**Course name: Introduction to International Relations**

**Code:**

**Term: Spring**

**ECTS credits:** 6

**Lessons per week: 90 + 90 min**

**Language: Eng.**

**Instructor: Aliaksei Kazharski**

**Form of study: lecture + seminar**

# Prerequisites

none

# Course Objectives

The course is meant to provide a basic introduction into the study of international relations. The students will familiarize themselves with the historical origins, the purpose, the major stages of evolution and the prospects of the discipline , as well as become acquainted with the basic theoretical approaches it has developed. Furthermore, the course intends to give an insight into the pivotal problems and points of debate inside the discipline and to test their own critical thinking capabilities on suggested empirical cases through active involvement in class discussions, debates and simulations. Upon completing the course the students should be able to both read and critically interpret original texts of international relations theory and to have developed a basic analytical toolkit for practiccing independent interpretation of IR phenomena in the further stages of their career.

# Contents

Session 1 Introduction. Course objectives and requirements

Session 2. International relations: genealogy of the discipline

Session 3. Realist theory and the critique of 'liberal utopianism': 'state of nature', *realpolitik* and the origins of war

Session 4. Neorealism (structural realism): international system, stability and polarity

Session 5. The liberal response to neorealism: 'complex interdependence', cooperation and international institutions

Session 6. The English school of international relations: 'international society' and 'world order'

Session 7. Sociological institutionalism: sovereignty and decolonization

Session 8. Marxism in international relations: world-systems theory and the critique of globalized capitalism

Session 9. Liberalism after the Cold War: the 'end of history' and the role of 'soft power'

Session 10. Geopolitics and its critics: is the world a global chessboard?

Session 11. Cultural determinism in IR: a 'clash of civilizations'?

Session 12 Constructivism: identity in international relations

Session 13. Poststructuralism: analysis of foreign policy discourses

# Themes and Readings involved

**Session 2. International relations: genealogy of the discipline**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Carr, E. (1946). *The twenty years' crisis, 1919-1939: An introduction to the study of international relations*. London: Macmillan  *: pp. 1-18*

Wilson W. The Fourteen Points. Available from <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/>

*Auxillary texts*

Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2013).Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches (Fifth Edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 34-39

Viotti, P., & Kauppi, M. (2012).*International Relations Theory*(Fifth Edition ed.). Longman: pp 1-12

Optional reading

Bátora, J., & Hynek, N. (2009). On the IR barbaricum in Slovakia. *Journal of InternationalRelations and Development,*(12), 186-193.

Hollis, M., & Smith, S. (1990). *Explaining and understanding international relations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

**Session 3. Realist theory and the critique of 'liberal utopianism': 'state of nature', *realpolitik* and the origins of war**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Mearsheimer, J. (2014). Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West’s Fault. *Foreign Affairs*.

Morgenthau, H. (1948). *Politics among nations; the struggle for power and peace*(1st ed.). New York: Knopf. : pp. 13-15, 21-29, 43-45

Morgenthau, H. (1978). Six principles of political realism. In *Politics among nations; the struggle for power and peace* (5th ed., pp. 4-15). New York: Knopf.

*Auxillary texts*

Burchill, S., & Linklater, A. (1996). Theories of international relations (3rd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press: pp. 29-34

Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2013).*Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches*(Fifth Edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.: pp 71-78

Optional reading

Williams, M. (Ed.). (2007). *Realism reconsidered the legacy of Hans Morgenthau in international relations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*Recommended video*

Through the Realist Lens. Conversations with History: John Mearsheimer

<http://conversations.berkeley.edu/content/john-mearsheimer>

Question for debate

Russia's policies in the Ukrainian crisis: 'imperialist' or 'status quo'?

**Session 4. Neorealism (structural realism): structure of international politics, stability, polarity**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub.: pp. 116-128, 161-182

*Auxillary texts*

Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2013).*Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches* (Fifth Edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 79-85

Optional reading

Keohane, R. (Ed.). (1986). *Neorealism and its critics*. New York: Columbia University Press.

*Recommended video*

Theory and International Politics. Conversations with with History: Kenneth Waltz

*<http://conversations.berkeley.edu/content/kenneth-waltz>*

Question for debate

After the Cold War: is our world uni- or multipolar?

**Session 5. The liberal response to neorealism: 'complex interdependence', cooperation and international institutions**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Keohane, R., & Nye, J. (1977). Realism and complex interdependence. In *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition*. Boston: Little, Brown.

*Auxillary texts*

Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2013).*Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches* (Fifth Edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 100-101

Viotti, P., & Kauppi, M. (2012).*International Relations Theory* (Fifth Edition ed.). Longman pp. 129-131, 137-156

Optional reading

Moravcsik, A. (1997). Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics, *International Organization* 51:4, pp. 513-553.

Short essay question

Explain how Keohane and Nye understand complex interdependence

**Session 6. The English school of international relations: 'international society' and 'world order'**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Bull, H. (1977). *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.: pp. 3-21

Watson, A. (1992). *The evolution of international society a comparative historical analysis*. London: Routledge. pp. 182-196, 214-227, 294-298

*Auxillary texts*

Viotti, P., & Kauppi, M. (2012).*International Relations Theory* (Fifth Edition ed.). Longman pp. 239-243 246-9

Optional reading

Buzan, B. (2014). *An introduction to the English School of International Relations: The societal approach* (1. publ. ed.). Cambridge [u.a.: Polity Press.

Hurrel, A. (2007). *On global order: Power, values and the constitution on International Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.

*Recommended video*

Iver B. Neumann: Eurasian steppe and international relations

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\_dQ0Ul6369o>

Short essay question

How does the English school understand 'international society' and how is it different from the understanding of international politics developed in the realist tradition?

**Session 7. Sociological institutionalism: sovereignty and decolonization**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Krasner, S. (1999). *Sovereignty: Organized hypocrisy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. pp. 1-9

Krasner, S. (2001). *Problematic sovereignty contested rules and political possibilities*. New York: Columbia University Press.: pp. 1-12, 24-40

Strang, D. (1996). Contested sovereignty: The social construction of colonial imperialism. In *State sovereignty as social construct*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Optional reading

March, J., & Olsen, J. (n.d.). The Institutional Dynamics of International Political Orders. *International Organization,*943-969.

Strang, D., & Meyer, J. (n.d.). Institutional conditions for diffusion. *Theory and Society,* 487-511.

*Recommended movie*

Hotel Rwanda (2004) <http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0395169/>

Question for debate

Decolonization: did it bring more good or harm?

**Session 8. Marxism in international relations: world-systems theory and the critique of globalized capitalism**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Wallerstein, I. (2000). The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System/ Essential Wallerstein. In *The essential Wallerstein*. New York: New Press :

*Auxillary texts*

Viotti, P., & Kauppi, M. (2012).*International Relations Theory* (Fifth Edition ed.). Longman pp. 189-193, 199-209

Optional reading

Cox, R. (1983). Gramsci, Hegemony And International Relations : An Essay In Method. *Millennium - Journal of International Studies,* 162-175.

*Recommended movie*

E-Germinal (Inside Apple) <http://www.upsidedistribution.com/?Inside-Apple>

Short essay question

Explain how Wallerstein understands the 'world-system' and try to locate Slovakia in it. Is it in the core, the periphery or the semi-periphery? Provide empirical arguments.

**Session 9. Liberalism after the Cold War: the 'end of history' and the role of 'soft power'**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Fukuyama, F. (1989). The End of History? *The National Interest*.

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs. pp. xx-xii (Preface), 1-18

*Auxillary texts*

Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2013).*Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches* (Fifth Edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 126-130

Optional reading

Ikenberry, G. (2011). *Liberal leviathan: The origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Simulation

How can Slovakia have soft power?

**Session 10. Geopolitics and its critics: is the world a global chessboard?**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.: pp. xiii-xiv (Introduction), pp. 24-40

*Auxillary texts*

Dodds, K. (2007). An Intellectual Poison? In *Geopolitics a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Optional reading

Toal, G. (1996). *Critical geopolitics: The politics of writing global space*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Agnew, J. (1998). *Geopolitics re-visioning world politics*. London: Routledge.

Short essay question. Why can geopolitics be thouht of as 'intellectual poision'?

**Session 11. Cultural determinism in IR: a 'clash of civilizations'?**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Huntington, S. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*.

Rubenstein, R., & Crocker, J. (summer 1996). Challenging Huntington. *Foreign Policy,*(No. 96), 113-128.

Optional reading

*Recommended video*

Civilizations in World Politics : Beyond East and West. Peter J. Katzenstein's lecture at Orbis Hall, Kyung Hee University, December 3, 2012 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fm3WBwstLkc>

Short essay question. Is the 'Islamic State' (ISIS) proof to the 'clash of civilizations' doctrine?

**Session 12 Constructivism: identity in international relations**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Bátora, J. (2007). Identita a štátny záujem? O čo ide v slovenskej zahraničnej politike. In *Slovenská otázka dnes.* Bratislava: Kalligram

Ringmar, E. (2002). The Recognition Game. Soviet Russia Against the West.*Cooperation and Conflict*.

Optional reading

Hynek, N., & Teti, A. (2010). Saving identity from postmodernism? The normalization of constructivism in International Relations. *Contemporary Political Theory,* *9*(2), 177-199.

Hopf, T. (1998). The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory. *International Security,* 171-200.

Short essay question

Why can studying identity and recognition be important for understanding international relations?

**Session 13. Poststructuralism: analysis of foreign policy discourses**

Mandatory reading

*Primary texts*

Weldes, J. (1999). The Cultural Productions of Crises: US Identity and Missiles in Cuba. In *Cultures of insecurity: States, communities, and the production of danger*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

*Auxillary texts*

Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2013).*Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches* (Fifth Edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 233-238

Burchill, S., & Linklater, A. (1996). Theories of international relations (3rd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press: 161-171

Optional reading

Campbell, D. (1992). *Writing security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Neumann, I. (2008). Discourse Analysis. In *Qualitative Methods in International Relations: A Pluralist Guide.*London: Palgrave Macmillan.

...

# Obligatory Readings

...

# Primary Sources

Bátora, J. (2007). Identita a štátny záujem? O čo ide v slovenskej zahraničnej politike. In *Slovenská otázka dnes.* Bratislava: Kalligram

Brzezinski, Z. (1997). *The grand chessboard: American primacy and its geostrategic imperatives*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.: pp. xiii-xiv (Introduction), pp. 24-40

Bull, H. (1977). *The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.: pp. 3-21

Carr, E. (1946). *The twenty years' crisis, 1919-1939: An introduction to the study of international relations*. London: Macmillan  : pp. 1-18

Fukuyama, F. (1989). The End of History? *The National Interest*.

Huntington, S. (1993). The Clash of Civilizations. *Foreign Affairs*.

Keohane, R., & Nye, J. (1977). Realism and complex interdependence. In *Power and interdependence: World politics in transition*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Krasner, S. (1999). *Sovereignty: Organized hypocrisy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press. pp. 1-9

Krasner, S. (2001). *Problematic sovereignty contested rules and political possibilities*. New York: Columbia University Press.: pp. 1-12, 24-40

Mearsheimer, J. (2014). Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West’s Fault. *Foreign Affairs*.

Morgenthau, H. (1948). *Politics among nations; the struggle for power and peace*(1st ed.). New York: Knopf. : pp. 13-15, 21-29, 43-45

Morgenthau, H. (1978). Six principles of political realism. In *Politics among nations; the struggle for power and peace* (5th ed., pp. 4-15). New York: Knopf.

Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. New York: Public Affairs. pp. xx-xii (Preface), 1-18

Ringmar, E. (2002). The Recognition Game. Soviet Russia Against the West.*Cooperation and Conflict*.

Rubenstein, R., & Crocker, J. (summer 1996). Challenging Huntington. *Foreign Policy,*(No. 96), 113-128.

Strang, D. (1996). Contested sovereignty: The social construction of colonial imperialism. In *State sovereignty as social construct*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallerstein, I. (2000). The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System/ Essential Wallerstein. In *The essential Wallerstein*. New York: New Press :

Waltz, K. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub.: pp. 116-128, 161-182

Watson, A. (1992). *The evolution of international society a comparative historical analysis*. London: Routledge. pp. 182-196, 214-227, 294-298

Weldes, J. (1999). The Cultural Productions of Crises: US Identity and Missiles in Cuba. In *Cultures of insecurity: States, communities, and the production of danger*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Wilson W. The Fourteen Points. Available from <http://www.ourdocuments.gov/>

...

# Secondary Sources

Burchill, S., & Linklater, A. (1996). Theories of international relations (3rd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press: pp. 29-34 [session 3]; pp. 55-58 [session 9]; pp. 161-171 [session 13]

Dodds, K. (2007). An Intellectual Poison? In *Geopolitics a very short introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jackson, R., Sørensen, G. (2013).*Introduction to international relations: Theories and approaches* (Fifth Edition ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.   
pp. 34-39 [session 2] pp. 71-78 [session 3] pp. 79-85 [ session 4] pp. 100-101 [session 5]; 126-130 [session 9]; pp. 233-238 [session 13]

Viotti, P., & Kauppi, M. (2012).*International Relations Theory* (Fifth Edition ed.). Longman

pp. 1-12 [session 2]; pp. 129-131, 137-156 [session 5]; pp. 239-243, 246-249 [session 6]; pp. 189-193, 199-209 [session 9]

# Supplementary Readings and Sources

Specified for each session

# Evaluation Criteria

During the semester the students are supposed to deliver 6 short essays ('memos') 500 words max, dealing with the question(s) specified for the session. The question should always be answered based on the required readings, as well as the students own informed opinion, and should demonstrate the student's ability to critically reflect on the particular topic.

The students are also expected to deliver 1 longer essay (1200 words) at the end of the course on a subject of their specific interest. The topic should be approved by the course leader in advance.

The essays must be delivered by the deadline, which is the eve of each lecture (9 p.m.). Essays delivered after the deadline will not be considered.

**When writing their essays the students must cite their sources properly. Copy-pasting without quotation marks or paraphrasing without references is unacceptable and will be automatically treated as plagiarism!**

**Written essays are 40% of the final grade.**

The students are expected to attend lecture and seminar sessions, and to participate actively in class discusison, debates and simulations. An absolute precondition for meaningful participation is reading the mandatory texts. The student's ability to comment on the required readings in class will be a primary criterion of evaluation.

The course will include three in-class debates (sessions 3, 4 and 7). The students will be split into two groups and will be responsible for preparing their argumentation as a group.

The class will also include one simulation that involves group work (session 9).

**Attendance and participation are 30% of the final grade.**

During the semester the students will receive two written assignments in class which will be based on the required readings.

**In class tests are 30% of the final grade.**

A midterm evaluation will be provided.

# Course Evaluation (%)

A – excellent: 100-93%,

B – very good: 92-84%,

C – good: 83-74%,

D – satisfactory: 73-63%,

E – sufficient: 62-51%,

Fx – fail: 50-0%.

Passing a course assumes that student was not absent at more than 4 lessons.