

Centre for International Politics, Organisation and Disarmament
School of International Studies
Jawaharlal Nehru University

Realism and World Politics (IO-644)
Monsoon 2013 Semester

Instructor: Prof. Rajesh Rajagopalan
Room 216, SIS Building (Ph. 2670-4349) Email:
Class Time: Tuesdays and Thursdays, 10:00 am-11:30 am
Office Hours: One hour after class and by appointment

Course Description

Realism and its variants remain one of the most important and definitely the oldest of the theoretical approaches to the study of interstate politics. This course is designed to provide an intensive reading of recent Realist literature in international politics. This course is structured presuming you have some basic understanding of international political theory; reading and discussions will build on that base. It may be useful to revisit more introductory material from time to time, especially that relating to Realism and its variants. We will start with some of the basic writings in the field and build up to some of the major debates, both within Realism as well as between Realists and other alternate theoretical approaches. However, by and large, we will focus on the Realist responses and writings rather than on challenges from other theoretical perspectives.

Course Requirements and Grade Assessment

All students are expected to actively participate in class discussions. All papers should be emailed to my email address above.

- a) You will be required to write two book/essay reviews. Each review should be at least 800 words in length. In order to avoid duplication, you are required to get prior approval for the essay you want to review. Preferably, the essays for review should not be from the syllabus, unless there is a very good reason for it. Reviews are due on September 24 and October 22. The reviews will account for 20% (2x10%) of your total grade. Please email your reviews to the address mentioned above. Ensure that your file is in MS Word 2003, and that your name is mentioned in the file name (eg.: "review essay-1-your-name")
- b) You are required to write a term paper on a topic of your choice. The choice of topic will, however, have to be approved by the instructor. Topics should be approved by September 5. The term paper should be roughly 4000 words in length (including footnotes). Class presentations of the papers are on October 3 (initial) and November 7. These term papers should be research papers, not opinion pieces. **Term papers should follow the SIS Style Manual, strictly**. Please consult the instructor if you are uncertain about any rule. The term paper is due on November 19 and will account for 40% of your total grade. Please email your paper to the address mentioned above. Ensure that your file is in MS Word 2003, and that your name is mentioned in the file name (eg.: "termpaper-your-name")
- c) A final exam will be held in class during exam week and will account for the remaining 40% of your total grade.

Explanations of Grades

- A+: Essay/paper demonstrates extraordinary and original insight *and* is elegantly written and argued. Awarded very rarely.
- A: Essay/paper that demonstrates comprehensive grasp of the subject matter and some originality and is well written.
- A-: Competent response that covers most of the major points/issues and is cogently written and argued.
- B+: Competent response, cogently written and argued but with one major or a few minor mistakes.
- B: Demonstrates some competence, but marred by either major mistakes or omissions and is not well written.
- B-: Only covers very few expected points or issues.
- C+: Answer/essay that demonstrates poor or no understanding of the subject matter.

Plagiarism or any other kind of academic cheating will invite severe penalties. Please consult the instructor if you are unsure of the rules regarding plagiarism.

Course Reading Schedule

[Most readings are available on JSTOR and other electronic databases on the JNU Library website. Those materials that are not available on JSTOR will be available from the Photocopying Shop in the Basement level of the SIS building]

1. Realism and Neorealism: An Overview

Required:

John Mearsheimer, "E.H. Carr vs. Idealism: The Battle Rages On," *International Relations*, 19(2) June 2005, pp. 139-52 at <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0035.pdf>; Robert Gilpin, "The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism," *International Organization* 38:2 (spring 1984), pp. 287-304; Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18:4 (spring 1988), pp. 615-628.

Recommended:

"Roundtable: The Battle Rages On: Mearsheimer vs. Paul Rogers, Richard Little, Christopher Hill, Chris Brown and Ken Booth," *International Relations* 19 (3) September 2005, at <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0036.pdf>; John Mearsheimer, "Realism, the Real World and Academia," in Michael Brecher and Frank P. Harvey (editors), *Realism and Institutionalism in International Relations* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002) at <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0029.pdf>; Hans J. Morgenthau, "Another 'Great Debate': The National Interest of the United States," *American Political Science Review* 46:4 (December 1952), pp. 961-88; Robert Gilpin, "No One Loves a Political Realist" *Security Studies* 5:3 (spring 1996), pp. 3-26; Joseph Grieco, "Realist International Theory and the Study of World Politics" in Michael W. Doyle and G. John Ikenberry (eds.), *New Thinking in International Relations Theory* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997), pp. 163-201. John Herz, "The Security Dilemma" *World Politics* 2:2 (January 1950), pp. 157-180; Kenneth N. Waltz, *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959) and *Theory of International Politics* (New York: Random House, 1979); and Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981); Daniel Garst, "Thucydides and Neorealism," *International Studies Quarterly* 33 (1989): 3-27; Laurie M. Johnson Bagby, "The Use and Abuse of Thucydides in International Relations," *International Organization* 48 (1994): 131-53; E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (London: Macmillan, 1961); John Vasquez, *The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Michael C. Williams (editor), *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans Morgenthau in International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); Mihaela Neacsu, *Hans J. Morgenthau's Theory of International Relations: Disenchantment and Re-enchantment* (Houndmills: Palgrave-Macmillan, 2009); Richard Ned Lebow, *The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003); Duncan Bell (editor), *Political Thought and International Relations: Variations on a Realist Theme* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008)

2. Neorealism and the End of the Cold War

Required:

William C. Wohlforth, "Realism and the End of the Cold War" *International Security* 19:3 (winter 1994) pp. 91-129; Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "Power, Globalization and the End of the Cold War: Reevaluating a Landmark Case for Ideas," *International Security* 25:3 (winter 2000).

Recommended:

Richard Ned Lebow, John Meuller and William C. Wohlforth, "Realism and the End of the Cold War," *International Security* 20:2 (autumn 1995), pp. 185-187; Robert D. English, "Power, Ideas and New Evidence on the Cold War's End: A Reply to Brooks and Wohlforth" *International Security* 26:4 (spring 2002), pp. 70-92; Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, "From Old Thinking to New Thinking in Qualitative Research" *International Security* 26:4 (spring 2002), pp. 93-111; Rey Koslowski and Friedrich V. Kratochwil, "Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System," *International Organization* 48:2 (spring 1994), pp. 215-47.

3. Realism and the Balance of Power

Susan B. Martin, "From Balance of Power to Balancing Behavior: The Long and Winding Road," in Andrew A. Hanami (editor), *Perspectives on Structural Realism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 62-82; T.V.

Paul, James J. Wirtz, and Michael Fortman, *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004)(read: Introduction; chapters 4, 5, 11, Conclusion); Richard Little, "The Balance of Power in *Politics Among Nations*," in Michael C. Williams (editor), *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans Morgenthau in International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); William C. Wohlforth, "The Perception of Power: Russia in the pre-1914 Balance," *World Politics* 39:3 (April 1987), pp. 353-81.

Recommended: Other chapters in T.V. Paul, James J. Wirtz, and Michael Fortman, *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century*(Stanford University Press, 2004)

4. Balance of Power vs. Hegemonic Realism

Required:

Robert Gilpin, "Theory of Hegemonic War," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18:4 (spring 1988), pp. 591-613; William C. Wohlforth, *et al*, "Testing Balance of Power Theory in World History," *European Journal of International Relations* 13:2 (2007), pp. 155-85; Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, *World Out of Balance: International Relations and the Challenge of American Primacy* (Princeton University Press, 2008), chps 1-3, pp. 1-97; Douglas Lemke, "Great Powers in the Post-Cold War World: A Power Transition Perspective" in T.V.Paul, James Wirtz and Michael Fortmann, *Balance of Power: Theory and Practice in the 21st Century* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), pp. 52-75.

Recommended:

Jonathan M. DiCicco and Jack S. Levy, "The Power Transition Research Program: A Lakatosian Analysis," in *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (editors), (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2003), pp. 109-57; Jack S. Levy, "Theories of General War," *World Politics* 37:3 (April 1985), pp. 344-74; A.F.K. Organski and Jacek Kugler, *The War Ledger* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981) esp. chp. 3; Woosang Kim, "Power Transitions and Great Power War from Westphalia to Waterloo," *World Politics* 45:1 (1992), pp. 153-72; Stefano Guzzini, "'Realisms at War': Robert Gilpin's Political Economy of Hegemonic War as a Critique of Waltz's Noorealism," (unpub. mans.)

5. Defensive/Contingent Realism

Required:

Evan Braden Montgomery, "Breaking Out of the Security Dilemma: Realism, Reassurance, and the Problem of Uncertainty," *International Security* 31:2 (Fall 2006), pp. 151-85; Stephen Van Evera, "Offense, Defence and Causes of War," *International Security* 22:4 (spring 1998), pp. 5-43; Charles L. Glaser, "Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help," *International Security* 19:3 (winter 1994-95), pp. 50-90.

Recommended:

Robert Jervis, "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 30:2 (January 1978), pp. 167-218; Thomas Christensen and Jack Snyder, "Chain Gangs and Passed Bucks: Predicting Alliance Patterns in Multipolarity," *International Organization* 44:2 (spring 1990), pp. 137-68; Charles L. Glaser and Chaim Kaufmann, "What is the Offense-Defense Balance and Can We Measure It?" *International Security* 22:4 (spring 1998), pp. 44-82; James W. Davis, Jr., Bernard I. Finel, Stacie E. Goddard, Stephen Van Evera, Charles L. Glaser, Chaim Kaufmann, "Correspondance: Taking Offense and Offense-Defense Theory," *International Security* 23:3 (winter 1998), pp. 179-206; Charles L. Glaser, "The Security Dilemma Revisited," *World Politics* 50:1 (October 1997), pp. 171-201.

6. Offensive Realism

Required:

John Mearsheimer, "Power and Fear in Great Power Politics," in G.O. Mazur (ed), *One Hundred Year Commemoration to the Life of Hans Morgenthau* (New York: Semenenko Foundation, 2004) at <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0033x2.pdf>; Randall Schweller, "Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back In" *International Security* 19:1 (summer 1994), pp. 72-107; John Mearsheimer, "Reckless States and Realism," *International Relations* 23 (2), June 2009, pp. 241-56 at <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0048.pdf>.

Recommended:

John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001); Benjamin Franklin, "Restating the Realist Case: An Introduction" *Security Studies* 5:3 (spring 1996), pp. xiv-xx; Sean M. Lynn Jones, "Realism and America's Rise: A Review Essay," *International Security* 23:2 (fall 1998), pp. 157-82; Eric Labs, "Beyond Victory: Offensive Realism and the Expansion of War Aims," *Security Studies* 6:4 (summer 1997), pp. 1-49; Randall Schweller, "Neorealism's Status-Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma?" *Security Studies* 5:3 (spring 1996), pp. 90-121.

7. Bringing OR and DR Together

Required Reading:

Davide Fiammenghi, "The Security Curve and the Structure of International Politics: A Neorealist Synthesis," *International Security*, 35:4 (Spring 2011), pp. 126-54; Eric J. Hamilton and Brian C. Rathbun, "Scarce Differences: Towards a Material and Systemic Foundation for Offensive and Defensive Realism," *Security Studies*, (2013), 22:3 pp. 436-65

8. Neoclassical Realism

Required:

Randall L. Schweller, "Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Underbalancing," *International Security* 29:2 (Fall 2004), pp. 159-201; Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, "State Building for Future Wars: Neoclassical Realism and the Resource-Extractive State," *Security Studies* 15:3 (July-September 2006), pp. 464-95. Steven E. Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro (editors), *Neoclassical Realism, the State and Foreign Policy* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009): select chapters TBA; Hyon Joo Yoo, "Domestic hurdles for system-driven behaviour: Neoclassical Realism and Missile defence policies in Japan and South Korea," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 12:2 (2012), pp. 317-348.

Recommended:

Fareed Zakaria, "Realism and Domestic Politics: A Review Essay," *International Security* 17:1 (summer 1992), pp. 177-98; Randall L. Schweller, "The Progressiveness of Neoclassical Realism," in *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (editors), (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2003), pp. 311-48;

9. Realisms and American Hegemony

Required:

Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar," *International Security* 31:2 (Fall 2006), pp. 7-41; Michael Mastanduno, "Preserving the Unipolar Moment: Realist Theories and US Grand Strategy After the Cold War" *International Security* 21:4 (spring 1997), pp. 49-88; William C. Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World" *International Security* 24:1 (summer 1999), pp. 5-41; Nuno P. Monteiro, "Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity is not Peaceful," *International Security*, 36:3 (Winter 2011/12), pp. 9-40; Christopher Layne and Bradley A. Thayer, *American Empire: A Debate* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

Recommended:

William J. Brenner, "In Search of Monsters: Realism and Progress in International Relations Theory After September 11," *Security Studies*, 15:3 (July-September, 2006), pp. 496-528; Stephen W. Walt, *Taming American Power: The Global Response to US Primacy* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005); Christopher Layne, *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006); John J. Mearsheimer, "Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War," *International Security* 15:1 (summer 1990), pp. 5-56; Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Emerging Structure of International Politics" *International Security* 18:2 (autumn 1993), pp. 44-79; Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise" *International Security* 17:4 (spring 1993), pp. 5-51; Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions of US Grand Strategy"; Barry R. Posen, "European Union Security and Defence Policy: Response to Unipolarity?" *Security Studies* 15:2 (April-June 2006), pp. 149-86.

10. Realists and American Strategy

Required:

Christopher Layne and Benjamin Schwarz, "American Hegemony: Without an Enemy," *Foreign Policy* 92 (autumn 1993), pp. 5-23; Michael C. Desch, "The Keys that Lock up the World: Identifying American Interests in the Periphery," *International Security* 14:1 (summer 1989) pp. 86-121; Michael C. Desch, "The Myth of

Abandonment: The Use and Abuse of the Holocaust Analogy,” *Security Studies* 15:1 (January-March 2006), pp. 106-45; John J. Mearsheimer and Steven Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy*, Faculty Working Paper, Harvard University, available at <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0040.pdf>.

Recommended:

John Mearsheimer, “Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq War: Realism Versus Neo-Conservatism,” *opendemocracy.com* at <http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0037.pdf>; Campbell Craig, “American Realism versus American Imperialism,” *World Politics* 57 (October 2004), pp. 143-71; Kenneth N. Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Be Better* Adelphi Paper No. 171 (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1981); Christopher Layne, “The Real Conservative Agenda,” *Foreign Policy* 61 (winter 1985-86), pp. 73-93; Christopher Layne, “From Preponderance to Offshore Balancing: America’s Future Grand Strategy,” *International Security* 22:1 (summer 1997), pp. 86-124.

11. Realism and Domestic Factors

Required:

Stephen Van Ivera, “Why States Believe Foolish Ideas: Nonself-Evaluation by States and Societies,” in Andrew A. Hanami (editor), *Perspectives on Structural Realism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), pp. 163-98; Michael Mastanduno, David A. Lake and G. John Ikenberry, “Towards a Realist Theory of State Action” *International Studies Quarterly* 33:4 (December 1989), pp. 457-474; B.I. Finel, “Black Box or Pandora’s Box: State Level Variables and Progressivity in Realist Research Programs,” *Security Studies* 11:2 (winter 2001-2002), pp. 187-227; Jennifer Sterling-Folker, “Realist Environment, Liberal Process and Domestic-Level Variables,” *International Studies Quarterly* 41:1 (March 1997), pp. 1-25.

Recommended:

Sten Rynning, “Shaping Military Doctrine in France: Decisionmakers Between International Power and Domestic Interests,” *Security Studies* 11:2 (winter 2001-2002), pp. 85-116; Barry R. Posen, *The Sources of Military Doctrine: France, Britain and Germany Between the World Wars* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1984); Stephen Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987); Fareed Zakaria, *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America’s World Role* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Jack Snyder, *Myths of Empire: Domestic Politics and International Ambition* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993). Aaron L. Freidberg, *The Weary Titan: Britain and the Experience of Relative Decline, 1895-1905* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988)

12. Neorealism and Foreign Policy

Required:

Colin Elman, “Horses for Courses: Why Not Neorealist Theories of Foreign Policy?” *Security Studies* 6:1 (autumn 1996), pp. 7-53; Kenneth N. Waltz, “International Politics is Not Foreign Policy” *Security Studies* 6:1 (autumn 1996), pp. 54-57; Colin Elman, “Cause, Effect and Consistency: A Response to Kenneth Waltz” *Security Studies* 6:1 (autumn 1996), pp. 58-61.

Recommended:

Shibley Telhami, “Kenneth Waltz, Neorealism and Foreign Policy,” *Security Studies* 11:3 (spring 2002), pp. 158-70.

13. Realism and Culture

Required:

Michael C. Desch, “Culture Clash: Assessing the Importance of Ideas in Security Studies,” *International Security* 23:1 (summer 1998), pp. 141-70; Colin Dueck, “Realism, Culture and Grand Strategy: Explaining America’s Peculiar Path to World Power,” *Security Studies* 14:2 (April-June 2005), pp. 195-231

Recommended:

John S. Duffield, Theo Farrell, Richard Price and Michael C. Desch, “Isms and Schisms: Culturalism versus Realism in Security Studies,” *International Security* 24:1 (summer 1999) pp. 156-80.

14. Realist Constructivism

Required:

Jennifer Sterling-Fokler, “Realism and the Constructivist Challenge: Rejecting, Reconstructing or Rereading,” *International Studies Review* 4:1 (spring 2002), pp. 73-97; J. Samuel Barkin, “Realist Constructivism,”

International Studies Review 5 (2003), pp. 325-42; Patrick Thaddeus Jackson (editor), "The Forum: Bridging the Gap: Towards A Realist-Constructivist Dialogue," *International Studies Review* 6 (2004), pp. 337-52.

Recommended:

Jennifer Sterling-Folker and Rosemary E. Shinko, "Discourses of Power: Traversing the Realist-Postmodern Divide," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 33:3 (June 2005), pp. 637-64.

15. Neorealist Responses to Theoretical Challenges

Required:

Markus Fischer, "Feudal Europe, 800-1300: Communal Discourse and Conflictual Practice," *International Organization* 46:2(spring 1992), pp. 427-66; Christopher Layne, "Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace," *International Security* 19:2 (autumn 1994), pp. 5-49; John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise on International Institutions," *International Security* 19:3 (winter 1994-95), pp. 5-49.

Recommended:

Rodney Bruce Hall and Friedrich V. Kratochwil, "Medieval Tales: Neorealist 'Science' and the Abuse of History," *International Organization* 47:3 (summer 1993), pp. 479-91; Markus Fischer, "On Contexts, Facts and Norms: Response to Hall and Kratochwil," *International Organization* 47:3 (summer 1993), pp. 493-500; Jonathan Mercer, "Anarchy and Identity," *International Organization* 49:2 (spring 1995), pp. 229-252; Ido Oren, "The Subjectivity of the 'Democratic' Peace: Changing U.S. Perceptions of Imperial Germany," *International Security* 20:2 (autumn 1995), pp. 147-84.

16. Critiques of Neorealist Methodology

Required:

Keith Topper, "The Theory of International Politics: An Analysis of Neorealist Theory," *Human Studies* 21 (1998), pp. 157-86; John A. Vasquez, "The Realist Paradigm and Progressive versus Degenerative Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition," *The American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997), pp. 899-912; Kenneth N. Waltz, "Evaluating Theories," *The American Political Science Review* 91:4 (December 1997), pp. 913-17; Kenneth Waltz, "Foreword: Thoughts about Assaying Theories," in *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (editors), (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2003), pp. vii-xii.

Recommended:

Miriam Fendius Elman, "Lessons from Lakatos" and David Dessler, "Explanation and Scientific Progress," and Andrew Bennett, "A Lakatosian Reading of Lakatos: What Can We Salvage from the Hard Core?" in *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field* by Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (editors), (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2003).