

INR 6337 SECTION 0580 – UF – SPRING 2018
SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Prof. Badredine Arfi
Office: Anderson Hall 221
Phone: (352) 273 2357
Time: W 2-4 periods
Place: Conference Room AND 216 and (if need be) Mat 114
Email: barfi@ufl.edu
Office hours: Wed 1-3pm; Fri 10:45am-12pm; by appointment.

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course is designed as a focused/limited introductory survey to a variety of approaches and topics in the study of international security. The rationale for the course's teaching strategy is rooted in a concern about the slow evolution and stagnation of traditional security studies. It has unfortunately become a "fact of life" in the study of international relations (IR) and international security (IS) that IR/IS courses would normally be expected to begin by spending a number of weeks "recycling" different brands or variations of realist, (neo-)liberal, and mainstream (thin) constructivist thinking, etc. This course does not follow such a path. Therefore, as a way of alerting students to these lingering issues as well as equipping them with effective tools which they will definitely find useful as future scholars dealing with IR/IS issues, this course focuses on the value-added of many bodies of literature in IR/IS and how they have transpired specifically in the scholarship about international security. Overall *Security Studies* as a discipline has evolved into a collection of approaches, most (if not all) of which are united by a profound dissatisfaction with so-called traditional security studies by constantly questioning the foundations upon which the dominant state-centrism and military-centrism of security is built and the lack of attention to a much broader definition of security. The course thus seeks to explicate key assumptions underpinning some of these approaches as well as explore just how and in what ways they challenge traditional security studies, and in what ways they compare and contrast with each other. The course does this using an issue-areas based strategy so that we simultaneously consider these issue-areas and how various theoretical approaches and schools of IR/IS theory investigate them.

REQUIREMENTS

- Students are required to "digest" thoroughly the weekly readings before coming to class and thus come prepared to fully discuss the readings in depth and share their insights with the rest of the class.
- Each student is required to write weekly 4-5 page reaction papers. The papers are to be posted on canvas by Tuesday 1:00-11:59pm. Each paper must focus on a particular question/theme relevant to one or more of the readings.
 - Each weekly paper must consist in developing a puzzling question/theme rather than summarizing the readings.
- Each student is required to make at least one presentation and lead the class discussion on the topics addressed in one of his/her weekly papers.
 - The student making the presentation should post the reaction paper (which can exceptionally go up to 8 pages) on canvas-discussion for the class to download it on Tuesday 1:00-8:00pm as well as post it as usual on canvas for the instructor.

- The other students are required to read the received paper before class and come prepared to raise issues from/with it in the class discussion ensuing from the presentation.
- Students are required to write a 15-20 page research paper on a topic of international security of their choice using one (or more) of the approaches examined in the course. Please see details down below.
- All students will be presenting their respective research papers to the class at a date/time to be specified later.

GRADING POLICY

- Presenting one weekly paper and leading the ensuing discussion: 10% of the final grade.
- Weekly papers: 40% of the final grade.
- Research paper: 40% of the final grade
- Presenting the research paper: 10% of the final grade

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

REQUIRED READINGS

1. Solingen, Etel. 2007. Nuclear Logics: Contrasting Paths in East Asia and the Middle East. Princeton University Press.
2. Articles posted on canvas (organized by week and posted in a 'Required' folder per each week).
3. Note that there is a set of additional recommended readings for each week (posted in 'Recommended' folders). Students are highly encouraged to read some of these if only in a brief manner.

SPECIFICS ON THE RESEARCH PAPER

In order for the instructor to provide timely and useful guidance on the research paper, students will be required to turn in through canvas various brief intermediate papers throughout the semester.

Each student must:

1. Define a research question that interests him/her and that applies a security approach (broadly speaking) from the materials covered in this course. Submit the research question and an abstract. **Date: Feb 2nd**
2. Submit a 2-3 page summary of the proposed research and expected results. **Date: Feb 16th**
3. Submit a 6-8 page paper discussing the relevant literature to the research question (empirical as well as theoretical). **Date: March 16th**
4. The final paper should be 15-20 pages long, including the bibliography. **Date: April 25th**

IMPORTANT NOTES:

- The instructor reserves the right to change any part or aspect of this document should a need for doing so emerge at any point in time during the semester.
- All students are required to abide by UF standards of academic honesty laid out in the Student Honor Code, posted at <http://www.dso.ufl.edu/sccr/process/student-conduct-honor-code/>

Important Dates:

Classes Begin	January 8
Official University Holidays - no classes	January 15: Martin Luther King Jr. Day March 3 – 10: Spring Break
ISA 59 th Annual Convention – San Francisco	April 4 – 7
Reading Days - no classes	April 26-27
Final Exams	April 28, May 4

WEEKLY READING ASSIGNMENTS AND OUTLINE OF THE COURSE

Week 1 / January 10: What Is Security? Part I

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

Week 2/ January 17: What is Security? Part II.

1. Beier, J. Marshall and Samantha L. Arnold. 2005. Becoming Undisciplined: Toward the Supradisciplinary Study of Security. International Studies Review 7: 41–61.
2. Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 2006. The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies. Review of International Studies 32: 329–352.
3. Krahnemann, Elke. 2008. Security: Collective Good or Commodity? European Journal of International Relations 14 (3): 379-404.
4. Spieker, Jörg. 2011. Foucault and Hobbes on Politics, Security, and War. Alternatives: Global, Local, Political 36 (3): 187-199.
5. Anderson, Ben. 2011. Affect and Security: Exercising Emergency in 'UK Civil Contingencies'. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space 29: 1092-1109.

6. Gjørsv, Gunhild Hoogensen. 2012. Security by any Other Name: Negative Security, Positive Security, and a Multi-Actor Security Approach. Review of International Studies 38: 835–859.
7. Silina, Everita. 2016. “Being Critical About Security: What Critical Political Economy Says about Security and Identity.” In: Cafruny A., Talani L., Pozo Martin G. (eds) The Palgrave Handbook of Critical International Political Economy, 163-180. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Sjoberg, Laura. 2016. Centering Security Studies around Felt, Gendered Insecurities. Journal of Global Security Studies 1 (1): 51–63.

Week 3/ January 24: Logics of Rationalist Might/Power, and Stories Thereof

1. Glaser, Charles. 1994-95. Realists as Optimists: Cooperation as Self-Help. International Security 19 (Winter): 50-90.
2. Suganami, Hidemi. 1997. Stories of War Origins: A Narrativist Theory of the Causes of War. Review of International Studies 23: 401–418.
3. Walt, Stephen M. 1999. Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies. International Security 23 (4): 5–48.
4. Atkinson, Carol. 2006. Constructivist Implications of Material Power: Military Engagement and the Socialization of States, 1972-2000. International Studies Quarterly 50: 509-537.
5. Hinchliffe, Steve and Nick Bingham. 2008. Securing Life: The Emerging Practices of Biosecurity. Environment and Planning A 40: 1534-1551.
6. Tang, Shiping. 2009. The Security Dilemma: A Conceptual Analysis. Security Studies 18 (3): 587-623.
7. Schweller, Randall L. 2010. The logic and Illogic of the Security Dilemma and Contemporary Realism: A Response to Wagner’s Critique. International Theory 2 (2): 288–305.
8. Kim, Tongfi. 2011. Why Alliance Entangle but Seldom Entrap States. Security Studies 20 (3): 350-377.
9. Hamilton, Eric J. and Brian C. Rathbun. 2013. Scarce Differences: Toward a Material and Systemic Foundation for Offensive and Defensive Realism. Security Studies 22:436–465.

Week 4/ January 31: Terrorism – Phenomena, Discourses, Strategies, Policies, ...

1. Pape, Robert A. 2003. The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism. American Political Science Review 97 (3): 343-361.
2. Bankoff, Greg. 2003. Regions of Risk: Western Discourses on Terrorism and the Significance of Islam. Studies in Conflict & Terrorism 26: 413–428.
3. Kydd, Andrew H. and Barbara Walter. 2006. Strategies of Terrorism. International Security 31 (1): 49-80.
4. Moghadam, Assaf. 2006. Suicide Terrorism, Occupation, and the Globalization of Martyrdom: A Critique of Dying to Win. Studies in Conflict and Terrorism 29 (8): 707-729.
5. Piazza, James A. 2008. Incubators of Terror? Do Failed and Failing States Promote Transnational Terrorism. International Studies Quarterly 52 (3): 469-488.
6. Jordan, Jenna. 2009. When Heads Roll: Assessing the Effectiveness of Leadership Decapitation. Security Studies 18 (4): 719-755.
7. Horowitz, Michael C. 2010. Nonstate Actors and the Diffusion of Innovations: The Case of Suicide Terrorism. International Organization 64 (1): 33-64.
8. Chowdhury, Arjun and Ronald R. Krebs. 2010. Talking about Terror: Counterterrorist Campaigns and the Logic of Representation. European Journal of International Relations 16 (1): 125-150.

9. Wittendorp, Stef. 2016. Conducting Government: Governmentality, Monitoring, and EU Counter-Terrorism. Global Society 30 (3): 465-483.
10. Zech, Steven T. and Michael Gabbay. 2016. Social Network Analysis in the Study of Terrorism and Insurgency: From Organization to Politics. International Studies Review 18: 214–243.

Week 5/ February 7: Security Institutions

1. Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan. 1995. The Promise of Collective Security. International Security 20 (1): 52-61.
2. Alagappa, Muthiah. 1997. Regional Institutions, the UN and International Security: A Framework for Analysis. Third World Quarterly 18 (3): 421- 441.
3. Bøås, Morten. 2000. Security Communities: Whose Security? Cooperation and Conflict 35 (3): 309–319.
4. Lake, David A. 2001. Beyond Anarchy: The Importance of Security Institutions. International Security 26 (1): 129-160.
5. Pouliot, Vincent. 2008. The Logic of Practicality: A Theory of Practice of Security Communities. International Organization 62 (2): 257-288.
6. Stephen, Matthew D. 2015. ‘Can You Pass the Salt?’ The Legitimacy of International Institutions and Indirect Speech. European Journal of International Relations 21 (4): 768–792.
7. Engelbrekt, Kjell. 2016. “A Puzzle and Conceptual Framework.” In: High-Table Diplomacy: The Reshaping of International Security Institutions, chap. 1. Wash DC: Georgetown University Press.
8. Oates, John G. 2016. The Fourth Face of Legitimacy: Constituent Power and the Constitutional Legitimacy of International Institutions. Review of International Studies 43 (2): 199–220.

Week 6/ February 14: Ontological Security

1. Marlow, Jim. 2002. Governmentality, Ontological Security and Ideational Stability: Preliminary Observations on the Manner, Ritual and Logic of a Particular Art of Government. Journal of Political Ideologies 7 (2): 241–259.
2. Mitzen, Jennifer. 2006. Ontological Security in World Politics: State Identity and the Security Dilemma. European Journal of International Relations 12 (3): 341–370.
3. Steele, Brent J. 2008. Ontological Security in International Relations: Self-identity and the IR State. New York: Routledge; chaps. 1-3.
4. Rossdale, Chris. 2015. Enclosing Critique: The Limits of Ontological Security. International Political Sociology 9:369–386.
5. Rumelili, Bahar. 2015. Identity and Desecuritisation: The Pitfalls of Conflating Ontological and Physical Security. Journal of International Relations and Development 18: 52–74.
6. Subotic, Jelena. 2016. Narrative, Ontological Security, and Foreign Policy Change. Foreign Policy Analysis 12: 610–627.
7. Croft, Stuart 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.
8. Shani, Giorgio. 2017. Human Security as Ontological Security: A Post-Colonial Approach. Postcolonial Studies 20 (3): 275-293.
9. Browning, Christopher S. and Pertti Joenniemi. 2017. Ontological Security, Self-articulation and the Securitization of Identity. Cooperation and Conflict 52 (1): 31–47.
10. Pratt, Simon Frankel. 2017. A Relational View of Ontological Security in International Relations. International Studies Quarterly 61: 78–85.

11. Solomon, Ty. 2017. Ontological Security, Circulations of Affect, and the Arab Spring. Journal of International Relations and Development <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41268-017-0089-x>

Week 7/ February 21: Securitization

1. Williams, Michael C. 2003. Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics. International Studies Quarterly 47: 511–531.
2. Balzacq, Thierry. 2005. The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context. European Journal of International Relations 11 (2): 171–201.
3. Stritzel, Holger. 2007. Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. European Journal of International Relations 13 (3): 357–383.
4. Guzzini, Stefano. 2011. Securitization as a Causal Mechanism. Security Dialogue 42 (4-5):329-341.
5. Floyd, Rita. 2011. Can Securitization Theory Be Used in Normative Analysis? Towards a Just Securitization Theory. Security Dialogue 42 (4-5): 427-439.
6. Jones, Lee. 2011. Beyond Securitization: Explaining the Scope of Security Policy in Southeast Asia. International Relations of the Asia-Pacific 11: 403–432.
7. Roe, Paul. 2012. Is Securitization a ‘Negative’ Concept? Revisiting the Normative Debate over Normal versus Extraordinary Politics. Security Dialogue 43 (3): 249-266.
8. Sheikh, Mona Kanwal. 2014. The Religious Challenge to Securitisation Theory. Millennium: Journal of International Studies 43 (1): 252-272.
9. Rythoven, Eric Van. 2015. Learning to Feel, Learning to Fear? Emotions, Imaginaries, and Limits in the Politics of Securitization. Security Dialogue 46 (5): 458-475.
10. Fisher, Jonathan and David M. Anderson. 2015. Authoritarianism and the Securitization of Development in Africa. International Affairs 91(1): 131–151.
11. Balzacq, Thierry, Sarah Léonard, and Jan Ruzicka. 2016. ‘Securitization’ Revisited: Theory and Cases. International Relations 30 (4): 494–531.
12. Marchand, Marianne H. 2017. Crossing Borders in North America after 9/11: ‘Regular’ Travellers’ Narratives of Securitisations and Contestations. Third World Quarterly 38 (6): 1232-1248.
13. Kearns, Matthew. 2017. Gender, Visuality and Violence: Visual Securitization and the 2001 War in Afghanistan. International Feminist Journal of Politics 19 (4): 491-505.

Week 8/ February 28: Human Security – Part I

1. Paris, Roland. 2001. Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air? International Security 26 (2): 87-102.
2. Newman, Edward. 2001. Human Security and Constructivism. International Studies Perspectives 2: 239–251.
3. Thomas, Caroline. 2001. Global Governance, Development and Human security: Exploring the Links. Third World Quarterly 22 (2): 159–175.
4. Kerr, Pauline, William T. Tow, and Marianne Hanson. 2003. The Utility of the Human Security Agenda for Policymakers. Asian Journal of Political Science 11 (2): 89-114.
5. Hoogensen, Gunhild & Kirsti Stuvøy. 2006. Gender, Resistance and Human Security. Security Dialogue 37 (2): 207-228.
6. Kaldor, Mary, Mary Martin, and Sabine Selchow. 2007. Human Security: A New Strategic Narrative for Europe. International Affairs 83 (2): 273–288.
7. Chandler, David. 2008. Human Security: The Dog That Didn’t Bark. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 427–438.

- a. Wibben, Annick T. R. 2008. Human Security: Toward an Opening. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 455–462.
- b. Ambrosetti, David. 2008. Human Security as Political Resource: A Response to David Chandler's 'Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark'. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 439–444.
- c. Owen, Taylor. 2008. The Critique That Doesn't Bite: A Response to David Chandler's 'Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark'. Security Dialogue 39 (4): 445–453.
8. De Larrinaga, Miguel & Marc G. Doucet. 2008. Sovereign Power and the Biopolitics of Human Security. Security Dialogue 39 (5): 517–537.
9. Newman, Edward. 2010. Critical Human Security Studies. Review of International Studies 36 (1): 77-94.

Spring Break March 3-10

Week 9/ March 14: Human Security – Part II

1. Christie, Ryerson. 2010. Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique? Security Dialogue 41 (2): 169-190.
2. Kim, Sung Won. 2010. Human Security with an Asian Face? Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies 17 (1): 83-103.
3. Martin, Mary and Taylor Owen. 2010. The Second Generation of Human Security: Lessons from the UN and EU Experience. International Affairs 86 (1): 211–224.
4. Tzifakis, Nikolaos. 2011. Problematizing Human Security: A General/Contextual Conceptual Approach. Southeast European and Black Sea Studies 11 (4): 353–368.
5. Kurusu, Kaoru. 2011. Japan as an Active Agent for Global Norms: The Political Dynamism Behind the Acceptance and Promotion of "Human Security". Asia-Pacific Review 18 (2): 115-137.
6. Owens, Patricia. 2012. Human Security and the Rise of the Social. Review of International Studies 38: 547–567.
7. Peterson, Jenny H. 2013. Creating Space for Emancipatory Human Security: Liberal Obstructions and the Potential of Agonism. International Studies Quarterly 57: 318-328.
8. Caballero-Anthony, Mely. 2015. Community Security: Human Security at 21. Contemporary Politics 21 (1): 3–69.
9. Homolar, Alexandra. 2015. Human Security Benchmarks: Governing Human Well-being at a Distance. Review of International Studies 41: 843–863.
10. Rudnicka, Lisa and David Boromisza-Habashib. 2017. The Emergence of a Local Strategies Approach to Human Security. Journal of Multicultural Discourse 12 (4):382-398.

Week 10/ March 21: Logic of Nuclear (In)Security

1. Tannenwald, Nina. 2005. Stigmatizing the Bomb: Origins of the Nuclear Taboo. International Security 29 (4): 5-49.
2. Solingen, Etel. 2007. Nuclear Logics: Contrasting Paths in East Asia and the Middle East. Princeton University Press. [**skip chapters on Iraq and Libya**]
3. Becker, Una, et al. 2008. Democracy and Nuclear Arms Control – Destiny or Ambiguity? Security Studies 17 (4): 810-854.
4. Lieber, Keir A. and Daryl G. Press. 2013. Why States Won't Give Nuclear Weapons to Terrorists. International Security 38 (1): 80–104.

5. Gavin, Francis J. 2015. Strategies of Inhibition Francis J. Gavin: U.S. Grand Strategy, the Nuclear Revolution, and Nonproliferation. International Security 40 (1, Summer): 9–46.
6. Das, Runa. 2017. A Post-colonial Analysis of India–United States Nuclear Security: Orientalism, Discourse, and Identity in International Relations. Journal of Asian and African Studies 52 (6): 741–759.
7. Gartzke, Erik and Matthew Kroenig. 2017. Social Scientific Analysis of Nuclear Weapons: Past Scholarly Successes, Contemporary Challenges, and Future Research Opportunities. Journal of Conflict Resolution 61 (9): 1853-1874.

Week 11/ March 28: Peacekeeping, Peace Building and Intervention

1. Barnett, Michael. 2006. Building a Republican Peace: Stabilizing States After War. International Security 30 (4): 87-112.
2. Fortna, Virginia Page and Lise Morjé Howard. 2008. Pitfalls and Prospects in the Peacekeeping Literature. American Review of Political Science 11: 283-301.
3. Autesserre, Séverine. 2009. Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence, and International Intervention. International Organization 63 (2): 249-280.
4. Paris, Roland. 2014. The ‘Responsibility to Protect’ and the Structural Problems of Preventive Humanitarian Intervention. International Peacekeeping 21 (5):569-603.
5. Peter, Mateja. 2015. Between Doctrine and Practice: The UN Peacekeeping Dilemma. Global Governance 21: 351-370.
6. Portmess, Lisa and Bassam Romaya. 2015. Digital Peacekeepers, Drone Surveillance and Information Fusion: A Philosophical Analysis of New Peacekeeping. Theoria 145 (62:4): 5-22.
7. Karim, Sabrina and Kyle Beardsley. 2016. Explaining Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Peacekeeping Missions: The Role of Female Peacekeepers and Gender Equality in Contributing Countries. Journal of Peace Research 53 (1): 100–115.
8. Björkdahla, Annika and Johanna Mannergren Selimovic. 2016. A Tale of Three Bridges: Agency and Agonism in Peace Building. Third World Quarterly 37 (2): 321–335.
9. Randazzo, Elisa. 2016. The paradoxes of the ‘Everyday’: Scrutinising the Local Turn in Peace Building. Third World Quarterly 37 (8): 1351–1370.
10. Donais, Timothy and Erin McCandless. 2017. International Peace Building and the Emerging Inclusivity Norm. Third World Quarterly 38 (2); 291–310.
11. Sandler, Todd. 2017. International Peacekeeping Operations: Burden Sharing and Effectiveness. Journal of Conflict Resolution 61 (9): 1875-1897.

ISA 59th Convention, San Francisco, April 4 - 7

Week 12/ April 11: Cyber Security, Oil Security

1. Campbell, David. 2005. The Biopolitics of Security: Oil, Empire, and the Sports Utility Vehicle. American Quarterly 57 (3): 943-972.
2. Kello, Lucas. 2013. The Meaning of the Cyber Revolution: Perils to Theory and Statecraft. International Security 38 (2): 7–40.
3. Gartzke, Erik. 2013. The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War in Cyberspace Back Down to Earth. International Security 38 (2): 41–73.
4. Glaser, Charles L. 2013. How Oil Influences U.S. National Security. International Security 38 (2): 112–146.
5. Colgan, Jeff D. 2013. Fueling the Fire Pathways from Oil to War. International Security 38 (2): 147–180.

6. Lindsay, Jon R. 2014/2015. The Impact of China on Cybersecurity: Fiction and Friction. International Security 39 (3):7-47.
7. Lobato, Luísa Cruz and Kai Michael Kenkel. 2015. Discourses of cyberspace securitization in Brazil and in the United States. Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional 58 (2): 23-43.
8. Griffin, James M. 2015. Petro-Nationalism: The Futile Search for Oil Security. The Energy Journal 36: 25-41.
9. Gompert, David C. & Martin Libicki. 2015. Waging Cyber War the American Way. Survival: Global Politics and Strategy 57 (4): 7-28.
10. Emerson, R. Guy. 2016. Limits to a Cyber-Threat. Contemporary Politics 22 (2): 178-196.
11. Eun, Yong-Soo and Judith Sita Aßmann. 2016. Cyberwar: Taking Stock of Security and Warfare in the Digital Age. International Studies Perspectives 17: 343-360.
12. Brantly, Aaron. 2017. Innovation and Adaptation in Jihadist Digital Security. Survival: Global Politics and Strategy 59 (1): 79-102.

Week 13/ April 18: Great Powers and Security

1. Paul, T.V. 2005. Soft Balancing in the Age of U.S. Primacy. International Security 30 9 (1): 46-71.
2. Wohlforth, William C. 2009. Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War. World Politics 61 (1): 28-57.
3. Finnemore, Martha. 2009. Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn't All It's Cracked Up to Be. World Politics 61 (1): 58-85.
4. Schweller, Randall L. 2010. Entropy and the Trajectory of World Politics: Why Polarity Has Become Less Meaningful. Cambridge Review of International Affairs 23 (1): 145-163.
5. Haas, Mark L. 2014. Ideological Polarity and Balancing in Great Power Politics. Security Studies 23 (4): 715-753.
6. Rosato, Sebastian. 2014/2015. The Inscrutable Intentions of Great Powers. International Security 39 (3): 48-88.
7. Parent, Joseph M. and Sebastian Rosato. 2015. Balancing in Neorealism. International Security 40 (2): 51-86.
8. Lim, Darren J. & Zack Cooper. 2015. Reassessing Hedging: The Logic of Alignment in East Asia. Security Studies 24 (4): 696-727.
9. Jones, Catherine. 2015. Great Powers, ASEAN, and Security: Reason for Optimism? The Pacific Review 28 (2): 259-280.
10. Brooks Stephen G. And William C. Wohlforth. 2015/2016. The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers in the Twenty-first Century: China's Rise and the Fate of America's Global Position. International Security 40 (3): 7-53.
11. Yarhi-Milo, Keren, Alexander Lanoszka, and Zack Cooper. 2016. To Arm or to Ally? The Patron's Dilemma and the Strategic Logic of Arms Transfers and Alliances. International Security 41 (2): 90-139.
12. Freedman, Joshua. 2016. Status Insecurity and Temporality in World Politics. European Journal of International Relations 22 (4): 797-822.
13. Cypher, James M. 2016. Hegemony, Military Power Projection and US Structural Economic Interests in the Periphery. Third World Quarterly 37 (5): 800-817.

Week 14/ April 25: Globalization and Security

1. Barkawi, Tarak and Mark Laffey. 1999. The Imperial Peace: Democracy, Force and Globalization. European Journal of International Relations 5 (4): 403-434.
2. Michael Dillon and Julian Reid. 2001. Global Liberal Governance: Biopolitics, Security and War. Millennium: Journal of International Studies 30 (1): 41- 66.

3. Kinnvall, Catarina. 2004. Globalization and Religious Nationalism: Self, Identity, and the Search for Ontological Security. Political Psychology 25 (5): 741-767.
4. Ripsman, Norrin M. and T. V. Paul. 2005. Globalization and the National Security State: A Framework for Analysis. International Studies Review 7: 199–227.
5. Biersteker, Thomas. 2014. Dialectical Reflections on Transformations of Global Security during the Long Twentieth Century. Globalizations 11 (5):711–731.
6. Nathan, Andrew J. and Andrew Scobell. 2016. Globalization as a Security Strategy: Power and Vulnerability in the “China Model”. Political Science Quarterly 131 (2): 313-339.
7. Koff, Harlan. 2016. Reconciling Competing Globalizations through Regionalisms? Environmental Security in the Framework of Expanding Security Norms and Narrowing Security Policies. Globalizations 13 (6): 664-682.
8. Lazell, Melita. 2016. Liberalism(s) and the Critical Securitization of Development Debate, Globalizations 13 (4): 361-376.
9. Gordeeva, Evgenia. 2016. A Transforming International System and the Three Approaches to the Security Dilemma. European Journal of Futures Research 4 (6): 1-15.
10. Amusan, Lere and Samuel Oyewole. 2017. The Quest for Hegemony and the Future of African Solutions to African Development Problems: Lessons from Headways in the African Security Sector. Journal of Asian and African Studies 52 (1): 21–33.