

**Higher School of Economics 2018**

Утверждена Академическим советом  
образовательной программы  
«5» сентября 2018 г., № протокола\_1

Академический руководитель  
образовательной программы



---

# **Introduction to International Relations**

---

## **Part 1: Course Information**

### **Instructor Information**

**Instructor:** Anastasia Likhacheva  
**Office:** Room 421, 17 Malaya Ordynka, Moscow  
**Office Hours:** by appointment  
**E-mail:** alikhacheva@hse.ru

### **Course Description**

The goal of this course is to familiarize students with the basic theories, history, and philosophy of international relations. This course starts out with laying out the leading theories of international relations such as realism, liberalism, and constructivism and then deals with such historical topics as World War I, World War II, the Cold War, and the Rise of China and the decline of the United States. In addition, the students will be exposed to the main philosophy of Plato, Hegel, and Marx; thereby, understanding the origins of the ideas of the end of history and the clash of civilizations.

After taking this course, students are expected to have a broader and deeper understanding of international relations and contribute to creating a better world for international society.

While above course description is very traditional, my thoughts on how to organize the final week of the course may change depending on the consciousness level of my students. Therefore, I would like to reserve the right to make changes for the final week.

### **Prerequisites**

Global History and Introduction to Political Science are formal prerequisites for students wishing to enroll in Introduction to International Relations.

## **Learning Outcomes**

- Students will have basic understanding of realism, liberalism, and constructivism, three main theoretical paradigms of international relations in the US and the West.
- By studying historical cases such as World War I, the Cold War, etc., students will develop interest in history.
- Exposure to philosophical ideas of Plato, Hegel, and Marx will deepen students' understanding of the world and their interest in philosophy
- By combining theory, history, and philosophy, students will develop analytical and debating skills that will enable them to succeed in whatever they do.

## **Textbook & Course Materials**

### **Required Text:**

Joseph S. Nye, Jr., *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*, 6th ed. (New York: Pearson Longman, 2007) (ISBN 0-321-39395-3)

While there is a more recent edition of the book, for our purposes, it does not make any difference; therefore, I recommend you to acquire a copy of the 6th edition book.

### **Recommended Readings:**

Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, trans. by Rex Warner (London: Penguin Books, 1972)

Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf., 1985)

Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979)

Alexander Wendt, "Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No. 2 (1992): 391-42.

Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984)

Richard Rosecrance, *The Rise of the Trading State: Commerce and Conquest in the Modern World* (New York: Basic Books, 1986)

Joseph R Strayer and Hans W Gatzke, *The Mainstream of Civilizations since 1789*, 4th ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1984), pp. 674-697.

Keir A. Lieber, "The New History of World War I and What It Means for International Relations Theory, " *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (Fall 2007), pp. 155-191

A. J. P. Taylor, *The Origins of the Second World War*, 2nd ed. (Greenwich: Fawcett, 1961)

Milton Friedman and Anna Jacobson Schwartz, *A monetary History of the United States, 1867-196* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963)

Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: A Touchstone Book, 1994)

Donald Palmer, *Looking at Philosophy: The Unbearable Heaviness of Philosophy Made Lighter*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006)

Robert C. Tucker, *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978)

Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Avon Books, 1992)

Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72:3 (Summer 1993)

Calvocoressi, Peter. *World politics since 1945*. Routledge, 2013.

Carr, Edward Hallett, *The Twenty Years Crisis 1919-1939*, (Reissued with a new preface from Michael Cox by Palgrave MacMillan, 2016)

Luttwak, Edward N. "From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics: Logic of Conflict, Grammar of Commerce." *The National Interest*, no. 20, 1990, pp. 17-23.

Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince* (any edition)

**LECTURE/SEMINAR/HOMEWORK HOURS**

<b>NO</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lectures &amp; Seminars</b>	<b>Home work</b>	<b>Hours total</b>
1	An Overview of the course	4	6	10
2	Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism	4	6	10
3	Realism and the Peloponnesian War	4	6	10

4	Liberalism and Constructivism	4	6	10
5	Balance of Power and the Origins of World War I	4	6	10
6	A New Interpretation of World War I	4	6	10
7	The Rise and Fall of Collective Security	4	6	10
8	Mid-term exam	2		2
9	The Origins of World War II	4	6	10
10	The history of the Cold War	4	6	10
11	The End of the Cold War	4	6	10
12	Hegel, Marxism and Communism	4	8	12
13	The End of History or the Clash of Civilizations?	4	8	12
14	The Rise of China and the decline of the US	4	8	12
15	Plato: Should Philosopher Be King? Democracy Idea Reexamined	4	8	12
16	Final Exam	2		2
	Total	60	92	152

## Part 2: Course Requirements and Grading

<b>Midterm Exam</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>Final Exam</b>	<b>30%</b>
<b>Attendance</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>Homework</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>In-Class Participation</b>	<b>25%</b>

### Attendance

Attendance in class is basic and mandatory. Under emergency situation, students should give me advance notices as soon as possible, and it will be counted as late. If you miss class more than two or three times without advance notices, you will be downgraded and your highest possible mark for In-Class Participation will be 7 of 10.

### Homework

When students have difficult time understanding a certain chapter, they will be given homework to summarize the chapter and answer some of homework questions.

### In-Class Participation

I don't want and expect my students to study only during exam periods. Therefore, it is absolutely necessary for students to actively participate in the class every time they attend. Students must prepare for in-class work in advance in order to be able to actively participate in the discussion. As far as I am concerned, it is more important for students to study everyday than on exam days.

### Mid-term and Final Exams

Students will be given mid-term and final exams at the end of week 8 and week 16.

Mid-term exam will be organized as a writing assignment in class.

The final exam will be organized as an oral one. Students will get two questions from the program; take 30 minutes to prepare and about 10 minutes for the answer and extra questions if needed.

## Part 3: Topic Outline/Schedule

### Weekly Schedule:

- Week 1. An Overview of the Course
- Week 2. Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism
- Week 3. Realism and the Peloponnesian War
- Week 4. Liberalism and Constructivism
- Week 5. Balance of Power and the Origins of World War I
- Week 6. A New Interpretation of World War I
- Week 7. The Rise and Fall of Collective Security
- Week 8. Mid-term exam
- Week 9. The Origins of World War II
- Week 10. The History of the Cold War
- Week 11. The End of the Cold War
- Week 12. Hegel, Marxism, and Communism
- Week 13. The End of History or the Clash of Civilizations?
- Week 14. The Rise of China and the Decline of the United States
- Week 15. Plato: Should Philosopher Be King? Democracy Idea Reexamined
- Week 16. Final Exam

### Class Schedule

#### Week 1: An Overview of the Course

#### Week 2: Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism

##### (1) Readings

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 1.

##### (2) Learning Objectives

This session is an introduction to basic concepts of IR. Students should be exposed to following topics:

1. What is international politics?
2. Anarchic Politics: Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism
3. Building Blocs
4. A Brief Summary of the Peloponnesian War: Causes and Theories
5. Inevitability and the Shadow of the Future
6. Ethical Questions and International Politics
7. Three Views of the Role of Morality

### **(3) Session Outline**

#### 1. What is international politics?

a world imperial system, a feudal system, and an anarchic system of states  
IR a self-help system  
Hobbes's state of nature  
Domestic law vs. International law: legal, political, and social differences

#### 2. Anarchic Politics: Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism

##### a) Realism

The dominant tradition in thinking about international politics  
Major realist scholars and political leaders: Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Hans Morgenthau, Kenneth Waltz, Henry Kissinger, etc.

##### b) Liberalism

Major liberal scholars and political leaders: Baron de Montesquieu, Immanuel Kant, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and President Woodrow Wilson  
Richard Rosecrance: Trading States

##### c) Constructivism

Alexander Wendt: Ideas, Identity, Culture, Morality, etc.

#### 3. Building Blocs

##### a) Actors: states vs. nonstate actors

b) Goals: military security, economic wealth, social issues, ecological changes, etc.

c) Instruments: military force vs. economic interdependence, communication, international institutions, and transnational actors

#### 4. A Brief Summary of the Peloponnesian War: Causes and Theories

##### a) Summary

Sparta: a conservative land-oriented state  
Athens: a commercial and sea-oriented state  
a civil war in Epidamnus: involvement of Corcyra and Corinth  
Potidaea, Megara.  
Athenian power broken after 404 B.C.

b) Causes and Theories

Thucydides's explanation of the war: "the growth of Athenian power and the fear this caused in Sparta"

Other explanations: Security dilemma, Prisoner's Dilemma, etc.

5. Inevitability and the Shadow of the Future

- a) Cooperation is difficult to develop when playing the game only once
- b) Robert Axelrod: tit for tat. good strategy when there is a "long shadow of the future"
- c) Thucydides had pessimistic view of human nature: Yale classicist Donald Kagan Athenian power actually not growing. war was not caused by impersonal forces but bad decisions in difficult circumstances

6. Ethical Questions and International Politics

a) Famous Meian Dialogue

Athenians claiming that "the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept." The lesson realists in the field of IR continue to emphasize: Might makes right.

b) Kantian and utilitarian choices in moral situation

Moral arguments can be judged in three ways: motives or intentions, the means used, and the consequences or net effects.

6. Three Views of the Role of Morality

- a) Skeptics: moral categories have no meaning in IR
- b) State Moralists: IR politics rests on a society of stae with certain rules, most important one is that of sovereignty
- c) Cosmopolitans: IR politics is not just a society of states, but also a society of individuals

**(4) Discussion/Test Questions**



1. Among three main paradigms of international relations (realism, liberalism, and constructivism), which one do you think explains international relations best? Explain why?
2. Can Ethics play a role in the field of international relations?
3. According to Thucydides, what was the main cause of the Peloponnesian War? Why do you think Thucydides is considered as one of the founding fathers of international relations?
4. What is the main lesson of the Melian Dialogue?
5. Describe Hobbesian state of nature
6. Was the Pelopponesian War inevitable?

### **Week 3: Realism and the Peloponnesian War**

#### **(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

"Six Principles of Political Realism by Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6<sup>th</sup> ed., New York: Alfred A. Knopf., 1985, pp. 4-17.

"The Melian Dialogue" by Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, trans. by Rex Warner. London: Penguin Books, 1972, pp. 400-408.

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 1.

Recommended Readings:

Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979)

#### **(2) Learning Objectives**

This session deals with the most dominant paradigm of international relations in the past, that is realism. While there are so many variants of realism, students will have a good understanding of realism if they can understand Hans Morgenthau's six principles of political realism.

This session also deals with the famous Melian dialogue: by reading a chapter from Thucydides's own writing, students would have the taste of classical readings.

By reading both Thucydides and Morgenthau, students would have a fairly good idea as to how realists understand the world and what lessons they are trying to teach the world.

### **(3) Session Outlines**

#### 1. Six Principles of Political Realism

- 1) politics is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature
- 2) the concept of interest defined in terms of power
- 3) concept of interest defined as power is an objective category which is universally valid, but it does not endow that concept with a meaning that is fixed once and for all
- 4) aware of the moral significance of political action: importance of prudence
- 5) refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe
- 6) the difference between political realism and other schools of thought is real, and it is profound.

#### 2. Athenian arguments against the Melians

"when these matters are discussed by practical people, the standard of justice depends on the equality of power to compel and that in fact the strong do what they have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept"

#### 3. Melian arguments against the Athenians

"We trust that the gods will give us fortune as good as yours, because we are standing for what is right against what is wrong; and as for what we lack in power, we trust that it will be made up for by our alliance with the Spartans, who are bound, if for no other reason, the for honour's sake, and because we are their kinsmen, to come to our help"

#### 4. Realism's message for IR scholars and people

What matters in IR is power, and might makes right. And it is not only irrational but also fatal for leaders of nation to rely upon justice, honour, fortune, sentiments, etc. for nation's future.

**(3) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. What similarities and differences do you find in Thucydides's and Morgenthau's political realism?
2. Is political realism still the most dominant paradigm in IR?
3. What is prudence?
4. What is power?
5. In what specific ways political realism different from other schools of thought?
6. Why does political realism refuse to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe?

**Week 4: Liberalism and Constructivism****(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 1.

Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), pp. 246-312

Recommended Readings:

Robert O. Keohane, *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984)

Richard Rosecrance, *The Rise of the Trading State: Commerce and Conquest in the Modern World* (New York: Basic Books, 1986)

**(2) Learning Objectives**

Liberalism has been offering the field of international relations an alternative view to realism. Economic interdependence, international institutions, democratic peace are some of the topics liberals deal with. In today's world liberalism seem to offer a better explanation of international relations than realism. Students should have a good understanding of both realism and liberalism.

After the end of the Cold War and the publication of Alexander Wendt's book, constructivism suddenly became one of three main paradigms of international relations. Its emphasis on norms, identity, culture, and morality are not new to IR; however, Wendt did a wonderful job of presenting it as a scientific viewpoint. Students should learn the concept of Hobbesian, Lockean, and Kantian anarchy.

**(3) Session Out line**1. What is liberalism?

- a) Brief explanation of Baron de Montesquieu, Immanuel Kant, Jeremy Bentham, and John Stuart Mill
- b) Liberal's emphasis on international institutions, non-state actors, international society, economic interdependence, democratic peace, transnational global society
- c) Richard Rosecrance: trading states

2. Emergence of Constructivism

- a) Alexander Wendt's constructivism
- b) Structure and roles under anarchy: Hobbesian, Lockean and Kantian Cultures
- c) The Hobbesian culture: An enemy does not recognize the right of the Self to exist as a free subject at all.
- d) The Lockean culture: The kill or be killed logic of Hobbesian state of nature has been replaced by the live and let live logic of the Lockean anarchical society: It is based on a different role structure, rivalry rather than enmity. Unlike enemies, rivals expect each other to act as if they recognize their sovereignty, their "life and liberty," as a right, and therefore not to try to conquer or dominate them
- e) The Kantian culture: The Kantian culture is based on a role structure of friendship. Disputes will be settled without war or the threat of war (the rule of non-violence); and they will fight as a team if the security of any one is threatened by a third party

**(3) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. Which theory, realism or liberalism, do you think better explain today's world?
2. Can you explain Kant's democratic peace idea?
3. What is the main argument of trading states by Rosecrance?
4. How economic interdependence leads to better cooperation among nations?
5. What kind of culture are we living in today? Hobbesian, Lockean, or Kantian?
6. Does Constructivism have a future in the study of international relations?

**Week 5: Balance of Power and the Origins of World War I****(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 3.

Recommended Readings:

Joseph R Strayer and Hans W Gatzke, *The Mainstream of Civilizations since 1789*, 4th ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1984), pp. 674-697.

**(2) Learning Objectives**

One of the most famous IR scholars of recent times, Kenneth Waltz, argued that if there is any scientific theory in international relations, balance of power is it. However, the concept of balance of power is very controversial. Some scholar use it as a means to balance power, others to balance threat, and still others as an alliance. Anyway, students will be exposed to various use of the balance of power theory.

This session also deals with the origins of World War I, one of the most discussed yet still confusing topics in IR. There are literally almost a hundred reasons as to why the war broke out. Nationalism, imperialism, militarism,

the cult of offensive, social Darwinism, naval arms race, assassination, etc. to name a few. Students will freely choose whatever cause they like to choose and advance their arguments in the class. In the process, students should be able to learn to eliminate weak arguments and come up with one or two plausible arguments for the causes of World War I.

### **(3) Session Outline**

#### 1. Balance of power

states balance power not preserve peace, but to preserve their independence. The balance of power helps preserve the anarchic system of separate states

#### 2. Power

- a) Power is the ability to achieve one's purposes or goals: Robert Dahl, defines power as the ability to get others to do what they otherwise would not do.
- b) Hard power vs. Soft power: hard power can rest on inducements ("carrots") or threats ("stick"). Soft power: getting others to want what you want. culture, ideology, and institutions
- c) Balance of power as Distribution of power, Balance of Power as Policy, Balance of Power as Multipolar Systems, and Alliances

#### 3. The Origins of World War I

- a) Three Levels of Analysis
- b) Structural level: the rise of German power and the increased rigidity in the alliance systems
- c) The rise of nationalism, increased complacency, social Darwinism, and German policy all contributed to the loss of moderation in the process of the international system and helped contribute to the onset of World War I
- d) domestic politics of Germany: an attempt by German elites to distract attention from the poor domestic integration of German society
- e) the role of individuals: Kaiser Wilhelm II, a great sense of inferiority

#### 4. Was War Inevitable?

- a) Deep causes: changes in the structure of the balance of power and certain aspects of the domestic political systems
- b) Intermediate causes: German policy
- c) Precipitating cause: the assassination of Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo by a Serbian terrorist

#### 5. What kind of War?

- a) A simple local War

- b) a one-front war
- c) a two-front war without Britain: Germany and Austria versus France and Russia
- d) a war without the US

6. Lessons of History Again

- a) Was World War I an accidental war?
- b) Beware of complacency about peace or believing that the next crisis is going to fit the same pattern as the last crisis

**(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. What is the most important function of the balance of power?
2. What is balance of power?
3. What is power? How important is soft power in today's world?
4. Can you briefly explain the road leading to World War I
5. What do you think was the most important cause for World War I?
6. Do you think World War I was avoidable?
7. What kind of lessons can we learn from World War I?

**Week 6: A New Interpretation of World War I**

**(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Keir A. Lieber, "The New History of World War I and What It Means for International Relations Theory," *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 2 (Fall 2007), pp. 155-191

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 3.

Recommended Readings:

Joseph R Strayer and Hans W Gatzke, *The Mainstream of Civilizations since 1789*, 4th ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1984), pp. 674-697.

## **(2) Learning Objectives**

This session talks about the possibility that German leaders, particularly the German Kaiser, are mainly responsible for the outbreak of World War I. Defensive Realists' main arguments such as security dilemma and the cult of offensive as well as other viewpoints will be disputed. Students will read for the first time a serious academic article, and it might be too difficult for them to digest. However, it will be a good experience anyway.

## **(3) Session Outline**

1. "blind blunder" explanations: unintended or undesired  
the concept of the security dilemma and spiral model dynamics and offense-defense variables
2. "cult of the offensive," "short-war illusion," spiral dynamics, or preemptive strike incentives do not accord with the empirical record
3. German leaders went to war in 1914 with eyes wide open: they provoked a war to achieve their goal of dominating the European continent, and did so aware that the coming conflict would almost certainly be long and bloody

## **(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. Traditionally, how did IR scholars explain World War I?
2. What is Schlieffen Plan?
3. Explain the Fischer Controversy.
4. What is defensive realism?
5. What is the New History of WW I?
6. Explain the Zuber theses.



7. Why do you think IR scholars have so much difficulty placing blame on particular leaders?

8. Would it be too much to pinpoint Germany and Kaiser Wilhelm II as the main cause of World War I?

## **Week 7: The Rise and Fall of Collective Security**

### **(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 4.

Recommended Readings:

Joseph R Strayer and Hans W Gatzke, *The Mainstream of Civilizations since 1789*, 4th ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1984), pp. 746-771.

### **(2) Learning Objectives**

In the past, Woodrow Wilson was ridiculed as an idealist; however, many people are now claiming that Wilson's ideals are becoming reality in today's world. Students will learn Wilson's idea of collective security and its history. In particular, students will learn how the United States failed to join the League and how it worked during 1920s. And why it failed eventually.

### **(3) Session Outline**

#### 1. The Rise and Fall of Collective Security

- a) League of Nations: Wilson called a utopian
- b) How does collective system work? First, make aggression illegal and outlaw offensive war. Second, deter aggression by forming a coalition of all nonaggressive states. Third, if deterrence failed and aggression occurred, all states would agree to punish the state that committed aggression

#### 2. The United States and the League of Nations

The unwillingness of states to relinquish some sovereignty in exchange for collective security lay at the heart of one of the League's most notable weaknesses: the failure of the United States to join its own creation

### 3. The Early Days of the League

- a) France "Little Entente" ; Germany enormously weakened; 1924-1930 a period of relative success
- b) The Manchurian Failure and the Ethiopian Debacle

### **(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. Why do you think Woodrow Wilson was called a utopian?
2. What are some of the critical flaws of the collective security idea?
3. Why couldn't the U.S. join the League of Nations?
4. Did the League of Nations succeed during the 1920s?
5. Why did the League of Nations fail eventually?

### **Week 8: Mid-Term Exam**

### **Week 9: The Origins of World War II**

#### **(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 4.

Recommended Readings:

Joseph R. Strayer and Hans W. Gatzke, *The Mainstream of Civilizations since 1789*, 4th ed. (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1984), pp. 746-771.

A. J. P. Taylor, *The Origins of the Second World War*, 2nd ed. (Greenwich: Fawcett, 1961)

Milton Friedman and Anna Jacobson Schwartz, *A monetary History of the United States, 1867-196* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 240-407

## **(2) Learning Objectives**

As far as World War II is concerned, most people automatically suggest that Hitler was the main cause, and it is hard to dispute such an argument. Although scholars like A. J. P. Taylor argue that Hitler was an opportunist and did not have a world domination in mind when he started the war, few people accept such arguments.

While there is no denying that World War II had a lot to do with Hitler, people have to wonder how it was possible for Hitler to gain power and also why did Japan attack Pearl Harbor. In this session, the importance of the Great Depression as the main causes of World War II will be explored.

## **(3) Session Outline**

### 1. The Origins of World War II

- a) Hitler's War? Hitler wanted War, but not the war as we now know as World War II
- b) Hitler's Strategy: First, he set out to destroy the Versailles framework through a very clever set of diplomatic maneuvers. The second phase (1936-1940) was Hitler's expansion into the small countries neighboring Germany. The third phase was short (1940). "the phony war" period. The fourth phase of Hitler's plans, "the phase of overreaching" (1941-1945), unleashed the full-scale war.
- c) the role of the individual
- d) systemic and domestic causes: 1) the Western democracies were torn apart by class cleavages and ideological disputes; 2) economic collapse; 3) the U.S. policy of isolationism

### 2. Was War Inevitable?

No, but it became increasingly likely as time passed. In 1926 (after the Locarno treaties), that probability diminished, but after the Great Depression in 1929 and Hitler's ascent to power in 1933, the funnel of choices narrowed until the war became global in 1941

### 3. The Pacific War

The war in the Pacific had separate origins. In the 1930s, the military and extreme nationalists gained control of the government. When the Depression cut Japan's trade, they faced a bleak future. Tried to create what it called the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

### 4. The role of the Soviet Union in WWII ?

### 5. Lessons of World War II

a) Some say key lessons of the 1930s is the evil of appeasement: appeasement was the wrong approach to Hitler, but British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain was not such a coward as the Munich experience makes him out to be. He wanted to avoid another world war.

## **(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. Do you think World War II was Hitler's war?
2. What do you think is the most important causes of World War II?
3. What is main argument of A.J.P Taylor?
4. What impact did the Great Depression have on the rise of Hitler and the outbreak of World War II?
5. How do you explain the origins of the Pacific War?

## **Week 10: The History of the Cold War**

### **(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 5.

### **(2) Learning Objectives**

This session deals with the origins of the Cold War, and how American scholars view the causes of the Cold War. Three approaches to the Cold War

interpretation will be examined as well as six main issues that the United States and the Soviet Union clashed.

Also, the idea of the Truman Doctrine and George Kennan's Containment will be examined. In particular, Kennan's containment policy had been the foundation of American foreign policy for almost fifty years.

Issues of nuclear weapons and the significance of the Cuban missile crisis will also be examined. Students will be exposed to nuclear jargons such as MAD, Deterrence, Second-Strike capability, etc. While serious scholars no longer talk about these topics, it will be interesting for students for intellectual and historical purposes to know these things.

### **(3) Session Outline**

#### 1. Three Approaches to the Cold War: the traditionalists, the revisionists, and postrevisionists

- a) The traditionalists: Stalin and the Soviet Union are responsible for the outbreak of the Cold War
- b) The revisionists: the Cold War was caused by American rather than Soviet expansionism. Level one revisionists stress the importance of individuals. Level two revisionists see the problem not in individuals, but in the nature of U.S. capitalism.
- c) The postrevisionists: they argue that the traditionalists and revisionists are both wrong because nobody was to blame for starting the Cold War. Bipolar structure of the postwar balance of power. The Soviets and the Americans had different goals at the end of the war. The Soviets wanted tangible possessions--territory. Americans had intangible or milieu goals--they were interested in the general context of world politics.
- d) Later postrevisionist like Gaddis moving toward a traditionalist viewpoint: become increasingly convinced that the USSR was primarily responsible for the onset and nature of the superpower conflict

#### 2. Roosevelt's and Stalin's Policies

- a) Roosevelt placed too much faith in the United Nations, overestimated the likelihood of American isolationism, and most important, underestimated Stalin
- b) Stalin was a committed communist who, although he saw the world within the framework of communism, often used pragmatic tactics

#### 3. Phases of the Conflict

The early stages of the Cold War can be divided into three phases: 1945-1947--the gradual onset; 1947-1949--the declaration of the Cold War; and 1950-1962--the height of the Cold War

a) The early stages of the Cold War: six issues

- i) Soviet actions in Poland and Eastern Europe
- ii) The lend-lease aid program abruptly stopped
- iii) German reparation problem
- iv) East Asia
- v) The atomic bomb
- vi) The eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East

b) The second phase (1947-1949): Greece and Turkey

- i) The Truman Doctrine: talked about the need to protect free people everywhere
- ii) Two shocks in 1949: the explosion of the atomic bomb by the Soviet Union and communization of China
- iii) NSC-68: called for a vast increase in the U.S. defense expenditure
- iv) The outbreak of the Korean War

#### 4. Levels of Analysis

a) Societal explanations

Constructivists point out that the Russian political culture emphasized absolutism rather than democracy, a desire for a strong leader, fear of anarchy, fear of invasion, a worry or shame about backwardness, and secrecy. In addition, the communist system treated class rather than individual rights as the basis for justice. In contrast, the American culture emphasized liberal democracy, pluralism, and fragmentation of power. Instead of shame of backwardness, the United States took pride in its technology and expanding economy. Isolated and open government. Instead of class, individual justice.

#### 5. Containment

- a) Two large ambiguities: whether to contain Soviet power or to contain communism; and whether to spend resources to prevent any expansion of Soviet power or just in certain key areas that seemed critical to the balance of power
- b) George Kennan's idea of containment: against the Truman Doctrine. involved fewer military means and was more selective.

#### 6. The Rest of the Cold War

a) Khrushchev failed in the Berlin crisis of 1958-1961 and again in the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962

- b) From 1969 to 1974, detente of Nixon administration
- c) Soviet invasion of Afghanistan

**(2) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. What do you think were the main causes of the Cold War?
2. Do you think if the US and the USSR acted differently, would they have averted the Cold War?
3. Explain the difference between the Truman Doctrine and Kennan's containment.
4. From a constructivist's point of view, is it possible for two superpowers with such a different culture to come together?
5. What lessons did the US and USSR learn from the Cuban Missile Crisis?

**Week 11: The End of the Cold War****(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 5.

Recommended Readings:

Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: A Touchstone Book, 1994), pp. 762-804

**(2) Learning Objectives**

When the Cold War ended in 1991 (1989 depending on who you ask), Americans celebrated their "victory." A lot of people claimed that their patient containment policy advocated by George Kenna finally paid off. Some even claimed that it was Regan's hard policy that pushed the Soviet Union on the verge of breakdown. And realist scholars later claimed that it was the breakdown of the Soviet economy that led to the fall of communism. Not many people at least in the U.S. gave credit to Gorbachev's policy, intended or unintended. This session should examine the flaws of the

traditional explanations for the end of the Cold War and pay more attention to individual role played by Gorbachev.

**(3) Session Outline**

1. Why did the Cold War end?

- a) Containment worked
- b) "Imperial overstretch"
- c) the U.S. military buildup in the 1980s forced the Soviets to surrender in the Cold War

2. Precipitating, intermediate, and deep causes for the timing of the end of the Cold War

- a) Precipitating cause: Mikhail Gorbachev's *perestroika and glasnost*
- b) Intermediate causes: soft power of liberal ideas and imperial overstretch
- c) Deep causes: the decline of communist ideology and the failure of the Soviet economy

3. The Role of Nuclear Weapons

- a) revived the concept of limited war
- b) crises replaced central war as the moments of truth
- c) nuclear weapons made deterrence the key strategy
- d) the development of a de facto regime of superpower prudence
- e) the superpowers learned to communicate

4. The Cuban Missile Crisis

- a) October 1962. 13 day crisis. risks of losing control weighed heavily on President Kennedy

**(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

- 1. What are some of the weaknesses of the "imperial overstretch" argument or U.S. military buildup explanation for the end of the Cold War?
- 2. How important was Gorbachev's role in ending the Cold War?
- 3. What would be a constructivist's explanation of the end of the Cold War?
- 4. What lessons can we learn from the end of the Cold War?
- 5. What do you think is the role of nuclear weapons in today's world?



6. What lessons did the superpowers learn from the Cuban Missile Crisis?

## **Week 12: Hegel, Marxism, and Communism**

### **(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Donald Palmer, *Looking at Philosophy: The Unbearable Heaviness of Philosophy Made Lighter*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006), pp. 258-270.

Recommended Readings:

Robert C. Tucker, *The Marx-Engels Reader*, 2nd ed. (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1978), introduction.

### **(2) Learning Objectives**

In order to understand Karl Marx, we need to talk about Hegel and Feuerbach. Hegel saw history as marching of spirit, and through the process of thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis, spirit realizes its true reality. As far as Hegel is concerned everything in this world is actually spirit. And man is God self-alienated. On the other hand, Feuerbach believed that even spiritual things such as God are in fact created by human imagination and frustration.

Marx criticized both Hegel and Feuerbach yet borrowed many concepts from them, such as alienation, thesis, anti-thesis, etc. As far as Marx is concerned, alienation of labor is the greatest in the capitalist society with the possible exception of slavery, and eventually the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeois will lead to the fall of capitalism. In a communist society, everybody will create things according to their creative desires and be happy. Students will be exposed to Marx's idea of communism and make a judgement as to what would be our best economic system.

### **(3) Session Outline**

1. Hegel asserted, "Man is God self-alienated"

History march of Spirit. Thesis, Anti-thesis, and synthesis. History ends with absolute freedom.

2. Feuerbach "God is man self-alienated"

Beauty, justice, idea, etc. projection of human beings.

3. Marx called Feuerbach as a crypto-idealist

Feuerbach thought himself as idealist but as far as Marx is concerned, he is really a materialist, thus the name crypto-idealist

4. The concept of alienation

the process of the subject being split from its natural objects. Marx preferred the designation *homo faber* to *homo sapiens*. Alienation happens if the work a person performs is not the expression of natural creative need but is motivated by the necessity of fulfilling other needs, such as economic or avaricious ones.

5. Foundation vs. Superstructure

Foundation: natural resources, means of production, and means of distribution

Superstructure: art, religion, poetry, and philosophy.

6. Class struggle and internal contradictions of capitalism

conflict between proletariat and bourgeois

capitalism's emphasis on competition leads to its own opposite, monopoly.

capitalism's need to solve the problem of unemployment

7. Classless utopian world

private ownership will be abolished, as well as the division of labor. We will all be artists and philosophers, and we will "hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticize (poetry) after dinner, just as (we) have in mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic."

**(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. Explain the ideas of Man is God self-alienated and God is man self-alienated
2. What is alienation for Marx?
3. How is superstructure created for Marx?
4. Explain internal contradictions of capitalism.

5. It is relatively easy to understand Marx's idea of communism in economic aspects, but what about politics? How should it be run in a classless society?
6. Without the division of labor, is it possible to achieve expertise in the field of medicine, engineering, etc. that require a long time of training and practice?
7. Do you think true communism is possible in our world?

## **Week 13: The End of History or the Clash of Civilizations**

### **(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Nye, *Understanding International Conflicts*, ch. 9.

Recommended Readings:

Francis Fukuyama, *The End of History and the Last Man* (New York: Avon Books, 1992)

Samuel Huntington, "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72:3 (Summer 1993)

### **(2) Learning Objectives**

After the end of the Cold War, Francis Fukuyama boldly came up with the idea that the history has ended with the victory of liberal democracy. He borrows main ideas from Hegel. Utilizing the concept of the struggle for recognition, Fukuyama argues that only the democratic system has no inner contradiction, while kingship, dictatorship, communism, monarchy, etc. all have inner problems. As far as Fukuyama is concerned, nobody can replace the idea of democracy since everybody is recognized as equal; thus, history has ended.

In contrast to Fukuyama, Huntington argued that history has not only ended but also will intensify according to civilizational fault lines. Before the Cold War, nations fought for political, ideological, and economical reasons, but from now on they will fight for civilizational reasons. Students will study both Fukuyama and Huntington and they will decide whose view is more rational.

**(3) Session Outline**

1. The End of History

Liberal democracy as the final form of human government

Alternatives to liberal democracy: fascism, communism, dictatorship, etc.

Over time, however, liberal capitalism proved more successful in producing a higher level of welfare and citizen participation

2. The Clash of Civilizations

Huntington argued that rather than the fundamental sources of conflict in the new world being primarily ideological or economic, the great divisions that would dominate conflict would be cultural. He divided the world into eight great "civilizations" and predicted conflict along the fault lines of those civilizations

**(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. How come people began to accept the legitimacy of liberal democracy?
2. Is it possible for us to have a political system other than democracy in the future?
3. How much do you think the future of international relations will be clash of civilizations?

**Week 15: Plato: Should Philosopher Be King? Democracy Idea Reexamined**

**(1) Readings**

Required Readings:

Donald Palmer, *Looking at Philosophy: The Unbearable Heaviness of Philosophy Made Lighter*, 4<sup>th</sup> ed. (Boston: McGraw Hill, 2006), pp. 59-71.

**(2) Learning Objectives**

Western philosophy begins and ends with Plato. Students will be exposed to Plato's basic ideas such as the myth of the cave, justice, and philosopher king idea. As far as Plato is concerned, it is wrong for soldiers and common people to rule the government. Only the people who are enlightened such as philosopher should run the government. However, philosophers should have

no private property and no family, and their concern would only be the happiness of the whole people, while common people can have private property and family. In today's world so many "unqualified" people select "unqualified" leaders. Do you think it is good idea to have democracy as many people commonly believe or there is a merit in philosopher king idea?

**(3) Session Outline****1. The Myth of the Cave**

Plato suggests that if the enlightened man were to return to the cave, he would appear ridiculous because he would see sunspots everywhere and not be able to penetrate the darkness. And if he tried to liberate his fellow prisoners they would be so angry at him for disturbing their illusions that they would set upon him and kill him--a clear allusion to the death of Socrates.

**2. Knowledge vs. Opinion and the intelligible world vs. the visible world**  
knowledge consists of understanding and pure reason; opinion consists of belief and conjecture. The intelligible world consists of the forms and scientific concepts. The visible world consists of particular objects and images.

**3. What is justice: philosopher should be king**

individual's psyche has three aspects: the appetitive, animal side; the spirited source of action; and the rational aspect  
The ideal City also have three classes: the workers and the artisans; the soldiers; and the rulers. In the City, the rulers must be philosophers who have beheld the Forms and therefore know what is good.

**(4) Discussion/Test Questions**

1. What is enlightenment? Do you believe that somebody can have a lot better knowledge and understanding of the world than others? If that is possible, is it not a good idea for them to rule the country?
2. What are some of weaknesses of democracy?
3. Why would Plato object to the idea of country being ruled by either soldiers or common people?
4. Can you make sense of Plato's philosopher king idea?

**Week 16: Final Exam**