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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 the Second World War 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 constructed 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 Western nation-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 and history 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. Ethical questions such as just war or international economic inequality have long histories of engagement by scholars of politics beyond the state. 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.

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 recent international politics: 9/11 and its aftermath. 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 Twentieth-Century world order. In Module II, we continue to use 9/11 and its aftermath as a touchstone, turning to the question of changing international political violence as well as to efforts to regulate or resist that violence through law or through social struggle. 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: 9/11 and the Space and Time of International Politics

**Module I: Questions of Global Order from Colonialism to 9/11**

Lecturer: Adam Branch

Lecture 2: Colonial Legacies and 9/11
Lecture 3: The ‘Hot’ Cold War and Decolonisation
Lecture 4: Interpreting the End of the Cold War
Lecture 5: Did 9/11 Change Everything?
Lecture 6: The Gender of 9/11

**Module II: The Changing Nature of International Violence, Law, and Resistance**

Lecturer: Adam Branch

Lecture 7: Terrorism, Insurgency, War
Lecture 8: The War on Terror in Domestic and Transnational Politics
Module III. Global Justice and Human Rights
   Lecturer: Adam Branch
Lecture 12: Histories of Human Rights
Lecture 13: Global Criminal Justice: Histories and Visions
Lecture 14: The International Criminal Court in Practice
Lecture 15: Climate Change and the Limits of International Politics
Lecture 16: Climate Justice, Global Justice, Planetary Justice

Lent Term:
Module IV: Sovereignty and Its Discontents
   Lecturer: Mark Shirk
Lecture 17: Sovereignty, States, and Nations
Lecture 18: Development of the Westphalian Order
Lecture 19: Evolving Norms and Practices of Sovereignty Since Westphalia
Lecture 20: Empire and Hierarchy
Lecture 21: Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism, and Post-Colonialism
Lecture 22: Alternatives to Sovereignty – From Anarchists to ISIS

Module V: Great Power Politics and the Future
   Lecturer: Mark Shirk
Lecture 23: Rise of the West?
Lecture 24: Great Powers and Debates about Polarity
Lecture 25: China and the BRICS as Rising Powers
Lecture 26: A Post-Western Order?
Lecture 27: Social Scientific(ish) Visions of the Future
Lecture 28: Science Fiction’s Visions of the Future

Easter Term: Revision Lectures
Monday, Week 1, 10-11 am
Wednesday, Week 1, 10-11 am
(The lectures are identical, so students are expected to attend only one.)

Teaching
The paper is taught through a combination of 29 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 module.

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 two weeks of Lent term. There will be two identical Revision Lectures during Easter term. 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 just that – supplementary. They are meant to be useful for writing supervision essays and for preparing for the exam, to focus further on specific topics or aspects of topics.

It is not expected that students will read all the Supplementary Readings for the topics they are focusing on. Instead, students should read those texts of particular interest and relevance, as guided by the lectures, their supervisors, and their own concerns. 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 in the POL2 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, of which students select two. Among the twelve, there will be two or three questions associated with each module (although students may draw on any lecture/topic in answering any of the questions).

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 the paper underwent considerable revision for 2015-2016 and for 2017-2018. Therefore, exams prior to that of 2018 may cover material that is not covered in POL2 this year. For this reason, the sample supervision questions, sample exam, and 2018 exam should be the focus in revising for this year’s exam.
Lecture 1: 9/11 and the Time and Space of International Politics

Major, spectacular and shocking events like 9/11 can illuminate fundamental questions about how to understand international politics. How do we place 9/11 in history? Can we identify the legacies it is part of and distinguish the consequences it has given rise to? In addition to these questions about time, it raises questions about the geography of international politics – how might 9/11 and the global War on Terror it gave rise to look from different locations in the world, and from different experiences? In this lecture, we take a first look at 9/11 through the eyes of writers and academics who were in New York on that day, while also asking about the time and space of politics through Hannah Arendt.

  www.newyorker.com/archive/2001/09/24/010924ta_talk_wtc

MODULE I: Questions of Global Order from Colonialism 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 yet others saw it as entrenching the unequal power relations that had always been present, whether along the lines of colonialism, gender, class, 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, seeking first their antecedents in colonialism and the Cold War.

Lecture 2: Colonial Legacies and 9/11

Where do we begin a history of our international political present? In this lecture, we turn to the colonial past to locate legacies that can help historicize the events of 9/11 and its aftermath. In particular, we focus here on the ways that colonialism understood those subject to colonial rule, those whose land was taken, those who were enslaved, or, in certain cases, those who were subject to attempts at extermination. Central will be the relation between race and violence – how violence is deployed against those defined as racially different, and how people subject to such violence have responded.

Core reading:
- Jennifer Pitts, A Turn to Empire: The Rise of Imperial Liberalism in Britain and France (Princeton, 2005), Ch. 1, 5, 8. [An important text for placing Western political liberalism in its imperial context.]
• Edward Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient* (New York: Vintage, 1978), Introduction. [*Orientalism*, although not easy or uncontroversial, has been a foundational book for scholarship on the politics and culture of colonialism and postcolonialism.]


**Supplementary reading:**

• Aimé Césaire, *Discourse on Colonialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000 [1955]). [Alongside Fanon’s *Wretched of the Earth*, a key anti-colonial text that also helped set the stage for postcolonial thought.]

• Frantz Fanon, *Wretched of the Earth* (Grove Press, 1961): Ch. 1, ‘On Violence’ [The formative theorization of anti-colonial revolt, describing how the violence of colonial occupation creates a context in which anti-colonial violence is liberating, but still dangerous. We read chapter 2 for the next lecture.]

• 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 by the British historian.]


• Lisa Lowe, *The Intimacies of Four Continents* (Duke University Press, 2015), Ch. 1 & 5 [An important recent book exploring the relationships between peoples of the four continents as they developed through broad networks of colonial trade and rule.]


**Lecture 3: The ‘Hot’ Cold War and Decolonisation**

The traditional history of the Cold War has cast it as a bipolar struggle between the US and the USSR. However, if we consider the broader set of dynamics during that period – in particular decolonization, the changing role of the UN, and the emergence of ‘development’ – then new continuities may emerge between the Cold War and the post-9/11 world. Here we read both contemporary historians of the Cold War and also some of the key thinkers of that time, in particular those engaged in anti-colonial struggles.

**Core reading:**


• Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea, 1815 to the Present* (Penguin, 2012), Ch. 7-10. [A comprehensive, critical historical text placing the emergence and politics of the UN in both the context of the Cold War and decolonization.]


**Supplementary Reading:**

• Hakim Adi, ‘Pan-Africanism and West African Nationalism in Britain’, *African Studies Review*, vol. 43, no. 1, 2000, pp. 69–82. [British historian excavates the place of Britain in the development of Pan-Africanism during and before the Cold War.]
• Frantz Fanon, ‘The Trials and Tribulations of National Consciousness’, in The Wretched of the Earth, trans. C. Farrington (Grove Press, 1963). [Vigorous denunciation of the national bourgeoisie in independent Africa; the chapter is called ‘Pitfalls of National Consciousness’ in the other popular translation.]
• Che Guevara, ‘Message to the Tricontinental’ (1966), and ‘Cuba: Historical Exception or Vanguard’ (1961). https://www.marxists.org/archive/guevara/works.htm [Che discusses the possibilities for Third World solidarity in the age of neocolonialism.]
• C.L.R. James, The Black Jacobins: Toussaint L’Ouverture and the San Domingo Revolution (First edition 1938; Second revised edition 1963). [A classic work that should be read in full and at leisure; for now, focus on the ‘Appendix: From Toussaint L’Ouverture to Fidel Castro’.]
• Robin D.G. Kelley, Freedom Dreams: The Black Radical Imagination (Beacon Press, 2003), ‘‘This Battlefield Called Life”: Black Feminist Dreams’. [Essential work for understanding histories and cultures of black radicalism and internationalism.]
• Walter Rodney, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa (Howard UP, 1974), Ch. 1. [The foundational work by the Guyanese political economist on the destructive economic impact that colonialism had on Africa.]
• W.W. Rostow, Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-Communist Manifesto (Cambridge University Press, 1960), Introduction, Ch. 2. [A highly influential programmatic statement of development as modernization on a universal model.]
• Odd Arne Westad, The Global Cold War (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), Ch. 1-3. [Extremely useful critical history of the Cold War, putting the ‘periphery’ at the centre.]

Lecture 4: 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 was said to have transformed international politics in perhaps even more fundamental ways. This lecture explores competing interpretations of the end of the Cold War and the visions for the world emerging at that moment.

Core Reading:
• 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.]

Supplementary reading:
• Eqbal Ahmad, ‘The Cold War from the Standpoint of its Victims’, Available online 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.]
• 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.]
• Gilbert Rist, The History of Development: From Western Origins to Global Faith (Zed Books, 2014), Ch. 4-6. [Places changing ideas around development in historical perspective. Very useful as a reference throughout this module.]
• Emanuele Saccarelli and Latha Varadarajan, Imperialism: Past and Present (Oxford University Press, 2015), Ch. 1, 2, 5. [An incisive work that provides an argument for placing recent events within the longer history of imperialism.]

Lecture 5: Did 9/11 Change Everything?
The violence of 9/11 and the US response shattered many of the images of post-Cold War stability and progress. 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. Or, some maintain, by launching two invasions of foreign countries as well as a global ‘War on Terror’, the US had embarked on a program to build a new empire.

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.]
• 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.]

Supplementary reading:
• Paul Gilroy, After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture? (Routledge, 2004). [One of Britain’s most important contemporary intellectuals inquires into the meanings of Empire in the wake of 9/11].
Lecture 6: The Gender of 9/11

Some feminist theorists have argued 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:
- 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.]

• Nadje 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.]


• Charles W. Mills, ‘Revisionist Ontologies: Theorizing White Supremacy’, *Social and Economic Studies* 43, no. 3 (1994): 105-34. [Foremost political philosopher asks how to theorize global white supremacy, interesting as comparison to how global patriarchy is conceived and thinking about their intersection.]


**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. ‘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? (Lecture 2 & 5)

2. Have visions of world order that arose during the Cold War survived until the present? Or did they die with the end of the Cold War and 9/11? (Lecture 3, 4, 5)

3. Did the end of the Cold War present a moment of political opportunity? If so, for whom? (Lecture 4)

4. Does cultural difference produce political violence? (Lecture 5, 2)

5. Was the invasion of Iraq a case of “blood for oil”? (Lecture 5, 4)

6. Was the War on Terror a war for women or a war on women? Or neither? (Lecture 6)
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 flourishing of national ‘wars on terror’ globally, to a broad geography of drone strikes, proxy wars, and increased state surveillance and repression. In response, there were new efforts to stop or regulate that violence through law, as well as new forms of popular resistance that arose against the wars on terror. 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. After considering transnational resistance to transnational political violence, we turn to international law as a project for ending or limiting war, setting the stage for our consideration of international criminal law and global justice in Module III.

Lecture 7: Terrorism, Insurgency, War

With insurgency and counterinsurgency, terrorism and counterterrorism, we see global and local politics crashing together. The resulting dynamics raise difficult questions of sovereignty and strategy, of legitimacy and efficacy. Are we in an era of ‘new’ new wars, with terrorism and insurgency taking centre stage, requiring new forms of counterterrorism and counterinsurgency in response? Or are the forms of violence and counterviolence that have arisen since 9/11 all too familiar from previous periods, representing new justifications for essentially similar political dynamics? Here we look at controversies over post-9/11 political violence.

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.]
- 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, this time with a seminal analysis of the politics of counterinsurgency. From a different era, but equally illuminating for today.]
- Daniel Branch and Elisabeth Jean Wood, ‘Revisiting Counterinsurgency’, Politics and Society, 38, 1 (2010): 3-14. [Placing the turn to counterinsurgency in recent historical perspective; see also the other articles in the special issue.]

Supplementary reading:
- 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.]
- 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: The War on Terror in Domestic and Transnational 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:
• 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.]
• 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.]
• Maria Ryan, “’War in countries we are not at war with’: The “war on terror” on the periphery from Bush to Obama’, International Politics, vol. 48 2-3 (2011): 364-389. [Looks to the War on Terror as transnational, merging international and domestic across many countries and regions.]

Supplementary reading:
• 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). [Examination of the international legal dimensions of so-called ‘extraordinary rendition’.]


---

**Lecture 9: Transnational Resistance Today**

In the midst of these transnational forms of political violence, a panoply of new movements are emerging among youth, women, students, communities of color, the urban poor, middle classes, rural dwellers, and many others. Some respond directly to the War on Terror; others to the depredations of global capitalism; others to unresolved colonial legacies of race, gender, and geography; others to state oppression and authoritarianism. How do we make sense of this efflorescence of protest globally? To what extent are the protests novel, and to what extent to they draw on older legacies of transnational organization and struggle? Many of the readings for Lecture 3 will be relevant here as well.

**Core reading:**

- S.M. Borras, ‘La Vía Campesina and its global campaign for agrarian reform’, *Journal of Agrarian Change*, vol. 8, no. 2–3 (2008): 258–289. [A political economist looks to one of the most prominent peasant social movements for lessons about global struggle.]

**Supplementary reading:**

- Adam Branch and Zachariah Mampilly, *Africa Uprising: Popular Protest and Political Change* (Zed, 2015), Chapters 1, 4, 9. [Well, if you don’t like this book, at least you’ll have the chance to tell the author in person.]
• Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Assembly* (Oxford University Press, 2017). [The latest installment in one of the most important visions for international politics of the last 20 years; see the beginning of the collaboration in *Empire* (2000)].
• Sunaina Marr Maira, *The 9/11 generation: youth, rights, and solidarity in the war on terror* (New York University Press, 2016), Introduction, Ch. 5. [A look at youth communities of color in the US amidst the War on Terror.]
• Chandra Talpade Mohanty, *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity* (Duke, 2003), Ch. 1, 2, 9 [On the complex politics of feminist solidarity across the Global North-South divide.]
• Robbie Shilliam, ed., *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperialism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity* (Routledge, 2011). [Important collection of essays, see especially Ch. 2, 4, 6, 10-12.]

**Lecture 10: International Law and International Force**
Here, we turn from popular struggles for justice to institutional efforts to prevent and contain force through law. We focus on the international law of war – both *jus ad bellum* and *jus in bello* – to explore its possibilities and limitations for dealing with the War on Terror and its aftermath. This lecture serves also as an important background for Module III and the engagement with international criminal law there.

**Core Reading:**
• Michael Byers, *War Law* (Grove, 2005). [Comprehensive account of the law of war from the perspective of the aftermath of the US invasion of Iraq, with a focus on the UN Security Council.]
• Conway Henderson, *Understanding International Law* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Ch. 1, 3, 4, 8. [An extremely useful overview of international law, of central importance for explaining key terms and concepts.]
• Siba N. Grovogui, *Sovereigns, Quasi Sovereigns, and Africans* (Minnesota, 1996), Ch. 1, 2. [Considers the always partial and qualified manner in which sovereignty was granted to Africans, with important lessons for international order and sovereignty today.]

**Supplementary reading:**

**Lecture 11: Testing the Law of War: The Iraq Invasion**
Must war be legal for it to be just? Today, questions about the legitimacy and legality 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 Iraq invasion, assessing the reasons given for the war against theories of just war and humanitarian
intervention, building on Lecture 10. We also glance briefly at the development of counterinsurgency towards drones.

**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.]
- 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].

**Supplementary reading:**
- 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].
- 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.]

**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 and insurgency can be clearly distinguished and require fundamentally distinct responses.’ Assess the validity of this statement. (Lecture 7, 8)
2. Does foreign intervention always give rise to resistance? (Lectures 7, 8, 11)
3. ‘When it comes to counterterrorism, liberty and security will, unfortunately, always be in tension.’ Is this true? (Lecture 8, 9)
4. Do today’s global social movements represent a fundamental break from movements of the past? If so, why? (Lecture 9, 3)
5. Is international law really law? (Lecture 10)
6. Was the Iraq war just? (Lecture 11, 10)
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 and was 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: Histories of Human Rights

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 4). 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, with a look back to Arendt’s critique of the very notion of human rights beyond the state.

Core reading:

Supplementary reading:
• Conway Henderson, Understanding International Law (Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Ch. 10. [A good background of the place of human rights within international law.]
• Sally Engle Merry, Human Rights and Gender Violence: Translating International Law into Local Justice (University of Chicago Press, 2006), ch. 1 & 6. [Anthropologist explores the disjunctures between ‘global’ cultures of human rights and ‘local’ cultures of justice.]
• 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.]
• Aryeh Neier, ‘Did the Era of Rights End on September 11?’ (2002). [Director of Human Rights Watch hopes it didn’t.]
• Issa Shivji, The Concept of Human Rights in Africa (Codesria Book Series, 1989), pp. 59-92. [An effort by a foremost Tanzanian legal scholar to reconceptualize human rights as responding to both domestic and international oppression.]

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 prominent 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.]

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.]
• 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.]
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:
- 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.]

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.]
- 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.]
- 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.]

Lecture 15: Climate Change and the Limits of International Politics

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 overall introduction to the topic.]
**Lecture 16: Climate Justice, Planetary Justice**

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:**
- Donna Haraway, ‘Staying with the Trouble: Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Cthulucene’, ch. 2 in Moore, *Anthropocene or Capitalocene*? [The prominent philosopher of science offers novel ways of thinking with the planet today; there are shorter versions online as well.]

**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: Mark Shirk

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: Sovereignty, States, and Nations
What does modern sovereignty entail, exactly? And why is it attached to the nation-state and not to 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:
- Weber, Max (1919) Politics as a Vocation. [Origin of the most commonly used definition of a state.]

Supplementary Reading:
- 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.]
- Bartelson, Jens (2009) Visions of World Community. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Esp. Chapters 3 and 4. [Explains the processes by which the nation-state was constructed.]
• Anderson, Benedict (2006) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso. Ch. 2, 3, 6 [Classic text on understanding nation as an imagined political community.]

• Gellner, Ernest (1980) *Nations and Nationalism*. Cornell University Press. Ch. 1, 4, 5 [Classic text linking the emergence of nationalism to the industrial revolution.]


**Lecture 18: Development of 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 18th century.

**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]  


**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.]  

- 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.]  


Lecture 19: Evolving Norms and Practices of Sovereignty Since Westphalia
While the modern sovereign state is said to have formed sometimes between the 16th and 18th centuries, this has not been the end of its development. Instead, it has continued to develop and change over time. This lecture will give an overview of those changes and outline some of the debates over how change happens, when it happened, and what changed.

Core Reading:
- 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.]

Supplementary Reading:
- Philpott, Daniel (2001) Revolutions in Sovereignty: How Ideas Shaped Modern International Relations. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Ch. 8-12, p. 151-250 [How the end of colonialism was a major change in the international system]
• Morgan, Kimberly J. and Ann Shola Orloff, eds. (2017) The Many Hands of the State. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Introduction, p. 1-34 [Argument that states are not singular and they are constantly making and remaking themselves]

**Lecture 20: Empire and Hierarchy**

While International Relations as a field is often obsessed with the interactions between states, history tells us that states are a recent phenomenon. Some even argue that the modern states system was not developed until the 1960s. For most of human history, it was empires that dominated the world. A focus on empires, in turn, forces scholars to deal not just with anarchy, but also hierarchy. This lecture will look at empires, theorize what makes an empire different than a state, look at systems with that had empires embedded within states, and think some about how this may change standard IR stories.

**Core Reading:**


**Supplementary Reading:**

• Motyl, Alexander (2001) Imperial Ends: The Decay, Collapse, and Revival of Empire. New York: Columbia University Press. [Argument about the end of empires that has a similar view to Nexon and Wright]
• Mulich, Jeppe, “Micro-regionalism and Intercolonial Relations: The Case of the Danish West Indies, 1730-1830” Journal of Global History 8:1 (2013): 72-94 [Article that builds on Nexon and Wright’s definition of empire to look colonies have interacted across empires]
• Shirk, Mark. “Bringing the State Back into the Empire Turn: Piracy and the Layered Sovereignty of the 18th Century Atlantic” International Studies Review 19:2 (2017): 143-165 [Argument on how to deal with Empires that have sovereign state at their core, also includes pirates!]
• Zarakol, Ayşe, editor. (2017) Hierarchies in International Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. [Rest of book is a good overview of hierarchies in IR]
Lecture 21: Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism, and Post-Colonialism

One cannot seriously discuss empires without looking at their effects on those being ruled. This lecture will focus on modern empires and their colonial subjects with the aim of giving students a different way to view international politics than so far discussed in this module. It will also take seriously the claims European colonization still leaves a powerful legacy even after the decolonization process after World War II.

Core Readings


Supplementary Reading:

- 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].
Lecture 22: Alternatives to Sovereignty – From Anarchists to ISIS

Sovereignty made be a dominant norm in international politics, but it is not the only game in town. This may be most apparent in ‘terrorist organizations’. 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. It will also look at the historical role of ‘company states’ – another sovereign alternative.

Core Reading:


Supplementary Reading:


- Devji, Faisal. 2005. Lanscapes of the Jihad: Militancy, Morality, Modernity. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. Ch. 1,2 [Argument that al Qaeda is not political but metaphysical and this is what makes it so hard for states to understand them and their ‘demands’]


- 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]

• Cronin, Audrey Kurth (2015) ISIS is not a terrorist group. *Foreign Affairs* 94: 87. [Distinguishing ISIS from al-Qaeda].


**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 does the modern concept of sovereignty (and state) entail? (Lecture 17)

2) What is the ‘Westphalian order’ in international politics? (Lecture 18)

3) Has the international system been static or dynamic since the 18th century? Why and how? (Lecture 19)

4) How does an empire differ from a state? What are the implications of thinking about international politics in terms of empires? (Lectures 20 and 21)

5) Does ISIS (or al-Qaeda – pick one) present a real challenge to our understanding and practice of modern sovereignty? (Lecture 22)
MODULE V: Great Power Politics and the Future

Lecturer: Mark Shirk

Module IV covered the nature and historical development of, and alternatives and opposition to, the modern sovereign state system. However, there is a major source of change and friction within that system that has not been covered, despite being a major concern for international relations scholars. This is a type of systemic change based on the rise and fall of powerful states. This module will look at this dynamic in detail for the first four lectures. The final two lectures will then zoom out to think about the future of the modern sovereign state system and international politics in general.

Lecture 23: 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:

Kalberg, 149–64. London: Roxbury. [Argument that the rise of rational thought put the West (and in particular northern Europe) ‘ahead’ of the East]


- 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.]

Lecture 24: 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 the late nineteenth century to the 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. [Makes the argument that the only system level change possible in international relations is in the number of great powers.]

Supplementary Reading:
- Bobbitt, Philip. 2002. The Shield of Achilles: War, Peace, and the Course of History. 1st ed. New York: Knopf. P. 520-37 [An overview of the Treaty of Utrecht (1713) that makes the claim that ‘balance of power’ was created during the 18th century]


• Baldwin, David A. (2002), Power and International Relations, in Walter Carsnaes et al., editors, Handbook of International Relations. London: Sage. [Another primer on how power is understood in IR.]

**Lecture 25: China and the BRICS as 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:**


**Supplementary Reading:**


• 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.]

• 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]


• Kang, David C. (2007) China Rising: Peace, Power, and Order in East Asia. Columbia University Press. Ch, 1,3,9 [Arguing that the rise of China is not a threat to global order].
• Economy, Elizabeth C. 2010. The River Runs Black: The Environmental Challenge to China’s Future. 2 edition. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press. Ch. 1,2 [An Argument that China’s rise may be halted by its environmental problems]


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.]


Supplementary Reading:


• 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.]

Lecture 27: Social Scientific(ish) Visions of the Future
While IR is a discipline that attempts to explain the present, it has been hard for scholars to ignore the future. This lecture will look at some prominent visions of the future from scholars interested in international politics.

Core Reading:

Supplementary Reading:
Lecture 28: Science Fiction’s Visions of the Future

Social scientists are not all that great at the future. But science fiction writers often have plausible detailed visions. They range from a world without states, to a world where humans extend beyond earth, to the ravages of climate change. Each of these books is set in a future world, changing the technological and environmental conditions in which humans act, but preserving the need for politics.

Core & Supplementary Reading:

- Stephenson, Neal (1992) Snow Crash. New York: Bantam Dell [constructed in a world where states are, at best, one of many political actors and corporate identities abound]
- Card, Orson Scott (1985) Ender’s Game. New York: Tor. [A World Government forms to defeat an extra-terrestrial enemy, what happens when that enemy is defeated?]  
- Gibson, William, “The Gernsback Continuum” http://writing2.richmond.edu/jessid/eng216/gernsback.pdf [A story about how the future was perceived in the 1930s with anti-utopian overtones]

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 23)
2) What kind of great power polarity describes our current moment? (Lecture 24)
3) Which one is a greater threat to stability: American decline or China’s rise? (Lecture 25)
4) Are we at nearing the end of the Western international order? (Lecture 26)
5) Describe international politics in the year 2100. (Lectures 27 and 28)
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?
2018-2019 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?
POL 2 Examination Questions 2017-8

Cross-Cutting Questions:
Each student must answer ONE of these questions. Material can be drawn from any of the modules.

1. What aspects of international politics does attention to race help us understand better?
2. Is international law really law?
3. Have we moved from a period of optimism about global progress to one of pessimism?
4. Does the ‘anthropocene’ require a new vision of global justice and international order?

Module-Specific Questions:
Each student must answer TWO of these questions.

1. Did 9/11 represent a fundamental break in international political order?
2. Is the ‘War on Terror’ a new form of imperialism?
3. Are feminism and militarism inherently at odds?
4. Can the international use of military force be illegal but legitimate?
5. Are drones effective tools in counterinsurgency?
6. Should domestic counterterrorism and international counterterrorism have the same objectives?
7. ‘The issue is emphatically not whether one favors “justice” for international wrongdoers, but whether the ICC—with its inherent illegitimacy—could ever be the right vehicle for the job.’ (John Bolton, Former United States Ambassador to the UN) Do you agree with Bolton’s assessment of the ICC?
8. Is climate change an environmental problem or a political problem?
9. Do twenty-first century examples of military intervention and their reception by the international community indicate the weakening of the Westphalian state sovereignty norm?
10. Which one is a greater challenge to the nation-state sovereignty principle: capitalist globalisation, international organizations (such as the EU) or alternative visions of sovereignty (such as those espoused by ISIS or al-Qaeda)?
11. Are we undergoing systemic change now? If so, is it a matter of changing great powers (or number of great powers), or are there other changes that could be considered systemic as well?
12. Will the rise of China and other non-Western countries lead to the creation of a more egalitarian international order?