

SIMS22 Integration:
International Relations and the Making of a Global World
Fall 2018

Amanda Cheney (Course Coordinator)
amanda.cheney@svet.lu.se

Martin Hall
martin.hall@svet.lu.se

Oriol Sabaté Domingo
oriol.sabate_domingo@svet.lu.se

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course focuses on the historical origins of the global, international state system in order to better understand challenges facing the world today. In a complex and fast-moving global climate, the deep approach to international history and politics offered in this course will help students understand why the world looks the way it does and provide them with the tools to analyze it. We will consider a range of different processes tied to the emergence of the global world in the long nineteenth century and beyond, including, but not limited to, economic, military, legal, normative, cultural, linguistic and institutional practices. These practices and processes are examined from a number of different theoretical perspectives and on a variety of analytical levels and scales. Students will be introduced to central issues in current and (to a lesser extent) past scholarly debates regarding the origins of the global international state system, key concepts and analytical tools. More specifically, the course will examine the following themes:

- the relative importance of military power to Western imperial expansion versus knowledge construction
- the relationship between international law and the subordination of non-Western states
- the agency of peripheral and non-Western states
- the extent to which contemporary economic globalization is a categorical departure from “integration” in earlier historical periods
- the co-constitutive relationship between individual states and the international system, including the relationship between the character of post-colonial statehood and the international system

COURSE DESIGN

The course is based on a combination of lectures and seminars which are thematically linked. The lectures have an interdisciplinary focus, offer background knowledge and will help students orient themselves towards existing scholarship on the topic. The seminars focus on critically evaluating scholarly approaches and students will give oral and written presentations.

Memo Writing and Discussion Leadership – Our goal is to use each seminar session to integrate and critique the assigned readings, as well as identify areas ripe for new research.

Each week two students will circulate to their fellow students before the class meets a short and critical assessment of the readings, “memos” (approximately three to four pages in length), with the assessment highlighting key methodological and substantive issues posed by the readings (rather than, say, a simple summary of each reading). These students will also serve as weekly “discussion leaders.” The assumption in this exercise is that the two discussion leaders will collaborate on producing a single written document/ memo that will also serve as a foundation for in-class discussion. The course instructor(s) will open the seminar with some comments and then turn to the two discussants of the week to lead us through the issues posed by the readings. While “knowing” the literature is an important component of this process, so is identifying the limits of that literature and neglected areas of study.

**Memo writers must circulate their memos to their colleagues before the class meets by
** Mondays as 12 noon at the latest. ****

“Author’s Defendant” Role – once during the semester, each student will be assigned the role of “author’s defendant” and should be able to defend the merits of the week’s readings in seminar. This task includes serving as “resident expert” on the text, so that you can be called on to explain or clarify questions other students or the instructor may have about the readings.

Participation in Seminars – students are expected to attend every session, to have done the required readings in advance, and to participate actively and constructively in discussions, even on weeks when they are not memo writers or author defendants. Unless there are valid reasons to the contrary, compulsory participation in the above mentioned seminars is required. Students who have been unable to participate due to circumstances such as accidents or sudden illness will be offered the opportunity to compensate for or re- take compulsory components. This also applies to students who have been absent because of duties as an elected student representative.

If you fail to attend a seminar you are required to do the following:

Read carefully the memo distributed by the discussion leaders for this seminar. Write a 1500-2000 word response paper that discusses the strengths and weaknesses of the points raised in the memo as well as two to three additional issues raised in the readings that require further consideration. Upload this response paper in the folder missed seminars.

ASSESSMENT

Assessment is based on a final course paper, which will take the form of a literature review.

Literature Review: In this assignment students will be asked to consider how a specific event/process in history can yield important insights on current international politics and global trends. Each student chooses their own topic and constructs a review of existing literature on this topic. Special consideration should be given to identifying the limits of that literature as well as the limits of historical insights to be drawn, i.e. how to avoid drawing too easy “lessons” from history.

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

On completion of the course, the student shall:

Knowledge and understanding

- demonstrate fundamental knowledge of the history of the international system from global perspectives
- identify a variety of practices involved in integrating the world into a global international state system such as imperial expansion, economic globalization and international norms diffusion
- discuss several scholarly, theoretical approaches for understanding integration and the making of the global world
- relate the historical development of the international system to aspects of present-day world politics and international relations

Competence and skills

- interrogate the explicit and implicit assumptions used in scholarly theories such as constructivism, postcolonialism and world-systems theory
- synthesize competing theoretical perspectives
- identify and evaluate evidence used to make arguments
- raise and debate complex and contentious questions related to global politics in a constructive manner
- communicate their own ideas/arguments within a given time frame and with clarity and coherence, both orally and in writing
- collaborate with peers and contribute to a shared learning environment
assess the quality of their own work and the work of their peers

Judgement and approach

- evaluate the relative importance of different practices involved in integrating the world into a global system
- apply scholarly theories and concepts studied during the course to understand and analyze international politics and history
- critically reflect on the historical legacies of varied processes of global integration

READINGS

Electronic versions of ALL of the assigned readings are available on our Live@Lund course site. You can also find copies of all the texts on reserve in the campus library.

SCHEDULE

Tuesday 4 Sept. 13:00-14:00 **Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 148**

Introduction to course and planning session

Amanda Cheney

In this introductory session we will overview course expectations and assign seminar responsibilities for memo writers and author defendants for the entire course.

Thursday 6 Sept. 11:00-12:00 **Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 236**

Lecture: History, Ideas, Power and the Evolution of the International System

Amanda Cheney

Throughout the course term, we will be examining the origins of today's global, international state system from a variety of analytical perspectives. The purpose of this lecture is to provide a broad overview of existing international relations (IR) scholarship on the evolution of the international system, much of which comes under the heading of the "English School." The English School contends that the design of our present-day international system (characterized by territorially discrete, sovereign states which regard one another as formal equals) originally emerged in Europe and was then propagated globally as non-European polities were socialized to accept European norms. After presenting these conventional accounts, I will suggest a number of reasons why we should question their reliability.

Tuesday 11 Sept. 13:00-15:00 **Location: Eden 137**

Seminar: History, Ideas, Power and the Evolution of the International System

Amanda Cheney

To prepare for seminar discussion, consider the following questions:

- (1) Not unlike English School scholars, Ruggie argues that in order to understand "the real world of international relations," we need to focus on "ideas" and practices of social construction. Does the notion that ideas are socially causative necessarily exclude the relevance of (material) "power" and coercion in the construction of the modern world?
- (2) Is putting the experiences of non-Western polities like Japan and China at the center of analysis enough to redress the Western/Eurocentrism of the classical English School?
- (3) Is the English school mistaken about the actual content of the ideas about governance, political authority and territorial extent which Europeans supposedly propagated as universal standards?

READINGS:

Watson, Adam (1992) *The Evolution of International Society: A Comparative Historical Analysis*. London; New York: Routledge. Introduction, Ch 1, 22, 23, 24, 25, Conclusion, Epilogue. (74 pgs)

Zhang, Yongjin (1991) "China's Entry into International Society: Beyond the Standard of 'Civilization.'" *Review of International Studies* 17(1): 3-16.

Suzuki, Shogo (2005) "Japan's Socialization into Janus-Faced European International Society." *European Journal of International Relations* 11(1): 137–64.

Kayaoglu, Turan (2010) "Westphalian Eurocentrism in International Relations Theory." *International Studies Review* 12 (2):193–217.

Zarakol, Ayşe (2014) "What Made the Modern World Hang Together: Socialisation or Stigmatisation?" *International Theory* 6(2): 311–32.

Macdonald, Paul K (2014) *Networks of Domination: The Social Foundations of Peripheral Conquest in International Politics*. Oxford University Press. Introduction, Ch 1, 2 (77 pgs)

Ruggie, John Gerard (1998) "What Makes the World Hang Together? Neo-Utilitarianism and the Social Constructivist Challenge." *International Organization* 52(4): 855–85.

Tuesday 11 Sept. 16:00-17:30 Location: Gamla kirurgen R236
Guest Lecture: Taming the Imperial Imagination: How the British Came to Know Afghanistan and Why it Matters
Martin Bayly (LSE)

Colonial knowledge played a key role in shaping the practices of colonial rule in South Asia and across the British empire as a whole. This lecture pays particular attention to the ways in which the Afghan polity was constructed for British colonial administrators throughout the nineteenth century. This knowledge informed policy choices and cast Afghanistan in a separate legal and normative universe. The talk considers the genesis of this knowledge and how it was built, refined, and warped by an evolving colonial state. Beginning with the disorganised exploits of nineteenth-century explorers, and ending with the strategic logic of the militarised 'scientific frontier' the talk offers insights into the origins of contemporary foreign policy expertise and the forms of knowledge that inform interventions in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, and elsewhere today.

Thursday 13 Sept. 10:00-12:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 236
Lecture: World Historical Narratives
Martin Hall

In this lecture, I will make two arguments. First, I will claim that the way in which globalization is understood and studied in the field of international relations is unfortunately dominated by one fundamental approach - which I call globalization theory - and, moreover, that this approach is so dominating that it seems self-evidently correct, and therefore politically neutral. Within historical sociology and civilizational analysis there is a rival approach that, when comparing the two, clearly reveals the political nature of globalization theory. My claim is not that globalization theory in any sense is "wrong" but that it is neither self-evidently correct nor politically neutral. My second argument is that the reason for this dominance is that international relations relies entirely on a single particular narrative about the history of global political space.

Tuesday 18 Sept., 10:00-12:00 Location: Eden 137

Seminar: World Historical Narratives

Martin Hall

In this week's readings critical perspectives on globalization theory and "the European Miracle" thesis predominate. Some potential discussion issues to consider include, but are not limited to:

1. Is the critique of the European Miracle thesis exaggerated? Is Eurocentrism just being replaced with Sinocentrism, or any other centrism? Is explanatory Eurocentrism the same as political or moral Eurocentrism?
2. Several of the texts argue that implicitly or explicitly, international relations theory is dependent on world historical narrative. Is this necessarily true?

READINGS:

Hall, Martin (2015) "Narratives of global political space" in Global Community? Transnational and Transdisciplinary Exchanges, Enroth and Brommesson (eds) Rowman and Littlefield p. 19-37 (18 pgs)

Inglis, David (2010) "Civilizations or Globalization(s)?: Intellectual Rapprochements and Historical World-Visions." European Journal of Social Theory 13(1): 135-152.

Go, Julian and George Lawson (2017) "Introduction: For a Global Historical Sociology" in Global Historical Sociology, Go and Lawson (eds). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1-34.

Goody, Jack (2006) The Theft of History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. "Introduction" and "Ch 1: Who stole what? Time and space," p. 1-15

Jones, Eric (1987) The European Miracle: Environments, Economies and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia, Second Edition. Cambridge University Press. Introduction and Ch. 12. (34 pgs)

Hobson, John (2012) The Eurocentric Conception of World Politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Ch. 1: Introduction, Part V: Conclusion (64 pgs)

Hobson, John (2004) The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Ch 1, Part IV (68 pgs)

Thursday 20 Sept. 11:00-12:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 240

Lecture: The Great Divergence and the Historical Origins of Present-Day Inequality

Oriol Sabaté Domingo

Economic historians traditionally saw the so-called "rise of the west" as a long-term process of gradual economic improvement that began in the late Middle Ages. New information on living standards and national accounts cast doubt on this approach and has triggered a heated debate about the historical origins of modern economic growth and the moment

when Western Europe and the rest of the world started to diverge. The lecture will focus on the new quantitative information that informs this debate and will present some of the main methodological and conceptual challenges ahead.

Tuesday 25 Sept. 10:00-12:00 Location: Eden 137

Seminar: The Great Divergence and the Historical Origins of Present-Day Inequality

Oriol Sabaté Domingo

In this seminar we will discuss some of the potential causes of the Great Divergence. Did cultural changes in Western Europe pave the ground for modern economic growth? Or did Western Europeans react to unique economic shocks and factor endowments that created the necessary incentives to innovate? Or were maybe state policies that made the difference? To address these questions, the week's readings will present some of the conflicting hypotheses that have come to dominate the debate in recent years. Our main goal will be to map the debate and to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each of them.

The seminar will also address a fundamental methodological debate. Indicators used to track the historical evolution of economic and social processes can be the result of estimates based on scarce and partial information. The lack of information and the associated problems of reliability generate an academic dilemma: should this type of information be used as tentative evidence, or should be dismissed to avoid misinterpretations? To put it in another way, is bad data preferable to no data? And what is good enough?

READINGS:

Findlay, Ronald and O'Rourke, Kevin H. (2009) *Power and Plenty: trade, war, and the world economy in the second millennium*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, Ch 6, p. 311-364.

de Vries, J. (1994) "The Industrial Revolution and the Industrious Revolution," *Journal of Economic History*, 54(2), 249-270

Mokyr, Joel (2005) "The Intellectual Origins of Modern Economic Growth," *Journal of Economic History*, 65(2): 285-351

O'Brien, Patrick (2011) "The nature and historical evolution of an exceptional fiscal state and its possible significance for the precocious commercialization and industrialization of the British economy from Cromwell to Nelson", *Economic History Review*, 64 (2): 408-446

Allen, Robert (2009) *The British Industrial Revolution in Global Perspective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Ch 1, 6 (43 pgs)

Humphries, Jane (2013) "The lure of aggregates and the pitfalls of the patriarchal perspective: a critique of the high wage economy interpretation of the British industrial revolution", *Economic History Review*, 66 (3): 693-714

Parthasarathi, Prasannan (2011) *Why Europe Grew Rich and Asia Did Not. Global Economic Divergence, 1600-1850*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Introduction, p. 1-18.

Thursday 27 Sept. 11:00-12:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 240
Lecture: Economic Globalization and Inequality in the Last Two Centuries
Oriol Sabaté Domingo

The purpose of this lecture is to provide an overview of the main waves of economic globalization that took place during the nineteenth and the twentieth century. The attention will be focused on the evolution of international trade, capital markets, and migration, as well as on the comparison between the so-called "First Globalization" (starting in the nineteenth century until the outbreak of World War I) and the current era of globalization.

Tuesday 2 Oct. 10:00-12:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 236
Seminar: Economic Globalization and Inequality in the Last Two Centuries
Oriol Sabaté Domingo

This seminar aims to address the relationship between globalization and inequality between countries. Some scholars and pundits have argued that globalization exacerbates the differences between countries and condemns the poorest nations to rely on unfair international market relations. Others have argued that globalization paves the ground for a process of economic convergence that leaves all countries better off. We will engage in this debate from a historical perspective, considering how globalization and inequality between countries interrelated over the last two centuries.

There are several questions to be addressed. First of all, inequality needs to be correctly defined. What does the literature generally mean by inequality between countries? Is it a useful conceptualization? How is it measured? Secondly, the relationship between inequality and globalization is certainly complex and multidimensional. Which have been the main positive and negative impacts of globalization on inequality between countries according to the literature? How have been they assessed? Thirdly, the historical experience might be very informative to understand the present-day challenges that our societies are facing. What can we learn from the past? Should we expect inequality to grow or to fall under the current state of affairs?

Other more general questions are no less important and might be also addressed. Above all, why should we bother at all about inequality? Shouldn't we focus our attention on poverty instead? Some authors argue that globalization fosters economic growth and material well-being but increases inequality. If this was the case, would it really matter if inequality between countries increases?

READINGS

Daudin, Guillaume; Morys, Matthias; and O'Rourke, Kevin H. (2010) "Globalization, 1870-1914", in Stephen Broadberry and Kevin H. O'Rourke (eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of Modern Europe, Volume 2. 1870 to the Present*, Cambridge University Press, Ch. 1, p. 5-29

Findlay, Ronald and O'Rourke, Kevin H. (2009) Power and Plenty: trade, war, and the world economy in the second millennium, Princeton: Princeton University Press, Ch 9.
Reglobalization: The Late Twentieth Century in Historical Perspective, p. 473-525

Lindert, Peter H. and Williamson, Jeffrey G. (2003) "Does Globalization Make the World More Unequal?", in Bordo et al. (eds.) Globalization in Historical Perspective, University Chicago Press, Ch. 5, p.227-275 URL: <http://www.nber.org/chapters/c9590>

Vries, Peer (2013) Escaping Poverty. The origins of modern economic growth, Vienna University Press, Part 2, Ch 15. Globalisation and Great Divergence: How the Third World came into existence, p. 272-289

Milanovic, Branko (2016) Global Inequality. A new Approach for the Age of Globalization, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Ch 3, 5 (66 pgs)
Ch 3. Inequality among Countries. From Karl Marx to Frantz Fanon, and Then Back to Marx?
Ch 5. What Next? Ten Short Reflections on the Future of Income Inequality and Globalization

Alvaredo, Facundo; Atkinson, Anthony B.; Piketty, Thomas; and Saez, Emmanuel (2013) "The Top 1 Percent in International and Historical Perspective", Journal of Economic Perspectives, 27 (3): 3-20

Scheve, Kenneth and Stasavage, David (2016) Taxing the Rich. A History of Fiscal Fairness in the United States and Europe, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, Ch 8. Why Taxes on the Rich Declined, p. 185-206 * (not yet uploaded to live@lund)

Thursday 4 Oct. 11:00-12:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 240
Lecture: Ideational Transformations in the Long 19th Century
Amanda Cheney

This lecture will provide an overview of new conceptions of space, time, shared identity and political authority that emerged in the long nineteenth century. More specifically this lecture will examine how these new "ideational constructs" created the possibility for new types of political entities (i.e. sovereign, territorial nation-states). Thongchai Winichakul has famously argued that the historical political entities that occupied the space of today's Thailand were very different from Thailand in its modern form—not only in terms of their geographical extent, but also in their conceptions of political authority and shared identity. A number of new methods of knowledge production, technologies of geography, discourses, and other ideational inventions, were necessary to make it possible to conceive of "Siam" in its modern form, "Thailand." This was the case not just for Thailand, but for all countries. Therefore, will also consider what these transformations meant for the international system itself.

Tuesday 9 Oct 13:00-15:00 Location: Eden 137
Seminar: Knowledge, Imagination, Map-making and State-making
Amanda Cheney

Places like Siam/Thailand, Afghanistan and India's northeastern frontier are rarely the focus of IR theories. Nevertheless, sites like these, across the so-called global periphery, have seen some of the most fundamental and consequential contestations over the exercise of political authority and the nature of the prevailing international order. On the margins of empires is not only where colonial powers encountered serious difficulties, but also where processes of state formation and recognition remain particularly salient. What's more, for all its focus on great powers and the "core" of the international system, conventional IR theory is widely criticized for not being able to explain transformation and dramatic change in the nature of the international system. Therefore, a key question we will examine in this seminar is how placing the "periphery" at the center of analysis can help us to better understand world politics.

READINGS:

Thongchai Winichakul (1994) *Siam Mapped a History of the Geo-Body of a Nation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press. (174 pgs)

Hopkins, Benjamin D (2007) "The Bounds of Identity: The Goldsmid Mission and the Delineation of the Perso-Afghan Border in the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of Global History* 2(2): 233-254.

Bayly, Martin J (2015) "Imperial Ontological (in)Security: 'Buffer States', International Relations and the Case of Anglo-Afghan Relations, 1808-1878." *European Journal of International Relations* 21(4): 816-40.

Guyot-Réchar, Bérénice (2017) "When Legions Thunder Past: The Second World War and India's Northeastern Frontier." *War in History* <https://doi.org/10.1177/0968344516679041>. (33 pgs)

Tuesday 16 Oct. 13:00-15:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 236
Seminar: Whose International Law?
Amanda Cheney

In this seminar we will return to some of the questions raised in the first week of the course, focusing specifically on the role of international law in the making of the global international state system. Contrary to classical English School accounts of the global expansion of the European model and the universalization of "Westphalian" norms, critical examinations of how specific non-European polities were integrated into the global international system reveal widespread hybridization and manipulation of these universal rules and standards. At the same time that dominant states use international law as a tool of (neo)imperialism, we see that "peripheral" polities often appropriate hegemonic discourse as a "weapon of the weak" to successfully advance their interests in a system not of their own making. Further complicated yet, international law is not singular and has gone through a number of important transformations as it has been applied in a variety of different ways across time and space. So, whose international law is it? How can international law simultaneously be a "weapon of the weak" and an instrument of domination?

READINGS:

Anghie, Antony (1999) "Finding the Peripheries: Sovereignty and Colonialism in Nineteenth-Century International Law." *Harvard International Law Journal* 40(1): 1-71.

Becker Lorca, Arnulf (2010) "Universal International Law: Nineteenth-Century Histories of Imposition and Appropriation." *Harvard International Law Journal* 51(2):475-552.

Pitts, Jennifer (2012) "Empire and Legal Universalisms in the Eighteenth Century." *The American Historical Review* 117(1):92-121.

Finnemore, Martha (1996) "Constructing Norms of Humanitarian Intervention," in Katzenstein (ed) *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, Columbia University Press (25 pgs)

Horowitz, Richard S (2004) "International Law and State Transformation in China, Siam, and the Ottoman Empire during the Nineteenth Century." *Journal of World History* 15(4):445-86.

Natarajan, Usha (2011) "Creating and Recreating Iraq: Legacies of the Mandate System in Contemporary Understandings of Third World Sovereignty." *Leiden Journal of International Law* 24(4): 799-822.

DEADLINE

**** Friday October 19, 17:00 ****

Designation of literature review topic and preliminary literature list

Tuesday 23 Oct. 13:00-15:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 236

Seminar: Language and the Construction of International Order

Amanda Cheney

In this seminar we will examine the role of language in international politics. International politics is often conducted in two or more languages. Translations between languages do not exist naturally in the world, nor do bilingual and multilingual agents who make interlingual communications possible. Furthermore, since no two languages are exactly the same, what is possible to argue in one language may be impossible to argue in another. These insights are seemingly simple, yet have been largely ignored by mainstream IR scholarship. In this week's seminar we will consider whether or not we should regard translation as an integral practice of international politics. A key question to consider for seminar discussion is what (if any) value added do we get by considering questions of language when compared to more conventional analysis based on states' military capabilities or economic interests?

READINGS:

Liu, Lydia H (2004) *Clash of Empires : The Invention of China in Modern World Making*, Harvard University Press, Intro, Ch 1, 2, 4 (100 pgs) Intro, Ch 1, 2, 4 (p. 108-139)

Wigen, Einar (2015) "Two-Level Language Games: International Relations as Inter-Lingual Relations." *European Journal of International Relations* 21(2):427–50.

Cheney, Amanda J (2017) "Tibet Lost in Translation: Sovereignty, Suzerainty and International Order Transformation, 1904–1906." *Journal of Contemporary China*, 26(107): 769-783.

Palabiyik, Mustafa Serdar (2014) "The Emergence of the Idea of 'International Law' in the Ottoman Empire before the Treaty of Paris (1856)." *Middle Eastern Studies* 50(2): 233–51.

Martin, Emma (2016) "Translating Tibet in the Borderlands: Networks, Dictionaries, and Knowledge Production in Himalayan Hill Stations." *Transcultural Studies* 0(1): 86–120.

Aydın, Cemil (2006) "Beyond Civilization: Pan-Islamism, Pan-Asianism and the Revolt against the West." *Journal of Modern European History* 4,(2): 204–23.

Seymour, Lee J. M. (2013) "Let's Bullshit! Arguing, Bargaining and Dissembling over Darfur." *European Journal of International Relations* 20(3): 1-25.

Thursday 25 Oct. 10:00-12:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 236
Lecture: Global Transformation in the Long 19th Century and Beyond
Martin Hall

The traditional view in international relations is that, from a political point of view, the modern world was born in 1648 with the peace of Westphalia. Recently, this view is becoming more and more challenged. Now, the nineteenth century is thought of as the origin of the modern world order. At the same time, the long 19th century world order looked very different from the post-WWII order, which in turn is being eroded (?) towards the end of the 20th century and beginning of the 21st. This lecture will briefly characterize the development of the world order from the 19th to the late 20th century.

Tuesday 30 Oct. 10:00-12:00 Location: Gamla kirurgen HusR 236
Seminar: Integration, Fragmentation and Transformation between the Long 19th Century and Post-Cold War World
Martin Hall

In this week's readings the seminal article by John Gerard Ruggie on embedded liberalism is the centerpiece. Some potential discussion issues to consider include, but are not limited to

1. Was the 19th century world order disembedded liberalism, or something else altogether? In what, exactly, was liberalism embedded in the post-WWII period? Can we usefully describe the current development as a disembedding process, and, if so, what remains?

2. Is the “move” of the origin of the modern world order from 1648 to the 19th century analytically useful, important, justified?

READINGS:

Ruggie, John Gerard (1982) “International Regimes, Transactions, and Change: Embedded Liberalism in the Postwar Economic Order.” *International Organization* 36(2):379–415.

Risse-Kappen, Thomas (1994) "Ideas do not Float Freely: Transnational Coalitions, Domestic Structures, and the End of the Cold War" *International Organization* 48(2): 185-214.

Buzan, Barry, and George Lawson (2013) “The Global Transformation: The Nineteenth Century and the Making of Modern International Relations.” *International Studies Quarterly* 57(3): 620–34.

Koslowski, Rey, and Friedrich V. Kratochwil (1994) “Understanding Change in International Politics: The Soviet Empire’s Demise and the International System.” *International Organization* 48(2): 215–47.

Keohane, Robert O. (1984) *After Hegemony : Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press: p. 5 – 46; p. 243 259

Kaufman, Stuart J. (1997) “The Fragmentation and Consolidation of International Systems.” *International Organization* 51(2): 173–208.

Ikenberry, John (2015) “The Future of Multilateralism: Governing the World in a Post-Hegemonic Era.” *Japanese Journal of Political Science* 16(3): 399–413.

Leonhard, Jörn (2009) "The Rise of the Modern Leviathan" in Stefan Berger (ed) *A Companion to nineteenth century Europe, 1789-1914*, Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 137-147.

Strongly recommended: Maier, Charles. "Leviathan 2.0: Inventing Modern Statehood" in *A World Connecting, 1870-1945*, Emily Rosenber (ed) Harvard: Harvard University Press.

DEADLINE

**** Friday November 2, 17:00 ****

Literature Review