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## ****Course Description****

The goal of this course is introducing concepts, assumptions, theoretical arguments, and theoretical applications of various theories of international relations. The primary focus of this course is mainstream theories in IR. At the beginning of the course, we will go through basic concepts in the field of IR. IR theories and related models are the main contents in this course. Students will follow the major debates between major scholars, which carry the IR field forward and improve the validity and reliability of IR researches. In the meantime, we will discuss the application of rational choice theory, feminism, and English school and critical theory in IR field.

## Course Objectives

* Understand major theories in the field of international relations, including realism, liberalism, constructivism, and rational choice.
* Understand the development of IR as a discipline.
* Understand the ontology, epistemology, and methodology of IR theories.

# Course Requirements

## Class Organization

The course is designed as a reading-intensive seminar. There will be no lectures. Students should be prepared to critically discuss all of the assigned reading each week. Attendance in class is mandatory, as is regular participation in class discussion. There is a reading list for each week. It is the responsibility of the students to **FINISH** the required readings before the class.Students should develop critical thinking while reading the materials. In the class, the assigned discussion leaders will lead the discussion by raising questions and critique on the readings. The rest of the students should join the discussion accordingly and provide critical thinking to these works. The instructor will intervene and guide the direction of discussion if necessary.

While you are reading, please constantly think about the following questions:

* Why does the author want to write this article?
* What puzzle the author tries to solve?
* What are the dependent variables and independent variables? What does the causal mechanism look like?
* How convincing are the author’s empirical strategy and use of evidence? Could a different strategy be more convincing?
* What are possible counter-arguments that could be made?

## Grading Policy

Class participation: 20%

Discussion leader and presentation: 20%

Response paper: 15%

Book review: 20%

Final exam: 25%

Grade Scale:

100-90 A+ 89-85 A 84-80 A-

79-77 B+ 76-73 B 72-70 B-

70 and below F

## Assignments

All assignments and exams use English.

### Response paper:

* Starting from the week on classical realism, each student will select **one** week to serve as a discussion leader. The discussion leader is required to write one response paper, which is due one night before the class. The discussion leader will upload his/her response paper to a shared folder.
* Each paper should be at least 3-pages long (Times New Roman font size of 12, double space), including **SUMMARIES and CRITIQUE**. Summary should not take more than half of the reponse paper. The quality of the response paper is primaril**y** based on critique, not summaries. A response paper with too many summaries and too little critique will receive B- or below.
* At the end of the paper, students will propose **two questions** for class discussion.
* NO COPY&PASTE from the text (especially the sumamries). ALWAYS PARAPHRASE!
* PhD students: write two response papers and present on two weeks.

### Presentation:

* The discussion leaders will take 20-30 minutes to present and discuss his/her paper at the beginning of the class. No slides for presentation.
* PhD students: present twice during the semester.

### Book review:

* Each student will pick one book. The best source of books is a walk on the 2nd floor of the library of social science in the general buiding. Students can also select a book of their own interest. Student need to write on different books, but the instructor must approve the book.
* After the instructor agrees with the selection, the student will write a book review between 2000-4000 words (Times New Roman font size of 12, double space).
* Examples of reviews can be found in *Perspective of Politics* and *International Studies Review.*
* Please note that a book review is more than a summary. It is a critical response to a scholarly work. Authors usually cite other scholarly works to evaluate the book being reviewed.
* Book review is due on week 17. And please, NO COPY&PASTE from the book. ALWAYS PARAPHRASE!

### Final exam:

Three hours open book exam. The format will be finalized before the exam

## ****Attendance and Class Activities****

* Students are required to attend class regularly unless excused in advance or you have proof of emergency. I will accept notes from the student attesting to the date of the illness as an excused absence. A student may also use the university’s online system to register an excused absence.
* A student who experiences a prolonged absence or an illness preventing attendance is required to provide written documentation of the illness from the relevant healthcare provider, verifying the dates of the treatment and the period during which the student was unable to meet academic responsibilities.
* Religious observances: Please let me know in advance if a religious observance will cause you to miss a class. Provided you give advance notice. You will have the opportunity to make up exams or other assignments.

## ****Ethics****

* I have zero talerence on plagiarism. Student should not plagiarize when writing every assignement in this course. I frequently upload student papers to Turnitin service to check plagiarism. Once confirmed, the assignment will receive a failing grade. Meanwhile, I will inform the student’s mentor at the department or program.
* I have given failing grades to graduate and undergraduate students due to plagiarism. I do not work with students who had a record of plagiarism.

## Class materials

* The online learning system Moodle contains all the required book chapters, the articles, and recommended reading materials. Please inform the instructor if there is any problem with the reading materials.
* I have reserved several key readings in the library. Please be aware of copyrights regulations and do not reprint these works. Students are encouraged to gather a course pack together.

## Readings

## Week 1 (9/17): Introduction to the course

Kaldor, Mary. 2018. “Cycles in World Politics.” *International Studies Review* 20 (2): 214–22. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viy038>.

## Week 2 (9/24): the use of theory: where we are?

Desch, Michael C. 2019. “How Political Science Became Irrelevant.” The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 27, 2019. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Political-Science-Became/245777>

Kristensen, Peter Marcus. 2018. “International Relations at the End: A Sociological Autopsy.” *International Studies Quarterly*. Accessed May 14, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqy002>.

Lake, David A. 2011. “Why ‘Isms’ Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress.” *International Studies Quarterly* 55 (2): 465–80. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00661.x>.

\*Recommended

Reiter, Dan. 2015. “Should We Leave Behind the Subfield of International Relations?” *Annual Review of Political Science* 18 (1): 481–99. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-polisci-053013-041156>.

Whyte, Christopher. “Can We Change the Topic, Please? Assessing the Theoretical Construction of International Relations Scholarship.” *International Studies Quarterly* 63, no. 2 (June 1, 2019): 432–47. doi:[10.1093/isq/sqy050](https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqy050).

Tickner, J. Ann. 1997. “You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists.” *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4): 611–32.

Sil, Rudra, and Peter Joachim Katzenstein. 2010. *Beyond Paradigms: Analytic Eclecticism in the Study of World Politics*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire ; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

## Week 3 (10/1): Autumn festival, no class

## Week 4 (10/8): Concepts in IR

Drezner, Daniel. 2021. “Power and International Relations: A Temporal View.” *European Journal of International Relations* 27 (1): 29–52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066120969800>.

 Nye, Joseph S. “Soft Power: The Evolution of a Concept.” *Journal of Political Power* 0, no. 0 (February 10, 2021): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2158379X.2021.1879572>.

Fazal, Tanisha M. 2004. “State Death in the International System.” *International Organization* 58 (2): 311–44. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818304582048>.

\*Recommended

Powell, Robert. 1991. “Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory.” The American Political Science Review 85 (4): 1303–20.

Holsti, Kalevi J. “Change in International Politics: The View from High Altitude.” *International Studies Review* 20, no. 2 (June 1, 2018): 186–94. doi:[10.1093/isr/viy030](https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viy030).

Goemans, Hein. 2006. “Bounded Communities: Territoriality, Territorial Attachment, and Conflict.” Territoriality and Conflict in an Era of Globalization, 25–61.

Mattern, Janice Bially, “The Concept of Power and the (Un)discipline of International Relations”, in The Oxford Handbook of International Relations. OUP Oxford.

Baldwin, David. “Power and International Relations”. In Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, eds. 2012. Handbook of International Relations. 2 edition. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Dahl, Robert A. “The Concept of Power.” *Behavioral Science* 2, no. 3 (January 1, 1957): 201–15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830020303>.

Lee, Melissa M. 2018. “The International Politics of Incomplete Sovereignty: How Hostile Neighbors Weaken the State.” *International Organization* 72 (2): 283–315. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818318000085>.

Grieco, “Understanding the Problem of International Cooperation,” in Baldwin, David A. 1993. Neorealism *and Neoliberalism : The Contemporary Debate*. New Directions in World Politics. New York: Columbia University Press.

Snidal, Duncan. 1991. “International Cooperation among Relative Gains Maximizers.” *International Studies Quarterly* 35 (4): 387–402.

## Week 5 (10/15) Classical Realism, balance of power, alliance politics

Thucydides, ‘The Melian Dialogue’

Hans J. Morgenthau & Kenneth Thompson. *Politics among Nations: the Struggle for Power and Peace*, sixth edition. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1985, Ch1 “A Realist Theory of International Politics”, Ch11 “the Balance of Power”.

Edry, Jessica, Jesse C. Johnson, and Brett Ashley Leeds. undefined/ed. “Threats at Home and Abroad: Interstate War, Civil War, and Alliance Formation.” *International Organization*, 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818321000151>.

\*Recommended

Carr, Edward Hallett. 1964. *The Twenty Years’ Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. 450th ed. edition. New York, N.Y.: Harper Perennial. Ch5-6

Lobell, Steven E. “A Granular Theory of Balancing.” *International Studies Quarterly* 62, no. 3 (September 1, 2018): 593–605. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqy011>.

Walt, Stephen M. 1987. *The Origins of Alliances*. Cornell Studies in Security Affairs. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Snyder, Glenn. 1997. *Alliance Politics*. Cornell Studies in Security Affairs. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Weitsman, Patricia A. 2004. *Dangerous Alliances* : Proponents of Peace, Weapons of War. Edited by Anonymous. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

Leeds, B.A. 2003. “Do Alliances Deter Aggression? The Influence of Military Alliances on the Initiation of Militarized Interstate Disputes.” *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (3): 427–439.

Morrow, James D. 1991. “Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances.” *American Journal of Political Science* 35 (4): 904–33. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2111499>.

Schweller, Randall L. “New Realist Research on Alliances: Refining, Not Refuting, Waltz’s Balancing Proposition.” *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 4 (1997): 927–30.

## Week 6 (10/22): Neorealism (I), hierarchy in IR

Waltz, Kenneth Neal. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Addison-Wesley Series in Political Science. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co. Skim chapters 1-2, and read chapters 3-9. (Yes, the whole book)

Lake, D.A. 2009. Hierarchy in International Relations. Cornell Univ Pr, Ch2

\*Recommended

Keohane, Robert O., and N. Waltz Kenneth. 2000. “The Neorealist and its Critic.” International Security 25 (3): 204–5.

Krauthammer, C. 1990. “The Unipolar Moment.” *Foreign Affairs* 70 (1): 23–33.

Wæver, Ole. 2009. “Waltz’s Theory of Theory.” *International Relations* 23 (2): 201–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117809104635>.

Legro, Jeffrey W., and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. “Is Anybody Still a Realist?” International Security 24 (2): 5–55. https://doi.org/10.1162/016228899560130.

Feaver, Peter D., Gunther Hellmann, Randall L. Schweller, Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, William C. Wohlforth, Jeffrey W. Legro, and Andrew Moravcsik. 2000. “Brother, Can You Spare a Paradigm?(Or Was Anybody Ever a Realist?).” International Security 25 (1): 165–193.

Singer, J. David. “The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations.” *World Politics* 14, no. 1 (October 1961): 77–92. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009557>.

Art, Robert J., and Kenneth Neal Waltz. *The Use of Force: Military Power and International* Politics. Rowman & Littlefield, 2009.

Kang, David C. “International Order in Historical East Asia: Tribute and Hierarchy Beyond Sinocentrism and Eurocentrism.” *International Organization* 74, no. 1 (ed 2020): 65–93. doi:[10.1017/S0020818319000274](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818319000274).

MacKay, Joseph. “Legitimation Strategies in International Hierarchies.” *International Studies Quarterly* 63, no. 3 (September 1, 2019): 717–25. doi:[10.1093/isq/sqz038](https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqz038).

## Week 7 (10/29): Neorealism (II) defensive realism, power transition theory

Christensen, Thomas J., and Jack Snyder. 1990. “Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity.” *International Organization* 44 (2): 137–68.

Lemke, Douglas. 2002. *Regions of War and Peace*. Cambridge Studies in International Relations ; 80. Cambridge University Press. CH2

\*Recommended

Waltz, Kenneth N. 2000. “Structural Realism after the Cold War.” *International Security* 25 (1): 5–41.

Jervis, Robert. 1978. “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma.” World Politics 30 (2): 167–214.

Baldwin, David A. 1993. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism : The Contemporary Debate*. New Directions in World Politics. New York: Columbia University Press. Ch2

Organski, A. F. K., and Jacek Kugler. 1980. *The War Ledger*. Edited by Anonymous. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vasquez, John A. “The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz’s Balancing Proposition.” *The American Political Science Review* 91, no. 4 (1997): 899–912.

Reed, William. “Information, Power, and War.” *American Political Science Review* 97, no. 04 (2003): 633–41. doi:[10.1017/S0003055403000923](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055403000923).

Smith, Alastair. “Alliance Formation and War.” *International Studies Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (December 1, 1995): 405–25. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2600800>.

Glaser, Charles L. “Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help.” *International Security* 19, no. 3 (1994): 50–90. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539079>.

## Week 8 (11/5): Neoclassical realism, the problem of reputation

Rose, Gideon. 1998. “Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy.” *World Politics* 51 (1): 144–72. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887100007814>.

Taliaferro, Jeffrey W., Steven E. Lobell, and Norrin M. Ripsman. “Is Peaceful Change in World Politics Always Desirable? A Neoclassical Realist Perspective.” *International Studies Review* 20, no. 2 (June 1, 2018): 283–91. doi:10.1093/isr/viy023.

Sundaram, Sasikumar S. 2020. “The Practices of Evaluating Entitlements: Rethinking ‘Reputation’ in International Politics.” *International Studies Quarterly* 64 (3): 657–68. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqaa041>.

\*Recommended

Narizny, Kevin. 2017. “On Systemic Paradigms and Domestic Politics: A Critique of the Newest Realism.” International Security 42 (2): 155–90.

Schweller, Randall L. 2006. *Unanswered Threats : Political Constraints on the Balance of Power. Princeton Studies in International History and Politics*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University. Intro p1-10, Ch2

Kupchan, Charles. 1994. *The Vulnerability of Empire*. Cornell Studies in Security Affairs. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Ch 1-2.

Ripsman, Norrin M., Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, and Steven E. Lobell. 2016. N*eoclassical Realist Theory of International Politics*. 1 edition. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Brawley, Mark R. 2013. *Political Economy and Grand Strategy: A Neoclassical Realist View*. 1 edition. London: Routledge.

Lobell, Steven E., Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, eds. 2009. N*eoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy.* 1 edition. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Copeland, Dale C. *The Origins of Major War*. Cornell University Press, 2001.

## Week 9 (11/12): Offensive Realism, hedging

Mearsheimer, John J. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: Norton. (Yes, the whole book)

Koga, Kei. “The Concept of ‘Hedging’ Revisited: The Case of Japan’s Foreign Policy Strategy in East Asia’s Power Shift.” *International Studies Review* 20, no. 4 (December 1, 2018): 633–60. doi:[10.1093/isr/vix059](https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/vix059).

\*Recommended

Kuik, Cheng-Chwee. 2016. “How Do Weaker States Hedge? Unpacking ASEAN States’ Alignment Behavior towards China.” Journal of Contemporary China 25 (100): 500–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10670564.2015.1132714>.

Mearsheimer, John J. 1990. “Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War.” *Atlantic* (0276-9077) 266 (2): 35.

Snyder, H. Glenn. 2002. “Mearsheimer’s World-Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security: A Review Essay.” *International Security* 27 (1): 149–73.

Zakaria, Fareed. 1999. *From Wealth to Power : The Unusual Origins of America’s World Role*. Princeton Studies in International History and Politics. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. Ch2

Gartzke, Erik. 1999. “War Is in the Error Term.” *International Organization* 53 (3): 567–87. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081899550995>.

## Week 10 (11/19): bargaining, coercive diplomacy, foreign policymaking,

Levy, Jack S. “Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations.” *International Studies Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (March 1, 1997): 87–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0020-8833.00034>

Yarhi-Milo, Keren. 2013. “In the Eye of the Beholder: How Leaders and Intelligence Communities Assess the Intentions of Adversaries.” *International Security* 38 (1): 7–51. <https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00128>.

\*Recommended

Wagner, R. Harrison. “The Theory of Games and the Balance of Power.” *World Politics* 38, no. 4 (July 1986): 546–76. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2010166>.

Niou, Emerson M. S., Peter C. Ordeshook, and Gregory F. Rose. 1989. *The Balance of Power : Stability in International Systems*, Cambridge University Press.

Kahler, Miles. “Rationality in International Relations.” *International Organization* 52, no. 04 (1998): 919–41. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081898550680>.

McDermott, Rose. 2004. “Prospect Theory in Political Science: Gains and Losses From the First Decade.” *Political Psychology* 25 (2): 289–312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00372.x>.

Sechser, Todd S. 2018. “Reputations and Signaling in Coercive Bargaining.” Journal of Conflict Resolution 62 (2): 318–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002716652687.

Horowitz, Michael C., and Allan C. Stam. 2014. “How Prior Military Experience Influences the Future Militarized Behavior of Leaders.” *International Organization* 68 (3): 527–59. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818314000046>.

## Week 11 (11/26): AMUN, make up class TBA, Liberalism, democratic peace

Lake, David A., Lisa L. Martin, and Thomas Risse. 2021. “Challenges to the Liberal Order: Reflections on International Organization.” *International Organization* 75 (2): 225–57. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000636>.

Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory.” *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 585–602.

\*Recommended

Christian Reus-Smit, “The Strange Death of Liberal IR Theory,” European Journal ofInternational Law, 12, 3 (2001): 573-93

Kucik, J., and E. Reinhardt. 2008. “Does Flexibility Promote Cooperation? An Application to the Global Trade Regime.” International Organization 62 (03): 477–505.

Mesquita, Bruce Bueno de, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. “An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace.” American Political Science Review 93 (4): 791–807. https://doi.org/10.2307/2586113.

Weiss, Jessica Chen. 2013. “Authoritarian Signaling, Mass Audiences, and Nationalist Protest in China.” *International Organization* 67 (1): 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818312000380>.Doyle, Michael W. 2005. “Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace.” *American Political Science Review* null (03): 463–466.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization* 51 (4): 513–53. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081897550447>.

Hyde, Susan D., and Elizabeth N. Saunders. “Recapturing Regime Type in International Relations: Leaders, Institutions, and Agency Space.” *International Organization* 74, no. 2 (ed 2020): 363–95. doi:[10.1017/S0020818319000365](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818319000365).

Dafoe, A. 2010. “Statistical Critiques of the Democratic Peace: Caveat Emptor.” American Journal of Political Science.

Oneal, John R., and Bruce Russett. *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations*. 1st ed. W. W. Norton & Company, 2001.

Oneal, John R, and Bruce M Russet. 1997. “The Classical Liberals Were Right: Democracy, Interdependence, and Conflict, 1950–1985.” *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (2): 267–94.

Gartzke, Erik. 2007. “The Capitalist Peace.” *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (1): 166–91

Kindleberger, Charles P. 1986. *The World in Depression, 1929-1939: Revised and Enlarged Edition*. Revised. University of California Press.

Ikenberry, G. John. 2018. “The End of Liberal International Order?” *International Affairs* 94 (1):7–23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix241>.

Jeffry A. Frieden, “Actors and Preferences in International Relations,” in David A. Lake and Robert Powell, eds., *Strategic Choice and International Relations* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999), pp. 39–76.

## Week 12 (12/3): Neoliberal institutionalism, interdependence

Mansfield, Edward D., and Nita Rudra. 2021. “Embedded Liberalism in the Digital Era.” *International Organization* 75 (2): 558–85. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000569>.

Farrell, Henry, and Abraham L. Newman. 2019. “Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion.” *International Security* 44 (1): 42–79. https://doi.org/10.1162/isec\_a\_00351.

\*Recommended

Krasner, Stephen D. 1983. *International Regimes*. Cornell Studies in Political Economy. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Ch1

Keohane, Robert O. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Sommerer, Thomas, and Jonas Tallberg. “Diffusion Across International Organizations: Connectivity and Convergence.” *International Organization* 73, no. 2 (ed 2019): 399–433. doi:[10.1017/S0020818318000450](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818318000450).

 Cha, Taesuh. 2019. “Is Anybody Still a Globalist? Rereading the Trajectory of US Grand Strategy and the End of the Transnational Moment.” *Globalizations*, May. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14747731.2019.1611011>

Reus-Smit, Christian. 1997. “The Constitutional Structure of International Society and the Nature of Fundamental Institutions.” International Organization 51 (4): 555–89. https://doi.org/10.1162/002081897550456.

Keohane, O. Robert. 1998. “International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?” *Foreign Policy*, no. 110: 82–96+194.

Gilpin, Robert. 1981. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Keohane, Robert O. 1989. *Power and Interdependence*. Edited by Anonymous. Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown Series in Political Science. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman.

Koremenos, Barbara, Charles Lipson, and Duncan Snidal. 2001. “The Rational Design of International Institutions.” *International Organization* 55 (04): 761–799.

## Week 13 (12/10): Constructivism (I)

Wendt, Alexander. 1992. “Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics.” *International Organization* 46 (02): 391–425.

Hopf, Ted. 1998. “The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory.” *International Security* 23 (1): 171–200.

\*Recommended

Hopf, Ted. 2017. “Change in International Practices.” *European Journal of International Relations*, August, 1354066117718041. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066117718041>.

Johnston, Iain. 2007. *Social States: China in International Institutions, 1980-2000*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, Ch1

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Mercer, Jonathan. “Anarchy and Identity.” *International Organization* 49, no. 02 (1995): 229–52. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300028381>.

Larson, Deborah Welch, and Alexei Shevchenko. “Lost in Misconceptions about Social Identity Theory.” *International Studies Quarterly* 63, no. 4 (December 1, 2019): 1189–91. doi:[10.1093/isq/sqz071](https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqz071).

## Week 14 (12/17): Constructivism (II) , non-state actors and policy diffusion

Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. *Activists beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Cornell University Press, Ch1&6.

Gilardi, Fabrizio. “Transnational Diffusion: Norms, Ideas, and Policies.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2:453–477. Sage Thousand Oaks, CA, 2012.

\*Recommended

Hall, Nina, Hans Peter Schmitz, and J. Michael Dedmon. “Transnational Advocacy and NGOs in the Digital Era: New Forms of Networked Power.” *International Studies Quarterly* 64, no. 1 (March 1, 2020): 159–67. doi:[10.1093/isq/sqz052](https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqz052).

Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” *International Organization* 52 (04): 887–917.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2000. “The Origins of Human Rights Regimes: Democratic Delegation in Postwar Europe.” *International Organization* 54 (2): 217–52. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081800551163>.

Hall, Rodney Bruce and Thomas J. Biersteker. “The Emergence of Private Authority in the International System.” In *The Emergence of Private Authority in Global Governance*, ed. Rodney Bruce Hall and Thomas J. Biersteker, 3-22. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Haufler, Virginia. “Corporations in Zones of Conflict: Issues, Actors, and Institutions.” Chapter 4 in Avant, Finnemore, and Sell, *Who Governs the Globe*?, 2010, Cambridge University Press.

Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. “Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (1): 391–416.

Risse, Thomas. “Transnational Actors and World Politics”. Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, eds. 2012. *Handbook of International Relations*. 2 edition. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Klotz, Audie. “Norms Reconstituting Interests: Global Racial Equality and U.S. Sanctions against South Africa*.” International Organization* 49, no. 3 (ed 1995): 451–78. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300033348.

## Week 15 (12/24): feminist theory, English School

Schwartz, Joshua A., and Christopher W. Blair. 2020. “Do Women Make More Credible Threats? Gender Stereotypes, Audience Costs, and Crisis Bargaining.” *International Organization* 74 (4): 872–95. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000223>.

Buzan, Barry, and Richard Little. 2000. *International Systems in World History: Remaking the Study of International Relations*. Oxford University Press, USA, Ch2, 3, & part II.

\*Recommended

Tickner, J. Ann, and Jacqui True. 2018. “A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War I Women’s Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda.” *International Studies Quarterly*. Accessed May 14, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqx091>.

Little, Richard. “The English School’s Contribution to the Study of International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 6, no. 3 (September 1, 2000): 395–422. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066100006003004>.

Bull, Hedley. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politic*s. Macmillan International Higher Education, 2012.

Buzan, Barry. “The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR.” *Review of International Studies* 27, no. 3 (July 2001): 471–88. doi:[10.1017/S0260210501004715](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210501004715).

秦亚青。国际关系理论中国学派生成的可能和必然，《世界经济与政治》2006年 第3期。

Ren, Xiao. “Grown from within: Building a Chinese School of International Relations.” *The Pacific Review* 33, no. 3–4 (July 3, 2020): 386–412. doi:[10.1080/09512748.2020.1728573](https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2020.1728573).

## Week 16 (12/31):  Rational choice and its critics

Fearon, James. 1995. “Rationalist Explanations for War.” International Organization 49 (3): 379–414.

Fearon, J., and A. Wendt. 2002. “Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View.” In Carlsnaes, Walter, Thomas Risse-Kappen, and Beth A. Simmons, eds. 2013. *Handbook of International Relations*. 2nd ed. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif: SAGE.

\*Recommended

Kydd, Andrew H. 2015. *International Relations Theory: The Game-Theoretic Approach*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press. Ch2

Green, Donald, and Ian Shapiro. 1996. *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. Yale University Press, especially Ch3

Webster, Kaitlyn, Chong Chen, and Kyle Beardsley. 2019. “Conflict, Peace, and the Evolution of Women’s Empowerment.” International Organization 73 (2): 255–89. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818319000055.

Dixit, Avinash K., and Barry J. Nalebuff. *The Art of Strategy: A Game Theorist’s Guide to Success in Business and Life*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2010.

Zagare, Frank C. 2018. “Explaining the Long Peace: Why von Neumann (and Schelling) Got It Wrong.” *International Studies Review* 20 (3): 422–37. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/vix057>.

## Week 17 (1/7): dependency theory, Rethinking theories: where will we go

Mahoney, James and Diana Rodriguez-Franco, “Dependency Theory”, in *The Oxford Handbook of political development*, chapter 2

Crawford, Neta C. “The Potential for Fundamental Change in World Politics.” *International Studies Review* 20, no. 2 (June 1, 2018): 232–38. doi:[10.1093/isr/viy034](https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viy034)

\*Recommended

Guzzini, Stefano. “Embrace IR Anxieties (or, Morgenthau’s Approach to Power, and the Challenge of Combining the Three Domains of IR Theorizing).” *International Studies Review* 22, no. 2 (June 1, 2020): 268–88. doi:10.1093/isr/viaa013.

Paul, T. V. “Assessing Change in World Politics.” *International Studies Review* 20, no. 2 (June 1, 2018): 177–85. doi:[10.1093/isr/viy037](https://doi.org/10.1093/isr/viy037).

Katzenstein, Peter J. 2018 “The Second Coming? Reflections on a Global Theory of International Relations.” *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*. Accessed September 6, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cjip/poy012>.

Wight, Martin. “Western Values in International Relations.” In *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*, 3:89–131, 1966.

## Week 18 (1/14) Final exam