

University of Western Ontario: Department of Political Science

**POLITICAL SCIENCE 9512B**

**Tuesdays 12:30-2:30**

**SSC 4112**

**International Relations II**

Winter 2013

Course Director: Dr. Adam Harmes

Office Hours: Mondays 1-2:30 p.m., 4155 SSC

Email: aharmes@uwo.ca

---

**Course Description:**

This course provides students with an advanced introduction to theoretical approaches and contemporary issues within the study of International Relations. The first part of the course examines explanatory theories of IR and approaches to foreign policy and global governance. The second part of the course examines ongoing issues in IR through the lens of current cases. Specific topics examined in the course include: the evolution of IR theory; IR's fourth debate; the integration of IR and comparative theories, realist and neoconservative visions of foreign policy and global governance; liberal visions of foreign policy and global governance; theories of international political economy; basic economics and the great recession; climate change; covert operations in IR; foreign policy tools and rogue states; humanitarian intervention and the R2P; and the Middle East conflict.

**Course Structure:**

The course meets weekly on Tuesday afternoons from 12:30-2:30 and will consist of 13 sessions of approximately 2 hours each. Seminars will be comprised of group and class discussions focused around the readings assigned for each week as well as 15 minute mini-lectures at the start of each class.

**Required Readings:**

All required readings for this course are available online.

**Course Evaluation:**

Participation	20%	
Mini-Lecture	20%	
Analysis of IR Theory/Policy Brief	20%	Due 12 February
Research Essay	40%	Due 12 March

**Participation** 20%

Students are expected to have completed, and thought about, all assigned readings prior to coming to class and to actively contribute to seminar discussions. For every class, each student must prepare a **typed** list of 2 discussion questions or points of analysis for each reading (include your name and the date). Questions should be detailed and make specific reference to the readings through the use of quotes etc. If you miss the class, you must email the questions to me. Students will receive comments on their first question sheet only to ensure they understand what is expected. After that, they will simply receive a final participation grade that takes the questions sheets and seminar participation into account. The participation grade will also be based on 2 peer rankings conducted at the mid-point and end of the semester.

**Mini-Lectures (or Op-Ed)** 20%

Each student will give one 15 minute (max) mini-lecture, using PowerPoint, at the start of each class. The lecture will present a brief argument based on the week's assigned question. While the course readings can be used, the lecture does not need to address all or any of them. Instead, it should focus on making a clear argument based on the assigned question. Students can reformulate the question if desired but must get the instructor's permission to do so. The lecture must make use of PowerPoint and must include:

- a 1-2 page typed outline of the presentation with enough copies for the instructor and all students
- a printout of the Power Point presentation in the "handout, 6 slides per page" format for the instructor only

Students will be graded on the organization of their argument, their use of PowerPoint, their oral presentation skills and their response to questions. The emphasis will be on giving a presentation rather than on the specific content of the argument.

If the class has more than 12 students, some MA students will be assigned to write an 800 word op-ed making an argument related to an assigned class' subject matter. (An op-ed is an 'opinion-editorial' piece such as a column on the Comment page of a newspaper). The op-ed will be due one week before the assigned class and the student must provide copies for the instructor and all students. The argument presented in the op-ed will be discussed in the assigned class.

**Analysis of IR Theory (PhDs)** 20%

PhD students will complete one analysis of an IR theory or 'great debate' from the list below. The analysis will be 8-10 typed, double-spaced, pages in length and must be framed as an argument. Late papers will be penalized at a rate of 3% per day including weekends and papers longer than 10 pages will be penalized. Extensions will only be given for documented illnesses, emergencies, etc and will not be given for workload. Students must choose a topic that is different from their mini-lecture/op-ed and from their research essay. Students must choose one of the following theories or 'great debates':

- The idealism vs classical realism debate (first debate)
- The traditionalism vs scientific method debate (second debate)
- Neorealism (first approach in third debate)
- Liberalism (second approach in third debate)

- Marxism/structuralism/historical materialism (third approach in third debate)
- The inter-paradigm debate in IPE (economic neoliberalism, Keynesian-welfare, economic nationalism)
- Positivism, Constructivism and Post-Structuralism (epistemological part of fourth debate)
- Feminism and Post-Colonialism (ontological part of the fourth debate)

Each summary should include:

- the main arguments and assumptions of the theoretical approach
- the main strands of the theoretical approach and their differences (i.e. offensive vs defensive realism or the different strands of liberalism)
- the explanatory vs advocacy aspects of the approach where relevant (i.e. what the approach advocates vs how it explains events)
- the main authors associated with the approach and its strands
- the main critiques of the approach (i.e. those from other approaches in the debate)
- the historical context of the approach (i.e. the historical context of the broader great debate it is part of)
- the relation of the approach to its earlier or later version (i.e. classical realism and neorealism or idealism and liberalism)
- key sub-theories associated with the approach (i.e. regime theory and liberalism)
- bibliography of all sources with a minimum of ten

Students should make use of a variety of sources including IR textbooks, chapters in books on IR theory as well as original sources.

***Policy Brief (MAs) 20%***

MA students will complete one foreign policy briefing paper on a contemporary international issue. The briefing paper will be 8-10 typed, double-spaced, pages in length and must be framed as an argument in favour of a specific policy option. Late papers will be penalized at a rate of 3% per day including weekends and papers longer than 10 pages will be penalized. Extensions will only be given for documented illnesses, emergencies, etc and will not be given for workload. Students must choose a topic that does not overlap with their mini-lecture/op-ed or research essay. The policy briefing paper will include:

- empirical background on the issue
- the domestic and geopolitics of the issue including the views and policies advocated by relevant domestic interests (i.e. NGOs, think tanks, provinces, political parties, etc) and key international actors (other states, IOs, INGOs)
- the pros and cons of different policy options (in both policy and political terms)
- an argument in favour of a specific policy option

Examples of potential issues include: a response to an international crisis such as a natural disaster, civil war affecting Canadian citizens abroad, or the actions of a 'rogue state'; preparations for an upcoming international negotiation or summit on trade agreements, climate change, etc; or development of policy on an ongoing issue such as foreign aid, Canada-US relations, the middle-east conflict, etc.

**Research Essay** **40%**

Each students will complete one research essay, with 10-12 typed double-spaced pages of text plus a bibliography. The essay will be a standard, thesis-based research paper where students will construct an argument around their chosen topic. Students may choose any topic that falls within the areas of IR and which differ from other course essays. The intent is to get students started towards their MRPs/dissertations and topics should ideally be directed towards these. All topics must be approved by the course instructor. Grading will be based on research, organization and presentation of the argument as well as on strong analysis and creativity of thought. Late papers will be penalized at a rate of 3% per day including weekends and papers longer than 12 pages will be penalized. Extensions will only be given for documented illnesses, emergencies, etc and will not be given for workload.

**COURSE SCHEDULE AND READINGS****Jan. 8 Introduction**

This class will be used to introduce the general subject matter of the course and to outline the course structure, readings and requirements. We will also have short discussions on techniques for PowerPoint presentations as well as on predicting state behaviour.

**Jan. 15 Review: The Evolution of IR Theory**

This seminar reviews the three “great debates” in the evolution of IR theory including: 1. the idealism/realism debate; 2. the traditionalism/behaviouralism debate; and 3. the inter-paradigm debate between neorealism, liberalism and critical theory. In doing so, we examine the key theoretical terminology, assumptions and historical context of each of the approaches/debates.

**Required Readings:**

John Baylis and Steve Smith (eds). 2001. *The Globalization of World Politics, Second Edition*. Chapter 7 “Realism” pp. 141-161

Joshua Goldstein and Sandra Whitworth. 2005. *International Relations, Canadian Edition*. Chapter 3 “Liberal and Critical Approaches”, pp. 86-126.

David Long. 1995. “The Harvard School of Liberal International Theory: A Case For Closure”. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 24: 489-505.

Morton Kaplan. 1966. “The New Great Debate”, *World Politics*. 19(1): pp. 1-20.

Handout on the “Chronology and Components of IR’s Four Great Debates”, pp. 1-2.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

How would realism and liberalism, as explanatory theories, explain why the US decided to invade Iraq and which one offers the best explanation?

**Jan. 22 IR’s Fourth Debate**

This seminar examines the epistemological aspects of IR’s “fourth great debate” including constructivism and post-structuralism as challenges to positivism.

**Required Readings:**

Christian Reus-Smit. 2001. “Constructivism”, in S. Burchill et al (eds.), *Theories of International*

*Relations, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 188-212.

Dunne, T., Kurki, M. and S. Smith. 2007. *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. M. Kurki and C. Wright. Chapter 1 “International Relations and Social Science”, pp. 13-32.

Dunne, T., Kurki, M. and S. Smith. 2007. *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. David Campbell. Chapter 11 “Poststructuralism”, pp. 203-227.

Geeta Chowdhry. 2006. “Post-Colonial Readings of Child Labour in a Globalized Economy” in R. Stubbs and G. Underhill (eds.), *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order, Third Edition*, pp. 233-244.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

Using an example (such as child labour, the invasion of Iraq, etc), outline what constructivism and poststructuralism would have to say and whether you think they offer any useful insights?

**Jan. 29 Integrating IR and Comparative Theories**

This seminar examines the similarities and differences between key IR and comparative theories such as neoliberal institutionalism, historical institutionalism, functionalism, liberal-pluralism, rational choice theory, public choice theory and others.

**Required Readings:**

John Hobson. 2009. “Comparative Politics and International Relations” in T. Landman and N. Robinsom (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp. 175-189.

Adam Harmes. 2012. “Mapping Explanatory Theories in Domestic, Comparative and International Politics”. Pp. 1-40.

Rand Dyck. 2011. *Canadian Politics; Critical Approaches, Sixth Edition*. Chapter 1, read only the ‘Approaches to the Study of Politics’ section, pp. 10-24.

Vivien Schmidt. 2009. “Comparative Institutional Analysis” in T. Landman and N. Robinsom (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Comparative Politics*. Los Angeles: Sage, pp. 125-143.

Michael Howlett, M. Ramesh and Anthony Perl. 2009. *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles & Policy Subsystems, Third Edition*. New York: Oxford University Press, Chapter 2 ‘Understanding Public Policy: Theoretical Approaches’, pp. 17-48.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

What are the main differences between historical institutionalism and rationalist/rational choice institutionalism and which do you think is a better explanatory theory?

**Feb. 5 Foreign Policy and Global Governance: Realist and Neoconservative Visions**

This seminar examines the normative (advocacy) aspects of realism and neoconservatism as guides to foreign policy and global governance.

**Required Readings:**

Michael Williams. 2005. “What is the National Interest?: The Neoconservative Challenge in IR Theory”. *European Journal of International Relations*. 11: 307-337.

Lee Hamilton,. 2005. “The great U.S. foreign policy divide”. *Globe and Mail*. 7 November, 2005, pp. 1-2.

Robert Gilpin. 2002. “A Realist Perspective on International Governance” in D. Held and A.

McGrew (eds.), *Governing Globalization* Blackwell, pp. 237-248.

Brian Schmidt and Michael Williams. 2008. "The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives Versus Realists". *Security Studies*. 17(2): 191-220.

John Kirton,. 2006. "Harper's 'Made in Canada' Global Leadership" in A. Cooper and D. Rowlands (eds.), *Canada Among Nations 2006*, pp. 34-57.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

What are the main differences between realism and neoconservatism and which is a better guide to US foreign policy?

**Feb. 12 Foreign Policy and Global Governance: Liberal and Critical Visions**

This seminar examines the normative (advocacy) aspects of liberalism and critical theory as guides to foreign policy and global governance including key concepts such as human security, global public goods and soft power. We will also conduct the first peer participation review.

**Required Readings:**

David Mutimer. 1999. "Beyond Strategy: Critical Thinking and the New Security Studies" in C. Snyder (ed.), *Contemporary Security and Strategy*. Macmillan, pp. 77-99.

Anthony McGrew,. 2002. "Liberal Internationalism: Between Realism and Cosmopolitanism" in D. Held and A. McGrew (eds.), *Governing Globalization* Blackwell, pp. 267-289.

Bernard Prosper. 2006. "Canada and Human Security: From the Axworthy Doctrine to Middle Power Internationalism". *The American Review of Canadian Studies*. Summer, 2006, pp. 233-261.

Kim Richard Nossal,. 1998. "Foreign Policy For Wimps". *Ottawa Citizen*. 23 April, 1998, p. A19.

Inge Kaul et al. 1999. "Defining Global Public Goods" in I. Kaul et al (eds.), *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21st Century* New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 2-19.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

Is PM Harper's approach to Canadian foreign policy better or worse for Canada than the previous Axworthy doctrine with its focus on a human security and soft power?

**Feb. 19 Reading Week - No Class**

**Feb. 26 IPE Theories**

The seminar examines the inter-paradigm debate in international political economy including economic liberalism/neoliberalism, the Keynesian-welfare approach and economic nationalism.

**Required Readings:**

M. Howlett, A. Netherton and M. Ramesh. 1999. *The Political Economy of Canada: An Introduction* Chapter 2 "Liberal Political Economy", pp. 17-35.

Adam Harmes. 2012. "The Rise of Neoliberal Nationalism". *Review of International Political Economy*. 19(1): 59-86.

Richard Lipsey, Christopher Ragan and Paul Courant. *Economics* Chapter 18, "Benefits and Costs of Government Intervention", pp. 381-402.

Eric Helleiner. 2002. "Economic Nationalism as a Challenge to Economic Liberalism?: Lessons

from the 19th Century”. *International Studies Quarterly*. 46: 307-329.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

Which approach, neoliberal globalization or social democratic multilateralism, offers a better approach to globalization?

**Mar. 5 The Basics of Economics and the Great Recession**

This seminar will take the form of a lecture and is designed to give students a basic conceptual understanding of both domestic and international economics. We will also briefly look at the debate between neoliberalism and the Keynesian-welfare approach over the current great recession and the euro crisis.

**Required Readings:**

Thomas Lairson and David Skidmore. 2003. *International Political Economy: The Struggle for Power and Wealth* Chapter 2 “The Economics of International Political Economy” pp. 17-39.

Adam Harmes. 2001. *Unseen Power* Stoddart “International Economics 101: ‘The Impossible Trinity’” pp. 50-53.

Paul Krugman. 2009. “How Did Economists Get It So Wrong?”. *New York Times Magazine*. 6 September 2009, pp. 1-12.

Sher Verick and Iyanatul Islam. 2010. The Great Recession of 2008-2009: Causes, Consequences and Policy Responses. Discussion Paper No. 4934. Germany: Institute of Labour Studies, pp. 1-61.

Andrew Moravcsik. 2012. “Europe After the Crisis: How to Sustain a Common Currency”. *Foreign Affairs*. 91: 54-68

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

Has stimulus or austerity been a better response to the Great Recession?

**Mar. 12 Climate Change**

This seminar examines the domestic and geopolitics of climate change as well the different policy tools which have been proposed to address it.

**Required Readings:**

TD Bank Financial Group. 2010. “Market-Based Solutions to Protect the Environment”. *TD Economics Special Report*. 7 March, 2010, pp. 1-18.

Geoffrey Heal. “New Strategies for the Provision of Global Public Goods: Learning from International Environmental Challenges” in I. Kaul, I. Grunberg and M. Stern (eds.), *Global Public Goods: International Cooperation in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 220-239.

David Levy. 2005. “Business and the Evolution of the Climate Regime: The Dynamics of Corporate Strategies” in D. Levy and P. Newell (eds.) *The Business of Global Environmental Governance*. Cambridge: The MIT Press, pp. 73-104.

Radoslav Dimitrov. 2010. “Inside UN Climate Change Negotiations”. *Review of Policy Research*. 27(6): 795-821.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

What are the arguments for and against a carbon tax and should Canada adopt one?

**Mar. 19 Covert Operations in IR**

This seminar examines the growing use of covert operations – including drone strikes, special forces raids, intelligence operations and cyber-warfare – as a foreign policy tool.

**Required Readings:**

- Jennifer Kibbe. 2011-12. “Conducting Shadow Wars”. *Journal of National Security Law & Policy*. 5(2): 373-392.
- Craig Forcece. 2011-12. “Spys Without Borders”. *Journal of National Security Law & Policy*. 5(1): 179-210.
- Laura Dickinson. 2011-12. “Outsourcing Covert Activities”. *Journal of National Security Law & Policy*. 5(2): 521-537.
- Media articles on drones: Hillel Ofek. 2010. “The Tortured Logic of Obama’s Drone War”. *The New Atlantis*. Spring, 2010: 35-44; Stephanie Nolan. 2012. “A taboo thought in Pakistan: Are U.S. drones working?”. *The Globe and Mail*. 17 November, 2012; Editorial. 2012. “Rules for Targeted Killing”. *The New York Times*. 29 November, 2012.
- James Farwell and Rafal Rohzinski. 2011. “Stuxnet and the Future of Cyber War”. *Survival: Global Politics and Strategy*. 53(1): 23-40.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

What are the pros and cons of covert operations and do you think they should be discontinued or reformed?

**Mar. 26 Foreign Policy Tools and the Debate Over Rogue States**

This seminar examines various foreign policy approaches and tools of statecraft including forms of international law, sanctions and constructive engagement and looks at their application to ‘rogue states’. We will also discuss the pros and cons of various FP tools related to carrots, sticks and persuasion.

**Required Readings:**

- Colin Dueck. 2006. “Strategies for Managing Rogue States”. *Orbis*. Spring, 2006: 223-241.
- Randall Newnham. 2009 “Carrots, Sticks, and Bombs: The End of Lybia’s WMD Program”. *Mediterranean Quarterly*. 20(3): 77-94.
- Robert Litwak. 2008. “Regime Change 2.0”. *The Wilson Quarterly*. 32(4): 22-27.
- Shai Feldman, Shlomo Blom and Shimon Stein. 2012. “What To Do About Nuclearizing Iran?: The Israeli Debate”. Middle East Brief No. 59, Brandeis University, Crown Center for Middle East Studies, pp. 1-7.
- Kenneth Waltz. 2012. “Why Iran Should Get the Bomb”. *Foreign Affairs*. 91: 2-5.
- Matthew Kroenig. 2012. “Time to Attack Iran”. *Foreign Affairs*. 91: 76-86.
- Colin Kahl. 2012. “Not Time to Attack Iran”. *Foreign Affairs*. 91: 166-173.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

What are the various foreign policy options for dealing with Iran and what should the US do?

**Apl. 2 The Debate Over Humanitarian Intervention and the R2P**

This seminar examines the R2P doctrine as well as liberal, realist, neoconservative and post-colonial views on humanitarian intervention. It also examines some of the various policy tools related to different forms and degrees of intervention. It then applies these approaches and tools to the specific

contexts of Libya and Syria. This class occurs during the week of the International Studies Association conference and will likely be rescheduled.

**Required Readings:**

- Gareth Evans . 2008. “The Responsibility to Protect: An Idea Whose Time Has Come...and Gone?”. *International Relations*. 22(3): 283–298.
- Cristina Badescu and Thomas Weiss. 2010. “Misrepresenting R2P and Advancing Norms: An Alternative Spiral?”. *International Studies Perspectives*. 11: 354-374.
- Mohammed Ayoob. 2004. “Third World Perspectives on Humanitarian Intervention and International Administration”. *Global Governance*. 10: 99-118.
- Caitlyn Alyce Buckley. 2011. “Learning from Lybia, Acting in Syria”. *Journal of Strategic Security*. 5(2): 81-104.
- Eva Bellin and Peter Krause. 2012. “Intervention in Syria: Reconciling Moral Premises and Realistic Outcomes”. Middle East Brief No. 64, Crown Center for Middle East Studies, Brandeis University, pp. 1-6.
- Martha Hall Findlay. 2011. “Can the R2P Survive Lybia and Syria?”. Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute. Strategic Studies Working Group Papers, pp. 1-8.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

What are the pros and cons of various options for intervening in Syria and what should NATO have done and/or do now?

**Apl. 9 The Middle East Conflict**

This seminar examines the history and contemporary situation in the Arab-Israeli conflict including key actors and issues, regional dynamics as well as US and Canadian foreign policy towards the region. Peer participation review.

**Required Readings:**

- Thomas Magstadt. *Nations and Governments: Comparative Politics in Regional Perspective, Fifth Edition*. pp. 459-466, 472-497. Skim for background on the conflict.
- Guy Ben-Porat. 2006. “Markets and Fences: Illusions of Peace”. *The Middle East Journal*. 60(2): 311-328.
- John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt. 2006. “The Israel Lobby”. *London Review of Books*. 23 March, 2006: 1-31.
- Daniel Byman. 2011. “Israel’s Pessimistic View of the Arab Spring”. *The Washington Quarterly*. 34(3): 123-136.
- Rex Brynen. 2007. “Canada’s Role in the Israeli-Palestine Peace Process” in P. Heinbecker and B. Momani (eds.) *Canada and the Middle East: In Theory and Practice*. Wilfred Laurier Press, pp. 73-89.

**Mini-Lecture Question:**

Does Mearsheimer and Walt’s article on the Israel lobby mean that realism is wrong?

**(Graduate) Statement of Academic Offences**

Scholastic offences are taken seriously and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, at the following Web site:

[http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic\\_discipline\\_grad.pdf](http://www.uwo.ca/univsec/handbook/appeals/scholastic_discipline_grad.pdf)