

M.St. International Relations 2011/13

International Relations Theory (Core I)

Lorraine Macmillan

Course Description

How does one explain the countless encounters between peoples and cultures that occur across the globe daily? Is there a central logic that underpins their myriad forms – wars, treaties, alliances, migrations and trade, etc? Which interactions are the most influential: those between states, international organizations or companies, for example? What best explains the character of these dealings? These are some of the fundamental questions international relations scholars attempt to answer. They do so from a variety of theoretical perspectives. The aim of this course is to come to grips with some of them.

As an academic discipline, international relations has not yet celebrated its centenary. Although young, its roots extend back much further, in practice, in debate and in philosophy. Indeed, the association between practice and theory has been strong with many important theorists having been key actors on the international stage themselves. In this core course, students are introduced to the ‘mainstream’ theories and thinkers of international relations that have dominated the discipline since its inception: realism and liberalism. The course tracks the chief concepts that have been the source of controversy between the schools. These core concepts provide important foundations for the various options modules students may choose to study. Of course, many are also elaborated and refined in the second and third core modules.

Mainstream theories have been challenged from a range of alternative perspectives and, in so doing, have opened up the span of concepts that are deemed pertinent to the study of international relations. This core module examines two alternative approaches, namely, constructivism and feminism.

Readings

This core course is designed around six lectures and two seminars. Attendance at each is expected. In lectures, students are provided with an overview of the various theories, their main concerns and thinkers who propelled debate forward. **It is essential to have the required readings for each lecture/seminar completed in advance of coming to Cambridge (these readings will be available electronically). There will be insufficient time during the evenings of the residential period for this preparation.** Required readings are listed in the order they should be read whereas further readings are listed alphabetically. Further reading lists are given so that students may deepen their understanding of the basic overviews provided in lectures, required readings and seminars. They are expected to engage with at least some of this material but may do so at times and at a depth of their own choosing.

To lay the groundwork for the preparatory reading, students may like to begin with a student textbook and obtain through this a general overview of the field.

Any of the following would be useful for this task, although Carlsnaes et al. is most suited to those with a background of study in IR.

Brown C, Ainsley K. 2005. Understanding International Relations. Palgrave.
 Carlsnaes W, Risse T, Simmons BA, editors. 2002. Handbook of International Relations: Sage.
 Dunne T, Kurki M, Smith S, editors. 2007. International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity: Oxford University Press.
 Jackson R, Sorenson G. 2003. Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches. Oxford University Press.

It is also helpful to students to have at least a basic knowledge of the history of world politics in the 20th century. Time invested in preparatory reading for the history course will pay dividends across many courses, IR included.

Course Objectives

In written examinations, and in oral seminar contributions, students are expected to:

- Demonstrate an understanding of the concepts propelling debate in the realist, liberal, constructivist and feminist schools of thought;
- Display a knowledge of how these concepts are utilized and emphasized differently among the competing theories;
- Show comprehension of how the concepts have evolved in the course of debate;
- Identify key thinkers and locate them in the intellectual and historical landscapes within which they operated;
- Explain how different texts relate to others in the corpus examined;
- Exhibit an appreciation of different modes of explanation and the tensions and politics involved;
- Demonstrate a critical approach to all texts and the arguments contained therein;
- Articulate the strengths and weaknesses of the major theories considered;
- Show an ability to operationalize the concepts in the construction of concise, well structured, well referenced exam answers which are supported with examples.

Assessment

Students are required to sit an invigilated (hand) written examination of three hours.

Course Outline

Date	Time	Lect/Seminar No	Topic
Tues, Sept 13	2-3.15	L1	Realism
	4-5.15	L2	Liberalism
Wed, Sept 14	9-10.15	L3	Neorealism
	11-12.15	L4	Neoliberalism

	2-3.15	S1	<i>IR as narrative</i>
Thurs, Sept 15	9-10.15	L5	Constructivism
	11-12.15	L6	Gender and IR
	2-3.15	S2	<i>Forms of explanation</i>

Reading List

Lecture 1: Realism

Required reading

1. Jackson R, Sorenson G. 2003. Realism. In: Jackson R, Sorenson G, editors. Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches: Oxford University Press.
2. Holzgrefe JL. 1989. The origins of modern international relations theory. Review of International Studies 15(1).
3. Morgenthau H. 1948. Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. Chap 1: Principles of realism.
4. Carr EH. 2001. The Twenty Years Crisis. Cox M, editor. Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave. Chap 6: The limitations of realism.

Further reading

1. Brown C, Nardin T, Rengger N, editors. 2002. International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War: Cambridge University Press. (Extracts on Thucydides, Machiavelli and Hobbes.)
2. Bull H. 1969. The twenty years' crisis thirty years on. International Journal 24(4):625-638.
3. Gilpin R. 1981. War and Change in World Politics. Cambridge University Press. Chap 1: The nature of political change.
4. Guzzini S. 2004. The enduring dilemmas of realism in international relations. European Journal of International Relations 10(4):533-568.
5. Hollis M, Smith S. 1991. Explaining and Understanding International Relations. Clarendon Press. Chap 6: The games nations play.
6. Lebow RN. 2010. Classical realism. In: Dunne T, Kurki M, Smith S, editors. International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity: Oxford University Press.
7. Mearsheimer JJ. 2005. E.H. Carr vs idealism: The battle rages on. International Relations 19:139-152.
8. Rosenberg J. 1990. What's the matter with realism? Review of International Studies 16(4):285-303.
9. Rosenthal JH. 2002. Righteous Realists: Political Realism, Responsible Power, and American Culture in the Nuclear Age. LSU Press. (Not for copying).
10. Schmidt BC. 1998. Lessons from the past: Reassessing the interwar disciplinary history of international relations. International Studies Quarterly 42(3):433-439.

11. Smith MJ. 1990. Realist Thought from Weber to Kissinger. Louisiana State University Press. Chap 3: The idealist provocateurs.
12. Waever O. 1996. The rise and fall of the inter-paradigm debate. In: Smith S, Booth K, Zalewski M, editors. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*: Cambridge University Press.
13. Williams M. 2005. *The Realist Tradition and the Limits of International Relations*. Cambridge University Press. Chap 3: Hans Morgenthau and the historical construction of realism. (Available online through Cambridge library.)

Lecture 2: Liberalism

Required reading

1. Burchill S. 2005. Liberalism. In: Burchill S, Linklater A, Devetak R, Donnelly J, Paterson M, Reus-Smit C, True J, editors. *Theories of International Relations*: Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Doyle M. 1986. Liberalism and world politics. *American Political Science Review* 80(4):1151-1169.
3. Long D, Wilson P, editors. 1995. *Thinkers of the Twenty Years Crisis: Interwar Idealism Reassessed*: Clarendon Press. Introduction.
4. Ashworth L. 2006. Where are the idealists in interwar international relations? *Review of International Studies* 32:291-308.

Further reading

1. Ambrosius LE. 1991. *Wilsonian Statecraft: Theory and Statecraft of Liberal Internationalism During World War I*. Wilmington, Delaware: SR Books. Chap 5: American ideals and European realities.
2. Axelrod R, Hamilton WD. 1984. The evolution of cooperation. *Science* 211(4489):1390-1396.
3. Brown C, Nardin T, Rengger N, editors. 2002. *International Relations in Political Thought: Texts from the Ancient Greeks to the First World War*: Cambridge University Press.
4. Doyle M. 1983. Kant, liberal legacies and foreign policy, Parts I and II. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 12(3):205-235; 323-353.
5. Hill C. 1989. 1939: The origins of Liberal Realism. *Review of International Studies* 15(4):319-328.
6. Jackson R, Sorenson G. 2003. Liberalism. In: Jackson R, Sorenson G, editors. *Introduction to International Relations: Theories and Approaches*: Oxford University Press.
7. Jahn B. 2005. Kant, Mill and illiberal legacies in international affairs. *International Organization* 59(1):177-207.
8. Long D. 1991. Hobson and idealism in international relations. *Review of International Studies* 17(3):285-304.
9. Markwell DJ. 1986. Sir Alfred Zimmern revisited: fifty years on. *Review of International Studies* 12(4):272-292.
10. Navari C. 1989. The Great Illusion revisited: The international political theory of Normal Angell. *Review of International Studies* 15(4):341-358.
11. Richardson JL. 1997. Contending liberalisms: Past and present. *European Journal of International Relations* 3(1):5-33.

Lecture 3: Neorealism

Required reading

1. Waltz K. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley. Chap 5: Political structures.
2. Buzan B, Jones C, Little R, editors. 1993. *The Logic of Anarchy: Neorealism to Structural Realism*. New York: Columbia University Press. Chap 1: Overview.
3. Rose G. 1998. Neoclassical realism and theories of foreign policy. *World Politics* 51(1):144-172.

Further reading

1. Ashley RK. 1986. The poverty of neorealism. In: Keohane RO, editor. *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
2. Buzan B. 1999. The timeless wisdom of realism? In: Smith S, Booth K, Zalewski M, editors. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*: Cambridge University Press.
3. Jervis R. 1998. Realism in the study of world politics. *International Organization* 52(4):971-991.
4. Lebow R. 1994. The long peace, the end of the Cold War, and the failure of Realism. *International Organization* 48(2):249-277.
5. Mearsheimer JJ. 2003. *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton. Chap 3: Wealth and power.
6. Schweller R. 2004. Unanswered threats: A neoclassical realist theory of underbalancing. *International Security* 29(2):159-201.
7. Snyder GH. 2002. Mearsheimer's world-offensive realism and the struggle for security. *International Security* 27(1):149-173.
8. Vasquez J. 1999. *The Power of Power Politics: From Classical Realism to Neotraditionalism*. Cambridge University Press. Chap 2: The role of the realist paradigm in the development of a scientific study of international relations.
9. Walt SM. 2002. The enduring relevance of the realist tradition. In: Katznelson I, Milner H, editors. *Political Science: State of the Discipline III*: WW Norton and Co.
10. Zakaria F. 1992. Realism and domestic politics: A review essay. *International Security* 17(1):177-198.

Lecture 4: Neoliberalism

Required reading

1. Jervis R. 1999. Realism, neoliberalism and cooperation: Understanding the debate. *International Security* 24(1):42-63.
2. Axelrod R, Keohane RO. 1985. Achieving co-operation under anarchy: strategies and institutions. *World Politics* 38(1):226-254.
3. Moravcsik A. 1997. Taking preferences seriously: a liberal theory of international politics. *International Organisation* 51(4).
4. Powell R. 1991. Absolute and relative gains in International Relations theory. *American Political Science Review* 85(4):1303-1320.

Further reading

1. Deudney D, Ikenberry GJ. 1999. The nature and sources of liberal international order. *Review of International Studies* 25(2):179-186.
2. Grieco J. 1993. The relative gains problem for international cooperation. *American Political Science Review* 87(3):729-735.
3. Grieco J. 1988. Anarchy and the limits of cooperation: A realist critique of the newest liberal institutionalism. *International Organization* 42(3):485-508.
4. Hall PA, Taylor RCR. 1996. Political science and the three new institutionalisms. *Political Studies* 44(5):936-957.
5. Hasenclever A. 2000. Integrating theories of international regimes. *Review of International Studies* 26(1):3-33.
6. Ikenberry GJ. 2003. Political and legal. *Review of The Breaking of Nations: Order and Chaos in the Twenty-first Century* by Robert Cooper. *Foreign Affairs*.
7. Keohane RO. 2002. *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World*. Routledge. Chap 1: From interdependence and institutions to globalization and governance. (Available online in Cambridge library).
8. Keohane RO, Martin LL. 1995. The promise of institutionalist theory. *International Security* 20(1):39-51.
9. Keohane RO, editor. 1986. *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press. Chap 11: Reflections on the Theory of International Politics – A response to my critics.
10. Legrow JW. 1999. Is anybody still a realist? *International Security* 24(2):5-55.
11. Lipson C. 1984. International cooperation in economic and security affairs. *World Politics* 37:1-23.
12. Milner HV. 1988. Trading places: Industries for free trade. *World Politics* 40(3):350-376.

Lecture 5 Constructivism

Required reading

1. Adler E. 2002. Constructivism and international relations. In: Carlsnaes W, Risse T, Simmons BA, editors. *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage.
2. Zehfuss M. 2001. Constructivism in International Relations: Wendt, Onuf and Kratochwil. In: Fierke KM, Jorgensen KE, editors. *Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe.
3. Wendt A. 1992. Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics. *International Organisation* 46(2):391-425.
4. Lapid Y, Kratochwil F, editors. 1996. *The Return of Culture and Identity in IR Theory*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner. Chap 11: Is the ship of culture at sea or returning?

Further reading

1. Adler E. 1997. Seizing the middle ground: Constructivism in world politics. *European Journal of International Relations* 3(3):319-363.
2. Barnett MN, Finnemore M. 2005. The power of liberal international organizations. In: Barnett MN, Duvall R, editors. *Power in Global Governance*: Cambridge University Press.
3. Berenskoetter F. 2009. Identity in international relations. In: Denmark R, editor. *International Relations Compendium Project*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.
4. Cederman LE, Daase C. 2003. Endogenizing corporate identities: The next step in constructivist IR theory. *European Journal of International Relations* 9(1):5-35.
5. Copeland D. 2000. The constructivist challenge to structural realism. *International Security* 25(2):187-212.
6. Diez T. 2005. Constructing the self and changing others: Reconsidering 'normative power Europe'. *Millennium Journal of International Relations* 33(3):613-636.
7. Fierke KM. 2000. Constructivism. In: Dunne DJ, Kurki M, Smith S, editors. *International Relations Theories: Diversity and Discipline*: Oxford University Press.
8. Finnemore M, editor. 1996. *National Interests in International Society*: Cornell University Press. Chap 1: Defining state interests.
9. Kratochwil F. 2006. Grand theory in the age of its impossibility: Contemplations on Alexander Wendt. In: Guzzini S, Leander A, editors. *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and his Critics*. London: Routledge.
10. Lebow R. 2001. Thucydides the constructivist. *American Political Science Review* 95(3):547-560.
11. Risse T, Sikkink K. 1999. The socialization of international human rights norms into domestic practices. In: Risse T, Ropp SC, Sikkink K, editors. *The Power of Human Rights: International Norms and Domestic Challenges*: Cambridge University Press.
12. Ruggie JG. 1998. What makes the world hang together? Neo-utilitarianism and the social constructivist challenge. *International Organization* 52(4):855-885.
13. Wendt A. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. Chap 1: Four sociologies of international politics.
14. Zehfuss M. 2001. Constructivism and identity: A dangerous liaison. *European Journal of International Relations* 7(3):315-348.

Lecture 6 Gender and IR

Required reading

1. Tickner JA, Sjoberg L. 2007. Feminism. In: Dunne DJ, Kurki M, Smith S, editors. *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*: Oxford University Press.
2. Tickner JA. 1988. Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Reformulation. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 17(3):429-440.

3. Youngs G. 2006. Feminist international relations in the age of the War on Terror, ideologies, religions and conflict. *International Journal of Feminist Politics* 8(1).

Further Reading

1. Caprioli M. 2000. Gendered conflict. *Journal of Peace Research* 37(1):51-68.
2. Carver T. 2002. Men and IR/men in IR. In: Odysseos L, Seckinelgin H, editors. *Gendering the International*: Palgrave.
3. Elshtain JB. 1987. *Women and War*. Basic Books. Chap: Female privatization – The beautiful soul.
4. Enloe C. 1989. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. London: Pandora Books. Chap 9: The personal is international.
5. Goldstein J. 2001. *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. Cambridge University Press. Chap 7: Reflections: The mutuality of gender and war.
6. Hansen L. 2000. The Little Mermaid's silent security dilemma and the absence of gender in the Copenhagen School. *Millennium Journal of International Relations* 29(2):285-306.
7. Mohanty CT. 2003. *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity*. Durham and London: Duke University Press. Chap 1: Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourses.
8. Mottier V. 2004. Feminism and gender theory: The return of the state. In: Gaus G, Kukathas C, editors. *Handbook of Political Theory*: Sage.
9. Pratt N, Nadjie AA. 2009. *What Kind of Liberation? Women and the Liberation of Iraq*. University of California Press. Chap 5: Towards a feminist and anti-imperialist politics of peace.
10. Sylvester C. 1994. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*. Cambridge University Press. Chap 4: The third debate in IR visited by feminists.
11. Tickner JA. 2002. Feminist perspectives on international relations. In: Carlsnaes W, Risse T, Simmons BA, editors. *Handbook of International Relations*: Sage.
12. 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):101-114.

Seminar 1: International Relations as Narrative

What purposes do stories of great debates serve in the discipline of IR?

1. Kahler M. 1997. Inventing international relations: International relations theory after 1945. In: Doyle MW, Ikenberry GJ, editors. *New Thinking in International Relations Theory*: Westview Press..
2. Wilson P. 1998. The myth of the 'First Great Debate'. *Review of International Studies* 24(Special issue):1-16.

Seminar 2: Forms of explanation

What are the fault lines dividing mainstream IR explanations from those of alternative approaches?

1. Glynn J, Howarth D. 2007. Logics of Explanation in Social and Political Theory. London and New York: Routledge. Introduction.
2. Kratochwil F. 2000. Constructing a new orthodoxy? Wendt's Social Theory of International Politics and the constructivist challenge. Millennium Journal of International Relations 29(1):73-101.
3. Molloy S. 2006. The Hidden History of Realism. Palgrave Macmillan. Introduction: A genealogical reading of realism.