This document details the specific topics we will examine, gives you specific guidelines on what to read, and offers an introductory outline of each topic. On top of the reading listed here, please make sure you attend the two terms of IR lectures at the Exam Schools that accompany this paper. You should also check out the departmental reading list (available on Weblearn) to search out additional readings where useful.

Course Objectives
The International Relations core course aims to give students a wide-ranging introduction to the scholarly study of international politics. By the end of this course, students should be able to:
-   Confidently summarise, evaluate, and deploy major theoretical approaches to the study of international politics, especially the 'realist', 'liberal', and 'constructivist' schools of thought.
-   Display good empirical knowledge of major recent trends, developments and events in international politics, including globalization, the changing nature of security and conflict, the 'democratic peace', the 'war on terror', and practices of humanitarian intervention. They should, in particular, display extensive awareness of events since 1990, and be able to use these events as empirical evidence in assessing theories and claims about international politics.
-   Demonstrate a good understanding of the varying explanations scholars have proposed to explain key trends and events, being able to identify relevant authors and the key ideas and explanations they have proposed.
-   Be able to offer sophisticated analyses of critical problems in international politics, such as the emergence of terrorism, the decline of war, the increasing prominence of non-state actors in international policy-making, the role of ideas, identity and culture in shaping state behaviour, the peace-creating or conflict-creating impact of democracy and democratization, and so forth.

Topics
The departmental IR reading list is divided into three primary topics subdivided into a core topic (each) plus 9 subsidiary topics, making for 12 topics in total. For our tutorials, I have organised this into the following eight topics, which necessarily excludes some of the topics of the departmental reading list, and combines others. If something has been excluded which you are really keen to study, let me know, but I plan to go with:

Week 1: Competing Approaches to the Study of International Relations
Week 2: Interests, Ideas and the Sources of State Behaviour
Week 3: Power and International Politics
Week 4: Globalization and Global Governance
Week 5: The Changing Nature of Security and Conflict
Week 6: Identity and Culture in International Security
Week 7: Democratic Peace Theory and Democratization
Week 8: Humanitarian Intervention, Atrocity Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect

These topics must all be seen as interrelated – you should refer to readings and concepts from other week's topics where useful and avoid the tendency to 'compartmentalise' thinking about certain questions in terms of only the readings from certain weeks.

Essays Etc.

I believe that to succeed on this course, you must engage in a very heavy load of reading. In consequence, I choose to set a relatively moderate essay load: you will write four essays over the term, on topics of your choice (but please co-ordinate with tutorial partners to try and get at least one essay on each week). On weeks when you do not write essays you must, however, produce essay plans (see below), which will also be marked and must cite relevant readings. It is, in a sense, a risk to not require you to write more than four essays over the term on the assumption that you will substitute the reading I think you need to do in place of the one or two essays more I might ask you to do but am not. So please respond to this move professionally, and place a priority in engaging in extensive reading.

If you are writing an essay: Essays are between 1500-2500 words, and contain citations. I know some tutors don't care about citations, but I think it's helpful to properly reference your work: it is particularly important in IR, and will make your essays more useful for revision. Any citation style that is comprehensible will be fine, though I would generally recommend using footnotes rather than in-text citations. Where you are referencing a specific point or fact, please include specific page numbers.

Each week I have provided several possible essay titles, so choose one. Almost all are based on questions from past exam papers. If you wish to write on a different question of your own choosing, I am in principle fine with this, but only if you agree the question with me in advance.

I am not fond of the practice of students having to read their essays out in tutorials. As such, you must e-mail your essay to me and your tutorial partner by **5pm the day *before* the tutorial** – that is your deadline. I will normally pidge your marked essays back to you by the day after the tutorial at the latest. We will see how things pan out, but my intention is that I will give you about a half page/a page of typed feedback, and a guideline mark band. Such mark bands are not sure-fire indicators of what you should get in the exam – essays and exam answers are not commensurable media.

If you are not writing an essay: Instead, you have two tasks. First, you **must** read your tutorial partner's essay before the tutorial. You should be able to have a good debate and discussion about it and the week's topic more generally. Second, you should write up a brief **essay plan** of your own, around 1-2 pages of bullet-pointed notes, on a different question than that chosen by your tutorial partner for their essay (you should co-ordinate). The plan must include key thinkers and examples. This way, through pooling essay plans and essays between you and your tutorial partner, you will get a broad set of notes for collections and finals that cover more than just one side of every topic. You do not need to email me the plan, but bring copies of it to the tutorial for me and your tutorial partner(s).

*Free advice***:** This may be obvious, but is worth highlighting. Good essays in IR need to show three crucial things: **familiarity with the literature**, use of **'real world' examples**, and **critical reasoning/engagement with counter-arguments**. So you need to read the views of academics that disagree with arguments you make, so you can address their objections. The same goes for essay plans.

What Reading You Need To Do

As I suggested above, **a lot.** Even more than other PPE undergraduate papers, the IR Core Course is quite a squeeze – plenty of UK undergraduate students would spend a whole three year degree studying IR (true of almost no other PPE papers) whereas for you we are teaching it in eight weeks.

You can view this two ways. On the one hand, it puts a heavy workload on you, though again, I have tried to compensate by being reasonable with essays. On the other hand, it provides you with a very obvious way to shine in the crowd of PPE undergraduate students by really applying yourself to the readings. **Please do so**. And make effective, succinct notes: try and boil down every article/chapter you read to between half a page and a page of notes. You will not remember all these readings by the time you get to finals, and will be incredibly thankful if you have an efficient, consistent sent of notes like this which allow you to reabsorb the content of key readings without having to go back and read them.

In each week, **all the 'Preliminary' readings in my reading list below must be read regardless of whether you are writing an essay or not**. They are compulsory, but reading them alone is <u>not</u> sufficient. You must in addition read 2-3 readings from the other sections which interest you/reflect your essay question – look through to see what reading will be most useful for your question. And you must cite readings extensively in essays/plans to demonstrate what you have read.

You will need to do extensive reading over the holidays to make this amount of work manageable. Doing extra work on the Week One readings will make subsequent readings easier, and I have given three introductory texts at the start of the reading list that you must read the indicated sections of – they will make this course much easier for you if you have a good command of their contents. That is the minimum amount of work you should do over the holidays. Ideally having a go at some readings from later weeks would be a good idea too. If you struggle to get hold of books over the holidays because you are unable to access the university libraries, let me know. You should consider buying a copy of the Chris Brown *Understanding International Relations* book from the General Introductory Reading – there are often second hand versions of this for as little as £3 from online booksellers.

I have given chapter or page references for many readings. Where I have not, this doesn't mean you should read the whole book. Choose an interesting and useful chunk of it to read, but at least 1-2 chapters.

It is also important to keep up to date with recent international news – this course is vastly easier if you have a genuine enthusiasm for international affairs. At least checking in with a reliable international news website like www.bbc.co.uk every couple of days is a good idea. Reading a high quality daily or weekly newspaper (or their websites) with good international coverage is even better. *The Economist, Guardian/Observer, New York Times, Washington Post, International Herald Tribune, Le Monde, The Times, Wall Street Journal, The Financial Times,* and similar are all relatively high quality good options, but they do <u>all</u> have considerable ideological agendas, especially on certain issues – so read them critically. Personally, on the British newspapers side, I advise against relying on *The Daily Telegraph* despite its apparent broadsheet format, and certainly not on tabloid newspapers. *The Independent* is erratic, its daily 'briefing' the "i" is not useful. If you're particularly keen, checking out specialist international politics news sites like foreignpolicy.com, especially their columns by IR scholars (e.g. Stephen Walt), is a great idea to gain an edge though, again, read critically – for more a more theory orientated but easy reading sit check out http://www.theory-talks.org/ which has interviews with leading IR scholars about how they see IR. The regular output of think tanks like *International Crisis Group, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International* and similar will also be useful – the former's monthly briefing especially so.

I do not want people to struggle due to excessive workloads, and if you are having serious problems with the reading, or have any other questions or problems, you should get in touch with

me at jonathan.leadermaynard@politics.ox.ac.uk. I expect us to avoid any occurrence of people missing deadlines for essays, but if there is some serious problem you *must* let me and your tutorial partner know well in advance so that we can see if there is a solution. I really hope, however, that this does not happen.

Reading List

General Introductory Reading

On top of the weekly readings, you should consider the following __compulsory__ reading. I suggest starting with the Chris Brown book, which gives a very approachable overview of approaches to thinking about international relations. The Baylis & Smith is a good overall textbook/revision book for the course, but I have listed it below mainly as an introductory source of recent international history – you really must develop a good command of this to provide examples and historical evidence for essays/tutorials. The **exam places particular emphasis on knowledge of international politics since 1990** – so you need to gain a good familiarity with this in particular.

- Brown, Chris, *Understanding International Relations* (3rd edn 2005), Ch. 1, 2 & 3, although the whole book is good.
- Nau, Henry R., *Perspectives on International Relations* (2009/2011), Intro, Ch. 6 & 7
- John Baylis & Steve Smith, *The Globalization of World Politics* – this has many editions, you should read what, in the 5th edition, are chapters 3 and 4 on "International History, 1900-1999" and "From the cold war to the world economic crisis". If you cannot get hold of the 5th edition, read the roughly comparable historical chapters in the older editions. For week 1, you should read chapters on 'Realism', 'Liberalism', 'Social Constructivism' and 'Contemporary Mainstream Approaches'.

Week One – *Competing Approaches to the Study of International Relations*

Introductory Note: Traditionally, the discipline of International Relations is seen as dominated by three theoretical schools: 'realism', 'liberalism' and 'social constructivism'. This week focuses on the core claims and features of these schools. Scholars also sometimes make mention of two other major theoretical approaches: the International Society Approach (also often known as 'the English School') and Critical Approaches (which include Marxist, Post-Marxist and Poststructuralist theories of International Relations). You need to have a good understanding of realism, liberalism and constructivism – you may examine the other approaches if you wish, and there are often exam questions on them, but they are not required study. This week has a heavier reading load than later weeks, in anticipation of you doing it over more time in the vacation.

Essay Questions:
1. Is realism the best theory that we have to explain what happens in international relations?
2. Defend a realist, liberal, constructivist OR international society account of international relations.
3. How does the 'anarchy' of international politics shape states' behaviour?
4. To what extent do EITHER constructivists OR international society theorists underestimate the importance of material forces?
5. How valuable are critical theory approaches in understanding contemporary international politics?

PRELIMINARY READING
- Jack Donnelly, *Realism and International Relations* (2000) Ch. 1-4
- Robert Jervis, 'Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation', *International Security,* Vol. 24, No. 1 (1999)
- Kenneth Waltz, 'Structural Realism after the Cold War', *International Security,* Vol.25, No.1 (2000)
- Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye, *Power and Interdependence* (1977/2000/2011). Ch.1-3
- Michael Doyle, 'Liberalism and World Politics', *American Political Science Review*, 80 (1986), pp. 1151-1169

- Wendt, Alex, 'Anarchy is What States Make it: The Social Construction of International Relations', *International Organization, vol.* 46, no. 2 (1992)
- Martha Finnemore *National Interests in International Society* (1996), Ch. 1

FURTHER READING

Realism
- John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (2001), Ch. 1 & 2
- Hans Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace* (1948; recent edn. 1985), Ch. 1, 2 & 3
- Robert Jervis, "Realism in the Study of World Politics," *International Organization,* vol. 52, no. 4
- Gideon Rose, "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy," *World Politics,* vol. 51, no. 1 (October 1998)
- Paul Schroeder, 'Historical Reality vs. Neo-realist Theory', *International Security* 19/1 (1994): 108-148 [see also correspondence between Colin and Miriam Fendius Elman, and Schroeder, 'History vs. Neo-realism: A Second Look', in *International Security* 20/1 (1995): 182-195.]
- Jeffrey Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, 'Is Anybody Still a Realist?', *International Security* 24/2 (1999): 5-55.
- Hidemi Suganami, 'Bringing Order to the Causes of War Debates', *Millennium-Journal of International Studies* 19:1 (1990), 19-36
- Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State, and War* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959)

Liberalism
- Robert Axelrod and Robert O. Keohane, 'Achieving Cooperation Under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions' in David Baldwin (ed.), *Neorealism and Neoliberalsm: The Contemporary Debate* (1993)
- Daniel Deudney and John G. Ikenberry, 'The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order', *Review of International Studies*, 25 (1999), pp. 179-196.
- Andrew Moravcsik, 'Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics', *International Organization*, 51 (1997), pp. 513-53.
- Christian Reus-Smit, "The Strange Death of Liberal IR Theory," *European Journal of International Law,* vol. 12 (2001), pp. 573-93.

Constructivists
- Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink, 'International Norm Dynamics and Political Change', International Organization, Vol. 52, No. 4 (1998)
- Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Relations* (1999), pp.1-38 & Conclusion
- Jeffrey Checkel, 'The Constructivist Turn in International Relations Theory', *World Politics*, Vol. 50 (1998).

International Society Theory
- Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society,* (2002), Ch. 1
- Chris Brown, 'International Theory and International Society: The Viability of the Middle Way?', *Review of International Studies*, 21 (1995), pp. 183-196.
- Andrew Hurrell, *On Global Order* (2007)
- Timothy Dunne, 'The Social Construction of International Society,' *European Journal of International Relations,* 1 (1995), pp. 367-89.

Marxist and Critical Perspectives
- Steven C. Roach, 'Critical Theory' in Tim Dunne, Milja Kukri and Steve Smith (eds.), *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity* 3rd ed. (2013).
- Henry Nau, *Perspectives on International Relations* (2009/2011), pp. 53-56 & Ch. 13 [pages may differ in 2011 edition – you want the section of the first chapter on Critical Theory perspectives].

- Robert Cox, 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', Millennium (Vol. 10, No. 2, 1981), pp. 126-55.

Week Two – *The Sources of State Behaviour*

Introductory Note: To explain why states behave the way they do, do we need to examine domestic politics, ideology, individual personalities, psychology, group culture and so on? These sorts of factors have often been the focus of the sub-field of political science known as Foreign Policy Analysis. But are states' behaviour and interests really shaped in interesting ways by such *distinctive properties of states* (what IR theorists often call 'the unit level'), or can we generally view states as fundamentally similar entities whose behaviour is largely shaped by 'international' or 'structural' factors ('the system level'), as classical IR theorists have tended to? This week examines such questions.

Essay Questions:
1. 'In the final analysis, a state's foreign policy choices will be determined by whichever domestic interest groups are the strongest.' Do you agree?
2. 'Public opinion has no impact on foreign policy.' Discuss.
3. Do ideas trump interests in foreign-policy making? Discuss with reference to concrete foreign policy choices of ONE OR MORE countries since 1990.
4. What are the main causes of changes in foreign policy? Discuss with reference to concrete foreign policy choices of ONE OR MORE countries since 1990.

PRELIMINARY READING
- Valerie Hudson, "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 1/1 (2005): 1-30
- Graham Allison, *Essence of Decision* (1999), Ch. 1, 3 & 5
- Stephen Krasner, 'Are Bureaucracies Important? Or Allison Wonderland?', *Foreign Policy* 7, (Summer 1972), pp. 159-179.
- Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization* 42 (1988)
- Judith Goldstein and Robert Keohane (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy* (1992) Ch. 1

FURTHER READING
- Kenneth Waltz , *Theory of International Politics* (1979), Ch. 6
- Barry Buzan, *People, States and Fear* (2nd edn., 1991)

Ideas & Ideology
- Richard Price and Nina Tannenwald, "Norms and Deterrence: The Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Taboo" in Peter Katzenstein (ed.), *The Culture of National Security* (1996)
- Goldstein, Judith, and Keohane, Robert (eds.), *Ideas and Foreign Policy* (1992) Ch. 2 & 6
- Michael Hunt, *Ideology and US Foreign Policy* (1987/2009).Ch. 1 & 5
- Neta Crawford, *Argumentation and Normative Change* (2002)

Public Opinion and Domestic Politics
- Ole Holsti, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus Mershon Series: Research Programs and Debates," *International Studies Quarterly* 36/4 (1992)
- Piers Robinson, "The CNN Effect: can the news media drive foreign policy?," *Review of International Studies* 25 (1999): 301-309
- John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy* (2008)

Psychological Foundations
- Irving Janis, *Groupthink* (1982)
- Herbert C. Kelman, "Social-Psychological Dimensions of International Conflict," in I. William Zartman (ed.), *Peacemaking in International Conflict: Methods and Techniques,* Revised Edition (Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 2007), 61-107

- Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976)

US Foreign Policy

- The National Security Strategy of the United States (2002), http://www.commondreams.org/headlines02/0920-05.htm **or** http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/20/politics/20STEXT_FULL.html
- Barrack Obama, "Commencement Address at West Point", 28 May 2014, http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/full-text-of-president-obamas-commencement-address-at-west-point/2014/05/28/cfbcdcaa-e670-11e3-afc6-a1dd9407abcf_story.html
- John Hudson, "White House to Use West Point Speech to Launch New Foreign Policy Offensive", May 27 2014, http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2014/05/27/white_house_to_use_west_point_speech_to_launch_new_foreign_policy_offensive
- Stephen Walt, "The Genius of Neoconservatism", www.foreignpolicy.com blog post, October 24 2012, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/10/24/the_genius_of_neoconservatism
- Michael Hunt, *Ideology and US Foreign Policy* (1987/2009).Ch. 1 & 5
- George Bush, 'New World Order', *Public Papers of the Presidents, Administration of George Bush*, (1990), ii, pp. 1218-22.
- John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy* (2008)

Other Case Studies in Foreign Policy

- Vladimir Putin, 'Speech and the Following Discussion at the Munich Conference on Security Policy', http://archive.kremlin.ru/eng/speeches/2007/02/10/0138_type82912type82914type82917type84779_118123.shtml
- United Kingdom Cabinet Office, *The National Security Strategy of the United Kingdom: Security in an Interdependent World* (London: HMSO, 2008).
- Tony Blair, 'Doctrine of the International community at the Economic Club', (1999) http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/www.number10.gov.uk/Page1297
- Irwin Wall, 'The French-American War Over Iraq', *Brown Journal of World Affairs,* Vol. 10 No. 2 (2004), pp.123-139
- Jean-David Levitte, 'Conference by His Excellency Jean-David Levitte, Ambassador of France to the United States', http://www.consulatfrancehouston.org/pages_anglaises/speechlevitte.htm
- Dettke, D., *Germany Says 'No', The Iraq War and the Future of German Foreign and Security Policy,* (2009)

Week Three – *Power and International Politics*

Introductory Note: The question of who is powerful is central to international relations. Theorists disagree over what forms of power are now most important in global politics, and consequently over where we should focus to see who is making the most critical decisions. And even in the traditional evaluation of the comparative strength of the 'great powers', theorists are divided between those who see the world as still unambiguously dominated by one superpower – the US – and those who stress rising powers, and American decline.

Essay Questions:
1. Is the era of US hegemony over, and is a new global balance of power emerging?
2. How should we assess the power of international actors?
3. Which of the main approaches to International Relations best explains the constraints to US power in current world affairs?
4. "'Soft power' can never count as 'true power'." Do you agree?
5. Is America an empire?

PRELIMINARY READINGS
- Christopher Layne, "The Waning of U.S. Hegemony – Myth or Reality?: A Review Essay," *International Security* 34, 1 (2009): 147-172.
- Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth, *World out of Balance: International Relations and*
- *the Challenge of American Primacy* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2008).
- Brian C. Schmidt, 'Competing Realist Conceptions of Power', *Millennium* 33/3 (2005)
- Joseph Nye, *Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics* (2004)
- John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis and Transformation of the American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011).
- Yuen Foong Khong, 'Primacy or World Order?: The United States and China's Rise – A Review Essay,' *International Security* 38/3 (2013/14): 153-175.

FURTHER READING
The Nature of Power
- Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall (eds.), *Power and Global Governance* (2005), Ch.1
- Joseph Nye, *The Future of Power* (2011)
- Felix Berenskoetter & Michael Williams (eds.), *Power in World Politics* (2007)
- *International Political Sociology*, Forum on 'Assessing the Impact of Foucault on International
- Relations', (Vol. 4, No. 2, 2010).

Evaluating American Power
- Michael Mandelbaum, 'The Inadequacy of American Power', *Foreign Affairs*, 81:5, (2002).
- Christopher Layne, 'The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment,' *International Security* 31/2 (2006): 7-41.
- Barry R. Posen, 'Command of the Commons: the Military Foundation of US Hegemony,' *International Security*, vol. 28, no. 1 (Summer 2003)
- Joseph Nye, *The Paradox of American Power: why the world's only superpower can't go it alone* (2002)
- Michael Beckley, 'China's Century? Why America's Edge Will Endure', *International Security* 36/3 (2011/12), pp. 41-78. [See also discussion in Vol. 37, No. 3.]
- Michael Cox, 'American power before and after 11 September – dizzy with success?', *International Affairs* 78/2 (2002)

US Grand Strategy
- Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, William C. Wohlforth, 'Don't Come Home America: The Case Agains Retrenchment,' *International Security* 37/3 (2012/13): 7-51 [and following

correspondence: 'Debating American Engagement: The Future of US Grand Strategy', *International Security* 38/2 (2013): 181-199.]

Rising Powers
– *International Affairs*, 82/1 (2006) special issue on 'Perspectives on Emerging Would-Be Great Powers' and 89/3 (2013) special issue on 'Negotiating the Rise of New Powers'.
– Robert Pape, 'Soft Balancing against the United States', *International Security* 30/1 (2005)
– Alastair Iain Johnston, 'How New and Assertive is China's New Assertiveness?,' *International Security* 37/4 (2013): 7-48.

American Empire (also read Evaluating American Power readings)
– John G. Ikenberry, 'America's Imperial Ambition', *Foreign Affairs* (2002)
– Daniel Nexon and Thomas Wright, 'What's at Stake in the American Empire Debate?', *American Political Science Review* (Vol. 101, No. 2, 2007), pp. 253-71.
– Sebastian Mallaby, 'The Reluctant Imperialist: Terrorism, Failed States and the Case for American Empire,' *Foreign Affairs* 81/2 (2002): 2-7

Week Four – *Globalization, Global Governance and Cooperation*
Introductory Note: Many International Relations scholars argue that a gradual but immensely powerful transformation has been taking place in international politics in the post-World War II era: globalization. With the rise of new technologies, greater economic interaction and integration, and the rise of new social movements and non-state actors, the world is gradually moving from a system of independent and powerful states into a world of diffused power, and complex interdependence. Is this right? And do international institutions – by which we mean not just formal organisations like the UN or EU but also general stable sets of rules and relationships like international laws and co-operative endeavours – therefore matter more and more in international politics? And do other actors, such as transnational advocacy groups or corporations, empowered by globalizing forces, now play a major role?

Essay Questions:
1. Under what conditions does globalization strengthen or weaken the state?
2. Is the neoliberal faith in international institutions misplaced?
3. What role do international institutions play in promoting cooperation?
4. What is new about the so-called Global Era (if anything) and how do we best explain it?

PRELIMINARY READING
- Anthony McGrew, "Globalization and global politics," in Baylis, John & Smith, Steve, *The Globalization of World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Henry R. Nau, *Perspectives on International Relations,* 2nd Edition (Washington D.C: CQ Press, 2009), Ch. 16 ("Global Governance: International and Regional Institutions")
- Susan Strange , 'The Defective State', *Daedalus* (Spring 1995)
- Kenneth Abbott and Duncan Snidal, 'Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42 (1998)
- John J. Mearsheimer, 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security*, 19, 3 (Winter 1994/95) and exchange in 20, 1
- Peter Evans, 'The Eclipse of the State?', *World Politics* 50 (October 1997).

FURTHER READING
Globalization
- Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson (eds.), *Globalization in Question* (1999) Ch. 1 & 2
- Time Büthe and Walter Mattli, *The New Global Rulers* (Princeton UP, 2011).
- Joseph Stiglitz, *Globalization and Its Discontents* (Norton, 2002).

Explanations of Cooperation International Institutions
- Joseph M. Grieco, 'Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalsm' in David Baldwin (ed.), *Neorealism and Neoliberalsm: The Contemporary Debate* (1993)
- Milner, Helen, 'International Theories of Cooperation among Nations: Strengths and Weaknesses', *World Politics* 44 (April 1992).
- Walt, Stephen, 'Why Alliances Endure or Collapse', *Survival* 39 (1), (Spring 1997).
- Taylor, Paul and Curtis, Devon, "The United Nations" in Baylis, John & Smith, Steve, *The Globalization of World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Marrack Goulding , 'Globalisation and the United Nations: New Opportunities, New Demands', *International Relations*, 14:4, (1999).

Global Civil Society
- Scott Turner, 'Global Civil Society, Anarchy and Governance: Assessing an Emerging Paradigm', Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 35, No. 1 (1998), pp.25-42
- Richard Price, 'Transnational Civil Society and Advocacy in World Politics' (Review Article), *World Politics*, Vol. 55, No. 4 (July 2003).

Regional Integration and Governance

- Acharya, Amitav, 'The Emerging Regional Architecture of World Politics,' World Politics, 59, 4 (2007).
- Mattli, Walter, *The Logic of Regional Integration*: *Europe and Beyond* (1999), Ch. 1 & 2.
- Mansfield, Edward, and Helen Milner, 'The New Wave of Regionalism', *International Organisation*, 53, 3, (1999)
- Hakim, Peter and Litan, Robert E. (eds.), *The Future of North American Integration: Beyond NAFTA* (2002).
- Farrell, Mary (ed.), *Global Politics of Regionalism* (London: Pluto Press, 2005), Ch. 1 & 3
- Ngaire Woods (ed.), *Explaining International Relations since 1945* (1996), Ch.15
- Pugh, Michael and WPS Sidhu, *The United Nations and Regional Security: Europe and Beyond* (2003) (parts 1 and 2).
- Smith, Peter, and Chambers, Edward, (eds), *NAFTA in the New Millennium* (2002).

Week Five – The Changing Nature of Security and Conflict

Introductory Note: Several scholars claim that in the past few decades, the nature of conflict and security has fundamental changed. By contrast with previous eras, the argument runs, where conflict occurred exclusively between states, and for a core set of common political objectives, modern conflict occurs for new reasons, between new sorts of actors, exacerbated by new forces, and fought in new ways. And whilst these 'new wars' have proliferated, classic 'old wars' have declined considerably. Is this argument plausible? And if some things have changed about modern war, what are they? What are the most important security concerns in the 21st Century?

Essay Questions:
1. Is the post-Cold War world a more secure world or just a world with new insecurities?
2. "In a globalized world, security is indivisible." Discuss.
3. How effective is the United Nations in managing global security issues, and what are its most significant achievements?
4. Which theoretical perspective in international relations helps us understand best why NATO has survived the end of the Cold War?
5. Is climate change now the biggest threat to international security?

PRELIMINARY READING
– Mary Kaldor, *New and Old Wars: Organised Violence in a Global Era* (Polity, 2006/2013).
– Henry Nau, *Perspectives on International Relations* (Washington DC: CQ Press, 2009), Ch. 7 ("Terrorism and the World after 9/11: Religious, Ethnic and National Conflicts")
– Siniša Maleševíc, *The Sociology of War and Violence* (2010), Ch. 10.
– Human Security Report Project, *Human Security Report 2005: War and Peace in the 21st Century* (2005) http://www.hsrgroup.org/human-security-reports/2005/overview.aspx, esp. Part I.
– Institute for Economics and Peace, *The Global Terrorism Index 2014* (Sydney: IEP, 2014)

FURTHER READING
New Patterns of Violence
– Human Security Report Project, *Human Security Report 2013: The Decline in Global Violence: Evidence, Explanation, and Contestation* (2013) http://www.hsrgroup.org/human-security-reports/2013/text.aspx
– Steven Pinker, *The Better Angels of Our Nature: The Decline of Violence in History and Its Causes* (2011)
– John Mueller, *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War* (1996), Ch. 10 & 11
– Michael Mandelbaum, 'Is Major War Obsolete?', *Survival* 40/4 (1998)
– Elke Krahmann (ed.), *New Threats and New Actors in International Security* (Palgrave, 2005)
– Lawrence Freedman, 'International Security: Changing Targets', *Foreign Policy* (Spring 1998)

Notions of Security
– David Baldwin, 'The Concept of Security', *Review of International Studies* 23:1 (1997)
– Steve Smith, 'The Contested Concept of Security', in Ken Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics* (2004)
– United Nations, 'A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility', *Report of the UN Secretary-General's High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change* (2004), http://www.un.org/secureworld
– Barry Buzan, Ole Waever and Jaap de Wilde, *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (1998)

Cyberwar and the Internet
– Erik Gartzke, 'The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War in Cyberspace Back Down to Earth,' *International Security* 38/2 (2013): 41-73

- Dorothy E. Denning, "Activism, hacktivism, and cyberterrorism: the Internet as a tool for influencing foreign policy," in John Arquilla and David Ronfeldt (eds.) *Networks and netwars: The future of terror, crime, and militancy* (2001)
- P.N. Howard, A. Duffy, D. Freelon, M. Hussain, W. Mari, & M. Mazaid, "Opening Closed Regimes: What Was the Role of Social Media During the Arab Spring?", *Working Paper* Seattle: PIPTI. (2011). [Available: http://pitpi.org/index.php/2011/09/11/opening-closed-regimes-what-was-the-role-of-social-media-during-the-arab-spring/]

Climate Change and Security
- Thomas Homer-Dixon, 'Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases', *International Security*, 19/1 (1994): 5-40
- Thomas Homer-Dixon, 'On the Threshold: Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict', *International Security*, 16/2 (1991): 76-116
- Jon Barnett and W. Neil Adger, 'Climate Change, Human Security and Violent Conflict', *Political Geography*, Vol. 26, No. 6 (2007), pp. 639-55.
- Gwynne Dyer, *Climate Wars: The Fight for Survival as the World Overheats* (Oxford: OneWorld Publications, 2010)

The UN and International Security
- Mats Berdal, 'The United Nations Security Council: Ineffective but Indispensable', *Survival*, (Summer 2003)
- Vaughan Lowe, Adam Roberts, Jennifer Welsh, and Dominik Zaum (eds.) *The United Nations Security Council and War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press 2008), pp.1-34, 49-55 & Ch. 5
- Michael Glennon, 'Why the Security Council Failed', *Foreign Affairs*, (May/June 2003). See also responses in *Foreign Affairs* (Jul/Aug 2003)
- Mats Berdal and Spyros Economides (eds), *United Nations Interventionism 1991-2004* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Richard Price and Mark Zacher, (eds.), *The United Nations and Global Security* (2004)
- The United Nations, *The Charter of the United Nations,* https://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/
- Inis L. Claude, 'Peace and Security: Prospective Roles for the Two United Nations', *Global Governance,* 2/3 (1996).

NATO
- Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett (eds.), *Security Communities* (1998) Ch. 1, 2, 12 & 13
- Robert McCalla, 'NATO's persistence after the cold war', *International Organization*, 50/3 (1996)
- Peter Katzenstein (ed.), *The culture of national security: norms and identity in world politics* (1996), Ch.10
- Stephen Walt, *The Origins of Alliances* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987).
- John Duffield, 'The North Atlantic Treaty Organization', in Ngaire Woods (ed.), *Explaining International Relations since 1945* (1996)
- Charles Glaser, 'Why NATO is Still the Best', *International Security* 18/11 (1993)
- Michael C. Williams and Iver Neumann, 'From Alliance to Security Community: NATO, Russia and the Power of Security', *Millennium* 29/2 (2000)
- Christopher Hammer and Peter Katzenstein, 'Why is There No NATO in Asia?', *International Organization*, 56/3 (2002)

Week Six – Identity and Culture in International Security

Introductory Note: The rise of social constructivism and the apparent increasing importance of religious or culturally motivated conflict (including terrorism) has led some scholars to see the broad set of phenomena subsumed under 'culture' as playing an increasingly central role in contemporary patterns of violent conflict and perceptions of insecurity. No longer, it is argued, are conflicts fought over a small set of largely universal material interests, instead they are clashes of cultural or civilizational identity, norms and practices. Is this true, and if so, in what ways does culture matter to contemporary international politics and conflict?

Essay Questions:
1. What evidence is there to support the claim that culture is a cause of conflict in international relations?
2. Has the 'War on Terror' proved Samuel P. Huntington's 'Clash of Civilisations' Theory?
3. Is religious extremism the cause or effect of contemporary international conflict?
4. "Since the end of the Cold War, conflict has been about identity more than about ideology or economics." Do you agree?
5. Is 'ethnic conflict' a helpful way of explaining the changing patterns of violence and insecurity in any TWO of the following cases: the former Yugoslavia; the former Soviet Union; the Middle East; Africa?
6. "The rise of religious terrorism has fatally undermined realist explanations of international conflict." Do you agree?

PRELIMINARY READING
- Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996), Ch. 1, 6 & 10
- Erik Gartzke and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch, 'Identity and Conflict: Ties that Bind and Differences that Divide', *European Journal of International Relations* 12/1 (2006): 54-87
- Posen, Barry, 'The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict', *Survival* (Spring 1993)
- John Mueller, 'The Banality of 'Ethnic War',' *International Security* 25/1 (2000)
- Stuart J. Kaufman, 'Symbolic Politics or Rational Choice?: Testing Theories of Extreme Ethnic Violence,' International Security 30/4 (2006): 45-86 [and, optionally, the following correspondence with Arman Grigorian 'Correspondance: Hate Narratives and Ethnic Conflict,' *International Security* 31/4 (2007): 180-191]

FURTHER READING
On Huntington
- Edward Said, 'The Clash of Ignorance,' *The Nation* (2001)
- Errol A. Henderson and Richard Tucker, 'Clear and present strangers: the clash of civilizations and international conflict,' *International Studies Quarterly* 45/2 (2001)
- Giacomo Chiozza, 'Is there a clash of civilizations? Evidence from patterns of international conflict involvement, 1946-97,' *Journal of Peace Research* 39/6 (2002)

Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict and Identity
- Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities* (1983/2006)
- James D. Fearon and David D. Laitin, 'Violence and the Social Construction of Ethnic Identity,' *International Organization* 54/4 (2000): 845-877
- Rogers Brubaker and David D. Laitin, 'Ethnic and Nationalist Violence', *Annual Review of Sociology* 24 (1998), 423-452
- Jonathan Leader Maynard, 'Identity and Ideology in Political Violence and Conflict', *St. Anthony's International Review* 10/2 (2015)
- Siniša Malešević, *Nation-States and Nationalisms* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2013), Ch. 4

- Stephen Van Evera, 'Hypotheses on Nationalism and War', *International Security*, 18 (1994/95): 5-39.
- Joane Nagel, "Masculinity and nationalism: gender and sexuality in the making of nations." *Ethnic and racial studies* 21/2 (1998): 242-269.

Culture
- Ronald L. Lepperson, Alexander Wendt and Peter Katzenstein, 'Norms, Identity and Culture in National Security,' in Peter Katzenstein (ed.), *The Culture of National Security* (1996)
- Simon Murden, "Culture in World Affairs", in Baylis, John & Smith, Steve, *The Globalization of World Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Tarak Barkawi, 'Connection and Constitution: Locating War and Culture in Globalization Studies', *Globalizations*, Vol.1, no.2 (2004), pp.155-70.
- Richard Ned Lebow, *A Cultural Theory of International Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)
- Brian Barry, 'The Limits of Cultural Politics', *Review of International Studies*, 24 (1998), pp. 307-319.
- Edward Said, *Orientalism* (2003) (esp. Preface and Afterward)

Ideology
- Jonathan Leader Maynard, 'Rethinking the Role of Ideology in Mass Atrocities', *Terrorism and Political Violence* 26/5 (2014): 821-841
- Francisco Gutiérrez Sanín and Elisabeth Jean Wood, 'Ideology in civil war: instrumental adoption and beyond,' Journal of Peace Research 51/2 (2014)

Terrorism
- Human Security Report Project, *Human Security Brief 2007 – Dying to Lose: Explaining the Decline in Global Terrorism* (2007)
- John Mueller, 'Is there still a terrorist threat?', *Foreign Affairs,* (Sep/Oct 2004)
- John Mueller and Mark G. Stewart, 'The Terrorism Delusion: America's Overwrought Response to September 11,' *International Security* 37/1 (2012): 81-110.
- Audrey Kurth Cronin, 'How al Qaeda Ends, The Decline and Demise of Terrorist Groups', *International Security*, 31/1, Summer 2006, pp. 7-48.
- Clark McCauley and Sophia Moskalenko, 'Mechanisms of Political Radicalization: Pathways Toward Terrorism', *Terrorism and Political Violence* 20 (2008).
- Delacoura, Katerina, 'Violence, September 11 and the Interpretations of Islam', *International Relations,* Vol. 16, No. 2 (2002), p.269-273
- Howard, Michael, 'What's in a Name?', *Foreign Affairs* (2002)
- Roberts, Adam, 'The War on Terror in Historical Perspective', *Survival*, 47/2 (2005).

The Middle East and Arab Spring
- Fred Halliday, *Islam and the Myth of Confrontation: Religion and Politics in the Middle East* (1996), Ch. 1 & 4
- Ray Hinnebusch, 'The Politics of Identity in Middle East International Relations' in Louise Fawcett (ed) *The International Relations of the Middle* East (2005).
- Wendy Pearlman, 'Emotions and the Microfoundations of the Arab Uprisings', *Perspectives on Politics,* 11/2 (2013).
- Fouad Ajami, 'The Arab Spring at One: A Year of Living Dangerously', *Foreign Affairs* (2012)
- Marc Lynch, *The Arab uprising: the unfinished revolutions of the new Middle East* (2012)
- Michael N. Barnett, "Identity and Alliances in the Middle East," in Katzenstein, Peter (ed.), *The Culture of National Security* (1996)
- Louise Fawcett (ed.) *The International Relations of the Middle East* (2005)
- William L. Cleveland, *A History of the Modern Middle East* (2000), Ch. 22 & 23

- Avi Shlaim, *The Iron Wall: Israel and the Arab World* (2001)

Religion
- Tony Blair, 'Religious difference, not ideology, will fuel this century's epic battles', *The Observer*, 25 January 2014, http://tinyurl.com/l2uh3w3
- Steve Clarke, *The Justification of Religious Violence* (2014)
- John L. Esposito and Michael Watson, *Religion and the Global Order* (2000)
- Naveed S. Sheikh, *The New Politics of Islam: Pan-Islamic Foreign Policy in a World of States* (2002). Ch. 1, 4 & 5
- Gilles Kepel, *The Revenge of God: the Resurgence of Islam, Christianity and Judaism in the Modern World* (Polity Press, 1994)

Yugoslavia
- Valère Philip Gagnon Jr., *The Myth of Ethnic War* (2004)
- Paul Roe, 'Former Yugoslavia: The Security Dilemma That Never Was?', *European Journal of International Relations* 6/3 (2000)
- Paul Roe, 'The Intra-state Security Dilemma: Ethnic Conflict as a "Tragedy?"', *Journal of Peace Research* 36:2 (March 1999)
- Laura Silber and Alan Little, *The Death of Yugoslavia* (rev. edn., 1996)
- Misha Glenny, *The Fall of Yugoslavia* (3rd edn. 1996)
- Norbert Both and Jan Willem Honig, *Srebrenica: Record of a War Crime* (1996)

The Former Soviet Union
- Barnett Rubin and Jack Snyder (eds.), *Post-Soviet Political Order: Conflict and State-Building* (1998)
- Edward W. Walker., *Dissolution: Sovereignty and the Break-Up of the Soviet Union* (2003)

Rwanda
- Lee Ann Fujii, 'Transforming the moral landscape: the diffusion of a genocidal norm in Rwanda,' *Journal of Genocide Research* 6/1 (2004): 99-114.
- Scott Straus, *The Order of Genocide: Race, Power and War in Rwanda* (2006)
- Gerard Prunier, *The Rwanda Crisis: History of a Genocide* (1995)

Week Seven – *Democratic Peace Theory and Democratization*
Introductory Note: The Democratic Peace Theory (also sometimes referred to as Liberal Peace Theory – though the two might not be thought to be completely identical) is a major set of claims about modern patterns of war and peace. Succinctly, the theory observes that democracies do not appear to go to war with one another (though they do frequently go to war with non-democracies), and suggests that something about the nature of democracy causes this pacific behaviour. This week examines the debate over this purported 'democratic peace', and competing explanations for it. It naturally ties in with observations about the decline of major war and the role of democratisation in causing conflict from Week 5.

Essay Questions:
1. What are the most important causes of the 'democratic peace'?
2. Is the spread of democracy a sound strategy for promoting peace?
3. "Democratic peace theory suggests that relations between the West and parts of the Middle East would become much more peaceful if the states in the latter region democratized." Discuss.
4. "War between major states is now obsolete." Discuss. [This question should be answered with additional reference to the decline of major war readings from Week 5].
5. When are emerging democracies likely to experience violent conflict?

PRELIMINARY READING
– Michael Doyle, 'Kant, Liberal Legacies and Foreign Affairs' Parts 1 & 2, *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 12/3 and 12/4 (Summer and Fall 1983).
– John Oneal and Bruce Russett, 'The Kantian Peace: The Pacific Benefits of Democracy, Interdependence and International Organizations, 1885-1992', *World Politics,* 52/1 (1999)
– Sebastian Rosato, 'The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,' *American Political Science Review* (2003)
    o See also Doyle's reply in: Michael Doyle, 'Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace,' *American Political Science Review* 99/3 (2005)
– Christopher Layne, 'Kant or Cant: The Myth of Democratic Peace', *International Security* (1994), 19, 5-49
– Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, 'Democratization and the Danger of War', *International Security* 20 (1995)

FURTHER READING
The Causes of the Democratic Peace
– John Owen, 'How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace', *International Security* 19/2 (1994) OR John Owen, *Liberal Peace and Liberal War* (1997)
– Thomas Risse-Kappen, 'Democratic Peace – Warlike Democracies? A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument,' *European Journal of International Relations* 1/4 (1995): 491-517.
– Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey (eds.), *Democracy, Liberalism and War: Rethinking the Democratic Peace Debate* (2001). Ch. 1, 8 & 10
– Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey, 'The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization,' *European Journal of International Relations* 5/4 (1999): 403-434
– Steve Chan, 'In Search of Democratic Peace: Problems and Promise', *Mershon International Studies Review* 41 (1997)
– Barbara Farnham, 'The Theory of Democratic Peace and Threat Perception', *International Studies Quarterly* 47 (2003)

Democratization and Violence

- Michael D. Ward and Kristian S. Gleditsch, 'Democratizing for Peace,' *American Political Science Review* 92/1 (1998): 51-61
- Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), Ch.1
- Edward D. Mansfield and Jack Snyder, 'Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War', *International Organization* 56/2 (2002)
- Jack Snyder, *From Voting to Violence: Democratization and Nationalist Conflict* (2000).

The Illiberal Democracy Debate
- Fareed Zakaria, 'The Rise of Illiberal Democracy', *Foreign Affairs* (Nov-Dec 1997).
  - o Replies: John Shattack, and J. Brian Atwood, 'Defending Democracy', and Marc F. Plattner, 'Liberalism and Democracy in Foreign Affairs', (Mar-Apr 1998); 'Illiberal Illusions' in *Foreign Affairs,* (May-Jun 1998). Contributions by Kupchan, Charles A; Pilon, Julian Geran; Gould-Davies, Nigel and Cain, Kenneth.
- Fareed Zakaria, *The Future of Freedom: Illiberal Democracy At Home and Abroad* (2003)

Week Eight – *Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect*
Introductory Note: This topic links together empirical and theoretical IR research with normative (moral) inquiry, in studying emerging norms of humanitarian intervention, atrocity prevention, and the responsibility to protect. For most of the post-World War II era, state sovereignty was taken to be formally inviolable (except through war in self-defence). But in the 1990s and 2000s, international actors and scholars have displayed an increasing concern with humanitarian catastrophes like genocides, mass atrocities, famine and sub-state violence. In consequence, theorists have devoted considerable attention to the moral, legal and pragmatic viability of 'humanitarian intervention' – the use of military and non-military policies to prevent humanitarian crises in other states, going far beyond traditional 'peacekeeping' policies (which rested on the consent of the state which peacekeepers were sent to).

Essay Questions:
1. Do states have a right to intervene in other states to protect human lives?
2. Is there a fundamental tension between the principle of state sovereignty and the 'responsibility to protect'?
3. Is the 'Responsibility to Protect' now a norm of international politics?
4. 'Attempts at humanitarian intervention have been dominated by failure.' Discuss.
5. How should states prevent mass atrocities and crimes against humanity?

PRELIMINARY READING
Alex J. Bellamy, and Nick Wheeler, 'Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics', in J. Baylis, S. Smith and P. Owens (eds). *The Globalization of World Politics* (Oxford, 2010)
Robert O. Keohane and Jens Holzgrefe (eds.), *Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas* (Cambridge, 2003) (especially, but not solely, the chapter by Fernando Téson).
Jennifer Welsh, 'Implementing the ''Responsibility to Protect'': Where Expectations Meet Reality', *Ethics & International Affairs* 24/4 (2010)
David Chandler, 'The responsibility to protect? Imposing the "Liberal Peace"', *International Peacekeeping* vol. 11, no. 1 (2004)
Nicholas J. Wheeler, *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society* (Oxford, 2000)

FURTHER READING
United Nations Reports
United Nations, *Implementing the Responsibility to Protect: Report of the Secretary-General*, A/63/667, 12 January 2009.
United Nations, *Early Warning, Assessment and the Responsibility to Protect: Report of the Secretary-General*, A/64/864, 14 July 2010
United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* (2004)

Normative Dimensions
Martha Finnemore, 'Paradoxes in humanitarian intervention,' in Richard Price (ed.), *Moral Limit and Possibility in World Politics* (2008): 197-224.
Alex J. Bellamy, *Responsibility to Protect: The Global Effort to End Mass Atrocities* (Polity, 2009)
International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, *The Responsibility to Protect* (Ottawa: International Development Research Centre, 2001)
Gareth Evans, *The Responsibility to Protect: Ending Mass Atrocity Crimes Once and For All* (Brookings Institution Press, 2008)
James Pattison, *Humanitarian Intervention and the Responsibility to Protect: Who Should Intervene?* (Oxford, 2010)
Christopher Greenwood, 'Is there a Right to Humanitarian Intervention?', *The World Today*, vol. 49, no. 2 (1993)

Jennifer Welsh (ed.), *Humanitarian Intervention and International Relations* (Oxford, 2004)
Mary Kaldor, *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention* (Polity, 2007)
Simon Chesterman, *Just War or Just Peace: Humanitarian Intervention and International Law* (Oxford, 2002)

Humanitarian Intervention and Atrocity Prevention in Practice
Alex J. Bellamy, 'Military Intervention', in D. Bloxham and R. Moses (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide Studies* (Oxford, 2010)
Gareth Evans, 'Ethnopolitical Conflict: When is it Right to Intervene?' *Ethnopolitics*, vol. 10, no. 1 (2011), and responses by Caplan, Kuperman and Tannam
Alex J. Bellamy, *Global Politics and the Responsibility to Protect: From Words to Deeds* (Routledge, 2011)
Mats Berdal and Spyros Economides, eds., *United Nations Interventionism 1991-2004* (Cambridge, 2007)
Alan J. Kuperman, 'Suicidal Rebellions and the Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention,' *Ethnopolitics* 4/2 (2005): 149-73.

Alternatives to Military Intervention
Oxford Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict & The Australian Civil-Military Centre, *The Prevention Toolbox* (2013) [working paper plus set of six policy briefs on mediation, sanctions, military strategies, combating ideologies, the ICC, and commissions of inquiry],
http://www.acmc.gov.au/publications/the-prevention-toolbox-acmc-supports-oxford-project-on-how-to-prevent-mass-atrocities/
Thomas G. Weiss, 'Sanctions as a Foreign Policy Tool: Weighing Humanitarian Impulses', *Journal of Peace Research* 36/5 (1999)
Daniel Drezner, 'Sanctions Sometimes Smart: Targeted Sanctions in Theory and Practice', *International Studies Review* 13 (2011)
Thomas G. Weiss, *Humanitarian Intervention: Ideas in Action,* 2nd ed (Polity, 2012)
Jamie F. Metzl, 'Information Intervention: When Switching Channels Isn't Enough', *Foreign Affairs* 76/6 (1997)
Bruce Jentleson, 'Coercive Diplomacy: Scope and Limits in the Contemporary World', *Stanley Foundation Policy Analysis Brief* (2006)