

DHP P291**Power in Theory and Practice
Spring 2018**

Professor Daniel Drezner
Cabot 611
7-4720

daniel.drezner@tufts.edu

Office hours: Wednesday 1 PM – 3:30 PM or by appointment

OVERVIEW

Those who study international politics for a living are certain about two facts: power is the defining concept of the discipline, and each scholar's idiosyncratic definition of power is superior to everyone else's. This lack of consensus is a problematic state of affairs. The most widely-cited definition is Robert Dahl's: "A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would otherwise not do." Most scholars, however, cite Dahl's definition only to criticize it. This problem has been compounded by the enormous gap between theoretical debates about power and efforts to develop concrete ways to measure and observe it.

The practical need for a better conceptual and empirical understanding of power should be obvious. In the decade since the 2008 financial crisis, there have been an extraordinary series of debates about whether the distribution of power has been rejiggered. Scholars and commentators have fiercely debated the relative power of the United States and China. Some argued that the 2008 financial crisis left the United States as still the most powerful actor in the world; others argue that it is now China. Public opinion polling shows that ordinary citizens are as divided as experts about these questions. Scholars and policymakers appear similarly split on Russia's relative power. Others have argued that the nature of power itself has diffused so rapidly that no actor or concert of actors can credibly wield authority anymore.

The goal of this course is to confront these conceptual and empirical problems head-on, so as to get a better understanding of what power means, its myriad dimensions, how it is perceived over time, and how it is exercised by actors in world politics.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

A note about the readings. This is a seminar course for Fletcher students. This means that I expect you to have done all of the readings in advance and that you are prepared to discuss them in class. Indeed, you will be expected to email me discussion

questions the morning of our class sessions. I place great importance on this: you will note that 20% of your grade is determined by your class participation. Read *all* of the assigned materials before class meets. I am aware that this is not the only course you will be taking this quarter, and I have really, really tried to keep the number of pages per week down. Scanning the syllabus, you will probably believe this claim to be insincere, but trust me, there is a lot that is being left out.

You will have two written assignments for this class. The first paper, due right before spring break, is a 2,000 word essay that defines and categorized who you think the great powers are in world politics. The second paper, due the last day of reading period, is a 2,500 word analytical essay that hypothesizes which components of the current liberal international order are most likely to endure through the year 2100.

All told, your grade in this course will be determined as follows:

Class participation	30%
First paper	30%
Second paper	40%

THE READINGS

Required books

David Baldwin, *Power and International Relations: A Conceptual Approach* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2016).

Daniel W. Drezner, *Theories of International Politics and Zombies*, Revived Edition. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).

David Edelstein, *Over the Horizon: Time, Uncertainty, and the Rise of Great Powers* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2017).

Oona Hathaway and Scott Shapiro, *The Internationalists: How a Radical Plan to Outlaw War Remade the World* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2017).

Steven Lukes, *Power: A Radical View*, second edition (London: Palgrave, 2005).

Joseph Nye, *The Future of Power* (New York: PublicAffairs, 2011).

Mary Elise Sarotte, *1989: The Struggle to Create Post-Cold War Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014).

COURSE OUTLINE

Week 1 (1/23): Greetings and salutations and power and world politics

Drezner, *Theories of International Politics and Zombies*, all.

Thucydides, “The Melian Dialogue,” from *History of the Peloponnesian War*.

Week 2 (1/30): The historiography and definition of power

Robert A. Dahl, “The Concept of Power.” *Behavioral Science* 2 (July 1957): 201-215.

Peter Bachrach and Morton S. Baratz. “Two Faces of Power,” *American Political Science Review* 56 (December 1962): 947-952.

Lukes, *Power: A Radical View*, all.

Peter Digeser, “The fourth face of power,” *Journal of Politics* 54 (November 1992): 977-1007. (1992)

Baldwin, *Power and International Relations*, chapters two and three.

Week 3 (2/6): Is power in world politics different from domestic politics?

J. David Singer, “The level-of-analysis problem in international relations,” *World Politics* 14 (October 1961): 77-92.

Helen Milner, “The assumption of anarchy in international relations theory: a critique.” *Review of International Studies* 17 (January 1991): 67-85.

Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, “Power in International Relations,” *International Organization* 59 (January 2005): 39-75.

Seva Gunitsky, “From Shocks to Waves: Hegemonic Transitions and Democratization in the Twentieth Century,” *International Organization* 68 (Summer 2014): 561-597.

Patrick J. McDonald, “Great Powers, Hierarchy, and Endogenous Regimes: Rethinking the Domestic Causes of Peace,” *International Organization* 69 (Summer 2015): 557-588.

Stacie Goddard and Daniel Nexon, “The Dynamics of Global Power Politics: A Framework for Analysis,” *Journal of Global Security Studies* 1 (February 2016): 4-18.

Week 4 (2/13): Power and time

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, “International norm dynamics and political change,” *International Organization* 52 (Autumn 1998): 887-917.

Paul Pierson, “Increasing returns, path dependence, and the study of politics,” *American Political Science Review* 94 (June 2000): 251-267.

Monica Duffy Toft, “Issue Indivisibility and Time Horizons as Rationalist Explanations for War,” *Security Studies* 15 (January/March 2006): 34-69.

Scott E. Page, “Path Dependence,” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science* 1 (2006): 87-115.

Edelstein, *Over the Horizon*, introduction and chapter one.

Week 5 (2/19, 7:00 PM: NOTE SPECIAL DATE/TIME): The fungibility of power

Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye. “Power and Interdependence revisited,” *International Organization* 41 (Autumn 1987): 725-753.

Robert Art, “American foreign policy and the fungibility of force,” *Security Studies* 5.4 (Summer 1996): 7-42.

David Baldwin, “Force, fungibility, and influence,” *Security Studies* 8 (Summer 1999): 173-183.

Rebecca Adler-Nissen and Vincent Pouliot. “Power in practice: Negotiating the international intervention in Libya.” *European Journal of International Relations* 20 (December 2014): 889-911.

Week 6 (2/27): Operationalizing and measuring power

Ashley Tellis et al, *Measuring national power in the postindustrial age*. Rand Corporation; 2001.

U.S. National Intelligence Council, *The World in 2036*.

Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, “The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers in the Twenty-First Century: China's Rise and the Fate of America's Global Position,” *International Security* 40 (Winter 2015/16): 7-53.

Nye, *The Future of Power*, chapter one.

Week 7 (3/6): Power and international relations theory

Robert Cox, “Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory,” *Millennium* 10 (June 1981): 126-155.

Baldwin, *Power and International Relations*, rest.

Edelstein, *Over the Horizon*, rest.

J. Ann Tickner, “What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions,” *International Studies Quarterly* 49 (March 2005): 1-21.

Week 8 (3/13): Military power

Erik Gartzke, Jeffrey Kaplow, and Rupal Mehta, “Deterrence and the Structure of Nuclear Forces,” working paper, UC-San Diego, August 2017.

Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), chapter one.

Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, “Don't Come Home, America: The Case against Retrenchment.” *International Security* 37 (Winter 2012/13): 7-51.

Daniel W. Drezner, “Military Primacy Doesn't Pay (Nearly As Much As You Think).” *International Security* 38 (Summer 2013): 52-79.

Nye, *The Future of Power*, chapter two.

3/14, 2:00 PM: FIRST PAPER DUE.

Week 9 (3/27): Economic power

Leslie Gelb, “GDP Now Matters More Than Force,” *Foreign Affairs* 89 (November/December 2010): 35-43.

Daniel W. Drezner, “Bad Debts: Assessing China's Financial Influence in Great Power Politics.” *International Security* 34 (Fall 2009): 7-45.

Lori Buck, Nicole Gallant, and Kim Richard Nossal, “Sanctions as a Gendered Instrument of Statecraft: The Case of Iraq,” *Review of International Studies* 24 (January 1998): 69-84.

Christina Lai, “Acting one way and talking another: China’s coercive economic diplomacy in East Asia and beyond,” *The Pacific Review* 31 (Spring 2018): 169-187.

John Hurley, Scott Morris, and Gailyn Portelance, “Examining the Debt Implications of the Belt and Road Initiative from a Policy Perspective.” CGD Policy Paper 121, Center for Global Development, March 2018.

Nye, *The Future of Power*, chapter three.

Week 10 (4/3): Legal power

Jack Goldsmith and Eric Posner, “A Theory of Customary International Law,” *University of Chicago Law Review* 66 (Autumn 1999): 1113-1177.

Abbott, Kenneth W., Robert O. Keohane, Andrew Moravcsik, Anne-Marie Slaughter, and Duncan Snidal. “The Concept of Legalization,” *International Organization* 54 (Summer 2000): 401-419.

Hathaway and Shapiro, *The Internationalists*, all.

Week 11 (4/10): Soft power

Rodney Bruce Hall, “Moral Authority as a Power Resource,” *International Organization* 51 (Autumn 1997): 591-622.

David Singh Grewal, “Network power and Globalization,” *Ethics & International Affairs* 17 (September 2003): 89-98.

Jean-Marc F. Blanchard and Fujia Lu. “Thinking hard about soft power: A review and critique of the literature on China and soft power.” *Asian Perspective* 36 (October/December 2012): 565-589.

Carol Atkinson, “Does soft power matter? A comparative analysis of student exchange programs 1980–2006,” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6 (January 2010): 1-22.

Nye, *The Future of Power*, chapter four.

Week 12 (4/17): Power and non-state actors

Bas Arts, “Non-state actors in global governance: Three faces of power.” Preprints aus der Max-Planck-Projektgruppe Recht der Gemeinschaftsgüter, No. 2003/4.

Doris Fuchs, “Commanding heights? The strength and fragility of business power in global politics.” *Millennium* 33 (June 2005): 771-801.

Niall Ferguson, “The False Prophecy of Hyperconnection: How to Survive the Networked Age.” *Foreign Affairs* 96 (September/October 2017): 68-79.

Josh Busby, “Bono Made Jesse Helms Cry: Jubilee 2000, Debt Relief, and Moral Action in International Politics,” *International Studies Quarterly* 51 (June 2007): 247-508.

Week 13 (4/24): Power, the end of the Cold War, and the present day

Sarotte, 1989, all.

Hal Brands and Charles Edel, “The Disharmony of the Spheres,” *Commentary*, December 14, 2017.

Richard Haass, “America and the Great Abdication,” *The Atlantic*, December 28, 2017.

Evan Osnos, “Making China Great Again,” *The New Yorker*, January 8, 2018.

G. John Ikenberry, “The end of the liberal international order?” *International Affairs* 94 (January 2018): 7-23.

5/1, 2:00 PM: FINAL PAPER DUE