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In any mapping exercise of the global contours of International Relations, a focus on the English-speaking countries of the world makes considerable sense: so much of the discipline of IR has evolved in the academy in English-speaking countries; so much of the research in IR is published in English; and so much of the debate about the discipline occurs in English. What Holsti (1985: ix) called an “Anglo-American core of “producers”” has dominated the discipline, creating an “intellectual condominium” (Holsti 1985: 103) or a hegemonic educational duopoly (Jarvis 2001: 274–275; see also Wæwer 1998; Crawford and Jarvis 2001). And attached to the “core” have been “small appendages in other anglophone countries,” notably Australia and Canada (Holsti 1985: ix).

The purpose of this chapter is to examine IR on the “Anglo” side of the putative Anglo-American condominium. However, what constitutes the “Anglo” world of IR is more problematic than it might at first appear. We would start with Britain as a “core” producer—despite the obvious inappropriateness of using “Anglo” to mean all of the United Kingdom. But what beyond that “Anglo core” should be included? Holsti might have recognized the contributions of “small anglophone appendages,” but these “anglo” appendages have often been difficult to see. For example, in Wæwer’s examination of global IR, Canada simply disappears into “North America” (1998: 696). Likewise, in their historiography of IR, Groom and Mandaville (2001: 152–159) discuss “North American” IR, even though there is not a single Canadian, anglophone or francophone, among those they cite. The contributions of the Australian academy have not suffered the same fate, perhaps because there is no wider geographic unit into which Australians can as readily be tossed. But Australian IR does share with Canadian IR—that same invisibility accorded to IR in other English-speaking parts of the world that are not deemed “core.”

What might comprise the “non-core” of “anglo appendages”? One might include all those sites of IR scholarship where English is the usual language of instruction: Ireland, Canada, the anglophone Caribbean, the English-speaking South Pacific, New Zealand, Australia, Hong Kong, Singapore, the countries of South Asia, and the countries of East, Southern, and West Africa. However, the problem with terming all these places “anglo” or “English-speaking” is that a number of other languages, official and unofficial, are also spoken. Thus, for example, it makes no sense to refer to the Canadian academy as “English-speaking” (or anglo), since francophone scholars (even if they are perfectly fluent in English) would most definitely not consider themselves “anglo”! One could make the same observation about scholars in Ireland, Hong Kong, or South Africa.

We argue that instead of focusing on language, we should consider the one other obvious commonality of these places: they were all at one time part of the British Empire. Indeed, since we are engaged in a mapping exercise, we borrow a cartographic trope to describe both
the UK “core” and the “non-core” locales that were at one time a part of the British Empire. In that era, maps of the world invariably showed the various parts of the Empire in crimson: the UK at the imperial center, together with the various dominions, colonies, territories, and dependencies across the globe, the Mercator projection invariably overmagnifying the extent of the Empire on which the sun never set.

Therefore, in this chapter we seek to map the professing of IR in those parts of this post-Imperial (with a capital I) “crimson world” not surveyed by other authors. We look at the United Kingdom, Ireland, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and survey the professoriate, their research interests, and the institutions of IR research. We show that there are clear similarities in how IR is being professed in these locales and how the IR community is being socially reproduced in these countries.

While we demonstrate the similarities of approaches to IR in these countries, we also demonstrate the differences between how IR is professed in the United States and how it is professed in these other locales. Historically, there was little agreement on the nature of the Anglo-American “condominium.” For example, Fitzpatrick saw little difference between the “Anglo” and the “American” approaches to IR (1987: 51). By contrast, Lyons claimed that there was a “distance” between British and American scholars (1986: 629); likewise, Smith argued that he could see an “Atlantic divide” in the Anglo-American condominium (Smith 1985: ix–xiv). We suggest that, more recently, the divide has become much wider: the divide is now between these post-Imperial “crimson” locales (the “Anglo core” and the “Anglo non-core”) on the one hand, and the U.S. on the other. In particular, we will show that the theoretical approaches to IR that enjoy dominance in the American academy, such as rational choice, formal modeling, and quantitative approaches, are generally not employed at all in the “crimson world.”

What explains this “crimson” divide – not only the similarities across the five “crimson” countries, but also the differences between the professing of IR in those places and IR in the U.S.? While there are long-term, historical, and underlying causes at work that could explain the evolving shape of the academy on each side of the divide, this chapter focuses on the more immediate and proximate causes: the pattern of academic social reproduction over the past decade. In particular, there is an increasing lack of transboundary scholarly cross-fertilization between the academy in these five “post-Imperial” locales on the one hand, and the U.S. on the other. We show that in Britain and Australia, and to a lesser extent in Canada, Ireland, and New Zealand, there has been a tendency to hire indigenously trained Ph.Ds to fill IR positions, or Ph.Ds from other “post-Imperial” countries. The result is that fewer American-trained Ph.Ds now occupy IR posts in these countries. At the same time, however, IR in the U.S. continues to be professed almost entirely by American-trained Ph.Ds. This, we argue, constitutes the emergence of (at least) two separate English-speaking IR “research communities” – in the Kuhnian sense of the term paradigm (Kuhn 1962). Unlike the plethora of paradigmatic typologies that emerged to explain the development of contending theories in IR in the 1970s and 1980s – based variously on such elements as basic assumptions, units of analysis, values, assumptions about the state of nature, or the role of structure and theory – the emergence of an American and Anglo set of IR research communities is built on (at least) two social and academic contexts that have evolved into distinct, but not entirely disconnected, research traditions. Within the Anglo research community, our data show that through hiring practices, preferences of theories and methods, and research interests, the Anglo core and the post-Imperial non-core (the “crimson world”) are partially integrated with one another, and they are growing increasingly distinct from the “American” IR core. The “American” core has (rightly or wrongly) been increasingly accused of parochialism,
self-referentiality, and working in the interests of the U.S. state in a post 9/11 world – a connection that concerns many non-American IR scholars uncomfortable with the practices and the consequences of uncontested American hegemony.

These developments, we conclude, have considerable implications for the longer term durability of the hegemony of American IR. A decade ago, Wæver argued that we were increasingly seeing the “de-Americanization of IR” in other parts of the world (1998: 726). Our survey of the academy in Britain, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia confirms Wæver’s contention: the professing of IR in these parts of the world is distinctly more different from the professing of IR in the U.S. than it was even a quarter of a century ago.

We acknowledge that focusing on this divide might be useful for examining differences in how IR is professed in the U.S. and how it is professed in these locales, but it is not without its limitations. First, a focus on division disguises the many differences within each of these geographically defined sides of the divide. However, in many ways, American and British realist scholars have much more in common with each other than they do with their national compatriots working within more liberal or radical traditions. Likewise, those more critical traditions that seek to challenge the basic assumptions of the dominant discourses in IR (both liberal and realist) have become increasingly important in the non-core and more firmly grounded outside the American academy (Murphy and Tooze 1991; Onuf 1997). Furthermore, the American academy is so vast and diverse that there are considerable differences in American IR, including significant contributions to the critical school.⁴

We recognize that, to some extent, how IR is professed in many places in the world goes well beyond territoriality. In particular, many of those who receive doctorates in IR from English-speaking universities, whether in the United States or in the post-Imperial locales surveyed in this chapter, go on to profess IR in the non-English-speaking world – in continental Europe, post-colonial Africa, and elsewhere. They might teach in their own language, but their training, their research agendas, and their tendency to publish in English-language journals all place them firmly within a Western core of IR. In this sense, the colonialism of Western IR as a discipline has been even more expansive and total than the legacies of British imperialism and later American (neo)colonialism. Indeed, some would argue that this is more properly a form of academic dependency. The form of “colonial present” (Gregory 2004) that IR’s “Anglo-American” core has established is one whose territorial expansiveness is arguably greater than that of colonialism itself. However, if indeed there are profound epistemological differences between the “Anglo” and “American” traditions in IR, one should consider which (if any) of the dominant traditions is more closely associated (or perhaps more aptly put, of more use to) IR’s dependent colonies of English-speaking scholarship.⁵

The mapping operation: methodology

As with other contributions to this volume, the “mapping exercise” in this chapter seeks to outline the nature of IR as it is professed (or, as Jarvis (2001: 374) likes to put it, “done”) in Britain, and, working westward, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. Since the professing of IR in these places is primarily conducted in the confines of universities, we look at IR under three main headings:

- The university setting for the professing of IR; in other words, the institutional sites in which IR is taught and researched.
- The professoriate, particularly the research interests of IR faculty and their scholarly training. Given the importance of the permanent professoriate for research, (post-)
graduate supervision, and undergraduate teaching, for each country we sought to identify all those who contribute to IR in one way or another. Since the vast majority of the universities offering International Relations programs of some sort have fully developed websites, much of the information about IR programs and the professoriate who offer them was taken from university websites, with follow-up information elicited from colleagues by email. We noted each scholar's research interests as outlined on their unit's website, or inferred it from their publications — though we acknowledge that it is not possible to identify these interests in precise tabular form. Because a scholar's epistemological and ontological approaches to the discipline are so heavily influenced by their (post)graduate education, we also noted the doctoral "pedigree" of each scholar. Our database includes 688 scholars: 319 in the UK, 15 in Ireland, 228 in Canada, 20 in New Zealand, and 106 in Australia.

- The institutions of IR research, including the primary scholarly associations, and the main journals for IR scholarship, on the grounds that journals are "the crucial institution of modern sciences" (Waever 1998: 697).

Three caveats should be entered. First, this chapter focuses on the professoriate and their research interests rather than on their actual research outputs or their teaching activities. A complete mapping of the terrain would require a detailed examination of the actual scholarship of the approximately 700 IR scholars in these four countries, including a characterization of methodologies and epistemologies and a listing of the scholarly outlets selected. It would also require a survey of how IR is actually taught at both the undergraduate and (post)graduate levels at universities in these locales by looking at course outlines/syllabi and the readings, particularly the textbooks (Nossal 2001), assigned to IR students.

Second, the portrait of IR in each of these places is a snapshot taken in 2006; the data are therefore approximate. Universities in most of the locales surveyed in this chapter are in the midst of a major rejuvenation in the ranks of the professoriate, with large-scale retirements and new hirings. Moreover, there will be grey areas. For example, we did not count emeritus or retired faculty. And with increasing "workforce dualization" (Barrow 1995; Nossal 2006) considerable teaching is being done by non-permanent and part-time academics who often do not show up on departmental web-pages.

Finally, our mapping exercise seeks to capture how IR is professed. We attempt to identify those who "do" IR - through their research interests, supervisory interests, or course teaching. The problem, of course, is that the boundaries between IR and other subdisciplines within political science, and between IR and other disciplines such as history, sociology, and international development studies, have grown increasingly blurred. The result is that a mapping exercise runs the risk of pigeon-holing scholars inappropriately — usually by excluding those whose statements of research, supervisory, or teaching interests understate the IR component.

The "Anglo" core: the United Kingdom

A great deal has been written about IR in the United Kingdom (see e.g. Suganami 1983; Holsti 1985; Smith 1985; Lyons 1986; Waever 1998; Crawford 2001; Little 2002; Kennedy-Pipe and Rengger 2006; Linklater and Suganami 2006, among many others), in particular its contribution to IR theory. These contributions are a key aspect of the evolution of the field itself. From what was eventually termed the English School through to the contemporary debates on post-positivist IR, one can trace a lineage of British scholarship that was, at least
in part, distinct from its American counterpart. IR’s first “great debate” between idealists and realists was clearly articulated in Carr’s The Twenty Years’ Crisis. Although commonly labeled a realist, Carr and his contemporaries like Wight spent a great deal of time considering the earlier works of Hobbes, Kant, and most importantly Grotius. Carr and Wight (as well as their followers like Hedley Bull and R.J. Vincent) may have shared certain assumptions with popular realists in the United States like Morgenthau, but the British scholars tended to pay more serious attention to the idea of an international society. Moreover, Carr in particular was well trained in the dialectical approach to social philosophy, and he, like many other English School scholars, was far less interested in an applied and “scientific” approach to understanding world politics than his (mostly later) American counterparts (Carr 1939, 1961).

During the Cold War era, the problem-solving emphasis of American realism could be closely linked to the foreign policy interests of the American state. In Britain, the societal aspects of the English School continued to be a more important component of IR approaches. By the time of IR’s second discipline-defining debate in the late 1960s that pitted behavioral approaches against those whose method of establishing “fact” was embedded in normative historical explanations, a fairly clear demarcation between (at least part of) the Anglo and American traditions was obvious (Smith and Hollis 1991; Buzan 1993). Many members of the English School (especially early members like Carr) were trained as historians, and most were skeptical of the utility of applied behavioralism when discussing such macro questions as those in world politics (Carr 1961).

Thus, the perceived limitations of realism as the dominant lens in IR fostered alternative approaches to realism, notably liberal and radical schools. These alternatives were not just about a different set of primary assumptions from the realist core of IR as described by Holsti and Banks in the 1980s; they were also further developments of the English School’s notion of international society (e.g. Bull 1977), or, in the case of Marxists, a structural system, and, most of the alternatives to realism also shared concerns about positivist/behavioral claims to truth (Banks 1985; Holsti 1985). Almost ironically, the rejection of realism became increasingly associated with a rejection of positivism/behavioralism in the wake of the “second debate.” The melding of realism and positivism/behavioralism was mostly (but not exclusively) an American enterprise (Waever 1997).

By the advent of neorealism in the 1980s (especially Waltz’s version of structural realism), the scientific method of positivism had become an integral aspect of neorealist assertions (Waltz 1979). Although there were varying degrees to which neorealists built on or used behavioral methods, Waltz’s claim that a good theory is only good to the extent to which it can accurately explain the “world as it is” was particularly difficult for many outside of the U.S. to accept. The idea that theory could be objective, or that IR theorists should aspire to be objective, flew in the face of an understanding of all theories as inherently political — whether intended or not. For an increasing number of scholars outside of the U.S., theoretical claims about the “world as it is” are a reflection of social context from which those claims are made, who is making the claims, and for what purpose. Such an understanding of theory came from a set of epistemological assumptions that were incommensurable with those of positivism. These two epistemological paradigms became the basis of IR’s “third debate” between positivism and dialectics (Heilbroner 1980). By the early 1990s, the relevance of the various versions of neorealism seemed to be seriously challenged by the end of the Cold War system. However, while neorealism itself did not disappear, the alternatives to realism and neorealism within the American academy (mainly liberal and later social constructivist approaches) had also become heavily enmeshed in a wider trend throughout American
political science towards problem-solving and positivist traditions. For Ricci, the "tragedy" of American political science was its preference for the scientific and applied aspects of IR; by contrast, the British tradition (along with many within English-speaking IR in Europe, Canada, Australasia, and elsewhere) was marked by a wider mistrust of the implied politics of the so-called attempts at theoretical and empirical objectivity (Ricci 1984). While this, of course, was not exclusively true in either case – there are many post-positivist IR scholars at work within the American academy, and many positivists at work within the British and other academies – one cannot deny that the roots of post-positivist IR are linked to the differences between the American and Anglo traditions. Our "mapping exercise" of the UK demonstrates these differences.

The university setting

Hoffmann claimed that IR was "born and raised in America" (1977: 60), but such a claim of paternity would not stand up well in a DNA test. Professorial chairs in International Relations and departments of international politics emerged in Britain long before IR emerged as a discipline in the United States. In 1919, a professorial chair at the University College of Wales at Aberystwyth was endowed as a memorial to those who had died in the Great War. This Woodrow Wilson Chair was intended to explore the causes of war and the conditions of peace in international politics, and around this Chair was organized the first Department of International Politics, with Alfred Zimmern as the Wilson Chair and Sydney Herbert as the first lecturer in the field. In 1920 the Stephenson Chair in International History was created at the University of London; in 1924 the Sir Ernest Cassel Chair in International Relations was created, with Philip Noel-Baker as its first incumbent. These chairs, together with a readership in international law, formed the basis of a new Department of International Studies that gave courses on international relations, diplomatic and international institutions, and inter-imperial relations of the British Empire. In 1924, Sir Montague Burton, owner of a tailoring firm which, inter alia, provided uniforms for the British army during World War II, endowed a professorship at Oxford University to give, in the words of the university's statutes, "instruction on the theory and practice of International Relations," and in 1930 gave the London School of Economics and Political Science a bequest to support Noel-Baker's professorship (Suganami 1983; Lyons 1986; Waever 1998: 709–712; Bauer and Brighi 2003).

These early developments had at least two lasting impacts on the evolution of IR in Britain. First, the establishment of specific chairs and institutes in the UK meant that IR as an academic discipline was in many instances institutionally insulated from larger departments of politics or political science. The early scholars of IR were often trained in the related disciplines of history, diplomacy, international law, or political philosophy (among others) and, as a result, they brought to the study of IR intellectual tools and traditions from their related fields of study. In most instances, behavioral and rational-choice methods were not the preferred means for making claims about the world as it was (or is).

The institutional isolationism that came with specific schools of IR also meant that the behavioral revolution which swept through the American academy in the 1950s and 1960s was far less prevalent in British IR. For those trained as social historians or those whose intellectual links were to debates in contemporary philosophy, applied behavioral methodologies seemed to be irrelevant to the key issues of IR. For some at least, IR's second great debate was less about a choice and more about an American flirtation with a method of particular use to policy-makers and think-tanks.
Second, IR in Britain was transformed by the rapid expansion of the university system over the course of the twentieth century—most recently by the "promotion" of a large number of polytechnics to universities. In particular, this has had the effect of dramatically increasing the size of the IR professoriate, and, as we will argue below, diversifying it.

Today, IR is taught at 65 of the UK's 89 universities. Whereas in the U.S. most IR teaching and research is lodged almost exclusively in departments of political science (or government), in Britain IR is professed in a variety of institutional settings. First, the historical legacy of the British origins of IR may be seen in the maintenance of separate departments, schools or centers of international politics (University College of Wales at Aberystwyth and City University) or International Relations (London School of Economics, St. Andrews, and Nottingham Trent). At 14 universities, IR is taught in departments or schools of politics, political studies, or government (only one university—Birmingham—has a "political science" department). The most common disciplinary unit is politics and the international: at 22 universities IR is taught in units of International Relations or international studies and government or politics. A number of universities have abandoned the departmentalized model that remains standard in North America, so that at many institutions IR is taught as a subject or a discipline within larger divisions, schools, or faculties that combine politics with cognate (and sometimes not-so-cognate) academic disciplines. At some universities, IR is conducted outside the rubric of politics or political studies altogether: at the University of Bradford, for example, the home of IR is in the Department of Peace Studies.

The professoriate

The "location" of IR within the British academy is crucial for the way in which the discipline is professed. As Wæver (1998: 710) put it, in Britain "IR is much less one-dimensionally defined as political science than is the case in the United States." This is certainly reflected in the research/teaching interests that may be identified for the 319 individuals in this study. While there are some scholars who list their primary interests in the IR subfields of security studies or British and/or American foreign policy, much larger numbers list interests in such areas as international political economy; IR theory of different kinds; critical studies; globalization; gender; and regional international relations. Moreover, the research interests of these scholars tend to be less applied and not so concerned with problem-solving. Most importantly, there are virtually no professors of IR in the British academy who embrace methodologies popular in American IR, such as rational choice or formal modeling.

Contrasting the working groups of the British International Studies Association with the various sections of the International Studies Association (see Table 16.1) shows not only the pattern of research interests in Britain, but also the degree to which research interests differ between the U.S. and the UK. While the ISA is markedly international for a scholarly organization based in the U.S.—in 2006, its 4,000 members came from approximately 70 countries—it is nonetheless dominated by scholars at U.S. universities, and is thus a useful reflection of research interests in American IR.

While there are many similarities between the sections of the two associations, there are also some notable differences. First, a large percentage of ISA sections (10 out of 23) deal with issues, or are dominated by research problems that tend to work within an applied, behavioral, rational-choice, or problem-solving way. By contrast, only about one-third of BISA's working groups deal with applied or problem-solving issues.

Second, ISA's sections are more closely tied to established university disciplines such as education, law, communication, and environmental studies, whereas BISA's sections are
organized more around the subfields of IR such as foreign policy and political economy. This may be a reflection of the fact that IR in the UK has had a more distant relationship from the wider field of political science.

However, perhaps the most striking difference between ISA and BISA is the inclusion in the ISA of highly specific applied research working groups such as those on the Scientific Study of International Processes and Active Learning in International Affairs. Although there is usually a higher percentage of American participants at the ISA’s annual conventions, a quick review of the program of ISA’s 2007 Chicago meeting (http://isanet.arts.arizona.edu/chicago2007) reveals that about 80 to 85 percent of those papers with titles indicating a “scientific” approach were given by scholars from American universities.

Finally, also notable is the absence of the kind of “neo-neo” positivist–rationalist research agenda (Waever 1997) that is so common among IR scholars in the U.S. Certainly the listing confirms the frequent observation that there is a marked absence of any indication of followers of rational choice or quantitative approaches at UK universities (Waever 1998; Jarvis 2001). Only at the University of Essex did we find an indication that scholars are pursuing the kind of IR research agenda which dominates American IR.

As Table 16.2 shows, the doctoral backgrounds of the UK scholars in this study are overwhelmingly domestic: 233, or 80 percent, received (or actively finished) their doctorate from a UK university; the percentage would be higher still if we added those 16 individuals who profess IR without a doctorate, since the vast majority of them have first or second degrees from UK universities. Only 8 percent have doctorates from American universities. (The remaining 12 percent have Ph.Ds from European, Australian, Canadian, and other universities.)
Table 16.2 IR scholars in the United Kingdom: country where doctorate granted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>79.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Europe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The institutions of IR research

As noted above, the main scholarly association for IR in the United Kingdom is BISA. Formed in 1975 to promote interaction and interchange between scholars professing International Relations, BISA holds an annual conference in December at universities around Britain (Kennedy-Pipe and Rengger 2006). It has an active membership of over 1,000: approximately 40 percent of BISA members are postgraduate students; approximately 10 to 12 percent of the membership are from outside the UK, mostly from Europe.

Mention should also be made of Chatham House, the premier international affairs think-tank in the UK. This organization emerged out of an initiative by members of the British and American delegations to the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 to create an Anglo-American Institute of International Affairs with branches in London and New York to discuss international issues and promote international peace. In the event, two national organizations emerged. While the British side of the institute was created quickly in 1920, by contrast, in the United States isolationism slowed the creation of the American branch of the organization. This meant that a joint organization, even with “close” foreigners like the British, was out of the question. As a result, an all-American Council on Foreign Relations was created in 1921. For its part, the Institute of International Affairs moved into the home of former British prime ministers, Chatham House, and received a royal charter in 1926 as the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Today, the organization is known simply as Chatham House. It has over 2,300 members and a considerable research operation overseen by International Relations scholars in their own right.

Journals widely regarded as the “leading” IR journals in Britain are Review of International Studies, the journal of BISA; Millennium, a student-run journal founded by LSE professor F.S. Northedge in 1971; International Affairs, the quarterly journal of Chatham House; and The Round Table: Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs, founded in 1910 and now published by Taylor & Francis and edited at the University of Kent. However, there are a large number of journals published by British publishing houses, and edited by scholars at UK universities, that could be added to this list. Most of these journals are more “diverse” in terms of their scholarship than comparable American IR journals. For example, Millennium and Review of International Studies routinely publish critical IR scholarship; by contrast, International Studies Quarterly, International Organization, and other leading American journals tend to be dominated by rational-choice, problem-solving scholarship.
The post-Imperial "non-core"

This section looks at the professing of IR in Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia. We follow the same format used in the case of the "Anglo core" by looking at general contributions to the field, followed by a survey of each country. Less has been written about contributions to IR from the "non-core" countries than has been written about the United Kingdom. This is not to say, however, that there have not been significant contributions made by Irish, Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand scholars – especially in regard to IR theory. Like the case of "Anglo" IR, the evolution of IR in these non-core countries has been a part of the evolution of the discipline itself. Any serious reading list on IR theory would likely include the works of Canadian and Australian scholars such as Kal Holsti or Hedley Bull. Although it has been common to bemoan Canadian IR as a miniature replica of American realist thought (Rioux et al. 1988: 57–58; Melakopides 1998: 14; Keeble and Smith 1999: 9–10), recently Canadian IR has come to be known theoretically for contributions to critical theory.

In his seminal and discipline-defining piece on IR’s "third debate," Lapid acknowledged that his call for more reflexive theorizing came out of his experiences as a visiting scholar to Canada in the late 1980s (Lapid 1989). At that time, Canadian-based neo-Gramscian and post-structural scholars like Robert W. Cox, Stephen Gill, and R.B.J. Walker were beginning to question the implications of a dominant form of theorization that was firmly rooted in an understanding that theory itself could be an objective reflection of the "world as it is" (Cox 1987; Gill 1993; Walker 1993; Cox and Sinclair 1996). In the wake of Lapid’s call for methodological and theoretical pluralism (a pluralism that included space for critical and reflexive approaches that claimed all theory to be inherently political), a number of scholars in Canada sought to redefine the critical school (e.g. Cox 1987; Gill 1993; Walker 1993; Sjolander and Cox 1994; Whitworth 1994; Neufeld 1995). Indeed, by the mid-1990s, so many critical scholars in Canada had embraced a neo-Gramscian perspective that in 1995 Steve Smith referred to the "Canadian–Italian" school of International Relations (Smith 1995).

As in Canada, there was a marked transformation in the IR community in Australia and New Zealand in the 1990s. While the Australian contribution to the English School in the 1960s and the 1970s was very much in the realist tradition, by the 1990s this had changed dramatically. In 1987 Kubalkova and Cruickshank might have been criticizing Australian IR for its tendency "to peddle Eurpeocentrism of whatever variety," and calling for an "authentic Australian voice" in the global conversation on IR (Kubalkova and Cruickshank 1987: 118). But in the 1990s, a number of Australian and New Zealand students of IR established themselves as contributors in their own right to global IR theory (e.g. Campbell 1992; Linklater 1992; George 1994; Pettman 1996; and, in New Zealand, True 1996, 2006). Importantly, all of these Australasian voices were writing IR from a critical perspective. For our purposes here, it is interesting to note that while the American IR research paradigm has evolved into a research tradition that values problem-solving approaches, those approaches that are "Anglo" non-core have clear ties to (and in some cases are at the leading edge of) those non-positivist, non-rationalist, and often critical perspectives that one sees in the UK.

Ireland

Ireland has eight universities: Dublin City University; the University of Limerick; National University of Ireland, Galway; National University of Ireland, Maynooth; Trinity College Dublin; University College Dublin; University of Dublin; and University College Cork.
While an undergraduate program in politics is offered at all universities, at two universities (NUI Galway and NUI Maynooth) politics is taught in conjunction with sociology, but at neither university is there a full-time permanent faculty member in IR.

In the other six universities there are 15 scholars of IR teaching in departments or schools of political science (Trinity College Dublin), government (University College Cork), government and law (Dublin City), and politics and public administration (Limerick). Only at University College Dublin is IR taught in a School of Politics and International Relations. The research interests of the 15 scholars of IR include: Irish foreign policy, European Union security, IR theory, IPE, and globalization. Fully 80 percent of these scholars received their doctorates from Irish or UK universities; only 6.7 percent had degrees from U.S. universities.

The Political Studies Association of Ireland (PSAI) provides the main organizational network for political scientists in Ireland, holding an annual conference in October and a postgraduate conference each spring. It maintains seven specialist groups, including an International Relations and Area Studies Specialist Group and the Democratization, Conflict and Peace Studies Specialist Group. PSAI’s peer-reviewed journal, *Irish Political Studies*, tends to publish research on domestic Irish politics. Research on IR may be found in *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, published by the Royal Irish Academy and its National Committee for the Study of International Affairs, a scholarly and general interest forum for the discussion of international affairs in Ireland. This journal, published annually, contains scholarship concerned not only with Irish foreign policy, but also with broader issues of international relations.

**Canada**

IR is taught at virtually all of Canada’s 50 universities. Canadian universities remain heavily departmentalized, not having (yet) been affected by the academic managerialism that has almost entirely “de-departmentalized” the Australian academy (see below). As in the United States, IR in Canada is overwhelmingly professed in departments of political science (or political studies, or politics): the only Department of International Studies is at University of Northern British Columbia, where it exists alongside the Department of Political Science; and the only exclusively international affairs department is to be found at the graduate level, the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA) at Carleton University. Doctoral programs in IR are offered at 18 universities: Alberta, British Columbia, Calgary, Carleton, Concordia, Dalhousie, Laval, McGill, McMaster, Montréal, Ottawa, UQAM (Université du Québec à Montréal), Queen’s, Royal Military College, Simon Fraser, Toronto, Western Ontario, and York.

A total of 228 full-time/permanent scholars were identified as doing IR in Canada, a marked increase since the late 1990s when Porter (2001: 139) identified 188 full-time IR scholars for his survey. Among the most mentioned research interests are: international relations theory, international political economy, Canadian foreign policy, globalization, and global governance. There is a notable absence of interest (and expertise) in the Canadian academy in many of the methods of IR found in the American academy: rational choice, game theory, formal modeling, or quantitative methods.

This is perhaps particularly surprising given the number of Canadian IR scholars who received their doctoral training in the United States. As Table 16.3 shows, of the 225 scholars with doctorates, nearly 30 percent have doctorates from American universities. However, it should be noted that there has been a particular pattern in the recruitment of individuals with Ph.Ds from U.S. universities: of the 66 scholars with U.S. doctorates, 10 are at francophone
universities, and 20 are concentrated at only three English-speaking universities: the University of British Columbia, the University of Toronto, and McGill University. While the departments at UBC, Toronto, and McGill do not exclusively recruit IR scholars with American doctorates – 10 of the 30 IR scholars in the three departments have non-American doctorates – an examination of recruiting patterns over the past three decades suggests that these departments generally hire candidates with an American doctorate in a way not seen at other Canadian universities (Nossal 2000).

The primary associational outlets for IR research are the ISA meetings, the annual meetings of the Canadian Political Science Association, and the Société québécoise de science politique. Graduate students in IR tend to gravitate to the CPSA meetings; to the Colloque de la recherche étudiante en science politique (CRESP), an annual bilingual meeting run by the Société Québécoise de Science Politique involving graduate students from Québec, Ontario and New England. In 2004, Canadian IR scholars formed themselves into a separate region of ISA; there are approximately 250 members of ISA-Canada, which holds its annual regional meeting in conjunction with the CPSA meetings.

There are five main Canadian journals for IR scholarship. The *Canadian Journal of Political Science* (CJPS), the journal of the Canadian Political Science Association, publishes articles in both English and French. While CJPS is primarily an outlet for students of Canadian politics, the journal also publishes IR scholarship. The quarterly journal of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, formed in 1928 on the model of Chatham House, is the *International Journal*. It is peer-reviewed and edited by university-based scholars. *Canadian Foreign Policy* is a peer-reviewed journal published by the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton University, and, as its title suggests, focuses on scholarship in Canadian foreign policy. *Studies in Political Economy* is a peer-reviewed interdisciplinary journal, also published at Carleton University, which since 1979 has provided scholars who work in the traditions of socialist political economy with an outlet for their research. IR scholarship in French appears in *Études Internationales*, published by the Institut québécois des hautes études internationales at Université Laval in Québec City. The *Revue Politique et Sociétés*, the peer-reviewed journal of the Société Québécoise de Science Politique, is not dissimilar to the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* in that it tends to focus on Québec/Canadian politics, comparative politics, and political theory rather than IR (though there have been issues on North American integration and post-Cold War foreign policy).

**Australia**

Of the 38 universities in Australia 30 teach politics or international relations. Nearly all Australian universities have “de-departmentalized” their teaching, locating political science as
"disciplines" or "areas" within larger units, usually schools or faculties. As in Britain, a number of universities have combined government/politics with International Relations/studies (Deakin, Flinders, Macquarie, New England, New South Wales, Queensland, Sunshine Coast, Sydney, and Western Australia).

There is one major dedicated department of International Relations in Australia. The Department of International Relations at Australian National University (ANU) has been a long-standing site of “production” of IR theory, dating back to the 1960s, when Bull was a professor in the department. In 1977, he moved to Oxford as the Montague Burton Professor of International Relations; likewise, Vincent, another leading “English School” scholar, completed his Ph.D. in the ANU department before moving to the UK, as the Montague Burton Professor of International Relations at the London School of Economics. In addition to the DIR, IR is also offered at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels in the School of Social Sciences in the Faculty of Arts.

The Ph.D. in IR is offered at a number of universities, including Adelaide, ANU, Deakin, Flinders, LaTrobe, Melbourne, Monash, Murdoch, New South Wales, Queensland, Sydney, Tasmania, and Wollongong. However, ANU enjoys a major position in the Australian academy: nearly 40 percent (26 out of 67) of Australians currently teaching IR have doctorates from the ANU.

A total of 106 IR scholars in Australia was identified; five do not have doctorates. Of the remaining 101, 67 (66.3 percent) have doctorates from Australian universities. A further 20 scholars have doctoral degrees from the UK; fewer than 10 percent have doctorates from American universities (see Table 16.4).

While Australian IR scholars identify an array of research interests, the most frequently mentioned is IR theory, with many indicating a non-realist/anti-realist orientation, confirming the conclusion of observers like Higgott and George in the early 1990s that the English School realism of the 1960s and the 1970s was increasingly being challenged by alternative approaches, particularly critical theory and international political economy (Higgott and George 1990; Higgott 1991). Australian foreign policy is the next most frequently mentioned, followed by international political economy and security issues of different sorts. As in other locales surveyed in this chapter, there is little evidence of interest in rationalist approaches to IR.

While many IR scholars routinely attend the annual meetings of the ISA, there are two major indigenous locations for the presentation of IR research. One is the IR stream of the annual meetings of the Australasian Political Studies Association. The other is the biennial Oceania Conference on International Studies, designed to be a forum for the presentation of research from Australia, New Zealand, and the South Pacific. Inaugurated in 2004 by the

| Table 16.4 IR scholars in Australia: country where doctorate granted |
|-------------------|--------|------|
| Country           | No.    | %    |
| Australia         | 67     | 66.3 |
| UK                | 20     | 19.8 |
| U.S.              | 9      | 8.9  |
| Canada            | 3      | 3.0  |
| Other             | 2      | 2.0  |
| Totals            | 101    | 100.0|
Department of International Relations at ANU, OCIS meetings were held at the University of Melbourne in 2006 and at the University of Queensland in 2008.

There are three major scholarly journals for IR research published in Australia. The *Australian Journal of Political Science* is a peer-reviewed journal published by the Australasian Political Studies Association; while most of its articles focus on aspects of Australian politics, IR research is also published. The *Australian Journal of International Affairs* is published by the Australian Institute of International Affairs, created in 1933 on the model of Chatham House and the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. Published since 1946, and edited by university professors at the ANU, it provides an outlet for both scholarly and policy-relevant studies on IR. The *Australian Journal of Politics and History* also publishes scholarship on international politics, Australian foreign policy, and Australian relations with the Asia-Pacific region.

**New Zealand**

IR is taught at six of the eight universities in New Zealand: Auckland, Canterbury, Otago, Massey, Victoria University of Wellington, and Waikato. We identified 20 IR scholars whose research interests are dominated by IR theory (with eight scholars mentioning this as their primary research interest), and foreign policy and security coming in at second place.

Unlike other locales surveyed in this chapter, there is no dominant doctoral pedigree of IR scholars in New Zealand: rather, Ph.D. backgrounds are almost evenly divided between New Zealand (15 percent), Australia (25 percent), the UK (25 percent), the U.S. (20 percent), and Canada and South Africa (15 percent).

The Australasian Political Studies Association and the Oceanic Conference on International Studies are the main venues for the presentation of IR research – other than local conferences and the International Studies Association annual meetings. New Zealand also has an Institute of International Affairs. Founded in 1934, the NZIA is affiliated with the Victoria University of Wellington. It publishes the *New Zealand International Review*, which is a bimonthly magazine rather than a scholarly journal. The School of Political Science and International Relations at Victoria University of Wellington publishes *AntePodium*, the world’s first online academic journal (http://www.vuw.ac.nz/atp/). *AntePodium* is self-consciously anti-mainstream: its website calls for contributions that will develop “critical, subversive, and innovative theoretical approaches to the study of world affairs.”

**Analysis**

How can we explain the patterns of IR outlined above? Our focus is on the proximate rather than the underlying causes at work in the academy in each of these countries. We argue that the *proximate* cause lies in the sociology of the contemporary academy, and particularly in the distinctive patterns of academic social reproduction in the academy in each of these locales. Of considerable importance are the hundreds of hiring decisions that, in the aggregate, give shape to the academy and to how IR is professed. But each hiring decision is a microcosmic exercise in the privileging of some epistemological and methodological approaches, and the rejection of other approaches.

**Staffing and the social reproduction of IR**

Where scholars receive their doctoral training will have a marked impact on both teaching and research. Our data suggest that in all the locales surveyed in this chapter, there has been
a tendency to staff IR positions with those who have received their doctoral training “in
country,” though this varies considerably, as Table 16.5 shows.

British universities are most inclined to hire those with indigenous Ph.Ds and least inclined
to hire those with U.S. doctorates. In the case of Australia, Canada, Ireland, and New
Zealand, there has been a progressive abandonment of the practices of their Imperial pasts,
born of necessity when universities were being replicated in Imperial possessions, of hiring
those with degrees from universities in the Imperial center. In the past, these were either
locals who had traveled to the Imperial center for higher education and returned “home” to
teach, or those from the Imperial center who moved to the “colonies” (or who were induced
to take up positions there by favorable tax regimes’).

In both Ireland and New Zealand there is still a reliance on foreign Ph.Ds, a function in part
of the small size of the academy in both of those countries. By contrast, in both Australia
and Canada we have seen a growing abandonment of reliance on the imperial center/center
and a growing “Canadianization” and “Australianization” of IR.

In Canada, Nossal (2000) has shown that Canadian IR has been increasingly
“Canadianized” over the past 30 years. However, Canada does still have the largest concen-
tration of U.S. Ph.Ds within its professoriate (at nearly one-third), and as discussed, these
are highly concentrated within three of its larger departments. On pedigree alone, McGill,
Toronto, and UBC are the most “Americanized” Canadian departments of political science.
It is not coincidental that the largest centers of critical and “alternative” IR are found in more
diversified departments, such as York, Carleton, Laval, Simon Fraser, and UQAM, among
others. At the same time however, with a large number of Ph.D.-granting institutions in IR
and a large cohort of graduate students and recently completed Ph.Ds entering the system, the
tradition of a distinct and often less “applied” approach to IR in Canada remains healthy, with
a large number of scholars committed to contributing to broader IR debates globally.

The survey here suggests that the same trend is occurring even more robustly in Australia.8
Two-thirds of those who profess IR in Australia have indigenous Ph.Ds, and their
research interests and publications tend to focus, as noted above, on international political
economy and critical approaches, as a survey of the 2004 and 2006 Oceanic Conferences on
International Studies suggests.9 While Australian IR theorizing, like Canadian or British
theorizing, does not appear to have made an impact in the U.S., there appears to be consid-
erable cross-fertilization between and among academics in the five countries surveyed in this
chapter.

In the “Anglo” core, by contrast, we have not seen a similar trend towards a “Britishization”
of IR, since the vast majority of those professing IR in the UK have always been UK-educated.
So while the “Anglo” core has sustained (and reproduced) itself as primarily Anglo, one would

---

### Table 16.5 IR scholars in the Anglo core and the post-imperial non-core

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population (millions)</th>
<th>Universities</th>
<th># IR scholars identified</th>
<th>% IR scholars with indigenous Ph.Ds</th>
<th>% IR scholars with U.S. Ph.Ds</th>
<th>% IR scholars with other Ph.Ds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
suspect that those differing approaches to the study of IR that have been so strong within the British research and literature will remain distinct from those in the “American” core. It is likely that the close research and paradigmatic relationship between British, Irish, Canadian, and Australian critical post-positivist perspectives will continue. Certainly an examination of a BISA conference program (for example, http://www.bisa.ac.uk/2006/index.htm), or a glance at the topics in publications like Millennium or Review of International Studies demonstrates the extent to which there is a clear demarcation at the level of epistemological assumptions between the “Anglo”/British and “American” cores in IR.

In this sense, the British “core” reproduces itself in exactly the same way as the American “core”: American political science departments are almost completely staffed by scholars who have Ph.Ds from American universities. As American IR has evolved an increasingly unique worldview, with its own preferences for methodologies that are deemed relevant to the core (rational choice, behavioral, positivist, policy relevant, some would argue theoretical, or at very least a-historical, and decidedly empirical), the rift between the “Anglo” and “American” cores of IR is often perpetuated by parochial hiring practices. In keeping with Kuhn’s notion of a research paradigm, each of these increasingly independent “research communities” has been perpetuating itself, while the common epistemological and methodological preferences within the “crimson world” have resulted in more national cross-fertilization than happens in the case of the “American” core and the outside world.

But as universities in the “non-core” progressively abandon what in Australia is called “colonial cringe” – the almost fawning reverence for the “product” of the core and a concomitant self-deprecation of indigenous “product” – and more like the British and American “cores” – i.e., to increasingly hire those with indigenous Ph.Ds – we are likely to see an acceleration of the second major development we identify in this chapter: the divide between the United States and others.

The crimson divide

The survey in this chapter confirms what many others have argued: that there is a considerable divide between IR as it is professed in the American academy and IR as it is professed in these countries. First, some of the dominant approaches in the United States academy – rational choice, quantitative methods, formal modeling – are simply not found in the “crimson world,” a cultural/anthropological oddity given the number of “products” of the American academy who teach in the locales surveyed in this chapter. This, however, merely entrenches the trend noted above: without individuals on staff to reproduce those approaches, Ph.D. programs in the “non-core” will tend to graduate those who are not familiar with, or sympathetic towards, those “American” approaches.

Second, it is true that the American academy remains an important referent for the academy in the non-core. For example, publishing in a leading American journal is still widely perceived to be a mark of scholarly excellence, particularly by those higher up the academic food chain who like any measure that allows them to claim that their institution is “world-class” in the various bean-counting exercises that are deeply entrenched in the contemporary academy. Likewise, some “theoretical products” of the American academy tend to be “consumed” by those outside the United States more eagerly than others: consider the degree to which constructivism has been embraced in the academy in Britain, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand and the degree to which rational choice is actively shunned.

Moreover, it is also important to note that the research interests listed by those who are teaching and researching IR in the locales surveyed in this chapter strongly suggest that the
The theoretical product of the American academy in IR is frequently used in a largely negative way: referred to in order to be criticized and rejected in favor of different, and distinctly non-American, perspectives. As Jarvis notes, "the would-be challengers to positivist-rationalist-based epistemologies derive almost universally from non-American pedigrees. British, European, Canadian and Australian theorists have been the originators and driving force of most of these alternative perspectives" (Jarvis 2001: 373). The survey in this chapter confirms this, to the extent that we can infer theoretical perspectives from research interests and publications.

**Conclusion: implications for the hegemony of American IR**

It is often argued that American IR is hegemonic, and that theoretical and methodological fashions in the U.S. dominate academic discourse and fashion in other parts of the world. Likewise, it is often argued that American journals of IR remain the "gold standard" no matter where in the world one professes IR. Yet, as Wæver noted almost a decade ago, global IR was fragmenting into a "not so international discipline." He predicted that the result is likely to be a slow drift from a pattern with only one professional and coherent national market – the United States, and the rest of the world more or less peripheral or disconnected – toward a relative American abdication and larger academic communities forming around their own independent cores... in short, the "de-Americanization of IR".

(Wæver 1998: 726)

The "divide" identified in this chapter confirms not only Wæver's prediction of greater pluralism in IR, but also his argument that we would see the progressive de-Americanization of IR. The hiring practices in both the American academy itself and those locales surveyed in this chapter suggest that, as IR becomes increasingly nationalized, and nationally self-reproducing, the gulf between American IR and the way in which IR is professed outside the United States will deepen and widen.

Moreover, academic-reproductive feedback mechanisms are likely to entrench these trends. First, as hirings of those with indigenous Ph.D.s increase, the attraction of going to the U.S. for the doctorate will diminish. This, in turn, is likely to cause a diminution in the "colonial cringe" that has historically privileged American Ph.D.s over indigenous doctorates. Second, as the paranoia that washed across the U.S. after 9/11 has made it increasingly difficult for all foreigners to attend American universities, the number of International Relations Ph.D.s trained in the U.S. will diminish, and reduce further the transmission of American methodologies and epistemologies abroad. By the same token, it is likely that more and more students seeking to go abroad for a doctorate in IR will end up in one of the countries surveyed in this chapter. These students are likely to be exposed to an IR that is highly critical of problem-solving approaches; that does not have a central security focus; that is more skeptical of the dominant, or hegemonic, role played by actors such as the U.S.; and that tends towards a worldview of systemic or structural subordination.

Third, this will entrench the absence of certain methodological and epistemological practices that are already noticeable. The almost complete absence of IR scholars in the locales surveyed in this chapter who do rational choice, formal modeling, or quantitative methods is a stark reminder that the jeremiads about American hegemony in IR simply have it wrong. And since virtually no IR doctoral program in Australia, Britain, or Canada teaches
methodologies like rational choice or formal modeling in a positive way, it is likely that these are methodologies and epistemologies that will become increasingly more Americo-centric.

Likewise, although the theoretical “production” of the American IR “core” will likely continue to be consumed by those in the non-core, that production is less and less likely to be persuasive to non-American scholars of IR, particularly as other sites of scholarly “production” become more accepted as a “gold standard” in their own right. Certainly, as *International Studies Quarterly and International Organization* have become less accessible to scholars who do not employ certain methodologies, and thus less relevant, it is likely that their “value” in non-American eyes will diminish, and other publication outlets will acquire increased value as a place in which to publish.

In short, the hegemonic position of American IR has been seriously challenged by the way in which IR has been “done” in the Anglo core and the post-Imperial non-core in the past decade. IR as it is professed in these countries will never supplant American IR – the American academy is too vast, too self-referential, and too Americo-centric. But our survey of the professoriate in Britain, Ireland, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia strongly suggests that the days of American hegemony in IR are already gone.

Notes

1 As Little (1995), Dunne (1998), and Linklater and Saganami (2006: 12–42) note, the “English School” of IR is similarly misnamed, given the non-English roots of so many of its primary exponents.

2 In Canadian usage, “anglo” – uncapitalized – is both a noun and an adjective for “English-speaking.”

3 Although we follow Wallerstein (1976) in seeking to identify a “core,” we categorize other places as “non-core” rather than trying to identify the semiperiphery or periphery. See Crawford 2001: 240, n1; Jarvis 2001: 369.

4 R.B.J. Walker (interview, February 25 2004) noted that when Richard Ashley was co-editing *International Studies Quarterly* in the 1980s, an active group of critical theorists was working in American political science departments; by the early 2000s, however, many had moved to departments of history, philosophy, and sociology; indeed, some had left the U.S. altogether. Many were no longer publishing in IR journals but in journals of comparative politics, development studies and post-colonialism, critical social geography and history, contemporary philosophy, and sociology.

5 The approach used in this volume is, of course, just one way of understanding the process of intellectual hegemony. For one of many possible alternatives, see Agnew 2007.

6 While the approaches used by some scholars may be inferred from titles of books and articles, not all faculty members identify their preferred approach. In addition, some professors list more than one research interest.

7 For example, Canada staffed a massive expansion of its university system in the 1960s by negotiating a “tax holiday” with the U.S. Internal Revenue Service for U.S. academics who took positions at Canadian universities.

8 See Jarvis (2001: 374), who claimed that 70 percent of recent IR hires in Australia’s seven research-intensive universities had non-Australian degrees.
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