

PS 540: Proseminar in International Relations
Fall 2005: Christopher K. Butler

Overview:

This is an introduction to the scientific study of International Relations. We will explore the history of International Relations theory and examine its dominant theoretical approaches (including realism, liberalism, constructivist approaches, micro- and macro-theories of conflict, deterrence, international political economy and integration). We will also critically examine contemporary theoretical and empirical research in the field.

Evaluation in the class will include a literature review, two compare-and-contrast theoretical approach papers, critiques of the contemporary literature, and a final exam. Graduate students pursuing International Relations as a major field will be encouraged to meld the literature review and the two compare-and-contrast theoretical approach papers into a single research-design paper that can be used for future research upon completion of the class.

Contact Information:

Class Meetings: Wednesdays from 1:00 to 3:30 pm in SSCI 2069

Instructor's Office: SSCI 2051

Office Phone: 277-3742

E-mail: ckbutler@unm.edu

Office Hours: Mondays and Thursdays from 3:00 to 5:00 pm and by appointment.

Books:

Required

Doyle, Michael W. 1997. *Ways of War and Peace : Realism, Liberalism, and Socialism*. W W Norton & Co.

Knutsen, Torbjørn L. 1997. *A History of International Relations Theory*. St. Martin's Press.

Sprinz, Detlef F. and Yael Wolinsky-Nahmias, eds. 2004. *Models, Numbers, and Cases : Methods for Studying International Relations*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Recommended

Dougherty, James E. and Robert L. Pfalzgraff. 2000. *Contending Theories of International Relations: A Comprehensive Survey* 5th ed. Addison Wesley Longman.

Style Manual for Political Science. 2001. American Political Science Association.

McCloskey, Deirdre. 2000. *Economical Writing*. Waveland Press.

Other Readings

In addition to the books for the class, there will be article and chapter selections. Readings not available on-line can be found in the file cabinet in the department lounge.

Americans with Disabilities Act:

Qualified students with disabilities needing appropriate academic adjustments should contact me as soon as possible to ensure your needs are met in a timely manner. Handouts are available in alternative accessible formats upon request.

CLASS DESIGN:

As a seminar, the class will be highly dependent on active participation of the students. Each student will be evaluated each class session on general participation, preparedness, and attentiveness. Attendance is mandatory.

R.A.C.E. through the readings

About half of the class readings and discussion will be divided using the following approach:

- Review of the general topic area,
- Advocacy of individual research papers,
- Critiques of individual research papers, and
- Extensions of individual research papers.

To this end, a portion of the reading for each class will be from overview writings and existing literature reviews. These are noted on the reading schedule as “Review Material” and are **required** reading for all students. The first half hour of class will be devoted to this material.

Four research papers will also be assigned for each class period. For each paper, three students will be assigned roles of either “Advocate”, “Critic”, or “Extender” in the previous class period. The discussion period for each paper (roughly 30 minutes) will be structured as follows:

- The Advocate will provide an oral summary of the paper’s purpose, theory, methods, and results.
- The Critic will critically evaluate the paper’s theory, methods, and results. Each component of the critique can be presented either after the Advocate has made a complete presentation or after the Advocate has completed the presentation on that component. The Advocate is expected to defend the research paper.
- During the above presentation, all other students are expected to interject questions regarding clarity and understanding, and to add to the debate on the merits of the research.
- After or during the discussion outlined above, the Extender will discuss potential new research that would build on the paper or was sparked in some way by the reading or discussion of the paper.

By way of preparation, the students in assigned roles will type up their basic points in a one- to two-page paper, in which the heading and first paragraph are in the following format:

Author’s Last Name, First Name. Year. “Article Title.” *Journal Title* vol.(issue): pages.

The purpose of this paper is to The author uses the theoretical approach of ... and made the following assumptions: From these assumptions, the author drew the following theoretical propositions: The method employed is The unit of analysis is The research method/estimation technique is The author found the following results:

The remainder of the write-up is role specific. The Advocate should elaborate on each component (purpose, theory, methods, and results); the Critic should lay out criticisms of each component; the Extender should discuss at least two possible extensions of the research.

Students with assigned roles will be evaluated on their oral presentations and their write-ups. Students *without* assigned roles will still be evaluated on general participation, preparedness, and attentiveness during the presentation of *each* research paper. Attendance is mandatory.

Grading

Attendance and Participation	20%
Response Essays (6)	15%
“R.A.C.E. through the readings” assignments	20%
Literature Review	15%
Final Exam	30%
	<hr/>
	100%

Late assignments:

Assignments that are turned in late—by any amount of time—will be docked one letter grade. Special circumstances may warrant individual extensions setting a new due date. Extensions must be requested before the first due date is reached. Only one extension per assignment will be given.

Literature Review

Choose a topic in international relations that interests you. In consultation with the instructor, find a prominent work on that topic and conduct a literature “trace” using the Social Science Citation Index. Then write a five-page (double-spaced) literature review that highlights a subset of the literature “trace”. Thus, the literature review will describe the progress over time from the initial work to the present, organized by different subtopics spawned by the initial work. Skimming the included literature will be necessary. If the initial work is a book, do NOT include published book reviews. Be sure to add a list of references (not included in the page count).

Final exam in the form of a comprehensive exam:

There will be an eight hour, open-book, open-note final exam modeled on the International Relations comprehensive exam. Generally, this means two essays (to be typed with references) with some choice of questions. The questions will be distributed on the last day of class and due one week later. (Unlike a real “comp”, I will leave it to your honor and discretion to choose your own eight hours.)

I will grade individual assignments on a 4-point scale, sometimes by letter and sometimes by number. Your final grade will depend on your weighted average. (Students enrolled for undergraduate or non-degree credit can receive grades in the D- to C- range.)

Average	Final Grade
above 4.17	A+
between 3.84 and 4.17	A
between 3.50 and 3.84	A-
between 3.17 and 3.50	B+
between 2.84 and 3.17	B
between 2.50 and 2.84	B-
between 2.17 and 2.50	C+
between 1.84 and 2.17	C
below 1.84	F

Class Schedule

Aug 24 Syllabus/Basic Theoretical Divisions

Required of everyone:

Doyle intro; Knutsen ch. 9

Response Essay:

Doyle discusses three “worldviews” and three “levels of analysis” as central components of his understanding of international relations. Knutsen discusses three “basic paradigms” bolstered by three “spheres of international interaction” and three ideological traditions. Define each of these authors' terms (15 all together) and then explain what each author means in terms of the other author's concepts.

Aug 31 No Class (Conference)

Sep 7 Historical Roots

Required of everyone:

Knutsen intro + chaps. 1-3

Response Essay:

Provide your own summary narrative of the evolution of the concept sovereignty. Discuss how sensitive this evolution was to the peculiarities of European history?

Sep 14 Realism

Required of everyone:

Doyle part I; Knutsen chaps. 4 & 7

Response Essay:

Discuss the extent to which there is a unified realist theory. What are the common assumptions of this unified theory? What do these common assumptions tell us to predict regarding international relations?

Sep 21 Theory and Testing in International Relations

Required of everyone:

S&W-N chaps. 1, 2, 6, 10, 15

Response Essay:

Provide two examples of research questions appropriate for each method discussed in the readings (case studies, statistical analysis, and formal modeling). For each example, (1) discuss why it is appropriate for that method, (2) whether it could be studied using either of the other two methods, and (3) how the question would have to be modified in order to be appropriate for another method.

Sep 28 International Security Studies

Required of everyone:

S&W-N chaps. 5, 9, 14

Response Essay:

Explain the difference between the following two questions and discuss how selection issues affect the attempt to answer either question. (1) How did the Great Depression lead to the outbreak of World War II? (2) How do economic conditions lead to the outbreak of war?

Oct 5 International Interaction Game/Expected Utility Theory of War

Required of everyone:

Bueno de Mesquita & Lalman (1992) chaps. 2-3 + appendix

Breakdown readings:

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

Bueno de Mesquita, B. (1990). "Pride of Place: The Origins of German Hegemony." *World Politics* 43(1): 28-52.

Oct 12 Alliances and Deterrence

Required of everyone:

D&P pp. 532-42

Breakdown readings:

Huth, P., C. Gelpi, et al. (1993). "The Escalation of Great Power Militarized Disputes: Testing Rational Deterrence Theory and Structural Realism." *American Political Science Review* 87(3): 609-623.

Gibler, D. M. and J. A. Vasquez (1998). "Uncovering the Dangerous Alliances, 1495-1980." *International Studies Quarterly* 42(4): 785-807.

Lai, B. and D. Reiter (2000). "Democracy, Political Similarity, and International Alliances, 1816-1992." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(2): 203-227.

Ross, R. S. (2002). "Navigating the Taiwan Strait: Deterrence, Escalation Dominance, and U.S.-China Relations." *International Security* 27(2): 48-85.

Oct 19 Power Transition Theory

Required of everyone:

DiCicco, J. M. and J. S. Levy (1999). "Power Shifts and Problem Shifts: The Evolution of the Power Transition Research Program." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43(6): 675-704.

Breakdown readings:

Kim, W. (1992). "Power Transitions and Great Power War from Westphalia to Waterloo." *World Politics* 45(1): 153-172.

de Soysa, I., J. R. Oneal, et al. (1997). "Testing Power-Transition Theory Using Alternative Measures of National Capabilities." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(4): 509-528.

Oct 26 Liberalism

Required of everyone:

Doyle part II; Knutsen chaps. 5 & 8

Response Essay:

Discuss the intertwined roles of freedom, reason, and capitalism in liberal theories of international relations.

Nov 2 Democratic Peace

Required of everyone:

Kant, I. (1795) *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*
(<http://www.constitution.org/kant/perpeace.htm>)

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

Breakdown readings:

Peceny, M. (1997). "A Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Peace: The Ambiguous Case of the Spanish-American War." *Journal of Peace Research* 34(4): 415-430.

Henderson, E. A. (1998). "The Democratic Peace Through the Lens of Culture, 1820-1989." *International Studies Quarterly* 42(3): 461-484.

Remmer, K. L. (1998). "Does Democracy Promote Interstate Cooperation? Lessons from the Mercosur Region." *International Studies Quarterly* 42(1): 25-51.

Kadera, K. M., M. J. C. Crescenzi, and M. L. Shannon (2003). "Democratic Survival, Peace, and War in the International System." *American Journal of Political Science* 47(2): 234-247.

Nov 9 International Political Economy

Required of everyone:

S&W-N chaps. 3, 7, 11, 12

Breakdown readings:

Barbieri, K. (1996). "Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict?" *Journal of Peace Research* 33(1): 29-49.

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

Clark, W. R. and M. Hallerberg (2000). "Mobile Capital, Domestic Institutions, and Electorally Induced Monetary and Fiscal Policy." *American Political Science Review* 94(2): 323-346.

Anderton, C. H. and J. R. Carter (2001). "The Impact of War on Trade: An Interrupted Times-Series Study." *Journal of Peace Research* 38(4): 445-457.

Nov 16 Two-Level Games

Required of everyone:

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

Breakdown readings:

Milner, H. V. and B. P. Rosendorff (1997). "Democratic Politics and International Trade Negotiations: Elections and Divided Government as Constraints on Trade Liberalization." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(1): 117-146.

Trumbore, P. F. (1998). "Public Opinion as a Domestic Constraint in International Negotiations: Two-Level Games in the Anglo-Irish Peace Process." *International Studies Quarterly* 42(3): 545-565.

Mansfield, E. D., H. V. Milner, et al. (2000). "Free to Trade: Democracies, Autocracies, and International Trade." *American Political Science Review* 94(2): 305-321.

Trumbore, P. F. and M. A. Boyer (2000). "International Crisis Decisionmaking as a Two-Level Process." *Journal of Peace Research* 37(6): 679-697.

Nov 23 Civil War

Breakdown readings:

- Mansfield, E. D. and J. Snyder (1995). "Democratization and the Danger of War." *International Security* 20(1): 5-38.
- Doyle, M. W. and N. Sambanis (2000). "International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis." *American Political Science Review* 94(4): 779-801.
- Belloni, R. (2001). "Civil Society and Peacebuilding in Bosnia and Herzegovina." *Journal of Peace Research* 38(2): 163-180.
- Fisher, R. J. (2001). "Cyprus: The Failure of Mediation and the Escalation of an Identity-Based Conflict to an Adversarial Impasse." *Journal of Peace Research* 38(3): 307-326.
- Hegre, H., T. Ellingsen, et al. (2001). "Toward a Democratic Civil Peace? Democracy, Political Change, and Civil War, 1816-1992." *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 33-48.

Nov 30 Nuclear Weapons

Required of everyone:

D&P ch. 8

Breakdown readings:

- Solingen, E. (1994). "The Political Economy of Nuclear Restraint." *International Security* 19(2): 126-169.
- Fetter, S. and D. T. Hagerty (1996). "Nuclear Deterrence and the 1990 Indo-Pakistani Crisis." *International Security* 21(1): 176-185.
- Sagan, S. D. (1996). "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb." *International Security* 21(3): 54-86.
- Kraig, M. R. (1999). "Nuclear Deterrence in the Developing World: A Game-Theoretic Treatment." *Journal of Peace Research* 36(2): 141-167.

Dec 7 Terrorism

Breakdown readings:

- Enders, W. and T. Sandler (1999). "Transnational Terrorism in the Post-Cold War Era." *International Studies Quarterly* 43(1): 145-167.
- Enders, W. and T. Sandler (2000). "Is Transnational Terrorism Becoming More Threatening? A Time-Series Investigation." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(3): 307-332.
- Bueno de Mesquita, E. (2005). "The Quality of Terror." *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 515-530.
- Pape, R. A. (2003). "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 97(3): 343-362.
- Rosendorff, B. P. and T. Sandler (2004). "Too Much of a Good Thing?: The Proactive Response Dilemma." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(5): 657-671.