

Beyond International Relations 2019-2020

**School of Social Sciences
University of Westminster**
32-38 Wells Street,
London, W1T 3UW

Beyond IR:

The Politics of the International, the Global and the Planetary

2019 - 2020

Module Code: 7PIRS001W

Spring semester

Time: 2.00 – 5.00pm Tuesdays

Room: Regent Street **516**

Module leader: Professor David Chandler

Room: Wells Street 504

Email: D.Chandler@Westminster.ac.uk

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

Short Module Title:	Beyond International Relations
Module Code:	7PIRS001W
Module Level:	7
Academic credit weighting:	20
Length:	1 semester
School:	Social Sciences
Module Leader(s):	Professor David Chandler
Extension:	7605
Room :	WS504
Email:	D.Chandler@Westminster.ac.uk
Host course:	MA International Relations
Status:	Core
Subject Board:	MA International Relations
Pre-requisites:	None
Co-requisites:	None
Assessment:	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 increasingly 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 IR from the vantage point of today, focusing on the establishment of the world of the international on the basis of what is seen now as a very narrow modernist or Eurocentric understanding – therefore we start with a rethinking of the two founding moments of IR as a liberal political discipline: 1492 and the construction of a 'one world world' and the liberal imaginary of the social contract, establishing the polity as separate from the 'state of nature'. The second section narrows our focus to the afterlife of IR, the Global or liberal turn of the 1990s and 2000s. The attempt to ground IR through a universal or global imaginary, is reflected upon through three lenses – human security, liberal internationalism and global governance – and their challenges by different modes of contemporary thinking. In third section, the module considers the shift from the deconstruction and critique of the Global and towards a new positive and constructive paradigm of 'pluriversal', 'cosmopolitical' and 'planetary' perspectives, often 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 climate change and contemporary issues of governance.
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 19](#) of this module guide. [The deadline for the essay is 1.00pm Thursday 9 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.
- Katherine McKittrick (ed) *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis*. London: Duke University Press, 2015.
- Fagan, Madeleine. 2016. "Security in the Anthropocene: Environment, Ecology, Escape." *European Journal of International Relations*.
- William E. Connolly, *Facing the Planetary*. Duke University Press, 2017.
- Deborah Danowski and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *The Ends of the World*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016.
- 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)
- 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.
- Douglas 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 Hynes 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).

Seminar Programme Dates

Introduction

W1 21 January - Seminar 1 - Introduction: The International, the Global and the Planetary *and seminar allocation*

Part One: Introduction From the “World” to the Planet – Coloniality and Climate Change

W2 28 January – Seminar 2 – The ‘Overrepresentation’ of “Man”

W3 4 February – Seminar 3 - The Politics/ Nature Divide

Part Two: Debating the Global

W4 11 February - Seminar 4 – Human Security vs Biopolitics

W5 18 February – no class this week

W6 25 February – Seminar 5 – Liberal Internationalism vs New Institutionalism

W7 3 March – Seminar 6 – Global Governance vs Planet Politics

Part Three: After the Global

W8 10 March – Seminar 7 – Decoloniality and Pluriversal Politics

W9 17 March – Seminar 8 – Cosmopolitics after the ‘One World World’ *and essay preparation*

W10 24 March – no class this week

W11 31 March – Seminar 9 - The Anthropocene

Conclusion

W12 7 April – Seminar 10 - Conclusion: Rethinking the Rise and Fall of the Global

Essay Submission – 1.00pm Thursday 9 April

Beyond International Relations 2019-2020
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 two-four 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 apogee of the international, enabling a liberal or universal imaginary of development, rights and progress. *The planetary* challenges the liberal or universal imaginary and provides a very different perspective, potentially revealing how the global reproduces the hegemonic, colonial and destructive assumptions implicit in international relations as a discipline.

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

Questions

What is the relation between IR and other disciplines?

Do we need a 'beyond' to IR? Why?

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*).

* 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

* 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>

-----Part One: From the “World” to the Planet – Coloniality and Climate Change-----

Seminar 2 (28 January)

The ‘Overrepresentation’ of “Man”

This seminar discusses the ‘beyond of IR’ as established with the ‘discovery’ of the New World, which enabled the construction of the time and space of IR as a discipline – with the establishment of modernity on the basis of universal ideas of linear time and space and the modern state and human as subject. What we will later discuss as ‘The One World World’ or in Sylvia Wynter’s terms ‘the overrepresentation of Man’. Thus, in the work of Sylvia Wynter we are provided with an introduction to the necessity of a beyond of IR seen as the product of colonial power, not only in colonial practices of dispossession and enslavement but importantly as a regime of knowledge, as well as power, on the basis of a Eurocentric conception of time, space and the human as modern, secular and rational subject divided and governed on the geographic, cultural, temporal, economic and political grounds of race. We start with some of the work of Anibal Quijano which provides an introduction to the theme. For those of you interested in the more contemporary extension of these grounding assumptions, Anthony Pagden’s work on the Eurocentric origins of governance and human rights might be useful.

Questions

What is the ‘overrepresentation’ of “Man”?

How does Sylvia Wynter distinguish Man1 and Man2?

What are the implications of Eurocentrism for the discipline of IR?

Essential reading

* Anibal Quijano, ‘Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality’, *Cultural Studies* Vol. 21, Nos. 2-3 March/May 2007, pp. 168-178

OR

* Anibal Quijano, ‘Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America’, *Nepantla: Views from the South* 1, no. 3 (2000): 533-579

– you only need to read up to p.556.

* Sylvia Wynter (1995) ‘1492: A New World View’, in *Race, Discourse, and the Origin of the Americas. A New World View*, edited by Vera Lawrence Hyatt and Rex Nettleford, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, pp.5–57.

OR

* 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.

Additional reading

* Anthony Pagden (2003) ‘Human Rights, Natural Rights, and Europe's Imperial Legacy’, *Political Theory*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Apr), pp. 171-199

* Anthony Pagden (1998) ‘The genesis of ‘governance’ and Enlightenment conceptions of the cosmopolitan world order’, *International Social Science Journal* 155 (March): 7– 15.

* Sylvia Wynter and Katherine McKittrick (2015) 'Unparalleled Catastrophe for Our Species? Or, to Give Humanness a Different Future. Conversations', in *Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis*, edited by Katherine McKittrick, Durham: Duke University Press. Pp.9–89.

- pdf provided only pp.9-24.

* Birgit M. Kaiser and Kathrin Thiele (2017) 'What is Species Memory? Or, Humanism, Memory and the Afterlives of "1492"', *Parallax*, Vol. 23, No. 4, 403–415.

* Sylvia Wynter (2006) 'On How We Mistook the Map for the Territory, and Reimprisoned Ourselves in Our Unbearable Wrongness of Being, of Desêtre: Black Studies Toward the Human Project', in *Not Only the Master's Tools: African-American Studies in Theory and Practice*, edited by Lewis Gordon and Jane Anna Gordon, New York: Paradigm, pp.107–69.

* Katherine McKittrick, "Substructure," from *Don't Wear Down* 2019: 39-41., (<http://www.katherinemckittrick.com/wornout/>),

Seminar 3 (4 February)

The Politics/ Nature Divide

Since the end of the cold war the disciplinary understanding of IR has been constantly adding new actors and concerns. This module seeks to raise a 'beyond' to this process, suggesting a more fundamental transformation in thinking and theorising is called for. We started this process last week in considering the challenge to the modernist or liberal canon itself. This week, we take an alternative angle into this problematic, considering how adding concerns of climate change begin to deconstruct the assumptions of the discipline further. Michel Serres' 'The Natural Contract' can be 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 second, more contemporary reading is Latour's 'triangulation' of the international, the global and the planetary, summarising his 2018 book, *Down to Earth*.

Questions

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

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

What are the implications of IR as a discipline of moving beyond a 'social contract' understanding of politics?

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.

Additional 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 Two: Debating the Global-----

Seminar 4 (11 February)

Human Security vs Biopolitics

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 with the Foucauldian critics who argue that the problems lie precisely in the pursuit of global liberal ends. The (broadly) Foucauldian critique takes on board the globalising of the international liberal order and opens up new approaches to critique in terms of liberal 'governmentality' and 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, Achille Mbembe, Mick Dillon, Julian Reid and Mark Duffield.

Questions

What are the politics of human rights and human security?

How does Booth link security and emancipation?

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

Essential reading

* Achille Mbembe, 'Necropolitics', *Public Culture* (2003) 15(1): 11–40.

<https://read.dukeupress.edu/public-culture/article/15/1/11/31714/Necropolitics>

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

* 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.

Additional reading

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

* 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.

* 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.

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).

* 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.

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).

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

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

* 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.

* 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.

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).

Seminar 5 (25 February)

Liberal Internationalism vs New Institutionalism

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?

How does new institutionalism challenge rationalist assumptions?

How does Mark Usher's materialist approach draw out the logic of the 'bottom-up' approach?

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.

* Mark Usher, 'Territory incognita', *Progress in Human Geography* (2019).

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0309132519879492>

Additional reading

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

* 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).

* 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).

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 6 (3 March)

Global Governance vs Planet Politics

Over the last two seminars we discussed Foucauldian critiques of the global, as an exercise of liberal hegemonic power and control, then neoliberal or neo-institutionalist critiques of the global imaginary as failing due to its linear, abstract and reductionist assumptions. This seminar could be seen as bringing both critiques together, where planetary imaginaries are seen to be conceptualised in a number of ways, which increasingly problematize and seek to move beyond the global. These ways will be considered in more detail in the next section of the module.

Questions

How do the authors of the Planet Politics Manifesto position it at the 'End of IR'?

How does Conway approach the claim that we should 'listen to what the planet is telling us'?

How does Rothe link different temporalities to different approaches to planet politics?

Essential reading

* 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>

* Delf Rothe, 'Governing the End Times? Planet Politics and the Secular Eschatology of the Anthropocene', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 2019. Early view.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0305829819889138>

* Philip Conway (2019) 'On the way to planet politics: From disciplinary demise to cosmopolitical coordination', *International Relations*, 2019. Early view.

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0047117819879482>

Additional reading

* 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>

* Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (2003) *Death of a Discipline*, Columbia University Press, chapter 3 'Planetary'.

* Eva Giraud, 'The planetary is political', *BioSocieties* volume 14, pages 472–481 (2019)

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057%2Fs41292-019-00169-1>

-----Part Three: After the Global-----

Seminar 7 (10 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?

What does Rojas mean by the colonial, decolonial and modernity critique?

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>

* 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>

Additional reading

* 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

Marisol de la Cadena, M. (2015) 'Uncommoning Nature', *e-Flux journal* 56th Biennale, 22 August.

<http://supercommunity.e-flux.com/texts/uncommoning-nature/>

* 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.

Seminar 8 (17 March)

Cosmopolitics after the 'One World World' and essay preparation

This session continues and develops some of the themes raised last week in Seminar 7 (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 or 'compositionism' 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 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

* 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 9 (31 March)

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

* 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>

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/>

Additional reading

* Elizabeth Johnson and Harlan Morehouse (with Simon Dalby, Jessi Lehman, Sara Nelson, Rory Rowan, Stephanie Wakefield and Kathryn Yusoff), 'After the Anthropocene: Politics and geographic inquiry for a new epoch', *Progress in Human Geography* 2014, Vol. 38(3) 439–456 – especially the Rory Rowan, Stephanie Wakefield sections

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

* Nigel Clark and Kathryn Yusoff, 'Geosocial Formations and the Anthropocene', *Theory, Culture and Society* 2017, Vol. 34(2–3) 3–23

David Chandler (2019) 'Rethinking the Anthropocene as Carnivalocene' *E-IR*, 11 April 2019.

<https://www.e-ir.info/2019/04/11/rethinking-the-anthropocene-as-carnivalocene/>

* Scott Hamilton, 'Securing ourselves from ourselves? The paradox of Entanglement in the Anthropocene', *Crime Law Social Change* (2017) 68:579–595.

* 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>

* 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).

William E. Connolly, *Facing the Planetary*. Duke University Press, 2017.

Deborah Danowski and Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, *The Ends of the World*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016.

-----Conclusion-----

Seminar 10 (7 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?

Essential reading

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

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

5,000 word Essay Deadline 1.00pm Thursday 9 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. What is the ‘overrepresentation’ of Man? How can alternative approaches to IR overcome this?
3. How is the world understood differently in new institutionalist approaches compared to International or Global ones?
4. What do liberal or universalist approaches differ from planetary understandings?
5. How do decolonial or pluriversal approaches problematise the ‘One World World’?
6. How might the Anthropocene transform IR as a discipline?

Assessment Rationale

The assessment regime is designed to encourage research expertise in the area of the 'beyond' of International Relations. It aims to develop advanced understanding of the concepts, frameworks and approaches which challenge and seek to go beyond modernist, liberal or universal conceptions of the international. The assessment by essay enables students to develop a critical understanding and to apply key theoretical accounts to current debates and problems with regard to the impact of these approaches.

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 these understandings 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.

Notes