

**Political Science 240/IRGN 254
International Relations Theory**

(Spring Quarter 2003)

Prof. Stephan Haggard

**(Office hours, Monday 12-2, Robinson Building 1425
or by appointment at shaggard@ucsd.edu or 4-5781)**

This course provides an introduction to some strands of contemporary international relations theory.

Writing requirements (approximately 60 percent). Three five page papers on the assigned readings, due in class on the day of the discussion (late papers will not be accepted). Alternatively, you may write a single, 15-20 page review essay that deals with the assigned and background readings for a particular session in greater depth. "Background" readings include important or exemplary statements on a particular issue, provide more on the history of a given debate, or suggest cognate areas of inquiry that we cannot explore in depth (or even at all).

Seminar participation (approximately 40 percent). In addition to active participation in the discussion, students will be responsible for initiating one or two seminars—depending on class size--through a brief (10-15 minute) presentation. The presentation will simply outline some of the most important questions that arise out of the readings.

The following books have been ordered for purchase.

David A. Lake and Robert Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley, 1979.

Helen V. Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information: Domestic Politics and International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

Peter J. Katzenstein, Robert O. Keohane, and Stephen D. Krasner, eds., *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999. [Also available in *International Organization* 52, 4 (Autumn 1998).]

Robert Powell, *In the Shadow of Power: States and Strategies in International Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999).

Stephen van Evera, *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999).

I. March 31. Introduction. International Relations in the United States: A Sociology of Knowledge

Recommended

Miles Kahler, "Inventing International Relations: International Relations Theory after 1945," in Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, eds., *New Thinking in International Relations Theory* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1997), pp. 20-53

Katzenstein, Keohane, and Krasner, eds., *Exploration and Contestation in the Study of World Politics*, articles by Katzenstein, Keohane, and Krasner; Wæver; Ruggie; and Jervis.

Background

On US parochialism and other traditions in IR, see Stanley Hoffmann, "An American Social Science: International Relations," *Daedalus* 106, 3 (1977): 41-60 Robert Crawford and Darryl Jarvis, eds. *International Relations: Still an American Social Science* (2001).

For other critical reviews of the development of IR theory in the last several decades, see Kal Holsti, *The Dividing Discipline* (1985); Stephan Haggard, "Structuralism and Its Critics: Recent Progress in International Relations Theory," in Emanuel Adler and Beverly Crawford, ed., *Progress in Postwar International Relations*. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991.); and Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, *Progress in International Relations Theory* (2003). James Dougherty and Robert Pfaltzgraff, *Contending Theories of International Relations* (1996 and various earlier editions) provides an encyclopedia-like overview of the field.

The field has seen several waves of debate about the issue of "science," initially over "behavioral" vs. "traditional" approaches and most recently around the question of formal modeling. See Klaus Knorr and James Rosenau, ed., *Contending Approaches to International Politics* (1969); Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, "Toward a Scientific Understanding of International Conflict: A Personal View," *International Studies Quarterly* 29, 2 (1985) and the comments by Jervis and Krasner; and Steven Walt, "Rigor or Rigor Mortis: Rational Choice and Security Studies," *International Security* 23, 4 (Spring 1999) and the responses in *IS* 24, 2 (Fall 1999).

The relationship between IR theory and historical scholarship is also an uneasy one, although there are professional efforts afoot to bridge the gap through an organized APSA section on International History and Politics. See for example John Lewis Gaddis, "History, Science and the Study of International Relations," in Ngaire Woods, ed. *Explaining International Relations since 1945* (1996); Robert Jervis' comments on the debate over the balance of power and concert approaches to the 19th century system, "A Political Science Perspective on the Balance of Power and the Concert," *American Historical Review* 97, 3 (1992); Aaron Friedberg, *The Weary Titan: Britain and the Experience of Relative Decline, 1895-1905 and Fared Zakaria, From Wealth to Power* (1999).

II. April 7. Models of the International System I: Basic Choices and the Problems They are Supposed to Solve.

Robert Jervis, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, 30 (1978), pp. 167-214.

Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, chapters 1-6.

Helen Milner, "The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique," in David Baldwin, ed., *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).

David A. Lake, "Anarchy, hierarchy, and the variety of international relations," *International Organization*, 50, 1 (Winter 1996), pp. 1-34.

Miles Kahler, "Evolution, Choice, and International Change," in Lake and Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice*, pp. 165-196.

Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It," *International Organization* 46, 2 (1992)

Background.

On traditional conceptions of the balance of power, see Ernst Haas, "The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept of Propaganda?" *World Politics* 5 (1953): 442-477; Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations* (many editions); Inis Claude, *Power and International Relations* (1962), pp. 3-93. John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (2001) continues this tradition. Edward Gulick's *Europe's Classical Balance of Power* (1967) is an influential historical account on the 19th century system, but see the essay by Jervis cited above.

Systems theory rose and fell out of favor, but Robert Jervis, *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life* (1997) revives it, for example in his discussion of feedback (ch. 4).

For more on the debate over neo-realism see John Ruggie, "Continuity and Transformation in the World Polity: Toward a Neorealist Synthesis," *World Politics* 35, 2 (1983); Robert Keohane, ed. *Neorealism and Its Critics* (1986); Barry Buzan, Charles Jones, and Richard Little, *The Logic of Anarchy: Neorealism to Structural Realism* (1993); David Baldwin, ed. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate* (1993); Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (1999); Emanuel Adler, "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism and World Politics" *European Journal of International Relations* 3 (1997); Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: Liberalism and IR Theory," *IO* (Autumn 1997) and Jeff Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24, 2 (Fall 1999 and the responses in *IS* 25, 1 [Summer 2000]).

Joseph Grieco cast the debate over realism in terms of "relative gains" in *Cooperation Among Nations: Europe, America, and Non-Tariff Barriers to Trade* (1990), but see Robert Powell "Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory," *American Political Science Review* 85, 4 (1991): 1303-1320.

An important precursor to certain strands of constructivism—although he denied it—is Hedley Bull's *Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (1977) and the collection *Hedley Bull on International Society* (2000) edited by Kai Alderson and Andrew Hurrell. A recent exemplar of this tradition is Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society* (1996) and "Norms, Culture and World Politics: Insights from Sociology's Institutionalism," *IO* 50 (1996): 325-347.

On economic models of systemic change, see George Modelski, "The Long Cycle of Global Politics and the Nation State," *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 20, 2 (1978): 214-35; Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in International Politics* (1981); Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 500 to 2000* (1987); Joshua Goldstein, *Long Cycles: Prosperity and War in the Modern Age* (1988); and Torbjorn Knutsen, *The Rise and Fall of World Orders* (1999).

For models of the international system that emphasize its hierarchical dimension, see Wolfgang Mommsen, *Theories of Imperialism* (University of Chicago Press, 1977) for a compact summary of classic theories of imperialism; Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World System I* (New York: Academic Press) and his many other writings on the "world systems" approach; Robert W. Tucker's realist account, *The Inequality of Nations* (New York, Basic Books 1977); Michael W. Doyle, *Empires* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986); and Robert W. Cox, *Production, Power and World Order* (1987); and Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri's incomprehensible *Empire* (2000). Inequality has been a central theme in the outpouring of work on "globalization" but the links have not been made to international politics; a useful exception is Andrew Hurrell and Ngaire Woods eds. *Inequality, Globalization and World Politics* (1999).

Samuel Huntington sees the international system in terms of *The Clash of Civilizations: Remaking of World Order* (1996).

Stephen Krasner has revived discussion of the concept of sovereignty as a constitutive element of the international order. See his "Compromising Westphalia," *International Security* 20, 3 (Winter 1995/96) 115-15 and *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (1999) and Hendrik Spruyt's fascinating historical account, *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors* (1994).

III. April 14. Models of the International System II: Outlines of the Rationalist Synthesis

Robert Powell, *In the Shadow of Power: States and Strategies in International Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), chapters 1, 3, 4, and 5.

David Lake and Robert Powell, "International Relations: a Strategic Choice Approach" and James D. Morrow, "The Strategic Setting of Choices: Signaling, Commitment, and Negotiation in International Politics," in Lake and Powell, *Strategic Choice*.

James Fearon, "Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation," *International Organization*, 52, 2 (Spring 1998), pp. 269-305.

James de Nardo, "Complexity, Formal Models, and Ideology in International Studies," in Michael Doyle and G. John Ikenberry, eds. *New Thinking in International Relations Theory* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997).

Background

Key contributions to the theory of coercive bargaining are Thomas C. Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict* (1960) and particularly *Arms and Influence* (1966). Some examples of early game-theoretic approaches to coercive bargaining and deterrence include Glenn H. Snyder and Paul Diesing, *Conflict among Nations: Bargaining, Decision-Making and System Structure in International Crises* (1977) and Stephen Brams, *Superpower Games* (1985).

Early statements of the problems of nuclear deterrence are Henry Kissinger, *Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy* (1957) and Bernard Brodie, *Strategy in the Missile Age* (1959). Some important contributions to the theory of deterrence include Alexander George and Richard Smoke, *Deterrence in American Foreign Policy* (1974); R. Harrison Wagner, "Deterrence and Bargaining," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 26, No. 2. (June, 1982), pp. 329-358; John Mearsheimer, *Conventional Deterrence* (1983); Frank Zagare, *The Dynamics of Deterrence* (1987); Paul Huth, *Extended Deterrence and the Prevention of War* (1988); "The Rational Deterrence Debate: A Symposium," in *World Politics* 41 (January 1989); Robert Powell, *Nuclear Deterrence Theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990); Frank Zagare and D. Mark Kilgour, *Perfect Deterrence* (2000). For a debate on method and measurement, see Richard Ned Lebow and Janice Gross Stein, "Deterrence: The Elusive Dependent Variable," *World Politics* (April 1990), pp. 336-369 and Paul Huth and Bruce Russett, "Testing Deterrence Theory: Rigor Makes a Difference," *World Politics* 52 (July 1990), pp. 466-501. A useful review is Paul K. Huth, "Deterrence and International Conflict," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 2. (1999), pp. 25-48.

On arms races, crisis bargaining and escalation, see G. D. Hess for a succinct introduction to Richardson's contribution, "An Introduction to Lewis Fry Richardson and His Mathematical Theory of War and Peace," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 14, 1 (1995): 77-113 and Herman Kahn, *On Escalation* (1965). Examples of more recent refinements include James Morrow, "Capabilities, Uncertainty and Resolve: A Limited Information Model of Crisis Bargaining," *AJPS* 33, 4 (1989): 941-72; James Fearon, "Signaling vs. the Balance of Power and Interests: An Empirical Test of a Crisis Bargaining Model," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38, 2 (1994): 236-69; Andrew Kydd, "Game Theory and the Spiral Model," *World Politics* 49 (1997): 371-400; Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James Morrow and Ethan R. Zorick, "Capabilities, Perception and Escalation," *American Political Science Review* 91, 1 (1997): 15-27; Anne Sartori, "The Might of the Pen: A Reputational Theory of Communication in International Disputes," *International Organization* 56, 1 (2002). A useful overview is Kenneth Schultz, *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy* (2001), ch. 2.

IV. April 21. An Application: Some Approaches to War

Stephen Van Evera, *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1999). Entire book except chapter 8, but read selectively using the list of hypotheses in the Appendix as a guide.

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

Eric Gartzke, "War is in the Error Term," *International Organization*, 53, 3 (Summer 1999), pp. 567-587.

Robert Powell, "Bargaining Theory and International Conflict," *American Review of Political Science* 5 (2002): 1-30.

Background

The literature on war is vast, and the issue is treated in much more detail in seminars by Christian Gleditsch and Branislav Stanchev; van Evera in particular provides an exhaustive guide to the literature. See Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War* (Norton Critical Edition, 1998 has very useful essays); Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, (1976 edition, edited by Peter Paret, Michael Howard and Bernard Brodie has excellent introductory essays); Edward Hallett Carr's influential interpretation of the interwar period, *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939* (1939, reprinted 1964); Kenneth Waltz's *Man, the State, and War* (1959); Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War* (1973); Donald Wittman, "How a War Ends: A Rational Model Approach," *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 23, No. 4. (Dec., 1979), pp. 743-763, which was an important precursor to the bargaining approach to war; Bruce Bueno de Mesquita's expected utility model in *The War Trap* (1981) and BDM and David Lalman, *War and Reason* (1992); and the "power transition" approaches in A. F. K. Organski and Jacek Kugler, *The War Ledger* (1981) and Dale Copeland's *The Origins of Major War* (2000). John Vazquez, *The War Puzzle* (1993) provides an overview of the inductive tradition of war studies associated with J. David Singer among others. A useful review is Jack Levy, "The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace," *Annual Review of Political Science* 1998 1:139-165. There is no substitute for gaining familiarity with a particular conflict, and all students interested in security studies should have some knowledge of the origins, course and termination of World Wars I and II.

The study of war cannot be limited to interstate conflicts; one of the more dynamic areas of research in the field at the moment is on civil wars. See Barry Posen, "The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict," in Michael E. Brown, ed. *Ethnic Conflict and International Security* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993). James Fearon and David Laitin, "Explaining Interethnic Cooperation," *APSR* 90,4 (1996): 715-735; David Lake and Donald Rothchild, eds., *The International Spread of Ethnic Conflict* (1998); David Mason and Patrick Fett, "How Civil Wars End: A Rational Choice Approach," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40, 4 (1996): 546-68; Barbara Walter and Jack Snyder, eds., *Civil Wars, Insecurity and Intervention* (1999), particularly de Figueiredo and Weingast "The Rationality of Fear" and Barbara Walter, *Committing to Peace: The Successful Settlement of Civil Wars* (2002).

V. April 28. Theories of International Institutions

Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984), chapter 5.

Lisa Martin, "Interests, Power and Multilateralism," *International Organization* 46, 4 (Autumn 1992): 765-792)

Lisa L. Martin and Beth Simmons, "Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions," in Katzenstein, Keohane, and Krasner, eds., *Exploration and Contestation*.

Barbara Koremenos, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal, "The Rational Design of International Institutions," *International Organization* 55, 4 (Autumn 2001), pp.761-799.

Kenneth Abbot et. al., "The Concept of Legalization" and Kenneth Abbot and Duncan Snidal, "Hard and Soft Law in International Governance," and Judith Goldstein, Miles Kahler, Robert O. Keohane, and Anne-Marie Slaughter, eds., *Legalization and World Politics*, chapters by Abbott et al., Abbott and Snidal, Kahler. [Also available in *International Organization* 54, 3 (Summer 2000)]

Background

An important precursor to the early-1970s revival in the study of international institutions was work on national and regional integration, including particularly Karl Deutsch, *Nationalism and Social Communication* (1953) and Ernst Haas, *The Uniting of Europe* (1958). The study of European integration, including its legal components, remains vital and important; Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe* (1998) provides an historical introduction. See also the debates in the pages of *IO* on the Court of Justice, which touches on central issues of the meaning of the community: Anne-Marie Burley and Walter Mattli, "Europe Before the Court: A Political Theory of Legal Integration," *IO* 47 1 (1993): 41-76; the "Dissent and debate" between Garrett and Slaughter and Mattli in *IO* 49, 1 (1995): 171-190; and the symposium with articles by Geoffrey Garrett, R. Daniel Keleman and Heiner Schulz; Karen Alter; and Mattli and Slaughter in *IO*, 52, 1 (1998). Helen Milner and Ed Mansfield provide a broader overview of recent theoretical work on regionalism in *The Political Economy of Regionalism* (1997).

The revival of the study of international institutions crystallized in the 1970s around the concept of international regimes. See Stephen Krasner, ed. *International Regimes* (1983) and Kenneth Oye, *Cooperation under Anarchy* (1986). For reviews, see Stephan Haggard and Beth Simmons, "Theories of International Regimes," *International Organization* 41, 3 (1987): 491-517 and Andreas Hasenclever, Peter Mayer and Volker Rittberger, *Theories of International Regimes* (1997). Stephen Krasner emphasizes the difference between efficiency and distributive theories of regimes in "Global Communications and National Power: Life on the Pareto Frontier," *World Politics* 43, 3 (1991): 336-366. Beth Yarbrough and Robert Yarbrough apply a transactions cost approach to institutions in *Cooperation and Governance in International Trade* (1992). John Ruggie (ed.) renewed discussion of multilateralism as an institution in *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institution* (1993).

The process through which the study of international law was squeezed out of American international relations is outlined in Miles Kahler, "Inventing International Relations." Many introductory textbooks provide an introduction, and if you have an interest in international institutions you should take the time to scan one; for example, Mark Janis and John Noyes, *International Law: Cases and Commentary* (2001).

Security institutions include most broadly "concerts," which remain the subject of controversy with respect to the 19th century European system, and collective security arrangements, which the history of the League of Nations threw into ill-repute; useful discussions of both can be found in Inis Claude, *Power and International Relations* (1962). On the 19th century system, see Robert Jervis, "From Balance to Concert: A Study of International Security Cooperation," *World Politics* 38, 1 (1985): 58-79. A recent exchange on collective security which mirrors earlier debates is Charles Kupchan and Clifford Kupchan, "Concerts, Collective Security, and the Future of Europe," *International Security* 16, 1 (1991): 114-161 and Richard Betts "Systems for Peace or Causes of War? Collective Security, Arms Control and the New Europe," *International Security* 17, 1 (1992): 5-44. G. John Ikenberry looks at the settlement of major wars in terms of "constitutional" arrangements in *After Victory* (2001). Helga Haftendorn, Robert O. Keohane

and Celeste Wallander, eds. extend institutionalist models to the security realm in *Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions Over Time and Space* (1999). In *Security Communities* (1998), Manuel Adler and Michael Barnett (eds.) revived a concept first introduced by Karl Deutsch; see Deutsch et. Al. *Political Community in the North Atlantic Area* (1957). Examples of constructivist approaches to security cooperation can be found in Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security* (1996), particularly the essays by Risse-Kappen and Barnett on NATO and the Middle East respectively.

Alliance formation is a big topic, typically subsumed under discussions of balancing. However, alliances are institutions. See Mancur Olson and Richard Zeckhauser, "An Economic Theory of Alliances," *Review of Economics and Statistics* 48, 3 (1966) for a collective action approach; Michael Altfeld and Bruce Bueno de Mesquita's cost-benefit model in "Choosing Sides in Wars," *International Studies Quarterly* 23 (1979): 87-112; Steven Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (1987); Thomas Christensen and Jack Snyder, "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity," *International Organization* 44 (1990): 137-68; James Morrow, "Alliances and Asymmetry: an Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances," *AJPS* 35 (1991): 904-933; James Fearon, "Signaling Foreign Policy Interests: Tying Hands vs. Sinking Costs," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41, 1 (1997): 68-90.

For a realist critique of the new institutionalist enterprise, see John Meersheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security* 19, 3 (1994): 5-49 and responses by Mansfield and Snyder, Keohane and Martin, Kupchan and Kupchan, Ruggie, Wendt and Mearsheimer in *IS*, 20, 1 (Summer 1995). An attempt at integration from the realist side is Randall Schweller and David Priess, "A Tale of Two Realisms: Expanding the Institutions Debate," *Mershon International Studies Review* 41, Supplement (1997). The debate has recently turned to the question of compliance. See Abraham Chayes and Antonia Handler Chayes, "On Compliance," *International Organization* 47, 2 (1993), 175-205 and George W. Downs, David M. Rocke and Peter Barsoom, "Is the News About Compliance Good News about Cooperation?" *IO* 50, 3 (1996): 379-406.

One particular structural theory of international cooperation, institutions and outcomes that deserves special mention is the theory of hegemonic stability. See Robert Gilpin, *U.S. Power and the Multinational Corporation* (1975); Stephen Krasner, "State Power and the Structure of International Trade," *World Politics* 28, 3 (1978): 317-47; Charles Kindleberger, *The World in Depression, 1929-1939* (1973); Duncan Snidal, "The Limits of Hegemonic Stability," *International Organization* 39, 4 (1985): 579-614; David Lake, "Leadership, Hegemony and the International Economy," *International Studies Quarterly* 37, 4 (1993): 459-89; Robert Pahre, *Leading Questions: How Hegemony Affects the International Political Economy* (1999). For an acid commentary on the American preoccupation with hegemonic decline in the 1980s, see Susan Strange, "The Persistent Myth of Lost Hegemony," *IO* 41, 4 (1987): 551-74.

VI. May 5. Strategic Interaction under Conditions of Interdependence of Different Sorts: Markets, Networks, Transnational Relations

Jeffrey A. Frieden and Ronald Rogowski, "The Impact of the International Economy on National Policies: An Analytical Overview," in Robert O. Keohane and Helen V. Milner, eds., *Internationalization and Domestic Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 25-47.

Geoffrey Garrett, "Global Markets and National Politics: Collision Course or Virtuous Circle?" in Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner, eds. *Exploration and Contestation*.

Miles Kahler, "Modeling Races to the Bottom," at <http://www2-irps.ucsd.edu/faculty/mkahler/papers.html>.

Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1998), chs. 1, 2 and 6, and either 3, 4 or 5.

Thomas Risse-Kappen, "Bringing Transnational Relations Back in: An Introduction," and "Structures of Governance and Transnational Relations: What Have We Learned?" in Risse-Kappen, ed., *Bringing Transnational Relations Back In* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Background

Work in international political economy has developed around particular issue areas: trade, money and finance, foreign direct investment, and increasingly the movement of peoples and international environmental issues as well. This literature is reviewed in Lawrence Broz's IPE seminar and his syllabus

provides an introduction. A few more general issues deserve mention, however. Richard Cooper's *Economics of Interdependence* (1968) was one of the first works to outline the policy dilemmas associated with increasing economic integration among the advanced industrial states. Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye collected important early papers on *Transnational Relations and World Politics* (1972) and their *Power and Interdependence* (second edition, 1989) stimulated work on interdependence in political science. Peter Evans' *Dependent Development* (1979) both summarizes earlier dependency theory and moves beyond it. Dani Rodrik considers some of the general political dilemmas associated with globalization in "How Far Will International Economic Integration Go?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* (Winter 2000), but the "open economy politics" assumption hinges on the extent of integration; for a skeptical view see Robert Wade, "Globalization and its Limits: Reports of the Death of the National Economy are Greatly Exaggerated," in Suzanne Berger and Ronald Dore, *National Diversity and Global Capitalism* (1996).

There is of course substantial work that looks at the effects of international factors on domestic political outcomes. See Peter Gourevitch, "The Second Image Reversed: International Sources of Domestic Politics," *International Organization* 32, 4 (1978): 881-911. Keohane and Milner, eds., *Internationalization and Domestic Politics* (1996) provides an overview of the issues.

There is a large literature on "economic statecraft": the manipulation of international economic ties for political ends. Albert Hirschman's *National Power and the Structure of Foreign Trade* (1945, reprinted 1980), is still worth scrutiny. See also Harrison Wagner, "Economic Interdependence, Bargaining Power, and Political Influence," *International Organization*, 42, 3 (1988): 461-483; David Baldwin, *Economic Statecraft* (1985) and the substantial literature on sanctions; two recent contributions that provide good introductions are George Shambaugh, *States, Firms and Power* (1999) and Daniel Drezner, *The Sanctions Paradox* (1999). This literature is quite different than the question of whether and how international economic integration might affect conflict, a question that goes all the way back to Lenin's *Imperialism: the Highest Stage of Capitalism* and Schumpeter's *Imperialism and Social Classes*. See Susan McMillan, "Interdependence and Conflict," *Mershon International Studies Review* 41, 1 (1997): 33-58; Bruce Russett and John Oneal, *Triangulating Peace* (2001), ch. 4; Joanne Gowa, *Allies, Adversaries and Free Trade* (1994); Ed Mansfield, *Power, Trade and War* (1995). It is also different from the question of whether the existence of economic interdependence affects in any fundamental way the nature of international bargaining. John Odell addresses that issue in *Negotiating the World Economy* (2000), ch. 2.

In addition to the work on transnational relations and networks introduced by Keck and Risse-Kappen, there is also the question of the international diffusion of institutions, ideas and norms. See John Meyer's sociological approach in Michael Hannan and John Meyer, *National Development and the World System: Educational, Economic and Political Change, 1950-1970* (1979); Peter Hall, ed. *The Political Power of Economic Ideas: Keynesianism Across Nations* (1989); Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society* (1996).

VII. May 12. The Domestic Sources of State Behavior I: Outlines of the Current Rationalist Synthesis

Jeffrey Frieden, "Actors and Preferences in International Relations" and Ronald Rogowski, "Institutions as Constraints on Strategic Choice," in Lake and Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice*, pp. 115-136
Milner, *Interests, Institutions, and Information*, chapters 1-4, 9 and one of the remaining chapters (5-8)

James Fearon, "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes," *American Political Science Review* 88, 3 (1994): 577-92.

Kenneth Schultz, *Democracy and Coercive Diplomacy* (2001), chs. 2 and 3.

Background

The two level-game metaphor gained currency with Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: the Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization* 42, 3 (1988) and Peter Evans, Harold Jacobson, and Robert Putnam, eds. *Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics* (1993), and was incrementally refined; for example, Keisuke Iida, "When and How Do Domestic Constraints Matter? Two-Level Games with Uncertainty," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37, 3 (1993): 403-26 and Jongryn Mo, "The Logic of Two-Level Games with Endogenous Domestic Coalitions," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38, 3 (1994): 402-422.

Needless to say, the study of foreign policymaking is vast and a full consideration is far beyond the scope of this course. A number of classic articles on American foreign policy are conveniently collected in John Ikenberry, ed., *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays* (1989). Some suggestions for getting started in particular areas: on public opinion, Douglas Foyle, *Counting the Public In: Presidents, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy* (1999); on Congress; James M. Lindsay, *Congress and the Politics of U.S. Foreign Policy* (1994); on the executive, Richard Neustadt, *Presidential Power* (1967), I.M. Destler, *Presidents, Bureaucrats and Foreign Policy* (1972); Alexander George, *Presidential Decision-Making in Foreign Policy* (1980); on the constitutional issues surrounding executive-legislative relations, Gordon Silverstein, *Imbalance of Powers* (1997); on bureaucratic politics, Morton Halperin, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy* (1974), I.M. Destler, *Presidents, Bureaucrats and Foreign Policy* (1974); civil-military relations, Richard Betts, *Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises* (1977), Samuel Huntington, *The Soldier and the State: the Theory and Politics of Civil-Military Relations* (1981); Barry Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine* (1984); Jack Snyder *The Ideology of the Offensive* (1984).

VIII. May 19. The Domestic Sources of State Behavior II: Institutions, Credible Commitments and Decision-Making Processes

Lisa L. Martin, *Democratic Commitments: Legislatures and International Cooperation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), chapters 1-3, 7, and 8.

Peter F. Cowhey, "Domestic Institutions and the Credibility of International Commitments: Japan and the United States," *International Organization* 47, 2 (Spring 1993), pp. 299-326.

Andrew MacIntyre, "Institutions and Investors: The Politics of Economic Crisis in Southeast Asia," *International Organization*, 55, 1 (Winter 2001), pp. 81-122.

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

Jonathan Bendor and Thomas Hammond, "Rethinking Allison's Models," *American Political Science Review* 86, 2 (1992): 301-22.

IX. May 26. No Class.

X. May 19. The Domestic Sources of State Behavior III: Democracy, Coalitions, and Culture

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith, "An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace," *American Political Science Review* 93 (December 1999), pp. 791-807.

Kenneth A. Schultz, "Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform: Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War," *International Organization* 53 (Spring 1999) pp. 233-266.

Bruce Russett and John Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Independence and International Organizations* (2001), ch. 2.

Jack Snyder, *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), ch. 1-3.

Etel Solingen, *Regional Orders at Century's Dawn: Global and Domestic Influences on Grand Strategy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998), chs. 1-3.

Alastair Ian Johnston, "Cultural Realism and Strategy in Maoist China," in Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security* (1996).

Background

The literature on the democratic peace is an industry of its own and explored in more detail in advanced seminars, but some important contributions include Michael Doyle's "Liberalism and World Politics," *APSR* 80 (December 1986): 1151-1169; Bruce Russett *Grasping the Democratic Peace* (1993); David Lake, "Powerful Pacifists: Democratic States and War," *APSR* 86, 1 (March 1992): 24-37; Lars-Erik Cederman, "Back to Kant: Reinterpreting the Democratic Peace as a Macrohistorical Learning Process," *APSR* 95, 1 (2001): 15-31. Some self-explanatory extensions—by way of example--include Randall Schweller, "Domestic Structure and Preventive War: Are Democracies More Pacific?" *World Politics* 44 (January 1992): 235-269; Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder, "Democratization and the Danger of War," *International Security* 20, 1 (Summer 1995): 5-38; Charles Kegley and Margaret Hermann, "Military Intervention and the Democratic Peace," *International Interactions* 21, 1: 12-21; Randolph Siverson and Juliann Emmons, "Birds of a Feather: Democratic Political Systems and Alliance Choices in the 20th Century," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35, 2 (1996): 285-306. Zeev Moaz, "The Controversy over the Democratic Peace," *International Security* 22, 1 (Summer 1997): 162-198 provides a review.

Some important comparative "large" institutional and coalitional approaches to foreign economic policy include Peter Katzenstein, ed., *Between Power and Plenty* (1978) and Katzenstein, *Small States in World Markets* (1985); John Ruggie, "International Regimes, Transactions and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order," *IO*, 36 (1982): 379-415; Peter Gourevitch, *Politics in Hard Times: Comparative Responses to International Economic Crises* (1986); John Ikenberry, David Lake, and Michael Mastanduno, eds. *The State and American Foreign Policy* (1988); Jeffrey Frieden, "Invested Interests: the Politics of National Economic Policies in a World of Global Finance," *IO* 45 (1991): 425-452; Beth Simmons, *Who Adjusts? Domestic Sources of Foreign Economic Policy During the Interwar Years* (1994); Orfeo Fioretos, "The Domestic Sources of Multilateral Preferences: Varieties of Capitalism in the European Community," in Peter Hall and David Soskice, *Varieties of Capitalism* (2001).

The new cultural approach is best outlined in Katzenstein, ed., *The Culture of National Security* (1996), but individual contributions from very different national settings include Jeffrey Legro, *Cooperation Under Fire: Anglo-German Restraint During World War II* (1995); Alastair Johnston, *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (1995); Elizabeth Kier, *Imagining War: French and British Military Doctrine between the Wars* (1997).

XI. June 9. Rationality and Cognitive Processes: Does It Make a Difference How the Brain Works?

Miles Kahler, "Rationality in International Relations," in Katzenstein, Keohane and Krasner, eds. *Exploration and Contestation*.

Robert Jervis, "Hypotheses on Misperception," *World Politics* 20, 3 (April 1968): 454-79.

Arthur Stein, "When Misperception Matters," *World Politics* 34, 4 (July 1982): 505-26.

Jack Levy, "Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield," *International Organization* 48, 2 (1994): 279-312.

Yuen Foong Khong, *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and Vietnam Decisions of 1965* (Princeton University Press, 1992), ch. 2, "The AE Framework."

Judith Goldstein and Robert O. Keohane, "Ideas and Foreign Policy: An Analytic Framework" in Goldstein and Keohane, ed., *Ideas and Foreign Policy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993).

Jack Levy, "Prospect Theory, Rational Choice and International Relations," *International Studies Quarterly* 41, 1 (1997): 87-112.