Prof. Badredine Arfi
Office: Anderson Hall 221
Phone: (352) 273 2357
email: barfi@ufl.edu
Office hours: Wed 1:00-4:00pm; or by appointment.

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 teaching strategy is rooted in a concern that it has 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 does not follow such a 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/IS and how they have transpired specifically in the scholarship about international 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 many of these approaches as well as explore 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 issue-areas based strategy so that we simultaneously consider these issue-areas and how various theoretical approaches and schools of IR/IS theory investigate them.

REQUIREMENTS

- Students are required to "digest" thoroughly the weekly readings before coming to class and come prepared to fully discuss the readings in depth and share their insights with the rest of the class.
- Each student is required to make a number of power point presentations and lead the class discussions therewith.
- Students are required to write a research paper on a topic of international security of their choice using one (or more) of the approaches examined in the course. Please see details down below.
- All students will be presenting their respective research papers to the class at a date/time to be specified later.

GRADING POLICY

- Presentations: 40% of the final grade.
- Research paper: 50% of the final grade
- Presenting the research paper: 10% of the final grade

Note: Late papers will not be accepted except for document-justified reasons.

REQUIRED READINGS

1. Articles and book chapters posted on canvas (organized by themes and posted in a 'Required' folder per each week).
2. Note that there is a set of additional recommended readings for each week (posted in 'Recommended' folders). Students are highly encouraged to read at least some of these if only in a brief manner.

SPECIFICS ON THE RESEARCH PAPER

In order for the instructor to provide timely and useful guidance on the research paper, students will be required to turn in through canvas 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: Feb 1st**

2. Submit a 2-3 page summary of the proposed research and expected results. **Date: Feb 15th**

3. Submit a 6-8 page paper discussing the relevant literature to the research question (empirical as well as theoretical). **Date: March 15th**

4. The final paper should be 15-20 pages long, including the bibliography. **Date: April 19th**

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.

-   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/

Important Dates:

Classes Begin	January 7th
Official University Holidays - no classes	January 21st: Martin Luther King Jr. Day March 2nd – 9th: Spring Break
ISA 60th Annual Convention – Toronto, CA	March 27th – 30th
Reading Days - no classes	April 25th – 26th
Final Exams	April 27th – May 3rd

5

READING ASSIGNMENTS AND OUTLINE OF THE COURSE

Theme 1 / January 11: What Is Security? Part I

1. Herz, John H. 1950. Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma. <u>World Politics</u> 2 (2):157-180.
2. Walt. Stephen. 1991. The Renaissance of Security Studies. <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 35 (2): 211-239.
3. David A. Baldwin. 1997. The Concept of Security. <u>Review of International Studies</u> 23: 5–26.
4. Huysmans, Jef. 1998. Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier. <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 4 (2): 226–255.
5. Eriksson, Johan. 1999. Observers or Advocates? On the Political Role of Security Analysts <u>Cooperation and Conflict</u> 34 (3): 311–330.
6. Liotta, P. H. 2000. Through the Looking Glass: Creeping Vulnerabilities and the Reordering of Security. <u>Security Dialogue</u> 36 (1): 49–70.
7. Farrell, Theo. 2002. Constructivist Security Studies: Portrait of a Research Program. <u>International Studies Review</u> 4 (1: Spring): 49-72.

Theme 2/ January 18: What is Security? Part II.

1. Beier, J. Marshall and Samantha L. Arnold. 2005. Becoming Undisciplined: Toward the Supradisciplinary Study of Security. <u>International Studies Review</u> 7: 41–61.
2. Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 2006. The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies. <u>Review of International Studies</u> 32: 329–352.
3. Krahmann, Elke. 2008. Security: Collective Good or Commodity? <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 14 (3): 379-404.
4. Anderson, Ben. 2011. Affect and Security: Exercising Emergency in `UK Civil Contingencies'. <u>Environment and Planning D: Society and Space</u> 29: 1092-1109.
5. Gjørv, Gunhild Hoogensen. 2012. Security by any Other Name: Negative Security, Positive Security, and a Multi-Actor Security Approach. <u>Review of International Studies</u> 38: 835–859.
6. Silina, Everita. 2016. "Being Critical About Security: What Critical Political Economy Says about Security and Identity." In: Cafruny A., Talani L., Pozo Martin G. (eds) <u>The Palgrave Handbook of Critical International Political Economy</u>, 163-180. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Sjoberg, Laura. 2016. Centering Security Studies around Felt, Gendered Insecurities. <u>Journal of Global Security Studies</u> 1 (1): 51–63.

Theme 3/ January 25: Logics of Might/Power, and Stories

1. Glaser, Charles. 1994-95. Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help. <u>International Security</u> 19 (Winter): 50-90.
2. Suganami, Hidemi. 1997. Stories of War Origins: A Narrativist Theory of the Causes of War. <u>Review of International Studies</u> 23: 401–418.
3. Walt, Stephen M. 1999. Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies. <u>International Security</u> 23 (4): 5–48.
4. Atkinson, Carol. 2006. Constructivist Implications of Material Power: Military Engagement and the Socialization of States, 1972-2000. <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 50: 509-537.
5. Tang, Shiping. 2009. The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis. <u>Security Studies</u> 18 (3): 587-623.
6. Schweller, Randall L. 2010. The logic and Illogic of the Security Dilemma and Contemporary Realism: A Response to Wagner's Critique. <u>International Theory</u> 2 (2): 288–305.
7. Kim, Tongfi. 2011. Why Alliance Entangle but Seldom Entrap States. <u>Security Studies</u> 20 (3): 350-377.
8. Hamilton, Eric J. and Brian C. Rathbun. 2013. Scarce Differences: Toward a Material and Systemic Foundation for Offensive and Defensive Realism. <u>Security Studies</u> 22:436–465.

Theme 4/ February 1: Terrorism – Phenomena, Discourses, Strategies, Policies, ...

1. Pape, Robert A. 2003. The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism. <u>American Political Science Review</u> 97 (3): 343-361.
2. Kydd, Andrew H. and Barbara Walter. 2006. Strategies of Terrorism. <u>International Security</u> 31 (1): 49-80.
3. Moghadam, Assaf. 2006. Suicide Terrorism, Occupation, and the Globalization of Martyrdom: A Critique of Dying to Win. <u>Studies in Conflict and Terrorism</u> 29 (8): 707-729.
4. Piazza, James A. 2008. Incubators of Terror? Do Failed and Failing States Promote Transnational Terrorism. <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 52 (3): 469-488.
5. Horowitz, Michael C. 2010. Nonstate Actors and the Diffusion of Innovations: The Case of Suicide Terrorism. <u>International Organization</u> 64 (1): 33-64.

6. Chowdhury, Arjun and Ronald R. Krebs. 2010. Talking about Terror: Counterterrorist Campaigns and the Logic of Representation. <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 16 (1): 125-150.
7. Zech, Steven T. and Michael Gabbay. 2016. Social Network Analysis in the Study of Terrorism and Insurgency: From Organization to Politics. <u>International Studies Review</u> 18: 214–243.
8. Jarvis, Lee and Tim Legrand. 2017. 'I Am Somewhat Puzzled': Questions, Audiences and Securitization in the Proscription of Terrorist Organizations. <u>Security Dialogue</u> 48 (2) 149–167.

Theme 5/ February 8: Security Institutions

1. Mearsheimer, John J. 1994/1995. The False Promise of International Institutions. <u>International Security</u> 19 (3): 5-49.
2. Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan. 1995. The Promise of Collective Security. <u>International Security</u> 20 (1): 52-61.
3. Alagappa, Muthiah. 1997. Regional Institutions, the UN and International Security: A Framework for Analysis. <u>Third World Quarterly</u> 18 (3): 421- 441.
4. Bøås, Morten. 2000. Security Communities: Whose Security? <u>Cooperation and Conflict</u> 35 (3): 309–319.
5. Lake, David A. 2001. Beyond Anarchy: The Importance of Security Institutions. <u>International Security</u> 26 (1): 129-160.
6. Pouliot, Vincent. 2008. The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities. <u>International Organization</u> 62 (2): 257-288.
7. Engelbrekt, Kjell. 2016. "A Puzzle and Conceptual Framework." In: <u>High-Table Diplomacy: The Reshaping of International Security Institutions</u>, chap. 1. Wash DC: Georgetown University Press.
8. Oates, John G. 2016. The Fourth Face of Legitimacy: Constituent Power and the Constitutional Legitimacy of International Institutions. <u>Review of International Studies</u> 43 (2): 199–220.

Theme 6/ February 15: Ontological Security

1. Mitzen, Jennifer. 2006. Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma. <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 12 (3): 341–370.
2. Steele, Brent J. 2008. <u>Ontological Security in International Relations: Self-identity and the IR State</u>. New York: Routledge; chaps. 1-3.

3. Rossdale, Chris. 2015. Enclosing Critique: The Limits of Ontological Security. International Political Sociology 9:369–386.
4. Subotic, Jelena. 2016. Narrative, Ontological Security, and Foreign Policy Change. Foreign Policy Analysis 12: 610–627.
5. Shani, Giorgio. 2017. Human Security as Ontological Security: A Post-Colonial Approach. Postcolonial Studies 20 (3): 275-293.
6. Browning, Christopher S. and Pertti Joenniemi. 2017. Ontological Security, Self-articulation and the Securitization of Identity. Cooperation and Conflict 52 (1): 31–47.
7. Pratt, Simon Frankel. 2017. A Relational View of Ontological Security in International Relations. International Studies Quarterly 61: 78–85.
8. Solomon, Ty. 2017. Ontological Security, Circulations of Affect, and the Arab Spring. Journal of International Relations and Development 21: 934–958.

Theme 7/ February 22: Securitization

1. Williams, Michael C. 2003. Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics. International Studies Quarterly 47: 511–531.
2. Balzacq, Thierry. 2005. The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context. European Journal of International Relations 11 (2): 171–201.
3. Stritzel, Holger. 2007. Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. European Journal of International Relations 13 (3): 357-383.
4. Guzzini, Stefano. 2011. Securitization as a Causal Mechanism. Security Dialogue 42 (4-5):329-341.
5. Roe, Paul. 2012. Is Securitization a 'Negative' Concept? Revisiting the Normative Debate over Normal versus Extraordinary Politics. Security Dialogue 43 (3): 249-266.
6. Sheikh, Mona Kanwal. 2014. The Religious Challenge to Securitisation Theory. Millennium: Journal of International Studies 43 (1): 252-272.
7. Rythoven, Eric Van. 2015. Learning to Feel, Learning to Fear? Emotions, Imaginaries, and Limits in the Politics of Securitization. Security Dialogue 46 (5): 458-475.
8. Balzacq, Thierry, Sarah Léonard, and Jan Ruzicka. 2016. 'Securitization' Revisited: Theory and Cases. International Relations 30 (4): 494–531.
9. Marchand, Marianne H. 2017. Crossing Borders in North America after 9/11: 'Regular' Travellers' Narratives of Securitisations and Contestations. Third World Quarterly 38 (6): 1232-1248.

Theme 8/ March 1: Human Security

1. Paris, Roland. 2001. Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? <u>International Security</u> 26 (2): 87-102.
2. Newman, Edward. 2001. Human Security and Constructivism. <u>International Studies Perspectives</u> 2: 239–251.
3. Hoogensen, Gunhild & Kirsti Stuvøy. 2006. Gender, Resistance and Human Security. <u>Security Dialogue</u> 37 (2): 207-228.
4. Christie, Ryerson. 2010. Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique? <u>Security Dialogue</u> 41 (2): 169-190.
5. Kurusu, Kaoru. 2011. Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms: The Political Dynamism Behind the Acceptance and Promotion of "Human Security". <u>Asia-Pacific Review</u> 18 (2): 115-137.
6. Owens, Patricia. 2012. Human Security and the Rise of the Social. <u>Review of International Studies</u> 38: 547–567.
7. Peterson, Jenny H. 2013. Creating Space for Emancipatory Human Security: Liberal Obstructions and the Potential of Agonism. <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 57: 318-328.
8. Caballero-Anthony, Mely. 2015. Community Security: Human Security at 21. <u>Contemporary Politics</u> 21 (1): 3–69.

<p style="text-align:center;color:red;">Spring Break March 2nd – 9th, 2019</p>

Theme 9/ March 15: Logic of Nuclear (In)Security

1. Tannenwald, Nina. 2005. Stigmatizing the Bomb: Origins of the Nuclear Taboo. <u>International Security</u> 29 (4): 5-49.
2. Becker, Una, et al. 2008. Democracy and Nuclear Arms Control – Destiny or Ambiguity? <u>Security Studies</u> 17 (4): 810-854.
3. Lieber, Keir A. and Daryl G. Press. 2013. Why States Won't Give Nuclear Weapons to Terrorists. <u>International Security</u> 38 (1): 80–104.
4. Gavin, Francis J. 2015. Strategies of Inhibition Francis J. Gavin: U.S. Grand Strategy, the Nuclear Revolution, and Nonproliferation. <u>International Security</u> 40 (1, Summer): 9–46.
5. Das, Runa. 2017. A Post-colonial Analysis of India–United States Nuclear Security: Orientalism, Discourse, and Identity in International Relations. <u>Journal of Asian and African Studies</u> 52 (6): 741–759.

6. Gartzke, Erik and Matthew Kroenig. 2017. Social Scientific Analysis of Nuclear Weapons: Past Scholarly Successes, Contemporary Challenges, and Future Research Opportunities. Journal of Conflict Resolution 61 (9): 1853-1874.

Theme 10/ March 22: Peacekeeping, Peace Building and Intervention

1. Barnett, Michael. 2006. Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States After War. International Security 30 (4): 87-112.
2. Autesserre, Séverine. 2009. Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention. International Organization 63 (2): 249-280.
3. Paris, Roland. 2014. The 'Responsibility to Protect' and the Structural Problems of Preventive Humanitarian Intervention. International Peacekeeping 21 (5):569-603.
4. Peter, Mateja. 2015. Between Doctrine and Practice: The UN Peacekeeping Dilemma. Global Governance 21: 351-370.
5. Karim, Sabrina and Kyle Beardsley. 2016. Explaining Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Peacekeeping Missions: The Role of Female Peacekeepers and Gender Equality in Contributing Countries. Journal of Peace Research 53 (1): 100–115.
6. Randazzo, Elisa. 2016. The paradoxes of the 'Everyday': Scrutinising the Local Turn in Peace Building. Third World Quarterly 37 (8): 1351–1370.
7. Donais, Timothy and Erin McCandless. 2017. International Peace Building and the Emerging Inclusivity Norm. Third World Quarterly 38 (2); 291–310.
8. Sandler, Todd. 2017. International Peacekeeping Operations: Burden Sharing and Effectiveness. Journal of Conflict Resolution 61 (9): 1875-1897.

Re-visioning International Studies: Innovation and Progress
ISA 60th Annual Convention
March 27th - 30th, 2019, Toronto, Ontario, Canada[1]

Theme 11/ April 5: Cyber Security, Oil Security

1. Kello, Lucas. 2013. The Meaning of the Cyber Revolution: Perils to Theory and Statecraft. International Security 38 (2): 7–40.
2. Gartzke, Erik. 2013. The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War in Cyberspace Back Down to Earth. International Security 38 (2): 41–73.
3. Glaser, Charles L. 2013. How Oil Influences U.S. National Security. International Security 38 (2): 112–146.
4. Colgan, Jeff D. 2013. Fueling the Fire Pathways from Oil to War. International Security 38 (2): 147–180.

5. Lindsay, Jon R. 2014/2015. The Impact of China on Cybersecurity: Fiction and Friction. <u>International Security</u> 39 (3):7-47.

6. Lobato, Luísa Cruz and Kai Michael Kenkel. 2015. Discourses of cyberspace securitization in Brazil and in the United States. <u>Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional</u> 58 (2): 23-43.

7. Griffin, James M. 2015. Petro-Nationalism: The Futile Search for Oil Security. <u>The Energy Journal</u> 36: 25-41.

8. Eun, Yong-Soo and Judith Sita Aßmann. 2016. Cyberwar: Taking Stock of Security and Warfare in the Digital Age. <u>International Studies Perspectives</u> 17: 343–360.

9. Brantly, Aaron. 2017. Innovation and Adaptation in Jihadist Digital Security. <u>Survival: Global Politics and Strategy</u> 59 (1): 79–102.

Theme 12/ April 12: Great Powers and Security

1. Wohlforth, William C. 2009. Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War. <u>World Politics</u> 61 (1): 28-57.

2. Finnemore, Martha. 2009. Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn't All It's Cracked Up to Be. <u>World Politics</u> 61 (1): 58-85.

3. Schweller, Randall L. 2010. Entropy and the Trajectory of World Politics: Why Polarity Has Become Less Meaningful. <u>Cambridge Review of International Affairs</u> 23 (1): 145-163.

4. Haas, Mark L. 2014. Ideological Polarity and Balancing in Great Power Politics. <u>Security Studies</u> 23 (4): 715-753.

5. Rosato, Sebastian. 2014/2015. The Inscrutable Intentions of Great Powers. <u>International Security</u> 39 (3): 48-88.

6. Jones, Catherine. 2015. Great Powers, ASEAN, and Security: Reason for Optimism? <u>The Pacific Review</u> 28 (2): 259-280.

7. Brooks Stephen G. And William C. Wohlforth. 2015/2016. The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers in the Twenty-first Century: China's Rise and the Fate of America's Global Position. <u>International Security</u> 40 (3): 7-53.

8. Cypher, James M. 2016. Hegemony, Military Power Projection and US Structural Economic Interests in the Periphery. <u>Third World Quarterly</u> 37 (5): 800–817.

9. Markowitz, Jonathan N. and Christopher J. Fariss. 2018. Power, Proximity, and Democracy: Geopolitical Competition in the International System. <u>Journal of Peace Research</u> 55 (1): 78–93.

Theme 13/ April 19: Globalization and Security

1. Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 1999. The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization. <u>European Journal of International Relations</u> 5 (4): 403-434.
2. Kinnvall, Catarina. 2004. Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security. <u>Political Psychology</u> 25 (5): 741-767.
3. Ripsman, Norrin M. and T. V. Paul. 2005. Globalization and the National Security State: A Framework for Analysis. <u>International Studies Review</u> 7: 199–227.
4. Biersteker, Thomas. 2014. Dialectical Reflections on Transformations of Global Security during the Long Twentieth Century. <u>Globalizations</u> 11 (5):711–731.
5. Nathan, Andrew J. and Andrew Scobell. 2016. Globalization as a Security Strategy: Power and Vulnerability in the "China Model". <u>Political Science Quarterly</u> 131 (2): 313-339.
6. Koff, Harlan. 2016. Reconciling Competing Globalizations through Regionalisms? Environmental Security in the Framework of Expanding Security Norms and Narrowing Security Policies. <u>Globalizations</u> 13 (6): 664-682.
7. Amusan, Lere and Samuel Oyewole. 2017. The Quest for Hegemony and the Future of African Solutions to African Development Problems: Lessons from Headways in the African Security Sector. <u>Journal of Asian and African Studies</u> 52 (1): 21–33.

---

[1]**Re-visioning International Studies: Innovation and Progress**
ISA 60th Annual Convention
March 27th - 30th, 2019, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

International Studies scholarship has become increasingly interdisciplinary and multi-vocal. We no longer operate within one or two academic fields. Voices from around the world collectively or individually speak to pressing issues like conflict and inequality. We share an international focus, yet we adopt diverse approaches and methods. Categories of research are proliferating, which is a reflection of the exponentially increasing internal complexity of international studies. The mere number of sections, caucuses and regions under the International Studies Association umbrella exemplifies the range of our interests and contributions. Re-envisioning International Studies, as a theme, recognizes and celebrates our diversity. While global challenges require a unified front, the daunting task is to find ways to communicate more effectively across theoretical and methodological boundaries.

Today, the local and international are closely linked. Levels of analysis are no longer clear-cut. Communication technologies facilitate the creation of new identities and the consolidation of existing ones. More information is available now than ever, but means for integration into knowledge lag behind. How are discoveries, expressed in theories and investigated through various methods, to be shared in comprehensible ways across subfields? Re-envisioning International Studies requires new strategies for communicating within and beyond academic and policy communities while we strive to develop rich theories and cutting edge methodologies . Innovation, if it is to be carried out with positive impact, requires concentration and time investment. Any discussion of innovation in international studies and re-envisioning of multidisciplinary endeavors raises questions of how we can dedicate sufficient time to keep ourselves informed about the rest of the scholarship.

Since its founding, the International Studies Association has promoted intellectual diversity as well as respect for theoretical and ideological expansiveness. Going forward, we need to move further toward genuine engagement and communication across disciplinary and methodological fault lines. We invite panel, paper and roundtable proposals that employ novel methodological and theoretical approaches towards addressing 21st century global questions and topics. We look forward to conversations about innovative approaches to international studies. In Re-envisioning International Studies, we encourage the exchange of ideas on new methods and theories and ideas about the best ways to encourage these dialogues across diverse approaches and methods to bring together our community. We welcome proposals that address the following questions:

- What kind of new methodological approaches do different disciplines, such as anthropology, sociology, philosophy, economics, and communication, contribute to the study of global dynamics? How can scholars protect the integrity of the disciplinary theories and methodologies, while increasing their applicability?
- How can we communicate our theories and findings beyond scholars who share our approaches and methods? How can we better integrate findings from other disciplines into our own scholarship?
- What is the future of various theories of international studies? How do we define theoretical progress and innovation in different thematic areas?
- How has the discipline of International Relations transformed with an increasingly multidisciplinary scholarship?
- How can technology be further utilized in communicating ideas across borders? How is it theorized in international studies? What kind of an epistemological impact does it have?
- With more information available than ever, how are discoveries, expressed in theories and investigated through methods, to be shared in mutually comprehensible ways?
- How do we re-envision International Studies and its thematic subfields? Are there more integrative and inclusive ontological and epistemological possibilities that do not compromise diversity?
- How is innovation tied to responsible scholarship? How can we increase access and diversity through new methods and theories?
- What are the challenges brought by innovation? Is innovation always desirable? Under which conditions, do innovation and progress become burdensome practices or problematic concepts?
- Where have we made progress in international studies and where do we need to make more progress? How can we use visual communication toward that end?