

CRITICAL SECURITY STUDIES (PSC 7312)

Thursdays, 2:00-4:45

Derby 2078

Prof. Jennifer Mitzen (.1), Derby 2036.

Office hours: Mondays 1-3 and by appointment

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course introduces students to the subfield of critical security studies (CSS), which means it takes a broadly constructivist and critical perspective to the study of security. Traditionally, International Relations (IR) security studies literature focuses on state security, studying it especially through realist and sometimes (neo)liberal lenses. This course presumes background knowledge of those mainstream security approaches and issues (such as realism and (neo)liberalism, the causes of war, strategy, deterrence, arms control or alliance theory), but it does *not* deal directly with them. Instead, we ask, what is security? Who or what is being secured and for and by whom? We question whether the state is the appropriate (or only) referent object for security, and particularly draw on analytical models from outside the mainstream. We also ask how to conduct research in critical security studies.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

1. Recognize various ways in which the ‘critical turn’ is different from mainstream security studies.
2. Outline and criticize critical theories of security, identifying distinct assumptions and claims and comparing and contrasting among them.
3. Understand various ways of empirically examining critical security questions.
4. Apply critical theories of international security to political events and practical dilemmas.
5. Construct persuasive written and oral arguments supported by evidence, orally and in writing, about security issues from a critical perspective.
6. Develop skills in leading and participating in inclusive seminar discussion.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Participation. All students are expected to attend each class session (5%) and to come to class prepared to participate actively in class discussion based on a close reading of the assigned articles. Participating actively is as much about listening as it is about talking. We will go over discussion norms in class. (10%)

You also will engage in group seminar leading. I will divide the class into groups of three or four. Each group will be assigned to one session and will work together, in consultation with me, to determine how to present the material. The group will then (in conjunction with me) lead part or all of the seminar. (10%) Your seminar peers will evaluate the seminar and your seminar partners will evaluate your collaboration skills.

Guidelines for structuring the seminar and for leading the discussion of an article, will be available on Carmen, along with rubrics for this assignment and peer evaluation forms.

Writing. The writing requirement has two parts:

- Four 2-3 page “response papers” to weekly readings (40%). These papers are not summaries; students should address a subset of the weeks’ reading, aiming to raise 3-4 interesting questions through critique, comparison, and so on. Response papers are due by 6 pm Tuesday evening. Rubric is included at end of syllabus. Late papers will not be accepted.
- One 4000-5000 word (15-20 pages, inclusive) seminar paper or critical review essay (30%), due at the end of the semester. The topic is open, but must be cleared with me. A one paragraph topic proposal is due week 8, in class. Rubric for paper is included at end of the syllabus.

GRADE SCALE

PARTICIPATION

Attendance.	5
Class contributions.	15
Presentation.	10

WRITING

Response papers. 4 @ 10 points each	40
Seminar paper.	30

TOTAL **100**

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

“It is the responsibility of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct. The term “academic misconduct” includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations. Instructors shall report all instances of alleged academic misconduct to the committee (Faculty Rule 3335-5-487). For additional information, see the Code of Student Conduct <http://studentlife.osu.edu/csc/>.”

COMMITMENT TO ACCOMMODATE DISABILITIES

Students with disabilities (including mental health, chronic or temporary medical conditions) that have been certified by the Office of Student Life Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated and should inform the instructor as soon as possible of their needs. The Office of Student Life Disability Services is located in 098 Baker Hall, 113 W. 12th Avenue; telephone 614-292-3307, slds@osu.edu; slds.osu.edu

CALENDAR

Note that all readings are required and students are expected to read them prior to class. Most are or will be posted on Carmen/Canvas.

WEEK	DATE	TOPIC	
	PART ONE	INTRODUCTION	
1	January 10	Introduction	
2	January 17	What is CSS?	
3	January 24	How to study CSS	
	PART TWO	THREE LOCALES	
4	January 31	Aberystwyth	
5	February 7	Copenhagen	
6	February 14	Paris	
	PART THREE	FIVE APPROACHES	
7	February 21	PostStructuralist	
8	February 28	Feminist / Gender	
9	March 7	Post-Colonial	
10	March 14	SPRING BREAK	
11	March 21	Ontological Security	
12	March 28	New Materialist	
13	April 4	ISA – NO CLASS	
	PART FOUR	RETHINKING THREAT:	
14	April 11	Space	
15	April 18	Time	

PART I: INTRODUCTION

WEEK 1: Organizational Meeting & Introduction

- Toril Moi. “Discussion or Aggression? Arrogance and Despair in Graduate School,”

What is Security?

- Arnold Wolfers. 1952. “‘National Security’ as an Ambiguous Symbol,” *Political Science Quarterly* 67 (4), 481-502.
- Emma Rothschild. 1995. “What is Security?” *Daedalus* 124, 3, 53-98.

WEEK 2: What does it mean to study security from a critical perspective?

- Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit. 1998. "Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism," *European Journal of International Relations*, 4(3), 259-294.
- Jef Huysmans. 1998. "Security! What Do You Mean? From Concept to Thick Signifier," *European Journal of International Relations* 4(2), pp. 539-561.
- Christopher Browning and Matt McDonald. 2011. "The Future of Critical Security Studies: Ethics and the Politics of Security," *European Journal of International Relations*, 19(2), 235-255.

WEEK 3: How can security be studied critically?

- Mark B. Salter and Can E. Mutlu, eds. 2013. *Research Methods in Critical Security Studies: An Introduction* (NY and London: Routledge), Excerpts.
- Claudia Aradau and Jef Huysmans. 2014. "Critical Methods in International Relations: The Politics of Techniques, Devices and Acts," *European Journal of International Relations*, 20 (3), 596-619.
- Wanda Vrasti. 2008. "The Strange Case of Ethnography and International Relations," *Millennium* 37, 2, 179-301.

PART II: THREE LOCALES

WEEK 4: Aberystwyth

- Richard Devetak. "Critical Theory," chapter seven in *Theories of International Relations*.
- Ken Booth. 1991. "Security and Emancipation," *Review of International Studies* 17(4): 313-36.
- Mike Bourne & Dan Bulley, 'Securing the Human in Critical Security Studies: The Insecurity of a Secure Ethics', *European Security*, vol.20, no.3, 2011.
- Ruth Blakely. 2013. "Human Rights, State Wrongs, and Social Change: The Theory and Practice of Emancipation," *Review of International Studies*, 39, 3, 599-619.

WEEK 5: Copenhagen

- Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner), Chapters 1 and 2.

- Lene Hansen. 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.
- Juha Vuori. 2008. "Illocutionary Logic and Strands of Securitization: Applying the Theory of Securitization to the Study of Non-Democratic Political Orders," *European Journal of International Relations*, 14, 1, 65-99.
- Jarrod Hayes. 2012. "Securitization, Social Identity, and Democratic Security: Nixon, India, and the Ties that Bind," *International Organization*, 66, 1, 63-93.

WEEK 6: Paris

- Thierry Balzacq, 'The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context', *European Journal of International Relations*, vol.11, no.2, 2005.
- Didier Bigo. 2002. "Security and immigration: Towards a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27(Special Issue), 63–92.
- Sarah Leonard. 2010. "EU Border Security and Migration into the European Union: FRONTEX and securitization through practices," *European Security*, 19, 2, 231-254.

PART III: FIVE APPROACHES

WEEK 7: Post-Structuralist

- Judith Butler. 2010. "Performative agency," *Journal of Cultural Economy* 3(2): 147–161.
- David Campbell. 1998. 2nd edition. *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity* (MN: University of Minnesota Press), chapters ## and epilogue.
- Mark Laffey. 2000. "Locating Identity: Performativity, Foreign Policy and State Action," *Review of International Studies*, 26 (3), 429-444.
- Vicki Squire. 2017. "Governing Migration through Death in Europe and the US: Identification, Burial and the Crisis of Modern Humanism," *European Journal of International Relations*, 23, 3, 513-532.

Week 8: Feminist / Gender

Topic proposal due for seminar paper

- Jill Steans. 2003. "Engaging from the Margins: Feminist Encounters with the Mainstream of International Relations," *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 5, 3, 428-454.
- Christine Sylvester. 2012. "War experiences/war practices/war theory," *Millennium* 40(3): 483-503.
- Lauren Wilcox. 2014. "Explosive bodies and bounded states: Abjection and the embodied practice of suicide bombing," *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 16(1): 66-85.
- Dan Reiter. 2015. "The Positivist Study of Gender and International Relations," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 59, 7, 1301-1326.

WEEK 9: Postcolonial

- Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey. 2006. "The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies," *Review of International Studies* 32(2), 329-352.
- Paul Gilroy. 2001. "Joined-Up Politics and Postcolonial Melancholia," *Theory Culture and Society*, 18, 2-3, 151-167.
- Vivienne Jabri. 2014. "Disarming norms: postcolonial agency and the constitution of the international," *International Theory* 6(2), 372-390.
- Catarina Kinnvall. 2016. "The Postcolonial has moved into Europe: Bordering, Security, and Ethno-Cultural Belonging," *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 54, 1, 152-168

WEEK 10: BREAK

WEEK 11: Ontological Security

- Jennifer Mitzen and Kyle Larson. 2017. "Ontological security and Foreign Policy," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Politics*.
- Catarina Kinnvall and Jennifer Mitzen. 2017. "Introduction to the Special Issue: Ontological Security in World Politics," *Cooperation and Conflict*, 52, 1,

- Stuart Croft and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2017. "Fit for Purpose? Fitting Ontological Security Studies into the Discipline of International Relations: Towards a Vernacular Turn," *Cooperation and Conflict*, 52, 1, 12-30.
- Dmitry Chernobrov. 2016. "Ontological Security and Public (Mis)Recognition of International Crises: Uncertainty, Political Imagining, and the Self," *Political Psychology*, Vol. (#), pp. 1-16.
- Ty Solomon. On-line first. "Ontological Security, Circulations of Affect, and the Arab Spring," *Journal of International Relations and Development*, xxxxxx.

WEEK 12: New Materialist

- Latour, Bruno, 1996b. 'On Actor-Network Theory', *Soziale Welt* 47(4): 369-381.
 - <http://www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/P-67%20ACTOR-NETWORK.pdf>
- Tom Lundborg and Nick Vaughan-Williams. 2015. "New Materialisms, discourse analysis, and International Relations: A Radical Intertextual Approach," *Review of International Studies* 41 (3), 3-25.
- Marieke de Goede. 2017. "The Chain of Security," *Review of International Studies*, 44, 1, 21-42.
- Claudia Aradau. 2010. "Security that Matters: Critical Infrastructure and Objects of Protection," *Security Dialogue*, 41, 5, 491-514.

WEEK 13: NO CLASS: ISA

PART III: Rethinking Threat: Space and Time

WEEK 15: Space

- John Agnew. 1994. "The territorial trap: The geographical assumptions of international relations theory," *Review of International Political Economy* 1(1), 53-80.
- Simon Dalby. 2008. "Imperialism, Domination, Culture: The Continued Relevance of Critical Geopolitics," *Geopolitics* 13: 413-436.
- Stuart Elden, 2010. "Land, Terrain, Territory," *Progress in Human Geography*, 34 (6), #.
- Louise Amoore. 2006. "Biometric Borders: Governing Mobilities in the War on Terror," *Political Geography*, 25, 336-51.

WEEK 17: Time

- Kimberly Hutchings. 2007. "Happy Anniversary! Time and Critique in International Relations Theory," *Review of International Studies*, 33, S1, 71-89.
- Ulrich Beck. 2003. "The Silence of Words: On Terror and War," *Security Dialogue*, 34, 3, 255-267
- Marieke De Goede and Samuel Randalls. 2009. "Precaution, Preemption: Arts and Technologies of the Actionable Future," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 27, 5, 859-878

CRITICAL REVIEW ESSAY

A review essay is not just a book review; it's an attempt to use a given book, books, or set of articles on a common theme/topic, to make a larger, original point about the subject in question. A review essay summarizes the main arguments (briefly!) and critiques its main points (usually by considering additional evidence and by developing arguments of your own). But it also presents your own views, derived from that critique, about what this work means either for the development of the field or for international relations more generally. An effective review essay even of a single book necessarily draws on materials other than the book under review, either to place it in a larger intellectual context or to offer evidence supporting the reviewer's own views.

Some questions to consider:

1. What is the central question(s) the book (or set of books/articles) addresses?
2. Why is it an important question?
 - a. Is there a previous literature on the issue?
 - b. Does this work address that debate?
 - c. What are its conclusions, relative to others?
3. What is the main argument of the book? What does it tell us about the relations between states and what are its implications for the field of IR?
4. How persuasive is the argument? What are its flaws or limitations? How might it be improved?
5. To a set of books/articles:
 - a. How is the topic discussed by each of the authors?
 - b. Characterize the debate, i.e., organize the arguments to summarize the current state of knowledge
 - c. Can the authors/discussions be organized into distinct schools/perspectives?
 - d. What divides or joins the authors?
 - e. What concepts/methods are crucial to each perspective/school?
 - f. What does each view highlight versus obscure/hide?
 - g. What are the strengths and weaknesses of each?
6. What questions are left unanswered? What are the gaps in our knowledge? What might the answers be? How might we go about answering them? Where should the literature go from here? Are there other theories or literatures relevant to this problem (and how)?

RESPONSE PAPER RUBRIC

Response papers are worth 10 points each: 3 points summary and 7 points critique/raising questions.

CONTENT	3	2	1	0
Summary 3 points:	Demonstrates firm grasp of author's argument and concepts therein; represents it fairly, accurately and even eloquently. Appropriately cites evidence from text	Demonstrates good grasp of argument and central concepts. Perhaps some awkwardness or superficiality. Perhaps too many direct quotes.	Representation of author's argument is superficial and perhaps some inaccuracies.	Badly misrepresents the theories and concepts.
	7-6	5-4	3-2	1-0
Critique and question raising 7 points:	Goes beyond assignment to explore implications of arguments or evidence in new contexts or in particularly thoughtful, insightful, perhaps original ways. Shows nuanced grasp of relevant concepts and theories and the ability to apply them with facility. Raises question(s) for discussion that are integrative, provocative, generative.	Meets parameters of the assignment but does not exceed them. Demonstrates good grasp of concepts and theories but some awkwardness or superficiality in applying them. Raises question(s) for discussion that are mainly comprehension-based or yes / no	Does not address some aspects of assignment; it demonstrates a somewhat shaky grasp of relevant concepts and theories. Superficial question(s) or forgets to raise question(s).	Does not address assignment; does not convey understanding of the relevant concepts and theories. Does not raise question(s).

FINAL PAPER RUBRIC (30 points)

CONTENT	Sophisticated	Highly Competent	Fairly Competent
Introduction 2 points	2 Clear, eloquent identification of nuanced central argument. clear sense of evidence / key points to follow. Reveals organizational structure of paper. Guides reader smoothly and logically into the body of the paper.	1 Thesis paragraph clearly identifies central argument. Gives reader a reasonably good sense of the nature of the evidence that will follow.	0 Identifies central argument but is not stated sufficiently clearly. Does not guide the reader into the body of the paper.
Conclusion 2 points	2 Elegantly synthesize and reframe key points from the paper. Suggest new perspectives or questions relevant to the central argument and bring closure.	1 Synthesizes and brings closure but doesn't examine new perspectives or questions.	0 Restates same points as topic paragraph without reframing them; introduces new material rather than new perspectives.
Organization 4 points	4-3 Logical and quickly apparent. Connections among paragraphs are clearly articulated and transitions between paragraphs are smooth. Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent	2-1 Logical and apparent overall, but transitions not consistently smooth. Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point and, for the most part,	0 Can only be discerned with effort; not all parts of paper fit; not all parts of paper are effectively integrated. In several paragraphs there is no distinct,

	point, expressed in a clear topic sentence; the parts of each paragraph connect logically and persuasively, and internal transitions are smooth.	the parts of each paragraph connect logically and effectively. In most paragraphs the point is expressed in clear topic sentence.	coherent point; topic sentences are often missing or unclear; parts of paragraphs do not connect logically.
Mechanics 2 points	2 Clean, formatted correctly. No incomplete or run-on sentences Title; Quotes are properly attributed and cited. No spelling or grammatical errors	1 A few minor spelling or grammatical errors. Quotes are properly attributed and cited. Title	0 Several spelling and / or grammatical errors. Title. In a few places quotes are not attributed or cited.
Grasp of Readings discussed 6 points	6-5 Represents the theories and concepts accurately, fairly, eloquently. Represents outside author's arguments correctly, and demonstrates firm grasp of author's arguments.	4-3 Represents theories and concepts accurately and clearly.	2-0 Represents theories and concepts accurately but not very clearly or thoroughly; there are minor inaccuracies.
Depth of Analysis 8 points	8-6 Goes beyond assignment to explore implications of arguments or evidence in new contexts or in	5-3 Fully meets parameters of the assignment but does not exceed them.	2-0 Does not address some aspects of assignment; it demonstrates a somewhat shaky

	particularly thoughtful, insightful, perhaps original ways. Paper shows nuanced grasp of relevant concepts and theories and the ability to apply them with facility.	Demonstrates good grasp of concepts and theories but some awkwardness in applying them.	grasp of relevant concepts and theories.
Evidence 6 points	6-5 Rich, detailed and well chosen evidence to support central argument. Each section employs appropriate illustrations and/or quotations. Connection between argument and evidence is clearly and compellingly articulated in all cases. Where applicable, important opposing evidence is considered and convincingly refuted.	4-3 Well chosen though not particularly rich or detailed. The connection between argument and evidence is clearly articulated; where applicable, opposing evidence is considered and refuted.	2-0 Connection between argument and evidence is not clearly articulated in all cases; where applicable consideration of opposing evidence is cursory, or evidence is not convincingly refuted.