

Beyond International Relations 2018-2019

**Department of Politics and International Relations**  
**University of Westminster**  
32-38 Wells Street,  
London, W1T 3UW

# Beyond IR:

**The Politics of the International, the Global and the Planetary**

2018 - 2019

**Module Code: 7PIRS001W**

Spring semester

Time: 1.00 – 4.00pm Tuesdays

Room: Regent Street **152**

**Module leader: Professor David Chandler**

Room: Wells Street 504

Email: [D.Chandler@Westminster.ac.uk](mailto:D.Chandler@Westminster.ac.uk)

**Full Module Title: Beyond International Relations: The Politics of the International, the Global and the Planetary**

<b>Short Module Title:</b>	Beyond International Relations
<b>Module Code:</b>	7PIRS001W
<b>Module Level:</b>	7
<b>Academic credit weighting:</b>	20
<b>Length:</b>	1 semester
<b>Faculty:</b>	Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities
<b>Department:</b>	Politics and International Relations
<b>Module Leader(s):</b>	Professor David Chandler
<b>Extension:</b>	7605
<b>Room :</b>	WS504
<b>Email:</b>	D.Chandler@Westminster.ac.uk
<b>Host course:</b>	MA International Relations
<b>Status:</b>	Core
<b>Subject Board:</b>	MA International Relations
<b>Pre-requisites:</b>	None
<b>Co-requisites:</b>	None
<b>Assessment:</b>	1 essay 5,000 words (100%)

## Module Summary

This module reconsiders the 'beyond' of international relations. After the end of the cold war it seemed that international relations, as traditionally understood by the discipline in terms of power politics, *Realpolitik*, had come to an end. The assumptions of state-based politics, which had informed classical IR, in turn came into question. IR was understood as a discipline founded upon 'seeing like a state' (from the perspective of a very white, western elite) whereas there were many other, more pluralised, ways of seeing and thinking about politics. Thirty years into the opening up of the discipline of IR (to a global era), this module provides a chance to reflect upon the 'beyond' of the International. In the 1990s it seemed that this beyond offered a positive opportunity to think from non-state-based positions, from the universal view of global interests and concerns: to construct a liberal/globalised community, adding many more issues and concerns beyond traditional state security. In the 2000s it appeared that the beyond of the International, and the power, governance and knowledge assumptions that it relied upon, was not necessarily the globalising of liberal forms of rule or, if it was, this was no longer to be understood positively. In the deconstruction of the Global, universal, imaginary in the 2000s, the call within the discipline has not been for a return to the understandings of the past, but rather for a further problematisation of its assumptions: the rise of the Planetary.

In this module we analyse the new forms of thinking that have sought to grasp the world beyond the politics of the 'International': alternative ways of seeing and theorising the problems and assumptions of the political sphere. Of most importance, for this module, is that the beyond of IR is a set of discussions that do not see the world in terms of state-based theories of strategy and interests, therefore there is less attention to inter-national theory. The starting assumption is not the state acting in the context of anarchy. Of course, we still have states and states are central to policy-making discourses and international practices, but dominant discussions and debates in IR focus more upon how we understand and see the world beyond the narrow assumptions which informed the discipline of International Relations.

The module is in three sections. Firstly, it considers how the Global or liberal turn was constructed in the 1990s (the deconstruction of the 'methodological nationalism' that necessarily informed classical IR). This first paradigm is a constructive or positive one - the development of constructivist, critical and cosmopolitan approaches, posed in direct opposition to state-based understandings. The second paradigm is a deconstructive or negative one; we analyse how the limits to global and liberal aspirations enabled these framings to be deconstructed and critiqued - especially in the historical, sociological, economic frameworks of new institutionalist, critical and decolonial understandings. Third, the module considers whether the present moment marks the closure of 'the rise and fall of the Global', perhaps a shift away from the deconstruction and critique of the Global and towards a new positive and constructive paradigm, sometimes associated with the planetary politics of the Anthropocene.

### Module Aims

1. To introduce students to the theoretical frameworks and practices of the world beyond international relations, to the debates which it has triggered, and the way that approaches to the discipline of IR have developed in the post-cold war era.
2. The module considers the implications of the shift from an elite world of inter-state relations to a more socially complex world and how this shift has been theorised and understood in different ways (both positively and negatively).
3. The module analyses how the centrality of the state (both analytically and as a key institutional actor) has changed for international theorising. In this context, it particularly focuses on what might be termed 'neoliberal' or new institutionalist, critical and decolonial approaches, which place difference at the centre of international frameworks.
4. The module also introduces students to frameworks of complexity and posthumanism which suggest that international problems can neither be grasped in global nor international terms.

### Learning Outcomes

By the end of this module students will be able to:

1. Analyse a range of specialised theories that can be applied to the study of international relations; both in terms of understanding the shift to the global and the limits of this shift.
2. Critically evaluate how state-based approaches to IR have been displaced and the impacts that this has had upon ways of thinking about the discipline.
3. Analyse the relevance of critical, institutionalist and decolonial understandings of the limits of the global imaginary.
4. Critically analyse the limits to traditional understandings of structure and agency in the international sphere and how these apply to *Realpolitik* and power relations.
5. Select and apply specialised international theories and approaches to specific research problems and recognise the basic costs and benefits of those selections.

### 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. The assessment for this module is one essay of 5,000 words. **The essay questions are available on page 21** of this module guide. **The deadline for the essay is 1.00pm Thursday 11 April 2019.**

## Key Readings

- Bruno Latour, *Down to Earth: Politics in a New Climatic Regime*. Cambridge: Polity, 2018.
- Marisol de la Cadena and Mario Blaser (eds) *A World of Many Worlds*, Duke University Press, 2018.
- Dipesh Chakrabarty, 2018. 'Planetary Crises and the Difficulty of Being Modern', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 46(3) 259–282.
- Michel Serres, *The Natural Contract*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995.
- Fagan, Madeleine. 2016. "Security in the Anthropocene: Environment, Ecology, Escape." *European Journal of International Relations*.
- Dipesh Chakrabarty, 2012. 'Postcolonial Studies and the Challenge of Climate Change', *New Literary History*, Volume 43, Number 1: 1-18.
- Sylvia Wynter, 2003. 'Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation – an argument', *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3(3): 257-337.
- Burke, Anthony, Stefanie Fishel, Audra Mitchell, Simon Dalby, and Daniel J. Levine. 2016. "Planet Politics: A Manifesto from the End of IR." *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 44(3): 499–523.
- Cameron Harrington, 2016, 'The Ends of the World: International Relations and the Anthropocene', *Millennium*, 44(3)
- Audra Mitchell, 2017, 'Is IR going extinct?', *European Journal of International Relations* 23(1)
- Ulrich Beck, 'Toward a New Critical Theory with a Cosmopolitan Intent', *Constellations*, 10:4 (2003).
- Daniel Chernilo, 'The critique of methodological nationalism: Theory and history', *Thesis Eleven*, Vol 106, Issue 1, 2011
- Johan Galtung, 'Violence, Peace and Peace Research', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.6, No.3 (1969), pp.167 – 191.
- Ken Booth, 'Security and Emancipation', *Review of International Studies*, Vol.17, No.4 (1991), pp.313-327.
- Douglass North, 'Dealing with a Non-Ergodic World: Institutional Economics, Property Rights, and the Global Environment', *Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum*, Vol. 10, No.1 (1999), pp.1-12.
- Michael Dillon and Luis Lobo-Guerrero, 'Biopolitics of security in the 21st century: an introduction', *Review of International Studies*, (2008), 34, 265–292.
- Coleman M, Grove K, 2009, "Biopolitics, biopower, and the return of sovereignty" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 27(3) 489 – 507.
- David Chandler, *Hollow Hegemony* (London, Pluto Press, 2009)
- David Chandler, 'The Global Ideology: Rethinking the Politics of the "Global Turn" in IR', *International Relations*, Vol. 23, No. 4 (2009), pp.530-547
- Nik Hynek and David Chandler, 'No emancipatory alternative, no critical security studies', *Critical Studies on Security*, (2013) Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.46–63.
- David L. Blaney, Arlene B. Tickner, 'Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR', *Millennium* 45:3, 293-311, 2017.
- Anibal Quijano, 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America', *Nepantla: Views from the South* 1, no. 3 (2000): 552.
- John Law, 'What's Wrong with a One World World', 2011.
- Bruno Latour, 'Whose Cosmos, whose cosmopolitics? Comments on the Peace Terms of Ulrich Beck', *Common Knowledge* 10:3, 2004
- Erika Cudworth and Stephen Hobden, *Posthuman International Relations: Complexity, Ecologism and Global Politics* (London: Zed, 2011).
- Rosa Braidotti, *The Posthuman* (Cambridge: Polity, 2013).

## Seminar Programme Dates

### Introduction

W1 22 January - Seminar 1 - Introduction: The International, the Global and the Planetary *and seminar allocation*

W2 29 January – Seminar 2 – 30 Years after the End of History: The International vs the Global vs the Planetary

### Part One: The Global vs The International

W3 5 February – Seminar 3 – Globalisation vs Methodological Nationalism

W4 12 February – Seminar 4 – Social Constructivism vs Rationalism

W5 19 February - Seminar 5 - Human Security vs State Security

W6 26 February – *Student Engagement Week - No seminar – class activity tba*

### Part Two: Critiques of the Global Imaginary

W7 5 March - Seminar 6 – The Biopolitical Critique

W8 12 March - Seminar 7 – New Institutionalism and Neoliberalism

W9 19 March – Seminar 8 – Decoloniality and Pluriversal Politics

### Part Three: The Rise of the Planetary

W10 26 March Seminar 9 – Cosmopolitics after the ‘One World World’ *and essay preparation*

W11 2 April – Seminar 10 - The Anthropocene

W12 9 April – Seminar 11 - Conclusion: Rethinking the Rise and Fall of the Global

**Essay Submission – 1.00pm Thursday 11 April**

## Seminar Programme/ Readings

Please use this module guide only for this semester's module information and readings (the reading list link on Blackboard is a little out of date so please use instead the 'Reading and Lectures' link).

You are required to read at the very least the first 'Essential reading' before the seminar, but preferably all three of the short pieces, the additional readings are intended more for use in essay writing.

\* Readings which are asterisked are available directly on the 'Readings and Lectures' section of Blackboard

### -----Introduction-----

#### Seminar 1 (22 January)

#### Introduction: Beyond IR: The International, the Global and the Planetary *and allocation of seminar presentations*

The discipline of International Relations was shaped by discourses of Realism – based on a model of international anarchy in which states pursued the interests of *realpolitik* in the international sphere. This seminar introduces students to what happened after the weakening of this paradigm with the end of the cold war (please note that a grounding in IR theory is not essential for this module). We will introduce two major paradigms of thought, the global and the planetary, which have both challenged the dominance of the international. *The global* could be seen to be the opposite of the international, enabling a liberal or universal imaginary of progress. *The planetary* challenges the liberal or universal imaginary and provides a very different perspective, potentially displacing both the international and the global.

*We will also allocate seminar topics, so please consider which you would like to introduce.*

#### Questions:

What is the difference between International Relations and Global Politics?

How was the Global constructed against the classical paradigm?

What is the difference between Planetary and Global politics?

#### Background reading

I realise that you might not have time to do much prior reading; below are a couple of articles by Dipesh Chakrabarty to give some broader context to the debates and discussions in this module (*so please read even if this is after the first seminar*) and an example of recent, more narrow, IR debate on the distinctions and implications of the planetary, the global and the international:

\* Dipesh Chakrabarty, 2012. 'Postcolonial Studies and the Challenge of Climate Change', *New Literary History*, Volume 43, Number 1: 1-18.

[https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/59592/2/01\\_Chakrabarty\\_Postcolonial\\_Studies\\_and\\_the\\_2012.pdf](https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/bitstream/1885/59592/2/01_Chakrabarty_Postcolonial_Studies_and_the_2012.pdf)

\* Dipesh Chakrabarty, 2018. 'Planetary Crises and the Difficulty of Being Modern', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 46(3) 259–282.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0305829818771277>

\* Anthony Burke, Stefanie Fishel, Audra Mitchell, Simon Dalby, Daniel J. Levine, 'Planet Politics: A Manifesto from the End of IR', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 2016, 44(3), 499–523.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0305829816636674>

\* David Chandler, Erika Cudworth, Stephen Hobden, 'Anthropocene, Capitalocene and Liberal Cosmopolitan IR: A Response to Burke et al.'s 'Planet Politics', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 2018, 46(2), 190–208.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0305829817715247>

\* Stefanie Fishel, Anthony Burke, Audra Mitchell, Simon Dalby, Daniel Levine, 'Defending Planet Politics', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 2018, 46(2), 209-219.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0305829817742669>

-----  
**Seminar 2 (29 January)**

**30 Years after the End of History: The International vs the Global vs the Planetary**

The session provides an introductory overview of what is at stake for the discipline of international relations 30 years after the end of the Cold War. Two of the essential readings were published in 1989/1990 and both consider there to be break from the the traditional framing of the 'international'. Perhaps the best known is Fukuyama's classic article 'The End of History' seen as the harbinger of 'the global': arguing that IR need not be seen as a timeless word of conflict and that this world is exhausted without a clash of ideologies giving conflict in the international sphere meaning. The second, and perhaps more prescient, is Serres' 'The Natural Contract' seen as an early treatise on the distinctiveness of 'the planetary': the view that political and international theory, in their focus on conflict, consigned the reality of the world to the background. The third, more contemporary reading is Latour's 'triangulation' of the international, the global and the planetary, summarising his recent book, *Down to Earth*.

**Questions**

Was Fukuyama right to argue that conflict between states needed the meaning provided by ideologies?

How, according to Serres, does the Planetary challenge the International?

How, according to Latour, does the Planetary challenge the Global?

**Essential reading**

\* Michel Serres, *The Natural Contract*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1995). (Only the first two chapters essential, to page 50)

\* Bruno Latour, 'On a Possible Triangulation of Some Present Political Positions', *Critical Inquiry* 44 (Winter 2018): 213-226.

\* Francis Fukuyama, 'The End of History', *The National Interest*, Summer 1989, 1-18.

**Background reading**

Bruno Latour, *Down to Earth: Politics in the New Climactic Regime*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2018).



- \* Bruno Latour, Denise Milstein, Isaac Marrero-Guillamón & Israel Rodríguez-Giralt (2018) 'Down to earth social movements: an interview with Bruno Latour', *Social Movement Studies*, 17:3, 353-361
- \* Bruno Latour, 'Onus Orbis Terrarum: About a Possible Shift in the Definition of Sovereignty', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 2016, Vol. 44(3) 305–320.
- \* Mark B. Salter and William Walters, 'Bruno Latour Encounters International Relations: An Interview', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 2016, 44(3), 524–546.  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0305829816641497>

## -----Part One: The Global vs The International-----

### Seminar 3 (5 February)

#### Globalisation vs Methodological Nationalism

Globalisation and its meaning are important for this module, not so much in empirical terms as in what globalisation says about the methodological tools needed to grasp the 'international' sphere. It is very important to read the Rosenberg critique of globalisation theory (the *International Politics* article is provided on Blackboard, but the book would be better). This is because the key point we wish to discuss is how state-based understandings of the international collapsed so rapidly after the end of the cold war. Please also ensure that you read the Ulrich Beck article in *Constellations* and the Chernilo, to consider what the critique of 'methodological nationalism' means. It could be understood that globalization achieved what critical IR approaches did not (during the cold war), that is to successfully challenge the dominant state-based paradigm both in empirical terms but also (more importantly) in methodological and analytical terms. How did globalization achieve this sea change – for empirical reasons, for analytical reasons?

#### Questions:

- What is globalisation?
- What is the problem with 'methodological nationalism'?
- Why is the global the 'second (age of) modernity'?

#### Essential reading

- \* Justin Rosenberg, 'Globalisation Theory a Post Mortem', *International Politics*, 2005, 42, (2–74).
- \* Ulrich Beck, The Cosmopolitan Condition Why Methodological Nationalism Fails, *Theory, Culture & Society*, 2007, 24(7–8): 286-290.
- \* Daniel Chernilo, 'The critique of methodological nationalism: Theory and history', *Thesis Eleven*, Vol 106, Issue 1, 2011  
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0725513611415789>  
<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.ip.8800098>

#### Additional reading

- \* Ulrich Beck, 'Toward a New Critical Theory with a Cosmopolitan Intent', *Constellations*, 10:4 (2003).  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1351-0487.2003.00347.x/abstract>
- Ulrich Beck, 'The cosmopolitan perspective: sociology of the second age of modernity', *British Journal of Sociology*, Volume 51, Issue 1 2000 79–105  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2000.00079.x/abstract>
- \* Justin Rosenberg, 'International Relations — The 'Higher Bullshit': A Reply to the Globalization Theory Debate', *International Politics*, 2007, 44, (450–482).

\* Jan Aart Scholte 'Premature Obituaries: A Response to Justin Rosenberg', *International Politics*, 42(3), (2005): 390–399.

David Held and Anthony McGrew, 'Introduction: Globalization at Risk', in Held and McGrew (eds) *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies* (Cambridge: Polity, 2007).

Justin Rosenberg, *The Follies of Globalisation Theory* (London: Verso, 2000).

Robert Cooper, *The post-modern state and the world order* (Demos, 2002).

<http://www.demos.co.uk/files/postmodernstate.pdf>

*The Economist*, 'Foreign Policy: A three-way world', 18 December 1997.

<http://www.economist.com/node/455907>

David Held, *Democracy and the Global Order: From the Modern State to Cosmopolitan Governance* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995).

Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds.) (1997) *The Globalization of World Politics*, Oxford: OUP.

Albrow, M. (1996) *The Global Age*, Cambridge: Polity.

Archibugi, Daniele, Held, David and Kohler, Martin (eds) *Re-imagining Political Community: Studies in Cosmopolitan Democracy* (London: Polity Press, 1998)

Bauman, Z. (1998) *Globalization: The Human Consequences*, Cambridge: Polity.

Martin Shaw, *Theory of the Global State: Globality as an Unfinished Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000)

Clark, I. (1999) *Globalization and International Relations Theory*, Oxford: OUP.

Featherstone, M., Lash, S. and Robertson, R. (eds.) (1995) *Global Modernities*, London: Sage Publications.

Giddens, A. (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge: Polity.

Giddens, A. (1999) *Runaway World*, Profile Books, London: Profile Books.

Scholte, J. (2000) *Globalization: a Critical Introduction*, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

---

## Seminar 4 (12 February)

### Social Constructivism vs Rationalism

The shift towards a global world without a shift to a global form of sovereignty, and the maintenance of the inter-state system, necessitated a different understanding of the mechanisms of the international arena. Constructivism provided a sociological understanding of interaction, which challenged the rationalist approach of previous IR thinking. This was based upon an endogenous understanding of the intersubjective construction of identities and interests as opposed to rationalist IR approaches, which argued that states came to the international sphere already equipped with identities and interests, derived exogenously from international interaction. A new, post-foundational, agency of international dynamics emerged through interaction, states were no longer the central constitutive subjects of the international realm but were the products of this realm. The inversion of the relations between the international and the sovereign state are reflected well in the works of Jackson and Krasner (in additional readings below) as well as in the rise of global civil society, especially international NGO 'norm-entrepreneurs'.

### Questions

Why were rationalist approaches central to the discipline of IR?

What is an endogenous understanding and how does this inverse traditional approaches to IR?

What happens to politics and power in constructivist approaches?

Why is the end of the international associated with the rise of constructivism?

### Essential reading

\* Alexander Wendt 'Anarchy is what States Make of It', *International Organization*, Vol. 46, No.2 (1992), pp.394-419.

\* Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', *International Organization*, Vol.52, No.4, (1998), pp. 887-917

\* Mary Kaldor, 'The Idea of Global Civil Society?', *International Affairs*, Vol.79 (2003), No.3, pp.583-593.

### Additional reading

Robin Cook's speech on the government's ethical foreign policy, *Guardian*, 12 May 1997.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/1997/may/12/indonesia.ethicalforeignpolicy>

Robert H Jackson, *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations and the Third World* (Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Stephen D. Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999).

Kathryn Sikkink, *The Justice Cascade: Human Rights Prosecutions and Change in World Politics*, Chapter 1: Introduction

[https://bc.sas.upenn.edu/system/files/Sikkink\\_04.08.10.pdf](https://bc.sas.upenn.edu/system/files/Sikkink_04.08.10.pdf)

Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink, *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1998).

Thomas Risse, Stephen C. Ropp and Kathryn Sikkink, *The Power of Human Rights* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999/2001).

John Keane, *Global Civil Society?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003)

Tim Dunne and Nicholas J. Wheeler (eds) *Human Rights in Global Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Geoffrey Robertson QC, *Crimes Against Humanity: The Struggle for Global Justice* (London: Penguin, 1999/2000).

Mary Kaldor, *Global Civil Society: An Answer to War* (London: Polity, 2003)

David Chandler, 'Building Global Civil Society "From Below"?', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, Vol.33, No.2, 2004, pp.313-339.

<http://www.davidchandler.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Millennium-Building-GCS-published.pdf>

David Chandler, 'Deriving Norms from "Global Space": The Limits of Communicative Approaches to Global Civil Society Theorising', *Globalizations*, Vol. 4, No.2, (2007), pp.283-298.

<http://www.davidchandler.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Globalizations-Global-Space.pdf>

David Chandler, 'Global Space: Positivism, Progress and the Political - Reply to Kaldor, Dallmayer, Lipshutz, Berendsen and Patomäki', *Globalizations*, Vol. 4, No.2, (2007), pp.318-320. (For a draft of the responses replied to click the second link below)

<http://www.davidchandler.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Globalizations-Reply-Global-Space.pdf>

<http://www.davidchandler.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Globalizations-Global-Space-Responses.pdf>

---

## Seminar 5 (19 February)

### Human Security vs State Security

Critical theorists welcomed the shift to the global in the 1990s, seeing this an opportunity for a radical decentring of state-based approaches to security. Of particular interest, in terms of this module, is how the agency of human security and the barriers to human security are constructed. These frameworks, which argue that the particular interests of states are a barrier to a universalist liberal approach to global rights and justice, will be contrasted (in seminar 6) with the Foucauldian critics who argue that the problems lie

precisely in the pursuit of global liberal ends. This week we will also consider the work of Johan Galtung – especially his views of ‘structural violence’ and ‘positive peace’ as precursors of critical security approaches. For a background, to those unfamiliar with the discipline of International Relations, the Cox and Linklater readings (in the additional reading section) are classic statements.

### Questions

What is the problem with state-based approaches to security?

What is the barrier to global emancipation?

What is the agent of global emancipation?

What are the politics of human rights and human security?

### Essential reading

\* Ken Booth, ‘Security and Emancipation’, *Review of International Studies*, Vol.17, No.4 (1991), pp.313-327.

\* Johan Galtung, ‘Violence, Peace and Peace Research’, *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol.6, No.3 (1969), pp.167 – 191.

\* Tim Dunne and Nicholas J. Wheeler, ‘We the Peoples’: Contending Discourses of Security in Human Rights Theory and Practice’, *International Relations*, 18:1, (2004), pp.9-23.

### Additional reading

\* Robert Cox, ‘Social forces, states and world orders: beyond international relations theory’, *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 10 (1981), 128.

\* Andrew Linklater, ‘The Question of the Next Stage in International Relations Theory: A Critical-Theoretical Point of View’, *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, 21 (1992), 77-98.

\* Kathleen Ho, ‘Structural Violence as a Human Rights Violation’, *Essex Human Rights Review* Vol. 4 No. 2 September 2007.

Nicholas J Wheeler, *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (eds) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997).

J. Ann Tickner, ‘Re-visioning Security’, in Ken Booth and Steve Smith (eds) *International Relations Theory Today* (Cambridge: Polity, 1995/2002), pp.175-197.

Ken Booth, ‘Security in Anarchy: Utopian Realism in Theory and Practice’, *International Affairs*, Vol.67, No.3 (1991), pp.527-545.

Andrew Linklater, *The Transformation of Political Community* (Cambridge: Polity, 1998).

\* Nik Hynek and David Chandler, ‘No emancipatory alternative, no critical security studies’, *Critical Studies on Security*, (2013) Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.46–63.

David Chandler, ‘Universal Ethics and Elite Politics: the Limits of Normative Human Rights Theory’, *International Journal of Human Rights*, Vol. 5, No. 4, 2001, pp.72-89.

[http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal\\_articles/IJHR%20-%20Universal%20Ethics.pdf](http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/IJHR%20-%20Universal%20Ethics.pdf)

Simon Dalby, ‘Geopolitical Change and Contemporary Security Studies: Contextualizing the Human Security Agenda’, Working Paper No.30, Institute of International Relations, University of British Columbia, April 2000. <http://www.igi.ubc.ca/sites/liu/files/Publications/webwp30.pdf>

Marlies Glasius and Mary Kaldor, ‘Individuals First: A Human Security Strategy for the European Union’, *Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft*, No.1, 2005, pp.62-82. <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/id/ipg/02693.pdf>

Clare Short MP, "Security, development and conflict prevention", Department for International Development, 13 May 1998. <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/news/speeches/files/sp13may.html>

Mary Kaldor *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1999). Especially, Chapter 6: Towards a Cosmopolitan Approach Study Group on Europe's Security Capabilities, *A Human Security Doctrine for Europe*, Barcelona: 15 September 2004.

<http://www.lse.ac.uk/Depts/global/Human%20Security%20Report%20Full.pdf>.

\* Johan Galtung, 'Twenty-Five Theses on Development Theory and Practice', *Kasarinlan: Philippine Journal of Third World Studies*, Vol 11, No 1 (1995).

Ken Booth (ed.) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (New York: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005).

J. L. Holzgrefe and Robert O. Keohane (Eds) *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

Final Report of the Commission on Human Security

<http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/index.html>

especially Chapter 1: Human Security Now

<http://www.humansecurity-chs.org/finalreport/chapter1.pdf>

United Nations Development Project, *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*.

<http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/>

especially Chapter 2, 'New Dimensions of Human Security'

[http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/pdf/hdr\\_1994\\_ch2.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/1994/en/pdf/hdr_1994_ch2.pdf)

David Chandler, 'Human Security: The Dog that Didn't Bark', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (2008), pp.427-438.

[http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal\\_articles/Security%20Dialogue%20-%20Human%20Security%20I.pdf](http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/Security%20Dialogue%20-%20Human%20Security%20I.pdf)

David Chandler, 'Human Security II: Waiting for the Tail to Wag the Dog: Rejoinder to Ambrosetti, Owen and Wibben', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (2008), pp.463-469.

[http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal\\_articles/Security%20Dialogue%20-%20Human%20Security%20II.pdf](http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/Security%20Dialogue%20-%20Human%20Security%20II.pdf)

## -----Part Two: Critique of the Global Imaginary-----

### Seminar 6 (5 March)

#### The Biopolitical Critique

The (broadly) Foucauldian critique takes on board the globalising of the international liberal order and opens up new approaches to critique in the international sphere: those of liberal 'governmentality' and of liberal 'biopolitics'. The biopolitical critique is pursued particularly in terms of security regimes, with good examples being the work of Giorgio Agamben, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Mick Dillon, Julian Reid and Mark Duffield. The governmentality approach, focuses more on global liberal approaches to statebuilding and intervention, less determined by economic interests but by epistemic and ideational frameworks legitimising the internationalisation of the liberal order, Jahn's work is particularly useful in this respect, in describing the telos of intervention as a 'liberal ideology'.

#### Questions

Why did Foucauldian approaches increasingly become popular in IR in the 2000s?

What is the Foucauldian critique of the emancipatory aspirations of critical theory?

What is the difference between a governmentality critique and a biopolitical critique?

**Essential reading**

\* Michael Dillon and Luis Lobo-Guerrero, 'Biopolitics of security in the 21st century: an introduction', *Review of International Studies*, (2008), 34, 265–292.

\* Thomas Lemke, "'The Birth of Bio-Politics" – Michel Foucault's Lecture at the Collège de France on Neo-Liberal Governmentality', *Economy and Society*, Volume 30, Issue 2, 2001, pages 190-207.

\* Coleman M, Grove K, 2009, "Biopolitics, biopower, and the return of sovereignty" *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 27(3) 489 – 507.

**Additional reading**

Hardt, M. and Negri, A. (2006) *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire* (London: Penguin).

Duffield, M. (2007) *Development, Security and Unending War: Governing the World of Peoples* (London: Polity).

\* Jahn, B. (2007) 'The Tragedy of Liberal Diplomacy: Part I', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 1:1, pp.87-106

\* Jahn, B. (2007) 'The Tragedy of Liberal Diplomacy: Part II', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 1:2, pp.211-229.

\* Julian Reid, 'The Biopoliticization of Humanitarianism: From Saving Bare Life to Securing the Biohuman in Post-Interventionary Societies', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 4:4, (2010), pp.391-411.

\* Colleen Bell & Brad Evans, 'Terrorism to Insurgency: Mapping the Post-Intervention Security Terrain', *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 4:4, (2010), pp.371-390.

\* John Heathershaw, 'Unpacking the Liberal Peace: The Dividing and Merging of Peacebuilding Discourses', *Millennium - Journal of International Studies*, (2008), 36, 597.

\* Nik Hynek and David Chandler, 'No emancipatory alternative, no critical security studies', *Critical Studies on Security*, (2013) Vol. 1, No. 1, pp.46–63.

Dillon, M. and Reid, J. (2009) *The Liberal Way of War: Killing to Make Life Live* (London: Routledge).

Jabri, V. (2007) *War and the Transformation of Global Politics* (Basingstoke: MacMillan).

Michael Hardt, M and Antonio Negri, A. (2001) *Empire* (New York: Harvard University Press, 2001).

Scott Hamilton, 'Add Foucault and Stir: The Perils and Promise of Governmentality and the Global', *European Review of International Studies*, Vol. 1(2) (2014).

<http://www.budrich-journals.de/index.php/eris/article/view/16508/14414>.

Mark Duffield, *Global Governance and the New Wars: The Merging of Development and Security* (London: Zed Books, 2001).

\* Thomas Lemke, 'Foucault, Governmentality, and Critique', *Rethinking Marxism: A Journal of Economics, Culture & Society*, Volume 14, Issue 3, 2002, pages 49-64.

David Chandler, "From Security to Insecurity: Kaldor, Duffield and Furedi", *Journal of Conflict, Security and Development*, Vol. 8, No. 2 (2008), pp.265-276.

[http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal\\_articles/CSD%20-%20Security%20review%20article.pdf](http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/CSD%20-%20Security%20review%20article.pdf)

Chandler, D. 'War without End(s): Grounding Global War', *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 40, No. 3 (2009), pp.243-262.

[http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal\\_articles/Security%20Dialogue%20-%20War%20without%20End\(s\).pdf](http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/Security%20Dialogue%20-%20War%20without%20End(s).pdf)

David Chandler, 'Critiquing Liberal Cosmopolitanism?: The Limits of the Biopolitical Approach', *International Political Sociology*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (2009), pp.53-70.

[http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal\\_articles/IPS%20-%20Global%20Cosmopolitanism.pdf](http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/IPS%20-%20Global%20Cosmopolitanism.pdf)

David Chandler, 'Globalizing Foucault: From Critique to Apologia - Reply to Kiersey and Rosenow', *Global Society*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (2010), pp.135-142.

[http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal\\_articles/Global%20Society%20-%20Chandler%20response.pdf](http://www.davidchandler.org/pdf/journal_articles/Global%20Society%20-%20Chandler%20response.pdf)

## Seminar 7 (12 March)

### New Institutionalism and Neoliberalism

Neoliberal frameworks of understanding, informed by new institutionalist approaches, conceptualise the problems of democracy and markets as endogenous social and historical products. In this 'bottom-up' understanding, international policy interventions shifted from exporting 'one-size-fits-all' liberal universalist approaches of the global, to a much richer and more sociologically informed view of the contextual, cultural, social and historical preconditions for progress and to the social processes through which 'path-dependencies' and problematic forms of governance were reproduced. Particularly those of New Institutional Economics, of which World Bank adviser and Nobel Prize winner, Douglass North provides the key example. These new institutionalist approaches sought to explain how differences between states could increase despite a globalised context, which allegedly removed barriers between states and created an equal and universal playing field. New institutionalist approaches bring the state back into international theorising but not as the rational actor of traditional IR theory but vital institutional frameworks, shaped by sociological and historical interactions. It is these frameworks, which are analysed as the socially constructed explanations for global differentiation. The emergence and the consequences of this approach will be examined in this seminar. For new institutionalist approaches, the world becomes increasingly differentiated and policy interventions, intended to universalise in a global world can unintentionally increase differentiations.

#### Questions

How do new institutionalist approaches explain the relationship between universalising or globalising forces and increased differentials in the world?

What is the solution to the barriers to development in these approaches?

Can international aid or external assistance enable progressive change?

How does new institutionalism challenge rationalist assumptions?

#### Essential reading

\* Douglass North, 'Dealing with a Non-Ergodic World: Institutional Economics, Property Rights, and the Global Environment', *Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum*, Vol. 10, No.1 (1999), pp.1-12.

\* Douglass C. North, 'Institutions', *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 5, No. 1, (Winter, 1991), pp. 97-112.

\* Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, 'A Theory of Political Transitions', *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (Sep., 2001), pp. 938-963.

#### Additional reading

\* Douglass North, John Joseph Wallis and Barry R. Weingast, 'A Conceptual Framework For Interpreting Recorded Human History', *NBER Working Paper Series*, Working Paper 12795, 2006.

B Guy Peters, *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The 'New Institutionalism'* (Continuum, 2005).

Douglass North, (1990) *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic Performance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Foucault, M. (2008) *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France 1978-1979* (Basingstoke: Palgrave).

Commission for Africa, *Our Common Interest*, 11 March 2005.

<http://www.commissionforafrica.info/2005-report>

\* Geoffrey M. Hodgson, 'Institutional Economics into the Twenty-First Century', *Studi e Note di Economia*, 14:1 (2009), pp. 3-26.

\* Douglass North, 'Institutions, Organizations and Market Competition' paper.

- \* Douglass North, 'Institutions and Economic Growth: An Historical Introduction', *World Development*, Vol. 17, No. 9, pp. 1319-1332, (1989).
- \* Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, James Robinson, Yunyong Thaicharoend, 'Institutional causes, macroeconomic symptoms: volatility, crises and growth', *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 50 (2003) 49–123
- \* Daron Acemoglu and Simon Johnson, 'Unbundling Institutions', *NBER Working Paper Series*, Working Paper 9934, 2003.
- \* Mushtaq H. Khan, 'State Failure in Developing Countries and Strategies of Institutional Reform', paper. Douglass North, *Understanding the Process of Economic Change* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005).
- Mancur Olson, *The Rise and Decline of Nations: Economic Growth, Stagflation and Social Rigidities* (Yale University Press, 1982).
- Douglass North, Wallis, J.J. and Weingast, B.R. (2009), *Violence and Social Orders: A Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Human History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Daron Acemoglu and James A. Robinson, *Why Nations Fail: The Origins of Power, Prosperity and Poverty* (Profile Books, 2012).
- Francis Fukuyama, *The Origins of Political Order: From Prehuman Times to the French Revolution* (Profile Books, 2012).
- Peter J. Katzenstein (ed) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics* (New York: Columbia University Press).
- Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (Penguin Books, 1979).
- Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (Polity Press, 1984).
- Walter Powell and Paul DiMaggio, *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* (University of Chicago Press, 1991).
- W Richard Scott, *Institutions and Organizations: Ideas and Interests* (Sage, 2007).
- Sven Steinmo, Kathleen Thelen and Frank Longstreth (eds) *Structuring Politics: Historical Institutionalism in Comparative Analysis* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- James Mahoney and Kathleen Thelen (eds) *Explaining Institutional Change: Ambiguity, Agency, and Power* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

-----

## **Seminar 8 (19 March)**

### **Decoloniality and Pluriversal Politics**

Decolonial scholars and advocates of alternative epistemologies argue that the discipline of IR does violence through its assumption that there is one world 'reality' and merely different cultures or ways of seeing this one world. It is argued that this approach to the 'Global' supports Western hegemonic assumptions of superiority, through the demeaning and exclusion of other ways of knowing and of doing politics internationally. This position questions the ontological assumption of one world-ism and therefore aligns itself with what is often called 'the ontological turn' in IR. The universal construction of the global is thereby understood as a colonizing move, the critical response being that of 'provincializing' or 'pluriversalizing' – reducing this perspective to one among many possible ways of engaging with the world.

#### **Questions**

- What is the link between universality and colonialism?
- What's the difference between pluralist and pluriversal?
- Why do Blaney and Tickner argue for a shift from epistemology to ontology?



### Essential reading

\* Rojas, Cristina (2016) 'Contesting the Colonial Logics of the International: Toward a Relational Politics for the Pluriverse', *International Political Sociology* 10(4): 369–382.

<https://academic.oup.com/ips/article-abstract/10/4/369/2613785>

\* Escobar, A. (2016) 'Thinking-feeling with the Earth: Territorial Struggles and the Ontological Dimension of the Epistemologies of the South', *Revista de Antropología Iberoamericana* 11(1): 11 – 32.

<http://www.aibr.org/antropologia/netesp/numeros/1101/110102e.pdf>

\* David L. Blaney, Arlene B. Tickner, 'Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR', *Millennium* 45:3, 293-311, 2017.

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0305829817702446>

### Additional reading

\* Wynter, Sylvia (2003) 'Unsettling the coloniality of being/power/truth/freedom: towards the human, after man, its overrepresentation – an argument', *CR: The New Centennial Review* 3(3): 257-337.

\* John Law, 'What's Wrong with a One World World', *Distinktion: Scandinavian Journal of Social Theory* (2011) 16(1): 126–39.

<http://www.heterogeneities.net/publications/Law2011WhatsWrongWithAOneWorldWorld.pdf>

\* Mario Blaser and Marisol de la Cadena, 'Introduction: PLURIVERSE: Proposals for a World of Many Worlds' in Marisol de la Cadena and Mario Blaser (eds) *A World of Many Worlds*, Duke University Press, 2018.

[https://www.dukeupress.edu/Assets/PubMaterials/978-1-4780-0295-6\\_601.pdf](https://www.dukeupress.edu/Assets/PubMaterials/978-1-4780-0295-6_601.pdf)

\* Cuiscanqui, Silvia Rivera (2012) 'Ch'ixinakax utxiwa: A Reflection on the Practices and Discourses of Decolonization', *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 111(1): 95-109.

\* Anibal Quijano, 'Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America', *Nepantla: Views from the South* 1, no. 3 (2000): 552.

<https://www.unc.edu/~aescobar/wan/wanquijano.pdf>

Sankaran Krishna 'Decolonizing International Relations' E-IR, 8 October 2012

<http://www.e-ir.info/2012/10/08/decolonizing-international-relations/>

Mignolo, W. (2013) 'On Pluriversity', *waltermignolo.com*. Available at: <http://waltermignolo.com/on-pluriversity/>.

David L. Blaney, Arlene B. Tickner, 'Introduction: Thinking Difference', in Blaney and Tickner (eds) *Thinking International Relations Differently* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012).

<http://www2.hhh.umn.edu/uthinkcache/gpa/globalnotes/Blaney%20and%20Tickner,%20Introductions%20to%20Worldingvolumes.pdf>

\* Mark Jackson, 'Composing postcolonial geographies: Postconstructivism, ecology and overcoming ontologies of critique', *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography* 35 (2014) 72–87.

Mignolo, Walter (2011) *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Walter D. Mignolo, 'The North of the South and the West of the East: A Provocation to the Question', *Ibraaz*, October 2014.

<http://www.ibraaz.org/usr/library/documents/main/the-north-of-the-south.pdf>

Shilliam, Robbie (2015) *The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections*, London: Bloomsbury.

Persaud, Randolph B. and R. B. J. Walker (2015) 'Introduction: Race, De-coloniality and International Relations', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 40(2): 83-84.

Hamid Dabashi, *Can Non-Europeans Think*, London: Zed Books, 2015.

Chakrabarty, Dipesh (2000) *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Chen, Kuan-Hsing (2010) *Asia as Method: Toward Deimperialization*, Durham: Duke University Press.

Ling, L. H. M. (2002) *Postcolonial International Relations: Conquest and Desire between Asia and the West*, London: Palgrave.

Inayatullah, Naeem and David L. Blaney (2004) *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, New York: Routledge.

## -----Part Three: The Rise of the Planetary-----

### Seminar 9 (27 March)

#### Cosmopolitics after the 'One World World' and essay preparation

This session continues and develops some of the themes raised last week in Seminar 8 (Decoloniality and Pluriversal Politics). The aim of this session is to draw out further the links between a shift towards 'ontological politics' and the rise of conceptions of the Planetary vis-à-vis the Global. Isabelle Stengers and Bruno Latour are often seen as leading theorists of cosmopolitics and contrast their approach with the assumptions of Kantian or 'Global' cosmopolitanism. As Blaser states, the Planetary can be seen as distinct from the Global as it implies an openness rather than a closure; where radical difference is positive and enabling rather than problematic. What is seen to be problematic about consensus politics or shared views of community?

#### Questions

What's the difference between Cosmopolitanism and Cosmopolitics?

What's wrong with a 'one world' world?

What's the difference between Latour's and Blaser's views of Cosmopolitics?

#### Essential reading

\* Marisol de la Cadena (2010) 'Indigenous Cosmopolitics In The Andes: Conceptual Reflections beyond "Politics"', *Cultural Anthropology* 25(2): 334–370.

<https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1548-1360.2010.01061.x>

\* Stengers, Isabelle (2005) "The Cosmopolitical Proposal." In *Making Things Public: Atmospheres of Democracy*, edited by Bruno Latour and Peter Weibel, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp.994–1003.

<https://balkanexpress.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/stengersthe-cosmopolitical-proposal.pdf>

\* Bruno Latour (2004) 'Whose Cosmos, whose cosmopolitics? Comments on the Peace Terms of Ulrich Beck', *Common Knowledge* 10:3,

[http://www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/92-BECK\\_GB.pdf](http://www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/92-BECK_GB.pdf)

\* Mario Blaser (2016) 'Is Another Cosmopolitics Possible', *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 31, Issue 4, pp. 545–570

<https://culanth.org/articles/852-is-another-cosmopolitics-possible>

#### Additional reading

John Law, 'Actor Network Theory and Material Semiotics', (2008) In: Turner, Bryan S. ed. *The New Blackwell Companion to Social Theory*, 3rd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 141–158.

<http://www.heterogeneities.net/publications/Law2007ANTandMaterialSemiotics.pdf>

Martin Holbraad, Morten Axel Pedersen and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, 'The Politics of Ontology: Anthropological Positions', *Cultural Anthropology Online* (2014): 2.

<https://culanth.org/fieldsights/462-the-politics-of-ontology-anthropological-positions>

\* Mario Blaser, 'Ontology and indigeneity: on the political ontology of heterogeneous assemblages', *Cultural Geographies* published online 4 October 2012.

\* Mario Blaser, 'Political ontology: cultural studies without "culture"? *Cultural Studies* (2009) 23 (5–6), 873–96.

---

## Seminar 10 (2 April) The Anthropocene

The shift to 'after the Global' was already perhaps pre-empted in the last two seminars on the rise of pluriversal thinking and the discussion around 'the ontological turn'. Here, thinking that remains stuck in the universal knowledge assumptions of both the construction and deconstruction of 'the Global' is inevitably problematic. However, while the challenge posed to the Global is clear, discussion about the Anthropocene remains very open at present. As Delf Rothe examines, two popular approaches in IR discourses are OOO (object-oriented) approaches which question the importance of the level of appearances and draw out future-oriented potentials and that of ANT (actor networks) which stress the contingency of the present or actual through the importance of networks of relations. Madeleine Fagan and Audra Mitchell in their *European Journal of International Relations* pieces from 2016 and 2017 pose fundamental questions to the discipline in terms of its securitising and knowledge assumptions.

### Questions

How does the Anthropocene go beyond the deconstruction/critique of the global?

How does the Anthropocene challenge the disciplinary assumptions of IR?

How can concerns about security be understood in the Anthropocene?

### Essential reading

Delf Rothe, 'Global Security in a Posthuman Age? IR and the Anthropocene Challenge, *E-IR*, 13 October 2017.

<http://www.e-ir.info/2017/10/13/global-security-in-a-posthuman-age-ir-and-the-anthropocene-challenge/>

\* Fagan, Madeleine. 2016. "Security in the Anthropocene: Environment, Ecology, Escape." *European Journal of International Relations*.

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1354066116639738>

\* Audra Mitchell, 'Is IR going extinct?', *European Journal of International Relations* 23(1) 2017

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1354066116632853>

\* Chakrabarty, D. 2018. 'Planetary Crises and the Difficulty of Being Modern', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 46(3) 259–282.

### Additional reading

Burke, Anthony, Stefanie Fishel, Audra Mitchell, Simon Dalby, and Daniel J. Levine. 2016. "Planet Politics: A Manifesto from the End of IR." *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 44(3): 499–523.

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0305829816636674>

Stefanie Fishel, Anthony Burke, Audra Mitchell, Simon Dalby, Daniel Levine, 'Defending Planet Politics' *Millennium Journal of International Studies* First Published December 21, 2017

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0305829817742669>

## Beyond International Relations 2018-2019

David Chandler, Erika Cudworth, Stephen Hobden, 'Anthropocene, Capitalocene and Liberal Cosmopolitan IR: A Response to Burke et al.'s 'Planet Politics', *Millennium Journal of International Studies* First Published August 22, 2017

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0305829817715247>

Simon Dalby, 'International Security in the Anthropocene', *E-IR*, 23 February 2015.

<http://www.e-ir.info/2015/02/23/international-security-in-the-anthropocene/>

Cameron Harrington, 'Posthuman Security and Care in the Anthropocene', *E-IR*, 10 October 2017.

<http://www.e-ir.info/2017/10/10/posthuman-security-and-care-in-the-anthropocene/>

Cameron Harrington, 'The Ends of the World: International Relations and the Anthropocene', *Millennium*, 44(3) 2016

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0305829816638745>

Erika Cudworth and Stephen Hobden, *Posthuman International Relations: Complexity, Ecologism and Global Politics* (London: Zed, 2011).

Rosa Braidotti, *The Posthuman* (Cambridge: Polity, 2013).

---

### **Seminar 11 (9 April)**

#### **Conclusion: The Rise and Fall of the Global**

In the concluding session we will address any final concerns with regard to the essay assignment and also revisit the (slightly adapted) questions that we asked in the introductory seminar.

#### **Questions**

What are the differences and similarities between the International and the Planetary? Is the beyond of IR that different?

Is the world more full or emptier today for IR scholars?

What is the difference between Planetary and Global politics?

#### **Reading**

Have another look over the readings for the first two seminars.

**Essay Assessment** (please pay attention to the assessment criteria below – especially the first point)

**5,000 word Essay Deadline 1.00pm Thursday 11 April 2019**

Choose one of the following six essay titles:

1. What are the key differences between the ‘International’, the ‘Global’ and the ‘Planetary’? Why are these important?
2. Has IR theory succeeded in overcoming ‘methodological nationalism’? If so, how?
3. How is the world understood differently in new institutionalist approaches compared to International or Global ones?
4. What do approaches critical of the Global have in common?
5. How do decolonial or pluriversal approaches problematise the ‘One World World’?
6. How does the Anthropocene transform IR as a discipline?

## **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.**

