

**MSc International Relations & MSc International
Relations Theory, 2012-13**

**IR462: Introduction to International
Political Theory**

Dr Joe Hoover, Course Coordinator
Room CLM 5.08
(Secretary: Uzma Lone, Room CLM 6.08)

Prof Chris Brown
Room CLM 4.08
(Secretary: Romy Ajodah, Room CLM 6.09)

Seminars:

Tuesday, 10:00am - 12:00pm

Tuesday, 2:00pm - 4:00pm

Wednesday, 10:00am - 12:00pm

Contents

Introduction.....	3
Aims and Objectives.....	3
IR462, IR463 and IR464.....	3
Teaching Methods.....	4
Presentations:.....	4
Reading in General, Reading Guides & Reading Summaries:.....	5
Modes of Assessment.....	5
Course Literature.....	6
General Texts.....	6
Recommended Texts.....	7
Reference Texts.....	8
Journals.....	8
Moodle.....	9
Office Hours:.....	9
Seminar Programme.....	10
1. Organisation of Seminars: Background to IPT.....	10
2. Liberal Political Theory and the Development of International Political Theory.....	11
3. The Moral Standing of the State.....	11
4. International Human Rights.....	12
5. Critiques of Human Rights and Universal Values.....	13
6. International Humanitarianism.....	13
7. Global Social Justice.....	15
8. International Criminal Law.....	15
9. Beyond the Liberal Origins of International Political Theory.....	17
Appendix 1.....	18
Past and Sample Exam Papers.....	18

Introduction

For much of the last century the discourses of ‘political theory’ and ‘international relations theory’ developed separately. IR theory was dominated by the various so-called ‘Great Debates’ between (neo) realism and (neo) liberalism, discouraging normative thought, while Anglo-American analytical political theory has concentrated on meta-ethical issues and tended to accept a divide between the ‘international’ and the ‘domestic’. When IR theory did address normative issues (as with, e.g., the ‘English School’) the assumption was that its findings would be *sui generis*. In recent years, however, this situation has changed; political theorists have increasingly come to understand that the divide between the international and the domestic is unsustainable, while IR theorists have realised that their specialised categories do not address many of the most pressing issues of the day. The result has been the emergence of a new discourse of ‘international political theory’, the subject of this course. The course is structured around both close examination of the literature and application to ‘real world’ situations and cases.

Aims and Objectives

The aims of this course are: to provide intellectual challenge to academically able graduate students by engaging with difficult and demanding material at the cutting edge of contemporary international political theory; to examine a number of key normative issues in IR, exploring the relationships between theory and practice and between ethics and politics; to investigate changes in the discipline of IR over the last two decades and the emergence of international political theory as a discrete area of study; to provide a basis for research at the doctoral level, or for careers in fields (including work in government, international organisations, business and the media) which require articulate, clear thinking individuals with a grasp of contemporary normative issues in international relations; and to provide a framework to assist concerned citizens to think about issues which will be of increasing importance in the 21st century.

The objectives of the course are to facilitate students 1) in a critical engagement with a wide range of literature in contemporary international political theory, broadly defined; and 2) in the display of this engagement via the development of a succinct writing style and the ability to present complex arguments orally.

IR462, IR463 and IR464

IR462 *Introduction to International Political Theory* is a stand-alone, half-unit post-graduate course taught in Michaelmas Term. It also acts as a useful introduction to themes that are picked up in half-unit courses on *The IPT of Humanitarian Intervention* (course IR463) and *The Politics of International Law* (course IR464) taught in Lent Term. IR462 is not a prerequisite for IR464, though it is highly recommended, and students without a theoretical background should certainly take IR462 before attempting IR464. IR463 presumes knowledge of the basic literature and themes of contemporary international political theory and therefore it is highly recommended that students take IR 462. Any student who wishes to register for IR463 without taking IR462 should contact

Prof Brown (c.j.brown@lse.ac.uk) in advance to ensure that his or her knowledge of IPT will be adequate for the demands of the course.

These three courses are quite closely related one to another and therefore are covered by the same Moodle site under the heading 'IR306/ IR462/ IR463/ IR464 Sovereignty Rights and Justice Group. This allows us to communicate easily with all the students taking these courses to keep them informed on lectures, articles, etc. of common interest and to share electronic access to readings across the courses (and therefore make more readings available online to more students), but it does mean that the Moodle site is quite complex. Students should ensure that they are signed up for the right seminars and know their way around the Moodle site early in term.

Teaching Methods

Teaching will be via a series of 2 hour seminars commencing in the second week of Michaelmas Term at which students will be expected to participate in discussions of the relevant literature. The programme of seminars is set out below. There are no lectures for this course.

Students will be required to present in the seminars, setting out an agenda for discussion and responding to the seminar questions for each topic. Feedback will be provided, in the seminars and/or privately, on both content and presentational ability. In addition, three people in each seminar will be asked to make notes on one each of three key pieces of reading every week. The schedule for these reading summaries will be worked out by your seminar teacher.

Presentations:

- 25 minutes (maximum) long in total
- 2 students per seminar
- Handout (maximum length two sides of A4), showing skeleton structure of presentation, to be saved to Moodle by 6pm on the day before the seminar. Please print out and bring along handouts for everyone if 6pm deadline is missed.
- Presenters should co-ordinate before the seminar to agree who will cover which aspects of the topic. The best presentations are usually those which the presenters work on jointly. *NB seminar teacher will formatively assess content for the presentation as a whole, but will give feedback to each student separately on presentation skills.*
- Presentations should set out the material of the topic under discussion in particular by reference to the seminar questions which are listed immediately under the topic headings below. Presenters should *focus on making well substantiated arguments*.
- We encourage the use of PowerPoint or similar software to make presentations in seminar, as it allows for an interesting mix of text, pictures and even film clips.

Presentations should include:

- Context of the topic – its location within the wider debate
- Main arguments found in the readings (in particular with relevance to seminar questions)
- Analysis and critique of those arguments

Reading in General, Reading Guides & Reading Summaries:

Everyone is expected to read for each seminar. Try to read the majority of the Essential Primary Reading each week along with a selection of the Essential Background- and Further Reading that you find useful or interesting. You do not have to read all pieces listed under each topic but you should read widely – some pieces in detail and some just skimmed – until you feel you have a grasp of the subject. Presenters should try to read all of the Essential Primary reading, and much of the Further reading. Full details of the works mentioned in the seminar programme are provided in the separate Bibliography, available via Moodle. Where a chapter reference for a book is given, it is likely that the rest of the book will also be useful – don't feel you have to stop at the end of the chapter if you're gripped by the argument!

Reading Guides: A reading guide to each seminar topic is available on Moodle. These guides should help you to identify how the literature fits together, where to start and what to look out for as you prepare for the seminars, essays and exams. Unless seminar discussion is too lively to interrupt, seminar teachers will talk through the reading guide for the following week at the end of each seminar.

Reading Summaries: Each week, three people will be asked to make notes on one each of three key pieces prior to the seminar. These *reading summaries* should have a bullet point format, and include:

- Title, author and details of book or journal the piece is taken from, including publication date.
- Context – location of the piece in the wider debate (e.g. aims of the author in the piece, whether it is a response to another author).
- Main arguments put forward by the author.

The suggested maximum length for each summary is two A4 sheets. Summaries should be saved to Moodle by 6pm on the day before the seminar. The aim of these summaries is to give you practice in condensing the main arguments in academic writing into note form, and to provide *aide memoirs* of the key pieces to assist in exam revision. Reading summary authors will be asked to comment on the summaries in the seminars, in particular with regard to the seminar questions.

Modes of Assessment

'Formative Assessment': Students will be expected to contribute to seminar discussions, to make at least one presentation during the term, and to write reading summaries as detailed above. Two pieces of formal written work are required.

1. A 'Book Report': this should be an approximately 1000 word report on one of the following books. The report should summarise briefly and critique the main arguments presented by the author(s), assess their significance, and relate them to the broader agenda of international political theory. The Book Report should be handed to your seminar teacher in your **Week 6 seminar** (2nd week of November) or before.

Appiah, K.A. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*
Benhabib, S. *Another Cosmopolitanism*
Cohen, J. ed. *For Love of Country*
Frost, M. *Global Ethics*
Rawls, J. *The Law of Peoples*
Rieff, D. *A Bed for the Night: Humanitarianism in Crisis*
Shue, H. *Basic Rights*
Simpson, G. *Law, War and Crime*
Walzer, M. *Just and Unjust Wars*

2. A conventional essay of c. 2,000-2,500 words on a question taken from the IR462 sample exam paper, or the IR462 past exam papers, or on a question agreed in advance by your seminar teacher. This essay should be handed to your seminar teacher in your **Week 8 seminar** (last full week of November) or before – this is to allow us to return your essay marked by the end of term.

Your book report and essay should also be submitted in electronic copy to Moodle.

‘*Summative Assessment*’: This will be by an unseen two-hour written examination (100%) taken in the Summer Term. The exam paper will contain 8 questions, of which students will be required to answer 2. Revision sessions will be provided at the beginning of the Summer Term. A sample exam paper and the 2008/09, 2009/10, 2010/11 and 2011/12 exam papers are provided as Appendix 1 to this course guide.

Course Literature

The following General and Recommended books will be quite widely used, and the Economist’s Bookshop has been asked to stock them. Students are encouraged to buy one or two and to co-ordinate purchasing so that they have access to a range of them.

General Texts

These texts provide an overview of the material covered on the course and you should consult a selection prior to the start of seminars and in the early weeks. They will also prove useful throughout the term and for exam preparation.

D. Bell *Ethics and World Politics* (Oxford, 2010) is a comprehensive introductory text with individual chapters written by top scholars in the field of international political theory. (<http://www.oup.com/uk/orc/bin/9780199548620/>)

C. Brown *Sovereignty, Rights and Justice* (Polity, 2002) is an excellent introductory text for international political theory.

M. Cochran *Normative Theory and International Relations* (Cambridge UP, 2000) is a good account of the ‘cosmopolitan-communitarian debate’, and explication of a ‘pragmatic’ solution. Engages with feminist critiques.

- R. Shapcott *International Ethics: A Critical Introduction* (Polity 2010) is an up-to-date and comprehensive introduction to many of the issues covered on the course.
- M.L. Frost *Global Ethics* (Routledge, 2009) makes a strong case for the centrality of ethics to the study of IR and is an exposition of the author's 'constitutive' theory.
- K. Hutchings *International Political Theory* (Sage, 1999) is a valuable general introduction to international political theory, with a focus on the contributions of feminism, Critical Theory and postmodernism.
- K. Hutchings *Global Ethics* (Polity 2010) is an introductory text that focuses on ethical theory and how it influences the various debates in global ethics.
- T. Pogge and D. Moellendorf *Global Justice: Seminal Essays* and T. Pogge and K. Horton *Global Ethics: Seminal Essays* (Paragon, 2008) are two large collections of classic papers on the subject matter of this course.

Recommended Texts

These texts cover more specific aspects of the course and appear on the weekly reading list, but they are all important texts with wider significance for the course.

- K. A. Appiah *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers* (Allen Lane, 2006). An interesting if somewhat unsystematic reflection on the subject matter of the course as a whole, with a slightly misleading title - his perspective is as communitarian as it is cosmopolitan.
- C.R. Beitz *Political Theory and International Relations* (Princeton UP, 1979/2000): a classic 'cosmopolitan' statement. The Second Edition (2000) reprints the first with an 'Afterword', most of which can be found elsewhere.
- T. Dunne & N.J. Wheeler (eds.) *Human Rights in Global Politics* (Cambridge UP, 1999) among the best collections on human rights.
- A. Linklater *The Problem of Harm in World Politics* (Cambridge UP: 2011) a treatise on international ethics from one of the most important contemporary theorists of IR.
- J. Rawls *The Law of Peoples* (Harvard University Press, 1999) the culmination of Rawls's political theory, a short study which defends a non-cosmopolitan approach to international justice, upholding the rights of 'decent well-ordered societies'.
- D. Rieff *A Bed for the Night* (Vintage, 2002) is an assessment of humanitarian action through the 1990s which documents the loss of neutrality of aid workers and the politicisation of humanitarianism.

- G. Simpson *Law, War and Crime* (Polity Press, 2007) focuses in particular on international criminal cases, but with much to say on wider issues.
- M. Walzer *Just and Unjust Wars* (Basic Books, 2006) provides a classic study of ‘rights of communities’, well worth investing in for the wealth of detail, but key theoretical sections are extracted in Beitz (1985).
- N. Wheeler *Saving Strangers* (Oxford, 2000) is a comprehensive text on cases of humanitarian intervention, and also includes a substantive introduction on the justification of interventions. Note: this text is available as an e-book in the LSE library.

Reference Texts

These texts provide background for issues, ideas and thinkers you may not be familiar with; they are intended for reference purposes and are not key texts for the course. They are all available in the library.

- R. Goodin & P. Pettit *Contemporary Political Philosophy: an anthology* (Blackwell, 2006) is a comprehensive reference text with selected readings from key thinkers in contemporary political thought.
- A. MacIntyre *A Short History of Ethics* (Routledge, 1998) has individual chapters on key thinkers and is useful background reading.
- C. Reus-Smit & D. Snidal *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (Oxford, 2008) is a wide ranging collection on International Relations, but the normative aspects of the discipline are heavily emphasised.
- R. Shafer-Landau *Ethical Theory: an anthology* (Blackwell, 2007) is a comprehensive reference text with selected readings on relevant topics from key thinkers in contemporary ethics.
- * The Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy, available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/> is an excellent resource for background information on thinkers or ideas that may be unfamiliar to you. This online resource is written by academics and features extensive citations and further readings. If you use this resource as a reference in your essays, reference the title of the encyclopaedia entry, its author, the encyclopaedia itself and the url of the entry.

Journals

The journal literature is very important in this area of IR, although the standard US journals are mainly useful for material on particular recent cases – see esp. *Foreign Affairs*. Better for international political theory are *Review of International Studies*, *Journal of International Political Theory*, *International Theory*, *Millennium* and *Ethics and International Affairs*, which usually have material of interest. Less oriented towards mainstream IR, *Human Rights Quarterly* and *Philosophy and Public Affairs* are also

important. *Political Theory* and *Contemporary Political Theory* tend, as their names suggest, to publish cutting-edge work in 'domestic' political theory – much of which is highly relevant to IPT. *Ethics* is the best journal to read to keep up to date with the latest developments in (again mostly non-international) ethical thought.

Moodle

Moodle is the web-based location for IR462 course materials. It also provides additional teacher-to-student and student-to-student communication. The IR462 site is shared with IR306, IR463 and IR464, and can be accessed via the 'Apps' menu on the LSE. Students need to self-register onto the course via the link on the Moodle homepage to gain access to the site. Further guidance will be given as necessary in the first seminar. Help in using the system is also available online, plus the Teaching and Learning Centre runs tutorials which students are encouraged to make use of.

The IR306/462/463/464 Moodle site is based on a shared, easy-to-navigate front page, through which all course materials for IR462, arranged by topic, can be accessed. Some material is shared between the four courses, including a shared general bibliography, web links and feeds, and news of upcoming events of interest. Material specific to one of the courses is clearly marked with the relevant course number. This includes reading lists, discussion groups, space for class presentations and other work, and past exam papers. The readings for each week are outlined and linked where possible. E-pack links are scanned readings that are not otherwise available online.

Notices about the IR462 course will be posted on Moodle rather than emailed to students, so check the site regularly or sign up forum automatic notifications. Seminar discussion areas are intended to be used by students as a more informal space in which to consider the issues covered by the course. They will not be moderated by seminar teachers and students should ensure that their posts are appropriate. Other resources may become available as the Moodle area is developed through the academic year and your feedback on the site is welcomed. Please direct questions or feedback to Joe at j.hoover@lse.ac.uk.

Office Hours:

Joe: Mondays from 2:00pm - 4:00pm. Sign up on LSEforYOU. If you need to have a longer discussion or arrange an alternative time, please e-mail Joe on j.hoover@lse.ac.uk.

Prof Brown: Monday from 1:30pm - 2.30pm for short drop-in meetings. If you need to have a longer discussion or arrange an alternative time, please e-mail Prof Brown on c.j.brown@lse.ac.uk.

Seminar Programme

[Seminars begin in Week 2]

1. Organisation of Seminars: Background to IPT

Part of this session will be taken up with course organisation, but this will be followed by a general discussion of the relationship between IR and International Political Theory, ‘normative theory’ and ‘international ethics’, and with preliminary discussion of the divide often claimed to exist between ‘cosmopolitan’ and ‘communitarian’ political theories.

Essential Primary Reading:

Brown (2004) charts the history of IPT within IR and introduces much of the core literature and many of the key issues on the course. *Hutchings* (2010) Chapters 2 and 3 sets out a way to categorise ethical theories as ‘rationalist’ and ‘alternatives to rationalist’ or, for the most part, ‘contextualist’. *Erskine* (2008) Chapter 2 outlines and critiques impartialist cosmopolitanism (as a prelude to justifying her own ‘embedded’ cosmopolitanism).

Essential Background Reading:

Students new to IPT should read *Hutchings* (2010) Chapter 1 for basic background. *Brown* (2002c) is an excellent introductory text to most of the material covered on the course. In spite of its title *Appiah* (2006) is a readable and lively reflection on both cosmopolitan and communitarian concerns. *Ainley* (2009) documents the increasing importance of the individual (versus the state) in international relations. Well worth watching is the film ‘Examined Life’ – featuring, among others, Peter Singer, Martha Nussbaum and Anthony Appiah who are all on the IR462 reading list: <http://www.zeitgeistfilms.com/examinedlife/>. You might also want to read the accompanying book *Taylor* (2009).

Further Reading:

The idea of classifying international political theory into cosmopolitan and communitarian camps emerges explicitly in *Brown* (1992) and *Thompson* (1992), although it was implicitly present in *Linklater* (1990 and 1998); *Cochran* (2000) Part 1 is a good summary. *Cohen* (1996) contains a plea for a cosmopolitan approach from Martha Nussbaum, and a series of responses – see, in particular, those of Michael Walzer and Benjamin Barber – which (unintentionally) reveal difficulties with the cosmopolitan/communitarian classification. *Frost* (2009), *Cochran* (2000) and Benhabib (2006) are key references on international ethics. The exchange between Frost and Sutch in the *Review of International Studies* (Sutch, 2000: Frost, 2000) although nominally about human rights and constitutive theory (and referring to Frost’s 1996 book – also worth reading) is actually of a wider relevance.

2. Liberal Political Theory and the Development of International Political Theory

Are there any essential truths about human nature that we can use to ground ethical theory? How does our ethical perspective influence our determination of legitimate political order? Whose needs, rights or duties lay claim upon us?

Essential Primary:

Readings exemplifying and applying different approaches to moral theory are *Beitz* (1975), *O'Neill* (2008), *Walzer* (1981), and *MacIntyre* (2008).

Essential Background:

The debates over rationalist and contextualist approaches to ethics underlie a good deal of the readings for this course. See, *Hutchings* (2010). Also, *Cochran* (1999) and *Hutchings* (1999) both address how these issues explicitly impact international political theory.

Further Reading:

Further reading within the rationalist tradition includes *Barry* (1989), *Beitz* (1999) and *Pogge* (1992) who all build upon the liberal contractualism of Rawls. *O'Neill* (2000) furthers her Kantian perspective. Drawing on the Kantian tradition *Linklater* (2007a) and *Benhabib* (2006) push the boundaries of liberal theory. Further responses to the dominant contractualist and Kantian strands in political theory can be found in *MacIntyre* (2007) and *Walzer* (1994). *Nussbaum* (1993) develops a universalist account of the virtues that challenges both rationalist and contextualist perspectives. For additional background, see *Erskine* (2008). *Mulhall and Swift* (1996) provide important background on many of the thinkers for this week.

3. The Moral Standing of the State

What role does the state play in the life of the individual? Do states have moral standing and/or rights of non-intervention because of their role as guarantors of individual rights to self-determine? Is Michael Walzer's attempt to derive the rights of political communities from the rights of individuals successful?

Essential Primary:

Walzer (2000) Chapters 4 & 6 set out Walzer's basic position. *Beitz* (1979/2000) Part II refutes the idea that states might have a moral standing. *Luban's* 'Romance of the Nation State' (read alongside *Walzer's* reply in *Beitz et al* (1985)) is an argument in favour of universalism in contrast to Walzer's supposed relativism. *Sutch* (2009) offers a re-evaluation and defence of Walzer.

Essential Background:

Walzer (2007) collects his essays in political theory including his work on humanitarian intervention, while *Walzer* (2004) traces the evolution of his thought on war. In both cases, one can see a movement away from the strong defence of non-intervention in his earlier work. *Walzer* (1994) provides further background. For a defence of Walzer's status as a liberal, see *Brown* (2007). For classic statements of communitarian positions, see *Sandel* (1982) and *Taylor* (1992).

Further Reading:

Here IPT intersects with the debate between communitarianism and individualism in contemporary political theory – key texts for this debate are collected in *Avineri & de-Shalit* (1992). *Barry* (1999) and *Jones* (1999a & 1999b) offer cosmopolitan critiques of statism. *Viroli* (1995) is a good exploration of patriotism. For more on ‘liberal nationalism’ see *Miller* (1995 and 2007) and *Canovan* (2000). On Walzer’s work on justice, see critical essays and *Walzer’s* response in *Miller & Walzer* (1995).

4. International Human Rights

What are human rights? Can any of these rights exist without political systems to implement and defend them? Why do ‘traditional’ critiques of human rights have so little purchase in actual politics – do we have a vested interest in the existence of human rights, leading us to ignore valid philosophical critiques?

Essential Primary:

Griffin (2001) attacks rights proliferation in the UN human rights regime. *Shue* (1996) Chapter 1 argues for a minimalist set of rights based on basic human needs. *Charvet & Kaczynska-Nay* (2008) Chapter 11 offers a liberal defence of the international human rights regime. *Donnelly* (2007) canvases the controversies over the universality of rights. Finally, *Beitz* (2003) critiques efforts to limit the proliferation of rights and to offer final justifications.

Essential Background:

Donnelly (2006) provides an introduction to thinking about human rights. *Dunne & Wheeler* (1999) offer an overview of contemporary issues. *Hafner-Burton & Tsutsui* (2007) look at the success of human rights in preventing violence and abuse.

Further Reading:

Further reading relevant to the above authors includes *Beitz & Goodin* (2009), which debates *Shue’s* work; *Beitz* (2009), which is a book length treatment; *Donnelly* (1998) which provides a functionalist defence of human rights; and *Griffin* (2008) which is an expanded argument for his conception of human rights. Other interesting recent work on human rights includes *Ignatieff* (2001) and *Cohen* (2004), with *Rawls* (1999) providing important background – also see *Martin & Reidy* (2006). *Baynes* (2009) reviews recent work on human rights, focusing on what he terms a ‘political conception’ of rights.

Recent critiques of human rights often update long-standing ones; see *Brown* (1997c/1999), *Evans* (1996), and *Robinson* (1998). Earlier critiques include *MacIntyre* (2007), *Marx* (2000) and *Bentham* (1843). *Reus Smit* (2011) and *Moyn* (2010) tell alternative stories of the history and politics of struggles for human rights. Useful collections and background material includes *Steiner & Alston* (2007), which provides texts of all the major human rights documents and commentary; *Lauren* (2003) is a comprehensive history; *Brown* (2001) provides an overview; *Jones* (1994) is a general text on rights thinking; *Dunne & Wheeler* (1999) is a wide-ranging collection; and *Evans* (1998) is a critical collection on human rights. Finally, *Human Rights Quarterly* and

International Journal of Human Rights are useful and reliable sources of reading material on all human rights issues.

5. Critiques of Human Rights and Universal Values

How “universal” is the contemporary international human rights regime? To what extent is it a gendered and Western political project that benefits particular groups and neglects others? Should women and members of non-Western cultures reject the human rights regime?

Essential Primary:

Mackinnon (1993) argues that human rights fail to reflect the experience of women. *Mutua* (2008) presents a strong critique of the human rights regime as ideological. *An-Na'im* (1991) makes a compelling case for the importance of taking culture seriously. *Coomaraswamy* (1994) highlights the limits of the rights discourse in non-liberal and non-Western contexts. Finally, *Okin* (1999) brings together many of the issues for the week by asking the question, “Is Multiculturalism Good for Women?”

Essential Background:

Brown (2000b) is a useful piece that illustrates the difficulties that universalist doctrines face in a diverse world. *Peterson & Parisi* (1998) provides background on the feminist critique of liberal political thinking and human rights. *Geertz* (1984) is a well-known engagement with the debate over universalism and relativism with wider significance for the multicultural critique examined in this week.

Further Reading:

Further readings on feminism and human rights include *Peterson* (1990); *Ashworth* (1999); and *Robinson* (2003). *Peters & Wolper* (1995) is a wide-ranging collection on human rights and feminism. *Hutchings* (2000) provides a feminist analysis of the different perspectives on moral theory that justify human rights. Finally, *Mackinnon* (2006) develops and broadens her earlier work on human right. For further reading on multicultural critiques of human rights see *Parekh* (1999) and *Jones* (2001). More fundamental critiques are raised by *Pagden* (2003) and *Mutua* (2001). *Lyons & Mayall* (2003) is an important collection that highlights the issue of group rights within the human rights regime. *Kymlicka* (1995a) argues that liberal democracies can make room for multiculturalism and develops an account of group rights that is compatible with individual rights. *Barry* (2000) rejects cultural-based arguments with a strongly egalitarian argument for equal individual rights.

6. International Humanitarianism

Is humanitarian intervention ever justified? Is there a duty to intervene (perhaps a Responsibility to Protect), and if so, on who does the duty fall? Can humanitarian intervention be neutral or apolitical?

Essential Primary:

Barnett & Weiss eds. (2008) Chapter 1 looks at arguments that the growth of humanitarianism is leading us towards a more just world order, as well as arguments that

the practice is descending into a dark age. *Wheeler* (2000), especially Chapter 1, is of the first view, and is a call for a norm of humanitarian intervention from an English School, solidarist perspective. *Rieff* (2002a), especially Part 1, makes a powerful claim that the practice is in crisis. *Chandler* (2006b), especially Chapter 2, argues that Western humanitarianism always has a dark side and *Weiss* (1999) sees humanitarianism as unavoidably political.

Essential Background:

Ramsbotham & Woodhouse (1996) contains an excellent summary of the classical approach to humanitarianism. The bastion of classical, neutral and impartial humanitarianism has been the International Committee of the Red Cross, examined in *Forsythe* (2005). A more self-consciously political strand of humanitarianism can be traced from episodes such as the British-led abolition of the Atlantic slave trade, explored in *Hochschild* (2005) and *Kaufmann and Pape* (1999). *Barnett* (2011) is an excellent political history of humanitarianism. A key issue within contemporary humanitarianism is the controversial practice of military humanitarian intervention, which focuses our attention on putative clashes between state sovereignty and universal human rights. *Smith* (1998) and *Weiss* (2007) are good general introductions to humanitarian intervention today and *Bass* (2008) recounts the history of the practice.

Further Reading:

Bellamy & Williams (2011) is as up-to-date a scholarly account of the responsibility to protect process as you will find, examining Cote d'Ivoire and Libya. *Weiss* (1999) sparks a lively discussion in an important Ethics & International Affairs forum (1999). There has been much soul-searching about the humanitarian calling in recent years, of which *Rieff* (2002a, 2002b & 2005), *Kennedy* (2004), *Terry* (2002) and *Orbinski* (2008) are excellent examples. *Moore* (1998) and *Weissman* (2004) contain valuable practitioner accounts from a wide range of actors. *Lang* (2003), *Holzgrefe & Keohane* (2003), *Chatterjee & Scheid* (2004) (including *Brown* (2003b), a defence of inconsistency in humanitarian action) and *Nardin & Williams* (2005) are good introductions to the academic debates. Particularly useful articles include *Sherman* (1998) and *Walzer* (1995). Root-and-branch critiques of Western humanitarianism in general, and the practice of humanitarian intervention in particular, include *Chandler* (2006) and *Belloni* (2007). The Responsibility to Protect report is available here: <http://www.iciss.ca/pdf/Commission-Report.pdf>. See commentary by *Evans* (2008b) and an assessment of action on R2P over the last 5 years by *Bellamy* (2010). *Economides & Berdal* (2007) is very good on specific interventions, *Shawcross* (2000) is a highly readable if journalistic general study of the 1990s cases. *Mamdani* (2007 - LRB) is a scathing attack on calls for intervention in Darfur – see *Mamdani* (2009) for a book-length exploration of the politics of the Darfur 'genocide' and responses to it, linking the West's reactions firmly to its colonial past.

7. Global Social Justice

Does Rawls offer good reasons why his account of social/distributive justice should not apply at the international level? Or are cosmopolitan principles of justice and programmes of reform such as those espoused by Thomas Pogge more convincing? Is Pogge correct to link human rights to issues of world poverty?

Essential Primary:

Singer (1971) is a radical utilitarian call for global justice. *Rawls* (1999 Part I plus sections 15 and 16) paints a much more circumscribed picture of what can and should be achieved on a 'global' level. *Brown* (2002) defends Rawls' international theory. *Beitz* (1979/2000), especially Part 3, and *Pogge* (2002 – though see Pogge 2005a for a condensed version of the argument and a response to critics) refute Rawls. *Pogge* 1994 is a direct response to Rawls' 'Law of Peoples'.

Essential Background:

Brown (2006) looks at the many meanings of justice in IPT. *Pogge & Moellendorf* (2008) contains many key readings – all papers collected here are relevant to the topic and document the progression of debates on global justice.

Further Reading:

The *Review of International Studies* (2005) produced a Special Section on Beitz's 1979 work to mark its 25 anniversary. *Ethics and International Affairs* (2005) has a symposium on Pogge's work. Pogge's webpage has a valuable list of his writings: <http://pantheon.yale.edu/~tp4/index.html>. *Jaggar* (2010) contains critiques of Pogge. The *Ethics and International Affairs* (2002b) Debate on Global Justice is an exchange between Singer and Kuper. *Singer* (2009) brings his thinking up to date. *Rawls* (1971) is regarded by many as the most important work on social justice within the Anglo-American tradition of the 20th century, but argues that justice is for the most part only possible within the borders of a state. *O'Neill* (1975) is an early and much shorter version of *O'Neill* (1986) which, like Pogge, establishes principles for helping the distant poor via rights rather than via utilitarianism. *Barry* (1994, 1998) proposes a cosmopolitan notion of 'justice as impartiality' and *Caney* (2005) is an influential recent cosmopolitan statement. *Sen* (2009) attempts to some extent to bridge the international/global positions, and argues that ideas of justice (globally and locally) are inevitably plural and require adjudicating between. See *Brown* (2010) and *Schmidtz* (2011) for reviews of Sen. For recent thinking on causes and approaches to global poverty and inequality from practitioners (all of whom have worked for the World Bank), see *Collier* (2007), *Moyo* (2009), *Easterly* (2007) and *Calderisi* (2007). For a sharp criticism of World Bank poverty relief policies see *Wade* (2004).

8. International Criminal Law

Since 1945, and in particular since 1989, there has been a significant increase in the amount and application of international criminal law – mostly in the form of war crimes trials. Are such trials an appropriate response to gross abuses of human rights? Does the establishment of the International Criminal Court signal agreement around cosmopolitan ethical principles? Is the Court an independent arbiter of justice, a low-

cost way for the international community to appear to ‘do something’ in the face of atrocity or just one more player in the game of international power politics?

Essential Primary:

Simpson (2007) is a theoretically rich argument about the politics of war crimes trials – see in particular Chapter 1 on the relationships between international criminal law and politics and Chapter 2 on whether war crimes trials should take place at the international or local level. *May* (2005), especially Chapter 1, is a powerful philosophical justification of international criminal law and the incursions on sovereignty it entails. *Rudolph* (2001) examines the conditions under which an atrocities regime can be built and become effective. *Moghalu* (2008), especially Chapter 6, examines the politics of the ICC. *Ainley* (2011) assesses structural and operational arguments in favour of and against the ICC.

Essential Background:

On the development of international humanitarian and criminal law see *Cassese* (2008). On the International Criminal Court, see *Schabas* (2007) – chapters 1 and 2 are particularly useful. The website of the Court has a wealth of information: <http://www.icc-cpi.int/home.html&l=en>, as does the Coalition for the ICC website: <http://www.iccnw.org/>, which includes fact sheets on the positions states have taken towards the Court. The International Center for Transitional Justice website (<http://www.ictj.org/en/>) provides both background on TJ and analysis of current TJ processes.

Further Reading:

Human Rights Watch (2008) is an assessment of the first five years of the ICC. *Ainley* (2008) and *Laughland* (2008) are critical of many aspects of war crimes trials. *Vinjamuri* (2010) examines the trend towards expecting justice mechanisms to bring peace. *Human Rights Watch* (2009) outlines the dangers of giving up on justice in order to achieve peace. *Waddel & Clark* (2008) is a collection of essays on the effects of the ICC in Africa – see, in particular, *Clark* (2008b). On Darfur, see *De Waal & Stanton* (2009) and *Peskin* (2009); on Uganda, see *Allen* (2006). China’s position on the ICC is usefully summarised by *Gao & Wang* (2007).

The ‘War on Terror’ has challenged international law and impacted on the US position on the ICC: see *Greenwood* (2002) and *Rivkin & Casey* (2007) on the effects of the War on law. *Mansell* (2004) examines American exceptionalism post 9/11, *McGoldrick* (2004) looks at the ICC, human rights and humanitarian law in the context of the War on Terror. *Ralph* (2007) is particularly good on the US (pre-Obama) and the ICC. *Rivkin & Casey* (2003) document the post 9/11 split in European and American attitudes to international law. The pieces in *Ignatieff* (2005) look at American exceptionalism more broadly. On the wider effects of the War on Terror on international human and humanitarian rights see *Fitzpatrick* (2003) and *Weller* (2002).

McCormack & Simpson (1997) offers theoretical and historical insight on international criminal law and *Reus-Smit* (2004) gives a constructivist perspective. *Tallgren* (2002) questions the purpose of international criminal law. *Charlesworth & Chinkin* (2000) use

feminist theory to analyse and critique the international justice system, including human rights law. On international law and sovereignty, *Goldsmith & Posner* (2005) argue that international law is simply a tool of state interests, whereas *Allott* (2004) and *Slaughter* (2004) see sovereign states as increasingly irrelevant.

9. Beyond the Liberal Origins of International Political Theory

Can the tension between universalism and particularism be resolved? Is there a workable middle-way between cosmopolitan and communitarian perspectives? What can ground our political commitments in the absence of sure ethical justification?

Essential Primary:

Appiah (2005) Chapter 6 argues for a rooted cosmopolitanism that accepts the importance of context and particular loyalties. Similarly, *Nussbaum* (2000) Chapter 1 tries to bring together elements of virtue ethics and Kantian morality. *Benhabib* (2006) Parts I & II also attempts to bring Kantian cosmopolitanism into a less abstract register. In contrast, *Rorty* (1998) Chapter 9 argues that human rights and the development of a sense of global justice do not depend upon final rational foundations, but instead sentimental education. *Connolly* (2000) starts from similarly anti-foundationalist premises but focuses on the persistence and nature of political contestation that becomes increasingly important if one abandons the quest for foundations.

Essential Background:

Essential background readings for this week include *Brown* (2000); *Cochran* (2000); *Erskine* (2008); and *Hutchings* (1999). Also, *Hutchings* (2010) and *Bell* (2010) both provide useful background for what should now be rather less unfamiliar ideas.

Further Reading:

Erskine (2002 and 2007) provide background on her account of 'embedded cosmopolitanism' and build on the work of *Walzer* (1994 and 2007). Also, see *Sutch* (2010). *Nussbaum* (1997 and 2004) elaborates her position. *Phillips* (2001) is an important criticism of her work and the *Ethics* (2000) symposium on Nussbaum's political philosophy provides further commentary. *Habermas* (2005) is a response to the challenges of increasing global diversity/pluralism. Also, *Linklater* (1998 and 2007) is an influential account from within International Relations. Finally, *Shapcott* (2001) is a good critical text on Habermasian Critical Theory.

Rorty (1989, 1997 and 1999) provides further reflections based on his neo-Pragmatism. *Bellamy* (2002) and *Festenstein* (2002) both apply Pragmatism to issues in international political theory. Also, *Festenstein* (2001) is a collection of critical commentary on Rorty's work. *Connolly* (1999) works out the implications of his pluralist theory. *Campbell & Shapiro* (1999) is a collection on post-modern thinking in the field. *Honig* (2008) contrasts Benhabib with Connolly to suggest a distinctive account of human rights that emerges from Connolly's thinking. Also, *Connolly* (2005) contains a challenging chapter on 'Pluralism and Sovereignty'.

Appendix 1

Past and Sample Exam Papers

The IR462 course was significantly revised and updated in 2010/11. The past exam papers below (in particular the sample paper and the papers from 2010/11 and 2011/12) are a reasonably good indication of the kind of questions you will be asked in the exam, and questions which are on topics no longer covered are marked in italics.

IR462 Sample Examination Paper:

There are 8 questions: answer 2.

1. The human rights project is an ideological political project that privileges the experience of Western men at the expense of others. Do you agree?
2. Are there compelling reasons to assign rights to political communities?
3. What does it mean to be 'humanitarian' in an international context?
4. Are there any universal values?
5. Is the International Criminal Court working to advance cosmopolitan goals?
6. Discuss the value of classifying international political theorists into 'cosmopolitan' and 'communitarian' camps.
7. What, if anything, should be done to achieve global social justice?
8. To what extent does *EITHER* Benhabib *OR* Rorty *OR* Nussbaum succeed in resolving the key controversies in international political theory?

2011/12 IR462 Exam Paper:

1. What moral obligations do the rich have to the distant poor?
2. Are there good reasons to believe that human rights exist?
3. Is there anything wrong with patriotism?
4. Is the existence of an International Criminal Court best explained by arguments about political power or arguments about moral progress?
5. Is humanitarian intervention a form of neo-imperialism used by the strong to dominate the weak?
6. Do the liberal origins of IPT make it less rather than more likely to achieve the liberal goals of equality and justice?

7. Is the nation state a necessary condition for human flourishing?
8. Can the tensions between universalism and particularism in IPT be resolved?

2010-11 IR462 Exam Paper:

1. 'The growth of the human rights movement since 1945 is evidence of moral progress in international politics'. Do you agree?
2. 'Most of us do not merely let people starve, but participate in starving them' (Thomas Pogge). If this is true, does it prove that we have duties of justice to those beyond our state borders?
3. 'The idea of cultural relativism is nothing but an excuse to violate human rights.' Do you agree?
4. Is cosmopolitanism admirable, but ultimately unrealistic?
5. Are ethical theories which emphasize context more persuasive than those which are founded on universal claims?
6. 'The nation-state remains a crucial instrument of democratic politics' (Michael Walzer). Should the nation-state be preferred to institutions of global governance on this basis?
7. Is international criminal law anything more than a tool of Western domination?
8. Should humanitarian actors strive to be neutral and impartial, or just the opposite?

2009-10 IR462 Exam Paper:

1. 'States are the least suitable actors to be charged with the protection of universal human rights, except for all the others.' Do you agree?
2. *Does the 'logic of consequences' always trump the 'logic of appropriateness' when it comes to respecting state sovereignty?*
3. *Is Hedley Bull right to privilege order over justice in international affairs?*
4. 'Non-foundational accounts of human rights may be compelling in classrooms, but when it matters, in situations of potential danger, they will always be inadequate.' Do you agree?
5. Is international law the best way to achieve justice in international relations?
6. Can a state ever be a humanitarian actor?
7. Are critics of the international human rights regime just defending their own particularist interests?

8. 'International law is inherently political. The mistake liberals often make is to presume this is a bad thing.' Discuss.

2008-09 IR462 Exam Paper:

1. *Do the logics of expected consequences always trump the logics of appropriateness in international relations?*
2. *'The military adventurism of the US and its allies since 9/11 demonstrates the inability of international law to constrain the actions of powerful states.'* Discuss.
3. Does Michael Walzer distinguish sufficiently between state, nation and political community in his defence of the norm of non-intervention?
4. If we have rights at all, do we have them by virtue of our status as human beings or solely as citizens of particular states?
5. Do contemporary international institutions facilitate or frustrate the achievement of justice?
6. Can outsiders ever know enough about the causes of humanitarian crises to save those who are suffering?
7. 'For all its faults, the notion of a cosmopolitan-communitarian debate remains the most fruitful way of organising the subject matter of International Political Theory.' Discuss.
8. 'Peace can only last where human rights are respected, where the people are fed, and where individuals and nations are free' (Dalai Lama). Do you agree?