

Please note: course outlines are updated over the summer. There is likely to be very little change in paper content but updated versions will be available in September.

POL 2: INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT, ORDER AND JUSTICE
2017-2018

Paper Organisers and Lecturers:

Adam Branch
Department of Politics and International Studies
Email: arb209@cam.ac.uk

Ayşe Zarakol, az319@cam.ac.uk
Department of Politics and International Studies
Email: az319@cam.ac.uk

Supervisors:

Maha Rafi Atal	mra42@cam.ac.uk
Kaitlin Ball	kb558@cam.ac.uk
Duncan Bell	dsab2@cam.ac.uk
Adam Branch	arb209@cam.ac.uk
Mike Clark	mdc48@cam.ac.uk
Geoffrey Edwards	gre1000@cam.ac.uk
David Fowler	dmf28@cam.ac.uk
Jeremy Green	jbg35@cam.ac.uk
Jaakko Heiskanen	jwh48@cam.ac.uk
Christopher Hill	cjh68@cam.ac.uk
Pieter van Houten	pjv24@cam.ac.uk
K-C Lin	kcl35@cam.ac.uk
James Mayall	jblm2@cam.ac.uk
Justin Pearce	jp663@cam.ac.uk
Evaleila Pesaran	ep336@cam.ac.uk
Glen Rangwala	gr10009@cam.ac.uk
Aaron Rapport	ar727@cam.ac.uk
Stefano Recchia	sr638@cam.ac.uk
Vsevolod Samokhvalov	vs314@cam.ac.uk
Ian Shields	ies25@cam.ac.uk
Ayşe Zarakol	az319@cam.ac.uk

Outline of Paper

Aims and Objectives

This class will introduce students to politics beyond the state. We will seek to understand the contemporary international political world as the product of intersecting forms of power, each of which has a distinct history and may require a distinct analytical approach. The dominant traditions in the study of international relations in the West since World War II have emphasized the power of and relations among states – their conflicts and efforts at coordination. But, as new global political realities have emerged in recent decades, new theoretical approaches have entered the debates on international relations with the objective of interpreting these new realities and re-interpreting dominant histories of international order.

Some of these approaches maintain that actors beyond the state – international organizations, social movements, multinational corporations, or terrorist groups – need to be included or foregrounded in order to understand international politics. Others have argued that alternative logics – such as race, gender, or supposed civilizational divides – shape international politics and should not be ignored by focusing too exclusively on inter-state interaction. Still others have argued that giving priority to the Westphalian state obscures the very different visage that international politics may have from the standpoint of the non-Western world and occludes alternative possibilities of order and justice. Thus, the global study of international relations today requires attention to other forms and histories of international order, as well as a history of the state and how we understand it. This paper seeks to explore international politics but will leave open the questions of what issues matter, whose experiences should be the basis for theory, and what methodological tools we can use in this pursuit.

For this reason, POL2: International Conflict, Order and Justice is structured around debates among scholars espousing different theoretical approaches as they make sense of a series of key topics in international politics. The five topics are: the nature of international political order; the changing face of war and conflict; global justice and human rights; sovereignty and hierarchy; and international politics and systemic change. Students can expect to find that distinct approaches to international relations may sit uneasily with each other epistemologically or politically. These tensions should not be a cause for frustration but, rather, should provoke further reflection and critical inquiry.

Three primary themes will cut across all five modules. First, **conflict**. Under this theme, we will examine not only conflict among states, whether violent or non-violent, but also violence by non-state actors as well as conflict that crosses the domestic-international divide, such as in occupation and counterinsurgency. We will also look at systemic forms of international structural violence and repression, such as might exist along class, race, or gender lines, which may be embedded in the existing international system. This leads to the second theme: **order**. While order among states is a perennial concern for international relations, there is also the question of whose interests that order serves and at whose expense it is maintained. What is the character of international order – for example, is it hierarchical or anarchical – what are its origins, and how does it establish its legitimacy? And are there alternative ways to order the world? This points to the third theme: **justice**. Normative international relations has dealt extensively with ethical questions such as just war or international economic inequality. This paper will also pay attention to the demands for international and global justice being made by a diversity of voices today both in the political sphere and within the study of international politics itself – signaling again the importance of an inclusive approach to international relations theory.

Being an introduction, this paper should not be treated as the final word on any of these approaches or issues. Rather, it is meant to whet students' appetites and help them decide, as they advance to Part II of the HSPS Tripos, what they wish to focus on – such as, for instance, international organizations, international law, political theory, international sociology, international political economy, Marxism, gender, race, development, or a specific region. The objective of the course is thus two-fold: to ensure that students have a firm foundation for future studies in international politics, and to equip students with the conceptual tools needed to critically interpret and to act in the contemporary world.

Structure of Paper

The paper begins with one of the most important events in contemporary international politics: 9/11. We use 9/11 as a starting point for exploring some of the key concepts and tensions in international politics. In Module I, we look at the changes in international order introduced by 9/11, placing those changes in the context of debates over post-Cold War world order. In Module II, we continue to use 9/11 and its aftermath as a touchstone, turning to the question of international political violence, with a focus on terrorism, insurgency, humanitarian intervention, drones, and counterterrorism. Module III shifts from international violence to the pursuit of justice for violence. We explore the dominant vision for global justice in the post-Cold War world – human rights – and look at one of the most prominent (and controversial) international institutions established to realize human rights – the International Criminal Court. We end the module by asking whether human rights and global justice are adequate to what may be the most pressing global challenge today – climate change.

The second term considers two big ideas in international politics over a longer span of time, thus providing a broader historical context for the questions explored in Term 1. First, in Module IV, sovereignty is put into question: we aim to understand how the modern sovereignty principle evolved over the centuries as well as the contemporary challenges to the idea of nation-state sovereignty. Then, Module V asks how international order has changed over time – do we see only minor shifts within more fundamental continuities, or have there been more radical ruptures that might point towards the possibility of divergent futures?

Lecture List

Michaelmas Term:

Lecture 1: Introduction: Approaching International Politics

Module I: International Political Order: From the Cold War to 9/11

Lecturer: Adam Branch

Lecture 2: Interpreting the End of the Cold War

Lecture 3: Did 9/11 Change Everything?

Lecture 4: US Foreign Policy after 9/11

Lecture 5: Historical Antecedents of the War on Terror

Lecture 6: The Gender of 9/11

Module II: The Changing Nature of War and International Conflict

Lecturer: Adam Branch

Lecture 7: Defining Terrorism

Lecture 8: A New Form of Warfare? Insurgency and Counterinsurgency
Lecture 9: The Ethics of War: The Iraq Invasion
Lecture 10: Drone Debates
Lecture 11: The War on Terror in Domestic Politics

Module III. Global Justice and Human Rights

Lecturer: Adam Branch

Lecture 12: Human Rights after the Cold War
Lecture 13: Global Criminal Justice: Histories and Visions
Lecture 14: The International Criminal Court in Practice
Lecture 15: Global Justice and Climate Change
Lecture 16: Climate Justice and the Limits of International Politics

Lent Term:

Module IV: Sovereignty and Its Discontents

Lecturer: Ayşe Zarakol

Lecture 17: Understanding the Westphalian Order
Lecture 18: Sovereignty and the Nation-State
Lecture 19: Intervention – From R2P to Crimea
Lecture 20: IOs/Globalisation & the Significance of Brexit
Lecture 21: Alternatives to Modern Sovereignty – Anarchists to ISIS

Module V: International Politics and Systemic Change

Lecturer: Ayşe Zarakol

Lecture 22: Rise of the West?
Lecture 23: Great Powers and Debates about Polarity
Lecture 24: Structural Cleavages – North/South & East/West
Lecture 25: Rising Powers
Lecture 26: A Post-Western Order?

Easter Term: Revision Lectures

Monday, Week 1, 9-11 am

Wednesday, Week 1, 9-11 am

(The lectures are identical, so students are expected to attend only one.)

Teaching

The paper is taught through a combination of 26 lectures and six hours of supervision for each student. Supervisions are organised by Directors of Study. Students should complete a piece of written work for each supervision; at least four of these pieces of work should be essays. Two of the supervisions set by supervisors can be alternative written work; this could be for example, an exercise based on the reading. Details on question selection, length of essay, and style should be discussed with each student's specific supervisor. Students should have one or two revision supervisions in Easter Term. Lists of **sample essay questions** for supervisions are given at the end of each of the modules.

Given the significant depth and breadth of the reading, attending lecture is essential for students to establish paths through the material. Lectures begin promptly at 10:00 am on Mondays and at 10:00 am on Wednesdays. There will be two lectures per week in the Michaelmas term and two per week in the Lent term, with no lectures in the final three

weeks of Lent term. There will be two identical Revision Lectures during Easter term, each two hours long. Students are expected to attend only one of these lectures.

Readings

There are two categories of readings in the paper guide below: first, **Core Readings**; second, **Supplementary Readings**. Core Readings are to be read by all students and will establish the foundation for the corresponding lecture. Supplementary Readings are useful for supervision essays or for students particularly interested in specific topics or aspects of topics. It is not expected that all students will have read the Supplementary Readings for each lecture, though reference to them may be made in class. Students may also find that reading additional chapters beyond what is assigned in the books on the reading list, or looking into other works by included authors, can be helpful in writing supervision essays or revising for the exam. Many of the readings can be found on the paper's Moodle site.

Assessment

There will be a three-hour unseen examination paper in the Easter term, in which each student will be required to answer three questions. The exam will be divided into two sections. The first will comprise four cross-cutting questions pertaining to the paper as a whole, of which students select one to answer. The second section will comprise twelve questions. There will be two or three questions associated with each module (although students may draw on any lecture/topic in answering these questions). Students will be required to answer two questions from this section.

In addition to the sample supervision essay questions included at the end of each module, there is a list of sample cross-cutting questions included at the end of the paper guide. There is also a sample exam at the end of the paper guide as a whole.

Previous years' exams for POL2 are available on the paper's Moodle site, and last year's exam is included at the end of the paper guide. Students should be aware, however, that there have been new modules introduced to the paper this year, and so previous exams may cover material that is not covered in POL2 this year. For this reason, the sample supervision questions and sample exam should be the focus in revising for the exam.

MICHAELMAS TERM

Lecture 1: Introduction: Approaching International Politics

What do we study, when we study international politics? What are the concerns that motivate us? How do we decide what concepts to use, what locations to focus upon, and which actors and forces to privilege? This lecture will introduce students to the paper and to how we might approach the study of international politics.

MODULE I: International Political Order: From the Cold War to 9/11

Lecturer: Adam Branch

How is the world ordered today? The standard answer is that the world is divided up into states, which pursue their interests through conflict and cooperation. The end of the Cold War, the terrorist acts of 9/11, and the inception of the War on Terror brought that image of the world into question from many different quarters, however. The end of the Cold War saw a debate arise between, on the one hand, those who celebrated a new era of peace, and, on the other, those who saw a dangerous turn towards instability. A third position argued that, from the standpoint of the non-Western world, the end of the Cold War meant little at all, as existing structures of power were simply affirmed. After 9/11, a new round of re-assessment occurred: some saw 9/11 as the opportunity to bring new order to the world, others saw it as proof of global disorder, and a third group saw it as entrenching the unequal power relations that had always been present, whether along the lines of colonialism, gender, or race. This module explores these visions of the changing international order – hope, despair, more of the same – as they evolved from the early 1990s until today.

Lecture 2: Interpreting the End of the Cold War

The shock of 9/11 and the upheaval caused by its global response make it easy to forget that, a mere ten years before 9/11, the end of the Cold War had transformed understandings of international politics in perhaps even more fundamental ways. This lecture explores competing interpretations of the end of the Cold War and visions for the world that was thought to be emerging at that moment.

Core reading:

- Samuel P. Huntington, 'The Clash of Civilizations?', *Foreign Affairs* 72, No. 3 (1993). [This influential text frames post-Cold War world order as one of conflict between oppositional civilizations. Although written before 9/11, it has provided one popular framework for understanding the event.]
- Francis Fukuyama, 'The End of History?', *National Interest*, No. 16 (1989): 3-18. [An influential thesis claiming that the end of the Cold War has brought an end to alternatives to liberal, free-market democracy.]
- Tony Blair, Prime Minister's speech, 'Doctrine of the International Community', 24 April 1999. <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+www.number10.gov.uk/Page1297> [A key declaration of the vision behind the 1990's international community.]

Supplementary reading:

- Eqbal Ahmad, "The Cold War from the Standpoint of its Victims." pp. 219-227 in *The Selected Writings of Eqbal Ahmad*, edited by Carolee Bengelsdorf, Margaret Cerullo, and Yogesh Chandrani (Columbia University Press, 2006). Available at

<http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon1/eqbalahmadcoldwar.html> [Ahmad was a Pakistani political analyst and activist, as well as a prominent critic of US foreign policy.]

- Jarat Chopra and Thomas Weiss, "Sovereignty Is No Longer Sacrosanct: Codifying Humanitarian Intervention," *Ethics and International Affairs* 6 (1992): 95-117. [A resounding call for a human rights world order to replace the Cold War.]
- Kaplan, Robert, "The Coming Anarchy: How Scarcity, Crime, Overpopulation and Disease are Rapidly Destroying the Social Fabric of our Planet", *The Atlantic Monthly*, 1994. [It's bad – very bad, says the prominent political writer.]
- Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* (Polity Press, 2012 [1998]), Chapter 1. [It's bad, says the LSE professor, but there are also new opportunities for global civil society that have arisen in the midst of the expanding violent chaos.]
- John Mearsheimer, 'Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War', *International Security* 15:1 (1990). [Europe is bound for instability with the end of a bipolar order, the Realist international relations scholar explains.]

Lecture 3: Did 9/11 Change Everything?

Some have argued that 9/11 proved conclusively that global politics today is no longer restricted to states, but is defined by broad and conflicting cultural or religious identities. Others argue, conversely, that 9/11 in fact demonstrates the state's continuing centrality to international politics, and that we need to look at the recent history of superpower politics and the Cold War itself to understand the attacks. We explore this debate here.

Core reading:

- Mahmood Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror* (Random House, 2004), pp. 3-38. [Mamdani is a Ugandan political analyst and one of Africa's most important public intellectuals; here he offers a critique of Huntington, arguing that terrorism must be seen in historical perspective and in the context of the politics of powerful states. See chapter 4 and the conclusion for his full argument.]
- Kenneth Waltz, 'The Continuity of International Politics', in Booth and Dunne, *Worlds in Collision* (Palgrave, 2002), pp. 348-353. [The doyen of contemporary Realism in International Relations argues that 9/11 has not fundamentally changed the underlying realities of international politics, despite signs to the contrary.]

Supplementary reading:

- Amitav Acharya, 'State-Society Relations: Asian and World Order after September 11', in Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, eds., *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order* (Palgrave, 2002), pp. 194-204. [An argument from a prominent IR scholar that state politics need to be foregrounded in understanding 9/11.]
- Eqbal Ahmad, 'Terrorism: Theirs and Ours', *Geopolitics Review* 2, No. 3 (2001). [Although he died in 1999, Ahmad's writings on terrorism have proved prescient for the post-9/11 world.]
- Benjamin Barber, 'Democracy and Terror in the Era of Jihad vs. McWorld', in Booth and Dunne, *Worlds in Collision* (Palgrave, 2002), pp. 245-262. [A discussion of the conflict between, and mutual dependence of, the globalizing market and localizing religious or cultural particularism.]
- Francis Fukuyama, 'History and September 11', in Ken Booth and Tim Dunne, eds., *Worlds in Collision: Terror and the Future of Global Order* (Palgrave, 2002), pp. 27-36. [Fukuyama integrates 9/11 into his thesis.]

Lecture 4: US Foreign Policy after 9/11

The violence of 9/11 and the US response shattered many of the images of post-Cold War stability and progress. With the US launching two invasions of foreign countries as well as a global 'War on Terror', vitriolic debates arose among policy makers over the proper role of US power in the world and, among analysts, over how to characterize US power. Some saw the US as embarked on a campaign to protect its economic interests; others saw it as pursuing political domination; others saw the US as having embarked on a program to transform the world through military intervention and regime change, building a new empire.

Core reading:

- George W. Bush, 'Address to the Joint Session of the 107th Congress', 20 September 2001. <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/1555641.stm>;
- Michael Ignatieff, 'The Burden', *New York Times Magazine*, 5 January 2003. [Ignatieff is a prominent political philosopher and, until recently, leader of the Canadian Liberal Party. Here he calls for a new US empire in response to 9/11.]
- John Mearsheimer, 'Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq war: realism versus neo-conservatism', *OpenDemocracy.net*, 19 May 2005. https://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-americanpower/morgenthau_2522.jsp [A prominent US realist assesses the gulf between realism and neo-conservatism in understanding an appropriate US response to 9/11, with a focus on the Iraq war.]

Supplementary reading:

- Arundhati Roy, 'The Algebra of Infinite Justice', *The Guardian*, 29 September 2001. <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/sep/29/september11.afghanistan> [Roy is an Indian author (winner of the Man Booker Prize) and political activist; here she interrogates 'Operation Infinite Justice', as the US named its military campaign in Afghanistan immediately after 9/11.]
- Robert Jervis, 'Understanding the Bush Doctrine', *Political Science Quarterly* 118, No. 3 (2003): pp. 365-388. [Excellent analysis of the belief system behind the U.S. invasion of Iraq, by one of America's foremost international relations scholars.]
- Andrew J. Bacevich, *American Empire: The Realities and Consequences of U.S. Diplomacy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), Ch. 1. [Former US Army Colonel turned conservative critic of US militarism and empire, followed by a vast number of further books and articles.]
- Bonnie Mann, *Sovereign Masculinity: Gender Lessons from the War on Terror* (Oxford UP, 2014), pp. 1-14, 169-214. [Prominent feminist philosopher explores the role of masculinity in the war on terror.]
- Alex Callinicos, 'The Grand Strategy of the American Empire', *International Socialism* 97, (Winter 2002): 3-38. [A Marxist international relations scholar builds the case for understanding – and opposing – the US as a not-so-benevolent imperialist.]

Lecture 5: Historical Antecedents of the War on Terror

For many analysts, there was nothing particularly new about the War on Terror. In fact, they argued, it was simply reprising long-standing divisions between the West and the non-Western world. These divisions were developed and imposed most importantly under colonialism, and so we need to look to the colonial legacy to understand the politics of the War on Terror, they argue. Others maintain that the colonial legacy is either a positive one, or else is irrelevant for contemporary politics.

Core reading:

- Edward Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (New York: Vintage, 1978), Introduction. [*Orientalism* was a founding book for postcolonial theory across the disciplines; although not an easy or uncontroversial text, it remains essential for helping understand the legacies of colonialism today.]
- Niall Ferguson, *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World* (London: Penguin, 2003), Introduction. [A prominent account of the benefits that imperialism brought to the colonies.]

Supplementary Reading:

- Antony Anghie, 'The Evolution of International Law: Colonial and Postcolonial Realities', *Third World Quarterly* 27, No. 5 (2006): 739-753. [On the continuities in international law as an 'othering' process from the early colonial period to the war on terror.]
- James Tully, 'Lineages of Contemporary Imperialism', in Duncan Kelly, ed., *The Historical Roots of British Imperial Thought* (Oxford UP, 2009). [Erudite introduction to the debates over the shifts in imperialism through the 20th century.]
- Walter Rodney, *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* (Howard UP, 1974), Ch. 1. [The classic work by the Guyanese political economist on the destructive economic impact that colonialism had on Africa.]
- Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World* (New Press, 2008), Introduction, Part 1: 'Bandung', 'Havana'. [An engaging historical work on the efforts by Third World political leaders and social movements to develop alternative visions of world order.]
- Meghana Nayak, 'Orientalism and "saving" US Identity after 9/11', *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 8, No. 1 (2006): 42-61. [Using Said's framework, Nayak identifies post-9/11 US foreign policy as an 'orientalizing' project, premised on the violent establishment of 'self' versus a gendered and racialized 'other'.]

Lecture 6: The Gender of 9/11

Some feminist theorists have argued in a similar vein that there is nothing new about 9/11 or the War on Terror: for these writers, both are part of a long history of violence against women, and so we need to look at these episodes through a gender lens to grasp their full meaning. Gender has typically been excluded from the study of international relations, however, which has traditionally considered it to belong to the domestic political realm, without relevance for the supposedly abstract and universal political logics of the international. These writers challenge this assumption, showing how gender shapes international order and how certain images of, and assumptions about, gender are built into the very way we think about international politics.

Core reading:

- Lila Abu-Lughod, 'Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others', *American Anthropologist* 104, No. 3 (2002): 783-790. [On the use of gender and racial images to justify supposedly humanitarian intervention. About Afghanistan, but illuminating for Iraq as well.]
- Catharine MacKinnon, 'Women's September 11th: Rethinking the International Law of Conflict', *Harvard International Law Journal* 47 (2006): 1-30. Also in MacKinnon, *Are Women Human? And Other International Dialogues* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2006), pp. 259-278. [Feminist political theorist, lawyer, and activist dramatically overturns assumptions about 9/11.]

- bell hooks, 'Feminism and Militarism: A Comment', *Women's Studies Quarterly* 23, No. 3/4 (1995): 58-64. [Theorist and activist discusses the relation between militarism and patriarchy and breaks down the supposed opposition between women and war, demonstrating the intersecting nature of different forms of power.]

Supplementary reading:

- Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases* (University of California Press, 1989; 2001), Ch. 1, 3, Conclusion. [Groundbreaking work in feminist international relations, setting the stage for much of the work that has followed; see also Enloe's pieces in Supplementary Reading for more on the Iraq War specifically.]
- Iris Marion Young, 'The Logic of Masculinist Protection: Reflections on the Current Security State', *Signs: Journal of Women, Culture and Society* 29, No. 2 (2003). [A preeminent philosopher explores the domestic consequences of the global War on Terror.]
- Nadjie Al-Ali, 'Reconstructing Gender: Iraqi Women between Dictatorship, War, Sanctions and Occupation', *Third World Quarterly* 26, No. 4-5 (2005): 739-758. [What 'liberation' means to Iraqi women – a lesson in why international politics cannot be understood without considering how politics looks from different standpoints.]
- Nivedita Menon, "Feminists and 'Women'" in *Seeing Like a Feminist* (Penguin, 2012)

SAMPLE ESSAY QUESTIONS: (Relevant lectures/topics are suggested for each question; students may, of course, draw on any lectures/topics in writing their essays.)

1. Did the end of the Cold War present a moment of political opportunity, and, if so, for whom? (Lectures 2 & 4)
2. Does cultural difference produce political violence? (Lectures 3 & 2)
3. Was the invasion of Iraq a case of "blood for oil"? (Lecture 4)
4. '9/11 and the War on Terror are not proof of the continued importance of colonialism, but, rather, are proof of how much things have changed since colonialism'. Is this true? (Lectures 5 & 3)
5. Was the War on Terror a war for women or a war on women? Or neither? (Lectures 6 & 4)

MODULE II: The Changing Nature of War and International Conflict

Lecturer: Adam Branch

The terrorist acts of 9/11 set in motion a long train of political violence – from the declaration of a 'War on Terror', to the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq, to a broad geography of drone strikes, proxy wars, and increased state surveillance and repression. In this module, we look at these many forms of violence that erupted across the globe in the wake of 9/11, with a focus on the politics and ethics of international violence today.

Lecture 7: Defining Terrorism

While some see contemporary terrorism as a throwback to medieval times, a reaction against an ever-expanding modern globalization, others see terrorism as itself a product of globalization and modernity. Others still, however, insist that terrorism should not be

elevated into part of a global struggle, but is simply a political tactic in local struggles and should be judged as such. These readings map out this controversy.

Core reading:

- Charles Tilly, 'Terror, Terrorism, Terrorists', *Sociological Theory* 22, No. 1. (2004): 5-13. ['Some vivid terms serve political and normative ends admirably despite hindering description and explanation of the social phenomena at which they point.' Such as terrorism, as the renowned sociologist explains.]
- John Gray, *Al Qaeda and What It Means to Be Modern* (London: The New Press, 2003), Ch. 1 and 6. [Al Qaeda is as modern as globalization, argues the British political philosopher.]
- Michael Walzer, 'Terrorism: A Critique of Excuses', in Walzer, *Arguing About War* (Yale UP, 2004). [The preeminent liberal political philosopher and just war theorist applies his arguments to terrorism.]

Supplementary reading:

- Bruce Hoffman, *Inside Terrorism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006; Revised Edition), Chapters 1, 9. [Probably the most widely read introduction to terrorism in historical perspective.]
- Faisal Devji, *The Terrorist in Search of Humanity: Militant Islam and Global Politics* (Hurst, 2010), Ch. 1. [A complex, difficult, but iconoclastic account of terrorism and humanitarian politics.]
- Robert A. Pape. (August 2003). "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism." *American Political Science Review* 97(3): 343-361. [Political scientist argues that suicide terrorism has secular and strategic goals.]
- Ayşe Zarakol, 'What Makes Terrorism Modern? Terrorism, Legitimacy, and the International System,' *Review of International Studies*, 37 (2011). [A constructivist account of the legitimacy claims made by terrorists in historical perspective.]
- Noam Chomsky, 'Who Are the Global Terrorists?', in Boothe and Dunne, *Worlds in Collision* (Palgrave, 2002), pp. 128-137. [For a longer treatment that places the events of 9/11 in the historical context of US foreign policy by perhaps its most important American critic, see Chomsky's bestselling *9-11* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2001).]

Lecture 8: A New Form of Warfare? Insurgency and Counterinsurgency

With insurgency and counterinsurgency, we see global and local politics crashing together. The resulting dynamics raise difficult questions of sovereignty and strategy, as the US-led coalitions quickly discovered during their occupations of Afghanistan and Iraq. Insurgency and counterinsurgency have both been subject to significant theorization over the last century, and there is today an expanding literature reflecting on the most recent round of wars of occupation and the global War on Terror. Here we explore some of the directions that debate is heading, with an eye to historical precedents as well.

Core reading:

- Eqbal Ahmad, 'Revolutionary War and Counter-insurgency', *Journal of International Affairs* 25, No. 1 (1970): 1-47. Excerpted as 'Counterinsurgency' in *The Selected Writings of Eqbal Ahmad*, pp. 36-64. [Ahmad, again, with a seminal analysis of the politics of counterinsurgency. From a different era, but equally illuminating for today.]
- David Kilcullen, 'Countering global insurgency', *Journal of Strategic Studies* 28, No. 4 (2005): 597-617. [Military analyst provides a highly influential account of the connections between local and global forms of insurgent violence and how to combat that violence. Look for resonances with the *The U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual*.]

Supplementary reading:

- Frantz Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth* (Grove Press, 1961): Ch. 1, 'On Violence' [The foundational theorization of anti-colonial revolt, describes how the violence of colonial occupation creates a context in which anti-colonial violence is liberating, but still dangerous.]
- Donald Rumsfeld, 'Transforming the military', *Foreign Affairs* (May/ June 2002). [The former Defense Secretary lays out his vision for the 'Revolution in Military Affairs.']
- Ernesto "Che" Guevara, *Guerrilla Warfare* (1961), Chapter 3, available online. [The classic work on how insurgents should engage with the civilian population.]
- Richard Falk, 'Intervention and Resistance', *Boston Review* (December 1993/January 1994). <http://new.bostonreview.net/BR18.6/interresist.html> [Intervention will always lead to resistance, the radical international lawyer explains, with a focus on Somalia.]
- Rashid Khalidi, 'Iraq and American Empire', *New Political Science* 28, No. 1 (March 2006): 125–34. [Explorations of the political order is the US building through its occupation of Iraq.]

Lecture 9: The Ethics of War: The Iraq Invasion

Can war be just? Today, questions about the legitimacy of the Iraq War continue to reverberate, as the recent Chilcot Report makes clear. This lecture looks to the debates that took place in the lead up and aftermath of the invasion, assessing the reasons given for the war against theories of just war and humanitarian intervention.

Core Reading:

- Alex J. Bellamy, *Just Wars: From Cicero to Iraq* (London: Polity, 2006), Ch. 7, 8. [Exploration of the legitimacy of the War on Terror and of pre-emptive and preventive war, with immediate application to Iraq.]
- Michael Byers, *War Law* (Grove, 2005), Introduction, Part I (pp. 1-81). [Places the US invasion of Iraq in post-Cold War legal context, with a focus on the UN Security Council.]

Supplementary Reading:

- Fernando R. Tesón, 'Ending Tyranny in Iraq'; Terry Nardin, 'Humanitarian Imperialism', *Ethics & International Affairs* 19, No. 2 (September 2005). [Debate over whether the 2003 Iraq War was a humanitarian intervention].
- Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust Wars* (Basic Books 1977; 1992), Preface to 2nd Edition and Chapters 4-6. [The classic work on the topic; the entire book is illuminating for many of the themes we are covering in this module.]
- Kenneth Roth, 'Was the Iraq War a Humanitarian Intervention?' *Journal of Military Ethics* 5, No. 2 (2006): 84-92. [Careful analysis by the head of the international NGO Human Rights Watch. Answers the title question in the negative].
- Laura Sjoberg, 'Why Just War Needs Feminism Now More than Ever', *International Politics* 45 (2008). [Critical reading of just war theory from a feminist perspective.]
- Adam Roberts, 'Law and the Use of Force After Iraq', *Survival* 45, No. 2 (Summer 2003): 31-56. [Reviews various possible justifications for the Iraq War.]

Lecture 10: Drone Debates

The use of drones has expanded greatly as part of changes in the War on Terror. For some analysts, they are a terrifying new development in the machinery of killing; for others, they are an important step towards making war and security more humane. In this lecture, we

look at the reasons for the increasing reliance on drones and ask about the ethics of their use.

Core Reading:

- Audrey Kurth Cronin, 'Why Drones Fail', Daniel Byman, 'Why Drones Work', *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2013). [As the titles promise, these authors consider the efficacy of drones as tools of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency.]
- Stanford Law School & NYU School of Law, *Living under Drones: Death, Injury, and Trauma to Civilians from US Drone Practices in Pakistan* (Stanford/New York, 2012), pp. 1-27; available online. [Detailed and devastating report about the effects of drone attacks on the civilian populations subject to them.]
- Hugh Gusterson, *Drone: Remote Control Warfare* (MIT Press, 2016), ch. 1 and 5. [Anthropologist's careful consideration of the ethics of drones and the meaning for those who deploy them.]

Supplementary Reading:

- David Cole, 'The Drone Presidency,' *New York Review of Books*, 18 August 2016. [Recent overview of the trajectory of drone warfare.]
- Peter Singer, 'Robots at War: The New Battlefield', *Wilson Quarterly*, 2009. <https://wilsonquarterly.com/quarterly/winter-2009-robots-at-war/robots-at-war-the-new-battlefield/> [Engaging background to the technological questions around drones.]
- Stephanie Carvin, 'The trouble with targeted killing', *Security Studies* 21, No. 3 (2012) [Looks beyond the technological dimensions of drones to place them in the context of the practice of targeted killing.]

Lecture 11: The War on Terror in Domestic Politics

As the War on Terror has shifted from wars of occupation to surveillance, policing, and 'countering violent extremism', many of the tactics and ideas that were developed as part of international counterterrorism have been brought into the domestic politics of Western states. This lecture explores to what extent the War on Terror has blurred the line between domestic and international realms.

Core reading:

- Zygmunt Bauman, et al., 'After Snowden: Rethinking the impact of surveillance', *International Political Sociology* 8 (2014): 121-144. [A discussion of the ramifications of globalized surveillance for international politics, written by some of the most prominent contemporary international theorists.]
- Michael Ignatieff, "Lesser Evils," *New York Times Magazine*, 2 May 2004, <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/05/02/magazine/lesser-evils.html> [Ignatieff proposes a political ethics for liberal democracies in the face of terrorism.]
- Hisham Aidi, *Rebel Music: Race, Empire, and the New Muslim Youth Culture* (Vintage, 2014), Prologue, Chapter 4, 9. [A globe-spanning look at the past and present of youth communities facing the War on Terror; these chapters focus on the UK. Good background on the social politics of Prevent in the UK.]

Supplementary reading:

- Jessica Stern, 'Mind over martyr: How to deradicalize Islamist extremists', *Foreign Affairs* (2010): 95-108. [A definitive statement of the emerging 'countering violent extremism' agenda.]

- Anthony Richards, 'From terrorism to "radicalization" to "extremism": counterterrorism imperative or loss of focus?', *International Affairs* 91, No. 2 (2015): 371–380. [Critical assessment of the UK government's Prevent agenda.]
- Rita Abrahamsen, 'A Breeding Ground for Terrorists? Africa & Britain's "War on Terrorism"', *Review of African Political Economy* 31, No. 102 (2004): 677-684. [How Africa has been defined as a source of terrorism and how UK policy towards the continent has been shaped by that understanding.]
- Leila Nadya Sadat, 'Extraordinary Rendition, Torture, and Other Nightmares from the War on Terror', *George Washington Law Review* 75, No. 5/6 (2007). [Critical examination of the international legal dimensions of so-called 'extraordinary rendition'.]

SAMPLE ESSAY QUESTIONS: (Relevant lectures/topics are suggested for each question; students may, of course, draw on any lectures/topics in writing their essays.)

1. Terrorism is just a political tactic, and a terrorist is simply someone who employs that tactic to realize certain ends. Assess the validity of this statement. (Lectures 7 & 11)
2. Does foreign intervention always give rise to insurgency? (Lectures 8 & 10)
3. Was the Iraq war just? (Lecture 9)
4. Is there anything truly new about drones as a weapon? (Lectures 10 & 8)
5. 'When it comes to counterterrorism, liberty and security will, unfortunately, always be in tension.' Is this true? (Lectures 11 & 10)

Note: Students who would like to learn more about the history of the wars in Afghanistan or in Iraq can refer to some of these key texts. Feel free to find other sources as well. If you would like, you can draw on this material for empirical evidence for the themes raised in the lectures.

- Ahmed Rashid, *Descent into Chaos: How the War Against Islamic Extremism is Being Lost in Pakistan, Afghanistan and Central Asia* (Allen Lane, 2008).
- Seth Jones, *In the Graveyard of Empires: America's War in Afghanistan* (W.W. Norton, 2009).
- Ahmed S. Hashim, *Insurgency and Counter-Insurgency in Iraq* (Cornell UP, 2006).
- Toby Dodge, *Iraq – From War to a New Authoritarianism* (Routledge, 2013)
- Thomas E. Ricks, *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq* (Penguin, 2007)

MODULE III. Global Justice and Human Rights

Lecturer: Adam Branch

The end of the Cold War gave birth to a new vision of the possibilities of global justice, a form of justice that would be anchored in universal human rights and enforced by the international community. During the 1990s, this cosmopolitan vision of a humanitarian world order was ascendant, given apparent support by a series of humanitarian interventions, a new robust UN role in peacekeeping, and the development of the International Criminal Court. However, with the new century, this vision has come under challenge. Some argue that the War on Terror brought the "age of rights" to an end. Others

argue that the most pressing forms of global violence and suffering we face today -- in particular in climate change -- reveal the limits of this human rights vision for justice. Others argue that a human rights world order was never possible or perhaps even desirable in the first place. The module explores the rise and possible fall of global human rights, with a focus on the International Criminal Court and on global climate justice.

Lecture 12: Human Rights after the Cold War

The end of the Cold War and the UN-authorized war against Iraq produced a new exuberance among lawyers, diplomats, and activists about the possibilities for human rights to be enforced around the world (see Chopra & Weiss in Lecture Two). Others, however, raised doubts and asked whether human rights would become simply another guise for Western power. This lecture explores the positions in this debate.

Core reading:

- Louis Henkin, 'Human Rights: Ideology and Aspiration, Reality and Prospect', in Samantha Power and Graham Alison, eds., *Realizing Human Rights: Moving from Inspiration to Impact* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2000). [A vision of the progressive realization of human rights by one of the fathers of the human rights movement.]
- Boutros Boutros-Ghali, *An Agenda for Peace, 1992 Report of the Secretary General* (New York: United Nations): <http://www.un-documents.net/a47-277.htm> [Key statement from the UN Secretary General of the new vision for international order.]
- Makau wa Mutua, 'Savages, Victims, and Saviors: The Metaphor of Human Rights', *Harvard International Law Journal* 42, No. 1 (Winter 2001): only pp. 201-219. [Places contemporary international human rights discourse in the context of the colonial civilizing mission.]

Supplementary reading:

- David Kennedy, "The International Human Rights Movement: Part of the Problem?," in *The Dark Sides of Virtue* (2004). [Prominent law professor raises a series of doubts about human rights' ability to be part of the solution.]
- Noam Chomsky, 'The United States and the Challenge of Relativity', in *Rogue States: The Rule of Force in World Affairs* (2000). [Human rights as a cloak of US interests?]
- Samuel Moyn, *The Last Utopia: Human Rights in History* (Harvard, 2010): Ch. 5 and Epilogue. [Influential recent work providing a critical political history of human rights.]
- Michael Ignatieff, "Human Rights as Politics," in *Human Rights as Politics and Idolatry* (2001). [Eloquent defense of human rights as a form of politics.]
- Adam Branch, 'American Morality over International Law: Origins in UN Military Interventions, 1991-1995', *Constellations* 12, No. 1 (2005). [Traces the expanding use of force by the UN Security Council, arguing that it reveals the impossibility of enforcing human rights.]
- Aryeh Neier, "Did the Era of Rights End on September 11?" (2002). [Director of Human Rights Watch hopes it didn't.]

Lecture 13: Global Criminal Justice: Histories and Visions

Global criminal justice has been imagined as the pinnacle of a human rights world order, in which certain fundamental human rights can be enforced by international courts of law. Its proponents argue that international criminal trials can realize justice and peace; critics maintain that it will achieve neither. This lecture places global criminal justice in the context of human rights, while also exploring the so-called 'peace versus justice' debate.

Core reading:

- William Schabas, *Unimaginable Atrocities: Justice, Politics, and Rights at the War Crimes Tribunals* (Oxford UP, 2012), Introduction, Ch. 3, 7. [An engaging account of the development of international criminal law from a foremost scholar-practitioner.]
- Leslie Vinjamuri, 'Deterrence, Democracy, and the Pursuit of International Justice', *Ethics and International Affairs* 24, No. 2 (2010): 191-211. [Careful critical examination of the different justifications used for international criminal trials.]
- Henry Kissinger, 'The Pitfalls of Universal Jurisdiction', *Foreign Affairs* 80, No. 4 (2001); vs. Kenneth Roth, 'The Case for Universal Jurisdiction', *Foreign Affairs* 80, No. 4 (2001). [The arch-realist versus the head of Human Rights Watch on universal jurisdiction – you can guess which side each is on.]

Supplementary reading:

- Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil* (Penguin, 1963), pp. 313-388. [If you haven't read it, you should do so at some point. A classic.]
- Karen Engle, 'A Genealogy of the Criminal Turn in Human Rights', in *Anti-Impunity and the Human Rights Agenda*, edited by Karen Engle, Zinaida Miller and D.M. Davis (Cambridge, 2016). [Traces the origins of the turn to criminalization by the human rights industry; the entire volume is illuminating.]
- Payam Akhavan, 'Beyond Impunity: Can International Criminal Justice Prevent Future Atrocities?', *American Journal of International Law* 95, No. 1 (2001): 7-31. [A firm believer in the power of international trials to effect positive political change.]
- Gerry Simpson, *Law, War & Crime: War Crimes, Trials and the Reinvention of International Law* (Polity, 2007), Ch. 1, 3. [An astute and theoretically rigorous treatment of the dilemmas inherent in international criminal trials.]
- John J. Mearsheimer, 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security* 19 (1994/5): 5-49. [Realist critique of international institutions, applicable to international tribunals.]

Lecture 14: The International Criminal Court in Practice

The International Criminal Court (ICC) was hailed by Ban Ki-Moon as representing 'a fundamental break with history;' 'The old era of impunity is over', he said, and now 'we are witnessing the birth of an age of accountability.' Today, however, the ICC looks to be in crisis, with little to show for its 15 years of work and billion dollars spent. What does the short history of the ICC reveal about the possibilities of global justice today?

Core reading:

- *Rome Statute of the ICC* (1998). Skim, with special attention to Preamble and Articles 1, 2, 3, 5, 11-17, 53. <http://www.un.org/law/icc/index.html>
- Luis Moreno-Ocampo, 'Keynote Address', Council on Foreign Relations (2010). Available online; search by the title. [The controversial first Chief Prosecutor of the ICC gives his vision for the court.]
- Ban Ki-moon, 'With the International Criminal Court, a New Age of Accountability', *Washington Post*, 29 May 2010. [Another enthusiastic supporter.]
- David Bosco, *Rough Justice: The International Criminal Court in a World of Power Politics* (Oxford UP, 2014), Introduction, Ch. 6. [A critical examination of the political pragmatism of the ICC. See also Chapter 1 for an explicit application of IR theory to the ICC.]
- Adam Branch, 'Uganda's Civil War and the Politics of ICC Intervention', *Ethics & International Affairs* 21, No. 2 (2007). [Your faithful lecturer waxes critical about the possibility of the ICC realizing peace or justice in Uganda.]

Supplementary reading:

- Payam Akhavan, 'The Lord's Resistance Army Case: Uganda's Submission of the First State Referral to the International Criminal Court', *The American Journal of International Law* 99, No. 2 (2005): 403-421. [A strong defense of the positive impact that the ICC will have on Uganda's war and politics.]
- Mahmood Mamdani, 'Responsibility to Protect or Right to Punish?', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 4, No. 1 (2010): 53-67. [Ugandan scholar places the ICC in the context of destructive, coercive Western intervention in Africa.]
- Sarah Nouwen and Wouter Werner, 'Doing Justice to the Political: The International Criminal Court in Uganda and Sudan', *The European Journal of International Law* 21, No. 4, (2011). [Examines the problematic political logics that are inherent to supposedly apolitical ICC trials.]
- Kathryn Sikkink, *The Justice Cascade: How Human Rights Prosecutions Are Changing World Politics* (W.W. Norton, 2011), pp. 1-28, 162-188. [Strong proponent of the idea that international trials have led to a cascade of accountability mechanisms at different levels.]
- Fatou Bensouda, 'We Are Not Against Africa', *New African*, September 2012. www.newafricanmagazine.com/features/politics/fatou-bensouda-we-are-not-against-africa [The current Chief Prosecutor, herself a Gambian lawyer, makes her case.]
- Kofi Annan, 'Africa and the International Court', *New York Times*, 30 June 2009. [Former UN Secretary General is enthusiastic about the ICC's role in Africa.]
- Adam Branch, 'Dominic Ongwen on Trial: The ICC's African Dilemmas', *International Journal of Transitional Justice* 11 (2017): 30-49. [Your faithful lecturer again voices his doubts about the ICC, explaining why it has focused exclusively on Africa.]
- 'Is the International Community Abandoning the Fight Against Impunity?', on-line debate, International Centre for Transitional Justice, <https://www.ictj.org/debate/article/debate-whose-time-has-come> [Illuminating debate among top figures in the international criminal justice world – especially recommended are Ignatieff's interventions.]

Lecture 15: Global Justice and Climate Change

Is international criminal justice adequate to the forms of violence, the massive collective suffering that humanity faces today? Some argue that the ICC and the major human rights institutions we have developed simply cannot deal with the greatest challenge humanity is facing – climate change. This lecture looks at how climate change transforms our understanding of international politics, setting the stage for asking how it transforms our visions of global justice in the next lecture.

Core reading:

- Amitav Ghosh, *The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable* (University of Chicago Press, 2016), Part I. [Brilliant work by the famous novelist and essayist, taking climate change seriously as a global phenomenon.]
- Naomi Klein, *This Changes Everything* (Penguin, 2015), Introduction, Ch. 1, 13. [Partisan and gripping account of the political struggles around climate change, from the deniers, to the techno-optimists, to the communities seeking solutions on their own terms.]

Supplementary reading:

- Ulrich Beck, *World at Risk* (Polity, 2013), Ch. 1, 5. [The foremost theorist of the 'risk society' addresses the transformations climate change is introducing in our global political world.]

- Simon Dalby, 'The Geopolitics of Climate Change', *Political Geography* 37 (November 2013): 38–47. [An analysis of the radical transformations that climate change is forcing to our understanding of global politics.]
- Jeremy Davies, *The Birth of the Anthropocene* (University of California, 2016), ch. 1. [Perhaps the best introduction to the topic.]
- Jeffrey Sachs, *The Age of Sustainable Development* (Columbia University Press, 2015), Ch. 1, 6, 14. [The preeminent development economist – and 'Bono's professor' – brings the planet back in to global poverty. Started as a MOOC, so easy reading.]
- Cameron Harrington, 'The Ends of the World: International Relations and the Anthropocene', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 44, No. 3 (2016): 478-498. [Applies debates over the anthropocene to international relations, raising key questions for the future study of planetary politics.]
- Christian Parenti, *Tropic of Chaos: Climate Change and the New Geography of Violence* (New York: Nation Books, 2011), Ch. 1, 2. [On the new conflicts and security regimes provoked by climate change.]

Lecture 16: Climate Justice and the Limits of International Politics

What does justice mean in the so-called age of the Anthropocene? Do we need a new vision of global justice, and new institutions, that are adequate to planetary devastation instead of the individual atrocities that international criminal justice was designed for?

Core reading:

- Amitav Ghosh, *The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable* (University of Chicago Press, 2016), Parts II and III. [Again, perhaps the most insightful text yet written on the ethics of climate change.]
- Jean-Baptiste Fressoz and Christophe Bonneuil, *The Shock of the Anthropocene: The Earth, History and Us* (Verso, 2016), Ch. 1, 4, 10. [How do we understand responsibility for the anthropocene? Do we blame humankind, capitalism, industry, *mankind*, or empire? And how do we imagine justice based upon that attribution of responsibility?]

Supplementary reading:

- Saskia Sassen, *Expulsions: Brutality and Complexity in the Global Economy* (Harvard UP, 2014), Ch. 2. [The sociologist examines the human consequences of increasing contemporary land alienation.]
- Thomas Pogge, 'Are We Violating the Human Rights of the World's Poor', *Yale Human Rights and Development Law Journal* 14, no. 2 (2011): 1–33. [What is the responsibility of Western consumers in perpetuating global poverty? Pogge asks.]
- Vandana Shiva, *Making Peace with the Earth* (London: Pluto, 2013), Ch. 1, 4, 9. [The visionary eco-feminist discusses contemporary environmental and political crisis.]
- Anil Agarwal and Sunita Narain, *Global Warming in an Unequal World: A Case of Environmental Colonialism* (Centre for Science and Environment, New Delhi 1991). Available at http://cseindia.org/challenge_balance/Reading/GlobalWarming%20Book.pdf [Perhaps the earliest statement of the idea of 'common and differentiated responsibilities.' See the discussion of this key work in Dipesh Chakrabarty, 'Climate and Capital', *Critical Inquiry* 41, No. 1 (2014): 1-23.]
- Craig M. Kauffman, & Pamela L. Martin, 'Scaling up buen vivir: Globalizing local environmental governance from Ecuador', *Global Environmental Politics* 14, No. 1 (2014): 40-58. [Thinking through the implications of indigenous Andean concepts of development for global political economy.]

SAMPLE ESSAY QUESTIONS: (Relevant lectures/topics are suggested for each question; students may, of course, draw on any lectures/topics in writing their essays.)

1. Can the international community enforce human rights? (Lectures 12 & 14)
2. Can international criminal justice avoid being political? (Lectures 13 & 14)
3. Why has the ICC focused on Africa? (Lectures 13 & 14)
4. Does climate change 'change everything' when it comes to international politics? (Lectures 15 & 16)
5. 'Climate justice demands that individuals everywhere reduce their carbon footprint'. Is this true? (Lectures 15 & 16)

LENT TERM

Module IV: Sovereignty and Its Discontents

Lecturer: Ayşe Zarakol

Nation-state sovereignty is the building block of modern international politics. In this module, we aim to understand how the modern sovereignty principle evolved, as well as the contemporary challenges to this principle. Can the nation-state survive into the twenty-first century, or will it be replaced by alternatives? If so, what would those alternatives look like? It may also be that nation-state is more resilient than is usually assumed, as demonstrated by Brexit.

Lecture 17: Understanding the Westphalian Order

The modern international order is often referred to as the Westphalian system, in reference to the Westphalian arrangement of 1648, which is thought to have given birth to the modern sovereignty principle. The actual evolution of “Westphalian” sovereignty is a more complicated and gradual story. In this lecture, we review the historical development and expansion of the Westphalian order from Medieval Europe to the present.

Core Reading:

- Krasner, Stephen (1993) ‘Westphalia and All That’, in Judith Goldstein & Robert O. Keohane (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy: Beliefs, Institutions and Political Change*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. [This article reviews the conventional IR wisdom on Westphalia and argues that Westphalia has always been an ideal-type]
- Hobson, John M and Jason C. Sharman (2005) The Enduring Place of Hierarchy in World Politics: Tracing the Social Logics of Hierarchy and Social Change. *European Journal of International Relations* 11(1): 63-98. [This article makes an argument that hierarchies have always played an important role in the Westphalian order.]

Supplementary Reading:

- Osiander, Andreas (2001) Sovereignty, international relations and the Westphalian Myth. *International Organization* 55(2): 251–287. [This article shows that the Westphalian myth is a creation of the nineteenth and twentieth century.]
- Bukovansky, Mlada, ‘The altered state and the state of nature—the French Revolution and international politics,’ *Review of International Studies* 25 (1999): 197-216. [This article argues that the French Revolution fundamentally altered the organising principles of the international order.]
- Buzan, Barry and George Lawson (2014) Rethinking benchmark dates in international relations. *European Journal of International Relations* 20(2): 437-462. [Questions the classical benchmark dates in IR].
- de Carvalho, Benjamin, Halvard Leira and John M. Hobson (2011) ‘The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1919’, *Millennium* 39(3): 735-758 [This article challenges the notion that international relations as we know them emerged through the peace of Westphalia.]
- Lawson, George and Robbie Shilliam (2009) ‘Beyond hypocrisy? Debating the ‘fact’ and ‘value’ of sovereignty in contemporary world politics’. *International Politics* 46: 657–670. [This article reviews the recent literature on Westphalian sovereignty.]
- Kayaoğlu, Turan. ‘Westphalian Eurocentricism in International Relations Theory,’ *International Studies Review* 12 (2010): 193-217. [This article discusses the

explanatory blind spots created if we assume that Westphalia is the starting point for IR].

- Blaney, David L. and Naeem Inayatullah (2002) 'The Westphalian Deferral'. *International Studies Review* 2(2): 29-64. [This article argues that the Westphalian system did not solve the problem of difference in the international order but merely transformed it.]

Lecture 18: Sovereignty and the Nation-State

What does modern sovereignty entail, exactly? And why is it attached to the nation-state and not other forms of political authority? In this lecture, we discuss definitions of modern sovereignty and consider the systemic implications of arranging international politics around this principle.

Core Reading:

- Tilly, Charles (1985) War Making and State Making as Organized Crime. In *Bringing the State Back In* edited by Peter Evans, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [A classic argument about the relationship between war-making and the emergence of the European nation-state]
- Weber, Max (1919) Politics as a Vocation (Lecture). <http://anthropos-lab.net/wp/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/Weber-Politics-as-a-Vocation.pdf> [Origin of the most commonly used definition of a state]

Supplementary Reading:

- Biersteker, Thomas (2002) State, Sovereignty and Territory, in Walter Carlsnaes et al., editors, *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage, pp. 157-176. [Primer on IR understandings of sovereignty.]
- Ruggie, John Gerard (1993) Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations. *International Organization* 47: 139-174. [This essay provides an overview of the developments that gave rise to 'modernity' and the modern state.]
- Benton, Laura (2010) *A Search for Sovereignty*. Cambridge University Press. [Explains the rise of territoriality as a feature of sovereignty]
- Branch, Jordan (2012) "Colonial Reflection" and Territoriality: The Peripheral Origins of Sovereign Statehood. *European Journal of International Relations* 18(2): 277-97. [This article argues that the modern states system resulted from interactions between Europe and the rest of the world.]
- Bartelson, Jens (2009) *Visions of World Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Esp. Chapters 3 and 4. [Explains the processes by which the nation-state were constructed]
- Anderson, Benedict (2006) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso. [Classic text on understanding nation as an imagined political community].
- Gellner, Ernest (1980) *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press. [Classic text linking the emergence of nationalism to the industrial revolution.]
- Tilly, Charles (1992) *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990–1992*. Wiley-Blackwell. [Book version of the "states make war, war makes states" argument].

Challenges to the Sovereignty Principle

Like any other political arrangement, the modern sovereignty principle has created particular winners and losers, and exists more comfortably with certain economic and social

arrangements than others. The next three lectures provide snapshots of international political practices or experiments that test the modern sovereignty principle.

Lecture 19: Intervention – From R2P to Crimea

Some authors have argued that in the modern order the sovereignty principle has been breached more often than it is honoured: formal empires survived well into the twentieth century, and current practices of humanitarian intervention are seen by some as a continuation of this tradition. This lecture focuses on two recent events – the UN authorised intervention in Libya in 2011 and Russia’s annexation of Crimea in 2014 – to ponder whether the modern sovereignty principle has been significantly eroded recently.

Core Reading:

- Krasner, Stephen (1999) *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton University Press. Read Chapter 1: “Sovereignty and Its Discontents”. [Overview of the different definitions of sovereignty and the ways they are violated]
- Brockmeier, Sarah, Oliver Stuenkel & Marcos Tourinho (2016) The Impact of the Libya Intervention Debates on Norms of Protection. *Global Society* 30(1): 113-133. [Overview of the use of R2P in Libya and repercussions]
- Buchan, Russell and Nicholas Tsagourias (2017) The Crisis in Crimea and the Principle of Non-Intervention. *International Community Law Review* 19 (2-3) 165-193. [Law journal article on how to understand Russia’s annexation of Crimea. Also gives the background of the case]

Supplementary Reading:

- Weiss, Thomas G. (2004) The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era. *Security Dialogue* 35(2): 135-153. [Explains the history and evolution of humanitarian intervention].
- Bellamy, Alex J. (2009) Realizing the Responsibility to Protect. *International Studies Perspectives* 10(2): 111–128. [Overview of the implementation challenges of R2P]
- Mamdani, Mahmood (2010) Responsibility to Protect or Right to Punish? *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 4(1): 53-67. [A critical perspective on R2P]
- Dunne, Tim (2013) ‘Internationalism and Interventionism’ in Tim Dunne and Trine Flockhart, eds. *Liberal World Orders*. British Academy Scholarship Online. [Primer on interventionism as an approach.]
- Edward Keene (2013) International Hierarchy and the Origins of the Modern Practice of Intervention. *Review of International Studies* 39(5): 1077-90. [‘This article argues that hierarchy plays an important role in shaping the practice of intervention, and that the changing nature of international hierarchy is a crucial part of the story of how the modern practice of intervention emerged.’]
- Averre, Derek and Lance Davies (2015) Russia, humanitarian intervention and the Responsibility to Protect: the case of Syria. *International Affairs* 91(4): 813-834. [Extends the debates to the case of Syria].

Lecture 20: IOs/Globalisation & the Significance of Brexit

Another challenge to nation-state sovereignty comes from efforts to give more authority to supra-national organisations and/or to do away with national borders to facilitate the more efficient movement of capital, labour and goods. This lecture discusses the history and the logic of such efforts, from the League of Nations to the EU and WTO, and considers to what extent they have challenged the authority of the nation-state. Or is Brexit an indication that such efforts have reached their limit?

Core Reading:

- Strange, Susan (1995) The Defective State. *Daedalus* 124 (2, What Future for the State?): 55-74. [Classic overview of the changes and challenges globalisation brings to bear on the nation-state].
- Pettifor, Ann (2016) Brexit and its Consequences. *Globalizations* 14(1): 127-132. [Brexit is too recent for there to have emerged a settled academic literature on it. This is an example of article that sees Brexit as a popular backlash against globalization].
- Morgan, Jamie (2016) Brexit: Be Careful What You Wish For? *Globalizations* 14(1): 118-126. [This article argues that it is unlikely that Brexit will solve the grievances that resulted in Brexit, because those grievances are rooted in trends that transcend the EU].

Supplementary Reading:

- Barnett, Michael & Martha Finnemore (1999). The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations. *International Organization*, 53(4), 699-732. [Overview of the IR literature on IOs and the ways they constrain state behaviour].
- Martin, Lisa L. and Beth A. Simmons (2002) International Organizations and Institutions, in Walter Carsnaes et al., editors, *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage, pp. 192-211. [Primer on international organizations].
- Risse, Thomas (2002) Transnational Actors and World Politics, in Walter Carsnaes et al., editors, *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage, pp. 255-274. [Primer on transnational actors].
- Habermas, Jürgen (1999) The European Nation-State and the Pressures of Globalization. *New Left Review* 235: 46. [Classic article by a leading philosopher on the pressures of globalisation].
- Mann, Michael (1997) Has globalization ended the rise and rise of the nation-state? *Review of International Political Economy* 4(3): 472-96. [Classic article by a leading sociologist on the pressures of globalisation].
- Thompson, Helen (2016) Between Scylla and Charybdis. *Juncture* 23(2): 111-115. [Essay explaining policy drivers of Brexit].
- Jensen, Mads Dagnis and Holly Snaith (2016) When politics prevails: the political economy of a Brexit. *Journal of European Public Policy* 23(9): 1302 – 1310. [An article about the politics of Brexit].
- Worth, Owen (2016) Reviving Hayek's dream. *Globalizations* 14(1): 104-109. [An article arguing that Brexit was not generated by anti-market forces but the opposite].

Lecture 21: Alternatives to Modern Sovereignty – Anarchists to ISIS

Extending back to the nineteenth century, terrorist organisations have often had alternative conceptions of sovereignty. Nineteenth century anarchists, for instance, rejected the nation-state model in favour of individual authority. In the contemporary order, radical Islamist organisations have advocated alternative models of sovereignty organised around the Caliphate and the religious community of *umma*. This lecture focuses on the sovereignty models advocated (and practiced) by Al Qaeda and ISIS to consider whether they truly signal a departure from the Westphalian model.

Core Reading:

- Zarakol, Ayşe (2011) What Makes Terrorism Modern? Terrorism, Legitimacy, and the International System. *Review of International Studies* 37(5): 2311-36. [An argument

as to why some types of terrorism challenge modern notions of sovereignty and others do not].

- Wood, Graeme (2015) “What ISIS Really Wants”, *The Atlantic*. March. <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2015/03/what-isis-really-wants/384980/> [Controversial article that takes ISIS at its word.]
- Hasan, Mehdi (2015) How Islamic Is the Islamic State? Not at All. What *The Atlantic* got wrong about ISIS. *The New Statesman*. March 13. [One of the responses to the Wood article] <http://www.newstatesman.com/world-affairs/2015/03/mehdi-hasan-how-islamic-islamic-state>

Supplementary Reading:

- Devji, Faisal (2015) ISIS: Haunted by Sovereignty. *Spiked*. December. [Good essay on how to understand the relationship of ISIS to the modern concept of sovereignty].
- McDonald, Kevin (2014) Isis jihadis aren’t medieval – they are shaped by modern western philosophy. *The Guardian*, September 9. [Short op-ed arguing that ISIS is modern.]
- Hashim, Ahmed S. (2014) The Islamic State: From al-Qaeda Affiliate to Caliphate. *Middle East Policy* 21(4): 69-83. [Overview of the rise of ISIS]
- Cronin, Audrey Kurth (2015) ISIS is not a terrorist group. *Foreign Affairs* 94: 87. [Distinguishing ISIS from al-Qaeda].
- Rapoport, David C. (2001) The Fourth Wave: September 11 in the history of terrorism. *Current History* December: 419-424. [Summarising the classic argument on how to periodise different manifestations of terrorism.]
- Chailand, Gerard (2007) and Arnaud Blin, eds., *The History of Terrorism*. University of California Press. [Comprehensive overview of the history of terrorism].
- Mueller, John and Mark Stewart (2016) Misoverestimating ISIS: Comparisons with al-Qaeda. *Perspectives on Terrorism* 10(4): 32-41.

SAMPLE ESSAY QUESTIONS: (Relevant lectures/topics are suggested for each question; students may, of course, draw on any lectures/topics in writing their essays.)

1. What is the ‘Westphalian order’ in international politics? (Lecture 17)
2. What does the modern concept of sovereignty (and state) entail? (Lecture 18)
3. Which one poses the greater threat to the modern sovereignty principle: the intervention in Libya or the annexation of Crimea? (Lecture 19)
4. Should we understand Brexit as a moment when the nation-state has reasserted itself against the forces of globalisation and/or the increasing authority of international organisations? (Lecture 20)
5. Does ISIS (or al-Qaeda – pick one) present a real challenge to our understanding and practice of modern sovereignty? (Lecture 21)

Module V: International Politics and Systemic Change

Lecturer: Ayşe Zarakol

Systemic change is one of the major concerns of international relations scholars, as was first raised in Module I. While some argue that international politics is defined by systemic anarchy and thus limit possibility of change to shifting polarity within an essentially stable system, others see a more fundamental break between the modern order and its historical

antecedents, and thus allow for the possibility of a more radical end to the contemporary order. In this module, we consider the arguments for both.

Lecture 22: Rise of the West?

Arguably, one of the most crucial defining aspects of the modern international order is that it has been dominated by Western powers since at least the nineteenth century. In this lecture, we review the historical evolution of this status quo, focusing especially on the nineteenth century, when many of the features of the current arrangement emerged.

Core Reading:

- Buzan, Barry and George Lawson (2013) The global transformation: the nineteenth century and the making of modern international relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 57(3): 620-634. [This article argues that all of fundamental characteristics of the modern international order emerged in the nineteenth century. (There is a book version that develops the argument further – see supplementary readings).]
- Goldstone, Jack (2000) 'The Rise of the West or Not? A Revision to Socio-Economic History,' *Sociological Theory* 18(2): 175-94. [This article on the 'Rise of the West' makes an argument for the importance of contingent and accidental factors in history.]

Supplementary Reading:

- Anievas, Alexander and Nişancıoğlu, Kerem (2013) 'What's at Stake in the Transition Debate? Rethinking the Origins of Capitalism and the "Rise of the West".' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 42(1): pp. 78-102. [This article challenges the endogenously driven accounts for the rise of capitalism in Europe.]
- Buzan, Barry and George Lawson (2015) *The Global Transformation*. Cambridge University Press. Part I and II [Book version]
- Goldstone, Jack (1987) 'Cultural Orthodoxy, Risk, and Innovation: The Divergence of East and West in the Early Modern World'. *Sociological Theory* 5(2): 119-35.
- Hobson, John M. (2004) *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 12. [Hobson underlines the 'Eastern' contributions to the 'Rise of the West']
- Kidd, Colin (2004) 'Hybridity' *London Review of Books* 26(2): 14-15. [Review of Bayly's *Birth of the Modern World*, a classic text.]
- Pomeranz, Kenneth (2000) *The Great Divergence*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. [Pomeranz argues that Europe's nineteenth-century divergence from the Old World owes much to the fortunate location of coal, which substituted for timber.]
- Zarakol, Ayşe (2014) 'What made the modern world hang together: socialisation or stigmatisation?' *International Theory* 6(2): 311-332. [An argument about the role of social mechanisms in the spread of Western order around the globe. Also see Zarakol (2011) *After Defeat*. Cambridge University Press.]

Lecture 23: Great Powers and Debates about Polarity

The modern international order may have been dominated by Western powers for the last two centuries, but it has not always been dominated by the same ones. Some scholars argue that the main shifts in the system have been around the identity and number of great powers, from European dominated multipolarity in late nineteenth century to bipolarity of the Cold War to the unipolarity of the post-Cold War years. This lecture reviews the arguments about polarity and implications for system stability.

Core Reading:

- Waltz, Kenneth (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. Waveland Press. Chapter 6: Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power. [Foundational text for structural realism, making the argument that the only system level change possible in international relations is in the number of great powers.]
- Levy, Jack S. and William R. Thompson (2006) Hegemonic Threats and Great Power Balancing in Europe, 1495 – 1999. *Security Studies* 14(1): 1-33. [In addition to its own substantive contribution, the article provides a good overview of balance-of-power theory].

Supplementary Reading:

- Schroeder, Paul W. (1994) "Historical Reality vs. Neo-Realist Theory," *International Security* 19 (1) ; see also below
- Schroeder, Paul W. (2003) Why Realism Does Not Work Well for International History (Whether or Not It Represents a Degenerate IR Research Strategy), in John A. Vasquez and Colin Elman, eds. *Realism and the Balancing of Power: A New Debate*. Pearson. [Historian questioning the realist reading of history from which balance-of-power theories are derived.]
- Wagner, R. Harrison (1993) What Was Bipolarity? *International Organization* 47(1) (1993): 77–106. [This article questions received wisdom on the bipolarity of the Cold War years]
- Webb, Michael C. and Stephen D. Krasner (2009) Hegemonic Stability Theory: An Empirical Assessment. *Review of International Studies* 15(2): 183-189. [Provides an overview of HST, a theory about the benefits of unipolarity, and empirically tests it.]
- Wohlforth, William C. (2003) Measuring Power—and the Power of Theories, in John A. Vasquez and Colin Elman, eds. *Realism and the Balancing of Power: A New Debate*. Pearson. [Article about how to measure power.]
- Baldwin, David A. (2002), Power and International Relations, in Walter Carlsnaes et al., editors, *Handbook of International Relations*. London: Sage. [Another primer on how power is understood in IR.]

Lecture 24: Structural Cleavages – North/South & East/West

When we look beyond the world of Great Powers, many observers of international politics often refer to North/South and East/West cleavages, the manifestations of which we can also see in terms such as the "Global South"; "Developing Countries" or "Third World". What do these cleavages entail and where do they come from? This lecture reviews the historical evolution of these fault-lines and discusses their implications for contemporary politics.

Core Reading:

- Wallerstein, Immanuel 1976. "A World-System Perspective on the Social Sciences" *The British Journal of Sociology* 27 (3): 343 – 352. [Summary of the World Systems Perspective, which argues that the real division in the world is not between nation-states but between the core, semi-periphery and periphery of the world economy]
- Lustick, Ian (1997). The Absence of Middle Eastern Great Powers: Political "Backwardness" in Historical Perspective. *International Organization* 51(4): 653-683. [Argues that Western intervention is an obstacle to political development in the Middle East in the Tillyian sense]
- Zarakol, Ayşe (2011) *After Defeat: How the East Learned to Live with the West*. Cambridge University Press. Introduction. [An argument about the existence of a social hierarchy between the West and the East in the modern order].

Supplementary Reading:

- Escobar, Arturo (2011) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*. Princeton University Press. Chapter 2. [The Tale of Three Worlds]
- Zarakol, Ayşe (2011) *After Defeat: How the East Learned to Live with the West*. Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1 and 2. [Explaining the emergence of social hierarchies in the international system].
- Mohammed Ayoob (1989) The Third World in the System of States: Acute Schizophrenia or Growing Pains? *International Studies Quarterly* 33 1: 67 – 79.
- Dirlik, Arif (2007) Global South: Predicament and Promise. *The Global South* 1(1): 12-23. [Overview of the development of the concept of 'global south' and an argument about China's possible leadership role]
- Rist, Gilbert (2004) *The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith*. Zed Books. [Places changing ideas around development in historical perspective].
- Prashad, Vijay (2008) *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*. [Historical overview of Third Worldism].

Lecture 25: Rising Powers

In recent years, there has been a lot of attention on so-called "rising powers", especially on China but also on the BRICS in general. How do we define "rising powers"? Do they pose a challenge to the modern international order? Is Russia a "rising power" or declining one? Should we welcome a multipolar system or fear it?

Core Reading:

- Ikenberry, John G. (2008) The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive? *Foreign Affairs* 87(1): 23-37. [Optimistic take by a liberal on the rise of China.]
- Lake, David A. (2006) American Hegemony and the Future of East-West Relations. *International Studies Perspectives* 7: 23-30. [Suggestions as to how the US should deal with the rise of China]
- Schweller, Randall L. and Xiaoyu Pu (2011) After Unipolarity: China's Visions of International Order in an Era of US Decline. *International Security* 36(1): 41-72. [Sample IR article dealing with the rise of China.]

Supplementary Reading:

- Chase-Dunn, Christopher (2010) *Adam Smith in Beijing: A World-Systems Perspective* [Review Essay] *Historical Materialism* 18: 39-51. [A World-Systems take on the rise of China]
- Layne, Christopher (2012) This Time It's Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana. *International Studies Quarterly* 56(1): 203-13. [Sample IR article predicting the end of American hegemony.]
- Ruchir Sharma (2012) Broken BRICs: Why the Rest Stopped Rising? *Foreign Affairs*, November/December. Also review "The Rise of the Rest" Collection from *Foreign Affairs*. [Argues that the BRICs are no longer rising.]
- Kang, David C. (2007) *China Rising: Peace, Power, and Order in East Asia*. Columbia University Press. [Arguing that the rise of China is not a threat to global order].
- Kang, David C. (2003) Getting Asia Wrong: The Need for New Analytical Frameworks. *International Security* 27.4 (2003): 57-85. [An argument that theoretical frameworks derived from European experience cannot predict Chinese behaviour.]
- Fortescue, Stephen (2017) Can Russia Afford to be a Great Power? Lowy Institute Report. <https://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/can-russia-afford-be-great->

[power](#) [Decent primer on the ways Russian ambition (and success) in great power politics exceeds its material capability].

Lecture 26: A Post-Western Order?

Building on Lecture 24, in this lecture we will ask if the “Rise of the Rest” means something more significant than shifting polarity and whether we are nearing the end of the Western dominated international order. What would a post-Western order look like? Is it the same thing as a post-Westphalian order?

Core Reading:

- Immanuel Wallerstein (2002) The Eagle Has Crash Landed. *Foreign Policy* 131: 60-68. [Essay predicting that the end of capitalism is near (predates the Global Financial Crisis)]
- Roger C. Altman (2013) The Fall and Rise of the West. *Foreign Affairs*, January/February. [Argues that the West emerge stronger from the Financial Crisis.]
- Mann, Michael (2013) The End May be Nigh, but for Whom? In *Does Capitalism Have a Future?* Oxford University Press. [Argues that capitalism will survive in a modified form.]
- Mishra, Pankaj (2016) Welcome to the age of anger. *The Guardian*. December 8. <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/dec/08/welcome-age-anger-brexit-trump> [A stock-taking essay of our times]
- Buzan, Barry and George Lawson (2015) *The Global Transformation*. Cambridge University Press. Chapter 9. [Overviews of post-Western world scenarios]

Supplementary Reading:

- Abu-Lughod, Janet (1989) *Before European Hegemony*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [Classic text on the world before European hegemony]
- Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey (2006) The Postcolonial Moment In Security Studies. *Review of International Studies* 32: 329–352. [Argument for a postcolonial take on IR]
- Harvey, David (2015) *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism*. London: Profile Books. [Primer on the arguments for the end of capitalism]
- Mitchell, Timothy (2011) *Carbon Democracy: Political Power in the Age of Oil*. London: Verso. Introduction & Conclusion. [Argues that the democratic model in the West cannot survive the end the exhaustion of oil and associated climate change.]
- Phillips, Andrew (2010) *War, Religion and Empire: The Transformation of International Orders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 2 & 10. [Importance of religion in international affairs]
- Phillips, Andrew and Jason C. Sharman (2015) Explaining Durable Diversity in International Systems: State, Company, and Empire in the Indian Ocean. *International Studies Quarterly* 59(3): 436-448. [Historical argument for the sustainability and durability of diverse international systems]
- Essays by Wallerstein, Collins, Derluigan and Calhoun in *Does Capitalism Have a Future?* Oxford University Press.

SAMPLE ESSAY QUESTIONS: (Relevant lectures/topics are suggested for each question; students may, of course, draw on any lectures/topics in writing their essays.)

1. What is the best explanation for the “great divergence”? (Lecture 22)
2. What kind of great power polarity describes our current moment? (Lecture 23)

3. Assume for the purposes of this essay that the North-South divide is primarily an economic hierarchy and the West-East one is a social-cultural one. Which of these hierarchies generate more conflicts and why? (Lecture 24)
4. Which one is a greater threat to stability: American decline or China's rise? (Lecture 25)
5. Are we at nearing the end of the Western international order? (Lecture 26)

Sample Cross-Cutting Questions:

1. Does international law shape the behavior of states?
2. Have non-state actors become more important than states in international politics?
3. Are there certain aspects of international politics that can be understood without attention to gender?
4. Is the distinction between domestic and international politics still useful in today's era of globalization?
5. Is the legacy of colonialism more important in terms of its impact on domestic politics or international politics?
6. Does the international economy operate independently of international politics?
7. Will violence always be part of international politics, even if its precise form changes over time?
8. Is contemporary international political order defined by anarchy or hierarchy among states?

2017-2018 SAMPLE EXAM

A) Cross-Cutting Questions

Each student must answer ONE of these questions. Material can be drawn from any of the modules.

- 1) What role should morality play in international politics?
- 2) Is violence necessarily a part of international politics?
- 3) Does imperialism still shape our political world today?
- 4) Which actors matter in international politics?

B) Module-Specific Questions

Each student must answer TWO of these questions.

- 1) Did the end of the Cold War change everything, or did 9/11 change everything? Or neither?
- 2) How does our understanding of 9/11 change – if at all – when we view it from perspectives outside the West?
- 3) Is international law gendered?
- 4) Is terrorism always a form of *political* violence?
- 5) Does military intervention have to be authorized by the United Nations Security Council in order to be legitimate?
- 6) Are human rights able to be enforced?
- 7) If we are facing a planetary crisis today, who or what is to blame for it?
- 8) Is sovereignty on the wane today?

- 9) Did the attainment of formal sovereignty fundamentally change Third World states' status in international order?
- 10) Is ISIS a harbinger of the future or a relic of the past?
- 11) Does China's rise pose a challenge to the study of international politics?
- 12) Is there a particular period from history that can help illuminate the future of international politics?

POL2 2017 Exam Questions

[Note that some of these questions refer to modules included in 2016-17 but not included this year]

A) Cross-Cutting Questions

Each student must answer ONE of these questions. Material can be drawn from any of the modules.

- 1) Can the exercise of power produce positive outcomes in international relations, or is it always a means of dominating weaker groups and states?
- 2) To what extent do legacies of colonialism still shape international politics?
- 3) "A country that demands moral perfection of itself as a test of its foreign policy will achieve neither perfection nor security". (Henry Kissinger). Do you agree with Kissinger's assessment of international politics?
- 4) Are we in a post-Westphalian age?

B) Module-Specific Questions

Each student must answer TWO of these questions.

- 5) To what degree can cultural difference help explain international conflict?
- 6) Is the War on Terror gendered?
- 7) "The best thing for a state to do that wants to promote economic development is to get out of the way". Assess the validity of this statement.
- 8) "All terrorism is local". Assess the validity of this statement.
- 9) Since established democracies do not fight each other, promoting democracy abroad offers the surest path to "perpetual peace". Do you agree with this statement?

10) Would the 2003 Iraq War have been just, had it been authorized by the UN Security Council?

11) How does avoiding Eurocentrism in the study of international relations change our understanding of contemporary international order?

12) Is the state a unitary, rational actor?

13) Is "leadership" essential for achieving cooperation through diplomacy?

14) Does a state's public diplomacy add to its international power and influence in any meaningful way?

15) Can international criminal justice avoid being politicised?

16) Is it true that climate change "changes everything", as Naomi Klein puts it, when it comes to international politics?