

Module Title: International Politics A

Module Code: POP88061

Module Name: International Politics A 2025-26

- **ECTS Weighting: 10**
- **Semester/Term Taught: Semester 2**
- **Contact Hours: 2 Hours Lecture per week**
- **Module Personnel: Dr Sotirios Karampampas**
- **Module Pre-Requisite : None**
- **Module Co-Requisite: POP88071 International Politics B**

Module Learning Aims:

The module aims to

- Introduce students to the main theoretical paradigms in international relations and their foundational assumptions.
- Explore key themes and debates in contemporary international politics, including security, governance, and global challenges.
- Familiarise students with recent research and methodological developments in the field of IR.
- Encourage critical engagement with both canonical and contemporary texts.
- Support students in developing the analytical and conceptual tools necessary for independent research.

Module Learning Outcomes:

Upon successful completion of the module, students will be able to

- Demonstrate a critical understanding of core IR theories and their application to global politics.
- Evaluate key debates on topics such as anarchy, hierarchy, cooperation, conflict, and migration.
- Assess and interpret recent scholarly contributions and methodological approaches in IR research.
- Apply theoretical frameworks to analyse real-world international political phenomena.
- Formulate well-structured research questions informed by theoretical and empirical insight.



Module Content:

This module introduces students to foundational theoretical approaches and key issue-areas in the study of international relations. The first half of the module surveys core paradigms—realism, liberalism, Marxism, constructivism, and hierarchical approaches—alongside debates on anarchy, order, class, and identity. The second half turns to substantive issues of contemporary relevance, including security and conflict, foreign policy decision-making, global governance, environmental politics, and migration. The module emphasises recent research in the field and familiarises students with key debates and evolving methodological approaches in contemporary IR research. Students will critically engage with both canonical texts and cutting-edge scholarship, gaining the tools to analyse international politics and explore original research questions across both theoretical and empirical dimensions of the field.

Recommended Reading List:

Top Reads

Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (eds.). (2023). *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. 9th edition. Oxford University Press (multiple editions).

Frieden, J. A. et al. (2021). *World Politics: Interests, Interactions, Institutions*. 5th edition. WW Norton & Company (multiple editions).

Mingst, K. A., & McKibben, H. E. (2021). *Essentials of International Relations*. 9th edition. WW Norton & Company. (multiple editions).

Sørensen, G., Møller, J., & Jackson, R. H. (2022). *Introduction to international relations: Theories and Approaches*. Oxford University Press.

Weber, C. (2014). *International Relations Theory: A Critical Introduction*. 2nd edition. Routledge.

Week 1 – Introduction: What is International Relations?

Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (eds.). (2023). **Chapter 1**

Chan, S. (2002). On different types of international relations scholarship. *Journal of Peace Research*, 39(6), 747-756.

Frieden, J. A. et al. (2021). **Chapter 2**

Snyder, J. (2004). One world, rival theories. *Foreign Policy*, (145), 52-62.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/4152944>

Weber, C. (2014). **Chapter 1**



Week 2 – Realism: Power & Anarchy

Legro, J. W., & Moravcsik, A. (1999). Is Anybody Still a Realist? *International Security*, 24(2), 5-55. <https://doi.org/10.1162/016228899560130>

Mearsheimer, J. J. (2003). *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. Updated edition. WW Norton & Company. (multiple editions)

Walt, S. M. (2009). Alliances in a unipolar world. *World Politics* 61(1): 86-120. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887109000045>

Waltz, K. (2000). Structural realism after the Cold War. *International Security* 25(1): 5-41. <https://muse.jhu.edu/article/447711>

Weber, C. (2014). **Chapter 2**

Week 3 – Liberalism: Cooperation & Institutions

Ikenberry, G. J. (2018). The end of liberal international order? *International Affairs*, 94(1), 7-23. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iix241>

Keohane, R. O. (2012). Twenty years of institutional liberalism. *International Relations*, 26(2), 125-138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117812438451>

Moravcsik, A. (1997). Taking preferences seriously: A liberal theory of international politics. *International Organization*, 51(4), 513-553. <https://doi.org/10.1162/002081897550447>

Way, L. A. (2022). The rebirth of the liberal world order? *Journal of Democracy*, 33(2), 5-17. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2022.0014>

Weber, C. (2014). **Chapter 3**

Week 4 – Hierarchy & International Order

Allan, B. B., Vucetic, S., & Hopf, T. (2018). The distribution of identity and the future of international order: China's hegemonic prospects. *International Organization*, 72(4), 839-869. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818318000267>

Beardsley, K. et al. (2020). Hierarchy and the provision of order in international politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 82(2), 731-746. <https://doi.org/10.1086/707096>

Butt, A. I. (2013). Anarchy and hierarchy in international relations: Examining South America's war-prone decade, 1932–41. *International Organization*, 67(3), 575-607. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818313000155>



Kim, W., & Gates, S. (2015). Power transition theory and the rise of China. *International Area Studies Review*, 18(3), 219-226.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/2233865915598545>

Lake, D. A. (1996). Anarchy, hierarchy, and the variety of international relations. *International Organization*, 50(1), 1-33. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706997>

Week 5 – Marxism: Class, Capital & Hegemony

Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (eds.). (2023). **Chapter 8**

Bieler, A., & Morton, A. D. (2004). A critical theory route to hegemony, world order and historical change: Neo-Gramscian perspectives in International Relations. *Capital & Class*, 28(1), 85 - 113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030981680408200106>

Cox, R. W. (1981). Social forces, states and world orders: Beyond international relations theory. *Millennium*, 10(2), 126-155.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298810100020501>

Davenport, A. (2013). Marxism in IR: Condemned to a Realist fate? *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(1), 27-48.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066111416021>

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

Week 6 – Constructivist and Critical IR

Adler-Nissen, R. (2016). The social self in international relations: Identity, power and the symbolic interactionist roots of constructivism. *European Review of International Studies*, 3(3), 27-39. <https://doi.org/10.3224/eris.v3i3.27340>

Ann Tickner, J. (2011). Retelling IR's foundational stories: Some feminist and postcolonial perspectives. *Global Change, Peace & Security*, 23(1), 5–13.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14781158.2011.540090>

Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (2001). Taking stock: the constructivist research program in international relations and comparative politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4(1), 391-416. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.4.1.391>

Pourmokhtari, N. (2013). A postcolonial critique of state sovereignty in IR: The contradictory legacy of a 'West-centric' discipline. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(10), 1767–1793. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2013.851888>

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.



Week 7 – Reading week

Week 8 – Security & Conflict (7)

Baldwin, D. A. (1997). The concept of security. *Review of International Studies*, 23, 5-26. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20097464>

Fearon, J. D. (1995). Rationalist explanations for war. *International Organization*, 49(3), 379-414. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706903>

Herz, J. H. (2003). The security dilemma in international relations: Background and present problems. *International Relations* 17(4): 411-416.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117803174001>

Paris, R. (2001). Human security: paradigm shift or hot air? *International Security*, 26(2), 87-102. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3092123>

Peoples, C. and Vaughan-Williams, N. (ed.) (2020). *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. 3rd edition. Routledge (multiple editions).

Week 9 – Foreign Policy

Avey, P. C. et al. (2022). Does social science inform foreign policy? Evidence from a survey of US national security, trade, and development officials. *International Studies Quarterly*, 66(1). <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqab057>

Ba, H.-L. K., & McKeown, T. (2021). Does grand theory shape officials' speech? *European Journal of International Relations*, 27(4), 1218-1248.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/13540661211012060>

Hendrix, C. S. et al. (2023). The cult of the relevant: International relations scholars and Policy Engagement beyond the Ivory Tower. *Perspectives on Politics*, 21(4), 1270-1282. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759272300035X>

Putnam, R. D. (1988). Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games. *International Organization*, 42(3), 427-460. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2706785>

Walt, S. M. (2005). The relationship between theory and policy in international relations. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8(1), 23-48.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.012003.104904>



Week 10 – International Institutions & Global Governance

Fazal, T. M. (2013). The demise of peace treaties in interstate war. *International Organization*, 67(4), 695-724. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818313000246>

Gray, J. (2018). Life, death, or zombie? The vitality of international organizations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 62(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqx086>

Howard, L. M., & Stark, A. (2017). How civil wars end: The international system, norms, and the role of external actors. *International Security*, 42(3), 127-171. https://doi.org/10.1162/ISEC_a_00305

Katzenstein, P. J., Keohane, R. O., & Krasner, S. D. (1998). International organization and the study of world politics. *International Organization*, 52(4), 645-685. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S002081830003558X>

Lake, D. A. (2010). Rightful rules: Authority, order, and the foundations of global governance. *International Studies Quarterly*, 54(3), 587-613. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2010.00601.x>

Week 11 – Sovereignty & Borders

Linebarger, C., & Braithwaite, A. (2022). Why Do Leaders build walls? Domestic politics, leader survival, and the fortification of borders. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 66(4-5), 704-728. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022002721106661>

MacFarlane, N., & Sabanadze, N. (2013). Sovereignty and self-determination: Where are we? *International Journal*, 68(4), 609–627. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24709362>

Paris, R. (2020). The right to dominate: How old ideas about sovereignty pose new challenges for world order. *International Organization*, 74(3), 453-489. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000077>

Rosenberg, A. S., & Avdan, N. (2025). Assessing border walls' varied impacts on terrorist group diffusion. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 42(4), 438-461. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07388942241270927>

Simmons, B. A., & Goemans, H. E. (2021). Built on borders: Tensions with the institution liberalism (thought it) left behind. *International Organization*, 75(2), 387-410. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818320000600>



Week 12 – Environment & Climate Change

Aklin, M., & Mildenberger, M. (2020). Prisoners of the wrong dilemma: Why distributive conflict, not collective action, characterizes the politics of climate change. *Global Environmental Politics*, 20(4), 4-27. https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00578

Austrup, D. (2024). Realist climate action: Between responsiveness and responsibility. *European Journal of Political Theory*, 0(0), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14748851241233511>

Dalby, S. (2013). Climate change: New dimensions of environmental security. *The RUSI Journal*, 158(3), 34-43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03071847.2013.807583>

Dalby, S. (2014). Rethinking geopolitics: Climate security in the Anthropocene. *Global Policy*, 5(1), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12074>

Kamal Uddin, M. (2017). Climate change and global environmental politics: North-South divide. *Environmental Policy and Law*, 47(3-4), 106-114. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EPL-170022>

Assessment Details:

Class Participation: 10%

Reaction Papers: 20%

Article Review: 20%

Research Proposal: 50%