

**INTRODUCTION TO INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
GRADUATE SEMINAR
KETCHUM 116
MONDAY 3:35 - 6:00PM
FALL 2014**

Professor: Megan Shannon
Office: Ketchum Arts and Sciences 122
Phone: (303)492-0797
Email: meganlshannon@gmail.com or Megan.L.Shannon@colorado.edu
Office hours: Monday and Wednesday 1:00 - 2:30pm

If my office door is open, feel free to stop by, even if it is not during specified office hours. You can also email me or talk to me before or after class to schedule a meeting.

Class Description

This class introduces the systematic study of international politics. While sometimes the media portrays global events such as terrorist attacks as entirely random events, the fact is that patterns of behavior exist at the international level. Our job is to figure out how we can identify patterns in international relations, propose explanations for those patterns, and discover new patterns of our own. We explore political phenomena such as interstate and civil conflict, the formation and growth of supranational institutions, and conflict management.

The class views international politics through the lens of strategic choice. Strategic choice means that international actors are purposive, and their actions are pursued in anticipation of how other actors will behave. Actors have unique interests they want to achieve in international relations, but cannot always achieve their interests because of other actors' preferences and behavior. Moreover, they are constrained by an institutional framework of norms, rules, and international law. It is the combination of interests, interactions, and institutions that produces global politics as we observe it. Strategic choice may seem like a simple and obvious concept, but it is a powerful framework that helps us move away from perceiving international politics as entirely random, and start looking for patterns in behavior.

What This Class Promises to You

Throughout the semester, you will learn the social science of international relations. As social scientists, we identify puzzling phenomena in international politics. We will explore how scholars have addressed those puzzles, as well as develop our own logical stories that answer those puzzles. We will devise ways to see how valid our stories are, and look for evidence that can help confirm or reject the stories. We'll identify the holes in the proposed stories and address alternative explanations. Finally, we'll draw conclusions about how right or wrong our stories are.

What You Bring to the Class

As part of the University of Colorado community, we strive to find truth. We are a research community that seeks to understand the world around us. CU cannot achieve those goals without the engagement of its graduate students. That means your participation in this class is valuable. You have unique gifts, skills, and insights that advance our search for truth and knowledge. If you withhold participation, it stifles and hinders the ability of the community to

conduct research.

By enrolling in this class, you have the opportunity to develop, enhance, and contribute knowledge in political science. As members of this class, you and I commit to:

- Being in class, and being on time
- Doing the readings in advance
- Engaging in class discussion and using technology only to further that discussion

Books and Readings

Lake, David A. and Robert Powell, eds. 1999. Strategic Choice and International Relations. Princeton: Princeton University Press. ISBN 978-0691026978.

Students are expected to find other readings on their own, unless the reading is not easily accessible through Google Scholar or JSTOR. In that case, the reading will be posted to D2L.

Grades

Participation, 25% of overall grade

To function as a class, your participation is needed. You can participate by asking questions and making quality contributions to class discussion. Your participation is assessed by how much you engage the assigned readings. I will call on students to identify and discuss various aspects of the readings. If you show up to every class but do not say a word, you can expect a B minus for this portion of the grade.

Peer Reviews, 25% of overall grade

You will write two reviews of already published papers throughout the semester. The purpose of this is to learn how to critically and constructively analyze work in political science. Even though the paper has already been published, you will assign it a decision of publish as is, publish with minor revisions, publish with major revisions, or reject. Each person will review a different paper, and you will sign up for the papers to review at the beginning of the semester. The peer review must be typed, Times New Roman 12pt font, page numbers, stapled, and submitted to me as a hard copy at the beginning of the class during which the article will be discussed. It should be about two single-spaced pages. Items marked with a * are those that I suggest for peer review.

Discussion Leadership, 25% of overall grade

Each of you will lead the class discussion of two articles during the semester. I will largely be hands-off during this time. The purpose is for you to become an expert on two readings, as well as develop teaching and leadership skills. You will sign up for the articles for which you'll lead discussion at the beginning of the semester. Items marked with a + are those that will be led by a student for discussion.

Final Exam 25% of overall grade

The final exam will be composed of questions similar to what you would encounter on the IR comprehensive exam. You will write between 12-15 pages to answer the questions. You'll receive the exam on the last day of class, and it will be due during finals week.

Requirements for Students Auditing the Class

Students auditing the class are expected to complete the readings and fully participate in the discussion. Additionally, students auditing the class will complete one peer review and will lead discussion of one article.

Grading Scale

	B+ 89 - 87	C+ 79 - 77
A 93 - 100	B 86 - 83	C 76 - 73
A- 92 - 90	B- 82 - 80	C- 72 - 70

The Grade of A

The grade of A is given to work that expresses clear, cogent, novel, and logical arguments. Work that receives an A does not merely summarize existing literature - it offers new and meaningful contributions. It uses evidence from scholarly works and reputable sources to back up its conjectures. It fully considers a number of possible stories before settling on the right one. Work receiving an A is clearly written and organized.

Work receiving an A grade is able to identify a dependent and independent variable in a given piece of scholarly work. The student can explain the relationship between variables being tested, as well as the way those variables are operationalized and measured. The student can identify weaknesses in the empirical test of the relationship and propose alternative ways of testing the relationship. The student knows what conclusions are supported by the empirical test and which conclusions are not.

A grade of A indicates novel and creative thinking. The student develops unique criticism of existing empirical work, and suggests appropriate ways to remedy flaws in the literature.

The Grade of B

The grade of B is given to work that makes arguments, but the argument is not logically consistent. It provides some evidence for its conjectures, but the evidence is not always relevant or does not strongly support the story. It summarizes the literature more than it offers unique contributions.

Work receiving the grade of B can identify dependent and independent variables and hypotheses, but exhibits confusion over the results of an empirical test. It is not able to critically assess the limits of a particular test or suggest alternative ways of testing the relationship. B work may also be somewhat confused about the extent to which conclusions are supported by an empirical test.

Work receiving the grade of B takes potshots at existing empirical work, or offers elementary and rote criticism. It does not provide meaningful alternative ways to address flaws in the literature.

The Grade of C

Work receiving the grade of C is given to work that expresses unclear and muddled arguments. It avoids taking a definite position and tries to straddle a number of different stories. The work does not provide clear evidence for its conclusions. It relies on emotions or personal opinion to support its conjectures. Finally, the writing is unclear and disorganized.

Work receiving a C has trouble identifying theory, dependent variables, independent variables, or hypotheses. It does not engage in much critical assessment of empirical tests. It may be able to identify conclusions that are drawn in a particular work, but cannot adequately explain how the evidence provided supports those conclusions.

Schedule of Lecture Topics and Readings

The syllabus may be modified as needed to reflect the pace of the course. Readings may be added or subtracted. Complete the readings listed for each day before coming to class.

Good Practices for Studying International Relations

Week 1 (September 8)

- Zinnes, Dina. “Three Puzzles In Search of a Researcher.”
- Munger, Michael. “10 Tips on How to Write Less Badly.”
- Digital Distraction, Astronomy Education Review.
- Miller et. al, “How to Be a Good Peer Reviewer.”

Strategic Choice and International Relations

Week 2 (September 14)

- Lake, David. “Why Isms Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress.” *International Studies Quarterly* 55:465-480.
- Fearon, James. “Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science.” *World Politics* 43:169-195.*+
- Lake and Powell, Ch 1.
- Walt, Stephen. “Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies.” *International Security* 23(4):5-48.+

Actors in the International System: the State

Week 3 (September 22)

- Acemoglu, Johnson, and Robinson. “The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development.”+
- Levi, Margaret. *Of Rule and Revenue*, selected chapters.
- Skocpol, Theda. *States and Social Revolutions*, selected chapters.
- Lake, David. “The New Sovereignty in International Relations.” *International Studies Review* 5:303-323.+

Actors in the International System: Preferences of States

Week 4 (September 29)

- Waltz, Kenneth. *Theory of International Politics*, Ch 5.+
- Lake and Powell, Ch 2.
- Barnett, Michael and Raymond Duvall. “Power in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59(1):39-75.*+
- Moravcsik, Andrew. “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization* 51(4):513-553.*+

State Preferences: Domestic

Week 5 (October 6)

- Putman, Robert. “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games.” *International Organization* 42(3):427-460.+
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, and Alastair Smith. “Domestic Explanations of International Relations.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 15:161-181.
- Schultz, Kenneth. “The Politics of Risking Peace: Do Hawks or Doves Deliver the Olive Branch?” *International Organization* 59(1):1-38.*+
- Gandhi, Jennifer. 2010. *Political Institutions Under Dictatorship*. Ch 1, 4.

Actors in the International System: Institutions

Week 6 (October 13)

- Lake and Powell, Ch 4.

- Posner, Daniel. “The Political Salience of Cultural Difference: Why Chewas and Tumbukas are Allies in Zambia and Adversaries in Malawi.” *American Political Science Review* 98(4):529.*+
- Martin, Lisa and Beth Simmons. “Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions.” *International Organization* 52(4):729-757.
- Barnett, Michael and Martha Finnemore. “The Politics and Pathologies of International Organizations.” *International Organization* 53(4):699-732.*+

Actors in the International System: Anarchy as an Institution

Week 7 (October 20)

- Lake and Powell, Ch 5.
- Wendt, Alexander. “Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics.” *International Organization* 46:391-425.*+
- Snidal, Duncan. “Relative Gains and the Pattern of International Cooperation.” *American Political Science Review* 85(3):701-726.
- Ruggie, John. “What Makes the World Hang Together?” *International Organization* 52:855-85. *+

Actors in the International System: Non-State Actors

Week 8 (October 27)

- Hyde, Susan. “Catch Us If You Can: Election Monitoring and International Norm Diffusion.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(2). *+
- Horowitz, Michael. “Nonstate Actors and the Diffusion of Innovations: the Case of Suicide Terrorism.” *International Organization* 64(1):33-64.*+
- Donno, Daniella. “Who is Punished? Regional Intergovernmental Organizations and the Enforcement of Democratic Norms.” *International Organization* 64(1):33-64.*+
- Carpenter, Charli. “Vetting the Advocacy Agenda: Network Centrality and the Paradox of Weapons Norms.” *International Organization* 65(1):69-102.*+

Outcomes: Interstate Conflict

Week 9 (November 3)

- Fearon, James. “Rationalist Explanations for War.” *International Organization* 49:379-414.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James Morrow, Randolph Siverson, and Alastair Smith. “An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace.” *American Political Science Review* 93(4):791-807.
- Slantchev, Branislav. “The Power to Hurt: Costly Conflict with Completely Informed States.” *American Political Science Review* 97(1):123-133.*+
- Weeks, Jessica. “Strongmen and Straw Men: Authoritarian Regimes and International Conflict.” *American Political Science Review*: 106(2):326. *+

Outcomes: Intrastate Conflict

Week 10 (November 10)

- Fearon, James and David Laitin. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” *American Political Science Review* 97(1):75-90.*+
- Humphreys, Macartan and Jeremy Weinstein. “Handling and Manhandling in Civil War.” *American Political Science Review* 100(3):429-447.*+
- Walter, Barbara. “The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement.” *International Organization* 51(3):335-364.*+

- Fortna, Page. “Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War.” *International Studies Quarterly*.*+

Outcomes: Conflict Management

Week 11 (November 17)

- Kydd, Andrew. “Which Side Are You On? Bias, Credibility, and Mediation.” *American Journal of Political Science*.*+
- Gent, Stephen, and Megan Shannon. “The Effectiveness of Arbitration and Adjudication: Getting Into a Bind.” *Journal of Politics*.*+
- Hultman, Lisa, Jacob Kathman, and Megan Shannon. “United Nations Peacekeeping and Civilian Protection in Civil War.” *American Journal of Political Science*.*+

Methodological Innovations in International Relations

Week 12 (December 1)

- Zeitzoff, Thomas. “Using Social Media to Measure Conflict Dynamics: An Application to the 2008-2009 Gaza Conflict.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55(6):938-969.*+
- McDermott, Rose. “New Directions for Experimental Work in International Relations.” *International Studies Quarterly* 55:503-520.
- Tingley, Dustin and Barbara Walter. “The Effect of Repeated Play on Reputation Building: An Experimental Approach.” *International Organization* 65(2):343-365.*+
- Tomz, Michael and Jessica Weeks. “Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace.” *American Political Science Review* 107(4).

Contemporary Challenges to the Discipline of International Relations

Week 13 (December 8)

- Maliniak, Daniel, Ryan Powers, and Barbara Walter. “The Gender Citation Gap in International Relations.” *International Organization*.
- Kadera, Kelly. “The Social Underpinnings of Women’s Worth in the Study of World Politics: Culture, Leader Emergence, and Coauthorship.” *International Studies Perspectives*.
- Final Exam Assigned

Final Exam due at 4:00pm Monday, December 15th