

Course Code: IP2024	
Module Name: Security Studies—Conceptual Approaches	
Academic Year and Term: 2017-2018, Term I	
Lectures: Tuesdays, 9:00-9:50 at Rhind Bldg. D104	
Dr. Alexander Lanoszka Rhind Bldg. D522 Alexander.Lanoszka@city.ac.uk Available: Tuesdays, 13:00—14:50	Tutorial I: Tuesdays, 10:00–10:50 Tutorial I Location: College AG03 Tutorial II: Tuesdays, 12:00–12:50 Tutorial II Location: College AG226 Tutorial III: Tuesdays, 15:00–15:50 Tutorial III Location: Drysdale ELG05 Twitter Hashtag: #IP2024

Module Description

The world seems to be becoming a scary place again: an arms race is unfolding in East Asia, large-scale military exercises are taking place on Europe’s eastern borders, nationalism appears to be re-emerging, and espionage tales are becoming common again. How can we even begin to make sense of it all?

This module aims to introduce you to international security studies. Its approach will be much more theoretical than empirical or topical: you would be exposed to a variety of different arguments about why violent conflict happens and how we should even think of security in the first place. The first half of the module will mostly be spent exploring realist and rationalist understandings of war and conflict. The second half will be spent addressing alternative hypotheses of war and conceptualisations of security.

Some omissions are necessary: we will not be covering terrorism, nuclear proliferation, or civil war, for example. The purpose of this module is to equip you with the theoretical tools and concepts you need for understanding security most broadly.

Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this module, students will be expected to be able to:

- *Knowledge and Understanding*
- Understand the changing nature of the concept of security and its evolution throughout the 20th and 21st centuries
- Demonstrate knowledge of the different theoretical understandings of the concept of security.
- Understand and engage critically with the assumptions that underpin contending conceptualisations of international security challenges.
- Identify the links between conceptual debates in security studies and in International Relations more generally.
- Apply a multidisciplinary approach to the study of security, drawing not only from International Relations and political science but also economics, sociology, international law, history and psychology.

Skills

- Distinguish empirical, normative and explanatory statements from each other
- Define abstract concepts and apply them with consistency and rigour when making sense of complex issues affecting international security.
- Formulate clear arguments in written and oral format
- Justify your own positions on a number of topics related to the study of international security.
- Demonstrate the importance of IT and time management skills

Values and Attitudes

- Appreciate the complex nature of the concept of security

- Appreciate the role that theories play in explaining contemporary international security threats, challenges and conflicts
- Demonstrate tolerance towards the opinions of your colleagues
- Produce written materials that indicate in a precise and honest the nature of your work with proper attribution to the work of others
- Show consideration for the rules and regulations of the University

Teaching Pattern and Tutorials

This module is for one term with two contact hours per week. It relies upon a combination of lectures and tutorials. The lectures serve to introduce the core concepts and themes raised in the assigned readings. They are not substitutes for doing the readings themselves. Under no circumstance can students rely on lectures to be anything more than introductory guide to the subject material.

Tutorials will be more interactive since we will be discussing the materials raised in both the lecture and the readings. Specifically, we will address a question that I have already assigned in this syllabus. Using the readings and the concepts discussed in lecture, we will explore the questions posed from different angles—be they strategic, political, economic, legal, or moral. At least through weeks 1 and 5, we will set aside on a weekly basis to answer questions students may have from the preparatory work done. As such, students are expected to do the readings and to undertake independent study in order: (1) to understand the topics covered in the weekly sessions; (2) to broaden and to deepen their knowledge of the subject; and (3) to develop their own value positions on a number of topics relating to international security. **Attendance will be monitored regularly.**

Lectures will take place between 3 October and 12 December 2017. Tutorials will begin on Week 2.

In general, good participation in the tutorial entails several things:

- **Carefully reading and understanding the assigned texts before coming to the session:** Much of our discussion will be based on the assigned readings. Because citing specific passages and claims will be necessary to support an

argument, you must be familiar with the material. I strongly recommend that you prepare a one page “cheat sheet” for each reading that summarises its main points.

- **Coming prepared to raise questions you have about the material and to express your opinions about the author’s arguments:** Critical thinking goes beyond simple comprehension. It involves placing the arguments in their contexts and evaluating their strengths and weaknesses. To like or to dislike a piece is insufficient. As important as your gut reactions, you must back your arguments with evidence and logic. Any lack of understanding regarding a certain topic in the lectures and readings should be raised during the first part of tutorial. Chances are that if you have difficulty grasping a concept, then someone else is facing that same difficulty as well. After all, much of this module centres on sophisticated scholarship produced in strategic studies, political science, and history.
- **Listening attentively to your classmates and responding respectfully to their comments:** The seminars involve me moderating and facilitating an informed discussion among students. For meetings to be effective, please listen to the points that other students are making rather than simply waiting to make your next comment. Vigorous disagreement is a major part of the academic world, but students must maintain a respectful, civil, and collegial tone. Personal attacks have no place here.
- **Other points of courtesy:** Please avoid side conversations, arrive on time, and do not leave early unless you have spoken with me before the beginning of the tutorial. I understand that many would like to use cell phones to retrieve notes and readings, but I would suggest that you use an alternative device because cell phone use in the classroom is very distracting and may be interpreted—rightly or wrongly on my part—as discourteous.

Most importantly, have fun! Our meetings are meant to offer an opportunity for engaging intellectually with your peers. Play the devil’s advocate or adopt positions that you otherwise would find disagreeable. Do not be shy about asking questions. Moreover, engaging in a critical but collegial dialogue with your classmates will force you to be articulate and clear in your arguments. Sometimes

you might even concede that your argument is wrong. To paraphrase John Stuart Mill, even if you stand by your argument at the end of the debate, defending it forces you to reassess your own premises in a way that *could* reinforce your convictions. Either way, you emerge from the dialogue stronger than before.

Assessment

Coursework (50% of module mark—pass mark: 40%)

50% Written essay — Deadline: 21 December 2017 at 16:00.

For this essay, you have two options:

- Use the rationalist explanations of war (see week 4) to understand a war of your choosing. Specifically, which—if any—of the rationalist explanations best accounts for the war, and why? Does the war comport with none of the explanations and if so, why not? To what extent does the war support or invalidate rationalist assumptions? If you select this option, then I expect you to use proper academic sources in your research about the conflict you have chosen. *NOTE: If you choose this option, then you must tell me which war you have decided to study at the end of your tutorial on week 7.*

OR

- Choose ONE of (a) the Crowe Memorandum; (b) the Long Telegram; or (c) NSC-68 and scrutinise the basis for the threat assessments made in those documents. For example, what about the adversary—whether Imperial Germany or the Soviet Union—made it so threatening, according to the author(s)? To what extent did the author rely on military capabilities, domestic politics, economic or international behaviour to draw inferences about the adversary's intentions? Do the policy prescriptions flow from the given explanation of the adversary's behaviour? Is there a theory of international politics implicit in the document? All three primary documents are available on the Moodle.

The word limit per written essay is 2,500 words. Students may go over or under by 10%. The word limit runs from the Introduction to the Conclusion of the assignment and will include quotes and footnotes that appear in the body of the assignment. It does not include the following: title page, abstract, diagrams,

graphs, images, bibliography, and appendices. I will only mark an assignment up to the word limit. The part of the assignment that exceeds this limit will not be marked. I will provide feedback and explain that the penalty has been applied.

Other rules governing the formatting of the essay:

- Times 12 or its close equivalent (usually the default setting)
- 1” margins all around
- Double-spacing
- Page numbers—if your first page is the cover page, then set this page number to 0. (In Word, select “Page Numbers” from the “Insert” menu and click on “Format.”)
- Consistent usage of one standard citation style (Harvard, Chicago, MLA, etc.)
- A standard cover page that includes the word count.

Failure to format your essay properly will result in a small deduction of your mark.

Examination (50% of module mark—pass mark: 40%)

Cumulative Final Exam (to be held in January) whereby all material covered in the lectures and required readings may appear. It will be closed-book/closed-note and will feature one-third “short answer” and two-third “essay questions.” It will be a 2 hour unseen examination.

Submission of Coursework

Students should refer to the Programme Handbook for information about coursework. To summarise:

- (a) **Deadlines are final:** Your work should be ready for submission on the deadline. Please do not leave submission until the last minute. Coursework submitted after the deadline will not be marked. If you anticipate that you will be unable to submit your coursework on time due to Extenuating Circumstances, then you must submit an Extenuating Circumstances claim to the School Office by the appropriate deadline in accordance with the School

Policy. The onus is on you to submit such a claim in a timely manner. If the Extenuating Circumstances panel accepts your claim, then you will receive an extension and your work will be marked as normal. If it rejects your claim and you submit your work late, then you will receive a mark of 0% for your coursework and you will be required to resit at a later date. Resits are capped at the minimum pass mark for the module (40%). Note that travel delays and IT problems are invalid Extenuating Circumstances.

- (b) **Submission:** Students must submit an electronic copy of the assignment on the module on Moodle by the deadline—this will be your coursework receipt. Do not submit elsewhere. Nor do you submit directly to the teaching staff. *The responsibility is on you to ensure that your coursework is submitted on time and in the correct manner. If you experience any difficulties submitting on Moodle, then please contact your Programme Administrator immediately.*
- (c) **Plagiarism:** By submitting your essay for assessment electronically, you are agreeing to the following declaration: “The work I have submitted is exclusively my own work except where explicitly indicated with quotations and citation. I have read and understood the statement on plagiarism contained in the School Handbook and understand that plagiarism is a serious academic offence and could result in my exclusion from the University.” If you are unsure whether you are paraphrasing properly, then at least provide the full citation and have all directly quoted passages in quotation marks. *All written work will be submitted electronically via Turnitin.*
- (d) **Assistance:** In case you need help with referencing or essay written, then please refer yourself to your Programme Handbook. The Student Centre also provides a series of workshops to help students develop study skills. You can email them at the following address: academiclearningsupport@city.ac.uk. You can find further details of the support available on their website: <http://www.city.ac.uk/studentcentre>.

Office Hours

Drop-in office hours are on Tuesdays, from 13:00–14:50 at D522. No appointment is necessary but I would suggest bringing something to read in case you have to

wait. Please let me know if this time does not work with your schedule so that we can arrange an alternative appointment.

Letter Writing Requests

Absolutely DO NOT put my name down as a reference without asking for my permission first. I strongly encourage all students contemplating further postgraduate studies to consult with me first. Please note that I have very specific guidelines about letter writing. Read the document first before approaching me. Doing so will save everyone time and energy.

<http://www.alexlanoszka.com/LanoszkaPolicy.pdf>

Email Confirmation and Communication

Once you have read through this syllabus, please send me an email with subject line **“IP2024: Syllabus Read”**. In this email, state your name, your reasons for enrolling in this course, previous modules that may be relevant, and statement of origin. The email should be no longer than four sentences.

Please note that all emails sent to me should include “IP2024” at the beginning of the subject line. Responses could take up to 1-2 business days (no weekends). If I believe that answering your email would take me more than five minutes to do, then I would invite you to meet me during my office hours instead. If you have not received a response after 2 business days, then please resend your email. I will NOT respond to emails that are not sent from your city.ac.uk account.

Twitter

Over the course of the term I might tweet relevant articles that bear on the subjects and issues raised in this module. Tweeted articles are not required readings—they serve to complement the material. I will be using the hashtag **#IP2024**.

SCHEDULE

Week	Date	Lecture Topic	Tutorial
1	3/10/17	Security and Security Studies	No tutorial
2	10/10/17	The Balance of Power	What's the balance of power in theory and historical practice?
3	17/10/17	Coercion: Air Power	How can we measure air power's effectiveness?
4	24/10/17	The Causes of War	Why do wars begin and end?
5	31/10/17	Threat Assessments	How should we assess the Russia/China/North Korea threat?
Reading Week			
7	14/11/17	Liberalism, Economics, and War	How might economics affect war?
8	21/11/17	Peace Studies and Human Security	What are the advantages and disadvantages of broadening the concept of security?
9	28/11/17	Environmental Security and Political Violence	Is the environment a national security issue?
10	5/12/17	Critical Security Studies and Gender Security	What should the role be between the academy and policy?
11	12/12/17	When is War Murder? Moral and Ethical Issues	Were the atomic bombings of Japan morally defensible?
Coursework Due on 21 December 2017			
Cumulative Final Exam sometime between 15 and 27 January 2018			

Reading List and Module Schedule

Recommended readings marked with * are *strongly* recommended.

Week 1: What is Security and How Will We Study It?

In this session we will address why states want what we call security and what approach we will use to understand international security. We will review how the study of international security has evolved since the Second World War.

Required Reading:

Stephen Walt, “The Renaissance of Security Studies,” *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 35, no. 2 (1991): 211-239.

Ken Booth and Nicholas Wheeler, “Uncertainty,” in *Security Studies: An Introduction*, ed. Paul D. Williams (London: Routledge, 2008): 133–141.

Recommended:

Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2009): 8-19.

David A. Baldwin, “The Concept of Security,” *Review of International Studies*, vol. 23, no. 1 (1997): 5-26.

Mohammed Ayoob, “The Security Problematic of the Third World,” *World Politics*, vol. 43, no. 1 (1990): 257-283.

Week 2: The Balance of Power

What is power? What is anarchy and why, according to some scholars and policy-makers, does it lead states to balance military power with military power? How historically common were balance of power systems? Or is just an artefact of a peculiar moment in European history? We will take up these questions in the lecture and seminar.

Required Reading:

William C. Wohlforth et al, "Testing Balance-of-Power Theory in World History," *European Journal of International Relations*, vol. 13, no. 2 (2007): 155-185.

Paul W. Schroeder, "The Nineteenth Century System: Balance of Power or Political Equilibrium?" *Review of International Studies*, vol. 15, no. 2 (1989): 135-153.

F. Gregory Gause III, "Balancing What? Threat Perception and Alliance Choice in the Gulf," *Security Studies*, vol. 13, no. 2 (2003): 273-305.

Recommended:

Keren Yarhi-Milo, Alexander Lanoszka, and Zack Cooper, "To Arm or to Ally? The Patron's Dilemma and the Strategic Logic of Arms Transfers and Alliances," *International Security*, vol. 41, no. 2 (2015): 90-139.

Week 3: The Causes of War

We study international security because we want to understand why wars take place—preferably to make sure that they do not happen. Why then do wars occur? Why can states not peacefully resolve their differences so as to avoid paying the (potentially high) costs associated with war? We will review and question the rationalist explanations for why wars take place (i.e. information asymmetry; commitment problems; issue indivisibility).

Required Reading:

Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, eds. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984): 78-89; 113-123.

Dan Reiter, “Exploring the Bargaining Model of War,” *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2003): 27-33.

James D. Fearon, “Rationalist Explanations of War,” *International Security*, vol. 49, no. 3 (1995): 379-383.

Recommended:

Robert Jervis, “Offense, Defense, and the Security Dilemma,” in *International Politics: Enduring Concepts and Contemporary Issues, 12th ed.*, eds. Robert Art and Robert Jervis (Pearson, 2015): 79–97.

Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett, “Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-86,” *American Political Science Review*, vol. 87, no. 3 (1993): 624-627.

Stephen Van Evera, “Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War,” *International Security*, vol. 22, no. 4 (1998): 5-43.

Week 4: Coercion: Air Power as a Case Study

Devising strategy involves more than just outlining a wish list of desirable things —it requires an understanding of how to optimise constrained resources in a world marked by competition, uncertainty, and conflicting values. We will examine basic concepts such as coercion, brute force, deterrence theory, and coercive bargaining.

Required Reading:

Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1966): 1-34.

Robert Pape, *Bombing to Win: Air Power and Coercion in War* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996): chapter 2.

Recommended:

Andrew L. Stigler, “A Clear Victory for Air Power: NATO’s Empty Threat to Invade Kosovo,” *International Security*, vol. 27, no. 3 (2002/03): 124-157.

Daniel R. Lake, “The Limits of Coercive Airpower: NATO's “Victory” in Kosovo Revisited,” *International Security*, vol. 34, no. 1 (2009): 83-112.

Week 5: Threat Assessments

What makes a threat ‘a threat’? This session will step back from the issues described in previous sessions to evaluate the literature on threat assessments. Note that we are not going to interrogate critically threat inflation and securitization—a topic which we leave for future sessions. Instead, we examine how the empirical literature has uncovered interesting variation in how leaders and intelligence organisations estimate threats.

Required Reading:

Robert Jervis, “Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma,” *World Politics*, vol. 30, no. 2 (1978): 167-179, 186-206, 211-214.

Keren Yarhi-Milo, “In the Eye of the Beholder: How Leaders and Intelligence Communities Assess the Intentions of Adversaries,” *International Security*, vol. 38, no. 1 (2013): 7-51.

Recommended:

Richard K. Betts, “Analysis, War, and Decision: Why Intelligence Failures are Inevitable,” *World Politics*, vol. 31, no. 1 (1978): 61-89.

Joshua Rovner, “Is Politicization Ever a Good Thing?” *Intelligence and National Security*, vol. 28, no. 1 (2013): 55-67.

Week 6: Reading Week

Week 7: Liberalism, Economics, and War

Whereas realists would stress balancing, liberals would stress political preferences, the domestic attributes of states, and economic linkages as variables that affect the likelihood of conflict. We focus on such variables to uncover the proposed causal mechanisms proposed by liberal theory.

Required Reading:

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence*, 4th ed. (Boston, MA: Longman, 2012): Chapter 1.

Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett, "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-86," *American Political Science Review*, vol. 87, no. 3 (1993): 624-627.

Geoffrey Blainey, *The Causes of War*, 3rd ed. (New York, NY: Free Press, 1973 [1988]): 18-32.

Dale C. Copeland, "Economic Interdependence and War: A Theory of Trade Expectations," *International Security*, vol. 20, no. 4 (1996): 5-41. (37 pp.)

Recommended:

Andrew Moravcsik, "Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics," *International Organization*, vol. 51, no. 4 (1997): 513-553.

Katherine Barbieri, "Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict?" *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 33, no. 1 (1996): 29-49.

Erik Gartzke, "The Capitalist Peace," *American Journal of Political Science*, vol. 51, no. 1 (2007): 166-191.

Henry Farber and Joanne Gowa, "Politics and Peace," *International Security*, vol. 20, no. 2 (1994): 123-146.

Week 8: Peace Studies and Human Security

Many scholars question the approach we examined in detail in the first half of this module: they are too positivist, too state-centric, too immoral even. Peace studies and human security are two distinct but overlapping critiques that raise such concerns. We explore them this week.

Required Reading:

Johan Galtung, "Violence, Peace, and Peace Research," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 6, no. 3 (1969): 167-191.

Astri Suhrke, "Human Security and the Interests of States," *Security Dialogue*, vol. 30, no. 3 (1999): 265-176.

Roland Paris, "Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?" *International Security*, vol. 26, no. 2 (2001): 87-102.

Recommended:

Johan Galtung, "A Structural Theory of Imperialism," *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 8, no. 2 (1971): 81-117.

Week 9: Environmental Security and Political Violence

One critique of the approach taken up in the first half of the module is that it takes the environment as ‘given.’ In a time of potentially significant climate change, such an assumption is unwarranted, even harmful. What is the relationship between environmental conditions and violent conflict? Should we consider climate change and other issues in environment security as issues that have national security importance?

Required Reading:

Daniel Deudney, “The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security,” *Millennium*, vol. 19, no. 3 (1990): 461-76. (16 pp.)

Thomas F. Homer-Dixon, “On the Threshold: Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict,” *International Security*, vol. 16, no. 2 (1991): 76-116. (41 pp.)

Jon Barnett and W. Neil Adger, “Climate Change, Human Security, and Violent Conflict,” *Political Geography*, vol. 26, no. 6 (2007): 639-655. (17 pp.)

Recommended:

Idean Salehyan, “From Climate Change to Conflict? No Consensus Yet,” *Journal of Peace Research*, vol. 45, no. 3 (2008): 315-326.

Katarzyna Zysk, “Russia’s Arctic Strategy: Ambitions and Constraints,” *Joint Force Quarterly* 57 (2010): 103-110.

Week 9: Critical Security Studies and Gender Security

Critical security perspectives offer the most direct and comprehensive attack on traditional approaches to understanding security. With its common focus on social structures and discourse, feminist theory is but one strand of it. This session will outline what makes critical security studies 'critical' and why it has emerged as a line of criticism. Feminism will also be discussed, though this session will show concerns about gender can be tackled empirically (and theoretically) in a variety of different ways.

Required Reading:

J. Ann Tickner, "You Just Don't Understand: Troubled Engagements Between Feminists and IR Theorists," *International Studies Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 4 (1997): 611-632.

Dara Kay Cohen, "Wartime Sexual Violence: Misconceptions, Implications, and Ways," *United States Institute of Peace Special Report* (2013).

Recommended:

Miranda Alison, "Women as Agents of Political Violence: Gendering Security," *Security Dialogue*, vol. 35, no. 4 (2004): 447-363.

Laura Sjoberg, "Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions," *Security Studies*, vol. 18, no. 2 (2009): 183-213.

Week 10: When Is War Murder? Moral and Ethical Issues

One issue we have skirted all term is the morality of what we are discussing at the end of the day: killing. Is it ever morally justifiable to take another life or to fight a war? What are the moral and ethic issues that should guide statecraft, especially with respect to counterinsurgency and major power war? We will frame our discussion around just war theory.

Required Reading:

Neta C. Crawford, "Just War Theory and the U.S. Counterterror War," *Perspectives on Politics*, vol. 1, no. 1 (2003): 5-25.

Michael Walzer, *Just and Unjust War* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1977 [2015]): chapter 2.

Paul Fussell, "Thank God for the Atom Bomb," *The New Republic* (August 1981). (14 pp.)