

**Chapter 1 : A Critical Assessment of Martin Wights Why Is There No International Essay**

*If you have access to journal via a society or associations, read the instructions below. Access to society journal content varies across our titles. If you have access to a journal via a society or association membership, please browse to your society journal, select an article to view, and follow.*

Duncan Snidal International Theory , 1: As Wight summed up the situation then: With questions about the good life thereby off the table, IT was limited to discussions of survival. Forty years on, things have certainly changed, both in world politics and in the academy. For an early and rather different assessment of the state of classical international theory see Jackson. Indeed, today war is far more common within than between states. Beyond this important change in the security sphere, moreover, rapid technological change has enabled a dramatic intensification in the depth and breadth of interactions between what used to be relatively autarkic societies. Not only has globalization produced massive changes in the international economy, it has also spurred the development of an incipient global civil society as well as an increase in international legalization and institutionalization. The consequences of globalization are similarly uneven, with many distributional losers and an increasingly despoiled global environment. But these changes nevertheless challenge the core empirical claim of IT skeptics, namely that international politics is and will always be a realm of necessity. For the moment at least, there seems to be much more to talk about than mere survival – or if it is survival, then it is increasingly global survival, not just the survival of the individual nation-state. These changes in world politics have been paralleled by scholarly developments, in at least three different intellectual communities. However, by 3 See, for example, Vincent and Bull. Why there is International Theory now 3 the trickle of scholarship had become a steady stream on a wide range of topics, with renewed interest in Just War Theory and its application to the War on Terror, humanitarian intervention, and civil wars; the distributional consequences of global economic and political structures; the political theory of sovereignty; transnational and global citizenship; the democratic deficits of international institutions; the political theory of European integration; the ethics of immigration policy; collective responsibility; global environmental philosophy; and the history of international thought – among others. While International Political Theory IPT ranges widely in both questions and approaches, it shares a common concern for theorizing the role of norms and values at the international level and for engaging concepts such as justice, rights and duties that have traditionally been considered the exclusive domain of the domestic. In contrast to the explicitly normative concerns of those engaged in IPT, in IR the main issues have always been positive ones of explanation and understanding. These latter approaches emphasized the importance of social forces and ideas in addition to the predominantly material variables of both realism and liberalism; they introduced explicitly normative concepts such as appropriateness and legitimacy as affecting international outcomes; and they 4 We thank Toni Erskine for this formulation. While this has made for some confusion, it has ensured that the level of theoretical sophistication within IR is much higher than it was four decades ago. There are now sustained conversations on a broad range of topics, from epistemology to ontology, methodology, and, not least, the realities of world politics. And then there is a third wave of theory coming out of International Law IL. Although theoretical reflection on IL goes back to Grotius, Pufendorf, and Vattel, there has been a marked resurgence in international legal theory, as prospects for IL being taken seriously by states have brightened with the end of the Cold War. Old institutions such as the United Nations have been reinvigorated, new institutions such as the WTO and ICC established, and the rise of interdependence has led to greatly expanded attention to private IL and to questions concerning the interface of international and domestic law. Some of the ensuing theoretical developments were a result of importing new ideas from outside, like rational choice models from IR or arguments from feminist theory; others emerged more organically from the efforts of international lawyers to come to grips with the new global order. Regardless, the effect has been a robust and diverse theoretical conversation around a variety of legal topics, including, for example, Just War Theory again in an age of humanitarian interventions and preventive war, the growing standing of individuals and non-state actors in the international legal order, the rise of international criminal justice, post-colonial critiques

of IL, and global constitutionalism, among others. Moreover, this interest in theory has come from a wide range of different traditions and has taken root in at least three distinct disciplinary communities – IPT, IR, and IL – suggesting that IT is here to stay and will remain intellectually diverse. If we are correct that IT has arrived, what is the problem? In brief, it is that different theoretical communities are not engaging each other in 6 And we have not even mentioned the parallel interventions of sociologists and anthropologists into this terrain as well. Why there is International Theory now 5 ways that could be mutually productive. Even within disciplines, closely related perspectives such as neorealism and neoliberalism often speak past one another; that certainly has been true of more radically different positions such as rationalism and post-structuralism. To be sure, theories sometimes are incompatible in whole or in part – although that still does not mean they cannot speak to each other at least by raising critiques of, and insofar as they share common empirical ground, posing substantive challenges to one another. In some cases, the differences can be attenuated, even if not overcome. At a minimum, challenges can be used to spur better theory in the other. This does not mean the theories have merged or do not retain differences, but engagement can eliminate false differences and encourage cross-fertilization that strengthens both. In contrast to the at least sporadic trade and warfare between theoretical approaches that takes place within the discipline-defined boundaries of IT, serious engagement across disciplines is almost non-existent. To be sure, the silo metaphor may reify what is on the ground a more fluid intellectual situation, and as such we do not want to over-state the impermeability of the boundaries between IPT, IR, and IL. Moreover, at an institutional level there have been halting but persistent efforts to promote inter-disciplinarity in the study of the international, particularly between IR and IL. But if there is some fluidity across the boundaries separating international theorizing in IPT, IR, and IL, significant intellectual impediments remain. But the isolation of disciplinary silos is perhaps nowhere more evident than in the fact that each has its own preferred journal outlets for IT, which might not be read at all by those outside. How many IR theorists, for example, read – or even know – the *Leiden Journal of International Law*, or even the *European Journal of International Law*, not *Relations* – both prominent outlets for international legal theory? Conversely, there is no journal dedicated solely to bringing normative, positive, and legal IT together; the only places where such work currently meets is in generalist political science journals like the *American Political Science Review* or *International Studies Quarterly*, which have many other demands on their space and do not publish IL in any case. Still, it may be objected that, by virtue of the questions they pose, normative, positive, and legal IT are essentially different, and as such it is perfectly natural, even desirable, for them to constitute distinct intellectual communities. Moreover, the contemporary vitality of IT is arguably rooted precisely in its disciplinary fragmentation. While we do not imagine that the diversity of IT can be reduced to a single conversation, or that this is even a desirable goal, there is nevertheless something important for these fields to talk about: These take two forms, one internal to IT itself and one external in its relationship to the real world. First, internally, while normative, positive and legal IT are perhaps essentially different at their core, their boundaries are necessarily fuzzy. Is good normative theory possible without taking into account empirical regularities like the democratic peace? Or is good positive theory possible 8 See, for example, Slaughter, Tulumello, and Wood , Brunnee and Toope , and Goldstein et al. Why there is International Theory now 7 without taking into account the normative force of IL? Or is good legal theory possible without taking into account tensions between morality and interests? In each of these cases, the answer is sometimes, but sometimes not. By engaging such questions, we seek to open up inquiry into the relations and interdependencies among these seemingly different areas. Second, externally, many – perhaps most – of the real world problems in which students of IT are interested have simultaneously normative, empirical, and legal aspects. A good example is the design of legitimate and effective institutions, a problem of immense practical importance and evident difficulty that has received attention in all three of our communities. So from the standpoint of policymakers and their critics , all three kinds of knowledge are needed, not just one. Insofar as our three communities hope to enlighten practice in the real world, therefore, it behooves them to think through how the kind of knowledge they produce is related to the kinds produced elsewhere. In doing so, IT seeks to encompass both the diversity and the unity of theoretical scholarship on the international. The diversity, in the sense that IT seeks to publish the best theory within each of our three

disciplinary communities taken on their own terms; but also the unity, in the sense that IT is particularly interested in work that cuts across or otherwise engages two or even all three communities simultaneously, whether in an integrative or in a critical way. They argue that while individual scholars can and often must bracket elements of the problem in their research, the field as a whole cannot do so. In all cases, we will press authors to make their arguments accessible to as wide an audience as possible and resist efforts that use specialized language in an exclusionary way. While the scope of IT is deliberately broad, however, in three respects it is bounded. Similarly, an article that analyzed the role of culture in global civil society would be of interest insofar as it connected culture to political questions such as governance and control. Therefore, IT welcomes submissions not only from political scientists but equally from philosophers, lawyers, anthropologists, economists, sociologists, and whomever else as long as they engage the political. While in a sense state-centric, this is actually agnostic with respect to the actors or processes involved, and would include constitutive challenges to the sovereignty regime from global, transnational, and regional phenomena. Taking these two definitions together, IT would exclude work dealing solely with domestic politics conventionally understood, but be open, for example, to a study of foreign policy decision-making that Why there is International Theory now 9 addresses issues across borders, as well as to a study of civil wars that share the logic of anarchy of many international problems. Formal or qualitative theory, empirical theory, social theory, legal and normative theory, conceptual analysis, philosophical reflection on the epistemology, ontology, or methodology of IT, practical ethics, history of international political thought, and no doubt others – each, in all their varieties – rationalist, realist, constructivist, liberal, post-structural, feminist, post-colonial, cosmopolitan, communitarian, critical, and whatever else – we take to be part of IT. The boundary here is constituted less by the type of theory than by the emphasis on an original contribution: Of course, this is not to diminish the importance of testing or otherwise evaluating theory empirically; rather, our belief is that with the inter-disciplinary expansion of IT in recent years, there is now also a place for a journal dedicated to advancing this conversation further. And sometimes that can be done empirically – for example, by highlighting the normative challenges posed by certain empirical facts,<sup>11</sup> or the tensions between ethical and legal imperatives in concrete cases. Creating an International Theory community Above all, the goal of IT is to generate a dialog among different types of theories, since it is only through such a dialog that the boundaries and relationships between theories, and thus their respective strengths and weaknesses, can be properly assessed. The breadth we aspire to is reflected in our Editorial Board, which is roughly tripartite in structure, 11 E. We have also sought similar diversity in the theoretical approaches that members of our Board engage. For a complete listing of Board members, as well as the opportunity to sign up for contents alerts, please see our website at [www](http://www). Thus, while not every conceivable IT audience is represented, this Board gives us a capacity to review and pursue a range of articles that we could not possibly manage on our own. And we hope it signals the broad range of scholarship that we seek to include. One thing we quickly realized in assembling this diverse board, however, is that it will be very difficult to ever bring them together for a fully representative board meeting. There is no single professional association or conference that encompasses a full cross-section of our Board. Fortunately, the electronic age makes it possible for a virtual Board to be an effective one – and so far we have been pleased with their responsiveness when called upon for guidance. We hope that the journal will be a vehicle that helps create a sense of community among the broad range of scholars that they represent. Of course, communication is inherently difficult across such a diverse community. Every subgroup has its own specialized language and particular frames of reference that facilitate its internal interaction and advancement. But these can also become jargonistic and self-referential in ways that make it difficult for outsiders to understand what is going on. IT hopes to find a middle ground between these advantages and disadvantages. While we will certainly publish articles that fall squarely within one subgroup, we will press authors to use their technical apparatus as sparingly as possible and, especially, to develop key parts of their intuitions and arguments in relatively accessible language. Moreover, we will require individual articles to be self-conscious about the horizons of their perspective, to be aware of the limits of their assumptions and hidden presumptions, and to be clearly written. In the end, there are few ideas so profound that they cannot be communicated in ordinary language, and so we will press authors to do so –

whether they are working with mathematics in formal theory or continental social theory in post-structuralism” even if they ultimately have to move into more specialized language to fully complete their argument. Nuts and bolts Many of the operational details of IT are standard and details on submitting manuscripts are posted on our CUP website. Nevertheless, it may be useful to reiterate some key points here and especially to point out some novel features of our intended editorial practice, which will continue to evolve as we learn. Why there is International Theory now 11 Because IT wants to make space for sustained theoretical development, we will accept articles of up to 15, words for review, although in most cases we will expect the final version to be under 12, words after the advice of reviewers is incorporated. That said, we are very interested in shorter articles and in some sense will favor them for the obvious reason that they allow us to publish more pieces. We will also consider a variety of other formats in addition to traditional articles. For example, we are currently working with a group of scholars organizing a symposium on a topic relevant to IT, which will consist of a series of shorter papers interacting with each other around a common topic. We are working with a different group organizing a symposium on a recent important book. Here the format is to ask the author to briefly summarize the book and then invite commentators from different perspectives to critique it, with a brief response by the author. Our expectation is that such symposia will introduce out-of-area ideas to a portion of our readers who might not normally engage them, while offering a different perspective to those who are familiar with the topic. Finally, while we will not publish book reviews, we are open to review essays that use several books as a springboard to develop a theoretical argument. All articles will be peer-reviewed using a double-blind procedure. This will be standard for many of our contributors but not for legal scholars used to publishing in law journals which have their own, very different procedures. Blind reviewing helps to ensure that we get the most forthright and reliable reviews not clouded by other considerations, or appearing to be so. Our goal is to process articles from their receipt to an initial decision within two months; our commitment is to do so within 3 months.

*'Political theory' is a phrase that in general requires no explanation. It is used here to denote speculation about the state, which is its traditional meaning from Plato onwards. On the other hand, the phrase 'international theory' does require explanation.*

Non-Western International Relations Theory: In western academic circles, engagement with IRT has witnessed a bloom especially with the end of the Cold War, where for the first time the marginalized and dissident voices within IR came to undermine the traditional way of thinking and doing international relations. Thus this study serves an important function by broadening the scope of the debate within IRT via the introduction of non-Western IR traditions. Thus this study encourages non-Westerners to make a contribution to IRT debate proportionally to the degree they are involved in its practice. This edited book by Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan- two influential academics in the field of IR- is composed of ten chapters which are written by eleven different academicians from a broad geography. Moreover, all the chapters are composed into an academic article like format. Thus, in order to enhance the understanding of each chapter, a conclusion sector is included at the end of each of them. Both Acharya and Buzan are known recently for their important engagement in bringing into Westerners attention the Asian studies, but differently from their previous works this one focuses especially on non-Western IRT. The latter is also part of the investigation done in following chapters. Moreover, this chapter is due to a thoughtful summary and description of the goals of this work- is of substantial importance in understanding the following chapters. They answer this question by embracing a pluralist view of theory and without engaging into the deep meta-theoretical debates between the hard positivist rationalist, materialist and quantitative understanding of theory, which dominates in US, and the softer reflectivist social, constructivist, and postmodern one found mainly in Europe. Additionally, they put forward some non rigid soft IRT conditions about what will be count as contribution to IR like; recognition by others in the IR academic community as being theory, being regarded by its creators as IRT and being a systematic attempt to generalize about IR. After making a brief sketch of the main branches of Western IRT, the writers explain five possible reasons of the absence of non-Western IRT, which constitute also the backbone of this work. Arguably they assert that the dominance of West exists because of: Western IRT has acquired hegemonic status in the Gramscian sense, 3. Non-Western IR theories do exist, but are hidden, 4. Local conditions discriminate against the production of IR theory, and 5. The West has a big head start, and what we are seeing is a period of catching up p. The assertions above are validated or not through the following chapters which conduct their study with regard to these hypothesis. As expected, this chapter concentrates on potential sources for a Chinese school of IRT. Qin firstly introduces the two meanings of theory in China, respectively the action-oriented one and the knowledge-oriented one. The later is closer to the western type thinking about theory and is used by Qin during this paper. Additionally he makes an evaluation about the state of art of IR discipline in China. On the other hand the Japanese IRT is shadowed by the fact that Japan has been an abortive regional hegemon in the past. Additionally he introduces three theorists as an illustration of Japanese theories of IR. Nishida as an innate constructivist, Tabata as an international law theorist and Hirano as an economist placing regional integration higher than state sovereignty. He concludes by stressing the optimistic view about future Japanese IRT. Chaesung Chun-the writer of this chapter- gives a comprehensive picture of the causes of the historical under development of IR in South Korea, which dates back since the liberation of Korea from Japanese colonialism in onward. He highlights the fact that what happened for nearly years in the West is the road to modernization has been condensed into years in Korea. He additionally notes that, Western IR theories-especially realism and security studies- have been very useful in explaining the reality of Korean international relations in South Korea until recently when non-traditional threats appeared on horizon and the South Korean academicians meet the post-positivist approaches. Chun states that, in the case of Northeast Asia, micro-theories like the game theory apply better than macro-or grand theories. According to him, India does not vindicate her geographical placement and historical experience by developing a separate IR discipline. We learn that, there are no undergraduate

programmes in this field and only four universities offer a Masters programme in India. Besides the critique above, he questions also the core assumptions of Western IRT. Then he stresses the blindness of the West to see the Indian thinker Kautilya as a forerunner of Machiavelli and Hobbes even of the Realpolitik itself. Additionally he stresses that the purpose of alternative sites of knowledge is to create non-hegemonic spaces where different traditions of IR can co-exist in a healthy dialogue. He then proposes two broad sets of scholarship that would offer illumination of possibilities for non-Western theorizing. The first consists in the works of transitional and hybrid scholars and the second rely on the traditions of political interaction that predate European colonialism. Sebastian and Irman G. Authors state that Indonesia may provide a useful exploratory study into non-Western theories that could be both innovative and emancipatory. According to them the sources for an Indonesian IRT are possible like Javanese and Seberang political culture and the Islamic influence but there is still a lack of effort among Indonesian IR scholars to develop it. He concludes that the nature of the Islamic theory on IR is decisively normative and can be best understood through the constructivist and critical approaches in IRT. However the author stresses the fragmentation within the Islamic world both in material and ideational context, as an obstacle to form an Islamic IR theory. What is called as Eurocentric view of the world here is the experience of the European modern history, being regarded as universal both in its values and application. According to writers, the very fact that Western IRT was built on this experience, posses limits and at the same time fosters us to question its universal validity and search pluralist ways to understand the IR. The later, writers stress, would also require us to re-construe developments in the Western world p. Here the editors offer some thoughts addressing the main question posed in this volume and then reflect on whether the question of a non-Western IRT is a meaningful one, and whether the way it is approached in this collection could result in a productive debate that would enrich the IR p. Simultaneously here is made an overall evaluation of the whole book. The aims of the contributors- as to investigate the reasons of the absence of non-Western IRT and possible non-Western IRT, by challenging the dominance of Western theory- introduced at the start of this book are vindicated. At the end of the reading is possible to see the debate about IRT being broaden into a direction that promises a fertile and constructive debate in the future. Thus, Western IRT is not and must not be the sole lens from which we look at the world. However, despite its novelty by offering a non-Western agenda for IRT, this book is restricted in the way of focusing mainly on Asia. As mentioned by the editors, the Middle East and Africa are intentionally excluded from the scope of this book- because their expertise does not lie in these regions- hoping others will do for these regions what they have done for Asia. On the other hand, the question why Russia is being excluded from Asia remains unanswered. Similarly Turkey is not mentioned as a candidate to contribute to non-Western IRT, while this book focuses also on the case of Islam. To conclude, this book is important not only for broadening the agenda of IRT, but also for raising many new questions about other regions like them mentioned above which wait to be answered. From the current developments in the world, it is obvious that Western IRT is insufficient in dealing with all the problems regardless space and time. Here this book comes at the right time for both Western and non-Western public interested in theoretical debates about IR and their consequences in practice.

**Chapter 3 : Martin Wight - Wikipedia**

*'Political theory' is a phrase that in general requires no explanation. It is used here to denote speculation about the state, which is its traditional meaning from Plato onwards.*

Postcolonialism and international relations theory Postcolonial International relations scholarship posits a critical theory approach to International relations IR , and is a non-mainstream area of international relations scholarship. Post-colonialism focuses on the persistence of colonial forms of power and the continuing existence of racism in world politics. However, a variety of evolved psychological mechanisms, in particular those for dealing with inter group interactions, are argued to influence current international relations. These include evolved mechanisms for social exchange, cheating and detecting cheating, status conflicts, leadership, ingroup and outgroup distinction and biases, coalitions, and violence. Evolutionary concepts such as inclusive fitness may help explain seeming limitations of a concept such as egotism which is of fundamental importance to realist and rational choice international relations theories. Nayef Al-Rodhan from Oxford University has argued that neuroscience [47] can significantly advance the IR debate as it brings forward new insights about human nature, which is at the centre of political theory. New tools to scan the human brain, and studies in neurochemistry allow us to grasp what drives divisiveness, [48] conflict, and human nature in general. The theory of human nature in Classical Realism, developed long before the advent of neuroscience, stressed that egoism and competition were central to human behaviour, to politics and social relations. Evidence from neuroscience, however, provides a more nuanced understanding of human nature, which Prof. Al-Rodhan describes as emotional amoral egoistic. These three features can be summarized as follows: This neurophilosophy of human nature can also be applied to states [49] - similarly to the Realist analogy between the character and flaws of man and the state in international politics. Prof Al-Rodhan argues there are significant examples in history and contemporary politics that demonstrate states behave less rationally than IR dogma would have us believe: Queer and transgender perspectives[ edit ] Queer international relations scholarship aims to broaden the scope and method of traditional international relations theory to include sexed and gendered approaches that are often excluded in the discipline at large. While affiliated with feminist theory and gender studies , as well as post-structuralism , queer IR theory is not reducible to any other field of international relations scholarship. Queer international relations theory works to expose the many ways in which sexualities and gender affect international politics. Queer IR theory takes sites of traditional international relations scholarship war and peace, international political economy , and state and nation building as its subjects of study. It also expands its scope and methods beyond those traditionally utilized in Realist IR scholarship. Ontologically , queer IR utilizes a different scope from traditional IR, as it aims to non-monolithically address the needs of various queer groups, including trans -, inter-, cross-, and pan-gendered, sexed, and sexualized bodies. Epistemologically , queer IR explores alternative methodologies to those traditionally used in IR, as it emphasizes the sexual dimension of knowledge within international relations. While queer IR incorporates transgender individuals in its expanded scope, some argue its emphasis on sexuality fails to adequately capture transgender experiences. This leads Stryker to advocate that transgender studies follows its own trajectory. She suggests some possible improvements that trans-theorizing may offer for feminist IR theory, which include a more nuanced understanding of gender hierarchy through a pluralist approach to sex, a holistic view of gender that resists viewing gender entirely either as a social construction or as biologically essential , and an increased awareness of gender as involving power relations among different sexes and genders. As such, Sjoberg advocates for the inclusion of trans-theorizing in feminist IR theory in the interests of improving explanations and understandings of global politics.

**Chapter 4 : Reading Martin Wight's 'Why is there no international theory?' as history**

*Some non-Western states are plausibly bidding for great power standing. Given these conditions, our question is 'why is there no non-Western international theory'. We are as intrigued by the apparent absence of theory in the non-West as Wight was by what he considered to be the absence of international theory in general.*

Early life[ edit ] Martin Wight was born in Brighton , Sussex. He took a First Class degree and stayed at Oxford for a short period afterwards engaged in postgraduate research. At about this time he also became involved with the work of the Revd. Dick Sheppard and his Peace Pledge Union. Two years later, however, his position at the school became untenable: At the behest of Margery Perham , he returned to Oxford to work, for the remainder of the Second World War , on an extended research project on colonial constitutions. Wight published three books on this topic: Witnessing at first-hand the early diplomatic wrangles at the UN reinforced his scepticism about the possibility of lasting co-operation between sovereign states - a view reflected in the first edition of his Power Politics , revised edition published posthumously in In , Wight went back again at Chatham House, collaborating with Toynbee on the production of the Surveys of International Affairs covering the war-years and contributing to his A Study of History. Ironically, these lectures were first delivered in the United States, at the University of Chicago, where Wight spent a term in Reconstituted and published in , International Theory: The Three Traditions seeks to make sense of the history of thought about international politics by dividing it into the categories of realism , rationalism and revolutionism , sometimes known as the Machiavellian , Grotian and Kantian traditions. In , Wight was invited by the Cambridge historian Herbert Butterfield to join the British committee on the theory of international politics , a group initially funded by the Rockefeller Foundation. His contributions to the Committee of the late s and early s were gathered together after his death by Hedley Bull, and published as Systems of States Legacy[ edit ] Wight died, at the age of 58, in Only after his death did some of the writings for which he is best known see the light of day. A trust fund was set up and the many contributions generously given enabled the series of Martin Wight Memorial Lectures to be launched. Sir Herbert Butterfield gave the first lecture at Sussex University on 23 April , and lectures have been given annually since then. They are available on the homepage of the Martin Wight Memorial Trust. Selected works[ edit ] Wight wrote many reviews, mainly for The Observer and International Affairs, but his main works are as follows: Letter on "Christian Pacifism", Theology Power Politics Looking Forward Pamphlet, no. Royal Institute of International Affairs, The Development of the Legislative Council , vol. A Christian Commentary on the Common Life, 1: Laski, An Introduction to Politics London: British Colonial Constitutions Oxford: Survey of International Affairs The World in March London: Toynbee, A Study of History, vol. USC, , pp. An Experiment in Sussex London: Andre Deutsch, , pp. Essays in the Theory of International Politics London: Essays in honour of C. OUP, , pp. An Appreciation", International Affairs Systems of States ed. Leicester University Press, The Three Traditions ed. Power Politics 2nd ed. A History of 75 Years London: Millennium Publishing Group, , pp. Four Seminal Thinkers in International Theory: Machiavelli, Grotius, Kant and Mazzini ed. Oxford University Press, Michele Chiaruzzi Soveria Mannelli: Palgrave Macmillan, , pp. Jaca Book, , pp. Tim Dunne, Inventing International Society: A History of the English School Basingstoke: The Rediscovery of History Milan: La teoria internazionale di Martin Wight Bologna:

**Chapter 5 : unconditional consciousness: ABSTRACT OF "WHY IS THERE NO INTERNATIONAL THEORY"**

*The paper denies the existence of a theory of international relations on the two possible senses: o Methodology of study of international relations. o Conceptual system which offers a unified explanation of international phenomena. It says that, in a first glance, the speculation of relations between states is already the scope of the political theory.*

It was derived from the historical and legal study of human interactions that had its origins in the growth of the diplomatic system in Europe and later elsewhere after the 15th century; works of 17th- and 18th-century thinkers such as Hugo Grotius. Other thinkers who influenced the school would include the international lawyers of the 19th and early 20th centuries, nationalist writers such as Mazzini and, of course, though largely negatively, Niccolo Machiavelli and Karl Marx. While the English School has perhaps been the most influential group of theorists to have developed the notion of international society, it has not been the only one. Some constructivist writers, such as Alexander Wendt; some communitarian writers, such as Amitai Etzioni; and some radical scholars of world politics, such as Richard Falk, have also used the notion of international society in more or less different ways. And the English school has also influenced writers whose broad philosophical approach is very different, such as James Der Derian whose thesis, later published as *On Diplomacy*, was supervised by Hedley Bull. This bibliography will focus principally on the English School approach to international society but will also draw attention to other accounts where they vary with, challenge, or enrich, in important ways, the English School approach. General Overviews The idea of international society as an essential part of the idea of a European states system and different from the notion of system that gained currency in US scholarship during the 1950s and 1960s developed largely in the United Kingdom during the 1950s and 1960s. Wight developed it in conjunction with a group of scholars at the London School of Economics, where he taught in the 1950s, and a more dispersed group that he was in regular contact with, the British Committee on the Theory of International Politics, convened initially by Herbert Butterfield and chaired in turn by Butterfield, Wight, Hedley Bull, and Adam Watson between 1950 and 1960. There is considerable controversy as to which of the two groups was more influential in shaping the idea of international society. Linklater and Suganami, Vizezzi, Dunne *A Study of Order in World Politics. Essays in the Theory of International Politics. A History of the English School.* Much criticized by some, including Hidemi Suganami, who thinks that Dunne does not give enough attention to other figures at the London School of Economics and includes a number of figures such as E. Carr who had little real influence on the committee. Forsyth is very much in agreement with Bull about the character of international society but thinks that Bull pays less attention than he might to the moral and conceptual foundations of this society. *A Case for Closure.* Linklater, Andrew, and Hidemi Suganami. *The English School of International Relations: Cambridge University Press, The Rediscovery of History.* Argues that the fundamental point of the school was the centrality of history as a mode of knowledge for international relations. Edited by Hedley Bull. Leicester University Press, Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative click here.

**Chapter 6 : Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and beyond Asia Review | Amitai Etzioni**

*Why is There No International Theory? of a state, which represents him in the international community, is a juristic expression of the belief in the sovereign state as the consummation of political experience and.*

**Chapter 7 : Why there is International Theory now | Duncan Snidal - calendrierdelascience.com**

*Why is there no Queer International Theory? Forthcoming in European Journal of International Relations Cynthia Weber University of Sussex calendrierdelascience.com @calendrierdelascience.com Since its formation as an academic field, Queer Studies has questioned "the.*

**Chapter 8 : Why is there no non-Western International Relations theory? Ten years on - LSE Research On**

*This article claims that the presumed non-existence of Queer International Theory is an effect of how the discipline of International Relations combines homologization, figuration, and gentrification to code various types of theory as failures in order to manage the conduct of international theorizing in all its forms.*

**Chapter 9 : International relations theory - Wikipedia**

*Four sociologies of international politics Part 1. Social Theory: 2. Scientific realism and social kinds 3. 'Ideas all the way down?': on the constitution of power and interest 4.*