

## **Term Information**

Effective Term Spring 2018

## **General Information**

Course Bulletin Listing/Subject Area Political Science  
Fiscal Unit/Academic Org Political Science - D0755  
College/Academic Group Arts and Sciences  
Level/Career Graduate  
Course Number/Catalog 7312  
Course Title Critical Security Studies  
Transcript Abbreviation Critical Security  
Course Description Introduces students to the Political Science subfield of critical security studies (CSS),  
Semester Credit Hours/Units Fixed: 3

## **Offering Information**

Length Of Course 14 Week, 12 Week, 8 Week, 7 Week, 6 Week, 4 Week  
Flexibly Scheduled Course Never  
Does any section of this course have a distance education component? No  
Grading Basis Letter Grade  
Repeatable No  
Course Components Seminar  
Grade Roster Component Seminar  
Credit Available by Exam No  
Admission Condition Course No  
Off Campus Never  
Campus of Offering Columbus

## **Prerequisites and Exclusions**

Prerequisites/Corequisites  
Exclusions Not open to students with credit for 8194.03 Sp 2015  
Electronically Enforced Yes

## **Cross-Listings**

Cross-Listings

## **Subject/CIP Code**

Subject/CIP Code 45.1001  
Subsidy Level Doctoral Course  
Intended Rank Doctoral

## **Requirement/Elective Designation**

The course is an elective (for this or other units) or is a service course for other units

## Course Details

### Course goals or learning objectives/outcomes

- Introduces students to the Political Science subfield of critical security studies (CSS),

### Content Topic List

- What is Critical? What is Security?
- Critical Theory and Emancipation
- Securitization
- Post-Structuralist Approaches
- Feminist Approaches
- Postcolonial Perspectives
- Psychoanalytic Approaches
- Ontological Security
- Critical Geography
- Human Security
- Environment

### Sought Concurrence

No

## Attachments

- Syllabus\_7312.pdf: Syllabus

*(Syllabus. Owner: Smith,Charles William)*

## Comments

## Workflow Information

| Status           | User(s)   | Date/Time           | Step                   |
|------------------|---|---------------------|------------------------|
| Submitted        | Smith,Charles William   | 06/21/2017 09:04 AM | Submitted for Approval |
| Approved         | Herrmann,Richard Karl   | 06/21/2017 09:13 AM | Unit Approval          |
| Approved         | Haddad,Deborah Moore  | 06/21/2017 10:32 AM | College Approval       |
| Pending Approval | Nolen,Dawn<br>Vankeerbergen,Bernadette Chantal<br>Hanlin,Deborah Kay<br>Jenkins,Mary Ellen Bigler | 06/21/2017 10:32 AM | ASCCAO Approval        |

## **CRITICAL SECURITY STUDIES (PSC 7312)**

**Thursdays, 2:00-4:45**

**Derby 2174 (the Reading Room)**

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

Office hours 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.

### **COURSE REQUIREMENTS**

**Participation.** All students are expected to attend each class session and to come to class prepared to participate actively in class discussion based on a close reading of the assigned articles. We will go over discussion norms in class. (20%)

The **writing requirement** has three 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 Wednesday evening. Their arguments will be part of our seminar discussion. Rubric is included at end of syllabus. Late papers will not be accepted.
- Four Question Lists regarding weekly readings (10%). On four of the weeks that students are not writing response papers, they should prepare questions based on the readings. Questions must be sent to me by Tuesday, 10 p.m. before the seminar meeting. I will then circulate a list of questions by 8 a.m. Thursday morning. There is no rubric for this requirement but we will discuss expectations in class.
- A 6000 word (15-20 pages, inclusive) seminar paper or critical review essay (30%), due at the end of the quarter. The topic is open, but must be cleared with me. A one paragraph topic proposal is due week 8, in class. Rubric is included at end of the syllabus.

## **GRADE SCALE**

### **PARTICIPATION**

|                      |    |
|----------------------|----|
| Attendance.          | 5  |
| Class contributions. | 15 |

### **WRITING**

|                                     |    |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Response papers. 4 @ 10 points each | 40 |
| Question lists. 5 @ 2 points each   | 10 |
| Seminar paper. 30 points paper      | 30 |

**TOTAL** 100

### **Letter Grades**

| Letter | Percentage |
|--------|------------|
| A      | 93-100     |
| A-     | 90-92.9    |
| B+     | 87-89.9    |
| B      | 83-86.9    |
| B-     | 80-82.9    |
| C+     | 77-79.9    |
| C      | 73-76.9    |
| C-     | 70-72.9    |
| D+     | 67-69.9    |
| D      | 60-66.9    |
| E      | 0-59       |

## **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. 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue; telephone 614-292-3307, [slds@osu.edu](mailto: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 1: Organizational Meeting & Introduction**

### **WEEK 2: What is Critical? What is Security?**

- Arnold Wolfers. 1952. “‘National Security’ as an Ambiguous Symbol,” *Political Science Quarterly* 67 (4), 481-502.
- David A. Baldwin. 1997. “The Concept of Security,” *Review of International Studies* 23: 5-26.
- Richard Price and Christian Reus-Smit. 1998. “Dangerous Liaisons? Critical International Theory and Constructivism,” *European Journal of International Relations*, 4(3), 259-294.
- 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: Critical Theory and Emancipation**

- Ken Booth. 1991. “Security and Emancipation,” *Review of International Studies* 17(4): 313-36.
- Richard Wyn Jones. 1995. “‘Message in a bottle’? Theory and praxis in critical security studies,” *Contemporary Security Policy* 16(3): 299-319.
- Shannon Brincat. 2011. “On the Methods of Critical Theory: Advancing the Project of Emancipation beyond the Early Frankfurt School,” *International Relations* 0(0), 1-28.
- 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.
- Joao Nunes. 2014. “Questioning Health Security: Insecurity and Domination in world politics,” *Review of International Studies*, 40(5), 939-960.

### **WEEK 4: Securitization**

- Barry Buzan, Ole Waever, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security: A New Framework for Analysis* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.), 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.
- Michael C. Williams. 2003. "Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics," *International Studies Quarterly* 47(4): 511-531.
- Matt MacDonald. 2008. "Securitization and the Construction of Security," *European Journal of International Relations*, 14 (4), 563-587.
- Claire Wilkinson. 2007. "The Copenhagen School on Tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is Securitisation Theory Usable Outside Europe?" *Security Dialogue* 38(1): 5-25.

### **WEEK 5: Post-Structuralist Approaches I**

- David Campbell. 1998. 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.
- Iver B. Neumann and Ole Jacob Sending. 2007. "'The International' as Governmentality," *Millennium – Journal of International Studies* 35(3), 677-701.
- Didier Bigo. 2002. "Security and immigration: Towards a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 27(Special Issue), 63–92.
- 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.

### **WEEK 6: Post-Structuralist Approaches II**

- Achille Mbembe. 2003. "Necropolitics," *Public Culture* 15(1), 11-40.
- Jef Huysmans. 2006. "International Politics of Exception: Competing Visions of International Political Order between Law and Politics," *Alternatives* 31, 135-165.
- Sergei Prozorov. 2006. "Liberal Enmity: The Figure of the Foe in the Political Ontology of Liberalism," *Millennium* 35 (1), 75-99.
- Linus Hagstrom. 2014. "The 'Abnormal' State: Identity, norm/exception, and Japan," *European Journal of International Relations*, published online March 2014.

- Frederic Megret. 2011. "War and the Vanishing Battlefield," *Loyola University Chicago International Law Review*, 9 (1), 131-155.

### **Week 7: Feminist Approaches**

- Lauren Wilcox. 2009. "Gendering the Cult of the Offensive," *Security Studies*, 18 (2), 214-240.
- Helen Kinsella. 2005. Discourses of Difference: Civilians, Combatants, and Compliance with the laws of war," *Review of International Studies*, 31, 163-185.
- Nicola Pratt. 2007. "The Queen Boat case in Egypt: sexuality, national security and state sovereignty," *Review of International Studies* 33(1), 129-144.
- Paul Kirby. 2012. "How is rape a weapon of war? Feminist International Relations, modes of critical explanation and the study of wartime sexual violence," *European Journal of International Relations* 19(4), 797-821.
- Veronique Pin-Fat and Maria Stern. 2005. "The Scripting of Private Jessica Lynch: Biopolitics, Gender, and the Feminization of the US Military," *Alternatives* 30 (1), 25-53.

### **WEEK 8: Postcolonial Perspectives**

- Tarak Barkawi and Mark Laffey. 2006. "The postcolonial moment in security studies," *Review of International Studies* 32(2), 329-352.
- John M. Hobson. 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.
- Rosa Vasilaki 2012. Provincialising IR? Deadlocks and Prospects in Post-Western IR Theory," *Millennium* 41(1), 3-22.
- Vivienne Jabri. 2014. "Disarming norms: postcolonial agency and the constitution of the international," *International Theory* 6(2), 372-390.

### **WEEK 9: Psychoanalytic Approaches**

- John Cash. 1989. "Ideology and Affect: The Case of Northern Ireland," *Political Psychology*, 10 (4), 703-724.
- Vanessa Pupovic. 2004. "War on the Couch: The Emotionology of the New International Security paradigm," *European Journal of Social Theory*, 7 (2), 149-170.



- Jeffrey Prager. 2008. "Healing from History: Psychoanalytic Considerations on Traumatic pasts and social repair," *European Journal of Social Theory*, 11(3), 405-420.
- Jeffrey Murer. 2009. "Constructing the enemy-Other: Anxiety, Trauma and mourning in the narratives of political conflict," *Psychoanalysis, Culture and Society*, 14, 109-130.
- Mark Salter and Can Mutlu. 2012. "Psychoanalytic Theory and Border Security," *European Journal of Social Theory*, 15 (2), 179-195.

**WEEK 10: NO CLASS (Spring Break)**

**WEEK 11: Ontological Security**

- Catarina Kinnvall. 2004. "Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security," *Political Psychology* 25 (5), 741-767.
- Brent J. Steele. 2005. "Ontological security and the power of self-identity: British neutrality and the American Civil War," *Review of International Studies* 31(3), 519-540.
- Alanna Krolkowski. 2008. "State Personhood in Ontological Security Theories of International Relations and Chinese Nationalism: A Sceptical View," *Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 2, 109-133.
- Bahar Rumelili. 2013. "Identity and Desecuritization: the pitfalls of conflating ontological and physical security," *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 1-23.
- Ingrid Creppel. 2011. "The Concept of Normative Threat," *International Theory*, 3 (3), 450-487.

**WEEK 12: Critical Geography**

- Richard Ashley. 1987. "The Geopolitics of Geopolitical Space," *Alternatives* 12, #
- 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.
- Louise Amoore. 2006. "Biometric Borders: Governing Mobilities in the War on Terror," *Political Geography*, 25, 336-51.
- Stuart Elden, 2010. "Land, Terrain, Territory," *Progress in Human Geography*, 34 (6), #.

- <http://eipcp.net/transversal/0507/weizman/en>

**WEEK 13: NO CLASS (International Studies Association Conference)**

**WEEK 14: Human Security**

- Roland Paris. 2001. "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air," *International Security*, 26 (2), 87-102.
- David Chandler. 2012. "Resilience and Human Security: The Post-Interventionist Paradigm," *Security Dialogue*, 43 (7), 213-229.
- Patricia Owens. 2012. "Human Security and the Rise of the Social," *Review of International Studies*, 38, 547-567.
- Edward Newmann. 2010. "Critical Human Security Studies," *Review of International Studies*, 36, 77-94.
- Jenny H. Peterson. 2013. "Creating Space for Emancipatory Human Security: Liberal Obstructions and the Potential of Agonism," *International Studies Quarterly*, 57, 318-328.

**WEEK 15: Environment**

- Daniel Deudney. 1990. "The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security," *Millennium*, 19(3), 461-476.
- Betsy Hartmann. 1998. "Population, environment, and security: a new trinity," *Environment and Urbanization*, 10(2), 113-127.
- Philippe Le Billon. 2008. "Diamond Wars? Conflict Diamonds and Geographies of Resources Wars," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 98(2), 345-372.
- Maria Julia Trombetta. 2008. "Environmental Security and Climate Change: analyzing the discourse," *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 21(4), 585-602.
- Kevin Grove. 2010. "Insuring 'Our Common Future?' Dangerous Climate Change and the Biopolitics of Environmental Security," *Geopolitics* 15 (3), 536-563.

## 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  | <b>3</b>  | <b>2</b>  | <b>1</b>   | <b>0</b>   |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| <b>Summary</b><br><br><b>3 points:</b>                       | 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.   |
|  | <b>7-6</b>  | <b>5-4</b>  | <b>3-2</b>   | <b>1-0</b>   |
| <b>Critique and question raising</b><br><br><b>7 points:</b> | Goes beyond assignment to explore implications of arguments or evidence in new contexts or in particularly thoughtful, insightful, perhaps original ways.<br><br>Shows nuanced grasp of relevant concepts and theories and the ability to apply them with facility.<br><br>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.<br><br>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.<br><br>Superficial question(s) or forgets to raise question(s). | Does not address assignment; does not convey understanding of the relevant concepts and theories.<br><br>Does not raise question(s). |

**FINAL PAPER RUBRIC (30 points)**

| <b>CONTENT</b>                             | <b>Sophisticated</b>   | <b>Highly Competent</b>   | <b>Fairly Competent</b>  |
|--|--|---|--|
| <b>Introduction</b><br><br><b>2 points</b> | 2<br><br>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<br><br>Thesis paragraph clearly identifies central argument. Gives reader a reasonably good sense of the nature of the evidence that will follow.             | 0<br><br>Identifies central argument but is not stated sufficiently clearly. Does not guide the reader into the body of the paper.                                     |
| <b>Conclusion</b><br><br><b>2 points</b>   | 2<br><br>Elegantly synthesize and reframe key points from the paper. Suggest new perspectives or questions relevant to the central argument and bring closure.   | 1<br><br>Synthesizes and brings closure but doesn't examine new perspectives or questions.  | 0<br><br>Restates same points as topic paragraph without reframing them; introduces new material rather than new perspectives.   |
| <b>Organization</b><br><br><b>4 points</b> | 4-3<br><br>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<br><br>Logical and apparent overall, but transitions not consistently smooth. Every paragraph makes one distinct and coherent point and, for the most part, | 0<br><br>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.              |
| <b>Mechanics</b><br><b>2 points</b>                   | 2<br><br>Clean, formatted correctly. No incomplete or run-on sentences<br><br>Title; Quotes are properly attributed and cited. No spelling or grammatical errors                       | 1<br><br>A few minor spelling or grammatical errors.<br><br>Quotes are properly attributed and cited.<br><br>Title                | 0<br><br>Several spelling and / or grammatical errors.<br><br>Title. In a few places quotes are not attributed or cited. |
| <b>Grasp of Readings discussed</b><br><b>6 points</b> | 6-5<br><br>Represents the theories and concepts accurately, fairly, eloquently.<br>Represents outside author's arguments correctly, and demonstrates firm grasp of author's arguments. | 4-3<br><br>Represents theories and concepts accurately and clearly.   | 2-0<br><br>Represents theories and concepts accurately but not very clearly or thoroughly; there are minor inaccuracies. |
| <b>Depth of Analysis</b><br><b>8 points</b>           | 8-6<br><br>Goes beyond assignment to explore implications of arguments or evidence in new contexts or in   | 5-3<br><br>Fully meets parameters of the assignment but does not exceed them.   | 2-0<br><br>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.  |
| <b>Evidence</b><br><b>6 points</b> | 6-5<br>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<br>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<br>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. |