

**INR 6337 SECTION 096G – UF – FALL 2014  
SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

Prof. Badredine Arfi

Office: Anderson Hall 221

Phone: (352) 273 2357

Time: R 2-4 periods

Place: Conference Room AND 216 and sometimes TUR 2303

Email: [barfi@ufl.edu](mailto:barfi@ufl.edu)

Office hours: Tuesdays 11:00am-12:00p.m. and 1:00-2:00pm; Thursdays 1:00-2:00pm

**COURSE DESCRIPTION**

This course is designed as a focused/limited introductory survey to a variety of approaches and topics in the study of international security. The rationale for the course's teaching strategy is rooted in a concern about the slow evolution and stagnation of traditional security studies. It has unfortunately become a "fact of life" in the study of international relations (IR) and international security (IS) that IR/IS courses would normally be expected to begin by spending a number of weeks "recycling" different brands or variations of realist, (neo-)liberal, and mainstream (thin) constructivist thinking, etc. This course simply does not follow that path. Therefore, as a way of alerting students to these lingering issues as well as equipping them with effective tools which they will definitely find useful as future scholars dealing with IR/IS issues, this course focuses on the value-added of many bodies of literature in IR and how they have been reflected specifically in thinking about security. Overall *Security Studies* as a discipline has evolved into a collection of approaches, most (if not all) of which are united by a profound dissatisfaction with so-called traditional security studies by constantly questioning the foundations upon which the dominant state-centrism and military-centrism of security is built and the lack of attention to a much broader definition of security. The course thus seeks to explicate key assumptions underpinning some of these approaches as well as exploring just how and in what ways they challenge traditional security studies, and in what ways they compare and contrast with each other. The course does this using an issues-based strategy so that we simultaneously consider these issues and how various theoretical approaches and schools of IR theory investigate them.

**WORK REQUIREMENTS**

- Students are required to "digest" thoroughly the week's readings before coming to class and thus come prepared to fully discuss the readings in depth and share their insights with the rest of the class.
- Each student is required to write weekly 4-5 page reaction papers. The papers are to be emailed to the instructor on Wednesday 1:00-8:00pm. Each paper must focus on a particular question relevant to one or more of the readings. Try to develop a puzzling question rather than summarize the readings.
- Each student is required to make presentations and lead the subsequent discussion for the first hour of class on the topics addressed in one of his/her weekly reaction papers. The student making the presentation should email the reaction paper (which can go up to 8 pages) to the class on Wednesday 1:00-8:00pm. The remaining students are required to read it before class and come prepared to raise issues from it in the class discussion ensuing from the presentation.

- Students are required to take one final examination. The exam is intended as a “real” practice for the international security comprehensive exam. As such, the format will mimic the comprehensive exam as much as possible. It will be a take-home exam with one question. The answer should be between 2,000 and 2,500 words.
- Students are required to write a 15-20 page research paper on a topic of international security of their choice. Please see details down below.

### GRADING POLICY

- Presenting report and leading the ensuing discussion: 10% of the final grade.
- Weekly papers: 30% of the final grade.
- Final examination: 30% of the final grade.
- Research paper: 30% of the final grade

Note: Late papers or exams will not be accepted.

### REQUIRED READINGS

1. McSweeney, Bill. 1999. Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations. Cambridge University Press.
2. Finnemore, Martha. 2003. The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force. Cornell University Press.
3. Solingen, Etel. 2007. Nuclear Logics: Contrasting Paths in East Asia and the Middle East. Princeton University Press.
4. Articles posted in Sakai (organized by week).

### SPECIFICS ON THE RESEARCH PAPER

In order for the instructor to provide guidance in the preparation of the paper, you will be required to turn in various brief intermediate papers throughout the semester.

#### Each student must:

1. Define a research question that interests him/her and that applies a security approach (broadly speaking) from the materials covered in this course. Submit the research question and an abstract. **Date: September 11**
2. Submit a 2-3 page summary of the proposed research and expected results. **Date: September 25**
3. Submit a 6-8 page paper discussing the relevant literature to the research question (empirical as well as theoretical). **Date: October 23**
4. The final paper should be 15-20 pages long, including the bibliography. **Date: December 4**

**IMPORTANT NOTES:**

- The instructor reserves the right to change any part or aspect of this document should a need for doing so emerge at any point in time during the semester.
- Students requesting classroom accommodation for disabilities must register with the Dean of Students Office and provide documentation from this office.
- All students are required to abide by UF standards of academic honesty laid out in the Student Honor Code, posted at <http://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conduct-honor-code/>

**HOLIDAYS**

<b>University Holidays - no classes</b>	<b>September 1: Labor Day</b> <b>October 17-18: Homecoming</b> <b>November 11: Veterans Day</b> <b>November 26-29: Thanksgiving break</b>
---	--

## WEEKLY READING ASSIGNMENTS AND OUTLINE OF THE COURSE

---

### Week 1 / August 28: What Is Security? Part I

1. Walt, Stephen. 1991. The Renaissance of Security Studies. International Studies Quarterly 35 (2): 211-239.
2. David A. Baldwin. 1997. The Concept of Security. Review of International Studies 23: 5-26.
3. Huysmans, Jef. 1998. Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier. European Journal of International Relations 4 (2): 226-255.
4. Eriksson, Johan. 1999. Observers or Advocates? On the Political Role of Security Analysts Cooperation and Conflict 34 (3): 311-330.

### Week 2/ September 4: What is Security? Part II.

1. Liotta, P. H. 2000. Through the Looking Glass: Creeping Vulnerabilities and the Reordering of Security. Security Dialogue 36 (1): 49-70.
2. Beier, J. Marshall and Samantha L. Arnold. 2005. Becoming Undisciplined: Toward the Supradisciplinary Study of Security. International Studies Review 7: 41-61.
3. Krahnemann, Elke. 2008. Security: Collective Good or Commodity? European Journal of International Relations 14 (3): 379-404.
4. Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 2006. The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies. Review of International Studies 32: 329-352.

### Week 3/ September 11: Logics of Rational Might and Stories

1. Glaser, Charles. 1994-95. Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help. International Security 19 (Winter): 50-90.
2. Walt, Stephen M. 1999. Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies. International Security 23 (4): 5-48.
3. Tang, Shiping. 2009. The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis. Security Studies 18 (3): 587-623.
4. Kim, Tongfi. 2011. Why Alliance Entangle but Seldom Entrap States. Security Studies 20 (3): 350-377.
5. Suganami, Hidemi. 1997. Stories of War Origins: A Narrativist Theory of the Causes of War. Review of International Studies 23: 401-418.
6. Atkinson, Carol. 2006. Constructivist Implications of Material Power: Military Engagement and the Socialization of States, 1972-2000. International Studies Quarterly 50: 509-537.

### Week 4/ September 18: Terrorism

1. Pape, Robert A. 2003. The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism. American Political Science Review 97 (3): 343-361.
2. Kydd, Andrew H. and Barbara Walter. 2006. Strategies of Terrorism. International Security 31 (1): 49-80.
3. Bankoff, Greg. 2003. Regions of Risk: Western Discourses on Terrorism and the Significance of Islam. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism 26: 413-428.
4. Moghadam, Assaf. 2006. Suicide Terrorism, Occupation, and the Globalization of Martyrdom: A Critique of Dying to Win. Studies in Conflict and Terrorism 29 (8): 707-729.

5. Piazza, James A. 2008. Incubators of Terror? Do Failed and Failing States Promote Transnational Terrorism. International Studies Quarterly 52 (3): 469-488.
6. Jordan, Jenna. 2009. When Heads Roll: Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership Decapitation. Security Studies 18 (4): 719-755.
7. Horowitz, Michael C. 2010. Nonstate Actors and the Diffusion of Innovations: The Case of Suicide Terrorism. International Organization 64 (1): 33-64.
8. Chowdhury, Arjun and Ronald R. Krebs. 2010. Talking about Terror: Counterterrorist Campaigns and the Logic of Representation. European Journal of International Relations 16 (1): 125-150.

### **Week 5/ September 25: Security Institutions**

1. Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan. 1995. The Promise of Collective Security. International Security 20 (1): 52-61.
2. Alagappa, Muthiah. 1997. Regional Institutions, the UN and International Security: A Framework for Analysis. Third World Quarterly 18 (3): 421- 441.
3. Bøås, Morten. 2000. Security Communities: Whose Security? Cooperation and Conflict 35 (3): 309-319.
4. Lake, David A. 2001. Beyond Anarchy: The Importance of Security Institutions. International Security 26 (1): 129-160.
5. Pouliot, Vincent. 2008. The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities. International Organization 62 (2): 257-288.

### **Week 6/ October 2: Identity, Culture, and Security**

1. McSweeney, Bill. 2004. Security, Identity and Interests: A Sociology of International Relations. Cambridge University Press.
2. Hoogensen, Gunhild and Svein Vigeland Rottem. 2004. Gender Identity and the Subject of Security. Security Dialogue 35 (2): 155-171.
3. Farrell, Theo. 2005. World Culture and Military Power. Security Studies 14 (3): 448-488.
4. Mitzen, Jennifer. 2006. Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma. European Journal of International Relations 12 (3): 341-370.

### **Week 7/ October 9: Securitization**

1. Balzacq, Thierry. 2005. The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context. European Journal of International Relations 11 (2): 171-201.
2. Williams, Michael C. 2003. Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics. International Studies Quarterly 47: 511-531.
3. McDonald, Matt. 2008. Securitization and the Construction of Security. European Journal of International Relations 14 (4): 563-587.
4. Stritzel, Holger. 2007. Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. European Journal of International Relations 13 (3): 357-383.
5. Behnke, Andreas. 2000. The Message or the Messenger? Reflections on the Role of Security Experts and the Securitization of Political Issues. Cooperation and Conflict 35 (1): 89-105.
6. Hansen, Lene. 2000. The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School. Millennium - Journal of International Studies 29 (2): 289-306.

### **Week 8/ October 16: Human Security – Part I**

1. Paris, Roland. 2001. Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? International Security 26 (2): 87-102.
2. Newman, Edward. 2001. Human Security and Constructivism. International Studies Perspectives 2: 239-251.
3. Hoogensen, Gunhild & Kirsti Stuvøy. 2006. Gender, Resistance and Human Security. Security Dialogue 37 (2): 207-228.
4. Chandler, David. 2008. Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 427-438.
  - a. Wibben, Annick T. R. 2008. Human Security: Toward an Opening. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 455-462.
  - b. Ambrosetti, David. 2008. Human Security as Political Resource: A Response to David Chandler's 'Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark'. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 439-444.
  - c. Owen, Taylor. 2008. The Critique That Doesn't Bite: A Response to David Chandler's 'Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark'. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 445-453.
5. Newman, Edward. 2010. Critical Human Security Studies. Review of International Studies 36 (1): 77-94.
6. Christie, Ryerson. 2010. Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique? Security Dialogue 41 (2): 169-190.
7. Tzifakis, Nikolaos. 2011. Problematizing Human Security: A General/Contextual Conceptual Approach. Southeast European and Black Sea Studies 11 (4): 353-368
8. Owens, Patricia. 2012. Human Security and the Rise of the Social. Review of International Studies 38: 547-567.

### **Week 9/ October 23: Human Security – Part II**

1. Thomas, Caroline. 2001. Global Governance, Development and Human security: Exploring the Links. Third World Quarterly 22 (2): 159-175.
2. Kerr, Pauline, William T. Tow, and Marianne Hanson. 2003. The Utility of the Human Security Agenda for Policymakers. Asian Journal of Political Science 11 (2): 89-114.
3. Kaldor, Mary, Mary Martin, and Sabine Selchow. 2007. Human Security: A New Strategic Narrative for Europe. International Affairs 83 (2): 273-288.
4. Kim, Sung Won. 2010. Human Security with an Asian Face? Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 17 (1): 83-103.
5. De Larrinaga, Miguel & Marc G. Doucet. 2008. Sovereign Power and the Biopolitics of Human Security. Security Dialogue 39 (5): 517-537.
6. Martin, Mary and Taylor Owen. 2010. The Second Generation of Human Security: Lessons from the UN and EU Experience. International Affairs 86 (1): 211-224.
7. Kurusu, Kaoru. 2011. Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms: The Political Dynamism Behind the Acceptance and Promotion of "Human Security". Asia-Pacific Review 18 (2): 115-137.
8. Peterson, Jenny H. 2013. Creating Space for Emancipatory Human Security: Liberal Obstructions and the Potential of Agonism. International Studies Quarterly 57: 318-328.

### **Week 10/ October 30: Logic of Nuclear (In)Security**

1. Solingen, Etel. 2007. Nuclear Logics: Contrasting Paths in East Asia and the Middle East. Princeton University Press. [skip chapters on Iraq and Libya]

2. Tannenwald, Nina. 2005. Stigmatizing the Bomb: Origins of the Nuclear Taboo. International Security 29 (4): 5-49.
3. Becker, Una, et al. 2008. Democracy and Nuclear Arms Control – Destiny or Ambiguity? Security Studies 17 (4): 810-854.
4. Lieber, Keir A. and Daryl G. Press. 2013. Why States Won't Give Nuclear Weapons to Terrorists. International Security 38 (1): 80-104.

### **Week 11/ November 6: Peacekeeping, Peace Building and Intervention**

1. Finnemore, Martha. 2003. The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs About the Use of Force. Cornell University Press.
2. Barnett, Michael. 2006. Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States After War. International Security 30 (4): 87-112.
3. Fortna, Virginia Page and Lise Morjé Howard. 2008. Pitfalls and Prospects in the Peacekeeping Literature. American Review of Political Science 11: 283-301.
4. Autesserre, Séverine. 2009. Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention. International Organization 63 (2): 249-280.

### **Week 12/ November 13: Cyber Security, Oil Security**

1. Campbell, David. 2005. The Biopolitics of Security: Oil, Empire, and the Sports Utility Vehicle. American Quarterly 57 (3): 943-972.
2. Kello, Lucas. 2013. The Meaning of the Cyber Revolution: Perils to Theory and Statecraft. International Security 38 (2): 7-40.
3. Gartzke, Erik. 2013. The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War in Cyberspace Back Down to Earth. International Security 38 (2): 41-73.
4. Glaser, Charles L. 2013. How Oil Influences U.S. National Security. International Security 38 (2): 112-146.
5. Colgan, Jeff D. 2013. Fueling the Fire Pathways from Oil to War. International Security 38 (2): 147-180.

### **Week 13/ November 20: Great Powers and Security**

1. Paul, T.V. 2005. Soft Balancing in the Age of U.S. Primacy. International Security 30 9 (1): 46-71.
2. Wohlforth, William C. 2009. Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War. World Politics 61 (1): 28-57.
3. Finnemore, Martha. 2009. Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn't All It's Cracked Up to Be. World Politics 61 (1): 58-85.
4. Legro, Jeffrey W. 2007. What China Will Want: The Future Intentions of a Rising Power. Perspectives on Politics 5 (3): 515-534.
5. Jabeen, Mussarat. 2010. Indian Aspiration of Permanent Membership in the UN Security Council and American Stance. South Asian Studies 25 (2): 237-253.
6. Schweller, Randall L. 2010. Entropy and the Trajectory of World Politics: Why Polarity Has Become Less Meaningful. Cambridge Review of International Affairs 23 (1): 145-163.
7. Goh, Evelyn. 2011. How Japan Matters in the Evolving East Asian Security Order. International Affairs 87 (4): 887-902.
8. Makarychev, Andrey and Viatcheslav Morozov. 2011. Multilateralism, Multipolarity, and Beyond: A Menu of Russia's Policy Strategies. Global Governance 17: 353-373.
9. Scobell, Andrew. 2012. Learning to Rise Peacefully? China and the security dilemma. Journal of Contemporary China 21 (76): 713-721.

10. Layne, Christopher. 2012. This Time It's Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana. International Studies Quarterly 56: 203–213.

#### **Week 14/ December 4: Globalization and Security**

1. Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 1999. The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization. European Journal of International Relations 5 (4): 403-434.
2. Michael Dillon and Julian Reid. 2001. Global Liberal Governance: Biopolitics, Security and War. Millennium: Journal of International Studies 30 (1): 41- 66.
3. Prins, Gwyn. 2004. AIDS and Global Security. International Affairs 80 (5): 931-952.
4. Ingram, Alan. 2010. Biosecurity and the International Response to HIV/AIDS: Governmentality, Globalization and Security. Area 42 (3): 293–301.
5. Kinnvall, Catarina. 2004. Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security. Political Psychology 25 (5): 741-767.
6. Ripsman, Norrin M. and T. V. Paul. 2005. Globalization and the National Security State: A Framework for Analysis. International Studies Review 7: 199–227.
7. Ukeje, Charles. 2008. Globalization and Conflict Management: Reflections on the Security Challenges Facing West Africa. Globalizations 5 (1): 35–48.
8. Hamilton-Hart, Natasha. 2009. War and Other Insecurities in East Asia: What the Security Studies Field Does and Does Not Tell Us. The Pacific Review 22 (1): 49–71.