

**Georgia Institute of Technology  
Sam Nunn School of International Affairs  
Fall 2015**

**INTA 6102: International Relations Theory  
Class Time: M 6:05-8:55 PM  
Classroom: Habersham G-17**

**Instructor:**

Dr. Mikulas Fabry  
Office location: Habersham 147  
Tel.: (404) 385-6883  
E-mail: mfabry@gatech.edu  
Office hours: by appointment Mondays 4:00-5:00 PM

**Course Description:**

This core graduate course offers an advanced introduction into international relations theory. Its purpose is to provide a representative overview of major theoretical approaches, debates and authors published in English over the past century, ever since the emergence of the distinct academic discipline of international relations at the end of World War I.

**Required Texts:**

E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (Palgrave, 2001)

Robert O. Keohane (ed.), *Neorealism and Its Critics* (Columbia University Press, 1986).

Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Economy* (Princeton University Press, 2005)

Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 4th ed. (Columbia University Press, 2012)

These books are available for purchase in the GT Barnes & Noble Bookstore and the Engineering Bookstore. They are also on reserve in the Main Library. Other readings will be available directly, or linked to particular online resources, on T-Square's course website (<https://t-square.gatech.edu/portal>) under "Resources". Resources using Microsoft Office software will use the 2007 version. It is the responsibility of students to ensure access to resources posted on T-Square. Should you experience technical difficulties, contact the Office of Information Technology (<http://www.oit.gatech.edu>) for help.

**Course Assignments, Due Dates and Grading:**

Students will be evaluated on the following basis:

■ Class attendance (10%) and participation (20%)

This course is a discussion seminar. Attendance is **mandatory** each class. Given the seminar format, student verbal participation is **absolutely indispensable**. Students are **required** to read the assigned material **prior** to each class and then be **ready and willing** to discuss it actively. To better steer seminar discussions, each student should prepare for each class, starting August 24, two questions that they were left with after reading the assigned material. The questions should be handed in – on a typed page containing the student’s name – to the instructor at the beginning of class.

■ Presentation (15%)

Each student will deliver one formal presentation on the readings to the class. The exercise is meant to serve as a takeoff point for further analysis by the rest of the class. The presentation, which will normally follow the instructor’s introductory remarks and precede general class discussion, should be 15 to 20-minutes long. The presentation should lay out the authors’ arguments and explain their strengths and weaknesses, whether empirical, logical, normative or practical. It should end by raising two questions left in the presenter’s mind. A written version of the presentation, roughly two single-spaced pages, should be e-mailed to the instructor by 4 PM of the day (Sunday) preceding the presentation.

■ One analytical response paper (15%)

Students are required to write one response paper on the assigned readings starting with Week 3 (August 31). **No student can write a response paper the week he/she presents.** You can turn in two response papers – in that case I will count the higher grade you receive. The response paper, which is due at the beginning of the class when the topic it deals with is discussed, should be no roughly two pages single-spaced (with 1” margin from each side and 12-size font). In the paper you should:

- (1) Briefly and concisely summarize the main arguments in the readings as they relate to the assigned topic.
- (2) Compare and contrast the readings. Are there any points of convergence between them? In what ways do they differ?
- (3) Critically engage with the readings. Do you find one more convincing than the others? If you do, why? If you do not find any of the readings convincing, why not? What questions are left in your mind?

■ Final take-home exam (40%)

The final take-home exam will ask you to answer essay-style four questions (10% of the final grade each), using two single-spaced pages per question. The assignment will be distributed on Wednesday, November 25 and be **due on Monday, December 7 at 2:00 PM in my mailbox in Habersham 129.**

**Penalty Policy and Academic Honesty:**

Response papers will not be accepted after the beginning of the class for which they are due. Take-home exams will be penalized by half a grade per day late, unless valid justification for missing the due date is provided before the due date. In all your coursework, you must adhere to Georgia Tech's Honor Code ([www.honor.gatech.edu](http://www.honor.gatech.edu)).

### **Outline of Classes and Readings:**

[N.B. The schedule is subject to revision; I will provide ample notice.]

#### **August 17: Course Introduction: What is IR Theory and Why Study It?**

#### **August 24: Mid-Century Realism**

Key question: What are the substantive claims of Carr's realism? What is his approach to IR theorizing?

Woodrow Wilson, Fourteen Points, Jan. 8, 1918, [avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/wilson14.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp)

E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (Palgrave, 2001), chs. 1-14.

#### **August 31: The "Behavioral Revolution" Debate**

Key question: What is the debate between "scientific"/"behavioral" and "traditional" approaches about? Can the two approaches be at all reconciled?

J. David Singer, "The Relevance of the Behavioral Sciences to the Study of International Relations," *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (1961), pp. 324-335.

Morton A. Kaplan, "Problems of Theory Building and Theory Confirmation in International Politics," *World Politics*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1961), pp. 6-24.

Hedley Bull, "International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach," *World Politics*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (1966), pp. 361-377.

Raymond Aron, "What is a Theory of International Relations?" *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (1967), pp. 185-206.

Hans Morgenthau, "Common Sense and Theories of International Relations," *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 21, No. 2 (1967), pp.207-214.

#### **September 7: Labor Day (NO CLASS)**

#### **September 14: Neorealism/Structural Realism**

Key question: What are the substantive claims of Waltz's realism? What is his approach to IR theorizing as compared to older forms of realism, such as Carr's?

Robert O. Keohane, ed. *Neorealism and Its Critics* (Columbia University Press, 1986), chs. 1-7, 11.

### **September 21: Neoliberalism/Institutional Theory**

Key question: What are the substantive claims and theoretical/methodological approach of neoliberalism? How do they compare with those of neorealism?

Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Economy* (Princeton University Press, 2005), preface to the 2005 edition and chs. 1-7, 11.

Joseph M. Grieco, "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism," *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No. 3 (1988), pp. 485-507.

### **September 28: The English School**

Key question: What is distinctive about Bull's substantive claims and epistemological and ontological assumptions in light of (neo)realist and (neo)liberal debates? Is Buzan's critique of the broader English School approach Bull represents valid?

Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 4th ed. (Columbia University Press, 2012), foreword to the 4<sup>th</sup> edition + chs. 1-9.

Barry Buzan, *From International to World Society? English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalization* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), ch. 1.

### **October 5: Constructivism**

Key question: What is constructivism? Do the authors agree on one answer? Does constructivism make, or at least imply, a substantive argument about international relations?

Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (1992), pp. 391-425.

Audie Klotz, "Norms Reconstituting Interests," *International Organization*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (1995), pp.451-78.

Thomas Risse, "'Let's Argue!': Communicative Action in World Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 54, No. 1 (2000), pp. 1-39.

Stephen D. Krasner, "Wars, Hotel Fires, and Plane Crashes," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (2000), pp. 131-136.

### **October 12: Fall Recess (NO CLASS)**

### **October 19: Critical Theory**

Key question: What is critical theory? Are all its forms compatible with one another?

Robert O. Keohane, ed. *Neorealism and Its Critics* (Columbia University Press, 1986), chs. 8-9.

Jim George and David Campbell, "Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (1990), pp. 269-293.

Andrew Linklater, "The Question of the Next Stage in International Relations Theory: A Critical-Theoretical Point of View," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (1992), pp. 77-98.

## **October 26: Feminism**

Key question: What is achieved theoretically by focusing on women and/or gender?

J. Ann Tickner, "What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 1 (2005), pp. 1-22.

Adam Jones, "Does 'Gender' Make the World Go Round? Feminist Critiques of International Relations," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 4 (1996), pp. 405-29.

Terrell Carver, Molly Cochran and Judith Squires, "Gendering Jones: Feminisms, IRs, Masculinities," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (1998), pp. 283-297.

Laura Sjoberg, "Gendered Realities of the Immunity Principle: Why Gender Analysis Needs Feminism," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 4 (2006), pp. 889-910.

## **November 2: Liberal Revival**

Key question: To what extent are the substantive claims of liberal theory actually compatible with one another?

Mark W. Zacher and Richard Matthew, "Liberal International Theory: Common Threads, Divergent Strands," in Charles W. Kegley (ed.), *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge* (St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 107-150.

Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History," *The National Interest*, Vol. 16 (Summer 1989), pp. 3-18.

Georg Sørensen, "Liberalism of Restraint and Liberalism of Imposition: Liberal Values and World Order in the New Millennium," *International Relations*, Vol. 20, No. 3 (2006), pp. 251-272.

G. John Ikenberry, "Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemma of Liberal World Order," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (2009), pp. 71-87.

## **November 9: Theory vs. History**

Key question: What is history for in IR theorizing?

John M. Hobson and George Lawson, “What is History in International Relations?,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (2008), pp. 415-435.

David M. McCourt, “What’s at Stake in the Historical Turn? Theory, Practice and Phronēsis in International Relations,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 1 (2012), pp. 23-42.

William Bain, “The English School and the Activity of Being an Historian,” in Cornelia Navari (ed.), *Theorising International Society: English School Methods* (Palgrave, 2008), pp. 148-166.

Christian Reus-Smit, “Reading History through Constructivist Eyes,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (2008), pp. 395-414.

### **November 16: Theory vs. Policy**

Key question: What is the proper relationship between theory and policy?

William Wallace, “Truth and Power, Monks and Technocrats: Theory and Practice in International Relations,” *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (1996), pp. 301-321.

Steve Smith, “Power and Truth: A Reply to William Wallace,” *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (1997), pp. 507-516.

Stephen Walt, “The Relationship between Theory and Policy in International Relations,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 8 (2005), pp. 23–48.

Christian Reus-Smit, “International Relations, Irrelevant? Don’t Blame Theory,” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (2012), pp. 525-540.

Paul Nitze, “The Implications of Theory for Practice in the Conduct of Foreign Affairs,” in Nicolas Guilhot (ed.), *The Invention of International Relations Theory: Realism, the Rockefeller Foundation and the 1954 Conference on Theory* (Columbia University Press, 2011), pp. 277-280.

### **November 23: US vs. Western non-US vs. Non-Western Theory**

Key question: Does US, and more broadly Western, hegemony in IR theorizing matter? Does the theorist’s nationality or geographical location necessarily color his/her view of the subject matter, and if so how?

Ole Wæver, “The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations,” *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (1998), pp. 687–727.

Tony Porter, "Can There be National Perspectives on Inter(national) Relations?" in Darryl Jarvis and Robert M. A. Crawford, eds., *International Relations - Still an American Social Science?: Toward Diversity in International Thought* (SUNY Press, 2001), pp. 131-147.

Knud Erik Jørgensen (2000) "Continental IR Theory: The Best Kept Secret." *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (2000), pp. 9-42.

Amitav Acharya, "Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theories Beyond the West," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 39 (2011), pp. 619-637.

**November 30: Wrap-up Class**