

POLI10003:Theories of International Relations

View Online



[1]

Acharya, A. and Buzan, B. 2010. Non-Western international relations theory: perspectives on and beyond Asia. Routledge.

[2]

Adam Jones 1996. Does 'Gender' Make the World Go Round? Feminist Critiques of International Relations. *Review of International Studies*. 22, 4 (1996), 405–429.

[3]

Adler, E. and Pouliot, V. 2011. International practices. *International Theory*. 3, 01 (Mar. 2011), 1–36. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S175297191000031X>.

[4]

Alexander Wendt 1992. Anarchy is what States Make of it: The Social Construction of Power Politics. *International Organization*. 46, 2 (1992), 391–425.

[5]

Axelrod, R. and Keohane, R.O. 1985. Achieving Cooperation under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions. *World Politics*. 38, 01 (Oct. 1985), 226–254.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2010357>.

[6]

Baldwin, D.A. 1993. Neorealism and neoliberalism: the contemporary debate. Columbia

University Press.

[7]

Barkawi, T. and Laffey, M. 2002. Retrieving the Imperial: Empire and International Relations. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 31, 1 (Jan. 2002), 109–127. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298020310010601>.

[8]

Barry Buzan 2001. The English School: An Underexploited Resource in IR. *Review of International Studies*. 27, 3 (2001), 471–488.

[9]

Baylis, J. et al. eds. 2014. Chapter 7 - Liberalism. *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.

[10]

Baylis, J. et al. eds. 2014. Chapter 9 - Marxist Theories of International Relations. *The globalization of world politics: an introduction to international relations*. Oxford University Press.

[11]

Beardsworth, R. 2011. *Cosmopolitanism and international relations theory*. Polity.

[12]

Bellamy, A.J. ed. 2004. *International Society and its Critics*. Oxford University Press.

[13]

Beth A. Simmons, Frank Dobbin and Geoffrey Garrett 2006. Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism. *International Organization*. 60, 4 (2006), 781–810.

[14]

Biccum, A.R. 2005. Development and the 'New' Imperialism: a reinvention of colonial discourse in DFID promotional literature. *Third World Quarterly*. 26, 6 (Sep. 2005), 1005–1020. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01436590500139656>.

[15]

Bieler, A. and 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 (Mar. 2004), 85–113. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/030981680408200106>.

[16]

Björkdahl, A. 2002. Norms in International Relations: Some Conceptual and Methodological Reflections. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*. 15, 1 (Apr. 2002), 9–23. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/09557570220126216>.

[17]

Bloomsbury Collections - International Society and the Development of International Relations Theory:
<https://www.bloomsburycollections.com/book/international-society-and-the-development-of-international-relations-theory/>.

[18]

Booth, K. and Smith, S. 1995. Chapter 11 - Neorealism in Theory and In Practice. *International relations theory today*. Polity Press.

[19]

Brock, G. 2009. *Global Justice*. Oxford University Press.

[20]

Brooke Ackerly and Jacqui True 2008. Reflexivity in Practice: Power and Ethics in Feminist Research on International Relations. *International Studies Review*. 10, 4 (2008), 693–707.

[21]

Brown, C. and Ainley, K. 2009. Introduction: Defining International Relations. *Understanding international relations*. Palgrave Macmillan. 1–17.

[22]

Brown, G.W. 2009. *Grounding cosmopolitanism: from Kant to the idea of a cosmopolitan constitution*. Edinburgh University Press.

[23]

Brown, G.W. and Held, D. eds. 2010. Editor's Introduction. *The cosmopolitanism reader*. Polity.

[24]

Brown, G.W. and Held, D. eds. 2010. *The cosmopolitanism reader*. Polity.

[25]

Bull, H. 2002. *The anarchical society: a study of order in world politics*. Palgrave.

[26]

Bulmer, S. 2013. Patriarchal Confusion? Making Sense of Gay and Lesbian Military Identity. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 15, 2 (Jun. 2013), 137–156.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2012.746565>.

[27]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Chapter 2 - Realism. *Theories of international relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.

[28]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Chapter 3 - Liberalism. Theories of international relations. Palgrave Macmillan.

[29]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Chapter 4 - The English School. Theories of international relations. Palgrave Macmillan.

[30]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Chapter 5 - Marx and Marxism. Theories of international relations. Palgrave Macmillan.

[31]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Chapter 7 - Critical Theory. Theories of international relations. Palgrave Macmillan.

[32]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Chapter 8 - Post-Structuralism. Theories of international relations. Palgrave Macmillan.

[33]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Chapter 9 - Constructivism. Theories of international relations. Palgrave Macmillan.

[34]

Burchill, S. and Linklater, A. 2013. Introduction. Theories of international relations. Palgrave Macmillan.

[35]

Burnham, P. 2001. Marx, international political economy and globalisation. *Capital & Class*. 25, 3 (Oct. 2001), 103-112. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/030981680107500109>.

[36]

Buzan, B. 2014. An introduction to the English school of international relations: the societal approach. Polity.

[37]

Buzan, B. 2004. From International to World Society?: English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation. Cambridge University Press.

[38]

Buzan, B. and Little, R. 2001. Why International Relations has Failed as an Intellectual Project and What to do About it. Millennium. 30, 1 (Jan. 2001), 19–39.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298010300010401>.

[39]

Callinicos, A. 1989. Chapter 3 - The Aporias of Poststructuralism. Against postmodernism: a marxist critique. Polity Press. 62–91.

[40]

Callinicos, A. 2004. Marxism and the International: The Future of the Capitalist State, Historical Materialism and Globalisation. The British Journal of Politics and International Relations. 6, 3 (Aug. 2004), 426–433.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-856X.2004.00148.x>.

[41]

Campbell, J.L. and Pedersen, O.K. 2001. The rise of neoliberalism and institutional analysis. Princeton University Press.

[42]

Caney, S. 2010. Climate change and the duties of the advantaged. Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy. 13, 1 (Mar. 2010), 203–228.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230903326331>.

[43]

Carlsnaes, W. et al. 2013. Chapter 1 'On the History and Historiography of International Relations'. Handbook of international relations. SAGE.

[44]

Carlsnaes, W. et al. 2013. Chapter 3 - Ethics and Norms in International Relations. Handbook of international relations. SAGE.

[45]

Carlsnaes, W. et al. 2013. Chapter 5 - Constructivism in International Relations: Sources, Contributions and Debates. Handbook of international relations. SAGE.

[46]

Carpenter, R.C. 2006. Recognizing Gender-Based Violence Against Civilian Men and Boys in Conflict Situations. *Security Dialogue*. 37, 1 (Mar. 2006), 83–103.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0967010606064139>.

[47]

Charvet, J. and Kaczynska-Nay, E. 2008. *The Liberal Project and Human Rights: The Theory and Practice of a New World Order*. Cambridge University Press.

[48]

Checkel, J.T. 1998. The Constructive Turn in International Relations Theory. *World Politics*. 50, 02 (Jan. 1998), 324–348. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887100008133>.

[49]

Chowdhury, G. and Nair, S. 2002. Introduction: Power in a postcolonial world: race, gender and class in international relations. *Power, postcolonialism, and international relations: reading race, gender, and class*. Routledge. 1–32.

[50]

Cox, R.W. 1983. Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: An essay in method. *Millennium: journal of international studies*. 12, 2 (1983), 162–175.

[51]

Cox, R.W. 1981. Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 10, 2 (Jun. 1981), 126–155.

[52]

Cynthia Weber 1992. Reconsidering Statehood: Examining the Sovereignty/Intervention Boundary. *Review of International Studies*. 18, 3 (1992), 199–216.

[53]

Darby, P. 2004. Pursuing the Political: A Postcolonial Rethinking of Relations International. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 33, 1 (Jan. 2004), 1–32.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298040330010101>.

[54]

David Campbell 1990. Global Inscription: How Foreign Policy Constitutes the United States. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*. 15, 3 (1990), 263–286.

[55]

Davis, N. 2014. A rose by any other name. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*. 25, (Jul. 2014). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2014.04.021>.

[56]

Della Porta, D. and Keating, M. eds. 2008. Chapter 5 - Constructivism: What It Is (Not) and How It Matters. *Approaches and methodologies in the social sciences: a pluralist perspective*. Cambridge University Press.

[57]

Dietzel, A. Global Justice. *International Relations Theory: A Practical Introduction*.

[58]

Dietzel, A. 2017. The Paris Agreement - Protecting the Human Right to Health? *Global Policy*. 8, 3 (Sep. 2017), 313–321. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.12421>.

[59]

Doty, R. 1996. The Logic of Differance in International Relations: US Colonization of the Philippines. *Post-realism: the rhetorical turn in international relations*. F.A. Beer and R. Hariman, eds. Michigan State University press. 331–345.

[60]

Doyle, M.W. and Ikenberry, G.J. 1997. Chapter 2 - Inventing International Relations: International Relations Theory after 1945'. *New thinking in international relations theory*. Westview Press.

[61]

Dunn, B., 'Can Marxism Explain the Crisis?' *The Socialist Review*, 363 (November), 2011: <http://socialistreview.org.uk/363/can-marxism-explain-crisis>.

[62]

Dunne, T. et al. 2013. Chapter 1 - International Relations and Social Science. *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*. Oxford University Press.

[63]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 3 - Classical Realism. *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*. Oxford University Press.

[64]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 4 - Structural Realism. *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*. Oxford University Press.

[65]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 5 - Liberalism. International relations theories: discipline and diversity. Oxford University Press.

[66]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 6 - Neoliberalism. International relations theories: discipline and diversity. Oxford University Press.

[67]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 8 - Marxism and Critical Theory. International relations theories: discipline and diversity. Oxford University Press.

[68]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 9 - Constructivism. International relations theories: discipline and diversity. Oxford University Press.

[69]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 10 - Feminism. International relations theories: discipline and diversity. Oxford University Press.

[70]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 11 - Poststructuralism. International relations theories: discipline and diversity. Oxford University Press.

[71]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Chapter 12 - Postcolonialism. International relations theories: discipline and diversity. Oxford University Press.

[72]

Dunne, T. et al. 2013. Chapter 16 - Still a Discipline After All these Debates? *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*. Oxford University Press.

[73]

Dunne, T. et al. eds. 2016. Introduction: Diversity and Disciplinarity in International Relations Theory. *International relations theories: discipline and diversity*. Oxford University Press.

[74]

Dunne, T. 1998. *Inventing international society: a history of the English school*. Macmillan in association with St Anthony's College, Oxford.

[75]

Dunne, T. et al. 2013. The end of International Relations theory? *European Journal of International Relations*. 19, 3 (Sep. 2013), 405–425.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066113495485>.

[76]

Edkins, J. and Pin-Fat, V. 2005. Through the Wire: Relations of Power and Relations of Violence. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 34, 1 (Aug. 2005), 1–24.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298050340010101>.

[77]

Edkins, J. and Vaughan-Williams, N. 2009. *Critical theorists and international relations*. Routledge.

[78]

Enloe, C.H. 2014. Chapter 5 - Gender makes the World Go Round: Where are the Women? *Bananas, beaches and bases: making feminist sense of international politics*. University of California Press.

[79]

Epstein, C. 2014. The postcolonial perspective: an introduction. *International Theory*. 6, 02 (Jul. 2014), 294–311. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1752971914000219>.

[80]

Finnemore, M. and Sikkink, K. 2001. Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics. *Annual Review of Political Science*. 4, 1 (Jun. 2001), 391–416. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.4.1.391>.

[81]

Foucault, M. and Rabinow, P. 1986. *The Foucault reader*. Penguin Books.

[82]

Franceschet, A. 1999. The Ethical Foundations of Liberal Internationalism. *International Journal*. 54, 3 (1999). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/40203406>.

[83]

Fukuyama, F. 2012. *The end of history and the last man*. Penguin Books.

[84]

G. John Ikenberry 2009. Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemmas of Liberal World Order. *Perspectives on Politics*. 7, 1 (2009), 71–87.

[85]

G. John Ikenberry 2011. The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism After America. *Foreign Affairs*. 90, 3 (2011), 56–68.

[86]

Gallagher, A.M. 2012. A Clash of Responsibilities: Engaging with Realist Critiques of the R2P. *Global Responsibility to Protect*. 4, 3 (Jan. 2012), 334–357. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1163/1875984X-00403004>.

[87]

Gardiner, S.M. 2010. *Climate ethics: essential readings*. Oxford University Press.

[88]

Gardner, R.N. 1990. The Comeback of Liberal Internationalism. *The Washington Quarterly*. 13, 3 (Sep. 1990), 23–39. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/01636609009445391>.

[89]

Gill, S.R. and Law, D. 1989. Global Hegemony and the Structural Power of Capital. *International Studies Quarterly*. 33, 4 (Dec. 1989). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2600523>.

[90]

Gramsci, A. et al. 1971. *Selections from the prison notebooks of Antonio Gramsci*. Lawrence and Wishart.

[91]

GROVOGUI, S.N. 2002. Regimes of Sovereignty: International Morality and the African Condition. *European Journal of International Relations*. 8, 3 (Sep. 2002), 315–338. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066102008003001>.

[92]

Gruffydd Jones, B. ed. 2006. *Decolonizing international relations*. Rowman and Littlefield.

[93]

Guzzini, S. 2004. The Enduring Dilemmas of Realism in International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*. 10, 4 (Dec. 2004), 533–568. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066104047848>.

[94]

Hansen, L. 2006. Discourse Analysis, Identity and Foreign Policy. Security as practice: discourse analysis and the Bosnian war. Routledge. 17-36.

[95]

Hayden, P. 2005. Cosmopolitan global politics. Ashgate.

[96]

Held, D. 2003. Cosmopolitanism: globalisation tamed? Review of International Studies. 29, 04 (Oct. 2003). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210503004650>.

[97]

Held, D. 2010. Cosmopolitanism: ideals and realities. Polity Press.

[98]

Hoffmann, S. 1995. The Crisis of Liberal Internationalism. Foreign Policy. 98 (Spring 1995). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/1148964>.

[99]

Hollinger, R. 1994. 'Chapter 7 - Modernity, Post-Modernism and International Relations'. Postmodernism and the social sciences: a thematic approach. Sage.

[100]

Hooper, C. 2001. Manly states: masculinities, international relations, and gender politics. Columbia University Press.

[101]

Hopf, T. 1998. The Promise of Constructivism in International Relations Theory. International Security. 23, 1 (Summer 1998). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2539267>.

[102]

Immanuel Wallerstein 1974. The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*. 16, 4 (1974), 387–415.

[103]

J. Ann Tickner 1997. You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements between Feminists and IR Theorists. *International Studies Quarterly*. 41, 4 (1997), 611–632.

[104]

Jabri, V. 2000. Reflections on the Study of International Relations. *Issues in international relations*. Routledge. 289–313.

[105]

Jackson, R. and Sorensen, G. 2010. IR as an academic subject. *Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches*. Oxford University Press. 28–57.

[106]

Jackson, R.H. 2000. *The global covenant: human conduct in a world of states*. Oxford University Press.

[107]

Jackson, R.H. and Sørensen, G. 2010. Chapter 5 - International Society. *Introduction to international relations: theories and approaches*. Oxford University Press.

[108]

Jean-Yves Haine 2009. The European Crisis of Liberal Internationalism. *International Journal* . 64, 2 (2009), 453–479.

[109]

Jervis, Robert Hans Morgenthau, Realism, and the Scientific Study of International Politics. *Social Research*. 61, 4.

[110]

Joseph M. Grieco 1988. Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism. *International Organization*. 42, 3 (1988), 485–507.

[111]

Justin Rosenberg 1990. What's the Matter with Realism? *Review of International Studies*. 16, 4 (1990), 285–303.

[112]

Kenneth N. Waltz 2000. Structural Realism after the Cold War. *International Security*. 25, 1 (2000), 5–41.

[113]

Keohane, R.O. 1988. International Institutions: Two Approaches. *International Studies Quarterly*. 32, 4 (Dec. 1988). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2600589>.

[114]

Keohane, R.O. and Martin, L.L. 1995. The Promise of Institutional Theory. *International Security*. 20, 1 (Summer 1995). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2539214>.

[115]

Keohane, R.O. and Waltz, K.N. 1986. *Neorealism and its critics*. Columbia University Press.

[116]

Koivisto, M. and Dunne, T. 2010. *Crisis, What Crisis? Liberal Order Building and World*

Order Conventions. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 38, 3 (May 2010), 615–640. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829810363509>.

[117]

Lawrence, P. 2014. *Justice for future generations: climate change and international law*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

[118]

Lawson, S. 2015. Chapter 5 - Liberal International Theory. *Theories of international relations: contending approaches to world politics*. Polity.

[119]

Lebow, R.N. 2005. Tragedy, Politics and Political Science. *International Relations*. 19, 3 (Sep. 2005), 329–336. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117805055410>.

[120]

Linklater, A. 2011. *The Problem of Harm in World Politics: Theoretical Investigations*. Cambridge University Press.

[121]

Linklater, A. and Suganami, H. 2006. *The English School of International Relations: A Contemporary Reassessment*. Cambridge University Press.

[122]

Lisa L. Martin and Beth A. Simmons 1998. Theories and Empirical Studies of International Institutions. *International Organization*. 52, 4 (1998), 729–757.

[123]

LITTLE, R. 2000. The English School's Contribution to the Study of International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*. 6, 3 (Sep. 2000), 395–422. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066100006003004>.

[124]

Lu, C. 2000. The One and Many Faces of Cosmopolitanism. *Journal of Political Philosophy*. 8, 2 (Jun. 2000), 244–267. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9760.00101>.

[125]

Maclean, J. 1988. Marxism and International Relations: A Strange Case of Mutual Neglect. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 17, 2 (Jun. 1988), 295–319. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298880170021201>.

[126]

Martha Finnemore 2001. Exporting the English School? *Review of International Studies*. 27, 3 (2001), 509–513.

[127]

Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink 1998. International Norm Dynamics and Political Change. *International Organization*. 52, 4 (1998), 887–917.

[128]

Matin, K. 2013. Redeeming the universal: Postcolonialism and the inner life of Eurocentrism. *European Journal of International Relations*. 19, 2 (Jun. 2013), 353–377. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/13540661111425263>.

[129]

Mearsheimer, J., 'Hans Morgenthau and the Iraq War: Realism Versus Neoconservatism.': https://www.opendemocracy.net/democracy-americanpower/morgenthau_2522.jsp.

[130]

Mearsheimer, J.J. 1990. Back to the Future: Instability in Europe after the Cold War. *International Security*. 15, 1 (Summer 1990). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2538981>.

[131]

Michael C. Williams 1993. Neo-Realism and the Future of Strategy. *Review of International Studies*. 19, 2 (1993), 103-121.

[132]

Michael W. Doyle 2005. Three Pillars of the Liberal Peace. *The American Political Science Review*. 99, 3 (2005), 463-466.

[133]

MILLIKEN, J. 1999. The Study of Discourse in International Relations: *European Journal of International Relations*. 5, 2 (Jun. 1999), 225-254.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/1354066199005002003>.

[134]

Morgenthau, H.J. 1952. Another "Great Debate": The National Interest of the United States. *American Political Science Review*. 46, 04 (Dec. 1952), 961-988.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/1952108>.

[135]

Moss, J. ed. 2015. *Climate Change and Justice*. Cambridge University Press.

[136]

NICHOLSON, M. 2000. What's the use of International Relations? *Review of International Studies*. 26, 2 (Apr. 2000), 183-198. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210500001832>.

[137]

Nye, J.S. 1988. Neorealism and Neoliberalism. *World Politics*. 40, 02 (Jan. 1988), 235-251.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2010363>.

[138]

el-Ojeili, C. 2015. Reflections on Wallerstein: The Modern World-System, Four Decades on.

Critical Sociology. 41, 4-5 (Jul. 2015), 679-700.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920513497377>.

[139]

Onuf, N.G. 2013. Making sense, making worlds: constructivism in social theory and international relations. Routledge.

[140]

Pinar Bilgin 2008. Thinking past 'Western' IR? *Third World Quarterly*. 29, 1 (2008), 5-23.

[141]

Powell, R. 1994. Anarchy in international relations theory: the neorealist-neoliberal debate. *International Organization*. 48, 02 (Mar. 1994).
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300028204>.

[142]

R. Charli Carpenter 2011. Vetting the Advocacy Agenda: Network Centrality and the Paradox of Weapons Norms. *International Organization*. 65, 1 (2011), 69-102.

[143]

Randall D. Germain and Michael Kenny 1998. Engaging Gramsci: International Relations Theory and the New Gramscians. *Review of International Studies*. 24, 1 (1998), 3-21.

[144]

Reus-Smit, C. 2002. Imagining Society: Constructivism and the English School. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. 4, 3 (Oct. 2002), 487-509.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-856X.00091>.

[145]

Reus-Smit, C. and Snidal, D. 2008. Chapter 11 - Neoliberal Institutionalism. *The Oxford*

handbook of international relations. Oxford University Press.

[146]

Richard K. Ashley 1984. The Poverty of Neorealism. *International Organization*. 38, 2 (1984), 225–286.

[147]

Richard Price 1995. A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo. *International Organization*. 49, 1 (1995), 73–103.

[148]

Rita Abrahamsen 2003. African Studies and the Postcolonial Challenge. *African Affairs*. 102, 407 (2003), 189–210.

[149]

Robert G. Gilpin 1984. The Richness of the Tradition of Political Realism. *International Organization*. 38, 2 (1984), 287–304.

[150]

Robert Jervis 1999. Realism, Neoliberalism, and Cooperation: Understanding the Debate. *International Security*. 24, 1 (1999), 42–63.

[151]

Roff, H.M. 2016. Gendering a Warbot. *International Feminist Journal of Politics*. 18, 1 (Jan. 2016), 1–18. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2015.1094246>.

[152]

Ronen Palan 2000. A World of Their Making: An Evaluation of the Constructivist Critique in International Relations. *Review of International Studies*. 26, 4 (2000), 575–598.

[153]

Rosenau, P. 1990. Once Again Into the Fray: International Relations Confronts the Humanities. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 19, 1 (Mar. 1990), 83-110. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298900190010701>.

[154]

Schroeder, P.W. 1997. History and International Relations Theory: Not Use or Abuse, but Fit or Misfit. *International Security*. 22, 1 (Summer 1997). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/2539329>.

[155]

Seth, S. ed. 2013. *Postcolonial theory and international relations: a critical introduction*. Routledge.

[156]

Shapiro, M. 1989. Textualising Global Politics. *International/intertextual relations: postmodern readings of world politics*. Lexington Books. 11-22.

[157]

Shapiro, M.J. and Der Derian, J. 1989. *International/intertextual relations: postmodern readings of world politics*. Lexington Books.

[158]

Shepherd, L.J. ed. 2015. *Gender matters in global politics: a feminist introduction to international relations*. Routledge.

[159]

Shue, H. 2014. *Climate justice: vulnerability and protection*. Oxford University Press.

[160]

Smith, S. et al. 1996. Chapter 2 - The Timeless Wisdom of Realism. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge University Press.

[161]

Smith, S. et al. 1996. 'Chapter 11 - The Achievements of Poststructuralism. *International theory: positivism and beyond*. Cambridge University Press.

[162]

Smith, S. et al. 1996. Chapter 16 - The future of international relations: Fears and hopes. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge University Press.

[163]

Smith, S. et al. 1996. Chapter 18 - All these theories yet the bodies keep piling up: Theory, Theorists, Theorising. *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*. Cambridge University Press.

[164]

Steans, J. 2003. Engaging from the Margins: Feminist Encounters with the 'Mainstream' of International Relations. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations*. 5, 3 (Aug. 2003), 428-454. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-856X.00114>.

[165]

Steans, J. 2006. Gender, Feminism, and International Relations. *Gender and international relations: issues, debates and future directions*. Polity. 7-19.

[166]

Tan, K.-C. 2004. *Justice without Borders: Cosmopolitanism, Nationalism, and Patriotism*. Cambridge University Press.

[167]

TAYLOR, L. 2012. *Decolonizing International Relations: Perspectives from Latin America*.

International Studies Review. 14, 3 (Sep. 2012), 386–400.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2012.01125.x>.

[168]

Terrell Carver, Molly Cochran and Judith Squires 1998. Gendering Jones: Feminisms, IRs, Masculinities. *Review of International Studies*. 24, 2 (1998), 283–297.

[169]

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

[170]

Tickner, J.A. 1992. Chapter 1 - Engendered Insecurities: Feminist Perspectives on International Relations. *Gender in international relations: feminist perspectives on achieving global security*. Columbia University Press.

[171]

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

[172]

Wallerstein, I. 2004. Chapter 2 - The Modern World-System as a Capitalist World-Economy. *World-systems analysis: an introduction*. Duke University Press. 23–41.

[173]

Walt, S.M. 1998. International Relations: One World, Many Theories. *Foreign Policy*. 110 (Spring 1998). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.2307/1149275>.

[174]

Waltz, K.N. 1979. Theory of international politics. McGraw-Hill.

[175]

WAYLEN, G. 2006. You still don't understand: why troubled engagements continue between feminists and (critical) IPE. *Review of International Studies*. 32, 01 (Feb. 2006). DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0260210506006966>.

[176]

Weber, C. 1994. Good girls, little girls and bad girls: Male paranoia in Robert Keohane's critique of feminist international relations'. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 23, (1994), 337-349.

[177]

WEISS, T.G. 2010. How United Nations ideas change history. *Review of International Studies*. 36, S1 (Oct. 2010), 3-23. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021051100009X>.

[178]

Weldes, J. 1996. Constructing National Interests'. *European journal of international relations*. 2, (1996), 275-318.

[179]

Wheeler, N.J. 1992. Pluralist or Solidarist Conceptions of International Society: Bull and Vincent on Humanitarian Intervention. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*. 21, 3 (Dec. 1992), 463-487. DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/03058298920210030201>.

[180]

Wheeler, N.J. 2000. *Saving strangers: humanitarian intervention in international society*. Oxford University Press.

[181]

William Bain 2000. *Deconfusing Morgenthau: Moral Inquiry and Classical Realism*

Reconsidered. *Review of International Studies*. 26, 3 (2000), 445–464.

[182]

Considine, L., 'Back to the Rough Ground! A Grammatical Approach to Trust and International Relations', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 44(1)1 (2015), pp. 109-127.

[183]

Guzzini, G., 'Structural Power: The Limits of Neorealist Power Analysis' *International Organization*, 47(3), 1993, pp. 443-478.

[184]

Peterson V. S., 'Feminist Theories Within, Invisible To, and Beyond IR' *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, 10(2), 2004, pp. 1-11.

[185]

Seth, Sanjay (2011), 'Postcolonial Theory and the Critique of International Relations,' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 40 (1), pp. 167-183.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0305829811412325?journalCode=mila>.