INR 7139

Issues in Domestic Security

Fall 2015

Instructor: Roger Handberg
Office: HPH 308
Office hours: MTW 1000-1130 or by appointment
Contact: 407-823-2608, roger.handberg@ucf.edu
Class hours: W 1-4pm

Overview:

Societies confront security challenges both externally and domestically – some arise from nature, others come from humans whose motivations can be both benign and malignant. In this course, the focus is upon what the challenges are and what solutions are pursued with what results. Inherently, domestic security analysis is a comparative enterprise even though it appears in the context of homeland security (wherever the specific homeland is located). The struggle for domestic security remains a constant one with success never permanent, new crises arise. What makes it even more difficult is that domestic security issues are not disconnected from each other but can pile up like a multiple car accident on the Interstate. In addition, domestic security questions are tied to the international system especially in an interconnected age where individuals can travel the globe quickly and even more quickly their message can span the world despite the best efforts to prevent such from occurring.

There has been an intense debate within the larger field of Security Studies between the "traditionalists" and the "wideners and deepeners." The traditionalists defined security studies as a subcomponent of international relations focused on the "the study of the threat, use and control of military force."[1] The focus was on the nation state (the Westphalian model) and interstate war. This was later conceptualized as strategic studies, it continues as a major component within the field. The wideners and deepeners added environmental, economic, energy, societal, political, and religious factors to the analysis. According to Cavelty and Mauer, the analysis is deepened to consider five levels of analysis: international systems, international subsystems (regions or organizations), units, subunits, and individuals.[2] Level of analysis is always a critical question in assessing how well a particular analysis is done and ultimately its usefulness. Individuals can carry out antisocial acts, the question becomes identifying such individuals and assessing their potential for harm. So, domestic security is often a combination of risk assessment and threat assessment – the two become related but different. Risk assessment is what it says; the effort is to identify the potential for a specific event to occur. A high level of risk does not mean such an event will occur immediately or ever.

---

[1] Stephen Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies," *International Studies Quarterly* (1991), 35: 212.
[2] Myrian Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer, *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 2.

RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX				
SEVERITY / PROBABILITY	Catastrophic (1)	Critical (2)	Marginal (3)	Negligible (4)
Frequent (A)	High	High	Serious	Medium
Probable (B)	High	High	Serious	Medium
Occasional (C)	High	Serious	Medium	Low
Remote (D)	Serious	Medium	Medium	Low
Improbable (E)	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low
Eliminated (F)	Eliminated			

http://acqnotes.com/acqnote/tasks/element-3-assess-and-document-risk (accessed January 8, 2015).

Threat assessment becomes even more difficult and complicated because the threat can come either externally or internally through insiders acting against the organization. The Green on Blue attacks in Afghanistan represent one example of such threats arising and only being retrospectively identified although Blue on Blue attacks (friendly fire) can occur when the risk assessment is done inadequately. This is defined as a fuzzy situation where clarity is difficult to obtain and accurate judgments as what the actual threat is becomes difficult. Such threat assessments occur routinely in weather forecasting and in other situations where uncertainty exists as to likely outcomes if certain events occur. Surprise is one thing; failure to be prepared in the presence of a warning is something different. The Katrina hurricane disaster in New Orleans was one example; the lack of preparedness accentuated the adverse outcomes that occurred despite warnings of potential disaster. In Security Studies, surprise occurs despite best efforts but retrospective analyses can often be useful in pointing out why it occurred. Two examples in American history are Pearl Harbor in 1941 and the Cuba Missile Crisis in 1962. In the former, strategic surprise was achieved by Japan while in the latter the attempt at strategic surprise was thwarted and the situation stabilized.

The literature with respect to domestic security is extremely fragmented because it crosses national and comparative politics plus the international politics literatures. There are many single state case studies which often use the US as an implicit comparison or the research tracks US security policy concerns. The textbook was chosen because it provides a different perspective on the question of US security which is usually done from the context of US military forces – the security threats to the United States come from many directions and in forms not obvious to uninformed observer. There are many definitions of security and what that entails. For our purposes, security translates as the absence of active threats to societal wellbeing although from a larger or more distant perspective, significant threats may loom over the horizon. More commonly, societies operate in a state of general security with potential threats existing

but not actualized yet. For example, individuals live in a society in which crime occurs but for most residing outside specific locales the threat is minimal even close to non-existent. Local law enforcement and existing social norms keep the situation under control. Only when the criminal activity metastases into the broader society does the breakdown of social and political order become an issue. Drug cartels exist in several societies to the point that their activities essentially disrupt and threaten the larger society through corruption of officials and violence. You see that presently in parts of Mexico.

Absolute security is not achievable in any society given local circumstances and threat factors. Instead, states focus on risk management which means that a failure always remains a possibility unlike the supposed NASA saying "Failure is not an option."[3] Intelligence operations are the most difficult of all because the analyst is evaluating both capabilities and intentions. Capabilities are often obscured by secrecy and deception or simply lack of information but even if your capabilities assessment is correct, their intentions remain unknown because of lack of clarity about their motivations and fears. Events often occur because one party comes to fear that the other side is going do something harmful so the necessity is to strike first. A group may be known to exist but you are unable to identify their target(s) or time of operation. Or, more likely, an incident occurs similar to those that happened before but it becomes a triggering event such as the Watts riot in 1965, http://crdl.usg.edu/events/watts_riots/?Welcome, erupted with significant damage to property and 34 deaths with 4,000 arrests. In 1992, riots broke out again after acquittal of the officers accused of beating Rodney King, a motorist; 50 were killed and over 12,000 arrested, http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/18/us/los-angeles-riots-fast-facts/. In both instances, the triggering events (the arrest of an individual and in the latter the jury acquittal of police officers) were not expected to bring the large scale outcomes that occurred. In 2014 a Ferguson, Missouri death of an individual by police action generated a significant national public reaction. Given such events occur routinely (police shootings nationally), what sets off the reaction is often difficult to determine: not why but why now?

For an intelligence gathering organization concerned with domestic threats, identifying such events in advance is extremely difficult if not impossible. The British government currently is attempting to assess the possibility of a terrorist threat by returning members of the Islamic State; individuals who have not committed a crime in Britain, a difficult task given the uncertainties since many in fact return disillusioned as a result of their experience. France is undergoing a crisis with several events deemed terrorist in intent and action. The whole question of "lone wolf" terrorists remains one of great difficulty in detection since a single individual out of a population of similar individuals becomes motivated to act.

Therefore, this course will organized in terms of challenges to the society and state which rests on that society. Level of economic development and previous history are always factors in assessing possible security threats within a specific situation. States lacking internal resources (i.e. "failing states") cannot mitigate conditions leading to disorder and possibly violence nor are they likely to have the capacity to suppress incidents when they occur. Previous history is always important in assessing situations

[3] http://www.spaceacts.com/notanoption.htm (accessed January 10, 2015).

given that the grievances confronted are often long standing and reflect fundamental cleavages within the society. Awareness of these factors always drives analysis since otherwise you have a situation of partial information that can lead you astray in your assessment. Domestic threat analysis is almost definition a case study although awareness of similar circumstances and situations elsewhere can provide a cross check on your conclusions. Cross national research often confronts the difficulty of collecting equivalent data across a spectrum of states. There are no easy answers and the questions come at you from multiple angles.

Textbook:

Jack A. Jarmon – *The New Era in U.S. National Security* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2014).

Additional readings are specified in the syllabus and will be added to across the semester. Readings can be accessed through the UCF Library online journal collection plus some items will be distributed via email so be sure to access your official UCF email to receive the materials.

Among the issues or problems to be considered here are (in no particular order):

Terrorism domestic/international
Migration and security
State failure and state building
Economic security
Religious and ethnic conflicts
Cybersecurity – terrorism, war and crime
Organized crime or gangs often transnational – drugs and other issues
Civil wars and domestic violence – counter insurgency
Climate change
Privatization of security
Gender based terrorism
Biological weapons
Health and security

With literature drawn from a diversity of fields most of which are interdisciplinary in nature.

- Economic/social development
- Poverty and inequality – stages of economic development, forced changes
- Ethnic/religious conflicts
- Security agencies, public and private
- Nationalism – messianic Russian mission, US exceptionalism
- Some potential sources of conflict are wired into a society – ethnic, religious, social, poverty
- Change difficult because upsets established social-political order within the society – asking those dominant to raise up others – 1960s – Alliance for Progress
- Progressive faith in democracy can lead to failure when those dominant resist relative or absolute decline – Sunni in Iraq relative to Shia.

- Simple faith in capitalism can cause failure – crony capitalism, or privatization of public goods to a clique

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course, though, focuses on issues which traditional Security Studies approaches have (until very recently) largely neglected, but which nevertheless impinge most directly on the domestic level. Part I starts by explaining what we mean by 'domestic security' in this course and by introducing some basic concepts we'll use in the class, such as threat perception, risk and threat analysis, political culture, and strategic culture. In Part II, the bulk of the class, then examines some of the main contemporary security challenges just alluded to, addressing issues like terrorism, intelligence failure, cyber-threats, genocide and environmental security.

ELIGIBILITY

This is a core course within the PhD in Security Studies, and consequently all students enrolled in that program are required to take it. A basic undergraduate to graduate-level knowledge of international relations theory and security studies is assumed, and those who lack a solid background in IR theory and international security are therefore strongly advised to read up on the basics before the course begins.

AIMS OF THE COURSE

Consistent with the aims of the Department of Political Science as a whole, the specific aims of this course are as follows:

(1) To help provide an advanced PhD-level education to a high academic standard;
(2) To provide specialized research training appropriate to the PhD program in Security Studies;
(3) To provide a sound intellectual basis for studying Security Studies from different theoretical and methodological perspectives;
(4) To produce graduates qualified to proceed to employment in both the public and private sectors.

OBJECTIVES OF THE COURSE

The key objectives of the course are as follows. By the end of the course, each student should have acquired:

(1) A knowledge of major approaches to and concepts within the study of security Studies and an understanding of how these can be applied to the empirical world;
(2) The conceptual and methodological tools necessary to further advanced study and investigation within the PhD program in Security Studies;
(3) Skills in library use, information retrieval, and oral and written exposition and argument, as well as an ability to analyze, interpret and synthesize complex theoretical and empirical materials within the study of international security.

KEY SKILLS

The course seeks to develop or enhance the following key skills:

Communication: constructing clear and incisive written assignments, presenting ideas and arguments orally, learning to teach peers, exchanging interpretations, responding to challenges.

Improving own learning and performance: essay preparation, accepting and responding to criticism, developing own opinions on key issues.

Information technology: word processing, library searches, use of the internet.

Problem solving: conceptualization of issues, identification and evaluation of relevant evidence, analysis and synthesis of evidence.

Critical thinking: thoughtful and critical reading, exposing assumptions, marshalling empirical evidence, assessing the coherence of arguments.

METHOD OF INSTRUCTION

The course will be taught in (informal) lecture and seminar format. Each lecture lasts about an hour and is designed to provide students with an advanced introduction to that week's topic. After a break, the lecture will then be followed by an hour and thirty minute seminar in which a discussion of that week's assigned readings will take place. In most classes there will also be a student presentation of an assigned text (see week-by-week breakdown which follows).

PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION

The course grade will be composed of three elements:

- An essay assignment of approximately about 8,000-10,000 words, worth 40%.
- Two student presentations, collectively worth 20%.
- A second essay assignment of approximately 8,000-10,000 words, worth 40%.

Students are required to complete the assigned readings prior to coming to class, and to participate actively in class discussions. The essay assignment is due at the beginning of the class held in Week 9, Wednesday, xxx at the start of class. The second essay assignment is due xxx at the start of class.

WHAT IS EXPECTED OF STUDENTS

I ask a number of fairly straightforward things of my students:

(1) You should complete the assigned readings prior to coming to class, and be prepared to participate actively in class discussions. Discussions rarely work well - and consequently everyone suffers - if class members arrive in classes without adequate preparation. You should let the course instructor know immediately if a required class reading is unavailable.

(2) You should hand in essay assignments and the exam on time. **The penalty for late work is ten percent per working day** (vacation periods and weekends count as working days). All work must also be submitted to the course instructor at the beginning of class.

(3) I will be looking for a number of qualities when grading your essays and final exams, aside from a basic awareness of the class readings and the discussion topics covered in class:

(i) **Evidence of having reflected upon relevant readings and topics in a thoughtful and critical way.** In other words, you should provide a considered and thoughtful answer which makes best use of the theoretical ideas and empirical materials discussed in class up to that point.

(ii) **Evidence of having gone beyond these materials**. In other words, it is vitally important to examine literature beyond the readings explicitly covered in class, making use of the additional (non-asterisk) materials cited on the course syllabus where available, as well as others you may find relevant.

(iii) **A sophisticated understanding of the issues raised by the course** which goes beyond that expected of an undergraduate or MA student.

PRESENTATION GUIDELINES

Each student will identify 2 articles and one book analyzing various challenges in domestic security for their presentations. The article comes from those listed below the dashed line in each class starting with Week 4 forward. You may suggest an alternative article (provide a copy to the instructor) but they cannot be one you have presented in a previous or concurrent course. The books are identified at the bottom of different weeks by the word **Book Review**.

In your presentations, you should ensure that you do a few (fairly basic) things:

- Outline the core argument of the text. What is the author's theory or hypothesis, and how does he or she try to show that it is correct or supported by available evidence?
- Present your own argument and response. Do you agree with the argument presented by the author? If so, why? If not, why not?
- You may use a Power Point if you wish, but this is not essential, although if referring to tables, provide a handout.
- Each presentation should last about 10-15 minutes, but not longer.
- You will be graded on the analytical coherence and style of your presentation, and your two presentations will be worth 20% collectively.

ESSAY EXTENSIONS

Requests for essay extensions must be made *in writing and supported by documentary evidence*, such as a letter from your doctor explaining why you were unable to hand in your essay. Since you are being given multiple weeks to complete the essay assignments, there should normally be no justifiable reason for late submission. Extensions to the deadlines will therefore be granted only under the most *exceptional* circumstances, such as a documented illness, a death in the family or some other severe incapacity. Requests for extensions should be made *before the essay is due*. Requests made after the deadline are not likely to be treated sympathetically. At the PhD level it is relatively rare to find instances of plagiarism; nevertheless, it does occasionally occur. It is a very serious academic offence to submit written work in which text has been copied from the work of someone else, whether from another student, from a book or article or downloaded from the internet, without acknowledging the source. If evidence of plagiarism is found, it will result in a 'Fail' grade in the course.

SEMINAR TOPICS AND READINGS

Items above the dashed line are *essential and required* readings; all others are intended as optional background reading which will help you round out your understanding of a topic. Note that you can download free online copies of most of the articles cited here via the UCF Library catalog. The Library provides online access to a large number of journals relevant to this course, such as *Security Studies*, *International Security, International Studies Quarterly, Journal of Conflict Resolution, Journal of Security Studies, Contemporary Security Policy, Review of International Studies, International Organization, Terrorism and Political Violence, Foreign Affairs, Foreign Policy* and *World Politics*. Other more practitioner driven journals include *Stability*, *Small Wars Journal,* and *Small Wars and Insurgencies*. We will use articles drawn from many of these. Where a required reading is unavailable online, I will provide an electronic copy via email, a week or so before the class.
Note that the following reading list is *provisional* only; some of these readings may change and/or be updated by the course instructor as necessary.

PART I: SOME BASIC CONCEPTS

Week 1: Introduction to the Class (August 26, 2015)

No reading assigned. Summary of the course content, the assessment procedures to be employed and the format to be followed. Distribution of syllabus and essay assignment. Distribution of article and book presentation assignments.

Week 2: Defining Security and Security Studies (September 2, 2015)

Jarmon – Introduction and Chapters 1-6, 14
Paul Williams, 'Security Studies: An Introduction', in Williams (ed), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013). Emailed
Arnold Wolfers, '"National Security" as an Ambiguous Symbol', *Political Science Quarterly,* 67: 4, December 1952. Also in Christopher Hughes and Yew Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
Emma Rothschild, 'What is Security?' *Daedalus*, 124: 3, Summer 1995.
David Baldwin, 'Security Studies and the End of the Cold War', *World Politics*, 48:1, October 1995.
Steve Smith, 'The Increasing Insecurity of Security Studies: Conceptualizing Security in the Last Twenty Years', *Contemporary Security Policy*, 20: 3, December 1999.

Richard Betts, 'Should Strategic Studies Survive?', *World Politics,* 50: 1, October 1997.
Lawrence Freedman, 'International Security: Changing Targets', *Foreign Policy*, 110: special edition, Spring 1998.
Pauline Kerr, 'Human Security and Diplomacy', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

Edward Kolodziej, 'What is Security and Security Studies? Lessons from the Cold War', *Arms Control*, 13: 1, April 1992 (*Arms Control*, by the way, is the old and now archaic-sounding title of the journal *Contemporary Security Policy*).
Richard Ullman, 'Redefining Security', *International Security*, 8: 1, Summer 1983. Also in Hughes and Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader*.
Jessica Tuchman Matthews, 'Redefining Security', *Foreign Affairs*, 68: 2, Spring 1989. Also in Hughes and Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader*.
Daniel Deudney, 'The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security', *Millennium*, 19: 3, Winter 1990.
David Baldwin, 'The Concept of Security', *Review of International Studies*, 23: 1, January 1997. Also in Hughes and Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader*.
Stephen Walt, 'The Renaissance of Security Studies', *International Studies Quarterly*, 35: 2, June 1991. Also in Hughes and Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader*.
Edward Kolodziej, 'Renaissance in Security Studies? *Caveat Lector*!' *International Studies Quarterly,* 36: 4, December 1992.
John Baylis and James Wirtz, 'Introduction', in John Baylis, James Wirtz, Eliot Cohen and Colin Gray (eds.), *Strategy In the Contemporary World: An Introduction to Strategic Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
Joseph Nye and Sean Lynn-Jones, 'International Security Studies: A Report of a Conference on the State of the Field', *International Security*, Vol. 12: 4, Spring 1988.
David Ekbladh, 'Present at the Creation: Edward Mead Earle and the Depression-Era Origins of Security Studies', *International Security*, 36:3, Winter 2011/12.
Fen Olsler Hampson, 'Human Security', in Paul Williams (ed)., *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013).
Barry Buzan and Lene Hansen, *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

Week 3: The Perception and Construction of Threat/ Intelligence Failure (September 9, 2015)

Thierry Balzacq, 'Constructivism and International Security Studies', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010). Emailed
Michelle Bentley, 'War and/of Words: Constructing WMD in US Foreign Policy', *Security Studies*, 22: 1, January 2013.
Alexander Wendt, 'Anarchy is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics', *International Organization,* 46: 2, Spring 1992.
David Patrick Houghton, 'Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision-Making: Towards a Constructivist Approach', *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 3: 24-45, January 2007.
James Wirtz, 'The Art of the Intelligence Autopsy', *Intelligence and National Security*, published 2014 and currently available online on the journal website.

Glenn Hastedt, 'The Politics of Intelligence and the Politicization of Intelligence: The American Experience', *Intelligence and National Security*, 28:1, February 2013.

Jane Cramer and Trevor Thrall, 'Introduction: Understanding Threat Inflation' and Robert Jervis, 'Understanding Beliefs and Threat Inflation', in Trevor Thrall and Jane Cramer (eds.), *American Foreign Policy and The Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

David McDonald, 'Constructivisms', in Paul Williams (ed)., *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013).

Carol Gordon and Asher Arian, 'Threat and Decision Making', *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 45: 2, April 2001.

Ingrid Creppell, 'The Concept of Normative Threat', *International Theory*, 3:3, September 2011.

Chaim Kaufmann, 'Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas: The Selling of the Iraq War', *International Security,* 29: 1, Summer 2004. David Rousseau, *Identifying Threats and Threatening Identities: The Social Construction of Realism and Liberalism* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006).

Shiping Tang, 'Fear in International Politics: Two Positions', *International Studies Review*, 10: 3, September 2008.

Baruch Fischoff and John Kadvany, *Risk: A Very Short Introduction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Daniel Gardner, *The Science of Fear: How the Culture of Fear Manipulates Your Brain (*New York: Plume, 2009).

Trevor Thrall and Jane Cramer (eds.), *American Foreign Policy and The Politics of Fear: Threat Inflation since 9/11* (New York: Routledge, 2009).

Alexander Wendt, *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Loch Johnson (ed.), *Strategic Intelligence,* Volumes I and II (Westport, CN: Praeger, 2007).

Loch Johnson, *National Security Intelligence: Secret Operations in Defense of the Democracies* (Cambridge, MA: Polity. 2012).

Roger George and James Bruce (eds), *Analyzing Intelligence: Origins, Obstacles, and Innovations* (Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2008).

***Book* Review** Robert Jervis, *Why Intelligence Fails: Lessons from the Iranian Revolution and the Iraq War* (New York: Cornell University Press, 2011).

Week 4: Strategic and Political Cultures (September 16, 2015)

Alastair Iain Johnston, 'Thinking about Strategic Culture', *International Security*, 19: 4, Spring 1995.

Colin Gray, 'National Style in Strategy: The American Example', *International Security*, 6: 2, Fall 1981.

Michael Desch, 'Culture Clash: Assessing the Importance of Ideas in Security Studies', *International Security*, 23: 1, (Summer 1998), 141-170.

Michael Barnett, 'Culture, Strategy and Foreign Policy Change', *European Journal of International Relations*, 5: 1, March 1999.

Sten Rynning, 'The European Union: Towards a Strategic Culture?' *Security Dialogue*, 34: 4, December 2003.
Peter Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Post War Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).
Peter Katzenstein (ed.), *The Culture of National Security* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1996).
Alasdair Ian Johnston, *Cultural Realism: Strategic Culture and Grand Strategy in Chinese History* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995).
Alan Macmillan, Ken Booth and Russell Trood, 'Strategic Culture' in Ken Booth and Russell Trood (eds.), *Strategic Cultures in the Asia-Pacific Region* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999).
Colin Gray, *Nuclear Strategy and National Style* (Lanham, MD: Hamilton Press, 1986).
Colin Gray, *Modern Strategy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
Jeffrey Lantis, 'Strategic Culture: From Clausewitz to Constructivism', *Strategic Insights*, 10: 4, October 2005.
Book Review Peter Katzenstein, *Cultural Norms and National Security: Police and Military in Post War Japan* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

PART II: SOME DOMESTIC SECURITY CHALLENGES

Week 5: Terrorism, Homegrown and Otherwise (September 23, 2015)

Jarmon – Chapters 8-10
Paul Wilkinson, 'Terrorism', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010). Emailed.
Robert Pape, 'Introduction: What is New About Research on Terrorism', *Security Studies*, 18:4, December 2009.
Martha Crenshaw, 'The Psychology of Terrorism: An Agenda for the 21st Century', *Political Psychology*, 21: 2, June 2000.
Andrew Kydd and Barbara Walter, 'The Strategies of Terrorism', *International Security,* 31: 1, Summer 2006.
Rosa Brooks, 'Muslim "Homegrown" Terrorism in the United States: How Serious Is the Threat?', *International Security*, 36:2, Fall 2011.

Paul Rogers, 'Terrorism', in Paul Williams (ed)., *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013).
Walter Lacquer, 'Terrorism', in Christopher Hughes and Yew Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
Brenda Lutz and James Lutz, 'Terrorism', in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
Louise Richardson, *What Terrorists Want: Understanding the Enemy, Containing the Threat* (New York: Random House, 2006).

David Patrick Houghton, 'The Psychology of Terrorism', in Houghton, *Political Psychology: Situations, Individuals, and Cases* (New York and London: Routledge, 2009).
Daniel Pipes, 'God and Mammon: Does Poverty Cause Militant Islam?', *National Interest*, Winter 2001/02 (available at www.danielpipes.org).
Book Review Louise Richardson, *What Terrorists Want: Understanding the Enemy, Containing the Threat* (New York: Random House, 2006).

Week 6: The Privatization of Security (September 30, 2015)

Deborah Avant, 'Private Security', in Paul Williams (ed). *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013). Emailed.
Anna Leander, 'The Privatization of International Security', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010). Emailed.
Deborah Avant and Lee Sigelman, 'Private Security and Democracy: Lessons from the US in Iraq', *Security Studies*, 19:2, June 2010.
Elke Krahmann, 'Security: Collective Good or Commodity?', *European Journal of International Relations*, 14: 3, August 2008.

David Shearer, 'Private Military Companies', in Christopher Hughes and Yew Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
William Hartung, *Prophets of War: Lockheed Martin and the Making of the Military-Industrial Complex* (New York: Nation Books, 2011).
Jeremy Scahill, *Blackwater: The Rise of the World's Most Powerful Mercenary Army* (New York: Nation Books, 2008).
P.W. Singer, *Corporate Warriors: The Rise of the Privatized Military Industry* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007).
Suzette Grillot, 'The Defense Trade', in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security* Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
Book Review William Hartung, *Prophets of War: Lockheed Martin and the Making of the Military-Industrial Complex* (New York: Nation Books, 2011).

Week 7: Cyber-Threats (October 7, 2015)

Jarmon – chapters 7-8.
Myriam Dunn Cavelty, 'Cyber-Threats', in Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.),*The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010). Emailed.
John Arquilla and David Ronfelt, 'Cyberwar is Coming!', in Arquilla and Ronfelt (eds.), *In Athena's Camp: Preparing for Conflict in an Information Age* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1997). You can find this chapter online at the following address:
http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/MR880/MR880.ch2.pdf.
Thomas Rid, 'Cyber War Will Not Take Place', *Journal of Security Studies*, 35:1, February 2012.

Sean Collins and Stephen McCombie, 'Stuxnet: The Emergence of a New Cyber Weapon and its Implications', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 7:1, April 2012.
Jon Lindsay, 'Stuxnet and the Limits of Cyber Warfare', *Security Studies*, 22: 3, August 2013.
Frank L. Greitzer, "Modeling Human Behavior to Anticipate Insider Attacks," *Journal of Strategic Security* (2011), 4: 25-48.

Matthew Devost, Brian Houghton and Neal Allen Pollard, 'Information Terrorism: Political Violence in the Information Age', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 9: 1, 1997.
Myriam Dunn Cavelty, 'Cyber-Security', in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security* Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
Maura Conway, 'The Media, Fear, and the Hyperreal: The Construction of Cyberterrorism as the Ultimate Threat to Critical Infrastructures', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Kristian Kristensen, *Securing the Homeland: Critical Infrastructure, Risk and (In)Security* (New York: Routledge, 2007).
Myriam Dunn Cavelty, *Cyber-Security and Threat Politics: US Efforts to Secure the Information Age* (London: Routledge, 2008).
Robert Latham, *Bombs and Bandwith: The Emerging Relationship Betweeen IT and Security* (New York: The New Press, 2003).
John Arquilla and David Ronfelt (eds.), *In Athena's Camp: Preparing for Conflict in an Information Age* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND, 1997).
Joshua Green, 'The Myth of Cyberterrorism', *Washington Monthly*, November 2002 (available at www.washingtonmonthly.com).
Book Review. Myriam Dunn Cavelty, *Cyber-Security and Threat Politics: US Efforts to Secure the Information Age* (London: Routledge, 2008).

Week 8: Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict and Genocide (October 14, 2015)
(Turn Assignment 1 in at start of class)
Adam Jones, 'Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity', in Paul Williams (ed). *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013). Emailed.
Scott Straus, 'Destroy Them To Save Us": Theories of Genocide and the Logics of Political Violence', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 24:4, July 2012.
Jeffrey Murer, 'Ethnic Conflict: An Overview of Analyzing and Framing Communal Conflicts from Comparative Perspectives', *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 24:4, July 2012.
Kristen Monroe, 'Review Essay: The Psychology of Genocide', *Ethics & International*
Affairs, 9: 215–39, March 1995.
Barry Posen, 'The Security Dilemma and Ethnic Conflict', *Survival*, 35: 1, Spring 1993.

Stuart Kaufman, 'Ethnic Conflict', in Paul Williams (ed)., *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013).

James Waller, *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).
Philip Gourevitch, *We Wish to Inform You That Tomorrow We Will Be Killed With Our Families: Stories From Rwanda* (New York: Picador, 1998).
Joshua Searle-White, *The Psychology of Nationalism* (New York and Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002).
Christopher Browning, *Ordinary Men: Reserve Police Battalion 101 and the Final Solution in Poland* (New York: HarperCollins, 1992).
David Patrick Houghton, 'Nationalism, Ethnic Conflict and Genocide', in Houghton, *Political Psychology: Situations, Individuals, and Cases* (New York and London: Routledge, 2009).
Benjamin Valentino, *Final Solutions: Mass Killing and Genocide in the 20th Century* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004).
Book Review James Waller, *Becoming Evil: How Ordinary People Commit Genocide and Mass Killing* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002).

Week 9: Environmental Security (October 21, 2015)

Simon Dalby, 'Climate Change and Environmental Security', in Paul Williams (ed)., *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013). Emailed.
Nils Peter Gleditsch and Ole Theisen, 'Resources, the Environment and Conflict', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010). Emailed.
Marc Levy, 'Is the Environment a National Security Issue?' *International Security*, 20: 2, Fall 1995.
Daniel Deudney, 'The Case Against Linking Environmental Degradation and National Security', *Millennium*, 19: 3, Winter 1990.
Peter Jacques, 'A General Theory of Climate Denial', *Global Environmental Politics*, 12: 2, May 2012.
Geoffrey Parker – "States Make War but Wars also Break States," Journal of Military History, January 2010, 74,1. Emailed.

Peter Jacques, *Environmental Skepticism: Ecology, Power and Public Life* (Burlington,VT: Ashgate, 2009).
Robert Falkner, 'Global Environmentalism and the Greening of International Society', *International Affairs,* 88: 3, May 2012.
Jessica Tuchman Matthews, 'Redefining Security', *Foreign Affairs*, 68: 2, Spring 1989. Also in Hughes and Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader*.
Jon Barnett, 'Environmental Security', in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security* Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
Simon Dalby, *Security and Environmental Change* (London: Polity, 2009).
Simon Dalby, *Environmental Security* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
Elizabeth Chalecki, *Environmental Security: A Guide to the Issues* (New York: Praeger, 2013).

Rita Floyd and Richard Matthew (eds.), *Environmental Security: Approaches and Issues* (New York: Routledge, 2013).
Thomas Homer-Dixon, 'Resources and Conflict', Christopher Hughes and Yew Ming Lai (eds.), *Security Studies: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2011).
Gwynne Dyer, *Climate Wars* (New York: Random House, 2008).
Nick Mabey, *Delivering Climate Security* (London: Royal United Services Insitute, 2007).
Nick Mabey et al., *Degrees of Risk: Defining a Risk Management Framework for Climate Security* (London: E3G, 2011).
Book Review Simon Dalby, *Security and Environmental Change* (London: Polity, 2009).

Week 10: Biological Weapons/Disease Vectors (October 28, 2015)

Jarmon – Ch. 11-13
Joshua Masters "Nuclear Proliferation," *The Nonproliferation Review*, (2009),16:3, 347-361, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10736700903255045
Gregory D. Koblentz, ("Regime Security: A New Theory for Understanding the Proliferation of Chemical and Biological Weapons," *Contemporary Security Policy*, 2013), 34:3, 501-525, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2013.842298
Ian Bellany, "Outflanking Missile Defences: the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, Nuclear Weapons and Terrorism," *Defense & Security Analysis* (2012), 28:1, 81-96, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14751798.2012.651381
Jason Enia & Jeffrey Fields, "The Relative Efficacy of the Biological and Chemical Weapon Regimes," *The Nonproliferation Review*, (2014), 21:1, 43-64, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10736700.2014.880560

Gary Cecchine, Melinda Moore – *Infectious Disease and National Security* (Rand, 2006), can find at http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2006/RAND_TR405.pdf
Jane Evans – "Pandemics and National Security," *Global Security Studies* (Spring 2010), 1: 1.
Harley Feldbam – US Global Health and National Security, can be accessed at http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/090420_feldbaum_usglobalhealth.pdf

Week 11: Failing States, Organized Gangs and Transnational Crime (November 4, 2015)

Jarmon – Chapters 9-10
Seth Kaplan, "Identifying Truly Fragile States," *Washington Quarterly* (March 2014), 37: 49-63. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2014.893173
Thomas M. Sanderson, "Transnational Terrorism and Organized Crime: Blurring the Lines, "SAIS Review of International Affairs, Volume 24, Number 1, Winter-Spring 2004, pp. 49-61.
James A. Piazza, ""Incubators of Terror: Do Failed and Failing States Promote T Transnational Terrorism?" *International Studies Quarterly* (2008), 52, 469-488.

Stewart Patrick, "'Failed States' and Global Security: Empirical Questions and Policy Dilemmas," *International Studies Review* (2007), 9: 644-662.
Louise I. Shelley and John T. Picarelli, "Methods and Motives: Exploring Links Between Transnational Organized Crime and International Terrorism," *Trends in Organized Crime*, (Winter 2005), 9: 52-67.

Alejandro Fontecilla Pinto and María Eugenia Suárez de Garay, "Community Policing in Mexico: The Framework of Resistance and Conditions of Possibility," *Stability* (2014), article 43, http://dx.doi.org/10.5334/sta.ep..

Week 12: Veterans' Day University Holiday (November 11, 2015)

Week 13: November 18, 2015)

Alex Bellamy, 'The Responsibility to Protect', in Paul Williams (ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, second edition (New York: Routledge, 2013).
Aidan Hehir, 'The Permanence of Inconsistency: Libya, the Security Council, and the Responsibility to Protect', *International Security*, 38:1, Summer 2013.
Robert Pape, 'When Duty Calls: A Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention', *International Security*, 37: 1, Summer 2012.
Richard Betts, 'The Delusion of Impartial Intervention', *Foreign Affairs*, 73: 6, November/December 1994.
Virginia Page Fortna, 'Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace after Civil War', *International Studies Quarterly,* 48: 2, June 2004.

Alex Bellamy, 'Humanitarian Intervention', in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security* Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
Alex Bellamy and Paul Williams, 'The New Politics of Protection? Cote D'Ivoire, Libya and the Responsibility to Protect', 87:4, *International Affairs*, July 2011.
Philip Cunliffe, 'Dangerous Duties: Power, Paternalism and the Responsibility to Protect', *Review of International Studies,* 36: S1, October 2010.
Daniel Lambach and Tobias Debiel, 'State Failure and Statebuilding', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010).
Alex Bellamy, 'Humanitarian Intervention', in Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies* (New York: Routledge, 2010).
Rory Stewart and Gerald Knaus, *Can Intervention Work?* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011).
Nathan Hodge, *Armed Humanitarians: The Rise of the Nation Builders* (New York: Bloomsbury USA, 2011).
Virginia Page Fortna, *Does Peacekeeping Work?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008).
Book Review Rory Stewart and Gerald Knaus, *Can Intervention Work?* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011).

Week: Revolutions, Insurgency, Military Coups (November 25, 2015)

(Turn your 2nd essay in at the start of class)

Timur Kuran, "Sparks and Prairie Fires: A Theory of Unexpected Political Revolution," *Public Choice* (1989), 61: 41-74.
Morris Silver – "Political Revolution and Repression: An Economic Approach," *Public Choice*, (1974), 17: 63-71.
Karen McCullagh, "E-democracy: Potential for Political Revolution," *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* (2003), 149-161.
Karen Rasler, "Concessions, Repression, and Political Protest in the Iranian Revolution," *American Sociological Review* (1996), 132-152.
William Reno, "The Politics of Insurgency in Collapsing States," *Development and Change* (2002), 837-858.
Sarah Johnstone and Jeffrey Mazo, "Global Warming and the Arab Spring," *Survival* (2011), 53: 2, 11-17.
Kurt Weyland, "The Arab Spring: Why the Surprising Similarities with the Revolutionary Wave of 1848?" *Perspectives on Politics* (December 2012), 917-934.
Robert H. Dix, "Military Coups and Military Rule in Latin America," *Armed Forces & Society* (1994), 20: 439-456.
J. Craig Jenkins and Augustine J. Kposowa, "The Political Origins of African Military Coups: Ethnic Competition, Military Centrality, and the Struggle Over the Post-Colonial State," *International Studies Quarterly* (1992), 271-291.

Edward N. Muller and Karl-Dieter Opp, "Rational Choice and Rebellious Collective Action," *American Political Science Review (1986), 471-488.*
F. Gregory Gause III, "Why Middle East Studies Missed the Arab Spring," *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2011).
Jeff Godwin, "Why We Were Surprised (Again) by the Arab Spring," Swiss Political Science Review (2011), 17: 452-456.
Juan Camilo Bohorquez, Sean Gourley, Alexander R. Dixon, Michael Spagat & Neil F. Johnson, "Common Ecology Quantifies Human Insurgency," *Nature* (December 2009), 462: 911-914.
Book Review: Sean McFate, *The Modern Mercenary: Private Armies and What They Mean for World Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014).

Week 14: What is Domestic Security? (December 2, 2015)

No assigned readings, come prepared for each to present your view of what is critical in domestic security both academically and practically. Have your own (without consultation with others) list of the three most critical domestic security issues confronting the United States and/or the world more broadly over the next decade and then over the next 25 years? Does academic research provide the tools necessary to understand such issues or should other approaches be developed or enhanced in order to do so?

INR 7139 ESSAY ASSIGNMENT 1

Answer the following essay question. Your answer should be approximately about 8,000-10,000 words, and should be typed and double-spaced. All pages should be numbered. Please make sure that your name and course code (i.e. INR 7139) are marked clearly on the cover sheet. You should include a cumulative bibliography at the end which includes all references used. You must use the referencing system employed by the American Political Science Review which you can Google (the guide appears in a number of locations, the only changes are that you provide page numbers for quotes and URLs for web references).

You should treat this assignment as an active research exercise; in other words, you should examine literature beyond the readings explicitly covered in class, preferably making use of the additional (non-asterisk) materials cited on the course syllabus as well as others you may find relevant. At a minimum, of course, it is also important that you demonstrate in your answer an awareness of the class materials and the discussion topics covered in class, that you show evidence of having done the course readings assigned thus far and show that you have reflected upon these readings in a thoughtful and critical way.

What exactly *is* 'domestic security', and what is 'Security Studies'? Can the latter include everything under the sun, and should it?

This assignment is due back at the beginning of the class held in Week 8 (October 14, 2015). As previously notified, this deadline is final, and late submissions will be heavily penalized. Since you are being given eight weeks to complete this term assignment, extensions will be granted only under the most exceptional circumstances.

INR 7139 ESSAY ASSIGNMENT 2

Answer the following essay question. Your answer should be approximately 8,000-10,000 words, and should be typed and double-spaced. All pages should be numbered. Please make sure that your name, scheme and course code (i.e. INR 7139) are marked clearly on the cover sheet. You should include a cumulative bibliography at the end which includes all references used. Your essay is built on materials in the course with you extending them further in an evaluative manner. **You should discuss with me what is your topic prior to beginning?**

Taking one of the challenges identified in the course (whether on the assignment reading list or from those listed earlier but not further specified or some other domestic security challenge that you can specify with precision), you are to examine the domestic security challenge in light of the following questions: What exactly is the challenge (specify with a precise definition or description what you are researching)? Why do states consider the challenge a domestic security challenge (do all states consider this a challenge or is it more probable for less developed states)? Is the challenge domestic or one derived from external sources or just exacerbated by external sources)? Briefly describe, with

references, the relevant literature regarding the specific challenge identify and assess as to quality of the data used, types of analyses made, and an assessment of their usefulness as social science research and policy relevance.

This assignment is due back at the beginning of the class held in Week 13 (November 25, 2015). As previously notified, this deadline is final, and late submissions will be heavily penalized. Since you are being given multiple weeks to complete this term assignment, extensions will be granted only under the most exceptional circumstances.