

**School of Oriental and African Studies
Department of Politics and International Studies**

International Theory

15PPOH014

2013-14 | Term 1



Convenors

Meera Sabaratnam & Mark Laffey

Meera Sabaratnam

Room 4413, Old Building

Ext. 4722 / 020 7898 4722

ms140@soas.ac.uk

Office hours: Mon 2.30-4 and by
appointment

Mark Laffey

Room 211, Old Building

Ext. 4744 / 020 7898 4744

ml23@soas.ac.uk

Office hours: Mon 4-6 and by
appointment

Lectures – Monday 1-2 | Tutorials – Wednesday 1-2, 2-3, 4-5

Course Aims and Organisation

This ten-week International Theory course aims to introduce postgraduate students to a selection of historically significant, interesting and challenging ways of thinking about world politics. These theoretical concepts and approaches will inform your further specialised coursework and independent dissertation research in the MSc programme, but are also objects of academic research in and of themselves.

As well as exploring the value, logic of and evidence for different approaches to the 'international', we will pay particular attention to the historical conditions in which ideas emerged and were contested, and how they are reconstituted in the present. Of central relevance here is the emergence of International Relations as a scholarly discipline. We will look at how approaches deploy key concepts such as power, identity, authority and historical development, and which levels of analysis they highlight. We will also reflect on their authors' aspirations for political relevance, scholarly validity and social progress. Moreover, we will examine the transformational potential of international theories to reframe our own political questions.

Each week's study will consist of a lecture, independent reading and a group tutorial on a specific topic, and two written assignments are due. As a rough guide, you should be spending an average of ten hours per week on work for the course, although this may vary according to your own course loads etc.

By the end of the course you should be able to:

- Understand the historical emergence of the international system
- Understand, appreciate and critique a range of different theoretical approaches to world politics with clarity, precision and imagination
- Identify how international theory interacts with the practices of world politics
- Discuss questions about the status of theory and social scientific knowledge
- Apply your understanding of theoretical problems in new domains and to new events

Readings

There is no required textbook for this course. All of the required readings will be posted on the Moodle-BLE or are available on-line. The supplemental readings listed in the syllabus are intended to be indicative rather than exhaustive. Students seeking additional material on a particular topic are encouraged to look through bibliographies of useful readings and to ask the course convenors. Students taking the course are advised to use at least three libraries in the University of London: SOAS library, Senate House library, and the London School of Economics library.

Assessment

Students will be assessed on the basis of two 2500 word essays and a two-hour final exam in May or June. The essays will count for 30% of the course (i.e., 15% each), and the exam for

the remaining 70%. Further guidance on essay topics will be available on BLE. Due dates for the essays are:

First essay due Friday 8 November 2013 by 4pm

Second essay due Monday 6 January 2014 by 4pm

All essays must be submitted electronically. The Faculty Office will not accept paper copies. All late essays will be penalized as per SOAS regulations at 2% per day. Extensions require students to apply to the Faculty Office. They will be granted only under exceptional circumstances. Students who think they may not meet the due date for an essay are strongly advised to contact one of us immediately.

Additional Resources

The following list contains some of the more prominent scholarly and not-so-scholarly journals that regularly publish articles on international politics, from within IR and other disciplines. Those marked with an * are the most prominent or especially useful.

*Alternatives	*International Studies Quarterly
*Antipode	International Studies Review
Cooperation and Conflict	*International Theory
*Diplomatic History	Journal of Conflict Resolution
*Environment and Planning D: Society and Space	Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies
*European Journal of International Relations	Journal of Peace Research
Foreign Affairs	*Millennium: Journal of International Studies
Foreign Policy	Monthly Review
Foreign Policy Analysis	*New Left Review
Global Society	*Political Geography
*International Affairs	Race and Class
*International Feminist Journal of Politics	*Review of International Political Economy
International Journal	*Review of International Studies
*International Organization	Security Studies
*International Political Sociology	*Third World Quarterly
International Politics	*World Policy Journal
International Relations	World Politics
*International Security	

There is a broader wealth of useful material and information available online. In particular, you are encouraged to read policy documents and public statements from a variety of institutions, groups and points of view, as a way to begin to get a feel for the everyday 'stuff' that makes up international politics. Good quality documentaries and films can be an excellent supplement to scholarly literature, as can well-written satire. Finally, you should keep abreast of current events, both within and beyond the North Atlantic region.

There are a number of academic blogs focused on IR which will be particularly helpful for deepening your understanding. These include, but are not limited to:

Theory Talks <http://www.theory-talks.org/>

E-ir.info <http://www.e-ir.info/>

The Duck of Minerva <http://www.whiteoliphaunt.com/duckofminerva/>

Crooked Timber <http://crookedtimber.org/>

The Disorder of Things <http://www.thedisorderofthings.com/>

The sidebars for these blogs include useful links to other sites of interest.

Course Outline (initials indicate lecturer)

1. You May Not Be Interested in Theory, But Theory Is Interested In You (30th September) (MS)
2. Worlding: What is the 'International'? When and Where does the 'Global' Begin? (7th October) (MS)
3. Empires: Then and Now (14th October) (MS)
4. Sovereignty: Organised Hypocrisy? (21st October) (MS)
5. The National Interest: Realist International Thought and Its Critics (28th October) (ML)

Week 6: Reading Week

6. The Man Question: Does Gender Make the World Go Round? (11th November) (ML)
7. Development: Time and Money in World Politics (18th November) (MS)
8. Security: Dangerous Ideas and the Construction of World Order (25th November) (ML)
9. Re-thinking Race: Critiques of Colonial Reason (2nd December) (MS)
10. Intervention in Syria: The Weapon of Theory (9th December) (MS/ML)

Topics and Readings

1. You May Not Be Interested In Theory, But Theory Is Interested In You

What is theory? How does it work? Why is understanding theory useful? For whom is theory designed? Is it distinct from or better than other forms of knowledge? How is it implicated in everyday life? What is special about IR as a discipline? The purpose of this week is to set out some markers for how to approach the challenges of theorising 'the international' and to contextualise the emergence of IR as a field of study.

Required Readings

- Berlin, I. 'The Purpose of Philosophy', in Berlin, I and Hardy, H (1999) *Concepts and Categories: Philosophical Essays*, (Princeton University Press), 1-11. Available online at: http://berlin.wolf.ox.ac.uk/published_works/cc/cc.pdf
- Bull, H. (1966) 'International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach', *World Politics*, 18(3), 361-377
- Jackson, P.T. (2011) 'Playing with fire' in *The Conduct of Inquiry In International Relations*, London: Routledge, 1-23.

Recommended Readings

- Bell, D. (2009). Writing the world: disciplinary history and beyond. *International Affairs*, 85(1), 3-22.
- Geuss, R. (1981) 'Ideology' in Geuss, R. (1981). *The idea of a critical theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge University Press, 4-26.
- Giddens, A. (1971). *Capitalism and modern social theory: An analysis of the writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hoffmann, S. (1977). An American social science: international relations. *Daedalus*, 106(3), 41-60.
- Hollis, M., & Smith, S. (1991). *Explaining and understanding international relations* (p. 102). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rosenau, J. N. and Knorr, K. (eds) (1969). *Contending approaches to international politics*. K. Knorr (Ed.). Princeton University Press.
- Singer, J. D. (1961). The level-of-analysis problem in international relations. *World Politics*, 14(1), 77-92.
- Smith, S. (2001) Singing Our World Into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11. *International Studies Quarterly*, 48(3): 499-515
- Vitalis, R. (2000). The graceful and generous liberal gesture: making racism invisible in American international relations. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 29(2), 331-356.
- Wendt, A. (1987). The agent-structure problem in international relations theory. *International Organization*, 41(3), 335-370.
- Wight, M. (1960). Why is there no International Theory?. *International Relations*, 2(1), 35-48.

Sample Essay Questions

- Should international theory aspire to 'scientific' status?
- Can international theory be detached from the political interests of dominant powers?

2. Worlding: What is the 'International'? When and Where Does the 'Global' Begin?

The term 'international', like all terms, was invented 'for someone and some purpose'. Indeed, most theories in International Relations can be understood as having their own particular ideas of what constitutes the boundary between 'self' and 'other'. On one reading, at the root of the idea of the 'international' is the idea that humanity is divided into 'nations', and that the 'international' is the space between them. Others emphasise the importance of 'civilizational' boundaries, whilst others look at wealth and social organisation as key fault-lines. Increasingly, however, the idea that we are living in a 'global' age has become more commonplace. How should International Theory approach the question of the 'international'? What are the tensions and similarities that emerge from alternative viewpoints? Should the 'international' be viewed as a zone of difference, or of interconnectedness? And does the contemporary 'global' order mark a radical historical departure from previous centuries?

Required Readings

- Bayly, C.A. (2004) 'Introduction' in Bayly, C.A. (2004) *The Birth of The Modern World: 1780-1914*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1-21
- Anderson, B. (1984) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London: Verso. 5-7 (Concepts); 37-46 (The Origins of National Consciousness).
- Held, D. (2000). Regulating globalization? The reinvention of politics. *International Sociology*, 15(2), 394-408.
- Huntington, S.P. (1993) The Clash of Civilisations and the Remaking of World Order. *Foreign Affairs*, 72(3), 22-49.

Recommended Readings

- Bull, H. (2002 [1979]). *The anarchical society: a study of order in world politics*. Columbia University Press.
- Buzan, B., & Albert, M. (2010). Differentiation: A sociological approach to international relations theory. *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(3), 315-337.
- Halliday, F. (1987). State and society in international relations: a second agenda. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 16(2), 215-229.
- Inayatullah, N., & Blaney, D. L. (2003). *International relations and the problem of difference*. Routledge.
- Keene, E. (2002). *Beyond the anarchical society: Grotius, colonialism and order in world politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Neumann, I. B. (1996). Self and other in international relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 2(2), 139-174.
- Rosenberg, J. (2002). *The follies of globalisation theory*. Verso.
- Sassen, S. (2006) 'Introduction' in Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sample Essay Questions

- Can we distinguish the 'global' from the 'international'?
- To what extent can globalisation be understood as a linear process?

3. From Empire to Governmentality? Hierarchy and Discipline in World Order

Political orders called 'empires' have been a recurring phenomenon in global history. But what are they and how do they work? What are their foundations? What kinds of power do they exercise? How does imperial rule affect the constitution of the 'international'? Has global governmentality replaced the need for empire? And is IR an imperial discipline in nature? In this session we will reflect on different understandings of global hierarchy and the relationship of IR to the maintenance of these hierarchies.

Required Readings

- Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2002). Retrieving the imperial: empire and international relations. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 31(1), 109-127.
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2004). Illusions of Empire-Defining the New American Order. *Foreign Affairs*, 83, 144-154.
- Fougner, T. (2008). Neoliberal governance of states: the role of competitiveness indexing and country benchmarking. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 37(2), 303-326.

Recommended Readings

- Anghie, A. (2007). *Imperialism, sovereignty and the making of international law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Doty, R. L. (1996). *Imperial encounters: the politics of representation in North-South relations* (Vol. 5). U of Minnesota Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2009). *Empire*. Harvard University Press.
- Harvey, D. (2003). *The new imperialism*. Oxford University Press.
- Hobson, J. A. (1975). *Imperialism a study*. New York: Gordon Press.
- Hobson, J. M., & Sharman, J. C. (2005). The enduring place of hierarchy in world politics: tracing the social logics of hierarchy and political change. *European Journal of International Relations*, 11(1), 63-98.
- Ignatieff, M. (2003). The American empire: the burden. *New York Times Magazine*, 5, 22. Available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/05/magazine/05EMPIRE.html>
- Jahn, B. (2005). Kant, Mill, and illiberal legacies in international affairs. *International Organization*, 59(1), 177-207.
- Joseph, J. (2009). Governmentality of what? Populations, states and international organisations. *Global Society*, 23(4), 413-427.
- Long, D., & Schmidt, B. C. (Eds.). (2005). *Imperialism and internationalism in the discipline of international relations*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Mehta, U. S. (1999). *Liberalism and empire: A study in nineteenth-century British liberal thought*. University of Chicago Press.
- *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* Forum on Barkawi and Laffey's 'Retrieving the Imperial'
 - Callinicos, A. (2002). The actuality of imperialism. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 31(2), 319-326.
 - Shaw, M. (2002). Post-imperial and quasi-imperial: state and empire in the global era. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 31(2), 327-336.
 - Walker, R. B. J. (2002). On the immanence/imminence of empire. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 31(2), 337-345.

Sample Essay Questions

- Is the United States of America a global empire today?
- Should governmentality be understood as an effective form of imperial power?

4. Sovereignty: Organised Hypocrisy?

Flags, passports, stamps, the exchange of ambassadors and a seat at the UN General Assembly are all markers of one's recognition as a *sovereign* state in the contemporary world. Sovereign states are entrusted with the rights to hold armies, levy taxes, imprison and fine individuals and enter into eternally binding treaties on behalf of populations. Yet sovereignty as a practice and concept is deeply contested. In this topic we will examine attempts to define it, narrate its historical emergence and articulate its political significance. Different theories of the international will shed light on diverse meanings, practices and experiences of sovereign power, and we will think about which actors can be meaningfully called 'sovereign' in the world. Following on from last week's topic, we will think about the linkages between imperialism and sovereignty and whether they are as disparate as they seem. We will also think about the relationship between sovereignty and statehood.

Required Readings

- Krasner, S. D. (2001). Rethinking the sovereign state model. *Review of International Studies*, 27(05), 17-42.
- Branch, J. (2012). 'Colonial reflection' and territoriality: The peripheral origins of sovereign statehood. *European Journal of International Relations*, 18(2), 277-297.
- Deng, F.M. (1996) 'Preface' in Deng, F. M. (Ed.). (1996). *Sovereignty as responsibility: conflict management in Africa*. Brookings Institution Press, ix-xxiii.

Recommended Readings

- Branch, J. (2011). Mapping the sovereign state: Technology, authority, and systemic change. *International Organization*, 65(1), 1-36.
- Jackson, R. H. (1993). 'Introduction' in Jackson, R. H. (1993) *Quasi-states: sovereignty, international relations and the Third World* (Vol. 12). Cambridge University Press, 1-12.
- Krasner, S. D. (1999). *Sovereignty: organized hypocrisy*. Princeton University Press.
- Osiander, A. (2001). Sovereignty, international relations, and the Westphalian myth. *International Organization*, 55(2), 251-287.
- Peterson, V. Spike. 1992. 'Security and Sovereign states: What is at stake in taking feminism seriously?' in V. Spike Peterson (eds.) *Gendered States: (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Press), pp. 31-64.
- Reus-Smit, C. (2001). Human rights and the social construction of sovereignty. *Review of International Studies*, 27(4), 519-538.
- Scott, J. C. (1998). *Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed*. Yale University Press.
- Shilliam, R. (2006). What about Marcus Garvey? Race and the transformation of the sovereignty debate. *Review of International Studies*, 32(3), 379.
- Spruyt, H. (1994). *The sovereign state and its competitors* (pp. 803-832). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Tilly, C., (1985) 'War making and state making as organized crime' in Evans, P. B., Rueschemeyer, D., & Skocpol, T. (Eds.). (1985). *Bringing the state back in*. Cambridge University Press.
- Weber, C. (1995). *Simulating sovereignty: Intervention, the state and symbolic exchange* (Vol. 37). Cambridge University Press.

Sample Essay Questions

- What is the relationship between sovereignty and statehood?
- To what extent is territoriality an important component of contemporary sovereignty?

5. The National Interest? Realist International Thought and its Critics

Fewer political ideas have stronger traction in Western foreign policy debates than that of 'the national interest'. Indeed, in certain times and places the idea has also dominated scholarly work in International Relations. But what *is* 'the national interest', and how do we know? This week we will explore the utility of approaches which foreground a notion of 'national interest' and think about their contributions to understanding world politics. We will also consider the anti-war activism of prominent realist scholars in the US in the twentieth century.

Required Readings

- Carr, E.H. (2001[1945]), 'The Harmony of Interests', in Carr, E. H. (2001). *The Twenty Years' Crisis: an introduction to the study of international relations, 1919–1939*, ed. M. Cox. Palgrave, 42-61.
- Morgenthau, H. (1965), 'We Are Deluding Ourselves in Vietnam', *New York Times Magazine*, 18, accessible at <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/vietnam/hans'.htm>
- Rose, Gideon. 1998. 'Neoclassical realism and theories of foreign policy,' *World Politics* 51(1): 144-172.
- Rosenberg, J.P. (1990) 'What's the Matter With Realism?', *Review of International Studies*, 16(4): 285-303.

Recommended Readings

- Ashley, R. K. (1984). The poverty of neorealism. *International Organization*, 38(02), 225-286.
- Ayooob, M. (1998). Subaltern Realism: International Relations Theory Meets the Third World, in Stephanie G. Neuman (ed.) *International Relations Theory and the Third World* (London: Macmillan)
- Cozette, M. (2008). What lies ahead: classical realism on the future of international relations. *International Studies Review*, 10(4), 667-679.
- Mearsheimer, J. and Walt, S. (2003) 'An Unnecessary War', *Foreign Affairs*, Jan/Feb 2003.
- Milner, H. (1991) 'The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique', *Review of International Studies*, 17(1): 67-85
- Morgenthau, H. J. (1952). Another "great debate": the national interest of the United States. *The American Political Science Review*, 46(4), 961-988.
- Niebuhr, R. (1932). *Moral man and immoral society: a study in ethics and politics*.

- Shilliam, R. (2007). Morgenthau in context: German backwardness, German intellectuals and the rise and fall of a liberal project. *European Journal of International Relations*, 13(3), 299-327.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Waltz, K. N. (2001 [1959]). *Man, the state and war: a theoretical analysis*. Columbia University Press.
- Waltz, K. N. (2000). Structural realism after the Cold War. *International Security*, 25(1), 5-41.
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, 46(02), 391-425.

Sample Essay Questions

- Does the national interest change over time?
- Do realists consider the international a sphere where morality should not apply?

******* Reading Week 4th-8th November *******

6. The Man Question: Does Gender Make the World Go Round?

One of the most controversial and challenging conceptual fields for theorising world politics is that of gender. Whilst its broad importance is becoming increasingly accepted, the specific ways in which it matters – to whom, where, how and why – are the focus of significant debates on war, security, identity, the global economy and other domains. In this week we will explore the diverse ways in which a consciousness of gender transforms our understanding of world politics and evaluate the depths of its challenges to ‘malestream’ thinking about the international.

Required Readings

- Enloe, C. (1994) *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, University of California Press (Chapter 1: Gender Makes the World Go Round)
- Cohn, C. (1987) ‘Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals’, *Signs*, 12:4, 687-718
- Youngs, G. (2004) Feminist International Relations: a contradiction in terms? Or: why women and gender are essential to understanding the world “we” live in, *International Affairs* 80(1): 75-87; and responses from
 - Andrew Linklater. 2004. ‘Dominant and destructive masculinities,’ *International Affairs* 80(1): 89-91;
 - Terrell Carver. 2004. ‘War of the worlds/invasion of the body snatchers,’ *International Affairs* 80(1): 92-94;
 - Cynthia Enloe. 2004. “‘Gender’ is not enough: the need for a feminist consciousness,’ *International Affairs* 80(1): 95-97. E

Recommended Readings

- Carpenter, R. C. (2002). Gender theory in world politics: Contributions of a non-feminist standpoint. *International Studies Review*, 4(3), 153-165.

- Enloe, C. (2005). What if patriarchy is “the big picture”? An afterword. *Gender, Conflict and Peacekeeping*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield (280-283).
- Hansen, L. (2000), ‘The Little Mermaid’s Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 29(2): 285-306.
- Hutchings, K. (2000). Towards a feminist international ethics. *Review of international studies*, 26(5), 111-130.
- Hutchings, K. (2008) ‘Making Sense of Masculinity and War’, *Men & Masculinities*, 10(4): 389-404
- Jones, A. (1996). ‘Does “Gender” make the world go round?’ *Review of International Studies* 22(4): 405-429. Reply from
 - Carver, T. et al. 1998. ‘Gendering Jones’, *Review of International Studies* 24(2): 283-297 and reply by
 - Jones in the same issue, ‘Engendering Debate’, *Review of International Studies* 24(2).
- Kirby, P. (2013) Refusing to be a Man? Men's Responsibility for War Rape and the Problem of Social Structures in Feminist and Gender Theory. *Men & Masculinities*, 16(1): 93-114.
- Moser, C. O., & Clark, F. (Eds.). (2001). *Victims, perpetrators or actors?: Gender, armed conflict and political violence*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Peterson, V. S. (2008). ‘new wars’ and gendered economies. *Feminist Review*, 88(1), 7-20.
- Peterson, V.S. (1992). *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)visions of International Relations Theory*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner & Co.
- Robinson, F. (2011). Stop talking and listen: discourse ethics and feminist care ethics in international political theory. *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 39(3), 845-860.
- Tickner, J. A. (1988). Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Reformulation. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3): 429-440.
- Tickner, J. A. (1997) ‘You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists’, *International Studies Quarterly*, 41: 611-632; see also responses by:
 - Keohane, R. O. (1998) ‘Beyond Dichotomy: Conversations between International Relations and Feminist Theory’, *International Studies Quarterly*, 42:1, 193-197
 - Marchand, M. (1998) ‘Different Communities/Different Realities/Different Encounters: A Reply to J. Ann Tickner’, *International Studies Quarterly*, 42:1, 199-204
 - Tickner, J. A. (1998) ‘Continuing the Conversation’, *International Studies Quarterly*, 42:1, 205-210

Sample Essay Questions

- Is war the continuation of patriarchy by other means?
- How do feminist claims about world order challenge the parameters of international ethics?

7. Development: Time and Money in World Politics

The notion of ‘development’ in international theory usually refers to two closely inter-connected elements of change. The first is that of *historical* development (i.e. social change over time) and the second refers to *economic* development (i.e. changes in the bases of production and forms of accumulation). Along with related concepts such as modernity and capitalism, the notion of ‘development’ forms the centrepiece of many materialist

theories of the international. Moreover the notion of 'development' is central to everyday international politics and foreign policy. This week we will examine the contributions of scholarly approaches which employ the notion of 'development' and think about its significance as a basis for the 'international'.

Required Readings

- Wallerstein, I. (2004) 'World Systems Analysis' in *World Systems History*: <http://www.eolss.net/ebooks/sample%20chapters/c04/e6-94-01.pdf>
- Halperin, S. (2007). Re-Envisioning Global Development: Conceptual and Methodological Issues. *Globalizations*, 4(4), 543–558.
- Escobar, A. (1994) 'Introduction: Development and the Anthropology of Modernity', in *Encountering Development: the Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1-20.

Recommended Readings

- Anievas, A. (2011). The international political economy of appeasement: the social sources of British foreign policy during the 1930s. *Review of International Studies*, 37(2), 601-29.
- Bhabra, G. K. (2010) *Rethinking modernity: postcolonialism and the sociological imagination*. Palgrave
- Davenport, A. (2011). Marxism in IR: Condemned to a Realist Fate? *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(1): 27-48.
- Fabian, J. (2002). *Time and the other: How anthropology makes its object*. Columbia University Press.
- Freeman, E. (2010). *Time binds: Queer temporalities, queer histories*. Duke University Press.
- Gill, S. (1995) Globalisation, Market Civilisation and Disciplinary Neoliberalism, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 24(3): 399-423.
- Halperin, Sandra. 2004. 'Dynamics of Conflict and System Change: The Great Transformation Revisited,' *European Journal of International Relations* 10(2): 263-306.
- Hindess, B. (2007). The Past Is Another Culture*. *International Political Sociology*, 1(4), 325-338.
- Hutchings, K. (2008) *Time and World Politics: thinking the present*, Manchester: Manchester University Press
- Matin, K. (2007). Uneven and combined development in world history: the international relations of state-formation in premodern Iran. *European Journal of International Relations*, 13(3), 419-447.
- Murray, R. (1971) The Internationalization of capital and the nation state. *New Left Review* 67: 84-109
- Polanyi, K. (1944). *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Beacon Press.
- Rodney, W. (1971) *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (Dar-es-Salaam: TPH)
- Rosenberg, J. P. (2006) 'Why is there no international historical sociology?' *European Journal of International Relations*, 12(3): 307-340
- Rosenberg, J. (2010). Basic problems in the theory of uneven and combined development. Part II: unevenness and political multiplicity. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 23(1), 165-189.
- Teschke, B. (2003). *The myth of 1648: class, geopolitics, and the making of modern international relations*. Verso.

Sample Essay Questions

- Does the notion of 'uneven and combined development' successfully improve upon world systems theory as an account of the international?
- Has the development of the international system been politically progressive?

8. Security: Dangerous Ideas and the Construction of World Order

What does it mean to see food shortages as a security threat? Why can cartoons initiate security crises? What happens when people, groups, environmental processes or even diseases are considered objects of security? How do conceptions of security contribute to the exercise of power and authority amongst global actors? And how do ideas of security shape relations between peoples and their governments? This week we will contemplate the notion of 'security' through looking at constructivist and poststructuralist accounts of how security is interpreted and practiced. We will focus on the emergence of seemingly new globalised security threats over the last twenty years and evaluate the idea that security threats are culturally constructed.

Required Readings

- Weldes, J et al. (1999). Introduction: Constructing Insecurity in Weldes, J et al. (eds.) *Cultures of Insecurity: States, Communities and the Production of Danger*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Watson, S. (2011) The 'human' as referent object? Humanitarianism as securitization', *Security Dialogue*, 42(1): 3-20.
- Der Derian, J. (2001) '9.11: Before, After, and In Between' *After September 11*, Essays published by SSRC, http://essays.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/der_derian.htm
- US Government, (2002) *National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/63562.pdf>

Recommended Readings

- Adler, E. (2008). The Spread of Security Communities: Communities of Practice, Self-Restraint, and NATO's Post-Cold War Transformation. *European Journal of International Relations*, 14(2), 195-230.
- Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329-352.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & De Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: a new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Christie, R. (2010). Critical voices and human security: To endure, to engage or to critique?. *Security Dialogue*, 41(2), 169-190.
- Duffield, M. (2007) *Development, Security and Unending War*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hansen, L. (2006). *Security as practice: discourse analysis and the Bosnian war*. Routledge.
- Hopf, T. (1999). The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory. *International Security* 23(1): 171-200
- Huysmans, J. (2006). *The politics of insecurity: Fear, migration and asylum in the EU*. Routledge.
- Katzenstein, P (ed.) (1996). *The Cultures of National Security*. Columbia University Press.

- Krishna, S. (1993) 'The Importance of Being Irony: A Postcolonial View on Critical International Relations Theory', *Alternatives* 18:3, 385-417.
- Laffey, M., & Weldes, J. (1997). Beyond belief: ideas and symbolic technologies in the study of international relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(2), 193-237.
- Shepherd, L. J. (2006). Veiled references: Constructions of gender in the Bush administration discourse on the attacks on Afghanistan post-9/11. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*, 8(1), 19-41.
- Sjöstedt, R. (2008). Exploring the construction of threats: The securitization of HIV/AIDS in Russia. *Security Dialogue*, 39(1), 7-29.
- Sterling-Folker, J. (2000). Competing paradigms or birds of a feather? Constructivism and neoliberal institutionalism compared. *International studies quarterly*, 44(1), 97-119.
- Thomas, N., & Tow, W. T. (2002). The utility of human security: sovereignty and humanitarian intervention. *Security Dialogue*, 33(2), 177-192.

Sample Essay Questions

- Is a 'security threat' essentially a discursive phenomenon?
- To what extent has the 'human' become the major reference point in contemporary security policy?

9. Re-thinking Race: Critiques of Colonial Reason

In this week we return to the Self-Other problematique to explore the specific dimension of race in more detail. What does it mean, theoretically speaking, to claim that the present world order is racialised, and are theories of the international able to deal with this issue? Does 'race' have causal or explanatory power as a category? If so, what is its basis? To what extent is race implicated in global governance? Did racism end with decolonisation? And can we 'decolonise' international theory? This week's readings offer different interpretations of how race manifests itself in the global order. You are also encouraged to think about how the race question re-frames other issues we have dealt with in the course.

Required Readings

- Todorov, T. (1984) 'Columbus and the Indians' in Todorov, T. (1984). *The conquest of America: The question of the other*. University of Oklahoma Press. 34-50.
- Krishna, S. (2001) Race, Amnesia and the Education of International Relations. *Alternatives* 26: 401-424
- Fanon, F. (1961) Concerning Violence in Fanon, F. (1961) *The Wretched of the Earth*, London: Penguin, trans., Constance Farrington, 35-61 (but please read to the end of the chapter if you have time).

Recommended Readings

- Abu-Lughod, L. (1991) Writing Against Culture in Fox, R. G. (Ed.). (1991). *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present* (p. 191). Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Anghie, A. (2008). Decolonizing the Concept of " Good Governance. In Jones, B.G. (ed) (2008) *Decolonizing international relations*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Balibar, E. (1991) Is there a neo-racism? In Balibar, E., & Wallerstein, I. M. (Eds.). (1991). *Race, nation, class: ambiguous identities*. Verso. 17-28.

- Barkawi, T., & Laffey, M. (2006). The postcolonial moment in security studies. *Review of International Studies*, 32(2), 329-352.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2009). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference (New Edition)*. Princeton University Press.
- Chowdry, G., & Nair, S. (Eds.). (2004). *Power, postcolonialism and international relations: Reading race, gender and class*. Routledge.
- Gilroy, P. (1993) *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*, London: Verso.
- Gruffydd Jones, B. (ed.)(2006) *Decolonizing International Relations*, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gruffydd Jones, B. (2008), Race in the Ontology of International Order. *Political Studies*, 56: 907–927.
- Hobson, J. M. (2007). Is critical theory always for the white West and for Western imperialism? Beyond Westphalian towards a post-racist critical IR. *Review of International Studies*, 33(S1), 91-116.
- Hobson, J. M. (2012) *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics: International Theory 1500-2010*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Inayatullah, N., & Blaney, D. L. (2003). *International relations and the problem of difference*. Routledge.
- Laffey, M. and Weldes, J. (2008) Decolonizing the Cuban Missile Crisis. *International Studies Quarterly* 52(3): 555-577.
- McCarthy, T. (2009). *Race, empire, and the idea of human development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mehta, U. S. (1999). *Liberalism and empire: A study in nineteenth-century British liberal thought*. University of Chicago Press.
- Muppidi, H. (2012). *The Colonial Signs of International Relations*. Columbia University Press.
- Said, E. (1973) *Orientalism*, London: Penguin.
- Special Issue of *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* (2013) on 'Race and International Relations' 26(1). All interesting but especially Sajed, Vucetic, Henderson, Thompson
- Vucetic, S. (2011). *The Anglosphere: Genealogy of a Racialized Identity in International Relations*, Stanford: Stanford University Press

Sample Essay Questions

- How useful is an understanding of race for an understanding of the contemporary international system?
- Can International Relations be decolonised?

10. Intervention in Syria: The Weapon of Theory

In this final session, we will re-examine the contemporary political controversies over intervention in Syria through the lenses of the various approaches we have encountered thus far. The aim of the session is to trace and identify the theoretical-political claims being made by different actors, to understand their relationship with one another, to evaluate their substance and embedded logics, and to imagine alternative ways of framing the issues. You will read and comment on the debate that took place on 29th August 2013 in the House of Commons on 'Syria and the Use of Chemical Weapons'.

Required Readings

- *Syria and the Use of Chemical Weapons*, HC Deb 29 August 2013, cols 1425-1556
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201314/cmhansrd/cm130829/debtext/130829-0001.htm#1308298000001>

Recommended Readings

- Blair, T. (1999) 'Doctrine of the International Community', Speech given to the Chicago Economic Club, 23rd April 1999. Available here:
http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/international/jan-june99/blair_doctrine4-23.html
- Putin, V.V. (2013) 'A Plea for Caution From Russia: What Putin Has To Say To Americans About Syria', *New York Times*, September 11th 2013. Available here:
<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/09/12/opinion/putin-plea-for-caution-from-russia-on-syria.html?pagewanted=all&r=0>
- Wilson, W. (1918) 'President Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points', January 8 1918. Available here: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp

Some Reading Questions for the Parliamentary Debate

- How do the speakers position the UK Government as an international actor? How much consensus is there on this point?
- How are other actors identified?
- What conceptual assumptions govern predictions of international action and the effects of intervention?
- What international norms or institutions appear strongest in what is being advocated?
- What do the speakers appear to fear?
- How is the structural position of the UK evaluated?
- What ethical and political relationships are imagined to exist with a) the United States? B) Syria? C) the rest of the world? What is the basis of these relationships?
- What conceptual issues and problems that you have encountered this term are *never* raised in the debate? What does this tell us?
- What alternative ways of framing the issues are there, and how might these change the debate?