

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS CORE SEMINAR
POLI 540, FALL 2020
Monday 2:45-5:35 PM, MEB 128

INSTRUCTOR:

Professor Ashley Leeds
119 Herzstein Hall, (713) 348-3037
leeds@rice.edu
www.ruf.rice.edu/~leeds
Office Hours: by appointment (via zoom whenever possible, but in person if requested)

COURSE CONTENT:

This seminar is intended to introduce political science Ph.D. students to research in the subfield of international relations. Students will be expected to demonstrate their ability to evaluate arguments and empirical evidence, to recognize linkages among studies and scientific progress, and to identify new research questions. You should leave this course with a familiarity with some research in the subfield of international relations, new research ideas, and improved skills in analytical thinking, writing, and oral presentation.

CONNECTION TO PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES:

This course contributes primarily to the first learning outcome for the political science Ph.D., but will also help you with your evaluation of research designs and methodologies, your communication skills, your teaching ability, and your professional development. The program learning outcomes for the political science Ph.D. are as follows:

Demonstrate advanced knowledge of theoretical and empirical research in two of the following three sub-fields of Political Science: American politics, comparative politics, and international relations.

Learn and apply social science research design and methodologies, including advanced statistical techniques.

Demonstrate the ability to communicate their research effectively through multiple mediums including scholarly writing, oral presentation, and poster sessions.

Demonstrate their competence as political scientists through research, teaching, and professional development activities.

SPECIAL NOTES RELATED TO DUAL-DELIVERY AND COVID-19:

Our course is scheduled to meet in dual-delivery mode, meaning that some class members may be present in the classroom and some may attend remotely via zoom. Whether we meet in person with some remote students or all remotely via zoom may change during the semester depending on conditions and the circumstances and preferences of class members. You will be informed via email of any changes.

Students who attend class in person are expected to wear a mask or face covering properly and to abide by Rice's physical distancing policy (maintain at least six feet of distance from other persons whenever possible). The instructor reserves the right to instruct students to leave the classroom if they are engaging in behavior that places faculty and/or students' health at risk.

Students attending remotely must have a working computer with a video camera, speaker, and microphone, and a working internet connection that allows the student to be on video during class. Please contact the instructor immediately if you have any concerns about this, or about keeping your camera on during class.

We will not be recording our discussions except if one or more students must attend a session asynchronously for reasons arranged with the instructor. In line with FERPA requirements, recorded classroom discussions involving students will be available only to students officially registered and enrolled in the class. If you have concerns about appearing on these recordings, please contact the instructor ahead of time.

I recognize this is an unusual semester, and I thank you in advance for your flexibility and cooperation as we navigate this together.

EVALUATION:

Grades will be determined in the manner described below. The Rice University Honor Code applies to all assignments for this course.

25% -- Class Participation and Attendance

The quality of a graduate level seminar depends to a great extent on the efforts of the students. You play a big role in creating your course. I expect that you will come to class each week prepared to discuss the assigned material and that you will share your ideas, questions, and views actively. Because class participation is vital to your performance in this course, please see me at once if you feel uncomfortable speaking in class or if you have any other challenges that limit your ability to participate actively.

Getting the most out of a seminar depends on being present. Normally, I expect no absences in a graduate level seminar except in the case of illness or emergency. I recognize that we are not in normal times, however, and that increased flexibility may be necessary this semester. To the best of your ability, I encourage you to discuss any circumstances with me that will preclude you from attending class ahead of time.

Because no student registered for this course is more than four time zones away from Houston, I expect students to attend class synchronously and to arrive on time. If you need to miss more than one synchronous session of the course, you will need to complete an alternate assignment in lieu of class participation. This assignment will involve writing a reaction memo of no more than four pages in response to the week's readings. You should complete this written assignment before viewing any video of class discussion.

If you are joining class remotely, please keep your video camera on and microphone muted when you are not speaking. Raise your hand when you have questions or would like to participate. Students needing an accommodation for using their camera or microphone should contact the instructor at the beginning of the semester to discuss needed adjustments.

Please leave ample time to read the work assigned for each week carefully. While you are reading, you should consider the following questions:

What is the purpose of the study? Does the author intend to describe the state of the world or the state of the literature? Does the author intend to advance a new theory? Does the author intend to provide an empirical test of an existing theory? How well does the author accomplish his or her goal?

What is the author's argument? What research question is the author trying to answer, and how does he or she answer it? What are the assumptions (explicit and implicit) upon which the author's argument is based? What are the independent and dependent variables, and what is the logic that links them together?

Is the theory logically consistent? Is it plausible?

Is the theory empirically relevant? Is the empirical record commensurate with expectations drawn from the theory? If the author provides empirical tests, are the research design, the operational measures of the concepts, and the methods of analysis appropriate? What further evidence would you use to evaluate the argument? What further testable hypotheses follow from this theory? How would you design a study that could determine the empirical relevance of the author's approach in comparison to other approaches?

Is the research interesting? How does this argument fit into the literature? What does this study tell us that we didn't already know? What should it tell us that it doesn't? What questions still need to be answered?

What policy recommendations would you make based on this study?

How do the selections we read this week fit together? How do they fit into the course as a whole? Are we seeing progress in this research area?

What new research needs to be done in this area?

I hope that we will engage in vigorous academic debate, but during these class discussions, classroom etiquette is vital. Please work to ensure that you make comments in ways that invite discussion. Our

classroom contains members with various life experiences, divergent perspectives, varying levels of experience with political science research, and different strategies for defending their views. Please state your opinions constructively and respectfully, listen carefully when your colleagues are speaking, and speak to me if you feel alienated, hurt, or offended by something that is said in class.

Grades for participation will be assigned at the end of the semester, but you may ask for feedback on your performance at any time. If you have concerns about the quality and quantity of your participation in the course, I hope you will speak to me.

10% – *Article Presentation (2 @ 5% each)*

Twice during the semester, you will choose one of the readings and present it to the class. You must clear the chosen reading with the instructor by the end of the day on Wednesday the week before you are scheduled to present. Your presentation should explain the motivation and purpose of the work; its argument, research design, and findings (where relevant); your views on its strengths and weaknesses; and how you think it fits with the works assigned for the week. Your presentation should be no more than 15 minutes. You will be provided with a rubric by which your presentation will be evaluated at the beginning of the semester.

40% – *Analytical Papers (2 @ 20% each)*

Twice during the semester you will be given a prompt for an analytical paper. You will have approximately one week to write each paper. The expectation is that the paper will be written based on the material you have been assigned to read for this class. You are not prohibited from engaging outside material, but you are also not required to do it, and I will be looking for evidence that you understand and engage the material assigned for this class. More instructions regarding the analytical papers will be provided when the prompts are distributed. The planned due dates are **October 12** and **December 4**. Late assignments will be penalized one half letter grade per day, unless arrangements are made with the professor before the due date (emergencies excepted).

5%-- *What Else Should We Have Read?*

Before our last class, each student will write a one to two page (double spaced) description of the week they wish was included in this syllabus. This should include a discussion of the topic area that the readings and class meeting would cover along with a minimum of two specific readings that you would have liked to see assigned to read for that week. We will share these statements with the class and discuss them during our last class period. The planned due date is **November 13**. Late assignments will be penalized one half letter grade per day, unless arrangements are made with the professor before the due date (emergencies excepted).

20%-- *Mock Comprehensive Exam*

At the end of the semester, you will take a mock comprehensive exam according to the rules for the written portion of the general exam in international relations. The exam will be distributed by **December 4**, and it is due by **December 16**, the last day of the fall semester exam period. Thus, you can choose which day during the final exam period you would like to take the mock comprehensive exam. Late assignments will be penalized one half letter grade per day, unless arrangements are made with the professor before the due date (emergencies excepted).

RICE HONOR CODE:

In this course, all students will be held to the standards of the Rice Honor Code, a code that you pledged to honor when you matriculated at this institution. If you are unfamiliar with the details of this code and how it is administered, you should consult the Honor System Handbook at <http://honor.rice.edu/honor-system-handbook/>. This handbook outlines the University's expectations for the integrity of your academic work, the procedures for resolving alleged violations of those expectations, and the rights and responsibilities of students and faculty members throughout the process.

DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER:

If you have a documented disability or other condition that may affect academic performance you should: 1) make sure this documentation is on file with the Disability Resource Center (Allen Center, Room 111 / adarice@rice.edu / x5841) to determine the accommodations you need; and 2) speak with the instructor to discuss your accommodation needs. The Department of Political Science is happy to do whatever we can to assure each student full and rewarding participation in classes.

TITLE IX RESPONSIBLE EMPLOYEE NOTIFICATION:

Rice University cares about your wellbeing and safety. Rice encourages any student who has experienced an incident of harassment, pregnancy discrimination, or gender discrimination or relationship, sexual, or other forms interpersonal violence to seek support through The SAFE Office. At Rice University, unlawful discrimination in any form, including sexual misconduct, is prohibited under Rice Policy on Harassment and Sexual Harassment (Policy 830) and the Student Code of Conduct. As the instructor and a responsible employee, I am **required** by Title IX to disclose all incidents of non-consensual interpersonal behaviors to the Title IX Coordinator on campus. Although responsible employees are required to make this notification, it is the student's choice to pursue a formal complaint. The goal is to make sure that students are aware of the range of options available and have access to the resources when in need. For more information, please visit safe.rice.edu, titleixrice.edu, or email titleixsupport@rice.edu.

SYLLABUS CHANGE POLICY:

This syllabus is only a guide for the course and is subject to change with advance notice if conditions warrant a change.

DISCUSSION SCHEDULE:

In crafting this syllabus, I took into account the fact that the great majority of students taking this class are neither IR majors nor IR minors, and thus this will likely be the only international relations seminar most of you take in graduate school. As a result, I decided not to focus as much on classic works or "great debates" as some core syllabi might, and instead to offer opportunities to engage more current research on particular topics in the field. In a core course, however, we must seek balance between

knowing where the field has been and where it is going, so there is more emphasis on older foundational works than in some research seminars focused on particular topics.

This syllabus should not be viewed as a comprehensive listing of all scholarly literature on international relations, nor of all the “good” or “important” work; that would be impossible to cover in one semester. At the end of the semester, you will even have an assignment that requires you to think about what is missing from this syllabus and what you would add. The reading selections are skewed towards works that employ positivist approaches. Some issue areas are not well represented due to constraints of time; it is impossible to devote time to every issue area in which there has been substantial research in a single semester. While we may sometimes discuss research methods, the readings on this syllabus are chosen primarily for their ideas, and not as exemplars of current research methods (which are emphasized more in other classes you will take). Even for the topics that are covered, you will read only a representative sample of the existing literature. This selection of readings, however, should serve to provide an introduction to our scholarly understanding, and the readings included herein should point you in profitable directions for future study on topics that you wish to pursue further. Feel free to ask me for suggestions for additional readings in areas that interest you.

The readings listed for each date are those that will be discussed during that class period. Thus, you should complete these readings before the class meeting.

Week #1: August 24: Introduction to Course; What is the Study of International Relations?

Review syllabus thoroughly.

Maliniak, Daniel, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael Tierney. 2011. International Relations in the US Academy. *International Studies Quarterly* 55 (2): 437–464.

Colgan, Jeff D. 2016. Where is International Relations Going? Evidence from Graduate Training. *International Studies Quarterly* 60 (3): 486-498.

Colgan, Jeff D. 2017. Gender Bias in International Relations Graduate Education? New Evidence From Syllabi. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 50 (2): 456-460.

Li, Quan. 2018. The Second Great Debate Revisited: Exploring the Impact of the Qualitative-Quantitative Divide in International Relations. *International Studies Review* 21 (3): 447-476.

Hendrix, Cullen and Jon Vreede. 2019. U.S. Dominance in International Relations and Security Scholarship in Leading Journals. *Journal of Global Security Studies* 4 (3): 310-320.

Week #2: August 31: Realism, Liberalism, Institutionalism, Constructivism, Rationalism, Feminism, and Racism (Note that this is a heavy reading week; you have no assignments for the following week due to Labor Day.)

Mearsheimer, John J. 1995. The False Promise of International Institutions. *International Security* 19 (3): 5-49.

Keohane, Robert O. and Lisa L. Martin. 1995. The Promise of Institutional Theory. *International Security* 20 (1): 39-51.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 1997. Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics. *International Organization* 51 (4): 513-553.

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

Milner, Helen V. 1998. Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics. *International Organization* 52 (4): 759-786.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1997. You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR

- Scholars. *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4): 611-632.
- Acharya, Amitav. 2014. Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds. *International Studies Quarterly* 58 (4): 647-659.
- Zvobgo, Kelebogile and Meredith Loken. 2020. Why Race Matters in International Relations. *Foreign Policy* <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/06/19/why-race-matters-international-relations-ir/>
- Lake, David A. 2011. Why “isms” are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress. *International Studies Quarterly* 55 (2): 465-480.

Week #3: September 7: No Class; Labor Day

Week #4: September 14: Power, Hierarchy, and Order

- Barnett, Michael and Raymond Duvall. 2005. Power in International Politics. *International Organization* 59 (1): 39-75.
- Lake, David A. 2007. Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics. *International Security* 32 (1): 47-79.
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2001. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, chapters 1-3.
- Morrow, James D. 2014. *Order Within Anarchy*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapter 1.
- Musgrave, Paul and Daniel H. Nexon. 2018. Defending Hierarchy from the Moon to the Indian Ocean: Symbolic Capital and Political Dominance in Early Modern China and the Cold War. *International Organization* 72 (3): 591-626.
- Farrell, Henry and Abraham L. Newman. 2019. Weaponized Interdependence: How Global Economic Networks Shape State Coercion. *International Security* 44 (1): 42-79.
- Buzas, Zoltan I. *forthcoming*. Racism and Anti-Racism in the Liberal International Order. *International Organization*.

Week #5: September 21: Deterrence and War

- Schelling, Thomas C. 1960. *The Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, chapters 1-2.
- Fearon, James D. 1995. Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49 (3): 379-414.
- Powell, Robert. 2006. War as a Commitment Problem. *International Organization* 60 (1): 169-203.
- Johnson, Jesse C. and Brett Ashley Leeds. 2011. Defense Pacts: A Prescription for Peace? *Foreign Policy Analysis* 7 (1): 45-65.
- Kydd, Andrew H. and Barbara F. Walter. 2006. The Strategies of Terrorism. *International Security* 31 (1): 49-80.
- Bartusevicius, Henrikas and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2019. A Two-Stage Approach to Civil Conflict: Contested Incompatibilities and Armed Violence. *International Organization* 73 (1): 225-248.

Week #6: September 28: International Cooperation

- Fearon, James D. 1998. Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation. *International Organization* 52 (2): 269-305.
- Guzman, Andrew T. 2008. *How International Law Works*. New York: Oxford University Press, chapter 2.
- Downs, George W., David M. Roache, and Peter N. Barsoom. 1996. Is the Good News About Compliance Good News About Cooperation? *International Organization* 50 (3): 379-406.
- Bechtel, Michael M. and Kenneth F. Scheve. 2013. Mass Support for Global Climate Agreements

Depends on Institutional Design. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110 (34): 13763-13768.

Kelley, Judith. 2007. Who Keeps International Commitments and Why? The International Criminal Court and Bilateral Nonsurrender Agreements. *American Political Science Review* 101 (3): 573-589.

Wallace, Geoffrey P.R. 2013. International Law and Public Attitudes Toward Torture: An Experimental Study. *International Organization* 67 (1): 105-140.

Week #7: October 5: Conflict Management and Resolution

Schultz, Kenneth A. 2005. The Politics of Risking Peace: Do Hawks or Doves Deliver the Olive Branch? *International Organization* 59 (1): 1-38.

Mattes, Michaela, and Jessica L.P. Weeks. 2019. Hawks, Doves, and Peace: An Experimental Approach. *American Journal of Political Science*. 63 (1): 53-66.

Allee, Todd L. and Paul K. Huth. 2006. Legitimizing Dispute Settlement: International Legal Rulings as Domestic Political Cover. *American Political Science Review* 100 (2): 219-234.

Kydd, Andrew. 2003. Which Side Are You On? Bias, Credibility, and Mediation. *American Journal of Political Science* 47 (4): 597-611.

Fortna, Virginia Page. 2004. Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War. *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (2): 269-292.

Mattes, Michaela and Burcu Savun. 2009. Fostering Peace After Civil War: Commitment Problems and Agreement Design. *International Studies Quarterly* 53 (3): 737-759.

Week #8: October 12: International Institutions; 1st Analytical Paper due before class

Abbott, Kenneth W. and Duncan Snidal. 1998. Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42 (1): 3-32.

Steinberg, Richard H. 2002. In the Shadow of Law or Power? Consensus-Based Bargaining and Outcomes in the GATT/WTO. *International Organization* 56 (2): 339-374.

Voeten, Eric. 2001. Outside Options and the Logic of Security Council Action. *American Political Science Review* 95 (4): 845-858.

Fang, Songying. 2008. The Informational Role of International Institutions and Domestic Politics. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (2): 304-321.

Carnegie, Allison. 2014. States Held Hostage: Political Hold-Up Problems and the Effects of International Institutions. *American Political Science Review* 108 (1): 54-70.

Jo, Hyeran and Beth A. Simmons. 2016. Can the International Criminal Court Deter Atrocity? *International Organization* 70: 443-475.

Week #9: October 19: The Political Consequences of the Global Economy

Rogowski, Ronald. 1987. Political Cleavages and Changing Exposure to Trade. *American Political Science Review* 81 (4): 1121-1137.

Frieden, Jeffrey A. 1991. Invested Interests: The Politics of National Economic Policies in a World of Global Finance. *International Organization* 45 (4): 425-451.

Mutz, Diana C. and Eunji Kim. 2017. The Impact of In-Group Favoritism on Trade Preferences. *International Organization* 71 (4): 827-850.

Colantone, Italo and Piero Stanig. 2018. The Trade Origins of Economic Nationalism: Import Competition and Voting Behavior in Western Europe. *American Journal of Political Science* 62 (4): 936-953.

Peters, Margaret E. 2015. Open Trade, Closed Borders: Immigration in the Era of Globalization. *World Politics* 67 (1): 114-154.

Gamso, Jonas and Farhod Yuldashev. 2018. Targeted Foreign Aid and International Migration: Is Development-Promotion an Effective Immigration Policy? *International Studies Quarterly* 62 (4): 809-820.

Week #10: October 26: International Norms

- Finnemore, Martha and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization* 52 (4): 887-917.
- Finnemore, Martha. 1993. International Organizations as Teachers of Norms: The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization and Science Policy. *International Organization* 47 (4): 565-597.
- Kelley, Judith. 2008. Assessing the Complex Evolution of Norms: The Rise of International Election Monitoring. *International Organization* 62 (2): 221-255.
- Schimmelfennig, Frank. 2001. The Community Trap: Liberal Norms, Rhetorical Action, and the Eastern Enlargement of the European Union. *International Organization* 55 (1): 47-80.
- Simmons, Beth A. and Hyeran Jo. 2019. Measuring Norms and Normative Contestation: The Case of International Criminal Law. *Journal of Global Security Studies* 4 (1): 18-36.
- Mitchell, Ronald B. and Charli Carpenter. 2019. Norms for the Earth: Changing the Climate on “Climate Change”. *Journal of Global Security Studies* 4 (4): 413-429.

Week #11: November 2: Diplomacy/Foreign Policy

- Trager, Robert F. 2016. The Diplomacy of War and Peace. *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 205-228.
- Fearon, James D. 1997. Signaling Foreign Policy Interests: Tying Hands versus Sinking Costs. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41 (1): 68–90.
- 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.
- McManus, Roseanne. 2014. Fighting Words: The Effectiveness of Statements of Resolve in International Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research* 51 (6): 726-740.
- Lupton, Danielle L. 2018. Signaling Resolve: Leaders, Reputations, and the Importance of Early Interactions. *International Interactions* 44 (1): 59-87.
- Yarhi-Milo, Keren, Joshua D. Kertzer, and Jonathan Renshon. 2018. Tying Hands, Sinking Costs, and Leader Attributes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62 (1): 2150-2179.
- Katagiri, Azusa and Eric Min. 2019. The Credibility of Public and Private Signals: A Document Based Approach. *American Political Science Review* 113 (1): 156-172.

Week #12: November 9: Democracy and International Relations

- Oneal, John R. and Bruce Russett. 1999. The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992. *World Politics* 52 (1): 1-37.
- Schultz, Kenneth A. 1999. Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform? *International Organization* 53 (2): 233-266.
- Tomz, Michael, Jessica L.P. Weeks, and Keren Yarhi-Milo. 2020. Public Opinion and Decisions About Military Force in Democracies. *International Organization* 74 (1): 119-143.
- Barnhardt, Joslyn N., Robert F. Trager, Elizabeth N. Saunders, and Allan Dafoe. *Forthcoming*. The Suffragist Peace. *International Organization*.
- Mattes, Michaela. 2012. Democratic Reliability, Precommitment of Successor Governments, and the Choice of Alliance Commitment. *International Organization* 66 (1): 153-172.
- Chiba, Daina, Jesse C. Johnson, and Brett Ashley Leeds. 2015. Careful Commitments: Democratic States and Alliance Design. *Journal of Politics* 77 (4): 968-982.

Hyde, Susan D. and Elizabeth Saunders. 2020. Recapturing Regime Type in International Relations: Leaders, Institutions, and Agency Space. *International Organization* 74 (2): 363-395.

November 13: What Else Should We Have Read? due by 5:00 pm.

Week #13: November 16: Course Wrap-Up

Reiter, Dan. 2015. Should We Leave Behind the Subfield of International Relations? *Annual Review of Political Science* 18: 481-499.

Musgrave, Paul. 2020. What the “Cult of the Irrelevant” Neglects (And Gets Right): A Review Essay. *Political Research Quarterly* 135 (1): 131-139.

Discussion of “What Else Should We Have Read?” contributions.

December 4: 2nd Analytical Paper due by 5:00 pm.

December 16: Mock Comprehensive Exam due by 5:00 pm.