



TEACHING IR GLOBALLY

GUNTHER HELLMANN (ED.)





President

Prof. Pe. Anderson Antonio Pedroso, S.J.

Vice-President

Prof. Pe. André Luís de Araújo, S.J.

Vice-President for Academics Affairs

Prof. José Ricardo Bergmann

Vice-President for Administrative Affairs

Prof. Ricardo Tanscheit

Vice-President for Community Affairs

Prof. Augusto Luiz Duarte Lopes Sampaio

Vice-President for Development and Innovation Affairs

Prof. Marcelo Gattass

Vice-President for Extension and Pedagogical Strategy Affairs

Prof^a. Jackeline Lima Farbiarz

Vice-President for Infrastructure and Services Affairs

Prof. Luiz Fernando Campos Ramos Martha

Deans

Prof. Júlio Cesar Valladão Diniz (CTCH)

Prof. Francisco de Guimaraens (CCS)

Prof. Sidnei Paciornik (CTC)

Prof. Hilton Augusto Koch (CCBS)

TEACHING IR GLOBALLY

Gunther Hellmann (Ed.)

© Editora PUC-Rio
Rua Marquês de São Vicente, 225, Casa da Editora PUC-Rio
Gávea – Rio de Janeiro – RJ – CEP 22451-900
T 55 21 3527-1760/1838
edpucio@puc-rio.br
www.editora.puc-rio.br

Editorial Board

Augusto Sampaio, Danilo Marcondes, Felipe Gomberg, Francisco de Guimaraens, Hilton Augusto Koch, Jackeline Lima Farbiarz, José Ricardo Bergmann, Júlio Cesar Valladão Diniz, Luiz Fernando Campos Ramos Martha, Marcelo Gattass, Sidnei Paciornik.

Cover graphic design:

Flávia da Matta Designer

Graphic design

SBNigri Artes e Textos Ltda.

Dados Internacionais de Catalogação na Publicação (CIP)

Teaching IR globally / Gunther Hellmann (ed.). – Rio de Janeiro: PUC-Rio, 2022.

1 recurso eletrônico (140 p.). – (Coleção Interseções)

Descrição baseada na consulta ao recurso eletrônico em 30 de novembro de 2022.

Exigências do sistema: conexão com a Internet, World Wide Web browser e Adobe Acrobat Reader.

ISBN (e-book): 978-65-88831-81-6

1. Relações internacionais - Estudo e ensino. 2. Política internacional - Estudo e ensino. I. Hellmann, Gunther. II. Série.

CDD: 327

Elaborado por Sabrina Dias do Couto – CRB-7/6138
Divisão de Bibliotecas e Documentação – PUC-Rio

Table of contents

Presentation 7

Jimmy Casas Klausen

Introduction 11

Gunther Hellmann

Thinking, theorising and researching International Relations (IR): teaching IR Theory to third-year undergraduate students at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa 13

Jacqui Ala

How I stopped worrying and learned to love IR (again) 23

Alexander Astrov

“Learning” and “unlearning” IR 31

Navnita Chadha Behera

Introducing IR by sidestepping IR-paradigmatism 35

Gunther Hellmann

Methodology and research practice 43

Benjamin Herborth

Teaching advanced IR Theory 55

Amy Niang

Decolonising world politics 63

Meera Sabaratnam and Kerem Nişancioğlu

Decentering International Relations 83

Karen Smith

Film, politics and society 93

Arlene B. Tickner

**Politics of (global) development & IR: shared premises and
normative commitments 109**

Heloise Weber

**Changing the approach: towards teaching IR theory more
globally 117**

Martin Weber

**Reading three books, three times each: theories of International
Relations in a possibly post-western world 123**

Ole Wæver

Author biographies 137

Presentation*

Jimmy Casas Klausen

Co-editor of *Contexto Internacional: Journal of Global Connections*

Associate Professor, Institute of International Relations

Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro

This volume *Teaching IR Globally* engages with and contributes to the current debate on non-Western and alternative approaches to the discipline of international relations (IR) and the study of global politics. The result of a workshop held in Johannesburg, South Africa in 2018, under the auspices of the World International Studies Committee (WISC), this collection of short essays on the craft of teaching accompanied by sample syllabi is unique in that it specifically addresses not how to undertake effective *research* on or in global IR, but rather how to *teach* IR globally to students at the undergraduate and post-graduate levels. The workshop brought together scholar-teachers from all over the world to exchange ideas on how to manage the inevitable pitfalls of ‘perspectivity’ in IR and how to avoid reproducing in classrooms or lecture halls the discipline’s historical and cultural specificity as though it were a universal and neutral field of inquiry rather than particular. (For more details on the original event, see <https://www.wiscnetwork.net/wisc-workshops/johannesburg-workshop-2018>.) In his Introduction, Gunther Hellmann contextualizes the event on which the subsequent short essays and sample syllabi were originally presented and discussed.

Hellmann’s Introduction is then followed by contributions by thirteen scholars presenting their twelve courses. (One was co-taught.) Rather than trying to group them thematically, we have opted for alphabetical order, but certainly common themes do emerge. The hope is that making this collection available as an open-access e-book will stimulate teachers of IR and global politics to *teach* IR globally—perhaps by encountering novel texts or unexpected permutations in the syllabi, by revising existing course sections to reflect new themes, or by innovating their assignments and student assessments. Certainly, some of the contributors developed courses to meet needs or requirements specific to their institutions; nevertheless, each contribution offers a number of ideas that can be adapted or creatively recontextualized.

Jacqui Ala starts off the individual contributions by offering a course plan that encourages advanced undergraduate students actively to situate themselves

in both the discipline of IR and their location in southern Africa. Next, Alexander Astrov provincializes Europe through collage-like IR scholarly collaborations that look across Eurasia with an eye trained by intellectual history. Navnita Chadha Behera provokes master's degree students to move beyond the epistemic organization of the discipline of IR by including geocultural traditions of IR in Asia, known for their own classic works. Gunther Hellmann meanwhile encourages undergraduate students in Germany to think beyond the '-isms' by debating old and new classics.

The previous contributors present courses designed to provoke undergraduate and early post-graduate students to confront their situatedness in various ways. Benjamin Herborth continues this trend by emphasising the craft of research in International Relations as an ongoing, 'living' practice with gaps and uncertainties—hence, not situatedness in geographic-cultural space or scholarly traditions but situatedness as a researcher. Relatedly, Amy Niang provokes master's degree students to reflect on the activity of IR theorising in relation to its world-making histories. Meera Sabaratnam and Kerem Nişancıoğlu present a syllabus that challenges final-year undergraduate students to link the racial history of IR, the wave of political decolonizations in Asia and Africa in the twentieth century, and current decolonisation struggles in theory and practice. Next, Karen Smith challenges students to decenter IR by developing an understanding of its history as a dominantly Western field and by traversing the frontiers of knowledge that construct it.

Drawing on filmic rather than only written texts, Arlene B. Tickner discusses a course on film and global politics in which students learn to see how persons inside and outside the Global South might be represented and how they participate in regimes of representation. Underscoring some shared characteristics of the two disciplines of IR and Development Studies, Heloise Weber presents a course on the politics of development that encourages critical reflection on established frameworks – for example, the state-centrism and Euro-modernism – of Global Development Studies and development policies. Then, in his presentation of a core course for an international master's degree, Martin Weber shows how to work with and against the '-isms' that usually organize the field of IR by staging thematic juxtapositions of familiar classics with texts usually relegated to the catch-all category 'other approaches.' Finally, Ole Wæver emphasizes how students might learn about the worlding practices of a possibly post-Western discipline of IR by carefully reading books as products of such worlding rather than simply exemplars of subject matter.

The editors of *Contexto Internacional* sent the short essays, but not the syllabi, out for double-blind peer review to two established scholars in IR theory in order to get feedback on the project. As the syllabi posed challenges in guaranteeing anonymity for the double-blind review process, the editorial team decided to send the referees only the Introduction and short essays. In addition to the names of authors, the names of specific universities or academic programs were omitted from the version circulated to our anonymous referees. The contributors then received the evaluations and suggestions on how to improve their short essays and revised them to clarify certain key points. This e-book is a partnership between WISC, the International Political Sociology Winter School and the journal *Contexto Internacional: Journal of Global Connections*—the latter both based at the Institute of International Relations of the Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro. WISC and Contexto Internacional gratefully acknowledge the financial support of IPS Winter School, and we thank especially João Pontes Nogueira of IRI, PUC-Rio.

Note

- *. [Note by Editors of *Contexto Internacional*] The syllabi published have been lightly edited for clarity and to correct any obvious errors. The reading lists in the syllabi, however, have been published as they were submitted, and *Contexto Internacional* does not take responsibility for incomplete, incorrect or misspelled bibliographic entries, nor for altered, incorrect or non-functional websites.

Introduction

Gunther Hellmann

President “World International Studies Committee” 2017-2021,
Chair of Political Science Goethe University

In January 2018 the World International Studies Committee (WISC) and the Johannesburg Institute for Advanced Study (JIAS) organized a Workshop on ‘Teaching IR Globally.’¹ International Relations scholars from a variety of countries and backgrounds discussed how ‘International Relations’ as an academic discipline is (and should be) taught globally. The overarching theme centered on the question of whether IR teaching must necessarily be biased towards a ‘national’ perspective (Lau Bertrand and Lee 2012; Hagmann and Biersteker 2014) or whether it is possible (and, if so, how) to break free from a ‘methodological nationalism’ (Chernilo 2010) in which so many academics in the social sciences and humanities are trapped. It similarly engaged the question of how traditional IR teaching based largely on a ‘Western’ canon (Tickner and Wæver 2009; Acharya and Buzan 2010, 2017; Hagmann and Biersteker 2018) ought to be expanded and/or adjusted in order to include (or even foreground) ‘non-Western’ or otherwise ‘alternative’ perspectives (Creuzfeldt 2013; Phull, Ciflikli and Meibauer 2019; Fierke and Jabri 2019). More basically still, if a ‘view from nowhere’ is impossible, how should the discipline reflect on its inevitable perspectivity² and what would it mean, in this light, to propagate ‘Global IR?’³

The Johannesburg Workshop was in line with WISC’s global mission which seeks to bring together academics globally, and especially from the Global South, to explore different aspect of international studies from a multitude of perspectives. The Workshop in Johannesburg was based on memos and exemplary syllabi from the teaching of participants. It focused on six broadly defined themes: ‘Delimiting the Subject Matter of “International Relations”’; ‘“Introducing” IR at the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Level – Theory and Subject Matter’; ‘Teaching/Introducing IR at the Master of Arts (M.A.) Level’; ‘Special Themes at the M.A. Level’; ‘Research Design, Methods and Didactics’; and ‘IR, “Science” and Epistemology.’

In the light of very productive exchanges, workshop participants agreed in the aftermath to produce a symposium with selected courses and the rationales for actually teaching these courses. This symposium is presented herewith. It takes the form of eleven short essays (with their respective syllabi). Each essay elaborates

tes on three aspects: (a) the major theme and content of the respective course, (b) why it was conceived and taught in this particular form, and (c) what impact on students the instructors observed. The authors hope that this symposium contributes to a growing awareness in the discipline of the necessity to engage in a global exchange about how we do and how we might teach IR alternatively.

Notes

- 1 For details see <https://www.wiscnetwork.net/wisc-workshops/johannesburg-workshop-2018>.
- 2 On the idea of a 'view from nowhere' see Nagel (1986); on inevitable perspectivity and its reflection in IR theory see Hellmann (2020). An expanded version of Hellmann (2020) with a more detailed bibliography is available online at <http://www.fb03.uni-frankfurt.de/77800435>.
- 3 For the debate on 'Global IR' see the 'ISA Presidential Special Issue' of *International Studies Review* (Kadera and Sjoberg 2016) with a diverse set of contributions, including Amitav Acharya; Wiebke WemheuerVogelaar, Nicholas J. Bell, Mariana Navarrete Morales, and Michael J. Tierney; Yaqing Qin; Eric M. Blanchard and Shuang Lin; Andrew Phillips; Fabio Petito; Jiajie He; Melisa Deciancio; Kwesi Aning and Fiifi Edu-Afful; Pinar Bilgin; John J. Mearsheimer; Andrew Hurrell; Peter J. Katzenstein; Navnita Chadha Behera; Barry Buzan; J. Ann Tickner; Peter Vale; Shiping Tang; Shirin M. Rai; and Farid Mirbagheri; see also Fonseca (2019).

Thinking, theorising and researching International Relations (IR): teaching IR Theory to third-year undergraduate students at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa

Jacqui Ala

Teaching International Relations (IR) theory at the University of the Witwatersrand has always been a challenge in that, as a theory curriculum team, we do not only want to expose students to the traditional Western-based theoretical canon, but also to relevant knowledge, concepts and histories located in the Global South. Our overarching objective is to offer students more holistic ontologies and epistemologies through which to understand and study the discipline. However, accomplishing this broad goal has necessitated spreading the theory curriculum over three courses. Students cover the 'Western'-based canon in their first-year introductory course to IR, namely, Realism, Liberalism, Marxism, Critical Theory and Feminism. The intermediate third year IR course which I will be discussing in this piece starts introducing and incorporating knowledges and ways of knowing from the Global South. The postgraduate course then builds and expands on these foundations. Being located in the Global South, coupled with growing societal demands for 'decolonised' curricula at South African higher education institutions, makes embracing ontological and epistemological plurality an imperative in our context.

The third-year IR theory course which I teach is titled 'Thinking, theorising and researching International Relations.' The title is important, as I want to establish from the outset that the course demands active, critical engagement with the course material. It is definitely not a traditional course where in each lecture an omniscient lecturer imparts to passive student recipients the central tenets and utility of one particular IR theory which students are then required merely to memorise. I want students to engage critically with the ontologies and epistemologies that give rise to different understandings and explanations of various elements encompassed by the field of International Relations. Consequently I have endeavoured to design a course structure that would create a learning environment conducive to achieving these objectives. Hence the first six classes are framed around a question or set of questions. These questions are designed to precipitate a critical interrogation of IR ontology and epistemology that pushes students' knowledge

and thinking beyond what was provided in their first two years of study. It introduces students to meta-theoretical dynamics inherent in theory construction. It encourages students to examine the subtext embodied in IR theories as well as the strengths and limitation inherent in IR theory derived from Western knowledge and contexts. Students are required to start considering whose knowledge, values and perspectives the Western IR theories they have studied to date reflect. Moreover they are asked to consider whether these theories privilege the positions of certain classes of actors over others and, if so, what the implications are for understanding and studying IR – especially from the Global South. We then explore how and why context matters both in terms of location, history, values, knowledge and culture as these shape how we experience and make sense of our world, and in terms of how interactions within it take place, both public and private. Thus, a small number of theories generated in a niche of Western knowledge cannot hope to be able to account for the analysis of all international relations. This point of view does not mean that we as IR educators in the Global South see no value in Western theories. However, we do believe that we cannot present them to students as paradigms whose ability to explain or understand IR holds constant in all temporal and socio-economic spatial locations.

The second five lectures of the course then turn to consider alternative or different theoretical accounts of IR, incorporating various knowledges from the Global South. Obviously, being located on the African continent, the course focuses predominantly on the ability of African knowledges to elucidate IR. The critical approach to theory continues. We consider whether local knowledges provide a different ontology and epistemological agenda to that of Western academic IR, whether such local knowledges reflect different societal values and priorities. Further, we explore the question of whether local knowledges need to be modified or refined to an abstract form for them to be of greatest utility in an academic context or whether they can be adopted *in situ*? Academics such as Paulin Hountondji (1983) and Basil Bernstein (2000) contend that the specialised and abstracted nature of academic knowledge makes it more powerful than everyday, common or folk knowledges because it provides people with the ability to understand and change their world. In contrast Boaventura de Sousa Santos (2015) and Walter D. Mignolo (2011, 2009) argue that local or indigenous knowledge can provide more effective ways of understanding and solving local as well as global challenges and therefore must be engaged with by academics. Exposing students to this debate allows them to realise that the ‘decolonisation’ of knowledge may be slightly more complex than merely adding or swapping out knowledges from

different contexts. To further achieve our objective of offering greater plurality of knowledge in this theory course, it must be noted that the majority of the prescribed readings provide alternative Global South perspectives of international relations. The course definitely shifts results in getting students to see IR theory from different perspectives. Students frequently comment that they have never been asked to think about IR in the way that this course asks them to. The majority of students enjoy the knowledge diversity of the course, although some state that the way that scholars interpret local values or ideals differs from their own cultural experiences and teaching. In particular, they are inspired by the section focusing on the incorporation of African philosophies into the study of IR. However most also argue that they would most definitely not want Western IR theory excluded in either the undergraduate or postgraduate curriculum.

**Thinking, Theorising
and
Researching
International Relations**

**INTR3025
Jacqui Ala**

First Block

Mondays 10:15 – 12:00 & Wednesday 14:15 – 16:00

Lecturer

Dr Jacqui Ala Room CB 116
Jacqueline.dematosala@wits.ac.za

Consultation Times

Mondays 9:00 – 10:00

Wednesday 11:00 – 13:30

Or by appointment. (Please email me to request a suitable time.) These only apply during term time and in the first block.

Aims

The objective of this course is to allow students to critically engage with IR theory. The course is thematically based and will engage with various theories during each class. As basic IR theoretical paradigms have been covered in both first and second year, students are assumed to be familiar with these. The course intends to facilitate critical engagement and reflection regarding the origins, purposes and uses of knowledges in the study of IR. Moreover, the course will also look at the incorporation of indigenous knowledge from various parts to the globe as a way to expand the analytic capacity of IR especially in the Global South.

Learning Outcomes

- a coherent and critical understanding of terms, concepts, and theories used in international relations together with relevant epistemologies and knowledges from the global South that could expand our theoretical repertoire.
- an ability to use existing and recent knowledge and theory and the ability to evaluate a multiplicity of possible answers.
- an understanding of the variety of methods of enquiry and research in the discipline
- an ability to deal with problems-based questions, using a range of enquiry skills to engage with conceptual and/or evidence-based solutions and theory-driven arguments.
- the ability to demonstrate well-developed information-retrieval skills and the analysis, synthesis and evaluation of quantitative and/or qualitative data, including the appropriate use of IT.

Competencies that will be assessed

- Students will be asked to critically engage with and reflect the arguments and debated encountered in the prescribed scholarly literature.
- Students will be required to produce a paper using a theory or theoretical concepts as an analytical tool.

Course Readings

A reading pack is provided and is attached to this course outline as there is no suitable textbook that covers the curriculum content.

It is imperative that you read before each class and go through your notes after each class.

Students can also refer to their first-year textbook: Baylis, J. Smith, S & Owen, P (2011), *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford University Press, UK. The assigned chapters from this textbook will provide a foundation or broader context for a specific topic where appropriate.

Modes of Assessments

Assessment No.	Type	Due Date	Mark Contribution
Assessment 1	Reading analysis	15 Feb	20%
Assessment 2	Reading analysis	1 March	20%
Assessment 3	In-class quantitative assignment	8 March	5%
Assessment 4	In-class quantitative assignment	14 March	5%
Exam	Seen Exam		50%

Assessment 1

Reading Analysis

Produce a comparative reading response of the two articles prescribed for lecture 2.

Assessment 2

Reading Analysis

Produce a comparative reading response of the using the Rosenberg and the Blaney & Tickner (2017) prescribed reading for lecture 5.

You will find a detailed description of what a reading response is as well as how to read for and write one attached to the course outline.

Assessments 3 & 4

These are quantitative assignments which will be handed out in these lectures. Thus it is imperative that you attend these classes or you will not receive the exercise or any marks. We will assist you with the completion of these two assignments in class.

Lecture Schedule Readings February 2019

Monday	Tues	Wednesday	Thur	Fri
<p>4 Lecture 1 What does IR study; what should it study & how should IR be studied?</p> <p>De Sousa, Santos. 2007. 'Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges.' <i>Review (Fernand Braudel Center)</i>: 45-89.</p> <p>Mansour, Imad. 2017. 'A Global South Perspective on International Relations Theory.' <i>International Studies Perspectives</i> 18(1) 2-3.</p> <p>Baylis, Smith & Owens – Introduction</p>	5	<p>6 Lecture 2 Whose knowledge of IR is it?</p> <p>Waever, O. 1998. 'The sociology of a not so international discipline: American and European developments in international relations.' <i>International Organization</i> 52(4): 687-727.</p> <p>Tickner, A. B. 2013. 'Core, periphery and (neo) imperialist International Relations.' <i>European Journal of International Relations</i>, 19(3): 627-646.</p>	7	8
<p>11 Lecture 3 Does context matter when we study and analyse IR?</p> <p>Bhabha, H. K. 1994. <i>The location of culture</i>. Routledge.</p> <p>Bhabha, Homi. 1988. 'The commitment to theory.' <i>New formations</i> 5(1): 5-23.</p> <p>Said, Edward W. 'Orientalism reconsidered.' <i>Race & class</i> 27(2): 1-15.</p> <p>Baylis, Smith & Owen – Post-Structuralism</p>	12	<p>13 Lecture 4 What does it mean to critically engage with or study?</p> <p>Chowdhry, G. 2007. 'Edward Said and contrapuntal reading: Implications for critical interventions in international relations.' <i>Millennium-Journal of International Studies</i> 36(1): 101-116</p> <p>de Sousa Santos, Boaventura. <i>Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide</i>. Routledge, 2015.</p> <p>Baylis, Smith & Owens Marxism</p>	14	<p>15 Reading response due by 12:30 CB126</p>
<p>18 Lecture 5 Are current IR theories universally applicable?</p> <p>Rosenberg, Justin. 2016. 'International Relations in the prison of Political Science.' <i>International Relations</i> 30(2): 127-153.</p> <p>Blaney, David L., and Arlene B. Tickner. 2017. 'International Relations in the prison of colonial modernity.' <i>International Relations</i> 31(1): 71-75.</p> <p>Tickner, A. B. 2003. 'Hearing Latin American voices in international relations studies.' <i>International Studies Perspectives</i>, 4(4): 325-350.</p>	19	<p>20 Lecture 6 Countering knowledge-exclusion of the Global South.</p> <p>Chowdhry, G., & Nair, S. 2002. 'Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations.' In <i>Reading Race, Gender and Class</i>. London and New York: Routledge.</p> <p>Mignolo, W. D. 2009. 'Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom.' <i>Theory, Culture & Society</i> 26(7-8): 159-181.</p> <p>Mignolo, Walter. <i>The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options</i>. Duke University Press, 2011.</p> <p>Baylis, Smith & Owens Postcolonialism</p>	21	22

<p>25 Lecture 7</p> <p>Looking to local or indigenous knowledge to pluralise IR knowledge – The inclusion of knowledge from the global South</p> <p>Odoom, I., & Andrews, N. 2016. 'What/who is still missing in International Relations scholarship? Situating Africa as an agent in IR theorising.' <i>Third World Quarterly</i>: 1-19.</p> <p>Hountondji, Paulin J. <i>African philosophy: Myth and reality</i>. Indiana University Press, 1996</p> <p>Tickner, Arlene. 'Seeing IR differently: notes from the Third World.' <i>Millennium</i> 32, no. 2 (2003): 295-324.</p>	26	<p>27 Lecture 8</p> <p>Pluralising IR knowledge – Situating Africa</p> <p>Grovogui, S. N. 2001. 'Come to Africa: a hermeneutics of race in international theory'. <i>Alternatives</i> 26(4): 425-448.</p> <p>Grovogui, Siba N. 2002. 'Regimes of sovereignty: International morality and the African condition.' <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 8(3): 315-338.</p>	28	<p>1 March Short Reading Assignment 1</p> <p>due by 12:30 CB126</p>
--	----	--	----	---

Lecture Schedule – March 2019

Monday	Tues	Wednesday	Thurs	Friday
<p>4 Lecture 9</p> <p>Quantitative Research Exercise due on Friday 8/3</p>	5	<p>6 Lecture 10</p> <p>Pluralising IR knowledge</p> <p>Siba N. Grovogui. 2015. 'Remembering democracy: anticolonial evocations and invocations of a disappearing norm', <i>African Identities</i> 13 (1): 77-91.</p> <p>Grovogui, Siba N. 2006. 'Mind, body, and gut! Elements of a postcolonial human rights discourse.' <i>Decolonizing international relations</i>: 179-196.</p> <p>Mignolo, Walter. <i>The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options</i>. Duke University Press, 2011.</p>	7	<p>8 Assessment 3 Hand in to CB126 by 12:30</p>

Writing for Success: Reader-Response

This section will help you determine the purpose and structure of developing a reader-response.

The Purpose of Reader-Response

Reader-response suggests that the role of the reader is essential to the meaning of a text, for only in the reading experience does the literary work come alive. Thus, the purpose of a reading response is examining, explaining, and defending your personal reaction to a text.

Your critical reading of a text asks you to explore:

- why you like or dislike the text;
- explain whether you agree or disagree with the author;
- identify the text's purpose; and
- critique the text.

There is no right or wrong answer to a reading response. Nonetheless, it is important that you demonstrate an understanding of the reading and clearly explain and support your reactions. Do

not use the standard approach of just writing: 'I liked this text because it is so cool and the ending made me feel happy,' or 'I hated it because it was stupid, and had nothing at all to do with my life, and was too negative and boring.' In writing a response you may assume the reader has already read the text. Thus, do not summarize the contents of the text at length. Instead, take a systematic, analytical approach to the text.

General Tips

1. Write as a Scholar

When writing a reader-response write as an educated adult addressing other adults or fellow scholars. As a beginning scholar, if you write that something has nothing to do with you or does not pass *your* 'Who cares?' test, but many other people think that it is important and great, readers will probably *not* agree with you that the *text* is dull or boring. Instead, they may conclude that *you* are dull and boring, that you are too immature or uneducated to understand what important things the author wrote.

2. Criticize with Examples

If you did not like a text, that is fine, but criticize it either from:

- **principle, for example:**
 - Is the text racist?
 - Does the text unreasonably put down things, such as religion, or groups of people, such as women or adolescents, conservatives or democrats, etc.?
 - Does the text include factual errors or outright lies? Is it too dark and despairing? Is it falsely positive?
- **form, for example:**
 - Is the text poorly written?
 - Does it contain too much verbal 'fat'?
 - Is it too emotional or too childish?
 - Does it have too many facts and figures?
 - Are there typos or other errors in the text?
 - Do the ideas wander around without making a point?
 - In each of these cases, do not simply criticize, but give examples. As a beginning scholar, be cautious of criticizing any text as 'confusing' or 'crazy,' since readers might simply conclude that *you* are too ignorant or slow to understand and appreciate it.

The Structure of a Reader-Response Essay

Choosing a text to study is the first step in writing a reader-response essay. Once you have chosen the text, your challenge is to connect with it and have a 'conversation' with the text.

In the beginning paragraph of your reader-response essay, be sure to mention the following:

- title of the work to which you are responding;
- the author; and
- the main thesis of the text.

Then, do your best to answer the questions below. Remember, however, that you are writing an essay, not filling out a short-answer worksheet. You do not need to work through these questions in order, one by one, in your essay. Rather, your paper as a whole should be sure to address these questions in some way.

- *What does the text have to do with you, your study or IR and how you see the discipline?* It is not acceptable to write that the text has NOTHING to do with you, since just about everything humans can write has to do in some way with every other human.

- *How much does the text agree or clash with your view of the world, and what you consider right and wrong?* Use several quotes as examples of how it agrees with and supports what you think about the world, about right and wrong, and about what you think it is to be human. Use quotes and examples to discuss how the text disagrees with what you think about the world and about right and wrong.
- *What did you learn, and how much were your views and opinions challenged or changed by this text, if at all? Did the text communicate with you? Why or why not?* Give examples of how your views might have changed or been strengthened (or perhaps, of why the text failed to convince you, the way it is). Please do not write 'I agree with everything the author wrote,' since everybody disagrees about something, even if it is a tiny point. Use quotes to illustrate your points of challenge, or where you were persuaded, or where it left you cold.
- *How well does the text address things that you, personally, care about and consider important to the world? How does it address things that are important to your family, your community, your ethnic group, to people of your economic or social class or background, or your faith tradition? If not, who does or did the text serve? Did it pass the 'Who cares?' test?* Use quotes from the text to illustrate.
- *What can you praise about the text? What problems did you have with it?* Reading and writing 'critically' does not mean the same thing as 'criticizing,' in everyday language (complaining or griping, fault-finding, nit-picking). Your 'critique' can and should be positive and praise the text if possible, as well as pointing out problems, disagreements and shortcomings.
- *How well did you enjoy the text (or not) as entertainment or as a work of art?* Use quotes or examples to illustrate the quality of the text as art or entertainment. Of course, be aware that some texts are not meant to be entertainment or art: a news report or textbook, for instance, may be neither entertaining or artistic, but may still be important and successful.

For the conclusion, you might want to discuss:

- your overall reaction to the text;
- whether you would read something else like this in the future;
- whether you would read something else by this author; and
- if you would recommend reading this text to someone else and why.

Adapted from <https://lumen.instructure.com/courses/56913/pages/writing-for-success-reader-response>

Your reading response should be no more than 3 pages long or 1500 words

How I stopped worrying and learned to love IR (again)

Alexander Astrov

With hindsight Martin Wight comes across as an optimist. He may have argued that International Theory is held together, as a tradition of thought, merely by the question of survival. Yet he still believed it was held together somehow and could be even reformulated into a more coherent body of thought. We are living through a stage when the field is hardly integrated at all. This may have opened interesting opportunities for research but poses a problem for teaching. How do you teach International Theory when its very existence is in question?

For years, this uneasy question could be easily avoided at Central European University (CEU) – perhaps too easily. We do not teach undergraduates here, admitting only 40 Masters students each year. So it is possible to assume (or pretend?) that all of them have already got the ‘basics’ elsewhere. And if they have not, it is up to them to catch up. This gives us license to explore more specialized, more advanced topics through smaller elective courses. And if some students graduate with a degree in IR but without ever reading any of the ‘IR Classics’, that may be even presented as a form of emancipation.

However, this kind of theoretical emancipation can be also seen as a symptom of a rather ‘practical’ malaise: we no longer have any sense of the world ‘as a whole’. I am perfectly aware of the powerful theoretical arguments meant to debunk that very ‘as a whole’. But some of them begin to ring hollow when whatever it is we are living in is disintegrating in front of our eyes. Or under our feet...

It was this line of thinking that led me, first, to imagine, and then to teach a course titled ‘Global Stage and Its Subjects: International Theory Meets Intellectual History’. The title itself was a collage, in the sense Christine Sylvester (2007) uses the term in her reflections on the disintegration of the field into mutually exclusive ‘camps’. It was collated from the themes outlined by three IR theorists whom I invited to participate in the course: Erik Ringmar, Iver Neumann, and Jens Bartelson.

There were three reasons for selecting these three. First, although constructivist by any textbook standards, none of them was schooled as a constructivist; each had to find his own way of breaking with the ‘classics’, and this experience of ‘breaking’ is still detectable, I believe, in all their theorizing. Second, all of them, and each in his own way, are still trying to think the ‘world’ or ‘world order’ or ‘international system’, while being perfectly aware of all the disciplinary baggage carried

by these old-fashioned concepts. Third, the way they cope with this tension in their research suggested an easily graspable and yet challenging theoretical engagement with the discipline's 'territorial trap': moving from Asia and the Middle East (Ringmar), through Eurasia (Neumann) to Europe (Bartelson), so that, to paraphrase T. S. Eliot, the 'end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started (IR classics) and know the place for the first time', indeed – so that the students could experience that same 'breaking point' within the discipline themselves.

How did it work? Each of the visitors submitted texts for four sessions. I added some texts characteristic of the visitors' work and also of the 'classical' IR themes. Students were asked to read ahead of each session and to write 'position-papers' for two subsequent ones. This way, by the time Iver Neumann arrived in Budapest to lead 'his' two sessions, for example, students were already familiar with his work and the literature that informed it. And so it goes.

Did it work? This I am still not sure about. Some students were happy, others not. But one comment in written evaluations stuck with me longer than others: 'OK, I can now see why some people may be interested in Waltz. The thing is: I am not that person'. Fair enough, it all depends on what kind of spin you put on this. Personally, I would like to think that the comment was written by a student who returned to CEU two years later, as a doctoral candidate, and then took another theory course of mine. That other course was an exemplary 'camp' of Sylvester: a very niche, abstract thing for a small group of students. After that course, the student wrote: 'I got the Machiavelli book you recommended out of the library and read it as I was travelling home/in my first couple of days back and I've surprised myself by actually really enjoying it. I know this wouldn't have been the case were it not for your course and I wouldn't have got anywhere near as much out of it without the course. Thank you for helping me to understand the importance of theory (again) and working to encourage us to really get into the nitty gritty of theory so that now I can use it as a base from which to work, rather than adding it on at the end when I find something which agrees with what I wanted to say'.

So, maybe, this is the trick? To somehow try to hold on to two different perspectives, two different modes of thinking about IR theory at once? (Now that I think about it, wasn't it what Jens Bartelson tried to do in his part?)

Department of International Relations
Central European University
Global Stage and Its Subjects: International Theory Meets Intellectual History
Fall 2016 MA
4 credits

Instructors: Alexander Astrov, Jens Bartelson, Iver Neumann, and Erik Ringmar

Course objectives

The course aims at providing students with an overview of theorising in the field of International Relations (IR). Although the field itself took shape as an institutionalised academic pursuit only in the twentieth century and for a long time remained a predominantly Western engagement, in many ways it emerged as a response to questions posed by European expansion beyond Europe's traditional boundaries. Throughout the century, these non-European origins of IR theorising were, by and large, ignored. However, as the twentieth century was nearing its end, especially after the end of the Cold War, more and more IR theorists started arguing against this initial Eurocentric view of the field — not only because political ordering on the ground called for appreciation of the diversity of the world, but also because the analytical tools with which IR theory approached this world required critical re-examination. On the one hand, this led to significant widening of the traditional field of study, bringing in issues, subjects, cultures and regions initially thought to be outside of the discipline's focus; on the other, the discipline's horizons were also extended in temporal terms, inviting more detailed study of historically distant ideas and practices. This course cannot possibly provide detailed analysis of this long and increasingly complicated process. Yet it will attempt to present some important nodal points in it, as well as some possible connections between these points that students may then choose to explore in their individual projects.

So, the course's main objectives are:

- to provide students with an understanding of intellectual and practical functions of theorising in international relations;
- to dispel the idea of 'theory' as a boring but mandatory engagement with abstract literature or a junk-shop of ready-made frameworks to be applied to various cases;
- to present theorising as a dramatic engagement with context-specific questions;
- to indicate how advances in understanding, once these occur, may be seen as outcomes of dialogical engagements between theories.

Learning outcomes

By the end of the course students will:

- develop ability to place their own research questions into the overall context of IR theorising;
- critically engage with ideas discussed by various theorists and schools of thought;
- get an overview or some of the state-of-the-art theorising in the field.

Requirements:

- Active participation in the seminars 10%
- Three position-papers for weeks 2-7 (the exact allocation of this assignment to be discussed in detail during the first session) 45% (15% each)
- Take-home exam (essay) 45%

Course outline

Week 1

Session 1 September 20

General discussion, distribution of assignments Background reading:

Wight, Martin. 1966. 'Why Is There No International Theory?,' In Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight (eds). *Diplomatic Investigations: Essays in the Theory of International Relations* (London: George Allen & Unwin), pp. 17-34.

Morgenthau, Hans. 1977. 'The Intellectual and Political Functions of Theory' in *Truth and Power: Essays of a Decade, 1960-1970*. New York: Praeger, pp. 248-261.

Aron, Raymond. 1965. *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*. New York: Doubleday & Co., pp. 1-18.

Session 2 September 22

Neumann, Iver. 2002. 'Returning Practice to the Linguistic Turn: The Case of Diplomacy'. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31(3): 627-651.

Ringmar, Erik. 2016. 'How the world stage makes its subjects: an embodied critique of constructivist IR theory'. *Journal of International Relations and Development* 19: 101-125.

Hutchings, Kimberly, Jens Bartelson, Edward Keen, Lea Ypi, Helen Kinsella, and David Armitage. 2014. 'Foundations of modern international theory. Critical Exchange'. *Contemporary Political Theory* 13(4): 387-418.

Week 2

Session 3 September 27

Fairbank, J. K., and S. Y. T'eng. 1941. 'On The Ch'ing Tributary System'. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 6(2): 135-246.

Zhang, Feng. 2009. 'Rethinking the "Tribute System": Broadening the Conceptual Horizon of Historical East Asian Politics'. *Chinese Journal of International Politics* 2: 597-626.

Session 4 September 29

Menocal, Maria Rosa. 2003. 'A Brief History of a First-Rate Place', in *The Ornament of the World: How Muslims, Jews and Christians Created a Culture of Tolerance in Medieval Spain*. Boston: Back Bay Books.

Abu-Lughod, Janet L. 1991. *Before European Hegemony: The World System, A.D. 1250-1350*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 185-247.

Week 3

Session 5 October 4

Ringmar, Erik. 2012. 'Performing International Systems: Two East Asian Alternatives to the Westphalian Order'. *International Organization* 66(2): 1-25.

Ringmar, Erik. 2014. 'Recognition and the Origins of International Society'. *Global Discourse* 4(2): 446-58.

Session 6 October 6

Starr, S. Frederick. 2013. *Lost Enlightenment: Central Asia's Golden Age from the Arab Conquest to Tamerlane*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2013.

BBC documentary: Lilley, Ian (producer), and Ian Lilley and Mark Bates (directors). 2012. *Lost Kingdoms of Africa*, Series 2, *The Berber Kingdom of Morocco*. Available at <https://youtu.be/ZYo8FEYkffs>

Week 4

Session 7 October 11

Agnew, John. 1994. 'The Territorial Trap: The Geographical Assumptions of International Relations Theory'. *Review of International Political Economy* 1(1): 53-80.

Wigen, Einar. 2015. 'Two-level language games: International relations as inter-lingual relations'. *European Journal of International Relations* 21(2): 427-450.

Session 8 October 13

Barfield, Thomas J. 2001. 'The Shadow Empires: Imperial State Formations along the Chinese-Nomad Frontier'. In Susan E. Alcock et al. (eds). *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 10-41.

Sverdrup-Thygeson, Bjørnar. 2012. 'A Neighbourless Empire? The Forgotten Diplomatic Tradition of Imperial China'. *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy* 7 (3): 245-267.

Week 5

Session 9 October 20

Kotkin, Stephen. 2007. 'Mongol Commonwealth? Exchange and Governance Across the Post-Mongol Space'. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, New Series* 8(3): 487-531.

Neumann, Iver B. 2011. 'Entry into International Society Reconceptualised: The Case of Russia'. *Review of International Studies* 37 (2): 463-484.

Session 10 October 21

Neumann, Iver B. and Vincent Pouliot. 2011. 'Untimely Russia: Hysteresis in Russian-Western Relations over the Past Millennium'. *Security Studies* 20 (1): 105-137.

Ostrowski, D.G. 2000. 'Muscovite Adaptation of Steppe Political Institutions: A Reply to Halperin's Objections'. *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History, New Series* 1(2): 267-297.

Week 6

Session 11 October 25

Becker-Lorca, Arnulf. 2011. 'Sovereignty Beyond the West: The End of Classical International Law'. *Journal of the History of International Law* 13(1): 7-73.

Session 12 October 27

Bartelson, Jens. 2014. *Sovereignty as Symbolic Form*. London & New York: Routledge, Chapters 1 and 3.

Week 7

Session 13 November 1

Bartelson, Jens. 2016. 'Recognition: A Short History', *Ethics & International Affairs* 30(3): 3030-321.

Bartelson, Jens. 2016. 'Blasts from the Past: War and Fracture in the International System'. *International Political Sociology* 10(4): 352-368.

Session 14 November 3

Bayly, Christopher A. 2010. 'The Age of Revolutions in a Global Context: An Afterword'. In David Armitage and Sanjay Subrahmanyam (eds.), *The Age of Revolutions in a Global Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 209-217.

Benton, Lauren. 2008. 'From International Law to Imperial Constitutions: The Problem of Quasi-Sovereignty, 1870-1900'. *Law and History Review* 26(3): 595-620.

Nardin, Terry. 2015. 'The Diffusion of Sovereignty'. *History of European Ideas* 41(1): 89-102.

Week 8

Session 15 November 8

Koskenniemi, Martti. 2001. *The Gentle Civilizer: The Rise and Fall of International Law, 1870-1960*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 98-178, 413-509.

Session 16 November 10

Carr, E.H. 1946. *The Twenty Years' Crisis*. London: Macmillan, pp. 22-94.

Morgenthau, Hans. 1946. *Scientific Man vs. Power Politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-40, 204-223.

Week 9

Session 17 November 15

Hoffmann, Stanley. 1977. 'An American Social Science: International Relations'. *Dædalus* 3: 41-60.

Navari, Cornelia, Felix Rösch, Hartmut Behr, Christof Frei, and Ned Lebow. 2016. 'Morgenthau in America': Forum. *Ethics & International Affairs* 30(1): 21-62.

Session 18 November 17

Waltz, Kenneth. 1959. *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1-15, 159-223.

Week 10

Session 19 November 22

Bull, Hedley. 1969. 'International Theory: The Case for a Classical Approach'. In Klaus Knorr and James Rosenau (eds), *Contending Approaches to International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 20-38.

Kaplan, Morton. 1966. 'The New Great Debate: Traditionalism vs. Science in International Relations'. *World Politics* 19(1): 1-20.

Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. New York: Random House, pp. 1-17, 79-101.

Session 20 November 24

Cox, Robert. 1986. 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory'. In Robert Keohane ed. *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 204-254.

Kratochwil, Friedrich and John Gerard Ruggie. 1986. 'International Organization: A State of the Art on an Art of the State'. *International Organization* 40(4): 753-775.

Wendt, Alexander. 1992. 'Anarchy is what states make of it: the social construction of power politics'. *International Organization* 46(2): 391-425.

Week 11

Session 21 November 29

Wæver, Ole. 1996. 'The Rise and Fall of the Inter-paradigm Debate.' In Steve Smith and Marysia Zalewski (eds). *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 149-185.

Kratochwil, Friedrich. 2006. 'History, Action and Identity: Revisiting the "Second" Great Debate and Assessing its Importance for Social Theory.' *European Journal of International Relations* 12(1): 5-29.

Reus-Smit, Christian. 2008. 'Reading History through Constructivist Eyes.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 37(2): 395-414.

Session 22 December 1

G. Thies, Cameron. 2002. 'Progress, History and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of the Idealist-Realist Debate'. *European Journal of International Relations* 8(2): 147-185.

Mouffe, Chantal. 2009. 'Democracy in a Multipolar World'. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 37(3): 549-561.

Brown, Chris. 2012. 'The "Practice Turn". *Phronesis* and Classical Realism: Towards a Phronetic International Political Theory?' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 40(3): 439-456.

Week 12

Session 23 December 6

Reus-Smit, Christian. 2013. 'Beyond metatheory?' *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 589-608.

Wæver, Ole. 2009. 'Waltz's Theory of Theory'. *International Relations* 23: 201-222.

Guzzini, Stefano. 2013. 'The Ends of International Relations theory: Stages of reflexivity and modes of theorizing'. *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 521-541.

Session 24 December 8 Closing discussion

“Learning” and “unlearning” IR

Navnita Chadha Behera

Introducing International Relations (IR) to the Master's degree students through a core paper on 'Theories of International Relations' is a consistently challenging enterprise because it involves teaching students both how to 'learn', *and* 'unlearn', in order to stay invested in the discipline in a critically engaging and productive manner. My classroom teaching experiences coupled with my research to understand the disciplinary knowledge structures of IR have helped me tease out the paradoxes involved in this exercise. While the students must learn the fundamentals of the Western canon of IR, the very process of doing so exposes them to the severe limitations of the theories' explanatory power and normative imaginations in applying these in the students' local diverse, if not divergent, contexts: hence, the need to '*unlearn*'.

Before explaining this further, let me briefly state the structural and temporal factors that make this task even more complex. Structural constraints are due to standard expectations of what a core paper in International Relations must do and the attending limitations in overhauling the syllabi coupled with the lack of textbooks that critically engage with theories of IR *beyond* Western frames, narratives and histories. Temporal factors pertain to the geocultural specificities of Delhi University's Department which has an enormous class size of about 500 Masters students (somewhat unevenly divided into two campuses), and which necessitates sharing the teaching of this paper and, as a logical corollary, entails different teaching styles and delivery. Also, a large proportion of students are not adept in the English language and hence face difficulties in accessing the existing body of literature.

So, how does one teach this paper? The first task is to explain different theoretical perspectives offered by realism, neo-liberal institutionalism, feminism, constructivism, critical theory, post-modernism, neo-Marxism and so on. Students learn what are the fundamental assumptions and tenets of each theory; their key variables for explaining international issues; and, their effectiveness or lack thereof in doing so. This is attempted by selecting a random albeit diverse range of contemporary issues/problematics that emerge from the class discussions. Such exercises help students in understanding the relative strengths of each theoretical approach and their shared deliberations of contemporary issues from different theoretical standpoints. It also renders the abstract concepts of IR more intelligible – especially for those facing linguistic challenges.

This, however, also creates the ground for the paradox outlined above. Two common – albeit illustrative and not exhaustive – responses of students are the following. Those who grasp the subject well sometimes lose interest because they may argue: ‘given the gaps and limitations in these theories in making sense of *their* world, what is the point of studying these?’ Many others seek an easier way out by selectively choosing only those exemplars/issues which find a better ‘fit’ within the given theoretical parameters and simply ignore/negate others. That is how, as a teacher, one faces the challenge to then make students ‘*unlearn*’ or at least critically to interrogate some of the foundational premises of IR theories and textual knowledge enshrined in its textbooks and to steer them in a different direction.

The pedagogic strategy deployed for this purpose is two-fold. First, it entails detailed class discussions on what I have termed the ‘*e-problematique*’ of IR that lies at the core of knowledge structures: by ‘*e-problematique*’ I mean accrediting *epistemic* knowledge as being superior to ontological knowledge claims, and *Euro-centrism*, which privileges European (or Anglo-American) history as *the* source for producing such epistemic knowledge at the cost of marginalizing and/or delegitimizing any other civilizational pasts as a useful site of knowledge-creation in IR. A candid, comprehensive and inclusive debate on how such foundational assumptions have shaped and even circumscribed the disciplinary knowledge of IR has barely begun to make its presence felt in the pedagogic practices of IR.

The second part carries this debate further through specific topics offered in the syllabi. The idea of teaching students about the Indian and Chinese traditions in IR is not to indulge in nativist claims but to recognise that there are indeed alternate vantage points for theorizing IR, which might have been silenced or pushed to the periphery for various academic and probably political reasons. Also, epistemological positions are not the only or necessarily the best way forward to understand reality and thus, as students of IR, we all need to turn our attention fully towards ontology – actually, ontologies in plural. In the same spirit, the class discussions on the ‘state of the art of IR’ focus on the cutting-edge developments in the domain of IR theories, especially the scholarly endeavours of those working on non-Western IR, post-Western IR, global IR and ‘doing IR differently’, which considers hitherto marginalized voices, be they those of particular races, geo-cultural loci, indigenous peoples or older civilizations.

The ultimate message that, I hope, students carry from this paper is that theorizing in IR, as indeed in any other field, is not a finite project but a constantly evolving one and any ‘disquietudes’ with theory should not become a ground for disengaging with but it calls for a continuing, deeper and critical engagement with the same.

DELHI UNIVERSITY
M.A. in Political Science
Core Paper: Theories of International Relations

Course Description

This course introduces graduate students to diverse traditions of theoretical endeavours in the International Relations as they have evolved around the world. It will cover both explanatory and normative paradigms in international relations theory and give a brief overview of the state of the art of IR to students. The purpose of the course is to provide a thorough background in all schools of IR theory and the debates between them regarding their perspective on the nature of international politics and how it is to be conceptualized, understood and judged, bearing in mind their geo-cultural specificities

Course Outline

1. Introduction

- 1.a. Evolution of the Discipline
- 1.b. The Great Debates
- 1.c. State of the Art

2. Realism: Its Variants and Complements

- 2.a. Structural Realism
- 2.b. Indian Tradition: Kautilya's Realpolitik
- 2.c. Chinese Tradition
- 2.d. European Schools of Thought
- 2.e. The English School
- 2.f. Neo-Liberalism Institutionalism

3. Alternative Approaches in IR

- 3.a. Critical Theory
- 3.b. Constructivism
- 3.c. Post-Modernism
- 3.d. Feminism
- 3.e. Neo-Marxism
- 3.f. Ethics in IR

4. Problematic of the 'International'

Reading List

Burchill, Scott et al. 2005. *Theories of International Relations* 3rd ed, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, Steve, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski (eds.). 1996. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, Chris and Kirsten Ainley. 2005. *Understanding International Relations*, 3rd Ed., Palgrave Macmillan.

Dunne, Tim., M. Kurki and Steve Smith. 2007. *International Relations. Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford University Press.

Bull, Hedley. 2002. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, 3rd edn., Basingstoke: Palgrave.

- Tickner, Arlene B. and Ole Wever (eds). 2009. *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*, London: Routledge.
- Chadha Behera, Navnita (ed). 2008. *International Relations in South Asia: Search for an Alternative Paradigm*, New Delhi, Sage.
- Kautilya, *Arthashastra*. 1993. Penguin Classics.
- Sun Tzu and Lionel Giles. 2007. *The Art of War*, Ulysses Press.
- Aron, Raymond. 1973. *Peace and War: A Theory of International Relations*, New York, Anchor Books.
- Bromley, S., William Brown and Suma Athreya (eds). 2004. *Ordering the International: History, Change and Transformation*, London: Pluto Press with The Open University,
- Cox, Robert and T. Sinclair. 1996. *Approaches to World Order*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baldwin, David A. (ed.). 1993. *Neo-Realism and Neo-liberalism: The Contemporary Debate* (New York: Columbia University Press.
- Baylis, Joh and Steve Smith (eds). 2001. *The Globalization of World Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, R. B. J. 1995. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1991. *The Consequences of Modernity*, London: Polity Press.
- Grant, Rebecca and Newland (eds). 1991. *Gender and International Relations*, Buckingham: Open University Press and Millennium Press.
- Brown, Chris. 1992. *International Relations Theory: New Normative Approaches*, Hamel Hamstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Carr, E.H. 1981. *The Twenty Years Crisis: 1919-1939*. London: Macmillan.
- Waltz, Kenneth. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. London: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Rosenberg, Justin. 1994. *The Empire of Civil Society*, Verso, London.
- Halliday, Fred. 1994. *Rethinking International Relations*, London: Macmillan Press.
- Hollis, Martin and Steve Smith. 1991. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*, Oxford University Press.
- Carlsnaes, W., T. Risse and B. Simmons (eds). 2006. *Handbook of International Relations*. London, Sage.

Introducing IR by sidestepping IR-paradigmatism

Gunther Hellmann

I have been teaching the course 'Classics in International Relations' annually for almost ten years in Frankfurt. It is conceived as an introduction to the discipline and is aimed at undergraduates in Political Science. Although the course is taught in German, much of the reading is in English. Students at that stage have, at a minimum, attended an introductory lecture in Political Science beforehand. The central goal of the course is to introduce them at an early stage to broad themes in IR based on a joint and close reading of authoritative, theory-centred articles or book chapters by recognized IR scholars. In fourteen classes we read old 'classics' (such as Thucydides and Kant), broadly recognized contemporary IR 'classics' (such as Deutsch, Waltz, Keohane and Nye, Wendt or Cox), as well as post-positivist scholars and contemporaries whose 'classics'-status may be a bid more contentious (e.g., Blaney and Inayatullah). This pedagogical strategy is based on the assumption that the best way to introduce both the subject matter of 'international relations' and its theories by exposing students early on to a variety of ways of theorizing international relations based on original texts to be read, commented on and discussed in depth.

I realize that this is an unorthodox way of introducing the discipline and its theories because it confronts students right away and, sort of, frontally with a broad variety of demanding theoretical vocabularies. However, I find it preferable and also manageable compared to alternative, e.g., textbook-based, introductions. It is preferable because it circumvents what I have increasingly come to see as one of the bad habits of the discipline, i.e., a form of *paradigmatism* which straightjackets the subject matters of international studies as well as its scholars into rather simplistic '-isms'.¹ Instead, students are exposed right away to the different (and differentiating) vocabularies, concepts and arguments we all fancy ourselves to develop as authors in our own writings. This enables them to learn early on that one and the same concept (e.g., theory, cause, power, state, actor, etc.) may have different meanings and functions in different theoretical vocabularies.

To be sure, this pedagogical strategy is quite challenging because reading Waltz and Wendt in the original as a means to 'introduce' IR amounts to learning to swim without 'dry lessons.' However, student evaluations and my own observation lead me to conclude that two pedagogical tools help students not to 'drown.'

(1) One of the requirements for earning credits asks students to submit comments

and/or elaborated questions of approximately 100-200 words, based on their reading and focused on some aspect they find worthy of discussing in depth. These comments and questions are uploaded prior to each class to a joint electronic learning platform. They help me in preparing for what students find both most difficult to grasp and most interesting to discuss and they, in addition, also guide a small student working group in preparing the respective class in depth with a tutor. (2) The class itself usually starts with a short presentation by the respective working group which highlights key themes and open questions, thereby providing an additional input to structure the class and helping to kick off the plenary discussion. Roughly 80 percent of the time in class then focuses, under my guidance, on a discussion of key concepts and central arguments. The students of the respective preparatory working group serve as ‘experts.’

One of the central values of this way of introducing IR in my view is that it sensitizes students early on to the complexity and variety of theoretical arguments and concepts. Rather than learning how to compartmentalize and stereotype international political thought and individual authors into simplistic ‘-isms’ students are challenged to grasp argumentative nuance and different conceptual meanings. They also learn early on that ‘theory’ has a different meaning in different IR vocabularies and that a great variety of different key concepts may be connected in variable ways in order to theorize (or make sense of) international affairs. A possible downside might be that students end the course with a mere overview of ‘islands’ of IR theorization where connecting the dots and rendering the different theoretical vocabularies into some coherent ‘IR-theory’ whole may seem futile. Yet this may be a quite realistic sense of what IR theory actually amounts to after all – and, given that more courses lie ahead for them in order to pursue some threads in more depth, the fact that more questions may have been raised (rather than that easily reproducible ‘knowledge’ may have been collected) may, at a minimum, be fully justifiable.

Note

1. For current trends in research and teaching, see Berenskoetter (2018) on recent developments in textbooks, and Albert (2017) on teaching and syllabi. (Albert’s article also includes links to online resources.) Hellmann (2020) includes a more detailed discussion, and there is an expanded version with a more detailed bibliography available online at <http://www.fb03.uni-frankfurt.de/77800435>.

'Classics' in International Relations
(Syllabus adopted for WISC-JIAS Workshop 2018 from German original)

Gunther Hellmann

- introductory course, taught at BA level in German; students at that stage have at a minimum attended an introductory lecture to Political Science beforehand;
- goal: introduction to broad themes in IR based on short authoritative texts by recognized IR scholars (not 'paradigms') displaying a variety of understandings as to (a) the subject matter of 'international relations' and (b) 'theory' of international relations;
- course is organized mainly around an in-depth discussion of the respective text(s) in class;
- student requirements:
 - a) short 'comments' on the readings to be uploaded prior to each class to a joint electronic learning platform; comments should engage some aspect of the text(s);
 - b) participation in a small working group preparing one session in detail under guidance of a tutor; task includes pre-screening 'comments' by fellow students; group prepares (and uploads) short paper with key themes/questions to be discussed in detail in class;
 - c) choice between (i) final take-home exam or (ii) term paper;

1. Introduction: 'Classical' Texts in IR?

Required Reading:

Wæver, Ole. 1997. 'Figures of International Thought: Introducing Persons instead of Paradigms.' In Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver (eds.). *The Future of International Relations. Masters in the Making*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-4, 7-12, 26-29 (browse rest).

Biddal, Henrik, Casper Sylves and Peter Wilson. 2013. 'Introduction.' In Henrik Biddal, Casper Sylvest and Peter Wilson, (eds). *Classics of International Relations: Essays in Criticism and Appreciation*, London: Routledge, pp. 1-8 (browse rest).

Suggested Reading:

Mukherjee, Ankhi. 2014. *What Is a Classic? Postcolonial Rewriting and Invention of the Canon*, Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Thompson, Kenneth W. 1980. *Masters of International Thought. Major Twentieth Century Theorists and the World Crisis*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, Preface (ixxi), browse following pages: 1-4; 63-66; 125-127; 179-181.

2. The 'Mother' of all IR 'Masters' – Thucydides

Required Reading:

Thucydides. 1964. 'Der Melierdialog' in: Georg Peter Landmann, Georg, *Geschichte des Peloponnesischen Krieges*, 2. Aufl., Reinbek: Rowohlt-Verlag, pp. 249-255.

Suggested Reading:

Johnson Bagby, Laurie M. 1994. 'The Use and Abuse of Thucydides in International Relations.' *International Organization*, 48 (1):131-153

Doyle, Michael W. 1990. 'Thucydidean Realism.' *Review of International Studies*, 16(3): 223-237.

Forde, Steven. 1995. 'International Realism and the Science of Politics: Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Neorealism.' *International Studies Quarterly*, 39(2): 141-160.

Gustafson, Lowell S. (ed.). 2002. *Thucydides' Theory of International Relations. A Lasting Possession*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Lebow, Richard Ned. 2001. 'Thucydides the Constructivist.' *American Political Science Review*, 95(3): 547-560.

3. The 'Grandfather' of Liberal IR Theory – Immanuel Kant

Required Reading:

Kant, Immanuel. 1984. *Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf*, Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun., pp. 3-21.

Suggested Reading:

Doyle, Michael C. 1986. 'Liberalism and World Politics.' *American Political Science Review*, 80(4): 1151–1169.

Lynch, Cecilia. 1994. 'Kant, the Republican Peace, and Moral Guidance in International Law.' *Ethics and International Affairs* 8: 39–58.

Franke, Mark F. N. 1995. 'Immanuel Kant and the (Im)Possibility of International Relations Theory.' *Alternatives: Social Transformation and Humane Governance* 20(3): 279–322.

Bohman, James and Matthias Lutz-Bachman (eds). 1997. *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: The MIT Press (among others: Jürgen Habermas on 'Kant's Idea of Perpetual Peace, with the Benefit of TwoHundred Years' Hindsight').

4. Liberalism I: Security Communities – Karl W. Deutsch

Required Reading:

Deutsch, Karl W. et al. 2009. 'Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the Light of Historical Experience.' In Andreas Grimm and Cord Jakobeit (eds). *Politische Theorien der Europäischen Integration. Ein Textund Lehrbuch*, Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp.80-93.

Suggested Reading:

Jahn, Beate. 2014. 'Liberalism – In Theory and History.' In Rebekka Friedman, Kevork Oskanian and Ramon Pacheco Pardo (eds). *After Liberalism? The Future of Liberalism in International Relations*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp.15-32.

Adler, Emanuel and Michael Barnett (eds). 1998. *Security Communities*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1995. *Cooperation Among Democracies: The European Influence on U.S. Foreign Policy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Koschut, Simon. 2016. *Normative Change and Security Community Disintegration: Undoing Peace*, Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

5. 'Classical' Realism – Hans J. Morgenthau

Required Reading:

Morgenthau, Hans J. 1978. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf, pp. 3-15.

Suggested Reading:

Turner, Stephen and George Mazur. 2009. 'Morgenthau as a Weberian Methodologist.' *European Journal of International Relations* 15(3): 477-504.

Tickner, J. Ann. 1988. 'Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Reformulation.' *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 17(3): 429-440.

Mearsheimer, John J. 2001. *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, pp. 1-28.

Rösch, Felix. 2014. 'Pouvoir, Puissance, and Politics: Hans Morgenthau's Dualistic Concept of Power?' *Review of International Studies* 40: 349–365.

6. Neorealism – Kenneth W. Waltz

Required Reading:

Waltz, Kenneth N. 2008. *Realism and International Politics*, New York, NY: Routledge, pp. 67-82.

Suggested Reading:

Mouritzen, Hans. 1997. 'Kenneth Waltz: A Critical Rationalist Between International Politics and Foreign Policy.' In Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver, Ole (eds). *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making*, London: Routledge, p. 66-89.

Keohane, Robert O. (ed). 1986. *Neorealism and Its Critics*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Legro, Jeffrey W. and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. 'Is Anybody Still a Realist?' *International Security* 24(2): 5-55.

Behr, Hartmut and Amelia Heath. 2009. 'Misreading in IR Theory and Ideology Critique: Morgenthau, Waltz, and Neo-realism.' *Review of International Studies* 35(2): 327-349.

7. Critical Theory – Robert W. Cox

Required Reading:

Cox, Robert W. 1981. 'Social Forces, States and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10(2): 126-155.

Suggested Reading:

Overbeek, Henk. 2000. 'Transnational Historical Materialism: Theories of Transnational Class Formation and World Order.' In Ronan Palan (ed). *Global Political Economy: Contemporary Theories*, London: Routledge.

Cox, Robert W. (ed). 1998. *Weltordnung und Hegemonie. Grundlagen der internationalen politischen Ökonomie*. Marburg: FEG am Institut für Politikwissenschaft.

Rengger, Nicholas and Ben Thirkell-White (eds). 2007. *Critical International Relations Theory after 25 years*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leysens, Anthony (ed). 2008. *The Critical Theory of Robert W. Cox. Fugitive or Guru?*

Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

8. Liberalism II: Complex Interdependence – Robert O. Keohane & Joseph S. Nye

Required Reading:

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. 2001. *Power and Interdependence*. New York, NY: Longman, pp. 3-32.

Suggested Reading:

Keohane, Robert O. and Joseph S. Nye. 1989. *Power and Interdependence* (2nd edition). New York, NY: Harper Collins Publishers, 245-267 (browse rest).

Baldwin, David A. (ed). 1993. *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Keohane, Robert O. and Lisa L. Martin. 2003. 'Institutional Theory as a Research Program.' In Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman (eds). *Progress in International Relations Theory: Appraising the Field*, pp. 71-107.

Moravcsik, Andrew. 2003. 'Theory Synthesis in International Relations: Real Not Metaphysical.' *International Studies Review* (March 2003). Part of a forum entitled 'Are Dialogue and Synthesis Possible in International Relations?'

9. English School – Hedley Bull

Required Reading:

Bull, Hedley. 2002. *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*, New York, NY: Columbia University Press, pp. 8-26, 44-50.

Suggested Reading:

Buzan, Barry. 2001. 'The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR.' *Review of International Studies* 27(3): 471-488.

Dunne, Tim. 1998. *Inventing International Society: A History of the English School*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Little, Richard. 2000. 'The English School's Contribution to the Study of International Relations.' *European Journal of International Relations* 6(3): 395-422.

10. Constructivism I – Nicholas Onuf

Required Reading:

Onuf, Nicholas G. 1989. *World of Our Making. Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, pp. 33-52 (browse 131, 52-65).

Suggested Reading:

Pin-Fat, Véronique. 2014. 'How Do We Begin to Think about the World?' In Jenny Edkins and Maja Zehfuss (eds). *Global Politics: A New Introduction*, New York: Routledge, pp. 20-38.

Onuf, Nicholas G. 2013. *Making Sense, Making Worlds: Constructivism in Social Theory and International Relations*, London: Routledge.

Fierke, Karin. 2013. 'Constructivism' In Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, (eds). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 187-204.

Zehfuss, Maja. 2002. *Constructivism in International Relations: The Politics of Reality*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kratochwil, Friedrich. 2016. 'A Funny Thing Happened on the Way to the Forum: Ruminations Concerning the Disappearance of Constructivism and its Survival in the Farcical Mode.' *European Review of International Studies* 3(3): 118–136 (browse rest of this 'Special Issue' on 'constructivism').

11. Constructivism II – Alexander Wendt

Required Reading:

Wendt, Alexander. 1992. 'Anarchy is What States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics.' *International Organization* 46(2): 391-425.

Suggested Reading:

Wendt, Alexander. 1999. *Social Theory of International Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Guzzini, Stefano and Anna Leander (eds). 2006. *Constructivism and International Relations: Alexander Wendt and His Critics*, London: Routledge.

Forum on 'Social Theory of International Politics' (2000). *Review of International Studies* 26:1, 125-180.

Copeland, Dale C. 2000. 'The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay.' *International Security* 25(2): 187-212.

12. Feminism – J. Ann Tickner

Required Reading:

Tickner, J. Ann. 1997. 'You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists'. *International Studies Quarterly* 41(4): 611-632.

Suggested Reading:

Zalewski, Marysia and Jane Parpart (eds). 1998. *The 'Man' Question in International Relations*, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Sylvester, Christine. 2000. *Feminist Theory and International Relations in a Postmodern Era*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sylvester, Christine. 2004. *Feminist International Relations: An Unfinished Journey*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tickner, J. Ann and Sjoberg, Laura. 2013. Feminism. In: Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 205-222.

13. Postmodernism/Poststructuralism – Richard K. Ashley & R. B. J. Walker

Required Reading:

Ashley, Richard K. and R.B.J. Walker. 1990. 'Introduction: Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissidence in International Studies.' *International Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 259-268.

Suggested Reading:

Campbell, David. 2013. 'Poststructuralism'. In: Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith (eds). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 223-246.

Ashley, Richard K. 1987. 'The Geopolitics of Geopolitical Space: Toward a Critical Social Theory of International Politics.' *Alternatives* 12(4): 403-434.

Walker, R.B.J. 1993. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Der Derian, James. 2009. *Critical Practices in International Theory*. Selected Essays, New York: Routledge.

14. Postcolonialism David L. Blaney & Naeem Inayatullah; Tarek Barkawi & Mark Laffey

Required Reading:

Blaney, David L. and Naeem Inayatullah. 2008. 'International Relations From Below.' In Christian ReusSmit and Duncan Snidal (eds). *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 667-670.

Barkawi, Tarek and Mark Laffey. 2006. 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies.' *Review of International Studies* 32: 329–352.

Suggested Reading:

Krishna Sankaran. 2014. 'How Does Colonialism Work?'. In Jenny Edkins and Maja Zehfuss (eds). *Global Politics: A New Introduction*, New York: Routledge, pp. 338-362.

Grovogui, Siba N. 2013. 'Postcolonialism'. In Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith, (eds). *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 247-265.

Blaney, David L. and Naeem Inayatullah. 2004. *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, New York, NY: Routledge.

Chowdhry, Greeta and Sheila Nair. 2003. *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race, Gender and Class*, New York, NY: Routledge.

Conclusions

Methodology and research practice

Benjamin Herborth

Methodology and Research Practice is a mandatory course taught in the second year of the B.A. programme in International Relations and International Organization at the University of Groningen in the Netherlands.¹ The course consists of a series of introductory lectures for approximately 200 students, and a series of seminars for 20 students each. The lectures provide an introductory overview of fundamental problems in philosophy of science as they pertain to the study of international politics, introduce basic methodological debates and showcase interpretive, qualitative and quantitative research traditions. The seminars provide a problem-based learning environment, in which students are guided step by step through the process of writing a research paper of 7000 words. The paper allows students to integrate for the first time theoretical, methodological and substantive insights gained during their studies, thus also preparing them for the B.A. thesis to be written in the third year of the programme.

The semester is organized in two blocks of seven weeks separated by an exam break of three weeks. While lectures are given weekly throughout the first block, the seminars are stretched out across the entire semester (including the exam break), thus allowing students to build on lecture material in the development of their projects. In terms of assessment, the research paper stands at the centre of the course. However, we use additional forms of assessment in order to cover the full scope of the course and to allow students to track their own progress throughout the semester. An online exam environment consisting of weekly sets of questions posted on a course-specific digital learning platform allows students to test their understanding of the basic methodological vocabulary introduced in the lectures through various types of questions (multiple choice, matching pairs, fill in the blank), which can be assessed automatically. Online tests can thus be repeated indefinitely, also after the completion of the course, which allows students to use these as a resource during their further studies. In addition, in order to stress critical engagement next to the vocabulary-learning element addressed through the online tests, students submit weekly essays of about 500 words responding to discussion questions.

As the seminars are designed as a problem-based learning space, which guides students step by step through the process of writing a research paper, seminar participation is also graded as a separate assessment point. This includes preparation of weekly tasks, presentations and peer feedback. The setup of the seminars allows students gradually to develop a 'living outline' of their paper, thus avoiding the 'outline trap' typically encountered with fixed outlines or proposals, namely,

that as students want to pass the outline stage, they are incentivized to cover up problems. A living outline challenges them, on the contrary, to highlight what is unclear at any given stage. Individual steps of the research process – moving from a broad topic to a specific research question, theoretical and methodological framework, selecting and analysing empirical material – can thus each be addressed from three different perspectives. First, seminar instructors draw on their own research experience, thus highlighting the character of the seminars as research workshops. Second, exemplary articles, representing various methodological perspectives, are read repeatedly with an eye to how they address the specific aspect highlighted in the seminar. Third, students present and discuss their own work as it develops, receiving continuous feedback from both the seminar instructor and their peers. The seminar setup thus invites students to think of themselves as researchers actively engaged in the production of knowledge.

Students have generally appreciated the opportunity to conduct independent research in a closely supervised learning environment. In particular, the clear position of the course in the degree programme, which allows students to integrate insights gained thus far and to prepare for the B.A. thesis by engaging in research on a topic of their own choosing, has garnered positive feedback. At the same time, the course setup has been continuously revised based on feedback and evaluations, introducing, for instance, the online learning environment in an effort to strengthen the link between lectures and seminars.

The basic idea behind this particular setup is to emphasize that doing research is a practical skill that can be taught and learned, and most effectively so by doing research in a setting that invites mutual criticism and fosters intellectual curiosity.² The fundamental challenge in teaching methodology is to avoid presenting it as a dry-swimming exercise. This is more than a matter of form and presentation: it cuts straight to the core of what is substantively at stake. Do we think of methodology in terms of a set of rules that is bound to discipline thought, i.e., to keep it within disciplinary boundaries? Or do we think of methodology as a set of tools to foster intellectual curiosity in a way that recognizes the social and dialogical nature of research? From the latter point of view, methodology is less about defending research design and operationalization against the standardized expectations of a disciplinary canon. It is, on the contrary, about inviting criticism by creating the highest possible degree of transparency about each step of the research process.

Notes

1. I have designed the course and coordinated it since 2013, first in collaboration with Christopher Lamont, now in collaboration with Julia Costa Lopez.
2. As always, the course is an attempt to concretize a particular view of education in a particular institutional setting. Important points of reference with regard to the underlying view/critique of pedagogy include Adorno (1971), Dewey (1923) and Rancière (1991).

Academic year 2018-2019 | Semester 2 Course unit syllabus
Methodology and Research Practice
BA International Relations and International Organization LYX076B10

B.A. Herborth (lectures and coordination)
J. Costa Lopez (lectures and coordination)
S. Alt, A.G. Harryvan, M.R. Kamminga, C.M. Ryan, L. Sprik, A.
A. Nohr, D. Schmid (seminar instructors)

1 / Type of course unit, number of ECTS credit points and admission requirements

- a) **Type:** Mandatory for all students in the Bachelor's programme in International Relations and International Organization (180 ects).
- b) **ECTS credit points:** 10 ects.
- c) **Admission requirements:** Admission to the 2nd year of the BA IRIO.
- d) **Contact details:**
 - Benjamin Herborth (lectures and coordination) – room H13.15.0519, office hours Tue b.a.herborth@rug.nl, 15.00-16.00 after lectures and by appointment.
 - Julia Costa Lopez (lectures and coordination) - room H1312.0107, office hours Tue 15.00-j.costa.lopez@rug.nl, 16.00 after lectures by appointment.
- e) **Time and place:** See roster.rug.nl under Faculty of Arts, Ba IR.

2 / Content of the course unit

MRP provides students with a practical lecture-seminar learning environment in which they will be introduced to the practice of inquiry and research methodology in International Relations. The lecture portion of this module will introduce students to methodological debates within the social sciences, research design, and research operationalization. The seminars will take the form of intensive methods workshops in which students will be expected to carry out independent research projects under step-by-step supervision covering the use of theory, methodological choices and the practice of inquiry. MRP aims to give students a strong foundation in applied research methods and skills that are transferable across a wide range of research careers.

3 / Position of the course unit in the degree programme

Building on prior qualifications obtained in Skills and Theory of International Relations, the 2nd year module provides a practice-oriented introduction into the conduct of inquiry, thus preparing students for the B.A. thesis to be written in the 3rd year.

4 / Learning outcomes of the course unit

The learning outcomes of this course unit contribute to the following programme learning outcomes (PLO) of the BA International Relations. You can find the full wording of the programme learning outcomes here: <http://www.rug.nl/let/organization/bestuur-afdelingen-en-medewerkers/bestuur-en-commissies/oeren/>

The learning outcomes (on an intermediate level) of this module are the following:

1. The student is able to acquire and organize knowledge and understanding at an intermediate level of key classic and contemporary debates on methodologies in international relations.
2. The student is able to apply methodological knowledge and understanding to critically and systematically evaluate methods of historical, social, and political research.
3. The student is able to apply methodologies and methods to critically and systematically evaluate a wide array of beliefs, ideas, and data, and analyze complex issues.

4. The student is able to apply methodological debates to understand the wider societal impact of social science research.
5. The student is able to acquire and organize knowledge about a topic of her/his choosing.
6. The student is able to evaluate research (plans) of both himself/herself, and others, in an analytical and substantiated manner, as well as in a way that respects scientific, social and ethical responsibilities.
7. The student is able to present original research in a clear and coherent manner in written form, demonstrating an appropriate language proficiency in English and/or Dutch.
8. The student is self-reliant and reliable in the execution of the individual requirements of this course unit.
9. The student is able to process effectively and efficiently large amounts of conceptual and theoretical textual material on international relations.

5 / Mode of instruction and learning activities

Weekly plenary lectures in the first block of the semester will present methodologies and methods not merely in a textbook-like manner, but also illustrate them with the help of examples taken from IR as well as social and political science in general. Already at the level of the plenary lectures the course unit strongly appeals to the students' capacity of self-study and self-organization.

Seminar groups will provide students with a problem-based learning environment, in which they are invited to apply the understanding of contemporary methodological debates and research methods gained in the lectures to particular research topics. Individual seminar sessions will focus on individual steps of the research process, ranging from the formulation of a research question and the choice of an appropriate conceptual/theoretical framework to questions of data selection, data analysis, and the presentation of research findings. Each of these steps will be discussed on the basis of 1) exemplary research articles, 2) the seminar instructor's own research experience, 3) student projects as they develop.

6 / Assessment

a) Mode of assessment

1. Exam (L1-4, L8-9): The exam covering the content of both lectures and lecture readings will have two parts:
 - a) Formative testing. The point of formative testing is to move away from a final evaluation point in which students are marked based on their performance and towards a reflexive form of self-testing over the course of the semester. Students will receive access to a set of multiple-choice questions based on each of the lectures, which help to identify and clarify the main take-away points from the lectures. The multiple-choice questions will be graded as pass/fail only and can be revisited at any time for self-study purposes. In order to pass, students will have to obtain 100% on each of the tests by midnight on the 31st of March 2019. Passing this component by the deadline will be a requirement for part b) to be assessed.
RESIT of part A. Students have unlimited resit opportunities for part A within the deadline. If all tests are not passed with 100% mark by the deadline, part A will be failed and no further resit opportunities will be offered.
 - b) Take-home essay exam. Students will have to write 6 take-home reflexive essays based on the content of both lectures and lecture readings in weeks 2 to 6. The questions for each week will be published after the lecture. These essays will have a maximum length of 500 words and will have to be completed on Nestor by

noon on the 2nd of April 2019. After the deadline, and if students have passed the formative testing part of the exam, two of the essays will be marked. The exam grade for the course will be average of both marks.

RESIT of part B. Those students who receive a fail mark in part B will be asked to attend an oral examination on the content of both the lectures and the lecture readings. The date and time of this oral examination will be communicated in April.

* Please note, all parts of the exam are individual assessment points. Any evidence of collaboration between students will result in either a fail mark or being referred to the Board of Examiners on suspected plagiarism. In some cases of suspected misconduct, students might be asked to attend an oral examination to verify the individual nature of the work. *

2. Research Paper (L3-L9): Groups of two students carry out a research project of their own design. The research project should i) situate itself within the context of a broader academic debate (theoretical reflection), ii) develop and justify a research design, iii) carry out first steps of an empirical analysis (7000 words including footnotes and excluding the bibliography). In exceptional cases seminar lecturers may allow for groups of three students or single-authored papers. The word limit for single-authored papers remains 7000, the word limit for papers authored by three students is 8500.
3. Seminar preparation and presentation (L2-4, L6, L8): as part of the process of writing the research paper, students will attend seven seminar sessions. In preparation for these sessions, students will write and update an online Wiki about their project, using and applying the concepts and approaches discussed in the lectures. In the seminars, they will be asked to discuss their progress on the paper and reflect on their methodological approach and choices. In week 12 they will present their research proposal and answer questions from the rest of the class; in week 16 they will present next-to-ready drafts of their research papers and again answer questions from the rest of the class. These three aspects (seminar preparation, participation, and presentation) will be jointly graded in one seminar participation and preparation grade (see assessment form in the appendix). If a student fails to meet the expectations regarding individual seminar participation, there will first be a verbal note advising the student to get on track. If the student continues to fail in meeting the expectations there will be a written note, which details what the student is expected to do and when s/he is expected to do it (yellow card). The written note informs the student that s/he is now using the resit chance for the seminar participation grade. If the student still fails to meet the expectations explained in the written note, seminar participation will be graded as insufficient (below 5,5). If the note is given in the final seminar, lecturers will offer a brief (10-15 min) oral examination as a resit opportunity.
4. Learning Journal (L6, also L3-4 and L7-8): Students reflect on qualifications obtained in a critical review of their own work. The leading questions will be: What qualifications do I have obtained that will help me in successfully writing a B.A thesis? What do I need to improve in order to successfully write a B.A. thesis. The learning journal will be graded as pass/fail and provide the basis for individual meetings that conclude the module (500 words).

A resit, if necessary, will be discussed in the individual meeting.

Exam, research paper and learning journal must each be completed successfully in order to pass the course.

- b) Assessment: duration, time and place; deadlines and procedures. Exam

Part a) deadline: 31st of March 2019 at midnight.

Part b) deadline: 2nd of April 2019 at noon.

Presentations

At time of seminar in week 12 and 16

Paper

Due at time of seminar in week beginning 3rd of June 2019 Resit due 28th of June 2019 at noon.

Learning Journal

Due Monday 10th of June at noon.

- c) Examples of tests

Representative examples of the exam and the assessments will be discussed during the lectures.

- d) Conditions for takings exams

The exam will be open to all students registered for the course.

7 / Assessment

- a) Assessment criteria

Exam questions will be assessed based on student's ability to independently understand and apply core concepts and approaches of methodology and methods (L1-4, L8), as well as to understand readings and debates relating to research practice and methodological debates in international relations (L9).

Please note that both parts of the exam (formative tests on Nestor and take-home exam) are individual exercises and assessment points. Any evidence of collaboration between students will be considered cheating and either receive a fail mark or be submitted to the Board of Examiners if suspected of plagiarism. Any evidence of this behaviour might result in students having to take a resit oral examination on the content of the course.

For the research paper and the seminar participation grade please see the attached evaluation forms.

- b) Calculating preliminary and final marks

- Exam: 20% (learning outcomes 1-4 and 8/9)

Part a: pass/fail

Part b: 20% of the grade.

- Research Paper: 60% of the grade (learning outcomes 3-9)

- Seminar Participation: 20% of the grade (learning outcomes 2-4, 6)

Preparation: 10%

Presentation: 10%

- Learning Journal: pass/fail (specifically learning outcome 6, also 3, 4, 7-9)

8 / Cheating and plagiarism

Cheating and plagiarism are subject to the provisions set down in the Teaching and Examination Regulations Part A, Article 4.13. You can find the regulations here:

- <http://www.rug.nl/let/organization/bestuur-afdelingen-en-medewerkers/bestuur-en-commissies/oeren/>

The Board of Examiners is always informed in cases of suspected cheating or plagiarism.

9 / Calculation of student workload

MRP is a 10 ECTS module. Under Dutch regulations, this means that you should expect on average a total workload of 280 hours for this course. In MRP, the teaching activities are projected to have an average workload in hours as follows:

- 10 ects = 280 hours
- Lectures: 7 (2x2 hours) = 28 hours
- Seminars: 7 (2x3 hours) = 42 hours
- Exam: Reading, writing take-home essays, online testing environment = 90 hours
- Research for and writing of the research paper and weekly wiki assignments = 116 hours
- Presentation = 2 hours
- Learning Journal reflecting on the learning experience throughout the course = 2 hours

10 / Literature

Compulsory: several online articles (see the weekly schedule below; all available through the RUG library/Nestor).

11 / Weekly schedule

The lectures will start in the first week of the semester (week of 04 February 2019), the seminars will start in the second week of the semester (week of 11 February 2019). Please regularly check your schedule for this course on:

- <http://rooster.rug.nl/>

Lecture schedule

Week	Date	Topics, literature and assignments
1	5 Feb.	Methodology and Research Practice: Introduction to the Module (Herborth) Tolstoy, Leo. <i>War and Peace</i> , London: Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., Book X, chapter 28: Napoleon's Cold. Why the War had to be Fought. At https://archive.org/details/warandpeace030164mbp Allcott, Hunt and Matthew Gentzkow. 'Social Media and Fake News in the 2016 Election.' Working Paper, Stanford University Press. At http://web.stanford.edu/~gentzkow/research/fakenews.pdf Scheppele, Kim Lane. 2013. 'The Rule of Law and the Frankenstate: Why Governance Checklists Do Not Work.' <i>Governance</i> 26: 559-562.
2	12 Feb.	International Relations as a Social Science: Theory, Methodology, Method (Herborth) Johnson, Teresa. 1991. 'Writing for <i>International Security</i> : A Contributor's Guide.' <i>International Security</i> 16 (2): 171-180. Morgenthau, Hans. 1944. 'The Limitations of Science and the Problem of Social Planning.' <i>Ethics</i> 54: 174-185. Rudolph, Susanne Hoeber. 2005. 'The imperialism of categories: situating knowledge in a globalizing world.' <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 3: 5-14.
3	19 Feb.	International Relations as a Social Science: Explaining, Understanding, and beyond (Herborth) Geertz, Clifford. 1972. 'Deep Play: Notes on the Balinese Cockfight.' <i>Daedalus</i> 101 (1): 1-37. Foucault, Michel. 1982. 'The Subject and Power.' <i>Critical Inquiry</i> 8 (4): 777-795. Comaroff, Jean and John L. Comaroff. 2012. 'Theory from the South: Or, how Euro-America is Evolving toward Africa.' <i>Anthropological Forum</i> 22 (2): 113-131.

4	26 Feb	Quantitative Approaches (Costa Lopez) <p>Franklin, Mark. 2008. 'Quantitative analysis.' In Donatella Della Porta and Michael Keating (eds), <i>Approaches and methodologies in the social sciences: a pluralist perspective</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 240-262.</p> <p>Bowman, Kirk, Fabrice Lehoucq and James Mahoney. 2005. 'Measuring Political Democracy.' <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 38 (8): 939-970.</p> <p>Sartori, Giovanni. 1970. 'Concept Misformation in Comparative Politics.' <i>American Political Science Review</i> 64 (4): 1033-1053.</p> <p>Correlates of War, 'State System Membership List Codebook. Version 2016.' At http://www.correlatesofwar.org/data-sets/state-system-membership/state-system-v2016-codebook</p> <p>Fazal, Tanisha M. 2011. <i>State Death: the Politics and Geography of Conquest, Occupation, and Annexation</i>, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 'Appendix A. Revising the Correlates of War list of Members of the Interstate System', pp. 243-258.</p>
5	5 March	Qualitative Approaches (Costa Lopez) <p>Bennett, Andrew and Colin Elman. 2007. 'Case Study Methods in the International Relations Subfield.' <i>Comparative Political Studies</i> 40 (2): 170-195.</p> <p>Rueschemeyer, Dietrich. 2003. 'Can one or a few cases yield theoretical gains?' In James Mahoney and Dietrich Rueschemeyer (eds), <i>Comparative Historical Analysis in the Social Sciences</i>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapter 9.</p> <p>Skocpol, Theda. 2015. <i>States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia, and China</i>, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 33-43 (skim also through the previous pages in chapter one to understand the project).</p>
6	12 March	Interpretive and Discursive Approaches (Herborth) <p>Milliken, Jennifer. 1999. 'The study of discourse in international relations: a critique of research and methods.' <i>European Journal of International Relations</i> 5 (2): 225-254.</p> <p>Cohn, Carol. 1987. 'Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals.' <i>Signs</i> 12 (4): 687-718.</p> <p>Yanow, Dvora and Marleen van der Haar. 2013. 'People out of Place: allochthony and autochthony in the Netherlands' identity discourse – metaphors and categories in action.' <i>Journal of International Relations and Development</i> 16 (2): 227-261.</p> <p>Huysmans, Jef. 2000. 'The European Union and the securitization of migration.' <i>Journal of Common Market Studies</i> 38 (55): 751-777.</p>
7	19 March	Analyzing empirical material in IR (Costa Lopez) <p>Skinner, Quentin. 2002. 'Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas.' In Quentin Skinner, <i>Visions of Politics</i>, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 57-89.</p> <p>Grayson, Kyle. 2012. 'How to Read Paddington Bear: Liberalism and the Foreign Subject in a Bear Called Paddington.' <i>The British Journal of Politics and International Relations</i> 15 (3): 378-393.</p> <p>Branch, Jordan. 2011. 'Mapping the Sovereign State: Technology, Authority, and Systemic Change.' <i>International</i> 65 (1): 1-36.</p>

Seminar Schedule:

Exemplary research articles:

- Quantitative: Western, Bruce and Katherine Beckett. 1999. 'How Unregulated Is the US Labor Market? The Penal System as a Labor Market Institution.' *American Journal of Sociology* 104 (4): 1030-1060.
- Qualitative: Elman, Colin. 1996. 'Extending offensive realism: The Louisiana purchase and America's rise to regional hegemony.' *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): 563-576.
- Interpretive: Weldes, Jutta. 1996. 'Constructing national interests.' *European Journal of International Relations* 2 (3): 275-318.

Note that the selection of exemplary articles to be discussed in the seminar may vary among groups. The three articles mentioned above, however, will be discussed in the lectures and they will be relevant for the exam as well.

Week 2, 11-15 Feb. 2019

Introduction

explain forms of assessment, clarify mutual expectations, signal to students to get their projects started early and to use the lectures not only to gain knowledge, but in order to think systematically about how they want to do research; get started with group formation.

Students are then given time until the final two weeks of the first block to consolidate their groups and develop research ideas

Week 7, 18-22 March 2019

How do I formulate a research question?

- explain how fundamental methodological choices discussed (also discussed in lectures 1-3) lead to different types of research questions – discuss the role of theory in developing a research project
- discuss the role of a “state of the art” literature review in providing a foundation for original research findings

Discuss exemplary research questions from selected student projects

Week 11, 15-19 April 2019

How do I develop a research design?

Research question and design presentations

- identify how different types of research questions lend themselves to different research designs
- clarify different goals of research (explaining, understanding, reconstruction, critique, normative reflection, thick description)

Discuss (tentative) research designs from the group

Week 12, 22-26 April 2019

Presentation and Discussion I

Formal presentation of the research design. Make sure to highlight what you are *uncertain* about at this stage in order to get focused and constructive feedback.

Week 13, 29 Apr -3 May 2019

How do I select cases/gather empirical material?

- discuss different types of data and evidence (qualitative, quantitative, etc.)
- discuss strategies of case selection across various methodological approaches

Use student projects as examples to discuss strategies and problems of selecting cases/evidence.

Week 14, 6-10 May 2019

How do I analyze empirical material?

- emphasize the importance of the distinction between gathering and analyzing evidence (e.g. conducting interviews vs analyzing/interpreting interview data)
- discuss strategies of analyzing and interpreting data across various methodological approaches

Use student projects as examples to discuss analytical strategies and techniques appropriate to their respective research questions

Week 16, 20-24 May 2019

Presentation of draft research papers and concluding

Discussion

- present research findings and discuss final steps towards completion of the paper
- discuss how to effectively communicate research findings, also to various non-academic audiences
- discuss typical expectations among different kinds of audiences (public administration, business, civil society actors, broader public, etc.)
- emphasize differences between genres of writing appropriate for each of these audiences
- practical uses of research skills

Research Paper Assessment Form

Name(s): Grade:

Seminar Instructor:

	++	+	+/-	-	--	
The overall analytical quality is excellent						The overall analytical quality is insufficient
The research question/focus is analytically precise and highly original						The research question lacks a clear focus and originality
The conceptual/ theoretical reflection in the paper is highly original						Conceptual/theoretical reflection is missing or flawed
The research design shows a high level of understanding of methodological problems in the social sciences and meaningfully connects conceptual and empirical inquiry						The research design shows a lack of understanding of methodological problems in the social sciences and fails to connect conceptual and empirical inquiry
The empirical application/ substantive discussion is highly informed both in terms of sources used and in terms of following through on conceptual reflections and research design						The empirical application/ substantive discussion is factually incorrect, not based on appropriate sources, and fails to connect to conceptual reflections and research design
The paper is written in a clear, faultless and engaging prose						The paper is poorly written, contains mistakes and lacks clarity
Annotation and bibliography are faultless						Annotation and bibliography are insufficient
The paper is professionally formatted						The formatting is incoherent and makes the paper unnecessarily difficult to read

Further Comments:

Seminar Participation Assessment Form

Name(s): Grade:

Further Comments:

	++	+	+/-	-	--	
The student has adequately prepared for all the seminars.						The preparation for the seminars has been insufficient.
The student has shown an excellent grasp of methodological concepts, approaches, and debates in class discussions and assignments.						The student has shown insufficient grasp of methodological concepts, approaches, and debates in class discussions and assignments. The student has required extensive support on core concepts by the lecturer.
The contribution to discussions in class and to discussions of peers have been frequent and of very high standard.						The student has not contributed to class discussions and to discussions with peers.
The student has completed the weekly Wiki on the research paper to a very high standard.						The student has not completed the weekly Wiki and/or has done so insufficiently.
The weekly Wiki assignments reflect a high standard of independent thinking.						The weekly Wiki assignments contain serious misunderstandings that have required frequent support by the lecturer.
The presentations reflected sustained effort and reflection on the topic.						The paper is poorly written, contains mistakes and lacks clarity
The presentations showed a high level of understanding of research design.						Annotation and bibliography are insufficient

Further Comments:

Teaching advanced IR Theory

Amy Niang

Themes and content

In this course I focus on four books and three key themes, namely, sovereignty, violence and the human, theory and identity. With regards to the first theme, I selected Bartelson's *Genealogy of Sovereignty* (1995) and Grovogui's *Sovereigns, Quasi-Sovereigns, and Africans* (1996). The first one is an exciting book that takes the history of ideas, the sociology of knowledge, and the intellectual context in which ideas emerge, amongst other themes, very seriously. Grovogui's book then brings a historical and pluralist dimension to the understanding of sovereignty. In showing that it is not a concept that came out of the blue but a protracted process that can be linked to concomitant phenomena, namely the making of Europe and the West, colonial and imperial encounters on one hand, and the division of the world into First, Second and Third Worlds on the other. The book enables a meaningful discussion over the relationship between theory, policy and power.

In the second instance, Butler's book *Frames of War* (2009), though not exactly an IR book, shows how the politics of representation brings into and out of focus the question of the human and, indirectly, the question of power and property. These are themes that coincide with debates on slavery in the New World and related discussions on the creation of the 'native', the 'indigene' and non-western subjects, themes that are being confronted in much of the critical IR literature. In a way, to revisit the question of the human in IR is necessarily about rethinking culture and the perversion of encounters in global history, for nations and communities were stripped of their property in the name of culture.

In the third instance, I introduce R. B. J. Walker's *Inside/Outside* (1992), a book that provides great insights into an understanding of theory as history. The book describes the early modern period and its aftermath as a time of a vigorous political theory of civil society to which Walker contrasts the limitations of international relations theories in the contemporary period. The centrality of the state and spatiotemporal assumptions about community inform Walker's critique of the ideological nature of mainstream IR theories. In all four books, overlapping themes and a critical outlook sustain a dynamic engagement with the question of theory, history and politics in IR.

I recently added Robert Vitalis's book, *White World Order, Black Power Politics* (2015). It makes for a nice complement to the above. If the origins of IR were so profoundly entrenched in imperial anxiety about the race question (the race question as the Humanities question), what does this say about everything we have accumulated as 'knowledge' about community, sovereignty, modernity, and so on? Even though Vitalis's historical study presumably provides new information on the origin of IR in the United States, it is also true that a number of critical scholars have discussed aspects of the racial and the colonial in the constitution of the discipline.

The reason for the selection of these books is to show how scholars coming out of different intellectual traditions enter into unusual conversations on themes that are central to the discipline but reveal different takes on the nature of global interconnectedness.

Discussing theory in IR

The strength of theory is no longer predictable, given the complexity of the world and the recent understanding of just how wide the gap has been between conventional constructs and historical processes. For instance, the belief that something called Europe could not have existed or been possible without the invention of Africa, Latin America and Asia, widespread among critical scholars, needs to be deepened to reveal what it means to understand the world as made of distinct worlds. It seems that we must start with the idea that basic IR theories have some truth in them so that we can try to expand our understanding of them; we must therefore take them for granted. But that's only one approach. Another approach would consist of looking into themes/ideas/concepts that structure the discipline. At the Masters (MA) level however, it is no longer enough to offer the traditional mainstream versus critical perspectives model. The choice often boils down to either describing the moral world sketched out in these perspectives or contrasting one perspective against another. The conversations that go on amongst theorists of different camps can, however, be self-absorbing and too narrowly framed. In reality, the challenge is to teach IR globally and not teach global IR as an extended realist programme that should apply everywhere regardless of location and context. The responsibility and challenge are therefore to make IR matter in all parts of the world. The boundaries of the discipline are not static; they shift according to one's vantage point.

By and large, the selected texts are open-ended perspectives on core concerns in IR. These allow us to constantly revisit the conditions under which we

can demonstrate that the particular theoretical view we are putting forward constitutes an adequate reading of the world we live in. This is not so much an invitation to ‘suspend judgment’ as it is an attempt to understand how knowledge is generated and administered. In other words, what are the conditions for the continued practice of elucidation?

One also realises that we are constantly discussing the discipline itself, what its object of study, its legitimacy, its shortcomings and possibilities are. More crucially, how we participate in the routine policing of the the study of the discipline in the way that we demarcate our field from other disciplines such as history, anthropology, literature and so on.

Why teach this course in this particular fashion?

IR is often seen, for better or worse, as a discipline that fetishizes abstract constructs and opaque theorisation, quantitative analysis, and a tendency to reduce social experience to indices and matrices. It is ultimately a social science with a parsimonious engagement in historical analysis. All of this contributes to representing the possibility of historical imaginations inspired by alternative conceptions of sociality, interdependence, co-constituted processes and non-linear change throughout the history of global encounters. The disempowering effects of excess theorisation extend to IR scholars’ capacity to engage with themes that are only important to them, to their capacity to be consumed by the elaboration of categories and models whose constant refining and remodeling becomes more important than the world they seek to elucidate. A first challenge is the possibility to teach IR as a ‘legitimate’ discipline in Africa despite its conceptual, methodological and ideological limits in non-Western contexts.

One implicit aim of teaching theory is to turn commonsense into ‘expert’ knowledge for greater insight into social experience. The tension between the two – artificially maintained and mediated by methodology – suggests that the one maintains coherence within knowable parameters while the other does not. But methodology in a way has to be considered as tool, object and institution altogether if it is to be deployed in an effective manner.

Ideas I develop from relevant readings in relation to Africa are meant to suggest that epistemology and location matter only if we are ready to give credence to specific historical processes and deliberations as sources of different kinds of theorizing. I discuss specific historical events in the course of class discussions as a way of indicating that historical processes should be taken seriously as theoretical practice, therefore as configurations to learn from and not just as illustrative

examples. To (re)value location in this manner is not about getting the small facts to coincide with larger questions, but rather about thematizing the relation of thought to knowledge and to experience.

Examples that emanate in class discussions are for the most part derived from African processes and phenomena. This means that whenever steady, often dense abstractions leave enough breathing space for pertinent associations, students are keen to exploit their analytical power in the context they know best. This means at the least that the demand for theorizing that hasn't lost this particular appeal is there whether it is responded to or not.

University of the Witwatersrand
Department of International Relations
INTR7067 Advanced IR Theory
Amy Niang

Course outline

This is a three-part seminar that revisits key concepts in the study of International Relations (IR) through a genealogical approach that engages the (1) theoretical, (2) historical and (3) normative dimensions of past and present configurations of 'the international.' The first part explores the notion of sovereignty as a central principle that structures theory and practice of international relations. It is based on two main books:

- Jens Bartelson, *A Genealogy of Sovereignty* (Cambridge, 1995)
- Siba Grovogui, *Sovereigns, Quasi-Sovereigns, and Africans* (Minnesota, 1996)

The second part explores the notion of violence and the human. The main reference is

- Judith Butler, *Frames of War* (Verso, 2009)

The third part revisits key ideas throughout the Renaissance and Modernity and the historical configurations that have shaped notions of ethics and political identity.

- Rob Walker, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory* (Cambridge, 1992)

The reason for the selection of these books is to show how scholars coming out of different intellectual traditions enter in unusual conversations on themes that are central to the discipline of international relations but reveal different takes on the nature of global interconnectedness.

Objectives

The main objective of the course is to explore a number of central themes in the study of international relations by looking at how different working assumptions inform divergent views and ideas on these themes. In particular, the course aims to cultivate a sensitivity towards the fluid boundaries of 'the international.' The secondary objective of the course is to show that key 'perspectives' in international relations are the outcomes of ongoing debates and conversations that often take place in distinct 'camps.'

Expectations and Assessment

Assessment consists of two written exams (March 20 and May 15), seminar presentations and participation. In addition, students are expected to present and defend an expanded theory section of their individual MA projects. The seminars are reading-intensive and student-led so preparation in all aspects of class interaction is critical.

Course weighting:

Written midterm-exam	30%
Written final exam	30%
Weekly submissions	15%
Class presentations/participation	15%
MA project presentation (theory section)	10%

Additional readings:

On Sovereignty:

Benton, Lauren. 2008. 'From International Law to Imperial Constitutions: The Problem of Quasi-Sovereignty, 1870–1900.' *Law and History Review* 26(3): 595-620.

Radhika, V. Mongia. 2007. 'Historicizing State Sovereignty: Inequality and the Form of Equivalence.' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49(2): 384-411.

On Violence and the Human

Duvall, R. D., and Himadeep Muppidi. 2012. 'Humanitarianism and its Violences.' In *The Colonial Signs of International relations*. Columbia University Press, pp.117-126.

Fanon, Frantz. 1990. 'On Violence.' In *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin, pp. 27-74.

Waltz, Kenneth. 1959. *Man, the State and War: A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 1-15

On Ethics and Identity

Reus-Smit, Christian. 2008. 'Reading History through Constructivist Eyes.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 37(2): 395–414.

Anghie, Antony. 1996. 'Francisco De Vitoria and the Colonial Origins of International Law.' *Social and Legal Studies* 5(3): 321-336.

Seminar Schedule

Date	Seminar	Comments
Week1	Introduction: IR theory, myths and ideology	
Week2	Bartelson: <i>A Genealogy of Sovereignty</i> Sovereignty and Fire Deconstructing Sovereignty Beyond Subject and Structure 4-Inventing Outsides	
Week3	Bartelson: <i>A Genealogy of Sovereignty</i> 5-How Policy Became Foreign 6-Reorganizing Reality 7-The End of Sovereignty? Benton: <i>From International Law</i>	
Week4	Grovogui: <i>Sovereign-Quasi-Sovereigns</i> Genesis, Order, and Hierarchy Partial Recognition to the Barbarous Natives Rights to Dispose of Themselves	
	Grovogui: <i>Sovereign-Quasi-Sovereigns</i> Behind the Veil of the Trust Constitutional Protection as Pretext 6-The Challenges of Postcolonialism Mongia: <i>Historicizing State Sovereignty</i>	
Week5	Butler: <i>Frames of War</i> Survivability, Vulnerability, Affect Torture and the Ethics of Photography 3-Sexual Politics Fanon: <i>On Violence</i>	
Week6	Midterm Exam	Hand written notes allowed

Week7	Butler: <i>Frames of War</i> Non-thinking in the Name of the Normative The Claim of Non-Violence Waltz: <i>Man, the State and War</i> Duvall and Muppidi: <i>Humanitarianism and its Violences</i>	
Week8	BREAK	
Week9	Walker: <i>Inside/Outside</i> From 'International Relations as political theory' through 'Sovereignty, Modernity and Political Community' Reus-Smit: <i>Reading History</i>	
Week10	Walker: <i>Inside/Outside</i> From 'History, structure, reification' through 'Oscillations and continuities' Anghie: <i>Francisco De Vitoria</i>	
Week11	MA Project presentation (theory section)	
Week12	Walker: <i>Inside/Outside</i> From 'On the spatio-temporal conditions of democratic practice' through 'Rearticulations of political space/ time'	
Week13		No seminar
Week14	Review seminar	
	EXAM	EXAM PERIOD

Decolonising world politics

Meera Sabaratnam and Kerem Nişancioğlu

Decolonising World Politics is a 15-credit, 10-week course for final year undergraduate students in their International Relations/Politics degrees. The course tracks theories and practices of decolonisation in the twentieth and twenty-first century, with a primary focus on African, Asian and diasporic figures. We focus on the intellectual and political claims, dilemmas and strategies of these figures, demonstrating both their overlaps and tensions. A key aim of the course is to cultivate appreciation for both the dynamism and contradictions of movements that have aimed to 'decolonise' the world order in different times and places. Given the location of the course in an International Relations programme, the course also aims to introduce these figures as developing and practising their own 'theories of the international' in making sense of the world. We make links with our first-year course Introduction to Global History, which tells a story of connected histories through capitalist transformation, revolution and empire.

This includes, for example, comparing W. E. B. Du Bois and Vladimir Lenin on questions of imperialism, or the different ways in which Mohandas Gandhi and Aimé Césaire mobilised culture anti-colonially. We look at varieties of women's activism and the attempts to build solidarity across/beyond lines of identity. We discuss tensions between violent and non-violent tactics as well as nationalist and internationalist aims. We highlight contemporary discussions around Afro-pessimist thought and traditions of political blackness. We close with reflections on what it means to approach the university as a space that might be decolonised.

By connecting contemporary debates to historical ones, we underscore the perennial character of some key questions within the politics of decolonisation, such as the relation between cultural and material dynamics of decolonisation, the difference between forms of strategic solidarity and essential/ist claims, and the distinctiveness of claims in different spaces, such as settler-colonial societies, imperial metropolises and the 'Third World'. In doing so, we collectively interrogate the contested character of decolonisation as a heterogeneous and disputed field of political activity.

From a teaching perspective, we developed this course based on our own research interests in coloniality, race and empire, as well as the politics of student activism in the university (Sabaratnam 2011; Nişancioğlu and Pal 2016; Bhabra

et al 2018). We wanted both to support and to challenge the students by giving them a space to critically examine the ideas, claims and practices being invoked. However, we also build into the pedagogy space to examine the limits of education itself as a space for liberation.

We teach the course through a two-hour interactive lecture and one-hour small-group tutorials.¹ The assessment is slightly unusual in format but corresponds with the module's aims of provoking critical thinking on questions of decolonisation. From 2019-20 it will be entirely based around having the students submit short reflective questions every other week based on their reading of the texts. We have found that this practice encourages consistent active reading across the course and deeper engagement in classroom discussions (Yamane 2006).

Students have found the module both very enjoyable and challenging. Many of the students who take the course have a broad political interest in questions of racism and coloniality, and a number are also political activists. Our large number of students with African and Asian heritage in the programme and module appreciate that the module often engages radical ideas and practices of resistance connected to their roots. In the context of a highly antagonistic and crude debate on these matters within social media, we believe that the module provides a space for considered reflection, mutual learning and independent thought.

However, the module does, as it should, expose the very profound challenges involved in confronting global coloniality. We feel that as things stand we need to better equip the students with respect to traditions of political organising and transformation, which will help them better realise their own agency within this political order. We also hope that over time the module contributes to wider efforts to connect syllabus design to political practice outside of the university (NYC Stands with Standing Rock Committee 2016; Roberts 2016).

Note

- 1 These were excellently led by Maya Goodfellow, Ini Dele-Adediji, Laurie Benson and Ida Danewid. Mark Laffey also co-taught the course in its first year.

Decolonising World Politics

Module Code: 153402002

Unit value: 0.5

Year of study: Year 3 of 3 or Year 4 of 4

Taught in: Term 1

Overview

Decolonisation was a set of historical processes that radically transformed international politics in practice and thought. The emergence of a world of sovereign states – a core premise for International Relations – is founded on the assumed completion of such processes. Yet increasingly, research in the field points to a number of ongoing theoretical, methodological and practical issues that result from the colonial and post-colonial constitution of global order. This course asks what it means to 'decolonise International Relations' by engaging with the challenges posed by anti-colonial, post-colonial and decolonial thinkers on such issues. We will do so by critically examining the complexity and diversity of anti-colonial movements and thinkers. We will study colonialism and anti-colonialism as international and transnational in thought and practice by exploring how both the colonised and the coloniser were transformed by decolonisation. We will also consider the contemporary relevance of decolonisation by looking at the condition of postcolonialism. In addition we will examine decoloniality in its intersections between 'race', gender and class. In doing so we will critically examine the relationships between theory and practice, text and action, thought and history. Moreover, we will critically assess key concepts and theories in contemporary International Relations from a decolonial lens.

Objectives and learning outcomes of the module

- Understand the historical complexity of decolonisation as an international and transnational process
- Understand, use and critique a range of different interpretations of colonialism and decolonisation
- Critically deploy 'decolonial' methods in historical and theoretical analysis
- Identify relationships between history, theory and practice

Course outline

1. Why Decolonise? - 1/10 KN / MS

PART I: Seeking Self-determination

2. Du Bois and Debates on Imperialism - 8/10 MS
3. Identity, Culture and Decolonisation - 15/10 MS
4. The Idea of the Third World - 22/10 MS
5. Decolonising India - 29/10 MS

*****Reading Week*****

6. Concerning Violence: Fanon in Algeria - 12/11 KN
7. Anticolonial nationalism and its alternatives - 19/11 KN

PART II: Decolonising the Metropole?

8. Political identity/identity politics - 26/11 KN
9. Death, Deportation and Disposability - 3/12 KN
10. Conclusion: Performing Decolonisation - 10/12 KN/MS

Assessment

	Weight	Word limit	Date of Submission
Reading Questions (AS2, AS3, AS4, AS5)	40%	N/A	AS2: 23/10 09.00 AS3: 13/11 09.00 AS4: 27/11 09.00 AS5: 11/12 09.00
Essay (AS1)	60%	3,000 words	07/01/2019

READING QUESTION: 40% [Hand in 10% every two weeks]

A fundamental part of the course is collective learning through participation and conversation in seminars. This collective and participatory component is built into your assessment. Every week you must come up with **one question** based on the week's reading in preparation for the seminar discussion.

These questions should identify something in the given authors' arguments that you found particularly:

- Interesting
- Inspiring
- Convincing
- Problematic
- Unconvincing
- Weak
- Any combination of the above

In addition to devising the question you should also provide **justification** for why you are asking these questions. To do this, you should:

- Spell out what is at stake in each of the questions you're asking: why is it important?
- Identify specific parts of the reading — quotes/passages/page numbers — that your questions refer to.
- Locate a controversy brought out by your questions. NB: a controversy usually arises out of a disagreement over how to answer any given question. This implies that there are different ways of answering any given question. So when devising your questions consider:
 - What are the different ways in which this can be answered?
 - How would people from different political, theoretical or personal positions attempt to answer this question?
 - And what would the author of your chosen reading respond to your question?
 - How do different answers to your question help respond to the 'provocation' in your given week (see week-by-week guide below).
 - Doing the above will help you prompt further discussion on the back of your questions.

You can focus on a particular passage, the reading as a whole, or through reference to or comparison with other texts, political events, historical processes, personal experiences, etc.

An example of an excellent question and justification, based on the Sabaratnam reading from week 1:

Question: *Does treating decolonising as a 'dialogue' elide the antagonism between coloniser and colonised (and thus its radical potential)?*

Justification: Sabaratnam's typology of strategies (see pp. 785-793) provide effective tools through which the world can be reinterpreted through a de-colonial lens; but the point is to change it. Insofar as decolonising is first and foremost a political project (or a project that is never independent from politics), centring a political strategy of decolonisation which explores and ultimately seeks to abolish the irreconcilable antagonism between coloniser and colonised (see Fanon's, 'Concerning Violence') appears to be problematic.

A 'less excellent' one, but one which shows some understanding:

Question: Are the different strategies identified by Sabaratnam compatible with each other?

Justification: In the article, Sabaratnam claims that the strategies are about challenging the 'exclusionary premise of a Western subject of world politics' (785), but the strategies seem to be doing different things in terms of historical analysis or cultural analysis. Don't these different approaches assume fundamentally different things?

Although you will bring these to class, you will also submit these for marks and feedback online as follows:

- AS2: Questions from Weeks 3 and 4 (Identity, Culture and Decolonisation/The Idea of the Third World)
- AS3: Questions from Weeks 5 and 6 (Decolonising India/Fanon and Algeria)
- AS4: Questions from Weeks 7 and 8 (Anti-colonial nationalism and its alternatives/ Political Identity/Identity Politics)
- AS5: Questions from Weeks 9 and 10 (Death, Deportation and Disposability/ Conclusion)

Each week, 1-3 students will be responsible for starting the class discussion by presenting their questions and justifications. When presenting, your aim is to provoke conversation, debate and collective learning which encourages your classmates to participate in the discussion.

Each individual presentation should take no more than 5 minutes. The presentation slots will be allocated at the start of term. You must indicate on your submission the week in which you presented.

ESSAY [3,000 words] 60%

You are required to write a 3,000-word essay on one of the 'provocations' from each week topic or a set question [to be distributed]. If you prefer, you are allowed to come up with your own essay question but this must be agreed with both your course convenor *and* seminar tutor before **Friday 7th December 2018**.

Essays should demonstrate a clear and deep engagement with the course material, focused on the core readings, but extending into the wider readings and other research. You will need to make an 'argument,' e.g., develop a sustained and clear line of thought that connects issues with each other, and support this with evidence and references. One of the most important skills you can demonstrate in good academic essay-writing is the capacity to show an understanding of competing interpretations and why they may be compelling even if you do not agree with them.

The deadline for this assignment is **Monday 7th January 2019**.

Useful Websites/Journals

- Decolonisation Indigeneity Education Society (DIES) Journal - <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/index>
- Race and Class - <http://journals.sagepub.com/home/rac>
- CLR James Journal
- Small Axe
- iMiXWHATiLiKE! - <https://imixwhatilike.org>

- Decolonise all the things - <https://decolonizeallthethings.com>
- Postcolonial Text <http://postcolonial.org/index.php/pct/index>
- Black Lives Matter Syllabus - <http://www.blacklivesmattersyllabus.com/>
- PoC Online Classroom - <http://www.poconlineclassroom.com/>
- History is a Weapon - <http://www.historyisaweapon.com/indexttrue.html#> Places to visit
- Black cultural archives - <http://bcaheritage.org.uk>
- Iniva [Stuart Hall Library] - <http://www.iniva.org/library>
- Black History Walk - <http://www.blackhistorywalks.co.uk>
- George Padmore Institute - <https://www.georgepadmoreinstitute.org/archive>

Reading List

Week 1: Why Decolonise?

'Decolonisation' as it is used today takes many forms. Although typically understood to refer to a particular history – the liberation of societies once ruled by European colonisers – it also refers to ongoing anti-colonial and anti-racist theory and practice. This involves not only collective forms of resistance but also the psycho-social – 'decolonising the mind' – by rewriting history from the perspective of the subaltern and dismantling the forms of knowledge produced by colonisers. Finally, decolonising also refers to radical forms of pedagogy and learning. This week we look at these different ways of understanding decolonising and ask: What does it mean to rewrite history and theory? And why/how should we do it?

[Each week, the 'provocation' raises a political point that relates to the week's topic; by the end of each week you should be able to formulate an informed response to the provocation]

Provocation: 'Decolonisation is over.'

Required Reading

Bull, H. 1984. 'The revolt against the West.' In Hedley Bull, *The expansion of international society*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 217-228.

Sabaratnam, M. 2011. 'IR in dialogue... but can we change the subjects? A typology of decolonising strategies for the study of world politics.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39 (3): 781-803.

Ndlovu-Gatsheni, S J. 2013. *Coloniality of Power in Postcolonial Africa: Myths of Decolonization*. Dakar: CODESRIA, Chapter 2: In the Snare of Colonial Matrix of Power At <https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/soas-ebooks/reader.action?docID=1220909&pg=54>

Further Reading

Crenshaw, K. 1991. 'Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color.' *Stanford Law Review* 43 (6): 1241-1299.

Freire, P. 2000. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Gruffydd Jones, B. 2006. *Decolonising International Relations*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Guha, Ranajit. 1988. 'On Some Aspects of the Historiography of Colonial India.' In Ranajit Guha and Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (eds), *Selected Subaltern Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 37-44.

hooks, b. 2014. 'A Revolution of Values.' In bell hooks, *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. London and New York: Routledge.

Robinson, C J. 1983. *Black Marxism: The making of the Black radical tradition*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Spivak, G. C. 1988. 'Can the subaltern speak?' In Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. London: Macmillan, pp. 271-313.

Trouillot, M R. 1995. *Silencing the past: Power and the production of history*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Wa Thiong'o, N. 1994. *Decolonising the mind: The politics of language in African literature*. Nairobi: East African Publishers.

Wynter, S. 1995. '1492: A new world view.' In Vera Lawrence Hyatt and Rex Nettleford (eds), *Race, discourse, and the origin of the Americas: A new world view*, pp. 5-57.

Part I: Seeking Self-determination

Week 2: Du Bois and Debates on Imperialism

The early part of the course examines aspects of an intensive period of anti-imperial and anti-colonial struggle between the beginning of the twentieth century and the formal independence of most European colonies by the 1960s. In the first of these topics, we look at the unfolding debates on imperialism through the writings and activism of W.E.B. Du Bois (1868-1963) within the early twentieth century. In the lecture, we will set the scene for the class discussion through a survey of the height of what Hobsbawm describes as the 'Age of Empire' in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, looking particularly at its material and ideological foundations, as well as attempted forms of resistance up to this point. This includes the expansion and consolidation of colonial control within Asia and Africa, the intensification of settler colonialism, the ideological co-ordinates of liberal political thought and the emergence of violent and non-violent resistance. Within this context, the lecture also introduces Du Bois as a figure whose long and varied biography incorporates multiple aspects of the historical struggles against empire, colonialism and racism on the global stage. The task set for students in the seminars is to consider and evaluate some of Du Bois' intellectual arguments on the question of imperialism in relation to each other and the positions of famous contemporaries – Lenin, Hobson and Wilson. The required readings provide short excerpts of some key texts which should be thoroughly read and examined for their arguments. To what extent do Du Bois' writings overlap with or contest those of his contemporaries? What kinds of concepts and logic underpin his arguments? What picture of imperialism can be built up from his ideas? What did he advocate for as a political programme? The readings this week are all documents from the period, authored by the subjects of our inquiry.

Provocation: 'Du Bois' analysis of imperialism was too focused on race.'

Required Reading

Du Bois, W E B. 1900. 'To the Nations of the World' (closing address, first Pan-African conference in London). At <http://www.blackpast.org/1900-w-e-b-du-bois-nations-world> (1 page).

Hobson, J A. 1902. 'Imperialism and the Lower Races.' In Hobson, J A, *Imperialism: A Study*. New York: James Pott & Company, pp. 237-246 only (8 pages).

Du Bois, W E B. 1915. 'The African Roots of War.' *The Atlantic*, pp. 707-714 <http://scua.library.umass.edu/digital/dubois/WarRoots.pdf> (8 pages).

Lenin, V I. 1916. 'The Division of the World Among the Great Powers.' *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, pp. 76-87.

Du Bois, W E B. 1917. 'Of the Culture of White Folk.' *Journal of Race Development* 7: 434-447. [14pp].

Wilson, W. 1918. *Fourteen Points* (1 page). At http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/wilson14.asp.

Du Bois, W E B. 1919. *Memorandum on the Future of Africa*. At <http://credo.library.umass.edu/view/full/mums312-b210-i068> (4 pages).

It is worth reading the other chapters of Hobson's and Lenin's works if you are interested in a fuller view of their analysis.

Useful background

Hobsbawm, E. 1987. *The Age of Empire 1875-1914*. New York : Vintage, chapter 3.
Contee, C G. 1972. 'Du Bois, the NAACP, and the Pan-African Congress of 1919.' *The Journal of Negro History* 57 (1): 13-28.
Stoddard, L. 1920. *The rising tide of color against white world-supremacy*. London: Chapman and Hall.
Swagler, M. 2017. *Did the Russian Revolution Matter for Africa? (Part I)*. At <http://roape.net/2017/08/30/russian-revolution-matter-africa-part/>.

Further Reading

Mehta, U S. 1999. *Liberalism and Empire: A Study in Nineteenth Century British Liberal Thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
McCarthy, T. 2009. *Race, Empire, and the Idea of Human Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Vitalis, R. 2000. 'The Graceful and Generous Liberal Gesture: Making Racism Invisible in American International Relations.' *Millennium* 29 (2): 331-356.
Pitts, J. 2005. *A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Reed Jr, A L. 1997. *W.E.B. Du Bois and American Political Thought: Fabianism and the Color Line*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Marable, M. 2005 [1986]. *W.E.B. Du Bois: Black Radical Democrat*. Boulder: Hall & Co.
Vitalis, R. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Week 3: Identity, Culture and Decolonisation

One notable aspect of anti-colonial struggles in the early twentieth century was the attempt to carve out a space for alternative identities and ways of being for the colonised, in the context of the historical and political erasures that colonialism was said to have produced. The emergence of prominent anti-colonial nationalism was

a manifestation of an alternative that sought to repel colonial rule. However, this conversation took place both after and alongside questions of culture and identity as the basis for decolonisation.

In this week we look at ideas from two prominent efforts in this regard – Gandhi's articulation of Indianness, and the *Négritude* movement. Both movements were conceived and populated within profoundly international networks, worked through different languages and had varying degrees of success in terms of their capacities for mass mobilisation. Both have been subject of major intellectual and political controversies both in the metropole and amongst those subjects interpellated by these labels. Ironically, critics have attacked both movements on the one hand for 'nativist' or even 'racist' essentialising and on the other for being ultimately derivative from Western ideas. Yet more sympathetic readings have found in these approaches a number of resources for making self, meaning and strategy out of a struggle for self-determination. Why is this? What does a reading of these two movements tell us about how to conceive culture and identity in the context of decolonisation? Can these movements be seen as engaging in 'cultural appropriation'? How do questions of gender emerge and become entwined with colonial power and resistance? In the lecture we will introduce the background to these two intellectual movements, outline some of the impact they had, the controversies generated and think about how we can begin to evaluate them as political and intellectual strategies. We will also look at some areas in which their contexts, approaches and ideas can be compared and contrasted.

This week's readings principally consist of sympathetic critical essays written by more contemporary scholars, with some suggestions for primary texts below. The latter are useful but the

former should take priority. For more critical accounts of these movements, please consult the further reading guide.

Provocation: 'Swaraj and Negritude confirm, rather than resist, the hold of Western political thought over the imagination of the colonised.'

Required Reading: Critical Essays

Nandy, A. 2012 [1983]. 'The Psychology of Colonialism.' In Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy: Loss and Recovery of Self Under Colonialism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, VI-VIII [48-63] [15 pages].

Rabaka, R. 2009. 'Aimé Césaire and Léopold Senghor: Revolutionary Negritude and Radical New Negroes'. In Reilan Rabaka, *Africana Critical Theory: Reconstructing The Black Radical Tradition: From W. E. B. Du Bois and C. L. R. James to Frantz Fanon and Amilcar Cabral*. Lexington Books, Chapter 4: 130-131 'Black Being-In-the- World'; 138-145 'Aimé Césaire; Revolutionary Négritude/Césaire's Radicalism'; 150- 159, 'A Satrean [sic] African Philosopher? Léopold Senghor'; 164-165 'Négritude's Connections and Contributions' [21 pages].

Nardal, J. 2002 [1928]. 'Black Internationalism.' In T D Sharpley-Whiting. *Negritude Women*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 105-107.

Nardal, J. 2002 [1928]. 'Exotic Puppets.' In T D Sharpley-Whiting. *Negritude Women*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 108-113.

Strongly Recommended: Source Texts

Gandhi, M K. 2003 [1938]. *Indian Home Rule, or Hind Swaraj*. Ahmedabad: Navajivan Trust. Read Sections 7-8; 13-14; 18-20: [18 pages]

Senghor, L S. 2015. 'Negritude: a Humanism of the Twentieth Century.' In P Williams and L Chrisman. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New Work and London: Routledge, pp. 27-35.

Césaire, S. 2002 [1942]. 'Malaise of a Civilisation.' In T D Sharpley-Whiting. *Negritude Women*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 130-134.

Further Reading

Bernasconi, R. 2010. 'Fanon's "The Wretched of the Earth" as the Fulfillment of Sartre's 'Critique of Dialectical Reason.' *Sartre Studies International* 16 (2): 36-46.

Bonnett, A. 2012. 'The Critical Traditionalism of Ashis Nandy: Occidentalism and the Dilemmas of Innocence.' *Theory, Culture & Society* 29 (1): 138-157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276411417462>

Césaire, A. 2000. *Discourse on Colonialism*. New York: NYU Press.

el-Malik, S S. 2015. 'Interruptive discourses: Léopold Senghor, African Emotion and the poetry of politics.' *African Identities* 13 (1): 49-61.

Glissant, E. 1989. 'Beyond Babel.' *World Literature Today* 63 (4): 561-564.

Jeanpierre, W A. 1965. 'Sartre's Theory of 'Anti-Racist Racism' in His Study of Negritude.' *The Massachusetts Review* 6 (4): 870-872.

Jules-Rosette, B. 2007. 'Jean-Paul Sartre and the philosophy of négritude: Race, self, and society.' *Theory and Society* 36 (3): 265-285.

Nielsen, C R. 2013. 'Frantz Fanon and the Négritude Movement: How Strategic Essentialism Subverts Manichean Binaries.' *Callaloo* 36 (2): 342-352.

Parekh, B C. 1989. *Gandhi's political philosophy: a critical examination*. London: Macmillan.

Parekh, B C. 1999. *Colonialism, Tradition, and Reform: An Analysis of Gandhi's Political Discourse*. New Delhi: SAGE.

Rabaka, R. 2016. *The Negritude Movement: W.E.B. Du Bois, Leon Damas, Aime Cesaire, Leopold Senghor, Frantz Fanon, and the Evolution of an Insurgent Idea* (Reprint edition). Lanham: Lexington Books.

Sharpley-Whiting, T D. 2000. 'Femme négritude: Jane Nardal, La Dépêche africaine, and the francophone new negro.' *Souls* 2 (4): 8-17.

Sharpley-Whiting, T D. 2002. *Negritude Women*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Shilliam, R. 2016. 'Colonial Architecture or Relatable Hinterlands? Locke, Nandy, Fanon, and the Bandung Spirit.' *Constellations* 23 (3): 425-435.

Upadhyaya, P C. 1989. 'A Celebration of the Gandhian Alternative.' *Economic and Political Weekly* 24 (48): 2655-2662.

Week 4: The Idea of the Third World

The 1955 Afro-Asian Conference held in Bandung, Indonesia, has become renowned as the first meeting of heads of state from what increasingly became known as the 'Third World.' Mostly comprised of states that had recently achieved independence from colonialism, this group developed its own collective positions on a range of political issues and sought to make wider changes in the global arena. Core amongst these were concerns with sovereignty, racial equality, economic justice, rights and political autonomy, as well as critiques of capitalism, imperialism and colonialism. Some Third Worldist positions were self-consciously revolutionary; others might be called 'reformist' in their aims and methods. These activities were seen to be institutionalised during the Cold War in fora such as the G77, the Non-Aligned Movement and various UN bodies. But why did they come together, and what did they hope to achieve? Who were their leaders? What, and how substantial, were the connections, affinities and purposes which bound them together? How did they affect global order? To what extent can the project of the Third World be understood as a success? In which dimensions? The lecture will introduce the background to this period, key developments within it as well as debates around the idea of the 'Third World.' This week's readings are a deliberately dissonant bunch, with different accounts of the meaning, causes and significance of the idea of the 'Third World.' Use the provocation and the readings critically to assess the historical significance and legacy of this idea. In terms of further historical detail the Appadorai piece in the further reading is detailed and useful as an account of the Bandung conference itself, and the Armstrong piece is a provocative challenge to the conventional historiography of that conference.

Provocation: 'The Third World project has been a failure.'

Required Reading

Berger, M. 2004. 'After the Third World? History, Destiny and the Fate of Third Worldism.' *Third World Quarterly* 25 (1): 9-39.

Kang, L. 2015. 'Maoism: Revolutionary Globalism for the Third World Revisited.' *Comparative Literature Studies* 52 (1): 12-28.

Desai, R. 2004. 'From National Bourgeoisie to Rogues, Failures and Bullies: 21st Century Imperialism and the Unravelling of the Third World.' *Third World Quarterly* 25 (1): 169-185.

Further Reading

Ahmad, A. 1987. 'Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the "National Allegory."' *Social Text* 17: 3-25.

Allison, R. 1988. *The Soviet Union and the Strategy of Non-Alignment in the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appadorai, A. 1955. 'The Bandung Conference.' *India Quarterly* 11 (3): 207-235.

- Armstrong, E. 2015. 'Before Bandung: The Anti-Imperialist Women's Movement in Asia and the Women's International Democratic Federation.' *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 41 (2): 305-331.
- Dirlik, A. 1994. 'The Postcolonial Aura: Third World Criticism in the Age of Global Capitalism.' *Critical Inquiry* 20 (2): 328-356.
- Dirlik, A. 2014. 'Mao Zedong Thought and the Third World/Global South.' *Interventions* 16 (2): 233-256.
- Escobar, A. 2011. *Encountering development: The making and unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mahbubani, K. 2009. *The New Asian Hemisphere: The Irresistible Shift of Global Power to the East*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Murphy, C. N. 1983. 'What the Third World Wants: An Interpretation of the Development and Meaning of the New International Economic Order Ideology.' *International Studies Quarterly* 27 (1): 55-76.
- Shaw, T. M. 1979. 'Dependence to (Inter) Dependence: Review of Debate on the (New) International Economic Order.' *Alternatives* 4 (4): 557-578.
- Wright, R. 1956. *The Color Curtain: A Report on the Bandung Conference*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.

Week 5: Decolonising India

The official departure of the British from India took place on 15th August 1947. Yet just a few years earlier Britain had been adamant that it would retain the 'Jewel in the Crown' of the British Empire. One widely received impression of the British departure from India was that it was negotiated in a civil, consensual and orderly way, with a bracketing of the death tolls of Partition as belonging to the post-colonial nationalist order. This week we will examine this historical period in detail, thinking about the long-term historical processes that led up to the British departure, the kinds of political, social and economic resistance that made it possible, the variety of tactics and strategies employed, the evolving and contested character of anti-colonial evolution, the forms of counter-revolution and counter-insurgency deployed and the kinds of dilemmas presented for the anti-colonial movement. We will pay particular attention to the question of the roles of elites and masses respectively in the processes resulting in decolonisation, thinking about what it means to mobilise effective political action, and what is meant by success or failure.

Provocation: 'Decolonisation in India was the achievement of the masses, not the elites.'

Required Reading:

- Krishna, G. 1966. 'The Development of the Indian National Congress as a Mass Organization, 1918-1923.' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 25 (3): 413-430.
- Spodek, H. 1971. 'On the Origins of Gandhi's Political Methodology: The Heritage of Kathiawad and Gujarat.' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 30 (2): 361-372.
- Bose, S. 2011. *His Majesty's Opponent: Subhas Chandra Bose and India's Struggle Against Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, P. 2012. 'Gandhi Centre Stage.' *London Review of Books*. July 5, pp. 3-11.

Further Reading

- Ambedkar, B. R. 1945. *What Congress and Gandhi have done to the Untouchables*. Delhi: Gautam Book Center.
- Anderson, P. 2013. *The Indian Ideology* (Reprint edition). London and New York: Verso.
- Arnold, D. 1984. 'Gramsci and peasant subalternity in India.' *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 11 (4): 155-177.

- Bayly, Christopher A. 1986. 'The origins of swadeshi (home industry): cloth and Indian society.' In Arjun Appadurai (ed), *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 285–322.
- Bayly, Christopher A. 1993. 'Knowing the country: Empire and information in India.' *Modern Asian Studies* 27 (1): 3–43.
- Bayly, Christopher A. 2000. 'Ireland, India and the Empire: 1780–1914.' *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 10: 377–397.
- Bayly, Christopher Alan and C A Bayly. 1987. *Indian society and the making of the British Empire*, Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bose, S C. 1997. *The Essential Writings of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bose, Sarmila. 2005. 'Love in the Time of War: Subhas Chandra Bose's Journeys to Nazi Germany (1941) and towards the Soviet Union (1945).' *Economic and Political Weekly* 40 (3): 249–256.
- Bose, Sugata. 2006. *A Hundred Horizons: The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Brown, Judith M. 1969. The Mahatma and Modern India. *Modern Asian Studies* 3 (4): 321–342.
- Brown, Judith M. 1994. *Modern India: the origins of an Asian democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chakrabarty, D. 2007. 'Remembering 1857: An Introductory Note.' *Economic and Political Weekly* 42 (19): 1692–1695.
- Chaudhuri, S B. 2018. *Civil Rebellion in the Indian Mutinies (1857–1859)*. Calcutta: The World Press Private.
- Dirks, N B, G Eley and S B Ortner. 1994. *Culture/power/history: A Reader in Contemporary Social Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gadgil, M and R Guha. 1993. *This fissured land: an ecological history of India*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gordon, R. 1975. 'The Hindu Mahasabha and the Indian National Congress, 1915 to 1926.' *Modern Asian Studies* 9 (2): 145–203.
- Guha, Ramachandra. 1983. 'Forestry in British and post-British India: A historical analysis.' *Economic and Political Weekly* 18 (44): 1882–1896.
- Guha, Ranajit. 1999. *Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hardas, B. 1998. *Armed struggle for freedom: 1857 to Subhash: ninety years of war of Indian independence*. Noida: Jagriti Prakashan.
- Hauser, W. 1985. 'Review of Review of Elementary Aspects of Peasant Insurgency in Colonial India, by Ranajit Guha.' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 45 (1): 174–177.
- Indian Council of Historical Research. 2008. *Towards freedom: documents on the movement for independence in India, 1945*. New Delhi: Indian Council of Historical Research and Oxford University Press.
- Krishna, G. 1966. 'The Development of the Indian National Congress as a Mass Organization, 1918–1923.' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 25 (3): 413–430.
- Low, D A. 1966. 'The Government of India and the First Non-Cooperation Movement—1920–1922.' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 25 (2): 241–259.
- Metcalf, T R. 2015. *Aftermath of Revolt: India 1857–1970*. Princeton University Press.
- Minault, G. 1982. *The Khilafat Movement: religious symbolism and political mobilization in India*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mukherjee, R. 1990. '"SATAN LET LOOSE UPON EARTH": THE KANPUR MASSACRES IN INDIA IN THE REVOLT OF 1857.' *Past & Present* 128 (1): 92–116.

Perusek, D. 1993. 'Subaltern Consciousness and Historiography of Indian Rebellion of 1857.' *Economic and Political Weekly* 28 (37): 1931-1936.

Ray, R K. 1974. 'Masses in Politics: the Non-Cooperation Movement in Bengal 1920- 1922.' *The Indian Economic & Social History Review* 11 (4): 343-410.

Reeves, P D. 1966. 'The Politics of Order: "Anti-Non-Cooperation" in the United Provinces, 1921.' *The Journal of Asian Studies* 25 (2): 261-274.

Roy, R. 2006. *Gandhi & Ambedkar: a study in contrast*. Delhi: Shipra Publications.

Savarkar, V D. 1970. *The Indian war of independence 1857*. 8th ed. New Delhi: Granthagar.

Sitaramayya, B P. 1946. *The History of the Indian National Congress*, Vol. 1. Bombay: Padma Publications.

Stokes, E. 1969. 'III. Rural Revolt in the Great Rebellion of 1857 in India: A Study of the Saharanpur and Muzaffarnagar Districts.' *The Historical Journal* 12 (4): 606-627.

Stokes, E. 1970. 'Traditional Resistance Movements and Afro-Asian Nationalism: The Context of the 1857 Mutiny Rebellion in India.' *Past & Present* 48: 100-118.

Stokes, E. 1986. *The Peasant Armed: the Indian revolt of 1857*. Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Toye, H. 2007. *Subhash Chandra Bose*. Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.

Week 6: Concerning Violence: Fanon in Algeria

The use of violence has been a perennial issue in discussions around and practices of decolonisation. As a strategic question, some have emphasised the need for self-defense in the face of colonial violence. In contrast, critics of this position have highlighted the successes of 'passive resistance.' On a more fundamental – ontological – level, Frantz Fanon suggests that violent resistance to colonialism is necessary to the very making of new, decolonised human subjectivities, wherein violence is embodied rather than strategic. Finally, there is disagreement on the politics of naming: what is and isn't a violent act? How do we define violence? And who gets to define and attribute it? This week we examine these issues by reading Frantz Fanon's classic essay 'Concerning Violence,' written in the context of the Algerian struggle for independence. Alongside this text we watch *Battle of Algiers* – also produced in reference to Algerian independence. This film depicts the use of violence by both the Front de Liberation Nationale and the French occupying forces. We will ask what meaning did 'Concerning Violence' and *Battle of Algiers* give to practices of decolonisation, and what meaning do these texts hold today?

Provocation: 'Decolonization is always a violent phenomenon'

Required Reading/viewing

Fanon, F. 2001. 'Concerning violence.' In Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin, pp. 27-84

Pontecorvo, G ,B Haggiag, J Martin, Y Saadi and F Solinas. 1966. *The Battle of Algiers*. Criterion collection: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O1Cn2p-AwPk>

A Chronology of the Algerian War of Independence: <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2006/11/a-chronology-of-the-algerian-war-of-independence/305277/>

Further Reading

Ahlman, J S. 2010. 'The Algerian Question in Nkrumah's Ghana, 1958–1960: Debating "Violence" and "Nonviolence" in African Decolonization.' *Africa Today* 57 (2): 66-84.

Arendt, H. 1970. *On violence*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1969/02/27/a-special-supplement-reflections-on-violence/>.

Armstrong, Amanda. 2016. 'Looting: A Colonial Genealogy of the Contemporary Idea.' *Postmodern Culture* 27 (1).

- Bhattacharya, T and B V Mullen. 2015. 'Rewinding the Battle of Algiers in the Shadow of the Attack on Charlie Hebdo.' *Critical Legal Thinking*. At <http://criticallegalthinking.com/2015/01/14/rewinding-battle-algiers-shadow-attack-charlie-hebdo/>.
- Byrne, J J. 2016. *Mecca of revolution: Algeria, decolonization, and the Third World order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clover, J. 2016. *Riot. Strike. Riot: The New Era of Uprisings*. New York: Verso Books.
- Dabashi, H. 2012. *The Arab Spring: the end of postcolonialism*. London: Zed.
- Dabashi, H. 2011. *Post-Orientalism: Knowledge and Power in a Time of Terror*. Piscataway: Transaction Publishers.
- Douglass, P and F Wilderson. 2013. 'The violence of presence: Metaphysics in a black- ened world.' *The Black Scholar* 43 (4): 117-123.
- Fanon, F. 1965. *A Dying Colonialism*. Transl. Adolfo Gilly. New York: Grove Press.
- Fanon, F. 2004. 'Algeria unveiled.' In Frantz Fanon, *Decolonization: perspectives from now and then*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Frazer, E and K Hutchings. 2008. 'On politics and violence: Arendt contra Fanon.' *Contemporary Political Theory* 7 (1): 90-108.
- Hahn, H. 1969. 'Ghetto sentiments on violence.' *Science & Society* 33 (2): 197-208.
- Lazreg, M. 2016. *Torture and the twilight of empire: from Algiers to Baghdad*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Shepard, T. 2008. *The invention of decolonization: the Algerian War and the remaking of France*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Seshadri-Crooks, K. 2002. 'I am a master: Terrorism, Masculinity, and Political Violence in Frantz Fanon.' *Parallax* 8 (2): 84-98.
- Shatz, A. 2017. 'Where Life is Seized.' *London Review of Books* 39 (2). At <https://www.lrb.co.uk/v39/n02/adam-shatz/where-life-is-seized>.
- Surkis, J. 2010. 'Ethics and violence: Simone de Beauvoir, Djamilia Boupacha, and the Algerian war.' *French Politics, Culture & Society* 28 (2): 38-55.
- Wang, J. 2012. 'Against innocence: Race, gender, and the politics of safety.' *LIES: A journal of materialist feminism* 1: 145-171. At <http://liesjournal.net/media/LIES-Against-Innocence.pdf>

Week 7: Anti-colonial Nationalism and its Alternatives

What comes after liberation? Anti-colonial struggles turned to a variety of practices in the construction of 'new societies' after the dismantling of formal colonialism. Although the sovereign nation-state form and attendant nationalism would seemingly win out, anti-colonial movements were replete with visions of society that were internationalist, transnational and global in scope. This week we look at the histories of nationalist movements, their pitfalls and anti-nationalist alternatives to anticolonial projects. In particular, we explore Pan-African and socialist currents within anticolonial movements as well as criticisms of nationalism from the perspective of class and gender. In doing so, we seek to explore whether the anti-colonial turn to nationalism and the sovereign state were inevitable or the result of contested processes and contingent outcomes. We also ask whether the lost histories of anti-nationalist anti-colonialism might offer insights into whether another world is possible.

Provocation: 'Nationalism was a betrayal of anti colonial movements'

Required Reading

Fanon, F. 1963. 'The pitfalls of national consciousness.' Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin, pp. 148-205. <https://www.marxists.org/subject/africa/fanon/pitfalls-national.htm>

Chadya, J. M. 2003. 'Mother politics: Anti-colonial nationalism and the woman question in Africa.' *Journal of Women's History* 15 (3): 153-157.

Further Reading

Chadya, J. M. 2003. 'Mother politics: Anti-colonial nationalism and the woman question in Africa.' *Journal of Women's History* 15 (3): 153-157.

Chatterjee, P. 1986. *Nationalist thought and the colonial world: A derivative discourse*. London: Zed Books.

Davies, C. B. 2009. 'Sisters Outside: Tracing the Caribbean/Black Radical Intellectual Tradition.' *small axe* 13 (1): 217-229.

Gaines, K. K. 2012. *American Africans in Ghana: Black expatriates and the civil rights era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

James, C. L. R. 2012. *A history of Pan-African revolt*. Oakland: PM Press.

James, L. 2014. 'Nation, diaspora and modernity.' In Leslie James, George Padmore and Decolonization from Below: *Pan-Africanism, the Cold War, and the End of Empire*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 143-163.

Jayawardena, K. 1986. *Feminism and nationalism in the Third World*. New York: Verso.

Kanogo, T. 1987. 'Kikuyu women and the politics of protest: Mau Mau.' In Sharon Macdonald, Pat Holden and Shirley Ardener (eds), *Images of women in peace and war: Cross-Cultural and Historical Perspectives*. London: Palgrave, pp. 78-99.

Legg, S. 2003. 'Gendered Politics and Nationalised Homes: Women and the anti-colonial struggle in Delhi, 1930-47.' *Gender, Place and Culture: A Journal of Feminist Geography* 10 (1): 7-27.

Luongo, K. 2006. 'If You Can't Beat Them, Join Them: Government Cleansings of Witches and Mau Mau in 1950s Kenya.' *History in Africa* 33: 451-471.

McClintock, A. 1991. "'No longer in a future heaven": Women and nationalism in South Africa.' *Transition* 51: 104-123.

McDuffie, E. S. 2011. *Sojourning for freedom: Black women, American communism, and the making of black left feminism*. Durham: Duke University Press.

McDuffie, E. S. 2008. 'A "New Freedom Movement of Negro Women": Sojourning for Truth, Justice, and Human Rights during the Early Cold War.' *Radical History Review* 101: 81-106.

Odhiembo, E. S. and J. Lonsdale. 2003. *Mau Mau & nationhood: arms, authority & nation*. Oxford: James Currey.

Padmore, G. 1974. *Pan-Africanism or communism*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.

Reddock, R. 2007. 'Gender equality, Pan-Africanism and the diaspora.' *International Journal of African Renaissance Studies* 2 (2): 255-267.

Robertson, Claire. 'The economic roots of African women's political participation.' In Muna Ndulo and Margaret Grieco (eds), *Power, Gender and Social Change in Africa*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Pubs, pp. 77-93.

Santorù, M. E. 1996. 'The colonial idea of women and direct intervention: The Mau Mau case.' *African Affairs* 95 (379): 253-267.

Shilliam, R. 2006. 'What about Marcus Garvey? Race and the transformation of sovereignty debate.' *Review of International Studies* 32 (3): 379-400.

Shilliam, R. 2012. 'Garvey's Vision' *3rd Marcus Garvey Annual Memorial Lecture*. At <https://rob-bieshilliam.wordpress.com/2012/06/26/garveys-vision/>.

Trehwela, P. 1988. 'George Padmore: A Critique. Pan Africanism or Marxism.' *Searchlight South Africa* 1 (1): 42-63.

Wallerstein, I. M. 2005. *Africa: The politics of independence and unity*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Wilder, G. 2014. *Freedom time: negritude, decolonization, and the future of the world*. Durham: Duke University Press

Week 8: Political Identity/Identity Politics

The question of identity in anti-colonial and anti-racist movements has always been fraught and contentious. On the one hand, racialised identities have been central to constructing solidarity and unity considered necessary for anti-racist political movements. On the other hand, many have argued that the very articulations of race on which anti-racist politics operates depends on categories produced by racism itself. This week we look at the ways in which ideas of 'politically black' and 'people of colour' have been deployed as a political forms of identification, used to designate not only the African diaspora but other racialised groups resisting racism. Although ostensibly an attempt to generate solidarity through a shared political identity, these terms have been criticised for imposing a false equivalence and homogeneity on the otherwise differentiated experience of various non-white peoples. This week we look at the ways in which different anti-racist movements have self-identified across shifting social, economic and political contexts. We will also explore articulations of 'race' through other identifications – class, gender, sexuality, etc. In doing so, we will return to and examine a cornerstone of the anti-colonial and anti-racist movement – the very meaning of 'race' itself.

Provocation: 'Black is a political colour.'

Required Reading

Hall, Stuart. 1991. 'Old and New Identities, Old and New Ethnicities.' In A D King (ed), *Culture, Globalization and the World-System: Contemporary Conditions for the Representation of Identity*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, pp. 41-61 [read Hall's responses to questions if you fancy] http://pages.mtu.edu/~jds/ack/readings/CSReadings/Hall_Old_and_New_Identities_Ethnicities.pdf

Brixton Black Women's Group. 1984. 'Black Women Organizing.' *Feminist Review* 17: 84-89. [this is from a special issue titled *Many Voices, One Chant: Black Feminist Perspectives*, which contains many important pieces from academics and activists. Some of these are cited below but the whole issue is worth looking into.]

Swaby, Nydia A. 2014. "'disparate in voice, sympathetic in direction": gendered political blackness and the politics of solidarity.' *feminist review* 108 (1): 11-25. [This is from another Feminist Review special issue, 20 years on from the last, titled *black british feminisms*. The whole issue is worth a close look] <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/fr.2014.30>

Video

Loretta Ross, 'The Origin of the phrase "Women of Color"' - <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=82vl34mi4Iw>

Further Reading

Amos, V and P Parmar. 1984. 'Challenging imperial feminism.' *feminist review* 17: 3-19.

Angelo, A. M. 2009. 'The Black Panthers in London, 1967-1972: A Diasporic Struggle Navigates the Black Atlantic.' *Radical History Review* 103: 17-35.

Andrews, Kehinde. 2016. 'The problem of political blackness: lessons from the Black Supplementary School Movement.' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 39 (11): 2060-2078.

Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies. 1982. *Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism In 70's Britain*. London and New York: Routledge.

Costa Vargas, J H. 2006. 'Black radical becoming: the politics of identification in permanent transformation.' *Critical Sociology* 32 (2-3): 475-500.

Davies, C. B. 2007. 'Carnival and Diaspora: Caribbean Community, Happiness and Activism.' *Left of Karl Marx: The political life of black communist Claudia Jones*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Gilroy, P. 1987. 'The Whisper Wakes, The Shudder Plays in Race, Nation and Ethnic Absolutism.' In Paul Gilroy, *There Ain't No Black in The Union Jack*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 43-69.

Gilroy, P and G Yancy. 2015. 'What "Black Lives" means in Britain.' *The New York Times* [online]. At http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2015/10/01/paul-gilroy-what-black-means-in-britain/?_r=0.

Gilroy, P. 2013. *There Ain't No Black in The Union Jack*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

James, W and C Harris. 1993. *Inside Babylon: The Caribbean Diaspora in Britain*. London: Verso.

Kelley, Robin D G and Betsy Esch. 1999. 'Black like Mao: Red China and Black Revolution.' *Souls* 1 (4): 6-41.

Kundnani, A. 2007. *The end of tolerance: racism in 21st century Britain*. London: Pluto Press.

Koram, K. 2016. "I'm not looking for a new England": On the Limitations of Radical Nationalism.' *Novara Media* [online]. At <http://novaramedia.com/2016/10/09/im-not-looking-for-a-new-england-on-the-limitations-of-a-radical-nationalism/>.

Lentin, A and G Titley. 2011. *The crises of multiculturalism: Racism in a neoliberal age*. London: Zed Books.

Mama, A. 1984. Black Women, the Economic Crisis and the British State. *Feminist Review* 17: 21-35.

Maylor, U. 2009. 'What is the meaning of 'black'? Researching 'black' respondents.' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 32 (2): 369-387.

Modood, T. 1994. 'Political blackness and british asians.' *Sociology* 28 (4): 859-876.

Pitcher, B. 2015. The politics of multiculturalism: race and racism in contemporary Britain. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rushdie, S. 2012. 'The New Empire within Britain.' *Imaginary homelands: Essays and criticism* 1981-1991. Random House. At http://public.wsu.edu/~hegglund/courses/389/rushdie_new_empire.htm

Shilliam, R. 2015. *The black Pacific: Anti-colonial struggles and oceanic connections*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Sivanandan, A. 1983. 'Challenging Racism: Strategies for the 80s.' *Race and Class* 25 (2): 1-11.

Sivanandan, A. 1981. From resistance to rebellion: Asian and Afro-Caribbean struggles. *Race and Class* 23 (1-2): 111-152.

Sky Palace. 2012. 'To be Liberated from Them (or Through Them): The Call for a New Approach.' *LIES: A Journal of Materialist Feminism*. At <http://liesjournal.net/media/LIES-Call-for-a-New-Approach.pdf>.

Solomos, J. 1989. *Race and racism in contemporary Britain*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Week 9: Death, Detention and Disposability

Ruth Wilson Gilmore famously defined racism as 'the state-sanctioned or extralegal production and exploitation of group-differentiated vulnerability to premature death.' Here we see contemporary theorisations of racialised colonial projects through the specific practices of (a) producing death, and (b) differentiating between groups that are human and thus worthy of life and protection and those that are non-human and therefore disposable. That such practices have a longer genealogy, traceable to colonial warfare and transatlantic slavery, demonstrates a pervasive continuity in the practices of racialisation. This week we examine these genealogies and contemporary practices in which they are manifest – in racialised police violence, im-

prisonment, gentrification, border security, the war on terror, environmental catastrophe and industrial disasters. Through an examination of the ideas of 'social death' and 'necropolitics' we interrogate similar yet distinct theorisations of such experiences of death and disposability. Finally, we explore contemporary attempts to challenge racism through the reclamation of life and a politics of vitality.

Required Reading

De Genova, N. 2017. 'The "migrant crisis" as racial crisis: do *Black Lives Matter* in Europe?' *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 41 (10): 1765-1782.

L,R.2013."Wanderings of the Slave: Black Life and Social Death," *Mute*, June 5. At <http://www.mute-mute.org/editorial/articles/wanderings-slave-black-life-and-social-death>.

Provocation: 'All Lives Matter.'

Further Reading

Bell, D A. 1992. *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York: Basic Books.

Benn, M and K Worpole. 1986. *Death in the City*. London: Canary.

Butler, J. 1993. 'Endangered/endangering: Schematic racism and white paranoia.' In Robert Gooding-Williams (ed), *Reading Rodney King/reading urban uprising*. New York: Routledge, pp. 15-22.

Cacho, L M. 2012. *Social death: Racialized rightlessness and the criminalization of the unprotected*. New York: NYU Press.

Collins, P H. 2002. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York and London: Routledge.

Combahee River Collective. 1977. *The Combahee River Collective Statement 1977*. At <http://www.versobooks.com/blogs/2866-the-combahee-river-collective-statement>.

Cowen, D and N Lewis. 2016. 'Anti-blackness and urban geopolitical economy: Reflections on Ferguson and the suburbanization of the "internal colony."' *Society and Space*. At <http://society-and-space.org/2016/08/02/anti-blackness-and-urban-geopolitical-economy-deborah-cowen-and-nemoy-lewis/>.

Davis, A Y. 2011. *Are prisons obsolete?* New York: Seven Stories Press.

Gilmore, R W. 2007. *Golden gulag: Prisons, surplus, crisis, and opposition in globalizing California*, Vol. 21. Berkley: University of California Press.

Giroux, H A. 2006. 'Reading Hurricane Katrina: Race, class, and the biopolitics of disposability.' *College Literature* 33 (3): 171-196.

Hill, M L and T Brewster. 2016. *Nobody: Casualties of America's war on the vulnerable, from Ferguson to Flint and beyond*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kelley, R D G. 2016. 'Thug Nation: On State Violence and Disposability.' In J T Camp and C Heatherton (eds), *Policing the Planet: Why the Policing Crisis Led to Black Lives Matter*. New York: Verso Books.

Lorde, A. 1987. 'The Uses of Anger: Women Responding to Racism.' *Women and Language* 11 (1): 4-4.

Mbembe, A. 2008. 'Necropolitics.' In S Morton and S Bygrave (eds), *Foucault in an Age of Terror*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 152-182.

McKittrick, Katherine. 2011. 'On plantations, prisons, and a black sense of place.' *Social & Cultural Geography* 12 (8): 947-963.

Alexander, M. 2010. *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness*. New York: The New Press.

Murch, Donna. 'Historicizing Ferguson: Police Violence, Domestic Warfare, and the Genesis of a National Movement Against State-Sanctioned Violence.' *New Politics* XV (3). At <http://newpol.org/content/historicizing-ferguson>.

Puar, J K. 2017. 'Hands Up, Don't Shoot!' *New Inquiry*. At <https://thenewinquiry.com/hands-up-dont-shoot/>.

Sexton, J. 2010. 'People-of-color-blindness notes on the afterlife of slavery.' *Social Text* 28 (2): 31-56.

Sexton, J. 2011. 'The Social Life of Social Death: On Afro-Pessimism and Black Optimism.' *In Tensions* 5: 1-47.

Smith, C. 2014. For Claudia Silva Ferreira: Death and the Collective Black Female Body. *Feminist Wire*. At <http://thefeministwire.com/2014/05/for-claudia-silva-ferreira-death-black-female-body>.

Spillers, H J. 1987. 'Mama's baby, papa's maybe: An American grammar book.' *diacritics* 17 (2): 65-81.

Taylor, K Y. 2016. *From #BlackLivesMatter to Black Liberation*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.

Wang, J. 2012. 'Against innocence: Race, gender, and the politics of safety.' *LIES: A journal of materialist feminism* 1: 145-171. At <http://liesjournal.net/media/LIES-Against-Innocence.pdf><http://liesjournal.net/media/LIES-Against-Innocence.pdf>.

Wilderson, F B. 2003. 'The prison slave as hegemony's (silent) scandal.' *Social Justice* 30 (2): 18-27.

Williams, Bianca C. 2015. '#BlackLivesMatter: Anti-Black Racism, Police Violence, and Resistance.' *Fieldsights* — Hot Spots Series, *Cultural Anthropology Online*. At <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/696-blacklivesmatter-anti-black-racism-police-violence-and-resistance>.

Yancy, G and J Jones. 2013. *Pursuing Trayvon Martin: historical contexts and contemporary manifestations of racial dynamics*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Week 10: Conclusion/Reflection

In our final week we collectively draw out and reflect on key themes that have emerged over the course of this module. We will discuss some of the key tensions within the movement to decolonise – between the cultural and material; particularity and universality; local and global; specific and general. We will also ask: what does it mean to decolonise today? In asking this question, we will interrogate our own position within the space of a university in Western metropole and reflect on recent calls to 'decolonise the university.' Is this possible? Is it desirable? Perhaps more disturbingly, is it correct and faithful to the history of anti-colonial resistance to use the language of decolonisation in this context?

Provocation: 'Decolonisation is not a metaphor.'

Required Reading:

Kelley, R D. 2016. 'Black study, black struggle.' *Boston Review* 7. At <http://bostonreview.net/forum/robin-d-g-kelley-black-study-black-struggle>.

Tuck, E and K W Yang. 2012. 'Decolonization is not a metaphor.' *Decolonization: Indigeneity, education & society* 1 (1): 1-40. At <http://decolonization.org/index.php/des/article/view/18630>.

Decentering International Relations

Karen Smith

This course aims to introduce students to the debate in International Relations (IR) about the Western-centric nature of the discipline, and its implications for our understanding of the world. It forms part of an M.A. in IR that is situated in the Institute for History at Leiden University. The insights of global historians that the Western experience is but one small sliver of the totality of human history are therefore very relevant to understanding the limitations of a field of study such as IR. To that end, we emphasise the way in which a Western-centric IR perpetuates and legitimises particular stories and narratives. Relatedly, by revisiting the origin story of IR, we consider the largely neglected exploitative and violent nature of Western engagements with the rest of the world, and the role of race and empire in shaping the discipline. We also critically engage with critiques relating to the inapplicability of existing IR theory to large parts of the world. Relevant questions include: ‘How “international” is IR?’; and ‘Can existing frameworks make sense of the current dynamics of the international system?’

The course also investigates the commonly held assumption that there is little or no theoretical work produced in the Global South. As a part of this, challenges to the creation of theory are considered, as well as questions asked about what constitutes theory, and by whose criteria we assess this. Ways in which IR can be made more inclusive are explored through considering contributions by non-Western scholars. Importantly, whilst critical of the universalist claims of traditional IR theories, we do not assume to find only difference when we look outside of the West for ways to understand the world. In searching for contributions, there is therefore acknowledgment that these might take the form of adaptations of existing concepts and theory, the bringing in of ideas that have their origin in cultures from the Global South. This is part of recognising the interactions and sharing of knowledge that has taken place between different parts of the world for millennia. Through this, we also problematise the distinction between the West and the non-West and, by association, Western and non-Western knowledge. At the same time, the possibility of radically different world views that force us to rethink existing categories and interpretations and may be regarded as constituting alternative theories are also examined. Besides highlighting the way in which certain voices have dominated the discipline while others have been marginalised, the course also challenges students to think in new and innovative ways to

understand international relations. Decentering IR by questioning its Western-centrism is not enough. We also consider ways of decentering the discipline by going in search of sources and ways of understanding that take us outside of the traditional archive and into the world of culture, for example.

The objectives of the course therefore include:

- Understanding the intellectual genesis and development of the field of IR from an inclusive perspective;
- Problematising the Western-centric nature of the field and critically discussing the benefits of opening up the field to previously marginalised voices;
- Problematising the Western-centric nature of the field and critically discuss the benefits of opening up the field to previously marginalised voices;
- Engendering familiarity with a range of contributions from the Global South;
- Illustrate familiarity with a range of non-Western contributions to IR;
- Assessing the value of different theoretical approaches to providing explanations for real-world phenomena;
- Assess the value of different theoretical approaches to providing explanations for real-world phenomena;
- Thinking creatively about ways to broaden our understanding of world politics.

The outcomes of the course include a recognition by students that the solution to Western-centrism in IR is not just studying other parts of the world, or about including authors who are based in the Global South. What is lacking is not merely contributions from the Global South *per se*, but their recognition in scholarly studies on world politics. Relatedly, we should also explore how the Global South's ideas and experiences have shaped various aspects of world politics.

Responses to the course range from surprise to relief. Some European and North American students are astounded that they never consciously thought about the fact that the way they view the world, or the concepts and theories they take for granted, are shaped by their cultural and socio-political background and not necessarily universally applicable. This sometimes leads to feelings of unease as they start questioning many things they hitherto accepted as commonsense. Others feel relieved and excited that there is more to their chosen field of study than anarchy and the balance of power. They intuitively understand that, in a changing global order, ideas apparently foreign to IR, such as *ubuntu* or Daoist philosophy, could shed light on phenomena and interactions that existing analytical frameworks simply cannot. This opens up a whole new world of potential

research areas. The challenge remains that contributions from the global South don't always take forms that are immediately recognizable to students of IR, and students are encouraged to think outside of the box. I am consistently delighted by the level of creative thinking this course elicits from students, ranging from essays on postcolonial interpretations of computer games to reflections on the value of traditional forms of Indian dance to understand power relations.

Leiden University
MA International Relations
Decentering International Relations
Instructor: Dr. K. Smith
ECTS: 10
Level: 500 (Master's)
Academic year: 2019-2020

Description

This course problematises the Western-centric nature of International Relations (IR) as a field of study. During the first part of the course we will briefly review the development of the discipline of IR and engage with critiques relating to its Western dominance and inapplicability to large parts of the world. We will ask questions such as: How 'international' is IR? Can existing frameworks make sense of the current changes in the international system? Next, we will investigate the claim that there is little or no theoretical work produced in the Global South, asking what the reasons for this are. The third part of the course will explore the different ways in which IR can be made more inclusive, as well as consider contributions by non-Western scholars. We will try to find answers to questions such as: Can we assume that an African/Asian/Latin American perspective on IR will necessarily be different from a European or North American one? How well do concepts travel across cultures and disciplines? How can we think innovatively about new ways of understanding international relations?

Objectives

Once you have completed this course you will be able to:

- Think creatively about ways to broaden our understanding of world politics. In addition to the above, this course also facilitates:
- Understand the intellectual genesis and development of the field of IR;
- Critical reading: recognising and understanding the authors' arguments, discerning the underlying assumptions, and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses;
- Thinking about real-world problems in an abstract way;
- Developing the necessary skills both to write and speak about theoretical matters.

Course load

- 24 hours of classes
- 120 hours of reading and class preparation (10 hours per week over 12 weeks)
- 35 hours to prepare for leading a class discussion
- 35 hours to complete the short assignment
- 66 Hours to complete the research essay

Total: 280 Hours

Teaching methods and attendance

This course consists of 2-hour seminar sessions. Much of the work, however, must be done outside the seminars. Thirteen sessions are scheduled. Students are allowed to miss one session with good reasons (for example, medical). If you miss more than one session without genuine extenuating circumstances, 0.5 will be subtracted from your participation mark. If you miss more than two sessions, your work will not be marked.

Assessment

Your final grade for this course will be based on:

1. **Participation (20%):** You are required to participate in all two-hour seminar sessions, by actively contributing to classroom discussions and debates.
2. **Short assignment (20%):** Write a paper of 1500-2000 words in which you reflect on the issue of difference in relation to IR from the Global South. Your paper should address the following questions in a unified, coherent way (in other words: don't write three separate sections headed by these questions):
 - Can we assume that an African/Asian/Latin American perspective on IR will necessarily be different from a European or North American one? Why/why not?
 - Should cultural difference be taken into account when studying and theorising about different parts of the world?
 - Can an emphasis on difference result in cultural essentialism and therefore lead to further marginalisation?

Read the following articles to get you started:

Bilgin, Pinar. 2008. 'Thinking past "Western" IR?'. *Third World Quarterly* 29 (1): 5-23.

Brown, William. 2006. 'Africa and international relations: a comment on IR theory, anarchy and statehood'. *Review of International Studies* 32 (1): 119-143.

Makarychev, Andrey and Viatcheslav Morozov. 2013. 'Is "Non-Western Theory" Possible? The Idea of Multipolarity and the Trap of Epistemological Relativism in Russian IR.' *International Studies Review* 15: 328-350.

You might also want to look at: Tickner, Arlene and Ole Wæver (eds). 2009. *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*. London and New York: Routledge.

3. **Leading discussion (20%):** In weeks 7 to 10 you will lead the class discussion on specific readings assigned to you (in groups of 2 or 3), providing a brief summary of the main arguments*, drawing linkages between the readings as well as with issues discussed previously, reflecting on some of the questions for discussion, and identifying further questions raised by the readings. *Remember that the emphasis is not on the content of the reading *per se*, but rather on how it relates to this course, and what kind of contribution it makes to IR from the Global South.
 - What constitutes the field of IR?
 - What real-life events influenced the development of the field of IR?
 - How do we know what we know about IR?
 - What role does history play in shaping a discipline?

4. **Research Essay (40%):**

One research essay of +/-4000 words including bibliography, endnotes and appendices. You will be allowed to write on any topic that builds on elements of the course, but are particularly encouraged to think about how contributions from the Global South (in any of the forms discussed in weeks 6 to 9) can help us to interpret existing challenges in new ways. You will have the opportunity to present your initial ideas in class.

CLASS SCHEDULE

Weeks 1 & 2: Introduction and the development of the discipline of IR Required reading:

Week 1:

Any introduction to the origins and development of the discipline of IR (usually the first chapter of IR textbooks). For example: Burchill, Scott, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True. 2005. *Theories of International Relations*. 3rd ed. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan; Brown, Chris and Kirsten Ainley. 2005. *Understanding International Relations*. London: Palgrave; Baylis, John, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. 2014. *The Globalization of World Politics: an Introduction to International Relations*. 6th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Week 2:

Smith, Steve. 2002. 'The United States and the Discipline of International Relations: "Hegemonic Country, Hegemonic Discipline'. *Review of International Studies* 4 (2): 67-86.

Vitalis, Robert. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Thakur, Vineet, Alex Davis and Peter Vale. 2017. 'Imperial Mission, 'Scientific' Method: an Alternative Account of the Origins of IR.' *Millennium* 46 (1): 3-23.

Questions for discussion:

- What role did race and empire play in development of the field of IR?

Week 3: *A critique of existing IR (theory) Required reading:*

Nayak, Meghana and Eric Selbin. 2010. *Decentering International Relations*. New York: Zed Books, chapter 1, pp.1-20.

Jones, Branwen Gruffydd (ed). 2006. *Decolonizing International Relations*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, chapter 1.

Tickner, Arlene. 2003. 'Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World'. *Millennium* 32 (2): 295-324.

Additional reading:

Hobson, John. 2012. *The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics – Western International Theory, 1760-2010*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, chapter 1.

Neuman, Stephanie (ed). 1998. *International Relations Theory and the Third World*. London: Macmillan, pp.1-13.

Dunn, Kevin and Timothy Shaw (eds). 2001. *Africa's Challenge to International Relations*. Houndsmills: Palgrave, chapter 1.

Questions for discussion:

- Where and why did IR originate?
- How 'international' is IR?
- To what extent is our understanding of international relations subverted (or enriched) by the dominant discourse of American scholarship on IR?
- What is Eurocentrism?
- Is the European understanding of concepts like the state relevant to Africa, Asia or the Middle East?

Week 4: *(Why) is there no non-Western theory? Required reading:*

Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan. 2010. 'Why is there no non-Western international relations theory?'. In Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan (eds), *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. London and New York: Routledge, pp.1-25.

Dabashi, Hamid. 2013. 'Can non-Europeans think?'. *Al Jazeera* [online]. At [https:// www.al-jazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/01/2013114142638797542.html](https://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/01/2013114142638797542.html).

Additional reading:

Wæver, Ole. 1998. 'The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations'. *International Organization* 52 (4): 687-727.

Aydinli, Ersil and Julie Mathews. 2000. 'Are the Core and Periphery Irreconcilable? The Curious World of Publishing in Contemporary International Relations'. *International Studies Perspectives* 1 (3): 289-303.

Thomas, Caroline and Peter Wilkin. 2004. 'Still Waiting after all these Years: 'The Third World' on the Periphery of International Relations'. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 6: 241-258.

Questions for discussion:

- Do factors like language and geography influence how people view the world?
- How can we think innovatively about new ways of understanding international relations?

Week 5: The Question of Difference

Required reading:

Bilgin, Pinar. 2008. 'Thinking past 'Western' IR?' *Third World Quarterly* 29 (1): 5-23.

Makarychev, Andrey and Viatcheslav Morozov. 2013. 'Is "Non-Western Theory" Possible? The Idea of Multipolarity and the Trap of Epistemological Relativism in Russian IR.' *International Studies Review* 15: 328-350.

Brown, William. 2006. 'Africa and international relations: a comment on IR theory, anarchy and statehood'. *Review of International Studies* 32 (1): 119-143.

Questions for discussion:

How useful is the distinction between the West and the non-West?

Should cultural difference be taken into account when studying and theorising about different parts of the world?

Do factors like language and geography influence how people view the world?

Can we assume that an African/Asian/Latin American perspective on IR will necessarily be different from a European or North American one? Why/why not?

Can an emphasis on difference lead to cultural essentialism and therefore further marginalisation?

Week 6: Doing IR differently

Required reading:

Vasilaki, Rosa. 2012. 'Provincialising IR? Deadlocks and Prospects in Post-Western IR Theory'. *Millennium* 41 (1): 3-22.

Smith, Karen. 2009. 'Has Africa Got Anything to Say? African Contributions to the Theoretical Development of International Relations'. *The Round Table: The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* 98 (402): 269-284.

Aydinli, Ersel and Gonca Biletkin. 2017. 'Widening the World of IR: A Typology of Homegrown Theorizing'. *All Azimuth* 0: 1-24.

Additional reading:

Special issue on 'Advancing Global IR: Challenges, Contentions, and Contributions'. *International Studies Review* 18 (2016).

Shilliam, Robbie (ed). 2011. *International Relations and Non-Western Thought – Imperialism, colonialism and investigations of global modernity*. London: Routledge.

Questions for discussion:

Is it possible to construct a universal IR theory, or are regional or country-specific theories more realistic (and desirable)?

What qualifies as a theory/theoretical contribution, and who decides?
Is there value in adapting existing theory, or is a radical overhaul what is needed?
How well do concepts travel across cultures and disciplines?

Week 7-10: Contributions from the Global South (revisions, importing concepts, and original theory)
For weeks 7-10 you will be assigned readings to lead the discussion on (in groups). You are expected to provide a brief summary of the main arguments* of the readings, drawing linkages between the readings as well as with issues discussed previously, reflecting critically on some of the questions for discussion, and identifying further questions raised by the readings. *Remember that the emphasis is not on the content of the reading per se, but rather on how it relates to this course, and what kind of contribution it makes to IR from the Global South.

Week 7: Contributions from the Global South – revisions

Jordaan, Eduard. 2003. 'The concept of a middle power in international relations: distinguishing between emerging and traditional middle powers'. *Politikon: South African Journal of Political Studies* 30 (2): 165-181.

Ayoob, Mohammed. 2002. 'Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case for Subaltern Realism'. *International Studies Review* 4 (3): 27-48.

Magued, Shaimaa. 2019. 'Constructivism in the Islamic approach to International Relations: Davuto'lu and Qutb as case studies'. In Nassef Manabilang Adiong, Raffaele Mauriello and Deina Abdelkader (eds), *Islam in International Relations: Politics and Paradigms*. New York: Routledge.

Week 8: Contributions from the Global South – importing concepts

Kavalski, Emilian. 2018. 'Chinese Concepts and Relational International Politics'. *All Azimuth* 7 (1): 87-102.

Nordin, Astrid. 2016. 'Hegemony in Chinese? Ba in Chinese international relations'. In Lion Koenig and Bidisha Chaudhuri (eds), *Politics of the 'other' in India and China*. London: Routledge.

Adiong, Nassef Manabilang, Raffaele Mauriello and Deina Abdelkader (eds). *Islam in International Relations: Politics and Paradigms*. New York: Routledge, selected chapters.

Murithi, Tim. 2007. 'A local response to the global human rights standard: the ubuntu perspective on human dignity'. *Globalisation, Societies and Education* 5 (3): 277-286.

Week 9-10: Contributions from the Global South – original theory?

Qin, Yaqing. 2016. 'A Relational Theory of World Politics'. *International Studies Review* 18: 33-47.

Adiong, Nassef Manabilang, Raffaele Mauriello and Deina Abdelkader (eds). *Islam in International Relations: Politics and Paradigms*. New York: Routledge, selected chapters.

Tieku, Thomas Kwesi. 2012. 'Collectivist Worldview: Its Challenge to International Relations'. In Scarlett Cornelissen, Fantu Cheru and Timothy Shaw (eds), *Africa and International Relations in the 21st Century*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ling, L H M. 2014. *The Dao of World Politics: Towards a Post-Westphalian, Worldist International Relations*. New York: Routledge, selected chapters.

Additional Reading:

Turner, John. 2012. 'Uncovering an Islamic Paradigm of International Relations'. In Christopher Flood, Stephen Hutchings, Galina Miazhevich and Henri Nickels (eds), *Political and Cultural Representations of Muslims*. Leiden: Brill, pp.11-23.

Qin, Yaqing. 2018. *A Relational Theory of World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tickner, Arlene and David Blaney (eds). 2012. *Thinking the International Differently*. London: Routledge.

Dunn, Kevin and Timothy Shaw (eds). 2001. *Africa's Challenge to International Relations Theory*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Tadjbakhsh, Shahrbanou. 2010. 'International relations theory and the Islamic worldview'. In Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan (eds), *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. London and New York: Routledge.

Cornelissen, Scarlett, Fantu Cheru and Timothy Shaw (eds). 2012. *Africa and International Relations in the 21st Century*. Houndsmills: Palgrave Macmillan.

Mishra, Malay. 2016. 'Kautilya's Arthashastra: Restoring its Rightful Place in the Field of International Relations'. *Journal of Defence Studies* 10 (2): 77-109.

Callahan, William. 2008. 'Chinese Visions of World Order: Post-hegemonic or a New Hegemony?'. *International Studies Review* 10 (4): 749-761.

Additional readings to be added – both by me and everyone in the class.

WEEK 11: Discussion of research essay ideas

WEEK 12: Concluding thoughts on the way forward

Questions for discussion:

How can we think innovatively about new ways of understanding international relations?

How do we break out of the disciplinary straightjacket?

What alternative sources might we consult in our search for contributions from the global South?

How will you be thinking and doing IR differently?

Film, politics and society

Arlene B. Tickner

Among the central aims of the social sciences, among them political science and International Relations (IR), explaining and interpreting diverse historical, political, social and cultural problems and processes involving states and societies figure prominently. Although film makes use of less 'scientific' methods, it shares a similar goal. In both instances, social scientific and cinematic, representations of reality play a key analytical role. However, while most individuals do not enjoy direct contact with the social sciences, mass media, including film, constitute one of the most pervasive vehicles of knowledge transmission, representation and social construction of reality. As such, film constitutes a space within which commonsense ideas about the world are produced, reinforced, confirmed or modified, and where stories about acceptable state and society behavior are naturalized and normalized (Lacy 2003: 614). Even the most frivolous movies reflect the historical and cultural context in which they were produced, and specific beliefs, worldviews and ideologies. While in some instances, the latter are fairly explicit as occurs in the case of Sergei Eisenstein's *Battleship Potemkin* (1925) or Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* (1935), two propaganda films that glorify the values of the Russian Revolution and German Nazism, Hollywood productions such as *Rocky IV* (1985) or *The Siege* (1998) are equally charged with political values and messages related to the Cold War and terrorism. The main objective of this course is to explore the ways in which film represents diverse social actors, problems and places with an eye to sensitizing students to the constructed nature of (global) reality, as well as the specific social and political effects that are created by distinct representational practices. The basic premise is that film offers a productive means of exploring a wide variety of issues pertinent to the study of world politics. While it assigns concrete meaning to abstract concepts such as war and conflict, violence, nationalism, capitalism, globalization, identity, difference, danger and social marginality, it also taps into student emotions, thus constituting a powerful and engaging pedagogical and heuristic tool.

The course begins with a brief conceptual framework whose objective is to provide students the basic interpretative skills needed to analyze and discuss the films, following which approximately nine or ten movies are projected and debated in the classroom. Customarily, students are asked to read a brief 'memorandum' before each viewing, in which I signpost some of the key points addressed in the film (from a representational perspective), establish links with the assigned

course readings and propose potential topics for group discussion and subsequent individual assessment in short writing assignments. A representative sampling of the movies that I use in the course includes: *Doctor Strangelove* (Stanley Kubrick, 1964); *Battle of Algiers* (Gillo Pontecorvo, 1966); *Full Metal Jacket* (Stanley Kubrick, 1987); *The White Balloon* (Jafar Panahi, 1996); *Traffic* (Steven Soderbergh, 2000); *Hotel Rwanda* (Terry George, 2004); *11'09"01-September 11* (Alan Brigand, 2002); *Le Haine* (Mathieu Kassovitz, 1995); *Inside Job* (Charles Ferguson, 2010); and *The Fourth World War* (Michael Franti and Suheir Hammad, 2004).

The main way in which film has been used in IR teaching has been to illustrate key theories, concepts and problems (see for example, Gregg 1998; Weber 2001; Engert and Spencer 2009; and Valeriano 2013). In contrast, I use film in this course to study how diverse global problems, subjects and places are represented, and what social, political and power effects result from specific representational practices. An example that my Colombian students can easily relate to illustrates how cinematic readings of reality inform wider social, political and economic dynamics. Since the 1980s, popular film (and television) representations of Colombia have constituted the country and its inhabitants invariably as inhospitable and dangerous tropical jungle and countryside, underdeveloped cities in which ruthless drug traffickers and terrorist guerillas roam wild, the state is either complicit or absent, and the local population is agentless or invisible. Students readily understand how such portrayals of their country and fellow citizens lend themselves to the US-led drug war and counterterrorist strategies designed to tame, civilize and 'save' Colombia, and to their own stigmatization by foreigners.

In sum, the movies that are viewed in this course offer useful insights into the ways in which film constructs reality based upon dominant stereotypes about race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality and social class, or conversely, seeks to debunk them. Therefore, a common theme that reemerges throughout the semester is how cinema works to create inferior, animalized or threatening 'others' in such a fashion that the use of repression and violence seems reasonable and justified. Admittedly, training students to detect representational practices in film and to understand their social and political effects may seem too limited an objective. However, in nurturing a critical practice of looking at film and other media, the potential impact of the class is both considerable and long-lasting. Once students understand that visual representations of reality are never neutral nor objective, but that they are ideologically charged and act to reinforce or contest existing stereotypes and political and social relations, many report never being able to view movies or television the same again, given that they are constantly inspecting the specific logics and the consequences of different representational practices.

Film, politics and society
Arlene B. Tickner

Course description

The objective of this course is to explore the ways in which film has imagined and represented diverse global spaces, social groups and problems with the aim of sensitizing students to the social and constructed nature of reality, as well as the specific political and power effects of distinct representational practices. Its basic premise is that film constitutes a productive site from which to explore a variety of issues that are relevant to the study of world politics. Rather than examining cinematography and its main theories, concepts and techniques, film will be used in the course as a heuristic tool that allows use to feel, interpret and understand different contemporary global phenomena. In consequence, a wide sampling of movies in ideological, historical and geographical will be used. In addition to examining how film constructs varied explanations of reality, based among others on cause-effect relations, and why certain narrative strategies are more effective than others in persuading spectators, the power implications and the transformative potential behind particular representations of the diverse problems studied will also be assessed.

Methodology

The course begins with a brief conceptual framework whose aim is to provide students with the interpretative tools needed for the viewing, critical analysis and discussion of the films. Following this introduction, films that address a variety of political, social, economic and cultural issues will be projected. Notwithstanding their diversity, the films can be grouped loosely into two blocks: the construction of the “national” and “problems of a globalized world”. Once each film is projected, the course will debate its contents, based upon the movie itself, assigned readings and a brief memo drafted by the professor that is intended to highlight some basic analytical points and to establish a small number of discussion questions. Both the assigned readings and the memo should be read before coming to class.

Guide for film discussion

The general purpose of the class discussion of each film is to identify the ways in which it represents global reality. Instead of reflecting an objective reality “out there”, we will understand “representation” as a series of social practices that provide reality with concrete meaning. In other words, reality has a social and constructed nature, and representational practices constitute the primary mechanism through which reality is created. In this sense, film plays a dual role: while it reflects predominant representational practices that exist in particular societies, it also participates actively in the creation of those same practices. The analysis of the representational practices present in each film should strive to answer general questions such as: what exactly is being represented in the movie? How is it being represented, in other words, how does the movie characterize the problems, characters and places that it represents? How does this specific strategy affect our way of seeing that which is being represented? And what are the political, social and power implications of specific representational practices?

Course Evaluation

The course evaluation consists of two written essays in response to analytical questions developed by the professor, a weekly blog and a final visual exercise.

Weekly Blog

The purpose of the weekly blog is to invite students to think, reflect and ask questions about the films viewed in class, beyond the group discussions. Each blog entry should be no less than 200 words and no longer than 400. Although the blogs have no required format, each entry

should contain four elements: a title that captures the main idea; the development of a main idea through which to interpret the film; the use of secondary arguments (for example, through specific examples from the film or references to the assigned readings) designed to illustrate and support the main idea); a conclusion.

Final Visual Exercise

The course's final project consists of a visual exercise in which groups of students analyze a global problem of their own choosing, based upon a comparison of the different ways in which it has been represented by at least three films.

CLASS SESSIONS AND REQUIRED READINGS

Week 1: Introduction to the Course

Week 2: Representation of Reality, Meaning and Effects

Sturken, Marita and Lisa Cartwright. 2001. 'Practices of Looking. Power and Politics'. In Marita Sturken and Lisa Cartwright, *Practices of Looking. An Introduction to Visual Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 10-44.

Hall, Stuart. 2002. 'Representation, Meaning and Language'. In Stuart Hall (ed), *Representation. Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London: Sage, pp. 15-64.

Week 3: Analyzing Film Images and Representations

Rosenstone, Robert A. 2003. 'The Reel Joan of Arc: Reflections on the Theory and Practice of the Historical Film'. *The Public Historian* 25 (3): 61-77.

PART I: THE CONTRUCTION OF THE "NATIONAL"

Week 4: The Cold War and U.S. Identity

Film: *Doctor Strangelove or How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb* (Stanley Kubrick, 1964).

Lipschutz, Ronnie D. 2001. 'Reds Among Us?'. In Ronnie D Lipschutz, *Cold War Fantasies: Film, Fiction and Foreign Policy*, Boulder: Rowmann and Littlefield Publishers, pp. 35-53.

Lipschutz, Ronnie D. 2001. 'Nukes!'. In Ronnie D Lipschutz, *Cold War Fantasies: Film, Fiction and Foreign Policy*, Boulder: Rowmann and Littlefield Publishers, pp. 79-101.

Lindley, Dan. 2001. 'What I Learned since I Stopped Worrying and Studied the Movie: A Teaching Guide to Stanley Kubrick's Dr. Strangelove'. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 34 (3): 663-667.

Boxen, Jeremy. 1997. 'Just What the Doctor Ordered. Cold War Purging, Political Dissent, and the Right Hand of Dr. Strangelove'. At <http://www.visual-memory.co.uk/amk/doc/0029.html>.

Week 5: Violent Conflict, "Us" and "Them" I

Film: *Battle of Algiers* (Gillo Pontecorvo, 1966).

Fanon, Frantz. 1999. 'The Fact of Blackness'. In Jessica Evans and Stuart Hall (eds), *Visual Culture: The Reader*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 417-420.

Fanon, Frantz. 1961. 'Concerning Violence'. In Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*. London: Penguin.

Stam, Robert and Louise Spence. 2000. 'Colonialism, Racism and Representation: An Introduction'. In Joanne Hollows, Peter Hutchings and Mark Jancovich (eds), *The Film Studies Reader*. London: Arnold Publishers, pp. 315-322.

Week 6: Violent Conflict, "Us" and "Them" II

Film: *Full Metal Jacket* (Stanley Kubrick, 1987).

Williams, Paul. 2003. "What a Bummer for the Gooks": Representations of White American Masculinity and the Vietnamese in the Vietnam War Film Genre 1977-1987'. *European Journal of American Culture* 22 (3): 215-234.

Williams, Doug. 1991. 'Concealment and Disclosure: From 'Birth of a Nation' to the Vietnam War Film'. *International Political Science Review* 12 (1): 29-47.

Week 7: Islamic World, Everyday Life and Western Stereotypes

Film: *The White Balloon* (Jafar Panahi, 1996).

Said, Edward. 1997. 'Introduction to the Vintage Edition'. In Edward Said, *Covering Islam*. New York: Vintage Books, pp. xi-xlvi.

Mir-Hosseini, Ziba. 2001. 'Iranian Cinema: Art, Society and the State'. *Middle East Report* 219: 26-29.

Kalami, Proshot. 2009. 'Whom does Iranian Cinema Speak to? Double Life of a Poetic Cinema'. *The International Journal of the Humanities* 6 (9): 37-45.

Aufderheide, Pat. 1995. 'Real Life is More Important than Cinema. An Interview with Abbas Kiarostami'. *Cineaste* 21 (3): 31-33.

Week 8: Review and Written Exam

PART II: PROBLEMS OF A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Week 9: Drug Trafficking

Film: *Traffic* (Steven Soderbergh, 2000).

Marez, Curtis. 2004. 'Introduction. Drug Wars'. In Curtis Marez, *Drug Wars*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 1-36.

Boyd, Susan. 2002. 'Media Constructions of Illegal Drugs Users, and Sellers: A Closer Look at *Traffic*'. *International Journal of Drug Policy* 13: 397-407.

Week 10: Humanitarian Intervention and R2P

Film: *Hotel Rwanda* (Terry George, 2004).

Harrow, Kenneth W. 2005. "Un train peut en cacher un autre". Narrating the Rwandan Genocide and "Hotel Rwanda". *Research in African Literatures* 36 (4): 223-232.

Barnett, Michael. 2002. 'Rwanda through Rose-Colored Glasses'. In Michael Barnett, *Eyewitness to a Genocide: The United Nations and Rwanda*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 49-73.

Week 11: Terrorism

Film: *11'09"01-September 11* (Alain Brigand, 2002).

Baudrillard, Jean. 'The Spirit of Terrorism'. In Jean Baudrillard, *The Spirit of Terrorism and Other Essays*. Transl. Chris Turner. London and New York: Verso, pp. 1-26.

Bhargava, Rajeev. 'Responses to 9/11: Individual and Collective Dimensions'. *Social Science Research Council (SSRC)*. At <https://items.ssrc.org/after-september-11/responses-to-9-11-individual-and-collective-dimensions/>.

Zehfuss, Maja. 2003. 'Forget September 11'. *Third World Quarterly* 24 (3): 513-528.

Week 12: Migrants, Minorities and Xenophobia

Film: *Le Haine* (Mathieu Kassovitz, 1995).

Sharma, Sanjay and Ashwani Sharma. 2000. "So Far so Good..." La Haine and the Poetics of the Everyday'. *Theory, Culture and Society* 17 (3): 103-116.

Kamili, Masoud. 2009. 'Institutional Otherization, Migration and Racism'. In Masoud Kamili, *Racial Discrimination: Institutional Patterns and Politics*. London: Routledge, pp. 37-62.

Week 13: Global Financial Crisis

Film: *Inside Job* (Charles Ferguson, 2010).

Council on Foreign Relations. 2011. 'Crisis Guide: The Global Economy'. At <http://www.cfr.org/economics/crisis-guide-global-economy/p19710>.

Week 14: Neoliberal Globalization and Resistance

Film: *The Fourth World War* (Michael Franti, Suheir Hammad, 2004).

Klein, Naomi. 2002. *Fences and Windows: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the Globalization Debate*. London: Picador.

Hessel, Stéphane. 2011. ¡Indignaos! Barcelona: Ediciones Destino.

Short documentary, 'Utopia on the Horizon'. At <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=OAnGxynPxL4>.

Week 15: Review and Written Exam**Week 16: Class Viewing of Final Visual Exercise****Seminar Schedule:****Exemplary research articles:**

- Quantitative: Western, Bruce and Katherine Beckett. 1999. 'How Unregulated Is the US Labor Market? The Penal System as a Labor Market Institution'. *American Journal of Sociology* 104 (4): 1030-1060.
- Qualitative: Elman, Colin. 1996. 'Extending offensive realism: The Louisiana purchase and America's rise to regional hegemony'. *American Political Science Review* 98 (4): 563-576.
- Interpretive: Weldes, Jutta. 1996. 'Constructing national interests'. *European Journal of International Relations* 2 (3): 275-318.

Politics of (global) development & IR: shared premises and normative commitments

Heloise Weber

In my contribution to this forum I make a pitch for why International Relations (IR) and Global Development have much in common, even if this is not always immediately obvious. Students of IR and Global Development benefit immensely from appreciating the significance and implications of their shared normative and political commitments.

In my research and teaching on the Politics of Global Development, I focus on core foundational assumptions which underpin IR and Development, and frame and sustain both disciplines. One can fruitfully approach the study of the Politics of (Global) Development in ways that explicate and engage some substantive relations constitutive of what is fundamental to mainstream IR, but otherwise consigned by it to the partitioned-off spheres of 'domestic politics' or 'development'. In this short outline, I identify foundational assumptions held in common by IR and Development Studies, and show how and why a critical approach to the politics of (Global) Development explicates a world of social and political relations otherwise considered to be *outside* rather than *integral* to IR. The point is not to add 'another perspective,' but rather to provide an approach that incorporates critical, historically informed analysis of global social and political change ('global development'), while accounting for ongoing legacies and implications of colonialism. This requires being attuned to apprehending transnational power relations and the practices of resistance these may engender, locally, trans-locally and globally.

Conventional approaches to international relations and development share significant intellectual pre-commitments, which are rarely interrogated. Both are premised on taking the international as a given political architecture, according to which formal accounts of politics, for instance, in terms of legal boundaries, are constructed, which sustain mainstream *analytical efforts* directed at global social and political change. The two fields are equally engaged in sustaining a hierarchical representation of IR and Development that disarticulates the underlying histories of inequality and domination, and thereby also occludes contemporary relations accordingly. Both are state-centric, with one focusing on the state as the primary 'object of development' (Mitchell 2002), while the other takes it as the

primary 'object of interest'. Both converge accordingly on how they construe 'stages of development' or 'civilizational stages' indexed to states conceived as discrete units that can be located, for instance, on the metaphorical 'development ladder'. This has two significant social and political implications: firstly, the 'silencing' of the past (cf. Trouillot 1995), disconnecting, for example, colonialism and its legacies from accounts that show how these shape the present realities of states categorised as 'developed' or 'developing'. Secondly, it serves to obscure how such legacies intersect with contemporary transnational relations of power, wealth and inequality. Addressing both these implications comprehensively is arguably one of the most important challenges for 'development thinking' and world political analysis, making this lesson central to students' learning, analytical outlooks and prospective practical orientations. Rethinking conventional theoretical and methodological premises thus becomes the core objective.

My teaching on the Politics of (Global) Development hence departs from conventional approaches which take the received categorisations of a hierarchy of states as given, with the logic of 'catching up' providing the normative reference point for analysis and the formulation of policy objectives. This departure means putting on the line the cornerstone assumptions of IR. *Consequently, I can emphasise substantive social and political relations as an analytical reference point for critical inquiry into power and contestation in Development and/or IR.*

Let me briefly illustrate my approach by reference to the first substantive topic I teach in the Politics of Global Development, which is entitled 'Politics of Poverty? Methods and Analyses' (with the sub-title 'Politics of Theory, Method and Poverty'). For this, I set two contrastive readings. One is based on Modernisation Theory and explicitly frames development in state-centred terms based on a comparative 'stages of growth' logic. The second is a critical take, in the form of a chapter by Timothy Mitchell, that investigates and explicates the problematic logic of taking the state as 'the Object of Development'. Mitchell's chapter demonstrates how the World Bank and USAID diagnose and analyse 'development and poverty' in Egypt as if the latter were a discrete object, disconnected spatially and temporally from 'extra-territorial' relations (Mitchell 2002: 230-231). Mitchell's point is complex, but the central insight for the students is to get at the limits of state-centred analysis, where the latter is premised on a disarticulation of transnationally constituted historical relations and legacies. The reading based on Modernisation Theory could be easily substituted with any reading taken from conventional IR, which has routinely deployed conceptual schemes such as 'degrees of

statehood', or 'quasi-states' in its practices of hierarchizing; and Mitchell's critique would equally and effectively apply to those.

The analytical value of 'opening up' IR and Development in this way cannot be underestimated, not least because, through such a move, a more expansive (and inclusive) understanding of politics and political relations is enabled (cf. Walker 1988; Enloe 2011). I have organised the readings around this topic to facilitate students' interest in taking further critical insights on comparison or the 'formal comparative method' (cf. McMichael 1990; Weber 2007; Walker et al 2018: 97-102). Against the backdrop of an appreciation of what is at stake *politically and intellectually* in accepting the established framework of analysis without critical reflection, students are also equipped to better understand why, for instance, poverty and deprivation in world politics persist and continue to be presented as 'development' challenges rather than as *expressions* of development processes.

Of course, this approach to teaching is not without challenges. For one, it requires an appreciation of (critical) political economy without succumbing to economic reductionism, and it must be complemented with an appreciation of how this intersects with inequalities of race (cf. Shilliam 2008; Walker et al 2018: 93-97) and gender (Elias 2011), for example. The promise, though, lies in enabling students to better appreciate how and why problematic assumptions which underpin established coordinates of the international can serve to engender relations of wealth and poverty, as well as domination and resistance (cf. Mitchell 2002; Shilliam 2008; Walker 2002; Walker et al 2018; McMichael 2010).

Politics of Development – Required and Recommended Readings

POLS7302

Heloise Weber

Topic 1: Welcome and Introduction: Overview of the Course

Required readings:

Enloe, Cynthia. 2011. 'The Mundane Matters'. *International Political Sociology* 5 (5): 447-450.
Shilliam, Robbie. 2021. 'Comparative Politics'. In Robbie Shilliam, *Decolonizing Politics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Weber, Heloise and M T B Berger. 2017. 'Global Poverty, Inequality and Development'. In Richard Devetak, Jim George and Sarah Percy (eds), *An Introduction to International Relations*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Recommended Readings:

McMichael, Philip. 2017. 'Instituting the Development Project'. In Philip McMichael, *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. 6th ed. London: Sage. See especially pp. 26-42.
McMichael, Philip. 2005. 'Globalization'. In Thomas Janoski (ed), *The handbook of political sociology: states, civil society and globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 587-606.
Saurin, Julian. 1996. 'Globalisation, Poverty and the Promises of Modernity'. *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 25 (3): 657-680.
Walker, R B J. 1988. 'Explorations'. In *One World, Many Worlds: Struggles for a Just World Peace*. London: Zed Books, pp. 81-114 (total pages of book 175).

Topic 2: The End of Poverty? Politics of method and analyses in the study of development

Required readings:

Sachs, Jeffrey. 2005. 'A Global Family Portrait'. In Jeffrey Sachs, *The End of Poverty: Economic Possibilities for Our Time*. New York: Penguin Press, pp. 5-25
Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. 'The Object of Development'. In Timothy Mitchell, *Rule of Experts Egypt, Techno-Politic, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 209-243 (plus notes pp. 350-360).

Recommended Readings:

Chandhoke, Neera. 1996. 'Limits of Comparative Political Analysis'. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 31 (4): 2-8.
Bhambra, Gurminder. 2014. *Connected Sociologies*. London: Bloomsbury. See especially chapters 2 ('From Modernization Theory to World History'), 6 ('Postcolonial and Decolonial Reconstructions') and 7 ('Sociology for an "Always-Already" Global Age').
Inayatullah, Naeem and David Blaney. 2004. *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*. London: Routledge.
Kothari, Smitu. 1996. 'Whose Nation? The Displaced as Victims of Development'. *Economic and Political Weekly* 31 (24): 1476-1488.
McMichael, Philip. 1990. 'Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method'. *American Sociological Review* 55 (3): 385-397.
Mitchell, Timothy. 1991. 'The Limits of the State: Beyond Statist Approaches and their Critics'. *American Political Science Review* 85 (1): 77-96.
Mongia, V Radhika. 2007. 'Historicizing State Sovereignty: Inequality and the Form of Equivalence'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 49 (2): 384-411.
Walker, R B J. 1988. 'Explorations'. In R B J Walker, *One World, Many Worlds: Struggles for a Just World Peace*. London: Zed Books, pp. 81-114.
Walker, R B J. 2002. 'International/Inequality'. *International Studies Review* 4 (2): 7-24.

Weber, Heloise. 2007. 'A Political Analysis of the Formal Comparative Method: Historicizing the Globalization and Development Debate'. *Globalizations* 4 (4): 559-572.

Topic 3: Historicizing Development: Relations of inequality across space and time

Required readings:

O'Brien, Robert and Marc Williams. 2007. 'European Expansion'. In *Global Political Economy – Evolution and Dynamics*. 2nd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 58-76.

James, C L R. 1963. 'The Property'. IN C L R James, *The Black Jacobins*. London: Vintage Books, pp. 6-26.

Recommended readings:

Bose, Sugata. 2009 [2006]. 'Flows of Capitalists, Laborers, and Commodities'. In Sugata Bose, *A Hundred Horizons – The Indian Ocean in the Age of Global Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, pp. 72-121.

Cooper, Frederick. 1997. 'Modernizing Bureaucrats, Backward Africans, and the Development Concept'. In Frederick Cooper and Randall Packard (eds), *International Development and the Social Sciences – Essays on the History and Politics of Knowledge*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 64-92.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 1989. 'Jute: The Nature of the Industry'. In Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Rethinking Working Class History Bengal 1890-1940*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 14-64.

Engels, Friedrich. 2005 [1845]. 'The Great Town'. In Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. London: Penguin Press, pp. 68-110

McMichael, Philip. 2016. 'Instituting the Development Project'. In *Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective*. 6th ed. London: Sage. See especially pp. 26-42.

Mintz, Sydney W. 1986. 'Production'. In Sydney W Mintz, *Sweetness and Power: the place of sugar in modern history*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, pp. 19-73, plus notes to this chapter, plus notes pp. 230-241.

Shilliam, Robert. 2008. 'What the Haitian Revolution Might Tell Us about Development, Security and the Politics of Race'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50 (3): 778-808.

Sheridan, B Richard. 1969. 'The Plantation Revolution and the Industrial Revolution'. *Caribbean Studies* 9 (3): 5-25.

Wolf, R Eric. 2010 [1982]. 'The Movement of Commodities'. In Eric R Wolf, *Europe and the People Without History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 310-353.

Topic 4: Politics of Representation in Development

Required Readings:

Said, Edward. 1978. 'Knowing the Oriental'. In Edward Said, *Orientalism*. New York: Penguin Books.

Kothari, Uma. 2006. 'An Agenda for thinking about "race" in development'. *Progress in Development Studies* 6 (1): 9-23.

Nzenza-Shand, Sekai. 2000. 'Clocks and Seasons'. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 25 (3): 353-355.

Recommended readings:

Doty, Roxanne. 1996. 'Getting the "Natives" to Work'. In Roxanne Doty, *Imperial Encounters: the Politics of Representation in North-South Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Fisher-Tine, Harald. 2005. 'Britain's other civilizing mission: Class prejudice, European 'loaferism' and the workhouse-system in colonial India'. *The Indian Economic and Social History Review*, 42 (3): 295-338.

Hindess, Barry. 2007. 'The Past Is Another Culture'. *International Political Sociology* 1 (4): 325-338.

Lugard, F D. 1922. 'Introduction'. In F D Lugard, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.

Lugard, F D. 1922. 'Labour in Tropical Africa'. In F D Lugard, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.

Lugard, F D. 1922. 'Conclusion'. In F D Lugard, *The Dual Mandate in British Tropical Africa*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.

Mennel, Stephen. 1997. 'On the Civilizing of Appetite'. In Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik (eds), *Food and Culture: A Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, pp 315-337.

Mignolo, Walter D. 2005. *The Idea of Latin America*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. *All the chapters are relevant, but see especially chapter 2 "Latin" America and the First Reordering of the Modern/Colonial World".

Rajagopal, Balakrishnan. 2003. 'Laying the Groundwork'. In Balakrishnan Rajagopal, *International Law from Below*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Shilliam, Robbie. 2014. 'Race and Development'. In Heloise Weber (ed.). *Politics of Development – A Survey*. London: Routledge.

See also:

Andreasson, Stefan. 2005. 'Orientalism and African Development Studies: The "reductive repetition" motif in theories of African underdevelopment'. *Third World Quarterly* 26 (6): 971-986.

Apffel-Marglin, Frederique and Suzanne Simon. 1994. 'Feminist Orientalism and Development'. In W Harcourt (ed), *Feminist Perspectives on Sustainable Development*. London: Zed, pp. 26-45.

Bebbington, Anthony and Denise Humphreys Bebbington. 2010. 'An Andean Avatar: Post-neoliberal and neoliberal strategies for promoting extractive industries'. Books World Poverty Institute Working Paper, University of Manchester. At <http://www.bwpi.manchester.ac.uk/resources/Working-Papers/bwpi-wp-11710.pdf>.

Biccum, April, R. 2005. 'Development and the "New" Imperialism': a reinvention of colonial discourse in DFID promotional literature'. *Third World Quarterly* 26 (6): 1005-1020.

Blaut, J M. 1993. *The Colonizer's Model of the World: geographical diffusionism and Eurocentric history*. New York: Guildford Press.

Bowden, Brett. 2004. 'In the name of progress and peace: the "standard of civilisation" and the universalising process'. *Alternatives: Global, Local and Political* 29:43-68.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 1, 'Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History', pp. 27-46.

Doty, Roxanne. 1996. *Imperial Encounters: the Politics of Representation in NorthSouth Relations*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, Chapter 3, 'Getting the "Natives" to Work', pp. 51-77 (See also, chapter 4 on the US and Philippine colonial/ post-colonial relations and chapter 5 on 'Resistance in Colonial Kenya').

Escobar, Arturo. 1995. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fahnbulleh, Miatta. 2006. 'In search of economic development in Kenya: colonial legacies and post-independence realities'. *Review of African Political Economy* 107: 33-47.

Goody, Jack. 1996. *The East in the West*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gordillo, Gaston. 2002. 'The Dialectic of Estrangement: Memory and the Production of Places of Wealth and Poverty in Argentinean Chaco'. *Cultural Anthropology* 17 (1): 3-31.

Hall, Stuart. 1992. 'The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power'. In S Hall and B Gieber (eds), *Formations of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, Chapter 6, pp. 275-331.

Hobson, John M. 2004. *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hill, Jonathan. 2005. 'Beyond the Other? A postcolonial critique of the failed thesis'. *African Identities* 3 (2):139-54.

Hammar, Amanda. 2002. 'Speaking With Space: Displacements and Claims in the Politics of Land in Zimbabwe'. In N Webster and L Engberg-Pedersen (eds), *In the Name of the Poor: Contesting Political Space for Poverty Reduction*. London: Zed. Chapter 6, pp. 129-156.

Mamdani, Mahmood. 1996. *Citizen and Subject-Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Mathews, Sally. 2004. 'Investigating NEPAD's Development Assumptions'. *Review of African Political Economy* 101: 497-511.

Mehmet, O. 1999. 'Westernizing the Third World'. In O Mehmet, *Westernising the Third World*. New York: Routledge (there are few graphs and formulas which are difficult to understand, but the text in general is useful, and offers a critical perspective on 'mainstream' approaches to development).

Memmi, Albert. 1965. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press. *All the chapters are relevant, but see especially the 'Introduction' chapter 6 'Heritage and Violence' and chapter 7 'The Object of Development'.

Patel, Raj. 2007. 'Just a Cry for Bread'. In Raj Pate, *Stuffed and starved: markets, power, and the hidden battle for the world food system*. Melbourne: Black Inc, pp. 75-98.

Pels, P. 1997. 'The Anthropology of Colonialism: Culture, History and the Emergence of Western Governmentality'. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 26: 163-183.

Seth, Sanjay. 2009. 'Historical Sociology and Postcolonial Theory: Two Strategies for Challenging Eurocentrism'. *International Political Sociology* 3 (3): 334-338.

Seth, Sanjay. 2007. 'Gender and the Nation: Debating Female Education'. In Sanjay Seth, *Subject Lessons: The Western Education of Colonial India*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 129-158 and 220-227 (notes).

Sidaway, J D. 2003. 'Sovereign Excesses? Portraying postcolonial sovereignty scapes'. *Political Geography* 22: 157-78.

Slater, David and Morag Bell. 2002. 'Aid and the Geopolitics of the Post-Colonial: Critical Reflections on New Labour's Overseas Development Strategy'. *Development and Change* 33 (2): 335-360.

Smits, K. 2008. 'John Stuart Mill on the Antipodes: Settler Violence Against Indigenous Peoples and the Legitimacy of Colonial Rule'. *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 54 (1): 1-15.

White, Sarah. 2002. 'Thinking race, Thinking development'. *Third World Quarterly* 23 (3): 407-419.

Wolf, Eric R. 1982. *Europe and the People Without History*, Berkeley and London: University of California Press.

On the institutionalisation and institutional dynamics of colonial relations of development:

Anghie, Antony. 1999. 'Finding the Peripheries: Sovereignty and Colonialism in Nineteenth-Century International Law'. *Harvard International Law Review* 40 (1): 1-71.

Barrington, J M. 1976. 'The Permanent Mandates Commission and educational policy in trust territories'. *International Review of Education* 22 (1): 88-94.

Bhuiyan, Abdul Hossain Ahmed, Aminul Haque Faraizi, and Jim McAllister. 2004. 'Treatise of Development: The Contexts of Developmentalism in Bangladesh'. *Alternatives: Global, Local and Political* 29: 169-198.

Bowden, Brett and Leonard Seabrooke (eds). 2006. *Global Standards of Market Civilization*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Dimier, Veronique. 2004. 'On Good Colonial Government: Lessons from the League of Nations.' *Global Society* 18 (3): 279-299.

Hobson, John M. 2009 [2004]. 'Constructing European Racist Identity and the invention of the world, 1700-1850: the imperial civilizing mission as a moral vocation'. In John M Hobson, *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 219-242 and 357-359 (notes).

Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts Egypt, Techno-Politics, Modernity*. Berkeley: University of California Press. *All the chapters are relevant, but see especially the 'Introduction', chapter 6 'Heritage and Violence' and chapter 7 'The Object of Development'.

Mintz, Sydney M. 1997. 'Time, Sugar and Sweetness'. In Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik (eds), *Food and Culture – A Reader*. New York and London: Routledge. pp. 357-369.

Topic 5: Domination and Resistance in Development: Infrapolitics of the poor

Required Readings:

McMichael, Philip. 2010. 'Changing the subject of development'. In P McMichael (ed), *Contesting Development: critical struggles for social change*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-13.

Scott, James. 1990. 'The Infrapolitics of Subordinate groups'. In James Scott, *Domination and the Arts of Resistance-Hidden Transcripts*. Yale: Yale University Press.

Weber, Martin. 2013. "'It's over; I've seen it on TV": Occupy's politics beyond media spectacle'. *Global Change, Peace & Security: formerly Pacifica Review: Peace, Security & Global Change* 25 (1): 123-126.

Recommended Readings:

Evans, Peter. 2005. 'Counterhegemonic Globalization: Transnational Social Movements in the Contemporary Global Political Economy'. In Thomas Janoski (ed), *The handbook of political sociology: states, civil society and globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 655-670.

McMichael, Philip. 2008. 'Peasants make their own history, just not as they please...' *Journal of Agrarian Change* 8 (2/3): 205-228.

McMichael, Philip. 2005. 'Globalization'. In Thomas Janoski (ed), *The handbook of political sociology: states, civil society and globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 587-606.

Mohan, Dia. 2004. 'Reimagining Community. Scripting Power and Changing the Subject through Jana Sanskriti's Political Theatre in Rural North India.' *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 33 (2): 178-217.

O'Brien, Robert, Anne Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte and Marc Williams. 2000. 'Complex Multilateralism: MEIs and GSMS'. In Robert O'Brien, Anne Marie Goetz, Jan Aart Scholte and Marc Williams, *Contesting Global Governance: Multilateral Institutions and Global Social Movements*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.1-23 (total pages in book 260).

Polanyi, Karl. 2001 [1957]. 'The Self-Regulating Market and the Fictitious Commodities'. In Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation – the political and economic origins of our time*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 68-76.

Scott, James C. 1985. 'Normal Exploitation, Normal Resistance'. In *Weapons of the Weak, Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, pp. 28-47 (total pages of book 389).

Seoane, J and E Taddei. 2002. 'From Seattle to Porto Alegre: The Anti-Neoliberal Globalization Movement'. *Current Sociology* 50 (1): 99-122.

Samid, Suliman. 2013. 'Occupation, colonization and dissensus: who are the 99%?' *Global Change, Peace & Security: formerly Pacifica Review: Peace, Security & Global Change* 25 (1): 119-121.

Walker, R B J. 1988. 'Explorations'. In R B J Walker, *One World, Many Worlds: Struggles for a Just World Peace*. London: Zed Books, pp. 81-114 (total pages of book 175).

Weber, Martin. 2009. 'Understanding and Analysing Social Movements and Alternative Globalization'. In P Hayden (ed), *Ethics and International Relations*. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, pp. 427-442.

On social struggles and social movements:

Bramble, T. 2006. "Another world is possible": A study of participants at Australian alter-globalization social forums'. *Journal of Sociology* 42 (3): 287-309.

Brincker, B and P Gundelach. 2005. 'Sociologists in Action: A Critical Exploration of the Intervention Method'. *Acta Sociologica* 48 (4): 365-375

Couldry, N. 2003. 'Book Review: Counterpublics and the State'. *Media, Culture & Society* 25 (4): 562-563.

della Porta, D. 2005. 'Deliberation in Movement: Why and How to Study Deliberative Democracy and Social Movements'. *Acta Politica* 40 (3): 336-350.

della Porta, D. 2006. 'Frames of Protest: Social Movements and the Framing Perspective'. *Contemporary Sociology* 35 (4): 411-412.

Diani, M. 1992. 'The Concept of Social Movement'. *The Sociological Review* 40 (1): 1-25.

Drache, D and M D Froese 2006. 'Globalisation, world trade and the cultural commons: Identity, citizenship and pluralism'. *New Political Economy* 11 (3): 361.

Dubet, F. 2004. 'Between a Defence of Society and a Politics of the Subject: The Specificity of Today's Social Movements'. *Current Sociology* 52 (4): 693-716.

Escobar, A. 1992. 'Culture, Practice and Politics: Anthropology and the study of social movements'. *Critique of Anthropology* 12 (4): 395-432.

Haber, P L. 1997. 'Social Movements and Socio-Political Change in Latin America'. *Current Sociology* 45 (1): 121-140.

Kimmerling, B. 1996. 'Changing Meanings and Boundaries of the "Political"'. *Current Sociology* 44 (3): 152-176.

Martinez-Torres, Maria Elena and Peter M Rosset. 2010. 'La Via Campesina: the birth and evolution of a transnational social movement'. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (1): 149-175.

Meszaros, George. 2000. 'Taking the land into their Hands: The Landless Workers' Movement and the Brazilian State'. *Journal of Law and Society* 27 (4): 517-541.

McDonald, K. 2002. 'From Solidarity to Fluidarity: social movements beyond collective identity – the case of globalization conflicts'. *Social Movement Studies* 1 (2): 109-128.

McDonald, K. 2004. 'Oneself as Another: From Social Movement to Experience Movement'. *Current Sociology* 52 (4): 575-593.

Olesen, T. 2004. 'Globalising the Zapatistas: from Third World solidarity to global solidarity?'. *Third World Quarterly* 25 (1): 255-267.

Olesen, T. 2006. 'Transnational Protest and Global Activism; Coalitions across Borders: Transnational Protest and the Neoliberal Order'. *International Sociology* 21 (3): 417-422.

Patomaki, Heikki and Teivo Teivanen. 2004. 'The world social forum, an open space or a movement of movements'. *Theory Culture and Society* 21 (6): 145-154

Petras, James and Henry Veltmeyer. 2001. 'Are Latin American peasant movements still a force for change? Some new paradigms revisited', *Journal of Peasant Studies* 28 (2): 83-118.

Robles, Wilder. 2001. 'The landless rural workers movement in Brazil'. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 28 (2): 146-161.

Scott, A. 1991. 'Action, Movement, and Intervention: Reflections on the Sociology of Alain Touraine'. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 28 (1): 30-45.

Smith, J. 2002. 'Globalizations and Social Movements: Culture, Power, and the Transnational Public Sphere'. *Social Forces* 81 (1): 374.

Tarrow, S. 1996. 'Social Movements in Contentious Politics: A Review Article'. *The American Political Science Review* 90 (4): 874-883.

Touraine, A. 2004. 'On the Frontier of Social Movements'. *Current Sociology* 52 (4): 717-725.

'Debates and Developments: Debate on the World Social Forum'. *International Journal for Urban and Regional Research* 29 (2): 409-466 (7 contributions).

Topic 6: Global Politics of Trade and Development

Required Readings

Thomas, Caroline and Martin Weber. 1999. 'New Values and International Organizations: Balancing Trade and Environment in the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA)'. In A Taylor and C Thomas (eds), *Global Trade and Global Social Issues*. London: Routledge, Chapter 7, pp. 133-150.

Or

Chodor, Tom. 2019. 'The rise and fall and rise of the transpacific partnership: 21st century trade politics through a new constitutionalist lens'. *Review of International Political Economy* 26 (2): 232-255.

Plus:

Barndt, Deborah. 1997. 'Bio/cultural Diversity and Equity in Post-NAFTA Mexico (or Tomasita Comes North While Big Mac Goes South)'. In J Drydyk and P Penz (eds), *Global Justice, Global Democracy*, Winnipeg: Fernwood Publishing, pp. 55-69.

And please also read one of the following:

Thomas, Caroline and Martin Weber. 2004. 'The Politics of Global Health Governance: What-ever Happened to "Health for All by the Year 2000"?' *Global Governance* 10 (2): 187-205.

Marsden, Emily. 1999. 'The Neem Tree Patent: International Conflict over the Commodification of Life'. *Boston College International & Comparative Law Review* 22 (2): 279-295.

Please browse the NAFTA Secretariat website for primary documents and policy trends:

<http://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/en/view.aspx?x=310>

And also: NAFTA's 20 year: <http://www.citizen.org/documents/NAFTA-at-20.pdf>

See also the link below to 'Public Citizen' for critical commentaries (including case examples) on the NAFTA: <http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=531>

Recommended Readings: NAFTA

Alvarez Robert R. 2001. 'Beyond the Border: Nation-State Enchroachment, NAFTA and Offshore Control in the US-Mexican Mango Industry'. *Human Organization* 60 (2): 121-127.

Gonzalez, G Carmen. 2010-2011. 'An Environmental Justice Critique of Comparative Advantage: Indigenous Peoples, Trade Policy, and the Mexican Neoliberal Economic Reforms'. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law* 32 (3): 723-803.

Eckstein, S and T Wickham-Crowley (eds). 2003. *What justice? Whose justice?: Fighting for fairness in Latin America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Esteva, Gustavo and Madhu Suri Prakash. 1998. *Grassroots Post-Modernism: Remaking the Soil of Cultures*. London: Zed, Chapter 5, 'People's Power: Radical Democracy for the Autonomy of their Commons', pp. 152-191.

Heyman, Josiah McC. 2001. 'Class and Classification at the U.S.-Mexico Border'. *Human Organization* 60 (2): 128-140.

Kay, Tamara. 2005. 'Labour transnationalism and global governance: the impact of NAFTA on transnational labor relationships in North America (North America Free Trade Agreement)'. *The American Journal of Sociology* 111 (3): 715-756.

McDonald, James H. 2001. 'Reconfiguring the countryside: power, control and the (re) organization of farmers in West Mexico'. *Human Organization* 60 (3): 247-258.

Marshall, Don B. 1998. 'NAFTA/FTAA and the new articulations in the Americas: seizing structural opportunities'. *Third World Quarterly* 19 (4): 673-700.

Patel, Raj. 2007. 'You have become Mexican'. In *Stuffed and starved: markets, power, and the hidden battle for the world food system*. Melbourne: Black Inc, pp. 47-74.

Perez, Marcela Alvarez and Mark T Berger. 2009. 'Bordering on the Ridiculous: MexAmerica and the New Regionalism'. *Alternatives: Global, Local and Political* 34: 1-16.

Pilcher, M Jeffrey. 2012. 'The Messy Business of Tacos'. *Guernica – a magazine of art and politics*. At <http://www.guernicamag.com/features/the-messy-business-of-tacos/>

Public Citizen: See also the link below to 'Public Citizen' for critical commentaries (including case examples) on the NAFTA: <http://www.citizen.org/Page.aspx?pid=531>

Ruiz-Beltran, Martin. 2001. 'The socio-economic and cultural impediments to well-being along the US-Mexico Border'. *Journal of Community Health* 26 (2): 123-132.

Sparke Mathew, B. 2006. A neoliberal nexus: Economy, security and the biopolitics of citizenship on the border. *Political Geography* 25: 151-180.

Schirm, Stefan A. 2002. 'Global Markets and NAFTA'. In Stefan A Schirm, *Globalization and the New Regionalism*. Cambridge: Polity, Chapter 5, pp. 137-173.

Zarembka, M Joy. 2004. 'America's Dirty Work: Migrant Maids and Modern-Day Slavery'. In Barbara Ehrenreich and Arlie Russell Hoschschild (eds), *Global Women, Nannies, Maids and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: A Metropolitan/Owl, pp. 142-153.

And, also, NAFTA's 20 year: <http://www.citizen.org/documents/NAFTA-at-20.pdf>

Recommended Readings: WTO

Howse, Robert. 2002. 'Human Rights in the WTO: Whose Rights, What Humanity? Comment on Petersmann'. *European Journal of International Relations* 13 (3): 651-659.

Please browse the website of the World Trade Organization: www.wto.org

Cerny, Phillip G. 1997. 'Paradoxes of the Competition State: The Dynamics of Political Globalization'. *Government and Opposition* 32 (2): 251-274.

Gill, Stephen. 2002. 'Constitutionalizing Inequality and the Clash of Globalizations'. *International Studies Review* 4 (2): 47-65

Higgott, Richard and Heloise Weber. 2005. 'GATS in context: development, an evolving lex mercatoria and the Doha Agenda'. *Review of International Political Economy* 12 (3): 434-455.

Shiva, Vandana. 1997. 'Biodiversity and People's Knowledge'. In Vandana Shiva, *Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge*. Boston: South End Press.

Petersmann, Ernst-Ulrich. 2001. 'Human Rights and International Economic Law in the 21st Century – the need to clarify their interrelationships'. *Journal of International Economic Law* 4 (1): 3-39.

Shiva, Vandana 2004. 'TRIPS, Human Rights and the Public Domain'. *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 7 (5): 665-673.

Williams, Marc and Lucy Ferguson. 1999. 'The world trade organisation, social movements and global environmental management'. *Environmental Politics* 8 (1): 268-289.

Xali, Mthetho. 2002. 'They Are Killing Us Alive': A Case Study of the Impact of Cost Recovery on Service provision in Makhaza Section, Khayelitsha.' In D McDonald and J Pape (eds), *Cost Recovery and the Crisis of Service Delivery in South Africa*. London: Zed.

Topic 7: Politics of 'Rights' to Water

Required Readings:

Conca, Ken. 2005. Chapter 7: Invisible hand, visible fist: the transnational politics of water privatization' in *Governing Water: Contentious Transnational Politics and Global Institution Building*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Plus one of the following:

Wutich, A. 2011. 'The Moral Economy of Water Reexamined: Reciprocity, Water Insecurity and Urban Survival in Cochabamba, Bolivia'. *Journal of Anthropological Research* 67 (1): 5-26.
EIDidi, H and E Corbera. 2017. 'A Moral Economy of Water: Charity Wells in Egypt's Nile Delta'. *Development and Change* 48 (1): 121-145.

Please also read one of the following:

Bakker, Karen. 2012. 'Commons versus Commodities – Debating the human right to water'. In Farhana Sulatana and Alex Loftus (eds), *Right to Water: Politics, Governance and Social Struggles*, Florence: Routledge.
Morgan, Bronwen. 2011. "Another world is possible": Bolivia and the emergence of a participatory public provision model for access to urban water services'. In Bronwen Morgan, *Water on Tap – Rights and Regulation in the Transnational Governance of Urban Water Services*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 85117 (total no of pages in book 226).

Recommended Readings:

Bakker, Karen. 2008. 'The Ambiguity of Community: Debating Alternatives to Private Sector Provision of urban Water Supply'. *Water Alternatives* 1 (2): 236-252. See www.water-alternatives.org.
Balanya, Belen, Brid Brennan, Oliver Hoedeman, Satoko Kishimoto and Philipp Terhorst (eds). 2005. *Reclaiming Public Water: Achievements, Struggles and Visions from Around the World*. Amsterdam: Transnational Institute and Corporate Europe Observatory. At <http://www.tni.org/tni-book/reclaiming-public-water-book>.
Boelens, Rutgerd. 2009. 'The Politics of Disciplining Water Rights'. *Development and Change* 40 (2): 307-31.
Castro, Esteban. 2005. *Water Power and Citizenship: Social Struggles in the Basin of Mexico*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Conca, Ken. 2005. *Governing Water: Contentious Transnational Politics and Global Institution Building*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
Dubreuil, Celine. 2006. *The Right to Water: From Concept to Implementation*. Marseilles: World Water Council. At www.worldwatercouncil.org/fileadmin/wwc/Library/RightToWater_Final-Text_Cover.pdf
Farhana Sultana and Alex Loftus (eds). 2012. *The right to water: politics, governance and social struggles*. London and New York: Earthscan.
Khumprakob, Melissa. 2004. 'The Vivendi-Argentina Water Dispute'. *Sustainable Development Law and Policy* 5 (1): 64-69.
Mustafa, Daanish and Philip Reeder. 2009. "People Is All That is Left to Privatize": Water Supply Privatization, Globalization and Social Justice in Belize City, Belize'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 33 (3): 789-808.

Nickson, Andrew and Claudia Vargas. 2002. 'Limitations of Water Regulation: The Failure of the Cochabamba Concession in Bolivia'. *Bulletin of Latin American Research* 21 (1): 99-120.

Phinney, Sarah. 2018. 'Detroit's Municipal Bankruptcy: Racialised Geographies of Austerity'. *New Political Economy* 23 (5): 609-626.

Schultz, Jim. 2008. 'The Cochabamba water revolt and its aftermath'. In Jim Shultz and Melissa Crane Draper (eds), *Dignity and defiance: stories from Bolivia's challenge to globalization*. Berkley: University of California Press.

Wagner, R John. 2012. 'Water and the Commons Imaginary'. *Current Anthropology* 53 (5): 617-641.

Water Alternatives is an interdisciplinary journal on water, politics and development. It covers very good debates and information on struggles over water. Please browse the website for articles: <http://www.water-alternatives.org>

World Water Forum, see: <http://www.worldwaterforum6.org/en/>

Topic 8: Politics of 'Land-grabs' and Dispossession

Required Readings:

Pichler, Melanie. 2015. 'Legal Dispossession: State Strategies and Selectivities in the Expansion of Indonesian Palm Oil and Agrofuel Production'. *Development and Change* 46 (3): 508-533.

Verkoren, Willemijn and Chanrith Ngin. 2017. 'Organizing against Land Grabbing in Cambodia: Exploring Missing Links'. *Development and Change* 48 (6): 1336-1361.

De Schutter, Olivier. 2011. 'How not to think about land-grabbing: three critiques of large-scale investments in farmland'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (2): 249-279.

Recommended readings:

Borras Jr, Saturnino M, Jennifer C Franco and Chunyu Wang. 2013. 'The Challenge of Global Governance of Land Grabbing: Changing International Agricultural Context and Competing Political Views and Strategies'. *Globalizations* 10 (1): 161-179.

Corson, Catherine. 2011. 'Territorialization, enclosure and neoliberalism: non-state influence in struggles over Madagascar's forests'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (4): 703-726.

Cramb, R A and Sujang S Patrick. 2013. 'The mouse deer and the crocodile: oil palm holders and livelihood strategies in Sarawak, Malaysia'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 40 (1): 129-154.

Franco, Jennifer, Les Levidow, David Fig, Lucia Goldfarb, Mireille Hönigke and Maria Luisa Mendonça. 2010. 'Assumptions in the European Union Biofuels Policy: Frictions with Experiences in Germany, Brazil and Mozambique'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (4): 661-698.

Friends of the Earth. 2010. *Africa: up for grabs – the scale and impact of land grabbing for agrofuels*. At www.foeeurope.org, see page 4.

Lyons, Kristen and Peter Westoby. 2014. 'Carbon colonialism and the new land grab: Plantation forestry in Uganda and its livelihood impacts'. *Journal of Rural Studies* 36: 13-21.

Li, Tania Murray. 2011. 'Centering labor in the land grab debate'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 38 (2): 281-298.

Makki, Fouad. 2012. 'Power and property: commercialization, enclosures, and the transformation of agrarian relations in Ethiopia'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 39 (1): 81-104.

Makki, Fouad. 2014. 'Development by Dispossession: Terra Nullius and the Social Ecology of New Enclosures in Ethiopia'. *Rural Sociology* 79 (1): 79-103.

Margulis, Matias E, Nora McKeon and Saturnino M Borras Jr. 2013. 'Land Grabbing and Global Governance: Critical Perspectives'. *Globalization* 10 (1): 1-23.

McMichael, Philip. 2013. 'Land Grabbing as Security Mercantilism in International Relations'. *Globalization* 10 (1): 47-64.

McMichael, Philip. 2012. 'The Land Grab and Corporate Food Regime Restructuring'. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 39 (3-4): 681-701.

Pye, Oliver. 2010. 'The Biofuel connection – transnational activism and the palm oil book'. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (4): 851-874

Vermeulen, Sonja and Lorenzo Cotula. 2010. 'Over the heads of local people: consultation, consent, and recompense in large-scale land deals for biofuels projects in Africa'. *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 37 (4): 899-916.

Wolford, W, S M Borras, R Hall and B White. 2013. 'Governing Global Land Deals: The Role of the State in the Rush for Land'. *Development and Change* 44 (2): 189-210.

Topic 9: Global Politics of Microcredit and Poverty

Required Readings:

Nandy, Ashis. 2002. 'The Beautiful, Expanding Future of Poverty: Popular Economics as a Psychological Defense'. *International Studies Review* 4 (2): 107-122.

Rahman, Aminur. 1999. 'Micro-credit initiatives for equitable and sustainable development: who pays?'. *World Development* 27 (1): 67-82.

Plus one of the following:

Elyachar, Julia. 2002. 'Empowerment Money: The World Bank, Non-Governmental Organizations and the Value of Culture in Egypt'. *Public Culture* 14 (3): 493-513.

Weber, Heloise. 2014. 'Global Politics of Microfinancing Poverty in Asia: the case of Bangladesh unpacked'. *Asian Studies Review* 38 (4): 544-563.

Recommended Readings: Microcredit and Microfinance

Karim, Lamia. 2008. 'Demystifying Micro-Credit – The Grameen Bank, NGOs, and Neoliberalism in Bangladesh'. *Cultural Dynamics* 20 (1): 5-29.

Brigg, Morgan. 2001. 'Empowering NGOs: The Microcredit Movement Through Foucault's Notion of *Dispositif*'. *Alternatives: Global, Local and Political* 26 (3): 233-258.

Hulme, D and P Moseley. 1996. *Finance against poverty: Volumes 1 and 2*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, S and B Rogaly. 1997. *Microfinance and Poverty reduction*. Oxford: Oxfam.

Special Issue on Microcredit/Microfinance. 2002. *Journal of International Development* 14 (3).

Lazar, Sian. 2004. 'Education for Credit: Development as Citizenship Project in Bolivia'. *Critique of Anthropology* 24 (3): 301-319.

McGregor, A. 1989. 'Towards a better understanding of credit in rural development: the case of Bangladesh, the patron state'. *Journal of International Development* 1 (4): 467-486.

Medeiros, Carmen. 2001. 'Civilizing the Popular? The Law of Popular Participation and the Design of a New Civil Society in 1990s Bolivia'. *Critique of Anthropology* 21 (4): 401-425.

Rankin, N Katharine. 2001. 'Governing development: neoliberalism, microcredit and rational economic woman'. *Economy and Society* 30 (1): 18-37.

Rogaly, Ben. 1996. 'Microfinance evangelism, destitute women, and the hard selling of a new anti-poverty formula'. *Development in Practice* 6 (2): 100-112.

Weber, Heloise. 'Gender and microfinance/microcredit'. In Jill Steans and Daniela Tepe-Belfrage (ed), *Handbook on gender in world politics*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, pp. 430-437.

Weber, Heloise. 2006. 'The global political economy of microfinance and poverty reduction: locating local 'livelihoods' in political analysis'. In Jude Fernando (ed), *Microfinance: perils and prospects*. New York: Routledge.

Weber, Heloise. 2004. 'The 'New Economy' and social risk; banking on the poor?'. *Review of International Political Economy*. 11(2): 356-386

Review of *International Political Economy*. 11(2): 356-386

Weber, Heloise. 2002. 'The imposition of a global development architecture: the example of microcredit'. *Review of International Studies* 28(3): 537-556.

Weber, Heloise. 2002. 'Global Governance and Poverty Reduction: the case of microcredit'. In S. Hughes and R. Wilkinson (eds). *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives*, London: Routledge.

Weber, Heloise. 2006. 'A Political Analysis of the PRSP Initiative: Social Struggles and the Organization of Persistent Relations of Inequality'. *Globalizations* 3 (2): 187-206.

CGAP (Consultative Group to Assist the Poorest): www.cgap.org

Grameen Bank: www.grameen.org

Microcredit Summit (homepage): www.microcreditsummit.org

Recommended: on the political economy of development and inequality

Brohman, John. 1995. 'Economism critical silences in development studies: a theoretical critique of neoliberalism'. *Third World Quarterly* 16 (2): 297-318

Davis, Mike. 2006. 'SAPing the Third World'. In Mike Davis, *Planet of Slums*. London: Verso, pp. 151-173.

Da Costa, Dia and Phil McMichael. 2007. 'The Poverty of the Global Order'. *Globalizations* 4 (4): 588-602.

Dupont, D N Veronique. 2002. 'The Dream of Delhi as a Global City'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 35 (3): 533-54.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2003. 'Reading: Women in Banana Republics'. In R Pettman (ed), *Understanding International Political Economy: with readings for the fatigued*. London: Lynne Rienner, pp. 71-76.

Fernandez-Kelly, P M. 1997. 'Maquiladoras: The View from the Inside'. In N Visvanathan (ed), *The Women, Gender and Development Reader*. London: Zed, pp. 203-215.

Gruffydd Jones, Branwen. 2012. "'Bankable Slums": the Global Politics of Slum Upgrading'. *Third World Quarterly* 33 (5): 769-789.

Enloe, Cynthia. 2003. 'Reading: Women in Banana Republics'. In R Pettman (ed), *Understanding International Political Economy: with readings for the fatigued*. London: Lynne Rienner.

Kothari, Smitu. 1996. 'Whose Nation? The Displaced as Victims of Development'. *Economic and Political Weekly* 31 (24): 1476-1488.

Patel, Raj. 2007. 'Introduction Our big fat contradiction'. In Raj Patel, *Stuffed and starved: markets, power, and the hidden battle for the world food system*. Melbourne: Black Inc, pp. 1-45.

Polanyi, Karl. 2001 [1957]. 'The Self-Regulating Market and the Fictitious Commodities'. In Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation – the political and economic origins of our time*. Boston: Beacon Press, pp. 68-76.

Rosser, Andrew. 2008. 'Neo-liberalism and the Politics of Aid Policy-Making in Australia'. *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 62 (3): 372-385.

Saurin, Julian. 1996. 'Globalisation, Poverty and the Promises of Modernity'. *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 25 (3): 657-680.

Standing, Guy. 2011. 'Why the Precariat Is Growing'. In Guy Standing, *The Precariat – The New Dangerous Class*. London and New York: Bloomsbury Academic, pp. 26-58.

UN-Habitat. 2007. 'Current Threats to Urban Safety and Security: *Enhancing Urban Safety and Security-Global Report on Human Settlements*'. New York: United Nations.

Weber, H. and Weber, M. 2020. 'When Means of Implementation meet Ecological Modernization Theory: A critical frame for thinking about the Sustainable Development Goals Initiative'. *World Development*. Volume 136, December 2020, 105129

Woost, D. Michael. 1997. 'Alternative Vocabularies of Development? "Community" and "Participation" in Development Discourse in Sri Lanka'. In R D Gtrillo and R L Stirrat (eds), *Discourses of Development – Anthropological Perspectives*. Oxford and New York: Berg Press.

Topic 10: Politics of the post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) Agenda: The SDGs, MDGs and Poverty

Required Readings:

Da Costa, Dia and Phil McMichael. 2007. 'The Poverty of the Global Order'. *Globalizations* 4 (4): 588-602.

Warren, Patrizio. 2006. 'MDG Activism and the Campesino Detachment'. *Mountain Research and Development* 26 (1): 9-14.

Plus one of the following:

Weber, H. 2014. 'When Goals Collide: Politics of the MDGs and the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals Agenda'. *SAIS Review of International Relations* 34 (2): 129-139.

Weber, Heloise. 2017. 'Politics of "Leaving No One Behind": Contesting the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals Agenda'. *Globalizations* 14 (3): 399-414.

Highly recommended

Amin, Samir. 2006. 'The Millennium Development Goals A Critique from the South'. *Monthly Review* 57 (10): 1-15.

Fukuda-Parr, Sakiko. 2004. 'Millennium Development Goals: Why They Matter'. *Global Governance* 10 (4): 395-402.

Alston, Philip. 2005. 'Ships Passing in the Night: The Current State of the Human Rights and Development Debate seen through the Lens of the Millennium Development Goals'. *Human Rights Quarterly* 27 (3): 755-829.

Di Muzio, Tim. 2008. 'Governing Global Slums: The Biopolitics of Target 11'. *Global Governance* 14 (3): 305-326.

Saith, Ashwani. 2006. 'From Universal Values to Millennium Development Goals: Lost in Translation'. *Development and Change* 37 (6): 1167-1199.

Satterthwaite, David. 2003. 'The Millennium Development Goals and urban poverty reduction: great expectations and nonsense statistics'. *Environment and Urbanization* 15 (2): 179-190.

Sexsmith, Kathleen and P McMichael. 2015. 'Formulating the SDGs: Reproducing or Reimagining State-Centred Development'. *Globalizations* 12 (4): 581-596.

Spann, Michael. 2017. 'Politics of Poverty: The Post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals and the Business of Agriculture'. *Globalizations* 14 (3): 36-378.

Suliman, Samid. 2017. 'Migration and Development after 2015'. *Globalizations* 14 (3): 415-431.

Nelson, J Paul. 2007. 'Human Rights, the Millennium Development Goals, and the Future of Development Cooperation'. *World Development* 35 (12): 2041-2055.

Weber, Heloise. 2015. 'Reproducing Inequalities through Development: The MDGs and the Politics of Method'. *Globalizations* 12 (4): 660-676.

Topic 11: 'Good Living'-An alternative politics?: 'Buen Vivir'/'sumak kawsay' – Learning from Indigenous conceptions of 'development'

Required readings:

Merino, Roger. 2016. 'An alternative to "alternative development"?: *Buen vivir* and human development in Andean countries'. *Oxford Development Studies* 44 (3): 271-286.

Casas, Tanya. 2014. 'Transcending the Coloniality of Development: Moving Beyond Human/Nature Hierarchies'. *American Behavioural Scientist* 58 (1): 30-52.

Recommended Readings:

Bebbington, Anthony and Denise Humphreys Bebbington. 2010. 'An Andean Avatar: Post-Neoliberal and Neoliberal Strategies for Securing the Unobtainable'. *New Political Economy* 16 (1): 131-145.

De La Cadena, Marisol. 2010. 'Indigenous Cosmopolitics in the Andes: Conceptual Reflections Beyond "Politics"'. *Cultural Anthropology* 25 (2): 334-370.

Escobar, Arturo. 2010. 'Latin America at Crossroads'. *Cultural Studies* 24 (1): 1-65.

González, Pablo Alonso and Alfrado Macías Vázquez. 2015. 'An Ontological Turn in the Debate on *Buen Vivir* – *Sumak Kawsay* in Ecuador: Ideology, knowledge, and the Common'. *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies* 10 (3): 315-334.

Ciccariello-Maher, George. 2013. 'Constituent Moments, Constitutional Processes'. *Latin American Perspective* 40 (3): 126-145.

Radcliffe, A Sarah. 2015. 'Development Alternatives'. *Development and Social Change* 46 (4): 855-874.

Radcliff, Sarah. 2010. 'Ethnicity, Development and Gender: Tsachila Indigenous Women in Ecuador'. *Development and Change* 41 (6): 983-1016.

North, L Lisa and Carlos Larrea. 1997. 'Ecuador: adjustment policy impacts on truncated development and democratisation'. *Third World Quarterly* 18 (5): 913-934.

Shaw, Karena. 2002. 'Indigeneity and the International'. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31 (1): 55-81.

Topic 12: Politics of development: revisiting the 'subject' – Outlook and 'Open Forum Discussion'

* No seminar this week.

Changing the approach: towards teaching IR theory more globally

Martin Weber

One of the challenges of teaching IR theory with an intent to enable students to be both competent on established approaches and equipped to engage critically and constructively with their respective limitations, has been how to negotiate the dominance of canonical thinking. The effect of the latter is readily and obviously brought home by the fact that the majority of IR theory courses aimed at providing a *comprehensive* introduction to this field of study follow a specific sequence that is also mapped out in the majority of textbooks on the matter: Realism, Liberalism (and neo-variants), then (perhaps) 'Globalism' (Structuralism, or Marxism), followed by Constructivism, and, finally (if the curriculum permits), we reach the outlying provinces of Feminist, Critical, and Poststructuralist theorizing.

This compartmentalizing approach to theoretical projects of explaining and understanding IR does, of course, serve useful heuristic and pedagogical purposes; or, at least it does so up to a point. When finding myself in the position of having to redesign an IR theory course for our Masters Program based on the premise of making this an *advanced* learning experience, the 'classical' approach began to look too limiting. As a result, I developed, tested, and have for the third year in succession adhered to a different approach. In order to explain how it works, it is useful to provide a brief impression of the student cohort that will typically enrol. The course is a core course for Master students in International Relations at the University of Queensland (Australia) and can be taken as an elective by students in Peace & Conflict Studies, as well as from cognate disciplines. A typical class has students (always more than only a few) from North America (Canada, the USA, but frequently also Mexico), Latin America (mostly from Brazil and Argentina), Africa (from South Sudan in particular, but also Kenya, and sometimes Nigeria), Europe (with an emphasis on Scandinavian countries), Eastern Europe and Central Asia, the SubContinent, China, Indonesia, Singapore and Australia. Although the preconditions for enrolment in this course stipulate undergraduate-level familiarity with IR theory, the levels of preparedness are predictably quite different; and the concerns that have motivated students to enrol in the study of IR are often related to situated experiences of political change and conflict that prompt very diverse perspectives and expectations.

In order to avoid the problems imparted by the textbook-template approach outlined above, I redesigned the course by focusing the sessions *thematically*. This is signalled already, if only subtly, in the course title: Theories *in* International Relation (rather than 'of'), puts an emphasis on how theories in the field may implicate and/or problematize each other, while signalling that the ostensible object of inquiry (International Relations) is co-produced rather than 'stable' and 'just there'. From this premise, the principles of the approach I have taken are relatively easy to sketch, and I'll do so by outlining by way of example *one* of the sessions from a course comprising 12-13 two-hour seminars.

The first principle was not to try too hard to *break* the habitual mould, but instead to work with it against it. So, much (though not all) of the course (see syllabus, Appendix 2) does *outwardly* look a bit like the textbook sequence. However, *under* the headers, something quite different happens, and to give you an example of this, let's look at the session entitled 'Who and what it is Liberal Thought in IR for?.'

The key to the different approach lies in the selection of readings in accordance with the idea that the different theories *address* thematic fields, rather than framing or defining them comprehensively. Thus, the field of 'liberal thought' is concerned, in one way or other, with questions of 'freedom'; this means that *any* theoretical account that speaks to such concerns is, in one way or another, relevant (linking here to my point above about 'co-production'). The readings for this topic reflect that. In preparation for the session, my students will read O'Neal's and Russett's account of Liberal Peace Theory (1999), but they will also read Shilliam's 'Forget English Liberty, Remember Atlantic Slavery' (2012), Neta Crawford's account of the democratic peace among the constituents of what has been referred to as the Iroquois Confederacy (1994), and Berlin's essay on the two concepts of liberty (2002).

The concept behind this approach is quite clear, and transferable also insofar as different texts could be recruited for similar effects: all of the texts in question deal somehow with questions of freedom, but they do so very differently, using different methods and pursuing different interests. By putting the texts next to one another, the questions can be made thematic and considered for their strengths and weaknesses in disclosing and explaining, as well as for what they disarticulate, omit or forget. *Theorising* is therefore put centrally into the seminar discussions, and we have avoided the problematic practice of compartmentalization that would put Crawford and Shilliam somewhere in the 'other approaches' section

towards the end of the course, and that would section off Berlin as belonging to a different discipline altogether.

This concept is replicable in a number of different ways; feminist texts frequently deal with questions of domination and repression; so, a sample text could (and should) figure in a session on 'liberal thought', not in the 'other approaches' section.

The reading list I have compiled for the UQ course is, of course, not at all considered as a model; it reflects pragmatic choices with regard to the cohort, experience of their readiness (or, more often than not, reluctance) to read a fair bit of material in preparation of their classes; and the challenges of thinking about how best to tease out the tensions in theorising across the different thematic fields. On the whole, though, the experience with students taking the class in this format has been very positive and encouraging.

POLS7251 Theories in International Relations

Martin Weber

Session 1:

Reading List

- Hollis, M and S Smith. 1991. 'Introduction: Two Traditions'. In *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 1-15.
- Gadamer, H G. 1979. 'The Hermeneutic Priority of the Question'. In *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed and Ward, pp. 325-333.
- Hay, C. 2002. 'What's Political About Political Science'. In Colin Hay, *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 59-88.
- Jackson, P T. 2010. 'Playing With Fire'. In P T Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-23.

Session 2:

- Schmitt, C. 2010. 'The Concept of the Political'. In Carl Schmitt, George Schwab, Tracy B Strong and Leo Strauss, *The Concept of the Political*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 52-112.
- Walker, R B J. 1993. 'International Relations as Political Theory'. In R B J Walker, *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-25.
- Bartelson, J. 1995. 'Sovereignty and Fire'. In Jens Bartelson, *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-11.
- Grovogui, S N. 1996. 'Genesis, Order, Hierarchy'. In S N Grovogui, *Sovereigns, QuasiSovereigns, and Africans: Race and Self-Determination in International Law*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 11-42.

Session 3:

- Skinner, Q. 2012. 'Freedom and the Historian'. In Q Skinner, *Liberty before Liberalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 101-120.
- Fasolt, C. 2004. 'A Dangerous Form of Knowledge'. In C Fasolt, *The Limits of History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 3-45.
- Cooper, F. 2005. 'Introduction'. In F Cooper, *Colonialism in Question: Theory, Knowledge, History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. 1-32.
- Federici, S. 2014. 'All the World Needs a Jolt'. In S Federici, *Caliban and the Witch*. Brooklyn: Autonomedia, pp. 21-60.

Session 4:

- Kaplan, M A. 1961. 'Is International Relations a Discipline?'. *The Journal of Politics* 23 (3): 462-76.
- Smith, S. 2004. 'Singing our World into Existence: International Relations Theory and September 11'. *International Studies Quarterly* 48 (3): 499-515.

Session 5:

- Cox, R. 1986. 'Social Forces, States, and World Orders Beyond International Relations Theory'. In R Keohane (ed), *Neorealism and Its Critics*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 204-54.
- Habermas, J. 1987. 'The Idea of the Theory of Knowledge as Social Theory'. In J Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interest*. Cambridge: Polity Press, pp. 43-64.

Session 6:

- Schweller, R. 2004. 'Unanswered Threats: A Neoclassicist Realist Theory of Underbalancing'. *International Security* 29 (2): 159-201.

Guilhot, N. 2010. 'American Katechon: When Political Theology Became International Relations Theory'. *Constellations* 17 (2): 224-253.

Bull, H. 2012. 'Part 1: The Nature of Order in World Politics'. In H Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp. 3-94.

Luttwak, E. 2001. 'The Scope of Grand Strategy'. In E Luttwak, *Strategy: The Logic of War and Peace*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, pp. 209-217.

Session 7:

Berlin, I. 2002. 'Two Concepts of Liberty'. In Isaiah Berlin and Henry Hardy (eds), *Liberty: Incorporating 'Four Essays on Liberty'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shilliam, R. 2012. 'Forget English Freedom, Remember Atlantic Slavery: Common Law, Commercial Law and the Significance of Slavery for Classical Political Economy'. *New Political Economy* 17 (5): 591-609.

Crawford, N C. 1994. 'A Security Regime Among Democracies: Cooperation Among Iroquois Nations'. *International Organization* 48 (3): 345-385.

O'Neal, J R and B Russett, B. 1999. 'The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence and International Organizations, 1885-1992'. *World Politics* 52 (1): 1-37.

Session 8:

Teschke, B. 2002. 'Theorizing the Westphalian System of States: International Relations from Absolutism to Capitalism'. *European Journal of International Relations* 8 (1): 5-48.

Mamdani, M. 2018. 'Introduction: Thinking Through Africa's Impasse'. In M Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 3-34.

Walker, R B J. 2002. 'International/Inequality'. *International Studies Review* 4 (2): 7-24.

Session 9:

Adler, E and V Pouliot. 2011. 'International Practices'. *International Theory* 3 (1): 1-36.

Ringmar, E. 2014. 'The Search for Dialogue as Hindrance to Understanding: Practices as Inter-Paradigmatic Research Program'. *International Theory* 6 (1): 1-27.

Weber, M. 2014. 'Between "Issues" and "oughts": IR Constructivism, Critical Theory, and the Challenge of Political Philosophy'. *European Journal of International Relations* 20 (2): 516-543.

Reus-Smit, C. 2013. 'Beyond Meta-Theory?'. *European Journal of International Relations* 19 (3): 589-608.

Finnemore, M and K Sikkink. 2001. 'Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics'. *Annual Review of Political Science* 4 (1): 391-416.

Session 10:

Inayatullah, N and D L Blaney. 2004. 'The Westphalian Deferral'. In N Inayatullah and D L Blaney, *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*. New York: Routledge, pp. 18-41.

Muppidi, H. 2012. 'Humanitarianism and its Violences'. In H Muppidi, *The Colonial Signs of International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press, pp. 117-126

Ahluwalia, P. 2010. 'Sartre, Camus and Fanon'. In P Ahluwalia, *Out of Africa: PostStructuralism's Colonial Roots*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 40-72.

Bhambra, G. 2013. 'The Possibilities of, and for, Global Sociology'. In J Go (ed), *Postcolonial Sociology*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing, pp. 295-314.

Shilliam, R. 2012. 'Redemption from Development: Amartya Sen, Rastafari, and Promises of Freedom'. *Postcolonial Studies* 15 (3): 331-50.

Reading three books, three times each: theories of International Relations in a possibly post-western world

Ole Wæver

This is not a course, I have taught. It is one that I – inspired by this Forum and the process behind it – am keen to do (as an M.A. elective). Ten years ago, I did one with the same structure. It operated along an axis of different IR theories, not paying attention to centre-periphery structures in the discipline, post-colonial agendas and the role of the Global South. This one aims to do ‘worlding beyond the west.’

The motive for the original course was trivial: the number of pages read. Following courses at Berkeley in the mid-1990s, I was enticed by discussions enabled by everybody having carefully read the weekly 600-page monograph. At Copenhagen, rules limit me to 900 pages altogether per semester (14 weeks, for 2 hours a week).

Our students should read *books* for at least three reasons: 1) since key interventions were made through books they need to be read in order to better understand the discipline; 2) some important insights can be grasped only by following a long argument and a detailed empirical exposé; 3) students must eventually write their own M.A. Thesis, which is more like a (short) book than an article, yet they increasingly only *see* articles or excerpts from books. How can they learn then to do something like a (mildly compressed) book?

Very few subjects are covered well by reading three books. For any course on ‘something’ – German foreign policy, Negotiation Theory, whatever – some key texts are in journals or edited volumes. The trick is therefore to focus on the books as such rather than as texts about a subject matter.

Instead of going through each book a third of the pages at a time, we analyze *all* of each book in one session, then again in a second session and then a third time, each with a different angle of observation:

1. WHAT does the book say and do: what argument does it make? What is its errand? What is the question it addresses, the debate it intervenes in, the lacunae it wants to fill or the assumptions it tries to rattle? How is the argument built and underpinned?
2. HOW does it do it? What role do theory, methods and empirics play in the book?
3. WHERE does it position itself – where does it speak from and what world does it thereby project in terms of the global landscape of theories? What alternatives are presented as relevant? Who becomes whom when viewed from there?

The original course I taught ten years ago had no ‘theme’ – I didn’t have a clue what those three books had in common, or what it would all lead to. Seinfeld-like, it was a course about nothing. It attempted to get into the actual operations of IR as a practice. The three books were Randall Schweller’s *Unanswered Threats* (2008), Jeffrey Legro’s *Rethinking the World* (2007) and Lene Hansen’s *Security as Practice* (2006). As an introduction to the three sessions on each of the books, there were two sessions on the history and sociology of the discipline; at the end, there was one on the question ‘what is theory?’

A thought-provoking finding was the depicted landscapes of theories and debates. Roughly: for Schweller, the most important theory debates were between neo-realists and neo-realists (offensive, defensive and neo-classical realism). Legro dealt with realists, liberalists and soft constructivists. Hansen tellingly had to position herself vis-à-vis both traditional IR and all kinds of critical approaches to justify post-structuralist discourse analysis. The ‘map’ was far from the ‘same,’ and the more established positions only argued their case vis-à-vis those ‘higher up’ in the hierarchy, not against dissidents: instances of the power in ignoring and ignorance (Biersteker 2009; Wæver 2007). The course worked from the assumption that the whole is always present in each part and all parts are constitutive of the whole. The global constellation among theories in IR should be found not looking outside and around texts but inside them.

The three books for the new course should again not be ideal typical – not representatives of positions. Each is creative, innovative, working *from* an established orientation, trying to craft its own way forward, thereby also offering a picture of the discipline it is working within and against. The discipline is practiced by authors struggling to innovate and connect, not repeat. We should focus on ‘figures’: persons instead of paradigms (see Hellmann’s syllabus on ‘Classics,’ Appendix 2 in ‘Teaching IR Globally I’ in this volume; Wæver 1997).

Admittedly, in the new course, I have stacked the cards more than first time around, when I honestly had no clue where it would go. One book is from a traditional realist-liberalist background, another is more critical and takes on the criticism of Western-centrism, but from a Western perspective and finally one engages a wider range of disciplines and sources to produce a novel take on classical questions at the heart of IR and political theory. While formally writing about ‘something else,’ how do these three books locate and relate peoples and knowledges in the world? Where do they speak from, about whom and to whom?

All three are relatively recent and widely celebrated as innovative. They represent 'state of the art' among different sub-sets of IR scholars. They are what we do now.

The three could be Joseph Nye's *The Future of Power* (2011), Kathryn Sikkink's, *Evidence for Hope: Making Human Rights Work in the 21st Century* (2017), and Amy Niang's *The Postcolonial African State in Transition: Stateness and Modes of Sovereignty* (2018).

WHAT they say is interesting; we will learn from reading. HOW they say and do this fosters learning and debate on our craft (Onuf 2018). WHERE they do it projects a global constellation of worldings, the international relations of geocultural epistemologies.

Theories of International Relations in a Possibly Post-Western World (14 weeks)

University of Copenhagen

Ole Wæver

1 Presentation of course – and lecture on the History and Sociology of International Relations Theories – Great Debates and After

Ashworth, Lucian M. 2019. 'A Historiographer's View: Rewriting the History of International Thought.' In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: SAGE, pp. 529-541.

Wæver, Ole 2021. 'Still a Discipline After All These Debates?' In Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki and Steve Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* (5th ed.) Oxford University Press, 322-344

2 IR in the Global South

Tickner, Arlene B. 2003. 'Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World'. *Millennium*, 32(2): 295-320

Tickner, Arlene B. and Ole Wæver. 2009. 'Conclusion: Worlding Where the West Once Was.' In Arlene B Tickner and Ole Wæver (eds), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World: Worlding Beyond the West*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 328-341.

Kristensen, Peter Marcus. 2015. 'Revisiting the "American Social Science"— Mapping the Geography of International Relations', *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 16: 3: 246–269,

3 Post-colonialism and/or post-disciplinarity

Seth, Sanjay. 2011. 'Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations.' *Millennium* 40 (1): 167-183.

Blaney, David L and Naeem Inayatullah. 2016. 'Difference.' In Aoileann Ni Mhurchú and Reiko Shindo (eds), *Critical Imaginations in International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 70-86.

Muppidi, Himadeep. 2018. 'Coloring the Global: Race, Colonialism and Institutionalism'. In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: SAGE, pp. 46-59.

Tickner, Arlene B. 2013. 'By way of conclusion: Forget IR?' In Arlene B. Tickner and David L. Blaney (eds), *Claiming the International*, London and New York: Routledge, pp. 214-232.

4-12 Reading Three Books, Three Times Each

	Joseph Nye Jr., <i>The Future of Power</i>	Kathryn Sikkink, <i>Evidence for Hope</i>	Amy Niang, <i>The Post-colonial African State</i>
What does the book say?	4	7	10
How does it argue this; how does it use theory, methods and data?	5	8	11
What IR discipline does it portray & position it-self in?	6	9	12

Nye, Joseph S. 2011. *The Future of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.

Sikkink, Kathryn. 2017. *Evidence for Hope: Making Human Rights Work in the 21st Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Niang, Amy. 2018. *The Postcolonial African State in Transition: Stateness and Modes of Sovereignty*, Rowman & Littlefield International

13 What is theory? What is theory in IR? What is IR theory?

Chen, Ching-Chang, Young Chul Cho and Young Chul Cho. 2016. 'Theory.' In Aoileann Ní Mhurchú and Reiko Shindo (eds), *Critical Imaginations in International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge.

Corry, Olaf. 2014. 'Models as Make-Believe: Imagination, Fiction and Scientific Representation.' *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 55 (1): 126-28.

Epstein, Charlotte and Ole Wæver. 2021. *The Turn to Turns: Whither the Political in Critical International Relations?* , article under review.

14 Conclusions: Is IR Global? A Discipline? For What World?

References

- Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan. 2010. 'Why Is there no Non-Western International Relations Theory? An Introduction'. In Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan (eds), *Non-Western International Relations Theory. Perspectives on and beyond Asia*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-25.
- Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan. 2017. 'Why Is there no Non-Western International Relations Theory? Ten Years On'.
- Adorno, Theodor W. 1971. *Erziehung zur Mündigkeit Vorträge und Gespräche mit Hellmut Becker 1959 bis 1969*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Albert, Craig D. 2017. 'Teaching International Relations Theory'. In Robert A Denemark and Renée Marlin-Bennett (eds), *The International Studies Encyclopedia*. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell. At <https://www.oxfordreference.com/view/10.1093/acref/9780191842665.001.0001/acref-9780191842665-e-0360> [Accessed on 18 June 2020]
- Ashworth, Lucian M. 2019. 'A Historiographer's View: Rewriting the History of International Thought'. In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: SAGE, pp. 529-541.
- Ashworth, Lucian M. 2019. 'A Historiographer's View: Rewriting the History of International Thought'. In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: SAGE, pp. 529-541.
- Bartelson, Jens. 1995. *A Genealogy of Sovereignty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berenskoetter, Felix. 2018. 'E pluribus unum? How Textbooks Cover Theories'. In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds), *The Sage Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 446-468.
- Berlin, Isaiah. 2002. 'Two Concepts of Liberty'. In I Berlin and H Hardy (eds), *Liberty: Incorporating "Four Essays on Liberty"*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bernstein, B B. 2000. *Pedagogy, symbolic control, and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Bhambra, Gurinder K, Dalia Gebrial and Kerem Nişancioğlu (eds). 2018. *Decolonising the University*. London: Pluto Press.
- Biersteker, Thomas J. 2009. 'The Parochialism of Hegemony: Challenges for "American" International Relations'. In Arlene Tickner and Ole Wæver (eds), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 308-327.

- Biersteker, Thomas J. 2009. 'The Parochialism of Hegemony: Challenges for "American" International Relations'. In Arlene Tickner and Ole Wæver (eds), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 308-327.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2016. *The International in Security, Security in the International*. 1st ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bilgin, Pinar. 2016. *The International in Security, Security in the International*. 1st ed. London and New York: Routledge.
- Blaney, David L and Naeem Inayatullah. 2016. 'Difference.' In Aoileann Ní Mhurchú and Reiko Shindo (eds), *Critical Imaginations in International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 70-86.
- Blaney, David L and Naeem Inayatullah. 2016. 'Difference.' In Aoileann Ní Mhurchú and Reiko Shindo (eds), *Critical Imaginations in International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 70-86.
- Butler, Judith. 2009. *Frames of War*. New York: Verso.
- Chen, Ching-Chang, Young Chul Cho and Young Chul Cho. 2016. 'Theory.' In Aoileann Ní Mhurchú and Reiko Shindo (eds), *Critical Imaginations in International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chen, Ching-Chang, Young Chul Cho and Young Chul Cho. 2016. 'Theory.' In Aoileann Ní Mhurchú and Reiko Shindo (eds), *Critical Imaginations in International Relations*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Chernilo, Daniel. 2010. 'Methodological Nationalism and the Domestic Analogy: Classical Resources for their Critique'. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 23 (1): 87-106.
- Corry, Olaf. 2014. 'Models as Make-Believe: Imagination, Fiction and Scientific Representation'. *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 55 (1): 126-28.
- Corry, Olaf. 2014. 'Models as Make-Believe: Imagination, Fiction and Scientific Representation'. *The British Journal of Aesthetics* 55 (1): 126-28.
- Crawford, Neta. 1994. 'A Security Regime among Democracies: Cooperation among Iroquois Nations'. *International Organization* 48 (3): 345-85.
- Creutzfeldt, Benjamin. 2013. 'Theory Talk #57: Siba Grovogui on IR as Theology, Reading Kant Badly, and the Incapacity of Western Political Theory to Travel very far in Non-Western Contexts'. *Theory Talks*. At <http://www.theory-talks.org/2013/08/theory-talk-57.html> [Accessed on 23 February 2020].
- Dewey, John. 1922. *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. Norwood: Macmillan.
- Du Plessis, Gitte. 2018. 'Collective Discussion: Diagnosing the Present'. *International Political Sociology* 12 (1): 88-107.
- Du Plessis, Gitte. 2018. 'Collective Discussion: Diagnosing the Present'. *International Political Sociology* 12 (1): 88-107.
- Elias, J. 2008. 'Struggles Over the Rights of Foreign Domestic Workers in Malaysia: The Possibilities and Limitations of 'Rights Talk''. *Economy and Society* 37 (2): 282-303.

- Elias, J. 2008. 'Struggles Over the Rights of Foreign Domestic Workers in Malaysia: The Possibilities and Limitations of 'Rights Talk'. *Economy and Society* 37 (2): 282-303.
- Engert, Stefan and Alexander Spencer. 2009. 'International Relations at the Movies: Teaching and Learning about International Politics through Film'. *Perspectives* 17 (1): 83-103.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2011. 'The Mundane Matters'. *International Political Sociology* 5 (4): 447-450.
- Hansen, Lene. 2006. *Security as Practice. Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.
- Enloe, Cynthia. 2011. 'The Mundane Matters'. *International Political Sociology* 5 (4): 447-450.
- Fierke, Karin and Vivienne Jabri. 2019. 'Global Conversations: Relationality, Embodiment and Power in the Move towards a Global IR'. *Global Constitutionalism* 8 (3): 506-535.
- Fonseca, Melody. 2019. 'Global IR and Western Dominance: Moving Forward or Eurocentric Entrapment?' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 48 (1): 45-59.
- Gregg, Robert W. 1998. *International Relations on Film*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Grovogui, Siba. 1996. *Sovereigns, Quasi-Sovereigns and Africans*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hagmann, Jonas and Thomas Biersteker. 2014. 'Beyond the Published Discipline: Toward a Critical Pedagogy of International Studies'. *European Journal of International Relations* 20 (2): 291-315.
- Hagmann, Jonas and Thomas Biersteker. 2018. 'Counter-Mapping the Discipline: The Archipelago of Western International Relations Teaching'. In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya, and Nick Onuf (eds), *The Sage Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London and New York: Sage Publications, pp. 428-445.
- Hansen, Lene. 2006. *Security as Practice. Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.
- Hellmann, Gunther. 2020. 'International Relations Theory'. In Bertrand Badie, Dirk Berg-Schlosser and Leonardo Morlino (eds), *Handbook of Political Science. A Global Perspective*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 1282-1299.
- Hellmann, Gunther. 2020. 'International Relations Theory'. In Dirk Berg-Schlosser, Bertrand Badie and Leonardo Morlino (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Political Science*. London: Sage Publications, pp. 1282-1299.
- Hountondji, P. 1983. *African Philosophy: Myth and Reality*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* 17 (3): 341-370.
- Kadera, Kelly and Laura Sjoberg (eds). 2016. 'ISA Presidential Special Issue'. *International Studies Review* 18 (1): 1-169.
- Lacy, Mark J. 2003. 'War, Cinema, and Moral Anxiety'. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 28 (5): 611-636.

- Lau Bertrand, Julia and Ji-Young Lee. 2012. 'Teaching International Relations to a Multi-cultural Classroom'. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 24 (1): 128-133.
- Legro, Jeffrey W. 2007. *Rethinking the World: Great Power Strategies and International Order*. 1st ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Legro, Jeffrey W. 2007. *Rethinking the World: Great Power Strategies and International Order*. 1st ed. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- McMichael, Philip. 1990. 'Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method.' *American Sociological Review* 55 (3): 385-397.
- McMichael, Philip. 1990. 'Incorporating Comparison within a World-Historical Perspective: An Alternative Comparative Method.' *American Sociological Review* 55 (3): 385-397.
- McMichael, Philip. 2010. 'Changing the subject of development.' In P McMichael (ed), *Contesting Development: critical struggles for social change*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-13.
- McMichael, Philip. 2010. 'Changing the subject of development.' In P McMichael (ed), *Contesting Development: critical struggles for social change*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1-13.
- Mignolo, W. 2009. 'Epistemic Disobedience, Independent thought and Decolonial Freedom.' *Theory, Culture & Society* 26 (7-8): 159-181.
- Mignolo, W. 2011. *The darker side of western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of Experts- Egypt, Techno-Politic, Modernity*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Mitchell, Timothy. 2002. *Rule of ExpertsEgypt, Techno-Politic, Modernity*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Nagel, Thomas. 1986. *The View from Nowhere*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nişancioğlu, Kerem and Maïa Pal. 2016. 'Counter-Conduct in the University Factory: Locating the Occupy Sussex Campaign'. *Global Society* 30 (2): 279-300.
- NYC Stands with Standing Rock Committee. 2016. '#StandingRockSyllabus'. At <https://nycstand-withstandingrock.wordpress.com/standingrocksyllabus/> [Accessed 9 June 2020].
- Nye, Joseph S. 2011. *The Future of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Nye, Joseph S. 2011. *The Future of Power*. New York: PublicAffairs.498 vol. 42(2) May/Aug 2020.
- O'Neal, John R and Bruce Russett. 1999. 'The Kantian Peace: The Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence, and International Organizations, 1885-1992'. *International Organization* 52 (1):

- Onuf, Nicholas. 2018. 'What We Do: International Relations as Craft'. In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: SAGE, pp. 513-526.
- Onuf, Nicholas. 2018. 'What We Do: International Relations as Craft'. In Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds), *The SAGE Handbook of the History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. London: SAGE, pp. 513-526.
- Phull, Kiran, Gokhan Ciflikli and Gustav Meibauer. 2019. 'Gender and Bias in the International Relations Curriculum: Insights from Reading Lists'. *European Journal of International Relations* 5 (2): 383-407.
- Rancière, Jacques. 1991. *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation*. Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.
- Roberts, Frank Leon. 2016. 'Black Lives Matter: Race, Resistance, and Populist Protest' syllabus. New York: Gallatin School of Individualized Study, New York University. At <http://www.blacklives-mattersyllabus.com/> [Accessed 9 June 2020].
- Sabaratnam, Meera, 2011. 'IR in dialogue... but can we change the subjects? A typology of decolonising strategies for the study of world politics'. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39 (3): 781-803.
- Schweller, Randall L. 2008. *Unanswered Threats: Political Constraints on the Balance of Power*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schweller, Randall L. 2008. *Unanswered Threats: Political Constraints on the Balance of Power*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Seth, Sanjay. 2011. 'Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations'. *Millennium* 40 (1): 167-183.
- Seth, Sanjay. 2011. 'Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations'. *Millennium* 40 (1): 167-183.
- Shilliam, Robbie. 2012. 'Forget English Freedom, Remember Atlantic Slavery: Common Law, Commercial Law, and the Significance of Slavery for Classical Political Economy'. *New Political Economy* 17 (5): 591-609.
- Shilliam, Robert. 2008. 'What the Haitian Revolution Might Tell Us about Development, Security and the Politics of Race'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50 (3): 778-808.
- Shilliam, Robert. 2008. 'What the Haitian Revolution Might Tell Us about Development, Security and the Politics of Race'. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50 (3): 778-808.
- Sikkink, Kathryn. 2017. *Evidence for Hope: Making Human Rights Work in the 21st Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sikkink, Kathryn. 2017. *Evidence for Hope: Making Human Rights Work in the 21st Century*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura. 2015. *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Sylvester, Christine. 2007. 'Whither the International at the End of IR?' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 35 (3): 551-573.
- Tickner, Arlene and Ole Wæver (eds). 2009. *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*. London: Routledge.
- Tickner, Arlene. 2003. 'Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 32 (2): 295-324.
- Tickner, Arlene. 2003. 'Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World.' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 32 (2): 295-324.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph, 1995. *Silencing the Past – Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Trouillot, Michel-Rolph, 1995. *Silencing the Past – Power and the Production of History*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Valeriano, Brandon. 2013. 'Teaching Introduction to International Politics with Film.' *Journal of Political Science Education* 9 (1): 52-72.
- Vitalis, Robert. 2015. *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Wæver, Ole and Arlene B Tickner. 2009. 'Conclusion: Worlding Where the West Once Was.' In Arlene B Tickner and Ole Wæver (eds), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World: Worlding Beyond the West*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 328-341.
- Wæver, Ole and Arlene B Tickner. 2009. 'Conclusion: Worlding Where the West Once Was.' In Arlene B Tickner and Ole Wæver (eds), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World: Worlding Beyond the West*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 328-341.
- Wæver, Ole. 1997. 'Figures of International Thought: Introducing Persons Instead of Paradigms?' In Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver (eds), *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-37.
- Wæver, Ole. 1997. 'Figures of International Thought: Introducing Persons Instead of Paradigms?'. In Iver B. Neumann and Ole Wæver (eds), *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 1-37.
- Wæver, Ole. 2007. 'Still a Discipline After All These Debates?' In Tim Dunne, Milya Kurki and Steve Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 288-308.
- Wæver, Ole. 2007. 'Still a Discipline After All These Debates?'. In Tim Dunne, Milya Kurki and Steve Smith (eds), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 288-308.
- Walker, R B J, Robbie Shilliam, Heloise Weber and Gitte Du Plessis. 2018. 'Collective Discussion: Diagnosing the Present.' *International Political Sociology* 12 (1): 88-107.
- Walker, R B J, Robbie Shilliam, Heloise Weber and Gitte Du Plessis. 2018. 'Collective Discussion: Diagnosing the Present.' *International Political Sociology* 12 (1): 88-107.

- Walker, R B J. 1988. 'Explorations.' In R B J Walker (ed), *One World, Many Worlds: Struggles for a Just World Peace*. London: Zed Books.
- Walker, R B J. 1988. 'Explorations.' In R B J Walker (ed), *One World, Many Worlds: Struggles for a Just World Peace*. London: Zed Books.
- Walker, R B J. 1992. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walker, R B J. 2002. 'International/Inequality.' *International Studies Review* 4 (2): 7-24.
- Walker, R B J. 2002. 'International/Inequality.' *International Studies Review* 4 (2): 7-24.
- Weber, Cynthia. 2001. *International Relations Theory. A Critical Introduction*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Weber, Heloise. 2007. 'A Political Analysis of the Formal Comparative Method: Historicizing the Globalization and Development Debate.' *Globalizations* 4 (4): 559-572.
- Weber, Heloise. 2007. 'A Political Analysis of the Formal Comparative Method: Historicizing the Globalization and Development Debate.' *Globalizations* 4 (4): 559-572.
- Winther, Rasmus Grønfeldt. 2015. 'The Structure of Scientific Theories.' At <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/structure-scientific-theories/> [Accessed on 13 June 2020].
- Winther, Rasmus Grønfeldt. 2015. 'The Structure of Scientific Theories.' At <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/structure-scientific-theories/> [Accessed on 13 June 2020].
- Yamane, David. 2006. 'Course Preparation Assignments: A Strategy for Creating Discussion-Based Courses.' *Teaching Sociology* 34 (3): 236-48.

Author biographies

Alexander Astrov Associate Professor of International Relations at Central European University in Vienna, Austria. His research interests are located at the intersection of International Relations theory, contemporary political theory and history of political thought. He is the author of *On World Politics: Neotraditionalism in International Relations* and *Self-founded Community: Minority Politics or Minor Politics?* (in Russian), as well as articles on great power management, Russia's never-ending quest for great-power status, and the use of collective memory in the shaping of foreign policy in the Baltic States.

Amy Niang Professor of International Relations at the University of the Witwatersrand. She is a Visiting Professor at the University of São Paulo and the Institute for Peace and Security Studies (IPSS) in Addis Ababa. She is the author of *The Postcolonial African State in Transition: Stateness and Modes of Sovereignty* (Rowman and Littlefield 2018).

Arlene B. Tickner Professor of International Relations in the Faculty of International, Political and Urban Studies at the Universidad del Rosario, Bogotá, Colombia. Her main areas of research include sociology of knowledge in the field of International Relations and the evolution of IR in non-Western settings, Latin American and hemispheric security, Colombian foreign policy, and Colombian-United States relations.

Benjamin Herborth Senior Lecturer at the Department of International Relations and International Organization and Director of Studies of the Research Master's programme Modern History and International Relations at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands. His research interests include social and political theories in and of international relations, the politics of security and mobility, German foreign policy, and reconstructive methodology. Cutting across these research interests is the belief that the field of International Relations, having a strong tradition of reifying both political spaces and political subjects, provides an excellent site for theorizing both. His work has been published, inter alia, in

Review of International Studies, International Studies Review, International Theory and Cambridge University Press.

Gunther Hellmann Professor of Political Science at Goethe University, Frankfurt (Germany). His research interests are in the fields of international relations theory and social theory, especially pragmatism, foreign policy analysis, specifically German and European foreign policy, and international security, particularly transatlantic and European security. He is one of the editors of *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* (ZIB), a German IR journal and, since 2017, President of WISC, the World International Studies Committee. Recently he edited *Theorizing Global Order. The International, Culture and Governance* (Campus, 2018); *Uses of the West* (Cambridge University Press, 2017, with Benjamin Herborth); and *The Transformation of Foreign Policy* (Oxford University Press, 2016, with Andreas Fahrmeir and Miloš Vec).

Heloise Weber Senior Lecturer in International Relations and Development at the School of Political Science and International Studies of the University of Queensland, Australia. Her research interests are at the intersection of critical approaches to IR and (Global) Development. More specifically, she is interested in the politics of knowledge and power, and how this informs struggles over injustices, both historically and in the contemporary context. From this vantage point, her work engages global dynamics and local experiences.

Jacqui Ala Associate Professor in International Relations at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa. She has dual qualifications in IR and education, specialising in the area of higher education. She lectures courses on IR theory, qualitative and quantitative research design as well as race and gender. She also oversees the doctoral programme. Her research interests include IR pedagogic research investigating the incorporation of indigenous knowledge within IR theory curricula in the Global South; gender and race in the contexts of the Global South; disability and global development with a focus on Southern Africa; global health and development issues.

Karen Smith Professor of International Relations at the Institute for History at Leiden University. She remains affiliated as an honorary research associate with the University of Cape Town, where she was based as an associate professor until 2017. Karen has recently been a visiting professor at Sciences Po, Paris, and has

served on the editorial boards of the journals *Review of International Studies*, *Foreign Policy Analysis* and *Rising Powers Quarterly*. Her current research focuses on non-Western, particularly, African, perspectives on international relations. She is co-editor (with Arlene Tickner) of *International Relations from the Global South: Worlds of Difference* (Routledge, 2020), and also serves as special adviser on the responsibility to protect to the United Nations Secretary-General.

Kerem Nişancıoğlu Lecturer in International Relations at SOAS University of London. His research focuses on the relationship between Eurocentrism, capitalism, colonialism and race. He is co-author with Alexander Anievas of *How the West Came to Rule: The Geopolitical Origins of Capitalism* (Pluto Press, 2015). His current research focuses on the role of colonialism and racialisation in the making of modern sovereignty. He is also interested in practices of and struggles against capitalism, colonialism and racism in universities and co-edited the volume *Decolonising the University* (Pluto Press, 2018) with Gurminder K. Bhambra and Dalia Gebrial.

Martin Weber His main research clusters are in International Social and Political Theory, and in Political Economy/International Political Economy (PE/IPE). In the former field, his work has focused on the contributions of Critical Theory to developments in normative International Political Theory, and to the 'social turn' in IR theory in general. His research in this field, which overlaps with his interests in International Political Economy, has been published in key journals (*European Journal of International Relations*, *Review of International Studies*, *Alternatives*, *Globalizations*), as well as in contributions to edited volumes. In PE/IPE, his work has focused on the political analysis of global governance, and in particular on global health governance and global environmental governance.

Meera Sabaratnam Senior Lecturer in International Relations in the Department of Politics and International Studies at SOAS University of London. Her research interests are in the colonial and postcolonial dimensions of world politics, in both theory and practice. She has chaired the Global Development Section of the International Studies Association and co-convened the Colonial/Postcolonial/Decolonial Workink Group of the British International Studies Association. Her recent award-winning book *Decolonising Intervention: International Statebuilding in Mozambique* (Rowman and Littlefield International, 2017) is available for free download here (bit.ly/DecolInt).

Navnita Chadha Behera Professor of International Relations at the Department of Political Science, University of Delhi. She is also an Honorary Director of the Institute for Research on India and International Studies and was Vice-President of the International Studies Association (2019-2020). Her research interests include International Relations theory, knowledge systems and the Global South, and IR pedagogy.

Ole Wæver is professor of International Relations at the Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen, founder of CAST, Centre for Advanced Security Theory, and Director of CRIC, Centre for Resolution of International Conflicts. Among his books are *International Relations Scholarship Around the World* (edited with Arlene B. Tickner, 2009), *Assembling Exclusive Expertise: Knowledge, Ignorance and Conflict Resolution in the Global South* (edited with Anna Leander, 2019), *Resolving International Conflict: Dynamics of Escalation, Continuation and Transformation* (edited with Isabel Bramsen and Poul Poder, 2019); *Translations of Security: A Framework for the Study of Unwanted Futures* (with Trine Villumsen Berling, Ulrik Pram Gad and Karen Lund Petersen, 2021; open access). He currently studies political speech acts, climate change and militarization in Uganda.