Compare and contrast realist, institutionalist, and disenfranchised theories of international relations with respect to their ability to explain differences across one of the pairs of issue areas A, B, C, or D A. security and human rights, B. security and environmental affairs, C. economic affairs and human rights, D. economic affairs and environmental affairs. NOTE: You CANNOT write on “security and economics” or “environmental affairs and human rights”. Your essay should address two questions · For each ISSUE AREA, which aspects are better explained by one theory, and which are better explained by another theory or theories? · For each THEORY, does it do better than, worse than, or equally as well as other theories at explaining what happens in one issue area vs. the other issue area. · Structure your essay by the six TENETS, i.e., intro, then, focus, actors, goals of actors; etc. In each section, briefly lay out what each of the three theories says about each tenet. Then, describe key examples for each issue area that relate to that tenet. Choose examples carefully so that they help you show: · Cases where one theory's tenets explain the examples from both issue areas · Cases where one theory's tenets explain the examples from one issue area but not the other. · Cases where one theory's tenets do not fit either issue area very well. Clarification of final essay expectations: This section clarifies for students who prefer more guidance. · Grading will be similar to the midterm; see grading rubric. Primary grading criteria: content, structure, and quality of argument. · Provide a balanced view of the usefulness of all 3 theories. · For example, a good approach would be: “this part of what I observe in each issue area, and the differences across issue areas is explained well by realism; but this other part of what I observe in each issue area is explained better by institutionalism; while disenfranchised theories help me understand this other part of the differences between these issue areas.” · Examine the patterns of international relations in both issue areas in terms of how states actually behave, not how they should behave (i.e., the way things ARE, not the way they SHOULD BE). · The best essays will cover most of the theoretical material by showing your understanding of each tenet without simply rephrasing or repeating the theory matrix description. Try to illustrate the essence of each tenet and its implications. Make sure to discuss concepts such as power, interests, norms, types of cooperation, and security, and link the argument to issues from some of the readings. Provide good theoretical reasoning in a coherent essay. Illustrate theoretical points with examples, using examples from readings or lectures during the term (examples involving international relations that you make up are unlikely to be as good, but are better than nothing). · Use examples from the lectures and readings to illustrate and support your argument. · Don’t forget to write a conclusion that restates the argument and briefly summarizes your overall conclusions from the analysis. · Expect to lose points for comments such as “we need cooperation to protect human rights, so the focus is institutionalism” or “realist countries don't protect human rights while institutionalist countries do” or “if we adopt realism, then everyone will only look out for themselves, so we should adopt institutionalist views instead” or “Paraguay has pursued a realist policy while the leaders of Bhutan have adopted a more feminist policy approach.” · Remember, political scientists use theory to explain the behavior of states; states do not generally use theory to guide their own behavior.