

**Graduate School in Social and Political Science (Semester 1 2015)**

**INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS THEORY  
(PGSP11156)**

**Course Organiser: Dr. Xavier Guillaume**

**Core Course for programme  
MSc International Relations**

Lecture Tuesdays 14.10 – 15:00 Seminar Room 1 & 2, Chrystal Macmillan Building  
Seminars (see below)

This is a core course on the MSc International Relations programme. It is also available as a one semester option for students on other graduate courses in the School of Social and Political Science and the School of Law.

**Course staff and contact details**

Lecturer

Dr. Xavier Guillaume

Room 4.24 CMB

Email: [xavier.guillaume@ed.ac.uk](mailto:xavier.guillaume@ed.ac.uk)

Feedback and Guidance hours: Tuesday, 16.15-18.15, or please email for an appointment outside these hours.

Postgraduate Tutor

Mr. Oliver Kearns

Email: [O.B.Kearns@sms.ed.ac.uk](mailto:O.B.Kearns@sms.ed.ac.uk)

Feedback and Guidance hours: please email for an appointment

**External Examiner**

The External Examiner for International Relations Theory is Professor Jonathan Joseph, Department of Politics, University of Sheffield.

## Content

Course staff and external examiner	1
Content	2
Course objectives	2
Course organisation	3
Assessment	3
Submission and return of coursework	5
Penalties for late submission	6
Extension procedure	6
Penalties for incorrect submission	8
Penalties for exceeding the word length	8
Academic misconduct in submission of essays	8
University email	9
Seminar	9
Essay questions	9
Lecture schedule	10
Suggested textbooks	11
Detailed schedule, seminar questions and compulsory readings	12
Appendix A: Coursework Assessment Form	43
Appendix B: Postgraduate Marking Scheme	44
Appendix C: Writing an essay – some advice	46

## Course Objectives

The discipline of international relations is a relatively young academic subject, only emerging as a distinct field within political science in the aftermath of World War I. To differentiate itself from the disciplines of international law and history, its intellectual predecessors, international relations has developed a number of theories of the nature of the international and its constituent parts, which seek to explain, understand, judge and even predict international behaviour. These theories are heavily indebted to previously established traditions in political philosophy and social theory and the ways in which they conceive of the nature of the state and decision makers, history, social scientific explanation and the relationship between politics and morality.

The course is designed to introduce students to some of the major theoretical and conceptual traditions of international relations as a way to make sense of the complex issues, developments and events constituting the international. The key objective of the course is to introduce students to the most significant orthodox and critical theoretical approaches within international relations. A critical assessment will be made of the principal propositions and arguments of the theories drawn from the diverse traditions of classical realism, neoliberalism, constructivism, poststructuralism, feminism and gender, neo-Marxism and postcolonialism.

### Course Organisation

The course is based on a weekly lecture and seminar. The weekly lecture takes place on Tuesdays between 14:10 and 15:00 in Seminar Room 1 & 2, Chrystal Macmillan Building.

For the seminars, students are divided into groups; these take place on Wednesdays. **Provisionally** there are 5 groups. The students will be automatically assigned to one of these groups on **Learn** by the first lecture.

**n.b.** There are no seminars in week 1.

Lecture	Tuesday	14:10 – 15:00	Seminar Room 1 & 2, CMB
Seminar	Tuesday	15:10 – 16:00	Seminar Room 1, CMB
	Wednesday	10:00 – 10:50	1.6, 24 Buccleuch Place
		11:10 – 12:00	1.6, 24 Buccleuch Place
		12:10 – 13:00	1.4, 22 Buccleuch Place
		14:10 – 15:00	1.6, 24 Buccleuch Place

### Assessment

Students are expected to undertake prior preparation for seminars and actively participate in discussions, including making presentations on relevant topics. More details on the organization of and requirements in seminars will be provided during the first week of the course.

Assessment is via coursework (100 %). The final grade of the course is based upon two assessed essays, one is worth 40% of the mark (1500 words) and the other one 60% of the mark (2500 words).

The following are the criteria through which the essay will be marked (see Appendix B). However, it is important to note that the overall mark is a result of a holistic assessment of the assignment as a whole.

- a. Does the assignment address the question set, and with sufficient focus?

- b. Does the assignment show a grasp of the relevant concepts and knowledge?
- c. Does the assignment demonstrate a logical and effective pattern of argument?
- d. Does the assignment, if appropriate, support arguments with relevant, accurate and effective forms of evidence?
- e. Does the assignment demonstrate reflexivity and critical thinking in relation to arguments and evidence?
- f. Does the assignment demonstrate an autonomous research process resulting in an answer moving beyond the common expectations of the lecture?
- g. Is the assignment adequately presented in terms of: correct referencing and quoting; spelling, grammar and style; layout and visual presentation?

The first essay of 1500 words is due no later than 12 noon on Thursday 29 October (Week 6; students should expect to receive their coursework back by 19 November). The second essay of 2500 words is due no later than 12 noon on Thursday 26 November (Week 11; students should expect to receive their coursework back by 17 December).

**\*\*Plagiarism\*\***: submitting written work containing text copied from someone else's work (without adequate citation), or in which others' ideas are presented as your own, are most heinous academic offences and carry severe penalties (see below). You can consult the chapter 3.6 on 'Plagiarism and How to Avoid It' in Oliver Daddow's International Relations Theory textbook.

### **Submission and Return of Coursework**

Coursework is submitted online using our electronic submission system, ELMA. You will not be required to submit a paper copy of your work.

Marked coursework, grades and feedback will be returned to you via ELMA. You will not receive a paper copy of your marked course work or feedback.

For information, help and advice on submitting coursework and accessing feedback, please see the ELMA wiki at: <https://www.wiki.ed.ac.uk/display/SPSITWiki/ELMA>.

When you submit your work electronically, you will be asked to tick a box confirming that your work complies with university regulations on plagiarism. This confirms that the work you have submitted is your own.

Occasionally, there can be problems with a submission. We request that you monitor your university student email account in the 24 hours following the deadline for submitting your work. If there are any problems with your submission the Course Secretary will email you at this stage.

We undertake to return all coursework within 15 working days of submission. This time is needed for marking, moderation, second marking and input of results.

Feedback for coursework will be returned online via ELMA.

If there are any unanticipated delays, it is the Course Organiser's responsibility to inform you of the reasons.

**All our coursework is assessed anonymously to ensure fairness: to facilitate this process put your Examination number (on your student card), not your name or student number, on your coursework or cover sheet.**

### **Penalties for Late Submission**

All deadlines for submission are at 12 noon prompt, and submitting even a minute after that deadline will incur a penalty. If you miss the submission deadline for any piece of assessed work, 5 marks will be deducted for each calendar day, or part thereof that work is late, up to a maximum of five calendar days (25 marks). After that, a mark of 0% (zero) will be given. It is therefore in your interest always to plan ahead, and if there is any reason why you may need an extension to follow the steps outlined in this handbook. Please note that a mark of zero may have very serious consequences for your degree, so it is always worth submitting work, even if late.

### **Extension procedure**

Extension requests must be made by completing the electronic form which can be found at

[http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/gradschool/on\\_course/for\\_taught\\_masters/extensions](http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/gradschool/on_course/for_taught_masters/extensions)

Extension requests should normally be made no more than two weeks prior to the deadline and should indicate the duration sought and require a separate application for each course. **Extensions cannot be retrospectively granted after a deadline has passed and instead special circumstances need to be submitted.**

All extension requests must use this process. You are welcome to discuss any issues affecting your studies with your Programme Director/Personal Tutor prior to submission. However, all extension request decisions for Graduate School programmes are made by the Graduate School Office, and any informal advice from any other member of staff does not equate to a final decision.

If you have a Learning Profile from the Student Disability Service allowing you the potential for flexibility over deadlines you must still make a formal extension request for such flexibility to be taken into account.

In cases where medical evidence is required please note that your work will be considered as late until evidence is submitted and confirmed. Evidence is to be submitted if requested by the GSO via your University email account or in person to GSO reception.

Further guidance on extension requests can be found at [http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/gradschool/on\\_course/for\\_taught\\_masters/extensions](http://www.sps.ed.ac.uk/gradschool/on_course/for_taught_masters/extensions)

The following are circumstances which would **USUALLY** be considered:

- Serious or significant medical conditions or illness (including both physical and mental health problems).
- Exceptional personal circumstances (e.g. serious illness or death of an immediate family member or close friend, including participation in funeral and associated rites; being a victim of significant crime).
- Exceptional travel circumstances beyond your control.
- Ailments such as very severe colds, migraines, stomach upsets, etc., **ONLY** where the ailment was so severe it was impossible for you to submit your work.

*This list is not exhaustive*

The following are examples of circumstances **NOT** normally considered for coursework extensions:

- Minor ailments such as colds, headaches, hangovers, etc.
- Inability to prioritise and schedule the completion of several pieces of work over a period of time.
- Problems caused by English not being your principal language.
- Poor time management or personal organisation (e.g. failure to plan for foreseeable last-minute emergencies such as computer crashes, printing problems or travel problems resulting in late submission of coursework).
- Circumstances within your control (e.g. a holiday; paid employment if you are a full time student; something considered more important).
- Requests without independent supporting evidence.
- Requests which do not state clearly how your inability to hand in your assessment on time was caused.
- Learning Profiles will be treated sympathetically as part of the case for an extension but do not by themselves guarantee this case.

## **Penalties for Incorrect Submission**

You should follow the submission procedures that are provided in an email from the course Learn page, before each submission, to ensure your coursework is submitted in the correct format. If you have any queries, you should contact the Course Secretary before the submission deadline. Any submission made incorrectly will incur a 5 mark penalty.

### **Penalties for Exceeding the Word Length**

All coursework submitted by students must state the word count on the front. All courses in the Graduate School have a standard penalty for going over the word length (if you are taking courses from other Schools, check with them what their penalties are):

If you go over the word length, 5% of the total marks given for that assignment will be deducted, regardless of by how much you do so (whether it is by 5 words or by 500!). This deduction will take place **after** any other potential penalty has applied. For example, if any essay gets 78 but is 2 days late and 100 words too long, the final mark will be  $(78-10) \times 0.95 = 64.6$ , which is rounded up to 65.

Word length includes footnotes and endnotes, appendices, tables and diagrams, but *not* bibliographies. Given that footnotes and endnotes are included, you may wish to use a short referencing system such as Harvard <http://www.docs.is.ed.ac.uk/docs/Libraries/PDF/SEcitingreferencesHarvard.pdf>.

### **Academic Misconduct in Submission of Essays**

Coursework submitted to the Graduate School will be regarded as the final version for marking. Where there is evidence that the wrong piece of work has been deliberately submitted to subvert hand-in deadlines - e.g. in a deliberately corrupted file - the matter may be treated as a case of misconduct and be referred to the School Academic Misconduct Officer. The maximum penalty can be a mark of 0% (zero). Please note that a mark of zero may have very serious consequences for your degree.

### **University Email**

The University's official means of communication with you is via your University email account. You should check your University email within 24 hours of an ELMA submission, as well as regular checks (at least three times a week) during semester time, as the Course Organiser and/or Course Secretary may attempt to contact you.

### **Seminars**

Seminars are an essential part of your academic learning and provide you with the chance to discuss the material covered during the course, further your own

thinking about a specific tradition, approach or issue and, importantly, to engage with fellow students in a dialogue.

### Essay questions

Essay 1 (40% of the overall mark)

1. What can an historiography of the discipline of International Relations tell us about it?
2. “Realism is an amoral and bellicose doctrine”. Do you agree with this statement?
3. Are international norms a tool for power politics or a genuine reflection of an emergent international society (e.g. Wendt, Finnemore, Sikkink)?

Essay 2 (60% of the overall mark)

1. Can we study gender in the discipline of International Relations without feminism? Should we?
2. Why should we historicise the discipline of International Relations?
3. Analyse the humanitarian intervention in Libya using one of the following approaches: poststructuralism or postcolonialism.

### Lecture Schedule

Lecture Schedule	Topic	Compulsory reading
<b>Week 1 (22 Sep.)</b>	<b>No course this week exceptionally</b>	
<b>Week 2 (29 Sep.)</b>	What is IR theory?	Burchill and Linklater 2005; Weber 2010
<b>Week 3 (6 Oct.)</b>	An historiography of IR theory	Wæver 1998; Schmidt 2002; Ashworth 2014



Lecture Schedule	Topic	Compulsory reading
<b>Week 4 (13 Oct.)</b>	Classical realism	Morgenthau 2006; Morgenthau 1945; Pin-Fat 2005 IMPORTANT: The library cannot make copy of more than 1 chapter per book assigned in a course. You will need to make copies of all the chapters for Morgenthau 2006.
<b>Week 5 (20 Oct.)</b>	Neoliberal institutionalism	Axelrod and Keohane 1985; Doyle 1986; Nye 1986; Mearsheimer 1994
<b>Week 6 (27 Oct.)</b>	Constructivism	Adler 1997; Finnemore and Sikkink 1998; Wendt 1992; Kratochwil 2000
<b>Week 7 (3 Nov.)</b>	Poststructuralism	Ashley and Walker 1990; Campbell 2013; Doty 1993; De Goede 2005; Spegele 2002
<b>Week 8 (10 Nov.)</b>	Feminism/Gender	Cohn 1987; Steans 2003; Change and Ling 2000; Keohane 1989
<b>Week 9 (17 Nov.)</b>	Neo-Marxism	Cox 1981; Teschke 2006; Rupert 2004; Gruyffydd Jones 2008
<b>Week 10 (24 Nov.)</b>	Postcolonialism	Seth 2013; Inayatullah and Blaney 2004; Marshall Beier 2002; Acharya and Buzan 2010
<b>Week 11 (1 Dec.)</b>	Conclusion	No readings

### Suggested textbooks

This course does not require the use of textbooks but students may find the following helpful (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

\*\*Baylis, John, Smith, Steve and Patricia Owens (eds). The globalization of world politics. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

A very good textbook, quite pedagogical, at the introductory level. Entries from some of the top scholars in their fields.

Burchill, Scott *et al.* (eds). 2005. Theories of International Relations. 3rd ed. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

A good textbook centering on specific approaches. Some very good entries for an introduction to these approaches.

Carlsnaes, Walter, Risse, Thomas and Beth A. Simmons (eds). 2002. Handbook of International Relations. London: SAGE Publications.

A very good collection of chapters by some leading scholars. Not necessarily all of them are at the introductory level.

Daddow, Oliver. 2013. International relations theory. The essentials. 2nd ed. London: SAGE.

A classical textbook but with some useful tips (Part III) for students on how to make the most of lectures or seminars, how to write essays, etc.

Dunne, Timothy, Kurki, Milja and Steve Smith (eds). 2013. International relations theories. Discipline and diversity. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

A classical textbook with entries from some of the top scholars in their fields.

\*\*Edkins, Jenny and Maja Zehfuss (eds). 2014. Global politics. A new introduction. London: Routledge.

A very original and well conceived textbook not based on approaches but rather on key questions. Largely oriented toward critical theory.

George, Jim. 1994. Discourses of global politics. A critical (re)introduction to International Relations. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

An old advanced textbook but which remain an excellent introduction to international relations theory from a critical perspective.

\*\*Weber, Cynthia. 2010. International relations theory. A critical introduction. 3rd ed. London: Routledge.

An excellent textbook using movies as a way to exemplify what a specific theory does and what it actually does not address in its theorizing. A very good way to become more familiar with how to approach theories.

### **Detailed Schedule, seminar questions and compulsory readings**

For each topic, beyond the compulsory readings, the weekly reading list below recommends a few articles/chapters for basic reading in order to further your knowledge of a tradition, approach or topic. Remember that the references here represent the tip of the iceberg of a huge literature, you should also use the bibliographies and references in these sources for the necessary further research which is expected in your essays (see Appendix C).

Journals focusing on theoretical issues in International Relations include, among others: *Review of International Studies*, *European Journal of International Relations*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *International Studies Perspectives*, *International Studies Review*, *International Security*, *International Organization*, *International Political Sociology*, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*; *Alternatives: Local, Global, Political*; *World Politics*. Other journals that are more policy-oriented but often include theory based articles are: *Foreign Affairs*, *Foreign Policy*, *International Affairs*, *Survival*. In some cases journals are available as E-Journals and can be accessed directly via the library website.

## Week 2. What is IR theory?

### Required reading:

Burchill, Scott and Linklater, Andrew. 2005. "Introduction," in Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater (eds) Theories of International Relations. 3rd ed. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Weber, Cynthia. 2010. International relations theory. A critical introduction. 3rd ed. London: Routledge. Chapter 1.

### Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

Alker, Hayward R. Jr. and Thomas J. Biersteker. 1984. "The Dialectics of World Order: Notes for a Future Archeologist of International Savoir Faire," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 28 (2), pp. 121–142.

Brecher, Michael. 1999. "International Studies in the Twentieth Century and beyond: Flawed Dichotomies, Synthesis, Cumulation," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 43 (2), pp. 213–264.

Boucher, David. 1998. Political Theories of International Relations. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, Chris, Nardin, Terry and Nicholas Rengger (eds.). 2002. International Relations in Political Thought. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bull, Hedley. 1995 [1972]. "The Theory of International Politics, 1919-1969," in James Der Derian (ed.) International Theory. Critical Investigations. New York: New York University Press.

Gareau, Frederick H. 1981. "The Discipline International Relations: a Multi-National Perspective," The Journal of Politics, vol. 43 (3), pp. 779–802.

\*\*George, Jim and David Campbell. 1990. "Patterns of Dissent and the Celebration of Difference: Critical Social Theory and International Relations," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 34 (3), pp. 269–293.

Halliday, Fred. 1995. "International Relations and Its Discontents," International Affairs, Vol. 71 (4), pp. 733–746.

Hoffmann, Stanley H. 1959. "International Relations: The Long Road to Theory," World Politics, vol. 11 (3), pp. 346–377.

Holsti, K. J. 1989. "Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, Which Are the Fairest Theories of All?," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 33 (3), pp. 255–261.

Hutchings, Kimberley. 1999. International Political Theory. London: SAGE.

Jeffery, Renée . 2005. "Tradition as Invention: The 'Traditions Tradition' and the History of Ideas in International Relations," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 34 (1), pp. 57–84.

Keene, Edward. 2005. International Political Thought: A Historical Introduction. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2011. The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations. Philosophy of Science and Its Implications for the Study of World Politics. London: Routledge.

Lapid, Yosef. 1989. "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 33 (3), pp. 235–254.

Lijphart, Arend. 1974. "The Structure of the Theoretical Revolution in International Relations," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 18 (1), pp. 41–74.

McClelland, Charles A. 1960. "The Function of Theory in International Relations," The Journal of Conflict Resolution, vol. 4 (3), pp. 303–336.

Morgenthau, Hans. 1995 [1970]. "The Intellectual and Political Functions of Theory," in James Der Derian (ed.) International Theory. Critical Investigations. New York: New York University Press.

Neumann, Iver B., and Ole Wæver, eds. 1997. The Future of International Relation. Masters in the Making? London: Routledge.

Onuf, Nicholas. 1995. "Levels," European Journal of International Relations, vol 1 (1), pp. 35–58.

\*\*Rengger, Nicholas. 2000. International Relations, Political Theory and the Problem of Order. London: Routledge.

Savigear, Peter. 1978. "International Relations and Philosophy of History," in Michael Donelan (ed.) The Reason of States: A Study in International Political Theory. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Schmidt, Brian C. 2008. "International Relations Theory: Hegemony or Pluralism?," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 36 (2), pp. 295–304.

Shepherd, Laura J., ed. 2010. Gender Matters in Global Politics. A Feminist Introduction to International Relations. London: Routledge.

Smith, Steve. 1992. "The Forty Years Detour. The Resurgence of Normative Theory in International Relations," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 21 (3), pp. 489–506.

Smith, Steve, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, eds. 1996. International Theory: Positivism and Beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sofer, Sasson. 2002. "Recovering the Classical Approach," International Studies Review, vol. 4 (3), pp. 141-151.

Suganami, Hidemi. 1978. "A Note on the Origin of the Word 'International'," British Journal of International Studies, vol. 4 (3), pp. 226–32.

\*\*Weber, Cynthia. 1998. "Reading Martin Wight's 'Why Is There No International Theory?' as History," Alternatives: Local, Global, Political, vol. 23 (4), pp. 451–469.

Weber, Cynthia. 1999. "IR: the Resurrection or New Frontiers of Incorporation," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 5 (4), pp. 435–450.

Wight, Martin. 1994. International Theory: The Three Traditions. London: Leicester University Press.

\*\*Wight, Martin. 1995 [1966]. "Why is there no International Theory?," in James Der Derian (ed.) International Theory. Critical Investigations. New York: New York University Press.

Wyn Jones, Richard, ed. 2001. Critical Theory and World Politics. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Week 3. An historiography of IR theory

Seminar questions:

What does mean thinking in terms of a discipline?

What are the premises behind the discipline of International Relations?

What does an historiography of the discipline of International Relations can tell us about it?

What are the consequences for thinking about International Relations theory by taking into account its historiography?

Required reading:

Wæver, Ole. 1998. "The rise and fall of the inter-paradigm debate," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski (eds.) International theory: positivism and beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, Brian C. 2002. "On the history and historiography of International Relations," in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth Simmons (eds) Handbook of International Relations. London: Sage.

Ashworth, Lucian M. 2014. A history of international thought. From the origins of the modern state to academic international relations. London: Routledge. Chapter 1.

Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

Ashworth, Lucian M. 1999. Creating International Studies. Angell, Mitrany and the Liberal Tradition. Aldershot: Ashgate.

\*\*Ashworth, Lucian M. 2002. "Did the Realist-Idealist Great Debate Really Happen? A Revisionist History of International Relations," International Relations, vol. 16 (1), pp. 33–51.

Ashworth, Lucian M. 2006. "Where Are the Idealists in Interwar International Relations?," Review of International Studies, vol. 32 (2), pp. 291–308.

\*\*De Carvalho, Benjamin, Halvard Leira and John M. Hobson. 2011. "The big bangs of IR: the myths that your teachers still tell you about 1648 and 1919," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 39 (3), pp. 735–758.

Guilhot, Nicolas. 2014. "Portrait of the realist as a historian: On anti-whiggism in the history of international relations," European Journal of International Relations, Published online before print.

\*\*Kaplan, Morton A. 1961. "Is International Relations a Discipline?," The Journal of Politics, vol. 23 (3), pp. 462–476.

Jørgensen, Knud Erik. 2000. "Continental IR Theory: the Best Kept Secret," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 6 (1), pp. 9–42.

\*\*Lapid, Yosef. 1989. "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 33 (3), pp. 235–254.

Long, David and Brian C. Schmidt, eds 2005. Imperialism and Internationalism in the Discipline of International Relations. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Long, David and Peter Wilson, eds. 1995. Thinkers of the Twenty Years' Crisis. Inter-War Idealism Reassessed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Osiander, Andreas. 1998. "Rereading Early Twentieth Century IR Theory: Idealism Revisited," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 42 (), pp. 409–432.

Osiander, Andreas. 2001. "Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth," International Organization, vol. 55 (2), pp. 251–287.

\*\*Schmidt, Brian C. 1998. "Lessons from the Past: Reassessing the interwar Disciplinary History of International Relations," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 42 (3), pp. 433-459.

Schmidt, Brian C. 2002. "Anarchy, World Politics and the Birth of a Discipline: American International Relations, Pluralist Theory and the Myth of Interwar Idealism," International Relations, vol. 16 (1), pp. 9-31.

Schmidt, Brian C., ed. 2012. International Relations and the first great debate. London: Routledge.

\*\*Smith, Steve. 1995. "The Self-Images of a Discipline: A Genealogy of International Relations Theory," in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds.) International Relations Theory Today. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Thies, Cameron G. 2002. "Progress, History and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of the Idealist–Realist Debate," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 8 (2), pp. 147–185.

Vigneswaran, Darshan and Quirk, Joel. 2010. "Past Masters and Modern Inventions: Intellectual History as Critical Theory," International Relations, vol. 24 (2), pp. 107–131.

\*\*Vitalis, Robert. 2000. "The Graceful and Generous Liberal Gesture: Making Racism Invisible in American International Relations," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 29 (2), pp. 331–356.

Vitalis, Robert. 2010. "The Noble American Science of Imperial Relations and Its Laws of Race Development," Comparative Studies in Society and History, vol. 52 (4), pp. 909–938.

Wilson, Peter. 1998. "The Myth of the 'First Great Debate'," Review of International Studies, vol. 24 (5), pp. 1-16.

\*\*Weber, Cynthia. 1999. "IR: the Resurrection or New Frontiers of Incorporation," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 5 (4), pp. 435–50.

## Week 4. Classical realism

### Seminar questions:

What are the key assumptions of classical realism?

What is power and how does it apply to international relations?

Is there a role for ethics in international relations?

Can classical realism escape its own utopianism?

### Required reading:

Morgenthau, Hans J. 2006[1985, 1978, 1973, 1967, 1960, 1954, 1948]. Politics among nations. The struggle for power and peace. 7th ed. Boston: McGraw Hill. Chapters 1-3.

Politics among nations went through many editorial changes whether done by Morgenthau himself or Kenneth Thompson. The first two chapters to read for instance were not included in the first edition.

**IMPORTANT: The library cannot make copy of more than 1 chapter per book assigned in a course. You will need to make copies of your own of the 3 assigned chapters. Chapter 1 is normally available on LEARN but you will need to make copies of Chapters 2 and 3.**

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1945. "The Evil of Politics and the Ethics of Evil," Ethics, vol. 56 (1), pp. 1-18.

Pin-Fat, Veronique. 2005. "The Metaphysics of the National Interest and the 'Mysticism' of the Nation-State: Reading Hans J. Morgenthau," Review of International Studies, vol. 32 (2), pp. 217-236.

Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

Bain, William. 2000. "Deconfusing Morgenthau: Moral Inquiry and Classical Realism Reconsidered," Review of International Studies, vol. 26 (3), pp. 445–464.

Barkawi, Tarak. 1998. "Strategy as a vocation: Weber, Morgenthau, and modern strategic studies," Review of International Studies, vol. 24 (2), pp. 159–184.

Barkin, J. S. 2003. "Realist constructivism," International Studies Review, vol. 5(3), pp. 325–342.

Bell, Duncan S. A. 2002. "Anarchy, Power and Death: Contemporary Political Realism as Ideology," Journal of Political Ideologies, vol. 7 (2), pp. 221–239.

Berridge, G. R. 2001. "Machiavelli: human nature, good faith, and diplomacy," Review of International Studies, vol. 27 (4), pp. 539-556.



Brown, Michael E., Lynn-Jones, Sean M. and Steven E. Miller, eds. 1995. The Perils of Anarchy. Contemporary Realism and International Security. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

\*\*Buzan, Barry. 1996. "The Timeless Wisdom of Realism" in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski, eds., International Relations Theory: Positivism and Beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

\*\*Der Derian, James. 1995. "A Reinterpretation of Realism: Genealogy, Semiology, Dromology," in James Der Derian (ed.), International Theory: Critical Investigations. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Donnelly, Jack. 2000. Realism and International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frankel, Benjamin, ed. 1992. Realism: Restatements and Renewal. London: Frank Cass.

Frankel, Benjamin, ed. 1996. The Roots of Realism. London: Frank Cass.

Frei, Christoph. 2001. Hans J. Morgenthau: An Intellectual Biography. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

George, Jim. 1995. "Realist Ethics, International Relations, and Post-modernism: Thinking Beyond the Egoism-Anarchy Thematic," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, pp. 24(2), pp. 195–223.

\*\*Gilpin, Robert. 1986. "The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism," in Robert O. Keohane (ed.), Neorealism and Its Critics. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gismondi, Mark. 2004. "Tragedy, Realism, and Postmodernity: Kulturpessimismus in the theories of Max Weber, E. H. Carr, Hans J. Morgenthau, and Henry Kissinger," Diplomacy and Statecraft, vol. 15 (3), pp. 435-464.

Guzzini, Stefano. 1998. Realism in International Relations and International Political Economy. The Continuing Story of a Death Foretold. London: Routledge.

\*\*Guzzini, Stefano. 2004. "The Enduring Dilemmas of Realism in International Relations," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 10 (4), pp. 533-568.

Lobell, Steven E., Ripsman, Norrin M., and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, eds. 2009. Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1946. Scientific Man versus Power Politics. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

\*\*Morgenthau, Hans J. 1948. *Politics among Nations. The struggle for power and peace*. New York: Knopf.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1951. "The Moral Dilemma in Foreign Policy," *Year Book of World Affairs*, vol. 5, pp. 12-36.

Mearsheimer, John J. 2001. The Tragedy of Great Power Politics. New York: Norton.

Mercer, Jonathan. 1995. "Anarchy and Identity," International Organization, vol. 49(2), pp. 229–252.

\*\*Molloy, Seán. 2006. The Hidden History of Realism. A Genealogy of Power Politics. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

\*\*Molloy, Seán. 2009. "Aristotle, Epicurus, Morgenthau and the Political Ethics of the Lesser Evil," The Journal of International Political Theory, vol. 5 (1), pp. 94–112.

Pichler, Hans-Karl. 1998. "The Godfathers of 'Truth': Max Weber and Karl Schmitt in Morgenthau's Theory of Power Politics," Review of International Studies, vol. 24 (2), pp. 185-200.

Ruggie, John G. 1995. "The False Premise of Realism," International Security, vol. 20 (1), pp.62-70.

Spegele, Roger D. 1996. Political Realism in International Theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taliaferro, Jeffrey W. 2001. "Security seeking under anarchy: Defensive realism revisited.," International Security, vol. 25(3), pp. 128–161.

Turner, Stephen and George Mazur. 2009. "Morgenthau as a Weberian Methodologist," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 15 (3), pp. 477–504.

Walker, R.B.J. 1987. "Realism, Change, and International Political Theory," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 31 (1), pp. 65-86.

\*\*Williams, Michael C. 2004. "Why Ideas Matter in International Relations: Hans Morgenthau, Classical Realism, and the Moral Construction of Power Politics," International Organisation, vol. 58 (4), pp. 633-665.

Williams, Michael C. 2005. The realist tradition and the limits of international relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wohlforth, William C. 1994. "Realism and the End of the Cold War," International Security, vol. 19 (3), pp. 91-129.

## Week 5. Neoliberal Institutionalism

### Seminar Questions:

What are the key assumptions of neoliberal institutionalism?

What differentiates neoliberal institutionalism from neorealism?

What elements of global politics does neoliberal institutionalism cover better than other theories of IR?

### Required Reading:

Axelrod Robert and Robert O. Keohane. 1985. "Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions," World Politics, vol. 38 (3), pp. 226-254.

Doyle, Michael W. 1986. "Liberalism and World Politics," The American Political Science Review, vol. 80 (4), pp. 1115-1169.

Nye Joseph S. 1986. "Neorealism And Neoliberalism," World Politics, vol. 40 (2), pp. 235-251.

Mearsheimer, John J. 1994. "The False Promise of International Institutions," International Security, vol. 19 (3), pp. 5-49.

Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

Baldwin, David, ed. 1993. Neorealism and Neoliberalism. The Contemporary Debate. New York: Columbia University Press.

Deudney, Daniel and John G. Ikenberry. 1999. "The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order," Review of International Studies, vol 25 (2), pp. 179-196.

\*\*Doyle, Michael. 1997. "A Liberal View: Preserving and Expanding the Liberal Pacific Union," in Michael Doyle and John G. Ikenberry (eds.) New Thinking in International Relations. Boulder: Westview.

Grieco, Joseph M. 1988. "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism," International Organization, vol. 42 (3), pp. 485-507.

\*\*Haggard, Stephen and Beth A. Simmons. 1987. "Theories of International Regimes," International Organization, vol. 41 (3), pp. 491-517.

Hasenclever, Andreas, Mayer, Peter and Volker Rittberger. 1997. Theories of International Regimes. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hurrell, Andrew. 1993. "International Society and the Study of Regimes: A Reflective Approach," in Volker Rittberger (ed.) Regime Theory and International Relations. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Keohane, Robert O. and Lisa L. Martin. 1995. "The Promise Of Institutional Theory," International Security, vol. 20 (1), pp. 39-51.

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. 1987. "Power and Interdependence Revisited," International Organization, vol. 41 (4), pp. 725-753.

Keohane, Robert O. 1984. After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Keohane, Robert O. 1986. "International Institutions and State Power," in Robert O. Keohane (ed.) Neorealism and Its Critics. New York: Columbia University Press.

Keohane, Robert O. 1991. "Cooperation and International Regimes", in Richard Little & Michael Smith (eds.) Perspectives on World Politics. London: Routledge.

\*\*Keohane, Robert O. & Joseph S. Nye. 2001. Power and Interdependence. 3rd ed. New York: Longman.

Krasner, Stephen, ed. 1983. International Regimes. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Milner, Helen V. 1997. Interests, Institutions and Information. Domestic Politics and International Relations. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 1993. "Preferences and Power in the European Community: A Liberal Intergovernmentalist Approach," Journal of Common Market Studies, vol. 31 (4), pp. 473-524.

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

O'Meara, Richard L. 1984. "Regimes and Their Implications for International Theory," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 13 (3), pp. 245-264.

Powell, Robert. 1991. "Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory," The American Political Science Review, vol. 85 (4), pp. 1303-1320.

\*\*Powell, Robert. 1994. "Anarchy in International Relations Theory: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate," International Organization, vol. 48 (2), pp. 313-344.

Rittberger, Volker, ed. 1993. Regime Theory and International Relations. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Weber, Katja. 1997. "Hierarchy Amidst Anarchy: A Transaction Costs Approach to International Security Cooperation," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 41 (2), pp. 321-340.

## Week 6. Constructivism

### Seminar Questions:

What are the key assumptions of constructivism?

How does constructivism allow us to better understand international politics?

What does it mean to say that the international structure and the units inhabiting it are co-constitutive?

Do you find the constructivist perspective convincing? Why?

### Required Reading:

Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change," International Organization, vol. 52 (4), pp. 887-917.

Wendt, Alexander. 1992. "Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics," International Organization, vol. 46 (2), pp. 391-425.

Autesserre, Séverine. 2009. "Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention," International Organization, vol. 63 (2), pp. 249-280.

Epstein, Charlotte. 2012. "Stop Telling Us How to Behave: Socialization or Infantilization?," International Studies Perspectives, vol. 13 (2), pp. 135-145.

Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

Adler, Emanuel. 1997. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 3 (3), pp. 319-363.

Adler, Emaniell and Michael Barnett, eds. 1998. Security Communities. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adler, Emanuel. 2005. Communitarian International Relations. London: Routledge.

Alker, Hayward R. 2000. "On Learning From Wendt," Review of International Studies, vol. 26 (1), pp. 141-50.

Barkin, J. Samuel. 2003. "Realist Constructivism," International Studies Review, vol. 5 (3), pp. 325-42.

Bially Mattern, Janice. 2005. Ordering International Politics. Identity, Crisis, and Representational Force. London: Routledge.

\*\*Biersteker, Thomas J. and Cynthia Weber. 1996. State Sovereignty as Social Construct. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Checkel, Jeffrey. 1998. "The Constructive Turn In International Relations Theory," World Politics, vol. 50 (2), pp. 324-348.

Copeland, Dale C. 2000. "The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay," International Security, vol. 25 (2), pp. 187-212.

Dunne, Tim. 1995. "The Social Construction of International Society," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 1(3), pp. 367-389.

Fierke, Karin M. 2000. "Logics of Force and Dialogue: the Iraq/UNSCOM Crisis as Social Interaction," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 6 (3), pp. 335-371.

Fierke, Karin M. and Knud Erik Jørgensen, eds. 2001. Constructing International Relations. The Next Generation. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Fierke, Karin M. 2003. "Breaking the Silence: Language and Method in International Relations," in François Debrix (ed.) Language, Agency, and Politics in a Constructed World. Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe.

Finnemore, Martha. 1996. National Interests in International Society. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

\*\*Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 2001. "Taking Stock: the Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics," Annual Review of Political Science, vol. 4, pp. 391-416.

Guzzini, Stefano. 2000. "A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 6 (2), pp. 147-182.

Hopf, Ted. 1998. "The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory," International Security, vol. 23 (1), pp. 171-200.

Katzenstein, Peter J. 1996. Cultural Norms and National Security. Police and Military in Postwar Japan. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

\*\*Katzenstein, Peter J. ed. 1996. The Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics. New York: Columbia University Press.

Klotz, Audie. 1995. "Norms Reconstituting Interests: Global Racial Equality and US Sanctions Against South Africa," International Organization, vol. 49 (3), pp. 451-478.

\*\*Kratochwil, Friedrich. 2000. "Constructing a New Orthodoxy? Wendt's 'Social Theory of International Politics' and the Constructivist Challenge," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 29 (1), pp. 73-101.

Lebow, Richard Ned. 2001. "Thucydides the Constructivist," American Political Science Association, vol. 95 (3), pp. 547-560.

Onuf, Nicholas. 1989. World of Our Making Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Price, Richard, and Christian Reus-Smit. 1998. "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 4 (3), pp. 259-294.

Price, Richard. 1995. "A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo," International Organization, vol. 49 (1), pp. 73-103.

Ringmar, Erik. 1996. Identity, Interest and Action. A Cultural Explanation of Sweden's Intervention in the Thirty Years War. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Risse, Thomas, Ropp, Stephen C. and Kathryn Sikkink, eds. 1999. The Power of Human Rights. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sterling-Folker, Jennifer. 2002. "Realism and the Constructivist Challenge: Rejecting, Reconstructing, or Rereading," International Studies Review, vol. 4 (1), pp. 73-97.

Tannenwald, Nina. 1999. "The Nuclear Taboo: the United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use," International Organization, vol. 53 (3), pp. 433–468.

Wendt, Alexander. 1987. "The Agent-Structure Problem In International Relations Theory," International Organisation, vol. 41 (3), pp. 335-370.

\*\*Wendt, Alexander. 1998. "On Constitution and Causation in International Relations," Review of International Studies, vol. 24 (5), pp. 101-118.

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. Social Theory of International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Zehfuss, Maja. 2001. "Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 7 (3), pp. 315-348.

Zehfuss, Maja. 2002. Constructivism in International Relations. The Politics of Reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

## Week 7. Poststructuralism

### Seminar Questions:

What are the key assumptions of poststructuralism?

What is the added value of poststructuralist approaches to international relations?

What is power and how does it apply to international relations?

"If there is 'nothing outside discourse', does this mean that language is all there is and reality is only a product of the imagination?" (Campbell 2013: 244)

"How can poststructuralism's concern with subjectivity, identity, power, and discourse be connected to the categories and concerns of IR?" (Campbell 2013: 244)

### Required Reading:

Campbell, David. 2013. "Poststructuralism," in Timothy Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith (eds) International relations theories. Discipline and diversity. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[A textbook chapter introducing very well the key dimensions of poststructural approaches]

Doty, Roxanne L. 1993. "Foreign policy as social construction: A post-positivist analysis of U.S. counterinsurgency policy in the Philippines," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 37 (3), 297–320.

De Goede, Marieke. 2005. Virtue, fortune, and faith. A genealogy of finance. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Introduction and Chapter 1.



Spegele, Roger D. 2002. "Emancipatory International Relations: good news, bad news or no news at all?," International Relations, vol. 16 (3), pp. 381–401.

Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

Ashley, Richard K. 1988. "Untying the Sovereign State: A Double Reading of the Anarchy Problematique," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 17 (), pp. 227-286.

Ashley, Richard K., and R. B. J. Walker. 1990. "Introduction: speaking the language of exile: dissidence in International Studies," International Studies Quarterly, vol. 34 (3), pp. 259-268.

\*\*Ashley, Richard K. 1996. "The Achievements of Post-Structuralism," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski (eds.) International Theory: positivism and beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bartelson, Jens. 2001. The critique of the state. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

\*\*Campbell, David. 1998[1992]. Writing security. United States foreign policy and the politics of identity. 2nd ed. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Campbell, David. 1998. "Why fight: Humanitarianism, principles, and post-structuralism," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 27 (3), pp. 497–521.

\*\*Campbell, David. 1998. "MetaBosnia: narratives of the Bosnian war," Review of International Studies, vol. 24 (2), pp. 261–281.

Campbell, David and Michael J. Shapiro, eds. 1999. Moral Spaces. Rethinking Ethics and World Politics. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Debrix, François and Cynthia Weber, eds. 2003. Rituals of Mediation. International Politics and Social Meaning. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

De Goede, Marieke (ed). 2006. International political economy and poststructural politics. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Der Derian, James. 1992. Antidiplomacy. Spies, Terror, Speed and War. Oxford: Blackwell.

Der Derian, James and Shapiro, Michael, eds. 1989. International/Intertextual Relations. Postmodern readings of world politics. New York: Lexington Books.

- Doty, Roxanne L. 1996. Imperial encounters. The politics of representation in North-South relations. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Edkins, Jenny, Persram, Nalini and Véronique Pin-Fat. 1999. Sovereignty and Subjectivity. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Edkins, Jenny, and Véronique Pin-Fat. 2005. "Through the Wire: Relations of Power and Relations of Violence," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 34 (1), pp. 1-24.
- Franke, Mark F. N. 2000. "Refusing an ethical approach to world politics in favour of political ethics," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 6 (3), pp. 307–333.
- Hoffman, Mark. 1987. "Critical Theory and the Inter-Paradigm Debate," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 16 (2), pp. 231-50.
- Laffey, Mark, and Jutta Weldes. 1997. "Beyond belief: ideas and symbolic technologies in the study of international relations," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 3 (2), pp. 193–237.
- Laffey, Mark. 2000. "Locating identity: performativity, foreign policy and state action," Review of International Studies, vol. 26 (3), pp. 429–444.
- Lapid, Yosef and Friedrich Kratochwil, eds. 1996. The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory. Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers.
- Milliken, Jennifer. 1999. "The Study of Discourse in International Relations: A Critique of Research and Methods," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 5 (2), pp. 225–254.
- Neumann, Iver B. 1999. Uses of the Other. "The East" in European Identity Formation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Polat, Necati. 1998. "Poststructuralism, Absence, Mimesis: Making Difference, Reproducing Sovereignty," European Journal of International Relations, vol. 4 (4), pp. 447–477.
- Shapiro, Michael J. 1992. Reading the postmodern polity. Political theory as textual practice. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Smith, Steve. 1996. "Positivism and Beyond," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski (eds.) International Theory: positivism and beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

\*\*Walker, R. B. J. 1990. Inside/Outside. International Relations as political theory. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Walker, R. B. J. 2002. "After the Future: Enclosures, Connections, Politics," in Richard A. Falk, Lester Edwin J. Ruiz and R. B. J. Walker (eds.) Re-Framing the International. Law, Culture, Politics. London: Routledge.

Walker, R. B. J. 2009. After the globe, before the world. London: Routledge.

Weber, Cynthia. 1995. Simulating Sovereignty. Intervention, the State and Symbolic Exchange. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

\*\*Weber, Cynthia. 1998. "Performative States," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 27 (1), pp. 77–95.

Week 8. Feminism/Gender

Seminar Questions:

What are the key assumptions of feminism/gender in international relations?  
What are the main advantages of feminist approaches, what can they capture that other orthodox approaches neglect?

On what grounds can it be argued that International Relations is a "gendered" discipline?

Should we study gender in IR without feminism?

Required Reading:

Cohn, Carol. 1987. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," Signs, vol. 12 (4), pp. 687-718.

Stearns, Jill. 2003. "Engaging from the margins: feminist encounters with the 'mainstream' of International Relations," The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, vol. 5(3), pp. 428–454.

Chang, Kimberly A. and L. H. M. Ling. 2000. "Globalization and its intimate other. Filipina domestic workers in Hong Kong," in Marianne H. Marchand and Anne Sisson Runyan (eds) Gender and global restructuring. Sightings, sites and resistances. London: Routledge.

Keohane, Robert O. 1989. "International Relations theory: contributions of a feminist standpoint," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 18 (2), pp. 245-253.

Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

\*\*Butler Judith. 1999 [1990]. Gender Trouble. Feminism and the subversion of identity. London: Routledge.

Butler, Judith. 2004. Undoing Gender. London: Routledge.

Carver, Terrell, Cochran, Molly and Judith Squires. 1998. "Gendering Jones: Feminisms, IRs, Masculinities," Review of International Studies, vol. 24 (2), pp. 283-97

\*\*Enloe, Cynthia. 2000 [1989]. Bananas, Beaches and Bases. Making Feminist Sense of International Politics. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2010. Nimo's War, Emma's War. Making Feminist Sense of the Iraq War. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hutchings, Kimberly. 1999. "Feminism, Universalism, and the Ethics of International Politics," in Vivienne Jabri and Eleanor O'Gorman (eds.) Women, Culture, and International Relations. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Jabri, Vivienne and Eleanor O'Gorman, eds. Women, Culture and International Relations. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Jones, Adam. 1996. "Does 'gender' make the world go round? Feminist critiques of international relations," Review of International Studies, vol. 22 (4), pp. 405-429.

Marchand, Marianne H. 1996. "Reconceptualizing 'gender and development' in an era of 'globalization'," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 25 (3), pp. 577-603.

Marchand, Marianne H., Reid, Julian and Boukje Berents. 1998. "Migration, (Im-)mobility and Modernity: Toward a Feminist Understanding of the Global Prostitution Scene in Amsterdam," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 27 (4), pp. 955-981.

Marchand, Marianne H. and Anne Sisson Runyan, eds. 2011 [2000]. Gender and Global Restructuring. Sightings, Sites and Resistances. London: Routledge.

\*\*Parpart, Jane L. and Marysia Zalewski (eds). 2008. Rethinking the man question. Sex, gender and violence in international relations. London: Zed Books.

\*\*Shepherd, Laura J., ed.. 2010. Gender matters in global politics. A feminist introduction to international relations. London: Routledge.

Spike Peterson, V. 1990. "Whose Rights? A Critique of the 'Givens' in Human Rights Discourse," Alternatives: Local, Global, Political, vol. 15 (3), pp. 303-344.

Spike Peterson, V., ed. 1992. Gendered States. Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher.

Sylvester, Christine. 1994. Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sylvester, Christine. 1994. "Emphatic Cooperation: A Feminist Method for IR," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 23 (2), pp. 315-336.

Sylvester, Christine. 1996. "The Contributions of feminist theory to international relations," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski (eds) International Theory: positivism and beyond. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1991. "Hans Morgenthau's principles of political realism: a feminist reformulation," in Rebecca Grant and Kathleen Newland (eds.) Gender and international relations. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1992. Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security. New York: Columbia University Press.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1997. "You just don't understand: Troubled engagements between feminists and IR theorists," International Organization, vol. 41 (4), pp. 611-632.

Weber, Cynthia. 1994. "Good Girls, Little Girls, and Bad Girls: Male Paranoia in Robert Keohane's Critique of Feminist International Relations," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 23 (2), pp. 337-349.

\*\*Weber, Cynthia. 2014. "Why is there no Queer International Theory?," European Journal of International Relations, published online 3 April 2014.

Youngs, Gillian. 2004. "Feminist International Relations: a contradiction in terms? Or: why women and gender are essential to understanding the world 'we' live in," International Affairs, vol. 80 (1), pp. 75-87.

Zalewski, Marysia. 1995. "Well, what is the feminist perspective on Bosnia?," International Affairs, vol. 71(2), pp. 339-356.

Zalewski, Marysia. 2007. "Do We Understand Each Other Yet? Troubling Feminist Encounters with(in) International Relations," The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, vol. 9 (2), pp. 302-12.

Week 9. Neo-Marxism

### Seminar Questions:

What are the key assumptions of neo-Marxism in international relations?  
What is the relevance of different neo-Marxist approaches today?  
Why do we need to historicise in IR?

### Required Reading:

Cox, Robert W. 1981. "Social forces, states and world orders: beyond International Relations theory," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 10(2), pp. 126–155.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1984. "The three instances of hegemony in the history of the capitalist world economy," in The Politics of the world economy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rupert, Mark. 2004. "Globalising common sense: a Marxian-Gramscian (re-)vision of the politics of governance/resistance," Review of International Studies, vol. 29 (1), pp. 181–198.

Gruyffydd Jones, Branwen. 2008. "'Tell no lies, claim no easy victories'. Possibilities and contradictions of emancipatory struggles in the current neocolonial condition," in Allison J. Ayers (ed.) Gramsci, political economy, and International Relations theory. Modern princes and naked emperors. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

\*\*Anievas, Alexander, ed. 2010. Marxism and World Politics. Contesting Global Capitalism. London: Routledge.

Arrighi, Giovanni. 1993. "The Three Hegemonies of Historical Capitalism," in Stephen Gill (ed.) Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arrighi, Giovanni. 1994. The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of our Times. London: Verso.

Banaji, Jairus. 2007. "Islam, the Mediterranean and the Rise of Capitalism," Historical Materialism, vol. 15 (1), pp. 47-74.

Banaji, Jairus. 2010. Theory as History: Essays on Modes of Production and Exploitation. Leiden: Brill.

Cardoso, Fernando H. and Enzo Faletto. 1979 [1971]. Dependency and Development in Latin America. Berkeley: University of California Press.

\*\*Dufour, Frederick Guillaume. 2008. "Historical Materialism and International Relations," in Jacques Bidet and Stathis Kouvelakis (eds.) Critical Companion to Contemporary Marxism. Leiden: Brill.

Galtung, Johan. 1969. "Violence, Peace and Peace Research," Journal of Peace Research, vol. 6 (3), pp. 167-191.

Galtung, Johan. 1971. "A Structural Theory of Imperialism," Journal of Peace Research, vol. 8 (2), pp. 81-117.

Heine, Christian and Benno Teschke. 1996. "Sleeping Beauty and the Dialectical Awakening: On the Potential of Dialectic for International Relations," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, vol. 25 (2), pp. 399-423.

\*\*Stephen Gill (ed.) Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

\*\*Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. Empire. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lacher, Hannes. 2002. "Making Sense of the International System: The Promises and Pitfalls of Contemporary Marxist Theories of International Relations," in Mark Rupert and Hazel Smith (eds.) Historical Materialism and Globalization. London: Routledge.

Lacher, Hannes. 2006. Beyond Globalization: Capitalism, Territoriality and the International Relations of Modernity. London: Routledge.

Payne, Anthony. 2005. The Global Politics of Unequal Development. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Teschke, Benno. 2003. The Myth of 1648. Class, Geopolitics and the Making of Modern International Relations. London: Verso Press.

\*\*Teschke, Benno. 2006. "Debating 'The myth of 1648': state formation, the interstate system and the emergence of capitalism in Europe — A rejoinder," International Politics, vol. 43(5), pp. 531–573.

Rosenberg, Justin. 2001 [1994]. The Empire of Civil Society. A Critique of the Realist Theory of International Relations. London: Verso.

Rupert, Mark and Hazel Smith, eds. 2002. Historical Materialism and Globalization. London: Routledge.

Van der Pijl, Kees. 1998. Transnational Classes and International Relations. London: Routledge.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1979. The Capitalist World Economy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1996. "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.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2011 [1974]. The Modern World-System. Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1980. The Modern World-System: Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600-1750. Boston: Academic Press.

Week 10. Postcolonialism

Seminar Questions:

What are the key assumptions of postcolonialism in international relations?  
What does it mean to be postcolonial?  
What are the distinguishing features of a postcolonial approach to International Relations (contrast Acharya and Buzan 2010 with the other readings)?

Required Reading:

Seth, Sanjay. 2013. "Postcolonial theory and the critique of International Relations," in Sanjay Seth (ed.) Postcolonial theory and international relations. A critical introduction. London: Routledge.

Inayatullah Naeem and David L. Blaney. 2004. International relations and the problem of difference. London: Routledge. Chapter 6.

Marshall Beier, J. 2002. "Beyond hegemonic state(ment)s of nature. Indigenous knowledge and non-state possibilities in international relations," in Geeta Chowdhry and Sheila Nair (eds.) Power, postcolonialism and international relations. Reading race, gender and class. London: Routledge.

Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan. 2010. "Conclusion. On the possibility of a non-Western international relations theory," in Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan (eds.) Non-Western international relations theory. Perspectives on and beyond Asia. London: Routledge.



Further reading (recommended readings are preceded with \*\*):

Anghie, Anthony. 2006. "Decolonizing the concept of 'good governance'," in Branwen Gruffydd Jones (ed.) Decolonizing international relations. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Ayotte, Kevin J., and Mary E. Husain. 2005. "Securing Afghan Women: Neocolonialism, Epistemic Violence, and the Rhetoric of the Veil." NWSA Journal, vol. 17 (3), pp. 112–133.

Barkawi, Tarak, and Mark Laffey. 2006. "The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies," Review of International Studies, vol. 32 (2), pp. 329–352.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. The location of culture, nation and narration. London: Routledge.

\*\*Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chan, Stephen, Peter G. Mandaville, and Roland Bleiker, eds. 2001. The Zen of International Relations. IR Theory From East to West. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Chowdhry, Geeta, and Sheila Nair, eds. 2002. Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations. Reading Race, Gender and Class. London: Routledge.

Cooper, Frederick, and Ann Laura Stoler, eds. 1997. Tensions of Empire. Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Darby, Philip, and A. J. Paolini. 1994. "Bridging International Relations and Postcolonialism," Alternatives: Global, Local, Political, vol. 19 (3), pp. 371–397.

Darby, Phillip. 2004. "Pursuing the Political: A Postcolonial Rethinking of Relations International," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Volume 33 (1), pp. 1-32.

Darby, Phillip, ed. 2006. Postcolonizing the International. Working to change the way we are. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.

Dirlik, Arif. 2002. "Whither History? Encounters with Historicism, Postmodernism, Postcolonialism." Futures, vol. 34 (1), pp. 75–90.

Doty, Roxanne L. 1993. "The Bounds of 'Race' in International Relations," Millennium: Journal of International Studies, Vol. 22 (3), pp. 443-61.

Doty, Roxanne L. 1996. Imperial Encounters. The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

\*\*Fanon, Frantz. 1962. Black Skin, White Masks. New York: Grove Press.

\*\*Gilroy, Paul. 1993. The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness. London: Verso.

Gruffydd Jones, Branwen, ed. 2006. Decolonizing International Relations. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.

Huggan, Graham. 1989. "Decolonizing the Map: Post-Colonialism, Post-Structuralism and the Cartographic Connection." Ariel, vol. 20 (4), pp. 115–131.

Krishna, Sankaran. 1999. Postcolonial Insecurities. India, Sri Lanka, and the Question of Nationhood. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

\*\*Inayatullah, N. and D.L. Blaney. 2004. International Relations and the Problem of Difference. London: Routledge.

\*\*Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1988. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses," Feminist Review, n°30, pp. 61–88.

\*\*Nandy, Ashis. 1983. The Intimate Enemy. Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism. Dehli: Oxford University Press.

Paolini, Albert. 1999. Navigating Modernity: Postcolonialism, Identity, and International Relations. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publisher.

Partha, Chatterjee. 1993. The Nation and its Fragments. Colonial and Postcolonial Histories. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Said, Edward W. 1979. Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books.

Said, Edward W. 1994. Culture and Imperialism. New York: Knopf.

Salter, Mark B. 2002. Barbarians and Civilization in International Relations. London: Pluto Press.

\*\*Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1994. "Can the Subaltern Speak?," in Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (eds) Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory. A Reader. New York: Columbia University Press.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1999. A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Young, Robert J. C. 2001. Postcolonialism. An Historical Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Week 11. Conclusion

[no tutorial this week]

## Appendix A | Coursework Assessment Form

### School of Social and Political Science – PG Feedback Form

<b>Exam number</b>		<b>Course code</b>	
<b>Course name</b>			
<b>Component name</b>		<b>Session</b>	
<b>Marker</b>		<b>Word Count</b>	

PLEASE NOTE

- 1) This form **must** be attached to the front of your essay prior to upload via ELMA. Failure to do so will result in a mark penalty.
- 2) The essay submitted **must** be your **final** version. You cannot re-submit/make subsequent changes.
- 3) All comments/marks/penalties are provisional until ratified by our Board of Examiners in June

#### Overview

<b>Marking criterion</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Grade A-H (if appropriate)</b>
Critical/conceptual analysis		
Strength/cohesion of argument		
Use of sources/evidence		
Structure & organisation		
Breadth and relevance of reading		
Clarity of expression, presentation and referencing		

*The final grade column above may be used at the marker's discretion. Such grades do not translate directly into a final mark.*

#### General comments

## Appendix B | Postgraduate Marking Scheme

<b>Mark</b>	<b>Description</b>
90-100% (A1)	Fulfils all criteria for A2. In addition is a work of exceptional insight and independent thought, deemed to be of publishable quality, producing an analysis of such originality as potentially to change conventional understanding of the subject.
80-89% (A2)	Outstanding work providing insight and depth of analysis beyond the usual parameters of the topic. The work is illuminating and challenging for the markers. Comprises a sustained, fluent, authoritative argument, which demonstrates comprehensive knowledge, and convincing command, of the topic. Accurate and concise use of sources informs the work, but does not dominate it.
70-79% (A3)	A sharply-focused, consistently clear, well-structured paper, demonstrating a high degree of insight. Effectively and convincingly argued, and showing a critical understanding of conflicting theories and evidence. Excellent scholarly standard in use of sources, and in presentation and referencing.
60-69% (B)	Good to very good work, displaying substantial knowledge and understanding of concepts, theories and evidence relating to the topic. Answers the question fully, drawing effectively on a wide range of relevant sources. No significant errors of fact or interpretation. Writing, referencing and presentation of a high standard.
50-59% (C)	Work which is satisfactory for the MSc degree, showing some accurate knowledge of topic, and understanding, interpretation and use of sources and evidence. There may be gaps in knowledge, or limited use of evidence, or over-reliance on a restricted range of sources. Content may be mainly descriptive. The argument may be confused or unclear in parts, possibly with a few factual errors or misunderstandings of concepts. Writing, referencing and presentation satisfactory.
40-49% (D)	Work which is satisfactory for Diploma. Shows some knowledge of the topic, is intelligible, and refers to relevant sources, but likely to have significant deficiencies in argument, evidence or use of literature. May contain factual mistakes and inaccuracies. Not adequate to the topic, perhaps very short, or weak in conception or execution, or fails to answer the question. Writing, referencing and presentation may be weak.

30-39% (E)	Flawed understanding of topic, showing poor awareness of theory. Unconvincing in its approach and grasp of the issues. Perhaps too short to give an adequate answer to the question. Writing, referencing and presentation likely to be very weak. A mark of 38/39 may indicate that the work could have achieved a pass if a more substantial answer had been produced.
20-29% (F)	An answer showing seriously inadequate knowledge of the subject, with little awareness of the relevant issues or theory, major omissions or inaccuracies, and pedestrian use of inadequate sources.
10-19% (G)	An answer that falls far short of a passable level by some combination of short length, irrelevance, lack of intelligibility, factual inaccuracy and lack of acquaintance with reading or academic concepts.
0-9% (H)	An answer without academic merit; conveys little sense that the course has been followed; lacks basic skills of presentation and writing.

## Appendix C | Writing an essay – some advice

Writing an essay takes time and when designing it you should always be asking yourself: “what is the question I am trying to answer?” and “what am I doing exactly to do so”. It is not enough to write about a topic – e.g. securitization, feminism, the intervention in Iraq, and so on – in a broad manner. You have to provide the reader a sense that you put forth an analytical answer to a specific question. Nothing more and nothing less. No digressions, tangents or interesting factoids. An essay is not about displaying knowledge, but about establishing your command of a relevant corpus of texts to put forth an argument to answer that question. Importantly: Answer the question you have been asked and not the one you want to answer!

Make sure you consult and understand the Postgraduate Marking Scheme (Appendix B) in order to be sure about a marker’s expectations when evaluating your essays. Do not expect a mark above the 60 band if you do not, for instance, write an essay that is “Effectively and convincingly argued, and show[s] a critical understanding of conflicting theories and evidence”.

It is always necessary to provide a clear introduction, in which you outline your understanding of the question (What does the question analytically speak about? What are the issues at stake? Why?), the objectives of your essay, how you will unpack your argument and what you are hoping to establish/show. Make sure that the marker is not left to guess what your argument is. For example, make sure that you introduce your main argument early on in the essay and that you build upon it throughout the essay. Make sure that the argument is clear throughout and revisited (signpost to the marker where you are in your argument and why, and where you are heading and why). Make sure your conclusion shows your command of your argument and how you are reflective about its strengths and weaknesses.

You have to identify the criteria – empirical, theoretical, normative – by which you make the judgment and argue the case. Do not waste time, paper or ink telling taking information out of a textbook and putting it into an essay. Demonstrate through your argument both knowledge of the theory you employ, or the theories you engage with, how they relate to the empirical material you are mobilizing in your question as well as an ability to evaluate their utility in answering your question vis-à-vis each other’s relative strengths and weaknesses.

Consider the structure of your essay. Often it is very useful to divide your argument into different subsections and provide subheadings. Your structure *is* your argument.

Don’t be afraid of placing yourself in the academic debate and critically take on board the ideas of established scholars. However, in doing so avoid being too personal. Use phrases such as “this paper...”, “this essay...”, “the argument

developed here...”, etc. Even if you are writing a conceptual/theoretical essay it can be very useful to illustrate your conceptual arguments by providing some empirical evidence/examples.

While it is a necessary step to do individual research (find suitable articles and other materials relating to your essay topic) for your essay, you should also demonstrate awareness and knowledge of the recommended texts. Furthermore, if you, for example, write an essay on Kenneth Walz’s neorealism make sure that you consult his original texts.

If you are asked to compare and contrast a particular social phenomena or set of theories you need to think of how to structure your argument, so as to avoid confusion or too much “jumping back and forth”.

Proofread your essay prior to submission so as to rid it of unnecessary spelling mistakes and grammatical errors. Clarity is key. Your marker is not here to second-guess what you are trying to say. If you are not a native speaker or if you are not confident about your command of English for such a task, do not hesitate to ask one of your friend to provide you with some feedback.

Make sure that you reference properly any quotes or paraphrasing in your text. Sometimes students do not provide full references, i.e. the author’s name, page number and year, make sure you do so.

Make sure that you stick to the word limit.

Make sure that your bibliography is complete, goes beyond textbooks and compulsory readings, and use consistently the same convention.