POL 3080 THEORIES / APPROACHES TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
Fall Semester 2012
Department of Political Science
University of Cincinnati

Mon, Wed, Fri 11:15 – 12:10 am
Rieveschl 422C
Dr. Ivan Dinev Ivanov
Phone: (513) 556-3318
Email: Ivan.Ivanov@uc.edu

* Please, contact me by email and I should be able to respond you within next 24 hrs.

COURSE DESCRIPTION:
This course surveys contemporary literature on the various approaches to the study of International Relations (IR) with special emphasis on theory, conceptualization and methodology. This course is structured to presents contending theoretical frameworks that focus on the impact of participating and non-participating individuals, domestic sources, and the international system that all play into. We will examine traditional IR theories such as realism, liberalism, as well as novel approaches such as constructivism.

COURSE OBJECTIVES:
Since theories/approaches of International Relations are a core course in international politics, the students are expected to become familiar with major theoretical arguments and develop different analytical skills. To be successful, our students should be able to identify central concepts such as relative and absolute gains, rationality, anarchy, etc as well as different components of each theory, as well as their primary assumptions, variables and explanatory models. At the end of this course, our students should be able to comprehend specific explanations of IR within the context of broader theoretical debates within International Relations. Furthermore, a student of IR should become familiar with arguments in favor or against the relevance of variables such as military, economic power and strategy, democracy, economic interdependence, etc and based on these skills, our students should be able to develop their own design, conduct independent research and justify it. Lastly, students should be able to relate policies and contemporary cases to theoretical models and present persuasive arguments based on the strengths and weaknesses of the various experiences.

REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Requirements</th>
<th>% of final grade</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 in-class exams</td>
<td>40% (total)</td>
<td>9/28 (20%) &amp; 11/9 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-home final paper</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>Exam Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-class participation and attendance</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Attendance will be taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate(s)</td>
<td>10% per entry</td>
<td>Check tentative schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grading Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>93% - 100%</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% - 92%</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87% - 89%</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83% - 86%</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% - 82%</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77% - 79%</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73% - 76%</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% - 72%</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67% - 69%</td>
<td>D+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63% - 66%</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60% - 62%</td>
<td>D-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59% - 0%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note that grades represent NON-NEGOTIABLE assessments of a student's comprehension of course material.

Policies and Caveats:

If a student has a disability that affects their performance in class, please notify me at the beginning of the semester in order to accommodate any and all needs and interests. Also, for advice and assistance one may contact the University’s Disability Services Office, located in 210 University Pavilion, or phone: (513) 556-6823, or email: disabisv@ucmail.uc.edu.

Students are expected to attend class. One’s attendance will be recorded at each class meeting and as stated above can affect a student’s grade. In the case of extraordinary circumstances (medical or family), I need to be informed prior to quizzes, exams, test, debates, etc...about a student's impending absence; email is recommended. Proper documentation should be provided when that student returns to class. Absences due to illness or injury will not be excused retroactively, unless students follow the aforementioned procedures. If you have questions – PLEASE ASK. Even though I do not necessarily require a medical note, I expect you to contact me in advance (preferably by email) and inform me if you are not feeling well.

Student who misses a total of fourteen (14, or 1/3 of our classes) or more class meetings will receive a class participation grade of zero (0), and may also have their overall course grade reduced. A student who has a total of twenty (20 or half) or more unexcused absences will receive a course grade of F.

I do NOT plan to makeup quizzes, or examinations; missing any quiz or exam without prior permission, may result in a zero on those course requirements. So be cautious and talk to me. Make-up quizzes or examinations will only be arranged in extreme cases; please be sure to let me know as soon as possible if you will not be able to attend the scheduled time(s). Debates will not be rescheduled or made-up.

Article Discussion and Debates:

Note: discussions and debates are important components of this course and combine for a total of 25% of the class’s overall grade.

Article Discussion – Reading Guide for Article Discussions is available on Blackboard, under “Assignments.” There are a total of three (3) articles.
The purpose of the readings’ and articles’ discussions is to have our students familiarize themselves with original pieces of IR research and presentation of different arguments within the field of International Relations. The articles’ discussion dates are posted below and class structure is organized accordingly. Students are expected to lead these class discussion(s) and my involvement will be limited. Be prepared.

**DEBATES** – Information on Debates is available on Blackboard, under “Assignments.” There will be a total of seven (7) debates.

Each debate will last 50-minutes, essentially an entire class period as posted on our calendar below. Students will be assigned to teams in advance and per debate, there will be two (2) opposing teams, essentially a total of 14 teams. Per debate and prior to each team’s presentation, I will introduce respective topics for the benefit of the audience (non-participating debate students, possible visitors and possible debate moderators). Each team’s participating members (panelist) will then present 3 to 4 minute summary [each] that contributes to their team’s overall presentation. I will facilitate the time keeping, as I will enforce each team’s adherence to rigorous time-tables in their presentation(s) and will deduct points for poorly prepared, ill-timed presentations.

Remember there will be a team grade and individual panelist grade. The intent is for each team’s panelist to convey the concepts of their supporting material – appropriately, in a timely manner and to work collectively in conveying their team’s position. Teams should organize to complete their combined presentation(s) in 15-minutes overall. We should allow for 20-25 minutes of teams/audience discussion after presentations. Please observe these rules. As those of us who have witnessed or taken part in debates understand, it is the moderator’s job to keep all on task, but it is the panelist’s preparedness that makes it a valuable experience. Your cooperation as teammates is essential; supporting one another in both team and individual pursuit is critical. Please, be prepared.

**UC Student Code of Conduct:**
The University of Cincinnati rules stipulate that all work submitted is expected to be original. Students should review the UC Student Code of Conduct and be aware of all activities defined as academic dishonesty. Although I do encourage students to exchange ideas and/or work together on certain assignments, *each student is responsible for completing and submitting his or her own homework*. Please be advised that according to the UC Student Code of Conduct plagiarism is defined as:

- Submitting another’s published or unpublished work in whole, in part or in paraphrase, as one’s own without fully and properly crediting the author with footnotes, quotation marks, citations, or bibliographical reference.
- Submitting as one’s own original work, material obtained from an individual or agency without reference to the person or agency as the source of the material.
Submitting as one’s own original work material that has been produced through unacknowledged collaboration with others without release in writing from collaborators.¹

For further information on appropriate citation visit the University of Wisconsin-Madison website and check a detailed instructional brochure about references on my webpage: http://www.wisc.edu/writing/Handbook/DocAPSA_PC.html

Cell phones, pagers and electronic messaging devices should be turned off completely (not muted) during class time, as I will take action if this is violated. Students who fail to comply with this rule will be dismissed. Please, understand the proper use of technology in the classroom. Laptops, tablets (but no cell phones) should be used solely for academic purposes and with discretion. Be aware that I will take action if students abuse this privilege.

REQUIRED TEXTS:

(1) Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR
Phillip Williams, Donald Goldstein and Jay Shafritz (WG&S), Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth, 2006; Call # JZ 1242.C53

(2) Theories of International Relations: Discipline and Diversity
Tim Dunne, Milya Kurki and Steve Smith (Eds.): Oxford University Press, 2007; Call # JZ 1305.I565

(3) There are additional required readings; check Blackboard under “Literature” for full articles, or available links will be under “Web Resources.” When electronic versions of readings are not available, paper copies will be distributed in class or course pack will be available.

CLASS POWER POINTS:

Power Points are available on Blackboard, under “Course Documents.”

WEEK # / SCHEDULE:

WEEK #1
I. Introduction to Course / Introduction to International Relations (IR) Theories
Why study International Relations theories? Defining and conceptualizing International Relations theories: ontology and epistemology; methods and scope; levels of analysis; testing theories.

Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 402-12

(Jack Snyder, “One World Rival Theories”)
The American Political Science Review, Vol. 91, no. 4, pp. 913-917


WEEK #2
POWER AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: VARIATIONS OF REALISM

II. Classical Realism

Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 57-63
(Hans Morgenthau, “Six Principles of Political Realism”)
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 281-285
(Hans Morgenthau, “The Balance of Power”)
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 53-57
(E. H. Carr, “The Realist Critique and the Limitations of Realism”)
International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity; pp. 52-71
(Richard Ned Lebow, “Classical Realism”)
Hans Morgenthau (1948), Chapters 1, 2 and 3, pp. 3-37 (recommended)

For the purpose of the debate:
Inis Claude, Jr., Power and International Relations, New York, Random House (1962), selected chapters

WEEK #3
VARIATIONS OF REALISM: DEFENSIVE AND OFFENSIVE REALISM

Defensive Realism / Neo-realism

Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 63-73
(Waltz, “The Origins of War in Neo-realist Theory”)
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 98-108
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 260-263
(Waltz, “International Conflict and International Anarchy: the Third Image”)
Kenneth Waltz, “The Emerging Structure of International Politics,”
International Security, Vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 44-79 (recommended)

Offensive Realism (Part 1)
John J. Mearsheimer, “The Tragedy of Great Power Politics,”
W.W. Norton (2001); Chapters 1, 2 & 3, pp. 1-82 (strongly recommended)
*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 693-700
(John Mearsheimer, “An Unnecessary War”)

---

**WEEK #4**

**LIBERALISM AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

Globalization and International Relations

*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp.331-336
(Robert Axelrod, “The Evolution of Cooperation”)
*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 122-127
(Keohane and Nye, “The Characteristics of Complex Interdependence”)
Keohane, “Power and Interdependence,” pp. 4-22 (recommended)

**FRIDAY Debate #1:**
Does Human Nature affect the course of International Relations?

---

**WEEK #5**

**LIBERALISM AND INTERNATIONAL POLITICS**

**Article Discussion:** Waltz – Globalization and Neo-liberalism

Critique: Kenneth Waltz, Globalization and Governance; *PS: Political Science and Politics*, Vol. 32, no. 4 (December 1999), pp. 693-700

**Cooperation and Institutions in International Politics**

Kenneth Oye, “Explaining Cooperation under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies,”
*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 320-331
(Robert Keohane, “Cooperation and International Regimes”)
*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 221-244
(Barnett and Finnemore, “The Politics, Power and Pathologies International Organizations”)

**FRIDAY Midterm Exam I**

---

**WEEK #6**

**INSTITUTIONALISM, COOPERATION AND THEIR CRITIQUE**
Article Discussion: Mearsheimer – International Institutions


FRIDAY Debate #2:
Do international institutions make difference in international politics?

WEEK #7
DEMOCRATIC PEACE AND DEMOCRATIC VICTORY THEORY

VII. Democratic Peace Theory and International Politics

Williams, Goldstein & Shafritz, pp. 19-33 (Doyle, “Kant’s Perpetual Peace”)


FRIDAY Debate #3:
Are democracies less likely to fight wars?

WEEK #8
OTHER SOURCES OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

VIII. Marxism and *Dependencia* in International Politics

*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 73-76
(Hobson, “The Economic Taproots of Imperialism”)

*International Relations Theory: Discipline and Diversity*; pp. 76-81
(M. Rupert, “Marxism and Critical Theory”)

*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 81-90
(Theonontonio Dos Santos, “The Structure of Dependence”)

IX. Psychology and International Politics (Limits of Strategic Choice: Constrained Rationality)

Robert Jervis, “Hypotheses on Misperception,”
*World Politics* Vol. 20, no. 3 (April 1968), pp. 454-479
James D. Fearon, “Rationalist Explanations for War,”

FRIDAY Debate #4:
Does regime type influence the outcome of international conflicts?

WEEK #9
OTHER SOURCES OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

X. Domestic and Bureaucratic Sources of International Politics

*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 178-209
(Graham Allison, “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis”)
Graham Allison “The Essence of Decision,” Chapter 3 (Organizational Process), pp. 67-100 and Chapter 4 (Governmental / Bureaucratic Model), pp. 144-184 (recommended)

FRIDAY Debate 5:
Are Foreign Policy decision-makers rational?

WEEK #10
OTHER SOURCES OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

US HEGEMONY (Part 1)

Conceptualization and Approaches to Hegemony

*Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR*; pp. 700-715
(Brooks and Wolfforth, “American Primacy in Perspective” and Joseph Nye, “Limits of American Power”)

FRIDAY Midterm Exam II
WEEK #12
US HEGEMONY (Part 2)

FRIDAY Debate #6:
Is U.S. power beneficial to world politics?

---

WEEK #13
THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 391-401
(John Mearsheimer, “Critique of Critical Theory”)
Fireke and Joergensen (2001), Chapter 1, pp. 3-10 (recommended)

International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity, pp. 166-185
(K. M. Fierke, “Constructivism”)
FRIDAY Debate #7:
U.S. hegemony after the 2008 global financial crisis.

---

WEEK #14
THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Article Discussion #3:
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 352-73 (Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is
What States Make of It”)

---

WEEK #15
Terrorism, Civilizations and Strategies to Respond to the New Threats

Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 538-546
(Thomas Barnett, “The Pentagon’s New Map”)
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 581-600
(Sam Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?”)
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 538-546
(Thomas Barnett, “The Pentagon’s New Map”)
Also check out his blog: http://www.thomaspmbarnett.com/weblog/
Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in IR; pp. 632-642
(Bruce Hoffman, “Terrorism Today and Tomorrow”)
## Tentative Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week One (8/27 – 8/31)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION</strong> to the course</td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION</strong> to IR Theories</td>
<td>No class: Watch video with Kenneth Waltz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Two (9/3 – 9/7)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No class: Labor Day</strong></td>
<td>Three Variations of Realism: Classical, Defensive and Offensive</td>
<td>Classical Realism: Human Nature Realism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Three (9/10 - 9/14)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Defensive Realism / Neo-realism (Part 1)</td>
<td>Defensive Realism / Neo-realism (Part 2)</td>
<td>Offensive Realism (Part 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Four (9/17 - 9/21)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offensive Realism (Part 2)</td>
<td>Neo-liberalism: core premises</td>
<td><strong>DEBATE #1:</strong> Does Human Nature affect the course of International Relations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Five (9/24 – 9/28)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Article #1 Discussion:</strong> Waltz: Globalization and Governance</td>
<td>International Institutionalism: core premises</td>
<td><strong>Midterm Exam I</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Six (10/1 - 10/5)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criticism of Institutionalism <strong>Article #2 Discussion:</strong> Mearsheimer: Int’l Institutions</td>
<td>Internal Sources of International Politics: ideologies</td>
<td><strong>DEBATE #2:</strong> Do international institutions make a difference in international politics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Seven (10/8 – 10/12)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Peace Theory (DPT)</td>
<td>Democratic Victory Theory (DVT)</td>
<td><strong>DEBATE #3:</strong> Are democracies less likely to fight wars?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Eight (10/15 – 10/19)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marxism and Dependencia in International Politics</td>
<td>Limits of Strategic Choice: Constrained Rationality</td>
<td><strong>DEBATE #4:</strong> Does regime type influence the outcome of international conflicts?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Nine (10/22- 10/26)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Domestic and Bureaucratic Sources of International Politics of FP and IR</td>
<td>Organizational Sources of International Politics</td>
<td>Bureaucratic Sources of International Politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Ten (10/29 – 11/2)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual and psychological sources of foreign policy</td>
<td>Psychology and IR: perceptions and misperceptions</td>
<td><strong>DEBATE #5:</strong> Are FP decision-makers rational?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Eleven (11/5 – 11/9)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The English School</td>
<td>Explaining US hegemony (part 1)</td>
<td><strong>Midterm Exam II</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Twelve (11/12 – 11/16)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No class:</strong> Veterans Day</td>
<td>Explaining US hegemony (part 2)</td>
<td><strong>DEBATE #6:</strong> Is U.S. power beneficial to world politics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Thirteen (11/19 – 11/23)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism and IR</td>
<td>Intro to Constructivism</td>
<td><strong>DEBATE #7:</strong> U.S. hegemony after the 2008 global financial crisis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Fourteen (11/26 – 11/30)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constructivism in int’l institutions, norms and security</td>
<td>Social Construction of Int’l Politics <strong>Article #3 Discussion:</strong> Wendt: Anarchy</td>
<td><strong>No class:</strong> Thanksgiving Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week Fifteen (12/3 – 12/7)</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues of terrorism and asymmetric warfare</td>
<td>Other contemporary issues of IR theory; conclusion.</td>
<td>Q&amp;A; Review (no formal class)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LITERATURE


__________, *The Essence of Decision*, Little Brown and Co, Boston, MA

Fireke and Joergensen (2001), *Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation*; Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe, c2001


---

2 This syllabus is subject to change. I reserve the right to add supplementary readings if necessary.