I. Course Description

This class provides a broad overview of the basic concepts, theories, and current debates in international politics. We will begin the course by exploring the nature of the international system and the key actors within it, such as states and international organizations. We will also examine different theoretical approaches that attempt to explain patterns of behavior among these groups and evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of each approach’s ability to make sense of (and predict) political events.

After considering some of the alternative ways of thinking about international relations, we will apply this knowledge to a series of issues related to security and political economy. We will inquire, for example, about the causes of war and how states and non-state actors might lessen the number and/or intensity of conflict around the world. We will also examine the relationship of states and markets and explore how trade and globalization actively shape politics in both visible and invisible ways. Finally, we will end the term by looking at a series of contemporary policy challenges that deeply affect states, yet are difficult for them to address within the confines of the existing international order. Throughout, we will attempt to balance theoretical analysis of international politics with a solid empirical grounding through case studies and discussions of current political events.

By the end of the course, students should be better equipped to analyze contemporary issues in world politics and have the theoretical tools to articulate and debate solutions to global challenges. Students will also develop a solid foundation for more advanced coursework in political science and international relations.

II. Course Materials

The following two books are required for this class, and may be purchased through the bookstore or any on-line retailer:


Additional course readings will be available through e-reserve.
In addition to the assigned course material, you should get in the habit of reading a major newspaper or newsmagazine on a regular basis to stay on top of current events. Recommended periodicals include the New York Times, Financial Times, Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, the International Herald Tribune, and the Economist. Many of these publications are available for free online, and also offer reduced student subscription rates. Those of you wishing to consult non-US news sources can find a partial list at the course’s Moodle page.

III. Requirements and Expectations

Your grade in this course will be based on the following assignments:

1. Class participation: 150 points
2. IR theory paper: 150 points
3. Policy analysis paper: 250 points
4. Crisis simulation preparation: 150 points
   a. Position paper (125 points)
   b. Negotiating document (25 points)
5. Final exam: 300 points

Total: 1000 points

1. **Class participation**: your participation grade will be based on informed contribution during regular class discussions and the in-class crisis simulation. When calculating your participation grade, I will be weighing the quality of contribution over quantity—you will be rewarded more for making thoughtful comments or raising questions that indicate you have prepared for class rather than dominating discussions just to hear yourself talk. Students who are perennially late or absent, or who do not do the readings before coming to class will receive low marks for participation.

2. **IR theory paper**: for this assignment, you will read a selected case study about a contemporary foreign policy dispute in American politics. The case study will be circulated to you in the second week of class. Then, drawing on at least two of the theoretical paradigms that we cover in the first weeks of class, you will write a 3-5 (double-spaced) paper that evaluates the relative explanatory/predictive power of your selected theories with respect to the actions of the American government. You paper should (a) note the salient assumptions and expectations of your selected IR theories; (b) apply them to the facts of the case study; (c) evaluate what the different theories do/do not/can/cannot explain about the case; and (d) draw appropriate conclusions about the relative strengths and weaknesses of the different approaches to understanding real-world political phenomena. This paper is due at the beginning of class on Monday, October 2nd.

3. **Policy analysis paper**: in this paper, you will use the theoretical arguments and concepts presented in the class to analyze a current challenge in international relations from the point of view of a senior policy analyst in one of the main bureaucratic agencies of a government of your choosing. You will then write a 6-8 page (double-spaced) research brief that outlines what you believe would be the best policy response for the government to make with respect to the challenge at hand. You are free to choose any contemporary policy challenge and relevant agency, but you are strongly encouraged to meet with me to discuss what you would like to do before beginning your research. You must notify me of your chosen topic in writing.
This paper gives you a great deal of freedom to customize your work and angle of approach. While many students will choose to analyze an issue from the point of view of the United States, a US-centric approach is not required—you are free to analyze an issue from the vantage point of any country that is of interest to you. If you choose to go with a non-US viewpoint, you should meet with me to discuss your plans and appropriate source materials.

Your research for this paper will involve familiarizing yourself with the main issues and facts of your chosen topic as well as any past or ongoing policy responses/preferences of the government. In writing the paper, you should at a minimum (a) identify the topic and why it is an important policy issue; (b) lay out your assumptions about the government’s core concerns/goals/strategies where this issue is concerned; (c) make an argument about what course of action you believe would best serve the country’s interests and why; (d) provide theoretical support and evidence/empirical examples for your argument; and (e) counter possible rival recommendations. This paper is due at the beginning of class on Monday, November 13th.

4. Crisis simulation preparation: during the 6th week of the term, we will hold an in-class simulation of crisis decision-making. In preparation for this simulation, you will be divided into teams and assigned countries to represent in a round of multi-lateral negotiations. As a team, you will research and prepare a short position paper (~3-5 double-spaced pages) in which you should (a) provide an overview of the pertinent issues of the crisis; (b) discuss how these issues relate to/are significant for your country; (c) identify what your country’s preferred policy stance is on these issues; and (d) outline possible scenarios through which the issue might be resolved. Based on your research and this position paper, your team will also prepare a 1-2 page negotiating document that proposes a plan for resolving the crisis. This document will be circulated to all other country teams prior to the simulation. The position paper and negotiating document are due at the beginning of class on Friday, October 13th.

5. Final Exam: The final exam will be cumulative, closed-book, and self-scheduled. It will comprise two sections: a short-answer section worth 150 points and an essay section worth 150 points. You will have a choice of questions in each section.

In addition to the above requirements, you will also have the opportunity to earn up to 25 additional points by completing occasional extra-credit opportunities, including unannounced, in-class quizzes on current events. There will be no make-ups possible on extra-credit work.

IV. Course Policies

* Policy on late papers: All papers must be turned in at the beginning of class in hard-copy form, not email. Any paper handed in after that time is considered late and will be penalized by 5% per day, up to 50% of the total value of the assignment. Always turn in your work—late is better than never. If you are unable to complete an assignment on time due to illness, you will not be penalized, provided that you can provide a doctor’s note.

* Policy on attendance and preparation: Attendance is required, and you are expected to complete the assigned readings before coming to class. However, if you need to miss class
for some reason, it is your responsibility to get notes from your fellow classmates and, if needed, to see me during office hours to go over any questions or material that we covered in class.

* **Policy on plagiarism and academic dishonesty:** Plagiarism, or passing off others’ work as your own, is a serious academic offense. Anyone caught cheating will automatically receive a zero for the assignment.

Although you are expected to draw on the work and ideas of others when writing your papers, you must take care to acknowledge these sources correctly. Direct quotations should be clearly marked and attributed. All other references to the ideas/research of others, including data, should be cited using a common citation system for the social sciences, preferably with in-text citations. If you are uncertain about how (or when) to cite something, please consult me or the experts at the Write Place (http://apps.carleton.edu/campus/asc/writeplace/). Please note: turning in a paper that you previously wrote for another class is not plagiarism per se, but is still academically dishonest and will result in a zero for the assignment.

For more information on Carleton’s policy on academic honesty, please consult http://apps.carleton.edu/campus/dos/handbook/academic_regs/?policy_id=21359. Also see http://apps.carleton.edu/campus/doc/honesty/complete/ for additional citation help.

* **Policy on special needs:** If you require special accommodation due to a documented physical or learning disability, please come see me during the first week of class in order to discuss how I can best assist you in meeting the objectives and requirements of this course.

* **Policy on classroom atmosphere:** Political discussions can get quite heated, emotional, and divisive. However, we will strive to maintain an environment of open and tolerant political dialogue in class where free exchange, debate, strong opinions, and even disagreement are encouraged, but incivility, hostility, and intimidation will not be accepted. This means: avoid pejorative and derogatory language, and focus any disagreements you may have on the logic/evidence/implications of the debate, not on the person making those arguments.

V. Schedule of Readings and Topics

The readings for this class comprise a mixture of general overviews (mostly from the Goldstein and Pevehouse text), excerpts of well-known books and articles (mostly from the Art and Jervis reader), and supplemental texts and case studies, which will be available on e-reserve. You will find some of the reading to be straightforward, while other texts may be more abstract and challenging. We will go over some of these texts in class during lecture or discussions, and you are certainly able to discuss any questions you might have during office hours. You are responsible for all the assigned material—even if we do not explicitly go over it in class, it is fair game for the final exam.

Unless marked, all readings should be done before class. Selections from the Art & Jervis text are marked (AJ). E-reserve items are marked (E)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept. 11</th>
<th>Introductions and Class Overview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Familiarize yourself with the course texts by looking through their tables of content and layout; explore the course website.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Read at your leisure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Jonathan Kirschner, “Alfred Hitchcock and the Art of Research” (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I: Key Theories and Concepts in IR**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Goldstein &amp; Pevehouse, ch. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* E.H. Carr, “The Nature of Politics” (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept. 15</th>
<th>Realism and Neorealism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Goldstein &amp; Pevehouse, ch. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Kenneth N. Waltz, “The Anarchic Structure of World Politics” (AJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* John J. Mearsheimer, “Anarchy and the Struggle for Power” (AJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept. 18</th>
<th>Liberalism and Institutionalism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Goldstein &amp; Pevehouse, ch. 3 (pp. 99-108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Kenneth Oye, “The Conditions for Cooperation in World Politics” (AJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept. 20</th>
<th>Critiques of Realist and Liberal Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Goldstein &amp; Pevehouse, ch. 3 (pp. 108-135) &amp; ch. 12 (pp. 460-474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Alexander Wendt, “Anarchy is What States Make of It” (AJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* J. Ann Tickner, “A Critique of Morgenthau’s Principles of Political Realism” (AJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept. 22</th>
<th>Domestic Politics and Foreign Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Goldstein &amp; Pevehouse, ch. 4 (pp. 147-165)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Ole R. Holsti, “Crisis Decision Making” (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Graham T. Allison, “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis” (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept. 25</th>
<th>Individual/Psychological Approaches to IR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Goldstein &amp; Pevehouse, ch. 4 (pp. 139-147).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Robert Jervis, “Perception and Misperception in International Politics” (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part II: Security and the International System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sept. 27</th>
<th>Conflict and Stability in the International System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Stephen M. Walt, “Alliances: Balancing and Bandwagoning” (AJ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sept. 29  Causes of War
* Goldstein & Pevehouse, ch. 5
* Karl von Clausewitz, “What is War?” (E)
* Stuart A. Bremer, “Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate War, 1816-1965” (E)

Oct. 2  Managing and Responding to Security Threats
* Robert Art, “The Four Functions of Force” (AJ)
* Thomas C. Schelling, “The Diplomacy of Violence” (AJ)
* Robert J. Art, “Coercive Diplomacy” (AJ)

Oct. 4  Conventional and NBC Weapons
* Goldstein & Pevehouse, ch. 6
* Ashton B. Carter, “How to Counter WMD,” Foreign Affairs, September/October 2004 (E)

Oct. 6  Terrorism
* Bruce Hoffman, “What is Terrorism?” (AJ)
* Robert A Pape, “The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism” (AJ)
* Walter Laquer, “Postmodern Terrorism: New Rules for an Old Game,” Foreign Affairs, September/October 1996 (E)

Oct. 9  Overcoming Conflict I: Institutions and Law
* Goldstein & Pevehouse, ch. 7
* Stanley Hoffman, “The Uses and Limits of International Law” (AJ)

Oct. 11  Overcoming Conflict II: Norms and Values
* Michael W. Doyle, “Kant, Liberal Legacies, and Foreign Affairs” (AJ)
* F. Gregory Gause III, “Can Democracy Stop Terrorism?” (AJ)
* Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder, “Democratization and War,” Foreign Affairs, May/June 1995 (E)

Oct 13  Overcoming Conflict III: Humanitarian Interventions, Peacekeeping, and Statebuilding
* James L. Payne, “Deconstructing Nation Building” (AJ)
* Stuart Eizenstat, John Edward Porter, and Jeremy Weinstein, “Rebuilding Weak States,” Foreign Affairs, January/February 2005 (E)

Oct. 16  ~ Enjoy Fall Break ~
Oct. 18  Crisis Simulation, Day 1

Oct. 20  Crisis Simulation, Day 2

Part III: International Political Economy

Oct. 23  Political Economy and International Politics
* Robert Gilpin, “The Nature of Political Economy” (AJ)
* Robert O. Keohane, “Hegemony in the World Political Economy” (AJ)

Oct. 25  International Trade and Monetary Policy
* Goldstein & Pevehouse, ch. 8 & ch. 9

Oct. 27  Development and North-South Relations
* Goldstein & Pevehouse, ch. 12 (pp. 455-460) & ch. 13
* Bruce R. Scott, “The Great Divide in the Global Village” (AJ)
* Nancy Birdsall, Dani Rodrik, and Arvind Subramanian, “How to Help Poor Countries,” Foreign Affairs, July/August 2005 (E)

Oct. 30  Economic Globalization
* Goldstein & Pevehouse, ch. 10 (pp. 394-409)
* Jeffrey Frankel, “Globalization of the Economy” (AJ)
* Martin Wolf, “Will Globalization Survive?” (AJ)
* Peter F. Drucker, “The Global Economy and the Nation-State,” Foreign Affairs, September/October 1997 (E)

Nov. 1  Regionalism and Integration
* Goldstein & Pevehouse, ch. 10 (377-393)
* Kenichi Ohmae, The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies, ch. 7-8 (E)
* John Kavanagh, Sarah Anderson, Jaime Serra, & J. Enrique Espinoz, “Happily Ever NAFTA?” Foreign Policy, September 2002 (E)

Nov. 3  What Cost Globalization?
* Geoffrey Garrett, “Globalization’s Missing Middle” (AJ)
* Dani Rodrik, “Trading in Illusions” (AJ)
* John Micklethwait and Adrian Woolridge, “Why the Globalization Backlash is Stupid” (AJ)
Part IV: Emerging Challenges

Nov. 6  Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict
* Chaim Kaufmann, “Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars” (AJ)
* Andrew Bell-Fialkoff, “A Brief History of Ethnic Cleansing,” Foreign Affairs, Summer 1993 (E)

Nov. 8  Transnational Politics
* Margaret E. Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, “Transnational Activist Networks” (AJ)
* Moisés Naím, “The Five Wars of Globalization” (AJ)
* Ana Arana, “How the Street Gangs Took Central America,” Foreign Affairs, May/June 2005 (E)

Nov. 10 Global Warming and the Environment
* Goldstein & Pevehouse: ch. 11
* Garrett Hardin, “The Tragedy of the Commons” (AJ)
* Thomas Homer-Dixon, “Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict” (AJ)
* John Browne, “Beyond Kyoto” (AJ)

Nov. 13 Human Rights
* Rhoda E. Howard and Jack Donnelly, “Human Rights in World Politics” (AJ)

Nov. 15 Conclusions: What lies ahead for the international community?
* Samuel P. Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?” (AJ)