

INR 3333 – spring 2023 Syllabus

Spring 2023 Introduction to International Security (INR 3333.)

Class # 28579 & Section 33IR

Meeting days & times: M, W, & F (period 7 – 1:55 p.m. – 2:45 p.m.)

Meeting location: Anderson Hall 0034 (AND0034.)

Instructor: **James Biondi**

Email: jbiondi@ufl.edu

Office Hours & Location: 330 Anderson Hall (3rd floor), M: 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m., & F: 3:00 p.m. – 4:30 p.m., or by appointment.

Course description:

Security is a contested, multifaceted, and evolving concept, which is what makes the study of security both problematic yet fascinating. The discipline of security studies has made its way into the academic and policy worlds alike, in addition to stretching far beyond the boundaries of International Relations. This course will provide you with an introduction to the various methodological, theoretical, and empirical branches of security studies. A primary aspect of this course will be to identify and critically analyze the commonalities, divergences, and nuances between the conceptualizations of security studies so you can question existing narratives and understandings of *what* security is, *how* it is conceptualized, *where* security goes, *who* is afforded security, and *how* security is practiced. Additionally, to gain a more comprehensive perspective, the course will go beyond big academic names, older works, and Western/European viewpoints on security studies by delving into recent scholarship, lesser-known scholars, and non-Western/non-European positions of security studies.

Student Learning Objectives:

- I. Acquire a comprehensive understanding of core topics/themes pertaining to the field of security studies.
- II. Apply theoretical concepts of security to real world empirical examples.
- III. Recognize the interrelation and interconnection between the themes/topics of security as outlined below in the syllabus.
- IV. Understand how security studies goes far beyond international relations and political science – with these issues being relevant to many realms of life and fields of study.

Assessments: (Exams will be taken in a *Blue Book* and assignments will be submitted via Canvas):

- I. **Attendance (5%):** attendance will be taken at every class. Only precleared justified absences will be accepted as a valid reason for missing class. Any medical or UF-affiliated absences should be accompanied by the requisite documentation. Please

arrive a few minutes before class begins so you can sign yourself in, in a timely fashion.

II. **Participation (5%):** students are encouraged to vocally engage with the material in a meaningful and thoughtful way. Do not burden yourselves with coming up with a “perfect” or “groundbreaking” contribution, as this is not necessary. However, please come prepared for each class by doing the assigned readings ahead of time. Participation will be assessed on an overall basis throughout the term rather than every time you speak. Therefore, consistency and frequency are key! See below for the participation grading criteria.

III. **In class midterm exam (25%):**

- Firstly, the exam will be closed book. Secondly, although you are not expected to cite like you are in essays, I encourage you to study in a manner that couples names with key arguments so you can utilize them in the exam. For example, you might want to say: “Mearsheimer argued that...,” or “according to Peterson...”
- While a part of the exam is to test your knowledge and understanding of the material, you will need to limit the descriptive nature of your answer. Every response must contain an *argument/position, theoretical analysis, and empirical examples*.
- The aim is not to impress by showing how much of an article you can memorize, but rather, how you *critically and analytically engage* with the question in a cogent and coherent manner.
- I will provide you with **three** essay questions, in which you will answer **one**. The first Q will be on one theme, and the second Q will be on another theme. Nonetheless, please note that all themes are interconnected in some way, shape or form. So, for example, if the essay Q is on human security you might have to branch out and incorporate other themes into your answer.
- I will also provide you with a structural outline, which I would like you to follow in terms of the essay structure and areas to cover when writing.
- I recommend you plan your essay before you begin writing. The essay question will have multiple components, which are designed to help breakdown the question into manageable and exploratory avenues for you to tackle.
- I will give you “hooks” or “springboards” on the question sheet to act as potential routes for you to efficaciously address the Q. I do not expect you to answer all the hooks/springboards, as they are meant to act as signposts or suggestions on how you may tackle the question. Of course, you can opt to go an alternative route and not take any of the springboards/hooks on offer, which is absolutely fine; after all, there are numerous ways to tackle an essay Q.
- **Any theme** that we have covered up to the point of the midterm could feature on the exam, so students should bear this in mind while preparing for the exam. In any case, many (if not all) of the themes are interconnected and interrelated in some way, shape,

and form. Therefore, although each question will have a specific thematic focus, theme synthetization is encouraged.

- **However, each question will have multiple components to it, which you will be required to answer.** These are different from the hooks or springboards, and I will clearly distinguish the components of the Q from the hooks/springboards on the exam sheet. Again, the Q components are mandatory, but the hooks/springboards are optional suggestions for avenues you might take to delve into your answer.
- We will talk more about the exam and essay writing nearer the exam. Please also note that makeup exams will not be permitted unless there is a valid/justified excuse with documentation. The exam may only be taken in a **Blue Book** with **pen (black or blue ink)** – no pencil. All electronics and bags must be set to the side of the classroom before the exam commences.
- I strongly recommend that any DRC students get in touch with the DRC 1-2 weeks prior to the exam, as the whole process can take a few days to administratively organize.

IV. Review essay/response paper (30%):

- I will provide you with a collection of readings in the form of articles or book chapters vis-à-vis one of the weekly themes, in which you will have to select **one** to critically engage with. There is no set question *per se*, as I want you to critically review the piece of literature you have selected.
- The aim here is to essentially address “how useful is this piece in tackling its question/topic? What are future avenues or issues the piece needs to explore?” or “what contribution does this piece has to X theme, and where does it fall short?” As with the exams, **you must have an argument.** Tell me where **you** stand in analyzing or critiquing the piece of literature.
- Remember an academic argument is not an opinion piece – either acting as a normative diatribe or extolling the praise of a particular work based on your own predilections. Instead, you must embed your argument by exposing the strengths, weaknesses, assertions, theory, and empirical evidence offered in the piece of work. Of course, your viewpoint will shine through – with some of you perhaps adopting a fonder standpoint than another, which is fine – and expected. However, your own view must be corroborated, unpacked, and substantiated by the propositions or claims that are in the piece of writing itself – matched against the relevant theory and empirical examples included or excluded from the work. We will talk about this nearer the time and please do consult the guidance sheet that I will post on Canvas.
- Structure it in the same form as a regular essay with an introduction, main body, and conclusion. Limit the description to briefly summarizing the author’s/authors’ main points albeit, do not forget this as it is needed! In the conclusion, you might want to offer future avenues that a scholar or the literature should go.
- I will attach a help sheet in terms of how to write a good response paper on Canvas for you to peruse before writing.

- Although it is possible to write a strong review/response paper without consulting other works, I strongly urge you to incorporate other works that relate to the theme of your choice. For instance, if you choose the reading that relates to human security, I suggest you bring in the assigned readings on human security.
- Of course, you are welcome to bring in any other suitable external sources you see fit, albeit this is not required. If you include external sources and you are unsure if they are well suited for a formal academic piece such as this paper, please do get in contact with me and I will show you how to vet or scrutinize your sources.
- To reiterate, as indicated above, most of the paper will analyze the reading in terms of its positives, drawbacks, gaps, and tensions. It is important that you do not merely summarize, and instead take a position i.e., have an analytical argument with a well-formed conclusion.
- I have enabled Turnitin for the essay assignment in addition to my own checking. Needless to say, please do not plagiarize – either unintentionally or purposefully – as this is an extremely serious academic infraction. Please remember to adequately cite throughout your work, which includes not only direct quotations but any idea, paraphrase, argument etc., or source of information that you draw upon.
- Having said that, keep direct quotations to a limited amount as I am interested in hearing from *you* – not somebody else. Nevertheless, this does not mean you can avoid citing as you will still be utilizing and consulting other works. If you are unsure on how to cite or have any further questions on plagiarism, please get in contact with me. In addition, please see below for more information on plagiarism.
- The length of this paper should range between 2000-2500 words. Papers below 2000 words and over 2500 words will receive a considerable point deduction. Papers under 1500 words and over 3000 words will not be accepted.
- Please use one of the following fonts: Times New Roman, Garamond, Century, Bodoni MT, or High Tower Text.
- You must cite in the form of footnotes. I am requiring you to use the Chicago Style of citations for your referencing (I will put the user manual on Canvas.)
- Format the essay in single space in a 12-point font with standard 1-inch margins. Furthermore, you must have a bibliography at the end of your paper. Note that the bibliography is **not** included in the word count **but** the words in footnotes are counted. Please take this distinction into account when looking at your word count.
- Late assignments will not be accepted unless there is a valid/justified excuse with documentation.
- In the event that your essay is late, please email me (via UF Gatormail.) Note that late essays will most likely be penalized.
- Essays sent in more than 48-hours after the due date will not be accepted.
- Please upload your document in either a Word Doc., or PDF.

- V. **Final exam (35%):** styled & formatted in the same way as the midterm exam with one exception – you will have a choice of **four** questions to choose from in which you will answer **one**. The questions could include **any theme** throughout the course, so please comprehensively prepare, although expect a heavier emphasis on the post-midterm themes. In any case, many (if not all) of the themes are interconnected and interrelated in some way, shape, and form. Therefore, although each question will have a specific thematic focus, theme synthezation is encouraged.

Please do all readings for that week/theme prior to class on Monday as we will aim to cover a theme per week beginning on Monday.

Grading Policy for exams, essay & participation:

Exams & Essay

Both exams and the essay will be out of 100 points. I do not believe in rigidly following a rubric or painstakingly deducting points for every “mistake” *per se*, so please do not view your grade as “why did I lose X number of points,” as my approach is not so mechanical. Instead, I assess your work based on its overall quality and assign a corresponding grade. I will be looking for: **argument, writing coherency, diligent writing, strong levels of analysis, engagement and understanding of the material, the reasoning/evidence used, and how well the question links together between all its parts.** To further break it down think of the grading being broken down into three elements:

- I. The extent to which the response demonstrates an understanding of key concepts and thoughtfully and thoroughly answers the questions.
- II. The depth of the analysis, including reference to specific citations and examples and attention to the connections between course materials.
- III. The overall quality of the work, including evidence of effort, logic and reasoning, and conformity to the formatting guidelines.

Participation

Participation will be assessed along the following guidelines:

- I. (A) – very regular, relevant, frequent, consistent, and thoughtful engagement. Such a contribution goes beyond asking the instructor questions, repeating information already said by one’s peers, and simply saying “author X said this...” or “according to reading Y...” as this is just reiterating substance from the readings/authors. Additionally, the student will oftentimes contribute something new/creative or analytical to the dialogue – either theoretically or empirically. Lastly, although contributions can be inventive, they remain relevant to the topic at hand.

- II. (A-) noticeable frequency, relevancy, and consistency in class participation. A relatively commendable amount of participation beyond asking the instructor questions and repeating information that has already been said by a classmate or a reading/scholar. Despite being less frequent and analytical than what is required for an (A) grade, the student will nonetheless be observable in their analysis and insightful participation – either theoretically or empirically.
- III. (B+) the same criteria as the A- grade **but** participation is on a less frequent and consistent scale.
- IV. (B) the student earnestly tries to contribute to the conversation or dialogue but struggles to apply the point/theme/theory/example in a meaningful, analytical or germane way. Although the student tries, the instructor has to oftentimes step in to assist the student in terms of making sense of a comment, applying/situating the student’s point or question raised to the ongoing dialogue, deduce relevancy, and relate the “author X said this” or “reading Y said that” remark by the student to something wider for it to fit the flow of the dialogue.
- V. (C+) the same criteria as the B grade **but** participation is on a less frequent and consistent scale.
- VI. (C) the student infrequently, irrelevantly, vaguely/confusingly (the comment struggles to make discernible sense), and inconsistently participates. In addition, the student does not tend to go beyond asking the instructor questions, or repeats information already said by the instructor, author/reading, or a peer.
- VII. (C-) the same criteria as the C grade **but** participation is on a less frequent and consistent scale.
- VIII. (D+ and below) for *very* seldom, sloppy, digressing, repetitive, or confusing participation.

The grading scale is as follows: 94-100(A); 90-93 (A-); 87-89 (B+); 83-86 (B); 80-82 (B-); 77-79 (C+); 73-76 (C); 70-72 (C-); 67-69 (D+); 63-67 (D); 60-62 (D-). Scores will be rounded in accordance with normal mathematical principles, i.e., a 92.5 is a 93, where a 92.4 is a 92.

Reading Assignments & Course Themes (to be done prior to class on Monday):

Week I/Theme I: introduction & roadmap of the course: What is security studies & the concept of security?

There are **no assigned readings for the first day of class** on Monday, January 9th.

For Wednesday, January 11th, please read the following:

- I. Stephen Walt. 1991. The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly* 35 (2): 211-239.
- II. Gjørsv, Gunhild Hoogensen. 2012. Security by any Other Name: Negative Security, Positive Security, and a Multi-Actor Security Approach. *Review of International Studies* 38: 835-859.

- III. Kolodziej, Edward, "Wither Security Studies After The Cold War?" in Bajpai, Kanti & Cohen, Stephen (eds.), *South Asia After the Cold War*. Oxfordshire, UK: Routledge, 1993 – read pages 20-25.
- IV. Baldwin, David, "The Concept of Security," *Review of International Studies* (1997) 23:1 5-26.

Supplementary Reading:

- V. Huysmans, Jef. 1998. Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier. *European Journal of International Relations* 4 (2): 226-255.

Week II/Theme II: is the study of security moving away from traditional & state approaches to security?

Required Readings:

- I. Chaijaroenwatana, Bussabong & Haque, Mahbubul: "Displaced Rohingya and Concern for Nontraditional Security Risks in Thailand," *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 47:3, 201-225.
- II. Alles, Delphine, "Premises, Policies and Multilateral Whitewashing of Broad Security Doctrines: A Southeast Asia-Based Critique of "Non-traditional" Security," *ERIS* vol. 6, Issue 1/2019, 5-26.
- III. Glaser, Charles, "The Security Dilemma Revisited," *World Politics* vol. 50, no. 1, Fiftieth Anniversary Special Issue (Oct., 1997), 171-201.

Supplementary Reading:

- IV. John Herz and the Security Dilemma – see Canvas.

Week III/Theme III: human (in)security – what is human security and how do we make a human life secure?

Required Readings:

- I. Paris, Roland. 2001. Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? *International Security* 26 (2): 87-102.
- II. Peterson, Jenny H. 2013. Creating Space for Emancipatory Human Security: Liberal Obstructions and the Potential of Agonism. *International Studies Quarterly* 57: 318-328.
- III. Peou, Sorpong. 2019. Human Security after 25 Years: Some Introductory Remarks and Critical Reflections. *Asian Journal of Peacebuilding* 7 (2): 161-181.
- IV. <https://www.un.org/humansecurity/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/h2.pdf> (skim the first 10 pages.)

Supplementary Readings:

- V. Kaldor M. Human Security: Practical Possibilities. *LSE Public Policy Review*. 2020; 1(2): 7, pp. 1-8.

- VI. Chandler, David, Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark. *Security Dialogue* August 2008, Vol. 39, No. 4 (August 2008), pp. 427-438.

Week IV/Theme IV: Critical Security Studies – how critical do we need to be and what does a critical approach look like?

Required Readings:

- I. Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 2006. The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies. *Review of International Studies* 32: 329-352.
- II. Nik Hynek & David Chandler (2013): No emancipatory alternative, no critical security studies, *Critical Studies on Security*, 1:1, 46-63.
- III. Makinda, Samuel, "Critical Security Studies, Racism & Eclecticism," *Security Dialogue*, 2021, vol. 52(S) 142-151.

Supplementary Readings:

- IV. Salter *et al*, "Horizon Scan: Critical Security Studies for the next 50 years," *Security Dialogue* vol. 50(4S) 9- 37.
- V. Chandler, David & Chipato, Farai, "A Call for Abolition: The disavowal and displacement of race in critical security studies," *Security Dialogue* 2021, vol. 52, (S) 60-68.
- VI. Ezemenaka, Kingsley & Ekumaoko, Chijioke, "The Dilemma of Global South's Contributions to Critical Security Studies: The African Case," *Journal of Black Studies* 2021 vol. 52 (8) 912-930.

Week V/Theme V: securitization – an avoidable and harmful construction or an ineluctable reality of world politics?

Required Readings:

- I. Roe, Paul. 2012. Is Securitization a 'Negative' Concept? Revisiting the Normative Debate over Normal versus Extraordinary Politics. *Security Dialogue* 43 (3): 249-266.
- II. Howell, Alison, and Richter-Montpetit, Melanie, "Is securitization theory racist? Civilizationism, methodological whiteness, and antiblack thought in the Copenhagen School," *Security Dialogue* 2020, vol. 51(1) 3-22.
- III. Weaver, Ole, and Buzan, Barry, "Racism and responsibility – The critical limits of deepfake methodology in security studies: A reply to Howell and Richter-Montpetit," *Security Dialogue* 2020, vol. 51(4) 386-394.
- IV. Rana, Sohel & Riaz, Ali, "Securitization of the Rohingya Refugees in Bangladesh," *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 2022, 1-17.

Supplementary Readings:

- V. Stritzel, Holger. 2007. Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. *European Journal of International Relations* 13 (3): 357-383.

- VI. Balzacq, Thierry, Sarah Léonard, and Jan Ruzicka. 2016. 'Securitization' Revisited: Theory and Cases. *International Relations* 30 (4): 494-531.
- VII. Baysal, Basar, "Coercion by fear: Securitization of Iraq prior to the 2003 war," *International Journal*, vol. 74 (3), 363-386.
- VIII. Bertrand, Sarah, "Can the subaltern securitize? Postcolonial perspectives on securitization theory and its critics," *European Journal of International Security* 2018 3:3 281-299.

Week VI/Theme VI: ontological security – is it possible to be “secure” in our state of being?

Required Readings:

- I. Badredine, Arfi. 2020. Security qua existential surviving (while becoming otherwise) through performative leaps of faith, *International Theory*, 12, 291-305.
- II. Mitzen, Jennifer. 2006. Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma. *European Journal of International Relations* 12 (3): 341-370.
- III. Rossdale, Chris. 2015. Enclosing Critique: The Limits of Ontological Security. *International Political Sociology* 9, 369-386.

Supplementary Reading:

- IV. Pratt, Simon Frankel. 2017. A Relational View of Ontological Security in International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 61: 78-85.

Week VII/Theme VII: Theme VII: how is security studies approaching the topic of terrorism?

Required Readings:

- I. Richard Jackson (2015) The epistemological crisis of counterterrorism, *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, 8:1, 33-54.
- II. Edward Newman (2006) Exploring the “Root Causes” of Terrorism, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 29:8, 749-772.
- III. Stampnitzky, Lisa, “Can Terrorism Be Defined?” In: *Constructions of Terrorism: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Research and Policy*, edited by Michael Stohl, et al., University of California Press, 2017.

Supplementary Reading:

- IV. Stump, Jacob, “On the future of critical terrorism studies: A response to Richard Jackson's minimal foundationalist redefinition of terrorism,” *Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression* 5:3 217-224.
- V. Holland, Jack, "Blair's War on Terror: Selling Intervention to Middle England." *BJPIR*: 2012, Vol 14, 74-95.
- VI. Stampnitzky, Lisa, *Disciplining Terror How Experts Invented "Terrorism."* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2013, chapters I, VIII & IX.

MIDTERM EXAM: Friday, February 24th, 2023 in class.

Week VIII/Theme VIII: R2P is dead; long live R2P! The relationship between foreign military intervention and security.

Required Readings:

- I. <https://www.globalr2p.org/what-is-r2p/>
- II. Chandler, David, "The R2P Is Dead, Long Live the R2P: The Successful Separation of Military Intervention from the Responsibility to Protect." *International Peacekeeping* 2015 22(1):1-5.
- III. Hobson, Christopher, "Responding to Failure: The Responsibility to Protect after Libya," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 44:3 (2016), 433-454.
- IV. Kuperman, Alan, "Did R2P Foster Violence In Libya?" *Genocide Studies and Prevention: An International Journal*, 13:2 (2019): 38-57.
- V. Morris, Justin, "Libya and Syria: R2P and the specter of the swinging pendulum," *International Affairs* 89:5 (2013), 1265-1283.

Supplementary Reading:

- VI. Robin Dunford & Michael Neu, "The Responsibility to Protect in a world of already existing intervention", *European Journal of International Relations*, 2019, Vol. 25(4) 1080 – 1102.
- VII. Kuperman, Alan J., "A Model Humanitarian Intervention? Reassessing NATO's Libya Campaign," *International Security*, Vol. 38, No. 1 (Summer 2013), pp. 105-136
- VIII. Thakur, Ramesh, "R2P After Libya and Syria: Engaging Emerging Powers," *The Washington Quarterly*, 36:2 2014, 61-76.

Week IX/Theme IX: security institutions/IGOs – how effective are international institutions in propagating security?

Required Readings:

- I. John J. Mearsheimer, "The False Promise of International Institutions," *International Security*, 19:3 (Winter 1994/1995), pp. 5-49.
- II. Robert Keohane and Lisa Martin, "The Promise of Institutional Theory: Response to John Mearsheimer," *International Security*, 20:1, (Summer 1995), pp. 39-51.
- III. Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan. 1995. The Promise of Collective Security. *International Security* 20 (1): 52-61.

Supplementary Readings:

- IV. Oates, John G. 2016. The Fourth Face of Legitimacy: Constituent Power and the Constitutional Legitimacy of International Institutions. *Review of International Studies* 43 (2): 199-220.

- V. Feraru, Atena S. 2018. Regime Security and Regional Cooperation among Weak States. *International Studies Review* 20: 101–126.

Week X/ Theme X: the political interaction between great powers, rising powers, IOs and international security.

Required Readings:

- I. Goddard, Stacie E. 2018. “The Politics of Legitimacy: How a Rising Power’s Right Makes Might”. In: *When Right Makes Might: Rising Powers and World Order*, Cornell University Press, chapters I & II. (Go to the library website for online access. If you are not on campus, make sure you connect to the VPN to access the book: <https://it.ufl.edu/ict/documentation/network-infrastructure/vpn/>)
- II. Acharya, Amitav, “After Liberal Hegemony: The Advent of a Multiplex World Order,” *Ethics & International Affairs*, 31 no. 3 (2017) 271-285.
- III. Jones, Catherine, “Great powers, ASEAN, and security: reason for optimism? The *Pacific Review*, 2015 Vol. 28, No. 2, 259-280,

Supplementary Readings:

- IV. Finnemore, Martha, “Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn't All It's Cracked up to Be,” *World Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 1, International Relations Theory and the Consequences of Unipolarity (January 2009), pp. 58-85.
- V. Voskressenski, Alexi, “The Role of the West in Evolving World Order, and Russian Politics,” *Russian Social Science Review*, vol. 58, no. 6 (2017), 469-508.
- VI. Gilady, Lilach, *The Price of Prestige: Conspicuous Consumption in International Relations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2018, chapters I & III. (Go to the library website for online access. If you are not on campus, make sure you connect to the VPN to access the book: <https://it.ufl.edu/ict/documentation/network-infrastructure/vpn/>)
- VII. Morris, Justin, "The Responsibility to Protect and the Great Powers: The Tensions of Dual Responsibility," *Global Responsibility To Protect* 7 (2015) 398-421.

REVIEW/RESPONSE ESSAY: due by Wednesday, March 22nd at 1:00 p.m. The selection of readings will be available on Canvas by March 1st (if not earlier.)

Week XI/Theme XI: health security in the age of COVID-19 – how COVID-19 has affected the landscape of international security.

Required Readings:

- I. Fernández, Ariana. Scauso. Marcos S. & Stavrevska, Elena. "Avatars of colonial and liberal violences: the revelatory character of COVID-19 governance in Colombia," *Third World Quarterly* 2022, vol. 43, no. 6, 1425-1440.
- II. Von Münchow, Sebastian, "The Security Impacts of the COVID-19 Pandemic," *Connections QJ* 19, no. 2 (2020): 5-9.
- III. Yaya, Sanni *et al*, "Globalization in the time of COVID-19: repositioning Africa to meet the immediate and remote challenges," *Globalization and Health* (2020) 16:51, 1-7.
- IV. Reich, Simon and Dombrowski, Peter, "The consequence of COVID-19: how the United States moved from security provider to security consumer," *International Affairs* 96: 5 (2020) 1253-1279.

Supplementary Readings:

- V. Youde, Jeremy, "The securitization of health in the Trump era," *Australian Journal Of International Affairs* 2018, Vol. 72, no. 6, 535-550.
- VI. Howell, Alison, "The Global Politics of Medicine: Beyond global health, against securitization theory," *Review of International Studies*, Volume 40, Issue 5: Global Health in International Relations, December 2014, 961 - 987.
- VII. Elbe, Stefan, "The pharmaceuticalisation of security: Molecular biomedicine, antiviral stockpiles, and global health security," *Rev Int Stud.* 2014 Dec; 40(5): 919-938.

Week XII/Theme XII: cyber security – has this been a trailblazer in the realm of security studies?

Required Readings:

- I. Kello, Lucas, "The Meaning of the Cyber Revolution: Perils to Theory and Statecraft," *International Security* vol. 38, no. 2 (fall 2013), pp. 7-40.
- II. Gartzke, Erik, "The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War in Cyberspace Back Down to Earth," *International Security* vol. 38. no. 2 (fall 2013): 41-73.
- III. Brantly, Aaron, "Innovation and Adaptation in Jihadist Digital Security," *Survival* 59:1, 79-102.

Supplementary Readings:

- IV. "Discourses of cyberspace securitization in Brazil and in the United States" – see Canvas.
- V. "BRICS Cybersecurity Cooperation: Achievements and Deepening Paths" – see Canvas.
- VI. Deibert, Ronald, "Toward a Human-Centric Approach to Cybersecurity," *Ethics & International Affairs* volume 32, issue 4, winter 2018, pp. 411-424.

Week XIII/Theme XIII: migration & security – why & how have migrants been securitized and viewed as a security threat?

Required Readings:

- I. Allen, William *et al*, "Who Counts in Crises? The New Geopolitics of International Migration and Refugee Governance," *Geopolitics* Volume 23, 2018 - Issue 1, 217-243.
- II. Crawley, Heaven, "Refugees, migrants, neither, both: categorical fetishism and the politics of bounding in Europe's migration crisis," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, volume 44, 2018 - issue 1, 48-64.
- III. Futák-Campbell, Beatrix, "Facilitating crisis: Hungarian and Slovak securitization of migrants and their implications for EU politics," *International Politics* 2022, 59 541-561.

Supplementary Readings:

- IV. Klaus, Witold & Pachocka, Marta, "Examining the Global North Migration Policies: A "Push Out - Push Back" Approach to Forced Migration," *International Migration*, volume 57, issue 5 October 2019, 280-293.
- V. Munck, Ronaldo *et al*, "Migration, Work, and Citizenship in the New World Order," *Globalizations*, June 2011, vol. 8, no. 3, 249-26.
- VI. "Migration as a Weapon in Theory and in Practice" – see Canvas.
- VII. "The Failure of Global Migration Governance" – see Canvas.
- VIII. "Human Trafficking and Migration Management in the Global South" – see Canvas.

Week XIV/Theme XIV: course conclusion: where is security studies heading? What issues are underexplored and brushed aside? What has been inflated and misconstrued? What has been done well? Where has it made positive inroads?

- I. "Ukraine war: Five reasons why Kyiv won't join the NATO military alliance any time soon," *Euronews* 08/22.
- II. "Ukraine submits an application to join NATO, with big hurdles ahead," *New York Times* 09/22.
- III. "Review: The agony of Yemen's 'forgotten' war," *Chatham House* 12/22.
- IV. "It's time to stop US arms sales to Saudi Arabia," *The Brookings Institution* 02/21.
- V. "The Saudis couldn't do it without us': the UK's true role in Yemen's deadly war," *The Guardian* 06/19.
- VI. Abrahamsen, Rita & Williams, Michael, "Security Privatization and Global Security Assemblages," *The Brown Journal of World Affairs*, fall/winter 2011, 18:1 171-180.

Supplementary Reading:

- VII. Sjoberg, Laura, "Failure and critique in critical security studies," *Security Dialogue* 2019, vol. 50(1) 77-94.

FINAL EXAM: Wednesday, April 26th, 2023, in class.

Information about the readings:

- There are no set or required textbooks for this class. Instead, articles and book chapters will be posted on Canvas – either in a PDF format or with the online link to access the material.

Important Notes:

- *The instructor reserves the right to change any part or aspect of this document/syllabus should a need for doing so emerge at any point in time during the semester.*
- My office hours are a time for you to come and seek clarification, air problems, discuss the material, or obtain guidance. Please do not feel you have to come to office hours with a long list of questions – although it is fine if you do so. All I ask is that you have some queries or comments already prepared so we can best maximize *our* time.
- Please ensure that all dialogue and comments in the classroom are conducted in a respectful and controlled manner. Having a differing viewpoint from another is perfectly expected, as this is the nature of scholarly discourse. Although we will be dealing with particularly contentious issues, do remember that the classroom is a safe space – welcomed and open to all enrolled.

Other Important Notes:

- Only **justified** absences **with documentation** will be permitted as a reason to turn in work late or miss a class.
- Incomplete grades may be granted under very special circumstances as supported by valid official documentation (in accordance with the university regulations). Any student seeking such accommodation must request it prior to the deadline for the specific assignment.
- Retroactive extensions/incompletes will only be considered under extreme circumstances.
- Online course evaluation process: Students are expected to provide professional and respectful feedback on the quality of instruction in this course by completing course evaluations online via GatorEvals. Guidance on how to give feedback in a professional and respectful manner is available from the Gatorevals website. Students will be notified when the evaluation period opens, and can complete evaluations through the email they receive from GatorEvals, in their Canvas course menu under GatorEvals, or via the evaluation system. Summaries of course evaluation results are available to students at the public results website.
- Per university rules there is a zero-percent tolerance on cheating, plagiarism, bribery, misrepresentation, conspiracy, fabrication (see university definitions down below).
- The Writing Studio (352-846-1138) can assist UF students with academic writing through one-on-one consultations either in person or online. Consultations can be scheduled through their website. English language learners can request general writing help or can get help with specific assignments are available for students who cannot visit the Writing Studio in person.

UF Policies:

- University Policy on Accommodating Students with Disabilities: Students with disabilities requesting accommodation should first register with the UF Disability Resource Center (352.392.8565) by providing appropriate documentation. Once registered, students will receive an accommodation letter which must be presented to the instructor when requesting an accommodation. Students with disabilities should follow this procedure as early as possible in the semester.
- Workload: as a Carnegie I, research-intensive university, UF is required by federal law to assign at least 2 hours of work outside of class for every contact hour. Work done in these hours may include reading/viewing assigned material and doing explicitly assigned individual or group work, as well as reviewing notes from class, synthesizing information in advance of exams or papers, and other self-determined study tasks.
- Statement regarding course recording: as in all courses, unauthorized recording and unauthorized sharing of recorded materials is prohibited.
- UF policy on the student computer requirement: Access to and on-going use of a computer is required for all students. The University of Florida expects each student entering a UF Online program, to acquire computer hardware and software appropriate to his or her degree program. Competency in the basic use of a computer is required.
- Course work will require use of a computer and a broadband connection to the internet, academic advising and registration can be done by computer, official university correspondence is often sent via e-mail and other services are provided that require access through the Internet. While the university offers limited access to computer software through its virtual computer lab and software licensing office, most students will be expected to purchase or lease a computer. The cost of meeting this requirement may be included in financial aid considerations.
- University policy on academic misconduct: Academic honesty and integrity are fundamental values of the University community. Students should be sure that they understand the UF Student Honor Code at <http://www.dso.ufl.edu/students.php>.

UF statement on recording:

- Students are allowed to record video or audio of class lectures. However, the purposes for which these recordings may be used are strictly controlled. The only allowable purposes are (1) for personal educational use, (2) in connection with a complaint to the university, or (3) as evidence in, or in preparation for, a criminal or civil proceeding. All other purposes are prohibited.
- Specifically, students may not publish recorded lectures without the written consent of the instructor. A “class lecture” is an educational presentation intended to inform or teach enrolled students about a particular subject, including any instructor-led discussions that form part of the presentation, and delivered by any instructor hired or appointed by the University, or by a guest instructor, as part of a University of Florida course. A class lecture does not include lab sessions, student presentations, and clinical presentations

such as patient history, academic exercises involving solely student participation, assessments (quizzes, tests, & exams), field trips, and private conversations between students in the class or between a student and the faculty or lecturer during a class session.

- Publication without the permission of the instructor is prohibited. To “publish” means to share, transmit, circulate, distribute, or provide access to a recording, regardless of format or medium, to another person (or persons), including but not limited to another student within the same class section. Additionally, a recording, or transcript of a recording, is considered published if it is posted on or uploaded to, in whole or in part, any media platform, including but not limited to social media, book, magazine, newspaper, leaflet, or third-party note/tutoring services. A student who publishes a recording without written consent may be subject to a civil cause of action instituted by a person injured by the publication and/or discipline under UF Regulation 4.040 Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code.

Legal & Technical Definitions:

- (I) Cheating: the improper taking or tendering of any information or material which shall be used to determine academic credit. Taking of information includes, but is not limited to, copying graded homework assignments from another student; working together with other individual(s) on a take-home test or homework when not specifically permitted by the teacher; looking or attempting to look at another student's paper during an examination; looking or attempting to look at text or notes during an examination when not permitted. Tendering of information includes, but is not limited to, giving your work to another student to be used or copied; giving someone answers to exam questions either when the exam is being given or after having taken an exam; giving or selling a term paper or other written materials to another student; sharing information on a graded assignment.
- (II) Plagiarism: the attempt to and/or act of representing the work of another as the product of one's own thought, whether the other's work is published or unpublished, or simply the work of a fellow student. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to, quoting oral or written materials without citation on an exam, term paper, homework, or other written materials or oral presentations for an academic requirement; submitting a paper which was purchased from a term paper service as your own work; submitting anyone else's paper as your own work.
- (III) Bribery: The offering, giving, receiving or soliciting of any materials, items or services of value to gain academic advantage for yourself or another.
- (IV) Misrepresentation: any act or omission of information to deceive a teacher for academic advantage. Misrepresentation includes using computer programs generated by another and handing it in as your own work unless expressly allowed by the teacher; lying to a teacher to increase your grade; lying or misrepresenting facts when confronted with an allegation of academic dishonesty.

- (V) Conspiracy: the planning or acting with one or more persons to commit any form of academic dishonesty to gain academic advantage for yourself or another.
- (VI) Fabrication: the use of invented or fabricated information, or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive for academic or professional advantage.

UF Resources & Outreach:

- Health and Wellness U Matter, We Care: If you or someone you know is in distress, please contact umatter@ufl.edu, 352-392-1575, or visit U Matter, We Care website to refer or report a concern and a team member will reach out to the student in distress.
- Counseling and Wellness Center: Visit the Counseling and Wellness Center website or call 352-392-1575 for information on crisis services as well as non-crisis services.
- Student Health Care Center: Call 352-392-1161 for 24/7 information to help you find the care you need or visit the Student Health Care Center website.
- University Police Department: Visit UF Police Department website or call 352-392-1111 (or 9-1-1 for emergencies).
- UF Health Shands Emergency Room / Trauma Center: For immediate medical care call 352-733-0111 or go to the emergency room at 1515 SW Archer Road, Gainesville, FL 32608; Visit the UF Health Emergency Room and Trauma Center website.
- GatorWell Health Promotion Services: For prevention services focused on optimal wellbeing, including Wellness Coaching for Academic Success, visit the GatorWell website or call 352-273-4450.
- Academic Resources E-learning technical support: Contact the UF Computing Help Desk at 352-392-4357 or via e-mail at helpdesk@ufl.edu.
- Career Connections Center: Reitz Union Suite 1300, 352-392-1601. Career assistance and counseling services.
- Library Support: Various ways to receive assistance with respect to using the libraries or finding resources.
- Teaching Center: Broward Hall, 352-392-2010 or to make an appointment 352- 392-6420. General study skills and tutoring. Writing Studio: 2215 Turlington Hall, 352-846-1138. Help brainstorming, formatting, and writing papers.
- Student Complaints On-Campus: Visit the Student Honor Code and Student Conduct Code webpage for more information. On-Line Students Complaints: View the Distance Learning Student Complaint Process.
- Career Connections Center: Career Connections Center (352-392-1601 | CareerCenterMarketing@ufsa.ufl.edu) connects job seekers with employers and offers guidance to enrich your collegiate experience and prepare you for life after graduation.
- Dean of Students Office: Dean of Students Office (352-392-1261) provides a variety of services to students and families, including Field and Fork (UF's food pantry) and New Student and Family programs

- Multicultural and Diversity Affairs: Multicultural and Diversity Affairs (352-294-7850) celebrates and empowers diverse communities and advocates for an inclusive campus.
- Office of Student Veteran Services: Office of Student Veteran Services (352-294-2948 | vacounselor@ufl.edu) assists student military veterans with access to benefits.
- ONE.UF: ONE.UF is the home of all the student self-service applications, including access to: Advising; Bursar (352-392-0181); Financial Aid (352-392-1275); Registrar (352-392-1374)
- Official Sources of Rules and Regulations: the official source of rules and regulations for UF students is the Undergraduate Catalog and Graduate Catalog.
- Student Handbook: student Responsibilities, including academic honesty and student conduct code.
- e-Learning Supported Services Policies includes links to relevant policies including Acceptable Use, Privacy, and much more.
- Accessibility, including the Electronic Information Technology Accessibility Policy and ADA Compliance.
- Student Computing Requirements, including minimum and recommended technology requirements and competencies.