

University of Oxford, Worcester College

**DPPE 214: International Relations
Hilary Term 2018**

Lecturer: Jeffrey Wright (jeffrey.wright@nuffield.ox.ac.uk)

Fridays at 12:30 p.m. in Worcester College

This course provides a survey of the field of International Relations (IR). Narrowly defined, IR refers to the interactions of two or more states across political boundaries. However, our conception of the field here at Oxford, and shared elsewhere, is much broader. The study of IR involves explaining the behavior of actors across states' boundaries while taking into account relevant historical, economic, social, and cultural factors and processes. Such actors encompass states, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, firms, and individuals. Therefore IR involves the study of both *inter*- and *trans*-national relationships.

Students are expected to write six essays over the term. Essays should be within the 1500-2500 range and use a consistent referencing system (e.g., Chicago, Oxford, MLA, etc.). They should be sent via email to the tutorial group by 12:00 p.m. on the day preceding the tutorial, unless otherwise directed. I will thoroughly annotate and mark essays and return them in a timely fashion. If you choose not to write an essay, please submit one of the following instead: two-page summary of the readings; one-page outline of an essay; or a one-page collection of insights or arguments in relation to a question or the topic more generally.

When writing essays, please bear in mind that University Examinations require you to illustrate your answers with contemporary or historical material. You will be expected to know the major developments in international affairs from 1990 onwards, and to cite these wherever appropriate. Questions referring specifically to events before 1990 will not be set.

Course Objectives

- To cultivate a deep and nuanced understanding of the major schools of IR thought;
- To develop a firm grasp of historical developments, events, and trends in global politics since 1990, and deploy them purposively and persuasively in defense or interrogation of different theoretical perspectives; and
- To produce sophisticated and poignant analyses of the principal challenges actors face in international politics and opportunities to manage or solve them.

Topics

- Week 1:** Overview of the Field
- Week 2:** Liberalism and Neoliberalism
- Week 3:** Realism and Neorealism
- Week 4:** Constructivism and the English School
- Week 5:** International Law and Institutions
- Week 6a:** Democratic Peace Theory
- Week 6b:** Identity, Culture, and Causes of War
- Week 7:** Globalization and Economic Inequality
- Week 8:** Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect

Background Reading

Over the course of term, and especially in preparation for finals next year, I strongly encourage you to supplement your learning by perusing these background texts. They will deepen an appreciation for IR theory developed this term as well as expand your mental inventory of empirical events and trends.

- Brown, Chris, and Kirsten Ainley. 2009. *Understanding International Relations*. Fourth Edition. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse, and Beth Simmons, eds. 2002. *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage.
- Reus-Smit, Christian, and Duncan Snidal, eds. 2008. *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baylis, John, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens, eds. 2010. *The Globalization of World Politics*. Fifth or Seventh Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Chapters 3-4 useful for historical overview of post-Cold War period.)
- Dunne, Tim, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, eds. 2013. *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Third Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Reading List & Questions

Week 1: Overview of the Field

Q1: “The chief purpose of the study of international relations is to understand the consequences of international anarchy.” Do you agree?

Q2: What are the strengths and weaknesses of the principal theoretical approaches to the study of international relations?

Required Reading

- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. 2012 [1977]. *Power and Interdependence*. Fourth Edition. Boston: Longman.
- Mearsheimer, John. 1994. “The False Promise of International Institutions.” *International Security* 19, no. 3: 5-49.
- Walt, Steven M. 1998. “International Relations: One World, Many Theories.” *Foreign Policy* 110 (Spring): 29-46.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Katherine Sikkink. 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” *International Organization* 52, no. 4: 887-917.
- Legro, Jeffrey W., and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” *International Security* 24, no. 2: 5-55.

Further Reading

- Hurd, Ian. 2008. “Constructivism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 2008. “The New Liberalism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wohlforth, William. 2008. “Realism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sil, Rudra, and Peter J. Katzenstein. 2010. “Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics: Reconfiguring Problems and Mechanisms Across Research Traditions.” *Perspectives on Politics* 8, no. 2: 411-431.

Week 2: Liberalism and Neoliberalism

Q1: “In the final analysis, a state’s foreign policy choices will be determined by whichever domestic interest groups are the strongest.” Do you agree?

Q2: What role do international institutions play in promoting cooperation? OR
Is the neoliberal faith in international institutions misplaced?

Required Reading

- Keohane, Robert O. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (Chapters 4-6.)
- Doyle, Michael. 1986. “Liberalism and World Politics.” *American Political Science Review* 80, no. 4: 1151-1169.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. 2001. “The Strange Death of Liberal IR Theory.” *European Journal of International Law* 12: 573-593.
- Keohane, Robert O., and Lisa L. Martin. 2003. “Institutional Theory as a Research Program.” In *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*. Edited by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Further Reading

- Keohane, Robert O., and Joseph S. Nye. 2012 [1977]. *Power and Interdependence*. Fourth Edition. Boston: Longman. (Fr. Week 1.)
- Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization* 51, no. 4: 513-553.
- Deudney, Daniel, and John G. Ikenberry. 1999. “The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order.” *Review of International Studies* 25: 179-196.
- Stein, Arthur. 2008. “Neoliberal Institutionalism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Week 3: Realism and Neorealism

Q1: “Since only material power is measurable, there is little point discussing non-material forms of power in international relations.” Discuss.

Q2: “Much promise, little delivery.” Is this a fair assessment of the co-operation promoted by international institutions since the end of the Cold War?

Q3: “NATO’s survival since the end of the Cold War merely confirms that we live in a unipolar world.” Discuss.

Required Reading

- Morgenthau, Hans J. 1993 [1948]. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Seventh Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill. (Chapter 1.)
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. (Chapter 6.)
- Waltz, Kenneth N. 2000. “Structural Realism After the Cold War.” *International Security* 25, no.1 (Summer): 5-41.
- Mearsheimer, John. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton. (Chapters 1-2.)
- Barnett, Michael, and Raymond Duvall. 2005. “Power in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59, no. 1: 39-75.

Further Reading

- Smith, Michael. 1986. *Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Press. (Chapters 1, 4, and 6.)
- Donnelly, Jack. 2000. *Realism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nye, Joseph S. 2009. *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics*. New York: Public Affairs.
- Lebow, Richard N. 2013. “Classical Realism.” In *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Third Edition. Edited by Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mead, Walter. 2014. “The Return of Geopolitics?” *Foreign Affairs* 93, no. 3: 69-79.

Week 4: Constructivism and the English School

Q1: How can we know when a state's behaviour is influenced by norms?

Q2: Do theories of international relations rely too much on the concept of rationality?

Q3: How valuable are notions such as "ideas" and "identities" in explaining contemporary international relations?

Required Reading

- Bull, Hedley. 2002 [1977]. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Third Edition. Basingstoke: Palgrave. (Chapters 1-2.)
- Wendt, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics." *International Organization* 46, no. 2: 391-425.
- Tannenwald, Nina. 1999. "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use." *International Organization* 53, no. 3: 433-468.
- Hurrell, Andrew. 2007. *On Global Order: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Chapters 2-3.)

Further Reading

- Ruggie, John G. 1982. "International Regimes, Transaction and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order." *International Organization* 36, no. 2: 379-415.
- Finnemore, Martha, and Katherine Sikkink. 1998. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, no. 4: 887-917. (Fr. Week 1.)
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 6.)
- Hurd, Ian. 2008. "Constructivism." In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. Edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Fr. Week 1.)

Week 5: International Law and Institutions

Q1: What contribution, if any, does international law make to international affairs?

Q2: What theory best explains the United Nations and its successes and failures?

Q3: What factors account for change in global governance?

Required Reading

- Abbott, Kenneth W., and Duncan Snidal. 2000. "Hard and Soft Law in International Governance." *International Organization* 54, no. 3: 421-56.
- Byers, Michael, ed. 2001. *The Role of Law in International Politics: Essays in International Relations and International Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Chapters 1 and 16.)
- Barnett, Michael N., and Martha Finnemore. 1999. "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations." *International Organization* 53, no. 4 (Autumn): 699-732.
- Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. "The Rational Design of International Institutions." *International Organization* 55, no. 4: 761-799.
- Jupille, Joseph, Walter Mattli, and Duncan Snidal. 2013. *Institutional Choice and Global Commerce*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 1.)

Further Reading

- Downs, George W., David M. Roake, and Peter N. Barsoom. 1996. "Is the Good News About Compliance Good News About Cooperation?" *International Organization* 50, no. 3: 379-406.
- Abbott, Kenneth W., et al. 2000. "The Concept of Legalization." *International Organization* 54, no. 3: 401-19.
- Berdal, Mats. 2003. "The United Nations Security Council: Ineffective but Indispensable." *Survival* 45, no. 2: 7-30.
- Weiss, Thomas G., and Sam Daws, eds. 2007. *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Chapters 1-2.)
- Lowe, Vaughan, Adam Roberts, Jennifer Welsh, and Dominik Zaum, eds. 2008. *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice Since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Abbott, Kenneth W., Philipp Genschel, Duncan Snidal, and Bernhard Zangl, eds. 2015. *International Organizations as Orchestrators*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Week 6a: Democratic Peace Theory

Q1: Does the democratic peace theory represent a challenge to Realism?

Q2: "The greater the number of democratic states, the more peaceful the world." Discuss.

Required Reading

- Doyle, Michael. 1983. "Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12, no. 3-4.
- Brown, Michael E., Sean M. Lynn-Jones, and Steven E. Miller, eds. 1996. *Debating the Democratic Peace*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Preface only)
- Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory." *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 4: 585-602.
- Slantchev, Branislav L., Anna Alexandrova, and Erik Gartzke. 2005. "Probabilistic Causality, Selection Bias, and the Logic of the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 3 (Aug.): 459-462.
- Gartzke, Erik. 2007. "The Capitalist Peace." *American Journal of Political Science*. 51, no. 1: 166-191.
- Tomz, Michael R., and Jessica L. P. Weeks. 2013. "Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace." *American Political Science Review* 107, no. 4: 849-865.

Further Reading

- Mueller, John. 1989. *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War*. New York: Basic Books. (Chapters 10-11.)
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1995. "Democratic Peace – Warlike Democracies? A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument." *European Journal of International Relations* 1, no. 4: 491-517.
- Lipson, Charles. 2003. *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Chapters 1-2.)
- Doyle, Michael W. 2005. "Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace." *American Political Science Review* 99, no. 3: 463-66.

Week 6b: Identity, Culture, and Causes of War

Q1: Which theoretical perspective or approach best explains the resurgence of nationalism in the post-Cold War period?

Q2: What evidence is there to support the claim that culture is a cause of conflict in international relations?

Q3: What have been the most significant changes in the character of conflict since 1990?

Required Reading

- Jervis, Robert. 1978. "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 30, no. 2: 167-214.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72: 22-49.
- Fearon, James D. 1995. "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization* 49, no. 3 (Summer): 379-414.
- Said, Edward. 2001. "The Clash of Ignorance." *The Nation* (October): 11-13.
- Fearon, James D., and David D. Laitin. 2000. "Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity." *International Organization* 54, no. 4: 845-877.
- Gartzke, Erik, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2006. "Identity and Conflict: Ties that Bind and Differences that Divide." *European Journal of International Relations* 12, no. 1: 54-87.

Further Reading

- Horowitz, Donald. 2000 [1985]. *Ethnic Groups in Conflict*. Second Edition. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. 2012 [1990]. *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Chapter 6.)
- Jepperson, Ronald L., et al. 1996. "Norms, Identity, and Culture in National Security." In *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. Edited by Peter J. Katzenstein. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Halliday, Fred. 2003 [1996]. *Islam and the Myth of Confrontation: Religion and Politics in the Middle East*. Second Edition. London: IB Tauris. (Chapters 1 and 4.)
- Kaufman, Stuart J. 2006. "Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice?: Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence." *International Security* 30, no. 4: 45-86.
- Pinker, Steven. 2011. *The Better Angels of Our Nature: The Decline of Violence in History and Its Causes*. New York: Penguin.

Week 7: Globalization and Economic Inequality

Q1: “The liberalisation of international trade has created more losers than winners.” Discuss.

Q2: Can economic globalization be reconciled with democracy?

Q3: Under what conditions does globalization strengthen or weaken the state?

Required Reading

- Beitz, Charles. 1999. “International Liberalism and Distributive Justice: A Survey of Recent Thought.” *World Politics* 51, no. 2: 269-96.
- Price, Richard. 2003. “Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics.” *World Politics* 55, no. 4: 579-606.
- Milner, Helen V., and Keiko Kubota. 2005. “Why the Move to Free Trade? Democracy and Trade Policy in the Developing Countries.” *International Organization* 59, no. 1: 107-143.
- Abbot, Kenneth W., and Duncan Snidal. 2009. “The Governance Triangle.” In *The Politics of Global Regulation*. Edited by Walter Mattli and Ngaire Woods. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rodrik, Dani. 2011. *The Globalization Paradox: Why Global Markets, States and Democracy Can't Coexist*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Chapters 1, 4, 7, and 9.)

Further Reading

- Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Stiglitz, Joseph. 2002. *Globalization and its Discontents*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Held, David, and Anthony McGrew, eds. 2003. *The Global Transformations Reader: An Introduction to the Globalization Debate*. Second Edition. Oxford: Polity. (Introduction and Chapters 3-7, 11-12, and 50.)
- Bhagwati, Jagdish. 2007. *In Defense of Globalization*. Second Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Büthe, Tim, and Walter Mattli. 2011. *The New Global Rulers: The Privatization of Regulation in the World Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bourguignon, Francois. 2016. “Inequality and Globalization: How the Rich Get Richer as the Poor Catch Up.” *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 1: 11-15.

Week 8: Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect

Q1: Is humanitarian intervention a legitimate exception to the general prohibition on the use of force in international relations?

Q2: Which theoretical perspective, if any, best explains the practice of humanitarian intervention?

Q3: “There is no fundamental tension between the principle of state sovereignty and the ‘Responsibility to Protect.’” Discuss.

Required Reading

- Greenwood, Christopher. 1993. “Is there a Right to Humanitarian Intervention?” *The World Today* 49 (2): 34-40.
- Evans, Gareth, and Mohamed Sahnoun. 2002. “The Responsibility to Protect.” *Foreign Affairs* 81, no. 6: 99-110.
- Chandler, David. 2004. “The Responsibility to Protect? Imposing the ‘Liberal Peace’” *International Peacekeeping* 11, no. 1: 59-81.
- Welsh, Jennifer. 2010. “Implementing the ‘Responsibility to Protect’: Where Expectations Meet Reality.” *Ethics & International Affairs* 24, no. 4: 415-430.
- Barnett, Michael. 2013. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarian Intervention*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. (Introduction, Part III, and Conclusion.)

Further Reading

- Holzgrefe, Jens L., and Robert O. Keohane, eds. 2003. *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal, and Political Dilemmas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- United Nations. 2009. *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: Report of the Secretary-General*. UNGA, A/63/677.
- Bellamy, Alex J., and Nick Wheeler. 2010. “Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics.” In *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. Edited by John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, Gareth. 2011. “Ethnopolitical Conflict: When is it Right to Intervene?” *Ethnopolitics* 10, no. 1, and responses by and Caplan, Kuperman, and Tannam.
- Doyle, Michael. 2011. “International Ethics and the Responsibility to Protect.” *International Studies Review* 13, no. 1: (72-84).