THEORIES OF INTERNATIONAL POLITICS POLSCI 772 Term 1, Fall 2020

Instructor: Marshall Beier Email: mbeier@mcmaster.ca Class: Tuesdays, 11:30-2:20 Room: N/A – Virtual **Office:** KTH-508; no in-person meetings **Office Hours:** Online, by appointment

Contents

Course Description
Course Objectives
Required Materials and Texts
Class Format3
Course Evaluation – Overview
Course Evaluation – Details
Seminar Participation (25%)4
Short Paper (30%), due two weeks after chosen topic is covered4
Essay (45%), due December 1, 20204
Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings5
Week 1 (Sept 15) Intro5
Week 2 (Sept 22) What is IR5
Week 3 (Sept 29) Epistemology & Method6
Week 4 (Oct 6) Worlds Apart7
Week 5 (Oct 13) Mid-Term Recess – NO CLASS8
Week 6 (Oct 20) Worlds of Conflict
Week 7 (Oct 27) Worlds of Inequality9
Week 8 (Nov 3) Worlds Collide10
Week 9 (Nov 10) Gender & IR 11
Week 10 (Nov 17) Poststructuralism12
Week 11 (Nov 24) Constructivist Turn 13
Week 12 (Dec 1) Postcolonialism14
Week 13 (Dec 8) Pop Culture
Course Policies
Submission of Assignments16

Grades	17
Late Assignments	17
Absences, Missed Work, Illness	17
Faculty of Social Sciences E-mail Communication Policy	17
University Policies	17
Academic Integrity Statement	17
Authenticity / Plagiarism Detection	
Courses with an On-line Element	
Online Proctoring	
Conduct Expectations	19
Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities	19
Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observar	· · ·
Copyright and Recording	19
Extreme Circumstances	20
Course Modification	20

Course Description

This course is designed to acquaint students with the main currents in the growing range of theoretical approaches that characterize the contemporary field of International Relations. We begin the first half of the course with a selection of readings that review 'the state of the field' and its origins, asking whose voices have dominated IR and whose interests and perspectives they speak. We then move to debates about epistemology and methodology, inquiring into what it means to make knowledge claims in our discipline and weighing various approaches to authorizing them. From there, we begin a genealogy of theory in International Relations, surveying the 'Great Debates' that give shape to the field's story about its own origins before examining contemporary mainstream approaches. The second half of the course takes us through a series of critical interventions that have variously contested the mainstream and one another. Some of these are well established, others are still struggling toward recognition, and others even now are only appearing at the critical margins of the discipline. Part of what fashions the concerns of this course is the way in which particular epistemological, methodological, and traditional norms inform expectations within International Relations about what sorts of questions it is appropriate to ask, how we ought to go about answering those questions, and whose voices speak with authority in theory and practice. The overall objective, however, is to give students a broad grounding in the wide (and widening) theoretical terrain of the field.

Course Objectives

By the end of the course students should:

- Have a deeper understanding of key theoretical currents in international relations.
- Recognize and evaluate key concepts from contemporary social theory and how they both play a part in and help us to make sense of international relations.
- Have built on and refined research and writing skills through argumentative essays.
- Have developed skills in leading and participating in group discussions.

Required Materials and Texts

• All required readings are available online via e-Journals or as eBooks from the Library website.

Class Format

The course will operate on a weekly seminar format based on regular and consistent participation by all students. In light of ongoing COVID-19 mitigation measures, seminars will be held using Zoom. All students will receive a weekly Zoom invitation via

email from the instructor. Please follow the link in the weekly invitation at the start of each week's class.

Course Evaluation – Overview

- 1. Seminar Participation 25%
- 2. Short Paper 30%, due two weeks after chosen topic is covered
- 3. Longer Paper 45%, due December 1, 2020

Course Evaluation – Details

Seminar Participation (25%)

Students will be graded on their participation in class discussions. Consistent participation informed by each week's assigned readings is expected. Beginning on week 2, one or two students per week will give short presentations (10-15 minutes in length) at the start of class. Presentations should offer students' critical assessments of the week's readings, highlighting common themes and making connections where appropriate. It is assumed that all students will come to class having read and thought about the assigned readings, so presentations should not simply summarize them. Each presentation should end by suggesting three or four questions with the aim of stimulating class discussion. (NB: presenters need only address the *assigned* readings for the week – recommended readings are intended to give additional background and elaboration of topics necessary for the longer paper due on December 1st).

Short Paper (30%), due two weeks after chosen topic is covered

Students will prepare a short paper of 8-10 pages in length. Topics will deal with issues raised in the assigned readings from a week selected by the student and will be developed individually by students in consultation with the instructor. This paper should deal with a topic from weeks 2 through 7 (i.e., up to and including the week of October 27th excluding week 5, which is Reading Week). Papers are to be submitted directly to the instructor at <u>mbeier@mcmaster.ca</u> in Word or PDF format by 11:59 pm on the due date; students will receive an email from the instructor within 24 hours confirming receipt of their paper.

Essay (45%), due December 1, 2020

Students will prepare an analytic essay of approximately 15 pages in length. Topics will deal with issues raised in the assigned and recommended readings of the course and will be developed individually by students in consultation with the instructor. Papers are to be submitted directly to the instructor at mbeier@mcmaster.ca in Word or PDF format by 11:59 pm on the due date; students will receive an email from the instructor within 24 hours confirming receipt of their paper.

Weekly Course Schedule and Required Readings

Week 1 (Sept 15) Intro

Introduction to the Course Readings: None

Week 2 (Sept 22) What is IR

What Is International Relations Theory, What Is It For, and Whose Is It? Assigned Readings:

• Martin Wight. 1960. "Why is There No International Theory?" *International Politics* 2(1): 35-48. doi: 10.1177/004711786000200104.

• Stanley Hoffman. 1987. Janus and Minerva: Essays in the Theory and Practice of International Politics. New York: Routledge, 3-24. [e-book].

• Robert W. Cox. 1981. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium* 10(2): 126-155. doi: 10.1177/03058298810100020501.

• Cynthia Enloe. 2004. "Margins, Silences and Bottom Rungs: How to Overcome the Underestimation of Power in the Study of International Relations" in *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 19-42. [e-book].

• Kelebogile Zvobgo and Meredith Loken. 2020. "Why Race Matters in International Relations." *Foreign Policy* (19 June). https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/06/19/why-race-matters-international-relations-ir/

• Zeynep Gulsah Capan. 2017. "Decolonising International Relations?" *Third World Quarterly* 38(1): 1-15. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2016.1245100.

Recommended Readings:

• Barry Buzan and Richard Little. 2001. "Why International Relations Has Failed as an Intellectual Project and What to Do About It." *Millennium* 30(1): 19-39.

• Stephen M. Walt. 1998. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories." *Foreign Policy* 110: 29-32, 34-46.

• Marysia Zalewski. 1996. "All These Theories Yet the Bodies Keep Piling Up': Theories, Theorists, Theorising," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski, eds., *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 340-353.

• Martin Hollis and Steve Smith. 1990. *Explaining and Understanding International Relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 45-91.

Week 3 (Sept 29) Epistemology & Method

Epistemology and Method: What Can We 'Know' and How Will We 'Know' It?

Assigned Readings:

• Kenneth N. Waltz. 1979. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1-17.

http://repository.fue.edu.eg/xmlui/bitstream/handle/123456789/3370/899.pdf?seq uence=1

• Mark A. Neufeld. 1995. *The Restructuring of International Relations Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 22-46. [e-book].

• Steve Smith. 1996. "Positivism and Beyond," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski, eds., *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11-44. [e-book].

• Didier Bigo and R.B.J. Walker. 2007. "Editorial: International, Political, Sociology," *International Political Sociology* 1(1), 1-5. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-5687.2007.00001.x.

• Roland Bleiker and Emma Huchison. 2008. "Fear No More: Emotions and World Politics," *Review of International Studies* 34(S1): 115-135. doi: 10.1017/S0260210508007821.

• Paul Musgrave. 2019. "Argument: IR Theory and Game of Thrones Are Both Fantasies," *Foreign Policy* (23 May). https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/05/23/ir-theory-and-game-of-thrones-are-both-fantasies/?fbclid=IwAR0X5pg06ABrWk02bXQsFKB0UM4nwbYDtEQAyaYK1IvZ HXkUvJn4a0R7-bE.

Recommended Readings:

• Kenneth N. Waltz. 1979 *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 18-78.

• James Der Derian. 1989. "The Boundaries of Knowledge and Power in International Relations," in James Der Derian and Michael J. Shapiro, eds., *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics*. New York: Lexington Books, 3-10. • R.B.J. Walker. 1993. *Inside/Outside: International Relations as Political Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-25.

• Jim George. 1992. *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 1-39.

Week 4 (Oct 6) Worlds Apart

Worlds Apart: Classical Realism and the Critique of Idealism Assigned Readings:

• Woodrow Wilson. 1918. "'The Fourteen Points,' Address to the U.S. Congress, 8 January." http://www.exodusbooks.com/Samples/VP/O3FourteenPoints.pdf.

• Christoph Frei. 2016. "Politics Among Nations: Revisiting a Classic." *Ethics & International Affairs* 30(1): 39-46. doi: 10.1017/S0892679415000593.

• Cornelia Navari. 2016. "Hans Morgenthau and the National Interest." *Ethics & International Affairs* 30(1): 47-54. doi: 10.1017/S089267941500060X.

• Michael C. Williams. 1996. "Hobbes and International Relations: A Reconsideration." *International Organization* 50(2), 213-236: doi: 10.1017/S002081830002854X.

• Jonathan Symons. 2019. "Realist climate ethics: Promoting climate ambition within the Classical Realist tradition." *Review of International Studies* 45(1): 141-160. doi: 10.1017/S0260210518000189.

Recommended Readings:

• Peter Wilson. 1998. "The Myth of the 'First Great Debate." *Review of International Studies* 24(5): 1-16.

• E.H. Carr. 1962. *The Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939: An Introduction to the Study of International Relations,* 2nd edition. London: Macmillan, 11-94.

• Hans Morgenthau. 1985. *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6th edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 3-17.

• Hedley Bull. 1981. "Hobbes and the International Anarchy." *Social Research* 48(4): 717-738.

• Mark Heller. 1980. "The Use & Abuse of Hobbes: The State of Nature in International Relations." *Polity* 13(1): 21-32.

• J. Ann Tickner. 1988. "Hans Morgenthau's Principles of Political Realism: A Feminist Reformulation." *Millennium* 17(3): 429-440.

• Thucydides. 1972. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. New York: Penguin Books, 400-408.

• Richard Ned Lebow. 1991. "Thucydides, Power Transition Theory, and the Causes of War," in Richard Ned Lebow and Barry S. Strauss, eds., *Hegemonic Rivalry: From Thucydides to the Nuclear Age*. Boulder: Westview Press.

• David Bedford and Thom Workman. 2001. "The Tragic Reading of the Thucydidean Tragedy." *Review of International Studies* 27(1): 51-67.

Week 5 (Oct 13) Mid-Term Recess – NO CLASS No class – Reading Week

Week 6 (Oct 20) Worlds of Conflict

Worlds of Conflict: Neorealism and Hegemonic War Assigned Readings:

• Kenneth N. Waltz. 1990. "Realist Thought and Neorealist Theory." *Journal of International Affairs* 44(1): 21-37. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24357222.

• Robert O. Keohane. 1984. *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.31-46. [e-book].

• Robert Gilpin. 1981. *War and Change in World Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 186-210. [e-book].

• David A. Lake. 1993. "Leadership, Hegemony, and the International Economy: Naked Emperor or Tattered Monarch With Potential?" *International Studies Quarterly* 37(4), 459-489. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2600841.

• Christine Sylvester. 2014. "Neorealist Reductionisms." *Australian Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 547-551. doi: 10.1080/10361146.2014.937373.

Recommended Readings:

• Paul W. Schroeder. 1994. "Historical Reality vs. Neo-Realist Theory." *International Security* 19(1): 108-148.

• Andrew Linklater. 1995. "Neorealism in Theory and Practice," in Ken Booth and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theory Today*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

• Friedrich Kratochwil. 1993. "The Embarrassment of Changes: Neo-Realism as the Science of Realpolitik Without Politics." *Review of International Studies* 19(1): 63-80.

• Isabelle Grunberg. 1990. "Exploring the 'Myth' of Hegemonic Stability."

International Organization 44(4): 431-477.

Week 7 (Oct 27) Worlds of Inequality

Worlds of Inequality: Marxist- and Gramscian-Inspired Approaches Assigned Readings:

• Mark Rupert. 2007. "Marxism," in Martin Griffiths, ed., *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge, 35-46. [e-book].

• John Maclean. 1988. "Marxism and International Relations: A Strange Case of Mutual Neglect," *Millennium* 17(2): 295-319. doi: 10.1177/03058298880170021201.

• Immanuel Wallerstein. 1996. "The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World-System," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski, eds., *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 87-107. [e-book].

• Stuart Hall. 1986. "Gramsci's Relevance for the Study of Race and Ethnicity." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 10:2: 5-27. doi: 10.1177/019685998601000202.

• Anna Stavrianakis. 2006. "Call to Arms: The University as a Site of Militarised Capitalism and a Site of Struggle," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 35(1), 139-154. doi: 10.1177/03058298060350011201.

Recommended Readings:

• Andre Gunder Frank. 1966. "The Development of Underdevelopment." *Monthly Review* 18(4): 17-31.

• Immanuel Wallerstein. 1974. "The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16(4): 387-415.

• Stephen Gill. 1993. "Gramsci and Global Politics: Towards a Post-Hegemonic Research Agenda," in Stephen Gill, ed., *Gramsci, Historical Materialism and International Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

• Kees van der Pijl. 1997. "Transnational Class Formation and State Forms," in Stephen Gill and James H. Mittelman, eds., *Innovation and Transformation in International Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

• A. Claire Cutler. 1999. "Locating 'Authority' in the Global Political Economy." *International Studies Quarterly* 43(1): 59-81.

• Robert O'Brien. 2019. "Revisiting Rosa Luxemburg's Internationalism," *Journal of International Political Theory* (online in advance of print).

Week 8 (Nov 3) Worlds Collide

Worlds Collide: From Strategic Studies to Security Studies Assigned Readings:

• Ken Booth. 1979. *Strategy and Ethnocentrism*. London: Croom Helm, 13-31. [e-book].

• Carol Cohn. 1987. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12(4): 687-718. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3174209.

• Steve Smith. 1999. "The increasing insecurity of security studies: Conceptualizing security in the last twenty years." *Contemporary Security Policy* 20(3): 72-101. doi: 10.1080/13523269908404231.

• Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey. 2006. "The postcolonial moment in security studies." *Review of International Studies* 32(2): 329-352. doi: 10.1017/S0260210506007054.

• Lee Jarvis. 2019. "Toward a Vernacular Security Studies: Origins, Interlocutors, Contributions, and Challenges." *International Studies Review* 21(1): 107-126. doi: 10.1093/isr/viy017.

Recommended Readings:

• Hans Morgenthau. 1962. "Death in the Nuclear Age," in Hans Morgenthau, *Politics in the Twentieth Century*, vol.3. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

• Phil Williams. 1987. "Nuclear Deterrence," in John Baylis, Ken Booth, John Garnett and Phil Williams, *Contemporary Strategy I*. New York: Holmes & Meier.

• Philip Green. 1966. *Deadly Logic: The Theory of Nuclear Deterrence*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 255-76.

• Stephen Walt. 1991. "The Renaissance of Security Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* 35(2): 211-239.

• Edward Kolodziej. 1992. "Renaissance in Security Studies? Caveat Lector!" *International Studies Quarterly* 36(4): 421-438.

• David Baldwin. 1995. "Security Studies and the End of the Cold War." *World Politics* 48(1): 117-141.

• Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams. 1996. "Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods." *Mershon International Studies Review* 40(Supplement 2): 229-254.

• Tarak Barkawi. 2011. "From War to Security: Security Studies, the Wider Agenda and the Fate of the Study of War." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 39(3): 701-716.

Week 9 (Nov 10) Gender & IR

Gender and International Relations

Assigned Readings:

• Cynthia Enloe. 2007. "Feminism," in Martin Griffiths, ed., *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge, 99-110. [e-book].

• Christine Sylvester. 1996. "The Contributions of Feminist Theory," in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski, eds., *International Theory: Positivism & Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 254-278.

• J. Ann Tickner. 1997. "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists," *International Studies Quarterly* 41(4): 611-632. doi: 10.1111/1468-2478.00060.

• Cynthia Enloe, 2014. *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: University of California Press, xi-xv, 1-18. [e-book].

• Catherine Eschle and Bice Maiguashca. 2006. "Bridging the Academic/Activist Divide: Feminist Activism and the Teaching of Global Politics," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 35(1): 119-137. doi: 10.1177/03058298060350011101.

Recommended Readings:

• Chandra Talpade Mohanty. 1984. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Boundary* 2 12(3)/13(1): 333-358.

• J. Ann Tickner. 1992. *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1-25.

• Sandra Whitworth. 2000. "Theory and Exclusion: Gender, Masculinity and International Political Economy," in Richard Stubbs and Geoffrey Underhill, eds., *Political Economy and the Changing Global Order*, 2nd edition. Toronto: Oxford University Press.

• V. Spike Peterson. 1997. "Whose Crisis? Early and Post-Modern Masculinism," in Stephen Gill and James H. Mittelman, eds., *Innovation and Transformation in International Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

• Marysia Zalewski and Jane L. Parpart, eds. 1998. *The Man Question in International Relations*. Boulder: Westview Press, passim.

• Cynthia Enloe. 2000. *Maneuvers: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 235-87.

• Sandra Whitworth. 1994. "Gender, International Relations, and the Case of the ILO." *Review of International Studies* 20(4): 389-405.

Week 10 (Nov 17) Poststructuralism

Deconstruction and the Linguistic Turn: Poststructuralism Assigned Readings:

• Jenny Edkins. 2007. "Poststructuralism," in Martin Griffiths, ed., *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge, 88-98. [e-book].

• David Campbell. 1998. *Writing Security: US Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1-13. [e-book].

• R.B.J. Walker. 1991. "State Sovereignty and the Articulation of Political Space/Time," *Millennium* 20(3): 445-461. doi: 10.1177/03058298910200030201.

• Jim George. 1995. "Realist 'Ethics,' International Relations, and Post-Modernism: Thinking Beyond the Egoism-Anarchy Thematic," *Millennium* 24(2): 195-223. doi: 10.1177/03058298950240020301.

• Judith Butler. 2010. "Performative Agency." *Journal of Cultural Economy* 3(2): 147-161. doi: 10.1080/17530350.2010.494117.

Recommended Readings:

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

• Richard K. Ashley and R.B.J. Walker. 1990. "Speaking the Language of Exile: Dissident Thought in International Studies." *International Studies Quarterly* 34(3): 259-268.

• Dalby, Simon. 1992. "Security, Modernity, Ecology: The Dilemmas of Post-Cold War Security Discourse." *Alternatives* 17(1): 95-134.

• V. Spike Peterson. 1992. "Security and Sovereign States: What is at Stake in Taking Feminism Seriously?" in V. Spike Peterson, ed., *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)Visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder: Lynn Rienner Publishers.

• Jim George. 1994. *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical (Re)Introduction to International Relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 191-219.

• Jean Baudrillard. 1995. *The Gulf War Did Not Take Place*, trans. Paul Patton. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

• David Campbell. 1994. "The Deterritorialization of Responsibility: Levinas, Derrida, and Ethics After the End of Philosophy." *Alternatives* 19(4): 455-484.

• Vivienne Jabri. 1998. "Restyling the Subject of Responsibility in International Relations." *Millennium* 27(3): 591-611.

• Jenny Edkins. 1999. *Poststructuralism and International Relations: Bringing the Political Back In*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, esp. pp.125-46.

Week 11 (Nov 24) Constructivist Turn

The Constructivist Turn Assigned Readings:

• Jeffrey T. Checkel. 1998. "The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory," *World Politics* 50(2): 324-348. https://www.jstor.org/stable/25054040.

• Alexander Wendt. 1992. "Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics," *International Organization* 46(2): 391-425. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706858.

• Vendulka Kubálková. 2001. "A Constructivist Primer," in Vendulka Kubálková ed., *Foreign Policy in a Constructed World.* New York: ME Sharpe, 56-76. [e-book].

• Emanuel Adler. 1997. "Seizing the Middle Ground: Constructivism in World Politics," *European Journal of International Relations* 3(3): 319-363. doi: 10.1177/1354066197003003003.

• Birgit Locher and Elisabeth Prügl. 2001. "Feminism and Constructivism: Worlds Apart or Sharing the Middle Ground?" *International Studies Quarterly* 45(1): 111-129. doi: 10.1111/0020-8833.00184.

Recommended Readings:

• Alexander Wendt. 1995. "Constructing International Politics." *International Security* 20(1): 71-81.

• David Dessler. 1999. "Constructivism Within a Positive Social Science." *Review* of *International Studies* 25(1): 123-138.

• John Gerard Ruggie. 1998. "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52(4): 855-885.

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

• Erik Ringmar. 1997. "Alexander Wendt: A Social Scientist Struggling with History," in Iver B. Neumann and Ole Waever, eds., *The Future of International Relations: Masters in the Making?* London: Routledge.

• Steve Smith. 2000. "Wendt's World." *Review of International Studies* 26(1): 151-163.

Week 12 (Dec 1) Postcolonialism

Reading IR: Postcolonialism

Assigned Readings:

• Rita Abrahamsen. 2007. "Postcolonialism," in Martin Griffiths, ed., *International Relations Theory for the Twenty-First Century*. London: Routledge, 111-122. [e-book].

• Phillip Darby and A.J. Paolini. 1994. "Bridging International Relations and Postcolonialism," *Alternatives* 19(3): 371-397. doi: 10.1177/030437549401900304.

• Sanjay Seth. 2011. "Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 40(1): 167-183. doi: 10.1177/0305829811412325.

• Arlene B. Tickner. 2013. "Core, periphery and (neo)imperialist International Relations." *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3): 627-646. doi: 10.1177/1354066113494323.

• V. Spike Peterson. 2020. "Family Matters in Racial Logics: Tracing Intimacies, Inequalities, and Ideologies." *Review of International Studies* 46(2): 176-196. doi: 10.1017/S0260210519000433.

Recommended Readings:

• Edward W. Said. 1979. Orientalism. New York: Vintage Books, 1-28.

• Edward W. Said. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Vintage, 3-61, 191-209.

• Arjun Appadurai. 1988. "Putting Hierarchy in Its Place." *Cultural Anthropology* 3(1): 36-49.

• Phillip Darby. 1998. *The Fiction of Imperialism: Reading Between International Relations & Postcolonialism*. London: Cassell, 9-33.

• Sandra Harding. 1998. *Is Science Multicultural? Postcolonialisms, Feminisms, and Epistemologies*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 146-87.

• Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. 1988. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, eds., *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

• Kwame Anthony Appiah. 1991. "Is the Post- in Postmodernism the Post- in Postcolonial?" *Critical Inquiry* 17(2): 336-357.

• Albert J. Paolini. 1999. *Navigating Modernity: Postcolonialism, Identity, and International Relations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner, 169-200.

• Geeta Chowdhry and Sheila Nair, eds. 2002. *Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations: Reading Race Gender and Class.* London: Routledge, passim.

• Sankaran Krishna. 1993. "The Importance of Being Ironic: A Postcolonial View on Critical International Relations Theory," *Alternatives* 18(3): 385-417. doi: 10.1177/030437549301800306.

• James Der Derian. 1994. "The Pen, the Sword, and the Smart Bomb: Criticism in the Age of Video." *Alternatives* 19(1), pp. 133-140. [Response to Sankaran Krishna's review article above].

Note: Essay due in class

Week 13 (Dec 8) Pop Culture

Pop Culture

Assigned Readings:

• Roland Bleiker. 2001. "The Aesthetic Turn in International Political Theory," *Millennium* 30(3): 509-533. doi: 10.1177/03058298010300031001.

• Jutta Weldes. 1999. "Going Cultural: Star Trek, State Action, and Popular Culture," *Millennium* 28(1): 117-134. doi: 10.1177/03058298990280011201.

• Kyle Grayon, Matt Davies, and Simon Philpott. 2009. "Pop Goes IR? Researching the Popular Culture–World Politics Continuum," *Politics* 29(3): 155-163. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9256.2009.01351.x.

• Nick Robinson. 2012. "Videogames, Persuasion and the War on Terror: Escaping or Embedding the Military-Entertainment Complex?" *Political Studies* 60(3): 504-522. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9248.2011.00923.x.

• Tim Aistrope. 2020. "Popular Culture, the Body and World politics." *European Journal of International Relations* 26(1): 163-186. doi: 10.1177/1354066119851849.

Recommended Readings:

• Cynthia Weber. 2001. *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*. London: Routledge, passim.

• Iver Neumann. 2001. "Grab a Phaser, Ambassador': Diplomacy in Star Trek." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 30(3): 603-624.

• Roland Bleiker, ed. 2000. Poetic World Politics, special issue of *Alternatives* 25(3).

• Roland Bleiker. 2000. *Popular Dissent, Human Agency and Global Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 244-272.

• Louise Amoore. 2007. "Vigilant Visualities: The Watchful Politics of the War on Terror." *Security Dialogue* 38(2): 215-232.

Course Policies

Submission of Assignments

Written work must be submitted directly to the instructor at <u>mbeier@mcmaster.ca</u> in either Word or PDF format, no later than 11:59 pm (Eastern) on the date it is due.

Grades

Grades will be based on the McMaster University grading scale:

MARK	GRADE
90-100	A+
85-90	A
80-84	A-
77-79	B+
73-76	В
70-72	B-
69-0	F

Late Assignments

Late papers will be accepted, but will be subject to a late penalty of 5 per cent per weekday to a maximum of 5 days, after which they will not be accepted and a mark of 0 will be recorded. In the interest of fairness to all students, there will be no exceptions to this unless you have arranged with me in advance for an extension. Papers submitted after deadlines (including excused late papers) will be marked, but comments will not be provided.

Absences, Missed Work, Illness

In light of the format of the course and the emphasis on regular and consistent participation in class discussions, attendance is mandatory. Some absences (such as in cases of illness, for example) may be unavoidable. Please contact me in advance (or as soon thereafter as possible) via email if you are going to be absent.

Faculty of Social Sciences E-mail Communication Policy

Effective September 1, 2010, it is the policy of the Faculty of Social Sciences that all email communication sent from students to instructors (including TAs), and from students to staff, must originate from the student's own McMaster University e-mail account. This policy protects confidentiality and confirms the identity of the student. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that communication is sent to the university from a McMaster account. If an instructor becomes aware that a communication has come from an alternate address, the instructor may not reply at his or her discretion.

University Policies

Academic Integrity Statement

You are expected to exhibit honesty and use ethical behaviour in all aspects of the learning process. Academic credentials you earn are rooted in principles of honesty and academic integrity. It is your responsibility to understand what constitutes academic dishonesty.

Academic dishonesty is to knowingly act or fail to act in a way that results or could result in unearned academic credit or advantage. This behaviour can result in serious consequences, e.g. the grade of zero on an assignment, loss of credit with a notation on the transcript (notation reads: "Grade of F assigned for academic dishonesty"), and/or suspension or expulsion from the university. For information on the various types of academic dishonesty please refer to the <u>Academic Integrity Policy</u>, located at <u>https://secretariat.mcmaster.ca/university-policies-procedures- guidelines/</u>

The following illustrates only three forms of academic dishonesty:

- plagiarism, e.g. the submission of work that is not one's own or for which other credit has been obtained.
- improper collaboration in group work.
- copying or using unauthorized aids in tests and examinations.

Authenticity / Plagiarism Detection

Some courses may use a web-based service (Turnitin.com) to reveal authenticity and ownership of student submitted work. For courses using such software, students will be expected to submit their work electronically either directly to Turnitin.com or via an online learning platform (e.g. A2L, etc.) using plagiarism detection (a service supported by Turnitin.com) so it can be checked for academic dishonesty.

Students who do not wish their work to be submitted through the plagiarism detection software must inform the Instructor before the assignment is due. No penalty will be assigned to a student who does not submit work to the plagiarism detection software. **All submitted work is subject to normal verification that standards of academic integrity have been upheld** (e.g., on-line search, other software, etc.). For more details about McMaster's use of Turnitin.com please go to www.mcmaster.ca/academicintegrity.

Courses with an On-line Element

Some courses may use on-line elements (e.g. e-mail, Avenue to Learn (A2L), LearnLink, web pages, capa, Moodle, ThinkingCap, etc.). Students should be aware that, when they access the electronic components of a course using these elements, private information such as first and last names, user names for the McMaster e-mail accounts, and program affiliation may become apparent to all other students in the same course. The available information is dependent on the technology used. Continuation in a course that uses on-line elements will be deemed consent to this disclosure. If you have any questions or concerns about such disclosure please discuss this with the course instructor.

Online Proctoring

Some courses may use online proctoring software for tests and exams. This software may require students to turn on their video camera, present identification, monitor and record their computer activities, and/or lock/restrict their browser or other

applications/software during tests or exams. This software may be required to be installed before the test/exam begins.

Conduct Expectations

As a McMaster student, you have the right to experience, and the responsibility to demonstrate, respectful and dignified interactions within all of our living, learning and working communities. These expectations are described in the <u>Code of Student Rights</u> & <u>Responsibilities</u> (the "Code"). All students share the responsibility of maintaining a positive environment for the academic and personal growth of all McMaster community members, **whether in person or online**.

It is essential that students be mindful of their interactions online, as the Code remains in effect in virtual learning environments. The Code applies to any interactions that adversely affect, disrupt, or interfere with reasonable participation in University activities. Student disruptions or behaviours that interfere with university functions on online platforms (e.g. use of Avenue 2 Learn, WebEx or Zoom for delivery), will be taken very seriously and will be investigated. Outcomes may include restriction or removal of the involved students' access to these platforms

Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities

Students with disabilities who require academic accommodation must contact <u>Student</u> <u>Accessibility Services</u> (SAS) at 905-525-9140 ext. 28652 or <u>sas@mcmaster.ca</u> to make arrangements with a Program Coordinator. For further information, consult McMaster University's <u>Academic Accommodation of Students with Disabilities</u> policy.

Academic Accommodation for Religious, Indigenous or Spiritual Observances (RISO)

Students requiring academic accommodation based on religious, indigenous or spiritual observances should follow the procedures set out in the <u>RISO</u> policy. Students should submit their request to their Faculty Office *normally within 10 working days* of the beginning of term in which they anticipate a need for accommodation <u>or</u> to the Registrar's Office prior to their examinations. Students should also contact their instructors as soon as possible to make alternative arrangements for classes, assignments, and tests.

Copyright and Recording

Students are advised that lectures, demonstrations, performances, and any other course material provided by an instructor include copyright protected works. The Copyright Act and copyright law protect every original literary, dramatic, musical and artistic work, **including lectures** by University instructors

The recording of lectures, tutorials, or other methods of instruction may occur during a course. Recording may be done by either the instructor for the purpose of authorized distribution, or by a student for the purpose of personal study. Students should be

aware that their voice and/or image may be recorded by others during the class. Please speak with the instructor if this is a concern for you.

Extreme Circumstances

The University reserves the right to change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances (e.g., severe weather, labour disruptions, etc.). Changes will be communicated through regular McMaster communication channels, such as McMaster Daily News, A2L and/or McMaster email.

Course Modification

The instructor and university reserve the right to modify elements of the course during the term. The university may change the dates and deadlines for any or all courses in extreme circumstances. If either type of modification becomes necessary, reasonable notice and communication with the students will be given with explanation and the opportunity to comment on changes. It is the responsibility of the student to check his/her McMaster email and course websites weekly during the term and to note any changes.