

Theories of International Relations

Course Convenor

Dr Jonathan Agensky

Room: CLM 4.08

e-mail: j.agensky@lse.ac.uk

tel: 020 7955 7400

Office hours: Tuesdays 2-4pm

Support Staff: Louise Taylor; Room CLM 6.09; email: l.taylor1@lse.ac.uk

Lectures

Mondays 11am-12pm, STC.S78

Tuesdays 10-11am, NAB 1.15 (N.B. these only run during weeks 1-3, Autumn Term)

Dr Jonathan Agensky (JA)

Professor Chris Brown (CJB)

Professor Barry Buzan (BB)

Dr George Lawson (GL)

Professor Iver Neumann (IBN)

Seminars

Group 1: Wednesdays 3-5pm, Room: 32L.G.24

Group 2: Wednesdays 10-12, Room: MT – CLM.3.06; LT – CLM.G.05

Group 3: Tuesdays 11am-1pm, Room: OLD.3.24

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 23 lectures and 20 seminars. Two revision classes will be held in Summer Term – details to be announced later in the year.

There are two main teaching methods used on the course: lectures and seminars.

- **Lectures:** lectures provide an overview of a particular topic. The course is structured in three sections. We begin with two tasks: ‘theorising theory’ and ‘theorising the international’. The former is an introduction to how to think about ‘doing’ theory; the latter explores 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.

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 to use PowerPoint, Prezi and other such programmes.

Assessment

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

- **Diagnostic test:** all students will take a diagnostic test on Wednesday 8th October in order to gauge your familiarity with core concepts and themes used on the course. The test will be assessed by advisers with feedback provided verbally to students. Please note that no preparation is required for this test and it does not constitute a part of your final grade.

- *Essays*: you will write three essays (2,000-2,500 words) during the course of the year. The first, due in week 6 of Autumn Term (Wednesday 12th November), should engage with the texts used to set up the course and its central concerns: how to 'do' theory and how to conceptualize IR as a field of enquiry. The second, due in week 2 of Spring Term (Wednesday 21st January), should be an assessment of mainstream theories and concepts. The final essay, due in week 8 of Spring Term (Wednesday 4th 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 encouraged, but not necessary, to provide an outline of your summative essay to your seminar leader. If you do so, please note that 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, if any, 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 4-16. 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 2 of Summer Term (Wednesday 6th May). 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 early June), 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. Two revision sessions 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.

Please place formative essays in the pigeonhole of your class teacher, located on the 6th floor of Clement House, by 5pm on the deadline day. Instruction regarding the summative essay will be circulated nearer the time. Deadlines for the assignments are:

- *Essay 1 ('doing theory'; 'theorising the international')*: Wednesday 12th November
- *Essay 2 (mainstream theories)*: Wednesday 21st January
- *Essay 3 (critical theories)*: Wednesday 4th March
- *Long essay*: Wednesday 6th May

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 intent*. 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 training sessions on referencing:
http://www2.lse.ac.uk/library/services/training/citing_referencing.aspx;
- the IR subject guide on the library website:
<http://www2.lse.ac.uk/library/subjectGuides/internationalRelations/help.aspx>.

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 handouts and 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 – please direct feedback and queries to Jonathan Agensky (j.agensky@lse.ac.uk)

Textbooks and journals

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

- Chris Brown and Kirsten Ainley, *Understanding International Relations* 4th edition, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009) – organised usefully around issues/topics rather than 'ism's'.
- Scott Burchill *et al* (eds.), *Theories of International Relations* 4th edition (London: Palgrave, 2009) – 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* (London: Routledge, 2010) – especially useful for the first part of the course ('doing' theory) and the third section on philosophy of science.

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.

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 'build bridges' between various approaches.

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 (and currently based at LSE); *International Affairs*, another good general journal, although more geared at empirical enquiry than theoretical work; 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 – as such it is a valuable way to get to know the best (and worst) of cutting-edge IR theory). *International Political Sociology* is also worth looking at for (mainly) ‘critical’ articles. *International Theory*, edited by Alex Wendt and Duncan Snidal, is a newish journal devoted to 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 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: (<http://thedisorderofthings.wordpress.com/>). ‘Relations international’ (<http://relationsinternational.com/>) is worth bookmarking, as is ‘Political Violence at a Glance’ (<http://politicalviolenceataglance.org/>). For those interesting in philosophy of social science, Daniel Little hosts an excellent site: <http://understandingsociety.blogspot.co.uk/>. 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 for 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 and Robert Cox, as well as our own Barry Buzan and Iver Neumann. 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.uk/>), the IISS (<http://www.iiss.org/>), RUSI (<http://www.rusi.org/>) and the European Council on Foreign Relations (<http://www.ecfr.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. The more disturbed amongst you may be interested in the ‘suicide attack database’ hosted by the University of Chicago (<http://cpost.uchicago.edu/search.php>). Not for the fainthearted ...

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

6 October	Theorising theory; theorising the international
7 October	International Relations vs. international relations (GL)
13 October	What do we study? (IBN)
14 October	Angell & Mackinder on the international in the early C20th (GL)
	What is theory? (IBN)

20 October	Slaughter & Mearsheimer on the international in the early C21st (GL)
21 October	Two ways of doing theory (IBN)

Part 2 Theories of International Relations

Mainstream approaches

27 October	Realism (CJB)
3 November	Anarchy (CJB)
10 November	Liberalism and neoliberal institutionalism (CJB)
17 November	Liberalism 3.0 (CJB)
24 November	Constructivism (CJB)
1 December	The English School (BB)
8 December	Sovereignty (BB)

Spring Term

Critical approaches

12 January	Marxism and critical theory (GL)
19 January	Empire (GL)
26 January	Post-structuralism (JA)
2 February	Power (JA)
9 February	Feminism (JA)
16 February	Security (JA)

Part 3: Theorising theory

23 February	Philosophy of Science I: Knowledge and certainty (JA)
2 March	Philosophy of Science II: Pluralism and paradigms (JA)
9 March	Philosophy of History I: Context (GL)
16 March	Philosophy of History II: Narrative (GL)

Summer Term

We will also hold two revision sessions in Summer Term, most likely in weeks 2 and 3 of 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: Doing theory, theorising the international

The first section of the course has two parts: three lectures explore what it means to 'do' theory; three more lectures examine 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?

Doing theory

Week 1 What do we study?

The objects of study in IR range from states to ideas, and from war to political economy. This lecture discusses what kind of phenomena these are. Taking its cue from Emile Durkheim, the lecture argues that objects of study in IR are best understood as 'social facts'. The lecture pays particular attention to what it means to call a state a 'social fact'.

Week 2 What is theory?

Doing theory is to stylize. Theory may be 'grand' or less 'grand'. Theory may vary as to its area of validity. Theory may depend on the concepts of the researcher or of those being studied. The lecture introduces these distinctions and gives examples from the analysis of power, with discussions about Michel Foucault's approach featuring prominently.

Week 3 Two ways of doing theory: ideal types and conceptual history

This lecture outlines two ways of 'doing' theory. The first stems from Max Weber's notion of ideal types. Ideal-types do not have any direct counterpart in social reality and cannot be used for hypotheses testing. The second arises from Reinhart Koselleck's understanding of conceptual history. The lecture argues that conceptual history is well suited to analysing changes in what might broadly be called discourse analysis.

Further reading

There are no particular readings you need to do for these sessions. However, the following will be used to inform the lectures, all of which can be found in the library:

Emile Durkheim (1982) *The Rules of Sociological Method* (London: Free Press). See also <http://durkheim.uchicago.edu/Summaries/rules.html>

Michel Foucault (1991) *Discipline and Punish* (London: Penguin).

Patrick Jackson (2010) *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations* (London: Routledge).

Helge Jordheim and Iver B. Neumann (2011) 'Empire, Imperialism and Conceptual History', *Journal of International Relations and Development* 14(2): 153-185.

Reinhart Koselleck et al (2002) *The Practice of Conceptual History* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press).

Max Weber (1918) 'Science as a Vocation' ('Wissenschaft als Beruf'), available at: <http://www.wisdom.weizmann.ac.il/~oded/X/WeberScienceVocation.pdf>.

Key questions

- What does it mean to 'do' theory?
- What makes a theory more or less successful?

Theorising the international

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 societies 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.

Further reading

* C.A. Bayly (2004) *The Birth of the Modern World* (Oxford: Blackwell).

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

* Barry Buzan and Richard Little (2002) 'Why International Relations Has Failed as an Intellectual Project and What to Do About It', *Millennium* 30(1): 19-39.

Barry Buzan and Richard Little (2000) *International Systems in World History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press): especially parts II and III.

* *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>.

Stanley Hoffman (1987) 'An American Social Science: IR' in Stanley Hoffman ed., *Janus and Minerva: Essays in International Relations* (Boulder: Westview): 3-24.

Kenneth Pomeranz (2000) *The Great Divergence* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Millennium (2014) Special Issue: 'The Standard of Civilization' 42(3).

* Robbie Shilliam (2011) 'The Perilous but Unavoidable Terrain of the Non-West' in Robbie Shilliam ed., *IR and Non-Western Thought* (London: Routledge): 12-26.

Arlene Tickner and David Blaney eds. (2012) *Thinking IR Differently* (London: Routledge).

Key questions

- What is International Relations? Is it different from international relations?
- 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 and Mackinder on 'the international' in the early 20th century

This lecture explores two contrasting approaches to theorising IR in the early 20th century. Both Angell and Mackinder wrote before IR was institutionalised as an academic discipline. Nevertheless, both outlined what they saw as the distinctive features of 'the international', both in order to establish a basis on which international politics could be explained and in order to influence policy making. Whereas Angell saw the international as acquiring a new form in the early 20th century, Mackinder argued that there were long-standing forces that shaped international politics. And whereas Angell argued that scholars of international relations should learn from political economy, Mackinder argued that they should draw primarily from geography and history. Interestingly, both Angell and Mackinder were deeply immersed in debates about empire, race and civilization, considered to be the foundations of international order in the early part of the 20th century.

Essential reading

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

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

Further reading

David Armitage (2013) *Foundations of Modern International Thought* (Cambridge: CUP).

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

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

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

* John Hobson (2012) *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics* (Cambridge: CUP).

Also see the forum on Hobson's book in *Millennium* 42(2) (2014).

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

* Robert Vitalis (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.

Srdjan Vucetic (2011) *The Anglosphere* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press).

Key questions

- In what sense do Angell and Mackinder provide a *theory* of the international?
 - How relevant are the arguments of Angell and Mackinder to 21st century concerns?
-

Week 3 Slaughter and Mearsheimer on 'the international' in the 21st century

This lecture examines two contrasting attempts to specify what 'international politics' 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, like Mackinder, stresses the importance of perennial (particularly geopolitical) themes to the make-up and practice of international relations. Which of these visions is more compelling? And why?

Essential reading

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

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

Further reading

To get an up-to-date sense of Slaughter's thinking, have a trawl through her tweets

(<http://twitter.com/SlaughterAM>), blogs (<http://www.theatlantic.com/anne-marie-slaughter/>)

and interviews (<http://www.princeton.edu/~slaughtr/commentary.html>). 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:

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/newsweek/2008/12/30/pull-those-boots-off-the-ground.html>.

Key questions

- Do the analyses of Slaughter and Mearsheimer have anything in common?
 - What distinguishes the ways in which Slaughter and Mearsheimer theorise the international from the views of Angell and Mackinder?
-

Part 2 Theories of International Relations

The second part of the course uses thirteen sessions in order to explore 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: 1. How well – or not – do these concepts/issues map onto existing IR theories?; 2. 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

The roots of realism can be found in texts by Thucydides, Augustine, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau and many others, but as a fully-fledged theory of international relations it is a twentieth century product. In the 1930s and 1940s, realism took the form of a critique of idealism/utopianism, and came to be the dominant approach in IR; the American ‘classical realists’, Niebuhr, Kennan and especially Morgenthau are central to this process. The recent revival of classical realism is, in part, a response to the rise of structural realism, the subject of the next session.

Essential reading

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).
Chris Brown (2012) ‘The Practice Turn, Phronesis and Classical Realism’, *Millennium* 40(3).
Michael Williams (2004) ‘Why Ideas Matter in IR: Morgenthau, Classical Realism, and the Moral Construction of Power Politics’, *International Organization* 58(4): 633-665.

Further reading

The Classical Realists

* E.H. Carr, *The Twenty Years Crisis* (especially the 2001 edition edited by Michael Cox)
Hans J. Morgenthau, *Scientific Man and Power Politics* (1947)
* Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations* (any edition up to 5th)
George Kennan, *American Diplomacy* (1952)
Reinhold Niebuhr, *Moral Man and Immoral Society* (1932)

Major Commentaries on the Classical Realists

Christoph Frei, *Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography* (2001).
Jonathan Haslam, *No Virtue Like Necessity: Realist Thought since Machiavelli* (2002).
Joel Rosenthal, *Righteous Realists* (1991).
* Michael Williams, *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations* (2005).
* Michael Williams (ed.), *Realism Reconsidered* (2007).
Nicolas Guilhot ed. *The Invention of International Relations Theory* (2011)

Tragedy

Part of the revival of classical realism focuses on the importance of the notion of ‘tragedy’.
See especially the essays in: *International Relations* 17(4) (2003), 19(3) (2005), & 21(1) (2007), now published as: Toni Erskine and Ned Lebow eds. *Tragedy and IR* (2012).
* John Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: Norton, 2001).
Reviewed in: Brian C. Schmidt, ‘Realism as Tragedy’, *Review of International Studies*, 30(3) (2004), 427-441.
* Richard Ned Lebow, *The Tragic Vision of Politics* (Cambridge, 2003). Also see Lebow’s *Cultural Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge, 2008).

Key questions

- Forget the so-called roots of realism; realism is a twentieth century doctrine with no relevant antecedents'. Discuss
 - How central to realist thought is a view of politics as necessarily 'tragic'?
-

Week 5 Anarchy

In the 1970s, Kenneth Waltz became the (reluctant?) progenitor of neo- or structural realism, re-orienting realism around the notion of 'anarchy'. Structural realism divides into 'offensive realism', 'defensive realism' and 'neo-classical realism'. Somewhat unintentionally, the turn to structural realism has revived interest in classical realist thought.

Essential reading

Kenneth Waltz, *Theory of International Politics* (1979), Chapters 5 & 6.

- 'Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory', *Journal of International Affairs* 44 (1990) 21-37.
- 'Structural Realism after the Cold War', *International Security* 25(1) (2000) 5-41.
- 'Why Iran Should Get the Bomb', *Foreign Affairs* (July/August) (2012).

Further reading

Waltz

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

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

International Relations Special Issue: 'The King of Thought: Theory, The Subject and Waltz' Part I, Vol. 23(2) (2009) and Part II, Vol. 23(3) (2009), published with additional material as: Ken Booth ed. (2011) *Realism and World Politics* (London: Routledge).

Conversation with Kenneth Waltz: <http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/people3/Waltz/waltz-con0.html>

Offensive vs. Defensive realism

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

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

Neoclassical Realism

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

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

* Randall Schweller, *Unanswered Threats* (Princeton, 2006).

Much recent attention has focused on:

Charles L. Glaser, *A Rational Theory of International Politics* (Princeton, 2010). For a discussion of this text (and others), see: Chris Brown, 'Realism: Rational and Reasonable', *International Affairs* 88(4) (2012). At the APSA Conference in 2010, Glaser's book was the subject of a roundtable featuring John Mearsheimer, Randall Schweller and others. An expanded version of the roundtable was published in *Security Studies* 20(3) (2011). More entertainingly, the original discussion can be found here:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tsQW0dLoYGs> for Mearsheimer

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0cXSeIPiFGQ> for Schweller

As a taster of the sort of critiques of the Anarchy Problematic that will be met next term, see:

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

Key questions

- 'IR theory must, by necessity, start with a theory of anarchy'. Do you agree?
- Are there important differences between the visions of realism offered by classical and structural realists?
- Is realism rational?

Week 6 Liberalism and neoliberal institutionalism

Classical liberalism rests on a variety of sources, Kant, Cobden and Mill being particularly important. *Contra* most branches of realism, international behaviour is linked to regime-type, and republics/liberal democracies are taken to be less warlike than monarchies/authoritarian regimes, although modern 'democratic peace' theory suggests that liberal regimes are only peaceful in their dealings with each other. In the 20th century liberalism has been associated with the promotion of international institutions; the modern version of liberalism ('neoliberal institutionalism' or 'neoliberalism' for short) is related to neorealism, but based on a more optimistic reading of the anarchy problematic.

Essential reading

Kant 'Perpetual Peace', Cobden 'Political Writings' and Mill 'A Few Words on Non-Intervention' in Chris Brown, Terry Nardin and N.J. Rengger (eds.), *International Relations in Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002).

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

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

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

Further reading

Classical liberalism

* 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*, Chapter 18.

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

Edwind van der Haar, *Classical Liberalism and IR Theory* (Macmillan, 2009).

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

Neoliberal institutionalism

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

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

Robert Keohane and Lisa Martin, 'Institutional Theory as a Research Program' in Elman and Elman eds., *Progress in International Relations Theory* (MIT, 2003): 71-107.

* 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.

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

Democratic peace

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

* Michael Brown *et al* eds (1996) *Debating the Democratic Peace* (Cambridge, MA: MIT).

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

John MacMillan (2012) 'Hollow Promises? Critical Materialism and the Contradictions of the Democratic Peace', *International Theory* 4(3): 331-366.

Michael Mann (1999) 'The Darkside of Democracy: The Modern Tradition of Ethnic and Political Cleansing', *New Left Review* 235 (May-June): 18-45.

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

* Bruce Russett (1993) *Grasping the Democratic Peace* (Princeton: Princeton UP).

Key questions

- Is liberalism in IR better seen as a theory or as an ideology?
- When and why do states co-operate?
- Critically assess the argument that democratic states will not go to war with each other. Illustrate your argument with examples.

Week 7 'Liberalism 3.0'

The events of the last two decades, and especially of the two terms of George W. Bush's presidency, have raised questions for the liberal conception of international relations. The charge often made is that the 'neo-conservative' vision of the world is, in effect, a modern version of Wilsonian liberal internationalism ('hard Wilsonianism' to use a phrase of Max Boot's.) One response to this is G. John Ikenberry's notion of Liberalism 3.0; another is Daniel Deudney's notion of 'republican security theory'.

Essential reading

G. John Ikenberry (2011) *Liberal Leviathan* (Princeton University Press). An abridged version of the book's argument can be found here: 'The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism after America', *Foreign Affairs*, 90(3) (2011): 56-68.

G. John Ikenberry (2009) 'Liberal Internationalism 3.0' *Perspectives on Politics* 7(1): 71-89.

Daniel Deudney (2004) 'Publius before Kant: Federal-Republican Security and Democratic Peace', *European Journal of International Relations* 10(3): 315-356.

Further reading

Ikenberry

* - *After Victory* (Princeton, 2001)

- 'American Power and the Empire of Capitalist Democracy' (2001) *Review of International Studies* 27(5): 191-212.

- For various unpublished papers and recent publications see Ikenberry's website:

<http://www.princeton.edu/~gji3/publications.html>

Ikenberry has worked closely with Daniel Deudney in the past. See:

Daniel Deudney and John Ikenberry, 'The Myth of Autocratic Revival', *Foreign Affairs* Jan/Feb (2009).
- 'The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order', *Review of International Studies* 25(2) (1999): 179-196.

But Deudney's take on these matters is now a little different. See:

* Daniel Deudney, *Bounding Power* (2007).
- 'The Philadelphia System: Sovereignty, Arms Control, and Balance of Power in the American States-Union, 1787-1861', *International Organization* 49(2) (1995): 191-228.

For a less sanguine take on the future of liberalism, see:

* Azar Gat (2007) 'The Return of Authoritarian Great Powers', *Foreign Affairs* 86(4): 59-69.
Also see: 'Debate: Which Way is History Marching' (Gat, Deudney, Ikenberry, Inglehart, Welzel) *Foreign Affairs* (July/August) 2009.
Chris Brown (2010) 'Rules and Norms in a Post-Western World', in: Oliver Kessler et al ed., *Rules, Politics and Knowledge* (New York: Macmillan).
George Lawson (2010) 'The "What", "Where" and "When" of the Global 1989', in: George Lawson et al eds., *The Global 1989* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

The implications of the 'rise of China' are central to the Liberalism 3.0 thesis:

Martin Jacques, *When China Rules the World* (2009) is alarmist;
Henry Kissinger, *On China* (2011) is more unperturbed;
Stefan Halper, *The Beijing Consensus* (2010) is more scholarly;
Arne Westad's *Restless Empire* (2012) widens the story;
David Shambaugh, *China Goes Global* (2013) is better than the above;
And more interesting than any of these is: Yan Xuetong, *Ancient Chinese Thought: Modern Chinese Power* (Princeton, 2011)

Key questions

- How successful is Ikenberry's attempt to develop a new strand of liberal IR theory?
- Is the world becoming more 'liberal'?
- Does the rise of China threaten the development of a liberal world order?

Week 8 Constructivism

The meaning and nature of constructivism are contested. The most prominent constructivist from the perspective of mainstream IR theory is Alexander Wendt. At the other end of the spectrum is Friedrich Kratochwil. Between these two extremes lie figures such as Harald Müller, Thomas Risse and Emmanuel Adler. Tim Dunne provides a link between constructivism and the English School.

Essential reading

Alexander Wendt (1992) 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization* 46(2): 391-426.
Friedrich Kratochwil (2000) 'Constructing a New Orthodoxy?' *Millennium* 29(1): 73-101.
Thomas Risse (2000) 'Let's Argue', *International Organization* 54(1): 1-41.
Tim Dunne (1995) 'The Social Construction of International Society', *European Journal of International Relations* 1(3): 367-389.

Further readings

Wendt

Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (1999), especially Chapter 1

- * 'The State as Person in International Theory', *Review of International Studies* 30(2) (2004): 289-316.
- 'Why a World State is Inevitable', *EJIR* 9(4) (2003): 491-542.
- 'Flatland: Quantum Mind and the International System' in: Mathias Albert, Lars Cederman and Alex Wendt eds. *New Systems Theories of International Politics* (2011). Wendt's book project on quantum theory and IR is described at <http://www.quantumconsciousness.org/views/QuantumMindAndSocialScience.html>
- Alexander Wendt and Raymond Duvall (2008) 'Sovereignty and the UFO', *Political Theory* 36(4) 607-633.

Critical constructivism

Friedrich Kratochwil, *Rules, Norms and Decisions* (1989).

- * 'Sovereignty: Myth, Organized Hypocrisy, or Generative Grammar?' (unpublished paper, available on Moodle) [Stephen Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton, 1999) Chapters 1 & 8 is the target of this paper].
- * Nicholas Onuf (1989) *World of Our Making* (Cambridge: CUP).

'Middle way' constructivism

Emanuel Adler (1997) 'Seizing the Middle Ground', *European Journal of International Relations* (3): 319-364.

Stefano Guzzini and Anna Leander eds. *Constructivism and IR* (Routledge, 2006). See the review by J.F. Keeley, 'Alex Wendt as Explorer', *Millennium* (2007) 35(2): 417-430.

- * Harald Müller (2004) 'Arguing, Bargaining and All That', *European Journal of International Relations* 10(3): 395-435.

Realist constructivism

These writers are essentially providing a constructivist version of liberal theory. Pointing in a different direction is:

Samuel Barkin *Realist Constructivism* (Cambridge, 2010);

- 'Realist Constructivism and Realist-Constructivism', *International Studies Review* 6(2) (2004): 337-352.

Applying constructivism

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

- * Jackson, Patrick (2007) *Civilizing the Enemy* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press).
- Nexon, Daniel (2009) *The Struggle for Power in Early Modern Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- * 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: CUP).
- * Ruggie, J.G. (1998) *Constructing the World Polity* (London: Routledge).
- Tannenwald, Nina (2007) *The Nuclear Taboo* (Cambridge: CUP).
- Towns, Ann (2010) *Women and States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Key questions

- Is there a single constructivist approach to the study of world politics?
- What is more important to understanding world politics: the logic of consequences, the logic of appropriateness, or the logic of arguing?
- How effectively can constructivism explain 'actual' international relations?

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 general evolution of international society in world history; and the specific, coercive story of the 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 have made particular play of human rights and their work is strongly connected to normative theory. The third thread is the debate between structural and normative readings 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 readings

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 readings

* 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).
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.
* N.B. <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/polis/englishschool/> is the online home of the English School, containing articles, papers, and a bibliography of English School resources.

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 Sovereignty

Realism, Liberalism, Constructivism and English School theory offer contrasting, sometimes overlapping, frameworks for explaining international politics. For all of them, however, a distinctive feature of the international is the institution of 'sovereignty'. This lecture demonstrates how the theoretical perspectives explored in previous weeks give us different ways of understanding how sovereignty works as a constitutive feature of international relations. It examines how sovereignty became a defining global political principle, how it links to other principles, particularly territoriality and nationalism, and how the practices associated with it have evolved. A key theme is the longstanding tension between the principle of sovereign equality, and various practices of inequality and hierarchy.

Essential readings

- Jackson, Robert (1999) 'Sovereignty in World Politics', *Political Studies* 47(3): 431-456.
- Holsti, Kalevi J. (2004) *Taming the Sovereigns* (Cambridge: CUP), chapters 3 & 4 (this is an e-book available through the main library catalogue).
- Simpson, Gerry (2004) *Great Powers and Outlaw States* (Cambridge: CUP) chapters 2 & 3 (this is an e-book available through the main library catalogue).

Further readings

- Bartelson, Jens (1995) *A Genealogy of Sovereignty* (New York: Cambridge University Press).
- Biersteker, Thomas and Weber, Cynthia (eds.) (1996) *State Sovereignty as Social Construct* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hashmi, Sohail (ed.) (1997) *State Sovereignty* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press). See in particular, Philpott, 'Ideas and the Evolution of Sovereignty'.
- Hinsley, R. H. (1986) *Sovereignty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Jackson, Robert (1990) *Quasi-States* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Jackson, Robert (ed.) (1999) *Sovereignty at the Millennium* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- * Keohane, Robert O. (1995) 'Sovereignty in International Society', in Hans-Henrik Holm and Georg Sørensen (eds.), *Whose World Order*, Westview Press, 165-86.
- * Krasner, Stephen (1999) *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy?* (Princeton University Press).
- Krasner, Stephen (1995) 'Compromising Westphalia', *International Security* 20(3): 115-51.
- Onuf, Nick (1991) 'Sovereignty: A Conceptual History', *Alternatives*, 16(4): 425-446.
- * Osiander, Andreas (2001) 'Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth', *International Organization* 55(2): 251-287.
- * Wendt, Alexander and Daniel Friedheim (2005) 'Hierarchy Under Anarchy', *International Organization* 49(4): 689-721.

Classical readings

There is a vast literature on sovereignty in western thought. See:

Extracts from Bodin (16th century), Hobbes and Grotius (17th century), Vattel and Rousseau (18th century), Hegel and Mill (19th century) in: Chris Brown *et al* eds., *International Relations In Political Thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002).

In the 20th century, the German jurist Carl Schmitt introduced a 'decisionist' understanding of sovereignty:

- *Political Theology* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press)
- *The Concept of the Political* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
- *The Nomos of the Earth* (New York: Telos)

The dark side of sovereignty: European colonialism and decolonisation

- * Anghie, Antony (2004) *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* (Cambridge: CUP).
- Benton, Lauren (2010) *A Search for Sovereignty* (Cambridge: CUP).

- * Grovogui, Siba (1996) *Sovereigns, Quasi-Sovereigns and Africans* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).
- Hobson, John (2004) *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization* (Cambridge: CUP).
- Inayatullah, Naeem and David Blaney (2004) *International Relations and the Problem of Difference* (London: Routledge)
- * Keene, Eddie (2002) *Beyond the Anarchical Society* (Cambridge: CUP).

Key questions

- What makes a state a state for the purposes of International Relations?
- If sovereignty is ‘organized hypocrisy’, what difference does that make to theorising international politics?
- Is sovereignty a source of equality or inequality in international affairs?

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 the schools of thought we examine, they form part of a collective attempt to broaden and deepen IR both in terms of its methods and its empirical focus.

Week 11 **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 readings

- * Arrighi, Giovanni (2010) *The Long Twentieth Century* (London: Verso).
- * Anievas, Alex ed. (2009) *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: Critical Theory as the Latest Edition of Liberal Idealism’, *Millennium* 27(3): 613-642.

- * Rosenberg, Justin (2010) 'Basic Problems in the Theory of Uneven and Combined Development', *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 23(1): 165-189.
- * Rosenberg, Justin (1994) *The Empire of Civil Society* (London: Verso), Chapters 1 and 5.
- 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'

- Clark, Ian (2011) *Hegemony in International Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- * Cox, Robert (1983) 'Gramsci, Hegemony and IR', *Millennium* 12(2): 162-175.
- Gilpin, Robert (1981) *War and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge: CUP).
- * 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 understanding world politics as a realm of hierarchy?

Week 12 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 readings

- 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 readings

- 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).
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri (2000) *Empire* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press).
- * Long, David and Brian Schmidt eds. (2005) *Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations* (New York, SUNY).
- Mann, Michael (2004) 'The First Failed Empire of the 21st Century', *Review of International Studies* 30(4): 631-653.
- Mann, Michael (2012) *The Sources of Social Power, Vol. 3: Global Empires and Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

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 13 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), we explore how matters of representation, language, and power have led some IR scholars to question received wisdom about contemporary international relations and political order. In doing so, we look critically and comparatively at different versions of poststructuralism, exploring the implications of poststructuralist ideas for the meaning of the 'international', and for making explanatory and normative claims about international politics.

Essential reading

- Ashley, R. and Walker, R. B. J. eds. (1990) 'Speaking the Language of Exile', *International Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 367-416.
- Campbell, David (1998) 'Why Fight: Humanitarianism, Principles, and Post-Structuralism', *Millennium* 27(3): 497-522.
- Epstein, Charlotte (2013) 'Constructivism or the Eternal Return of Universals in International Relations', *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 499-519.

Further reading

- * Ashley, R. K. (1989) 'Untying the Sovereign State', *Millennium* 17: 227-286.
- * Campbell, D. (1992) *Writing Security* (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- * Der Derian, J. (1992), *Antidiplomacy: Spies, Terror, Speed and War* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Der Derian, J. and Shapiro, M. (eds.), *International/Intertextual Relations* (Lexington, 1989).
- 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 (1999) *Poststructuralism in IR* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- Edkins, Jenny and Zehfuss, Maja (2005) 'Generalising the International', *Review of International Studies*, 31(3): 451-472.
- *Jabri, V. (1998) 'Restyling the Subject of Responsibility in IR', *Millennium* 27(3): 591-611.
- * Inayatullah, N. and D. Blaney (2004) *IR and the Problem of Difference* (London: Routledge).
- Laidi, Z. (1998) *A World Without Meaning* (London: Routledge).
- 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'?
 - How persuasive is the poststructuralist critique of realism?
 - What is the best way to characterise the relationship between poststructuralism and constructivism?
-

Week 14 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 'socially productive', and how it might be analysed with attention to discourse and modes of representation.

Essential Reading

- Barnett, M. & Duvall, R. 'Power in International Politics', *International Organization* 59(1) 2005: 39-75.
- Barnett, M. & Duvall, R. (eds.) *Power in Global Governance* (Cambridge: 2005). 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.

Further Reading

- * Edkins, Jenny and Véronique Pin-Fat (2005), 'Relations of Power and Relations of Violence', *Millennium* 34(1): 1-24.
- * Foucault, M. *Power*, Volume 3 of the *Essential Works of Foucault*, ed. J. D. Faubion (New York: New Press, 2000). See, in particular, 'Truth and Power', 'Governmentality' and "'Omnes et Singulatim'": Towards a Critique of Political Reason'.
- Guzzini, S. (1993) 'Structural Power: The Limits of Neorealist Power Analysis', *International Organization* 47(3): 443-478.
- Haugaard, M. *Power: A Reader* (New York: Manchester University Press, 2002).
- Hirst, P. 'The Eighty Years' Crisis, 1919-1999: Power', *Review of International Studies* 24(Special Issue) 1998: 133-148.
- * Ikenberry, John and Charles Kupchan (1990), 'Socialization and Hegemonic Power', *International Organization* 44(3): 283-315.
- Joseph, Jonathan (2010) 'The Limits of Governmentality: Social Theory and the International', *European Journal of International Relations* 16(2): 223-246.
- * Lukes, S. *Power: A Radical View* (London: Palgrave, 2004) N.B. it is worth getting hold of the substantially updated second edition.
- * Neumann, I. B. & Sending, O. J. (2006) 'The International as Governmentality', *Millennium* 35(3): 677-702.
- * Nye, Joseph S. (2004) *Soft Power* (New York: Public Affairs).
- Nye, Joseph S. (2011) 'Power and Foreign Policy', *Journal of political power* 4(1): 9-24.

Key questions

- Can poststructuralist and realist ideas about power ever be compatible?
 - Is the concept of 'governmentality' useful for understanding power in global governance?
 - In what ways do poststructural conceptualizations of power differ from notions of hegemony, socialization, or 'soft-power'?
-

Week 15 Feminism

This lecture maps out the contribution of feminist scholarship to IR theory. 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. It lays the ground for thinking about how feminist modes of IR theory intersect and influence other forms of IR ‘at the margins’—including postcolonial IR—and calls attention to the analytical and normative consequences of patriarchy and androcentrism across issue areas. Finally, it distinguishes between different strands of feminist theories and asks whether it is possible, as some constructivists claim, to incorporate ‘gender’ into IR theory without feminism.

Essential reading

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

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

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.

Further reading

Overviews

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

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

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

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

* Tickner, J Ann (2011) ‘Retelling IR’s Foundational Stories: Some Feminist and Postcolonial Perspectives’, *Global Change, Peace & Security* 23(1): 5-13.

Youngs, G. ‘Feminist IR: Contradiction in Terms?’, *International Affairs* 80(1) 2004: 101-14.

Secondary Reading

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

Cockburn, C. & Zarkov, D. (eds) *Militaries, masculinities and international peacekeeping* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 2002).

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

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.

* Goldstein, J. *War and Gender* (Cambridge, CUP, 2001)

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

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

Parpart, J and Zalewski, M. (eds.), *The ‘Man Question’ in IR* (Boulder: Westview, 1998).

Parpart, J. & Zalewski, M. (eds) *Rethinking the Man Question* (London: Zed, 2008).

Shepherd, Laura J. (ed.) (2010) *Gender Matters in Global Politics* (London: Routledge)

Steans, J. *Gender and International Relations* (Cambridge: Polity, 1998)

* Sylvester, C., *Feminist Theory and IR in a Postmodern Era* (Cambridge: 1994).

* Tickner, J. A ‘What is your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions’, *International Studies Quarterly* 49(1), 2005: 1-21.

* Zalewski, M. ‘Do We Understand Each Other Yet? Troubling feminist encounters within International Relations’, *British Journal of Politics and IR*, 9(2), 2007: 302-312.

Key questions

- What is distinctive about feminist critiques of mainstream IR theory?
 - Can the concept of 'gender' be divorced from feminist theory?
 - How might empirically driven feminist modes of IR differ from those that are conceptually driven?
-

Week 16 Security

Peace, war and security studies have long been targets for various forms of critical intervention. This lecture examines feminist critiques of how 'security' is understood in both mainstream and critical theories. Building on the previous lectures, we explore how the agenda of security studies has grown to encompass a wider range of security referents and modes of analysis. We assess how feminist arguments fit with contemporary developments in the theorization of security, and consider their strengths and weaknesses in relation to concepts like 'human security', 'insecurity', and 'securitization'.

Essential reading

- 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.
- Sylvester, C. (2013) 'Experiencing the End and Afterlives of International Relations Theory' *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 609-626.

Further Reading

- Bilgin, Pinar (2010) 'The 'Western-Centrism' of Security Studies' *Security Dialogue* 41(6): 615-662.
- Blanchard, E. 'Gender and the Development of Feminist Security Theory', *Signs* 28(4) 2003.
- * Buzan, Barry and Ole Waever (2009) 'Macrosecritisation and Security Constellations', *Review of International Studies* 35(2): 253-276.
- Buzan, B. and Hansen, L. (2009) *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (CUP).
- * 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. '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', *Security Dialogue* 42(4).
- Whitworth, S. (2004) *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner).
- Young, I. M. (2003) 'The Logic of Masculinist Protection', *Signs* 29(2).
- * Wilcox, L. (2009) 'Gendering the Cult of the Offensive', *Security Studies* 18: 214-240.

Key questions

- How do conceptions of security differ among and between mainstream and critical approaches? How commensurable are they?
 - 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, focusing on how concepts such as context and narrative help to build bridges between the two enterprises.

Week 17 Philosophy of Science I: Knowledge and certainty

This 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.

Perspectives covered include: those who read causation in ‘Humean’ terms; those who deny the relevance of causal models for the social sciences; and those who argue for a different, more complex, model of causation as the means to generate a ‘scientific’ IR. A central theme will be the way in which post-positivist approaches have opened up disciplinary debates about the importance of explanation, causality, and interpretation.

Essential reading

- 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

- Alker Jr, H. R., and T. J. Biersteker (1984) ‘The Dialectics of World Order: Notes for a Future Archeologist of International Savoir Faire’, *International Studies Quarterly* 28(2): 121-142.
- * Biersteker, T.J. (1989) ‘Critical Reflections on Post-Positivism in International Relations’, *International Studies Quarterly* 33(3): 263-267.
- * Haraway, Donna (1988) ‘Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective’, *Feminist studies* 14(3): 575-599.
- * Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus (2011) *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations* (London: Routledge).
- * Law, John, and John Urry (2004) ‘Enacting the Social’, *Economy and Society* 33(3): 390-410.
- Urry, John (2005) ‘The Complexities of the Global’, *Theory, Culture & Society* 22(5): 235-254.
- * Weber, Max. ‘Politics as a Vocation’ & ‘Science as a Vocation’. 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>]
- * Wight, C. ‘IR: A Science Without Positivism’, Ch. 1 in *Agents, Structures and International Relations: Politics as Ontology* (Cambridge: CUP, 2006).

Key questions

- To what extent is social science concerned with providing causal explanations?
- How important is prediction to the study of world politics?
- Can there be a social science without positivism?

Week 18 Philosophy of Science II: Pluralism and paradigms

This lecture traces the take up in IR of the Kuhnian notion of 'paradigms'. It examines the difficulties of adapting Kuhn's argument to IR and assesses recent arguments that suggest IR should embrace methodological pluralism. Drawing on this framework, we examine one of the most entrenched meta-theoretical problems in IR – the 'agent-structure' debate – and how some scholarship has attempted to resolve this through a turn to critical realism.

Essential reading

- Goddard, Stacie E., and Daniel H. Nexon (2005) 'Paradigm Lost? Reassessing Theory of International Politics' *European Journal of International Relations* 11(1): 9-61.
- Lake, David (2011) 'Why "isms" Are Evil', *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2): 465-480.
- Patomäki, Heikki, and Colin Wight (2000) 'After Postpositivism? The Promises of Critical Realism' *International Studies Quarterly* 44(2):213-237.

Further reading

- Bueno de Mesquita, B. *Predicting Politics* (Ohio State: 2002), Ch. 1.
- 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>
- * *European Journal of International Relations*, Special Issue: 'The End of IR Theory?' 19(3) 2013: see the contributions by Mearsheimer and Walt, and Jackson and Nexon.
- Gaddis, J. 'International Relations Theory and the End of the Cold War', *International Security*, 17(3) 1992/3: 5-58.
- Hollis, M. & Smith, S. 'The International System', Ch. 5 of *Explaining and Understanding in International Relations* (Oxford: 1991).
- * Jackson, Patrick and Daniel Nexon, 'Paradigmatic Faults in IR Theory', *International Studies Quarterly* 53(4) 2009: 907-930.
- Keohane, R. O. 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 32, 1988, pp. 379-396
- Knorr, K & Rosenau, J. (eds) *Contending Approaches to International Politics* (Princeton, 1969). See especially the contributions by Bull and Singer.
- Kuhn, T. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd Ed (Chicago: 1970).
- *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, 'Towards the Politics of Causal Explanation', *International Theory* 4(3) 2012: 400-429.
- Monteiro, N. P. & Ruby, K. G. 'IR and the False Promise of Philosophical Foundations', *International Theory* 1(1) 2009: 15-48.
- Smith, S. 'Singing Our World Into Existence', *International Studies Quarterly*, 48(3) 2004: 499-515.
- Wendt, A. 'Bridging the theory/meta-theory gap in international relations', *Review of International Studies*, 17(4) 1991: 383-392.
- * Wendt, A. 'The Agent-Structure Problem in International Relations Theory', *International Organization*, 41(3): 335-370.
- * Wight, C. (1999) 'They Shoot Dead Horses Don't They?', *EJIR* 5(1): 109-142.

Key questions

- What is a 'paradigm' and can we know the world without one?
- Are 'isms' evil?
- Is it possible to resolve the 'agent-structure' debate?

Week 19 Context

In some respects, history has always been a core feature of international studies. On both sides of the Atlantic, leading figures in the discipline such as E.H. Carr, Hans 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 research programmes 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: political 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 readings

- 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 readings

- 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).
- Sartori, Giovanni (1975) ‘Concept Misinformation in Comparative Politics’, *American Political Science Review* 64(4): 1033-1053.
- * 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 20 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 social theory by acknowledging that history is a form of social theory, and that social theory is necessarily historical.

Core readings

- 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 readings

- Abbott, Andrew (1992) ‘From Causes to Events: Notes on Narrative Positivism’, *Sociological Methods & Research*, 20(4): 428-455.
- Bleiker, Roland and Brigg, Morgan (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
- 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.
- 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).
- 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.
- * Suganami, Hidemi (1999) ‘Agents, Structures, Narratives’, *European Journal of International Relations* 5(3): 365-386.
- 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 act as a useful bridge between history and IR?
- Can we speak of an ‘eternal divide’ between history and social science?



Summer 2014 examination

IR436

Theories of International Relations

Suitable for all candidates

Instructions to candidates

Time allowed: 2 hours

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

1. 'The power of Waltz's theory is that it is immune from "internal critique".' Discuss.
2. How important is the concept of sovereignty to the development of International Relations theory?
3. 'Both liberalism and Marxism should be primarily understood as normative theories.' Discuss.
4. Do the concepts of empire and imperialism belong to the past?
5. Is it possible to study security in International Relations without feminism?
6. 'Post-structural readings of power are philosophically interesting, but empirically vacuous.' Do you agree?
7. Are International Relations theories incommensurable or can they be usefully combined?
8. What is the best way to understand the relationship between International Relations theory and the substance of international relations?