
PS 137
International Relations Theory

Fall 2017
TR 9:30 – 10:45am
MS 5200

Professor Arthur Stein

Bunche 3389B

Course related emails:

prof.stein.ps137.fall2017@gmail.com

General email: stein@polisci.ucla.edu

Office hours: T, Th 11a–12p, and by appt.

Class web site:

<https://moodle2.sscnet.ucla.edu/course/view/17F-POLSCI137A-1>

Teaching Assistants:

Joseph Perry

< joseph.perryucla1648@gmail.com

>

Stuart Pike

< swpike@ucla.edu >

This course focuses on approaches to the study of international politics, i.e., the different ways in which war and peace have been explained. Although you will learn a great deal about current international issues and about the evolution of international politics, the focus of this course is analytic rather than substantive, on general arguments and how to analyze international politics rather than on specific events and details. As such, the course will teach you how to think in general, in addition to dealing with international politics.

The course is multidisciplinary, and integrates psychology, economics, sociology, history, and geography in the study of international relations. It also draws from all the other subfields of political science, including American and comparative politics, as well as political theory. You will find that the course will help you to pull together quite disparate material from a variety of courses you may have taken.

Course requirements: First and foremost, doing the reading and coming to class (lectures and section). Taking this class means voluntarily entering into a social compact with the instructor and fellow students. Being prepared and coming to class are the core obligations. The course will have a midterm, and requires that you write a course paper.

A paper, 12–15 pages in length will be due during finals week. You must clear your topic with your TA by the third week, and preferably sooner. You will be required to submit a draft of the paper or an abstract by the end of the 7th week of the course. The abstract/draft paper will be marked and returned. The revised version will deal with the comments on the first draft as well as include perspectives discussed in the last three weeks. The final version will be submitted through TurnItIn.

The point of the paper is to apply the approaches discussed in the course to some current event. You need not pick a case in which the U.S. is a key actor.

Begin by selecting some issue. Follow the news about it. Read the newspaper. Keep digital copies of useful material so that you will be able to go back and reread them. Remember, you'll be coming across new perspectives each week of the course, so taking notes on what you find in news sources may not provide you with adequate information to deal with a per-

spective we have not yet covered. Keeping full texts of what you find will allow you to reassess in the light of new material discussed in the intervening weeks.

You might want to start by addressing the following questions: Do the analyses you have read typically focus on one level of analysis more than others? Do debates about the current event reflect alternative levels of analysis or alternative arguments within the same level of analysis?

You may use the levels of analysis to write a critical examination of the sources and consequences of policy. You may, if you prefer, make a theoretically-based policy recommendation, developing an alternative policy rather than explaining an extant one.

It is critically important that you get an early start. It is impossible to make the readings for each week the exact same number of pages. A light week of required readings means a week in which you should be reading for your paper and reading ahead in the course.

You should use resources available on the Web. An online guide with links to resources in international affairs can be found at <http://www2.etown.edu/vl/>. Use the google filter to search just scholarly material: <http://scholar.google.com>. Most news services, including the *Los Angeles Times* (<http://www.latimes.com/world/>), the *Washington Post* (<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/>), and the *New York Times* (<https://www.nytimes.com/section/world>) are available on the Web. Some will let you search archives which go back varying lengths of time. Some now charge for archived articles but you can get these for free from Lexis/Nexis (available electronically through UCLA). Some news magazines are available on the Web.

Some electronic materials, which are not publicly available on the web, are available through UCLA's library (<http://www.library.ucla.edu/search/eresources.cfm>). Through this link you can get to newspaper articles in Lexis. Also the Expanded Academic ASAP database in the California Digital Library has full text of articles. You need not be at a campus machine to use most of these, but you do have to set up your web browser to use a proxy server. Doing your paper will be made easier and richer using the net, but you will also have to use a library.

Besides the newspapers mentioned above, there are many superb newspapers published overseas in English. Examples include *The Guardian* (<https://www.theguardian.com/world>), *Asia Times* (<http://www.atimes.com>), *The Daily Star of Lebanon* (<http://www.dailystar.com.lb>), and *Le Monde Diplomatique* (<http://mondediplo.com>). There are many organizations and institutions that provide analysis both online and in published form. There are current events series, including International Crisis Group (<https://www.crisisgroup.org>), the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (<http://carnegieendowment.org>) the Council on Foreign Relations (<https://www.cfr.org/>), Chatham House (<https://www.chathamhouse.org/>), and Foreign Policy in Focus (<http://www.fpif.org/>). Journals that focus on current issues include *Foreign Affairs* (<http://www.foreignaffairs.org>), *Foreign Policy*, *The National Interest* (<http://www.nationalinterest.org>), *Washington Quarterly*, and *Orbis*. Also useful are special issues of *Current History* and the Headline Series of the Foreign Policy Association (<http://www.fpa.org/>). An excellent aggregator of reports from various institutes is ETH Zurich, Center for Strategic Studies, CSS Analyses in Security Policy (<http://www.css.ethz.ch/en/publications/css-analyses-in-security-policy.html>).

There are academic blogs devoted to making political science scholarship accessible, including The Monkey Blog at the *Washington Post* and Political Violence @ a Glance (<http://www.pvblog.org/>).

[//politicalviolenceataglance.org](http://politicalviolenceataglance.org)). To search scholarly sources use <http://scholar.google.com>. There are university institutes that address international issues, for example, Harvard University's Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs (<http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu>); the Yale version is Yale Global Online (<http://yaleglobal.yale.edu/>). A good portal for defense and intelligence matters is <http://www.globalsecurity.org/>. There are sites devoted to particular areas of the world. Examples for the Middle East include Omphalos: Middle East Conflict in Perspective (<https://www.lawfareblog.com/omphalos>), Project on Middle East Political Science (<http://pomeps.org>), and Brookings Markaz Middle East Politics & Policy (<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/markaz/>). Examples of sites devoted to Asian security include Princeton-Harvard China and the World Program (<http://cwp.princeton.edu>), South Asian Voices (<http://southasianvoices.org>), New Pacific Institute, Asia Security Watch (<http://asw.newpacificinstitute.org>) and The Diplomat (<http://thediplomat.com>). The Rising Powers Initiative is devoted to China and the rise of the rest (<http://www.risingpowersinitiative.org/>). Analytic commentary and analysis can be found at Project Syndicate (<https://www.project-syndicate.org/>).

Finally, virtually all governments (and even most revolutionary movements) have websites and make documents available online. You can easily get reports, speeches, position papers, background papers online.

Note that the specific items mentioned above are examples and should not be treated as a complete or final list. You will learn that the modern problem is too much information and that material has to be filtered and processed. For a source evaluation checklist, see <https://digitalliteracy.cornell.edu/tutorial/dpl3221.html>

Finally, if you do not use a research and reference manager, you should learn to use Zotero <https://www.zotero.org/>.

Available for purchase at ASUCLA:

Steger, Manfred B. 2017. *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*. 4th ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stein, Arthur A. 1990. *Why Nations Cooperate: Circumstance and Choice in International Relations*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

All the other readings below are available at JSTOR (URLs provided) or at the course website.

NOTE: Dates for the sessions and midterm are tentative.

1. Introduction (Sept. 28, 2017)

Questions: What are different approaches to explaining international politics? What are the different questions the field asks? What are the levels of analysis?

2. War and Individuals (Oct. 3, 2017)

Questions: Do leaders matter? What is assumed about international politics by focusing on individuals? Do individual characteristics explain the decision to use force? What individual attributes or experiences matter for foreign policy? What are the roots of personality? Does personality always explain foreign policy? Is international conflict a clash of personalities? What are the generational experiences that can shape attitudes and thus foreign policy?

Jervis, Robert. 2017. Leadership, Perception, and Policy. *International History and Politics Newsletter* 3 (1): 4–5.

Friedlander, Saul and Raymond Cohen. 1975. The Personality Correlates of Belligerence in International Conflict. *Comparative Politics* 7: 155–186. skim
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/421547>

Ellis, Cali Mortenson. 2017. If Leaders Really Do Matter, Which Life Experiences Count? A Case for the Systematic Study of Childhood. *International History and Politics Newsletter* 3 (1): 10–14.

Etheridge, Lloyd. 1978. Personality Effects on American Foreign Policy, 1898–1968: A Test of Interpersonal Generalization Theory. *American Political Science Review* 72: 434–451. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1954103>

Jervis, Robert. 2013. Do Leaders Matter and How Would We Know? *Security Studies* 22 (2): read 153–168, 172–178.

Roskin, Michael. 1974. From Pearl Harbor to Vietnam: Shifting Generational Paradigms. *Political Science Quarterly* 89: 563–588.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/2148454>

Beinart, Peter. 2006. The Isolationist Pendulum: Expect a Cyclical U.S. Retreat From World Affairs After the Iraq War. *Washington Post*, 22 January.

Not required, but you might find of interest:

McAdams, Dan P. 2016. The Narcissist: The Mind of Donald Trump. *The Atlantic*, June.

3. War and Culture (Oct. 5, 2017)

Questions: What is culture? What constitutes a cultural explanation for foreign policy? Are there cultural bases of international conflict? Is international conflict a clash of cultures?

Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. The Clash of Civilizations? *Foreign Affairs* 72 (3): 22–49. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20045621>

Lewis, Bernard. 1998. Memorandum for the President: What You Should Know About Islam. In *America and the Muslim Middle East: Memos to a President*, edited by Philip D. Zelikow and Robert B. Zoellick, 5–18. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Fukuyama, Francis. 1989. The End of History? *The National Interest*, no. 16: 3–18.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/24027184>

Ajami, Fouad. 2008. The Clash. *New York Times*, January 6.

Muller, Jerry Z. 2008. Us and Them: The Enduring Power of Ethnic Nationalism. *Foreign Affairs* 87 (2): 18-35. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032578>

Kagan, Robert. 2008. The End of the End of History. *New Republic*, April 23. <http://carnegieendowment.org/2008/04/23/end-of-end-of-history/zni>

4. Globalization and Peace (Oct. 10, 2017)

Questions: How do economic forces, such as industrialization and modernization, affect foreign policy? Are commerce, economic interdependence, and globalization the bases of peace?

Steger, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, preface, and chapters 1-5.

Kaysen, Carl. 1990. Is War Obsolete? *International Security* 14 (4): 42-64. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2538750>

5-6. Globalization and Conflict (Oct. 12 and 17, 2017)

Questions: Are the consequences of industrialization always benign? What are other implications of modernization and globalization? Do they strengthen nationalism or internationalism? Can globalization also be the basis for conflict?

Steger, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction*, chapters 6-8.

North, Robert C. 1977. Toward a Framework for the Analysis of Scarcity and Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 21 (4): 569-591. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2600191>

Homer-Dixon, Thomas F. 1994. Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict: Evidence From Cases. *International Security* 19 (1): 5-40. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539147>

Muller, Jerry Z. 2003. Is Culture Destroying Trade? *The Globalist*, October 6.

Barma, Naazneen H., Ely Ratner and Regine A. Spector. 2009. Open Authoritarian Regimes: Surviving and Thriving in the Liberal International Order. *Democracy and Society* 6(2): 8-11.

Ostry, Jonathan D, Prakash Loungani and Davide Furceri. 2016. Neoliberalism: Oversold. *Finance & Development* 53(2): 38-41.

7. Domestic Political Systems: Democracies, Autocracies and War and Peace (Oct. 19, 2017)

Questions: Are there differences in the foreign policies of democracies and dictatorships? Are democracies more peaceful? Toward whom? Why? Is there such a thing as a democratic peace? Does the process of democratization generate international conflict?

Feierabend, Ivo K. 1962. Expansionist and Isolationist Tendencies of Totalitarian Political Systems: A Theoretical Note. *Journal of Politics* 24 (4): 733–742. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2128045>

Andreski, Stanislaw. 1980. On the Peaceful Disposition of Military Dictatorships. *Journal of Strategic Studies* 3 (December): 3–10.

Gat, Azar. 2005. The Democratic Peace Theory Reframed: the Impact of Modernity. *World Politics* 58 (1): 73–100. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40060125>

Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder. 2007. Turbulent Transitions: Why Emerging Democracies Go to War. In *Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World*, edited by Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler. Hampson and Pamela R. Aall, 161-176. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press.

Fukuyama, Francis. 2006. After Neoconservatism. *New York Times*, February 19. <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/02/19/magazine/neo.html>

Gat, Azar. 2007. The Return of Authoritarian Great Powers. *Foreign Affairs*, (July/August): 59–69. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032415>

8. Domestic Politics: State Strength, Stability, and War (Oct. 24, 2017)

Questions: Can a cooperative or conflictual foreign policy be explained by the stability or instability of the regime? Do state/society relationships (weak versus strong state) explain foreign policy? What are the consequences of failed states?

Krasner, Stephen D. 1978. Policy-Making in a Weak State. In *Defending the National Interest: Raw Materials Investments and U.S. Foreign Policy*, read part of chap. 3, 55-70. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Mayer, Arno. 1969. Internal Causes and Purposes of War in Europe, 1870–1956. *Journal of Modern History* 41 (3): 291–303. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1899384>

Schwartz, Thomas Alan. 2009. “Henry, ...Winning an Election is Terribly Important”: Partisan Politics in the History of U.S. Foreign Relations. *Diplomatic History* 33(2): 173-190. skim

Krasner, Stephen D. 2013. Seeking ‘Good-Enough-Governance’ — Not Democracy. blogs.reuters.com, September 22.

Patrick, Stewart. 2006. Weak States and Global Threats: Fact or Fiction? *The Washington Quarterly* 29: 27–53.

Roy, Olivier. 2012. The transformation of the Arab world. *Journal of Democracy* 23(3): 5-18.

9. Levels of Analysis Redux (Oct. 26, 2017) [Midterm: Oct. 31, 2017]

Question: What is the debate between reductionism and structuralism all about?

10. Structural Realism: The International System as the Source of Conflict (Nov. 2, 2017)

Questions: What is a structural or systemic argument? What are the assumptions of this perspective? What are the implications of thinking of the international system as anarchic?

Orme, John. 1997-98. The Utility of Force in a World of Scarcity. *International Security* 22 (3): 138–167. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539360>

Mearsheimer, John J. 2001. Anarchy and the Struggle for Power. In *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, 29-54. New York: Norton.

11. The Balance of Power, Polarity, and Peace (Nov. 7, 2017)

Questions: What is the balance of power? How do we know when a balance of power exists? What does a balance of power explain? How would we evaluate balance-of-power theory against historical data? Are some distributions or balances of power, such as bipolarity or multipolarity, more stable?

Sheehan, Michael. 1996. The Meaning of the Balance of Power. In *The Balance of Power: History and Theory*, chap. 1, 1-23. New York: Routledge.

Deutsch, Karl and J. David Singer. 1964. Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability. *World Politics* 16 (3): 390–406. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2009578>

Mearsheimer, John J. 1990. Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War. *International Security* 15 (1): read 5-21, skim 21-31, skip pp. 31-56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2538981>

12. Unipolarity, Hegemony, the Rise of New Powers and Peace and Stability (Nov. 9, 2017)

Questions: What are the implications of hegemony or unipolarity? Does it make for stability or instability? Is the “unipolar moment” momentary? Are the implications different for economic and security issue? What is the relationship between balance-of-power theory and unipolarity/hegemony?

Tammen, Ronald L. 2008. The Organski Legacy: A Fifty-Year Research Program. *International Interactions* 34(4): read 314-323, skip 323-332.

- Ikenberry, G. John, Michael Mastanduno and William C. Wohlforth. 2009. Introduction: Unipolarity, state behavior, and systemic consequences. *World Politics* 61(1): 1-27. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40060219>
- Dobson, William J. 2006. The Day Nothing Much Changed. *Foreign Policy*, no. 156: 22–25. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25462079>
- Layne, Christopher. 2012. This time it's real: The end of unipolarity and the Pax Americana. *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1): 203-213.
- Haass, Richard N. 2008. The Age of Nonpolarity: What Will Follow U.S. Dominance? *Foreign Affairs* 87 (3): 44–56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20032650>

13. Structural Balance of Networks of Relationships (Nov. 14, 2017)

Questions: What is structural balance theory? How are the conceptions of balance and stability in structural balance theory different from those in balance of power theory?

- Harary, Frank. 1961. A Structural Analysis of the Situation in the Middle East. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 5 (2): 167–178. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/172784>

Start reading for next session.

14. Geopolitics, Technology, and International Politics (Nov. 16, 2017)

Questions: What geopolitical factors explain foreign policy choices and involvement in war? What technological factors explain foreign policy choices and involvement in war? Can international stability be explained by the nature of weapons systems?

- Dougherty, James E. and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr. 1981. Environmental Theories. In *Contending Theories of International Relations: a Comprehensive Survey*, 54–83. New York: Harper & Row.
- Van Evera, Stephen. 1998. Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War. *International Security* 22 (4): 5–43. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2539239>
- Van Creveld, Martin. 2007. War and Technology. *Footnotes*, The Newsletter of the Foreign Policy Research Center, 12 (25), Oct.
- Schelling, Thomas C. 2006. An Astonishing 60 Years: The Legacy of Hiroshima. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103(16): 6089-6093. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30051424>
- Van Creveld, Martin. 2000. Technology and War II: Postmodern War? In *The Oxford History of Modern War*, edited by Charles Townshend, 341-359. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wittes, Benjamin and Gabriella Blum. 2015. Introduction. In *The Future of Violence: Robots and Germs, Hackers and Drones — Confronting a New Age of Threat*. New York: Basic Books.

15-16. Realism, Liberalism and International Cooperation(Nov. 21 and 28, 2017) [**Thanksgiving: Nov. 23, 2017**]

Questions: Is strategic interaction another level of analysis? Are conflict and cooperation products of the strategic setting (and what explains that)? Why are the strategic settings (or games) of prisoners' dilemma and chicken the focus of so much attention and what do they teach us about international politics and the nature of international conflict and cooperation? What are the requisites of cooperation in international politics? Is misperception the source of conflict in international politics?

Stein, *Why Nations Cooperate*, pp. 3–111, 113–145, 151–169, 172–210.

17. The Promise of International Institutions and the Challenge of Terrorism

(Nov. 30, 2017)

Questions: What are the prospects for international politics? What do the different theories discussed in the course imply about the future? Does the growth of international institutions portend a transformation of world politics? What are the implications of the growing importance of subnational actors? What is terrorism about and what are its implications?

Huntington, Samuel P. 1973. Transnational Organizations in World Politics. *World Politics* 25 (3): 333–368. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2010115>

Kennedy, Paul. 2013. The Great Powers, Then and Now. *New York Times*, August 13.

Posen, Barry R. 2001-02. The Struggle Against Terrorism: Grand Strategy, Strategy, and Tactics. *International Security* 26 (3): skim 39–51, skip 51–55. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3092088>

Wright, Robert and Robert Kaplan. 2001. Mr. Order Meets Mr. Chaos. *Foreign Policy*, no. 124: 50–60. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3183190>

18. Conclusion: The End of War and New Threats (Dec. 5, 2017)

Questions: Are we witnessing the end of war? Or the transformation of war?

What have you learned? What do you still not know but know that you do not know? Can we combine competing perspectives on how the world works (and specifically, about international politics)? How should we handle theories at different levels of analysis? Are our models too general or ethnocentric? Can they deal with culturally distinctive conditions? What are the intellectual frontiers for the field? How do we react to the ambiguities and uncertainties associated with the current state of knowledge?

Pinker, Steven and Andrew Mack. 2014. The World is Not Falling Apart: Never Mind the Headlines. We've Never Lived in Such Peaceful Times. *Slate* Dec. 22.

Mueller, John. 2009. War Has Almost Ceased to Exist: An Assessment. *Political Science Quarterly* 124 (2): 297–321. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25655656>

- Goldstein, Joshua. 2011. World Peace Could be Closer Than You Think. *Foreign Policy* no. 188: 53-56. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41353192>
- Jervis, Robert. 2002. Theories of War in an Era of Leading-Power Peace. *American Political Science Review* 96(1): 1-14. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3117806>
- Mello, Patrick A. 2010. In search of new wars: The debate about a transformation of war. *European Journal of International Relations* 16(2): 297-309.
- National Intelligence Council. 2017. Global Trends: Paradox of Progress. January. Read pages 3-44, skip the rest.

ON WRITING:

Write **well-organized paragraphs** that tackle single thoughts. Each **should have a topic sentence that presents the point you want to make** or introduces a body of material. **The topic sentence should cover all the material in the paragraph.** There should be no material in the paragraph not covered by the topic sentence. If there is: throw it out, or rewrite the topic sentence, or split the paragraph into two or more paragraphs. You can then read the topic sentences to see if their order makes sense or if you need to rearrange the paragraphs. Make your case clear by writing discrete paragraphs, each introduced by an explicit point or statement of topic that is followed by explication, elaboration, or evidence linked explicitly to your point.

Read your paper before turning it in. Your spell checker (which you should use) is not enough. Moreover, even though you are turning in a “first draft,” it should, in fact, be at least a second draft.

Rules of Citation: You must cite all quotes, paraphrases, and IDEAS from other works. If you present an argument that has previously been offered elsewhere, you must cite it unless it is conventional, or at least common, wisdom. Check style sheets to find out how to cite web pages. Style sheets are available online. A classic published example is *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*, by Kate L. Turabian (The book is popularly referred to as Turabian). Or, you may substitute the longer and more expensive *Chicago Manual of Style* (the bible of publishers and copy editors). Portions of these are also available online.

You might also want to read, or read, something devoted to basic grammar and style before you begin writing. Examples include *The Elements of Style*, by William Strunk, Jr. and E. B. White, *On Writing Well* by William Zinsser, and *Style: Lessons in Clarity and Grace*, 11th edn., by Joseph M. Williams and Joseph Bizup

Procedures: Turn in the commented-upon first draft *with your final draft*. The final version is to be submitted through TurnItIn.

KEEP A COPY OF YOUR PAPER