

## **Contemporary Security Studies**

University of Massachusetts Lowell  
Graduate Course  
Tuesdays 5-7:50

---

Dr. Joel Day  
Email: joel\_day@uml.edu  
Phone: x45966  
Office: 435  
Office Hours: Tuesdays / Thursdays 2pm-3pm

---

### **Course Description and Objectives**

Security issues dominate the news and political discourse, yet few attempt to think critically about the competing theories and strategies of security. This course centers around the puzzles, theories, and challenges of security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. How is security for the state different from individual security? How are local, national, and global security architectures built, maintained, and challenged? Is security different across history and how has our understanding of it evolved? This course will focus on security challenges in the post-Cold War period, both for state and non-state actors.

This course offers a broad overview of the field of security studies. This is accomplished by introducing the main approaches explaining security, examining the central methodological tools and critiques in the field, evaluating the main security challenges, examining the tactics and strategies employed by security agencies, and outlining ways to reduce violence in the world. This course has several goals. Examinations, writing assignments, and discussions in class are all intended to help students develop their ability to: 1) understand leading theories in the field that explain war, conflict, and violence. 2) to comparatively engage types of security threats, including inter and intra state war, religious, political, and ethnic conflict, weapons of mass destruction, genocide, terrorism, technology and many others. 3) independently analyze and conduct original research on security threats and strategies. 4) thoroughly describe and understand how global security architectures can impact topics such as WMD, globalization, religion, diplomacy, and more. 5) have an introductory understanding of critiques and debates within the field of security studies.

### **Required Material**

No textbook is required for this course. All assignments are available on Blackboard. All required readings must be completed prior to the class meeting and lecture discussion for that lesson.

### **Expectations and Grading**

This is a graduate course and thus the bar is quite high for student performance. You are expected to attend class regularly, participate verbally and non-verbally, and keep current with the reading schedule. We will be reading several hundred pages per week. The reading will prove overwhelming in a single sitting, so I highly recommend daily work.

I do not post lecture notes online. I will provide an outline of the lecture during class to assist with note-taking. You must participate in the course by active and attentive note-taking. If you miss a class, you are expected to get notes from a classmate. You must attend class regularly, arrive early, and be

fully prepared for a lecture and discussion. Finally, you are expected to engage in engaged, respectful, inclusive, and professional demeanor at all times. Students can expect the same from me.

Course grades will be based on the following elements, but failure to complete any of the individual assignments is grounds for failing the course.

**Midterm Exam (30%)** The take-home midterm exam will be distributed in class on October 6 and it will be due on October 13. The exam accounts for 30% of the total course grade and covers material through October 13. Late exams will receive substantial deductions. *Note: PhD students in Criminology or Global Studies must meet with me to discuss additional midterm requirements designed to assist with Comprehensive Exam Preparation.*

**Research Paper (40%)** The final paper, worth 50% of the total course grade, will be a 20-page original research/policy paper on a topic of the student's choosing (*Ph.D. students must meet with me for additional requirements.*) I must approve the topic in advance – proposals are due by Week 3 (9/15). Students are strongly encouraged to meet with me to discuss their research paper well in advance of the deadline. The paper is due at the end of the assigned final exam period. Students should submit their papers on Blackboard. Papers will be evaluated on the basis of demonstration of critical analysis, relevance to the field, originality, defense of argument, organization, coherence, and writing style.

**Course Participation (10%)** Students should think of the course participation grade as an in-class oral examination extended throughout the semester. I evaluate participation on the basis of preparation, comprehension, professionalism, and engagement. To achieve the maximum score on participation, students should attend class regularly, prepare for discussion by completing the readings in advance, contribute to the discussion in class, and be respectful of and responsive to other students. Quantity of participation is not as important as quality. Questions, insights, and synthesis are all considered quality. Irregular attendance, rude behavior, arriving to class late, failing to participate in discussions, and disrupting class with side conversations, texting, sleeping, or using your laptop for non-course related reasons will detract from the participation grade.

**Quizzes (20%)** This course requires a commitment to a strict reading schedule. To enforce this, I will regularly begin classes with quizzes designed to show mastery over material assigned for that day. These require knowledge of key arguments of each reading assignment, understanding of broad themes, and occasionally, specific arguments from the reading. Quizzes are designed to develop critical thinking, retention, and content delivery skills – all of which will serve you very well in the professional world. You are required to present your information as though you were a mid-level intelligence officer briefing a senior official on the content of an article and relate the material to a contemporary issue. Quizzes are graded on a five point level, with 5 being the highest grade. A 4 indicates failure to link reading to a contemporary issue or lack of professionalism. Grades of 3 show missed crucial points or lack finesse. Grades of 2 indicate some reading, but no mastery of content or style. Grades of 1 are given for a student who demonstrably did not do the reading. Attendance is required to receive credit for a quiz (note that a 1 is better than a 0).

## Course Policies

### 1. Grading

I take grading very seriously. There will be no grade inflation in this course. Excellent grades must be earned and this requires tremendous effort (see below). All grades are weighted on a 4.0 system using the following allocation:

Grade %	Grade %
---------	---------

<b>A 94.0-100%</b>	<b>C+ 77.0-79.9%</b>
<b>A- 90.0-93.9%</b>	<b>C 74.0-76.9%</b>
<b>B+ 87.0-89.9%</b>	<b>C- 70.0-73.9%</b>
<b>B 84.0-86.9%</b>	<b>D 67.0-69.9%</b>
<b>B- 80.0-83.9%</b>	<b>F &lt;67.0%</b>

More information about the University of Massachusetts-Lowell grading policies is available online at: <http://www.uml.edu/Catalog/Undergraduate/Policies/Grading-Policies.aspx#a>

I do not grade on a curve – you get the grade you earn based on my overall assessment of your performance based on the following criteria:

**A** The student displays mastery of the material and more. The student performed far beyond my expectations in the course, displaying a grasp of the analytical and empirical material as well as creativity or insight beyond the material itself. The student will be among the top students in the degree program based on her/his performance in this course.

**A-** The student displays complete mastery of the course material. I was very impressed by the student's performance, and the student has acquired the analytical, theoretical, and empirical skills to achieve at a very high level in the degree program.

**B+** The student fully comprehends the course material. The student met all of my expectations in the course; the student will perform very well in the degree program.

**B** The student met most of the requirements of the course, but demonstrated weakness in either analytical or empirical skills or difficulty with time management. The student will perform well in the degree program when those skills are further developed.

**B-** The student demonstrated weakness in both analytical and empirical skills and also may have difficulty with time management, but clearly attempted to prepare for evaluated assignments. It is difficult to evaluate whether the student will succeed in the degree program.

**C** The student demonstrated disregard of the course requirements. Continuing in the degree program is not recommended.

**D** The student demonstrated blatant negligence and disrespect during the course. Continuing in the degree program is not recommended.

**F** The student did not attend class or did not perform to a level that I knew they were attending. Continuing in the degree program is not recommended.

## **2. Assignment Due Dates / Make Up**

Incompletes are granted only for significant and verifiable personal emergencies (e.g., serious personal illness, death in the family), which are accommodated only at my discretion. I must be notified in advance of the due date through the appropriate Dean's office. No extensions are granted due to the pressures of academic life (such as work due in other classes, extracurricular activities, or stress). I encourage students to think of course deadlines as opportunities to practice the self-discipline required for a successful professional life.

## **3. Academic Integrity**

Cheating and plagiarism should not be tolerated in any academic environment, and I intend to hold everyone equally accountable to that standard. If you witness an incident of concern, you should report it right away, as this protects the integrity of your own degree program. Please review the University policy on academic dishonesty, cheating and plagiarism at:

[http://www.uml.edu/catalog/undergraduate/policies/academic\\_dishonesty.htm](http://www.uml.edu/catalog/undergraduate/policies/academic_dishonesty.htm)

## **4. Student Complaints and Grade Disputes**

In the event you disagree with a grade, you must notify me via email and then schedule an appoint with

me to discuss the grade. To this appointment, you must bring the original piece of work with a professional, typed note outlining the reasons why you believe the grade is unfair or wrong. I will deliberate and revise the grade as I see fit. Please keep in mind that revisions of grades go both ways – up and down. If a dispute still remains, this course will follow the dispute procedure outlined by the university:

<http://www.uml.edu/Catalog/Undergraduate/Policies/Grading-Policies.aspx#a>

### 5. Student Disabilities

Students with disabilities should notify me immediately so that I can make the appropriate accommodations. Please see the University’s policies on students with disabilities, available at the following website: <http://www.uml.edu/student-services/Disability/Students/Information-for-Students.aspx>

### Schedule

Topic	Reading	Date
<b>Week 1: Overview, Definitions, Theoretical Approaches</b>	Get started on future reading.	<b>9/1</b>
<b>Week 2: Theoretical Approaches II</b>	<p>Stephen Walt, “The Renaissance of Security Studies,” <i>International Studies Quarterly</i> Vol. 35, No. 2 (June 1991): 211-240</p> <p>Barry Buzan, “New Patterns of Global Security in the 21st Century,” <i>International Affairs</i> Vol. 67, No. 3 (1991)</p> <p>Richard Betts “Should Strategic Studies Survive?” <i>World Politics</i> Vol. 50, No. 10 (October 1997): 7-34</p> <p>Roland Paris, “Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?” <i>International Security</i> Vol. 26, No. 2 (fall 2001)</p> <p>Ryerson Christie, “Critical Voices and Human Security: To Endure, To Engage or To Critique?” <i>Security Dialogue</i> 41:2 (April 2010), pp. 169-190.</p>	<b>9/8</b>
<b>Week 3: Interstate Security: Drivers of War and Peace</b>	<p>Robert Jervis, “Security Regimes,” <i>IO</i> 36:2 (spring 1982), pp. 357-378;</p> <p>John J. Mearsheimer, “Back to the Future: Instability in Europe After the Cold War,” <i>IS</i> 15:4 (summer 1990), pp. 5-56.</p> <p>John M. Owen, “How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace,” <i>IS</i> 19:2 (fall 1994) 87-125</p> <p>Edward Mansfield and Jack Snyder, “Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War,” <i>IO</i> 56:2</p>	<b>9/15</b>

Jack S. Levy, "The Causes of War and the Conditions of Peace," ARPS (June 1998) pp. 139-165.

**Week 4: Interstate Security II: Power, Transition, Future of Conflict**

William C. Wohlforth et al., "Testing Balance-of-Power Theory in World History," EJIR 13:2 (2007), pp. 155-185. **9/22**

William Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World," *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (1999): 5-41.

Martha Finnemore, "Legitimacy, Hypocrisy, and the Social Structure of Unipolarity: Why Being a Unipole Isn't All It's Cracked Up to Be," WP 61:1 (Jan. 2009), pp. 58- 85

**Week 5: WMD Security**

Nina Tannenwald, "The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use," IO 53:3 (summer 1999), pp. 433-468. **9/28**

Matthew Kroenig, "Importing the Bomb: Sensitive Nuclear Assistance and Nuclear Proliferation," JCR 53:2 (April 2009), pp. 161-180. Michael Horowitz, "The Spread of Nuclear Weapons and International Conflict: Does Experience Matter?" JCR 53:2 (April 2009), pp. 234-257.

Scott D. Sagan, "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb," IS 21 (winter 1996/97), pp. 54-86

**Week 6: State Failure, Intervention, Human Security**

Stephen D. Krasner, "Sharing Sovereignty: New Institutions for Collapsed and Failing States," IS 29:2 (fall 2004) pp. 85-120 **10/6**

Roland Paris. 2001. Human security: Paradigm shift or hot air? *International Security* 26, no. 2 (Fall): 87-102.

V. Fortna, "Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Institutions and the Duration of Peace After Civil War," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (June 2004)

Severine Autesserre, "Hobbes and the Congo: Frames, Local Violence and International Intervention," *International Organization*, Vol. 63, No. 2 (spring 2009): 249-280

Alan Kuperman, "The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 52: No. 1 (March 2008)

Robert Pape. 2012. When duty calls: A pragmatic standard of humanitarian intervention. *International Security*, 37, no. 1 (Summer): 41-80.

**Week 7: Substate Security – Repression, Violence, Genocide**

Christian Davenport, "State repression and political order," *Annual Review of Political Science* 10:1-23 (2007). **10/13**

Lee Ann Fujii, "The Power of Local Ties: Popular Participation in the

Rwandan Genocide,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (2008)

Dara Kay Cohen. "Explaining Rape During Civil War: Cross-National Evidence (1980–2009)." *American Political Science Review* 107.3 (August 2013): 461-477.

Courtenay Ryals Conrad and Will H. Moore. 2010. What stops the torture? *American Journal of Political Science* 54, no. 2 (April): 459-476.

Paul Kirby, ‘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* December 2013 19: 797-821.

**Week 8: Substate Security - Insurgency, Domestic Terror**

Paul Collier, Anke Hoeffler, and Dominic Rohner. 2009. Beyond greed and grievance: feasibility and civil war. *Oxford Economic Papers* 61, no. 1 (January): 1-27. **10/20**

Michael Ross. 2004. What do we know about natural resources and civil war? *Journal of Peace Research* 41, no. 3 (May): 337-356.

Mary Caprioli. 2005. Primed for violence: The role of gender inequality in predicting internal conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 49: 161-178.

Kristin Bakke. 2014. Help wanted? The mixed record of foreign fighters in domestic insurgencies. *International Security* 38, no. 4 (Spring): 150-187.

**Week 9: Terrorism**

Barry Posen, “The Struggle Against Terrorism: Grand Strategy, Strategy and Tactics,” *International Security* Vol. 26, No. 3 (winter 2001/02): 39-55 **10/27**

Robert Pape, *Dying to Win : The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism* (Random House, 2005).

Max Abrahms, “Why Terrorism Does Not Work,” *IS* 31:2 (fall 2006), pp. 42-78

Erica Chenoweth, “Democratic Competition and Terrorist Activity,” *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 72, No. 1 (January 2010), pp. 16-30.

Arjun Chowdhury and Ronald Krebs, “Talking about Terror: Counter-terror campaigns and the logic of representation,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 16: 125-150

**Week 10: Counter-terrorism**

Joseph Boyle, “Just War Doctrine and the Military Response to Terrorism,” *Journal of Political Philosophy* 11:2 (2003) 153-170. **11/3**

Jason Lyall and Isaiah Wilson III, “Rage against the Machines: Explaining Outcomes in Counterinsurgency Wars,” *International Organization* Vol. 63, No. 1 (winter 2009): 67-106.

Gary LaFree, Laura Dugan, and Raven Korte, “Is Counter Terrorism Counterproductive? Northern Ireland 1969-1992,” *Criminology*, Vol. 47

(2009), pp. 501-530.

Matthew M. Aid, "The CIA's New Black Bag is Digital," *Foreign Policy* (July 17, 2013).

Homeland Security Presidential Directive 8 (HSPD-8): National Preparedness (September 9, 2008); Homeland Security Presidential Directive 5 (HSPD-5): Management of Domestic Incidents (September 18, 2009); Presidential Policy Directive/PPD-8 (March 30, 2011); Chronology of Changes to the Homeland Security Advisory System, U.S. Department of Homeland Security (May 2011);

**Week 11:  
Transnational  
Organized Crime**

The Economist, "Minecraft: Illegal Mining in Latin America," Sept 16, 2014 **11/10**  
Stewart M. Young. "Going Nowhere "Fast" (or "Furious"): "The nonexistent US firearms trafficking statute and the rise of Mexican drug cartel violence." *U. Mich. JL Reform* 46 (2012): 1-303

**Week 12: Robots  
and Cyberconflict**

Johan Eriksson and Giampiero Giacomello, The Information Revolution, Security, and International Relations: (IR)relevant Theory? *International Studies Review* Vol. 27, No. 4 (2006): 221-244. **11/17**  
Dan Betz "Cyberpower in Strategic Affairs: Neither Unthinkable nor Blessed," *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 5 (2012): 689-711.  
Daniel Byman, "Why Drones Work: the case for Washington's weapon of choice," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2013, pp. 32-43.  
Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Why Drones Fail: when tactics drive strategy," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2013, pp. 44-54.

**Week 13: Causes of  
Human Security**

UN Human Security Unit: Strategic plan. Available at: **11/24**  
<https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/HSU/HSU%20Strategic%20Plan%202014-2017%20Web%20Version.pdf>  
Amanda Marie Murdie, Jakub Kakietek, "Do Development INGOs Really Work? The Impact of International Development NGOs on Human Capital and Economic Growth," *Journal of Sustainable Society, Vol. 1, No. 1 (2012)*  
Amanda Murdie and Tavishi Bhasin, "Aiding and Abetting: Human Rights INGOs and Domestic Protest," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 55 No. 2 (2011) 163-191.  
Mary Kaldor, Mary Martin, and Sabine Selchow, "Human Security: A New Strategic Narrative for Europe," *International Affairs* Vol. 83, No. 2, (2007): 273-288.  
Oliver Kaplan, "Protecting civilians in civil war: The institution of the ATCC in Colombia" *Journal of Peace Research* May 2013 50: 351-367.

**Week 14:** 9/11 Commission Report Executive Summary, Ch 1, Conclusion (Entire  
**Intelligence,** Highly Recommended) **12/1**  
**Challenges, Ethics**

Ronald Krebs, "In the Shadow of War: The Effects of Conflict on Liberal Democracy," *International Organization* Vol. 63, no. 1 (winter 2009): 177-210

**Week 15: Future of** Dan Drezner. 2013. Military primacy doesn't pay (nearly as much as you  
**Global Security – Is** think). *International Security* 38, no. 1 (Summer): 52-79 **12/8**  
**Violence Obsolete?**

Tanisha Fazal, "Why States No Longer Declare War," *Security Studies* Vol. 21, No. 4 (2012): 557-593.

Charli Carpenter, "Women, Children and Other Vulnerable Groups: Gender, Strategic Frames, and the Protection of Civilians as a Transnational Issue," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 49, No. 2 (June 2005).

National Intelligence Council. 2012. *Global trends 2030: Alternative worlds*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office. SKIM pp. 1-137.