



Contemporary Theories of World Politics

POL2020 Module Handbook

2016-2017

Module convenor: Dr. Stephane J. BAELE

Teaching Assistants: Mr Gerardus HOETJES, Dr. Henry JARRETT, Mr Kit WATERMAN.

Credit value: 15.00

ECTS value: 15.00

Pre-requisites: None

Co-requisites: None

Duration of module: One semester

Total student study time: 11 x 1.5 hour lectures

9 x 1 hour tutorials

123.5hrs Independent study, including preparation for essay, for class and independent research

This module provides an in-depth and critical examination of contemporary theoretical approaches to world politics. The study of conceptual frameworks in International Relations (IR) is important for how it can enhance our understanding of the dynamics of politics, including why and how the political world takes its existing forms. Theory is also the centre of gravity in the field of IR, providing points of collaboration and contestation between scholars on the nature of international political enquiry. The module explores a set of debates that turn around the definition and interpretation of key concepts such as structure, anarchy, power, interests, or identity. Exploring the various factors that shape international politics (security, economics, identity, worldviews, etc.) will lead us to survey the key 'isms' of the field – from classical realism to feminism – but also to expand our horizon by looking at powerful theories of social behaviour and conflict not usually included within IR as a discipline. Theories will be related to one another historically and conceptually and we will question the perceived distinctiveness of these traditions, by drawing links between them. Students are asked to think in an open and critical manner about the purpose of theories of world politics, including understanding the major attributes of each framework and how, most importantly, they can be 'put to work' through empirical illustrations.

1. INTENDED LEARNING OUTCOMES

On successful completion of this module, students should be able to demonstrate skills in the following areas:

Module-specific skills

1. In-depth knowledge of knowledge of debates related to contemporary theories of world politics.
2. Knowledge of contemporary issues in international politics.
3. Ability to articulate ones' own ethical and political positions on questions of international politics.

Discipline-specific skills

4. Ability to critically analyse both empirical and theoretical material.
5. Ability to deploy theoretical arguments and apply them to empirical case studies.
6. Ability to engage in critique.

Personal and key skills

7. Ability to construct reasoned argument.
8. Ability to communicate effectively in speech and writing.
9. Ability to work independently and with peers to achieve common goals.
10. Use ICT appropriately.

2. LEARNING AND TEACHING METHODS

This module is taught through weekly lectures (11 x 1.5 hour) and tutorials (9 x 1 hour). Subject knowledge will be developed and learnt in four main ways: (1) private study, (2) lectures, (3) tutorial discussions, and (4) an essay assignment. Intellectual material will be primarily textual sources. Core aspects of the main learning methods are as follows:

Private study

This remains the most important learning activity. It is compulsory to read the required readings each week prior to the tutorial. This will entail at least five hours of independent reading and note-taking for each class. Extensive preparation for class will make the difference in your essay and exam. Students are strongly encouraged to select other readings under the recommended list to broaden their understanding of the debates. For advice on choosing readings, please consult the lecturer or your seminar tutor. All core readings are available via the ELE page. NB. If you do not read for class you undermine the learning of those that do.

Lectures

Students are strongly encouraged to attend weekly lectures beginning in Week 1. The lecture will be held on Tuesdays in the Amory Moot Lecture Theatre, 11:30-13:00. The lecture provides an introduction to each topic on the syllabus. Failure to attend will result in misunderstandings and absent knowledge, jeopardizing the prospect of passing the course. Slides and recordings of the lecture will be subsequently uploaded to ELE. Recordings are only a complement to the actual lectures – be aware that technical problems leading to the absence of a particular recording do often happen and cannot be invoked as a reason for failure in assessment.

Tutorial discussions

Students will be allocated to a tutorial group of approximately 15-20 participants. Tutorials, which are led by a team of knowledgeable and dynamic TAs, begin in Week 3 with a debate on the lecture topic of Week 2. Students are asked to **read the core readings before the tutorials**. The form of teaching within the tutorial will vary depending upon the teacher and session. Please consult your TA for clarification on expectations.

Essay assignment

Students will research and write one essay of 1500 words during the module. Further details on the requirement for this essay are provided below as part of the assessment conditions.

Exam

The exam will be an hour and half in length and you will be expected to answer several questions in that time: a small set of multiple-choice questions, a theory-oriented question requiring a short answer, and an essay-like question in which you prove your ability to apply theories to a real-life case.

3. ASSESSMENT

The details of the module assessment are as follows.

<i>Percentage of contribution</i>	<i>Form of assessment</i>	<i>Size of assessment</i>	<i>ILOs assessed</i>	<i>Feedback method</i>
67	Examination	1.5 hour paper	1-10	Mark and short comments
33	Essay	1500 words	1-10	Written comments

For the essay, you have the choice between 21 essay questions. You answer one of these questions in a clearly written, well-documented (go beyond the lecture and key readings), and well-structured way.

The deadline is as follows: **12:00 on Friday, December the 2nd, 2016**. Submit online through eBart. Be aware that essays may also be processed through the Turnitin plagiarism detector software (which also compares with all previous essays submitted for this module).

The following criteria must be adhered to when writing your essay:

- Do not compose your own question or modify the selected question in any way.
- Copy the precise question at the top of the essay.
- Do not exceed the word limit.
- Provide an accurate word count.
- Submit the essay on time.

The following criteria will be used in assessing the essay:

1. Definition of the topic
 - Has the topic been clearly defined and directly addressed?
2. Structure of the essay
 - Does the introduction present a clear statement of the issues to be covered?
 - Does the essay/presentation have a clear structure or organisation in which a) the main points are developed logically; and b) the relevance of the material to the theme or argument is clear?
 - Is there an effective conclusion that draws together the main points?
3. Content
 - Is there evidence of adequate reading and research?
 - Has the question being answered?
 - Is the breadth of coverage adequate?
 - Are the issues and ideas analysed in sufficient depth?
 - Are arguments supported by evidence, examples, sources and quotations?
4. Analysis
 - Are the arguments logical and consistent?
 - Are opinions based on evidence and/or logic?
 - Does the essay show evidence of original or independent thought?
5. Presentation
 - Are arguments supported by evidence, examples, sources and quotations?
 - Fluency and style of writing.
 - Spelling, grammar, paragraphing.
 - Presentation of data: effective use of figures and tables and correct use of units and quantities.
 - Neatness and legibility.
 - Sources: are sources acknowledged? Are references cited? Are references presented correctly?

4. STRUCTURE OF THE MODULE, READINGS, AND ESSAY QUESTIONS:

Note: In order to reach a certain level of sophistication and to avoid repetitions with previous presentations of IR theories, we will primarily work with original papers, and not handbook chapters. If you feel you need to be reminded of the basics, it would be a good idea for you to get one of the numerous IR theory handbooks, e.g. Daddow's *International Relations Theory (really easy)*, Baylis & Smith's *Globalization of World Politics*, Dunne, Kurki & Smith's *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Burchill & Linklater's *Theories of International Relations*, or Carlsnaes, Risse & Simmons' *Handbook of International Relations*. Students are also encouraged to look at less formal sources of information, like the excellent *Theory Talks* blog, or youtube channels like *Allen Sens'* one (University of British Columbia – see e.g. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r_Gm79wstmY). Most required readings will be uploaded in due time on the ELE, but students are responsible for finding and getting the papers that are not uploaded (or arrive late) on the ELE.

1. Intro: Theory? World Politics? Theory of World Politics?

- What exactly is a theory? What do theories? Do we need theories?
- Getting the language right: talking about “paradigms”, “methods”, “epistemology”, “ontology”.
- Can we hope getting theories in the “social/soft sciences”, as opposed to “natural/hard sciences”?
- “International Relations” or “World Politics”?
- Is it possible to offer a theory of international relations / world politics?
- What did “great debates” do in IR?
 - Theory Talk #44 (Thursday, November 17, 2011): *Patrick Thaddeus Jackson about IR as a Science, IR as a Vocation, and IR as a Hard Board* – interview available online at <http://www.theory-talks.org/2011/11/theory-talk-44.html>
 - Daddow Chapters 1.1 “Introduction to International Relations” and 1.2 “International Relations Theory”.
 - ✦ Bird T. (2011): “Thomas Kuhn”, *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, online.
 - ✦ Freire L. (2013): “The potential and the pitfalls of metatheory in IR”, *Estudos Internacionais* 1(2): 271-302.
 - ✦ Hoffmann S. (2000): “An American Social Science: International Relations”, in Linklater A. (ed.): *International Relations. Critical Concepts in Political Science*. New York: Routledge, pp.77-98.
 - ✦ Jackson P.T. (2011): *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations*. New York: Routledge.
 - ✦ King G., Keohane R., Verba S. (1996): *Designing Social Inquiry*. (“Chapter 1. The Science in Social Science”). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - ✦ Matheson C., Dallmann J. (2014): “Historicist Theories of Scientific Rationality”, *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, online.
 - ✦ Preston J. (2012): “Paul Feyerabend”, *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, online.
 - ✦ Smith S. (2004): “Singing Our World into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11”, *International Studies Quarterly* 48(3): 499-515.
 - ✦ Sterling-Folker J. (2013): “Chapter 1. Making Sense of International Relations Theory”. In Sterling-Folker J., (ed.): *Making Sense of International Relations Theory. Second edition*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
 - ✦ Thornton S. (2013): “Karl Popper”, *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, online.
 - ✦ Walt S. (1998): “International Relations: One World, Many Theories”, *Foreign Policy* 110 (Special Edition: Frontiers of Knowledge): 29-46.
 - ✦ Wendt A. (1998): “On Constitution and Causation in International Relations”, *Review of International Studies* 24: 101-117.
 - ✦ Wight M. (2000): “Why there is no international theory”, in Linklater A. (ed.): *International Relations. Critical Concepts in Political Science*. New York: Routledge, pp.27-42.

✗ No essay question

2. Interests – mainly security – are what matters

- A dominant claim: states rationally seek to maximize their interests, and the most important one is security.
- Realism-s from classical realisms to defensive and offensive structural realisms.
- The neo-neo debate: how likely is cooperation in a world where each states tries to maximize its interest? Can institutions alter states' behaviour?
 - Grieco J. (1993): "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism", in Baldwin D. (ed.): *Neo-realism and Neo-liberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press. [NOTE: THIS IS A CORNERSTONE BOOK WHICH EXEMPLIFIES THE NEO-NEO DEBATE, SO STUDENTS INTERESTED IN THIS ISSUE ARE ADVISED TO READ MORE OF IT.](#)
 - Legro J., Moravcsik A. (1999): "Is Anybody Still a Realist?", *International Security* 24(2): 5-55.
 - ✦ Ashley R. (1986): "The Poverty of Neorealism", in Keohane R. (ed.): *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press: 255-300.
 - ✦ Axelrod R. (1984): *The Evolution of Cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
 - ✦ Axelrod R., Keohane R. (1985): "Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions", *World Politics* 38 (1): 226-254.
 - ✦ Baldwin D., ed. (1993): *Neo-realism and Neo-liberalism: The Contemporary Debate*. New York: Columbia University Press.
 - ✦ Carr E.H. (2001): *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. 2nd ed. / reissued with a new introduction and additional material by Michael Cox. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
 - ✦ Daddow Chapter 2.3 "Neorealism and neoliberalism"
 - ✦ Donnelly J. (2000): *Realism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - ✦ Doyle M. (1986): "Liberalism and World Politics", *American Political Science Review* 80: 1151-1170.
 - ✦ Feaver P., Hellman G., Schweller R., Taliaferro J., Wohlforth W., Legro J., Moravcsik A. (2000): "Brother Can You Spare a Paradigm? (or Was Anybody Ever a Realist?)", *International Security* 25(1): 165-93. [NOTE: THIS IS A COMPILATION OF SHARP REPLIES TO THE LEGRO & MORAVCSIK 1999 ARTICLE.](#)
 - ✦ Greener B. (2007): "Liberalism and the Use of Force: Core Themes and Conceptual Tensions", *Alternatives* 32: 295-318.
 - ✦ Green D., Shapiro I. (1994): *Pathologies of Rational Choice Theory: A Critique of Applications in Political Science*. Yale University Press.
 - ✦ Grieco J. (1988): "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism", *International Organization* 42: 485-508.
 - ✦ Guzzini S. (2001): "The Different Worlds of Realism in International Relations", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 30(1): 111-21.
 - ✦ Guzzini S. (2004): "The Enduring Dilemmas of Realism in International Relations", *European Journal of International Relations* 10(4): 533-568.
 - ✦ Howe P. (1994): "The Utopian Realism of E. H. Carr", *Review of International Studies* 20(3): 277-297.
 - ✦ Ikenberry J. (2009) "Liberal Internationalism 3.0" *Perspectives on Politics* 7(1): 71-89.
 - ✦ Jahn B. (2010) "Liberal Internationalism: From Ideology to Empirical Theory – And Back Again", *International Theory* 1(3) 409-438.
 - ✦ Jervis R. (1999): "Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation. Understanding the Debate", *International Security* 24(1): 42-63.
 - ✦ Keohane R. (1986): "Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond", in Keohane R. (ed.): *Neorealism and its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp.158-203.
 - ✦ Keohane R., ed. (1986): *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- ✦ Keohane R., Martin L. (1995): “The Promise of Institutional Theory”, *International Security* 20(1): 39-51.
- ✦ Korab-Karpowicz W. J. (2013): “Political Realism in International Relations”, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, online document.
- ✦ Molloy S. (2003): “Realism: A Problematic Paradigm”, *Security Dialogue* 34(1): 71-85.
- ✦ Powell R. (1994): “Anarchy in International Relations: The Neorealist-Neoliberal Debate”, *International Organization* 48(2): 313-344.
- ✦ Keohane R., Martin L. (2003): “Institutional Theory as a Research Program”, in Elman & Elman (eds.): *Progress in International Relations Theory*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press: 71-107.
- ✦ Mearsheimer J. (1994): “The False Promise of International Institutions”, *International Security* 19: 5-49.
- ✦ Mearsheimer J., Walt S. (2003): “An Unnecessary War”, *Foreign Policy* 134: 50-59.
- ✦ Mearsheimer (2008): “Anarchy and the Struggle for Power”, in Mingst & Snyder (eds.): *Essential Readings in World Politics*. New York: Norton, pp.60-79. [This text is a piece taken out of Mearsheimer's book *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*].
- ✦ Mearsheimer J. (2009): “Reckless States and Realism”, *International Relations* 23(2): 241-256.
- ✦ Moravcsik A. (1995): “Explaining International Human Rights Regimes: Liberal Theory and Western Europe”, *European Journal of International Relations* 1(2): 157-189.
- ✦ Moravcsik A. (1997): “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics”, *International Organization* 51(4): 513-553
- ✦ Morgenthau H. (2005 [1948]): *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace. 7th Edition*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- ✦ Nagel E. (1947): “Review: Scientific Man vs. Power Politics by Hans J. Morgenthau”, *The Yale Law Journal* 56(5): 906-909.
- ✦ Pape R. (2003): “The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism”, *American Political Science Review* 97(3): 1-19.
- ✦ Posen B. (1993): “The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict”, *Survival* 35(1): 27-47.
- ✦ Sandler T., Enders W. (2004): “An economic perspective on transnational terrorism”, *European Journal of Political Economy* 20: 301-316.
- ✦ Schroeder P. (1994): “Historical Reality vs. Neo-Realist Theory”, *International Security* 19(1): 108-148.
- ✦ Schmidt B., Williams M. (2008): “The Bush Doctrine and the Iraq War: Neoconservatives Versus Realists”, *Security Studies* 17(2): 191-220.
- ✦ Vasquez J. (1997): “The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative Versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition”, *American Political Science Review* 91(4): 899-912.
- ✦ Walt S. (1997): “The Progressive Power of Realism”, *American Political Science Review* 91(4): 931-935.
- ✦ Williams M. (2005): *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ✦ Wohlforth W. (2011): “Gilpinian Realism and International Relations”, *International Relations* 25(4) 499-511.
- ✦ Hellmann, Wolf R. (1993): “Neorealism, Neoliberal Institutionalism, and the Future of NATO”, *Security Studies* 3(1).
- ✦ Waltz K. (1979): *Theory of International Politics*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- ✦ Waltz K. (1990): “Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory”, *Journal of International Affairs* 44(1): 21-37.
- ✦ Waltz K. (2000): “NATO expansion: A realist's view”, *Contemporary Security Policy* 21(2): 23-38.
- ✦ Williams M. C. (2005): *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ✦ Williams M. C., ed. (2007): *Realism Reconsidered: The Legacy of Hans Morgenthau in International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- ✘ Essay question 1: Is the “neo-neo” debate a narrow discussion of limited interest, or does it focus on the most important question of international relations?
- ✘ Essay question 2: To what extent can the “neo-neo” discussion on cooperation shed light to the “Brexit” debate?
- ✘ Essay question 3: To what extent can (neo)realist theory explain the current Ukrainian conflict?
- ✘ Essay question 4: To what extent can (neo)realist theory explain the ongoing Syrian conflict?

3. Interests/Security matter (II): Limitations of the rational actor axiom

- States (and other significant actors) might not be pursuing their interests as rationally as the dominant view assumes. The lecture considers three main ways through which actors might not be as rational as we might think:
 - First, decisions are very often grounded on misperceptions (Jervis, Fearon, etc.).
 - Second, limits of cognition constrain “rationality” (Khong, etc.)
 - Third, emotions impact on reasoning (Crawford, Mercer, McDermott, etc.)
 - Crawford N. (2000): “The Passion of World Politics: Propositions on Emotion and Emotional Relationships”, *International Security* 24(4): 116-156.
 - Jervis R. (1988): “War and Misperception”, *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4): 675-700.
 - ⊕ Fearon J. (1995): “Rationalist Explanations for War”, *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.
 - ⊕ Frost M., Lechner S. (2015): “Two Conceptions of International Practice: Aristotelian Praxis or Wittgensteinian Language-games?”, *Review of International Studies*, FirstView.
 - ⊕ Hall T. (2011): “We will not Swallow This Bitter Fruit: Theorizing a Diplomacy of Anger”, *Security Studies* 20(4): 521-555.
 - ⊕ Hall T., Ross A. (2015): “Affective Politics after 9/11”, *International Organization*, FirstView.
 - ⊕ Hehir A. (2006): “The Impact of Analogical Reasoning on US Foreign Policy Towards Kosovo”, *Journal of Peace Research* 43(1): 67-81.
 - ⊕ Holmes M. (2015): “Believing This and Alieving That: Theorizing Affect and Intuitions in International Politics”, *International Studies Quarterly*, early view.
 - ⊕ Holmes M., Traven D. (2015): “Acting Rationally Without Really Thinking: The Logic of Rational Intuitionism for International Relations Theory”, *International Studies Review*, early view.
 - ⊕ Houghton D. (1996): “The Role of Analogical Reasoning in Novel Foreign-Policy Situations”, *British Journal of Political Science* 26(4): 523-552.
 - ⊕ Jervis R. (1983): “Deterrence and Perception”, *International Security* 7(3): 3-30.
 - ⊕ Khong Y.F. (1992): *Analogies at War. Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - ⊕ Khong Y.F. (1992): “Vietnam, The Gulf, and U.S. Choices: A Comparison”, *Security Studies* 2(1): 74-95.
 - ⊕ McDermott R. (2004): “The Feeling of Rationality: The Meaning of Neuroscientific Advances for Political Science”, *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(4): 691-706.
 - ⊕ Mercer J. (2005): “Rationality and Psychology in International Politics”, *International Organization* 59(1): 77-106.
 - ⊕ Mercer J. (2006): “Human nature and the first image: emotion in international politics”, *Journal of International Relations and Development* 9: 288-303.
 - ⊕ Mercer J. (2013): “Emotion and Strategy in the Korean War”, *International Organization* 67: 221-252.
 - ⊕ Pouliot V. (2008): “The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities”, *International Organization* 62(2): 257-288.
 - ⊕ Ross A. (2013): “Realism, Emotion, and Dynamics Allegiances in Global Politics”, *International Theory* 5(2): 273-299.
 - ⊕ Ross A. (2014): *Mixed Emotions: Beyond Fear and Hatred in International Conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- ✘ Essay question 5: Is the rational actor axiom of realist and neoliberal theories too shaky to make these theories valid or at least useful?
- ✘ Essay question 6: To what extent did (any of) the limitations of rational choice shape the US decision to invade Iraq in 2003?

4. Economics matter

- States' (and elites') behaviours are first and foremost determined by their place within a profoundly unequal global economic structure which creates power hierarchies.
- Are capitalism and (neo)liberalism the causes of this inequality?
- Marx' analysis of social hierarchy and Lenin's global extrapolation.
- Neo-Marxist IR: Wallerstein and Cox' theories.
- It's not all about the base, it is also the superstructure: The Frankfurt School on emancipation, the culture industry, false consciousness and the one-dimensional man.
 - Ghosh J. (2010): "The Unnatural Coupling: Food and Global Finance", *Journal of Agrarian Change* 10(1): 72-86
 - Wolfe P. (1997): "History and Imperialism: A Century of Theory, From Marx to Postcolonialism", *American Historical Review* 102(2): 388-420. Only read until p.405 – paragraph starting "At first sight...".
 - ✦ Barbieri K. (1996): "Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict?", *Journal of Peace Research* 33(1): 29-49.
 - ✦ Barrett R., Whyte M. (1982): "Dependency Theory and Taiwan: Analysis of a Deviant Case", *American Journal of Sociology* 87(5): 1064-1089.
 - ✦ Booth K. (1991): "Security and Emancipation", *Review of International Studies* 17(4): 313-326.
 - ✦ Bradshaw Y., Huang J. (1991): "Intensifying Global Dependency: Foreign Debt, Structural Adjustment, and Third World Underdevelopment", *The Sociological Quarterly* 32(3): 321-341.
 - ✦ Chang H-J. (2002): *Kicking Away the Ladder: Development Strategy in Historical Perspective*. New York: Anthem.
 - ✦ Chang H-J. (2002): "Kicking Away the Ladder: An Unofficial History of Capitalism, Especially in Britain and the United States", *Challenge* 45(5): 63-97.
 - ✦ Chase-Dunn C. (1981): "Interstate System and Capitalist World-Economy: One Logic or Two?", *International Studies Quarterly* 25(1): 19-42
 - ✦ Cox R. (1981): "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory", *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 10(2): 126-155.
 - ✦ Daddow Chapter 2.6 "Marxism" and 2.7 "Critical Theory"
 - ✦ Epstein G., ed. (2005): *Financialization and the World Economy*. Cheltenham MA: Edward Elgar.
 - ✦ Galtung J. (1971): "A Structural Theory of Imperialism", *Journal of Peace Research* 13: 81-94.
 - ✦ Galtung J. (1980): "A Structural Theory of Imperialism: Ten Years Later", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 9(3): 181-196.
 - ✦ Gilpin R. (2000): *The Challenge of Global Capitalism: The World Economy in the 21st Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
 - ✦ Grinin L., Korotayev A. (2012): "Does "Arab Spring" Mean The Beginning Of World System Reconfiguration?", *World Futures: The Journal of New Paradigm Research* 68(7): 471-505.
 - ✦ Hardt M., Negri A. (2000): *Empire*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
 - ✦ Hardt M., Negri A., Brown N., Szeman I. (2002): "The Global Coliseum: On Empire", *Cultural Studies* 16(2): 177-192.
 - ✦ Kurki M. (2009): "Karl Marx", in Edkins & Vaughan-Williams (eds): *Critical Theorists and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
 - ✦ Lenin V.: *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*. The text can be found here: <https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1916/imp-hsc/>

- ✦ Linklater A. (2009): “Chapter 5. Marx and Marxism”, in Burchill S., et al. (eds.): *Theories of International Relations. Fourth Edition*. New York: Palgrave McMillan.
- ✦ Peoples C. (2009): “Theodor Adorno”, in Edkins & Vaughan-Williams (eds): *Critical Theorists and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- ✦ Petras J., Brill H. (1986): “The IMF, Austerity and the State in Latin America”, *Third World Quarterly* 8(2): 425-448.
- ✦ Rupert M. (2009): “Antonio Gramsci”, in Edkins & Vaughan-Williams (eds): *Critical Theorists and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- ✦ Seligson M., Passé-Smith J. (2013): *Development and Underdevelopment: The Political Economy of Global Inequality, 5th edition*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- ✦ Singer P. (2000): *Marx. A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ✦ Stein H. (1992): “Deindustrialization, Adjustment, the World Bank and the IMF in Africa”, *World Development* 20(1): 83-95.
- ✦ Stiglitz J. (1999): “Reforming the Global Economic Architecture: Lessons from Recent Crises”, *Journal of Finance* 54(4): 1508-1522.
- ✦ Sutcliffe B. (2004): “World Inequality and Globalization”, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 20(1): 15-37.
- ✦ Wade R. (2004): “Is Globalization Reducing Poverty and Inequality?”, *World Development* 32(4): 567-589.
- ✦ Wade R. (2005): “Does Inequality Matter?”, *Challenge*, 48(5): 12-38.
- ✦ Wallerstein I. (1974): “The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 387-415
- ✦ Wallerstein I. (1976): “Semi-Peripheral Countries and the Contemporary World Crisis”, *Theory and Society* 3(4): 461-483
- ✦ Wallerstein I. (1997[1979]): *The Capitalist World Economy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ✦ Wallerstein I. (1995): “The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World System”, in Smith S., Booth K., Zalewski M. (eds.): *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 87-107.
- ✦ Walton J., Ragin C. (1990): “Global and National Sources of Political Protest: Third World Responses to the Debt Crisis”, *American Sociological Review* 55(6): 876-890.

✗ Essay question 7: The “core”/“periphery” argument is still valid today. Discuss.

✗ Essay question 8: Can the “Arab Spring” be understood in (neo-) Marxist terms?

5. Identities matter (I): Constructivism(s)

- States primarily act in line with shared norms and their (self-perceived) identity (or role), which determine their perceptions and interests. These norm and identities are both at once contingent and fixed.
- This “constructivist” view on international actors’ behaviour has solid roots in sociological and philosophical inquiries, e.g. Berger & Luckman, Becker, or Bourdieu.
- An alternative constructivist framework, Securitization Theory, is more significantly influenced by Austin’s analyses of the performative character of language.
 - Berenskoetter F. (2010): “Identity in International Relations”, *International studies Encyclopedia*, online.
 - Aspinal E. (2007): “Natural Resources and Identity in a Separatist Conflict”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51(6): 950-972.
 - ✦ Adler E. (1997): “Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics”, *European Journal of International Relations* 3(3): 319-363.
 - ✦ Adler E., Pouliot V. (2011): “International practices”, *International Theory* 3(1): 1-36.

- ✦ Adler-Nissen R., Pouliot V. (2014): “Power in practice: Negotiating the International Intervention in Libya”, *European Journal of International Relations* 20(4): 889-911.
- ✦ Austin J. (1975): *How to Do Things with Words. Second Edition*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- ✦ Baele S., Balzacq T. (2015): “The Third Debate and Postpositivism”, *International Studies Encyclopedia*, online.
- ✦ Baele S., Sterck O. (2014): “Diagnosing the Securitisation of Immigration at the EU Level: A New Method for Stronger Empirical Claims”, *Political Studies*, early view.
- ✦ Balzacq T. (2010): “1. A Theory of Securitization. Origins, Core Assumptions, and Variants”, in Balzacq T. (ed.): *Securitization Theory*. London: Routledge.
- ✦ Barnett M. (1997): “The UN Security Council, Indifference, and Genocide in Rwanda”, *Cultural Anthropology* 12(4): 551-578.
- ✦ Becker H. (1963): *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*. New York: Free Press.
- ✦ Berger P., Luckmann T. (1966): *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- ✦ Bourdieu P. (1991): *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- ✦ Bourdieu P. (1977 [1972]): *Outline of a Theory Of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ✦ Buzan B., Wæver O., de Wilde J. (1998): *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- ✦ Checkel J. (1998): “Review: The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory”, *World Politics* 50(2): 324-348.
- ✦ Daddow Chapter 2.5 “Social constructivism”
- ✦ Dunne T. (1995): “The Social Construction of International Society”, *European Journal of International Relations* 1(3): 367-389.
- ✦ Farrell T. (2002): “Constructivist Security Studies: Portrait of a Research Program”, *International Studies Review* 4(1): 49-72.
- ✦ Fearon J., Laitin D. (1995): “Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity”, *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.
- ✦ Finnemore M. (2003): *The Purpose of Intervention*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- ✦ Finnemore M. (2007): “5. Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention”, in Katzenstein P. (ed.): *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*. 153-185.
- ✦ Finnemore M., Sikkink K. (2001): “Taking Stock: Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics”, *Annual Review of Political Science* 4: 391-416.
- ✦ Hopf T. (2010): “The Logic of Habit in International Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations* 16(4): 539-561.
- ✦ Price R. (2007): *The Chemical Weapons Taboo*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- ✦ Flibbert A. (2006): “The Road to Baghdad: Ideas and Intellectuals in Explanations of the Iraq War”, *Security Studies* 15(2): 310-352.
- ✦ Hagstrom L., Gustafsson K. (2015): “Japan and Identity Change: Why it Matters in International Relations”, *The Pacific Review* 28(1): 1-22.
- ✦ Hopf T. (2002): *Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and foreign Policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- ✦ Johnson K. (1996/1997): “‘Aliens’ and the US Immigration Laws: The Social and Legal Construction of Nonpersons”, *University of Miami Inter-American Law Review* 28(2): 263-292.
- ✦ Malesevic S. (2010): *The Sociology of War and Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ✦ McInnes C., Rushton S. (2013): “HIV/AIDS and Securitization Theory”, *European Journal of International Relations* 19(1): 115-138.
- ✦ Messina A. (2014): “Securitizing Immigration in the Age of Terror”, *World Politics* 66(3): 530-559.

- ✦ Neumann I. (2007): “‘A Speech That the Entire Ministry May Stand for’, or: Why Diplomats Never Produce Anything New”, *International Political Sociology* 1(2): 183-200.
 - ✦ Onuf N. (1989): *World of Our Making*. Cambridge: CUP.
 - ✦ Rother S. (2012): “Wendt Meets East: ASEAN Cultures of Conflict and Cooperation”, *Cooperation & Conflict* 47(1): 49-67.
 - ✦ Schimmelfennig F. (1998): “NATO Enlargement: A Constructivist Explanation”, *Contemporary Security Policy* 8(3): 198-234.
 - ✦ Searle J. (1995): *The Construction of Social Reality*. New York: Free Press.
 - ✦ Thiess C. (2009): “Role Theory”. *International Studies Encyclopaedia*, online.
 - ✦ Wendt A. (1992): “Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics”, *International Organization* 46(2): 391-425.
 - ✦ Wendt A. (1995): “Constructing International Politics”, *International Security* 20(1): 71-81.
 - ✦ Wendt A. (1999): *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - ✦ Wendt A. (2004): “The State as Person in International Theory”, *Review of International Studies* 30(2): 289-316.
 - ✦ Williams M. (1998): “Identity and the Politics of Security”, *European Journal of International Relations* 4(2): 204-225.
 - ✦ Yanow D. (2003): *Constructing ‘Race’ and ‘Ethnicity’ in America: Category-Making in Public Policy and Administration*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
 - ✦ Zehfuss M. (2001): “Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison”, *European Journal of International Relations* 7(3): 315-348.
 - ✦ Zehfuss M. (2002): *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 - ✦ Zehfuss M. (2003): “Forget September 11”, *Third World Quarterly* 24(3): 513-528.
- ✗ Essay question 9: To what extent can we really claim that international relations are “constructed”?
 - ✗ Essay question 10: To what extent can a constructivist approach explain the progress and/or difficulties encountered in the TTIP (Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership) negotiations?
 - ✗ Essay question 11: To what extent can a constructivist approach explain the main developments of the still ongoing Greek crisis?

6. Identities matter (II): Psychological approaches to international conflict

- The problem of group identities lays much deeper than constructivists subsumed: it is grounded in necessary individual needs and almost inevitable behaviours.
- The lecture considers how social psychology has investigated the question of intergroup conflict and violence, with a story that begins after WW2 with Realistic Conflict Theory and finishes today with contemporary research on group-based emotions within the Social Identity Theory agenda.
- Various calls have been made to connect this approach to the more sociological insights of constructivism.
 - Hewstone M., Cairns E. (2001): “Social Psychology and Intergroup Conflict”, in Chirot & Seligman (eds.): *Ethnopolitical Warfare: Causes, Consequences, and Possible Solutions*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association: 319-342.
 - Baele S., Sterck O., Meur E. (2016): “Theorizing and Measuring Emotions in Conflict. The Case of the 2011 Palestinian Statehood Bid”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 60(4).
 - Youtube: “Immigration Nation Ep.1: White Australia Policy” (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QINUnxO5BkU>) and following episodes.
 - ✦ Brown R., Gaertner S., eds. (2003): *Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intergroup Processes*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- ✦ Cuhadar E., Dayton B. (2011): “The Social Psychology of Identity and Intergroup Conflict: From Theory to Practice”, *International Studies Perspectives* 12: 273-293.
 - ✦ Hornsey M. (2008): “Social Identity Theory and Self-categorization Theory: A Historical Review”, *Social and Personality Psychology Compass* 2(1): 204-222.
 - ✦ Huddy L. (2001): “From Social to Political Identity: A Critical Examination of Social Identity Theory”, *Political Psychology* 22 (1): 127-156.
 - ✦ Jost J., Banaji M. (1994): “The Role of Stereotyping in System-Justification and the Production of False Consciousness”, *British Journal of Social Psychology* 33: 1-27.
 - ✦ Jost J., Banaji M., Nosek B. (2004): “A Decade of System Justification Theory: Accumulated Evidence of Conscious and Unconscious Bolstering of the Status Quo”, *Political Psychology* 25(6): 881-919.
 - ✦ Jost J., Hunyady O. (2003): “The Psychology of System Justification and the Palliative Function of Ideology”, *European Review of Social Psychology* 13(1): 111-153.
 - ✦ Halperin E., Pliskin R., Saguy T., Liberman V., Gross J. (2014): “Emotion Regulation and the Cultivation of Political Tolerance: Searching for a New Track for Intervention”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58(6): 1110-1138.
 - ✦ Halperin E. (2014): “Chapter 19. Collective emotions and emotion regulation in intractable conflicts”, in Von Scheve & Salmela: *Collective Emotions*, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 281-298.
 - ✦ Reicher S., Hopkins N. (2001): “Psychology and the End of History: A Critique and a Proposal for the Psychology of Social Categorization”, *Political Psychology* 22 (2): 383-407.
 - ✦ Reicher S. (2004): “The Context of Social Identity: Domination, Resistance, and Change”, *Political Psychology* 25 (6): 921-945.
 - ✦ Seul J. (1999): “‘Ours is the Way of God’: Religion, Identity, and Intergroup Conflict”, *Journal of Peace Research* 36(5): 553-569.
 - ✦ Tajfel H., Billig G., Bundy R., Flament C. (1971): “Social Categorization and Intergroup Behaviour”, *European Journal of Social Psychology* 1(2): 149-178.
- ✖ Essay question 12: The core claims of Social Identity Theory apply all the way up from the most local level to the international level. Discuss.
 - ✖ Essay question 13: To what extent can the social psychology of intergroup conflict explain the rise and extension of the self-proclaimed “Islamic State”?

7. Worldviews matter

- To a point not considered by constructivists, international actors’ behaviour is driven by their all-encompassing ways of perceiving reality, which is expressed in – and structured by – language.
- These “worldviews” can be deconstructed, that is, challenged.
- They have been at the centre of Poststructuralism's concerns, yet this approach is usually situated outside “normal science”? From the Sokal hoax to the Third Debate.
- The roots of poststructuralist IR: The “French Theory” triangle (Foucault – Derrida – Deleuze).
- Power-knowledge nexuses and binaries in international relations: cases.
- Another (?) way to consider worldviews: Lakoff cognitive approach.
 - Campbell D. (1992): *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Manchester: Manchester University Press. READ ONLY: Section “Foreign Policy: War, the State, and Man” in Chapter 3 “Foreign Policy and Identity”; Section “Representing Danger” in Chapter 4 “Foreign Policy and Difference”; all sections of Chapter 6 “Writing Security”.
 - ✦ Albert M. (1998): “On Boundaries, Territory and Postmodernity: An International Relations Perspective”, *Geopolitics* 3(1): 53-68.
 - ✦ Barrett M. (1991): *The Politics of Truth From Marx to Foucault*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- ✦ Burchell G., Gordon C., Miller P., eds. (1991): *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- ✦ Campbell D. (1998) 'MetaBosnia', *Review of International Studies* 24: 261-281.
- ✦ Campbell D. (2005): "The Biopolitics of Security: Oil, Empire, and the Sports Utility Vehicle", *American Quarterly* 57(3): 943-972.
- ✦ Campbell D. (2008): "Time is Broken: The Return of the Past in the Response to September 11", *Theory & Event* 5(4): 1-16.
- ✦ Daddow Chapter 2.9 "Postmodernism"
- ✦ Derrida J. (1985): "Letter to a Japanese Friend. (Prof. Izutsu)". In Wood & Bernasconi (eds): *Derrida and Difference*. Warwick: Parousia Press, pp.1-5.
- ✦ Dean M. (2009): *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- ✦ Der Derian J., Shapiro M., eds. (1989): *International/Intertextual Relations*. New York: Lexington.
- ✦ Dillon M., Neal A., eds. (2008): *Foucault on Politics, Security and War*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- ✦ El Refaie E. (2001): "Metaphors We Discriminate By: Naturalized Themes in Austrian Newspaper Articles about Asylum Seekers", *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5(3): 352-371.
- ✦ Foucault M. (1982): "The Subject and Power", *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4): 777-795.
- ✦ Foucault M. (2003): *Society Must Be Defended. Lectures at the College de France 1975-1976*. New York: Picador.
- ✦ Gordon C. (1980): "Foreword", in Foucault M.: *Power/Knowledge. Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. New York: Random House: 229-260.
- ✦ Hamati-Ataya I. (2011): "Contemporary 'Dissidence' in American IR: The New Structure of Anti-Mainstream Scholarship?", *International Studies Perspectives* 12(4): 362-398.
- ✦ Howe N. (1988): "Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse", *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity* 3(2): 87-104.
- ✦ Kiersey N., Stokes D. (2013): *Foucault and International Relations: New Critical Engagements*. London: Routledge.
- ✦ Krebs R., Lobasz J. (2007): "Fixing the Meaning of 9/11. Hegemony, Coercion, and the Road to War in Iraq", *Security Studies* 16(3): 409-451.
- ✦ Lakoff G. (2002): *Moral Politics: How Liberals and Conservatives Think*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- ✦ Lakoff G. (2008): *The Political Mind: Why You Can't Understand 21st-Century American Politics with an 18th-Century Brain*. New York: Viking.
- ✦ Larner W., Walters W., eds. (2004): *Global Governmentality: Governing International Spaces*. London: Routledge.
- ✦ Lawlor L. (2014): "Jacques Derrida", *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, online.
- ✦ Leitch V. (2007): "Late Derrida: The Politics of Sovereignty", *Critical Inquiry* 33: 229-247.
- ✦ Lemke T. (2002): "Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique", *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society* 14(3): 49-64.,
- ✦ Neal A. (2009): "Michel Foucault", in Edkins & Vaughan-Williams (eds): *Critical Theorists and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- ✦ Neumann I. (1996): "Self and Other in International Relations", *European Journal of International Relations* 2(2): 139-174.
- ✦ Neumann I. (1999): *Uses of the Other: The East' in European Identity Formation*. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press.
- ✦ Reid J. (2005): "The Biopolitics of the War on Terror: A Critique of the 'Return of Imperialism' Thesis in International Relations", *Third World Quarterly* 26(2): 237-252.
- ✦ Rouse J. (2005): "Power/Knowledge", in Gutting G. (ed.): *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 95-122.
- ✦ Selby J. (2007): "Engaging Foucault: Discourse, Liberal Governance and the Limits of Foucauldian IR", *International Relations* 21(3): 324-345.
- ✦ Smith S. (1997): "Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory: A Reply to Østerud", *Journal of Peace Research* 34(3): 330-336.

- ✦ Springer S. (2012): “Neoliberalism as Discourse: Between Foucauldian Political Economy and Marxian Poststructuralism”, *Critical Discourse Studies* 9(2): 133-147.
- ✦ Zehfuss M. (2009): “Jacques Derrida”, in Edkins & Vaughan-Williams (eds): *Critical Theorists and International Relations*. London: Routledge.

✗ Essay question 14: Is poststructuralist thought a pertinent remedy against the problems associated with mainstream approaches to international politics?

✗ Essay question 15: To what extent can a poststructuralist approach shed light on European States’ responses to the ongoing migration crisis?

8. Worldviews matter (II): “Empire State of mind”?

- International actors’ behaviour is deeply influenced by their colonial past – not only as a poisonous economic heritage as Marxist scholars would emphasise, but also as a disabling worldview or state of mind (both among “Western” states and “developing” countries).
 - Youtube: “Edward Said on Orientalism”
(https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fVC8EYd_Z_g)
 - Said E. (1978): *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon. ONLY READ “Introduction” and “Orientalism Now. IV. The Latest Phase”.
 - Laffey M., Weldes J. (2008): “Decolonizing the Cuban Missile Crisis”, *International Studies Quarterly* 52: 555-577.
 - ✦ Ayoob M. (1995): *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
 - ✦ Barkawi T., Laffey M. (2006): “The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies”, *Review of International Studies* 32(2): 329-352.
 - ✦ Barkawi T., Laffey M. (2002): “Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations”, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 31(1): 109-127.
 - ✦ Bilgin P., Morton A. (2002): “Historicizing Representations of ‘Failed States’: Beyond the Cold-war Annexation of the Social Sciences?”, *Third World Quarterly* 23(1): 55-80.
 - ✦ Bilgin P., Morton A. (2004): “From ‘Rogue’ to ‘Failed’ States? The Fallacy of Short-termism”, *Politics* 24(3): 169-180.
 - ✦ Chowdhry G. (2007): “Edward Said and Contrapuntal Reading: Implications for Critical Interventions in International Relations”, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 36(1): 101-116.
 - ✦ Daddow Chapter 2.10 “Postcolonialism”
 - ✦ Darby P., Paolini A. (1994): “Bridging International Relations and Postcolonialism”, *Alternatives* 19: 371-397.
 - ✦ Fanon F. (2004 [1961]): *The Wretched of the Earth. With commentary by Jean-Paul Sartre and Homi K Bhabha*. New York: Grove Press.
 - ✦ Gibson R. (1992): *South of the West: Postcolonialism and the Narrative Construction of Australia*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
 - ✦ Huber D., Kamel L. (2015): “Arab Spring: The Role of the Peripheries”, *Mediterranean Politics* 20(2): 127-141.
 - ✦ Krishna S. (1993): “Review: The Importance of Being Ironic: A Postcolonial View on Critical International Relations Theory”, *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 18(3): 385-417.
 - ✦ Laffey M., Barkawi T. (2002): “Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations”. *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 3: 109-127.
 - ✦ Mishra V., Hodge B. (1991): “What is Post(-)colonialism?”, *Textual Practice* 5(3): 399-414.
 - ✦ Seth S. (2011): “Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations”, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 40(1): 167-183.
 - ✦ Shatz A. (2001): “Frantz Fanon: The Doctor Prescribed Violence”, *New York Times*, September 2nd 2001.

- ✦ Spivak G. (1988): “Can the subaltern Speak?”, in Nelson C., Grossberg L. (eds.): *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- ✦ Spivak G. (1999): *A Critique of Post-Colonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- ✦ Varadarajan L. (2009): “Edward Said”, in Edkins & Vaughan-Williams (eds): *Critical Theorists and International Relations*. London: Routledge.
- ✦ Young R. (2003): *Postcolonialism: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

✖ Essay question 16: Is Said’s claim that images of the “Arabs” and the “Orient” in the West reflect and structure prejudicial perceptions and politics still valid today?

✖ Essay question 17: To what extent can postcolonial thought explain how Western states react to the so-called “Islamic State”?

9. Gender matters

- Up until the 1990s, IR theorization has been completely blind to issues related to women – this neglect has not only led feminist scholars to “add” women-related problems to the research agenda of IR (e.g. sexual violence in war, etc.), but also to challenge some of the core assumptions, concepts and axioms of traditional IR theories.
 - 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.
 - Caprioli M. (2000): “Gendered Conflict”, *Journal of Peace Research* 37(1): 53-68.
 - ✦ Brown S. (1988): “Feminism, International Theory and International Relations of Gender Inequality”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3): 461-475.
 - ✦ Brown S. (1988): “Women and International Relations: A Bibliography”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3): 517-537.
 - ✦ Carpenter R. (2003): “‘Women and Children First’: Gender, Norms and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans”, *International Organization* 57(4): 661-94.
 - ✦ Cloud D. (2004): “‘To veil the threat of terror’: Afghan women and the ‘clash of civilizations’ in the imagery of the U.S. war on terrorism”, *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90(3): 285-306.
 - ✦ Daddow Chapter 2.8 “Feminism”
 - ✦ Elshtain J.B. (2009): “Woman, the State, and War”, *International Relations* 23(2): 289-303.
 - ✦ Enloe C. (1989): *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 - ✦ Enloe C. (2000): *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women’s Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 - ✦ Fukuyama F. (1998): “Women and the Evolution of World Politics”. *Foreign Affairs* 77(5): 24-40.
 - ✦ Halliday F. (1988): “Hidden from International Relations: Women and the International Arena”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3): 419-428.
 - ✦ 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.
 - ✦ Jones A. (1996): “Does ‘Gender’ Make the World Go Round? Feminist Critiques of International Relations”, *Review of International Studies* 22(4): 405-429.
 - ✦ Keohane R. (1989): “International Relations Theory: Contributions of a Feminist Standpoint”, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 18(2): 245-253.
 - ✦ Keohane R. (1998): “Conversations between IR and Feminist Theory”, *International Studies Quarterly* 42(1): 191-210.
 - ✦ Kinnvall C. (2009): “Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak”, in Edkins & Vaughan-Williams (eds): *Critical Theorists and International Relations*. London: Routledge.

- ✦ Mukwege M., Nangini C. (2009): “Rape with Extreme Violence: The New Pathology in South Kivu, Democratic Republic of Congo”, *PLoS Med* 6(12): e1000204.
- ✦ Peterman A., Palermo T., Bredenkamp C. (2011): “Estimates and Determinants of Sexual Violence Against Women in the Democratic Republic of Congo”, *American Journal of Public Health* 101(6): .
- ✦ Peterson V.S. (1992): “Transgressing Boundaries: Theories of Knowledge, Gender and International Relations”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 21(2): 183-206.
- ✦ Puechguirbal N. (2003): “Women and War in the Democratic Republic of the Congo”, *Signs* 28(4): 1271-1281.
- ✦ Sharlach L. (1999): “Gender and Genocide in Rwanda: Women as Agents and Objects of Genocide”, *Journal of Genocide Research* 1(3): 387-399.
- ✦ Sjoberg L. (2009): “Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions”, *Security Studies* 18: 183-213.
- ✦ Shepherd L. (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.
- ✦ Squires J., Weldes J. (2007): “Beyond Being Marginal: Gender and International Relations in Britain”, *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 9(2): 185-203.
- ✦ Steans J. (2009): *Gender and International Relations: Issues, Debates, and Further Directions*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- ✦ Tickner J. (1988): “Hans Morgenthau’s Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Reformulation”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3): 429-440.
- ✦ Tickner J., ed. (1992): *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ✦ Tickner J. (1996): “You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists”, *International Studies Quarterly* 41: 611-632.
- ✦ Tickner J. (1999): “Why Women Can’t Run the World: International Politics according to Francis Fukuyama”, *International Studies Review* 1(3): 3-11.
- ✦ Tickner J. (2001): *Gendering World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ✦ Tickner A. (2003): “Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23(2): 295-324.
- ✦ Trenholm J., Olsson P., Ahlberg B. (2011): “Battles on Women’s Bodies: War, Rape and Traumatization in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo”, *Global Public Health: An International Journal for Research, Policy and Practice* 6(2): 139-152.
- ✦ Weber C. (1994): “Good Girls, Little Girls, and Bad Girls: Male Paranoia in Robert Keohane’s Critique of Feminist International Relations”, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 23(2): 337-349.
- ✦ Whitworth S. (2004): *Men, Militarism and UN Peacekeeping: A Gendered Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- ✦ Whitworth S. (2005): “Militarized Masculinities and the Politics of Peacekeeping: The Canadian Case”, in Booth K. (ed.): *Critical Security Studies in World Politics*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, pp. 89-106.
- ✦ Windsor P. (1988): “Women and International Relations: What’s the Problem?”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3): 451-460.

- ✖ Essay question 18: To what extent are the core theoretical assumptions of mainstream IR really destabilized by the feminist arguments?
- ✖ Essay question 19: In IR, poststructuralist feminism threatens the advances of liberal feminism. Discuss.
- ✖ Essay question 20: What can a feminist approach teach us about the ongoing war in the Democratic Republic of Congo?

10. Everything (or nothing) matters! The “end of theory” debate

- Back to inductive science? Does the rise of econometric approaches kill theory-driven research?
 - Back to the quantitative/qualitative divide and the methods question.
 - Dunne T., Hansen L., Wight C. (2013): “The end of International Relations theory?”, *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 405-425.
 - ⊕ Hamati-Ataya I.: (): “IR Theory as International Practice/Agency: A Clinical/Cynical Bourdieusian Perspective”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 40(3): 625-646.
 - ⊕ Lake, David, ‘Why “isms” Are Evil’, *International Studies Quarterly* 55(2) 2011: 465-480.
 - ⊕ Lake D. (2013): “Theory is dead, long live theory: The end of the Great Debates and the rise of eclecticism in International Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3) 567-587.
 - ⊕ Jackson P. (2011): *The conduct of Inquiry in International Relations*. London: Routledge. Chapter 1 “Playing with fire” (p1) and Chapter 7 “A pluralist science of IR” (p188).
 - ⊕ Mearsheimer J., Walt S. (2013): “Leaving theory behind: Why simplistic hypothesis testing is bad for International Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 427-457.
 - ⊕ Jackson P., Nexon D. (2013): “International Theory in a Post-Paradigmatic Era: From Substantive Wagers to Scientific Ontologies”, *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 543-565.
- ✘ Essay question 21: Should today’s IR adopt Feyerabend’s famous motto “everything goes” and embrace theoretical and methodological anarchism?

11. Conclusions

- Critical summary of the previous lectures.
 - ✘ No essay question

* * *