "Feminism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 179-195.

* Mary Caprioli, "Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis," ***International Studies Review***, 6 (2004): 253-269.

*J. Ann Tickner and Jacqui True, "A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War I Women's Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda." ***International Studies Quarterly***, 62 (2018): 221–233.

* J. Ann Tickner, "What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions," ***International Studies Quarterly***, 49 (2005): 1–21.

Laura Sjoberg, "Gender, Structure, and War: What Waltz Couldn't See," ***International Theory***, 4 (2012): 1– 38.

Christine Sylvester, ***Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era***. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), Chapter 1.

Daniel Nexon and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson, ***Whiskey and IR Theory Podcast*** "Bananas, Beaches, and Bases" – Parts I and II.

XII. NON-WESTERN APPROACHES AND CRITIQUES (week of November 2nd)

International relations theory has primarily originated in the United States and Europe, or at least it is those formulations that have appeared in most books and journal articles. In the past few decades, scholarship has become more "global," and accordingly revisionist approaches have attempted to change the foci examined, the research questions explored, and the state-centric and Western-oriented approaches that have dominated the subfield.

*Shampa Biswas, "Postcolonialism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 219-235.

*Amitav Acharya, "Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds," ***International Studies Quarterly***, 58 (2014): 647–659.

*Errol A Henderson, "Hidden in Plain Sight: Racism in International Relations Theory," ***Cambridge Review of International Affairs***, 26 (2013): 71–92.

* Maiken Gelardi, "Moving Global IR Forward—A Road Map," ***International Studies Review*** (forthcoming).

Joseph MacKay and Christopher LaRoche, "Why Is There No Reactionary International Theory?" ***International Studies Quarterly***, 62 (2018): 234–244.

CHANGING THE LEVEL OF ANALYSIS: FOREIGN POLICY DECISION MAKING

XIII. RATIONAL CHOICE (week of November 9th)

Borrowed somewhat from economics, the rational choice approach has been one of the most important frameworks in international relations, especially in studies of war. The assumption of rationality is implicitly a part of other approaches (e.g., realism) and challenged by other approaches (e.g., constructivism, critical theory) that reject the belief that either situations are objectively assessed or indeed whether objectively is even possible. Here, the focus is on the individual decision-making level of analysis; by treating the state as a unitary actor allows it to amenable to rational choice models. Consistent with this approach, many applications involve game-theory.

*James Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War," ***International Organization***, 49 (1995): 379-414.

*Stephen Walt, "Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies," ***International Security***, 23 (1999): 5-48.

*Jack Levy, "Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations," ***International Studies Quarterly***, 41 (1997): 87-112.

*Jonathan Mercer, "Rationality and Psychology in International Politics," ***International Organization*** 59 (2005): 77–106.

Rose McDermott, "Prospect Theory in Political Science: Gains and Losses from the First Decade," ***Political Psychology***, 25 (2004): 289-312.

XIV. DECISION-MAKING (week of November 16th)

Starting in perhaps the 1950s, foreign policy decision making has been considered a distinct subfield within international relations. Explanatory factors are usually confined to subnational features such as the characteristics of leaders and bureaucratic processes. This contrasts with contextual factors such as system structure or national attributes. Nevertheless, this subfield intersected more with other areas of international relations as the latter began to incorporate domestic political influences (e.g., regime type, election timing) on international relations outcomes.

*Graham Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," ***American Political Science Review***, 63 (1969): 689-718.

*Graham T. Allison and Morton H. Halperin, "Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications," ***World Politics***, 24 (Supplement) (1972): 40-79.

*James Fearon, "Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations," ***Annual Review of Political Science***, 1 (1998): 289-313.

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

Jonathan Bendor and Thomas H. Hammond, "Rethinking Allison's Models," ***American Political Science Review***, 86 (1992): 301-322.

THE NEXT STEPS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY

XV. THE FUTURE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY (week of November 23rd)

Theorizing in international relations has come a long way in the past 70 years (and indeed longer), but there is perhaps greater disagreement among scholars now than in earlier decades. Where should the field go and what priorities should it emphasize? The concluding section of the course offers some differing opinions on these concerns.

*Ole Waever, "Still A Discipline After All These Debates?" in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds.), ***International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity***, 4th edition. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 300-322.

* John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing is Bad for International Relations," ***European Journal of International Relations***, 19 (2013): 427-457.

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

*Joseph Grieco, "The Schools of Thought Problem in International Relations," ***International Studies Review*** 21 (2019): 424–446.

Michael Ward, "Do We Have Too Much Theory in International Relations or Do We Need Less? Waltz Was Wrong, Tetlock Was Right," ***Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*** (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018).

Georg Sorensen, "The Case for Combining Material Forces and Ideas in the Study of IR," ***European Journal of International Relations***, 14 (2008): 5–32.

Patrick Thaddeus Jackson and Daniel Nexon, "International Theory in a Post-Paradigmatic Era: From Substantive Wagers to Scientific Ontologies," ***European Journal of International Relations***, 19 (2013): 543-565.

The descriptions and timelines contained in this syllabus and on the course website are subject to change at the discretion of the instructor.

Course Rules

1. No collaboration or consultation with other groups or individuals (with the exception of the instructor) is permitted in the completion of the paper assignment or the take-home exam.

2. Students are required to keep all notes, records of citations, and drafts associated with their assignments until two weeks after the final exam.

3. Students are expected to follow the Comet Creed: "As a Comet, I pledge honesty, integrity, and service in all that I do." The instructor will employ the latest software and other techniques to detect instances of academic dishonesty. Students are advised to consult university policies and guidelines – (http://www.utdallas.edu/deanofstudents/dishonesty/). The instructor will follow all UTD rules and processes regarding academic dishonesty – see http://www.utdallas.edu/deanofstudents/managing/

4. Students needing additional time or other accommodations concerning note taking, the course website, examinations, or the writing assignments should discuss such matters with the instructor at the outset of the course. Appropriate documentation concerning disabilities may be required. For further information, consult https://policy.utdallas.edu/utdbp3100.

5. Rules and procedures on student grievances and appeals are given at

http://policy.utdallas.edu/utdsp5005.

6. Students considering sharing personal information in email, in person, or within assignments or exams should be aware that faculty members and teaching/research assistants are required by UT Dallas policy to report information about sexual misconduct to the UT Dallas Title IX Coordinator. Per university policy, faculty members have been informed that they must identify the student to the UT Dallas Title IX Coordinator. Students who wish to have confidential discussions of incidents related to sexual harassment or sexual misconduct should contact the Student Counseling Center (972-883-2527 or after hours 972-UTD-TALK or 972-883-8255), the Women's Center (972-883-8255), a health care provider in the Student Health Center (972-883-2747), the clergyperson (or other legally recognized religious advisor) of their choice, or an off-campus resource (i.e., rape crisis center, doctor, psychologist). Students who are sexually assaulted, harassed, or victims of sexual misconduct, domestic violence, or stalking, are encouraged to directly report these incidents to the UT Dallas Police Department at 972-883-2222 or to the Title IX Coordinator at 972-883-2218. Additional information and resources may be found at http://www.utdallas.edu/oiec/title-ix/resources.

7. Additional UTD rules and policies relevant to this course, and more broadly to other courses can be found at https://go.utdallas.edu/syllabus-policies

8. General UTD resources and rules during the COVID-19 pandemic can be found at https://www.utdallas.edu/coronavirus/