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**Course Description**

This course will provide an overview of the central theoretical concepts and debates in the field of international relations. The first part of the course will focus on questions that have preoccupied scholars since the time of Thucydides: What are the implications of anarchy for order and justice in world politics? What are the conditions for peace and stability in world politics? Is military power all that matters in determining politics among nations? How useful are the major theoretical frameworks of Realism, Liberalism, and Constructivism? What do we learn from newer frameworks that add more diverse voices and subjects like feminism and post-colonialism?

What role do moral, legal, and humanitarian considerations play in the conduct of international relations?  Have new norms about human rights and the responsibility (R2P) to protect changed the way that states interact with each other and their populations? Is an interstate war likely in today’s security environment or has war fundamentally changed? What happens when we apply historical theories of international relations to different contexts like Africa?

The second part of this course will examine the historical development of great power politics. We will examine topics such as the origins of the First and Second World Wars, the Cold War, and the nuclear revolution. The third part of the course will examine whether traditional conceptions of international relations continue to be relevant in the contemporary world. What new concepts and theories have scholars developed about world politics since the end of the Cold War? Will conflicts among nations be replaced by clashes among civilizations? Will new great powers like China fundamentally change the international system as they become more powerful? What are the implications of North Korea’s expanding nuclear program? What is the future of the liberal world order in the 21st century?

This course is not explicitly focused on current events, but since our subject matter involves theoretical and conceptual issues about the nature of world politics, we expect all students to be up to date on important world events and policy debates. It is for this reason that all students must purchase a subscription to the *New York Times*. Following one or more of the many websites and blogs that focus on international relations can also greatly improve your understanding of the subject matter. The websites at *ForeignAffairs.com* and *realworld.com* are excellent places to start.

**Course Requirements and Evaluation**

1. Two 6-7 page essays. Each essay will count for 25**% of final grade**. Both of these essays will be based on the assigned readings. Due dates will be assigned well in advance.
2. Final Exam. 25**% of final grade**. The final will be an in-class exam that covers material for the entire semester. The date of the exam will be scheduled by the registrar.
3. Class Participation, Attendance, and Glow Participation. **25% of final grade**. All three of these components are important in determining your grade.

Regular attendance and participation is crucial for the successful functioning of this course. We do not formally take attendance every class, but we note absences and may be in touch with any student that misses class without an explanation. If you have a legitimate reason for missing class, you should send a note prior to the class meeting. Repeated unexplained and unauthorized absences may have a noticeable impact on your final grade. Making up a false story about your absence from class may have harsher consequences.

We expect all students to be ready and prepared to participate intelligently in every class session. We do not judge class participation by quantity or volume, and it is important to allow everyone a chance to participate. Instructions and expectations for GLOW participation will be outlined on a separate handout.

The use of laptops is not permitted without express written permission from the Dean of the College. All smartphones or equivalent devices must be securely put away and out of reach or sight before class begins. Any intentional violation of this policy may result in penalties up to and including expulsion from the course.

**Teaching Assistant**

The TA for this course is Giebien Na. He can be reached at gn4@williams.edu. Giebien is available for help with drafts of papers and anything related to posting on the GLOW system. Please be respectful of his time and schedule appointments with him well in advance of paper due dates.

**Course Materials**

There are no required books for this class. All class readings will be found in the course packets or handed out in class. We do not use the packet room. All course packets will be either brought to class or available at our offices. Please note that we may add or subtract readings from the latter part of the syllabus if better sources become available on our more current topics.

All students are required to obtain a subscription to the *New York Times* for the duration of the semester. You can subscribe for one dollar a week, which is a great bargain. You can find out more information here: <http://www.nytimes.com/subscriptions/edu/lp898Q4.html?campaignId=3J4JL>

We understand that there may be other ways, legal and illegal, to access the *NYT*. But in order to ensure that we are all on the same page, we are requiring all students to subscribe through the official channel. Proof of a subscription must be provided to Giebien no later than September 11.

**Class Schedule**

**Sept 6: Introduction**

**Sept 10: Violence and the Logic of Anarchy**

Anarchy is the central concept in the study of world politics. The fact that world politics takes place in a system without a central authority has tremendous implications for all of the actors, both large and small.

Thomas Hobbes, *Leviathan* (1651), Chapter 13, pp. 86-90. The indispensable foundation for understanding the condition of anarchy in world politics, despite the fact that Hobbes was concerned almost exclusively with domestic political systems. Perhaps the most important four pages of reading we will encounter over the entire semester.

Jesse McKinley, “California Officials Tackle a Toothy Lake Predator,” *New York Times*, September 12, 2007. What does a news story about the invasion of Lake Davis by Northern Pike in the 2000’s help explain about the logic of action in the international system? Quite a bit, but the differences are as important as the similarities.

Steven Pinker, *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined* (2011), pp. 1-30. A great overview of our violent and brutal past, which Pinker argues has become much less violent over time. How to account for the relative peacefulness of our current era is a major subtheme of this course. Please note the use of the word “relative.”

**Sept 13:  Realism and World Politics**

Realism remains an important theoretical framework for understanding world politics. The assigned readings by Machiavelli and Morgenthau, separated by over four centuries, both illustrate some of the underlying assumptions and theoretical expectations of the Realist tradition. The article by Snyder introduces you to the leading theoretical challengers to Realism.

Niccolo Machiavelli, *The Prince* (1515), Chapters 14-15, 17-18. Machiavelli’s purpose was to offer advice to a ruler about how to successfully rule his subjects, but his perspective is very important for capturing some essential characteristics of Realism. If you can understand the advice Machiavelli provides to the prince, you will also understand a great deal about state behavior in world politics.

Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations* (1948), pp. 3-17. An exile from Hitler’s Germany, Morgenthau exerted a tremendous influence on American elites after the Second World War.

Jacob Heilbrunn, “Realism is Back,” *Politico* (Sept/Oct 2017), pp. 1-4.

Jack Snyder, “One World, Rival Theories,” *Foreign Policy* (Nov/Dec 2004), pp. 52-62.

**Sept 17: Thucydides and the Causes of War**

Many scholars insist that almost everything you need to know about the essence of international relations can be gleaned from Thucydides. While that may be overstated, this account of conflict in Ancient Greece is an excellent and gripping introduction to the causes of war. Pay particular attention to the specific reasons offered by the Athenians and the Spartans for the decisions they make, as well as to the speeches of the Athenian leader Pericles. The Melian Dialogue (400-408) is a classic text of IR. Do not get lost in obscure dates and places; focus your attention on the essentially theoretical arguments made by Pericles, the Spartans, Corinthians and Melians to justify/explain their actions.

Victor Davis Hanson, “Raw, Relevant History,” *New York Times*, April 18, 1998.

Thucydides, *The Peloponnesian War* (circa 400 B.C), 72-87, 103-108, 118-123, 156-164, 400-408. Do not get lost in obscure dates and places; focus your attention on the essentially theoretical arguments made by Pericles, the Spartans, Corinthians and Melians to justify/explain their actions.

**Sept 20: Liberalism and World Politics**

Liberalism is the main rival to Realism in efforts to understand the nature of world politics. Liberals believe that cooperation in the international arena is possible. Daniel Drezner imagines how different theories of international relations would handle a global invasion of zombies. He outlines the ways liberals would seek to promote cooperation in the event of a zombie invasion including through global governance structures like the World Zombie Organization (WZO). Joanne Gowa critically analyzes a central theory within liberalism, the “democratic peace.”

Daniel Drezner, *Theories of International Politics and Zombies* (2015), “Introduction…To the Undead” (for an explanation of: why zombies?) pp.1-10 and “Regulating the Undead in a Liberal World Order,” pp. 51-64.

Joanne Gowa, “Introduction,” in *Ballots and Bullets: The Elusive Democratic Peace* (2000, pp. 3-11.

**Sept 24**: **Constructivism and World Politics**

Constructivism is a relatively new way of thinking about international relations. Its basic premise is that power between states is socially constructed and “inter-subjective.” That is, power is not simply a tally of planes, tanks, and ICBMs, but rather a web of relations and mutual recognition. Barnett summarizes the emergence of constructivism and illustrates how constructivist understand topic like refugees. Finnemore compares constructivism to neorealism and neoliberalism and applies a constructivist lens to patterns in international relations.

Michael Barnett, “Social Constructivism,” in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (2011), pp. 150-165.

Martha Finnemore, “Chapter One: Defining State Interests,” in *National Interests in International Security* (1996), pp. 1-33.

**Sept 27: Feminism/Gender in International Relations**

Feminist theorists in international relations make women visible as subjects in the study of global politics. They ask what theories of international relations miss when they ignore a large portion of the world’s population. Feminist scholars ask new questions about current topics in the field, like war and governance, and introduce new topics of study into the field, like military prostitution.

J. Ann Tickner and Laura Sjoberg, “Feminism,” in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* 3rd edition (2013), pp. 195-212.

Cynthia Enloe, *The Big Push* (2017), pp. 53-63.

**Oct 1:** **Postcolonialism**

Postcolonial theory emerged within the humanities, but postcolonial theorists have contributed to the study of international relations by broadening its historical and geographic lens. Postcolonial international relations challenges concepts that underlie the story of international relations like anarchy and sovereignty. A truly international international relations includes voices not only from the “global North” but also perspectives from the “global South.” Shampa Biswas introduces postcolonial international relations as a theoretical framework and applies this perspective to understanding the Iranian negotiations. Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey demonstrate what postcolonial theory contributes to security studies, a key field of study within international relations.

Shampa Biswas, “Postcolonialism,” in *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* 4th edition eds. Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, Steve Smith (2016), pp. 219-233.

Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, “The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies,” *Review of International Studies* (2006) pp. 329-352.

**Oct 4:** **Germany and the Origins of the First World War**

The discipline of international relations emerged as an effort to understand how the nations of Europe found themselves in a horrific conflict after almost a century of relative peace. The central question is whether the war was a result of Germany’s conscious and deliberate move to establish continental hegemony, or whether it was largely an “accidental war” brought about by mistaken conceptions of military strategy, bad leadership, and a willingness by all parties to run the risk of war to achieve national goals.

Michael Howard, *The First World War* (1988), pp. 18-31.

Patrick Glynn, *Closing Pandora’s Box* (1992), p. 1-44. A strong critique of the accidental war thesis.

Margaret MacMillan, “The Rhyme of History: Lessons of the Great War,” *The Brookings Essay* (2013), pp. 1-11.

**Oct 8: Reading Period**

**Oct 11: Collective Security and Appeasement: The Interwar Era**

It was the fervent hope of President Woodrow Wilson and much of the world that the end of the European war would usher in a lasting era of peace and collective security. Why Wilsonianism did not bring about such an era, and how Adolf Hitler was able to plunge Europe and the world into another total conflict, are two of the central issues of IR theory and world history. Spoiler alert: the answer is a little more complicated than “Hitler” and/or “appeasement.”

Donald Kagan, *On the Origin of War and the Preservation of Peace* (1995), pp. 281-297, 334-345, 382-417. A fairly standard account of the origins of the Second World War. Many historians would dispute his emphasis on appeasement.

Paul Kennedy, “A Time to Appease,” *The National Interest* (July/Aug 2010), pp. 7-17.

**Oct 15: The Long Peace: Bipolarity, Cold War, and the Creation of the Liberal Order**

The United States and the Soviet Union were ideological enemies armed with the most destructive weapons in history. Many people predicted that the Cold War would either go on indefinitely or end in another world war. The Waltz chapter is the most influential theoretical analysis of why a bipolar system turned out to be more stable and peaceful than predicted. What does it mean to be a great power (or a pole, or a superpower)? What happens to the importance of alliances and balancing when two states have so much more power than the rest of the world? The Ikenberry reading reminds us that the "long peace" also resulted from the decisions and choices of postwar leaders about the types of policies that would lead to prosperity and stability for America and Western Europe.

Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, pp 161-193.

G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan*, pp. 159-185.

**Oct 18:** **The Nuclear Revolution**

Most of us now take it for granted that nuclear weapons lead to a more peaceful world, at least at the level of great powers. It is hard to appreciate that for many decades the prospect of a nuclear exchange between the great powers was far from unthinkable. The Jervis chapter explains why a world with nuclear weapons is qualitatively different than one with conventional weapons. The Mueller chapter raises some skepticism about the widely held belief that the non-occurrence of WWIII is primarily due to nuclear weapons.

Robert Jervis, *The Illogic of American Nuclear Strategy* (1984), pp. 19-46.

John Mueller, *Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al-Qaeda* (2010), pp. 39-43.

**Oct 22: The Transformation of War and the “New Wars” Model**

War used to be considered violence on a battlefield, but today war has shifted into something that looks quite different. Mary Kaldor describes this shift in warfare and argues that today we are engaged in “new wars.” Carolyn Nordstrom illustrates what new war looks like on the ground and the fuzziness of the term “war” today. \*\*Please note this excerpt describes violence in war in detail which might be challenging to read. This chapter is not gratuitous, but Nordstrom’s point is that most people do not know what war looks like and if we are studying war we should seriously consider how it is experienced by individuals. If you have any concerns with completing this reading please see the professors.\*\*

Mary Kaldor, “Preface,” and “Introduction,” in *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* 3rd edition (2012), pp. vi-14.

Carolyn Nordstrom, “Finding the Frontlines,” in *Shadows of War: Violence, Power, and International Profiteering in the Twenty-First Century* (2004), pp. 42-53.

**Oct 25:** **The Laws of War and Morality in Conflicts Today**

If as many theories of international relations predict, states will go to war, it is in states’ interests to have standards regarding what is acceptable in war. The Laws of War have a long history but were codified in the Geneva Conventions drafted in 1949 and added to in 1977. What do the laws of war require and how are they applied or followed in conflicts today?

Hugo Slim, “Introduction,” “Limited Warfare and Its Rivals,” in *Killing Civilians: Method, Madness and Morality in War* (2008), pp. 1-36.

Tanisha Fazal, “Rebellion, War Aims & the Laws of War,” *Daedalus* (Winter 2017) pp. 71-82

**Oct 29:** **Human Rights**

Human rights focus on how a state treats its own citizens. Over time members of the international community have pushed to universalize standards related to human dignity. Certain human rights standards, specifically those outlined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, have been widely accepted by states. Despite a wide acceptance in principle of human rights, how do human rights influence state action?

UN General Assembly, "Universal Declaration of Human Rights," (1948).

Jack Donnelly, “Human Rights,” in *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations* (2011)*,* pp. 494-508.

Kathryn Sikkink, “Conclusion: Evidence for Hope without Complacency,” in *Evidence for Hope: Making Human Rights Work in the 21st Century* (2017), pp. 225-248.

**Nov 1: Humanitarian Intervention: The Responsibility to Protect (R2P)**

Should members of the international community intervene when citizens of one state are in the midst of a humanitarian crisis? Considering international norms of sovereignty, is intervention legal and/or legitimate? Why does the international community intervene in some crises and not others?

Martha Finnemore, “Changing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention,” in *The Purpose of Intervention* (2003), pp. 52-84.

Madeleine K. Albright and Richard S. Williamson, “The United States and R2P: From Words to Action,” Report Published by the United States Institute of Peace, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, and Brookings Institution, pp. 9-19 \*\*note you do not need to read the entire report\*\*

Benjamin Valentino, “The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention,” *Foreign Affairs* (Nov/Dec 2011), pp. 60-73.

**Nov 5: The Unipolar Revolution**

If the modern states system had revolved around a balance of power regime of two or more great powers, what would international relations be like in a system with only one great power? Would the unipolar power meet with resistance from other states? Would a unipolar system inevitably transition to a bipolar or multipolar system? If a system of two was better than a system with many great powers, was it possible that a system with one great power was the best of all?

Patrick E. Tyler, U.S. Strategy Plan Calls for Insuring No Rivals Develop,” and Tyler, “Lone Superpower Plan: Ammunition for Critics,” *New York Times*, March 8 and 10, 1992.

Robert Kagan and Kristol, “The Benevolent Empire,” *Foreign Policy* (Summer 1998), pp. 24-35.

Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth, “American Primacy in Perspective,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/Aug 2002), pp. 20-33.

Robert Kagan, “Not Fade Away: The Myth of American Decline,” *The New Republic* (February 2012), pp. 19-25.

Hal Brands and Eric Edelman, “The Upheaval,” *The National Interest* (July/Aug 2017), pp. 30-40.

**Nov 8: Nuclear Proliferation and Disarmament**

The end of the Cold War led to a massive reduction in the nuclear arsenals of the superpowers, but there are still thousands of nuclear warheads deployed and ready to be fired. What used to be a fringe position--the complete abolition of nuclear weapons--is now advocated by many academics and officials. These readings debate whether the United States and other nuclear powers should proceed towards abolition, maintain, or even expand and modernize their stock of nuclear weapons.

President Barack Obama Remarks in Prague, Czech Republic, April 5, 2009. Calls for “a world without nuclear weapons.” This speech helped Obama win a Nobel Peace Prize later that year.

Scott Sagan and Kenneth Waltz, “The Great Debate: Is Nuclear Zero the Best Option?” *The National Interest* (Sep/Oct 2010), pp.88-96.

Kenneth Waltz, “Why Iran Should Get the Bomb,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2012), pp.2-5.

Matthew Kroenig, “Think Again: American Nuclear Disarmament: A Smaller Atomic Arsenal Isn’t Just Wishful Thinking—It’s Bad Strategy,” *Foreign Policy* (Sept/Oct 2013), pp. 44-49.

Gene Gerzhoy and Nick Miller. “Donald Trump Thinks More Countries Should Have Nuclear Weapons. Here’s What the Research Says.” *Washington Post*, (April 6, 2016), pp. 1-4.

**Nov 12: Africa and Statehood**

Theories of international relations historically have been based on the European and U.S. experiences and shaped by individuals in these regions. The African context challenges dominant theories in international relations especially its model of statehood. Africa today cannot be understood without reference to the colonial context. However, we cannot only view Africa as a region facing challenges but must recognize African states as key players in international relations today. Somalia is a useful case study to examine these different themes.

Yolande Bouka, “Wakanda, Afrofuturism, and Decolonizing International Relations Scholarship,” blog post on *Political Violence at a Glance,* February 6, 2018.

Sekou Touré, “Africa’s Future and the World’s,” Foreign Affairs (1962)

Mary Harper, “Introduction,” in *Getting Somalia Wrong? Faith, War and Hope in a Shattered State* (2012), pp. 1-13.

Mary Harper, “Target Somalia: The New Scramble for Africa,” *BBC* News, April 23, 2017.

**Nov 15: Terrorism**

Terrorism is a concept that has been particularly challenging for scholars to define. The labeling of terrorism is a highly politicized act that is influenced by the victims of the violence and the perpetrator(s) of the violence. Kydd and Walter theorize about why certain groups use terrorism and when it is effective in helping those groups achieve their goals. The news articles identity patterns and questions based on recent terrorist attacks across the globe.

Andrew Kydd and Barbara Walter, "The Strategies of Terrorism," *International Security*

31:1 (Summer 2006), 49-79.

Mia Bloom, “Female Suicide Bombers Are Not a New Phenomenon,” *Washington Post,* August 6, 2014.

Rick Gladstone, "Many Ask, Why Not Call Church Shooting Terrorism?" *New York Times*, June 18, 2015.

Amanda Taub, “Control and Fear: What Mass Killings and Domestic Violence Have in Common,” *New York Times,* June 15, 2016

**Nov 19:** **A New Cold War? Putin and the Russian Challenge to the West**

Russia may not be the superpower it was during the Cold War, but the annexation of Crimea and other aggressive actions by President Vladimir Putin have caused great concern among the members of NATO. Russian interference in Western elections and domestic politics have also raised concern. Of course, some scholars would argue that the West is far from blameless in its policies toward Russia over the last two decades.

John Mearsheimer, “Why the Ukraine Crisis is the West’s Fault: The Liberal Delusions that Provoked Putin,” *Foreign Affairs* (Sept/Oct 2014), pp. 77-89.

Evan Osnos, David Remnick, and Joshua Yaffa, “Trump, Putin, and the New Cold War,” *The New Yorker* (March 2017), pp. 1-36

Robert Blackwill and Phillip Gordon, “Containing Russia, Again,” *Foreign Affairs* (Jan 2018), pp.1-5.

**Nov 22: Thanksgiving Break**

**Nov 26: The Rise of China and the Future of the International System**

As we all know from Thucydides and the First World War, the rise of new great powers and the decline of established great powers can lead to system shattering conflicts. Whether China’s rise will have that impact is considered by many to be the most important question in contemporary world politics. But that larger question turns on many other questions. Is China actually rising? Is the U.S. actually declining? Do the lessons of history from the era of Thucydides and the European balance of power system still apply in the 21st century?

David Shambaugh, “The Illusion of Chinese Power,” *The National Interest* (July/Aug 2014), pp. 39-48.

Hal Brands, “The Chinese Century?” *The National Interest* (March/April 2018), pp. 35-45.

John Mearsheimer, “Can China Rise Peacefully?” *The National Interest* (April 2014), pp. 1-22.

G. John Ikenberry, “The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive,” *Foreign Affairs* (Jan/Feb 2008), pp. 23-37.

**Nov 29:** **Great Power** **Conflict in the South China Sea**

If war breaks out between China and the United States, the precipitant will likely be a dispute over Taiwan or questions of sovereignty over islands and rights of navigation in the South China Sea. These readings explore both the risks of a wider conflict and the prospects for a negotiated settlement. Should the U.S. consider a deal that some would consider to be a 21st century version of appeasement?

Howard French, “China’s Dangerous Game,” *The Atlantic Monthly* (Nov 2014), pp. 1-29.

Graham Allison, “Destined for War,” *The National Interest* (May/June 2017), pp. 9-21.

John Mearsheimer, “Taiwan’s Dire Straits,” *The National Interest* (March/April 2014), pp. 29-39.

**Dec 3:** **The North Korea Nuclear Crisis**

Perhaps the most dangerous issue in world politics today. Analysts almost universally agree that there are no good options for dealing with North Korea, but there is wide disagreement over the merits or weakness of several bad options. Will it be possible to get North Korea to denuclearize? Should we accept the reality of North Korea’s arsenal or risk war in order to disarm them?

Evan Osnos, “The Risk of Nuclear War with North Korea,” *The New Yorker* (September 2017), 1-36.

Mark Bowden, “How to Deal with North Korea,” *The Atlantic* (July/August 2017).

John Delury, “Trump and North Korea: Reviving the Art of the Deal,” *Foreign Affairs* (March/April 2017), pp. 46-51.

Henry Kazianis, “Containing North Korea,” *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2017), pp. 5-9.

Ankit Panda and Vipin Narang, “North Korea’s Nuclear Program Isn’t Going Anywhere,” *Foreign Affairs* (Aug 2018), pp. 1-4.

**Dec 6: The End of the Liberal Order? Trump and World Politics**

Liberal internationalism has been the reigning ideology of American elites, both Democratic and Republican, since at least the end of the Second World War. In promoting the idea of “America First,” In contrast, President Trump has embraced an aggressively nationalist conception of our role in the world. Will he be able to overturn the postwar liberal order? Can the liberal international system survive without active American leadership? What are the 21st century alternatives, both good and bad, to a liberal world order?

Kori Schake, “The Trump Doctrine is Winning and the World is Losing,” *New York Times*, June 15, 2018.

John Ikenberry, “The Plot Against American Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2017), pp. 2-9.

Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, “Liberal World: The Resilient Order,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2018), pp. 16-24.

Yascha Mounk and Roberto  Stefan Foa, “The End of the Democratic Century: Autocracy’s Global Ascendance,” *Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2018), pp. 29-36.

Randall Schweller, “Three Cheers for Trump’s Foreign Policy: What the Establishment Misses,” *Foreign Affairs* (Sept/Oct 2018), pp. 133-143.

Graham Allison, “The Myth of the Liberal Order,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/Aug 2018), pp. 124-133.