

Yale University
Department of Political Science

Syllabus

THE PHILOSOPHY, HISTORY, AND SOCIOLOGY OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(Seminar)

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

Office: Rosenkranz 226, Tuesdays 2:00-4:00
Class: Rosenkranz 202, Tuesdays, 9:20-11:10
PLSC 193/671

COURSE OBJECTIVES

This seminar explores the philosophical foundations of the study of international relations, as well as the history and sociology of the discipline. We'll cover the historical development of IR as a professional discipline since the interwar period, going over the main foundational debates that organized the field, and addressing its sociological evolution. By the end of the course, students should have an understanding of the main meta-theoretical issues in the discipline and thus be able to enlarge their toolkit to critically engage scholarship in IR, political science, and the social sciences more broadly.

COURSE OUTLINE

The course covers the historical evolution of IR as a professional discipline *from the meta-theoretical perspective*. As the field evolves, we'll look at the development of the philosophical foundations of IR scholarship, covering the main positions in it and addressing the main criticisms of each. Finally, we'll study the sociology of IR, interrogating the ways in which scholarship is produced and the field is structured and disciplined.

REQUIREMENTS, GRADING, AND DEADLINES

Basic knowledge of IR theory is a plus.

The course will consist in a series of seminar sessions with pre-assigned readings. Students are expected to do all the 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 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: 25%;
- Response papers: 25%;
- Final paper: 50%.

Each student will post a 2-3 paragraph (max. 1 page) reaction to the weekly readings for five different weeks. Your response papers should be posted by Monday night at 8:00pm before the class meeting in which we will these readings.

The final paper should be emailed to me by Monday, May 3, at 4:00pm. This deadline is strict.

Papers received late will be dropped one letter grade for each 24 hours past the deadline. To receive an overall passing grade, students must receive a passing grade in all three components of the final grade.

While these policies 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. In emergency cases, you will need to present a doctor's note or a note from your college advisor in order to be excused from late work or a series of absences from class sessions.

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 cheating, plagiarism, and documentation. It is your responsibility to understand and abide by this policy. If you don't understand any aspect of the policy, 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 informally bringing questions that stem from the readings.

Response Papers: 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.) 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 five weeks in which to write reaction papers, though spacing things out over the semester might be best.

Final Paper: Students will write a substantial (15 pages for undergrads; 20-25 pages for graduate students) research paper. For undergraduates, the paper can be primarily focused on identifying a research question, discussing the strengths and weakness of existing literature relating to this question, and proposing a way to study the question further. Graduate students should view this as an opportunity to begin to develop publishable work. In order to discuss and approve paper topics, students should schedule individual meetings with me by the end of week 3.

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.

READINGS

The selected texts were chosen to represent the major positions and theories in the philosophical, historical, and sociological debates around the study of international relations. They provide a wide range of views and differ in both the evidence they provide and their persuasiveness. 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?

All of the readings will be made available as PDF files online at the Classes*v2 server.

The readings below for each session are listed in the order you should do them.

COURSE OUTLINE

Week 1 (Jan. 12) -- Introductory Remarks

Week 2 (Jan. 19) -- The Emergence of the Science Debate in IR

- Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, "Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of International Relations," in Reus-Smit and 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 Carlsnaes, Risse and Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002);
- Colin Wight, "Philosophy of Social Science and International Relations," in Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002).

Week 3 (Jan. 26) -- The Behaviorist Revolt

- David Easton, *A Framework for Political Analysis* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1965), selections;
- Morton Kaplan, "The New Great Debate: Traditionalism vs. Science in International Relations," in Knorr and Rosenau, editors, *Contending Approaches to International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969);
- Bruce Russett, "The Young Science of International Politics," *World Politics*, Vol. 22 (1969): 87-94;
- Bruce Russett, "A Macroscopic View of International Politics," in Davis, East and Rosenau, editors, *The Analysis of International Politics: Essays in Honor of Harold and Margaret Sprout* (New York: Free Press: 1972);
- Hedley Bull, "International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach," in Knorr and Rosenau, editors, *Contending Approaches to International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969).

Week 4 (Feb. 2) -- Instrumentalism and Its Children

- Milton Friedman, *Essays in Positive Economics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), selections;
- Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), selections;

- Duncan Snidal, "Rational Choice and International Relations," in Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002);
- Paul MacDonald, "Useful Fiction or Miracle Maker: The Competing Epistemological Foundations of Rational Choice Theory," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97 (2003): 551-565;
- Thomas Pepinsky, "From Agents to Outcomes: Simulation in International Relations," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 11 (2005): 367-394;
- James Fearon and Alexander Wendt, "Rationalism v. Constructivism: A Skeptical View," in Carlsnaes, Risse, and Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002);

Week 5 (Feb. 9) -- The Social Constructivist Challenge

- David Campbell, *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), selections;
- Chris Brown, "'Turtles all the way down:' Anti-Foundationalism, Critical Theory and International Relations," *Millennium*, Vol. 23 (1994): 213-236;
- Roxanne Lynn Doty, "Desire All the Way Down," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 26 (2000): 137-139;
- Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit, "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Relations Theory and Constructivism," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 4 (1998): 259-294;
- Yosef Lapid, "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33 (1989): 235-254;
- Emmanuel Navon, "The 'Third Debate' Revisited," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 27 (2001): 611-625.

Week 6 (Feb. 16) -- Scientific Realism to the Rescue

- Richard Boyd, "Scientific Realism," in Zalta, editor, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Stanford, CA: The Metaphysical Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University, 2002), <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-realism/>;
- Alex Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), selections;
- Heikki Patomaki and Colin Wight "After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 44 (2000): 213-237;
- Steven Smith, "Wendt's World," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 26 (2000): 151-163;
- Alex Wendt, "On the Via Media: A Response to the Critics," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 26 (2000): 165-180;
- Fred Chernoff, "Scientific Realism as a Meta-Theory of International Politics," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 46 (2002): 189-207;

- Colin Wight, "A Manifesto for Scientific Realism in IR: Assuming the Can Opener Won't Work," *Millennium*, Vol. 35 (2007): 379-398;

Week 7 (Feb. 23) -- Beyond Realism

- Martin Hollis, "The Last Post?" in Smith, Booth and Zalewski, editors, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996);
- Molly Cochran, "Deweyan Pragmatism and Post-Positivist Social Science in IR," *Millennium*, Vol. 31 (2002): 525-548;
- Milja Kurki, "Causes of a Divided Discipline: Rethinking the Concept of Cause in International Relations Theory," *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 32 (2006): 189-216;
- David Houghton, "Positivism 'versus' Postmodernism: Does Epistemology Make a Difference?" *International Politics*, Vol. 45 (2008): 115-128;
- Patrick Jackson, "Foregrounding Ontology: Dualism, Monism, and IR Theory," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 34 (2008): 129-153.

Week 8 (Mar. 2) -- IR as a Social Science

- Martin Hollis and Steven Smith, *Explaining and Understanding in International Relations* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990), selections;
- Martin Hollis, *The Philosophy of Social Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), selections;
- Daniel Dessler, "Constructivism within a Positivist Social Science," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 25 (1999): 123-137.

Week 9 (Mar. 23) -- Meta-Theory and Methodological Debates

- Gary King, Robert Keohane and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), selections;
- Henry Brady and David Collier, *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), selections;
- Dvora Yanow and Peregrine Schwartz-Shea, editors, *Interpretation and Method: Empirical Research Methods and the Interpretive Turn* (Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe, 2006), selections.

Week 10 (Mar. 30) -- Meta-Theory and Professional Training

- David March and Paul Furlong, "A Skin Not a Sweater: Epistemology and Ontology in Political Science," in Marsh and Toker, editors, *Theory and Methods in Political Science* (New York: Palgrave, 2002);
- Stephen Bates and Laura Jenkins, "Teaching and Learning Ontology and Epistemology in Political Science," *Politics*, Vol. 27 (2007): 55-63;

- Colin Hay, "Does Ontology Trump Epistemology? Notes on the Directional Dependence of Ontology and Epistemology in Political Analysis," *Politics*, Vol. 27 (2007): 55-63;
- Glyn Daly, "Ology Schmolgy: a Post-Structuralist Approach," *Politics*, Vol. 28 (2008): 57-60.

Week 11 (Apr. 6) -- The Sociology of Scientific Knowledge in IR

- Maliniak, Oakes, Peterson and 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).
- Ole Wæver, "The Sociology of a Not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in IR," *International Organization*, Vol. 52 (1998): 687-727;
- Karen Knorr Cetina, *Epistemic Cultures: How the Sciences Make Knowledge* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), selections;
- Steven Shapin, *The Scientific Life: A Moral History of a Late Modern Vocation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008), selections;
- Michele Lamont, *How Professors Think: Inside the Curious World of Academic Judgment* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), selections;
- Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," *Signs*, Vol. 12 (1987): 687-718.

Week 12 (Apr. 13) -- The Philosophical Underpinnings of Contemporary 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);
- Richard Herrmann, "Linking Theory to Evidence in International Relations," in Carlsnaes, Risse and Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2002);
- Colin Wight, "Incommensurability and Cross-Paradigm Communication in International Relations Theory: 'What's the Frequency, Kenneth?'" *Millennium*, Vol. 2 (1996): 291-320;
- James Rouse, "Vampires: Social Constructivism, Realism, and Other Philosophical Undead," *History and Theory*, Vol. 41 (2002): 60-78;
- Steven Smith, "Positivism and Beyond," in Smith, Booth and Zalewski, editors, *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Week 13 (Apr. 20) -- Conclusion: The Meta-Theoretical Future of IR

- Donald Puchala, "Beyond the Divided Discipline," in *Theory and History in International Relations* (New York: Routledge, 2003);
- Henry Nau, "Scholarship and Policy-Making: Who Speaks Truth to Whom?" in Reus-Smit and Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008);

- Robert Cox, "The Point Is Not Just to Explain the World but to Change It," in in Reus-Smit and Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008);
- Nuno Monteiro and Keven Ruby, "IR and the False Promise of Philosophical Foundations," *International Theory*, Vol. 1 (2009): 15-48;
- Nuno Monteiro and Keven Ruby, "The Promise of Foundational Prudence," *International Theory*, Vol. 1 (2009): XXX.