

**Sam Houston State University
Department of Political Science**

POLS 5373: International Relations (Spring 2017)

Instructor: Prof. Jonathan Brown
Virtual Office Hours: TU/W/TH 3:30 – 4:30 PM CST
Credit Hours: 3

Email: jnb047@shsu.edu
Phone: 936-294-4478

“War is a stern teacher.”
– Thucydides¹

“By criticizing our theories, we can
let our theories die in our stead.”
– Karl Popper²

Course Description

This course introduces students to the core concepts, theories, and debates in the field of International Relations (IR). It provides a broad survey of the major theoretical paradigms: realism, liberalism, constructivism, and the English School. It also delves deeply into major debates within and across these paradigms, such as the causes of war, the balance of power, the democratic peace, the possibility of international cooperation, the effectiveness of international institutions, and the causes and consequences of European integration. By thoroughly engaging these literatures, students will strengthen their analytical and evaluative skills and thus their ability to read, understand, and contribute to scholarly research in the field of Political Science.

A broader objective of this course is to motivate students to think comparatively and critically about different arguments or views on the same topic and to engage with a diversity of opinion in a given area. The reading selections present an array of competing analytical and methodological perspectives and are tailored to foster students’ appreciation for the importance of rigorous theory and empirics. The reading, writing, and discussion assignments also are meant to underscore the collaborative principle that doing good research requires discussing one’s ideas with colleagues and learning to offer and receive constructive, critical feedback.

General Learning Objectives

This course has the following three general learning objectives:

1. Gaining factual knowledge (terminology, classification, methods, and trends) about historical and contemporary world politics.
2. Learning fundamental principles, generalizations, and theories that help to explain rather than simply describe international relations.
3. Learning to *analyze* and *critically evaluate* ideas, arguments, and points of view regarding the study of international relations.

¹ Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War* (Rex Warner, trans. New York: Penguin, 1954), Book III, 82, p. 242.

² Karl Popper, “Evolutionary Epistemology,” in David Miller, ed., *Popper Selections* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985), p. 83.

Course Readings

The following five books have been ordered for this course:

1. Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (Boston: McGraw Hill, 1979).**
2. Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984).
3. Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999).
4. Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam, *Democracies at War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002).
5. Sebastian Rosato, *Europe United: Power Politics and the Making of the European Community* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012).

**Waltz's book was reissued in 2010 by Waveland Press. The contents of the book are unaltered across the two versions, so either is fine.

All of these books are available in the university bookstore. They also can be ordered from Amazon.com or from the publishers directly. All of these books except Waltz's also are available, free to you, as e-books through the SHSU library website (search by title or author).

Additional outside readings are available directly through the SHSU library website. Journal articles can be located using the "Research" function (search by journal title). Chapters from edited volumes are available in e-book format (search by book title, not chapter title).

Please let me know if you experience any difficulty accessing the readings.

Course Structure

This course is divided between seven lectures and seven student-facilitated debate discussions. For each of the lectures, I provide slides, a narrative linked to the slides, and a summary that recaps the main questions and answers. I highly recommend that you first read the slides and the narrative and then review the summary for each lecture. For each of the student-facilitated discussions, one or more students will summarize a scholarly debate and then pose questions to stimulate discussion among the entire class, aimed at understanding, analyzing, and evaluating the debate.

Course Requirements & Grade Distribution

Your final course grade will be based solely on the following components:

- 10% of your overall grade is based on lecture review forum posts.
- 10% of your overall grade is based on the first article review.
- 10% of your overall grade is based on the second article review.
- 20% of your overall grade is based on the debate discussion facilitation assignment.
- 20% of your overall grade is based on debate discussion board participation.
- 30% of your overall grade is based on the final exam.

The grading scale used in this course is as follows: 90-100 = A; 80-89 = B; 70-79 = C; 60-69 = D; 0-59 = F.

Explanation of Assignments

Lecture Review Forum Posts

For each lecture, you are required to make one review forum post. In a maximum of three sentences, your post should identify and define one idea or concept from the relevant lecture that stands out to you as particularly noteworthy, and explain why you think it is especially interesting or important. This can be an idea or concept that is completely new to you, something that you had never thought about in exactly this way (i.e., something you are now seeing through a new lens), or something that resonates with a current event in world politics.

There are seven lectures in the course, so you need to complete a total of seven separate posts. Provided you follow the instructions about length, content, and due date for each post, this component of your final course grade will be tallied as a proportion of completed posts. So, for instance, if you complete 7/7 posts, you get an A (100%) for this component of your final course grade. If you complete only 6/7 posts, you get a B (85%) for this component of your final course grade, and so on.

Article Reviews

You are required to complete two article review assignments. The first is due no later than 11:59 PM CST on Mon., 1/23. The second is due no later than 11:59 PM CST on Mon., 1/30. Each should be submitted via email to me either directly (jnb047@shsu.edu) or through Blackboard.

For the first article review assignment, please look through the online table of contents for the past three or four issues of the following top-ranked IR journals: *International Organization*, *International Security*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Journal of Peace Research*, *Security Studies*, and *Conflict Management and Peace Science*. After skimming the titles in these various tables of contents, please select one article that sounds most interesting to you, read it, and then write a brief evaluative assessment that (1) summarizes and critiques the article, (2) explains why you chose it, and (3) indicates how you might use or improve upon the article in your own research or work. This paper should be no longer than three double-spaced pages (typed in Times New Roman 12-point font with 1 inch margins all around). It is due to me via email no later than 11:59 PM CST on Mon., 1/23.

For the second article review, please look through the reference section or bibliography of the article chosen for your first review assignment. Please select one article that appears to take a contrasting perspective on the issue under consideration, read it, and then write a brief evaluative assessment that (1) summarizes and critiques the article, (2) indicates how it differs from the first article, and (3) explains which article you find more convincing. This paper should be no longer than three double-spaced pages (typed in Times New Roman 12-point font with 1 inch margins all around). It is due to me via email no later than 11:59 PM CST on Mon., 1/30.

Debate Discussion Facilitation

Each student is responsible for leading class discussion on one scholarly debate. The purpose of this assignment is twofold. First, this assignment is designed to help you strengthen your critical reading, thinking, and communication skills, all of which are important components of evaluating and actually doing good research. Second, this assignment is meant to foster engagement with your fellow students.

Each assignment involves two components: 1) a written handout on the debate, including three discussion questions, and 2) a facilitation of class discussion on the debate. I will explain each component in turn.

Written Handout

The written handout can be structured in outline form and should combine a discussion of each article in the debate with an attempt at synthesizing the debate as a whole. Your handout also should include at least three discussion questions for the class to consider and debate. Ideally, the handout will devote no more than one single-spaced page for each reading and one page for the synthesis and discussion questions (typed in Times New Roman 12-point font with 1 inch margins all around). Thus, for example, if there are three articles in the debate, the handout should be no more than four single-spaced pages in length.

In writing the handout, you might start by briefly summarizing each of the sources – for instance, identifying the main question(s) or issue(s) raised, answer(s) proposed, or critique(s) made by the authors – to demonstrate that you have read and understood their arguments. You might then state any specific questions, concerns, or critiques you have of the individual articles. In the synthesis part of the handout, you might indicate how the different authors approach the question(s) or issue(s), how their interpretations of it compare and contrast, how significant a challenge or issue they see it as being, what variables they see as causing or affecting it, which actors they see as essential for addressing it, what evidence they offer to support their arguments, and what, if any, policy recommendations they offer. Obviously, it might not be possible to cover all of these topics in any given handout, but these are some of the questions you should keep in mind when reading these sources.

All handouts should feature at least the following five elements: 1) a summary of the sources consulted; 2) an indication of how these sources compare and contrast on different issues; 3) some sort of overall synthesis or comparative assessment of the sources vis-à-vis one another; 4) an indication and explanation of which argument(s) you found most and least convincing; and 5) at least three discussion questions for the class to consider and debate.

Due to the size of the class, some debates may be assigned to more than one student. When this is the case, each assigned student is responsible for writing and submitting his/her own handout on the debate.

The handout must be emailed to the entire class through Blackboard no later than 11:59 PM CST on the Wednesday assigned to that debate. Please see the Course Outline and Class Schedule below for specific due dates.

Discussion Facilitation

The student(s) assigned to each debate must post three questions to the relevant debate discussion board. These questions should be written with the goal of stimulating discussion among the entire class, aimed at understanding, analyzing, and evaluating the debate. The student facilitators must then post follow-up comments as participants in the discussion.

For any debate that is assigned to more than one student, I will consult with those students ahead of time to help identify a total of three questions to be posted for that debate (drawn from the questions each student has developed on his/her own).

These questions must be posted to the relevant debate discussion board no later than 11:59 PM CST on the Wednesday assigned to that debate. Please see the Course Outline and Class Schedule below for specific due dates.

Debate Discussion Board Participation

Participation in the debate discussion board is not filler in this course. Instead, the debate discussion board is the principal medium through which students interact, discuss, and debate the course materials. For each debate, students are required to post an initial and follow-up responses to the discussion questions and other students' comments. I recommend reviewing the debate discussion board grading criteria below before participating in the discussion.

Final Exam

The final assignment is a mock comprehensive exam question for the IR subfield. It will be distributed on Wed., 5/3, and due back to me via email no later than 11:59 PM CST on Wed., 5/10.

Grading Criteria for the Written Assignments

All of the following factors are things that I will be looking for when grading your written assignments:

1. Following directions: assignments that conform to my specifications in terms of due date, page length, margins, typestyle, structure, etc. will score better than those that do not.
2. Tightness of focus: assignments that closely focus on the specific articles concerned will score better than those that do not.
3. Clarity of argument and expression: assignments that clearly express themselves and advance specific arguments will score better than assignments that are vague, confusing, or do not advance specific arguments.
4. Conciseness and brevity: assignments that avoid unnecessary repetition will score better than assignments that do not.
5. Structure: assignments that are well-structured will score better than assignments that are poorly organized.
6. Ability to identify important points or concepts: assignments that carefully distill what is essential to an author's argument and analysis from what is secondary or peripheral – and that identify key points of similarity and difference across articles – will score better than assignments that do not.

7. Depth, specificity, and sophistication of argument: assignments that demonstrate extensive thought – and that make specific, original, innovative, complex, and/or incisive arguments and analysis – will score better than assignments that appear to have been written in a hurry.
8. Quality of presentation: assignments that are proofread, spell-checked, well-written, and clearly expressed will score better than assignments that are not.
9. Full and appropriate reference(s): the main article(s) being discussed must be properly cited and referenced in a uniform bibliographic style.

Grading Criteria for Debate Discussion Board Participation

Criteria	A (3 points)	B (2 points)	C (1 point)	D-F (0 points)
Frequency	Participates 3-4 times distributed throughout week	Participates 3-4 times but not distributed throughout week	Participates 1-2 times on the same day	Participates 0 times
Initial Posting	Posting directly and specifically engages all discussion questions	Posting directly and specifically engages some discussion questions	Posting indirectly and generally engages discussion questions	Posts no response to discussion questions
Follow-Up Postings	Postings demonstrate analysis of others' posts and meaningfully extends discussion by building on previous posts	Postings elaborate on an existing post with further comment or observation	Postings contribute generally or vaguely (e.g., by simply agreeing or disagreeing) without enriching the discussion	Posts no follow-up responses to others
Content Contribution	Posts are factually correct, reflective, and substantive contributions that advance discussion	Posts are factually accurate but lack full conceptual development or reflective thought	Posts repeat but do not add substantively to discussion	Posts are off-topic, factually incorrect, or otherwise irrelevant to the discussion
References & Support	Posts cite specific literatures and course materials to support comments	Posts cite general course materials to support comments	Posts cite only personal experience to support comments	Posts include no substantive support for comments
Clarity & Mechanics	Posts are clear, concise, and formatted in an easily readable style without grammatical errors	Posts are informative but contain minor clarity and mechanics errors	Posts are courteous but not especially informative and contain clarity and mechanics errors	Posts are long, unorganized, rude, error-laden, or otherwise inappropriate

Communication & Response Time

My virtual office hours are TU/W/TH 3:30 – 4:30 PM CST. If you contact me during my office hours, you can expect a response during or shortly after this time period. If you contact me outside my office hours, you can expect a response within 24 hours (except on weekends, when my response time may be longer).

If you have questions or concerns at any point during the semester, please do not hesitate to contact me. I am here to help you get as much out of this course as you want.

University Policies

SHSU's policies on academic dishonesty, religious holidays, students with disabilities, and visitors in the classroom are available at: <http://www.shsu.edu/syllabus/>. For policies pertaining to Services for Students with Disabilities, please see: www.shsu.edu/dept/disability/.

Student Counseling Services

A recent American College Health Survey found stress, sleep problems, anxiety, depression, interpersonal concerns, death of a significant other and alcohol use among the top ten health impediments to academic performance. Students experiencing personal problems or situational crises during the semester are encouraged to contact the SHSU Counseling Center for assistance, support and advocacy. This service is free and confidential. The center is located in the new Student Health & Counseling Center. Ph. (936)-294-1720.

Student Veterans

The Veterans Resource Center assists SHSU students who have served the country with their transition into university life. First Floor of Academic Building III; (936)-294-1046.

Course Outline

Week	Dates (Wed – Tue)	Topic	Assignment(s)
1	1/18 – 1/24	Lecture 1	*All Students: <i>Lecture 1 review forum post</i> Due by Mon., 1/23 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>First article review</i> Due by Mon., 1/23 @ 11:59 PM CST
2	1/25 – 1/31	Lecture 2	*All Students: <i>Lecture 2 review forum post</i> Due by Mon., 1/30 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Second article review</i> Due by Mon., 1/30 @ 11:59 PM CST
3	2/1 – 2/7	Debate 1	*Facilitator(s): <i>Debate 1 written assignment</i> Due by Wed., 2/1 @ 11:59 PM CST

			<i>Debate 1 discussion questions</i> Due by Wed., 2/1 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 1 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 2/7 @ 11:59 PM CST *All other students <i>Debate 1 initial discussion post</i> Due by Sat., 2/4 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 1 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 2/7 @ 11:59 PM CST
4	2/8 – 2/14	Lecture 3	*All Students: <i>Lecture 3 review forum post</i> Due by Mon., 2/13 @ 11:59 PM CST
5	2/15 – 2/21	Debate 2	*Facilitator(s): <i>Debate 2 written assignment</i> Due by Wed., 2/15 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 2 discussion questions</i> Due by Wed., 2/15 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 2 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 2/21 @ 11:59 PM CST *All other students <i>Debate 2 initial discussion post</i> Due by Sat., 2/19 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 2 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 2/21 @ 11:59 PM CST
6	2/22 – 2/28	Lecture 4	*All Students: <i>Lecture 4 review forum post</i> Due by Mon., 2/27 @ 11:59 PM CST
7	3/1 – 3/7	Debate 3	*Facilitator(s): <i>Debate 3 written assignment</i> Due by Wed., 3/1 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 3 discussion questions</i> Due by Wed., 3/1 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 3 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 3/7 @ 11:59 PM CST *All other students <i>Debate 3 initial discussion post</i> Due by Sat., 3/5 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 3 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 3/7 @ 11:59 PM CST
8	3/8 – 3/14	Debate 4	*Facilitator(s): <i>Debate 4 written assignment</i> Due by Wed., 3/8 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 4 discussion questions</i> Due by Wed., 3/8 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 4 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 3/14 @ 11:59 PM CST

			*All other students <i>Debate 4 initial discussion post</i> Due by Sat., 3/12 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 4 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 3/14 @ 11:59 PM CST
9	3/15 – 3/21	Spring Break	Spring Break
10	3/22 – 3/28	Debate 5	*Facilitator(s): <i>Debate 5 written assignment</i> Due by Wed., 3/22 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 5 discussion questions</i> Due by Wed., 3/22 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 5 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 3/28 @ 11:59 PM CST *All other students <i>Debate 5 initial discussion post</i> Due by Sat., 3/26 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 5 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 3/28 @ 11:59 PM CST
11	3/29 – 4/4	Lecture 5	*All Students: <i>Lecture 5 review forum post</i> Due by Mon., 4/3 @ 11:59 PM CST
12	4/5 – 4/11	Debate 6	*Facilitator(s): <i>Debate 6 written assignment</i> Due by Wed., 4/5 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 6 discussion questions</i> Due by Wed., 4/5 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 6 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 4/11 @ 11:59 PM CST *All other students <i>Debate 6 initial discussion post</i> Due by Sat., 4/9 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 6 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 4/11 @ 11:59 PM CST
13	4/12 – 4/18	Lecture 6	*All Students: <i>Lecture 6 review forum post</i> Due by Mon., 4/17 @ 11:59 PM CST
14	4/19 – 4/25	Lecture 7	*All Students: <i>Lecture 7 review forum post</i> Due by Mon., 4/24 @ 11:59 PM CST
15	4/26 – 5/2	Debate 7	*Facilitator(s): <i>Debate 7 written assignment</i> Due by Wed., 4/26 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 7 discussion questions</i> Due by Wed., 4/26 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 7 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 5/2 @ 11:59 PM CST

			*All other students <i>Debate 7 initial discussion post</i> Due by Sat., 4/30 @ 11:59 PM CST <i>Debate 7 follow-up discussion posts</i> Due by Tue., 5/2 @ 11:59 PM CST
16	5/3 – 5/10	Final Exam	*All students <i>Final Exam</i> Due by Wed., 5/10 @ 11:59 PM CST

Class Schedule

Please note that the following is a tentative schedule of class meetings that is subject to change as needed.

Week 1 (1/18 – 1/24): Lecture 1 – The History of IR as an Academic Enterprise

Learning Objectives

By the end of this class meeting, students should be able to answer the following questions:

- 1) What is International Relations?
- 2) What is sovereign statehood?
- 3) What is anarchy?
- 4) What is the role of theory?
- 5) What are the four great debates?

Materials

- 1) Lecture 1 – Slides
- 2) Lecture 1 – Narrative
- 3) Lecture 1 – Summary

Readings

- 1) Brian C. Schmidt, “On the History and Historiography of International Relations,” in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002), pp. 3-17. [available as an e-book on the SHSU library website...by searching the book title, not the article title]
- 2) Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, Chapters 2-4 (pp. 18-78)
- 3) Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Chapter 1 (pp. 1-33).

Assignments

- 1) Lecture 1 review forum post due by Mon., 1/23 @ 11:59 PM CST.
- 2) First article review due by Mon., 1/23 @ 11:59 PM CST.

Week 2 (1/25 – 1/31): Lecture 2 – The Foundations of IR as an Academic Enterprise

Learning Objectives

By the end of this class meeting, students should be able to answer the following questions:

- 1) What is meta-theory?
- 2) What are the two sets of fundamental questions in 20th century philosophy of science?
- 3) What are the four main positions and protagonists in the debate over these questions?

Materials

- 1) Lecture 2 – Slides
- 2) Lecture 2 – Narrative
- 3) Lecture 2 – Summary

Readings

- 1) Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, Chapter 1 (pp. 1-17).
- 2) Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Chapter 1 (pp. 33-40).
- 3) Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, “How Not to be Lakatos Intolerant: Appraising Progress in IR Research,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (June 2002), pp. 231-262. [available on JSTOR]

Assignments

- 1) Lecture 2 review forum post due by Mon., 1/30 @ 11:59 PM CST
- 2) Second article review due by Mon., 1/30 @ 11:59 PM CST.

Week 3 (2/1 – 2/7): Debate 1 – Can and Should IR Ditch the Prevailing Schools of Thought? Lake and His Critics

Readings

- 1) David A. Lake, “Why ‘isms’ Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (June 2011), pp. 465-480. [available on JSTOR]
- 2) Rudra Sil and Peter J. Katzenstein, “De-Centering, Not Discarding, the ‘Isms’: Some Friendly Amendments,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (June 2011), pp. 481-485. [available on JSTOR]
- 3) Henry R. Nau, “No Alternative to ‘Isms’,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 55, No. 2 (June 2011), pp. 487-491. [available on JSTOR]

Assignments

- 1) Facilitator(s):
 - a) Debate 1 written assignment due by Wed., 2/1 @ 11:59 PM CST.
 - b) Debate 1 discussion questions posted by Wed., 2/1 @ 11:59 PM CST.
 - c) Debate 1 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 2/7 @ 11:59 PM CST.
- 2) All other students:
 - a) Debate 1 initial discussion board post due by Sat., 2/4 @ 11:59 PM CST.
 - b) Debate 1 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 2/7 @ 11:59 PM CST.

Week 4 (2/8 – 2/14): Lecture 3 – Realism

Learning Objectives

By the end of this class meeting, students should be able to answer the following questions:

- 1) What are the five common elements in the realist worldview?
- 2) What are the three main evolutionary stages in the realist research tradition?

Materials

- 1) Lecture 3 – Slides
- 2) Lecture 3 – Narrative
- 3) Lecture 3 – Summary

Readings

- 1) Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (5 Ed., New York: Knopf, 1978), Chapter 1 (pp. 4-15). [available online at: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/morg6.htm>]
- 2) Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, Chapters 5-6, 8 (pp. 79-128, 161-193).
- 3) Gideon Rose, “Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy,” *World Politics*, Vol. 51, No. 1 (October 1998), pp. 144-172. [available on JSTOR]

Assignment

- 1) Lecture 3 review forum post due by Mon., 2/13 @ 11:59 PM CST.

Week 5 (2/15 – 2/21): Debate 2 – Is Realist Work on the Balance of Power Degenerative? Vasquez and His Critics

Readings

- 1) John A. Vasquez, “The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz’s Balancing

- Proposition,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (December 1997), pp. 899-912. [available on JSTOR]
- 2) Kenneth N. Waltz, “Evaluating Theories,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (December 1997), pp. 913-917. [available on JSTOR]
 - 3) Thomas J. Christensen and Jack Snyder, “Progressive Research on Degenerative Alliances,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (December 1997), pp. 919-922. [available on JSTOR]
 - 4) Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, “Lakatos and Neorealism: A Reply to Vasquez,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (December 1997), pp. 923-926. [available on JSTOR]
 - 5) Randall L. Schweller, “New Realist Research on Alliances: Refining, Not Refuting, Waltz’s Balancing Proposition,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (December 1997), pp. 927-930. [available on JSTOR]
 - 6) Stephen M. Walt, “The Progressive Power of Realism,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (December 1997), pp. 931-935. [available on JSTOR]

Assignments

- 1) Facilitator(s):
 - a) Debate 2 written assignment due by Wed., 2/15 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 2 discussion questions posted by Wed., 2/15 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - c) Debate 2 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 2/21 @ 11:59 PM CST
- 2) All other students:
 - a) Debate 2 initial discussion board post due by Sat., 2/19 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 2 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 2/21 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 6 (2/22 – 2/28): Lecture 4 – Classical Liberalism

Learning Objectives

By the end of this class meeting, students should be able to answer the following questions:

- 1) What are the three common elements in the classical liberal worldview?
- 2) What are the main stages of development in the classical liberal tradition?
- 3) What is the Kantian triangle?
- 4) What are the two major lines of debate in the democratic peace literature?

Materials

- 1) Lecture 4 – Slides
- 2) Lecture 4 – Narrative
- 3) Lecture 4 – Summary

Readings

- 1) Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (Autumn 1997), pp. 513-554. [available on JSTOR]
- 2) John R. Oneal & Bruce Russett, "The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992," *World Politics*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (October 1999), pp. 1-37. [available on JSTOR]

Assignment

- 1) Lecture 4 review forum post due by Mon., 2/27 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 7 (3/1 – 3/7): Debate 3 – Is There a Democratic Peace? Layne & Spiro vs. Russett & Doyle (vs. Huth & Allee)

Readings

- 1) Christopher Layne, "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Autumn 1994), pp. 5-49. [available on JSTOR]
- 2) David E. Spiro, "The Insignificance of the Liberal Peace," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Autumn 1994), pp. 50-86. [available on JSTOR]
- 3) Bruce Russett, Christopher Layne, David E. Spiro, and Michael W. Doyle, "The Democratic Peace," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (Spring 1995), pp. 164-184. [available on JSTOR]
- 4) Paul K. Huth and Todd L. Allee, "Domestic Political Accountability and the Escalation and Settlement of International Disputes," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 46, No. 6 (December 2002), pp. 754-790. [available on JSTOR]

Assignments

- 1) Facilitator(s):
 - a) Debate 3 written assignment due by Wed., 3/1 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 3 discussion questions posted by Wed., 3/1 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - c) Debate 3 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 3/7 @ 11:59 PM CST
- 2) All other students:
 - a) Debate 3 initial discussion board post due by Sat., 3/5 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 3 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 3/7 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 8 (3/8 – 3/14): Debate 4 – Does the Democratic Peace Make Sense? Rosato and His Critics

Readings

- 1) Sebastian Rosato, “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (November 2003), pp. 585-602. [available on JSTOR]
- 2) David Kinsella, “No Rest for the Democratic Peace,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 3 (August 2005), pp. 453-457. [available on JSTOR]
- 3) Branislav L. Slantchev, Anna Alexandrova, and Erik Gartzke, “Probabilistic Causality, Selection Bias, and the Logic of the Democratic Peace,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 3 (August 2005), pp. 459-462. [available on JSTOR]
- 4) Michael W. Doyle, “Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 3 (August 2005), pp. 463-466. [available on JSTOR]
- 5) Sebastian Rosato, “Explaining the Democratic Peace,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 3 (August 2005), pp. 467-472. [available on JSTOR]

Assignments

- 1) Facilitator(s):
 - a) Debate 4 written assignment due by Wed., 3/8 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 4 discussion questions posted by Wed., 3/8 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - c) Debate 4 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 3/14 @ 11:59 PM CST
- 2) All other students:
 - a) Debate 4 initial discussion board post due by Sat., 3/12 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 4 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 3/14 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 9 (3/15 – 3/21): No Class...Enjoy Spring Break!

Week 10 (3/22 – 3/28): Debate 5 – Does Democracy Foster Military Victory? Reiter & Stam vs. Desch

Readings

- 1) Dan Reiter and Allan Stam, *Democracies at War*, Chapters 1-8 (pp. 1-205).
- 2) Michael C. Desch, “Democracy and Victory: Why Regime Type Hardly Matters,” *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 2 (Fall 2002), pp. 5-47. [available on JSTOR]
- 3) Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam, “Understanding Victory: Why Political Institutions Matter,” *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 1(Summer 2003), pp. 168-179. [available on JSTOR]
- 4) Michael C. Desch, “Democracy and Victory: Fair Fights or Food Fights?” *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 1(Summer 2003), pp. 180-194. [available on JSTOR]

Assignments

- 1) Facilitator(s):
 - a) Debate 5 written assignment due by Wed., 3/22 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 5 discussion questions posted by Wed., 3/22 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - c) Debate 5 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 3/28 @ 11:59 PM CST
- 2) All other students:
 - a) Debate 5 initial discussion board post due by Sat., 3/26 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 5 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 3/28 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 11 (3/29 – 4/4): Lecture 5 – Neoliberal institutionalism

Learning Objectives

By the end of this class meeting, students should be able to answer the following questions:

- 1) What is the motivating question of neoliberal institutionalism?
- 2) What is the motivating goal of neoliberal institutionalism?
- 3) What is the distinguishing assumption of neoliberal institutionalism?
- 4) What is cooperation?
- 5) What is the problem and paradox of cooperation?
- 6) What is the prisoners' dilemma?
- 7) What is Axelrod's solution to the prisoners' dilemma?
- 8) How do neoliberals use Axelrod's solution to answer their motivating question?
- 9) What are the two major criticisms leveled against neoliberal institutionalism?
- 10) What are the three broad areas of difference between neorealists and neoliberals?

Materials

- 1) Lecture 5 – Slides
- 2) Lecture 5 – Narrative
- 3) Lecture 5 – Summary

Readings

- 1) Robert Keohane, *After Hegemony*, Chapters 1, 4-6 (pp. 5-11, 49-109).
- 2) John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (Winter 1994-95), pp. 5-49. [available on JSTOR]
- 3) Barbara Koremenos, "The Continent of International Law," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 57, No. 4 (August 2013), pp. 653-681. [available on JSTOR]

Assignment

- 1) Lecture 5 review forum post due by Mon., 4/3 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 12 (4/5 – 4/11): Debate 6 – Is Cooperation Impeded by Relative Gains Concerns? Greico and His Critics

Readings

- 1) Joseph M. Grieco, “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism,” *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (Summer 1988), pp. 485-507. [available on JSTOR]
- 2) Duncan Snidal, “Relative Gains and the Pattern of International Cooperation,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 85, No. 3 (September 1991), pp. 701-726. [available on JSTOR]
- 3) Robert Powell, “Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 85, No. 4 (December 1991), pp. 1303-1320. [available on JSTOR]
- 4) Joseph Grieco, Robert Powell, and Duncan Snidal, “The Relative-Gains Problem for International Cooperation,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 3 (September 1993), pp. 729-743. [available on JSTOR]

Assignments

- 1) Facilitator(s):
 - a) Debate 6 written assignment due by Wed., 4/5 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 6 discussion questions posted by Wed., 4/5 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - c) Debate 6 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 4/11 @ 11:59 PM CST
- 2) All other students:
 - a) Debate 6 initial discussion board post due by Sat., 4/9 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 6 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 4/11 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 13 (4/12 – 4/18): Lecture 6 – The English School

Learning Objectives

By the end of this class meeting, students should be able to answer the following questions:

- 1) What are the four common elements in the English School perspective?
- 2) What are the English School’s six dimensions of normative responsibility?
- 3) What are the English School’s two conceptions of international society?

Materials

- 1) Lecture 6 – Slides
- 2) Lecture 6 – Narrative
- 3) Lecture 6 – Summary

Readings

- 1) Nicholas J. Wheeler, "Pluralist or Solidarist Conceptions of International Society: Bull and Vincent on Humanitarian Intervention," *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (December 1992), pp. 463-487. [available on Sage Journals]
- 2) Barry Buzan, "The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (2001), pp. 471-481. [available on JSTOR]
- 3) Robert Jackson, *The Global Covenant: Human Conduct in a World of States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), Chapter 7 (pp. 156-182). [available as an e-book on the SHSU library website]
- 4) Thomas Diez and Richard Whitman, "Analysing European Integration: Reflections on the English School – Scenarios for an Encounter," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (March 2002), pp. 43-67. [available on Wiley Online Library]

Assignment

- 1) Lecture 6 review forum post due by Mon., 4/17 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 14 (4/19 – 4/25): Lecture 7 – Constructivism

Learning Objectives

By the end of this class meeting, students should be able to answer the following questions:

- 1) What are the three main elements of the constructivist worldview?
- 2) What are Wendt's three cultures of anarchy?
- 3) What are Wendt's three degrees of cultural internalization?
- 4) What are Wendt's nine modes of anarchy?

Materials

- 1) Lecture 7 – Slides
- 2) Lecture 7 – Narrative
- 3) Lecture 7 – Summary

Readings

- 1) Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics*, Chapters 2-8 (pp. 47-378).

Assignment

- 1) Lecture 7 review forum post due by Mon., 4/24 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 15 (4/26 – 5/2): Debate 7 – Can Realism Explain European Integration? Rosato and His Critics

Readings

- 1) Sebastian Rosato, *Europe United*, Chapters 1-6 (pp. 1-254).
- 2) Andrew Moravcsik, “Did Power Politics Cause European Integration? Realist Theory Meets Qualitative Methods,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (October-December 2013), pp. 773-790. [available on Academic Search Complete]
- 3) Craig Parsons, “Power, Patterns, and Process in European Union History,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (October-December 2013), pp. 791-801. [available on Academic Search Complete]
- 4) Sebastian Rosato, “Theory and Evidence in *Europe United*: A Reply to My Critics,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (October-December 2013), pp. 802-820. [available on Academic Search Complete]

Assignments

- 1) Facilitator(s):
 - a) Debate 7 written assignment due by Wed., 4/26 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 7 discussion questions posted by Wed., 4/26 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - c) Debate 7 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 5/2 @ 11:59 PM CST
- 2) All other students:
 - a) Debate 7 initial discussion board post due by Sat., 4/30 @ 11:59 PM CST
 - b) Debate 7 follow-up discussion board posts due by Tue., 5/2 @ 11:59 PM CST

Week 16 (5/3 – 5/10) – Final exam

Assignment

- 1) Final Exam due by Wed., 5/10 @ 11:59 PM CST