

Yale University
Department of Political Science

Syllabus

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS GRADUATE FIELD SEMINAR

Nuno P. Monteiro
nuno.monteiro@yale.edu
Fall 2010

Office: Rosenkranz 226, Tuesdays 1:00-3:00pm
Class: Rosenkranz 102, Tuesdays 9:25-11:15am
PLSC 679

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course lays out the basic landscape of the field of international relations (IR), its central questions, approaches, concepts, and theories. The aim of the course is to provide students with a working understanding of the scope of IR, the role of theory in the field, its main questions, and existing answers to them. More generally, the course should provide students with a basic toolkit with which to evaluate existing theories, construct new theories, and think about the nature and possibility of causal explanation in IR.

The course starts out with a summary of the history of IR and its foundations in terms of the ways in which the knowledge it produces has been and continues to be legitimated. We then compare and contrast the two main meta-theoretical approaches to the study of international relations -- rationalism and reflectivism -- and explore the central concepts in the field: anarchy, power, and levels of analysis. The second part of the course is devoted to one of the main dichotomies in IR -- competition versus cooperation. We will cover the main theories accounting for the conditions under which states compete or cooperate. Specifically, we will study realism (both in its balance-of-power and its hegemonic component), liberalism (and its account of the role of international and domestic institutions), and constructivism (with its focus on identity, culture, and norms). Part three of the course covers the other central question in the study of international relations -- the causes of conflict. Here, we will cover the role of power; the role of crisis dynamics, credibility, and reputation; and that of domestic variables in producing war. We conclude by reflecting on the role and possibility of progress in IR.

Please be aware that this course is not focused on a description or analysis of the events, actors, institutions, and processes which make up international relations. Nor is the purpose of this course to expose you to cutting-edge work in IR. It is designed to give you the theoretical foundations and conceptual tools needed to pursue research in international relations and be able to place it in the field.

A secondary role of the course is to prepare you to pass the Ph.D. qualifying exam in IR. With this in mind, the course makes abundant use of materials included in the reading list for that exam.

REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

This course is intended primarily for doctoral students in the political science department. Others may be admitted, but students who are not intending to pursue a Ph.D. in political science are discouraged from taking this course. The level of theoretical abstraction and sophistication of the readings -- and, consequently, the class discussions -- will be above and beyond that which is required in order to engage in the practice (as opposed to the study) of international relations.

The course will consist in a series of seminar sessions with pre-assigned readings. Students are expected to do all the required readings prior to each session, as well as attend and participate in all sessions. The weekly sessions will focus on (i) laying out the main arguments of the assigned readings and (ii) critically discussing them. I will open up the session with a short (20-minute) lecture on the topic, laying out and interconnecting the main arguments in the readings, to be followed by a general examination and discussion of the core ideas.

Final grades will be assigned as follows:

- Seminar participation: 20%;
- Response papers: 20%;
- Great-book review: 20%.
- Final paper: 40%.

Please note that in order to receive an overall passing grade, students must receive a passing grade in *all* four components of the final grade.

While these requirements and the deadlines described below will be strictly enforced, I know that emergencies and illnesses might arise during the term. If that happens to be the case, please let me know as soon as possible so that we can work out alternative arrangements for you to complete your work within a reasonable period of time.

All assignments are non-collaborative and should be entirely your own work. Ideas drawn from other sources should be properly cited. Plagiarism is unacceptable and will result in penalties up to and including a failing grade for the assignment (and therefore the course) and referral to the university for disciplinary action. If you haven't done so yet, please familiarize yourself with the University's policy on academic honesty, including cheating, plagiarism, and document citation. It is your responsibility to understand and abide by this policy. If you don't, please ask.

DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENTS

Participation: Since the course will be conducted in a seminar format, students will take responsibility for leading much of the discussion. All students should be prepared to contribute to class discussion by doing *all* the readings in advance and bringing to class questions that stem from the readings. In order to encourage completion of the readings prior to each session, I reserve the right to call on students during the class and ask them to lay out the basic argument of any piece assigned for that session. I also reserve the right to ban electronic devices (other than pacemakers and ankle monitors for those on parole) from the classroom if it appears that they are impoverishing the discussions.

Response Papers: Each student will post a 2-3 paragraph (max. 1 page) reaction to the weekly readings for four different weeks. Your response papers should be posted on the Classes*V2 by 8:00pm the day before the class meeting in which we will discuss these readings. Short papers received after the deadline but before the relevant seminar session begins will be dropped one letter grade. Short papers will not be accepted after the relevant seminar session starts. Each of the four short papers will be worth 5% of the final course grade.

These short statements should include an analysis of strengths or weaknesses of arguments made by the authors for the relevant week; questions with which you were left by the readings; or points of confusion that should be clarified. (You should *not* summarize the readings; assume that everybody else has done the reading as well and understands the basic arguments.) You do not have to discuss all of the readings assigned for the week; you can discuss just one or two, or you can pick a broader range and compare them to each other (or to readings for earlier

weeks). You are welcome to choose any four weeks in which to write reaction papers, though spacing things out over the semester might be best.

“Great Books” Assignment: One of the purposes of the course is to encourage students to read the most important -- or “great” -- books in the field. Since it is impossible to assign all great books during one semester, a second-best option seems to be to ask each student to review one great book and then present its basic argument in class. The idea is to incorporate these basic arguments in the classroom discussion as well as to encourage students to read all of these canonical books at a later moment. In the last page of this syllabus, you will find a list of twenty books that no IR scholar should go without reading. (Or, put another way, no one who hasn’t read them should call themselves an IR scholar...) Each of the students in the seminar should select one book from the list during the second weekly session for this assignment, which has an in-class and a written component. The written assignment will be due in a session determined by mutual agreement between me and the student. The student will then make an in-class presentation during that session. For the written assignment, the student must write a 3-5 page critical review of the book. This review, which ought to keep summary to a minimum (*i.e.*, less than 1.5 pages), should highlight what the student feels are the strengths, weaknesses, insights, and oversights of the book they picked. (I encourage students to read a handful of book reviews in field journals in order to get a feel for what is expected.) Then, during the class in which the review is due, you will make a short, 10-minute presentation of the book’s goal, argument, structure, and evidence. In the Q&A that will ensue the presentation, you will be asked to clarify and defend the book as if you were its author.

Final Paper: Students will write a substantial (20-25 pages for graduate students) research paper. This paper may either be a critical review essay, a “long prospectus” for a (perhaps hypothetical) doctoral dissertation, or a research paper on a topic relevant to the course. In order to discuss and approve paper topics, students should schedule and have individual meetings with me by the end of week 9 (October 29). I encourage you to do it earlier.

Final papers should be printed in letter-sized paper, double-spaced, with 1-inch margins all around, using a size 12 standard font such as Arial, Calibri, or Times New Roman. You can use any citation style you fancy, as long as you stick to it throughout the paper.

The final paper should be emailed to me by Tuesday, December 14, 5:00pm. This deadline is strict. Papers received late will be dropped one letter grade for each 24 hours past the deadline.

READINGS

The selected texts were chosen to represent the major positions and theories in the study of international relations. They provide a wide range of views and differ in the general flavor or style, the persuasiveness of the theoretical argument, and the evidence provided in its support. As a whole, the selection is designed to encourage critical evaluation of existing academic literature. In order to best achieve this goal, keep in mind the following questions when doing the readings: What is the argument the author is trying to make? Why does it matter? What are its strengths and weaknesses? How convincing is it? What are possible counter-arguments? Above all, how does the argument advance our understanding of international politics?

The following books are required for the course:

- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Alastair Smith, Randolph Siverson, and James Morrow, *The Logic of Political Survival* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003);
- Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

- Charles L. Glaser, *Theory of Rational International Politics* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010);
- G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001);
- Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984);
- John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001);
- Bruce Russett and John Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence and International Organizations* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001);
- Thomas Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960);
- Thomas Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966);
- Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979);
- Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

All other readings will be available in PDF format on the Classes*V2 server at least one week before the session in which we will discuss them.

Please note that the readings for each session below are listed in the order you should do them. Essential readings are marked with an asterisk (*), but you should aim at doing *all* the readings, not only these. (This is particularly the case for Ph.D. students who intend to take the field exam in IR, who will sooner or later have to read all these works.)

COURSE SCHEDULE

PART I: THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF THE STUDY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Week 1 (Sep. 07) -- Introductory Remarks

(Begin reading.)

Week 2 (Sep. 14) -- Introduction: The History and Foundations of IR

- *Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, "Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of International Relations," in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 3-40;
- *Brian Schmidt, "On the History and Historiography of International Relations," in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002), 3-22;
- *Colin Wight, "Philosophy of Social Science and International Relations," in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002), 23-51.

- *Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), chapters 1 and 4;
- *Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chapter 1;
- Ole Wæver, "The Sociology of a Not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in IR," *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (1998): 687-727;
- Daniel Maliniak, Amy Oakes, Susan Peterson, and Michael Tierney, *The View from the Ivory Tower: TRIP Survey of International Relations Faculty in the United States and Canada* (Williamsburg, VA: Program on the Theory and Practice of International Relations, College of William and Mary, 2007);
- Nuno Monteiro and Keven Ruby, "IR and the False Promise of Philosophical Foundations," *International Theory*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2009): 15-48.

Week 3 (Sep. 21) -- Major Theoretical Approaches: Rationalism v. Reflectivism

- *James Fearon and Alexander Wendt, "Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View," in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002), 53-72;
- *Duncan Snidal, "Rational Choice and International Relations," in Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002), 73-94;
- *David A. Lake and Robert Powell, editors, *Strategic Choice and International Relations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), chapters 1 and 7;
- *Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chapters 3-4;
- *Chris Brown, "'Turtles all the way down': Anti-Foundationalism, Critical Theory and International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 23 (1994): 213-236;
- John Gerard Ruggie, "What Makes the World Hang Together: Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge," *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No.4 (1998): 855-885;
- Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow 1955 and 1999* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), chapter 1.

Week 4 (Sep. 28) -- Key Concepts: Anarchy, Power, and Levels of Analysis

- *Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, "Power in International Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (2005): 39- 75;
- *J. David Singer, "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations," *World Politics*, Vol. 14, No. 1 (1961): 77-92;
- *Peter Gourevitch, "The Second Image Reversed: the International Sources of Domestic Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 32 , No. 4 (1978): 881-912;
- *Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-level Games," *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No.3, (1988): 424-460;
- *Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (1992): 391-42;

- Hans Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1993, 7th ed.), chapters 1-3;
- Hedley Bull, "Society and Anarchy in International Relations," in Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wright, editors, *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968), 35-50;
- Peter Gourevitch, "Squaring the Circle: The Domestic Sources of International Relations," *International Organization*, Vol. 50, No. 2 (1996): 349-373.

PART II: THE STUDY OF COMPETITION AND COOPERATION

Week 5 (Oct. 05) -- Competition or Cooperation: The Security Dilemma

- * Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (1978): 167-214;
- * Charles L. Glaser, *Theory of Rational International Politics* (Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010).
- Robert Powell, "Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 85, No. 4 (1991): 1303-1320;

Week 6 (Oct. 12) -- Explaining Competition 1: Realism and the Balance of Power

- * John Mearsheimer, "Structural Realism," in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steven Smith, editors, *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 71-88;
- * Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), chapters 5-6;
- * John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001);
- Robert Keohane, editor, *Neorealism and Its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), chapters 6-7;
- Keir A. Lieber, "The New History of World War I and What It Means for International Relations Theory," *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (2007): 155-191.

Week 7 (Oct. 19) -- Explaining Competition 2: Realism and Hegemonic Power

- * Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), read chapters 1-2 and skim the rest;
- * A.F.K. Organski and Jacek Kugler, *The War Ledger* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), chapters 1-2;
- * Duncan Snidal, "The Limits of Hegemonic Stability Theory," *International Organization*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (1985): 579-614;
- * David A. Lake, "Anarchy, Hierarchy, and the Variety of International Relations," *International Organization*, Vol. 50, No. 1 (1996): 1-33.

Week 8 (Oct. 26) -- Explaining Cooperation 1: Liberalism and Institutions

- * Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 51, No. 4 (1997): 513-53;
- * Stephen D. Krasner, editor, *International Regimes* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1983), 1-22 and 355-368;
- * Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), chapters 1-7;
- * G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), chapters 1-3;
- * Hendrik Spruyt, "Institutional Selection in International Relations," *International Organization*, Vol. 48, No. 4 (1994): 527-58;
- * John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 3 (1994/95): 5-93;
- Kenneth W. Abbott, Robert O. Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Duncan Snidal, "The Concept of Legalization," *International Organization*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (2000): 401-419;
- Michael Barnett and Martha Finnemore, "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations," *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 4 (1999): 699-732;
- John Gerard Ruggie, "International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Post-war Economic Order," *International Organization*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1982): 379-415;
- George W. Downs, David M. Rocke, and Peter N. Barsoom, "Is the Good News about Compliance Good News about Cooperation?" *International Organization*, Vol. 50, No. 3 (1996): 379-406.

Week 9 (Nov. 02) -- Explaining Cooperation 2: Constructivism, Identity, and Norms

- * Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chapters 6-8;
- * Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett, editors, *Security Communities* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), chapters 1-2;
- * Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4 (1998): 887-918;
- * Nina Tannenwald, "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use," *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 3 (1999): 433-468;
- Alastair Iain Johnston, "Treating International Institutions as Social Environments," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 45, No. 4 (2001): 487-515.

PART III: THE STUDY OF THE CAUSES OF WAR

Week 10 (Nov. 09) -- Explaining Conflict 1: Power, War and Peace

- * James Fearon, "Rationalist Explanations for War," *International Organization*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (1995): 379-414;
- * Robert Powell, "Uncertainty, Shifting Power, and Appeasement," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 90, No. 4 (1996): 749-64;
- * Paul Huth, Christopher Gelpi, and D. Scott Bennett, "The Escalation of Great Power Militarized Disputes: Testing Rational Deterrence Theory and Structural Realism," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 3 (1993): 609-623;
- * Stephen Walt, "Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies," *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (1999): 5-48; and responses in Vol. 24, No. 2: 56-73 and 97-106;
- Nicholas Sambanis, "Using Case Studies to Expand Economic Models of War," *Political Perspectives*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (2004): 259-279;
- Jack Snyder, "Anarchy and Culture: Insights from the Anthropology of War," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 56, No. 1 (2002): 7-45;
- Steven Van Evera, *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), chapters 1-4.

Week 11 (Nov. 16) -- Explaining Conflict 2: Crisis Bargaining, Credibility, and Reputation

- * Thomas Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960), 1-52 and 83-161;
- * Thomas Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 1-125;
- * James Fearon, "Signaling vs. the Balance of Powers and Interests," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (1994): 236-69;
- Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), 217-72;
- Christopher Gelpi, "Crime and Punishment: The Role of Norms in International Crisis Bargaining," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 91, No. 2 (1997): 339-360;
- Andrew Kydd, "Trust, Reassurance, and Cooperation," *International Organization*, Vol. 54, No. 2 (2000): 325-357.
-

Week 12 (Nov. 30) -- Explaining Conflict 3: Domestic Politics

- * James Fearon, "Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes," *American Political Science Review*, No. 88, No. 3 (1994): 577-592;
- * Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Alastair Smith, Randolph Siverson, and James Morrow, *The Logic of Political Survival* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), chapters 1-3, 5-6;
- * Bruce Russett and John Oneal, *Triangulating Peace: Democracy, Interdependence and International Organizations* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001), chapters 1-6;
- * Sebastian Rosato, "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (2003): 585-602;

- Alexandre Debs and Hein Goemans, "Regime Type, the Fate of Leaders, and War," forthcoming in *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 104, No. 3 (2010);
- Kristian Gleditsch and Michael Ward "War and Peace in Space and Time: The Role of Democratization," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 1 (2000): 1-29;
- William Howell and John Pevehouse, "Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force," *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (2005): 209-232;
- Michael Tomz, "Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach," *International Organization*, Vol. 61, No. 4 (2007): 821-40;
- Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam, *Democracies at War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002), chapters, 1-3, 6-8;
- Kenneth Schultz, "Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 92, No. 4 (1998): 829-844;
- Kenneth Schultz, "Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform? Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War," *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 2 (1999): 233-266.

Week 13 (Dec. 07) -- Conclusion: Progress in IR

- * Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, "Introduction: Appraising Progress in International Relations Theory," in Elman and Elman, editors, *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2003), 1-20;
- * Richard Herrmann, "Linking Theory to Evidence in International Relations," in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse, and Beth A. Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002), 119-136;
- * Donald Puchala, "Beyond the Divided Discipline," in *Theory and History in International Relations* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 214-225;
- * Henry Nau, "Scholarship and Policy-Making: Who Speaks Truth to Whom?" in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 635-647;
- * Robert Cox, "The Point Is Not Just to Explain the World but to Change It," in Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 84-93;

Great Books

- Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis* (New York: Longman, 1999, 2nd ed.);
- Robert Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation* (New York: Basic Books, 1984);
- Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War* (New York: Free Press, 1973);
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, *The War Trap* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981);
- Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977);
- Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996);
- Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow 1955 and 1999* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002);
- Robert Jervis, *System Effects: Complexity in Political and Social Life* Princeton, Princeton University Press 1997);
- Stephen D. Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999);
- David A. Lake, *Hierarchy in International Relations* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2009);
- Richard Ned Lebow, *Between Peace and War* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1981);
- Richard Ned Lebow, *A Cultural Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008);
- Richard Little, *The Balance of Power in International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007);
- Glenn H. Snyder, *Alliance Politics* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997);
- Hendrik Spruyt, *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors: An Analysis of Systems Change* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994);
- Jack L. Snyder, *Myths of Empire* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1991);
- Steven Van Evera, *Causes of War: Power and the Roots of Conflict* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999);
- Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987);
- Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State, and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954);
- Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars: A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (New York: Basic Books, 1977).