

INR 6607: International Relations Theory

University of Florida

Syllabus: Fall 2024

Instructor: Dr. Drew Rosenberg
Office: 210 Anderson Hall
Email: andrewrosenberg@ufl.edu

Class location: 2336 Turlington Hall
Class time: Tu, 15:00–18:00
Office hours: Th, 10.00–12.00, or by appointment

Schedule a meeting with me: <https://calendly.com/asrosenberg>.

Course Description

This seminar introduces students to the field of International Relations (IR). The course has two main purposes: (1) to familiarize students with key debates in IR and (2) to help prepare MA and PhD students for comprehensive exams in IR.

NB: *Students who plan to take comprehensive exam in IR should not take this syllabus as an exhaustive guide to the field of IR but rather as a starting point.* Hundreds of articles are written every year and it is impossible to cover this large, diverse, and dynamic field in one semester. To be adequately prepared for the exam, you will need to develop a general sense of the discipline, acquired both by following citation trails in the readings for this course and by familiarizing yourselves with the general IR reading list.

NB, Part 2: IR is the most self-reflexive subfield of political science. Each year, scholars write dozens of great articles that interrogate how/when/why IR scholars miss _____. These are important debates, and we will talk about several of them in this class. These conversations also reveal that one could structure a class like this one in many different ways. Should we study paradigms? Topics? “Great Debates?” I have structured this semester in one way, and you should think about how you would structure a similar course.

Course Materials:

Readings

Most of the assigned readings are journal articles that you can easily access and download through the UF Libraries portal (if you are accessing it off-campus, make sure to activate your VPN). Other readings include (1) several book chapters, and (2) several articles from

the Handbook of International Relations (2013). PDFs of all assigned Handbook articles and some of the book chapters are provided on Canvas.

Assignments:

- **RESPONSE PAPERS (20%):** All students will write **three** 750 word papers reacting to weekly readings. **These papers are not summaries**; students should be critical summaries of subset of the weeks' reading, aiming to raise 3-4 interesting questions through critique, comparison, and so on. They should include a discussion of the theoretical strengths, weaknesses, and implications to the broader topic of the week. Responses will also include questions or areas to discuss in the seminar. If you were to suggest the authors improve upon the paper, what would you suggest and why? For example, you can describe how articles *X* and *Y* take a standpoint feminist approach, critique that approach, and provide an alternative. For each week you choose to write a response, papers are due by Monday evening, 11:59p. Late papers will not be accepted.
- **DISCUSSION LEADERS (20%):** Students will lead class discussions on assigned readings once during the semester. You can lead discussion either individually or as a team. Sign up or random assignments will be available on Canvas by August 30 at 11:59 PM. Discussion leaders have three main responsibilities:
 1. **Discussion Memo** (25 points):
 - Submit a memo of up to 1000 words synthesizing all assigned readings for the week
 - Include at least five questions for seminar discussion, addressing major theoretical issues, methodological innovations, controversies, or potential research extensions
 - Submit memos on Canvas by Sunday at 11:59 PM for class review
 - All students should come prepared to discuss the submitted memos in Tuesday's class
 2. **Presentation** (25 points):
 - Deliver a 10–15 minute presentation
 - Begin with a thematic overview of the week's readings and key issues
 - Highlight core methods, findings, and implications across readings, rather than reviewing each individually
 3. **Leading Class Discussion** (50 points):
 - Facilitate class discussion
 - Analyze strengths and weaknesses of the readings
 - Encourage class participation, raise questions, have fun!

Evaluation: Both presentation and discussion-leading performance will be assessed by peers and the professor.

- **BOOK REVIEW (25%):** One of the purposes of this class is to provide a broad introduction to the field of International Relations (this should be obvious). Unfortunately, this task is impossible for a variety of reasons (mostly time). As a remedy, each student will select one book to review during the first week of class (priority will be randomly assigned). I will provide 2/3 options for each week that align with the class' theme. **No two students can read the same book.** If you want to read another book, please let me know ASAP.

The written component is a 3–5 page double-spaced *critical* book review. **The book summary should be no longer than 1.5 pages.** The rest of the review should highlight the book's strengths, weaknesses, insights, and oversights. I recommend students read several book reviews in IR journals to get an idea of what I expect.

In addition to the written review, each student will be required to contribute a brief summary of their book review to a shared class Google Doc. This summary should be approximately 300–500 words and should include the following components:

- **Main Arguments:** Provide a concise overview of the book's central thesis and key arguments.
- **Strengths and Weaknesses:** Critically assess the book's contributions to the field, highlighting both its strengths and any notable limitations or oversights.
- **Discussion Questions:** Pose 2-3 questions that arise from your analysis of the book. These questions should aim to stimulate further thought and discussion on the book's themes and its relevance to the broader topics of the course.

This Google Doc will serve as a collaborative resource for the entire class, providing a valuable study tool for exams and a comprehensive overview of the books covered throughout the semester. Summaries must be submitted to the Google Doc by 3:00p on Tuesday (class time).

- **FINAL PAPER (25%):** Students will write a substantial (20-25 pages for graduate students) final paper. This paper may either be a critical review essay or a research paper on a topic relevant to the course. Both options have a firm maximum of 20 pages (double-spaced, normal academic font, 12 pnt). To discuss and approve paper topics, students should schedule and have individual meetings with me by the end of Week 5. A brief paper proposal/outline is due at the end of Week 9.

Critical review essay: CRAs go beyond merely summarizing key works in a research area. Instead, one should creatively engage with the literature by first concisely summarizing existing research into thematic “buckets.” A thematic “bucket” refers to a category or grouping of related research themes, ideas, or findings within a body of literature. When organizing a critical literature review, you identify common themes, concepts, or approaches that multiple works share and group them into these “buckets.” This helps to structure the review and makes it easier to analyze and critique

the existing research systematically. Then, the CRA should advance an argument for new directions the literature could take. This typically involves identifying common themes, assumptions, or points of view in the existing literature, which may often be implicit, and developing alternative themes, assumptions, or points of view to push the literature beyond its current state.

Research paper: Students may also write a classic article-style research paper. Such a paper will intervene in an existing or ongoing debate in the IR/IR theory literature and provide an original argument. For example, one could argue for the renewed applicability of hegemonic stability theory in the context of rising powers in the current multipolar international system. Your paper should include a clear research question or hypothesis, a comprehensive literature review, a detailed theoretical framework, and a well-supported argument. The paper should not only engage with existing debates but also push the conversation forward by offering new insights or perspectives. Use empirical examples to illustrate and support your theoretical arguments where relevant. Ensure that your paper adheres to academic standards in terms of structure, citations, and formatting.

- **PARTICIPATION/SEMINAR CONDUCT (10%):** All students are expected to attend each class session and come prepared to participate actively in class discussion.

Policies and procedures

Communication and logistics: Email

Please email me with any pressing questions or concerns. However, do not expect immediate replies. I often do not check my email on the weekends or in the evening.

Office Hours

I hold three office hours per week, but you may arrange a meeting outside of those hours if you are unavailable during this time. Please make use of office hours, as that is the time I allocate to be 100% available to you. If you have any questions or are having difficulty completing course requirements, please come see me as soon as possible. *Use the Calendly link at the top of this syllabus and on my website to book a meeting.*

AI Policy

Do not use any AI tools in this course.

The UF student conduct handbook states, “A Student must not submit as their own work any academic work in any form that the Student purchased or otherwise obtained from an outside source, including but not limited to: academic work in any form generated by an Entity; academic materials in any form prepared by a commercial or individual vendor of academic materials; a collection of research papers, tests, or academic materials maintained by a Student Organization or other entity or person, or any other sources of academic work.”

Entity “include[s] but is not limited to generative artificial intelligence, large language models, content generation bots, or other non-human intelligence or digital tools.”

Assignment dispensation policy

If a student is unable to complete an assignment, they will be allowed to turn it in late only if the absence is due to a *documented* medical, family, or similar serious emergency, observance of religious holy days (which requires written notification to the instructor at least 14 days prior to the due date), or properly documented University-sponsored planned activities. *Incomplete assignments or exams in all other cases will result in a score of zero.* If you become aware that you will not be able to complete an assignment or final project ahead of time, please contact the instructor and seek permission for an extension as soon as possible.

Academic misconduct

UF students are bound by The Honor Pledge which states, “We, the members of the University of Florida community, pledge to hold ourselves and our peers to the highest standards of honor and integrity by abiding by the Honor Code.” On all work submitted for credit by students at the University of Florida, the following pledge is either required or implied: “On my honor, I have neither given nor received unauthorized aid in doing this assignment.” The Honor Code (<http://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conduct-honorcode/>) specifies a number of behaviors that are in violation of this code and the possible sanctions. Furthermore, you are obligated to report any condition that facilitates academic misconduct to appropriate personnel. If you have any questions or concerns, please consult with the instructor or TAs in this class.

Disability services

Students with disabilities requesting accommodations should first register with the Disability Resource Center (352-392-8565, www.dso.ufl.edu/drc/) by providing appropriate documentation. Once registered, students will receive an accommodation letter which must be presented to the instructor when requesting accommodation. Students with disabilities should follow this procedure as early as possible in the semester.

Health and Wellness Resources

- U Matter, We Care: If you or a friend is in distress, please contact umatter@ufl.edu or 352-392- 1575 so that a team member can reach out.
- Counseling and Wellness Center: <https://counseling.ufl.edu/>, 392-1575; and the University Police Department: 392-1111 or 9-1-1 for emergencies.
- Sexual Assault Recovery Services (SARS) Student Health Care Center, 392-1161. University Police Department, 392-1111 (or 9-1-1 for emergencies). <http://www.police.ufl.edu>

Online Course Evaluations

Students are expected to provide feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing online evaluations at <https://evaluations.ufl.edu>. Evaluations are typically open during the last two or three weeks of the semester, but students will be given specific times when they are open. Summary results of these assessments are available to students at: <https://evaluations.ufl.edu/results/>.

In-Class Recording

Students are allowed to record video or audio of class lectures. However, the purposes for which these recordings may be used are strictly controlled. The only allowable purposes are (1) for personal educational use, (2) in connection with a complaint to the university, or (3) as evidence in, or in preparation for, a criminal or civil proceeding. All other purposes are prohibited. Specifically, students may not publish recorded lectures without the written consent of the instructor.

A “class lecture” is an educational presentation intended to inform or teach enrolled students about a particular subject, including any instructor-led discussions that form part of the presentation, and delivered by any instructor hired or appointed by the University, or by a guest instructor, as part of a University of Florida course. A class lecture does not include lab sessions, student presentations, clinical presentations such as patient history, academic exercises involving solely student participation, assessments (quizzes, tests, exams), field trips, private conversations between students in the class or between a student and the faculty or lecturer during a class session.

Publication without permission of the instructor is prohibited. To “publish” means to share, transmit, circulate, distribute, or provide access to a recording, regardless of format or medium, to another person (or persons), including but not limited to another student within the same class section. Additionally, a recording, or transcript of a recording, is considered published if it is posted on or uploaded to, in whole or in part, any media platform, including but not limited to social media, book, magazine, newspaper, leaflet, or third party note/tutoring services. A student who publishes a recording without written consent may be subject to a civil cause of action instituted by a person injured by the publication and/or discipline under UF Regulation 4.040 Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code.

Course Overview and Schedule:

Week 0: Background

These are important background readings on the discipline of IR. I have included them for reference because they provide a lot of important context that we would cover if we had an entire year together. We will talk about many of these issues throughout the term, but I recommend that you have a look at some of these even if you have an extensive IR background. Come talk to me if you have more questions or if you want some more suggestions.

- Nicolas Guilhot. 2008. “The Realist Gambit: Postwar American Political Science and the Birth of IR Theory.” *International Political Sociology* 2 (4): 281–304.
- Scott Hamilton. 2016. “A Genealogy of Metatheory in IR: How ‘Ontology’ Emerged From the Inter-Paradigm Debate.” *International Theory* 9 (1): 136–170. doi:10.1017/s1752971916000257. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s1752971916000257>.
- Patrick Thaddeus Jackson and Daniel H. Nexon. 2009. “Paradigmatic Faults in International-Relations Theory.” *International Studies Quarterly* 53 (4): 907–930. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2478.2009.00562.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2009.00562.x>.
- Morton A. Kaplan. 1966. “The New Great Debate: Traditionalism Vs. Science in International Relations.” *World Politics* 19 (1): 1–20.
- Friedrich Kratochwil. 2006. “History, Action and Identity: Revisiting the ‘Second’ Great Debate and Assessing Its Importance for Social Theory.” *European Journal of International Relations* 12 (1): 5–29. doi:10.1177/1354066106061323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066106061323>.
- Yosef Lapid. 1989. “The Third Debate: on the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era.” *International Studies Quarterly* 33 (3): 235–254. doi:10.2307/2600457. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2600457>.
- Daniel Maliniak et al. 2011. “International Relations in the U.S. Academy.” *International Studies Quarterly* 55 (2): 437–464. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00653.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00653.x>.
- Brian C. Schmidt. 2013. “On The History and Historiography of International Relations.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, 3–28. London: Sage.
- J. David Singer. 1961. “The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations.” *World Politics* 14 (1): 77–92.
- Jeremy Weiss. 2013. “E. H. Carr, Norman Angell, and Reassessing the Realist-Utopian Debate.” *The International History Review* 35 (5): 1156–1184. doi:10.1080/07075332.2013.817468. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2013.817468>.
- Colin Wight. 2013. “Philosophy of Social Science and International Relations.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, 29–56. London: Sage.

Week 1 (Aug. 27): Introductions and the International

- W.E.B. Du Bois. 1915. “The African Roots of War.” *The Atlantic Monthly* 115 (5): 707–714.
- John A. Hobson. 1906. “The Ethics of Internationalism.” *International Journal of Ethics* 17 (1): 16–28.

- Benoy Kumar Sarkar. 1919. “Hindu Theory of International Relations.” *American Political Science Review* 13 (3): 400–414.
- Brian C. Schmidt. 2005. “Paul S. Reinsch and the Study of Imperialism and Internationalism.” Chap. 2 in *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations*, edited by David Long and Brian Schmidt, 43–69. SUNY Press.

Week 2 (Sep. 3): Anarchy and Structure I: Origins and Orthodoxy

- Book review options:
 - Kenneth Waltz. 1959. *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
 - Robert Gilpin. 1981. *War and Change in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Readings:
 - William C. Wohlforth. 2008. “Realism.” In *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, edited by Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, 131–148. New York: Oxford University Press.
 - Robert Jervis. 1978. “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma.” *World Politics* 30 (2): 167–214.
 - Helen Milner. 1991. “The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: a Critique.” *Review of International Studies* 17 (1): 67–85.
 - Kenneth N. Waltz. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley, Ch. 5–6. This book is the most famous book in all of IR. You should buy it and read the whole thing. Any version will do.

Week 3 (Sep. 10): Anarchy and Structure II: Neoliberal Institutionalism

- Book review options:
 - G. John Ikenberry. 2001. *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major Wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - Robert O. Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Readings:
 - Robert Axelrod and Robert O. Keohane. 1985. “Achieving Cooperation Under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions.” *World Politics* 38 (1): 226–254.

- Joseph M. Grieco. 1988. “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism.” *International Organization* 42 (3): 485–507.
- Robert O. Keohane. 1982. “The Demand for International Regimes.” *International Organization* 36 (2): 325–355.
- Stephen Krasner. 1982. “Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regimes as Intervening Variables.” *International Organization* 36 (2): 185–205.
- Kenneth A. Oye. 1985. “Explaining Cooperation under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies.” *World Politics* 38 (1): 1–24.

Week 4 (Sep. 17): No Class; Instructor Traveling

Week 5 (September 24): Anarchy and Structure III: Further Responses

- Book review options:
 - Charles L. Glaser. 2010. *Rational Theory of International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - John J. Mearsheimer. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: WW Norton & Company.
- Readings:
 - Handbook: Duncan Snidal. 2013. “Rational Choice and International Relations.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, 85–111. London: Sage.
 - James D. Fearon. 1995. “Rationalist Explanations for War.” *International Organization* 49 (3): 379–414.
 - Jonathan Kirshner. 2022. *An Unwritten Future: Realism and Uncertainty in World Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Ch. 1 and 2.
 - John J. Mearsheimer. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: WW Norton & Company, Ch. 1 and 10.
 - Gideon Rose. 1998. “Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy.” *World Politics* 51 (1): 144–172.

Week 6 (October 1): Domestic Politics I: Regime Type, Public Opinion, and Leaders

- Book review options:
 - Jack Snyder. 2013. *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Elizabeth N. Saunders. 2011. *Leaders at War: How Presidents Shape Military Interventions*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Keren Yarhi-Milo. 2014. *Knowing the Adversary: Leaders, Intelligence, and Assessment of Intentions in International Relations*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Readings:
 - Handbook: Kenneth Schultz. 2013. “Domestic Politics and International Relations.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, 478–502. London: Sage.
 - James D. Fearon. 1994. “Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes.” *American Political Science Review* 88 (3): 577–592.
 - Bruce Russett. 1994. *Grasping the Democratic Peace: Principles for a Post-Cold War World*. Princeton: Princeton university press.
 - Michael R. Tomz and Jessica L.P. Weeks. 2013. “Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace.” *American Political Science Review* 107 (4): 849–865.
 - Robert D. Putnam. 1988. “Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: the Logic of Two-Level Games.” *International Organization* 42 (3): 427–460.
 - Jessica L. Weeks. 2008. “Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve.” *International Organization* 62 (1): 35–64.

Week 7 (October 8): Constructivism

- Book review options:
 - Neta C. Crawford. 2002. *Argument and Change in World Politics: Ethics, Decolonization, and Humanitarian Intervention*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore. 2004. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Readings:
 - Handbook: Emanuel Adler. 2013. “Constructivism in International Relations: Sources, Contributions, and Debates.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, 112–122. London: Sage.
 - Martha Finnemore. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Ch. 1.
 - Alexander Wendt. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chs. 1, 3, 6. This book is also a classic. You should buy it and read the whole thing.

Week 8 (October 15): Constructivism II

- Book review options:
 - Emmanuel Adler. 2019. *World Ordering: A Social Theory of Cognitive Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - Audie Klotz. 2018. *Norms in international relations: The struggle against apartheid*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Readings:
 - Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot. 2011. “International Practices.” *International Theory* 3 (1): 1–36. doi:[10.1017/S175297191000031X](https://doi.org/10.1017/S175297191000031X).
 - Michal Ben-Josef Hirsch and Jennifer M. Dixon. 2021. “Conceptualizing and Assessing Norm Strength in International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 27 (2): 521–547.
 - Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” *International Organization* 52 (4): 887–917.
 - Ronald R. Krebs and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson. 2007. “Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The Power of Political Rhetoric.” *European Journal of International Relations* 13 (1): 35–66.
 - David McCourt. 2016. “Practice Theory and Relationalism as the New Constructivism.” *International Studies Quarterly* 60 (3): 475–485.
 - Jennifer Sterling-Folker. 2000. “Competing Paradigms Or Birds of a Feather? Constructivism and Neoliberal Institutionalism Compared.” *International Studies Quarterly* 44 (1): 97–119.

Week 9 (October 22): Psychological Approaches

- Book review options:
 - Robert Jervis. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - Brian C. Rathbun. 2012. *Trust in International Cooperation: International Security Institutions, Domestic Politics and American Multilateralism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Readings:
 - Emilie M. Hafner-Burton et al. 2017. “The Behavioral Revolution and International Relations.” *International Organization* 71 (S1): S1–S31.
 - Jonathan Mercer. 2005. “Rationality and Psychology in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59 (1): 77–106.

- Jennifer Mitzen. 2006. “Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma.” *European Journal of International Relations* 12 (3): 341–370.
- Brian C. Rathbun, Joshua D. Kertzer, and Mark Paradis. 2017. “Homo Diplomaticus: Mixed-Method Evidence of Variation in Strategic Rationality.” *International Organization* 71 (S1): S33–S60.
- Keren Yarhi-Milo. 2013. “In the Eye of the Beholder: How Leaders and Intelligence Communities Assess the Intentions of Adversaries.” *International Security* 38 (1): 7–51.

Week 10 (October 29): Critical Theories, Critical Theory, and Post-Structuralism

- Book review options:

- David Campbell. 1992. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Roxanne Lynn Doty. 1996. *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Charlotte Epstein. 2008. *The Power of Words in International Relations: Birth of an Anti-Whaling Discourse*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Readings:

- Handbook: Maja Zehfuss. 2013. “Critical Theory, Poststructuralism, and Post-colonialism.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, 145–169. London: Sage.
- Robert W. Cox. 1981. “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory.” *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (2): 126–155.
- Roxanne Lynn Doty. 1993. “Foreign Policy As Social Construction: a Post-Positivist Analysis of U.S. Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines.” *International Studies Quarterly* 37 (3): 297–320.
- Lene Hansen. 2006. *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge, Ch. 1–2.
- Ido Oren. 1995. “The Subjectivity of the “Democratic” Peace: Changing US Perceptions of Imperial Germany.” *International Security* 20 (2): 147–184.

Week 11 (November 5): Feminist Theory and Approaches

- Book review options:

- Cynthia Enloe. 2014. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Christine Sylvester. 1994. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Post-modern Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Readings:
 - Handbook: Laura Sjoberg and J. Ann Tickner. 2013. “Feminist Perspectives on International Relations.” In *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd ed., edited by Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, 170–184. London: Sage.
 - J. Ann Tickner. 1997. “You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists.” *International Studies Quarterly* 41 (4): 611–632.
 - Cynthia Weber. 1994. “Good Girls, Little Girls, and Bad Girls: Male Paranoia in Robert Keohane’s Critique of Feminist International Relations.” *Millennium* 23 (2): 337–349.
 - Lauren Wilcox. 2009. “Gendering the Cult of the Offensive.” *Security Studies* 18 (2): 214–240.

Week 12 (November 12): Sovereignty, Race, and Empire—“The International” Revisited

- Book review options:
 - Adom Getachew. 2019. *Worldmaking after Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-Determination*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - Andrew S. Rosenberg. 2022. *Undesirable Immigrants: Why Racism Persists in International Migration*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - Alexander D. Barder. 2021. *Global Race War: International Politics and Racial Hierarchy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Readings:
 - Zoltán I Búzás. 2021. “Racism and Antiracism in the Liberal International Order.” *International Organization* 75 (2): 1–24.
 - Ida Danewid. 2021. “Policing the (Migrant) Crisis: Stuart Hall and the Defence of Whiteness.” *Security Dialogue*: 1–17.
 - Richard W. Maass. 2023. “Racialization and International Security.” *International Security* 48 (2): 91–126.
 - Olivia U. Rutazibwa. 2020. “Hidden in Plain Sight: Coloniality, Capitalism and Race/ism As Far As the Eye Can See.” *Millennium: Journal of International*

Studies 48 (2): 221–241.

- Robert Vitalis. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Introduction.

Week 13 (November 19): Power, Hierarchy, and Networks

- Book review options:

- David A. Lake. 2009. *Hierarchy in International Relations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Ayşe Zarakol. 2010. *After Defeat: How the East Learned to Live with the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Readings:

- Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall. 2005. “Power in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59 (1): 39–75.
- Henry Farrell and Abraham Newman. 2019. “Weaponized Interdependence.” *International Security* 44 (1): 42–79.
- Janice Bially Mattern and Ayşe Zarakol. 2016. “Hierarchies in World Politics.” *International Organization* 70 (3): 623–654.
- Meghan McConaughy, Paul Musgrave, and Daniel H. Nexon. 2018. “Beyond Anarchy: Logics of Political Organization, Hierarchy, and International Structure.” *International Theory* 10 (2): 181–218.

Week 14 (Dec. 3): IR and the “Crisis” of the Liberal International Order

- Book review options:

- Benno Teschke. 2003. *The Myth of 1648: Class, Geopolitics, and the Making of Modern International Relations*. London: Verso.
- Robert Vitalis. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Readings:

- Stephane J. Baele and Gregorio Bettiza. 2020. “‘Turning’ Everywhere in IR: On the Sociological Underpinnings of the Field’s Proliferating Turns.” *International Theory*: 1–27.
- G. John Ikenberry. 2020. *A World Safe for Democracy: Liberal Internationalism and the Crises of Global Order*. New Haven: Yale University Press, Ch. 1.

- David A. Lake. 2013. “Theory is Dead, Long Live Theory: The End of the Great Debates and the Rise of Eclecticism in International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 19 (3): 567–587.
- John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt. 2013. “Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing Is Bad for International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 19 (3): 427–457.
- Qin Yaqing. 2016. “A Relational Theory of World Politics.” *International Studies Review* 18 (1): 33–47.