# Course Title: International Relations

**Instructor**: Daniel Large

**ECTS**: 2

**Term:**  Winter 2024 (AY 2023/2024)

**Mode**: In person

**Class Times**: TBC

**Module:** MAIPA Mandatory Course

**Relation to other courses:**

**Office Hours**: Wednesdays 15.00-16.00 Room B419

**Background and Overall Aim of the Course**

This course provides an advanced introduction to IR theories. Its purpose is to give students an intensive orientation in, and to explore a part, of the vastness of the archive that contains both major and minor knowledges, vocabularies and intellectual resources to make global politics thinkable and to problematize it in different ways. As well as examining approaches to IR that are familiar in the ‘Western canon’, this course will explore a global approach to the study of IR in a changing world and pay particular attention to China.

**Learning Outcomes**

The overall aim of the course is to introduce students to both mainstream and alternative theoretical approaches to the study of world politics. By the end of the course, students will:

* Be conversant with both mainstream theoretical approaches to IR and,
* Become familiar with alternative theoretical approaches to IR
* Be able to compare, contrast and deploy different interpretations and explanations of IR

**Learning Activities and Teaching Methods**

The course is seminar-based. It will include regular short lectures on relevant concepts and topics. The sessions involve student participation in the form of short presentations and seminar-style discussions based on the course literature.

**Assessment**

* Participation: 10%
* Presentation: 20%
* Debate (oral contribution and speaking notes): 20%
* Final Paper: 50% (deadline: TBC, via Moodle)

**Approximate Workload Guidance**

* Seminar participation: 21 hours
* Seminar preparation (reading): 36 hours
* Class input/presentation: 10 hours
* Final assignment: 40 hours

**Grading**

CEU uses a system of letter grades and grade points for evaluation:

**A** 3.68 – 4.00

**A-** 3.34 – 3.67

**B+** 3.01 – 3.33

**B** 2.68 – 3.00

**B-** 2.34 – 2.67

**C+** 2.33 (minimum pass).

##### **Inclusive Learning Policy**

I endeavor to provide an inclusive learning environment. However, if you experience barriers to learning in this course, please consult CEU’s [Student Disability Policy](https://documents.ceu.edu/node/508) and connect with CEU’s Student Disability Services Officer, Natalia Nagyné Nyikes (nyikesn@ceu.edu).

# Course Requirements, Expectations and Classroom Policy

Attendance is expected*.* You are required to complete assigned readings prior to class. Laptops/tablets, and mobile phones should not be used during classes (unless by special permission). Non-compliance will affect participation grades.

# Good Academic Practices

Students are expected to abide by standards of academic integrity. Academic dishonesty – plagiarism, cheating or breaking other norms stipulated by the CEU Code of Ethics – will result in a failing grade. If you do not understand how to properly cite, consult your academic writing instructor and/or refer to your academic writing reader.  **Your paper will be run through**[**Turnitin**](https://www.turnitin.com/)**, software that checks for plagiarism.** For detailed information, please consult CEU’s Policy on Student Plagiarism.

# Background Course Reading

There is no set textbook for this course. For background reading, try:

* Hollis, Martin & Steve Smith, *Explaining and Understanding International Relations* (1991)
* Arlene B. Tickner and Karen Smith eds., *International Relations from the Global South.* Routledge
* Bull, Hedley, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* (1995 edn)
* Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith eds., *International Relations Theories* (OUP, 5th Edn 2021)
* Richard Devetak, Jacqui True eds., *Theories of International Relations* (Red Global Press, 2022 edn)
* Bukovansky, Mlada, Edward Keene, Christian Reus-Smit, and Maja Spanu, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of History and International Relations*. Oxford University Press, 2023.

**Course** **Overview**

1. Introduction
2. Setting the Scene
3. Realism
4. Liberalism
5. Constructivism
6. Critical Theories: Historical Materialism
7. Feminist IR
8. Global IR
9. Postcolonial & Decolonial IR
10. China, IR and World Order
11. Debate
12. Conclusions

***PLEASE NOTE****: The schedule below is accurate at the time of publication. Amendments are highly likely to be made prior to and during the course. You will be notified via Moodle about any amendments, including changes in the Required Readings.*

***The Moodle site should always be regarded and consulted as the most up to date course resource.***

**Week 1: Introduction**

This class will introduce the content, approach and organization of the course. It will also seek to understand your own interests and objectives concerning this course.

*Recommended*

* Dunne, Tim, Lene Hansen and Colin Wight, “The End of International Theory?” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 19, 3 (2013): 405-425.
* David A. Lake. 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.
* George Lawson. 2010. “The Eternal Divide? History and International
* Weiss, Thomas G., and Rorden Wilkinson. "Global governance to the rescue: Saving international relations?." *Global Governance* (2014): 19-36.
* Kanti Bajpai , Evan A Laksmana, ‘Asian conceptions of international order: what Asia wants’, *International Affairs*, 99, 4 (July 2023): 1371–1381.

**Week 2:** **Setting the Scene**

This class will offer an overview of big questions and debates in IR theory across time and place. Is IR still an American social science? How ‘global’ is IR? What is or should be the purpose of theory? Is it possible to do “science” in international relations? What kinds of analytical frameworks can we use to organize IR theories? Please familiarise yourself with the different approaches set out in the Callahan article in order to prepare for our main exercise.

*Required Reading*

* Callahan, William A. ‘China’s Strategic Futures: Debating the Post-American World Order’, *Asian Survey* 52, 4 (2012): 617-642.
* Chris Brown, ‘International Relations Theory Today’, in *Understanding International Relations* (Bloomsbury 2019): 37-55.

*Supplementary Reading*

* Cox, Robert. ‘The Point is Not Just to Explain the World but to Change It,’ Oxford Handbook of International Relations (OHIR)
* J. David Singer. 1961. “The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations.” *World Politics* 14 (1): 77–92.
* Tickner, Arlene, “Seeing International Relations Differently: Notes from the Third World”, *Millennium*, 6, 1 (2003).
* Waever, Ole, “The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in IR”, *International Organization*, 52, 4 (1998): 687-727.
* Reus-Smit, Christian and Duncan Snidal, “Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of IR.”, OHIR, Chapter 1
* Hoffmann, Stanley, “An American Social Science: International Relations”, Daedalus, Vol. 1(2), 1977: 41-60.
* Lake, David, “Why ‘isms’ Are Evil: Theory, Epistemology, and Academic Sects as Impediments to Understanding and Progress,” International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 55 (2011): 465–480. Nau, Henry, “Scholarship and Policy-Making: Who Speaks Truth to Whom?”, OHIR Chapter 36
* Stephane J. Baele and Gregorio Bettiza. 2020. “‘Turning’ Everywhere in IR: On the Sociological Underpinnings of the Field’s Proliferating Turns.” *International Theory*: 1–27.
* Kimberly Hutchings. 2019. “Decolonizing Global Ethics: Thinking with the Pluriverse.” *Ethics & International Affairs* 33 (2): 115–125.
* John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt. 2013. “Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing Is Bad for International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 19 (3): 427–457.
* Arlene B. Tickner. 2013. “Core, Periphery and (neo) Imperialist International Relations.” *European Journal of International Relations* 19 (3): 627–646.
* Alexander Wendt. 1998. “On Constitution and Causation in International Relations.” *Review of International Studies* 24 (5): 101–118.

**Week 3: Realism**

This class examines realism and main variants.

*Required Reading*

* Jack Donnelly, ‘Realism’, in Richard Devetak and Jacqui True eds., *Theories of International Relations* (2022 edn)

*Supplementary Reading*

* Carr, E.H., *The Twenty Years Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to The Study of International Relations* (Second edition 1946).
* Morgenthau, Hans, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (1948, most recent edition 1985)
* John J. Mearsheimer. 1994. “The False Promise of International Institutions.” *International Security* 19 (3): 5–49.
* Waltz, Kenneth. *Theory of International Politics* (1979).
* Ashley, Richard, “The Poverty of Neo-realism”, *International Organization*, Vol. 38, 2 (1984): 225-286.
* William C. Wohlforth, ‘Realism’, in *OHIR*:131-149.

**Week 4: Liberalism**

*Required*

* Scott Burchili, ‘Liberalism’, in Richard Devetak and Jacqui True eds., *Theories of International Relations* (2022 edn)

*Supplementary Reading/Watching*

* Keohane, Robert, *After Hegemony: Co-operation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (1984).
* Robert Axelrod and Robert O. Keohane. 1985. “Achieving Cooperation Under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions.” *World Politics* 38 (1): 226–254.
* Daniel Deudney. 2000. “Geopolitics As Theory: Historical Security Materialism.” *European Journal of International Relations* 6 (1): 77–107.
* Michael W. Doyle. 1986. “Liberalism and World Politics.” *American Political Science Review* 80 (4): 1151–1169.
* Abbott, Kenneth and Snidal, Duncan, “Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 42 (1998)
* Ruggie, John, “International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order”, *International Organization*, Vol. 36, 2 (1982): 379-416.
* Andrew Moravcsik,’The New Liberalism’, in *OHIR*: 234-254.

**Week 5:** **Constructivism**

This seminar will assess the contributions of constructivism to the theory of international relations, starting with Wendt’s “state centric” approach. It will also consider constructivist claims about the nature and impact of identity. How convincing is the argument that “anarchy is what states make of it”? How does constructivism conceive of and analyse the effect of identity?

*Required Reading*

* Alexander Wendt, 1992: ‘Annarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics’, *International Organization* 46(2): 391-425.
* Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. “International Norm Dynamics and Political Change.” International Organization 52 (4): 887–917

*Supplementary Reading*

* Christian Reus-Smit, ‘Constructivism’ in Richard Devetak and Jacqui True eds., *Theories of International Relations* (2022 edn)
* Adler-Nissen, R. and Pouliot, V. (2014) ‘Power in Practice: Negotiating the International Intervention in Libya’. *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 889-911.
* Ringmar, E. (2014). Recognition and the origins of international society. *Global Discourse, 4*(4), 446-458.
* Adler-Nissen, R., & Zarakol, A. (2021). Struggles for Recognition: The Liberal International Order and the Merger of Its Discontents. *International Organization, 75*(2), 611-634
* Wendt, Alexander, *Social Theory of International Politics* (1999).
* Adler, Emmanuel, “Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics”, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol.3, 3 (1997): 319-363.
* Kratochwil, F., “Constructing a New Orthodoxy: Wendt’s ‘Social Theory of International Politics’ and the Constructivist Challenge’, *Millennium*, 29, 1 (2000): 73-101.
* Mattern, Janice Bially, “The Power Politics of Identity”, *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 7, 3 (2001): 349-397
* Sikkink, Kathryn, *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions Are Changing World Politics* (2011).
* Jütersonke, O., Kobayashi, K., Krause, K., & Yuan, X. (2021). ‘Norm Contestation and Normative Transformation in Global Peacebuilding Order(s): The Cases of China, Japan, and Russia”. *International Studies Quarterly*.

**Week 6:** **Historical Materialism**

*Required Reading*

* Cox, Robert W. (1981): ‘Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory,’ *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10 (2): 126-55.
* Chen, D. (2022). A theory of dialectical transnational historical materialism for China’s state capitalism and the China–US rivalry. *Third World Quarterly, 43*(7), 1744-1764.

*Supplementary Reading*

* Justin Rosenberg. 2006. “Why Is There No International Historical Sociology?” European Journal of International Relations 12 (3): 307–340.
* Bieler, A., & Morton, A. D. (2018). *Global Capitalism, Global War, Global Crisis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
* Duzgun, Eren. 2018. “The International Relations of ‘Bourgeois Revolutions’: Disputing the Turkish Revolution”. *European Journal of International Relations* 24 (2): 414-439.
* Chacko, P., & Jayasuriya, K. (2018). “A Capitalising Foreign Policy: Regulatory Geographies and Transnationalised State Projects”. *European Journal of International Relations*, 24(1), 82-105.
* Teschke, Benno. "Theorizing the Westphalian System of States: International Relations from Absolutism to Capitalism." *European Journal of International Relations* 8, no. 1 (2002): 5-48
* Tansel, C.B. (2016) 'Geopolitics, social forces, and the international: Revisiting the ‘Eastern Question’'. *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 42, No. 03, pp. 492-512.
* Desai R (2013) *Geopolitical Economy: After US Hegemony, Globalization and Empire*. London: Pluto.
* Gill, S. 2008. Power and Resistance in the New World Order. Houndmills: Palgrave.
* Panitch, L., and S. Gindin. 2012. *The Making of Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of American Empire*. London: Verso, 1-21.
* Callinicos, A. 2009. *Imperialism and Global Political Economy*. Oxford: Polity, pp.188-227.

**Week 7: Feminist IR**

How does a feminist perspective challenge conventional theoretical and methodological approaches to IR?

*Required Reading*

* Smith, Sara (2017): Introducing Feminism in International Relations Theory, *e-International Relations*
* Tickner, J. A., & True, J. (2018). A Century of International Relations Feminism: From World War I Women's Peace Pragmatism to the Women, Peace and Security Agenda. *International Studies Quarterly, 62*(2), 221-233.

*Supplementary Reading*

* Steans, J., & Tepe-Belfrage, D. (Eds.). (2016). *Handbook on Gender in World Politics*: Edward Elgar.
* Weber, Cynthia. 2016. Queer International Relations: Sovereignty, Sexuality and the Will to Knowledge. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
* Martin de Almagro M and Ryan C (2019) Subverting economic empowerment: Towards a postcolonial-feminist framework on gender (in)securities in post-war settings. *European Journal of International Relations* 25(4): 1059-1079.
* Enloe, Cynthia. "Wounds: Militarized nursing, feminist curiosity, and unending war" *International Relations* 33, 3 (2019): 393 –412.
* Wilcox, Lauren (2015): Bodies of Violence: Theorizing Embodied Subjects in International Relations.  Oxford: Oxford University Press
* Tickner, J. Ann, “’You Just Don’t Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists”, International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 41, 4 (1997): 611- 632.

**Week 8: Global IR**

*Required*

* Acharya, A. (2016). ‘Advancing Global IR: Challenges, Contentions, and Contributions.’ *International Studies Review*, 18(1), 4-15.
* Qin, Yaqing. ‘A relational theory of world politics.’ *International studies review* 18, no. 1 (2016): 33-47.

*Supplementary*

* Anderl, F., & Witt, A. (2020). ‘Problematising the Global in Global IR’, *Millennium*, *49*(1), 32–57.
* Behera, N. C. (2021). Globalization, deglobalization and knowledge production. *International Affairs, 97*(5), 1579-1597.
* Tieku, T. K. (2021). The Legon School of International Relations. *Review of International Studies*, 656-671.
* Hwang, Y.-J. (2021). The births of International Studies in China. *Review of International Studies, 47*(5), 580-600.
* Phillips, A. (2016). Global IR Meets Global History: Sovereignty, Modernity, and the International System’s Expansion in the Indian Ocean Region. *International Studies Review, 18*(1), 62-77.
* Tsygankov, A. P., & Tsygankov, P. A. (2010). National ideology and IR theory: Three incarnations of the ‘Russian idea’. European Journal of International Relations, 16(4), 663-686.
* Bilgin, P. (2008). Thinking past ‘Western’ IR? *Third World Quarterly*, 29(1), 5-23.
* Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan, *The Making of Global International Relations: The Origins and Evolution of IR at its Centenary* (2019).

**Week 9: Postcolonial & Decolonial IR**

*Required Reading*

* Sabaratnam, M. (2020). ‘Is IR Theory White? Racialised Subject-Positioning in Three Canonical Texts. ‘*Millennium,*
* Getachew, A. (2019). ‘A Political Theory Of Decolonisation’, in *Worldmaking After Empire: The Rise and Fall of Self-*Determination, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

*Supplementary Reading*

* Howell, A., & Richter-Montpetit, M. (2020). ‘Is securitization theory racist? Civilizationism, methodological whiteness, and antiblack thought in the Copenhagen School.’ *Security Dialogue, 51*(1), 3-22.
* Henderson, E. A. (2013). Hidden in plain sight: racism in international relations theory. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 26(1), 71-92.
* Shilliam, R. (2021). *Decolonizing Politics: An Introduction*: Polity Press.
* Persaud, R., & Sajed, A. (Eds.). (2018). *Race, Gender, and Culture in International Relations: Postcolonial Perspectives.* London: Routledge.
* Owen, C., Heathershaw, J., & Savin, I. (2018). ‘How postcolonial is post-Western IR? Mimicry and mētis in the international politics of Russia and Central Asia’. *Review of International Studies, 44*(2), 279-300.

**Week 10: China, IR and Global Order**

*Required Reading*

* Mearsheimer, John ‘The Inevitable Rivalry: America, China, and the Tragedy of Great-Power Politics’, *Foreign Affairs* Nov/Dec 2021
* Ikenberry, G. John. "Why American Power Endures: The US-Led Order Isn't in Decline." *Foreign Aff.* 101 (2022): 56.

*Supplementary Reading*

* Foot, Rosemary, and Andrew Walter. *China, the United States, and global order*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
* Harding, Harry. “Has U.S. China Policy Failed?”, *The Washington Quarterly* 38, 3 (2015): 95-122.
* Wang, Jisi, Stapleton Roy, Aaron Friedberg, Thomas Christensen, Patricia Kim, Joseph S. Nye Jr, Eric Li, Kurt M. Campbell, and Ely Ratner. "Did America Get China Wrong: The Engagement Debate." *Foreign Affairs* 97 (2018).
* Yan Xuetong, “The Age of Uneasy Peace: Chinese Power in a Divided World”, *Foreign Affairs* Jan/Feb 2019.
* Medeiros, Evan S. “The Changing Fundamentals of US-China Relations”, *The Washington Quarterly*, 42, 3 (2019): 93-119.
* Zhang, Jue, and Jin Xu. ‘China–US Strategic Competition and the Descent of a Porous Curtain.’ *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 14, no. 3 (2021): 321-352.

**Week 11:** **Debating IR Theory**

This exercise will require you to debate IR theory from an assigned theoretical perspective. Further details on the Moodle site.

**Week 12:** **Conclusions**

What are the key conclusions from this course? What questions do you have going forward?