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Mode of Delivery
This course will be delivered online, leveraging zoom teleconference, online activities and assignments.

Description
The purpose of this course is to introduce students to the conceptualization, understanding and application of theory in International Relations (IR). The course begins with a brief introduction on the approaches to analysis within the discipline, ontology and epistemology, methodology and so on. This prepares students, firstly, for the discussion note and later the main coursework essay, which invites them to reflect on issues of what constitutes IR and how to 'do' the discipline. Secondly, it gives students the necessary grounding with which to examine, understand and analyse the varied theoretical approaches which are addressed within the course. They include classical theories like idealism and realism. This forms the basis for consideration of mainstream IR theory, having an eye to structural realism, liberalism, neoliberal institutionalism and cosmopolitanism, and the so-called 'neo-neo' debate. Alternatives are also examined, from the Constructivist turn in IR to critical theories such as Marxism and dependency theory, as well as some critical perspectives: neo-Gramscianism & Feminist IR theory. Finally, we explore the making of 'Global IR'. The course ends with a plenary session in which students have to apply their theoretical knowledge to a real-world problem. Thereafter, there will be a course wrap-up. In sum, this course should provide students with a broad introductory appreciation of IR theory, and consequently the theoretical tools which they require for success in the remainder of The UWI IIR's PGDip programme.

Aims
By the end of the course, students will be able to:
- Demonstrate a coherent understanding of different analytical approaches and theoretical traditions in IR;
- Recognise and analyse critically the different concepts, theories and sub-theories within the different traditions identified;
- Apply these skills to a range of assessments – both oral and written – which aim to offer a sophisticated and incisive critique of contemporary IR Theory.
**Organization and Teaching Methods**

There is an onus upon you, the student, to take responsibility for your own independent study: at postgraduate level there should be little spoon-feeding of information, and much of your learning will take place outside of the classroom. It is up to you to read widely, engage seriously with the literature, and use both the classes and the time between them productively. The structure of the course is oriented in a manner that will make best use of the time available, leveraging synchronous & asynchronous learning.

The respective classes—with the exception of those scheduled for 15th September, 6th October and 1st December—are divided up into *three learning sessions* as follows:¹

Each webconference begins as a synchronous learning environment, i.e. students and lecturer are online *simultaneously* at scheduled seminar sessions. In the case of the first learning session, please be advised:

• Lecturer-moderated class discussions, which are informed/driven by reading responses: 5pm–5:30pm;
• Lecturer presentation, making provision for *ad hoc* class discussions and debate: 5:30pm–6:30pm.

In the case of the asynchronous learning session (i.e. lecturer assigns students task(s), which they engage one another on, and he won’t be on hand), it will be held from: 6:30pm–7:00pm. More details will follow. Second & final synchronous learning session of the class (i.e. key takeaways & wrap-up): 7:00pm–7:45pm.²

**Requirements**

- Students are expected to attend classes regularly and to be present for at least 75% of the class duration. Punctuality is highly regarded. If you have an unavoidable absence you are expected to communicate with the lecturer beforehand or soon after the class. You are expected to be present for your group presentations. Students should not be absent for more than one third of the classes without a medical certificate or other very strong justification. Repeated absence may well result in failure of the course.
- This is a semester-long postgraduate level seminar, which requires a high level of commitment. Students are required to actively and constructively participate in a series of structured and focused seminar discussions, which will be informed by readings, and asynchronous learning.
- Reading in advance of seminars. The course outline will have a number of key readings for each topic, which you must read at the very minimum. These will be denoted by an asterisk*. Other references will also be advised and you are strongly encouraged to read as many of these as possible. Please note that the reading list is not exhaustive! You should actively search out other interesting sources (books, journal articles, policy briefings, newspapers, websites, and even videos) that speak to the issues at hand.

**Course Assessment and Weight %**

Students will be assessed throughout this course. Course Assessment: 100% coursework,³ as follows:

1. Reading responses (*Individual assignment*): 10%

Each student will prepare reading responses as regards each one of the required readings for each week's class. In the case of each reading, students must list: (i) two discussion points on issues that stood out as

---

¹ More details on the orientation/format of the 6th October and 1st December classes will follow.
² Our Zoom sessions: two hours and forty-five minutes, ending 15 min. early (as there are no breaks during the class).
³ All assignments must be submitted in Times New Roman 12 font size.
most important; and (ii) two questions on issues that require clarification/explanation. These weekly submissions should be no more than two-pages max. in length (typed, double-space). Submit via email to lecturer and send to classmates (via email or other agreed means) every Monday no later than at noon.

2. Class discussions and debates (online synchronous): 10%

The first half-hour of each class will be informed/driven by student-centred class discussions and debate, with other synchronous learning sessions of the class thereafter affording an opportunity for students to exchange views with the course lecturer on the topic of the given class (and issues arising from same). Students are expected to advance thoughtful and reasoned deliberations on the themes and (at least) assigned required readings, with their course assessment linked, in part, to their ability to do so.

3. Discussion Note (Individual assignment): 20%

Prepare a discussion note, which sets out perspective(s), in response to the following:

IR scholars are said to have an intellectual commitment to either "explaining" or "understanding" in their academic discipline, resulting in the ‘two purported camps' tending to talk past one another. Discuss.

The discussion note, which may adhere to a less formal paper outline, should be 1000 words (maximum), and this assignment is due on Friday, 16th October. Email to the course lecturer.

The discussion note will be graded on the following criteria: 1) clarity, 2) independent understanding, 3) analytical skill, 4) range of reading, 5) critical engagement with the literature, 6) structure, 7) referencing, and 8) the accuracy and presentation of the bibliography.

Your discussion note should be submitted directly to Turnitin.

More details on this assignment will follow.

4. Plenary Presentations – online synchronous (Group assignment): 20%

Students will be placed into pairs (or groups of three depending on class number) no later than. The presentations are scheduled for Tuesday, 1st December. The question is:

- Critically analyse a real-world problem, issue or episode of your choice with reference to the theoretical literature in IR. (E.g., COVID-19’s impact on the Caribbean.)

Students should not seek to describe every theory of IR: this presentation is not testing your ability to regurgitate everything covered in class. The best presentations will be those that choose one or two theoretical debates with which to engage, and evaluate a carefully chosen empirical issue against them. Good presentations usually pose an appropriate critical question at the outset which they then attempt to address, and they are marked by brevity, a tight analytical focus, good balance between explanation(description and analysis, and they probe a theory deeply (i.e. they grapple with different controversies within a body of theory rather than just offering a superficial engagement with it).

The presentation must be 15 minutes long (maximum). Any group that exceeds this time limit will automatically forfeit their chance of achieving an A-grade. The presentation must also be accompanied by a four-page (maximum) handout (typed, double-space) — emailed to myself no later than Friday, 27th November. (The handout will factor into respective marks for this assignment.) Your presentations will be graded on: 1) Clarity of Presentation, 2) Quality of Analysis, 3) Innovation, 4) Teamwork. More details will follow on the schedule for and organization of these presentations.
5. Essay (Individual assignment): 40%

There is a choice of five questions from which to choose one:

1. What is IR theory and what purpose does it serve?

2. Critically assess the argument that democratic states will not go to war with each other. Illustrate your argument with examples.

3. Much of what the world has witnessed in the last decade cannot be sufficiently explained by any one theory of IR. Critically assess the foregoing statement.

4. For some theorists, the behaviour of states is determined primarily by their internal characteristics. By contrast, other theorists argue that state behaviour is shaped primarily by their position in the international system, and especially by their relative power. Which view do you think is most accurate?

5. Recent events have led many to argue that Realism is resurgent. Discuss.

The essay should be 2000 words (maximum), and this assignment is due on Friday, 4th December. Email to the course lecturer.

The paper will be graded on the following criteria: 1) clarity, 2) independent understanding, 3) analytical skill, 4) range of reading, 5) critical engagement with the literature, 6) structure, 7) referencing, and 8) the accuracy and presentation of the bibliography.

Your essay should be submitted directly to Turnitin.

Policy on extensions and missed deadlines

Requests for extensions on the coursework will only be considered in cases of genuine emergency, with documentary evidence required. To ensure the smooth progression of the course, the maximum extension I am prepared to give in any eventuality will be one week. If you require a longer extension than this, you will simply have to withdraw from the course and take it next year instead.

If you submit the discussion note, group presentation handout and essay late and without an agreed extension, but within a week of the deadline, I will still grade it and give you feedback, but it will be returned with a maximum mark of 50%. If you submit the discussion note, group presentation handout and essay after this – or do not submit at all – you will receive failing grade of zero. Any discussion note, group presentation handout and essay that is more than 10% over or under the word limit will also only be returned with a maximum mark of 50%.

University Grading Scheme (graduate programming)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>70 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>60 – 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>50 – 59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0 – 49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plagiarism

UWI is committed to the highest standards of academic integrity and honesty. Students are expected to be familiar with the standards regarding academic honesty and to uphold the policies of the University in this respect. Students are particularly urged to familiarize themselves with the guide for staff and students (http://sta.uwi.edu/resources/documents/postgrad/guidelines_staff_students_plagiarism.pdf) and avoid any behaviour that could potentially result in suspicions of cheating, plagiarism, misrepresentation of facts and/or participation in an offence (all of which could result in expulsion from UWI). Please make sure that you acquaint yourself well with the UWI/IIR Graduate Policy on Plagiarism: https://www.dropbox.com/s/3y5ru75wt0mn7rg/Graduate%20policy%20on%20plagiarism.pdf

How to write well

If you struggle with writing (or even if your writing is very good and you want to improve it further) you can seek one-to-one coaching by making use of the UWI writing centre (advert below).

At the postgraduate level, you have to read widely and you must read proper academic sources. Anyone can read 2 or 3 journal articles per week, per course, and if you cannot do this, then you probably should not be doing a postgraduate degree. Weak papers tend to eschew proper academic literature for questionable internet sources, and they tend to define concepts with reference to dictionaries rather than via a critical engagement with the relevant academic debate. As a general rule of thumb, 80% of the sources in your bibliography should be a mixture of books, book chapters, and articles from genuine scholarly journals; it is okay to have some news or journalistic sources and technical papers from institutions like the IMF or World Bank, but these should never form more than about 20% of your bibliography. If they do, then, quite simply, you haven’t engaged sufficiently with the relevant academic literature, and it’s highly likely that your analysis will lack depth and insight as a result.
Accepting the question (or the premise of it) at face value

All questions have embedded within them a series of assumptions, and these need to be problematized (i.e. subjected to critical scrutiny). Once you recognise this, and begin your papers by unpicking the hidden assumptions within the question (and, as a consequence, their broader implications) you are already half way to developing a structure for analysis. This is particularly so on this course because most of the questions – in the first paper, at least – are designed with an unresolved theoretical and methodological controversy in mind. At the very least, you should begin every paper you write (and exam question, too) by explaining what you understand the question to mean, and justifying your broad answer to it, even if that answer is an equivocal one which involves you sitting on the fence. If you do this clearly, it shows the examiner that you understand both the problem at hand and the implications to which it gives rise, and it assures them that the essay is likely to unfold in a coherent way.

Structure

Structure is critical. Weak papers often have paragraphs of inconsistent length. It is important to begin by problematizing the question, and explaining how the paper will address it, and why you will do it in such a way. In a longer paper, it is important to use subheadings to break up the text and give it analytical focus. These are easy things to do if you have done some reading and plan your answer to the question well. Any question which requires a 2000–3000 word answer can be broken down into 2–3 sub-questions or puzzles. These questions can then be addressed systematically in one section after another, in turn allowing you to build a coherent and focused answer to the overarching question. You should always conclude by explaining clearly what your overarching answer to the question is; stronger papers always go beyond this, though, and reflect on the wider implications of the foregoing analysis.

Poor Referencing (and bibliographical presentation)

There is no excuse for reaching postgraduate level not having learned to reference accurately, particularly with the support available from the IIR Library and the UWI Writing Centre. Mixing and matching footnotes and in-text citations: You should ONLY use ONE referencing style (either in-text citations OR footnotes) and never change during a paper. The only situation in which you might use both is when you use the in-text system and have footnotes for points of clarification but NOT references. Also, you must present all of the required information for every single source you use, to indicate the information that you are citing in the text is valid. Therefore, it isn’t enough to simply put a web address as this means nothing. What is the source? Who is the author? When was it published? Where was it published? If you cannot provide this information, then this is not a suitable source to use in academic work.

Referencing is an extremely important skill that you must develop while at university. So if you struggle with it, then please come and see me for advice. Also, use a referencing program: Zotero, Endnote, CiteUwrite etc. will all help you keep track of sources, and ensure consistency in your bibliographies.

Poor use of source material

The key thing that is being tested in an essay is the extent to which you have read a wide range of academic literature, digested it, and can draw on it to add weight to your arguments. It is crucial, in this sense, that you support your arguments and ideas with evidence from the literature. The best papers are those that are clearly driven by their own analytical agenda, with the literature providing the fuel for the engine. By contrast, an even worse problem, though, is when students have not digested the
literature at all. This usually manifests itself in excessive numbers of quotes, and, especially, long quotes (2–3 lines or more). Simply copying and pasting massive quotes from a source earns you no credit. It shows no critical engagement with the literature, and is especially problematic when, as is often the case, little attempt is made to contextualise the long quote (i.e. to introduce it, and then explain its significance afterwards). A long quote CANNOT do YOUR analytical work for you. Its value is not self-evident, so if you do quote someone at length, there should, firstly, be a good reason for doing so (i.e. because the point the person makes is so important that it must be quoted verbatim and cannot simply be paraphrased), and, secondly, you need to explain why it matters in the context of the analysis that you’re advancing.

Of course, you should use quotes regularly (but sparingly) to support your arguments. But they should not overwhelm your paper, or obscure your analysis. It should be your analytical agenda doing the driving; you should be able to summarise the literature, having read and digested it, and, for the most part, you should be paraphrasing authors, and summarising their arguments in your own words (but obviously still providing a reference, since it is their ideas you are drawing on). When you use direct quotes, they must be in ‘quote marks’, and if you use a longer quote (again, more than 2-3 lines) make sure you INDENT it (and remove the quote marks), and that you go on to explain its significance.

The Norman Girvan Library

The IIR-based Norman Girvan Library is an important informational resource, which all IIR students should make use of accordingly. Like The UWI’s Alma Jordan Library, it offers a wide range of services, including on referencing. According to the library’s mission statement, “[T]he Institute houses the most comprehensive collection of information resources in the world on the international relations of the Caribbean.”

Continuing Learning Beyond Class Sessions

Students are encouraged to continue the discussion beyond the weekly course classes, and to augment the in-class learning space not only by way of individual learning but also via group chats, or other means of facilitating collaboration and peer learning, e.g. study/reading groups.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

Students should refer to The UWI St. Augustine Campus Student Disability Policy:
https://sta.uwi.edu/resources/policies/Student_Disability.pdf

The Code of Principles and Responsibilities for Students

Please refer to and be guided by: https://sta.uwi.edu/resources/documents/conduct.pdf

You are hereby prohibited from reproducing, re-publishing, re-broadcasting, re-posting, re-transmitting or transferring in whole or in part any Course Outlines, Course Materials or Lectures which have been provided to you as part of your course of study at The University of the West Indies (The UWI), without the prior permission of The UWI its authorised agents or copyright holders.
Reading List

Core Reading

There are many useful core texts in IR (and in related disciplines such as Political Science and IPE) which provide good overviews of the field. However, textbooks, in particular, can only ever provide an introduction, and you should move quickly beyond these and engage at a deeper level with primary texts and articles. If you avoid grappling with serious IR literature, you will run into trouble quickly.

Textbooks and other important books on IR Theory

Brown, C and K. Ainley  

Baylis, J., Smith, S. and Owens, P (Eds)  

Burchill, S and Linklater. A (Eds)  

Cerny, P.  
*Rethinking World Politics* (Oxford: OUP, 2010).

Dunne, T., Kurki, M., and S Smith (Eds)  

Griffiths, M (Ed)  
*International Relations Theory for the Twenty First Century* (New York: Routledge, 2007)

Heywood, A  
*Global Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2011)

Hobson, J M and S Hobden  
*Historical Sociology of International Relations* (Cambridge: CUP, 2002)

Hobson, J M  

Jackson, R and G Sorenson  

Kegley, C & Wittkopf, E.  
*World Politics: Trends and transformations* (Thomson Wadsworth, Australia, 2006)

Knight, WA and T Keating  
*Global Politics* (Oxford: OUP, 2010)

Little, R. & Smith, M  
*Perspectives on World Politics* (London: Routledge, 2005)

Ravenhill, J. (Ed)  
Tickner, A B and O Waever (Eds) International Relations Scholarship Around the World: Worlding Beyond the West (London: Routledge, 2009)


On questions of analysis, methods, ontology, epistemology and the state


Gowan, P. Research Methods in International Relations (London: Routledge, 2011)


Websites and News Sources

You should keep abreast of ‘real–world’ events during the course, but newspaper sources should generally not be the main focus of essays and analyses on IR Theory. Empirical analysis is obviously an important backdrop for the things we discuss on the course, but only insofar as it helps us think through different theoretical traditions within IR.

In terms of broader IR debates, you should also regularly check the Project Syndicate website which has articles from leading commentators (which are then syndicated to major global newspapers such as Le Monde, The Guardian, The New York Times and so on). In particular, Dani Rodrik, Robert Skidelsky, Jeffrey Sachs, Naomi Wolf, Joseph Nye and Joseph Stiglitz offer excellent commentary on global issues: http://www.project-syndicate.org/. E-IR is also a very good resource – http://www.e-ir.info/ Also check out: www.theory-talks.org

MyELEarning

For course updates and material, please regularly check MyELEarning.
Course Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Discussion and Lecture Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September</td>
<td>Introduction to the Course What is International Relations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; September</td>
<td>The Treaty of Westphalia, Sovereignty and the State in IR: A Critical Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September</td>
<td>Historiographical Considerations in (Western) IR: The Quest for 'Origins' via Typologies of the Classic Canon of Western Political Thought, and on to an &quot;American Social Science&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October</td>
<td>Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology in IR; Research Methods; Paradigm; Levels of Analysis; Structure and Agency; the Great Debates: A Snapshot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October</td>
<td>The Beginnings of a Discipline? Idealism as the precursor for Liberalism, and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October</td>
<td>Classical Realism and Structural Realism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; October</td>
<td>Neoliberal Institutionalism and Cosmopolitanism; the 'Neo-Neo' Debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; November</td>
<td>The Constructivist Turn in IR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November</td>
<td>Marxism, Dependency Theory and Neo-Gramscianism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November</td>
<td>Whither Critical Theory?: The Case of Feminist IR Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; November</td>
<td>Global International Relations in the Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; December</td>
<td>Plenary/Class Presentations (Group assignment) &amp; Course Wrap-up, incl. a closer look at Great Debates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disclaimer: This course calendar should be viewed as a planning tool and in some cases due to unforeseen circumstances, the course calendar, syllabus, and/or interactive sessions could be changed. Students will be notified ahead of time of any changes and updated accordingly.

Class Sessions and the Four-part Division of the Course

There will be twelve online class sessions, which are divided into four parts. **Part 1** (Topics 1-3): IR's (Western) Historical Development, Key Concepts and Traditions; **Part 2** (Topic 4): Paradigms and Philosophies of Research: Insights into the Nature and Purposes of IR Schools of Thought; **Part 3** (Topics 5-11): Theoretical Perspectives in and Debates informing the Study of IR; **Part 4**: Stocktaking of the Course, and more.

The COVID-19 Moment, IR and INRL 5008

COVID-19 has seemingly emerged as the most pressing challenge confronting the world today, its complex realities having rapidly disrupted (indeed, having pervasively ensconced themselves at the centre of) diplomacy and global affairs. Even so, the situation’s dynamics have the potential to shape politics among nations in the coming years, setting many of the conditions for and trends in international politics. In taking INRL 5008 at this juncture, you will have an opportunity to draw on key, oft-contending IR theoretical perspectives to help make sense of the COVID-19 moment. We will routinely look at the nexus between the COVID-19 crisis and IR, considering that the pandemic offers the clearest and most topical case example of how IR theories provide a lens through which one can view the contemporary world around us and get a handle on the role of salient actors, structures and processes.

---

*Guest lecture.*
Topic 1 – What is International Relations?

Before the discipline of International Relations, there was the study of international relations i.e. the influence of ‘external’ practices, ideas and institutions on societies around the world. This lecture provides an overview of the ‘deep roots’ of international relations. Its main point is that ‘international relations’ has a longer, deeper and broader history than that of modern Europe. **Key questions to think about when reading:** What is IR, and what is IR Theory? At all times, questions asked during the term: What different theories are there in IR, and why do we have so many of them? What kinds of issues do they tend to be interested in, and how is the knowledge created in IR generally constructed? How close are the links between the concepts and issues we use to understand/explain/describe the world, and actual events and processes in world politics?

*Haber, S H, Kennedy, D M and Krasner, S D*  
‘Brothers under the Skin: Diplomatic History and International Relations’, *International Security*, 22, 1, 1997

*Kaplan, M A*  

*Smith, S.*  
‘Paradigm Dominance in International Relations: The Development of International Relations as a Social Science’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 16, 2, 1987

Buzan, B and Little, R  
‘Why International Relations has failed as an academic project and what to do about it’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 30, 1, 2001

Hurrell, A.  
‘Towards the Global Study of International Relations’, *Revista Brasileira de Politica Internacional*, 59, 2, 2016

*Kaufman, S.*  

*Nicholson, M*  
‘What’s the use of International Relations?’ *Review of International Studies*, 26, 2, 2000

*Cello, L*  
‘Taking History Seriously in IR: Towards a Historcist Approach’, *Review of International Studies*, 44, 2, 2018

*Bell, D*  
‘Writing the world: Disciplinary History and Beyond’, *International Affairs*, 85, 1, 2009

*Snyder, J*  
‘One World, Rival Theories’, *Foreign Policy*, 140, November/December 2004

*Walt, Stephen M*  
‘International Relations: One World, Many Theories’, *Foreign Policy*, 110, 1998

*Holsti, K J*  
‘Along the Road to International Theory’, *International Journal*, 39, 2, 1984

*Dunn, F S*  
‘The Scope of International Relations’, *World Politics* 1, 1, 1948
In (Western) IR there is a standard tool-kit of concepts and terms that one must be familiar with in order to engage with the subject matter. This lecture reviews some of those foundational concepts and terms, providing a critical view of same. **Key questions to think about when reading:** What is the Westphalian state system? Has the Westphalian model of state sovereignty come under challenge? If so, how? Explain. Is sovereignty always upheld as sacrosanct? Provide examples.

*Hobson, J M, Carvalho, B and H Leira*  

*Moloney, P*  

*Miller, J.D.B.*  

*Paul, D*  
‘Sovereignty, Survival and the Westphalian Blind Alley in International Relations’, *Review of International Studies*, 25, 2, 1999

*Ayoob, M*  

Krasner, S D  

Stahn, C  

Ashley, R K  

Linklater, A  

Teschke, B  

Teschke, B  
‘Theorising the Westphalian System of States: International Relations from Absolutism to Capitalism,’ *European Journal of International Relations*, 8, 1, 2002

McCourt, D M  
It is said that in tracing the intellectual roots of (Western) IR, one must look at “traditions of IR.” In this lecture, we do just that. We are interested in framing (Western) IR’s intellectual currents along the lines of typologies, pinpointing how the discipline has apparently evolved into an “American social science.” Key Questions to think about when reading: What are the three “traditions of IR”? What is the significance of scholars connecting this relatively young academic discipline to some of the classic canon of Western political thought? That IR has apparently established itself as an “American social science” does not sit well for many. What is the controversy about? And why should it matter?

*Wight, M
‘Why is there no International Theory?’ International Relations, 2, 1, 1960

*Vergerio, C
‘Context, Reception, and the Study of Great Thinkers in International Relations’, International Theory, 11, 1, 2019

*Kristensen, P M
‘Revisiting the “American Social Science”—Mapping the Geography of International Relations’, International Studies Perspectives, 16, 3, 2015

Ahrensford, P J
‘Thucydides’ Realistic Critique of Realism’, Polity, 30, 2, 1997

Hurrell, A
‘Kant and the Kantian Paradigm in International Relations’, Review of International Studies 16, 3, 1990

Cutler, A C
‘The ‘Grotian Tradition’ in International Relations’, Review of International Studies 17, 1, 1991

Little, R
‘Historiography and International Relations’, Review of International Studies 25, 2, 1999

Smith, S
‘The Discipline of International Relations: Still an American Social Science?’, The British Journal of Politics and International Relations, 2, 3, 2000

Hoffmann, S
‘An American Social Science: International Relations’, Daedalus, 106, 3, 1977

Boucher, D
Political Theories of International Relations: From Thucydides to the Present (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998)

Johnson, L M

Parry, J T
‘What is the Grotian Tradition in International Law?’ University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law, 35, 2, 2014

Dunne, T

Hoffmann, S  ‘International Relations: The Long Road to Theory’, World Politics, 11, 3, 1959

Topic 4 – Ontology, Epistemology and Methodology in IR; Research Methods; Paradigm; Levels of Analysis; Structure and Agency; the Great Debates: A Snapshot

Key Questions to think about when reading: What are ontology and epistemology? Which comes first? To what extent do we need to think about them when engaging in the analysis of IR? Are they just philosophical issues which should not concern us? What are the implications of ontology and epistemology for IR Theory? What implications do they have for the methodologies we employ? In what way is the concept of ‘paradigm shift’ helpful to you as a student of IR, namely, in framing its study?


*Wight, C  ‘Inside the Epistemological Cave all Bets are Off’, Journal of International Relations and Development, 10, 1, 2007


Debate: which comes first, ontology or epistemology?


*Marsh, D and P Furlong  ‘On Ontological and Epistemological Gatekeeping: A Reply to Bates and Jenkins’, Politics, 27, 3
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On Ontology and Epistemology more generally

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borjana, A</td>
<td>“Epistemological challenges of globalization to the Westphalian thinking within International Relations. JANUS.NET e-journal of International Relations, 9, 1, May-October 2018.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Paradigm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Levels of Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Singer, J. D</td>
<td>‘The level-of-analysis problem in international relations’, World Politics, 14, 1, 1961</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure and Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Wight, C</td>
<td>‘They Shoot Dead Horses Don’t They? Locating Agency in the Agent-Structure Problématique’, European Journal of International Relations, 51, 1, 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Great Debates: A Snapshot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Topic 5 – The Beginnings of a Discipline? Idealism as the precursor for Liberalism, and more

Classical liberalism rests on a variety of sources, Kant, Wilson and Mill being particularly important. Contrary to most of the tenets of realism, international behaviour is linked to regime-type, and republics/liberal democracies are taken to be less warlike than monarchies/authoritarian regimes. In the 20th century, liberalism has been associated with the promotion of international institutions; the modern version of liberalism (‘neoliberal institutionalism’ or ‘neoliberalism’ for short). Key Questions to think about when reading: Why were the ‘idealists’ called as such, and how did they view the world? In what ways has idealism shaped contemporary liberalism? How plausible is an idealist approach for managing global politics? Is liberalism in IR truly liberal?


*Doyle, M ‘Liberalism and World Politics’, American Political Science Review, 80, 4, 1986

*Doyle, M ‘Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs’, Philosophy and Public Affairs, 12, 3–4, 1983


Topic 6 – Classical Realism and Structural Realism

The roots of realism can be found in texts by Thucydides, Augustine, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau and many others, but as a fully-fledged theory of international relations it is a twentieth century product. In the 1930s and 1940s, realism took the form of a critique of idealism/utopianism, and came to be the dominant approach in IR. Key questions to think about when reading: What is realism, and where does it come from? What different variants of realism have there been over time, when did they emerge, and for what reasons? According to Hans Morgenthau and E.H. Carr, what are the shortcomings of the ‘liberal project’?

*Dunne, T International Relations Theories (Oxford University Press, 2016, to be subjected to selective reading) 4th edition
In the 1970s, Kenneth Waltz became the (reluctant?) progenitor of neo- or structural realism, re-orienting realism around the notion of ‘anarchy’. Structural realism divides into ‘offensive realism’, ‘defensive realism’ and ‘neo-classical realism’. **Key questions to think about when reading:** Which strains of realism are most influential today? How does structural or neo-realism differ to classical realism? How well do realist approaches explain contemporary IR? Why does neo-realism generally remain dominant in, especially, American International Relations? How plausible is the idea of hegemonic stability? Is IR fundamentally a realist social science?

*Hamati-Ataya, I*  
‘Knowing and Judging in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Reflexive Challenge’, *Review of International Studies*, 36, 4, 2010

*Milner, H*  
‘The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory’, *Review of International Studies*, 17, 1, 1991

*Rosenberg, J*  
‘What’s the Matter with Realism?’ *Review of International Studies*, 16, 4, 1990

*Ruggie, J.*  

*Mann, M*  

*Moloney, P*  

*Morgenthau, H, J*  
*Politics Among Nations* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf., 1948)

*Ashley, R.*  

*Krasner, S*  
‘Abiding Discord’, *Review of International Political Economy*, 1, 1, 1994

*Strange, S.*  
‘Wake up Krasner! The World Has Changed’, *Review of International Political Economy*, 1, 2, 1994

*Waltz, K*  
‘Structural Realism After the Cold War’, *International Security*, 25, 1, 2000

*Foulon, M*  

*Grieco, J.*  

*Katzenstein, P, Keohane, R*,  
and *Krasner, S*  
**Topic 7 – Neoliberal Institutionalism and Cosmopolitanism; the 'Neo-Neo' Debate**

The events of the last two decades, and especially of the two terms of George W. Bush’s presidency, have raised questions for the liberal conception of international relations. The charge often made is that the ‘neo-conservative’ vision of the world is, in effect, a modern version of Wilsonian liberal internationalism.

**Key Questions to think about when reading:** What different variants of liberalism have there been over time, when did they emerge, and for what reasons? Which strains of liberalism are most influential today? How well do liberal approaches explain contemporary IR? To what extent is a liberal world order the best way of arranging international affairs? At its core, what is the ‘inter-paradigm’ debate about?

- *Kratochwil, F* and *Ruggie, J*  

- *Cerny, P*  

- *Gamble, A*  

- *Ruggie, J G*  

- *Guerrero, M G*  
  “Theoretically Thinking and Rethinking the international order: the new emerging international institutions through neo-institutionalist lenses.” JANUS.NET e-journal of International Relations, Vol.9, no2, November 2018 – April 2019.

- *Fukuyama, F*  
  ‘The End of History?’ *The National Interest, 16*, 1989

- *Harvey, D*  

- *Harvey, D*  
  ‘Neoliberalism as Creative Destruction’, *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 610, 1*, 2007

- *Keohane, R*  

- *Keohane, R* and *L Martin*  

- *Keohane, R* and *J Nye*  

- *Mearsheimer, J*  

- *Richardson, J*  
  ‘Contending Liberalisms: Past and Present’, *European Journal of IR, 3, 1*, 1997

Ikenberry, J  ‘Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order’, *Perspectives on Politics*, 7, 1, 2009


**On Cosmopolitanism**


*Held, D  ’Violence, Law and Justice in a Global Age’, *Constellations*, 1, 9, 2002


Carpenter, T  ‘Realism vs. Idealism: Both Are Needed, but National Interest Should Come First’, *American Conservative* 17, 4, 2018

Gizatova, G K  ‘Cosmopolitanism as a Concept and a Social Phenomenon’, *Journal of History, Culture & Art Research*, 6, 5, 2017

Lu, C  ‘The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism’, *Journal of Political Philosophy*, 8, 2, 2002

**The 'Neo-Neo' Debate**


**Topic 8 – The Constructivist Turn in IR**

The meaning and nature of constructivism are contested. The most prominent constructivist from the perspective of mainstream IR theory is Alexander Wendt. **Key Questions to think about when reading:** What role do ideas play in constructivism? When and why did this body of thought emerge? What is its relationship with other theories of IR? What different flavours of constructivism exist? Does it overplay the role of ideas in international politics?

* Baele, S J and Bettiza, G
  ‘‘Turning’ everywhere in IR: on the sociological underpinnings of the field’s proliferating turns’, *International Theory*, First View

* Adler, E
  ‘Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics’, *European Journal of International Relations*, 3, 3, 1997

*Dessler, D
  ‘Constructivism within a Positivist Social Science’, *Review of International Studies*, 25, 1, 1999

*Wendt, A

*Wendt, A

Guzzini, S

Marsh, D
  ‘Keeping Ideas in their Place: In Praise of Thin Constructivism’, *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 4, 4, 2009

Hopf, T

Wendt, A
  ‘Bridging the Theory/Meta Theory Gap in International Relations’, *Review of International Studies*, 17, 4, 1991

**Topic 9 – Marxism, Dependency Theory and Neo-Gramscianism**

Critical theorists draw on a long line of scholarship that extends from Marx and Gramsci via the Frankfurt School to modern day theorists such as Immanuel Wallerstein and, in IR, Robert Cox and Justin Rosenberg. For ‘critical’ scholars, world politics is marked by historically constituted inequalities between core and periphery, north and south, developed and underdeveloped. **Key Questions to think about when reading:** What is Marxism and where does it come from? What is the importance of concepts such as capital, class, hegemony, order, dependency, core-periphery and world system or world order in the Marxist tradition? How do they tend to understand the state? Do such approaches offer a plausible critique of IR? What do they lack? Do Marxian approaches have any continued relevance to IR Theory today?
*Cardoso, F.*

‘Dependency and Development in Latin America’, *New Left Review*, 74, July-August, 1972

*Cox, R.*


*Gamble, A*

‘Marxism after Communism: Beyond Realism and Historicism’, *Review of International Studies*, 25, 5, 1999

*Germain, R and M Kenny*


*Maclean, J.*

‘Marxism and International Relations: A Strange Case of Mutual Neglect’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 17, 2, 1988

*Van Der Pijl, K.*


**On Classical Marxism in IR and the Marxist tradition more broadly**

*Burnham, P*

‘Open Marxism and Vulgar Political Economy’, *Review of International Political Economy*, 1, 2, 1994

*Callinicos, A*


*Harvey, D*

*The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism* (London: Profile, 2010)

*Harvey, D*


*Lenin, V I*

*Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism* (Various editions – originally published 1917)
http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp--hsc/

*Marx, K*

*Capital: Critique of Political Economy*, Vols 1–3 (Various editions – originally published 1867)

*Marx, K and Engels, F*

*Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Various editions – originally published 1848)
On Dependency and World Systems Theory

Cardoso, F and Faletto, E  

Frank, A G and Gills, B  

Frank, A G  

Gills, B K  

Gills, B K  
‘In Memoriam: Andre Gunder Frank 24 February 1929 to 24 April 2005’, *Globalizations*, 2, 1, 2005

Girvan, N  

Hills, J.  

Palma, G  
‘Dependency: A Formal Theory of Underdevelopment of a Methodology for the Analysis of Concrete Situations of Underdevelopment’, *World Development*, 6, 1, 1978

Wallerstein, I  
*The Capitalist World Economy* (Cambridge: CUP, 1979)

Wallerstein, I  

Wallerstein, I  

On Gramsci and Neo-Gramscian Thought

Burnham, P  

Cox, R  

Cox, R and Sinclair, T (eds)  
*Approaches to World Order* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996) Various Chapters
**Topic 10 – Whither Critical Theory?: The Case of Feminist IR Theory**

**Key Questions to think about when reading:** What, if anything, is “critical” about critical theory? Which different bodies of thought can be placed in the critical theory camp? How does it differ to positivist, or “problem-solving” theory? Is this a problem? Is critical theory just about unquestioned answers, rather than unanswered questions? Or, to put it another way, is critical theory hindered by its weak scientific method and lack of a positivist ontology? What generally distinguishes feminist theories of IR? How can we draw parallels to critical theory, in particular, the latter’s pushback on “problem-solving” theory?

*Cox, R*  

*Ashley, R*  

*Carver, T*  
*Ferguson, Y H and Mansbach, R W*  

*Hoffmann, M*  

*Hobson, J M*  

*Kurki, M*  

*Peterson, V S*  
‘Feminist Theories within, Invisible to, and Beyond IR’, *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 10, 2, 2004

*Tickner, J A*  

*VARIOUS*  

*Lapid, Y*  

*Holsti, K J*  
‘Mirror, Mirror on the Wall, which are the Fairest Theories of all?’ *International Studies Quarterly*, 33, 3, 1989

*Biersteker, T*  

*George, G*  

*Ruggie, J G*  
‘Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations’, *International Organization*, 47, 1, 1993
On Feminist Approaches Specifically...

Enloe, C

Park-Kang, S

Parpart, J L and M Zalewski (eds)
Rethinking the “Man” Question: Sex, Gender and Violence in International Relations (London: Zed Books, 2008)

Peterson, V S
‘How the (Meaning of) Gender Matters in Political Economy’, New Political Economy, 10, 4, 2005

Peterson, V S and Runyan, A S

Robinson, F

Steans, J

Steans, J

VARIOUS

Waylen, G
‘You still don’t understand: why troubled engagements continue between feminists and (critical) IPE’, Review of International Studies, 32, 1, 2006

Topic 11 – Global International Relations in the Making

IR has come under increasing and sustained scrutiny for its, inter alia, Western-centric/Eurocentric outlook, including for the nature of its mainstream historicizing, intellectual traditions and debates. For critics, the discipline has locked-in a ‘circumscribed view’, not least with regard to how “international” its study really is, or how “encompassing” it really is. A diverse community of scholars has long pushed back on the “mainstream,” and the advent of ‘Global IR’ could be a turning point. Key Questions to think about when reading: Does (Western) IR perpetuate certain civilizational, gendered, racial and other dominant narratives? What are the implications for multi-pronged (including Global South) perspectives in the discipline? Against this backdrop, what is the promise of ‘Global IR’? What are its limitations?


*Snidal, D and Wendt, A  ‘Why There is International Theory Now,’ *International Theory*, 1, 1, 2009


Thomas C and Wilkin P.  ‘Still Waiting after all these Years: The ‘Third World’ on the Periphery of International Relations’, *British Journal of International Political Relations*, 6, 2, 2004


