

POLITICAL SCIENCE 560
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS: THEORY AND METHOD
FALL 2020

Glenn Palmer
Office Hours: by appointment

E-mail: gpalmer@psu.edu
Phone: 865-5594

This course has two main and closely related goals. The first is to introduce you to the significant works in our field, either those older ones that continue to affect current research or relatively newer ones that represent important trends, either substantively or methodologically. We will be looking at some representative examples of works from different subfields within international relations. This goal befits any proseminar in a discipline and it is one that I take seriously. A second goal is motivated more by a concern for your professional development as researchers and as active contributors to the literature, rather than as consumers of it. Graduate education in the classroom is usually done by exposing students to the important works in a field of study and by encouraging critical analysis of the theoretical foundations or implications of that work. A common result of that strategy is that students may become very good at criticizing research, even past the point where true merit in the work is recognizable and appreciated. A second result of this emphasis, and one that I hope this course will help to counter, is that students are not taught how scholars actually carry out their research and about the choices they make when they do so. One regrettable consequence of this is that students are frequently under-prepared for carrying out their own research when the time arrives. In this course, we will spend a lot of time looking at how specific scholars carried out their work. We will discuss, for instance, how the hypotheses were developed, what statistical tests were used, what the units of analysis were and how theoretical concepts were operationalized and measured. I hope this emphasis on the nuts and bolts of the research endeavor will aid in the development of your research skills.

Requirements

In seminars, student participation is vital. Students are expected to prepare fully for class and to participate meaningfully and constructively. I expect this course to have significant discussion and while I will generally lead the discussion, I will not spend much time in class lecturing. To facilitate discussion, I expect each student to write down questions and important issues coming out of the week's readings before class, and to raise them as topics for discussion. These could be real questions (e.g. "What did Schultz mean when he said X?") or merely observations intended to spark discussion (e.g. "I think Tickner is exactly right when she said Y" or "Jervis is totally wrong here"). The more of these points you have written down before class, the more interesting our discussions will be. I will occasionally ask each student directly what questions/issues s/he has written down for each class. Additionally, for some of the readings, I may ask a different person to assist me as discussion leader each week.

Second, there will be a term paper for the course. In that paper, you are required to prepare a research design on some major topic within the scope of the proseminar, which is very broad indeed. The point of the paper is to get students thinking both about topics you wish to pursue in your research after the seminar and to begin developing your skills as researchers. We will

discuss the particulars of that paper as the semester moves along. All students should discuss their paper topics with me. The paper is due by **noon on Tuesday, December 15.**

To be discussed:

Third, there will be six short papers, about four double-spaced pages in length, expected during the semester. These papers are to be emailed to me and to all seminar participants by 9:00 AM the Monday before the class for which they are assigned. I will assign you specific questions for you to address in these papers. I will give you these questions well before the assignments are due. No outside research is required.

On November 13 students will present the ideas they are working on for their final paper. This session is meant to provide the opportunity for useful feedback on the paper and to get students used to presenting their work verbally to others. Presenting one's work concisely is a facility that will be necessary in the development of your career.

The weighting of the four components of the course requirements for the course grade is:

| | |
|-----------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Class participation:</i> | 25% |
| <i>Small papers:</i> | 30% (5% each) |
| <i>Presentation:</i> | 10% |
| <i>Final paper:</i> | 35% |

Class Schedule

August 27 Introduction and Discussion

September 3 Approaches

J. David Singer. 1970. The Incomplete Theorist: Insight without Evidence. In Klaus Knorr and James N. Rosenau (eds.), *Contending Approaches to International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Dina Zinnes. 1980. Three Puzzles in Search of a Researcher. *International Studies Quarterly*, 24: 315-342.

Robert Axelrod. 1981. The Emergence of Cooperation among Egoists. *American Political Science Review*. 75: 306-318.

Robert Axelrod and Robert O. Keohane. 1985. Achieving Cooperation Under Anarchy. *World Politics*. 38: 226-254.

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 1985. Toward a Scientific Understanding of International Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*. 29: 121-136.

Christopher Achen and Duncan Snidal. 1989. Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies. *World Politics*. 41: 143-169.

Paul Huth and Bruce Russett. 1993. General Deterrence Between Enduring Rivals: Testing Three Competing Models. *American Political Science Review*. 87: 61-73.

David Lake. 2013. Theory is Dead, Long Live Theory: The End of the Great Debates and the Rise of Eclecticism in International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*. 19: 567-587.

September 10 Realism and Neorealism

- Robert Jervis. 1999. Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate. *International Security* 24: 42-63
- Thomas Christensen and Jack Snyder. 1990. Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity. *International Organization* 44: 137-168.
- John J. Mearsheimer. 1990. Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War. *International Security*. 15: 5-56
- Robert Powell. 1994. Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate. *International Organization*. 48: 313-344.
- Stephen Van Evera. 1998. Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War. *International Security*.22: 5-43.
- John Vasquez. 1997. The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs. *American Political Science Review*. 91: 899-912
- Douglas Lemke. 2008. Power Politics and Wars Without States. *American Journal of Political Science* 52: 774-786

Recommended:

- Kenneth N. Waltz. 1979. *Theory of international politics*.
- Michael Doyle. 1986. Liberalism and World Politics. *American Political Science Review* 80(4): 1151-1169.
- Stephen Krasner. 2004. Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States. *International Security* 29(2): 85-120.

September 17 Dependency, Constructivism and Feminism

- Alexander Wendt. 1992. Anarchy is What States Make of It. *International Organization*. 46: 391-425.
- Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*. 52: 887-917.
- Pamela Conover and Virginia Sapiro. 1993. Gender, Feminist Consciousness and War. *American Journal of Political Science*. 37:1079-1099.
- Mary Caprioli and Mark A. Boyer. 2001. Gender, Violence and International Crises. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 45: 503-518.
- J. Ann Tickner. 1997. You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists. *International Studies Quarterly* 41: 611-32
- James Fearon and David D. Laitin. 2000. Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity. *International Organization*. 54: 845-877.
- Andre G. Frank. 1967. Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America: Historical Studies of Chile and Brazil. Read page 143-167: "The Development of Underdevelopment."

John W. Meyer, John Boli, George M. Thomas, and Francisco O. Ramirez. 1997. "World Society and the Nation-State." *American Journal of Sociology* 103(1):144-81.

September 24 Rational Choice

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita. 1988. The Contribution of Expected Utility Theory to the Study of International Conflict. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18: 629-652.

Robert Powell. 2006. War as a Commitment Problem. *International Organization*. 60: 169-203.

Lisa Martin. 1999. The Contributions of Rational Choice: A Defense of Pluralism. *International Security* 24: 74-83.

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and James Morrow. 1999. Sorting through the Wealth of Notions. *International Security* 24: 56-73.

R. Harrison Wagner. 2000. Bargaining and War. *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 469-484.

Kenneth Schultz. 1999. Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform? Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War. *International Organization* 53: 233-266.

October 1 Regime Theory, International Cooperation, and Institutionalism.

John Ruggie. 1982. International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order. *International Organization* 36(2), 379-415.

John Ruggie. 1992, "Multilateralism: The Anatomy of an Institution." *International Organization* 46(3), 561-598.

Joe Grieco. 1988. "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism," *International Organization* 42(3), 485-507.

Helen Milner. International Theories of Cooperation Among Nations: Strengths and Weaknesses. *World Politics* 44 (3):466-496.

John Mearsheimer. 1994, The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security* 19 (3): 5-49.

Beth Simmons. 2000. International Law and State Behavior: Commitment and Compliance in International Monetary Affairs. *American Political Science Review* 94: 819-835.

Recommended:

James Fearon. 1998. "Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation." *International Organization* 52: 269-305.

Robert Powell. 1991. "Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory." *American Political Science Review* 85: 1303-1320.

Stephen Krasner. 1991. "Global Communications and National Power: Life on the Pareto Frontier." *World Politics* 43: 336-366.

Ronald Mitchell and Patricia M. Keilbach. 2001. "Situation Structure and Institutional Design: Reciprocity, Coercion, and Exchange." *International Organization* 55: 891-917.

October 8 Second Image reversed, domestic sources of foreign policies,
and two-level games.

- Peter Katzenstein. 1976. International Relations and Domestic Structures: Foreign Economic Policies of Advanced Industrial States. *International Organization* 30(1): 1:45.
- Peter Gourevitch. 1978, The Second Image Reversed: the International Sources of Domestic Politics. *International Organization* 32(2):881-911.
- Ronald Rogowski. 1987. Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade. *American Political Science Review* 81(4): 1121-1137.
- Robert Putnam. 1988, Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games. *International Organization* 42(3): 427-460.
- Jessica Weeks. 2012. Strongmen and straw men: Authoritarian regimes and the initiation of international conflict. *American Political Science Review*, 106: 326-347.
- James Fearon. 1994. Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes. *American Political Science Review*. 88: 577-592.

October 15 Conflict I

- Stuart Bremer. 1992. Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate War, 1816-1965. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36: 309-341.
- Paul Huth and Bruce Russett. 1984. What Makes Deterrence Work: Cases from 1900 to 1980. *World Politics* 36: 496-526.
- James Fearon. 1994. Signaling Versus the Balance of Power and Interests. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38: 236-269.
- Brett Ashley Leeds. 2003. Do Alliances Deter Aggression? The Influence of Military Alliances on the Initiation of Militarized Interstate Disputes. *American Journal of Political Science* 47: 427- 439.
- Roseanne McManus. 2014. Fighting words: the effectiveness of statements of resolve in international conflict. *Journal of Peace Research*, 51: 726-740
- William Reed. 2000. A Unified Statistical Model of Conflict Onset and Escalation. *American Journal of Political Science* 44: 84-93.
- George Downs and David Rocke. 1994. Conflict, Agency and gambling for resurrection: the principal-agent problem goes to war. *American Journal of Political Science*. 38: 362-380.
- Alex Braithwaite and Douglas Lemke. 2011. Unpacking Escalation. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*. 28: 111-123

October 22 Conflict II

- Erik Gartzke. 1999. War is in the Error Term. *International Organization* 53: 567-587.
- Darren Filson, and Suzanne Werner. 2002. A Bargaining Model of War and Peace: Anticipating the Onset, Duration, and Outcome of War. *American Journal of Political Science* 46: 819-838.

- Suzanne Werner. 1999. The Precarious Nature of Peace: Resolving the Issues, Enforcing the Settlement, and Renegotiating the Terms. *American Journal of Political Science* 43: 912-934.
- Barbara Walter. 1997. The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement. *International Organization* 51: 335-364.
- Andrew Kydd. 2003. Which Side Are You On? Bias, Credibility, and Mediation. *American Journal of Political Science* 47: 497-611.
- Michael Horowitz and Allan Stam. 2014. How prior military experience influences the future militarized behavior of leaders. *International Organization*, 68: 527-559.

October 29 Domestic Politics I

- T. Clifton Morgan and Sally Howard Campbell. 1991. Domestic Structure, Decisional Constraints, and War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35: 187-211.
- Kenneth Schultz. 2005. The Politics of Risking Peace: Do Hawks or Doves Deliver the Olive Branch? *International Organization*. 59: 1-38
- Michael Colaresi. 2004. When Doves Cry: International Rivalry, Unreciprocated Cooperation, and Leadership Turnover. *American Journal of Political Science* 48: 555-570.
- Stephen Walt. 1992. Revolution and War. *World Politics* 44: 321-368.
- Jeff Carter, Michael Bernhard and Glenn Palmer. 2010. Social Revolution, the State, and War: How Revolutions affect War-Making Capacity and Interstate War Outcomes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 56: 432-459
- Jeff Carter and Glenn Palmer. 2015. Keeping the Schools Open While the Troops are Away: Regime Type, Interstate War and Government Spending. *International Studies Quarterly*. 59:145-157.
- Putnam, Robert. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two Level Games. *International Organization* 42: 427-460.
- Kenneth Abbott and Duncan Snidal. 1998. Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42: 3-32.
- Barbara Koremenos Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. The Rational Design of International Institutions. *International Organization* 55: 761-799.
- Peter Rosendorff and Helen V. Milner. 2001. The Optimal Design of International Trade Institutions: Uncertainty and Escape. *International Organization* 55: 829-857.
- Brett Ashley Leeds. 1999. Domestic Political Institutions, Credible Commitments, and International Cooperation. *American Journal of Political Science* 43: 979-1002.
- David Stasavage. 2004. Open-Door or Closed-Door? Transparency in Domestic and International Bargaining. *International Organization* 58: 667-703.
- David Lake. 1996. Anarchy, Hierarchy, and the Variety of International Relations. *International Organization* 50: 1-33.
- Philip Arena and Glenn Palmer. 2009. Is it Politics or the Economy? Domestic Correlates of Dispute Involvement in Parliamentary Systems. *International Studies Quarterly* 53: 955-975.
- Jessica Weeks. 2012. Strongmen and straw men: Authoritarian regimes and the initiation of international conflict. *American Political Science Review*, 106: 326-347.
- Jeff Carter and Timothy Nordstrum. 2017. Term Limits, Leader Preferences, and Interstate Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 61: 721-735.

November 5 Domestic Politics II

- Kenneth Schultz. 1998. Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises. *American Political Science Review* 92: 829–44.
- James Fearon. 1994. Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes. *American Political Science Review*. 88: 577-592.
- Matthew Fuhrmann and Todd Sechser. 2014. Signaling Alliance Commitments: Hand-Tying and Sunk Costs in Extended Nuclear Deterrence. *American Journal of Political Science* 58: 919–35.
- William Howell and Jon Pevehouse. 2005. Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force. *International Organization*. 59: 209-232.
- Kenneth Schultz. 2001. Looking for Audience Costs. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45: 32-60.
- Jeff Carter. 2017. The Political Cost of War Mobilization in Democracies and Dictatorships. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61:1768-1794
- Jessica Weeks. 2008. Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve. *International Organization* 62: 35-64.
- Roseanne W. McManus and Keren Yarhi-Milo. 2017. The Logic of “Offstage” Signaling: Domestic Politics, Regime Type, and Major Power-Protégé Relations. *International Organization*. 71: 701-733

November 12 Presentations

November 19 The New Disaggregated Approach of Conflict Studies

- Eli Berman, Jacob N. Shapiro, and Joseph H. Felter. 2011. Can Hearts and Minds Be Bought? The Economics of Counterinsurgency in Iraq. *Journal of Political Economy*. 119(4): 766-819.
- Jan Pierskalla and Florian M. Hollenbach. 2013. Technology and Collective Action: The Effect of Cell Phone Coverage on Political Violence in Africa. *American Political Science Review* 107:207–224.
- Jacob N. Shapiro, and Nils B. Weidmann. “Is the Phone Mightier than the Sword? Cell Phones and Insurgent Violence in Iraq.” *International Organization*. 69(2) 247-274.
- David Yanagizawa-Drott. 2014. Propaganda and Conflict: Evidence from the Rwandan Genocide. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 129, 4, 1947-1994.
- Stelios Michalopoulos and Elias Papaioannou. 2016. The Long-Run Effects of the Scramble for Africa. *American Economic Review*, 106 (7): 1802-1848.
- Melissa Dell. 2015. Trafficking Networks and the Mexican Drug War. *American Economic Review* 105, 6: 1738-1779.

Recommended:

- Lars-Erik Cederman, Luc Girardin, and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2009. Ethno-Nationalist Triads: Assessing the Influence of Kin Groups on Civil Wars. *World Politics* 61(3): 403-437.

- Jason Lyall. 2010. Are Co-Ethnics More Effective Counter-Insurgents? Evidence from the Second Chechen War. *American Political Science Review*, 104:1, 1-20.
- Ole Magnus Theisen, Helge Holtermann and Halvard Buhaug (2011/2012). Climate Wars? Assessing the Claim That Draught Breeds Conflict. *International Security* 36(3): 79-106.
- Halvard Buhaug and Rod. 2006. Local Determinants of African Civil Wars, 1970-2001. *Political Geography* 25,3, 315-335.
- Jason Lyall. 2009. Does Indiscriminate Violence Incite Insurgent Attacks? Evidence from Chechnya. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 53 (3)
- F. Daniel Hidalgo, Suresh Naidu, Simeon Nichter, and Neal Richardson. 2010. Economic Determinants of Land Invasions. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(3): 505–523.

December 3 Globalization and Its Implications.

- Garrett, Geoffrey and Peter Lange. 1991. Political Responses to Interdependence: What's "Left" for the Left? *International Organization* 45(4): 539-564.
- Mosley, Layna. 2000. Room to Move: International Financial Markets and National Welfare States. *International Organization* 54(4): 737-773.
- Erik Wibbels, Erik and Moisés Arce. 2003. Globalization, Taxation, and Burden-Shifting in Latin America. *International Organization* 57(2): 111-136.
- Beth Simmons and Zachary Elkins. 2004. The globalization of liberalization. *American Political Science Review* 98(1):171-89.
- Xun Cao. 2012. Global Networks and domestic Policy convergence: a Network explanation of Policy changes. *World Politics* 64 (3): 375–425
- M. Kayser and M. Perss. 2012. Benchmarking across Borders: Electoral Accountability and the Necessity of Comparison. *American Political Science Review* 106(3): 661-684.

Recommended:

- Geoffrey Garrett. 1998. Global Markets and National Politics: Collision Course or Virtuous Circle? *International Organization* 52(4):787-824.
- Ethan Kapstein. 2000. Winners and losers in the global economy. *International Organization* 54(2): 359-384.
- David Cameron. 1978. The Expansion of Public Economy: A Comparative Analysis. *American Political Science Review* 72(4):1243-61.
- Nita Rudra. 2002. Globalization and the decline of the welfare state in less-developed countries. *International Organization* 56(2): 411-445.

December 10 Presentations

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY STATEMENT

Academic integrity is the pursuit of scholarly activity in an open, honest and responsible manner. Academic integrity is a basic guiding principle for all academic activity at The Pennsylvania State University, and all members of the University community are expected to act in accordance with this principle. Consistent with this expectation, the University's Code of Conduct states that all students should act with personal integrity, respect other students' dignity, rights and property, and help create and maintain an environment in which all can succeed through the fruits of their efforts.

Academic integrity includes a commitment by all members of the University community not to engage in or tolerate acts of falsification, misrepresentation or deception. Such acts of dishonesty violate the fundamental ethical principles of the University community and compromise the worth of work completed by others.

DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION STATEMENT

Penn State welcomes students with disabilities into the University's educational programs. Every Penn State campus has an office for students with disabilities. Student Disability Resources (SDR) website provides [contact information for every Penn State campus](http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/disability-coordinator) (<http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/disability-coordinator>). For further information, please visit the [Student Disability Resources website](http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/) (<http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/>).

In order to receive consideration for reasonable accommodations, you must contact the appropriate disability services office at the campus where you are officially enrolled, participate in an intake interview, and provide documentation: [See documentation guidelines](http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/guidelines) at (<http://equity.psu.edu/sdr/guidelines>). If the documentation supports your request for reasonable accommodations, your campus disability services office will provide you with an accommodation letter. Please share this letter with your instructors and discuss the accommodations with them as early as possible. You must follow this process for every semester that you request accommodations.

COUNSELING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICES STATEMENT

Many students at Penn State face personal challenges or have psychological needs that may interfere with their academic progress, social development, or emotional wellbeing. The university offers a variety of confidential services to help you through difficult times, including individual and group counseling, crisis intervention, consultations, online chats, and mental health screenings. These services are provided by staff who welcome all students and embrace a philosophy respectful of clients' cultural and religious backgrounds, and sensitive to differences in race, ability, gender identity and sexual orientation.

[Counseling and Psychological Services at University Park \(CAPS\)](http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/counseling/)

(<http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/counseling/>): 814-863-0395

[Counseling and Psychological Services at Commonwealth Campuses](http://senate.psu.edu/faculty/counseling-services-at-commonwealth-campuses/)

(<http://senate.psu.edu/faculty/counseling-services-at-commonwealth-campuses/>)

Penn State Crisis Line (24 hours/7 days/week): 877-229-6400
Crisis Text Line (24 hours/7 days/week): Text LIONS to 741741

EDUCATIONAL EQUITY/REPORT BIAS STATEMENT

Penn State takes great pride to foster a diverse and inclusive environment for students, faculty, and staff. Consistent with University Policy AD29, students who believe they have experienced or observed a hate crime, an act of intolerance, discrimination, or harassment that occurs at Penn State are urged to report these incidents as outlined on the [University's Report Bias webpage](http://equity.psu.edu/reportbias/) (<http://equity.psu.edu/reportbias/>)