



© A.V. Khudaykulova, 2020

© MGIMO University, 2020

This syllabus is designed in accordance with the MGIMO Educational Standard for the Bachelor Program in International Affairs.

Author \_\_\_\_\_ Associate Prof. A.V. Khudaykulova

Director MGIMO Library \_\_\_\_\_ M.V. Reshetnikova

## **PART 1. COURSE DESCRIPTION AND TEACHING METHODS**

### **1.1 The place and role of the course in the program of study:**

The course “Theory of international relations” is an under-graduate level introduction to international relations theory. It aims at providing students with a broad theoretical background in the field, in preparation for further advanced training, research, or qualifying examinations in IR.

### **1.2 The course goals and objectives:**

IR research is guided by paradigms, particular ways of looking at international relations. Current international politics is full of dramatic events: wars, conflicts, revolutions, crisis, interventions and popular campaigns for human rights. IR theory helps to understand and explain those events by equipping students with the appropriate conceptual instruments. Most debates over substantive issues of international politics are best seen through theoretical lenses. The course covers main theoretical traditions in the study international relations - Realism (Classical//Neo/Postclassical), Liberalism (Classical//Neo/Postclassical), Marxism (Classical//Neo/Postclassical), Critical theory, Constructivism, Postmodernism, as well as academic debates that comprise the IR theoretical landscape. Understanding them will give a necessary foundation for a deep investigation of some of the major topics of IR research.

The course provides an overview of a wide array of theories of international relations, from the major debate of (neo)realism vs. (neo)liberalism to the more recent challenge to rationalist explanations by constructivism and more "radical" challengers such as (neo)Marxism. Through in-depth discussion, students will explore, compare and debate the merits of theories to develop a solid grasp of the different theoretical perspectives and to establish their own theoretical preferences. In each case, we will locate the historical context of these theories, show the way how they can contribute to a better understanding of how international politics works, and identify their strong and weak points.

Accepting that theory is nothing more than a coherent, logical explanation for some phenomenon, the course will also examine contending theoretical approaches to some prominent issue areas within international relations: international order, war and peace, states, structure of the international system, different international systems, security. Hence it gives an understanding of today’s international system and its major problems.

The course pursues the following **objectives**:

1. To introduce the theoretical approaches to international relations and significant debates across theoretical paradigms
2. To orient students to understand the key theoretical and methodological distinctions that inform research into international relations
3. To demonstrate how theory provides a road map and methods which help to examine international events and processes

4. To explore the potential and limits of theoretical studies in IR
5. To offer students the opportunity to develop their own positions on different theoretical schools and key disciplinary issues
6. To give the students a concise picture of the Russian theory of international relations

At all times, students will be asked a question – How close are the links between the theories discussed and actual events and processes in international relations?

### **1.3 Learning outcomes:**

By the end of the course, students should be able to:

1. Be aware of different theoretical ways of seeing and understanding international affairs
2. Evaluate the advantages and difficulties of IR theories in comparison to each other
3. Discuss critically, and write knowledgeably about major IR theories, relating not only to historical processes, but also to current international events
4. Identify leading authors in the IR field and the theories they are identified with
5. Possess the means to apply IR theories, to link theory and practice and show how theory and practice intertwine in constituting mainstream IR theories
6. Apply theoretical frameworks to understanding practical IR issues, think theoretically about world politics and explain world it from different theoretical perspectives
7. Learn how to think and write critically about key debates in IR theory and crucial topics of world politics
8. Enhance their analytical skills in terms of developing and presenting their own arguments in informed discussion

### **1.4. Course requirements and evaluation:**

#### *Format:*

The format of this course shall be basically a lecture mixed with seminar. Lectures provide an overview of a particular topic (presentations will be provided for each lecture). Seminars consist of three elements: a presentation done by students; a discussant will comment briefly on the topic at hand, raising issues not addressed by the presenter and offering an alternative view; a class discussion on the material read and presented. All students will take 3 in-class quizzes within a course. These will be based on the readings for the day the quiz is held.

Attendance and active involvement in class discussions are essential to success in the course. Students will be required to attend not less than 90% of classes and to be prepared for class discussions on a regular basis. Active participation of students in class discussion is most encouraged.

#### *Reading:*

Lectures and the required reading complement each other, they are not substitutes, and you will need to do all the readings. This is a reading intensive course. So, the reading load for the course is heavy. In order to properly participate in class, students

must do all the readings prior to each session. The readings are varied. The reading list represents both traditional and modern writings in IR that will introduce you not only to theoretical schools and paradigms, but also to different methodologies, substantive issues on international politics.

Although there is no single textbook assigned for the course, it is specially recommended to read the following list of textbooks:

1. Scott Burchill, Andrew Linklater, Richard Devetak, Jack Donnelly, Matthew Paterson, Christian Reus-Smit and Jacqui True. *Theories of International Relations*. Third edition. 2005.
2. Jiirg Martin Gabriel. *Worldviews and Theories of International Relations*. 2010.
3. Robert Jackson Georg Sørensen. *Introduction to International Relations Theories and Approaches*. Fifth Edition. 2015.
4. Martin Griffiths, Steven C. Roach and M. Scott Solomon. *Fifty Key Thinkers in International Relations*. Second Edition. 2010.

Students should become aware of the periodical literature in the field and should be familiar with the following key international relations journals – World Politics, International Organization, Foreign Policy, International Studies Quarterly, Foreign Affairs, European Journal of International Relations, International Security, Review of International Studies, Security Studies.

The 2020 Theory of International Relations syllabus includes only material that is accessible online. All reading and journal articles can be found using links listed in the syllabus. Preparedness involves not only reading the materials, but also taking notes to use in class. The format of these notes is completely up to the student, but they should cover the most important themes in the readings as well as some critiques and questions. A key purpose of this kind of work is that you are able to read theory critically. An essential part of such critical reading is the ability to formulate a compelling interpretation of a text.

*Presentation:*

Students will also be required to prepare not less than 1 presentation individually (or in team) and to present in due time 3 control written tests. The length of presentation is preferably 15 minutes and should not exceed 20 minutes at maximum. Presentations are expected to offer a critical discussion of the reading material, present a summary of the main arguments of the reading, a discussion of how the reading relates to the broader themes of the course, and questions for discussion. A one-page handout is also required.

## PART 2. COURSE CONTENT

### 2.1 Types of work

Types of work	Academic hours
<b>Total</b>	<b>72</b>
Total for lectures, seminars	<b>32</b>
Lectures	20
Seminars	16
<b>Homework</b>	<b>40</b>
Presentations	20
Preparation for lectures, seminars and spoken exam	20
<b>Course works</b>	-
Course assessment	72

### 2.2 Course outline

Course Outline	Academic hours			
	Lectures	Seminars	Homework	Academic hours per topic
<b>Topic 1. International relations as a discipline: its evolution and purposes. Course introduction and overview</b>	<b>2</b>	-	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>
Lecture 1.1. Introduction to IR theory as a field	2	-	2	4
<b>Topic 2. Competing theoretical traditions in the study of international relations</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>60</b>
Lecture 2.1. Classical realism, neorealism, neo-classical realism in IR	4	-	2	6
Seminar 2.1. Realism: power and structure	-	4	2	6
Lecture 2.2. Liberalism (idealism), neoliberalism, neo-classical liberalism in IR	4	-	2	6
Seminar 2.2. Liberal theories of integration, collective security and regimes	-	4	2	6
Lecture 2.3. The first debate: realism vs. idealism. The classical origins of the debate. The neo-neo debate or synthesis: yesterday and today	2	-	2	4
Lecture 2.4. Marxism and critical theory. Marxism after Marx: dependency theory and world-system theory	2	-	2	4

Seminar 2.4. Post-marxism: class, social forces and emancipation	-	4	2	6
Lecture 2.5. Constructivism: the social construction of IR	2	-	2	4
Seminar 2.5. Constructivism: culture, norms, and identity	-	2	2	6
Lecture 2.6. Reconstructing IR: postmodernism	2	-	2	4
Seminar 2.6. Is inter-paradigmatic dialogue possible in IR?	-	2	2	4

## 2.3. COURSE CONTENT

### Topic 1. International relations as a discipline: its evolution and purposes. Course introduction and overview

#### Lecture 1.1. Introduction to IR theory as a field

This introductory session will provide an overview over the field of IR theory and basic theories in IR. The session begins with a discussion of what it is we are trying to accomplish in this field and of how best we can get there. Theories will be analysed as tools for understanding reality. The focus mainly will be done on traditional theories, which present a familiar picture of international politics as dominated by states and perhaps a few other inter-state structures, and in which national interests have been the driving force. Recent theoretical developments challenge the basis on which traditional theories have been constructed and seek to reconstruct IR in a different way. This raises a question about what theories are for.

The session begins by introducing the notion of ‘paradigm’. It explores if we can know the world without one and considers the nature and purpose of theory in the study of IR. The lecture will also introduce the relationship between theory and practice. We will also focus on the level analysis, objective and subjective perception and structure vs. agency.

The introductory lecture will explain how the course is organized, with particular reference to the reading list. Students will be offered a choice of topics for their respective seminar presentations.

*Questions:* What is international relations as a field? What is theory? What is international relations theory? What do we expect from theorizing international politics? What can theory perform and what not? What are the levels of analysis one needs to incorporate in good theory? What is the significance of different levels of analysis? At what level do the main forces of international relations operate? Why are they important? Can individuals, groups, or states change how states interact? Do individuals, groups, or states see the international system similarly or is it ambiguous? What do international relations scholars bother about? What are theories of IR good for? What are their purposes? What kind of analytical frameworks can we use to organize IR theories and how do they speak to one another? What great debates shape IR as a discipline?

Why is theory relevant to how we “perceive” international relations? What is the role of IR scholar in the world?

### **Consolidated Reading List:**

#### Textbooks:

1. Elias J., Sutch P. *International Relations. The Basics* – Routledge, 2007.
2. *International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity* / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
3. *The Globalization of World Politics* / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

#### Essential Readings:

1. Elman C., “How Not to Be Lakatos Intolerant: Appraising Progress in IR Research”, *International Studies Quarterly* June 2002, Volume 46, Issue 2, pp. 231–262  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2478.00231/pdf>
2. Schmidt B. “On the History and Historiography of IR”, in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations*, pp.3-22  
[http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/9396\\_008772ch01.pdf](http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/9396_008772ch01.pdf)
3. Singer J.D., “The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations”, *World Politics*, October 1961, Volume 14, No. 1, pp.77-92  
[http://sitemaker.umich.edu/jdsinger/files/the\\_level\\_of\\_analysis\\_problem\\_in\\_international\\_politics.pdf](http://sitemaker.umich.edu/jdsinger/files/the_level_of_analysis_problem_in_international_politics.pdf)
4. Tickner A., Tsygankov A., “Responsible Scholarship in International Relations: a Symposium”. *International Studies Review*, December 2008, Volume 10, pp. 661-666  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2008.00823.x/pdf>
5. Walt S.M., “One world, many theories”, *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1998, No. 110, Special Edition  
[http://www.columbia.edu/itc/sipa/S6800/courseworks/foreign\\_pol\\_walt.pdf](http://www.columbia.edu/itc/sipa/S6800/courseworks/foreign_pol_walt.pdf)

#### Additional Readings:

1. Barnett M., Sikkink K., “From International Relations to Global Society”, in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Chapter 3. pp. 62-83
2. Dune T., Hansen L., Wight C. “The End of International Relations Theory”, *European Journal of International Relations*, September 2013, Volume 19, No. 3, pp. 405-425  
<https://timjdunne.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/end-of-ir-theory-final-5-6-2013.pdf>
3. Grenier F., “The Theory-Practice Debate and Cultures of Scholarship in IR”, *International Researches*, June 2013, Volume 2, Issue 2  
<http://iresearcher.org/P%202,%2013-22.pdf>

Guzini S., “The Ends of IR Theory: Stages of Reflexivity and Modes of Theorizing”, *European Journal of International Relations*, September 2013, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.521-541 <http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/19/3/521.full.pdf+html>

4. Rosenau J., “Thinking Theory Thoroughly”, in Paul Viotti and Mark Kauppi’s, *International Relations Theory*, New York: Longman 2009, pp. 17-24 <http://euroakadeemia.ee/materjalid/Bak%20ReaderSeselgyte.pdf>

## **Topic 2. Competing theoretical traditions in the study of international relations**

### **Lecture 2.1. Classical realism, neorealism, neo-classical realism in IR**

Realism is the foundational approach of IR – heavily criticized, yet it continues to prove its durability. This session’s goal is to understand the key assumptions of realism, with special attention given to founding theorists. The main focus is on the evolution of realism and its impact on current international politics. Most of the discussion will focus on the issues of security, balance of power, anarchy and polarity. We will also make an assessment of strengths and weaknesses.

The theoretical roots of realism can be found in texts by Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Rousseau and many others, but as a fully-fledged theory of IR it is a twentieth century product. In the 1930s and 1940s, political realism took the form of a critique of idealism/utopianism, claiming to speak the truth about the grim realities of power politics in a dangerous world. Realism came to be a dominant approach to world politics among both scholars and policymakers. The American “classical realists”, Reinhold Neibuhr, George F. Kennan and especially Hans J. Morgenthau are central to this process, arguing that war is ultimately rooted in human nature. In the 1970s, neo- or structural realism, has generally replaced classical Realism. Structural realism divides into a number of different subgroups: ‘offensive realism’, ‘defensive realism’ and ‘neo-classical realism’. Structural realism of Kenneth Waltz adopted more ‘scientific’ methods, giving more space to economics, and deriving the nature of international politics from the structure of the system rather than from human nature. Despite a host of critiques from a variety of angles, Neorealism became extremely influential in the discipline of IR. John Mearsheimer is one of the strongest contemporary proponents of what he terms ‘offensive realism’, claiming that great powers think and sometimes act aggressively and that all states seek to maximize power as the best path to peace. Neoclassical realists jettison some of Waltz’s assumptions about power of structure and the unimportance of domestic politics and call for a return to realism’s classical roots. Randall Schweller: ‘neoclassical realism’ – not all states have similar interests – can be ‘status quo’ states or revisionist states. Fareed Zakaris: not all states are like ‘units’ – some are better in translating national power in state power.

### **Seminar 2.1. Realism: power and structure**

*Questions:* Is there a classical realist tradition? What place does human nature have in realism? What is meant by anarchy? What is the balance of power? Why is it so important to realists? Are there important differences between the versions of realism

offered by Carr, Morgenthau and Waltz? In what ways does neorealism represent an advance on classical realism? Which is more convincing and why? What are the commonalities and differences between Realism and Neorealism? Is the latter an advance on the former? What kind of international politics does neorealism imply? According to Mearsheimer, what are the tenets of defensive realism? Why is the security dilemma a foundational concept in the making of defensive realism? What are the tenets of offensive realism? Which does Mearsheimer think more appropriately characterizes international relations? What are the characteristics of the international system, and to what extent do systemic factors determine state behavior? Given these factors, under what conditions is international stability likeliest?

Topics for presentation:

1. Is Realism a theory of war, peace, or both?
2. Why do realist theorists doubt and even deny that progressive change is possible in international relations? Are they right or wrong?
3. Do states act only out of self-interest? Does realism preclude co-operation between states (and other actors)?

**Consolidated Reading List:**

Textbooks:

1. Elias J., Sutch P. International Relations. The Basics – Routledge, 2007.
2. International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
3. The Globalization of World Politics / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

Essential Readings:

1. Dunne T., Schmidt B.C. Realism (Chapter 7) in Baylis J., Smith S. (eds.) The Globalization of World Politics: an Introduction to International Relations. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. pp. 163-180
2. Tang S., “The Security Dilemma: a Conceptual Analysis”, *Security Studies*, September 2009, Volume 18, No. 3, pp. 587-623  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09636410903133050>
3. Taliaferro J.W., Lobell S.E., and Ripsman N.M., “Introduction: Neoclassical Realism, the State and Foreign Policy”, Cambridge University Press  
[http://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/31928/excerpt/9780521731928\\_excerpt.pdf](http://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/31928/excerpt/9780521731928_excerpt.pdf)
4. Waltz K.N., “Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory”, *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring/Summer 90, Vol. 44 Issue 1, pp.21-37  
<http://classes.maxwell.syr.edu/PSC783/Waltz44.pdf>
5. Waltz K.N., “Structural Realism after the Cold War”, *International Security*, Summer 2000, Volume 25, pp.5-41  
[http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/waltz\\_kenneth\\_v25n1.pdf](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/waltz_kenneth_v25n1.pdf)

Additional Readings:

1. Brooks S.G. “Dueling Realisms”, *International Organisation*, June 1997, Volume 51, Issue 03, pp.445-77  
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=173198&jid=INO&volumeId=51&issueId=03&aid=173197&bodyId=&membershipNumber=&societyE TOCSession=>
2. Carr E.H. “The Twenty Year’s Crisis. 1919-1939: an Introduction to the study of International Relations”. London: Macmillan. Chapters 1-3 (pp.1-40), 5-7, 9 (63-169)
3. Clausewitz von C. “On War”. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
4. Hobbes T. “Leviathan”. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-2
5. Huntington S., “The Clash of Civilizations?” *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993, Volume 72, No.3, pp.22-49  
[http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Acrobat/Huntington\\_Clash.pdf](http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Acrobat/Huntington_Clash.pdf)
6. Legro J.W., and Moravcsik A., “Is Anybody still a Realist?” *International Security*, Fall 1999, Volume 24, No. 2, pp.5-55  
<https://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/anybody.pdf>
7. Machiavelli N. “The Prince”. Chapters 5, 15, 17, 18, 21
8. Mearsheimer J., “The False promise of International Institutions”, *International Security*, Winter 1994/1995, Volume 19, No. 3, pp.5-49  
<http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0021.pdf>
9. Morgenthau H.J. “Politics among Nations”. New York: Knopf. Chapters 1-4 (pp.3-55)
10. Oren I., “The Unrealism of Contemporary Realism: the Tension between Realist Theory and Realist’s Practice”, *Perspectives on Politics*, 7:2 June 2009, Volume 7, No. 2, pp. 283-301  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPPS%2FPPS7\\_02%2FS1537592709090823a.pdf&code=276063ca561bab7e90aeca20ceafeb1](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPPS%2FPPS7_02%2FS1537592709090823a.pdf&code=276063ca561bab7e90aeca20ceafeb1)
11. Waever O., “The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations”, *International Organization*, September 1998, Volume 52, No. 04, pp 687 – 727  
[http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/sdrelint/ficheros\\_materiales/materiales035.pdf](http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/sdrelint/ficheros_materiales/materiales035.pdf)
12. Waltz K., *Theory of International Politics*, New York: Random House, 1979. Chapters 4, 5, 6

**Lecture 2.2. Liberalism (idealism), neoliberalism, neo-classical liberalism in IR**

Liberalism is the main competitor to realism in IR. The focus of this session is on the analysis of the core assumptions of liberal international thought and the evolution of liberal theories of IR. The session addresses issues of cooperation and integration in world politics, in particular, the role of regimes in issue areas in which actors’ expectations converge and sets of shared principles. Norms, rules and procedures gain importance in world politics in guiding state behaviour. The objective of this session is to explore the role that Liberalism plays – in conjunction with other theories – in defining IR.

Classical Liberalism rests on a variety of sources, John Lock, Immanuel Kant, Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham and John S. Mill, being particularly important. Liberals believed that traditional power politics were largely responsible for the war. After World War I idealists such as Woodrow Wilson attempted to prevent realist principles and practices from leading to a second world war. They prompted international cooperation through international organizations like the League of Nations, through trade and economic interaction, as well as the spread of democracy. International behaviour is linked to regime-type, liberal democracies are taken to be less warlike, although ‘democratic peace theory’ suggests that liberal regimes are only peaceful in their dealings with each other. While the outbreak of World War II discredited the liberal approach for some time, it became more prominent again in the 1970s under a variety of concepts: interdependence, transnationalism, pluralism, regime theory. In the 20th century liberalism has been largely associated with the promotion of international institutions as a means of efficient governance beyond the state. Some ideas of Liberalism resurfaced in the work of pluralists such as Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, who developed ideas of ‘complex interdependence’. These ideas crystallised into Neoliberalism. The liberal optimism of the 1990s – triumphantly proclaiming the end of history – has given way again to more pessimistic reflections on the clash of civilizations, a global war on terror and the like.

### **Seminar 2.2. Liberal theories of integration, collective security and regimes**

*Questions:* What are the main ideas of liberal IR theory? Is it fair to label liberalism as part of idealism, if idealism is to mean utopianism? What is collective security? How is it different from the balance of power? Do international institutions and regimes matter independently of great power interests or are they simply side effects of those interests? Why do liberals think that international institutions can increase the likelihood of states cooperating with each other? What features of the international system would demonstrate complex interdependence? What is the democratic peace, and what evidence exists to support it? How convincing is democratic peace theory?

#### **Topics for presentation:**

1. What are institutions, where do they come from, and what do they do? Would it be possible for international organizations (both IGOs and NGOs) to exercise independent influence in world politics?
2. What are the defining elements of international regime? How do they differ from international organization? How do we know whether an international regime “works”? Discuss one example.
3. The assumption that liberalism has indeed triumphed during the post 1945 period is vulnerable to the critique that the practices of trade, security, and development have never delivered on their promise. As a result, liberal international orders remain conveniently favorable to the most powerful states in the system. Do we have a basically liberal world today?

### Consolidated Reading List:

#### Textbooks:

1. Elias J., Sutch P. *International Relations. The Basics* – Routledge, 2007.
2. *International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity* / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
3. *The Globalization of World Politics* / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patrica Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

#### Essential Readings:

1. Dunne T., Liberalism (Chapter 8) in Baylis J., Smith S. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: an Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. pp. 186-201
2. Kant ‘Perpetual Peace’, Cobden ‘Political Writings’ and Mill ‘A Few Words on Non-Intervention’ in Chris Brown, Terry Nardin and N.J. Rengger (eds.), *International Relations in Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002
3. Keohane R., Nye J., “Power and Interdependence Revisited”, *International Organization*, Autumn 1987, Vol.44, No.4, [http://www.ri.ie.ufrj.br/intranet/arquivos/power\\_and\\_interdependece.pdf](http://www.ri.ie.ufrj.br/intranet/arquivos/power_and_interdependece.pdf)
4. Keohane R., *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World* – Routledge, 2004.

#### Additional Readings:

1. Axelrod R., Keohane O. “Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions”, *World Politics*, October 1985, Volume 38, No. 1, pp. 226-254  
<http://users.metu.edu.tr/utuba/Axelrod.pdf>
2. Ikenberry G.J., *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001) Chapters 1, 2
3. Ikenberry G.J., “Liberal Internatinalism 3:0 America and the Dilemma of Liberal World Order”, *Perspectives on Politics*, March 2009, Volume 7, No.1, pp.71-87  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPPS%2FPPS7\\_01%2FS1537592709090112a.pdf&code=flfe3cd80b16d2e4799cf8f415584175](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPPS%2FPPS7_01%2FS1537592709090112a.pdf&code=flfe3cd80b16d2e4799cf8f415584175)
4. Keohane R., Nye J., “Power and Interdependence” – Harper Collins Publishers, 1989.
5. Krasner S., “Structural causes and regime consequences: regimes as intervening variables” *International Organization*, Spring 1982, Volume 36, No. 2, pp.1-21  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2F3582\\_E81FDDE3B7D8F164CC7960C1D0BB923A\\_journals\\_INO\\_INO36\\_02\\_S0020818300018920a.pdf&cover=Y&code=9ea7ac850a4efb9fd298f403f4d38dc7](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2F3582_E81FDDE3B7D8F164CC7960C1D0BB923A_journals_INO_INO36_02_S0020818300018920a.pdf&cover=Y&code=9ea7ac850a4efb9fd298f403f4d38dc7)
6. Moravcsik A., “Taking Preferences Seriously: a Liberal Theory of International Politics”, *International Organization*, Autumn 1997, Volume 51, No. 4, pp.513-554  
<https://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/preferences.pdf>

7. Neumann I. B., Wæver O., Robert Keohane: a Contemporary Classic in The Future of International Relations. Masters in the Making? – Routledge, 2007. pp.96-122.
8. Rathbun B.C., “Is Anybody not an (International Relations) Liberal?” *Security Studies*, 2010, Volume 19, No. 1, pp.2-25  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09636410903546558>
9. Rosato S., “The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory”, *American Political Science Review*, November 2003, Volume 97, Issue 04, pp 585-602  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSR%2FPSR97\\_04%2FS0003055403000893a.pdf&code=5d01ac9221a93c0abcc11dafcdd37ae9](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSR%2FPSR97_04%2FS0003055403000893a.pdf&code=5d01ac9221a93c0abcc11dafcdd37ae9)

***Lecture 2.3. The first debate: realism vs. idealism. The classical origins of the debate. The neo-neo debate or synthesis: yesterday and today.***

This session discusses Realism and Liberalism in comparative way. The objective of this session is to establish in how far and in what ways these approaches differ and where they overlap. Which is the better explanation, realism or liberalism? Perhaps that depends upon whether we consider states to be purely self-seeking or obsessed with others. While both operate with assumption of the state as the main actor in IR, they work with different assumptions about power, cooperation, collaboration and different expectations about the input of elites and institutions in world politics.

On this basis we will be able to determine the parameters of IR as defined by these two most influential approaches.

While often posed in opposition to one another, Neorealism and Neoliberalism actually share a great deal. Robert Keohane himself has called neoliberal institutionalism as much realist as it is liberal. While neoliberal institutionalists question the conclusions realists arrive at, other scholars question the very basis for neorealist theory.

***Topics for presentation:***

1. Assuming you only had these two theoretical schools at your disposal to make sense of the world around you, which theory best describes contemporary international relations best today and why? Realism, Liberalism, or neither? Provide empirical evidence to justify your claims.
2. Are Realist and Liberal explanations competing or complementary?

***Consolidated Reading List:***

***Textbooks:***

1. Elias J., Sutch P. International Relations. The Basics – Routledge, 2007.
2. International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
3. The Globalization of World Politics / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

Essential Readings:

1. Thies C. G., “Progress, History and Identity in International Relations Theory: The Case of the Idealist-Realist Debate”, *European Journal of International Relations*, June 2002, Volume 8, No. 2, pp.147-185  
<http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/8/2/147.full.pdf+html>
2. Waever O. “The Rise and Fall of the Inter-Paradigm Debate”, in Smith S. et al eds., *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge UP, 1996.

Additional Readings:

1. Ashworth L., “Did the Realist-Idealist Debate Really Happen”, *International Relations*, April 2002, Volume 16, No. 1, pp.33-51  
<http://ire.sagepub.com/content/16/1/33.full.pdf+html>
2. Jervis R., “Realism, Neoliberalism and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate”, *International Security*, Summer 1999, Volume 24, No. 1, pp.42-63  
[http://www.rochelleterman.com/ir/sites/default/files/Jervis%201999\\_0.pdf](http://www.rochelleterman.com/ir/sites/default/files/Jervis%201999_0.pdf)

**Lecture 2.4. Marxism and critical theory. Marxism after Marx: dependency theory and world-system theory**

Although classical Marxism is largely silent about international relations, later Marxists have made important theoretical contributions about hegemony and imperialism. Marxism has offered a powerful critique of Western international relations theory that is still worth investigating. This session examines the contribution of critical international theory, its contemporary relevance and the veracity of the critiques rendered against it.

Critical theorists draw on a long line of scholarship that extends from Marx and Gramsci via the Frankfurt School to modern day theorists such as Immanuel Wallerstein, Robert Cox and Justine Rosenberg. For ‘critical’ scholars, world politics is marked by historically continued inequalities between core and periphery, north and south, developed and underdeveloped. To that end, liberal and realist approaches are seen as ideologies of inequality.

Marxist theories of IR pay particular attention to the role of production and the consent inequalities in the construction of the international order. Gramscian approaches, in addition, explore the cultural underpinnings of contemporary hegemony. Marxist theorists examine the social relations that underpin geopolitical systems. Such a commitment leads to debates about the hierarchical nature of international affairs. It also leads to attempts to construct a ‘social theory’ of ‘the international’. Many argue that the phenomenon of Globalisation and the expansion of capitalist forms of economy that have come with it demand a more specifically Marxist approach to IR.

World System Analysis and its critics'

**Seminar 2.4. Post-marxism: class, social forces and emancipation**

*Questions:* What are the main concerns of a Marxist approach to IR, and are they still relevant in today’s world? What are the basic arguments of dependency theory? How does critical theory differ from more traditional Marxist approaches? Nobody

disputes that critical theory has an emancipator goal from its Hegelian-Marxist origin, thus a utopian goal. If this is the case, what have been the progresses made by critical security studies over the utopian thinking so fiercely attacked by Carr, Neibuhr and Morgenthau?

Topics for presentation:

1. Are Marxist theories too 'rigid' or 'prescriptive' in describing what happens in international politics?
2. "The relevance of Marxism died with the end of the Cold War". Do you agree? Explain the contemporary resurgence of Marxism as a theory of IR since the end of the Cold War.
3. What is 'critical' about critical IR theory?

**Consolidated Reading List:**

Textbooks:

1. Elias J., Sutch P. International Relations. The Basics – Routledge, 2007.
2. International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
3. The Globalization of World Politics / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

Essential Readings:

1. Cox R., "Social forces, States and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory", *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Volume 10, No. 2, pp.126-155  
<http://mil.sagepub.com/content/10/2/126.full.pdf+html>
2. Krause K., "Critical Theory and Security Studies: The Research Programme of Critical Security Studies", *Cooperation and Conflict*, September 1998, Volume 33, No. 3, pp. 298-333  
<http://cac.sagepub.com/content/33/3/298.full.pdf+html>
3. Wallerstein I. 'The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World System', in Smith, Booth and Zalewski (eds), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, pp. 87–107

Additional Readings:

1. Ken B., "Critical Security Studies and World Politics"  
[https://inspirejournal.files.wordpress.com/2011/12/dezamaroczy01\\_critical\\_security\\_studies\\_review.pdf](https://inspirejournal.files.wordpress.com/2011/12/dezamaroczy01_critical_security_studies_review.pdf)
2. Immanuel Wallerstein on World-Systems, the Imminent End of Capitalism and Unifying Social Science <http://www.theory-talks.org/2008/08/theory-talk-13.html>

### **Lecture 2.5. Constructivism: the social construction of IR**

The domination of the discipline of IR by liberalism and realism has been berated and challenged by a number of competing paradigms. In the 1990's, a new school of scholarship, often labelled constructivism, gained strength as an alternative to traditional approaches. Constructivism is a new attack on realism as well as on rationalism.

The meaning and nature of constructivism are contested. Constructivism stresses that the reality of international politics is not given, but rather a construction of the social processes of international relations. Constructivists place a much stronger focus on the concept of intersubjectivity, identity formation, and the development of norms of interaction in their explanations for international outcomes. A. Wendt proposes that states construct their identities, and hence interests, through a process of mutual interaction. The main focus during this session will be done on the role of culture, norms, social factors and institutions in conditioning the agency of states and other actors, autonomous from and often prior to power.

The objective of this session is to explore the constructivist 'turn' in IR theory. What triggered this development, what was the rationale behind it and the impact it had on the discipline of IR more generally?

### **Seminar 2.5. Constructivism: culture, norms, and identity**

*Questions:* What is the significance of the claim that 'anarchy is what states make of it'? What is identity? What is a norm? How does it affect how actors behave in international relations? What explains actor behavior? Why do self-interested actors so often follow 'norms' that contradict their material interests? Is there a limit to what we can say is 'socially constructed' in international relations?

#### Topics for presentation:

1. Is there a single constructivist approach to the study of world politics? What is advantage of constructivist approach in comparison with other approaches to IR?
2. How effectively can constructivism explain 'actual' international relations?

### **Consolidated Reading List:**

#### Textbooks:

1. Elias J., Sutch P. International Relations. The Basics – Routledge, 2007.
2. International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
3. The Globalization of World Politics / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

#### Essential Readings:

1. Adler E., "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics", *European Journal of International Relations*, September 1997, Volume 3, No. 3, pp.319-363  
<http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/3/3/319.full.pdf+html>

2. Guzzini S., “A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations*, June 2000, Volume 6, No. 2, pp.147-182 <http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/6/2/147.full.pdf+html>
3. Wendt A. “Anarchy is what States Make of it: the Social Construction of Power Politics”, *International Organization*, Spring 1992, Vol.46, No. 2, pp.391-425 <https://ic.ucsc.edu/~rlipsch/Pol272/Wendt.Anarch.pdf>
4. Alexander Wendt on UFO’s, Black Swans and Constructivist International Relations Theory <http://www.theory-talks.org/2008/04/theory-talk-3.html>
5. Ronen P., “A World of their Making: an Evolution of the Constructivist Critique in International Relations”, *Review of International Studies*, 2000, Volume 26, No. 4, pp. 575-598 <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/12407/1/S0260210500005751a.pdf>

Additional Readings:

1. Zehfuss M., “Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison”, *European Journal of International Relations* September 1, 2001 no.7 pp.315-348 <http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/7/3/315.full.pdf+html>

**Lecture 2.6. Reconstructing IR: postmodernism**

The lecture maps out major developments in IR theory under the heading of ‘postmodernism’. It examines the arguments underlying postmodernist critiques of realist, liberal, constructivist and critical theories.

**Seminar 2.6. Is inter-paradigmatic dialogue possible in IR?**

We will draw together the different theoretical approaches and discuss to what extent they can accurately explain and predict core issues in international relations. We will also analyze an inter-paradigmatic debate that is still vigorously held among IR scholars today. In addition, we will consider the relevance of IR both in academic and policy-oriented terms.

Topics for presentation:

1. How can we best conceive of the relationship between various IR theories: cumulation, synthesis, bridge building, eclecticism, dialogue, debate, specialization?
2. What are the major gaps in international relations theory? What criteria would you use to make that determination? Please discuss with reference to three specific examples of 'theory' and 'applications' in international relations

**Consolidated Reading List:**

Textbooks:

1. Elias J., Sutch P. *International Relations. The Basics* – Routledge, 2007.
2. *International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity* / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.

3. The Globalization of World Politics / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

Essential Readings:

1. Devetak R., "Theories, Practices and Postmodernism in International Relations", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 1999, Volume 12, No. 2, pp. 61-73  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09557579908400243>
2. Dornelles F.K. "Postmodernism and IR: from Desperate Critiques to a Coherent Theory of Global Politics"  
[http://www.globalpolitics.net/essays/Krause\\_Dornelles.pdf](http://www.globalpolitics.net/essays/Krause_Dornelles.pdf)
3. Kavalski E., "The Fifth Debate and the Emergence of Complex International Relations Theory: Notes on the Application of Complexity Theory to the Study of International Life", *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, September 2007, Volume 20, No. 3, pp. 435-451  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09557570701574154>

**2.4. Suggested Exam Questions:**

1. Is international anarchy a good thing, a bad thing, or neutral?
2. From Morgenthau to Nye, power is one of the most critically reviewed variables in the international relations literature. Discuss the evolution and theoretical reach of power, both as a characteristic of states and as a structural characteristic of inter-state relations.
3. What is realistic about realism?
4. What kinds of identity matter in international relations?
5. 'International order without justice is ultimately unstable'. Discuss with reference to the thought at least one of the following: H. Bull, E. Carr,
6. Critically examine the relevance of any one of the following for thinking about international relations today: N. Machiavelli, C. Marx, I. Kant.
7. How useful is the realist injunction 'always follow the national interest'?
8. Critically assess the impact of either critical theory or postmodernism on the study of international relations.
9. 'Realism versus idealism': is this the 'timeless truth' of all debates in international relations theory?
10. Is anarchy what states make of it?
11. 'In a fragmented world, order must always take priority over justice'. Do you agree?
12. Is perpetual peace realistic?
13. Some suggest that the emergence of social constructivism has presented a fundamental challenge to neorealism and neoliberalism as core paradigms in international relations. Other contend that constructivist 'challenge' has generally swept the social sciences and has added depth to all paradigms of most disciplines and international relations is enhanced by this trend. To which view do you subscribe? Discuss the ways in which constructivist approaches undermine,

reinforce, or depart from the two traditional theoretical approaches mentioned above.

14. The following quote symbolizes an overwhelming problem in international relations today. What is that problem and why does it plague international relations in particular? What, if anything, can be done about it? Justify your response and provide empirical examples to substantiate your argument. “The central theme of International Relations is not evil but tragedy. States often share common interests, but the structure of the situation prevents them from bring about the mutually desired situation.” (Robert Jervis).
15. What are the key differences on human nature between realism and liberalism?
16. What is the value of realism and liberalism, in academia and in the real world, today?
17. What does ‘democratic peace’ mean for a liberal theory of international politics? Can a liberal theory remain viable, if ‘democratic peace’ is not real? Why and why not?
18. Do we need theories to study International Relations? Explain your answer using current examples from international politics.
19. Is Realism – as often claimed – really the dominant theory in IR?
20. Which is more dangerous for international politics: liberalism or classical realism?
21. What are the implications of international anarchy?
22. Can states cooperate with each other under conditions of international anarchy?
23. ‘Democratic peace theory is merely an un-dating of the thought of Immanuel Kant’. Discuss.
24. What is a “security dilemma”? Is there a solution to a security dilemma? Illustrate your answer with contemporary examples? How would a liberal and how would a Marxist interpret it?
25. How do critical and constructivist approaches challenge “mainstream” theories to the study of IR?
26. How valuable is the contribution of constructivism to the study of international relations?
27. Is constructivism becoming ‘the new orthodoxy’ in IR theory?
28. In what way is Marxist theorising still relevant to International Relations?
29. Which theoretical approach (Liberalism, Realism, Radicalism, Constructivism) do you find most appealing and why? What are its strengths, weaknesses? What make the others less appealing? What are their key shortcomings?
30. What are the theoretical traditions or “competing” paradigms that dominate the contemporary study of international relations?

## 2.5. Consolidated reading list (in alphabetic order):

### Textbooks:

1. Burchill S., Linklater A., Devetak R. et al. Theories of International Relations – Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
2. Elias J., Sutch P. International Relations. The Basics – Routledge, 2007.
3. Griffiths M. International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century. An Introduction – Routledge, 2007.
4. International Relations Theories : Discipline and Diversity / ed. by T. Dunne, M. Kurki, and S. Smith. - 3rd ed. - Oxford : Oxford Univ. Press, 2013.
5. The Globalization of World Politics / [ed. by] John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens Oxford University Press, 2014.

### Essential Readings:

1. Adler E., “Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics”, *European Journal of International Relations*, September 1997, Volume 3, No. 3, pp.319-363 <http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/3/3/319.full.pdf+html>
2. Cox R., “Social forces, States and World Order: Beyond International Relations Theory”, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Volume 10, No. 2, pp.126-155 <http://mil.sagepub.com/content/10/2/126.full.pdf+html>
3. Devetak R., “Theories, Practices and Postmodernism in International Relations”, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 1999, Volume 12, No. 2, pp. 61-73 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09557579908400243>
4. Dornelles F.K. “Postmodernism and IR: from Desperate Critiques to a Coherent Theory of Global Politics” [http://www.globalpolitics.net/essays/Krause\\_Dornelles.pdf](http://www.globalpolitics.net/essays/Krause_Dornelles.pdf)
5. Dunne T., Schmidt B.C. Realism (Chapter 7), Liberalism (Chapter 8) in Baylis J., Smith S. (eds.) *The Globalization of World Politics: an Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. pp. 163-180, pp. 186-201
6. Elman C., “How Not to Be Lakatos Intolerant: Appraising Progress in IR Research”, *International Studies Quarterly* June 2002, Volume 46, Issue 2, pp. 231–262 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1468-2478.00231/pdf>
7. Guzzini S., “A Reconstruction of Constructivism in International Relations”, *European Journal of International Relations*, June 2000, Volume 6, No. 2, pp.147-182 <http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/6/2/147.full.pdf+html>
8. Kant ‘Perpetual Peace’, Cobden ‘Political Writings’ and Mill ‘A Few Words on Non-Intervention’ in Chris Brown, Terry Nardin and N.J. Rengger (eds.), *International Relations in Political Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002
9. Kavalski E., “The Fifth Debate and the Emergence of Complex International Relations Theory: Notes on the Application of Complexity Theory to the Study of International Life”, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, September 2007, Volume 20, No. 3, pp. 435-451 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09557570701574154>

10. Keohane R., Nye J., "Power and Interdependence Revisited", *International Organization*, Autumn 1987, Vol.44, No.4, [http://www.ri.ie.ufrj.br/intranet/arquivos/power\\_and\\_interdependece.pdf](http://www.ri.ie.ufrj.br/intranet/arquivos/power_and_interdependece.pdf)
11. Keohane R., *Power and Governance in a Partially Globalized World* – Routledge, 2004.
12. Krause K., "Critical Theory and Security Studies: The Research Programme of Critical Security Studies", *Cooperation and Conflict*, September 1998, Volume 33, No. 3, pp. 298-333 <http://cac.sagepub.com/content/33/3/298.full.pdf+html>
13. Ronen P., "A World of their Making: an Evolution of the Constructivist Critique in International Relations", *Review of International Studies*, 2000, Volume 26, No. 4, pp. 575-598 <http://sro.sussex.ac.uk/12407/1/S0260210500005751a.pdf>
14. Schmidt B. "On the History and Historiography of IR", in Walter Carlsnaes et al., eds., *Handbook of International Relations*, pp.3-22 [http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/9396\\_008772ch01.pdf](http://www.sagepub.com/upm-data/9396_008772ch01.pdf)
15. Singer J.D., "The Level of Analysis Problem in International Relations", *World Politics*, October 1961, Volume 14, No. 1, pp.77-92 [http://sitemaker.umich.edu/jdsinger/files/the\\_level\\_of\\_analysis\\_problem\\_in\\_international\\_politics.pdf](http://sitemaker.umich.edu/jdsinger/files/the_level_of_analysis_problem_in_international_politics.pdf)
16. Tang S., "The Security Dilemma: a Conceptual Analysis", *Security Studies*, September 2009, Volume 18, No. 3, pp. 587-623 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09636410903133050>
17. Taliaferro J.W., Lobell S.E., and Ripsman N.M., "Introduction: Neoclassical Realism, the State and Foreign Policy", Cambridge University Press [http://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/31928/excerpt/9780521731928\\_excerpt.pdf](http://assets.cambridge.org/97805217/31928/excerpt/9780521731928_excerpt.pdf)
18. Tickner A., Tsygankov A., "Responsible Scholarship in International Relations: a Symposium". *International Studies Review*, December 2008, Volume 10, pp. 661-666 <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2008.00823.x/pdf>
19. Walt S.M., "One world, many theories", *Foreign Policy*, Spring 1998, No. 110, Special Edition [http://www.columbia.edu/itc/sipa/S6800/courseworks/foreign\\_pol\\_walt.pdf](http://www.columbia.edu/itc/sipa/S6800/courseworks/foreign_pol_walt.pdf)
20. Waltz K.N., "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory", *Journal of International Affairs*, Spring/Summer 90, Vol. 44 Issue 1, pp.21-37 <http://classes.maxwell.syr.edu/PSC783/Waltz44.pdf>
21. Waltz K.N., "Structural Realism after the Cold War", *International Security*, Summer 2000, Volume 25, pp.5-41 [http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/waltz\\_kenneth\\_v25n1.pdf](http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/waltz_kenneth_v25n1.pdf)
22. Wallerstein I. 'The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World System', in Smith, Booth and Zalewski (eds), *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, pp. 87–107
23. Wendt A. "Anarchy is what States Make of it: the Social Construction of Power Politics", *International Organization*, Spring 1992, Vol.46, No. 2, pp.391-425 <https://ic.ucsc.edu/~rlipsch/Pol272/Wendt.Anarch.pdf>
24. Wendt on UFO's, Black Swans and Constructivist International Relations Theory <http://www.theory-talks.org/2008/04/theory-talk-3.html>

### Additional Readings:

1. Axelrod R., Keohane O. "Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions", *World Politics*, October 1985, Volume 38, No. 1, pp. 226-254  
<http://users.metu.edu.tr/utuba/Axelrod.pdf>
2. Barnett M., Sikkink K., "From International Relations to Global Society", in *Oxford Handbook of IR*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. Chapter 3. pp. 62-83
3. Brooks S.G. "Dueling Realisms", *International Organisation*, June 1997, Volume 51, Issue 03, pp.445-77  
<http://journals.cambridge.org/action/displayFulltext?type=1&fid=173198&jid=INO&volumeId=51&issueId=03&aid=173197&bodyId=&membershipNumber=&so cietyETOCSession=>
4. Carr E.H. "The Twenty Year's Crisis. 1919-1939: an Introduction to the study of International Relations". London: Macmillan. Chapters 1-3 (pp.1-40), 5-7, 9 (63-169)
5. Clauzewitz von C. "On War". Oxford: Oxford University Press.
6. Dune T., Hansen L., Wight C. "The End of International Relations Theory", *European Journal of International Relations*, September 2013, Volume 19, No. 3, pp. 405-425 <https://timjdunne.files.wordpress.com/2012/10/end-of-ir-theory-final-5-6-2013.pdf>
7. Grenier F., "The Theory-Practice Debate and Cultures of Scholarship in IR", *International Researches*, June 2013, Volume 2, Issue 2  
<http://iresearcher.org/P%202,%2013-22.pdf>
8. Guzini S., "The Ends of IR Theory: Stages of Reflexivity and Modes of Theorizing", *European Journal of International Relations*, September 2013, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.521-541 <http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/19/3/521.full.pdf+html>
9. Hobbes T. "Leviathan". Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapters 1-2
10. Huntington S., "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs*, Summer 1993, Volume 72, No.3, pp.22-49  
[http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Acrobat/Huntington\\_Clash.pdf](http://www.hks.harvard.edu/fs/pnorris/Acrobat/Huntington_Clash.pdf)
11. Ikenberry G.J., *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001) Chapters 1, 2
12. Ikenberry G.J., "Liberal Internationalism 3:0 America and the Dilemma of Liberal World Order", *Perspectives on Politics*, March 2009, Volume 7, No.1, pp.71-87  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPPS%2FPPS7\\_01%2FS1537592709090112a.pdf&code=f1fe3cd80b16d2e4799cf8f415584175](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPPS%2FPPS7_01%2FS1537592709090112a.pdf&code=f1fe3cd80b16d2e4799cf8f415584175)
13. Immanuel Wallerstein on World-Systems, the Imminent End of Capitalism and Unifying Social Science <http://www.theory-talks.org/2008/08/theory-talk-13.html>
14. Ken B., "Critical Security Studies and World Politics"  
[https://inspirejournal.files.wordpress.com/2011/12/dezamaroczy01\\_critical\\_security\\_studies\\_review.pdf](https://inspirejournal.files.wordpress.com/2011/12/dezamaroczy01_critical_security_studies_review.pdf)
15. Keohane R., Nye J., "Power and Interdependence" – Harper Collins Publishers, 1989.

16. Krasner S., "Structural causes and regime consequences: regimes as intervening variables" *International Organization*, Spring 1982, Volume 36, No. 2, pp.1-21  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2F3582\\_E81FDDE3B7D8F164CC7960C1D0BB923A\\_journals\\_INO\\_INO36\\_02\\_S0020818300018920a.pdf&cover=Y&code=9ea7ac850a4efb9fd298f403f4d38dc7](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2F3582_E81FDDE3B7D8F164CC7960C1D0BB923A_journals_INO_INO36_02_S0020818300018920a.pdf&cover=Y&code=9ea7ac850a4efb9fd298f403f4d38dc7)
17. Legro J.W., and Moravcsik A., "Is Anybody still a Realist?" *International Security*, Fall 1999, Volume 24, No. 2, pp.5-55  
<https://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/anybody.pdf>
18. Machiavelli N. "The Prince". Chapters 5, 15, 17, 18, 21
19. Mearsheimer J., "The False promise of International Institutions", *International Security*, Winter 1994/1995, Volume 19, No. 3, pp.5-49  
<http://mearsheimer.uchicago.edu/pdfs/A0021.pdf>
20. Moravcsik A., "Taking Preferences Seriously: a Liberal Theory of International Politics", *International Organization*, Autumn 1997, Volume 51, No. 4, pp.513-554  
<https://www.princeton.edu/~amoravcs/library/preferences.pdf>
21. Morgenthau H.J. "Politics among Nations". New York: Knopf. Chapters 1-4 (pp.3-55)
22. Neumann I. B., Wæver O., Robert Keohane: a Contemporary Classic in The Future of International Relations. Masters in the Making? – Routledge, 2007. pp.96-122.
23. Oren I., "The Unrealism of Contemporary Realism: the Tension between Realist Theory and Realist's Practice", *Perspectives on Politics*, 7:2 June 2009, Volume 7, No. 2, pp. 283-301  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSPS%2FPSPS7\\_02%2F51537592709090823a.pdf&code=276063ca561bab7e90aeca20ceafeb1](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSPS%2FPSPS7_02%2F51537592709090823a.pdf&code=276063ca561bab7e90aeca20ceafeb1)
24. Rathbun B.C., "Is Anybody not an (International Relations) Liberal?" *Security Studies*, 2010, Volume 19, No. 1, pp.2-25  
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09636410903546558>
25. Rosenau J., "Thinking Theory Thoroughly", in Paul Viotti and Mark Kauppi's, *International Relations Theory*, New York: Longman 2009, pp. 17-24  
<http://euroakadeemia.ee/materjalid/Bak%20ReaderSeselgyte.pdf>
26. Rosato S., "The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory", *American Political Science Review*, November 2003, Volume 97, Issue 04, pp 585-602  
[http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSPR%2FPSPR97\\_04%2FS0003055403000893a.pdf&code=5d01ac9221a93c0abcc11dafcdd37ae9](http://journals.cambridge.org/download.php?file=%2FPSPR%2FPSPR97_04%2FS0003055403000893a.pdf&code=5d01ac9221a93c0abcc11dafcdd37ae9)
27. Wæver O., "The Sociology of a Not So International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations", *International Organization*, September 1998, Volume 52, No. 04, pp 687 – 727  
[http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/sdrelint/ficheros\\_materiales/materiales035.pdf](http://pendientedemigracion.ucm.es/info/sdrelint/ficheros_materiales/materiales035.pdf)
28. Waltz K., *Theory of International Politics*, New York: Random House, 1979. Chapters 4, 5, 6
29. Zehfuss M., "Constructivism and Identity: A Dangerous Liaison", *European Journal of International Relations* September 1, 2001 no.7 pp.315-348  
<http://ejt.sagepub.com/content/7/3/315.full.pdf+html>