

International Relations Theory Graduate Seminar

IR 440: Northwestern University

Professor Karen J. Alter. Scott Hall 319, (847) 491-4842, kalter@northwestern.edu

Course Description:

All discussion of international politics rests on conceptual foundations and assumptions. There is a Western IR canon, and a racial reckoning in relation to this canon. China's rise is also raising the question of whether there is a different Chinese approach to IR, or if China will assume already-theorized positions of a revisionist power. We will explore IR theory's conceptual foundations and assumptions, while also leaving room for student interest to shape the last 3 weeks of the class.

There is no right way to organize an IR theory core seminar, and the quarter system creates additional challenges. When I went to graduate school, a typical IR core seminar would include weeks on major areas of study in IR, such as war, international cooperation, international political economy, normative theories, the role of ideas in international relations, the democratic peace etc. Another approach might focus on conceptual ideas such as sovereignty, anarchy and power. I have included sample syllabi on our Canvas website, to provide a sense of the variety that exists.

Touchstone theme: A focus on change in the international order

This course will mix a focus on the classical paradigms in IR with a touchstone theme where different approaches are brought to life. A touchstone theme is also a way to create coherence and depth in the context of a survey course. The post-WWII global order is clearly changing. On the one hand, we have been here before. Global orders have changed fundamentally in the past, which is to say that great powers have risen and fallen, and there has been a major shift from city-states to nation-states, empires to multilateralism etc. We will study how these changes have been understood by international relations theories. Yet most of this scholarship focuses on the Westphalian system, a system created by and for European countries. The current moment is facing the rise of China, a country that in some ways wants to maintain the Westphalian system but in other ways seeks to supplant it. Critical scholars also want to change structural features of the international system. The contemporary part of this course focuses on how scholars are conceptualizing and defining 'change in the international order', why decolonization failed to change the international order despite the organized demands of developing countries, and how scholars are debating if, whether and how the rise of China will change the current international order.

Course Assignments

Two short exam-style papers (2x 35%) or an agreed upon alternative (e.g. review essay or research paper)

I will give you a comprehensive exam type of question and ask you to answer it by drawing on the readings we have covered in class. You may also bring in readings from other courses, or from your backpack of prior knowledge. Three times over the quarter I will distribute an exam question; the last exam question will be given the last week of class. The paper will be due one week later. You only need to answer 2 of the 3 questions.

Class Participation (20%): The participation grade has three components:

1. *Preparation and participation:* I expect you to come to each class prepared to discuss the readings for the week. Assigned readings are listed first, and required for each session. *Reading notes are not a substitute for doing the reading yourself.*
2. *Reading notes:* Graduate school is a collaborative process. We will divide the readings by the number of students so as to generate notes on everything we read. When the reading is article length, notes should be 1 page long, and in no case more than 2 pages, and include your name, the full citation, and

the page numbers where key arguments are made. Reading notes are due at noon on the day before our class meets.

Co-Teaching (10 %)

1. *Co-chairing a discussion*: This will take some preparation in advance, so you will need to read ahead the week you are a discussant. Discussants are welcome to substitute or bring in additional discussant readings related to the theme.
2. *Summarizing one set of additional readings*: The discussant provides notes on the readings assigned to the discussant, and they will also summarize the reading and interject the ideas in the class.
3. *Peer review of two exam-style papers*: I will assign pairs to be peer reviewers of each paper. I will provide a rubric, and I would like you to be a peer reviewer providing feedback on the paper. The feedback is due a week after the paper is submitted.

Reading Materials

Assigned readings are posted on canvas, or in the library reserve system. There are two books we will draw on. Michael Zürn's book *A Theory of Global Governance* exists as an unlimited us Ebook. Because we are interested in how IR is taught and explained, I ask you to consult a very popular undergraduate IR Textbook. Jeffrey Frieden, David Lake and Kenneth Schultz's textbook *World Politics: Interests, Interactions, Institutions*. I have purchased a copy for students to share.

Schedule and Reading Assignments

Week 1: Introduction to IR as a Discipline

A focus on theoretical foundations of IR and global order reinforces debates that have been Western, white and male. Except for the feminist readings, all of this week's readings were written by men.¹ This terrible balance is, unfortunately, representative of the state-centric, power-focused field of international relations, and the focus on IR theory. I don't like what I'm about to say, but it is unfortunately true. The main way to improve the gender balance is to cover feminized topics, including subjects related to international cooperation, human rights and gender in IR. The main way to improve the racial balance is to focus on race and subaltern perspectives. The assignment for the first class is to read any 2 readings from each group (plus the foreign policy article in the 3rd group).

Mainstream Maps of the IR Discipline (pick 2)- *tends to be American, European, male and white*

Stanley Hoffmann, "An American Social Science: IR," *Daedalus*, 1977, 106:41-60.

Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, "Between Utopia and Reality: The Practical Discourses of International Relations," in Reus-Smit and Snidal, editors, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*, 2008, 3-40.

Robert W Cox, 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', in Robert Keohane (ed), *Neorealism and Its Critics* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1986), pp.204-254.

J. David Singer. "The Levels-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations," *World Politics*, 1961, 14:77-92.

Tim Dunne, Lene Hansen, and Colin Wight, "The End of International Theory?" *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 2013:405-425

Ole Waever, "The Sociology of a Not so International Discipline: American and European Developments in International Relations" *International Organization* 52:4 (Autumn 1998) pp.687-727.

¹ Using [Jane Sumner's gender balance probabilistic assessment tool](#) the assigned and recommended readings for the first 6 weeks, this syllabus is 79% male, 13% female and 7% unknown (=probably male), and 56% White with 33.5% unknown (4.4% Asian, 5.48% Black, .55% Hispanic).

Steve Smith, "The Self-Images of Discipline: A Genealogy of International Relations Theory," in Smith and Booth, *International Relations Theory Today*: 1-37 (Penn State Press, 1995)

Brian Schmidt "On the History and Historiography of International Relations" from the *Handbook of International Relations*:3-22 Sage Publications (2001)

[Daniel Maliniak, Susan Peterson and Michael J. Tierney, "TRIP Around the World: Teaching, Research, and Policy Views of International Relations Faculty in 20 Countries." Teaching, Research, and International Policy \(TRIP\) Project.](#) The Institute for the Theory and Practice of International Relations, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA (May 2012)

Critiques of the IR as a Male & Western Discipline: (Pick 2)

Amitav Acharya, Barry Buzan, "Why is there no Non-Western International Relations Theory? Ten years on," *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, Volume 17, Issue 3, September 2017, Pages 341–370, <https://doi.org/10.1093/irap/lcx006>

Vasilaki, R. (2012). Provincialising IR? Deadlocks and Prospects in Post-Western IR Theory. *Millennium*, 41(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829812451720>

Boniface E.S. Mgonja and Iddi A.M. Makombe (2009) Debating international relations and its relevance to the third world *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations* 3(1): 027-037,

Johnston, Alastair Iain.2012 What (If Anything) Does East Asia Tell Us About International Relations Theory? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1), 53-78.

J. Ann Tickner (2011) "Retelling IR's foundational stories: some feminist and postcolonial perspectives," *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 23:1, 5-13, DOI: 10.1080/14781158.2011.540090

Ann Tickner, J. (2006). On the Frontlines or Sidelines of Knowledge and Power? Feminist Practices of Responsible Scholarship." *International Studies Review*, 8(3), 383-395.

Tickner, Arlene. B. (2013). Core, periphery and (neo)imperialist International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(3), 627–646. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066113494323>

Shilliam, Robbie (2011) Chapter 1: Non-Western thought and international relations in Shilliam ed *International Relations and Non-Western Thought: Imperialism, Colonialism and Investigations of Global Modernity*.

Race-based critiques of IR: (Read the first and then pick two)

Kelebogile Zvobgo, Meredith Loken "Why Race Matters in International Relations." *Foreign Policy* June 19, 2020 available at <https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/06/19/why-race-matters-international-relations-ir/>

Le Melle, T. (2009). Race in International Relations. *International Studies Perspectives*, 10(1), 77-83.

Duncan Bell (2013) Race and international relations: introduction, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 26:1, 1-4, DOI: 10.1080/09557571.2013.770297

Shilliam R, 'Race and research agendas' (2013) 26 *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 152

Persaud, Randolph B., & Sajed, Alina. (2018). Race, gender, and culture in international relations: Postcolonial perspectives. Routledge Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY. (Introduction)

Roediger, David (2015). "What would it mean to transform international relations?" in Anievas, Alexander, Manchanda, Nivi, & Shilliam, Robbie. *Race and racism in international relations: Confronting the global colour line* Routledge Abingdon, Oxon; New York. Pp.195-201

Mills, Charles W. (2015). "Unwriting and unwhitening the world" in in Anievas, Alexander, Manchanda, Nivi, & Shilliam, Robbie. *Race and racism in international relations: Confronting the global colour line* (Routledge Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: pp. 202-214

Week 2: Realist and Neorealist Theory

Realism is an evergreen theory and a self-fulfilling prophesy. China and Russia actively embrace realism as justification for their power accumulation and rising aggression. While progressives will argue about the many ways that realism is wrong and antiquated, security studies and political leaders will forever keep realism alive as a theory of international relations.

1. Hans J. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (Mc-Graw Hill, 1985), Selections

2. Ann Tickner “Hans Morgenthau’s Principles of Realism: A Feminist Restatement” *Millennium* Vol. 17. No. 3, pp. 429-440
3. Kenneth Waltz “The Anarchic Structure of World Politics” in *Theory of International Politics* (1979)-I assigned an edited version of chapters of his *Theory of International Politics*, which printed in the Art/Jervis reader.
4. Stephen Krasner. (1992). Realism, Imperialism, and Democracy: A Response to Gilbert. *Political Theory*, 20(1), 38–52. *This article channels a Morgenthauian realism, defending it while also displaying how interest defined as power works. It is dated— China is no where mentioned— but the point is that interest defined as power will create concrete foreign policy priorities. In the past, I have also assigned Mearsheimer as an example that channels realism.*
5. Mohammed Ayoob (2002) “Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case for Subaltern Realism” *International Studies Review* 4(3): 27-48. *This article criticizes neo-realism and neo-liberalism for failing in their own goals, and it creates a "subaltern" realism that better explains war and peace, and international collaboration. Subaltern realism is based on classical realism, which was more sensitive to context and history. Ayoob's subaltern realism better explains war and peace. An additional goal is to challenge the hegemony and myopia of IR theorizing in the US.*
6. Acharya, Amitav. 2022. Race and Racism in the Founding of the Modern World Order. *International affairs (London)* 98(1): 23-43. This article reveals the racism underpinning how realism has been practice.

How is this paradigm explained in an intro to IR course: Frieden, Lake & Shulz *World Politics* chapter on Why are there Wars?

Discussant Summarize: How Order is Maintained in a realist world

Edward Vose Gulick *Europe’s Classical Balance of Power* (1955) Chapter III on means (52-91) (see course reserves)

Walt, Stephen. (1985). Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power. *International Security*, 9(4), 3-43.

Notes on John Mearsheimer’s The Tragedy of Great Power Politics

Robert Keohane “Theory of World Politics: Structural Realism and Beyond” from *Neo-Realism and its Critics* (1986) 158-199 (*A critique of realism, yet fundamental elements are retained. These retentions are seen as a big flaw in Keohane’s theory of politics*)

Recommended classics of realist thinking:

Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War*. (1959)

Kenneth Waltz *Theory of International Politics* (1979)

E.H. Carr. *The Twenty-Years Crisis* (1951)

Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (1981)

Stephen Krasner, *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. (1999)

Robert Jervis, “Realism in the Study of World Politics,” *International Organization*, 52 (4) (1998): 971-992.

Recommended critiques

Andrew Moravcsik and Jeffrey Legro "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* (Fall 1999).

"Correspondence: Brother, Can You Spare a Paradigm? (Or Was Anybody Ever a Realist?)," *International Security* (Summer 2000).

(Critiques by Peter Feaver, Gunther Hellmann, Randall Schweller, Jeffrey Taliaferro and William Wohlforth and reply by Moravcsik & Legro)

Kapstein, E. B. Is realism dead? The domestic sources of international politics. *International organization*, 49(4), (1995). 24.

Wendt, Alexander (1995) "Constructing International Politics" *International Security*, Summer, 1995, 20(1): 71-81

Siba Grovogui (2002). “Regimes of Sovereignty: International Morality and the African Condition” *European Journal of International Relations*, 8(3): 315-338.

Barry Buzan, People, States, and Fear (1994)

Week 3: Constructivism: Anarchy v. Other Understandings of Structures

Each of these readings identifies fundamental features of the international structure that, according to the authors, are shaping of international relations. We want to understand the different formulations of the fundamental structures shaping IR, and think of how these structures matter. One structure is largely ignored. Marxism offered a structural theory rooted in material conditions associated with class and the economy. To some extent,

constructivism's focus on ideational superstructures has stepped into the void created by the discrediting of materialist Marxist thought. A cost of replacing Marxism with constructivism is that we no longer discuss how capitalism shapes the international system. Of this week's readings, Bull (1977) is the only one writing when Marxism still operated as a prominent theory of international relations. This may be why Bull comes closest to saying that the desire to protect property is a fundamental element of any human-centric social structure.

1. Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society*, Chs. 1 (concept of order) & 3 (how order is maintained) p. 3-22, 53-76.
2. Wendt, Alexander, "Anarchy is What States Make of It" *International Organization* (1992), 391-425.
3. Reus-Smit, Christian, 1997. "The Constitutional Structure of International Society and the Nature of Fundamental Institutions." *International Organization* 51 (4): 555-589.
4. Donnelly, Jack, "The Elements of the Structures of International Systems" *International Organization* (66)4: 609-643
5. Lake, David, [Authority, Coercion, and Power in International Relations](#), in *Back to Basics: State Power in a Contemporary World*, Martha Finnemore and Judith Goldstein, eds. (2013): 55-77
6. **How this paradigm is explained in an intro to IR course:** Frieden, Lake & Shulz World Politics chapter on International Law and Norms

Discussant Summarize: How Order is Maintained in the international social system

Only volunteer if you have access to the Bull book.

Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society*: Part II Order in the Contemporary International System (Chapters on the Balance of Power, Int'l law, War and Great powers and international order, 101-161, 184-232.

Copeland, Dale C. "The Constructivist Challenge to Structural Realism: A Review Essay." *International Security* 25, no. 2 (2000): 187-212. Accessed July 17, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/2626757. (on Canvas)

Recent podcast: [Has Constructivism exceeded its shelf life?](#)

Recommended:

Karl Deutsch, Political Community in the North Atlantic Area (1957) *Before Bull, before Wendt, Karl Deutsch was rejecting Realist arguments*

Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999)

Ruggie, John Gerard. "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 855-85

Martha Finnemore, *National Interests in International Society*, (1996)

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph Nye, *Power and Interdependence* (1977).

Hoffmann, Stanley "Hedley Bull and his Contributions to International Relations" in Hoffmann *World Disorders*.

Fernand Braudel "Divisions in Space and Time in Europe" p.21-89 in his book *The Perspective of the World* vol 3. 1979.

Jusin Rosenberg *The Empire of Civil Society* Version, 1994

David A. Lake, "Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics." *International Security* 32.1 (2007): 47-79.

Emanuel Adler, "Constructivism," in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth A. Simmons, eds., *Handbook of International Relations* (London: Sage, 2013), 112-144.

Martin Wight, *Systems of States* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1977), pp.21-45.

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 4 (2001), pp. 391-416.

John Gerard Ruggie, "Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations," *International Organization*, Vol. 47, No. 1, Winter (1993), pp. 139-174.

Week 4: Liberalism (A former prelim question will be distributed this week)

Liberalism, which dates back hundreds of years, is the Western alternative to realism. Liberal assumptions underpin all theories of international cooperation, and most theories of the global economy (Note that neo-liberalism is something different). Something to consider is whether liberalism is fused with capitalism. China wants to create capitalism with Chinese characteristics. Is this even possible?

- Michael Doyle, Ways of War and Peace, Part II on Liberalism (p. 205-311) Very readable synthetic overview of the liberal paradigm, revisiting its classical roots. Moravcsik distills and updates these arguments, and in doing so many of the deep nuances are eliminated. This reading also introduces the democratic peace argument.
- Andrew Moravcsik "The New Liberalism" Reus-Smit & Snidal eds *Oxford Handbook of International Relations* (2011)p. 235-251 (This is a shorter version of Moravcsik's "Taking Preferences Seriously" article. The longer argument is more systematic in that it is an attempt to build a testable and predictive liberal theory).
- Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, "Power and Interdependence Revisited" *International Organization* 41 (4) 1987: 725-753. This article also explain how order is maintained in this view.
- Búzás, Zoltán I. 2021. Racism and Antiracism in the Liberal International Order. *International Organization* 75(2): 440-63.

How this paradigm is explained in an intro to IR course: Frieden, Lake & Shulz *World Politics* chapter on Interests, Interactions & Institutions & the chapter on International Trade

Discussant Summarize: Without the US, will the Liberal World Order crumble?

- G. John Ikenberry, The End of Liberal International order?, *International Affairs*, Volume 94, Issue 1, January 2018, Pages 7–23, <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix241>
- John J. Mearsheimer; Bound to Fail: The Rise and Fall of the Liberal International Order. *International Security* 2019; 43 (4): 7–50. doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00342
- See also these short policy pieces
- Richard H. Haas [Liberal World Order RIP](#) Originally published in *Project Syndicate* March 21 2018
- Thomas Wright "[The Liberal World Order must be Replaced](#)" *The Atlantic* September 12, 2018
- Matthew Downhour [Opportunities and Pitfalls for a Revived Liberal International Order](#) *Liberal Currents Blog* September 28, 2022

Recommended:

- Christian Reus-Smit, "The Strange Death of Liberal International Theory," *European Journal of International Law*, 2001. Argues that institutional & structural liberalism killed the normative/political heart that is liberalism.
- Reus-Smit, Christian. 2011. "Struggles for Individual Rights and the Expansion of the International System." *International Organization* 65 (2): 207-242
- Arthur Stein, "Neoliberalism Institutionalism." In Christian Reus-Smit and Duncan Snidal, *The Oxford Handbook of International Relations*. 2009. P. 201-217
- Stanley Hoffmann "Liberalism and International Affairs" in *Janus and Minerva: Essays in the Theory and Practice of International Politics* Westview Press, 1987
- Michael W. Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 80, No. 4 (December 1986), pp. 1151-1169.
- Michael W. Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics Revisited," in Charles W. Kegley, ed. *Controversies in International Relations Theory: Realism and the Neoliberal Challenge* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995), pp. 83-106. This piece summarizes and revisits the debate about the democratic peace
- Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin, and Geoffrey Garrett, "Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism," *International Organization*, 60, 4 (Fall 2006), pp. 781-810.
- Andrew Moravcsik "The Liberal Paradigm in International Relations Theory: A Scientific Assessment" in Colin Elman and Miriam Fendius Elman, eds., *Progress in International Relations Theory: Metrics and Measures of Scientific Change* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002).
- Ruggie, J. (1982). "International Regimes, Transactions and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order." *International Organization* 36(2): 379-415.

Critiques

- Amitav Acharya, "Rethinking Demand, Purpose and Progress in Global Governance: An Introduction," in Acharya, ed., *Why Govern? Rethinking Demand and Progress in Global Governance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).
- Henderson, E. (2013). Hidden in plain sight: Racism in international relations theory. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 26(1), 71-92.
- John J. Mearsheimer; Bound to Fail: The Rise and Fall of the Liberal International Order. *International Security* 2019; 43 (4): 7–50. doi: https://doi.org/10.1162/isec_a_00342

Week 5: Constitutional Elements of the Post WWII International Order and how orders changes

After WWII, multilateralism replaced imperialism as the organizing form for international relations. Multilateralism embodies liberal assumptions, yet it is distinct in its own ways. Many Westerners see Russia's invasion of Ukraine as a fundamental challenge to the post WWII International Order, which leads directly to the question of how orders establish, and how they change.

1. Kratochwil, Friedrich. (1986). Of Systems, Boundaries, and Territoriality: An Inquiry into the Formation of the State System. *World Politics*, 39(1), 27-52.
2. Reus-Smit, Christian. 1997. "The constitutional structure of international society and the nature of fundamental institutions." *International Organization* 51 (4):555-589.
3. Ruggie, John. 1993. "Multilateralism: The anatomy of an institution." In *Multilateralism matters*, edited by John Ruggie, 3-47. New York: Columbia University Press.
4. Patrick Porter *The False Promise of Liberal Order: Nostalgia, Delusion and the Rise of Trump* (2020) Chapter 4, the Machiavellian Moment: roads ahead [This reading is a provocation](#)
5. **How this idea is explained in an intro to IR course:** Frieden, Lake & Shulz *World Politics* Chapter on Challenges to the Global Order

Thinking about Change

6. Holsti K. (1998) "The Problem of Change in International Relations Theory." (published as a working paper in 1998, and later included as a book chapter in a collection of essays, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-26624-4_5)
7. Koslowski, Rey, and Friedrich V. Kratochwil. "Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire's Demise and the International System." *International Organization* 48, no. 2 (1994): 215-47.

Discussant Summarize: Revisiting classics on how world orders change

Waltz, Kenneth *Theory of International Politics* excerpts on political structures and the Management of International Affairs

Robert Gilpin "The Nature of International Political Change" in *War & Change in World Politics* p 7-49 (1981) *See course reserves*

Recommended:

Ruggie, J. (1993). Territoriality and Beyond: Problematizing Modernity in International Relations. *International Organization*, 47(1), 139-174.

Stanley Hoffman Chapters 3 (Ideal Worlds), 8 (Delusions of World Order) in Hoffmann, *A World Disordered*

Paris, Roland. (2020). The Right to Dominate: How Old Ideas About Sovereignty Pose New Challenges for World Order. *International Organization*, 74(3), 453-489

Altman, Daniel (2020). The Evolution of Territorial Conquest After 1945 and the Limits of the Territorial Integrity Norm. *International Organization*, 74(3), 490-522.

CFR's June 2020 [Report on Perspectives on a Changing World Order](#)

Week 6: Zürn's Theory of Global Governance (A former prelim question will be distributed)

What is IR theory? This week we are reading a book to think also about the format of a book and Zürn's claims about what theories must do. We will interrogate Zürn's description and defense of what a theory must do; the idea that his theory of global governance applies to a specific context (the post-1990s global governance system); and his claim about the paradigm changing nature of his theory.

Zürn, Michael. *A Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018

Assignment: We will collectively read the theory (Intro + part I) and the conclusion. I recommend that you read my notes on Chapter 5 in conjunction with this reading. Note-takers will fill in the missing chapters:

Chapter 6: Theory of politicization (including measures and tests)

Chapter 7: Counter-institutionalization (including hypotheses and findings)

Chapter 8: Deepening (findings and arguments)

Chapter 9: Global governance with a Cosmopolitan Intent (if someone wants to explore political theory more)

How this idea is explained in an intro to IR course Frieden, Lake & Shulz chapter on What Shaped our World: Historical Introduction

Discussant: A symposium on this book

[Symposium: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation in Global Governance:](#) Edited by Orfeo Fioretos and Jonas Tallberg *International Theory* 13 (1) 2021

These last 3 topics were chosen by seminar participants

Week 7: Sovereignty and the State in IR

I have given you the original Krasner, which is long. The key idea to absorb is Krasner's 'organized hypocrisy' claim. An alternative to reading deeply beyond Krasner's central argument is to read Danile Phillpott's push back against Krasner's argument, alongside his comparison of another definition of sovereignty. I would then read the handbook chapter, as you get an update of how Krasner thinks about sovereignty. Biersteker is a critical scholar, so his is a critical engagement of the idea. I then offer 3 new readings that are chosen because I think they will be of particular interest to members of this class.

Old Classics

Stephen D. Krasner "Sovereignty and its Discontents" and "Conclusion: Not a Game of Chess." *Sovereignty:*

Organized Hypocrisy, Princeton University Press, 1999. **Optional: For a deep critical engagement on this book, see Philpott, Daniel. "Usurping the Sovereignty of Sovereignty?" *World Politics* 53, no. 2 (2001): 297-324.**

(skim) Stephen D. Krasner "The Persistence of State Sovereignty" in Orfeo Fioretos. *International History and Politics in Time*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2017 (also published in *Oxford Handbook on Historical Institutionalism* (2016) *A recap of the key concepts, an argument that the different notions of sovereignty contribute to partial sovereignty, plus Krasner's argument of the EU is the only example of sovereignty being transformed*

Thomas J. Biersteker "State, Sovereignty and Territory" from the *Handbook of International Relations* Sage Publications (2001)

New Challenges

Paris, Roland. (2020). [The Right to Dominate: How Old Ideas About Sovereignty Pose New Challenges for World Order.](#) *International Organization*, 74(3), 453-489

Simmons, B., & Goemans, H. (2021). [Built on Borders: Tensions with the Institution Liberalism \(Thought It\) Left Behind.](#) *International Organization*, 75(2), 387-410.

Chowdhury, Arjun. *The Myth of International Order: Why Weak States Persist and Alternatives to the State Fade Away.* (excerpts) New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. (Requested yet not yet provided) [Here](#) the author explains what he sees as the contribution of his book.

Discussant Recommendation: Is it possible to get beyond Westphalian sovereignty?

Possible readings:

Anghie, Antony. (2005). Governance and globalization, civilization and commerce. In *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* (Cambridge Studies in International and Comparative Law, pp. 245-272). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *This chapter assesses why the NIEO failed, and how IO 'good governance' strategies are the latest version of how imperial power denies developing country sovereignty. The entire book is available [here](#). A review of the larger book is available ([here](#))*

Hedley Bull *The Anarchical Society*, Part III: Alternative Paths to World Order *In this part of the book, Hedley Bull reviews history and explores whether it is possible or desirable to move beyond the anarchical society of states.*

Zurn, Michael. *A Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2018 Chapter 9: Global governance with a Cosmopolitan Intent

Recommended

- Nisancioglu, Kerem. "[Racial Sovereignty](#)." *European Journal of International Relations* 26, no. 1_suppl (2020): 39–63.
- Philpott, D. (1995). Sovereignty: An Introduction and Brief History. *Journal of International Affairs* (New York), 48(2), 353-368.
- Jackson, Robert H. *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Rosenau, J. (1992). Citizenship in a changing global order. In J. Rosenau & E. Czempiel (Eds.), *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* (Cambridge Studies in International Relations, pp. 272-294). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511521775.012

Week 8: Domestic Politics and International Relations – Digging deeper into the levels of analysis problem

This week is filled with classics, and some newer readings written by female scholars. Singer explains the level of analysis problem. Whereas the second image is usually a question of how domestic politics shapes IR, Gourevitch flips the directionality, asking how might IR defines domestic politics? Putnam explains how diplomats use domestic constraints in their diplomacy. Wangen et al. return to the classic of Graham Allison's breakdown of models of decision-making in the Cuban Missile Crisis, which brings in organizational theory. Barnhart et al explore how the expansion of women's suffrage has impacted foreign policy, bringing gender into the analysis. Alter puts side by side 3 models of how international law shapes state policy: state level bargaining, multilateral politics, and a politics where domestic actors use international law for their own purposes.

Old Classics

- J. David Singer. "The Levels-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations," *World Politics*, 1961, 14:77-92.
- Peter Gourevitch, "[The Second Image Reversed: The International Sources of Domestic Politics](#)." *International Organization* 32:4 (1978), pp. 881-912
- Putnam, Robert. "[Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games](#)" *International Organization*. Summer 1988: 427-460.
- Wangen, Patrice, and Sophie Vanhoonacker. "[Graham T. Allison, The Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis](#)." In *The Oxford Handbook of Classics in Public Policy and Administration*. Oxford University Press, 2015.

Newer Work

- Barnhart, J., Trager, R., Saunders, E., & Dafeo, A. (2020). [The Suffragist Peace](#). *International Organization*, 74(4), 633-670.
- Karen J. Alter "International Courts Altering Politics" in *The New Terrain of International Law: Courts, Politics Rights Putting the idea that international law is externally imposed alongside the idea that domestic actors are actively bringing international law in*. Skim 34-41. Focus on 42-67.

Discussant Recommendation

Whereas realist IR scholars see no significant role for domestic politics to shape state behavior, Liberals expect domestic politics to mostly matter in democracies. New literature on authoritarian politics focuses on the existence of domestic constraints. I recommended some options, but there may be others too.

- Weeks, Jessica L. "[Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve](#)." *International Organization* 62, no. 1 (2008): 35–64
- Hyde, Susan D, and Elizabeth N Saunders. "[Recapturing Regime Type in International Relations: Leaders, Institutions, and Agency Space](#)." *International Organization* 74, no. 2 (2020): 363–95.
- Solingen, Etel, and Joshua Malnight, 'Globalization, Domestic Politics, and Regionalism' in Tanja A. Börzel, and Thomas Risse (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism* (2016), <https://doi-org.turing.library.northwestern.edu/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199682300.013.5>

Recommended readings:

- Waltz, Kenneth N. (Kenneth Neal). *Man, the State, and War: a Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964. An interesting deep dive into the book is: [Suganami, Hidemi. "Understanding Man, the State, and War." *International Relations \(London\)* 23, no. 3 \(2009\): 372–88](#)
- Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics." *International Organization*, 1997. 51:513-553.
- Henry Farrell and Abraham Newman "Review Article: Domestic Institutions Beyond the Nation State: Charting the New Interdependence Approach" *World Politics* 66(2) 2014: 331-63. [Note this is one of the sample Review Essay Articles in the Folder]
- Gourevitch, Peter "Domestic Politics and International Relations" from the *Handbook of International Relations* Sage Publications (2001)
- Joanne Gowa, "Public Goods and International Institutions, *International Organization* 42:1 (1988): 15-32.
- R. Gilpin, "The Three Ideologies of Political Economy," in *Political Economy of International Relations*, 187.

Week 9: Thinking about orders: Empires, Medieval Systems, Complex Systems, and what might be

Sovereignty, despite its messiness, has created clarity about the international order that has not existed historically, and doesn't exist in global governance. By resolving where authority lies (the state, or the UN Security Council), there is a way to know who is in charge. Meanwhile, all other forms of political organization contain ambiguity which allows contestation over where authority resides. One can therefore ask if sovereignty has actually resolved the question of who is in charge of what? Will the concept of rule provide an antidote?

- Doyle, Michael *Empires* 1986, Chapters 1 (Imperialism & Empires), 14 (Imperial Development: The end of Empire?) *It is hard to find a contemporary mainstream IR scholar writing about empires. Doyle's book is a classic. Historians have no problem describing particular empires, but Doyle shows that in IR theory, it isn't all that easy to know an empire when one sees one.*
- Spruyt, Hendrik "Collective Beliefs and Visions of Order" *The World Imagined* Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp.34-79. *Spruyt's theoretical argument about how different cultures envision different orders. This is the most interpretivist Spruyt I have seen.*
- Costa Lopez, J. (2020). Political Authority in International Relations: Revisiting the Medieval Debate. *International Organization*, 74(2), 222-252. *Returning to medieval times to understand contestations over authority*
- Alter, K. J. and K. Raustiala (2018). "The Rise of International Regime Complexity." *Annual Review of Law and Social Science* 14: 329-349. *Multiple forces that layer on new institutions, generating contested global authorities. This article also summarizes the state of theorizing about regime complexity. Alter and Meunier's effort to theorize the politics of international regime complexity has over 1000 google citations. Has any consensus been reached?*
- Christopher Daase, Nicole Deitelhoff & Antonia Witt *Rule in the Study of World Politics*. This is an introduction to a forthcoming book that tries to replace the anarchy problematique with a concept of rule as a systemic conception of international politics.

Frieden, Lake & Shulz chapter on What Shaped our World: Historical Introduction

Discussant: Empires v. complex systems

IR scholars reductively and implausibly simplify, because complexity messes up IR theorizing. These readings try to discuss how to bring complexity back into IR theorizing.

- Critical Review- Special Issue on Robert Jervis *Systems effects* 15 years on. Intro by Frieden & Response by Jervis.
- Orsini, Amandine, Le Prestre, Philippe, Haas, Peter M, Brosig, Malte, Pattberg, Philipp, Widerberg, Oscar, Chandler, David. (2019). Forum: Complex Systems and International Governance. *International Studies Review*, *International Studies Review*, 2019-02-14. <https://academic.oup.com/isr/advance-article-abstract/doi/10.1093/isr/viz005/5319218?redirectedFrom=fulltext>
- Alter, K. J. and S. Meunier (2009). "The Politics of International Regime Complexity." *Perspective on Politics* 7(1): 13-24. *In this reading, Alter and Meunier try to develop propositions about how complexity is shaping global governance problems. The KKV types do not like that the directionality of the implications is not clear.*
- Alter, K. J. (2022). "The promise and perils of theorizing international regime complexity in an evolving world." *The Review of International Organizations* 17(2): 375-396. *In this reading, Alter comments on a special issue and how challenging it has been to theorize the complexity of global governance.*

Recommended Readings

- Pomper, Philip. "[The History and Theory of Empires.](#)" *History and Theory* 44, no. 4 (2005): 1-27.
- Derek O'Brien "Magna Carta, the 'Sugar Colonies' and 'Fantasies of Empire'" in Robert Hazell and James Melton's *Magna Carta and its Modern Legacies* (2015)
- Spruyt, Hendrik *Ending Empire* (2005) Introduction & Chapter 2 (The Changing fortunes of Empire)
- Hopson, John "Re-Embedding the Global Colour Line within Post 1945 International Theory" in Alexander Anievas, Nivi Manchanda and Ribbie Shillam eds *Race and Racism in International Relations: Confronting the Global Colour Line* p. 81-97

On regionalism

- Solingen, Etel, and Joshua Malnight, '[Globalization, Domestic Politics, and Regionalism](#)' in Tanja A. Börzel, and Thomas Risse (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism* (2016),
- Börzel, Tanja A., and Thomas Risse, '[Introduction: Framework of the Handbook and Conceptual Clarifications](#)' in Tanja A. Börzel, and Thomas Risse (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism* (2016)
- Söderbaum, Fredrick, '[Old, New, and Comparative Regionalism: The History and Scholarly Development of the Field](#)' in Tanja A. Börzel, and Thomas Risse (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Regionalism* (2016)

Wild Card Weeks: The class will pick the focus of the remaining 3 weeks, after which I will update readings. Possible topics (or offer your own)

A. Hierarchy & Authority International Relations

Hierarchy is a concept that David Lake has reinstated as an alternative to realism & liberalism, and it is arguably a Chinese approach to IR. We can discuss Lake's claims about hierarchy, and about the concept's applications.

Hierarchy is a power-infused way of thinking about authority. International institutions & international law lack power, but they have authority. We can think about the relationship of power, hierarchy & authority in IR.

- Lake, D. (1996). [Anarchy, hierarchy, and the variety of international relations.](#) *International Organization*, 50(1), 1-33.
- Viola, Lora Anne. *The Closure of the International System : How Institutions Create Political Equalities and Hierarchies.* Cambridge ;: Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- Freeman, Bianca, D.G Kim, and David A Lake. "Race in International Relations: Beyond the 'Norm Against Noticing.'" *Annual Review of Political Science* 25, no. 1 (2022): 175–96

B. A Chinese IR Theory? Relational approaches (or Imperialism redux?)

I would update these readings....

- David Kang, "International Order in Historical East Asia: Tribute and Hierarchy Beyond Sinocentrism and Eurocentrism," *International Organization* 74 (2020): 65-93
- Feng Zhang, *Chinese Hegemony: Grand Strategy and International Institutions in East Asian History* (Stanford University Press, 2015). Chapters 1 & 7.
- William Callahan, "Chinese Visions of World Order: Post-hegemonic or a New Hegemony?" *International Studies Review*, vol. 10:4 (2008)
- Hendrik Spruyt "An East Asian International Society and the Westphalian State System" in Hendrik Spruyt *The World Imagined* Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. 133-164.
- Ginsburg, Tom. 2020. Authoritarian International Law? *American Journal of International Law* 114(2): 221-60.
- Weiss, J., & Wallace, J. (2021). Domestic Politics, China's Rise, and the Future of the Liberal International Order. *International Organization*, 75(2), 635-664.

Discussant Summarize: How do debates about a Chinese world order fit with conversations about international authority?

David A. Lake, 'Rightful Rules: Authority, Order, and the Foundations of Global Governance' (2010) 54 *International Studies Quarterly* 587

Debate over Authoritarian International Law- [AJIL Unbound](#)- I recommend Scott and Mallat, but whichever interests you.

Recommended Readings

Callahan, William A. "Sino-speak: Chinese Exceptionalism and the Politics of History." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 71, no. 1 (2012): 33-55. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41350049>.

Johnston, Alastair Iain. 2012 What (If Anything) Does East Asia Tell Us About International Relations Theory? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15(1), 53-78.

Allan, Bentley B., Srdjan Vucetic, and Ted Hopf. 2018. "The Distribution of Identity and the Future of International Order: China's Hegemonic Prospects." *International Organization* 72 (4):839-869. doi: 10.1017/S0020818318000267. [This reading imagines how China could use hegemonic power to reshap identities.](#)

QIN Yaqing "Why is there no Chinese international relations theory?" *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific* Volume 7 (2007) 313-340 doi:10.1093/irap/lcm013

Salvatore Babones 2017. Taking China Seriously: Relationality, Tianxia, and the "Chinese School" of International Relations *Governance/Political Change, International Political Economy, World Politics* doi: 10.1093/acrefore/9780190228637.013.602

C. Gender and International Relations

Feminist perspectives (plus the discussant readings)

Tickner, J. Ann "Introduction: Gendering World Politics" Columbia University Press, p. 1-8. 2001.

Tickner, J. Ann. "What Is Your Research Program? Some Feminist Answers to International Relations Methodological Questions." *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1–21.

Gender as a lens:

Valerie M. Hudson, Mary Caprioli, Bonnie Ballif-Spanvill, Rose McDermott, and Chad F. Emmett. 2008/09. "The Heart of the Matter: The Security of Women and the Security of States." *International Security* 33(3): 7-45.

Charli Carpenter (2003). "“Women and Children First”: Gender, Norms, and Humanitarian Evacuation in the Balkans 1991-95," *International Organization*, 57(4): 661-94.

The Debate (read 1)

(This is a conversation provoked by Charli Carpenter’s article) Carver, Terrell, et al. "Gender and International Relations." *International Studies Review*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2003, pp. 287–302. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/3186423

(A conversation between American feminist and American IR scholars) "The State of Feminist Security Studies: a Conversation", *Politics and Gender* 7:4 (December 2011), with contributions by Jennifer K. Lobasz and Laura Sjoberg, J. Ann Tickner, Carol Cohn, Valerie M. Hudson, Annick T.R. Wibben, and Lauren Wilcox. pp. 573-604.

(This is an international conversation that gets beyond American debates) "The State of Feminist Security Studies: Continuing the Conversation" *International Studies Review* 14 (2013) with Laura J. Shepherd, Swati Parashar, Christine Sylvester, Teresia Teaiwa & Claire Slatter, Bina D’costa And Katrina Lee-Koo, Soumita Basu, Laura Mcleod

Teaching Feminist IR- No notes: Jacqui True: Feminism and Gender Studies in International Relations Theory

Recommended: A critical perspective on Western Feminist approaches

Alison M. Jagger. 2005. "Saving Amina" Global Justice for Women and Intercultural Dialogue" *Ethics in International Affairs* 19 (3), 55-75.

Discussant summarize: Should we resist the discipline's tendency to prefer the "gender as a lens" perspective

J. Ann Tickner "Feminist Perspectives on International Relations" from the *Handbook of International Relations* Sage Publications (2001)

Plus summarize also the conversation about women and support for war.

Richard C. Eichenberg, Gender Difference in American Public Opinion on the Use of Military Force, 1982–2013,

International Studies Quarterly, Volume 60, Issue 1, March 2016, Pages 138–148, <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqv019>

Joslyn Barnhart et al "The Suffragist Peace" *Forthcoming in IO* (I believe). Available here:

http://www.roberttrager.com/Research_files/Suffragist7.pdf

Deborah Jordan Brooks and Benjamin A. Valentino, "A War of One's Own: Understanding the Gender Gap in Support for War", *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75:2 (2011), pp. 270-286.

Recommended readings:

J. Ann Tickner. *Gendering World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press. 2001. Chs. 1, 2 and 4.

J. Ann Tickner (2011) "Retelling IR's foundational stories: some feminist and postcolonial perspectives," *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 23:1, 5-13, DOI: 10.1080/14781158.2011.540090

Ann Tickner, J. (2006). On the Frontlines or Sidelines of Knowledge and Power? Feminist Practices of Responsible Scholarship." *International Studies Review*, 8(3), 383-395.

Hooper, Charlotte "Masculinities, IR and the 'gender variable': a cost-benefit analysis for (sympathetic) gender skeptics" *Review of International Studies* 25 (1999): 475-491.

Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 2nd ed.

"The State of Feminist Security Studies: a Conversation", *Politics and Gender* 7:4 (December 2011), with contributions by Jennifer K. Lobasz and Laura Sjoberg, J. Ann Tickner, Carol Cohn, Valerie M. Hudson, Annick T.R. Wibben, and Lauren Wilcox. pp. 573-604.

Nicola Pratt "The Queen Boat case in Egypt: sexuality, national security and state sovereignty" *Review of International Studies* (2007) 33: 129-144.

Joshua Goldstein, *Gender and War* (Cambridge University Press 2001) Chs. 1, 4 and 5.

Mary Caprioli, "Feminist IR Theory and Quantitative Methodology: A Critical Analysis," *International Studies Review* Vol. 6 No. 2 (June 2004), 253-269.

Carol Cohn, "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals", *Signs* 12:4 (1987), pp. 687-718.

Jacqui True "Feminism and Gender Studies in International Relations Theory" Oxford Research Encyclopedia, International Studies (c) International Studies Association and Oxford University Press USA, 2020

D. International Regime Complexity

This is a debate I helped to launch which seeks to understand how the proliferation of international institutions is shaping of international politics. It gets to the question of how much the current international system—littered with preexisting institutions—is likely to change. Will it change by layering on new institutions (to what end)? Will it change by adapting new institutions?

E. Emotions, Biology, Values, and Cognitive Theories

Janice Gross Stein "Psychological Explanations of International Conflict" from the *Handbook of International Relations* Sage Publications (2001) p. 292-304.

Jonathan Mercer, "Emotion and Strategy in the Korean War," *International Organization*, 2013, 67(2): 221-252.

Stephen Peter Rosen, "Status, Testosterone, and Dominance," *War and Human Nature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005. pp. 71-98.

Kristen Monroe *Ethics in an Age of Terror* (Princeton University Press, 2012) Chapter 9 "A Theory of Moral Choice" p. 248-300.

Roger D. Petersen *Understanding Ethnic Violence* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. p. 17-39, 254-271.

Discussant Summarize: Robert Jervis, "Hypotheses on Misperception," *World Politics* 20 (April 1968), pp. 454-79.

Recommended:

Andrew A. G. Ross, *Mixed Emotions: Beyond Fear and Hatred in International Conflict*. University of Chicago Press, 2013.

- Jonathan Mercer, "Human Nature and the First Image: Emotion in International Politics," *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 9, 2006.
- Janice Bially Mattern, "A Practice Theory of Emotion for International Relations," in Emanuel Adler and Vincent Pouliot eds. *International Practices*. Cambridge University Press.. 2011.
- Philip E. Tetlock, "Social Psychology and World Politics." In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, and G. Lindzey, eds., *Handbook of Social Psychology*, 4th ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1998). pp. 868-912.
- Peter K. Hatemi, Rose McDermott "A Neurobiological Approach to Foreign Policy Analysis: Identifying Individual Differences in Political Violence" *Foreign Policy Analysis* 8:2 (April 2012) pp. 111–129
- Keren Yarhi-Milo, "In the Eye of the Beholder: How Leaders and Intelligence Communities Assess the Intentions of Adversaries", *International Security* 38:1 (Summer 2013), pp. 7-51.

F. Transnationalism and Networks

- R. Charli Carpenter, "Vetting the Advocacy Agenda: Network Centrality and the Paradox of Weapons Norms", *International Organization* 65:1 (2011), pp. 69-102.
- Emilie M. Hafner-Burton, Miles Kahler, and Alexander H. Montgomery, "Network Analysis for International Relations." *International Organization* 63-3 (Summer 2009): 559-592.
- Mette Eilstrup-Sangiovanni, "Varieties of Cooperation: Government Networks in International Security" in Miles Kahler, ed., *Networked Politics: Agency, Power and Governance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009), ch. 10 (pp. 194-227).
- David Bach and Abraham L. Newman, "Transgovernmental Networks and Domestic Policy Convergence: Evidence from Insider Trading Regulation," *International Organization*, vol. 64-3 (2010): 505-28.
- Discussant summarize: Margaret Keck and Kathryn Sikkink. *Activists Beyond Borders*. Cornell University Press, 1998, chapters 1-3 (pp. 1-120). *This reading is not in the coursepack. Please order the book or obtain from the library.*

Recommended readings:

- Miles Kahler, ed., *Networked Politics: Agency, Power and Governance* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2009)
- Slaughter, Anne-Marie. 2004. *A New World Order*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Reprint.
- Bob, Clifford. 2005. *The marketing of rebellion : insurgents, media, and international activism*, Cambridge studies in contentious politics. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Reprint.
- Bob, Clifford. 2012. *The global right wing and the clash of world politics*, Cambridge studies in contentious politics. New York: Cambridge University Press.