Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Teaching Introduction to International Politics with Film

BRANDON VALERIANO

University of Glasgow

This article is an overview of a comprehensive film-based course that covers basic topics appropriate for an introduction to international relations (or world politics) course. Film provides a new and novel perspective by which to view international interactions. I explore how various aspects of international politics are covered by movies with attention focused on how these films can provide important educational lessons to guide course content. The course focuses on the topics of conflict, peace, and theories of international interactions, but others should adapt the content to meet their pedagogical or ideological needs. Emphasis is placed on using film to explain events and theory. The goal is to utilize movies to reach out to students unfamiliar with the processes of global affairs so that they will be motivated to move on to advanced topics and understand the basic issues in the field.

Keywords film, introduction to international relations, pedagogy

Introduction

This article discusses the development and content of a film-based course teaching basic international relations concepts appropriate for an introduction to international relations (or world politics) course. The genesis of this educational method began during a shortened summer session. Methods utilized during the traditional school year were ineffective for the summer audience. Recognizing the constraints of the audience and the rather large time block, a shift that entailed the use of active-learning techniques was in order so I could communicate critical topics to the students. Although this course was developed with the summer session in mind, it can be adapted for any session or "blended" learning course. In fact, this course has become much more than a summer method. It is an appropriate and useful way to communicate basic international relations concepts to the unfamiliar student because visual analogies are a superior instructional method compared to other options.

Using novel approaches to communicate unfamiliar topics to students seems to be the thrust to pedagogical studies recently. Student responses have been overwhelmingly positive. Students who initially felt the method would be too basic for them were won over by the lessons and implications they never considered. Students

who were normally not interested in the course material began to consider what it truly meant to deal with global issues and have added political science as a major or minor. In short, the course was able to reach many students not normally engaged in the topic while reinforcing enduring lessons for more advanced students.

However, obstacles still remain. Freeing the student from the familiar structure of a lecture is perhaps not the best method to teach core concepts if handled without the careful consideration required. A film-based course should be an education tool, not a teaching crutch to support ineffective strategies. The goal of this course is to teach students how international interactions work between countries and how external views are constructed—critical topics for a basic liberal arts education. Therefore, drawbacks of this method should be considered in this context. Students must consider the implications of the use of force, morality, war, and peace in our time, since these remain relevant concepts in the current era of global politics. Moving beyond the typical course design allows for these issues to be introduced to a normally disinterested student body.[1] Film is simply a valuable method to engage students.

This article lays out the course design and methodology behind an intensive course in international relations that utilizes film to motivate students to consider critical concepts in international affairs. First, I argue that film is an effective tool in course construction. Second, the article discusses course themes and goals, as well as course content. Evidence will then be presented that suggests this method is effective in teaching core concepts.

Why Use Film to Inform about International Relations?

Almost every political science department teaches some form of "Introduction to International Relations" (or World Politics) regularly.[2] Undergraduates are less likely to read assigned texts. Instead, they respond more readily to visual and interactive mediums. With this in mind, a course was developed that could communicate the basics of international relations (IR) using film as a "core text." The events of today's world (9/11, the Second War in Iraq, and the conflict in Israel/Palestine) demonstrate the need for education about basic functions of international affairs. With a goal of making IR accessible to summer students, a new method became a necessity. Necessity can lead to innovation, and the method explored here can enhance all international relations courses.

This course was devised to utilize the medium of film to explain and discuss important topics in IR, but the method can be extended to any topic in political science. Film provides a window through which to view the world, and this course was meant to explore how various aspects of international politics have been covered and dramatized by movies and television. The goal of the course is to facilitate an understanding of morality, justice, and power from an international perspective. Film allows students to view these issues in an accessible but also entertaining fashion. For many students, a textbook is an obstacle rather than a bridge to knowledge (Cushman 1993). Teten (2010) suggests that a textbook can become "a source of alienation and intimidation for both the professor and student." The ease of associations one can make between film and concepts provides for a simple form of entry into the study of global interactions. As Beavers (2002) suggests, films and television are rarely used as a source of pedagogy in the field of IR; this article will rectify this problem.

Past research on the use of film in courses suggests many possible pedagogical advantages of exploration. Waalkes (2003, 156–157, 170) contends that film

encourages active learning and aids students' critical thinking. Students often learn by taking concrete examples and then applying abstract analysis to these examples, which take the form of a ''visual tool-kit.'' This course intends to follow the same path in that concepts and theories are connected to visual elements to increase concept reasoning and applications. Kuzma and Haney (2001, 34) argue that films stimulate the senses and engage emotions, important functions of an active-learning methodology. It is by this process that students can connect their own personal values and feelings to core academic concepts as introduced by the professor. Past research demonstrates that case-based learning with film is more successful than case-based learning through written materials (Krain 2010, 305), suggesting an important application in the use of film that is often ignored by scholars in favor of traditional lecture-reading-based learning methods. Why have so few sought to formalize a truly active visual-learning approach to international studies concepts?

Most researchers contend that students are already skilled in the analysis of the visual medium (Weber 2001), so the goal here should be to extend these skills and abilities to the classroom. In fact, films might level the playing field for the entire class because these examples serve as a shared experience and a common language of discussion for the group (Krain 2010, 296). Often international relations courses operate at different levels because some students have an extensive backlog of historical examples to apply concepts to, while other students might be unfamiliar with historical examples that might illuminate the concept being studied. It is in this way that shared film experiences might make the course accessible to everyone regardless of background knowledge, saving precious time that can be better utilized for concept instruction.

Past efforts note how film can be used to supplement course materials. The work of Simpson and Kaussler (2009) suggests that film can be used to augment simulations or the traditional learning process. The presentation contained herein notes that film can be used as more than a supplement for course materials, but, more importantly, film can be the entire focus of a course. Weber (2005, 377) notes that film can be used as a way to position the student to practice ideological critique. The student should ''gain control over these visual texts'' (Weber 2005, 378).

The typical emphasis of any international politics course is on international conflict and cooperation; this course is no different. These factors are given added emphasis because most films tend to focus on dramatic events that involve life or death struggles. Other important topics that are discussed include, but are not limited to, diplomacy, civil-military relations, nationalism, international interventions, clash of civilizations, and espionage. The class also covers important events in international history, international institutions, propaganda, and rivalry. Hopefully more films on topics such as migration flows and environmental issues can be added.

A point of caution should be made since the professor cannot go too far in making linkages between a film and a concept. The concept must dominate and never be minimized to suit a film. While it may be interesting to teach about power politics using the *Godfather* (1972) as an example, it is easy to imagine students extracting the wrong lessons. Scholars should also refrain from movies that follow the trajectory of the hero myth too closely (*Star Wars, Avatar, Independence Day*) since these perspectives might give too much weight to individuals over aggregate communities typically analyzed in international relations courses. Here, I discuss the more relevant movies.

Course Themes and Requirements

Overall, the theme of my introduction to international relations courses focus on the international community, violence, structure, and institutions. The main goal is to provide a context for understanding international interactions. The major theoretical perspectives are covered as are the paths to conflict and peace in the modern world.

The structure of this course is generally a half hour premovie lecture and a half-hour postmovie wrap-up and discussion. The premovie lecture is important because it allows the instructor to introduce concepts and to discuss facts about the screenwriter, director, and historical context of the movie in order to prepare the viewer (Lieberfeld 2007). Two hours are generally reserved for watching the movies during class. Time is reserved after the movie to reflect and discuss the implications of the viewing experience and the connection between the film and concepts. The student should leave with a focus on course concepts rather than plot. The instructor should schedule a day of focused discussion on core concepts. This time can also be used to cover concepts not readily covered by available movies.

The first challenge is to find a reader suitable for background information. While the emphasis is on film as the primary course material, a reader or textbook is still necessary in order to cover basic concepts. Furthermore, a reader or textbook is critical for those who have never had an international relations course and to support the assigned paper to be discussed. Major points of concern should be brevity, inclusiveness, and price.

As for course requirements and expectations, the students are to write a final paper accounting for 40% of the total grade. The length is that of a large term paper making this a rather intensive introduction course. This assignment tasks the student with finding a movie that is not on the syllabus and to discuss its relevance to international politics through the examination of a core concept. Students are instructed to create their own analogy, to decide which readings would support the lesson, and to discuss the implications of the movie chosen for IR instruction. The purpose of the assignment is to get students to individually apply a concept in international politics to a film in a creative way. Generally, students should be encouraged to choose unconventional films that are not focused on warfare. The students were also instructed to focus on concepts not covered by other movies. Movies that might cover such issues as norms, regime, environmental politics, and issues of international racism and diversity are particularly encouraged. The first part of the paper should discuss and outline the movie, but, more importantly, the goal is to inform the reader about the making of the film and its context. Next the students are to outline the concept the film utilizes as it is presented in the IR literature. Finally the student should draw direct connections between the concept under review and the material in the movie.

For general assessment, two tests are given, which are short answer and essay prompts designed to facilitate critical discussions of the movies or important international issues addressed by the movies. If adapted to a semester-long course, it is entirely appropriate that popular and classical literature is integrated into the structure of the course. Even the use of art might be advisable to communicate important lessons about state-to-state interactions. In general, the goal should be to use unconventional methods to engage normally excluded students.

Course Content

Obviously the most interesting aspect of the course to external evaluators is the movies chosen for viewing. Films used in this course should be chosen for content

and quality. If the film is awful, why use it? Horrible films only turn students off and lead the student to not respect the judgment of the instructor. The instructor must ask: Does this film cover an important lesson that cannot be covered as well by another film, and does it hold up to repeated viewings? If the answer is ''no'' to either of these questions, the film should be abandoned. The films chosen should have a message that is peerless. While *Fail Safe* (1964) does an adequate job of covering nuclear deterrence and the Cold War, *Dr. Strangelove* (1964) is shorter and is recognized as a top 100 classic film.[3]

During a conventional semester with a limited course time allotment, one option is to assign the films during lab or at night. However, it is almost necessary to show the movies during class so the professor could handle any comments and concerns that arise during the film. Some films required a running dialogue between the students and instructor to clear up concerns and to help them follow along. When the concept of interest comes on the screen it should be noted so students are not lost in the grander mechanizations of plot. Sometimes the movies are stopped to generate class-based discussion; other times, I save discussion for the end of the course.[4]

Prior to the course, literally hundreds of films were reviewed, and an extensive list of possible films is listed at the end of the syllabus. The instructor should avoid using too many war films. A course on war cinema alone could be designed, which would be useful to discuss issues such as the structure of command, civil-military relations, and the experience of combat. These issues, however, are beyond a typical introductory IR course.

Films that were considered or used in the past, but not chosen, include *Dr. Zhivago* (1965), the *Great Dictator* (1940), *Tora, Tora, Tora* (1970), and *Enemy at the Gates* (2001). Two films that were nearly chosen were the *Band of Brothers* (2001) series and *Triumph of the Will* (1935). *Band of Brothers* is a remarkable series but is largely uneven in quality. Its total length is also a deterrent to its use in the course. Students should be encouraged to examine individual episodes for their term paper reports since they contain important lessons in IR. The *Triumph of the Will* is an extraordinary film for the exploration of fascism as a doctrine and for the use of propaganda, but perhaps it is not best to expose students to fascist ideology without a deep exploration of the context and consequences of such imagery.

The course utilizes 14 core films. Next, I explain the background information and lesson content. Professors can extract some generalizations to determine what films best suit their needs.

Films as Concepts

Duck Soup (1933, 70 Minutes)

Duck Soup is used as an introduction to the course. Although it is a comedy, larger lessons are uncovered once one stops laughing. As film critic Roger Ebert notes, ''*Duck Soup* is probably the best Marx film. It represents a turning point in their movie work; it was their last film for Paramount, and the last in which all of the scenes directly involved the brothers.''[5] The film is used as both an ice breaker and a harbinger of things to come in the course. The plot follows Groucho Marx, who plays Rufus T. Firefly. He is put in charge of the country, Fredonia, which is a persistent enemy of neighboring Sylvania. The conflict between the two states is spurred on by the antagonist Trintino calling Firefly an ''upstart.'' While all these

issues are in jest, it compellingly illustrates the issues of prestige and conflict. Honor and conflict are deeply connected concepts (see O'Neill 1999).

When a state's honor is questioned, should this lead to conflict? At first it seems silly to construct a film around the insults that lead to war, but when one considers the application of such ideas to IR, lots of similar stories come to mind. The story of Bush lashing out at Saddam Hussein because "this is the guy who tried to kill my dad" is a prominent example of personal insults leading to conflict. States can go to war when nationalist fervor is funneled into fear-mongering and hatred directed at perceived slights and insults. *Duck Soup* covers this well in the depiction of the rush to war, the excitement that follows such a rush, and the eventual absurdness of the whole enterprise. The road to war can sometimes best be described as a mad comedy of errors based on good intentions, and this movie adeptly applies this perspective.

In addition, *Duck Soup* touches on concepts of leadership and personality. Gregg (1998, 268) argues that *Duck Soup* "is also about the insanity of war, the officially irrational pretexts for war, and, perhaps most importantly (if most absurdly), the consequences of entrusting the affairs of state to irresponsible leaders." Some observers would like to believe that war is a rational process led by rational leaders and publics, but the historical record tells us that we cannot assume this. *Duck Soup* is a perfect way to begin the discussion with the individual as the unit of analysis, which is typical in all IR courses. Where is the source of conflict located? Is it at the individual, state, dyadic, or systemic level (Singer 1961)? *Duck Soup* points to the individual and the state as sources of concern dovetailing nicely with other systemic and dyadic concepts to be covered later.

Another topic concerns misperception. Misperception is commonly cited as a persistent cause of war (Jervis 1976). In *Duck Soup*, the silly comment made by Ambassador Trintino raises the tension between the two countries. In a real-world situation, the tension may already be high due to series of disputes between the two states, and the movie illustrates this point nicely. Actions and events can be taken out of context and lead to further misunderstandings. Accumulated risk is an important topic in studies of deterrence and rivalry. While misperception is likely not a common cause of war, it is still an important background factor that should be explored. *Duck Soup* allows the classroom to engage these concepts in a way that utilizes humor.

A final topic is one of diplomacy and diplomatic spirit. Morgenthau (1960) extensively deals with the conduct of diplomacy. He feels the diplomatic spirit has declined over time, and the pomp and circumstance covered in *Duck Soup* is strange to a modern viewer. Only when one considers that this was the norm in the past does one truly understand what it means to suggest diplomacy is dead. The nuance and spectacle of the enterprise are lacking in current times. The delicate balance of negotiations, issues, and perceptions are important in the conduct of international affairs, and this movie can start this discussion.

Lord of the Flies (1963, 92 Minutes)[6]

Lord of the Flies truly starts off the course by addressing a series of important issues in international politics. Why is it acceptable to kill in the context of war but not in the context of daily life? What is it about international events that allows for the legitimate institutionalization of mass violence? What separates international and

domestic politics but rules and context? All these issues can be addressed through *Lord of the Flies*.

Lord of the Flies can be used as a metaphor for the international system. Here, a group of British schoolboys are stranded on a desert island and have to come up with the rules by which to govern their lives. The society constructed breaks down into two competing groups that go to war until they are rescued from the island. Consequently, the first and main issue of the film is the causes of conflict. Here the classic levels of analysis problem in international relations can be illustrated. What are the sources of conflict? In this film, the finger is clearly pointed at men. Men are innately evil, similar to Hobbes' state of nature, and in a system that lacks clear authority—in anarchy—conflict will commence. The push and pull between anarchy and order is clear for all to see.

The sources of violence in mankind then lead to a discussion of morality in the system. While violence may be caused by men, how does morality fit into the equation? When is it just to respond with force? The writings of Thomas Aquinas on Just War are used here as a basis for further discussion on morality, and each student is assigned "On War" to read.[7]

In relation to the concept of anarchy, some place an emphasis on rules and norms (Kegley and Raymond 1982) as being important factors in preventing conflict. In this movie, we can see that order and hierarchy can be created, but when order breaks down, conflict is likely to arise. While on the island, violence becomes institutionalized as an acceptable way to resolve important issues, the leaders of the two groups (Jack and Ralph) illustrate important points about norms. On the one hand, Jack rejects the order created by rules and, instead, embraces anarchy and utilizes conflict as a way to settle issues. On the other hand, Ralph creates the rules and believes in their ability to manage relations within the group. His embrace of rules and rejection of conflict shows how different leadership styles can have important implications for establishing norms and order in any political system.

We can take these analogies one step further and highlight the conflict between liberalism and realism as theories of international politics. The group led by Jack exemplifies those who believe in power politics, with their goal being to ensure the security of the group at any cost. Ralph's group is more peaceful and embraces law and morality on the island. The events the film depicts serve as an important starting point for a broader and general discussion of international relations theory that will influence the rest of the course.

Lord of the Flies also illustrates the effect of external threats on society. The concept of rivalry depicts a constant and continuous struggle between two long-standing enemies (Diehl and Goertz 2000). Rivals legitimize the "other" as an important external enemy that must be dealt with. In *Lord of the Flies*, the external enemy is the unknown beast. Jack uses the possibility of a beast on the island to mobilize the group for his own ends and to reject the rules set up by Ralph. Some leaders engaged in rivalry will mobilize the public to fight an enemy for their own ends (Colaresi 2005). This principle is clearly illustrated in Jack's rejection of the rules of the island and his turn as the group's leader so that he can protect them from the Beast, resulting in the suppression of all dissent in order to deal with the security threat. Although rival threats can either be real or imagined—such as the Beast— scholars seem to assume a rational process in the construction of an enemy image. The *Lord of the Flies*, however, reminds students that the state often inflates threats based on worse-case scenarios.

300 (2006, 117 Minutes)

300 is a tour de force of unrestricted violence and stylized action. It is silly and historically inaccurate in almost all respects. Yet, it does serve an important purpose in our class since it is a near perfect illustration of realism and the national interest as motivating concepts in international relations. Due to its historic inaccuracies, some groups may be offended, but this movie is not used as a historical lesson but as an object lesson of realism. The basic premise in a realist world is that one lives in a self-help environment. No state or institution can be depended on for support, and morality is of little use in a world where others do not adhere to the principle. There is no appeal to logic in this sort of world; order comes through power. Realist scholars suggest this is the realistic view of the world in the face of utopian or moralistic dreams. Actors in such a world must be first concerned with self-preservation and the national interest. The national interest, as a term (Morgenthau 1952), is reduced to three simple things: the protection of territory, institutions, and culture of the state to ensure survival of the state as a territorial entity. These are the bare minimums a state must be concerned with, and these concepts are covered in *300*.

The plot follows King Leonidas who decides to defend Sparta, and subsequently most of Greece, from the invading Persian army. As Machiavelli (1886) suggested, the duty of a leader (the Prince) is to protect the population of a state. No other goal is as important; the ends will justify the means. The story then follows Leonidas in his efforts to do what is necessary to ensure the security of his people, regardless of what that entails, including self-sacrifice.

In realism, power determines interest, and the real lesson should be that a weak state like Sparta is no match for the greater Persian army, but this is not the lesson the movie projects to the viewer. The lesson is that "might makes right." An army fighting for the national interest and protection of a state will defeat an aggressive horde bent on evil. When the Persian King Xerxes makes a fairly reasonable request (in the face of the power arraigned against the Spartans), the Spartan's reject a tribute of earth and water since it would suggest the Spartan state is bowing down and giving up the national interest. The Persian ambassadors also insult the Spartan Queen, showing dishonor to the institutional structure of Spartan culture. The response by the Spartans is to murder the Persian emissaries.

If the national interest is defined according to its academic concept (Morgenthau 1952) and not the more nebulous one used in society, then *300* illustrates perfectly the choices to be made during a period engulfed in conflict. The movie shows in a dramatic fashion that one cannot depend on allies (they may help but cannot be trusted), must be prepared to defend the country at all costs, and that culture is worth defending. All these concepts are directly referenced in the Melian Dialogue (Thucydides 2006), a long-taught lesson in IR about the failings of the moral/legalist perspective or appeals to allies. *300* takes these lessons and extends them by using the warlike Spartans instead of the Athenians as an example of how might makes right. The reading assignment for this movie is the Melian Dialogue from the history of the Peloponnesian Wars.

300 allows for a critical moment of reflection for the student. Once the fervor of war wears off, a rational discussion examining the extent of military power in the modern world can be conducted in class. Do the ends really justify the means? While it is important to protect the state, what about the often neglected realist lesson of prudence? The Spartans might have readjusted their goals in the face of such an

enemy so as to avoid conflict and promote a basic culture of peace. Yet, the movie makes no mention of these choices, and the student must be taught to critically engage such topics and not accept the facts as handed to them. In *Lord of the Flies*, the Beast was used as an external enemy that must be fought. Similarly, in *300*, the Persians are used as an external enemy that must be fought at all costs despite an internal vote against the operation. A lesson in critical thought might ask why these ''enemies'' are needed and what role do they play in society. Finally, one can use the movie to discuss the topic of democratic triumphalism in warfare (Reiter and Stam 2002). Do the Spartans win because they are motivated as free men, or is military capacity a better way of predicting victory? A useful discussion on political and military strategies can be conducted once these concepts are introduced.

Munich (2005, 163 Minutes)

Munich dovetails nicely with *300*. *Munich* demonstrates the consequences of retaliatory behavior. The setup is simple; in the aftermath of the 1972 terrorist attack on Israeli athletes during the Munich Olympic Games, a team of Israeli agents is sent out to extract revenge on those who committed and organized the murders. The team's actions begin to weigh heavily on each man in the team as they debate the moral consequences of their actions.

    Munich is a near perfect illustration of the moral critique of realism. When do the ends not justify the means? And more importantly, what happens when a state focuses on revenge and not forgiveness and progress? *Munich* is also used to discuss the concept of a ''Just War'' more fully. A ''Just War'' is one that must have the right intention, avoid evil, and seek to rectify wrongs done. The actions of the Israeli agents are punishment for the wrongs done against the Israeli athletes. But when does the act of punishment corrupt the punisher? There is a constant push and pull between morality and power politics in international relations behavior. This internal debate is rarely exhibited this well on film.

    An important reading to support this lesson is Morgenthau's (1960) six principles of realism that discuss the importance of laws in IR and debate the importance of morality in the world—as *Munich* does. Besides the main debate between morality and power politics, this movie also illustrates the concept of national morale that Morgenthau (1960) suggests is a critical area of national power. How are the actions taken by the Israeli team evidence of a state trying to repair its national morale? Did they succeed and what was the consequence? Overall, *Munich* makes the point that international relations are not as simple as conflict and force. There are consequences to actions, even when those actions are relatively easy to undertake.

Wilson (1944, 154 Minutes)

The movie covers the life and times of Woodrow Wilson, commonly recognized as a founding father of modern international liberalism. His ''Fourteen Points'' speech elucidates many of the hallmarks of liberal thought on cooperation such as free navigation of the seas and the use of institutions to promote world peace. The film re-creates most of the speech. Any reading on the basics of liberalism would be suitable accompaniment for the film.

    The coverage of the debate to pass the League of Nations proposal in the Senate is a strong point of the movie. This section of the movie can be used to illustrate the

process of domestic decision making as it influences foreign policy outcomes. As Putnam (1988) demonstrates, there is a process in international affairs of two-level games where outcomes need to be determined at the international level and also at the domestic level. While Woodrow Wilson won the international level, he failed miserably in controlling domestic outcomes.

Overall, the instructor should focus on the pillars of liberalism: trade, democracy, and international institutions, all evidenced by Wilson's consistent positions throughout the movie. These are all ideas that Wilson pushed as paths toward peace and are fully spelled out in the "Fourteen Points" speech. While he was unsuccessful, it is helpful to understand why he failed and how others can try to do a better job in constructing peace in the future.

High Noon (1952, 85 Minutes)

The classic *High Noon* is used to illustrate many international relations concepts, particularly the Bush Doctrine and U.S. foreign policy after 9/11. The idea to use this film to discuss the basics of American foreign policy came from a *New York Times* (Hoberman 2004) article that suggested that *High Noon* was George W. Bush's favorite movie. After reflection, one can see many parallels between the experience of the protagonist, Kane, and Bush.

High Noon is a western depicting Will Kane's (Gary Cooper) last day as sheriff of a small town. On his way out of town to honeymoon with his new bride, Kane gets word that Frank Miller is returning to town to exact his revenge on Kane for his imprisonment. The rest of the movie follows Kane in real time with his struggles to round up allies to fight Miller and the eventual clash between the two men.

Some feel the film is an allegory for the Hollywood blacklist; for us, the original context of the film is irrelevant. What is important is that the film follows closely the path of American foreign policy in general. The story is simple, Bush stands against terrorists and leaders he knows mean to do harm to the United States just as Kane stood against Miller's gang whom he knew would do harm to the town he is sworn to protect. The townsfolk in the film refuse to support Kane in his fight against Miller, suggesting either that he is not dangerous ("good for business" as the salon owner puts it) or that the problem is Kane's alone. Just as Bush felt he stood alone against enemies in Afghanistan and Iraq, Kane stands alone. Elements of neoconservatism are easily uncovered in this film. There is a hidden evil, and intentions are known, key aspects of Neoconservative thought. Kane knows that Miller is bad just as Bush knew that Saddam Hussein was an enemy of the United States.

Another important theme is that of an actor as an international cowboy offering strong threats to the enemy. No cowboy runs from a fight. Nor does a cowboy shrink from his duty even when his friends (allies) are unwilling to support him in his endeavor. The lack of support by the town is an example of unilateralism in foreign policy directly referenced in the Bush Doctrine (2002 version), the assigned reading for this day.

It is also useful to utilize the movie to discuss the issue of doves versus hawks in society. Doves may wish to limit the ability of a hawk to conduct combat operations. Here, both the town and Kane's wife are doves. Kane's wife, the ultimate dove since she is a Quaker, joins the fight at the end of the movie. She is compelled to protect her husband and the town in the face of danger, finding isolationism and pacifism useless. The movie might suggest doves are weak; eventually, they will see the utility

of force. Another parallel is between the interrupted honeymoon of Kane and his wife and Bush's own inability to celebrate a political honeymoon period in foreign policy before he had to deal with the events of 9/11.

Finally, the film illustrates the concept of preemptive and preventative action central to the Bush Doctrine. Kane is clear in his belief that Miller is a danger to the town. From Kane's perspective, Miller is a rogue actor bent on destruction. The only solution is the termination of said threat. Yet, is this extreme action even necessary in the movie, let alone in international affairs? Couldn't the town have surrounded and arrested Miller? Were other options available to Kane? Preemptive action is useful when one feels atrocities are imminent, yet how does one know when atrocities will occur? The movie *Minority Report* (2002) deals with this specific question, but the premise is handled better by *High Noon*.

All Quiet on the Western Front (1930, 138 Minutes)

All Quiet on the Western Front is utilized to teach about personal experience in combat and Marxist/Radical IR theory. The older black and white version is preferred over the newer version (1979) because it is simply a superior film.[8] In general, the film is so powerful, even more so than the book in some respects, because it personifies the "enemy." The main character, Paul, is a bright and handsome young man with whom every student can empathize.

The plot of the movie, told from the Germans' perspective, follows Paul and his comrades from school to the trenches of World War I. While the German grievances of the war are not used to justify conflict, the view of the individual caught up in war is an important aspect of the film. IR scholarship and teaching should not be removed from the object of study, combat, in this case. Engaging in an analysis of what it means and feels like to be a combat soldier is a critical component of an IR course.[9]

The general theme of the movie and book is that of a radical/Marxist perspective. Themes from this perspective focus on the perpetual class struggle fought in all levels of society. Radical social change is the only option to prevent future loss of men for spoils and treasure. The upper class, or government, uses individuals to fight their battles. Therefore, peace can only come through both the solidarity and awareness of the working class. The soldiers in *All Quiet* have no idea why they are fighting, or even what the fight means for their country. The boys are objectified as fighting machines who think little of the consequences of their actions. Key scenes are when the soldiers debate why they are fighting and when Paul visits the home front only to be confronted with older men criticizing his lack of nationalist sentiment. The question that simmers below the surface for Paul is why is he fighting, for the good of the country or for his comrades? The movie is a useful example of the extreme limits of patriotism. The high school teacher serves as both a real and symbolic enemy of the humble fighting man.

War, illustrated as a rush of nationalist fervor, has never been so aptly filmed in Western cinema. The only other movie that comes close is *Starship Troopers* (1997), which bogs down into a movie about fighting bugs pretty quickly. *All Quiet* follows closely with the idea that soldiers caught in battle are not the problem; the problem lies in the leadership who would utilize these men to achieve their own economic ends.

Other themes of concern are lost youth, death of comrades, recruitment and propaganda, and killing during battle. It is important that a student understands

who the enemy is and what their motivations are. They are not nameless and faceless men bent on destruction, but, typically, young men caught up in nationalist calls for duty. In a sense the derogatory names soldiers have for their enemies robs them of their real identity, a point illustrated in *300* as well. The exaggerated grotesqueness of the Persians paints a picture of barbarism—of being a monster, something not quite human. One must understand and empathize with the enemy in order to understand how stability in international affairs can be achieved.

Fog of War (2003, 95 Minutes)

Fog of War is an excellent documentary and a masterful study of policy, action, and guilt. The focus is on Robert McNamara, the former Secretary of Defense and the architect of the Vietnam War. In addition to a course reader, the Blight and Lang (2005) volume is assigned as background to *Fog of War,* and, more importantly, they learn the method of critical history. The research paper assignment instructs students to apply the method in *Fog of War* to another case of foreign policy action so they learn about the past event and also how to construct a historical narrative and to question the conventional wisdom of policy outcomes.

The general focus of my course unit on *Fog of War* is about the lessons contained within the movie, particularly the lesson about empathy. The insular view of foreign policy scholarship is a major weakness in the field. Early on, Morgenthau (1960) was a proponent of first looking at state goals and then looking at the goals of the enemy. The student must realize the enemy has policy goals too. Ignoring their views is a serious impediment to achieving peace in that one does not solve the basic issues of disagreement.

Other important lessons of the film regard the need for data analysis to move beyond personal perceptions. The film points out that rationality can be limited in international action. The guilt and remorse McNamara feels is powerful and serves as a perfect bookend for *All Quiet*. Actions in the international realm are not without consequence, and this theme is evident on the subject's face during the whole movie. It might be interesting to juxtapose this documentary with Rumsfeld's assessments of his time as Secretary of Defense.

Why We Fight (1943, Prelude to War: 51 Minutes)

Why We Fight is a seven-part documentary produced by Frank Capra during World War II. The purpose of the 1943 film was to demonstrate grievances during the early stage of the war to convince Americans to get behind the war effort. The films are masterful illustrations of the motivations for conflict for all states, not just those who fought heavily in World War II. In this course, the focus is on Volume 1, *Prelude to War*.[10]

The theme of the films seems to focus on the fight between free peoples and those enslaved by Fascism. Yet, the films do much more than this. They tend to serve as perfect case studies in exploring common IR theories regarding the onset of warfare. In the basic discussion of the free versus the enslaved, the commentary tilts towards the version of events that supports the democratic peace theory, the idea being that democracies are less war prone and that we must fight to make the world safe for democracy. The film also explores a misunderstood aspect of democratic peace theory (Ray 1995). Critics of the theory forget that a central problem

with the logic is that the theory makes no predictions as to peace between democracies and autocracies. The theory only predicts that dissimilar pairs are likely to engage in conflict. As the films suggest, the core causes of the conflict can be found in the differing perspectives of the leaders of democratic versus autocratic states.

The films contain a clear element of American propaganda, particularly evidenced in the use of negative or racist language towards enemies in the conflict. These flaws should be tempered because the film does a great job of following the path to war that is common in most wars (Vasquez and Valeriano 2010). Following the steps-to-war theory (Vasquez 1993), the films demonstrate the combination of territorial disputes, alliances, arms races, rivalry, systemic norms, and hardliners in power as causes of war. Each theoretical component is outlined, and the students then point out where in the film each issue is dealt with. The students are then encouraged to suggest additional paths to war as suggested by the film.

Battle of Algiers (1966, 121 Minutes)

The Battle of Algiers is a tremendous film long forgotten due to lack of availability and initial censorship by the French government. This all changed recently with the Criterion Collection release of a three-disc collector's edition.[11] The film tells the story of the French involvement in Algeria during the Algerian War (1954–1962). While it takes the perspective of both sides of the conflict, the general tone is one of sympathy for the Algerian plight despite their use of terrorist tactics.

The film is a marvelous depiction of both rebel counterinsurgency tactics and the French response. The French eventually withdrew, and their failure has been a popular case study in insurgent responses since. For the purposes of this class, the film is used most accurately to explain the dynamics of civil wars and rebellion. It answers the question, why do men rebel? The old view suggests that economic inequality and ethnic nationalism are the prime causes of rebellion. Fearon and Laitin (2003) make a strong case that the causes of rebellion can be narrowed down to opportunity, insurgency, and conditions. Opportunity includes the financiers and recruits able to source the rebellious fight. Insurgency is the use of armed tactics focusing on small, lightly armed combatants. The factor of conditions recognizes the importance of terrain, political capacity of the state, and bureaucratic poverty. Each of these factors is well represented in the film, and the task for the students is to identify them. The film makes it clear that the reason the Algerians were fighting was not solely due to ethnic concerns or economic inequality but that it was a response to poor treatment at the hands of the French and the lack of opportunities for young men in society. These issues could be discussed in light of the 2011 revolutions in North Africa and the Middle East. The sources of revolution seem to be food price inflation, high unemployment, large numbers of youths who are also well educated, and no clear path of transition out of an authoritarian system.

As depicted by the movie, the French response to the revolution was a failure. They focused on increasing the military presence and establishing checkpoints, which was a recipe for further resentment by the Algerians. As will be discussed in the next film, a better tactic to deal with a rebellious population is to understand the culture and motivations of the group. The *Battle of Algiers* is also useful to explore ongoing conflict situations that include insurgency or terrorism as tactics. This source material is rich for adaptation according to class objectives.

Lawrence of Arabia (1962, 216 Minutes)

Lawrence of Arabia is a beautifully shot and produced story that follows the rise and fall of T. E. Lawrence during his adventures during World War I. Yet, this is not really a war movie; it is about a man's personal struggle for justice and freedom for the people he was trying to help in the Middle East. Unfortunately, his promises of democracy and freedom were never fulfilled by the Great Powers during the treaty of Versailles. Due to his failure, Lawrence doomed himself to perpetual guilt. Various states in the Middle East were able to overthrow the dominance of the Ottoman Empire only to be dominated once again by the West.

The film is primarily used to discuss three major themes. The first theme is that leaders and actors must fulfill their promises if they are going to succeed as accepted heads of state and international actors. The movie vividly depicts Lawrence's guilt over his government's treatment of allies. One way to proceed is to remind students that future problems are often caused by the mistakes or failures of the past. As many suggest, the West's failure to live up to early promises of freedom and the entrenchment of corrupt leaders in the Middle East remains a primary cause (Owen 2000) of conflict in the region. These root causes of conflict can typically be found in the failures of the past.

The second theme is Lawrence's support of the principle of stakeholders in state building. The conquering force cannot just impose a favored government structure. It must be promoted and supported by influential actors within a polity. Failure to do this sets a state up for failure in the future. Scenes during the last third of the movie are critical for exhibiting this principle. Revolutions must be built from within.

The third and final theme regards insurgency and rebellion, a problem in many different conflict spots in the modern context. State actors typically failed to deal with these issues as they arise because they refuse to "go native." T. E. Lawrence is famous for his focus on blending in with his allies, just as Alexander the Great did long ago. In order to understand his friends and allies better, Lawrence lived and acted as they did. In doing so, he was a powerful force for change in the region. Unfortunately his dream was deferred for the greater goals of geopolitics. It is for this reason that *Lawrence of Arabia* should be a lesson of the failures of the past as sources of future discontent. Greater cultural and historical understanding of units in interaction is critical for the globalized perspective that is the goal of an introduction to international relations course.

Dr. Strangelove (1964, 94 Minutes)

Lindley (2001) provides an extensive guide to viewing *Dr. Strangelove* in class so only a few notes are offered here. The main purpose of exposing a student to *Dr. Strangelove* is to teach the concept of deterrence policy, a critical aspect of American foreign policy for over 50 years that continues to be a pivotal concept in international affairs. The central premise of the movie is that the Soviets build a "doomsday machine" set to go off if the United States launches a nuclear strike.

The movie itself provides a useful definition of deterrence: "deterrence is the art of producing in the mind of the enemy . . . the fear to attack." In deterrence policy, the ability to retaliate is a key condition for the efficacy of the program. Without an ability to absorb a first strike and respond in kind, a state has little hope of

deterring an attack in the first place. The problem with this conjecture is that the threat of retaliation needs to be credible in order to convince the enemy that attacking first would be a poor strategic choice. *Dr. Strangelove* does an excellent job of exploring the absurdity of such a conditional logic. If deterrence only works when the other side fears the response to an attack, how can one hope that the other side will take this retaliation seriously? The solution, theoretically, is to throw the steering wheel out the window, so to speak. The side targeted needs to be committed to respond to an attack, and humans cannot always be assumed to respond in a consistent manner. In the film, to solve this problem the Doomsday Machine is introduced. The solution is called the Doomsday Machine because it removes the human element from deterrence and makes global destruction assured. Unfortunately, the Soviets did not tell the United States that it had a doomsday machine. As Dr. Strangelove says, "Yes, but the whole point of the doomsday machine is lost if you keep it secret! Why didn't you tell the world, eh?"

This problem leads to another important point about deterrence and nuclear policy. While it is important to have a retaliatory capability, it is also important to have effective lines of communication open. The debate in the war room on whether or not the United States should warn the Soviets of a rogue nuclear attack illustrates the communication problem in warfare and demonstrates the push and pulls between the civilian and military leadership. On most occasions, the simple solution to issue disagreements comes through focused bargaining and negotiations. Without effective means of communication, this avenue is impossible.

Finally, *Dr. Strangelove* is useful to illustrate the security dilemma (Herz 1950).[12] Increases in one side's security cause a perceived decrease in the opposing side's security. The trap of the security dilemma and its consequences are displayed eloquently in the final scene of Dr. Strangelove. As both sides moved to advance their arsenals over the other, they both moved down a progressive path of war that could not be averted even through negotiations. *Dr. Strangelove* is the perfect movie to discuss nuclear policy, civil-military relations, insanity during the Cold War, and nuclear strategy so it should be a core film in this course.

Lord of the Rings Trilogy (2001–2003, Times Vary Depending on Version and Movie)

This new addition serves as a bookend to the entire course. The plethora of themes and concepts that can be explored with *Lord of the Rings* (LOTR) is overwhelming. Professors should choose which of the three films (or series of clips) they wish to show in class based on their goals. As Ruane and James (2012) explain, there are many uses of the film; in fact they use the film and books to orientate an entire course. My own use of the film is much more focused in that it can help cover some topics left out to this point. Beyond the basic notions of power politics, conflict, and cooperation, LOTR can be used to explore diversity, gender, and self-interest in the international context.

The first lesson should be focused on the old adage from the bureaucratic politics model of "where you stand depends on where you sit" (Allison 1971; Ruane and James 2008, 378). Each actor in LOTR has their own motivations and interests based on their cultural or ethnic orientation. The Elves are concerned with peace and the natural order while some Wizards are focused on extending their power (or balancing in Gandalf's case). The Orcs are focused on plunder, and the Ents would like

history to remain static or even regress a bit. Foreign policy orientations and strategic goals often vary depending on who you are and what issues are important. This lesson dovetails nicely with conceptions of diversity in international relations. Different groups have different perspectives, and this is illustrated in no place better than in LOTR. Every actor is shaped by how they relate to their surroundings; all motivations are determined by socially constructed perspectives.

As Ruane and James (2012, 385) write, each wave of feminist studies can be articulated through the study of LOTR. The desires of the human women represent first-wave feminism focused on inequalities. Other races act in the manner of second-wave feminism that is much more radical in scope than inequality-based feminist approaches. Finally, the Elves represent postcolonial and postmodern feminist approaches that move beyond traditional notions of equality and power. The approaches also question the relevance of the "state" in international politics since the goals of the state might not serve the goals of various gendered groups.

Gandhi (1982, 191 Minutes)

It seems fitting to wrap up the course with *Gandhi*. The intention is to end on a positive note of hope for peace through the avoidance of violence. Change can be obtained by simply refusing to engage in the power politics trap. As already noted, it takes two to tango in international conflict (Hensel and Diehl 1994). Without a response to violence with violence, the cycle cannot repeat itself. The film *Gandhi* accurately displays this process through telling the story of Gandhi's political life, starting with his radicalization and ending with his assassination.

Besides countering general IR themes, the film is specifically useful for countering two typical realist claims. One is that the ends will justify the means, which is attributed to Machiavelli. The general idea is that any action can be condoned as long as it conforms to the national interest. Gandhi demonstrates that this idea is wrong; the ends almost never justify the means. Holding down the Indian people for the continuation of an empire was a wrong policy that eventually led to a political awakening and independence in India. By practicing such a policy the colonizers ensured their rule would not be eternal. As Gandhi said, "By using similar means we can get only the same thing that they got . . . Your belief that there is no connection between the means and the ends is a great mistake" (Gandhi 2002).

Furthermore, the film examines passive resistance as a method of response to injustice, an all too important issue in the context of the revolutions of 2011. One need not go to the extreme lengths Gandhi went to obtain goals. Self-sacrifice is clearly a requirement, but collective action can overcome any obstacle according to Gandhi. To solve problems of commitment, Gandhi relied on the pure strength of his convictions (soul force) and the general utility of his arguments regarding social justice for the Indian people. Resistance by personality can be as strong as resistance by armed force. As Gandhi noted, "The moment he dropped the stick, he found himself free from all fear" (Gandhi 2002).

Assessment

So far, this article has made many assertions about the utility of the film-based method with little empirical evidence to back up these assertions. A review of empirical evidence should give the reader greater confidence in the effectiveness of the

method. As noted earlier in regards to course assignments, two tests are given throughout the semester to make sure the core concepts are grasped. One paper in the middle of the term is required; the goal of this assignment is to replicate the critical history approach utilized in the *Fog of War* to gain added insight to critical foreign policy decisions. The final project is a research paper (over 14 pages is the suggested length) connecting a concept in international relations to a movie.

Comparisons between my traditional Intro to IR course and this course are enlightening regarding the average grade for each course. Overall, my Introduction to International Relations courses perform substantially better during the summer months than during the normal semester terms. Since the sample size is so small (three classes each), we can have little confidence that the results are statistically significant, but there definitely is a trend of increased ability as demonstrated by conventional evaluation methods. The normal IR course has a course average that hovers between 78 and 82. The film-based IR course has a course average of 85 to 91.

I would like to attribute the gains in student learning to the movie-based pedagogical method. Surely, the smaller course size during the summer is a factor that might explain the better grades. The small class size issue might be mitigated by the fact that the normal IR course has teaching assistants available to help the students along with small course sections that meet once a week. As anyone who teaches during a shortened term can attest, grades are usually lower during the summer terms than the fall or spring. This is generally due to overall apathy and the fact that summer students have many other tasks to complete.

To gather further evidence, an anonymous survey was presented to the IR and film class at the University of Illinois during the Summer 2010 term. There were 24 responses and the scores were out of 5 with 5 being "agree strongly" and 1 being "disagree strongly." When asked if the film course was superior to a normal lecture course, the students voted a score of 3.91 suggesting they agree with the statement. When asked if the film course should replace the lecture course during the normal semester, the students voted a score of 3.53 suggesting they agree somewhat. Asked if the movies convey the lectures and concepts adequately, the students agreed strongly with a score of 4.2 out of 5.

Conclusion and Future Directions

After the shift towards a movie-based Introduction to IR course, it is easy to see a change in the responsiveness of my students. They are truly engaged during the life of the course, judging by attendance (which is nearly perfect) and participation, which leads to excitable debates about international policy lasting well after the allotted course time. Students are no longer caught at the margins and excluded from engagement because they could not really get interested in the readings or lecture topics during the summer months. The course grabs them early, gives them the basic concepts and prepares them for future work in the field. The effectiveness of this course has been demonstrated by the increased average grades and responses from my students.

The modern film industry is progressing to better deal with issues important to a global community. No longer can a film be made just for the American domestic market. All films need to have a global context to receive the green light. Through the years, my course has been able to discard some films for new ones that better display worldviews. Perhaps the best examples are the recent introductions of *300*

and *Munich*. *The Battle of Algiers* was recovered in popular use through a DVD reissue, and it allowed for engagement and reflection of counterinsurgency and terrorism that had direct applications to the situation in Iraq and Afghanistan. Even the *Watchmen* (2009) touches on IR in its central scheme to paint Dr. Manhattan as an otherworldly evil that the rest of the world should rally against to destroy, thus leading to world peace. *Monsters* (2010) is a useful allegory focused on the dangers of extremism regarding immigration; the monsters are aliens, but they just might as well have been earthly Mexicans. Hopefully the global economic crises can lead to new films that explore issues of economic relations between states and globalization in the modern context.

Overall, this course is designed so that the major concepts of International Relations are applied in a way that all students can embrace. Some of my brightest students regularly comment about how a lesson we covered in the context of a film led them to understand the current course of global affairs better than just reading it in a textbook because film has a way of rendering a point more vividly than printed material. If our goal is to cultivate an informed, educated, and global citizen, a course such as this meets this goal. Overall, the students are able to learn and absorb important lessons, to explain introductory topics in IR and are motivated to research these topics in the future.

Notes

1. This is not to suggest that engaged students are not served by the course. Frequently the more advanced students who have moved on to graduate school still comment that the lessons learned in this course have served them well.
2. Since we have a separate track for international political economy (IPE) at my college, I have removed IPE from my intro course almost entirely. There are plenty of movies that can be used to discuss basic IPE topics but I leave that for others.
3. The American Film Institute (afi.com) lists *Dr. Strangelove* as Number 39 overall, down 12 places from its 1997 ranking.
4. An issue to be aware of is the level of extreme violence in many of the films. The graphic depictions of combat in *Black Hawk Down* (2001), *Saving Private Ryan* (1998), and *Full Metal Jacket* (1987) are extreme and students should be warned beforehand if these types of movies are chosen. This is especially a concern for students who have experienced combat personally and have issues with Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).
5. http://rogerebert.suntimes.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=/20000709/REVIEWS 08/7090301/1023 (accessed 1/30/2011).
6. A case can be made for using either the old version of *Lord of Flies* (1963) or the newer American update (1990). The older version is preferred since it is superior in terms of quality and tone, but students generally will enjoy the update since it is more recent and of a visual style they are used to (color).
7. The classic text "On War" from *Summa Theologica* can be found online in public access format.
8. IMDB.com lists the 1930 version with 8.1 stars and the 1979 version has 7.1 stars. Generally IMDB ratings are skewed towards newer films so there seems to be some agreement that the older version is indeed better.
9. *Black Hawk Down* (2001) is a more recent example of a film that would be useful to dissect the first-person perspective during battle.
10. The films are in public domain and can be found online for free.
11. Also due to the film's clear parallels to the War in Iraq (2003) and counterinsurgency strategy.
12. The Dr. Seuss film *Butter Battle Book* (1989) is also useful for illustrating the security dilemma. Unfortunately it is only available on VHS and can be rather silly with all the talk of toast and butter wars.

References

Beavers, Staci. 2002. "*The West Wing* as a Pedagogical Tool." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 35(2): 213–216.

Blight, James G. and Janet M. Lang. 2005. *The Fog of War: Lessons from the Life of Robert S. McNamara*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Colaresi, Michael P. 2005. *Scare Tactics: The Politics of International Rivalry*. Syracuse: Syracuse University Press.

Cushman, Reid. 1993. "Textbooks, Technologies, and Tocqueville: Alternatives for Introductory American Government." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 26(2): 223–227.

Diehl, Paul and Gary Goertz. 2000. *War and Peace in International Rivalry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Fearon, James D. and David Laitin. 2003. "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War." *American Political Science Review* 91(1): 75–90.

Gandhi, Mahatma. 2002. *An Anthology of His Writings on His Life, Work, and Ideas,* 2nd ed. Edited by Louis Fischer. New York: Vintage Publishers.

Graham, Allison. 1971. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crises*. Boston: Little Brown.

Gregg, Robert W. 1998. *International Relations on Film*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Hensel, Paul R. and Paul F. Diehl. 1994. "It Takes Two to Tango: Nonmilitarized Response in Interstate Disputes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38(3): 479–506.

Herz, John. 1950. "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 2(2): 157–180.

Hoberman, J. 2004. "It's Always 'High Noon' at the White House," *The New York Times*, 25 April 2004.

Jervis, Robert. 1976. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kegley, Charles W., Jr. and Gregory Raymond. 1982. "Alliance Norms and War: A New Piece in an Old Puzzle." *International Studies Quarterly* 26(4): 572–595.

Krain, Matthew. 2010. "The Effects of Different Types of Case Learning on Student Engagement." *International Studies Perspectives* 11(3): 291–308.

Kuzma, Lynn M. and Patrick Haney. 2001. "And . . . Action! Using Film to Learn about Foreign Policy." *International Studies Perspectives* 2(1): 33–50.

Lieberfeld, Daniel. 2007. "Teaching about War through Film and Literature." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 40(3): 571–574.

Lindley, Dan. 2001. "What I Learned Since I Stopped Worrying and Studied the Movie: A Teaching Guide to Stanley Kubrick's *Dr. Strangelove*." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 34(3): 663–667.

Machiavelli, Niccolò. 1886. *The Prince, and Other Pieces*. London: G. Routledge.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1952. "Another Great Debate: The National Interest of the United States." *American Political Science Review* 46(4): 961–978.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1960. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. New York: Knopf.

O'Neill, Barry. 1999. *Honor, Symbols, and War*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Owen, Roger. 2000. *State, Power and Politics in the Making of the Modern Middle East,* 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

Putnam, Robert. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42(3): 427–460.

Ray, James Lee. 1995. *Democracy and International Conflict: An Evaluation of the democratic peace proposition*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Reiter, Dan and Allan C. Stam. 2002. *Democracies at War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ruane, Abigail E. and Patrick James. 2008. "The International Relations of Middle-earth: Learning from *The Lord of the Rings*." *International Studies Perspectives* 9(4): 377–394.

Ruane, Abigail E. and Patrick James. 2012. *The International Relations of Middle-earth: Learning from Lord of the Rings*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Simpson, Archie W. and Bernd Kaussler. 2009. "IR Teaching Reloaded: Using Films and Simulations in the Teaching of International Relations." *International Studies Perspectives* 10(4): 413–427.

Singer, J. David. 1961. "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations." *World Politics* 14(1): 77–92.

Teten, Ryan L. 2010. "When in Rome, Do as Jon Stewart Does: Using America: The Book as a Textbook for Introductory Level Classes in American Politics." *Journal of Political Science Education* 6(2): 163–187.

Thucydides. 2006. *The History of the Peloponnesian War*. New York, NY: Barnes & Noble Classics.

Vasquez, John A. 1993. *The War Puzzle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vasquez, John and Brandon Valeriano. 2010. "Classification of Interstate War." *Journal of Politics* 72(2): 292–309.

Waalkes, Scott. 2003. "Using Film Clips as Cases to Teach the Rise and "Decline" of the State." *International Studies Perspectives* 4(2): 156–174.

Weber, Cynthia. 2001. "The Highs and Lows of Teaching IR Theory: Using Popular Films for Theoretical Critique." *International Studies Perspectives* 2(3): 281–287.

Weber, Cynthia. 2005. *Imagining America at War: Morality, Politics, and Film*. London and New York: Routledge.

Film References

Annaud, Jean-Jacques, dir. *Enemy at the Gates*. Paramount Pictures, 2001. Film.

Attenborough, Richard, dir. *Gandhi*. International Film Investors, 1982. Film.

Bakshi, Ralph, dir. *Butter Battle Book*. Turner Network Television, 1989. TV.

Brooks, Peter, dir. *Lord of the Files*. Two Arts Ltd., 1963. Film.

Cameron, James, dir. *Avatar*. Twentieth Century Fox, 2009. Film.

Capra, Frank, producer. *Why We Fight: Prelude to War*. U.S. War Department, 1942. Film.

Chaplin, Charlie, dir. *Great Dictator*. Charles Chaplin Productions, 1940. Film.

Coppola, France Ford, dir. *Godfather*. Paramount Pictures, 1972. Film.

Edwards, Gareth, dir. *Monsters*. Vertigo Film, 2010. Film.

Emmerich, Roland, dir. *Independence Day*. Twentieth Century Fox, 1996. Film.

Fleischer, Richard and Kinji Fukasaku, dirs. *Tora, Tora, Tora*. Twentieth Century Fox 1970. Film.

Jackson, Peter, dir. *The Fellowship of the Ring*. New Line Cinema, 2001. Film.

Jackson, Peter, dir. *Return of the King*. New Line Cinema, 2003. Film.

Jackson, Peter, dir. *Two Towers*. New Line Cinema, 2002. Film.

King, Henry, dir. *Wilson*. Twentieth Century Fox Film, 1944. Film.

Lean, David, dir. *Lawrence of Arabia*. Columbia Pictures, 1962. Film.

Lucas, George, dir. *Star Wars Episode IV: A New Hope*. Twentieth Century Fox, 1977. Film.

Lumet, Sidney, dir. *Fail Safe*. Columbia Pictures, 1964. Film.

Kubrick, Stanley, dir., *Dr. Strangelove or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb*. Columbia Pictures, 1964. Film.

Kubrick, Stanley, dir. *Full Metal Jacket*. Warner Bros. Productions, 1987. Film.

Lean, David, dir. *Dr. Zhivago*. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, 1965. Film.

Mann, Delbert, dir. *All Quiet on the Western Front*. Norman Rosemont Productions, 1979. TV.

McCarey, Leo, dir. *Duck Soup*. Paramount Pictures, 1933. Film.

Milestone, Lewis, dir. *All Quiet on the Western Front*. Universal Pictures, 1930. Film.

Morris, Errol, dir. *Fog of War: Eleven Lessons from the Life of Robert S. McNamara*. 2003. Sony Pictures Classics, Film.

Pontecorvo, Gillo, dir. *Battle of Algiers*. Casbah Film, 1966. Film.

Riefenstahl, Leni, dir. *Triumph of the Will*. Reichspropagandaleitung der NSDAP, 1935. Film.

Scott, Ridley, dir. *Black Hawk Down*. Columbia Pictures, 2001. Film.

Snyder, Zack, dir. *300*. Warner Bros. Pictures-Legendary Pictures, 2006. Film.

Snyder, Zack, dir. *Watchmen*. Warner Bros. Pictures-Legendary Pictures, 2009. Film.

Spielberg, Stephen, producer. *Band of Brothers*. Dreamworks SKG, 2001.

Spielberg, Stephen, dir. *Minority Report*. Dreamworks SKG, 2002. Film.

Spielberg, Stephen, dir. *Munich*. Universal-Dreamworks SKG, 2005. Film.

Spielberg, Stephen, dir. *Saving Private Ryan*. Dreamworks SKG, 1998. Film.

Zinnemann, Fred, dir. *High Noon*. Stanley Kramer Productions, 1952. Film.