
MA Module Code: 7PIRS025W (Level: 7, Credits: 20)

Lecture and Seminar: Thursday 10.00am-1.00pm
Wells Street 206 (semester 1)

Module Leader: Professor David Chandler (Room: Wells Street 504, email: D.Chandler@wmin.ac.uk)

Module Summary

Today the biggest challenge facing policy-makers appears to be the growing awareness of complexity. In a complex world, it is seemingly much more difficult to govern, and to act instrumentally, in order to fulfil policy goals. The module introduces students to the theoretical frameworks and practices of the politics of complexity, the debates that have been triggered, and the way that complexity understandings have developed, especially in the 2000s and 2010s. Emphasis is placed upon introducing students to some of the conceptual frameworks deployed in understanding system effects on political, economic and social life and how these enable us to rethink governance, power and agency. However, this module is also very practically orientated, it engages with how complexity is reflected in new approaches to policy-making and understanding, particularly focusing on how problems are responded to and the distinctions between preventive policy-understandings, resilience/bouncing back approaches and more transformative understandings of how to engage with a complex world.
Module Aims

1. To introduce students to the theoretical frameworks and practices of the politics of complexity, the debates they have triggered, and the way that complexity approaches have developed, particularly over the last decade.
2. To consider the changing framework of discussions of governance in relation to questions of who governs, how governance is legitimated, the processes of governance and the objects of governance.
3. To trace discussion of policy-making in relation to agency and the politics of complexity, in particular the changing understandings of agency with more diversified ranges of actors and more circulatory, asymmetric and flatter concepts of agency.
4. To consider some of the contexts in which understandings of political power are expressed within the framework of complexity.
5. To analyse reflexive forms of governing, resilience and adaptivity as responses to the problem of governing complexity.
6. To examine the changing nature and dynamics of democratic practices, and to facilitate the development of analytical skills that enable students to understand different democratic initiatives within a wider framework of complexity approaches.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this module, students are expected to:
1. Critically evaluate a range of theories of complexity as they affect political understandings of the role and practices of government.
2. Demonstrate a sound critical and advanced understanding of the different ways in which complexity thinking is deployed as both a limit to political power and also as a way of enabling political change.
3. Analyse how different conceptualisations of politics and complexity developed in relation to different bodies of theory, such as pragmatism, neoliberalism, assemblage theory, complex adaptive systems, post-foundationalism, new institutionalism, actor-network-theory, new materialism and posthumanism.
4. Critically evaluate how the politics of complexity interrogates and challenges liberal modernist binaries of politics/economics, state/society, public/private, subject/object, mind/body, human/nature, threat/security referent, inside/outside, means/ends etc.
5. Rigorously evaluate the link between democracy as this is understood in terms of formal representation and in terms of social or societal processes.
Teaching, Learning and Assessment

One 3 hour seminar per week involving small group work and student led-discussions. Students are expected to prepare in advance as this involves discussion/interpretation of key readings.

Readings asterisked are available on Blackboard course materials.

The questions with each seminar presentation are to guide your thinking only; the readings will be at the centre of our discussion.

The 3 essential readings for each seminar will be discussed in groups or in class collectively, it is essential that you undertake at least your one group reading and preferably all three to make the most of the seminar discussion.

The assessment for this module is one book review of 1,500 words and one essay of 3,500 words.

The books for review and the essay questions are available on pages 28-29 of this module guide.

The deadline for the book review is 1.00pm Thursday 1 November 2018 and the deadline for the essay is 1.00pm 13 December 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of assessment</th>
<th>Weighting %</th>
<th>Qualifying mark/set %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essay (3,500 words)</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book Review (1,500 words)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Lecture Programme

| Week One: 27 September | Introduction: What Do We Mean By Complexity?  
Discussion of Assessment Regime and Seminar Allocation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week Two: 4 October</td>
<td>The End of Modernity? The Anthropocene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week Three: 11 October</td>
<td>Complex Life as a Constraint: From Linear to Non-Linear Causality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week Four: 18 October</td>
<td>Complex Life as Enabling &amp; Creative: Emergent Causality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week Five: 25 October</td>
<td>Resilience, Adaptation and Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Week Six: 1 November   | Student Engagement Week: Visit to ‘The Future Starts Here’,  
Victoria & Albert Museum, South Kensington (TBC) |
| 1 November             | **Book Review Deadline 1.00pm** |
| Week Seven: 8 November | The Implications for International Intervention |
| Week Eight: 15 November| The Implications for Rights and Representation |
| Week Nine: 22 November | The Implications for Knowledge: Is Sensing the new Knowing?  
Discussion of essay questions and preparation |
| Week Ten: 29 November  | Thinking Differently: Film showing, Donna Haraway: Story Telling for Earthly Survival discussion led by Harshavardhan Bhat and Ignacio Martínez |
| Week Eleven: 6 December| Implications for Research Methods: Actor-Network Theory, New Materialism, Posthumanism |
| Week Twelve: 13 December| Conclusion: Beyond Complexity? |
| 13 December            | **Essay Deadline 1.00pm** |
**Essential Reading**

**Key Texts**

**Background Reading**


**Periodicals and Other Sources**

Resilience: Policies, Practices and Discourses

Security Dialogue

International Political Sociology

Constellations

Ecology and Society

Economy and Society

Theory, Culture and Society

Millennium: Journal of International Studies
Week One: 27 September 2018
Introduction: What Do We Mean By Complexity?

This session intends to introduce students to the module as a whole and to the problematic governing complexity. We will begin to engage with the problematic at the most general level, especially as most of the class will not have had the chance to do much of the readings and discuss what complexity might be, how it might be measured and what the implications of complexity might be for governing and for our understandings of power and agency and also for critical theorising.

Questions

How can things be made more complex? What needs to be added or taken away?
What is the relationship between complexity and causality?
What is the relationship between complexity and agency?
Is complexity a solution or a problem?

3 Essential readings

Danile Clausen, ‘Crude Thinking — 7 Ways of Dealing with the Complex in IR’, E-IR, 29 January 2016

Readings

Anything on complexity or recent thinking in political theory, IR, philosophy, human geography and the social sciences more generally will be fine. There are some more specific suggestions below.
Ecologist Eric Berlow, 3 minute video ‘Simplifying Complexity’, 3 September 2013.
http://www.allianceforpeacebuilding.org/2013/09/simplifying-complexity-ted-talk/
http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/b03ls154
M. Mitchell Waldrop, Complexity: The Emerging Science at the Edge of Order and Chaos (Viking, 1993)
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Week Two: 4 October 2018
The End of Modernity? The Anthropocene

This session will discuss whether complexity is new or not. You may have come across the term ‘the Anthropocene’, this is a term for a new geological epoch, one in which human activities can no longer be seen as separate from the Earth's ecosystems, heralding a paradigm shift in governance theory and practice. This understanding of the end of an ‘outside’ - that human understandings of progress have reached a limit is crucial for understanding complexity. The entanglements of human actions with environmental processes is captured well in the work of sociologists Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck. For these theorists the complex world is understood as ‘late-modernity’, the ‘second modernity’, ‘risk society’ or the ‘globalised world’ and is a relatively recent phenomenon. Another position, that these entanglements of complexity are not new but merely involve the recognition that modernist assumptions rested on a false, reductionist set of understandings is perhaps most boldly articulated by Bruno Latour. What does Bruno Latour mean when he says: ‘Put quite simply, second modernity is first modernity plus its externalities: everything that had been externalized as irrelevant or impossible to calculate is back in – with a vengeance’? (Is Re-modernization Occurring’, p. 37)

Questions

Is the Anthropocene a threat or an opportunity?
How does the linking of culture/environment; human/nature change modernist thinking?
It seems that stratigraphers are engaged in similar debates to social scientists on when the divide between culture/nature was breached, what is at stake in this debate?

3 Essential readings


Readings

Some awareness of the Anthropocene and any books or articles by Anthony Giddens and Ulrich Beck and/or Bruno Latour will be fine for this session. These are major social theorists and their work is easily accessible. Some suggestions are below.

  http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0305829816636674
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Ian Sample, ‘Anthropocene: is this the new epoch of humans?’, *Guardian*, 16 October 2014.

The Anthropocene Project (website)

[http://www.economist.com/node/18741749](http://www.economist.com/node/18741749)


Welcome to the Anthropocene (website)


[http://t.co/ung1fOZcIP](http://t.co/ung1fOZcIP)


[http://anr.sagepub.com/content/1/1/57.full.pdf](http://anr.sagepub.com/content/1/1/57.full.pdf)

[http://anr.sagepub.com/content/1/1/62.full.pdf+html](http://anr.sagepub.com/content/1/1/62.full.pdf+html)
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**Week Three: 11 October 2018**

**Complexity as a Limit: From Linear to Non-Linear Causality**

In modernist understandings of governance, there was an assumption that certain sets of policies could be applied to achieve certain desired results. This was implied in the capacity to learn lessons from policy failures and the ability to export governance systems elsewhere in the world, from the spread of ‘civilisation’ under colonial rule to the contestation between liberal market economies and socialist state-based economic systems. However, these modernist views of linearity have been increasingly challenged by non-linear understandings of social causality which emphasise difference, plurality and social processes. For non-linear approaches, difference makes a difference. Firstly, differences in time, space, culture, law, politics, religion, economy etc mean that there is little ‘linear’ in the relation between cause and effect. Different contexts or states of affairs will be affected differently with different outcomes. Secondly, differences make a difference in terms of the direction of time, previous states of affairs, decisions etc impact on the responses to later events, this directionality of time is often called ‘path dependency’. Non-linear approaches were associated from the late 1970s with new institutionalist and neoliberal understandings, particularly in the field of international development (where North develops and applies Hayek’s approach). Non-linearity is at the heart of complexity understandings and is also associated with a radical or left critique of linear assumptions (see the Scott reading).

**Questions**

What is a ‘linear’ understanding? Why is it ‘mechanistic’ or ‘reductionist’?
Why does North say that “every effort at producing change in the system has usually produced almost exactly the reverse consequences downstream”?
What conditions are necessary for linear cause-and-effect outcomes? What are the consequences of this?

**3 Essential readings**


**Readings**
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David Chandler, Resilience: the Governance of Complexity (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014) chapters 1, 2 and 10.


Week Four: 18 October 2018

Complex Life as Enabling & Creative: Emergent Causality

Last session, non-linear approaches introduced us to the problem of complexity as a problem of knowledge. Adding differences of time and space made causal understandings more difficult. But not necessarily impossible, instrumental policy interventions were still possible even though the emphasis shifted from the policy-maker to the object of policy itself. The key shift in complexity understandings over the last couple of decades have involved a shift from a problem of knowledge of complex determinations to a question of the ‘emergent’ nature of reality itself. This understands complexity in a more ontological way, as not a problem of knowledge of determinations but of a reality which emerges more contingently without hidden determinations. This view of complexity is seen as advancing scientific knowledge in some US approaches, particularly those based at the Santa Fe Institute which seeks to apply complexity understandings to social problems, and as less ‘scientific’ and more open and creative in more ‘European’ critical social thought.

Questions

Is complexity similar to realism and/or to postmodernism?
What is a complex adaptive system? What is emergence?
Does complexity open up new avenues for research and understanding?

3 Essential readings

Politics of Global Complexity 2018-2019


And a video

‘How Wolves Change Rivers’ narrated by George Monbiot
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ysa5OBhXz-Q&app=desktop

Readings


Articles from the Millennium: Journal of International Studies, 41:3 (June 2013) special issue ‘Materialism and World Politics’.
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**Week Five: 25 October 2018**

Resilience, Adaptation and Vulnerability

In a more interconnected world, it is held there is less separation between governance policies and objects/subjects to be governed/secured. Often policy-making involves a greater understanding of our own relations/entanglements. Resilience has become a major field of policy-making through which these new, more relational understandings have been worked through. There are many possible examples, perhaps one useful one is that of resilience in relation to disasters. Disasters were once seen as external events or shocks, and which necessitated recovery and ‘bouncing back’, but now are increasingly understood rather differently. Disasters are part of a learning/developmental/governmental process in ways in which they were not before. Disasters are reinscribed as the final point of processes which were previously hidden to us, or which we lacked awareness of; processes (or assemblages, in current parlance) in which we were all the time and already embedded within as actors with agency. Thus, in reflexive resilience-thinking, disasters do not require ‘bouncing back’ to the status quo ante, but rather require self-reflexivity, in the awareness of how to bounce back differently: how to learn from the bad forms of governance that the disaster reveals and thus to prevent or limit such events in the future.

**Questions**

What is the difference between prevention, bouncing back and bouncing forward?
What happens when the security threat and the referent object of security are blurred?
What is the relationship between resilience and complexity?

**3 Essential Readings**


**Readings**
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Rockefeller Global Resilience Partnership
http://www.globalresiliencepartnership.org/.


Peter Rogers, Resilience and the City: Change, (Dis)Order and Disaster (Ashgate, 2012).

Julian Reid and Brad Evans, Resilient Life: The Art of Living Dangerously (Polity, 2014).


http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2013/feb/06/school-young-people-resilience-failure


The Future of Disaster Risk Management, FLACSO/UNISDR, April 2013.
http://www.preventionweb.net/files/35715_thefutureofdisasterriskmanagement.pdf

Week Six: 1 November 2018
Student Engagement Week
Week Seven: 8 November 2018

The Implications for International Interventions

There are few areas where complexity and the awareness of nonlinearity (the gap between intentions and outcomes) is growing faster than that of foreign policy, particularly with regard to the difficulties of exporting Western norms or in terms of interventions in the cause of peace, development and democracy. In the 1990s universal approaches were popular, in the fields of humanitarian intervention, human rights promotion, international peacebuilding and statebuilding etc. Today, these approaches to international policy intervention are seen to be much more problematic. In this session we hope to discuss how our understandings have shifted so rapidly, perhaps leading to scepticism towards any attempt at international problem-solving.

Questions

Why does the Overseas Development Institute see humanitarianism as problematic?
Is it possible to separate the fields of peace, development and rights?
How can international intereners ensure that the unintended consequences don’t undermine the intended ones?

3 Essential readings

Overseas Development Institute (2016) Time to let go: a three-point proposal to change the humanitarian system.
http://wwwbbcuknewsuk-politics37372597

Readings

Cedric de Coning (17 minute YouTube video) ‘Coping With Peacebuilding Complexity’.
http://wwwyoutubecom/watch?v=_n9dNELJ-qc
http://www.santafeedu/media/workingpapers11-06-022pdf
Daniela Körppen and Norbert Ropers, ‘Introduction: Addressing the Complex Dynamics of Conflict Transformation’.
Week Eight: 15 November 2018
The Implications for Rights and Representation

In Week 4, we have seen how approaches of complexity uphold an understanding of power as emergent and fluid. There, life is conceived as a productive, performative and enabling force, which is always in excess with regard to the rigid and constraining structures of the formal power of potestas. This week’s session enquires what the implications of this conception of power are for ideas of politics, law and rights. How can the traditional modern tenets of constitutions, representation and decision-making be reformulated in order to attend to the relational complexities of a natural-and-social world? How can the universality of rights be reconciled with the assumption of life’s infinite difference and plurality? How can the rigidity and generality of the law become responsive to the fluidity of emergent global processes? In a Spinozian fashion, some authors identify strategies of empowerment and development with the enhancement of individuals’ self-fulfillment and freedom (Sen). Others discard a paradigm of representation built on identity and focus on beings’ capacities of doing and becoming (Grosz, Sharp). In the domain of law, finally, there emerges a growing need to adjust existent normative frameworks to the fluidity and fleetingness of new global societal dynamics. Despite their variety, the many perspectives explored in the session seem to converge on a common trend. They express a move away from an
understanding of politics as the constructed and artificial sphere of human institutions and concerted action towards one that is increasingly searched at the level of everyday interactions, relations and practices.

Questions

What is freedom? Is it a state of being or a process? Why does it matter?
What does liberation, emancipation or autonomy mean in an entangled world?
Are all forms of representation problematic? What is problematic about representation per se?

3 Essential Readings

* Amartya Sen, Development as Freedom, Intro and Chapter 1
  http://my.iilstu.edu/~jkshapi/Grosz_freedom.pdf

Readings

  http://projectlamar.com/media/grosztime.pdf
Leo Benedictus, “The nudge unit – has it worked so far?”, Guardian, 2 May 2013.
  http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2013/may/02/nudge-unit-has-it-worked

For an application to the discourse of Human Rights you can look at
The Implications for Knowledge: Is Sensing the new Knowing?

How do we know things under complexity? What type of knowledge do we need? Many people argue that the type of knowledge needs to be context specific and real time. What is the difference between modernist forms of generating knowledge, through statistical generalisation and complexity approaches based upon ‘drilling down’? Can knowledge ever be ‘real time’ and, if it was, would it make a difference?

Questions

Why is it argued that correlation can replace causation?
Why is the situated perspective more ‘objective’ than a ‘God’s eye’ view?
Why is it argued that Big Data can resolve problems? How does this work?

3 Essential readings


Readings

* Stefano Canali, ‘Big Data, epistemology and causality: Knowledge in and knowledge out in EXPOsOMICS’, Big Data & Society, 3(2), 2016: 1–11 http://bds.sagepub.com/content/3/2/2053951716669530
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http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/9944/


---

**Week Ten: 29 November 2018**

Thinking Differently: Film showing, *Donna Haraway: Story Telling for Earthly Survival* discussion led by Harshavardhan Bhat and Ignacio Martínez

**Essential reading (before the seminar)**

Week Eleven: 6 December 2018
Implications for Research Methods: Actor-Network Theory, New Materialism, Posthumanism

For many thinkers today, complexity approaches have opened up new ways of thinking about the world that challenge some of the basic binaries of modernist thinking. What are the implications of the end of the nature/culture divide or the end of the subject/object divide? Is it important for us to experiment with how objects think and know the world? Why do some authors think that this is more important than understanding how people think about the world?

Questions

What is the difference between a ‘mediator’ and ‘intermediary’? What does ‘translation’ do?
Is complexity about ‘relations’ or ‘entities’ or both?
What is a ‘flat ontology’?
How can we learn ‘to be affected’ and why is this important?
Does the fact that we have more entanglements mean that our agency is increased?
Why does Latour counterpose ‘composition’ to ‘critique’?

3 Essential readings


Readings

Diana Coole and Samantha Frost, New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics (Duke University Press, 2010)
* Ian Bogost, Alien Phenomenology: Or What Its Like to be a Thing (University of Minnesota Press, 2012).
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http://humweb.ucsc.edu/feministstudies/faculty/barad/barad-posthumanist.pdf

The Invisible Committee, *To Our Friends* (2014) 4 Fuck Off Google
https://theanarchistlibrary.org/library/the-invisible-committee-to-our-friends


http://static.guim.co.uk/ni/1381763590219/-Some-thoughts-on-education.pdf


**Week Twelve: 13 December 2018**

**Conclusion: Beyond Complexity?**

In this concluding session we will reflect on the module as a whole and the implications of complexity for our understandings of governance, power and agency as well as considering whether the global world will continue to become more complex or whether complexity itself has limits and if so how these may be understood. Perhaps the fact that complexity now appears as something to be welcomed rather than feared indicates that the work of complexity is already achieved?
Assessment

Book review Deadline 1.00pm Thursday 1 November 2018

Choose one of the following ten books. Write a 1,500 word review on how the book relates to rethinking governance, power and agency today (do not just provide a summary of the book, treat it analytically).


3,500 word Essay  Deadline 1.00pm Thursday 13 December 2018

Choose one of the following six essay titles

1. What are the implications of complexity for our understanding of how governance should operate?
2. How is complexity linked to our understanding of the human?
3. What are the implications of complexity for our understanding of power?
4. How are resilience and complexity linked?
5. Do we still need knowledge in a world of complexity? What sort of knowledge?
6. What are the implications of complexity for our understanding of democracy and agency?
Assessment Rationale

The assessment regime is designed to encourage research expertise in the area of politics and complexity. It aims to develop advanced understanding of the concepts, frameworks and approaches of complexity thinking as applied to the rethinking of governance, agency and power. The assessment by essay and book review enables students to develop a critical understanding and to apply key theoretical accounts to current debates and problems with regard to the impact of complexity.

In particular, the book review is designed to develop analytical skills and to ensure that basic concepts and frames of debate are understood at an early stage of the module. The review encourages students to focus on their capacity to digest, comprehend and contextualise concepts, theories and policies key to governance and complexity.

The research essay allows students to develop an extended analysis of key concepts, theories and/or policies, to engage in an in-depth evaluation of competing interpretations and theoretical approaches, and to explore the application of governance practices both domestically and internationally. The essay challenges students to critically engage with their chosen topic and demonstrate their critical and analytical ability.

Further Information Regarding Coursework

In addition to the information contained in this Handbook, which is specific to the assessment for this module, you need to be aware of PIR’s general guidance and policies for coursework submission. The most up-to-date information is contained in the current version of the PIR Course Handbook, and includes guidance on:

- Submitting your work
- Late submission
- Plagiarism and referencing
- Mitigating circumstances
- Word limits

The current version of the PIR Course Handbook can be found on the Politics and International Relations Blackboard site.

Other important sources of information. For information about academic progression, condoned credits, referral opportunities and the calculation of degree awards, see the Handbook of Academic Regulations (section 17). As these are the overarching regulations at Westminster, they are very detailed and quite technical. If you need help interpreting the regulations, please email your Course Leader.