

Theories of International Relations

Course Convenor

Dr Katharine Millar

Room: CLM 4.10

E-mail: K.M.Millar@lse.ac.uk

Tel: 020 7955 6788

Office hours: TBC

Lectures

Michaelmas Term

Mondays (Weeks 1-11), 11.00am-12.00pm, CLM 7.02

Lent Term

Mondays (Weeks 1-11), 11.00am-12.00pm, 32L.G.03

Lecturers

Professor Barry Buzan (BB)

Dr Janina Dill (JD)

Dr George Lawson (GL)

Dr Katharine Millar (KM)

Seminars

Michaelmas Term

Group 1: Wednesdays (Weeks 1-11), 15.00 - 17.00, KSW 2.07

Group 2: Thursdays (Weeks 1-11), 14.00 - 16.00, TW1 2.04

Group 3: Wednesdays (Weeks 1-11), 10.00am - 12.00pm, OLD 3.25

Lent Term

Group 1: Wednesdays (Weeks 1-11), 15.00 - 17.00, KSW.2.07

Group 2: Thursdays (Weeks 1-11), 14.00 - 16.00, TW1.2.04

Group 3: Wednesdays (Weeks 1-11), 10.00am - 12.00pm, OLD 3.25

Introduction

This course is a graduate-level introduction to International Relations (IR) theory. It is structured around three core engagements: IR as a branch of philosophical knowledge; IR as a social science; and IR as a dimension of ‘actual existing’ world politics. The course surveys both mainstream and critical approaches to the subject, examining how these theories conceptualize ‘the international’ as a field of study. The course explicitly relates IR to cognate disciplines, reflects critically on the conceptual frameworks and modes of analysis used by IR theories, and studies the co-constitutive relationship between the theory and practice of international relations.

Aims

The course has four main aims:

- To enable students to assess the contributions and shortcomings of both mainstream and critical IR theories.
- To interrogate how ‘the international’ has been constructed as a field of study.
- To connect IR with debates, both methodological and theoretical, that have been germane to the formation of social science as a whole.
- To demonstrate how theory provides a road map, toolkit or lens by which to examine international events and processes.

Outcomes

By the end of the course, students will:

- Evaluate the advantages and difficulties of IR theories both in comparison to each other and vis-à-vis schemas drawn from other disciplines.
- Discuss critically, and write knowledgeably about, major IR theories, relating these both to contemporary events and historical processes.
- Possess the means to show how theory and practice intertwine in constituting mainstream and critical IR theories.
- Learn how to think and write critically about key debates in contemporary IR theory.

Teaching methods

IR 436 is the core course for both the *MSc International Relations Theory* and the *MSc International Relations Research*. The course consists of 20 lectures and 20 seminars. A revision class will be held in Summer Term – details to be announced later in the year.

There are three main teaching methods used on the course: lectures, seminars and small groups.

- **Lectures:** lectures provide an overview of a particular topic. The course is structured in three sections. We begin by ‘theorising the international’, exploring the ways in which IR theorists have conceptualised ‘the international’ as a field of study. The second section of the course examines both mainstream and critical approaches to the subject, applying these theories to key concepts in the discipline. The final part of the course focuses on philosophy of science and philosophy of history, paying attention to how these underpin – and sometimes undermine – IR theories.

Although no previous knowledge of IR theory is assumed, it is worth remembering that this is a graduate level course. As such, preparation – even for lectures – is vital. We suggest that you do some reading *before* the lectures and, in addition, strengthen your knowledge of IR theory by attending lectures in related courses such as *The Structure of International Society* (IR100) and *International Politics* (IR410).

- **Seminars:** There are 20 seminars starting in the first week of Autumn Term. The course guide outlines texts that are required reading each week. These are intended to provide a basis for class discussion, to introduce key concepts and issues, and to act as a starting point for more advanced, independent enquiry of particular topics. These texts should be digested *ahead* of the seminars.

Attendance at seminars is compulsory. If you do need to miss a seminar, please notify your class teacher ahead of time. While you are not expected to have prior knowledge of the material we will be discussing, it is important that you are keen, active and involved participants in the course as a whole. This means reading every week, thinking about the topics involved, working hard on the presentations, and generally playing your part in making the seminar an enjoyable, stimulating environment.

Most of the time, seminars will consist of three core elements:

- There will be a brief presentation (10 minutes) by one or two members of the group. Presentations should be based on the key questions listed under the weekly topics. Please note that presentation handouts should be circulated to the group twenty-four hours *before* the seminar takes place.
 - A discussant will comment briefly (no more than 5 minutes) on the topic at hand, raising issues not addressed by the presenter, offering an alternative view or, perhaps, discussing an additional question included in this course guide. Presenters and discussants should work together to ensure that their work is complementary.
 - The class will have a discussion based on the material presented. This will vary in form from week to week, ranging from a general conversation to smaller group work and, on occasion, written assignments.
- **Small groups:** During the reading weeks that are held during week 6 of Autumn Term and Spring Term, students will meet in small groups of 3-4 with their seminar leader. These ‘tutorial’ sessions are intended as forums for probing deeper into issues raised by the course, highlighting problems, and looking more closely at topics which students are engaging with in their written work. These sessions will be timetabled in consultation with seminar leaders.

Presentations

Begin presentations by setting out the question you are addressing and explaining why it is important. Outline your perspective clearly and identify issues for discussion. Do not merely read out a pre-prepared script, but, using a clear structure, talk through your argument. This makes the presentation more enjoyable to listen to, develops valuable presentation skills and ensures that you know your material. Presenters should also prepare a handout (e.g. outlining the main points covered by the talk) for classmates to download. You are welcome (in fact, encouraged) to use PowerPoint, Prezi and other such programmes.

Assessment

Formative assessment – the course has three forms of formative assessment:

- *Essays*: you will write three essays (2,000-2,500 words) during the course of the year. The first, due in week 7 of Autumn Term (Wednesday 9th November), should engage with the texts used to set up the course and its central concern: how to conceptualize IR as a field of enquiry. The second, due in week 2 of Spring Term (Wednesday 18th January), should be an assessment of mainstream theories and concepts. The final essay, due in week 8 of Spring Term (Wednesday 1st March), should interrogate critical approaches to the subject. Please note that these essays *can be used* in the development of your summative essay.
- *Outline*: it is strongly encouraged to provide an outline of your summative essay (see below) to your seminar leader. The outline should be 2-3 pages long and consist of: a question/title; an overview of your argument; a draft structure; and an indicative reading list. This is a chance to see how your ideas are developing, assess whether the argument is hanging together and receive some thoughts about what gaps need to be filled.
- *Verbal*: all students will conduct at least one presentation and take one turn as discussant during the second section of the course i.e. weeks 4-18. Class teachers will provide feedback on presentations. In addition, all students are expected to contribute regularly to seminar discussions.

Summative assessment – the course has two forms of summative assessment:

- *Long essay*: 50% of the final grade is drawn from a long essay (4,000 words) due in week 1 of Summer Term (Wednesday 26th April). We are open about both topics and methods. Essays should, of course, engage with a theoretical question, issue or puzzle, although this will be interpreted liberally in order to maximise independence of thought and creativity of research. Class teachers and advisors will provide guidance on the long essay during the year.
- *Exam*: during Summer Term (probably in mid-May), students will sit a two hour unseen exam. This exam constitutes 50% of your final grade. Last year's exam is provided at the back of this reading list. You can find copies of the exams from previous years in the library. A revision session relating to the exam will be held early in Summer Term. Once again, advisors and class teachers will provide guidance on the exam during the year.

Essay writing

Essay topics should be drawn from the questions listed under each topic or from prior discussion with class teachers. Essays should be typed, double spaced and printed on A4 paper. They should outline a sustained argument answering a specific question, backing up claims and refuting counter positions with examples and evidence. Essays should also include footnotes (where appropriate) and a bibliography. As a basic guide, we suggest reading and absorbing between 6-10 texts (articles, chapters and books) for each essay.

To reiterate, deadlines for the assignments are:

- *Essay 1 ('theorising the international')*: Wednesday 9th November
- *Essay 2 (mainstream theories)*: Wednesday 18th January

- *Essay 3 (critical theories)*: Wednesday 1st March
- *Long essay*: Wednesday 26th April

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the most serious offence in academic work. All summatively assessed work, as well as some formatively assessed work, will be checked against plagiarism software. The department takes plagiarism seriously and the penalties are severe. Plagiarised work will, at minimum, be given a mark of zero, and you may be denied a degree. If your referencing (or lack thereof) makes it difficult for examiners to identify clearly where you draw on the work of others and in what form you do so, you have committed plagiarism, *even if this was not your intention*. Drawing on the work of others includes, but is not limited to, direct use of other's formulations and paraphrasing of their formulations without due referencing. The work of others includes text and illustrations from books, newspapers, journals, essays, reports and the Internet. It is also an offence to plagiarise your own work (e.g. by submitting the same text for two different pieces of summative work).

The golden rule for avoiding plagiarism is to ensure that examiners can be in no doubt as to which parts of your work are your own formulations and which are drawn from other sources. To ensure this, when presenting the views and work of others, include an acknowledgement of the source of the material. For example, 'As Waltz (1979) has shown'. Also make sure to give the full details of the work cited in your bibliography. If you quote text verbatim, place the sentence in inverted commas and provide the appropriate reference. For example, 'It is not possible to understand world politics simply by looking inside states' (Waltz 1979: 65). Once again, make sure to give the full details of the work cited in your bibliography. If you want to cite the work of another author at length, set the quoted text apart from your own text (e.g. by indenting a paragraph) and identify it by using inverted commas and adding a reference as above. If you want to use references to third party sources you have found in a text, include a full reference. For example, 'Considerations of security subordinate economic gain to political interest' (Waltz 1979, cited in Moravcsik 1993: 129). In this instance, include bibliographical details for each work.

It is your responsibility to ensure that you understand the rules on plagiarism and do not submit plagiarised work. The failure of seminar leaders to detect breaches of these rules in formative or summative essays does not constitute an endorsement – implicit or explicit – of your referencing. You must read the school regulations and, if you have any questions, consult your seminar leaders and/or personal advisor. For further guidance on how to avoid plagiarism and how to reference, see:

- Richard Pears and Graham Shields, *Cite Them Right: The Essential Guide to Referencing and Plagiarism* (London: Pear Tree Books, 2008);
- LSE's regulations on plagiarism:
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/resources/calendar/academicRegulations/RegulationsOnAssessmentOffences-Plagiarism.htm>
- The library's guide to citing and referencing:
learningresources.lse.ac.uk/24/1/L045APACitingAndReferencingGuide.doc

Moodle

Moodle is the web-based location for IR436 course materials. Moodle can be accessed via the 'Welcome to LSE Moodle' quick link on the 'current students' page of the LSE website. Students need to self-register via the link on the Moodle homepage in order to gain access to the IR436 site. Help in using the system is available online, and the *Teaching and Learning Centre* runs tutorials that you can – and should – make use of.

The IR436 Moodle site contains an electronic version of the course guide, lecture slides, web links and news of upcoming events. We have tried to ensure that all essential readings are available electronically, although this should not be assumed and does not serve as a substitute for visiting the library! There is also an IR436 e-pack consisting of scanned readings that are not otherwise available electronically. Your views on the site are welcome.

Textbooks and journals

Although there is no textbook assigned for this course, it will be worth purchasing the following three books, particularly if you haven't studied IR before.

- Barry Buzan and George Lawson (2015) *The Global Transformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). This book blends IR and world history in order to trace the emergence of modern international order. It serves as a useful primer to many of the theoretical and empirical issues we will be wrestling with.
- Scott Burchill *et al* (eds.), *Theories of International Relations*, 5th edition (London: Palgrave, 2013) – solid 'ism'-based textbook pitched at quite a high level. Includes chapters on subjects such as historical sociology, international political theory and green politics as well as the usual suspects.
- Patrick Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations*, 2nd edition (London: Routledge, 2016) – especially useful for the third section of the course on philosophy of science. The second edition has a new, and very useful, introduction by Jackson exploring the debates that have emerged since the book was first published in 2011.

Three useful (although more expensive) reference texts would also be worth tracking down:

- Martin Griffiths (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of International Relations and Global Politics* (London: Routledge, 2007) – comprehensive contributions on a wide range of subjects.
- Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth Simmons (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, 2nd edition (London: Sage, 2012) – wide-ranging in scope and containing some important, if often complex, contributions from leading thinkers in the field.
- Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) – as with the Carlsnaes *et al* handbook, a wide-ranging book containing some important contributions.

It might also be worth buying a copy of the *Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*, edited by Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham, which contains further information on the main concepts and terms we use on the course. There is also a glossary on the course Moodle page that provides definitions of the key terms we will be using.

It is important to keep up to date with debates in the field through the major journals, all of which are available electronically. *International Organization* and *International Security* are the premier US journals. Please note that these journals are, in the main, gateways to mainstream approaches – they are interesting as much for what they omit as for what they cover. *International Studies Quarterly* is the house journal of the International Studies

Association. It provides an alternative showcase for mainstream theories, while self-consciously seeking to represent the breadth of work being done in the discipline.

The main non-US journals are the *European Journal of International Relations*, which is mostly (but by no means exclusively) associated with constructivism and post-positivism; the *Review of International Studies*, a well-established general journal published by the British International Studies Association; *International Affairs*, another good general journal, although more geared at ‘stuff’ than theory; and *Millennium*, a self-styled avant-garde journal edited by research students at LSE (N.B. the Millennium Editorial Board is open to all MSc students in the department – it is a valuable way to get to know the best (and worst) of cutting-edge IR theory).

International Political Sociology is worth looking at for (mainly) ‘critical’ articles. *International Theory*, edited by Alex Wendt and Duncan Snidal, is a high-calibre theory journal intended to explore the ways in which IR fits with – and rubs up against – cognate modes of enquiry.

Websites and blogs

There are an increasing number of blogs devoted to international studies, some of which repay regular visits. The journal *Foreign Policy* houses a number of blogs, including one by Stephen Walt, perhaps the world’s pre-eminent Realist. However, be warned: the site charges a subscription fee. ‘The Duck of Minerva’ (<http://duckofminerva.blogspot.com/>) is a collective venture established by a youngish crowd of IR scholars. ‘*The disorder of things*’ is a group blog set-up by an even younger, and altogether more radical, collective. ‘*Relations international*’ is worth bookmarking, as is ‘*Political Violence at a Glance*’. For those interesting in philosophy of social science, Daniel Little hosts an excellent [site](http://www.e-ir.info/). e-International Relations (<http://www.e-ir.info/>) is a solid, student-friendly site.

Other useful websites include <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/conversations/>, the front-page of the University of California, Berkeley’s ‘conversations with history’ TV programme. The site contains interviews with some of the leading figures in IR theory including Kenneth Waltz, John Mearsheimer, Stephen Krasner and Robert Keohane. <http://www.theory-talks.org/> has a number of interesting interviews, including those with Cynthia Enloe, Ann Tickner, Patrick Jackson, Siba Grovogui, Nick Onuf and Robert Cox, as well as our own Barry Buzan and Iver Neumann. Those of you keen on exploring ideas formulated outside IR, which I hope means all of you, can spend many happy hours roaming around this [site](http://www.theory-talks.org/), which features interviews with a range of historians, anthropologists, sociologists, classicists and even the odd neuroscientist. ‘*Global Social Theory*’ is an attempt to widen what is understood to be the theoretical ‘canon’.

In terms of ‘actual existing’ international affairs, the ‘World Affairs Journal’ provides up-to-date commentary on international affairs: <http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/>; <http://www.opendemocracy.net/> is a ‘global conversation’ that includes discussion of issues ranging from security to social justice. The main UK think-tanks working on international affairs are [Chatham House](http://www.chathamhouse.org/), the [IISS](http://www.iiss.org/), [RUSI](http://www.rusi.org/), and the [European Council on Foreign Relations](http://www.european-council.europa.eu/). <http://www.brookings.edu/> is the online home of the Brookings Institution, perhaps the main think-tank in the United States devoted to international studies.

Obviously, this is just the tip of a substantial iceberg. The key point is that websites, blogs and social media are an increasingly common – and powerful – means of conducting, and thinking about, IR theory. So make sure that you are part of the conversation.

List of Lectures

Autumn Term

Part 1

Theorising theory; theorising the international

26 September	International Relations vs. international relations (GL)
3 October	Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois on 'the international' (GL)
10 October	Slaughter, Mearsheimer and Pipes on 'the international' (GL)

Part 2

Theories of International Relations

Mainstream approaches

17 October	Realism and neorealism (JD)
24 October	War and security under anarchy (JD)
Reading week – meet in small groups: see p. 3	
7 November	Classical, Neo- and 'New' Liberalism (JD)
14 November	Regimes, Institutions and the Mitigation of Anarchy (JD)
21 November	The English School (BB)
28 November	Constructivism (JD)
5 December	International Law (JD)

Spring Term

Critical approaches

9 January	Marxism and critical theory (GL)
16 January	Empire (GL)
23 January	Post-structuralism (KM)
30 February	Power (KM)
6 February	Feminism (KM)
Reading week – meet in small groups: see p. 3	
20 February	Security (KM)

Part 3: Theorising theory

27 February	Philosophy of Science I: Knowledge and certainty (KM)
6 March	Philosophy of Science II: Pluralism and paradigms (KM)
13 March	Philosophy of History I: Context (GL)
20 March	Philosophy of History II: Narrative (GL)

Summer Term

We will hold a revision session early in Summer Term. Details will be forwarded to you nearer the time.

Topics: Overview, reading and key questions

It is not intended that students read *all* the references listed under each topic below. Essential readings are exactly that ... essential. Other important works are marked with an asterisk (*) and are usually held in the Course Collection and/or available electronically.

Autumn Term

Part 1: Theorising the international

The first section of the course examines how a range of scholars from different times and starting points imagine 'the international'. This helps to illuminate one of the central concerns of the course: is there something distinctive about IR, and if so, what is it?

Week 1 Introduction: International Relations and international relations

Before the discipline of **International Relations**, there was the study of **international relations** i.e. the influence of 'external' practices, ideas and institutions on polities around the world. This lecture provides an overview of the 'deep roots' of international relations. Its main point is that 'international relations' has a longer, deeper and broader history than that of modern Europe. Taking this longer lens provides us with a surer basis for thinking about the present international order and about the institutionalisation of IR as a discipline.

Essential reading

Benjamin de Carvalho, Halvard Leira and John Hobson (2011) 'The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1919', *Millennium* 39(3): 735-758.
Barry Buzan and George Lawson (2013) 'The Global Transformation', *International Studies Quarterly* 57(3): 620-634. Also see the responses by Daniel Nexon and Paul Musgrave, Andrew Phillips, and Christopher Chase Dunn in: *International Studies Quarterly* 57(3) 2013: 635-642.

Further reading

* Acharya, Amitav (2014) 'Global International Relations and Regional Worlds', *International Studies Quarterly* 58(1): 647-59.
Bayly, C.A. (2004) *The Birth of the Modern World* (Oxford: Blackwell).
* Buzan, Barry and Richard Little (2002) 'Why International Relations Has Failed as an Intellectual Project and What to Do About It', *Millennium* 30(1): 19-39.
Buzan, Barry and George Lawson (2015) *The Global Transformation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press). Also see the forums on the book in: [International Theory 8\(3\) 2016, and at The Disorder of Things](#).
European Journal of International Relations (2013) Special Issue: 'The End of International Relations Theory'? 19(3). Also see the debate at the Duck of Minerva: <http://www.whiteoliphaunt.com/duckofminerva/tag/ejir-special-issue-symposium>.
Hoffman, Stanley (1987) 'An American Social Science: IR' in Stanley Hoffman ed., *Janus and Minerva: Essays in International Relations* (Boulder: Westview): 3-24.
Millennium (2014) Special Issue: 'The Standard of Civilization' 42(3).
Pomeranz, Kenneth (2000) *The Great Divergence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
* Shilliam, Robbie (2011) 'The Perilous but Unavoidable Terrain of the Non-West' in Robbie Shilliam ed., *IR and Non-Western Thought* (London: Routledge): 12-26.
Tickner, Arlene and David Blaney eds. (2012) *Thinking IR Differently* (London: Routledge).

Key questions

- To what extent is IR as a discipline shaped by the experience of the modern West?
- Does it matter if IR is Eurocentric?

Week 2 Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois on 'the international'

This lecture explores three approaches to theorising International Relations in the early 20th century. Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois wrote before IR was institutionalised as an academic discipline. Nevertheless, all three outlined what they saw as the distinctive features of 'the international'. Angell saw the international as acquiring a new form in the early 20th century, which he associated with the 'interdependence' of financial markets. Mackinder argued that there were long-standing forces that shaped international politics, particularly geography and power politics. For Du Bois, international order was sustained by imperialism and underpinned by a racial 'colour line'. If Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois had distinctive takes on 'the international', all three were deeply immersed in debates about empire, race and civilization. IR as a discipline emerged from these debates.

Essential reading

Angell, Norman (1912) 'The Influence of Credit Upon International Relations', in *The Foundations of International Polity* (London: Heinemann).

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1915) 'The African Roots of War', *Atlantic Monthly*, May:
<http://scua.library.umass.edu/digital/dubois/WarRoots.pdf>

Mackinder, H. J. (1904) 'The Geographical Pivot of History', *The Geographical Journal*, 23 (4): 421-437.

Further reading

Angell, Norman (1910) *The Great Illusion* (London: G.P. Putnam and Sons):
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/38535/38535-h/38535-h.htm>

* Anievas, Alex et al (eds). (2015) *Race and Racism in International Relations* (London: Routledge), especially the Introduction and chapter by Charles Mills.

Ashworth, Lucian (2011) 'Halford Mackinder, Geopolitics and the Reality of the League of Nations', *European Journal of International Relations* 17(2): 279-301.

Belich, James (2009) *Replenishing the Earth* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Bell, Duncan (ed.) (2007) *Victorian Visions of Global Order* (Cambridge: CUP).

Du Bois, W.E.B. (1920) 'The Souls of White Folk' in: *Darkwater* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co): http://www.gutenberg.org/files/15210/15210-h/15210-h.htm#Chapter_II

* Du Bois, W.E.B. (1925) 'Worlds of Color', *Foreign Affairs*, April:
<https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/1925-04-01/worlds-color>

Guzzini, Stefano (2012) *The Return of Geopolitics in Europe* (Cambridge, CUP).

* Hobson, John (2012) *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics* (Cambridge: CUP).
Also see the forum on Hobson's book in *Millennium* 42(2) (2014).

Mackinder, H.J. (1919) *Democratic Ideals and Reality* (London: Henry Holt at Co).

* Schmidt, Brian (2002) 'Anarchy, World Politics and the Birth of a Discipline',
International Relations 16(1): 9-31.

Vitalis, Robert (2005) 'Birth of a Discipline' in: Long and Schmidt, *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of IR* (State University of New York Press): 159-182.

* Vitalis, Robert (2015) *White World Order, Black Power Politics* (Ithaca: Cornell). Also see the symposium on the book at the [Disorder of Things](#).

Key questions

- In what sense do Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois provide us with a *theory* of the international?
- To what extent was – and is – international order sustained by a 'global colour line'?
- How relevant are the arguments of Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois to 21st century concerns?

Week 3 Slaughter, Mearsheimer and Pipes on ‘the international’

This lecture examines three attempts to specify what ‘the international’ means from the perspective of IR as an established social science in the early part of the 21st century. Anne-Marie Slaughter, a former adviser to President Obama, picks up some of Angell’s themes in arguing that IR needs to meet the demands of an interdependent, networked world. John Mearsheimer follows Mackinder in stressing the importance of perennial (particularly geopolitical) themes to the make-up and practice of international relations. Daniel Pipes, like Du Bois, sees IR as intimately bound up with questions of race, even if he takes a quite different view than Du Bois about how to conceive race and what to do about the ‘global color line’. Which of these visions is more compelling? And to what extent can we draw common threads between the writings of Slaughter, Mearsheimer and Pipes, and those of Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois?

Essential reading

Mearsheimer, John (2011) ‘Imperial by Design’, *The National Interest*, Jan-Feb: 16-34.

Pipes, Daniel (1990) ‘[The Muslims are Coming! The Muslims are Coming!](#)’, *National Review*, November.

Slaughter, Anne-Marie (2009) ‘Power in the Networked Century’, *Foreign Affairs* 88(1): 94-113.

Further reading

To get an up-to-date sense of Slaughter’s thinking, have a trawl through her [tweets](#), [blog posts](#) and [interviews](#). A longer version of Mearsheimer’s article can be found in his *Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (Norton, 2001). A shorter version can be found in [Newsweek](#). Daniel Pipes runs both an extensive [website](#) and a [think-tank](#).

Key questions

- Do the analyses of Slaughter, Mearsheimer and Pipes have anything in common?
 - What distinguishes the ways in which Slaughter, Mearsheimer and Pipes theorise the international from the views of Angell, Mackinder and Du Bois?
 - To what extent do we need to read texts contextually?
-

Part 2 Theories of International Relations

The second part of the course explores the principal theories of International Relations. Most of the time, theories are covered in two sessions. In the first week, lectures provide a general introduction to a particular approach. In the second week, lectures tackle an issue/theme/concept of core concern to the theory. At all times, we will be asking two linked questions: a) How well – or not – do these concepts/issues/themes map onto existing IR theories?; and b) How close are the links between the concepts and issues we use to understand/explain/describe the world, and actual events and processes in world politics?

Week 4 Realism and Neorealism

Realism has deep roots in the writings of such thinkers as Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes. After the Second World War, E.H. Carr and Hans J. Morgenthau in particular sought to establish realism as an alternative to ‘idealism’, which they thought had dominated the interwar years. Realism soon became the principal IR theory, especially in North America. Following the behaviourist turn in political science, Kenneth Waltz became the progenitor of neo- or structural realism, aspiring to develop realism into a ‘scientific’ theory. Structural realism divides into ‘offensive realism’, ‘defensive realism’ and ‘neo-classical realism’. Recently, there has been revived interest in classical realist ideas.

Essential reading

Jeffrey W. Legro and Andrew Moravcsik (1999) 'Is Anybody Still a Realist?' *International Security*, 24(2): 5-55.

Stephen M. Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (1987), Chapters 1 & 2

Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (1979), Chapter 6.

Further reading

Classical realists

* Extracts From Thucydides, 'Peloponnesian War', Machiavelli 'The Prince' and Hobbes, 'Leviathan' in Chris Brown, Terry Nardin, and N.J. Rengger (eds.), *International Relations in Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis* (especially the 2001 edition by Michael Cox)

George Kennan, *American Diplomacy* (1952)

Hans J. Morgenthau, *Scientific Man and Power Politics* (1947)

* Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations* (up to 5th edition), especially Parts 1 & 4

Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932)

Commentaries on the classical realists

Christoph Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography* (2001)

* Nicolas Guilhot ed. *The Invention of International Relations Theory* (2011)

Jonathan Haslam, *No Virtue Like Necessity: Realist Thought since Machiavelli* (2002)

Joel Rosenthal, *Righteous Realists* (1991)

* Michael Williams, 'Why Ideas Matter in IR: Morgenthau, Classical Realism, and the Moral Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization*, 58(4) (2004): 633-665

Michael Williams, *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* (2005)

* Michael Williams (ed.), *Realism Reconsidered* (2007)

Neorealism(s)

* Ken Booth ed., *Realism and World Politics* (2011) [also published as 'The King of Thought', *International Relations*, 23(2) (2009) and 23(3) (2009)]

Charles L. Glaser, *A Rational Theory of International Politics* (2010)

Fred Halliday and Justin Rosenberg, 'An Interview with Kenneth Waltz', *Review of International Studies* 24(3) (1998): 371-386

Steve Lobell et al., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy* (2009)

* John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (2001) [reviewed in Brian C. Schmidt, 'Realism as Tragedy', *Review of International Studies*, 30(3) (2004): 427-441].

Gideon Rose, 'Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy', *World Politics* 51(1) (1998): 144-172

* Randall Schweller, *Deadly Imbalances* (1998)

Randall Schweller, *Unanswered Threats* (2006)

* Kenneth Waltz, 'Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory', *Journal of International Affairs*, 44(1) (1990): 21-37

Kenneth Waltz, 'The Emerging Structure of International Politics', *International Security*, 18(2) (1993): 44-79

* For 'A Conversation with Kenneth Waltz', click [here](#).

Key questions

- 'For classical realists, conflict stems from human nature, while for neo-realists conflict stems from the nature of the international system'. Discuss.
- Do defensive and neoclassical realism pose a threat to the 'scientific' credentials of neorealism?

Week 5 War and Security under Anarchy

One of the central preoccupations of IR is the possibility of security under conditions of anarchy. In a system of states without a centralised monopoly on the use of force, how can states ensure their survival? Realist scholars have devoted much thought to the link between the distribution of power in, and the stability of, the state system. At the same time, realists have grappled with the observation that war is costly, yet even 'rational' actors seem unable to avoid it.

Essential reading

James Fearon, 'Rationalist Explanations for War', *International Organization* 49(3) (1995): 379-414.

Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (1981), Chapters 1 and 2.

Robert Jervis, 'Theories of War in an Era of Leading-Power Peace', *American Political Science Review*, 96(1) (2002): 1-14.

Further reading

Theoretical takes on the anarchy problematic

Robert Art and Kenneth Waltz eds., *The Use of Force: Military Power and International Politics* (5th ed. 1999), especially the chapters by Art, Jervis and Waltz

* Michael Brown et al. eds. *The Perils of Anarchy* (1995)

* Michael Brown et al. eds. *Offense, Defence and War* (2004)

Dale Copeland, *The Origins of Major War* (2000)

* Steven van Evera, 'Offense, Defense and the Causes of War', *International Security* 22(4) (1998): 5-43.

* Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (1976), Chapter 3.

Michael Mandelbaum, 'Is Major War Obsolete?', *Survival* 40(4) (1999): 20-38

* Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, 'Security Seeking Under Anarchy', *International Security* 25(3) (2000): 128-161.

On war

Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett eds., *Security Communities* (1998), especially Part I

James Fearon & David Laitin, 'Ethnicity, Insurgency and Civil War', *American Political Science Review* 97(1) (2003): 75-90.

* Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars* (1999)

Michael Mandelbaum, 'Is Major War Obsolete?', *Survival* 40(4) (1999): 20-38

John Mueller, *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War* (1990), esp. Ch. 10

Sebastian Rosato, 'The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory', *American Political Science Review*, 97(4) (2003): 585-602

David C. Rapoport, 'The Four Waves of Modern Terrorism', in: Audrey K. Cronin and James M. Ludes (eds.), *Attacking Terrorism: Elements of a Grand Strategy* (2004)

* Laura Sjoberg, 'Gender Structure and War, What Waltz Couldn't See,' *International Theory* 4(1) (2012): 1-38.

Key questions

- In an anarchical system, is durable peace possible?
- How does a 'rational' hegemon react to the rise of a peer-competitor?
- Is war 'rational'?

Week 6 No lecture – reading week

Week 7 Classical, Neo- and 'New' Liberalism

Classical political liberalism traces its origins to thinkers as diverse as Kant, Paine and Smith. Liberal IR theorists tend to reject the realist conception of states as like-units, linking variations in state behaviour to differences in regime type. In particular, democracies/republics are considered to be less warlike than monarchies/authoritarian regimes. Modern 'democratic peace theory' has refined this theory into the statistically grounded hypothesis that consolidated liberal democracies do not go to war with each other. Another particularly influential strand of liberalism in IR, 'neoliberal institutionalism', accepts most of neorealism's basic assumptions, but, drawing on game theory, makes more optimistic predictions about the viability of cooperation under anarchy.

Essential reading

Robert Axelrod and Robert Keohane, 'Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions', *World Politics* 38(1) (1985): 226-254.

Michael Doyle 'Liberalism and World Politics', *American Political Science Review*, 80(4) (1986): 1151-1170.

Andrew Moravcsik, 'Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics' *International Organization*, 51(4) (1997): 513-553.

Further reading

Classical liberalism

* Immanuel Kant, 'Perpetual Peace', in: Chris Brown, Terry Nardin and N.J. Rengger (eds.), *International Relations in Political Thought* (2002).

Michael Doyle, 'Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Policy', Parts I and II, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, (12) (1983): 205-235 and 323-353

Stanley Hoffmann, 'Liberalism and International Affairs', in: *Janus and Minerva: Essays in the Theory and Practice of International Politics* (1987), Chapter 18

* Michael J. Smith, 'Liberalism' in Terry Nardin & David Mapel eds., *Traditions of International Ethics* (1992)

Neoliberalism(s) – and their critics

Joseph Grieco, 'Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism', *International Organization* 42(3) (1988): 485-508

John Ikenberry, *After Victory* (2000)

* Robert Keohane and Lisa Martin, 'Institutional Theory as a Research Program' in: Elman and Elman eds., *Progress in International Relations Theory* (2003)

Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, *Power and Interdependence* (1977)

* John J. Mearsheimer 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security*, 19 (1994/5): 5-49

Donald Puchala and Raymond Hopkins, *International Regimes: Lessons from Inductive Analysis* (1983)

Democratic peace theory

* Michael Brown et al eds., *Debating the Democratic Peace* (1996)

Jack Levy, 'Domestic Politics and War', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18(4) (1988): 653-673

Michael Mann, 'The Darkside of Democracy', *New Left Review*, 235 (1999): 18-45

Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder, 'Democratization and the Danger Of War', *International Security*, 20(1), (1995): 5-38

* Bruce Russett, *Controlling the Sword* (1989)

Bruce Russett, *Grasping the Democratic Peace* (1993)

Key questions

- Is liberalism in IR better seen as a theory or as an ideology?
 - Does neoliberal institutionalism challenge or extend neo-realism?
-

Week 8 Regimes, Institutions and the Mitigation of Anarchy

All variants of liberalism are associated with the theorization of cooperation. While neoliberal institutionalism explains the emergence of cooperative regimes as a rational choice depending on the distribution of gains/losses and available information, newer iterations of liberal theory have drawn attention to the capacity of institutions to influence states' interests and thus to afford durable order under anarchy. The empirical focus of these theorists, who are sometimes grouped in the category of 'new liberals', is on the implications of the decline of American hegemony and the rise to prominence of new state and non-state actors for the configuration of international institutions and the character of cooperation.

Essential reading

Anne Marie Slaughter, *A New World Order* (2005), Chapter 6.

John Ikenberry, 'Liberal Internationalism 3.0', *Perspectives on Politics*, 7(1) (2009): 71-87.

Beate Jahn, 'Liberal Internationalism: From Ideology to Empirical Theory – And Back Again', *International Theory*, 1(3) (2010): 409-438. Also see the exchange between Moravcsik and Jahn in *International Theory*, 2(1) (2011).

Further reading

* Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, 'The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization', *European Journal of International Relations*, 5(4) (1999): 403-434

* Stephan Haggard and Beth A. Simmons, 'Theories of International Regimes', *International Organization* 41(3) (1987): 491-517

Andrew Hurrell, *On Global Order* (2007)

John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan* (2011)

John Ikenberry and Anne-Marie Slaughter, *Forging a World of Liberty Under Law, Final Report of the Princeton Project on National Security* (2006)

Beate Jahn, 'Kant, Mill and Illiberal Legacies in International Affairs', *International Organization*, 59(1) (2005): 177-207

* Robert O. Keohane *After Hegemony* (1984)

Robert O. Keohane, 'The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the Liberalism of Fear. In Craig Calhoun, Paul Price, and Ashley Timmer (eds), *Understanding September 11* (2002)

* Steven Krasner (ed.), *International Regimes* (1983)

David Long, 'The Harvard School of Liberal International Theory: A Case for Closure', *Millennium* 24(3) (1995): 489-505

Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin and Geoffrey Garrett, 'The International Diffusion of Liberalism', *International Organization* 60(4) (2006), 781–810 [Also see the symposium that follows this article]

* Anne-Marie Slaughter, 'Governing the Global Economy Through Government Networks', in Michael Byers ed., *The Role of Law in International Politics* (2001)

Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World* (2008)

Key questions

- When and why do states co-operate?
 - Is democratization making international politics more peaceful?
-

Week 9 The English School

This lecture begins by reviewing the classical English school 'pluralism' of Bull, Wight and their successors. It then explores three additional threads that run through the fabric of English school theory alongside, and in debate with, this pluralist core. The first is historical. This work concentrates on: a comparison of different international societies; the evolution of international society in world history; and the coercive expansion of European international society. The second thread is solidarism. Solidarists take a progressive view of international relations, denying the pluralist assumption that coexistence provides the limits of international society. They make particular play of human rights and their work is strongly connected to normative theory. The third thread is the debate between structural and normative strands of English school theory: is the framework of the 'three traditions' fundamentally a normative debate, or can it also be constructed as a way of looking at the evolution and interplay of macro-scale social structures? This structural framing questions the linkage of solidarism to human rights, brings in the economic sector generally neglected by the English school, and focuses on institutions as social structures. This approach also builds links to constructivism, though without seeing the English School simply as a precursor to it.

Essential reading

Buzan, Barry (2010) 'Culture and International Society', *International Affairs* 86(1): 1-25.
Clark, Ian (2009) 'Towards an English School Theory of Hegemony', *EJIR* 15(2): 203-228.
Suzuki, Shogo (2005) 'Japan's Socialization into Janus-Faced European International Society', *European Journal of International Relations*, 11(1): 137-164.

Further reading

* Bull, Hedley (1977) *The Anarchical Society* (London: Palgrave), especially pp. 3-21.
Bull, Hedley and Adam Watson eds. (1984) *The Expansion of International Society* (Oxford).
* Buzan, Barry (2004) *From International to World Society?* (Cambridge: CUP).
Buzan, Barry (2001) 'The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR', *Review of International Studies*, 27(3): 471-488.
Buzan, Barry (2014) *An Introduction to the English School of IR* (Cambridge: Polity).
Gong, Gerritt (1984) *The Standard of 'Civilization' in International Society* (Clarendon).
* Keene, Edward (2002) *Beyond the Anarchical Society* (Cambridge: CUP).
Jackson, Robert (2000) *The Global Covenant* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
Linklater, Andrew and Hidemi Suganami (2006) *The English School of IR* (Cambridge: CUP).
Navari, Cornelia (ed.) (2009) *Theorising International Society* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).
* Suzuki, Shogo et al (eds.) (2013) *International Orders in the Early Modern World: Before the Rise of the West* (London: Routledge).
Vincent, John (1986) *Human Rights and International Relations* (Cambridge, CUP).
* Wheeler, Nicholas (1992) 'Pluralist and Solidarist Conceptions of International Society', *Millennium* 21(3): 463-487.
Wheeler, Nicholas (2001) *Saving Strangers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
* Wight, Martin (1991) *The Three Traditions* (Leicester: Leicester University Press).
Zhang, Yongjin (1991) 'China's Entry into International Society', *Review of International Studies* 17(1): 3-16.
* The online home of the English School can be found [here](#).

Key questions

- Critically assess solidarist and pluralist visions of the English School.
- Does the English School provide a convincing account of the expansion of international society?
- Is the English School best seen as a form of proto-constructivism?

Week 10 Constructivism

The introduction of constructivism has prompted a shift in IR theory away from a focus on the distribution of material power to a concern with the role of ideas in constituting state behaviour. Perhaps the most prominent constructivist, Alexander Wendt, accepts the 'states under anarchy' problematic, but rejects the immutability of anarchy. Other constructivists more fully embrace the idea of 'social construction', emphasising the role of otherwise relatively neglected aspects of world politics, such as language, identity and beliefs.

Essential reading

Emanuel Adler 'Seizing the Middle Ground', *EJIR* 3(3) (1997): 319-364

Alexander Wendt, 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization*, 46(2) (1992): 391-426

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', *International Organization*, 52(4) (1998): 887-917

Further reading

Theoretical debates

Samuel Barkin, *Realist Constructivism* (2010)

Charlotte Epstein, 'Constructivism, Or the Eternal Return of Universals in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3) (2013): 499-519.

Toni Erskine, 'Whose Progress, Which Morals? Constructivism, Normative Theory and the Limits of Studying Ethics in World Politics,' *International Theory* 4(3) (2012).

Jacques Hymans, 'The Arrival of Psychological Constructivism,' *International Theory* 2(3) (2010): 461-167.

* Friedrich Kratochwil, 'Constructing a New Orthodoxy?' *Millennium*, 29(1) (2000): 73-101

Nicholas Onuf, *World of Our Making* (1989)

* Richard Price and Chris Reus-Smit, 'Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism,' *EJIR* 4(3) (1998): 259-294.

* Thomas Risse, 'Let's Argue', *International Organization*, 54(1) (2000): 1-41. John G. Ruggie (1998) *Constructing the World Polity* (London: Routledge).

* Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (1999), especially Chapter 1 [Also see the forum on the book in: *Review of International Studies* 26(1) (2000)]

Wiener, Antje, 'Enacting Meaning in Use', *Review of International Studies*, 35(1) (2009).

Maja Zehfuss, 'Constructivism and Identity', *EJIR* 7(3) (2001): 315-348.

Applying constructivism

Crawford, Neta (2002) *Argument and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: CUP).

Fiaz, Nayza (2014), 'Constructivism Meets Critical Realism: Explaining Pakistan's State Practice in The Aftermath of 9/11', *EJIR*, 20(2): 491-515.

Finnemore, Martha (2003) *The Purpose of Intervention* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

* Jackson, Patrick (2007) *Civilizing the Enemy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).

Mitzen, Jennifer (2013) *Power in Concert* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).

Nexon, Daniel (2009) *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton).

* Phillips, Andrew (2011) *War, Religion and Empire* (Cambridge: CUP).

Philpott, Daniel (2001) *Revolutions in Sovereignty* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Price, Richard (2007) *The Chemical Weapons Taboo* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).

* Reus-Smit, Chris (2013) *Individual Rights and the Making of the International System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Tannenwald, Nina (2007) *The Nuclear Taboo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

* Towns, Ann (2010) *Women and States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

* Zarakol, Ayse (2011) *After Defeat* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Key questions

- Can constructivists *explain* state behaviour?
 - Do all forms of constructivism share a common denominator?
-

Week 11 International Law

Since the end of World War Two, international law has proliferated, mainly in the form of bi- and multilateral treaties. The existence of supposedly binding and enforceable rules challenges the assumption that the international system is anarchical. While constructivists have devoted more attention than other approaches to the study of international law, all theories discussed in the preceding weeks have proposed ways of interrogating the role of international law in IR. The challenge for these approaches is to show whether international law is a variable in its own right. Do states create or comply with international law when it furthers a prior interest and/or aligns with a shared norm, or does law make a substantive difference to international politics in its own right?

Essential reading

Jutta Brunée and Stephen Toope, *Legitimacy and Legality in International Law* (2010), Introduction and Chapter 3.

Janina Dill, *Legitimate Targets?* (2015), Chapters 1 and 2

Martha Finnemore, 'Are Legal Norms Distinctive?' *New York University Journal of International Law and Politics* 32 (2000): 699-705

Further reading

Eyal Benvenisti and George Downs, 'The Empire's New Clothes: Political Economy and the Fragmentation of International Law', *Stanford Law Review*, 60 (2007): 595-631

* Michael Byers ed., *The Role of Law in International Politics* (2000), esp. Chapters 1, 2, 3 & 9

* Jeffrey L. Dunoff and Mark A. Pollack eds., *International Law and IR* (2012)

Thomas Franck, *The Power of Legitimacy Among Nations* (1990), Chapters 1 and 2

Jack Goldsmith and Eric Posner, *The Limits of International Law* (2005)

H.L.A. Hart, *The Concept of Law* (1961, new edition 1994)

Rosalyn Higgins, *International Law and How We Use It* (1994), Chapters 1, 2, 3 & 6

* *International Organization*, Special Issue: 'Legalization and World Politics', 54(3) (2000)

Benedict Kingsbury, 'The Concept of "Law" in Global Administrative Law', *European Journal of International Law*, 20 (2009): 23-57

Benedict Kingsbury, 'The Concept of Compliance', *Michigan Journal of International Law*, 19 (1998): 345-372.

Harold Koh, 'Why Do Nations Obey International Law', *Yale Law Journal*, 106(8) (1997).

Martti Koskenniemi, 'Law, Teleology and International Relations', *International Relations*, 26(1) (2012): 3-34.

Martti Koskenniemi, 'The Mystery of Legal Obligation', Symposium on 'Legitimacy and Legality in International Law', *International Theory*, 3(2) (2011): 319-325.

* Martti Koskenniemi, 'Miserable Comforters: International Relations as New Natural Law', *European Journal of International Law* 15(3) (2009): 395-422

Nico Krisch, *Beyond Constitutionalism* (2010), Chapter 1 and Conclusion

Frédéric Mégret, 'International Law as Law', in: James Crawford and Martti Koskenniemi (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to International Law* (2012)

* Christian Reus-Smit ed., *The Politics of International Law* (2004), esp. Chapters 1 & 2

Adam Roberts, 'Law and the Use of Force after Iraq', *Survival* 45(2) (2003): 31-56

Joseph Weiler, 'The Geology of International Law', *Heidelberg Journal of International Law*, 624 (2004): 547-562.

Key questions

- Of what does international law consist?
- In what ways do legal rules differ from other kinds of rules?
- How is the international legal order changing?

Spring Term

Critical Approaches

This section of the course assesses the challenges posed to mainstream IR theory by ‘critical’ approaches to the subject. Although there is considerable variation both within and between critical IR, they form part of a collective attempt to broaden and deepen IR theoretically, methodologically, and historically.

Week 12 Marxism and critical theory

Critical theorists draw on a long line of scholarship that extends from Marx and Gramsci via the Frankfurt School to modern day theorists such as Immanuel Wallerstein and, in IR, Robert Cox and Justin Rosenberg. For ‘critical’ scholars, world politics is marked by historically constituted inequalities between core and periphery, north and south, ‘developed’ and ‘underdeveloped’. To that end, liberal and realist approaches are seen as ideologies of inequality. Rather than focusing on anarchy, Marxist theorists examine the social relations that underpin geopolitical systems. Such a commitment leads to debates about the hierarchical nature of international affairs. It also leads to attempts to construct a ‘social theory’ of ‘the international’.

Essential reading

- Cox, Robert (1981) ‘Social Forces, States and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory’, *Millennium* 10(2): 126-155.
- Rosenberg, Justin (2006) ‘Why Is There No International Historical Sociology?’ *European Journal of International Relations* 12(3): 307-340.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1995) ‘The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World System’, in: Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski (eds.), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press): 87-107.

Further reading

- * Arrighi, Giovanni (2010) *The Long Twentieth Century* (London: Verso).
- * Anievas, Alex ed. (2010) *Marxism and World Politics* (London: Routledge).
- Frank, Andre Gunder (1966) ‘The Development of Underdevelopment’, *Monthly Review*, 18(4): 17-31.
- Gill, Stephen (1995) ‘Globalisation, Market Civilisation and Disciplinary Neo-Liberalism’, *Millennium* 24(3): 399-423.
- Halliday, Fred (1994) ‘A Necessary Encounter: Historical Materialism and International Relations’, in: Fred Halliday, *Rethinking IR* (Basingstoke: MacMillan): 47-73.
- Jahn, Beate (1998) ‘One Step Forward, Two Steps Back’, *Millennium* 27(3): 613-642.
- Rosenberg, Justin (1994) *The Empire of Civil Society* (London: Verso), Chapters 1 and 5.
- * Rosenberg, Justin (2010) ‘Basic Problems in the Theory of Uneven and Combined Development’, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 23(1): 165-189.
- * Rosenberg, Justin (2016) ‘IR in the Prison of Political Science’, *International Relations* 30(2): 127-153. You can watch the lecture from which this article is based [here](#).
- * Teschke, Benno (2003) *The Myth of 1648* (London: Verso).
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1974) ‘The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System’, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 387-415.

The debate on 'hierarchy'

- * Bially Mattern, Janice and Ayşe Zarakol (2016) 'Hierarchies in World Politics', *International Organization* 70(3).
- Clark, Ian (2011) *Hegemony in International Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- * Gilpin, Robert (1981) *War and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: CUP). For an excellent retrospective on Gilpin's work, see: John Ikenberry ed. (2014) *Power and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- * Hobson, John (2014) 'Why Hierarchy and not Anarchy is the Core Concept of IR', *Millennium* 42(3): 557-575.
- Hobson, John and Jason Sharman (2005) 'The Enduring Place of Hierarchy in World Politics', *European Journal of International Relations* 11(1): 63-98.
- * Lake, David (2007) 'Escape from the State-of-Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics', *International Security* 32(1): 47-79.
- Donnelly, Jack (2006) 'Sovereign Inequalities and Hierarchy in Anarchy', *European Journal of International Relations* 12(2): 139-170.

Key questions

- What is 'critical' about critical IR theory?
 - 'Capitalism not anarchy is the defining feature of the international system'. Discuss.
 - What is the significance of seeing hierarchy rather than anarchy as the organizing principle of world politics?
-

Week 13 Empire

Most IR scholars accept that the modern states system emerged from a system of empires, even if they disagree about when and how this process took place. Fewer scholars accept that imperial legacies and practices continue to constitute core features of contemporary international relations. More often than not, empire is seen as a normative term rather than as an analytical tool. This lecture explores the political, economic and cultural components of empire, and assesses the extent to which imperial relations continue to underpin contemporary market, governance and legal regimes.

Essential reading

- Barkawi, Tarak (2010) 'Empire and Order in International Relations and Security Studies', in: Bob Denemark ed. *The International Studies Encyclopedia* (New York: Blackwell).
- Hobson, John (2007) 'Is Critical Theory Always for the White West and for Western Imperialism?' *Review of International Studies* 33(S1): 91-107.
- Vitalis, Robert (2010) 'The Noble American Science of Imperial Relations and Its Laws of Race Development', *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 52(4): 909-938.

Further reading

- * Benton, Lauren (2010) *A Search for Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- * Burbank, Jane and Frederick Cooper (2010) *Empires in World History* (Princeton).
- Darwin, John (2007) *The Rise and Fall of Global Empires, 1400-2000* (London: Penguin).
- Gallagher, John and Ronald Robinson (1953) 'The Imperialism of Free Trade', *The Economic History Review* 6(1): 1-15.
- Galtung, Johan (1971) 'A Structural Theory of Imperialism', *Journal of Peace Research*, 8(2): 81-117. Also see: Johan Galtung (1980) 'A Structural Theory of Imperialism: Ten Years Later', *Millennium* 9(3): 181-196.
- * Go, Julian (2011) *Patterns of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- * Halperin, Sandra and Ronan Palan eds. (2015) *Legacies of Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), especially the chapters by Barkawi and Panan.

- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2000) *Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).
- Mann, Michael (2004) 'The First Failed Empire of the 21st Century', *Review of International Studies* 30(4): 631-653.
- Mann, Michael (2012) *Global Empires and Revolution* (Cambridge: CUP).
- Motyl, Alexander (1999) *Revolutions, Nations, Empires* (New York: Columbia).
- * Nexon, Daniel and Thomas Wright (2007) 'What's at Stake in the American Empire Debate', *American Political Science Review* 101(2): 253-271.

Key questions

- Are 'international relations' better understood as 'imperial relations'?
- To what extent is the discipline of International Relations an imperial discipline?
- How useful is the concept of empire for understanding *contemporary* international relations?

Week 14 Poststructuralism

This lecture maps out major developments in IR theory under the heading of 'poststructuralism'. It examines the arguments underlying poststructuralist critiques of realist, liberal, English School, constructivist and critical theories. Calling attention to the influence of leading figures within literary theory and philosophy (e.g. Foucault, Derrida, Butler, Kristeva, and Lyotard), the lecture explores how matters of representation, language, and power have led some IR scholars to question established approaches to world politics. In doing so, the lecture looks critically and comparatively at different versions of poststructuralism, exploring the implications of poststructuralist ideas for the meaning of the 'international', 'the political', and for making explanatory and normative claims about international politics.

Essential reading

- Doty, R.L. (1993) 'Foreign Policy as Social Construction', *International Studies Quarterly* 37(3): 297-320.
- Edkins, Jenny (1999) *Poststructuralism in IR* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner), chapters 1 and 7.
- Walker, R.B.J. (1990) 'Security, Sovereignty, and the Challenge of World Politics', *Alternatives* 15(1): 3-27.

Further reading

- Ashley, R. and Walker, R. B. J. (1990) 'Speaking the Language of Exile', *International Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 367-416.
- * Ashley, R. K. (1988) 'Untying the Sovereign State', *Millennium* 17(2): 227-286.
- * Campbell, David (1992) *Writing Security* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- Campbell, David (1998) 'Why Fight: Humanitarianism, Principles, and Post-Structuralism', *Millennium* 27(3): 497-522.
- * Der Derian, James (1992) *Antidiplomacy: Spies, Terror, Speed and War* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Der Derian, J. and Shapiro, M. (1989) (eds.), *International/Intertextual Relations* (Lexington).
- Dillon, M. & Neal, A. (2008) *Foucault on Politics, Security and War* (London: Palgrave).
- Doty, R. (1996) *Imperial Encounters* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Edkins, Jenny and Maja Zehfuss (2005) 'Generalising the International', *Review of International Studies* 31(3): 451-472.
- * Epstein, Charlotte (2013) 'Constructivism, Or the Eternal Return of Universals in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 499-519.
- Inayatullah, N. and D. Blaney (2004) *IR and the Problem of Difference* (London: Routledge).
- * Jabri, V. (1998) 'Restyling the Subject of Responsibility in IR', *Millennium* 27(3): 591-611.
- Merlingen, M. (2013) '[Is Post-Structuralism a Useful Theory?](#)', e-International Relations.
- * Milliken, J. (1999) 'The Study of Discourse in International Relations', *EJIR* 5(2): 225-254.

Shapiro, M. (1992) *Reading the Postmodern Polity* (University of Minnesota Press).
 Walker, R. B. J. (1993) *Inside/Outside* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
 Weber, Cynthia (2010) 'Interruption Ashley' *Review of International Studies* 36(4): 975-87.

Key questions

- What do poststructuralists mean by 'critique'?
 - What is the relationship between 'the political' and 'the international'?
 - What is the best way to characterise the relationship between poststructuralism and constructivism?
-

Week 15 Power

One of the major contributions claimed by poststructuralist international theory is that it incorporates a more comprehensive and nuanced conception of 'power' than other perspectives. This lecture addresses the different dimensions of power proposed within the framework of poststructuralism, calling attention to how power might be thought of as 'relational' and 'productive', and how it might be analysed with attention to discourse and modes of representation. Particular attention is paid to the intersection of power/knowledge in producing 'the international', 'expertise', and those in the academy as 'international experts'.

Essential reading

Barnett, M. & Duvall, R. (2005) 'Power in International Politics', *International Organization* 59(1): 39-75.
 Barnett, M. & Duvall, R. (eds.) (2005) *Power in Global Governance* (Cambridge, CUP). See in particular: R. Lipschutz, 'Global Civil Society and Global Governmentality'.
 Bially Mattern, Janice (2005) 'Why "Soft Power" Isn't So Soft' *Millennium* 33(3): 583-612.
 Shilliam, Robbie (2015) *The Black Pacific* (London: Bloomsbury), Introduction and ch. 1

Further reading

* Edkins, Jenny and Véronique Pin-Fat (2005) 'Relations of Power and Relations of Violence', *Millennium* 34(1): 1-24.
 * Foucault, M. *Power*, Vol. 3, *Essential Works of Foucault*, ed. J. Faubion (NY: New Press, 2000). In particular, 'Truth and Power', 'Governmentality' and 'Omnes et Singulatum'.
 Gramsci, Antonio (2000) *The Gramsci Reader* (New York: NYU Press), particularly Parts VI and VII (for contrast with post-structural views of power)
 Guzzini, Stefano (1993) 'Structural Power: The Limits of Neorealist Power Analysis', *International Organization* 47(3): 443-478.
 Hirst, Paul (1998) 'The Eighty Years' Crisis, 1919-1999: Power', *Review of International Studies* 24(Special Issue): 133-148.
 * Ikenberry, John and Charles Kupchan (1990) 'Socialization and Hegemonic Power', *International Organization* 44(3): 283-315.
 Leander, A. (2005) 'The Power to Construct International Security' *Millennium* 33(3) 803-26
 Joseph, Jonathan (2010) 'The Limits of Governmentality', *EJIR* 16(2): 223-246.
 * Lukes, S. (2004) *Power: A Radical View* (London: Palgrave) N.B. get hold of 2nd edition.
 * Neumann, Iver & Ole Jacob Sending (2006) 'The International as Governmentality', *Millennium* 35(3): 677-702.
 * Nye, Joseph S. (2004) *Soft Power* (New York: Public Affairs).
 Rose, N. (1993) 'Government, Authority, and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism', *Economy and Society* 22(3): 283-299.
 Spivak, G. (1988) 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' In: C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press): 271-313.

Key questions

- How useful is the concept of ‘govenmentality’ for understanding how power operates in global governance?
 - In what ways do poststructural conceptualizations of power differ from notions of hegemony, socialization, or ‘soft-power’?
 - What can poststructural notions of power tell us about the role of knowledge – and the academy – in international politics?
-

Week 16 Feminism

This lecture maps out the contributions of feminist scholarship to IR theory. Initially, it distinguishes between different strands of feminist theories and feminist ‘ways of knowing’. It explores the distinctive claims of feminism, its critique of mainstream IR theories, and its overlaps – and tensions – with constructivism, critical theory and post-structuralism. This, in turn, lays the ground for thinking about how feminist modes of IR theory intersect with and influence other forms of IR ‘at the margins’—including postcolonial and queer IR—and calls attention to the analytical and normative consequences of patriarchy and androcentrism throughout ‘the international’.

Essential reading

Ackerly, Brooke and Jacqui True (2008) ‘Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations’, *International Studies Review* 10(4): 693-707.

Youngs, G. (2004) ‘Feminist International Relations: Contradiction in Terms?’ *International Affairs* 80(1): 101-114.

Zalewski, M. (2000) *Feminism after Post-Modernism? Theorising through Practice* (London: Routledge), Ch. 1

Further reading

Overviews

Forum, ‘Are Women Transforming IR?’ (2008) *Politics and Gender* 4(1): 121-180.

Hutchings, K. (2008) ‘Contrast and Continuity in Feminist IR’, *Millennium* 37(1): 97-106.

* Keohane, R., Tickner, J. A. et al (1998) ‘Conversations between IR and Feminist Theory’, *International Studies Quarterly* 42(1): 191-210.

Lewis, R. and S. Mills (eds.) (2003) *Feminist Postcolonial Reader* (New York: Routledge)

Steans, J. (2003) ‘Engaging from the Margins’, *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5(3): 428-454.

Additional reading

Buck, L., Gallant, N. & Nossal, K., ‘Sanctions as a Gendered Instrument of Statecraft’, *Review of International Studies*, 24(1) 1998.

* Carpenter, Charli (2002) ‘Gender Theory in World Politics: Contributions of a Nonfeminist Standpoint’, *International Studies Review* 4(3): 152-165.

Cockburn, C. & Zarkov, D. (eds.) (2002) *Militaries, Masculinities and International Peacekeeping* (London: Lawrence & Wishart).

Cohn, C. (1987) ‘Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals’, *Signs* 12(4).

Elshtain, J. B., *Women and War* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1987). See also: ‘Women and War: Ten Years On’, *Review of International Studies*, 24(4), 1998.

* Hooper, C. (2001) *Manly States* (New York, Columbia University Press).

* Hutchings, K. (2000) ‘Towards a Feminist International Ethics’, *Review of International Studies*, 26(Special Issue): 111-130.

* Mohanty, C. (2003) *Feminism without Borders* (Durham: Duke University Press).

Prugl, Elisabeth (1999) *The Global Construction of Gender* (New York: Columbia).

- Shepherd, Laura J. (ed.) (2010) *Gender Matters in Global Politics* (London: Routledge)
- Squires, J & Weldes, J. (2007) 'Beyond Being Marginal: Gender and International Relations in Britain', *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9(2): 185-203.
- Sylvester, C. (1994) *Feminist Theory and IR in a Postmodern Era* (Cambridge: CUP).
- * Tickner, J. A (2005) 'What is your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to IR Methodological Questions', *International Studies Quarterly* 49(1): 1-21.
- * Weber, C. (2016) *Queer International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press). Also see Weber, C. (2014) "You Make My Work (Im)Possible", [Duck of Minerva](#)
- * Zalewski, M. (2007) 'Do We Understand Each Other Yet? Troubling Feminist Encounters Within International Relations', *British Journal of Politics and IR*, 9(2): 302-312.

Key questions

- What is distinctive about feminist critiques of mainstream IR theory?
- Can the concept of 'gender' be divorced from feminist theory?
- Is feminist IR a mode of analysis, a theory, or a political project?

Week 17 No lecture – reading week

Week 18 Security

Peace, war and security studies have long been targets for modes of critical intervention. This lecture examines feminist critiques of how 'security' is understood in both mainstream and critical theories. The lecture explores in the ways in which the agenda of security studies has grown to encompass a wide range of security referents and modes of analysis. It also assesses how feminist arguments fit with contemporary developments in the theorization of security, and considers their strengths and weaknesses in relation to concepts like 'human security', 'insecurity', and 'securitization'.

Essential reading

- Buzan, B. and Hansen, L. (2009) *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Ch. 7
- Hansen, L. (2000) 'The Little Mermaid's Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School', *Millennium* 29(2): 285-306.
- Sjoberg, L. (2009) 'Introduction to *Security Studies*: Feminist Contributions', *Security Studies* 18(2): 183-213.

Further reading

- Bilgin, Pinar (2010) 'The 'Western-Centrism' of Security Studies' *Security Dialogue* 41(6): 615-662.
- Blanchard, E. (2003) 'Gender and the Development of Feminist Security Theory', *Signs* 28(4): 1289-1312.
- Buzan, Barry and Ole Wæver (2009) 'Macrosecuritisation and Security Constellations', *Review of International Studies* 35(2): 253-276.
- * Carpenter, Charli (2005) 'Women, Children and Other Vulnerable Groups', *International Studies Quarterly* 49(2): 295-334.
- * Hoogensen, Gunhild Stuvøy Kirsti (2006) 'Gender, Resistance and Human Security', *Security Dialogue* 37(2): 207-228.
- Jones, A. (2000) 'Gendercide and Genocide', *Journal of Genocide Research*, 2(2) 2000: 185-211.
- * Kirby, Paul (2013) 'How is Rape a Weapon of War? *EJIR* 19(4): 797-821.
- MacKenzie, M. (2009) 'Securitization and Desecuritization: Female Soldiers and the Reconstruction of Women in Post-Conflict Sierra Leone', *Security Studies* 18: 241-61.

- * *Security Dialogue* (2011) 'Special Issue on the Politics of Securitization', 42(4).
- Sylvester, C. (2013) 'Experiencing the End and Afterlives of International Relations Theory' *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 609-626.
- Whitworth, S. (2004) *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- Young, I. M. (2003) 'The Logic of Masculinist Protection', *Signs* 29(1): 1-25.
- * Wilcox, L. (2009) 'Gendering the Cult of the Offensive', *Security Studies* 18: 214-240.

Key questions

- How do conceptions of security differ between mainstream and critical approaches?
- What are the consequences of defining 'security' from a feminist point of view?
- Can the Copenhagen school accommodate feminist critiques?

Part 3 Theorising theory

The final section of the course explores the 'theory of theory', i.e. the concerns with issues of objectivity and truth, causation and chance, and power and knowledge that lie behind social scientific enquiry. The first two sessions look at whether social sciences, including IR, can be approached in a way comparable to natural sciences. The latter two sessions look at the use – and abuse – of history in social scientific research.

Week 19 Philosophy of Science I: Knowledge and certainty

This lecture is the first of two that draw on Patrick Jackson's *Conduct of Inquiry* to examine the role of epistemology in the study and practice of international relations. The lecture provides an overview of debates about the nature of 'scientific' knowledge and how these have been taken up in IR. Focusing on issues of causation and prediction, the lecture interrogates what it means to understand IR as a 'positivist' social science.

Essential reading

- Jackson, P. (2016) *The Conduct of Inquiry in IR, 2nd Edition* (London: Routledge) Ch. 1. Also see the interview with Jackson at [E-IR](#).
- Keohane, Robert O. (2009) 'Political Science as a Vocation', *PS: Political Science & Politics* 42(2): 359-363.
- Kurki, Milja (2006) 'Causes of a Divided Discipline' *Review of International Studies* 32(2): 189-216.
- Wendt, Alexander (1998) 'On Constitution and Causation in International Relations', *Review of International Studies*, 24(Special Issue): 101-117.

Further reading

- Chernoff, Fred (2014) *Explanation and Progress in Security Studies* (Palo Alto: Stanford).
- Elman, C. and M.F. Elman eds. *Progress in IR Theory* (MIT: 2003). Also see the 'theory talk' with Miriam Elman: <http://www.theory-talks.org/2009/07/theory-talk-32.html>
- * Jackson, Patrick and Daniel Nexon (2009) 'Paradigmatic Faults in IR Theory', *International Studies Quarterly* 53(4): 907-930.
- Kaplan, M. (1966) 'The New Great Debate: Traditionalism Vs. Science in International Relations', *World Politics* 19(1): 1-20.
- King, G., Keohane, R. and S. Verba (1994) *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research* (Princeton: Princeton University Press)
- Knorr, K & Rosenau, J. (eds) (1969) *Contending Approaches to International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University), especially the contributions by Bull and Singer.
- Kuhn, T. (1970) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd Ed (Chicago).

- * Kuhn, T. 'Logic of Discovery or Psychology of Research?' and 'Reflections on my Critics' in Alan Musgrave and Imre Lakatos eds. *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge* (Cambridge: 1970). See also the chapters by Popper, Lakatos and Feyerabend.
- * Kurki, M. and H. Suganami (2012) 'Towards the Politics of Causal Explanation', *International Theory* 4(3): 400-429.
- Patomäki, Heikki and Colin Wight (2000) 'After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism', *International Studies Quarterly* 44(2): 213-237.
- Singer, J.D. (1961) 'The Levels-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations, *World Politics* 14(1): 77-92.
- * Wight, C. (2006) 'IR: A Science Without Positivism', in: *Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology* (Cambridge: CUP), Ch. 1.

Key questions

- To what extent is social *science* distinguished by its focus on causal *explanation*?
 - How important is prediction to the study of world politics?
 - How (or what) does critical realism enable us to explain (in) international politics?
-

Week 20 Philosophy of Science II: Pluralism and paradigms

Building on themes explored in the previous lecture, this lecture investigates various understandings of social 'science' and the politics of 'truth claims'. Particular attention is paid to the ways in which 'post-positivist' approaches have opened up debates over explanation, causality, and interpretation. The lecture concludes with a critical reflection on the utility of epistemological debates – and the question of what we do with constructivism.

Essential reading

- Haraway, Donna (1988) 'Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective', *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-599.
- Jackson, P.T. (2016) *The Conduct of Inquiry in IR 2nd Edition* (London: Routledge), Ch. 7.
- Keene, Edward (2009) 'International Society as Ideal-Type', In: *Theorising International Society: English School Methods*, Navari, C. ed. (London: Palgrave): 104-124.
- Lake, David (2011) 'Why "isms" Are Evil', *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2): 465-480.

Further reading

- Barkawi, Tarak (1998) 'Strategy as a Vocation: Weber, Morgenthau and Modern Strategic Studies', *Review of International Studies* 24(2): 159-184.
- Bueno de Mesquita, B. *Predicting Politics* (Ohio State: 2002), Ch. 1.
- * Biersteker, T.J. (1989) 'Critical Reflections on Post-Positivism in International Relations', *International Studies Quarterly* 33(3): 263-67.
- * *European Journal of International Relations* (2013) Special Issue: 'The End of IR Theory?' 19(3): see the contributions by Mearsheimer and Walt, and Jackson and Nexon.
- Goddard, Stacie and Daniel Nexon (2005) 'Paradigm Lost? Reassessing Theory of International Politics', *European Journal of International Relations* 11(1): 9-61.
- Hollis, Michael and Steve Smith (1991) 'The International System', *Explaining and Understanding in International Relations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): Chapter 5.
- Keohane, R. O. (1988) 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, 32(4): 379-396.
- Muppidi, Himadeep (2012) *The Colonial Signs of International Relations* (Oxford: OUP).
- Qualitative Methods* (2004) – Symposium: 'Discourse and Content Analysis', available at: <https://www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/moynihan/cqrm/Newsletter2.1.pdf>
- * Sabaratnam, Meera (2011) 'Of Consensus and Controversy: The Matrix Reloaded', [*The Disorder of Things*](#) (see also the rest of this discussion series)

- Shapiro, Michael (1991) *Reading the Postmodern Polity* (Minneapolis: Minnesota) Chs. 1-3
- * Smith, Steve (2002) 'Positivism and Beyond', In: *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith et al (Cambridge: CUP): 11-47.
- Tilly, Charles (2004) 'Mechanisms in Political Processes', *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 21-41.
- Walker, R.B.J. (1989) 'History and Structure in the Theory of International Relations,' *Millennium*, 18(2): 163-183
- * Weber, Max. 'Politics as a Vocation', 'Science as a Vocation' and 'Methods'. In: *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, translated and edited by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946). [Both essays are available online at: <https://archive.org/details/frommaxweberessa00webe>]
- * Zalewski, Marysia (2002) "'All These Theories, Yet the Bodies Keep Piling Up'" In: *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, ed. Steve Smith et al (Cambridge: CUP): 340-354.

Key questions

- Can there be a social science without positivism?
- What is the epistemology of 'constructivism'?
- Are 'isms' evil? Either way, what do we do about 'all the bodies'?

Week 21 Context

In some respects, history has always been a core feature of the international imagination. Leading figures in the discipline such as E.H. Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau, Martin Wight and Stanley Hoffman employed history as a means of illuminating their research. And, since the end of the Cold War, the prominence of history has risen with the emergence – or reconvening – of historically oriented approaches such as constructivism, neo-classical realism and the English School. However, much of this literature – either deliberately or otherwise – operates under the guise of a well-entrenched binary: social scientists do the theory, historians do the spadework. This lecture problematizes this set-up, asking what it is we mean when we talk about history in IR. Along the way, special attention is given to the role of 'context' as developed by the 'Cambridge School' of intellectual historians.

Essential reading

- Skinner, Quentin (1988) 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas', in: James Tully (ed.), *Meaning and Context: Quentin Skinner and his Critics* (Princeton, NJ). Also see Skinner's 'reply to my critics' in the same book.
- Schroeder, Paul (1994) 'Historical Reality and Neo-Realist Theory', *International Security* 19(1): 108-148. Also see Elman and Elman's, 'Second Look', *International Security* 20(1): 182-193 and Schroeder's reply in the same volume, pp. 194-196.
- Lawson, Stephanie (2008) 'Political Studies and the Contextual Turn', *Political Studies* 56(3): 584-603.

Further reading

- Bell, Duncan (2009) 'Writing the World: Disciplinary History and Beyond', *International Affairs* 85(1): 3-22.
- * Carr, E.H. (1967) *What is History?* (London: Vintage).
- * Elman, Colin and Miriam Elman (eds.) (2001) *Bridges and Boundaries* (Cambridge, MA: MIT), especially the chapters by John Lewis Gaddis and Richard Ned Lebow.
- Evans, Richard (1997) *In Defence of History* (London: Granta).
- * Gaddis, John Lewis (1996) 'History, Science and the Study of International Relations', in Ngaire Woods (ed.), *Explaining International Relations Since 1945*, pp. 32-48.

- * Goodin, Robert and Charles Tilly (2006) 'It Depends', in: Robert Goodin and Charles Tilly (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Contextual Political Analysis*, pp. 3-34.
- Hobson, John and George Lawson (2008) 'What is History in IR?' *Millennium* 37(2): 415-435. Also see the essays by Chris Reus Smit and Eddie Keene in the same forum.
- Holden, Gerard (2002) "Who Contextualises the Contextualisers?" *Review of International Studies* 28(2): 253-270.
- * Lustick, Ian (1996) 'History, Historiography and Political Science', *American Political Science Review* 90(3): 605-618.
- Pierson, Paul (2004) *Politics in Time* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- * Vaughan-Williams, Nick (2005) 'International Relations and the "Problem of History"', *Millennium* 34(1): 115-136.

Key questions

- What is the best way of combining theory and history?
 - 'It depends' (Goodin and Tilly). Does it?
 - Are there any dangers in the turn to 'context' in IR?
-

Week 22 Narrative

This lecture looks at the work of 'narrative historians' and 'eventful sociologists' who attempt to theorise contingency, chance and uncertainty without losing track of the broader dynamics, processes and sequences that make up historical development. Regardless of sometimes stark disagreements over epistemology, subject matter and sensibility, the lecture examines whether enduring links can be established between history and theory by acknowledging that history is a form of theorising, and that theory is necessarily historical.

Essential reading

- Lawson, George (2012) 'The Eternal Divide? History and International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 18(2): 203-226.
- Roberts, Geoffrey (2006) 'History, Theory and the Narrative Turn in International Relations', *Review of International Studies* 32(4): 703-714.
- Suganami, Hidemi (1999) 'Agents, Structures, Narratives', *European Journal of International Relations* 5(3): 365-386.

Further reading

- Abbott, Andrew (1992) 'From Causes to Events: Notes on Narrative Positivism', *Sociological Methods & Research*, 20(4): 428-455.
- Bleiker, Roland and Morgan Brigg (2010) 'Autoethnography and International Relations', *Review of International Studies* 36(3): 777-818.
- Buzan, Barry and George Lawson (2014) 'Rethinking Benchmark Dates in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 20(2): 437-462.
- * Buzan, Barry and George Lawson (2016) 'Theory, History, and the Global Transformation', *International Theory* 8(3).
- Humphreys, Adam (2011) 'The Heuristic Application of Explanatory Theories in IR', *European Journal of International Relations*, 17(2): 257-277.
- * Jackson, Patrick (2006) 'The Present as History', in Robert Goodin and Charles Tilly (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook on Contextual Political Analysis*, pp. 490-505.
- Inayatullah, Naeem and Elizabeth Dauphinee (eds). (2016) *Narrative Global Politics* (London: Routledge).
- Kratochwil, Friedrich (2006) 'History, Action and Identity', *European Journal of International Relations* 12(1): 5-29.
- Lebow, Ned (2009) *Forbidden Fruit* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

- Ling, L.H.M. (2014) *Imagining World Politics* (London: Routledge).
- * *Security Studies* (2015) Symposium on 'Counterfactual Analysis', 24(3): 377-430, especially the contribution by Jack Levy.
- * Sewell, William (1996) 'Three Temporalities: Toward an Eventful Sociology,' in Terrence J. McDonald (ed.) *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*, pp. 245-280.
- Sewell, William (2005) *Logics of History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
- * Stone, Lawrence (1979) 'The Revival of Narrative', *Past and Present* 85(1): 3-24.
- Tilly, Charles (2006) *Why?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- * White, Hayden (1974) *Metahistory* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press).

Key questions

- Is history a social science?
 - Does narrative serve as a useful bridge between history and IR?
 - Can we speak of an 'eternal divide' between history and social science?
-



Summer 2016 examination

IR436

Theories of International Relations

Suitable for all candidates

Time allowed: 2 hours

This paper contains eight questions. Answer two questions. All questions will be given equal weight.

- 1 Is International Relations theory necessarily Eurocentric?
- 2 Does Realism rely on a rationality assumption?
- 3 'International law is what states make of it.' Do you agree?
- 4 How useful is the concept of international society?
- 5 'Real sovereignty belongs only to the powerful.' Discuss.
- 6 To what extent is capitalism the driving force of international relations?
- 7 'There is not a single issue in world politics that does not have a gendered dimension.' Is that right?
- 8 'History is a fiction that serves to persuade people that international politics is orderly.' Discuss.