

# **COURSE GUIDE**

## **International Security PLIT10019**

**Politics Honours**  
2012/13 Semester 2

**Course Convenor**

Dr Carmen Gebhard, [c.gebhard@ed.ac.uk](mailto:c.gebhard@ed.ac.uk)

**Lecturers**

Dr Carmen Gebhard, [c.gebhard@ed.ac.uk](mailto:c.gebhard@ed.ac.uk)  
Dr Xavier Guillaume, [x.guillaume@ed.ac.uk](mailto:x.guillaume@ed.ac.uk)  
Dr Jana Hönke, [j.hoenke@ed.ac.uk](mailto:j.hoenke@ed.ac.uk)

**Tutors**

Maggie Dwyer, [M.Dwyer@sms.ed.ac.uk](mailto:M.Dwyer@sms.ed.ac.uk)  
tbc

This handbook is also available on the LEARN page of “International Security”.  
<https://www.learn.ed.ac.uk/>

## Aims and Objectives

This course provides a broad conceptual framework for understanding and analyzing the main challenges to international security, and for assessing policy responses across the world. This includes an assessment of how the main theories of International Relations provide insights into international security and the conditions for war and peace. We will examine the role and future of international and regional security institutions along with the policies of key states. The course will address the implications of 9/11 and the emergence of the so-called “new” security agenda, including weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, ethnic violence, insurgency, religion, energy, and environmental change.

## Intended Learning Objectives/Outcomes

By the end of this course you should have:

- an understanding of some of the major debates in security studies
- a good intellectual grasp of the most critical challenges to international security
- the ability to apply International Relations theories to specific empirical issues in the field of security studies
- transferable skills such as analytical thinking and communication skills

## Teaching Arrangements

This course consists of one 50-minute lecture plus one 50-minute tutorial per week. The first lecture will be held on Monday 14 January, 09:00am in Minto House, LR1. Tutorials take place on the same day as the lecture. You have to sign up for a tutorial group well before the first lecture. You can do so on LEARN. The first tutorial will be in week 1.

## Lecture and Seminar Times

	<b>MONDAYS</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>
<b>Lecture</b>	09:00-09:50	Minto House, LR1
<b>Tutorial 1</b>	11:10-12.00	22 Buccleuch Place, 1.4
<b>Tutorial 2</b>	12.10-13.00	22 Buccleuch Place, 1.4
<b>Tutorial 3</b>	14.10-15.00	24 Buccleuch Place, 110
<b>Tutorial 4</b>	15.10-16.00	David Hume Tower, 9.01
<b>Tutorial 5</b>	16.10-17.00	14 Buccleuch Place, B.5
<b>Tutorial 6</b>	17.10-18.00	22 Buccleuch Place, 3.3

## LEARN – Virtual Classroom

Please consult the LEARN page of this course regularly. Digital copies of core readings [e-reserves] that are not available online or in the library will be provided on LEARN as well as the lecture slides and any material distributed or referred to in the lecture and tutorials. There will also be documents related to feedback, essay and policy brief writing as well as other useful material for the course ([www.learn.ed.ac.uk](http://www.learn.ed.ac.uk)).

## Weekly topics and dates

<b>Week</b> Lecture date	<b>Lecture Topic</b>
<b>1</b> 14 Jan 2013	<b>Introduction</b> ( <i>C. Gebhard</i> )
<b>2</b> 21 Jan 2013	<b>Analyzing International Security</b> ( <i>C. Gebhard</i> )
<b>3</b> 28 Jan 2013	<b>Conventional Security Studies</b> ( <i>X. Guillaume</i> )
<b>4</b> 4 Feb 2013	<b>Critical Security Studies</b> ( <i>X. Guillaume</i> )
<b>5</b> 11 Feb 2013	<b>The Changing Nature of War</b> ( <i>C. Gebhard</i> )
<b>Innovative Learning Week</b> (no lecture)	
<b>6</b> 25 Feb 2013	<b>Global and Regional Security Governance</b> ( <i>C. Gebhard</i> )
<b>7</b> 4 Mar 2013	<b>Security and Development</b> ( <i>J. Hönke</i> )
<b>8</b> 11 Mar 2013	<b>Security and Business</b> ( <i>J. Hönke</i> )
<b>9</b> 18 Mar 2013	<b>Intervention: Just War or just war?</b> ( <i>C. Gebhard</i> )
<b>20 Mar 2013</b>	<b>Simulation Game: To Win a War? Which War? And How?</b> (optional)
<b>10</b> 25 Mar 2013	<b>The Present is the Past is the Future?</b> ( <i>C. Gebhard</i> )
<b>11</b> 01 April 2013	<b>Reading week</b> (no lecture)

## Assessment

Your mark for this course will be based on three components:

### 1) Tutorial attendance and participation (10%, see appendix A)

The tutorials are designed to give you an opportunity to engage with the topics raised in the lecture, to discuss and share your ideas with other students and to develop your communication skills. The success of each session depends on your readiness to invest time in getting prepared and to engage in informed and critical discussions with other students.

Attendance will be monitored, and you are expected to attend every tutorial.

Should you be unable to attend you must inform your tutor in advance. Please be prepared to provide evidence where appropriate. Note that repeated or unexcused absence might affect your mark.

Engagement and active participation are encouraged. Tutors will seek to make sure everybody gets an opportunity to take part in the discussions and activities. Note that overtly passive behaviour and disinterest can affect your mark.

Listening to others is as important as talking. Listening carefully to the contributions of others will help you develop your own communication skills. Ideally, you will be able to incorporate and build off the ideas of others.

Preparation is essential because the tutorial depends on your contributions as much as others'. Make sure you have read both the core readings and the more specific tutorial readings. Always bring some ideas or points for discussion and be ready to be asked to share your perspective on topics raised in the lecture and in the readings. Tutors might give you tasks for specific sessions, which you have to prepare for as agreed.

### 2) Policy Brief (40%): due Monday, 25 February 2013, 12:00am.

Although underused in teaching, policy briefs offer a novel training tool and more realistic types of tasks that students may be faced with after university, especially in the domains of politics and international relations. They typically ask for an assessment of and recommendations to deal with a specific challenge, and comprise an executive summary, situation brief, policy options/recommendation and a list of key sources, as would be presented to decision-makers or managers. As such, they require a broader skill set than a regular undergraduate essay. Conventional essays obviously still have their part to play, and this is why we are retaining the essay and have a policy brief as an additional piece of coursework (instead of an exam).

The rationale and structure of policy briefs as a teaching tool are set out in:

- Keating, Michael F. and James D. Boys, (2009) 'The Policy Brief: Building Practical and Academic Skills in International Relations and Political Science', *Politics* 29:3, 201-208.

The specific Policy Brief assignment will be posted on LEARN nearer the time. It will be assessed in line with the honours assessment criteria and in terms of the quality of the research, presentation and policy analysis (see Appendix B).

### 2) Essay (50%): due Monday, 1 April 2013, 12:00am. Topics assigned closer to the date.

For essay assessment criteria, see Appendix C.

<p><b>Please see the 'Honours Handbook' for further information on submission of coursework, 'Late Penalty Waivers', plagiarism, learning disabilities, special circumstances, common marking descriptors, re-marking procedures and appeals.</b></p>
---

## Recommended Books

This textbook is recommended for purchase as we will use it throughout the semester:

- Williams, Paul (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge.

If you want to support a local independent bookshop, order from: Word Power Books, 43-45 West Nicolson Street, Edinburgh, EH8 9DB, Tel: 0131 662 9112, [www.word-power.co.uk](http://www.word-power.co.uk).

Other useful textbooks are:

- Baylis, John et al. (eds) (2010) *Strategy in the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (3<sup>rd</sup> edition).
- Collins, A. (ed.) (2010) *Contemporary Security Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press (2<sup>nd</sup> edition).
- Dannreuther, R. (2007) *International Security: the Contemporary Agenda*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Mahnken, T. and Maiolo, J. (eds) *Strategic Studies: A Reader*, London: Routledge
- Peoples, Columba and Nick Vaughan-Williams (2010) *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Michael E. (2010) *International Security: Politics, Policy, Prospects*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

NOTE: as International Security is such a fast changing field, make sure you always try to get the most recent editions of these textbooks. Also, these textbooks are all specifically designed for learning, which is why you should not reference them in your essay. You are instead encouraged to explore the more specialized research literature that these textbooks refer to, such as peer-reviewed journal articles.

## Peer-reviewed journals

The following peer-reviewed journals are particularly relevant for this course: *Contemporary Security Policy, Cooperation and Conflict, Foreign Affairs, International Affairs, International Peacekeeping, International Security, International Studies Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Journal of Strategic Studies, Millennium, Review of International Studies, Security Dialogue, Security Studies, Survival*.

## Weekly readings

This course guide provides you with three sets of readings for each week of the course:

- **Core readings:** these are compulsory readings, which you should ideally read before coming to the lecture. That way you will find it much easier to follow the session, and ask meaningful questions that help you with your learning.
- **Tutorial readings:** these are readings that you have to read before the tutorial to be able to contribute to the discussion and activities. They build on the core readings of each week, so make sure you read those first (see above).
- **Further readings:** these are suggested readings that are intended to give you more specific insights into a topic you are particularly interested in. They are also a starting point for your essay research but note that you will be expected to research well beyond this non-exhaustive list. Explore the bibliographies of these articles, too.

## Weekly Reading List

### WEEK 1: Monday, 14 January 2012

#### Introduction: Security? Security! (C. Gebhard)

This lecture is meant as an introduction to the course: we will discuss structure, assessment and expectations, and will then move on and try to answer some fundamental questions in the study of security: What is security? Whose security are we talking about? What counts as a security issue? And how can security be achieved? We will also take a look at the contemporary security agenda: what kind of issues, threats and fears are perceived as a challenge to security? In the tutorial, we will look at the specific agendas laid out in the US and EU security strategies to develop ideas about current security challenges and perceptions.

#### Core reading

Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge.  
[Introduction]

#### Tutorial readings

- US National Security Strategy (NSS) (2002, 2006, 2010)
- European Security Strategy (ESS): A Secure Europe in a Better World (2003)
- Report on the Implementation of the ESS: Providing Security in a Changing World (2008)

#### Further readings

\*Baldwin, D. (1997) 'The Concept of Security', *Review of International Studies* 23:1, 5-26.

Brown, M. E. (ed.). (2003) *Grave New World: Security Challenges in the 21st century*. Georgetown University Press.

\*Buzan, Barry (1991) *People, States and Fear: an Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Hemel Hempstead: Wheatsheaf. [chapters 5 and 10].

Buzan, B, O. Waever and J. de Wilde, *Security: A Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner [chapters 1 and 2].

\*Huysmans, J. (1998) 'Security! What Do You Mean?', *European Journal of International Relations* 4:2, 226-255.

Dannreuther, R. (2007) *International Security: the Contemporary Agenda*. Cambridge: Polity Press. [chapter 1]

Keen, D. (2000) 'War and Peace: What's the Difference?', *International Peacekeeping*, 7(4), 1-22.

Krahmann, E. (ed.) (2005) *New Threats and New Actors in International Security*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rothschild, E. (1995) 'What is Security?', *Daedalus* 124:3, 53-98.

Zedner, L. (2003) 'The Concept of Security: an Agenda for Comparative Analysis', *Legal Studies* 23:1, 153-175.

Peral, L. (ed.) (2009) 'Global Security in a Multi-Polar World', *Chaillot Paper*, No. 118. Paris: EUISS.

---

(\*particularly relevant for the issues covered in the lecture)

## **WEEK 2: Monday, 21 January 2012**

### **Analyzing International Security: What, When and How? (Carmen Gebhard)**

In this lecture we will discuss major geopolitical changes in global history that had an impact on the study of security. We will talk about the end of the Cold War as a critical turning point in International Relations, and look at the various implications security analysts have identified. In preparation for lectures 3 and 4, we will also start looking at the way International Relations theories have been developed to explain historical events and the subsequent changes in the international security agenda. In the tutorial we will look at three of the most prominent examples of the way the end of the Cold War was interpreted by analysts.

#### **Core readings**

- Dannreuther, R. (2007) *International Security: the Contemporary Agenda*. Cambridge: Polity Press. [chapter 2] [e-reserve on LEARN] OR Ferguson, N. (2004) 'A World Without Power', *Foreign Policy*, 32-39.
- Walt, S. M. (1998) 'International Relations: One World, Many Theories', *Foreign Policy*, 110 (Special Edition: 'Frontiers of Knowledge'), 29-32 and 34-46.

#### **Tutorial readings**

- Huntington, S. P. (1992) 'The Clash of Civilizations', *Foreign Affairs* 72: 22.
- Fukuyama, F. (1989) 'The End of History?', *The National Interest* 16 (Summer): 3-18.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (1990) 'Why we Will Soon Miss the Cold War', *The Atlantic Monthly*, 266:2, 35-50.

#### **Further readings**

- Baldwin, D.A. (1995) 'Security Studies and the End of the Cold War', *World Politics* 48:1, 117-141.
- Bialasiewicz, L. et al. (2007) 'Performing Security: the Imaginative Geographies of Current US Strategy', *Political Geography* 26:4, 405-422.
- Buzan, B (1997) 'Rethinking Security after the Cold War', *Cooperation and Conflict* 32:1. 5-28.
- Buzan, B. and Wæver, O. (2003) *Regions and powers: the structure of international security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \*Buzan, B. and L. Hansen (2009) *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 21-65.
- De Carvalho, B. et al. (2011) 'The Big Bangs of IR: The Myths That Your Teachers Still Tell You about 1648 and 1919,' *Millennium* 39:3, 735-758.
- Deudney, D. and G. J. Ikenberry (2009) 'The Unravelling of the Cold War Settlement', *Survival* 51:6, 39-62.
- Freedman, L. (1998) 'International Security: Changing Targets', *Foreign Policy*, 48-63.
- \*Freedman, L. (2006) 'The Transformation of Grand Strategy', *Adelphi Papers*, 45:379, 27-48.
- Inglehart, R. and P. Norris (2003) 'The True Clash of Civilizations', *Foreign Policy*, 63-70.
- Lebow, Richard Ned and Janice Gross Stein (1989) 'Rational Deterrence Theory: I Think, Therefore I Deter', *World Politics* 41:2, 208-224.
- Mandelbaum, Michael (1995) 'Lessons of the Next Nuclear War', *Foreign Affairs* 74:2, 22-37.

- Payne, K. B. (1986) *Strategic Defense: 'Star Wars' in Perspective*. Lanham MD: Hamilton Press.
- \*Robert D Kaplan, 'The Coming Anarchy', *The Atlantic Monthly*, February 1994.
- Roberts, A. (2008) 'International Relations after the Cold War', *International Affairs* 84:2, 335-350.
- Skidmore, D. (1999) 'Huntington's Clash Revisited', *Global Change, Peace & Security* 11:1, 63-73.
- Snyder, J. (2004) 'One World, Rival Theories', *Foreign Policy*, 145, 53-62.
- Van Evera, S. (1990-91) 'Primed for Peace: Europe after the Cold War', *International Security* 15:3, 7-57.
- \*Walt, S. M. (1991) 'The Renaissance of Security Studies', *International Studies Quarterly*, 211-239.

---

### **WEEK 3: Monday, 28 January 2012**

#### **Conventional Security Studies: Tragedy and Romance Between States (X. Guillaume)**

This session is dedicated to the two core traditions in International Relations. The realist and liberal tradition each follow a significantly different understanding of security. For the past 60 years, they have not only structured academic debates but also policy developments. The lecture concentrates on key elements while the tutorial helps students to engage with the arguments of each of these two traditions in the context of the debate over nuclear weapons.

#### **Core readings**

Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge. [chapter 2 and 3 – “Realisms” and “Liberalisms”]

#### **Tutorial readings**

- Sagan, S.D. and K. Waltz (2010) 'The Great Debate – Is Nuclear Zero the best Option?', *National Interest*.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1990) 'Nuclear Myths and Political Realities', *American Political Science Review* 84:3, 731–745.
- Quinlan, M. (2007) 'Abolishing Nuclear Armouries: Policy or Pipedream?' *Survival* 49:4, 7-15.

#### **Further readings**

- Buzan, B. (1991) *People, States and Fear: an Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. Hemel Hempstead: Wheatsheaf. [chapter 4]
- Chan, S. (1997) 'In Search of Democratic Peace: Problems and Promise', *Mershon International Studies Review* 41:1, 59–91.
- \*Deudney, D. and G. Ikenberry, (1999) 'The Nature and Sources of Liberal International Order', *Review of International Studies* 25:2, 179-196.
- \*Doyle, Michael W. (1986) 'Liberalism and World Politics', *American Political Science Review* 80:4, 1151–1169.
- Eric J. Labs (1997) 'Beyond Victory: Offensive Realism and the Expansion of War Aims', *Security Studies* 6:4, 1-49.
- Fearon, James D. (1995) 'Rationalist Explanations for War', *International Organization* 49:3, 379-414.



- Glaser, C. (1997) 'The Security Dilemma Revisited', *World Politics* 50:1, 171-201.
- Glaser, C.L. and C. Kaufmann (1998) 'What Is the Offense-Defense Balance and How Can We Measure It?' *International Security* 22:4, 44-82.
- Grieco, J. M. (1988) 'Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: a Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism', *International Organization* 42:3, 485-507.
- Jervis, R. (1978) 'Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma', *World Politics* 30:2, 167-214.
- Keohane, Robert O. 2005[1984]. *After Hegemony. Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kirshner, J. (2000) 'Rationalist Explanations for War?' *Security Studies* 10:1, 143-150.
- Lebow, Richard Ned (2003) *The Tragic Vision of Politics. Ethics, Interests and Orders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \*Legro, J. W. and A. Moravcsik, (1999) 'Is Anybody still a Realist?' *International Security*, 24:2, 5-55.
- Mansfield, Edward D. and Brian M. Pollins (2001) 'The Study of Interdependence and Conflict', *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45:6, 834-59.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Moravcsik, A. (1997) 'Taking Preferences Seriously: A liberal theory of International Politics', *International Organization* 51:04, 513-553.
- Morgenthau, Hans J. 1993 [1985] *Politics Among Nations. The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Brief edition revised by Kenneth W. Thompson. Boston, McGraw-Hill.
- Oye, Kenneth A. (ed.) (1986) *Cooperation under Anarchy*. Princeton: P. University Press.
- \*Rosato, S. (2003) 'The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory,' *American Political Science Review* 97:4, 595-602.
- Russett, B. (1993) *Grasping the Democratic Peace. Principles for a Post-Cold War World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Schweller, R L. (1994) 'Bandwagoning for Profit: Bringing the Revisionist State Back in,' *International Security*, 72-107.
- Schweller, R. (1996) 'Neorealism's Status-Quo Bias: What Security Dilemma?' in Frankel, B. (ed.) *Realism: Restatements and Renewal*. London: Frank Cass, 90-121.
- Van Evara, Stephen (1999) *Causes of War. Power and the Roots of Conflict*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1954) *Man, the State and War. A Theoretical Analysis*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. Boston, McGraw-Hill.
- Williams, Michael C. (2001) 'The Discipline of the Democratic Peace: Kant, Liberalism and the Social Construction of Security Communities,' *European Journal of International Relations* 7:4, 525-553.
- Wohlforth, W. et al. (2007) 'Testing Balance-of-Power Theory in World History', *European Journal of International Relations* 13:2, 155-185.
- More on the Nuclear Issue* (see also week 11)
- Lieber, K. and D. Press (2006) 'The End of MAD? The Nuclear Dimension of U.S. Primacy', *International Security* 30: 4, 7-44.
- Potter, William C. and G. Mukhatzhanova (2008) 'Divining Nuclear Intentions: A Review Essay', *International Security*, 33:1, 139-169.
- Quinlan, M. (2007) 'Abolishing Nuclear Armouries: Policy or Pipedream?' *Survival* 49:4, 7-15.

- Sagan, Scott D. (1996) 'Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb', *International Security* 21:3, 54–86.
- Sagan, S.D. (2009) 'The Case for No First Use', *Survival* 51:3, 163–182.
- \*Sagan, S.D. and K. Waltz (2002) *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Tannenwald, N. (1999) 'The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use', *International Organization*, 53:3, 433–468.
- Walker, W. (2007) 'Nuclear Enlightenment and Counter-Enlightenment', *International Affairs*, 83:3, 431–453.
- Wilkening, D. (2010) 'Nuclear Zero and Ballistic Missile Defence', *Survival*, 52, 6: 107–126

---

## **WEEK 4: Monday, 4 February 2012**

### **Critical Security Studies:**

#### **Saying is doing, but doing is what you (critically) make of it (X. Guillaume)**

This session is dedicated to Critical approaches in Security Studies. The multiple approaches of Critical Security Studies have a distinctive focus on agents and the individual level and thus are reflective of the limitations that classical paradigms such as Realism and Liberalism faced in understanding and explaining non-state security issues such as transnational terrorism, environmental issues or gender aspects of security. The lecture aims to offer a broad overview of the key dimensions of Critical Security Studies while the tutorial is designed to help you engage with a central question: the *production* of danger and security.

### **Core readings**

- Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge. [chapter 5 – “Constructivisms”]
- Peoples, C. and N. Vaughan-Williams (2010) *Critical Security Studies. An Introduction*. London: Routledge, Introduction. [chapter 1] [E-reserve on LEARN].

### **Tutorial readings**

- Cohn, Carol (1987) 'Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 12 (4): 687–718.
- Jaffe, Greg (2012) 'The World is Safer but no one in Washington can talk About it', *Washington Post*, 4 November 2012.

### **Further readings**

- Aas, K.F. Oppen Gundhus, H. and H.M. Lomell (eds) (2008) *Technologies of InSecurity: the Surveillance of Everyday Life*. London: Routledge.
- Adler, E. and M. Barnett (eds) (1998) *Security Communities*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barkawi, T. and M. Laffey (2006) 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies', *Review of International Studies* 32:2, 329–352.
- Bigo, D. (2006) 'Internal and External Aspects of Security', *European Security* 15:4, 385–404.
- \*Bialasiewicz, L. et al. (2007) 'Performing Security: the Imaginative Geographies of Current US Strategy', *Political Geography* 26:4, 405–422.

- Bilgin, P. (2005) *Regional Security in the Middle East. A Critical Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Booth, K (ed) (2005) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, London: Lynne Rienner.
- Buzan, B, O. Waever and J. de Wilde, *Security: A Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner [chapters 1 and 2].
- c. a. s. e. collective (group authorship) (2006) 'Critical Approaches to Security in Europe: a Networked Manifesto', *Security Dialogue* 37:4, 443–487.
- Campbell, D. (1992) *Writing Security. United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- \*Cohn, C., F. Hill and S. Ruddick (2005) The Relevance of Gender for Eliminating Weapons of Mass Destruction. *Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission*.
- \*Cox, R. W. (1981) 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10:2, 126-155.
- \*Dalby, Simon (1988) 'Geopolitical Discourse: the Soviet Union as Other', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 13:4, 415–442.
- Deudney, D.H. (1990) 'The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation with National Security', *Millennium* 19:3, 461-476.
- Dupont, A. (2008) 'The Strategic Implications of Climate Change', *Survival* 50:3, 29-54.
- Fierke, K. M. (2007) *Critical approaches to international security*. Cambridge: Polity.
- \*Floyd, R. (2007) 'Towards a Consequentialist Evaluation of Security: Bringing Together the Copenhagen and the Welsh Schools of Security Studies', *Review of International Studies* 33:2, 327-350.
- Guillaume, X. (2011) *International Relations and Identity. A Dialogical Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Hansen, L. (2000) 'The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 29:2, 285-306.
- Hansen, L. (2006) *Security as Practice. Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London: Routledge.
- \*Huysmans, J. (1998) 'Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier', *European Journal of International Relations* 4:2, 226–255.
- Huysmans, J., Dobson, A. and R. Prokhovnik (eds) (2006) *The Politics of Protection. Sites of Insecurity and Political Agency*. London: Routledge.
- Katzenstein, P.J. (ed.) (1996) *The Culture of National Security. Norms and Identity in World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- \*Krause, K., & Latham, A. (1998) 'Constructing Non-Proliferation and Arms Control: The Norms of Western Practice', *Contemporary Security Policy* 19:1, 23-54.
- Krause, K. and M.C. Williams (eds) (1997) *Critical Security Studies. Concepts and Cases*. London: UCL Press.
- Prozorov, Sergei. (2007) 'The Narratives of Exclusion and Self-Exclusion in the Russian Conflict Discourse on EU–Russian Relations', *Political Geography* 26:3, 309–329.
- Salter, M.B. (ed.) (2008) *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Stern, M. (2011). Gender and Race in the European Security Strategy: Europe as a 'Force for Good' Quest', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 14:1, 28-59.
- Weiss, T. G. (2004) 'The Sunset of Humanitarian Intervention? The Responsibility to Protect in a Unipolar Era', *Security Dialogue* 35:2, 135-153.
- Weldes, J. et al. (eds) (1999) *Cultures of Insecurity. States, Communities, and the Production of Danger*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Wendt, A. (1995) Constructing International Politics, *International Security*, 20:1, 71-81.
- Wendt, Alexander (1992) 'Anarchy is What States Make of it: the Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization* 46:2, 391-425.
- Zedner, L. (2003) 'The Concept of Security: an Agenda for Comparative Analysis', *Legal Studies*, 23:1, 153-175.

*Critical reflection of Critical Security Studies*

- \*Hobson, John M. (2007) 'Is Critical Theory Always for the White West and for Western Imperialism? Beyond Westphalian Towards a Post-racist Critical IR', *Review of International Studies* 33, 91-116.
- Mohanty, C.T. (1986) 'Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses', *Boundary 2*, 12:3, 333-58.
- Stern, M. and Zalewski, M. (2009) 'Feminist Fatigue (s): Reflections on Feminism and Familiar Fables of Militarisation', *Review of International Studies* 35:3, 611-630.

---

**WEEK 5: Monday, 11 February 2012**

**The Changing Nature of War: Old Problems, New Solutions? (C. Gebhard)**

In this lecture we will first look at traditional conceptions of "war" and discuss which role the concept plays in the study of security. We will look at some fundamental tenets of classical strategic thought on war before turning to more recent strategic trends and discussions. Is the post-Cold War world dealing with a "new" kind of wars? How have approaches to warfare changed from a military and technological point of view? To what extent do these new approaches reflect the changing nature of warfare? In the tutorial we will look more closely into the debate on whether new wars are actually "new" and whether recently developed concepts help solving the specific problems faced in today's warfare.

**Core readings**

- Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge. [chapter 13 – "War"] [if of interest, also chapter 31 – "Counterinsurgency"]
- Benbow, T. (2009) 'Irresistible Force or Immoveable Object? The "Revolution in Military Affairs" and Asymmetric Warfare', *Defense and Security Analysis*, 25:1, 21-36.

**Tutorial readings**

- Gray, C. (2010) 'War: Continuity in Change, Change in Continuity', *Parameters* 40, 5-13.
- Gray, C. (2012) 'Concept Failure? COIN, Counterinsurgency and Strategic Theory', *Prism* 3(3), 17-32.

Arquilla, J. and D Ronfeldt, *Networks and Netwars*, 2001. Also [www.rand.org](http://www.rand.org).

- \*Arreguin-Toft, I. (2001) 'How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict', *International Security* 26:1, 93-128.
- Berdal, M. (2003) 'How New Are New Wars-Global Economic Change and the Study of Civil War', *Global Governance* 9, 477-522.
- Benbow, T. (2008) 'Talking 'Bout Our Generation? Assessing the Concept of "Fourth-Generation Warfare"', *Comparative Strategy* 27:2, 148-163.

- Biddle, S. (2007), 'Iraq, Afghanistan and American Military Transformation' in Baylis, J. et al. (eds) *Strategy in the Contemporary World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cornish, P (2009) 'The US and Counter-insurgency', *International Affairs*, 85, 1: 61-79.
- Dalby, S. (2009) 'Geopolitics, the Revolution in Military Affairs and the Bush Doctrine', *International Politics* 46:2, 234-252.
- Duffield, M. (2001) *Global Governance and the New Wars*, London: Zed Books.
- Duffield, M. (2002) 'War as a Network Enterprise: the New Security Terrain and its Implications', *Cultural Values* 6:1/2, 153-165.
- Duyvesteyn, I. (2000) 'Contemporary War: Ethnic Conflict, Resource Conflict or Something Else?', *Civil Wars* 3:1, 92-116.
- Duyvesteyn, I. (2008) 'Great Expectations: the Use of Armed Force to Combat Terrorism', *Small Wars and Insurgencies* 19:3, 328-351.
- Echevarria II, A. J. (2005) 'Deconstructing the Theory of Fourth-Generation War', *Contemporary Security Policy* 26:2, 233-241.
- \*Fleming, C. M. (2009) 'New or Old Wars? Debating a Clausewitzian Future', *Journal of Strategic Studies* 32:2, 213-241.
- Graham, S. (2012) 'When Life Itself is War: On the Urbanization of Military and Security Doctrine', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 36(1), 136-155.
- Gray, C. (2001) 'The RMA and Intervention: A Sceptical View', *Contemporary Security Policy* 22:3, 52-65.
- Gray, C. (2005) *Another Bloody Century: Future Warfare*. London: Phoenix.
- \*Hammes, T. X. (2005) 'War Evolves into the Fourth Generation,' *Contemporary Security Policy*, 26:2, 189-221.
- \*Freedman, L. (2005) 'War Evolves into the Fourth Generation: A comment on Thomas X. Hammes', *Contemporary Security Policy*, 26:2, 254-263.
- \*Henderson, E. and Singer, J. (2002) "'New Wars" and Rumors of New Wars', *International Interactions*, 28:2, 165-190.
- Jones, D. M. and Smith, M. (2010) 'Whose Hearts and Whose Minds? The Curious Case of Global Counter-Insurgency,' *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 33:1, 81-121.
- \*Kaldor, M. (1999) *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Kalyvas, S.N. (2001) "'New" and "Old" Civil Wars: A Valid Distinction? *World Politics* 54:1, 99-118.
- Keen, D. (2000) 'War and Peace: What's the Difference?' *International Peacekeeping* 7:4, 1-22.
- Kilcullen, D. (2006) 'Counter-Insurgency Redux', *Survival* 48:4: 111-130
- Mack, A (2008), 'Why Big Nations Lose Small Wars: the Politics of Asymmetric Conflict' in Mahnken, T and Maiolo, J (eds) *Strategic Studies: A Reader*, London: Routledge.
- Mazarr, M.J. (2009) 'The Folly of 'Asymmetric War'', *Washington Quarterly* 31:3, 33-53.
- Melander, E., Öberg, M. and Hall, J. (2009) 'Are 'New Wars' more Atrocious? Battle Severity, Civilians Killed and Forced Migration Before and After the End of the Cold War', *European Journal of International Relations* 15:3, 505-536.
- Merom, G. (2012) 'The Age of Asocial War: Democratic Intervention and Counterinsurgency in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century', *Australian Journal of International Affairs* 66:3, 365-380.
- \*Münkler, H. (2005) *The New Wars*. Cambridge: Polity. [Chapter 1] [e-reserve on LEARN]
- Newman, E. (2004) 'The 'New Wars' Debate: A Historical Perspective is Needed', *Security Dialogue* 35:2, 173-189.

- Olsen, John A. and M. Van Creveld (2010) *The Evolution of Operational Art: From Napoleon to the Present*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \*Record, J. (2005), 'The Limits and Temptations of America's Conventional Military Primacy', *Survival* 47:1: 33-49.
- Smith, R. (2005) *The Utility of Force: the Art of War in the Modern World*. London: Vintage.
- Thornton, R. (2006) *Asymmetric Warfare: Threat and Response in the 21st Century*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Van Creveld, M. (2007) *The Changing Face of War: Lessons of Combat, from the Marne to Iraq*. San Marino: Presidio Press.
- Van Creveld, M. (2011) 'The Rise and Fall of Air Power', *RUSI Journal* 156:3, 48-54.
- Van Evara, S. (1999) *Causes of War. Power and the Roots of Conflict*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

---

**WEEK 6: Monday, 18 February 2012 - Innovative Learning Week (NO LECTURE)**

**NOTE: Policy Brief is due on Monday 25 February 2013, before 12:00 noon.**

---

**WEEK 7: Monday, 25 February 2012**

**Global and Regional Security Governance: United We Stand? (C. Gebhard)**

We will discuss the role of international and regional security institutions in the management of conflict and peace. We will first look at the fundamental tenets of institutionalist and regime theory as well as at the concept of security governance before turning to specific examples of global and regional security governance. In the tutorial, we will discuss recent examples of where security governance has been challenged by political interests and circumstances, and look at potential reforms to global and regional security regimes.

**Core readings**

- Drezner, Daniel W. (2008) 'Two Challenges to Institutionalism', in Alexandroff, A. (ed.) *Can the World Be Governed? Possibilities for Effective Multilateralism*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 139-159. [e-reserve on LEARN]
- Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Routledge. [chapter 23 – "Alliances"]

**Tutorial readings**

- Brooks, S. G. and Wohlforth, W. C. (2009) 'Reshaping the World Order – How Washington Should Reform International Institutions', *Foreign Affairs* 88, 49.
- Fearon, James D. (2008) 'International Institutions and Collective Authorization of the Use of Force', in Alexandroff, A. (ed.) *Can the World Be Governed? Possibilities for Effective Multilateralism*. Waterloo, Ontario: W. Laurier University Press, 160-193.

- \*Arquilla, J. (2007) 'The End of War as We Knew It? Insurgency, Counterinsurgency and Lessons from the Forgotten History of Early Terror Networks', *Third World Quarterly*, 28:2, 369-386.
- Breslin, S., and Croft, S. (2012) *Comparative Regional Security Governance*. Routledge.
- Buckley, C. A. (2012) 'Learning from Libya, Acting in Syria', *Journal of Strategic Security* 5:2, 10.

- Buzan, B. and Wæver, O. (2003) *Regions and Powers: the Structure of International Security*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \*Caporaso, J. A. (1992) 'International Relations Theory and Multilateralism: the Search for Foundations', *International Organization* 46:3, 599-632.
- Cortell, A. and Davis, J. (1996) 'How do International Institutions Matter? The Domestic Impact of International Rules and Norms', *International Studies Quarterly*, 451-478.
- Daalder, I., and Goldgeier, J. (2006) 'Global NATO', *Foreign Affairs* 85, 105.
- Diehl, P. F., and Frederking, B. (2010) *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- Dorman, A. M. (2012) 'NATO's 2012 Chicago Summit: a Chance to Ignore the Issues Once Again?' *International Affairs* 88:2, 301-312.
- Gheciu, A. (2008) *Securing Civilization? The EU, NATO and the OSCE in the Post-9/11 World: The EU, NATO and the OSCE in the Post-9/11 World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- \*Gordon, P. H. and Shapiro, J. (2004) *Allies at War: America, Europe and the Crisis Over Iraq*. New York et al.: McGraw Hill, 1-16.
- Grieco, J. M., Gelpi, C., Reifler, J. and P.D. Feaver (2011) 'Let's Get a Second Opinion: International Institutions and American Public Support for War', *International Studies Quarterly* 55:2, 563-583.
- Haftendorn, H., Keohane, R. O. and C.A. Wallender (eds) (1999) *Imperfect Unions: Security Institutions over Time and Space*. Oxford: Oxford University Press..
- \*Harsch, M. F. and Varwick, J. (2009) 'NATO and the UN', *Survival* 51(2), 5-12.
- Hofmann, S. C. (2011) 'Why Institutional Overlap Matters: CSDP in the European Security Architecture', *Journal of Common Market Studies* 49:1, 101-120.
- Hofmann, S. C. and Jütersonke, O. (2012) 'Regional Organizations and the Responsibility to Protect in the Context of the Arab Spring', *Swiss Political Science Review* 18:1, 132-135.
- Kanet, R. E. (2008) 'Still Mars, Still Venus? The United States, Europe, and the Future of the Transatlantic Relationship', *International Politics* 45:3, 231-235.
- Keohane, R.O. (1988) 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', *International Studies Quarterly* 32:4, 379-396.
- \*Keohane, R. O. (1998) 'International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?' *Foreign Policy*, 82-194.
- Krahmann, E. (2005) 'American Hegemony or Global Governance? Competing Visions of International Security', *International Studies Review* 7:4, 531-545.
- \*Mearsheimer, J. J. (1994) 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security* 19:3, 5-49.
- \*Keohane, R. O. and Martin, L. L. (1995) 'The Promise of Institutional Theory', *International Security* 20:1, 39-51.
- Schweller, R L, and D Priess (1997) 'A Tale of Two Realisms: Expanding the Institutions Debate,' *Mershon International Studies Review* 41:1, 1-32.
- Thomas, C. (2001) 'Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links' *Third World Quarterly* 22:2, 159-175.
- Walt, Stephen M. (1987) *The Origins of Alliances*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press.
- \*Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge. [chapter 24]
- \*Whitman, R. G., & Wolff, S. (2012) 'The EU as a Global Conflict Manager', *European Union as a Global Conflict Manager*. London: Routledge, 3-19. [e-book in library]

## **WEEK 8: Monday, 4 March 2012**

### **Security & Development: Humanizing Security or Securitizing Development? (J. Hönke)**

In this lecture, we will discuss the way development and the eradication of poverty have become intertwined with concerns over global and regional security – a tendency that is commonly referred to as the “security-development nexus”. We will first look at the modernization paradigm, which lies at the heart of Western perception of development, and its postcolonialist and culturalist critics. We will then discuss the central concept of “human security”, which has been employed in development-focused approaches to security. In the tutorial we will look more closely at the concept and discuss potential policy implications and criticisms.

#### **Core readings**

- Stern M. and Öjendal, J. (2010) ‘Mapping the Security-Development Nexus: Conflict, Complexity, Cacophony, Convergence?’, *Security Dialogue* 41:1, 5-29.
- Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge. [chapter 19 and 20 – “Human Security” and “Poverty”]

#### **Tutorial readings**

- Chandler, D. (2008) ‘Review Essay: Human Security: The Dog That Didn’t Bark’, *Security Dialogue* 39: 427-438.
- Owen, T. (2008) ‘The Critique That Doesn’t Bite: A Response to David Chandler’s ‘Human Security: The Dog That Didn’t Bark’, *Security Dialogue* 39: 445-453.
- (if of interest, also check out Ambrosetti, Chandler and Wibben in the same journal issue)

#### **Further readings**

- \*Ayoob, M. (1991) ‘The Security Problematic of the Third World’ *World Politics* 43:2, 257-283
- Ayoob, Mohammed (1995), *The Third World Security Predicament*, Boulder: Lynne Rienner.
- \*Bachmann, J. and Hönke, J. (2010) “‘Peace and Security’ as Counterterrorism? Old and New Liberal Interventions and Social Effects in Kenya”, *African Affairs* 109:434, 97-114.
- Barkawi, Tarak, and Mark Laffey (2006) ‘The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies’, *Review of International Studies* 32:2, 329-352.
- Belloni, R. (2007) ‘The Trouble with Humanitarianism’, *Review of International Studies* 33, 451-474.
- Beall, J., Goodfellow, T. and Putzel, J. (2006) ‘Introductory Article: On the Discourse of Terrorism, Security and Development’, *Journal of International Development* 18: 1, 51-67.
- Bilgin, P. (2008) ‘Thinking Past Western IR?’, *Third World Quarterly* 29:1, 5-23.
- \*Chandler, D. (2007) ‘The Security-Development Nexus and the Rise of Anti-Foreign Policy,’ *Journal of International Relations and Development* 10:4, 362-386.
- Chandler, D. (2010) *International Statebuilding: The Rise of Post-Liberal Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Collier, P. (2003) *Breaking the Conflict Trap. Civil War and Development Policy*. Washington DC: World Bank Oxford University Press.
- Collier, P. (2008) ‘Facing the Problems of Global Development’, in Alexandroff, A. (ed.) *Can the World Be Governed? Possibilities for Effective Multilateralism*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfred Laurier University Press, 241-280. [e-book]



- \*Duffield, M. (2001) *Global Governance and the New Wars. The Merging of Development and Security*. London, New York: Zed Books.
- \*Duffield, M. (2007) *Development, Security and Unending War. Governing the World of People*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Duffield, M. (1997) 'NGO Relief in War Zones: Towards an Analysis of the New Aid Paradigm', *Third World Quarterly* 18:3, 527-542.
- Etzioni, A. (2007) *Security First*. New Haven, Conn., London: Yale University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (2004) 'The Imperative of State-Building', *Journal of Democracy* 15: 2, 17–31.
- Hönke, J., and Müller, M. (2012) 'Governing (In)security in a Postcolonial World: Transnational Entanglements and the Worldliness of 'Local' Practice', *Security Dialogue* 43:5, 383-401.
- Kaldor, Mary, M. Martin, and S. Selchow (2007) 'Human Security: a New Strategic Narrative for Europe', *International Affairs* 83:2, 273-288.
- Khong, Y. (2001) 'Human Security: A Shotgun Approach to Alleviating Human Misery?', *Global Governance* 7:3, 231-236.
- Leys, C. (1996) *The Rise and Fall of Development Theory*. London: James Currey.
- Menkhaus, K. (2004) 'Vicious Circles and the Security Development Nexus in Somalia', *Conflict, Security & Development* 4:2, 149-165.
- Muscat, R. J. (2002) *Investing in Peace: How Development Aid Can Prevent or Promote Conflict*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- \*Paris, Roland (2001) 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?', *International Security* 26:2, 187-102.
- Paris, R. (2004) *At War's End: Building Peace after Civil Conflict*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Paris, R. and Sisk, T.D. (eds) (2008) *The Dilemmas of Statebuilding. Confronting the Contradictions of Postwar Peace Operations*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Peoples, Columba and Nick Vaughan-Williams (2010) *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*. London: Routledge [chapters 3 and 8].
- \*Reid-Henry, S. (2011) 'Spaces of Security and Development An Alternative Mapping of the Security-Development Nexus', *Security Dialogue* 42:1, 97-104. [in response to Stern and Öjendal (2010)].
- Richmond, O. P. and J. Franks (2009) *Liberal Peace Transitions: Between Statebuilding and Peacebuilding*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ryan, B. (2009) 'The EU's Emergent Security-First Agenda: Securing Albania and Montenegro', *Security Dialogue* 40:3, 311-331.
- Stewart, F. and E. V. K. Fitzgerald (2001) *War and Underdevelopment. The Economic and Social Consequences of Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, C. (2001) 'Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links', *Third World Quarterly* 22:2, 159-175.
- \*Thomas, C. (1987) *In Search of Security: The Third World in International Relations*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Tschirgi, N., Lund, M.S. and Mancini, F. (eds) (2009) *Security and Development: Searching for Critical Connections*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- \*Watson, Scott (2011) 'The 'Human' as Referent Object? Humanitarianism as Securitization', *Security Dialogue* 42: 3-20.
- Zoellick, R (2008) 'Fragile States: Securing Development', *Survival* 50:6, 67-84.
- Special Issue on Human Security in *Security Dialogue* (2004) 35:3.

---

**WEEK 9: Monday, 11 March 2012****Security and Business: The Political Economy of War and Peace (J. Hönke)**

In this lecture we will focus on the way security can be related to business. We will look at the political economy of war and peace by discussing specific examples of the “security-business nexus”, such as the role of private military and security companies (PMCs) and multinational corporations in the global governance of security as well as issues related to arms manufacturing and trade. In the tutorial, we will look at the destabilizing impact of PMCs on public security and the way these companies seek to enhance their reputation as security actors.

**Core readings**

Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge. [chapters 28 and 29 – “Private Security” and “International Arms Trade”]

**Tutorial readings**

Leander, A. (2005) ‘The Market for Force and Public Security. The Destabilizing Consequences of PMCs’, *Journal of Peace Research* 42, 605-622.

Joachim, J. and Schneiker, A. (2012) ‘New Humanitarians? Frame Appropriation through Private Military and Security Companies’, *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 40:2, 365-388.

**Further readings**

Avant, D. (2005) *The Market for Force*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Berdal, M. and D. Malone (eds.) *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars*. Lynne Rienner.

Collier, P. (2000) ‘Doing Well out of War: An Economic Perspective’, in Berdal, M. and D. Malone (eds) *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars*. Lynne Rienner.

\*Collier, P. (2003) ‘The Market for Civil War’, *Foreign Policy*.

Collier, P., and A. Hoeffle (1998) ‘On Economic Causes of Civil War’, *Oxford Economic Papers* 50, 563-73

Cramer, C. (2002) ‘Homo Economicus Goes to War: Methodological Individualism, Rational Choice and the Political Economy of War’, *World Development* 30:11, 1845-1864.

Deitelhoff, N. and Wolf, K.-D. (eds) (2010) *Corporate Security Responsibility?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Drohan, M. (2004) *Making a Killing: How and Why Corporations Use Armed Force to Do Business*. Guilford, CT: Lyon's Press.

Hönke, J. (2012) ‘Multinationals and Security Governance in the Community: Participation, Discipline and Indirect Rule’, *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding*, 6:1, 57-73.

Le Billon, P. (2001) ‘Angola’s Political Economy of War: the Role of Oil and Diamonds, 1975-2000’, *African Affairs* 100:398, 55-80.

Le Billon, P. (2001) ‘The Political Ecology of War: Natural Resources and Armed Conflicts’, *Political Geography* 20:5, 561-584.

Snyder, Richard (2006) ‘Does Lootable Wealth Breed Disorder? A Political Economy of Extraction Framework’, *Comparative Political Studies* 39:8, 943-968

*More on private military and security companies*

- Abrahamsen, R. and Williams, M.C. (2010) *Security Beyond the State. Security Privatization and International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Abrahamsen, R. and Williams, M.C. (2011) 'Privatisation in Practice. Power and Capital in the Field of Global Security', in Adler, E. and Pouliot, V. (eds) *International Practices*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 310-331. [E-reserve on LEARN].
- \*Avant, D.D. and de Nevers, R. (2011) 'Military Contractors and the American Way of War', *Daedalus*, 140:3, 88-99.
- \*Bjork, K. and Jones, R. (2005) 'Overcoming Dilemmas Created by the 21st Century Mercenaries: Conceptualising the Use of Private Security Companies in Iraq', *Third World Quarterly* 26:4-5, 777-796.
- Chesterman, S. and C. Lehnardt (2007) *From Mercenaries to Market: the Rise and Regulation of Private Military Companies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krahmann, E. (2010) *States, Citizens and the Privatisation of Security*. New York, NY, Cambridge University Press.
- Leander, A. (2005) 'The Power to Construct International Security: On the Significance of Private Military Companies', *Millennium* 33:3, 803-826.
- Singer, P.W. (2003) *Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

*On arms manufacturing and trade and "military-industrial complexes"*

- Krause, K. (1992) *Arms and the State: Patterns of Military Production and Trade*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Corera, G. (2006) *Shopping for Bombs: Nuclear Proliferation, Global Insecurity, and the Rise and Fall of the A.Q. Khan Network*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brooks, S. G. (2005) *Producing Security: Multinational Corporations, Globalization, and the Changing Calculus of Conflict*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- \*Der Derian, J. (2002) 'Cyberspace as Battlespace: The New Virtual Alliance of the Military, the Media and the Entertainment Industry', in Armitage, J. and J. Roberts (eds), *Living with Cyberspace: Technology and Society in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. New York: Continuum, 61-71.
- Der Derian (2009) *Virtuous Wars. Mapping the Military-Industrial – Media – Entertainment Network*. London: Routledge.
- Lobo-Guerrero, L. (2011) *Insuring War*. London: Routledge.
- Mutimer, D. (2000) *The Weapons State: Proliferation and the Framing of Security*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

*On multinational companies and conflict/security*

- Bailes, A. J. K. and I. Frommelt (eds) (2004) *Business and Security. Public-Private Sector Relationships in a New Security Environment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Deitelhoff, N. and Wolf, K. (eds) (2010) *Corporate Security Responsibility?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Haufler, V. (2010) 'Governing Corporations in Zones of Conflict: issues, actors and institutions', in Avant, D., M. Finnemore and S. Sell. (eds) *Who Governs the Globe?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \*Hönke, J. (2013) *Transnational Companies and (In)Security Governance*. Routledge [ch.1].
- Reno, W. (2004) 'Order and Commerce in Turbulent Areas: 19<sup>th</sup> Century Lessons, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Practice', *Third World Quarterly* 25:4, 607-625.
- Sweetman, D. (2009) *Business, Conflict Resolution and Peacebuilding: Contributions from the Private Sector to Address Violent Conflict*. London; New York: Routledge.

---

## WEEK 10: Monday, 18 March 2012

### **Intervention: Prevention, Pre-Emption, Protection – Just War or just war? (C. Gebhard)**

In this lecture we will deal with international intervention and interventionism against the background of prevention (pre-emption) and protection. Intervention not only touches upon the issue of sovereignty and the principle of political independence of states in the international system but also raises questions over the legitimacy and morality of such intervention, particularly in the context of prevention (pre-emption). We will discuss the concept of “Just War” and the way it has recently seen a revival in the form of “humanitarian wars”. In this context, we will also look at current debates over the “Responsibility to Protect” (R2P), i.e. not just the right but the obligation to intervene when human lives are threatened. In the tutorial, we will look more closely at the ambiguities of “Just Intervention”.

### **Core readings**

- Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge.  
[chapter 32 – “The Responsibility to Protect”]
- Freedman, L. (2006) ‘Iraq, Liberal Wars and Illiberal Containment’, *Survival* 48:4, 51-66.

### **Tutorial readings**

- O’Driscoll, C. (2011) ‘Talking About Just War: Obama in Oslo, Bush at War’, *Politics*, 31:2, 82-90.
- Etzioni, A. (2007) ‘Security First’, *National Interest*, Vol. 88: 11-15.
- Buckley, C. A. (2012) ‘Learning from Libya, Acting in Syria’, *Journal of Strategic Security*, 5:2, 10.

### **Further readings**

- \*Reichberg, G. and Syse, H. (2002) ‘Humanitarian Intervention: A Case of Offensive Force?’ *Security Dialogue* 33:3, 309-322.
- Ayoob, Mohammed, (2004) ‘Third World Perspectives on Humanitarian Intervention and International Administration’, *Global Governance* 10:1, 99-118.
- Badescu, C. G. and Bergholm, L. (2009) ‘The Responsibility to Protect and the Conflict in Darfur: The Big Let-Down’, *Security Dialogue* 40:3, 287-309.
- Bellamy, A. J. and Williams, P. D. (2011) ‘The New Politics of Protection? Côte d’Ivoire, Libya and the Responsibility to Protect’, *International Affairs* 87:4, 825-850.
- Bialasiewicz, L. et al. (2007) ‘Performing Security: the Imaginative Geographies of Current US Strategy’, *Political Geography* 26:4, 405-422.
- Cornish, P. (2009) ‘The United States and Counter-Insurgency’, *International Affairs* 85:1, 61-79.
- \* Dannreuther, R. (2007) *International Security: the Contemporary Agenda*. Cambridge: Polity Press. [chapter 8]
- \*De Goede, M. (2008) ‘The Politics of Preemption and the War on Terror in Europe’, *European Journal of International Relations* 14:1, 161-185.
- De Waal, A. (2007) ‘Darfur and the Failure of Responsibility to Protect’, *International Affairs* 83:6, 1039-1054.

- \*Dexter, Helen (2007) 'New War, Good War and the War on Terror: Explaining, Excusing and Creating Western Neo-interventionism', *Development and Change* 38:6, 1055-1071.
- Dexter, Helen (2008) 'The 'New War'on Terror, Cosmopolitanism and the 'Just War' Revival', *Government and Opposition* 43:1, 55-78.
- Elshtain, J. B. (2003) *Just War Against Terror. The Burden of American Power in a Violent World*. New York: Basic Books.
- Etzioni, A. (2007) *Security First*. New Haven, Conn., London: Yale University Press.
- Foyle, Douglas C. (2004) 'Leading the Public to War? The Influence of American Public Opinion on the Bush Administration's Decision to Go to War in Iraq', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 16:3, 269-294.
- Gilmore, J. (2011) 'A kinder, gentler counter-terrorism: Counterinsurgency, human security and the War on Terror', *Security Dialogue* 42: 1, 21-37.
- \*Gordon, P. H. (2007) 'Winning the Right War', *Survival* 49:4, 17-45.
- Gray, C (2006) *Another Bloody Century: Future Warfare*, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson. [chapter 9 in particular].
- Heisbourg, Francois (2003) 'A Work in Progress: the Bush Doctrine and its Consequences', *The Washington Quarterly* 26:2, 73-88.
- Hofmann, S. C. and Jütersonke, O. (2012) 'Regional Organizations and the Responsibility to Protect in the Context of the Arab Spring' *Swiss Political Science Review* 18:1, 132-135.
- Kahl, C. H. (2012) 'Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort', *Foreign Affairs* 91, 166.
- Kroenig, M. (2012) 'Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike is the Least Bad Option', *Foreign Affairs* 91, 76.
- Mueller, J. (2005) 'The Iraq Syndrome', *Foreign Affairs*, 84, 44.  
- Mueller, J. (2011) 'The Iraq Syndrome Revisited', *Foreign Affairs*, 90.
- Mueller, J. (2006) 'Is There Still a Terrorist Threat? The Myth of the Omnipresent Enemy', *Foreign Affairs* September/October.
- Münkler, H. (2005) *The New Wars*. Cambridge: Policy Press. [Chapter 5]
- Neal, A. (2012) 'Terrorism, Lawmaking and Democratic Politics: Legislators as Security Actors', *Terrorism and Political Violence* 24:3.
- O'Driscoll, C. (2006). Re-Negotiating the Just War: The Invasion of Iraq and Punitive War. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 19:3, 405-420.
- Pape, R.A. (2012) 'When Duty Calls: A Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention', *International Security*, 37:1, 41-80.
- \*Record, J. (2005), 'The Limits and Temptations of America's Conventional Military Primacy', *Survival*, 47:1: 33-49.
- Roberts, A. (2005) 'The War on Terror in Historical Perspective', *Survival* 17:2, 101-130.
- Stephenson, J. (2004) 'Counter-Terrorism: Containment and Beyond', Adelphi Paper, No. 367.
- Thornton, R (2006), *Asymmetric Warfare: Threat and Response in the 21st Century*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Van Creveld, M. (2011) 'The Rise and Fall of Air Power', *RUSI Journal*, 156:3, 48-54.
- On Humanitarian Intervention: Special Issue in *Security Dialogue* (2002) 33:3.
-

**Simulation Game: To Win a War? Which War? And How?**  
**Wednesday, 20 March 2013 – 1-3pm, Meadows Lecture Theatre**

Simulation games are an exciting tool to help you endorse critical knowledge while developing your own ability to debate and negotiate with others.

In this optional 2-hour session, we will perform a student-led simulation that deals with the role of states, organizations and other actors in the context of a particular contemporary security political scenario.

Participation is recommended but not a formal requirement for the course. Registration for the event and preparatory meetings will open in late January 2013 [on LEARN].

---

**WEEK 11: Monday, 25 March 2012**

**Power and Deterrence: The Present is the Past is the Future? (C. Gebhard)**

This session focuses on the question to what extent the current global security situation has triggered change in the way conflict situations are solved, and to what extent a traditional ‘balance of power’ logic is still at play. More specifically, we will look at the concepts of uncertainty, deterrence and coercion, and discuss their relevance in today’s security context. Based on this we will explore different perspectives on the way the global security situation is developing: is it foolish to be optimistic? Were realists right after all? In the tutorial, we will i.a. take the example of the dispute over Iran’s nuclear programme to focus on underlying power dynamics and the way the logic of confrontation has (not?) changed.

**Core readings**

- Williams, P. (ed.) (2012) *Security Studies: An Introduction* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). London: Routledge. [chapters 10 and 14 – “Uncertainty” and “Coercion”]
- Gray, C. (1999) ‘Clausewitz Rules, OK? The Future is the Past with GPS’, *Review of International Studies*

**Tutorial readings**

- Kroenig, M (2012) ‘Time to Attack Iran’, *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2012.
- Kahl, C. H. (2012) ‘Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort’, *Foreign Affairs*, 91, 166.

- Betts, R. K. (1997) ‘Should Strategic Studies Survive?’, *World Politics* 50, 7-33.
- Freedman, L. (2003) ‘Prevention, Not Preemption’, *The Washington Quarterly* 26:2, 105-114.
- Gray, C. (2003) ‘The Reformation of Deterrence: Moving On’, *Comparative Strategy* 22:5, 429-461.
- Gray, C. (2005) *Another Bloody Century: Future Warfare*. London: Phoenix.
- Klein, B. S. (1994) *Strategic Studies and World Order: The Global Politics of Deterrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Record, J. (2004) ‘Executive Summary: Nuclear Deterrence, Preventive War, and Counterproliferation’, *CATO Institute: Policy Analysis* 519.

- Smith, D. D. (2006) *Deterring America: Rogue States and the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lennon, A. T. and Eiss, C. (eds) (2004) *Reshaping Rogue States: Preemption, Regime Change, and US Policy Toward Iran, Iraq, and North Korea*. MIT Press.
- Knopf, J. W. (2010) 'The Fourth Wave in Deterrence Research', *Contemporary Security Policy* 31:1, 1-33.

*On Iran and the Nuclear Issue*

- Adib-Moghaddam, Arshin (2007) 'Manufacturing War: Iran in the Neo-Conservative Imagination', *Third World Quarterly* 28:3, 635-653.
- Amirahmadi, H. and ShahidSaless, S. (2013) 'Avoid Repeating Mistakes toward Iran', *The Washington Quarterly* 36:1, 145-162.
- Baram, A. (2012) 'Deterrence Lessons from Iraq: Rationality is Not the Only Key to Containment', *Foreign Affairs* 91, 76.
- Bialasiewicz, L. et al. (2007) 'Performing Security: the Imaginative Geographies of Current US Strategy', *Political Geography* 26:4, 405-422.
- Colby, E. (2007) 'Restoring Deterrence', *Orbis* 51:3, 413-428.
- Colby, E.A. and A. Long (2012) 'Why Not to Attack Iran', *The National Interest*, Jan. 11.
- Gusterson, H. (1999) 'Nuclear Weapons and the Other in the Western Imagination', *Cultural Anthropology* 14:1, 111-143.
- Gusterson, Hugh (1999) 'Nuclear Weapons and the Other in the Western Imagination', *Cultural Anthropology* 14:1, 111-143.
- Hurd, Elizabeth Shakman (2004) 'The International Politics of Secularism: U.S. Foreign Policy and the Islamic Republic of Iran', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 29:1, 115-138.
- Izadi, Foad, and Hakimeh Saghaye-Biria (2007) 'A Discourse Analysis of Elite American Newspaper Editorials. The Case of Iran's Nuclear Program', *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 31:2, 140-165.
- Kaye, D. D. and Wehrey, F. (2009) 'Containing Iran? Avoiding a Two-Dimensional Strategy in a Four-Dimensional Region', *The Washington Quarterly* 32:3, 37-53.
- Krause, K., & Latham, A. (1998) 'Constructing Non-Proliferation and Arms Control: The Norms of Western Practice', *Contemporary Security Policy* 19:1, 23-54.
- Lennon, A. T., & Eiss, C. (eds.). (2004) *Reshaping Rogue States: Preemption, Regime Change, and US Policy toward Iran, Iraq, and North Korea*. Boston: MIT Press.
- Litwak, R. S. (2008) 'Living with Ambiguity: Nuclear Deals with Iran and North Korea', *Survival* 50:1, 91-118.
- Montgomery, A.H. (2005) 'Ringling in Proliferation: How to Dismantle an Atomic Bomb Network', *International Security* 30:2, 153-187.
- \*Morgan, P. M. (2012) 'The State of Deterrence in International Politics Today', *Contemporary Security Policy* 33:1, 85-107.
- Mousavian, H. (2013) 'An Opportunity for a US-Iran Paradigm Shift', *The Washington Quarterly* 36:1, 129-144.
- Mueller, J. (2009) *Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al Qaeda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ogilvie-White, T. (1996) 'Is there a Theory of Nuclear Proliferation? An Analysis of the Contemporary Debate', *Nonproliferation Review* 4:1, 43-60.
- Parasiliti, A. (2010) 'After Sanctions, Deter and Engage Iran', *Survival* 52:5, 13-20.

- \*Potter, William C. and G. Mukhatzhanova (2008) 'Divining Nuclear Intentions: A Review Essay', *International Security*, 33:1, 139-169.
- Price, Richard (2007) 'Nuclear Weapons Don't Kill People, Rogues Do', *International Politics* 44:2/3, 232-249.
- \*Waltz, K. N. (2012) 'Why Iran Should Get the Bomb: Nuclear Balancing Would Mean Stability', *Foreign Affairs*, 91, 2.
- Williams, Michael C. (2003) 'Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics', *International Studies Quarterly* 47:4, 511-531.
- Wilner, A. S. (2012) 'Apocalypse Soon? Deterring Nuclear Iran and its Terrorist Proxies', *Comparative Strategy*, 31:1, 18-40.

**NOTE: Essay is due on Monday, 1 April 2013, before 12:00 noon.**



## Appendix A: International Security 2012-13 – Tutorial Assessment

Student name:

Tutor:

		Criteria			Mark*
		Performance			
		Strong	↔	Weak	
<b>Attendance / Promptness</b>	Student is <b>always</b> prompt to tutorials. (A)	Student is <b>rarely</b> late to tutorials. (B)	Student is late to tutorials <b>every second week.</b> (C)	Student is late to tutorials <b>every week.</b> (D)	—
<b>Level Of Engagement In Class</b>	Student proactively contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions <b>more than once</b> per class. (A)	Student proactively contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions <b>once</b> per class. (B)	Student <b>rarely</b> contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions. (C)	Student <b>never</b> contributes to tutorials by offering ideas and asking questions. (D)	—
<b>Listening Skills</b>	Student listens when others talk, both in small and large group discussions. Student <b>incorporates or builds off</b> of the ideas of others. (A)	Student <b>listens</b> when others talk, both in small and large group discussions. (B)	Student <b>does not</b> listen when others talk, both in small and large group discussions. (C)	Student <b>does not</b> listen when others talk, both in small and large group discussions Student often <b>interrupts</b> when others speak. (D)	—
<b>Preparation</b>	Student is <b>almost always</b> prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading. (A)	Student is <b>usually</b> prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading. (B)	Student is <b>rarely</b> prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading. (C)	Student is <b>almost never</b> prepared for tutorial with questions derived from required reading. (D)	—
				<b>Total</b>	—

**Tutor Comments:**

\*A grade will be awarded for each category, based on these general criteria, and then averaged out to give you your mark for the tutorial participation element (10% of your total mark, **capped at 70%**).

## Appendix B: Policy Brief Feedback and Assessment Criteria

Policy Briefs will be assessed using the following form:

<b>Marker</b> _____					
<b>Student Examination No:</b>					
<b>Policy Brief Number and Title:</b>					
	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E-H</b>
<i>Research</i>					
<i>Policy Analysis</i>					
<i>Presentation</i>					
Comments:					
Mark(s) deducted for late/overlong policy brief _____					

**A (70%)** A sharply-focused piece of work of high intellectual quality, which adopts a comprehensive approach to the question and maintains a sophisticated level of analysis throughout. Presentation should be of a professional standard.

**B (65%)** A very good piece of work that shows qualities beyond the merely routine or acceptable. The topic should be addressed in a critical and analytical way. There should be no significant errors of fact or interpretation. The quality of the writing and presentation should be without major blemish.

**C (55%)** A satisfactory answer with elements of the routine and predictable. It should be generally accurate and firmly based in the reading. It may draw upon a restricted range of sources but should not just re-state one particular source. Factual errors and misunderstandings of concepts and authors may occasionally be present but should not be a dominant impression. The quality of writing and presentation should be acceptable.

**D (45%)** A passable answer which understands the question and should be intelligible and in general factually accurate, but may well have deficiencies such as restricted use of sources or academic argument, poor expression, and irrelevancies to the question asked. The general impression may be of a rather poor effort, with weaknesses in conception or execution.

**E-H (35%)** A piece of work with evident weaknesses. It might also be a short and fragmentary answer with merit in what is presented but containing serious gaps. Inadequate economy of expression and presentation.

## Appendix C: Essay Assessment Criteria

The following are the criteria through which the essay will be marked. However, it is important to note that the overall mark is a result of a holistic assessment of the assignment as a whole.”

- a. Does the assignment address the question set, and with sufficient focus?
- b. Does the assignment show a grasp of the relevant concepts and knowledge?
- c. Does the assignment demonstrate a logical and effective pattern of argument?
- d. Does the assignment, if appropriate, support arguments with relevant, accurate and effective forms of evidence?
- e. Does the assignment demonstrate reflexivity and critical thinking in relation to arguments and evidence?
- f. Is the assignment adequately presented in terms of: correct referencing and quoting; spelling, grammar and style; layout and visual presentation.

**A3 (70-79%)** A sharply-focused answer of high intellectual quality, which adopts a comprehensive approach to the question and maintains a sophisticated level of analysis throughout. It should show a willingness to engage critically with the literature and move beyond it, using the sources creatively to arrive at its own independent conclusions.

**B B- (60-63%) B (64-66%) B+ (67-69%)** A very good answer that shows qualities beyond the merely routine or acceptable. The question and the sources should be addressed directly and fully. The work of other authors should be presented critically. Effective use should be made of the whole range of the literature. There should be no significant errors of fact or interpretation. The answer should proceed coherently to a convincing conclusion. The quality of the writing and presentation (especially referencing) should be without major blemish. Within this range a particularly strong answer will be graded B+; a more limited answer will be graded B-.

**C C- (50-53%) C (54-56%) C+ (57-59%)** A satisfactory answer with elements of the routine and predictable. It should be generally accurate and firmly based in the reading. It may draw upon a restricted range of sources but should not just re-state one particular source. Other authors should be presented accurately, if rather descriptively. The materials included should be relevant, and there should be evidence of basic understanding of the topic in question. Factual errors and misunderstandings of concepts and authors may occasionally be present but should not be a dominant impression. The quality of writing, referencing and presentation should be acceptable. Within this range a stronger answer will be graded C+; a weaker answer will be graded C-.

**D D- (40-43%) D (44-46%) D+ (47-49%)** A passable answer which understands the question, displays some academic learning and refers to relevant literature. The answer should be intelligible and in general factually accurate, but may well have deficiencies such as restricted use of sources or academic argument, over-reliance on lecture notes, poor expression, and irrelevancies to the question asked. The general impression may be of a rather poor effort, with weaknesses in conception or execution. It might also be the right mark for a short answer that at least referred to the main points of the issue. Within this range a stronger answer will be graded D+; a bare pass will be graded D-.

**E (30-39%)** An answer with evident weaknesses of understanding but conveying the sense that with a fuller argument or factual basis it might have achieved a pass. It might also be a short and fragmentary answer with merit in what is presented but containing serious gaps.

**F (20-29%)** An answer showing seriously inadequate knowledge of the subject, with little awareness of the relevant issues or literature, major omissions or inaccuracies, and pedestrian use of inadequate sources.

**G (10-19%)** An answer that falls far short of a passable level by some combination of short length, irrelevance, lack of intelligibility, factual inaccuracy and lack of acquaintance with reading or academic concepts.

**H (0-9%)** An answer without any academic merit which usually conveys little sense that the course has been followed or of the basic skills of essay-writing.