

**POLIM0029 Theoretical Approaches in Security**

Teaching Block: 1

Weeks: 1-12

<b>Unit Owner:</b>	Dr. Thomas Tyerman	<b>Level:</b>	M/7		
<b>Phone:</b>	TBC	<b>Credit points:</b>	20		
<b>Email:</b>	TBC	<b>Prerequisites:</b>	None		
<b>Office:</b>	TBC	<b>Curriculum area:</b>	N/A		
<b>Unit owner office hours:</b>	<b>Please see SPAIS MSc Blackboard for details</b> (Please note, there are no regular office hours during Reading Weeks)				
<b>Timetabled classes:</b>					
Please check your online timetable for day, time and venue of each seminar					
You are also expected to attend <b>ONE</b> seminar each week. Your online personal timetable will inform you to which group you have been allocated. Seminar groups are fixed: you are not allowed to change seminar groups without permission from the office.					
Weeks 6, 12, 18 and 24 are Reading Weeks; there is NO regular teaching in these weeks.					
In addition to timetabled sessions there is a requirement for private study, reading, revision and assessments. Reading the required readings in advance of each seminar is the <i>minimum</i> expectation. The University Guidelines state that one credit point is broadly equivalent to 10 hours of total student input.					
<b>Learning Outcomes</b>					
At the end of this unit students will:					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• be able to understand and critically evaluate key debates in thinking about security as a concept;</li> <li>• understand how 'new' security theories emerge, are advanced and contested and why;</li> <li>• be able to apply knowledge to 'key issues' in international security; and</li> <li>• be able to use knowledge acquired in the unit as a foundation for optional units in the MSc programme.</li> </ul>					
<b>Requirements for passing the unit:</b>					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfactory attendance at seminars</li> <li>• Completion of all formative work to an acceptable standard</li> <li>• Attainment of a composite mark of all summative work to a passing standard (50 or above)</li> </ul>					
<b>Details of coursework and deadlines</b>					
<b>Assessment:</b>	<b>Word count:</b>	<b>Weighting:</b>	<b>Deadline:</b>	<b>Day:</b>	<b>Week:</b>
Formative – presentation	n/a	0%	To be set in class		
Summative - essay	4,000 words	100%	9.30am 11 <sup>th</sup> January 2018	Thursday	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Summative essay questions will be made available on the SPAIS MSc Admin Blackboard site.</li> <li>• Instructions for the submission of coursework will be emailed prior to the submission deadline.</li> <li>• Assessment in the school is subject to strict penalties regarding late submission, plagiarism and maximum word count. See Appendix.</li> <li>• Marking criteria can be found in the Appendix.</li> </ul>					



### Unit description

This unit provides students with an understanding of international security through the examination of a series of key theoretical approaches to the concept of security. It provides an overview of the historical development of security theories, from the Cold War consensus around Realist understandings of security to the more recent deepening and broadening of security and the accompanying plurality of security theories that have emerged and the challenges that these present. It therefore provides a theoretical and conceptual foundation for the MSc in International Security.

### Objectives

This unit aims to provide students with a theoretical understanding of security issues and debates. The principal aim of the unit is to equip students to understand and analyse security challenges from different theoretical perspectives and assess the core assumptions as well as advantages and disadvantages of these approaches. For each theoretical approach we will ask the central questions: What is security? Who is the object and/or subject of security? Who is the agent of security? How is security achieved? Where is security done? The unit will therefore develop the student's interest in and knowledge and understanding of the role of security theories at different 'scales' – from international to national to human to everyday to global – and how new theories emerge out of debate, as well as in response to key events and sociological and political changes. Students will therefore develop an understanding of how security theories are political and apply this understanding to interpreting security issues and events.

### Learning outcomes

At the end of this unit students will:

- be able to understand and critically evaluate key debates in thinking about security as a concept;
- understand how 'new' security theories emerge, are advanced and contested and why;
- be able to apply knowledge to 'key issues' in international security; and
- be able to use knowledge acquired in the unit as a foundation for optional units in the MSc programme.

## Teaching arrangements

There are ten seminars in the unit (Weeks 1-5 and 7-11). Attendance is required. Weeks 6 and 12 are Reading Weeks; there is no regular teaching in these weeks. Students may also come to an office hour to discuss advice on presentations and essays. Office hours are held once a week, as posted.

## Requirements for credit points

For credit points to be awarded for this unit, you must complete all required work (two 5-minute presentations and an essay) to at least a passing standard (a mark of 50) and have no more than two non-excused seminar absences.

### 1. Seminar Presentations

Each student is required to make two (2) oral seminar presentations as part of a group set of presentations. The first presentation will take place in weeks 2-5, the second in weeks 7-10. The guidelines are as follows:

- The topics will be allocated in the first seminar
- Each presentation is to be of 5 minutes in length. As with the word limit on the essay, it is important to be concise.
- The presentation should not be read out word for word, but must be presented from notes and with an awareness of the structure and 'rules' for how to communicate effectively to an audience.
- It must address the topic set for that week and revolve around understandings of security theory. Additional information on the content of the presentations will be discussed in Week 1.
- A hand-out must be prepared and circulated which is to include a brief bibliography.
- The hand-out must be word-processed, and be **no longer than one side of A4 paper**. I will photocopy the handout for all seminar members if you send it me by 5 pm on the day BEFORE your seminar (or you must prepare and bring enough copies).
- There will be 5 minutes for you to answer questions from the seminar group.
- If requested, I will provide verbal and informal feedback on your presentation after seminar. When you are preparing for your presentation, focus on the importance of quality of handout, presentation style (pace, volume and time management), presentations content and contribution to the entire seminar.

The mark for the presentation does not count towards the final unit mark, but will provide guidance on areas to improve for the final essay such as structure or strength of evidence and argument.

### 2. Summative assessment: Essay (100% of the final mark)

The final grade for the course will be based on the following: **FINAL PAPER (4,000 words in length)**.

The essay for this unit is a summative essay, that is, it decides the final mark for this unit. In contrast, the presentation is formative, that is, it does not count towards the final mark for the unit but instead is aimed at, among other things, assisting you in preparing for the summative assessment. **The essay and the oral seminar presentation must be on different topics.** Essay questions will be distributed early in term.

Full details about all requirements and rules regarding essays – including formatting, submission, pass marks, extensions, feedback, resubmissions, and so on – are in the Departmental Graduate Studies handbook which is online at <http://www.bris.ac.uk/politics/current-pg/contents.html>.

You can access the Blackboard site via this URL: <https://www.ole.bris.ac.uk/webapps/login/> by using your University login and password. The Graduate Studies Administrator will circulate detailed information on how to submit your work before each hand-in date. Only electronic submission is accepted.

## Transferable skills

During this unit you will develop your transferable skills in group work, presenting to groups and writing.

## Development and feedback

You will receive written feedback on all of these aspects of your work with a view to assisting you in developing your abilities in these areas. The feedback on your essay will be returned to you via the Graduate Studies Coordinator.

## Seminar schedule

Week	Topic
1	Unit introduction: pictures of security: theory, practice, politics
2	Security, violence, and peace: peace studies and pacifism
3	Cold War realism and liberalism: security as deterrence vs cooperation
4	Post-Cold War security I: broadening the agenda and securitisation
5	Post-Cold War security II: human security and security as emancipation
7	Critical approaches: poststructuralism, identity, and (in)security
8	Feminism: security as gendered, embodied, everyday
9	Postcolonialism: security as eurocentrism, racism, and imperialism
10	International Political Sociology: security as risk, governance, technology, assemblage, and biopolitics
11	Security theories review and conclusions

## Core reading

Each week's seminar will proceed on the assumption that you have completed all of that week's Essential reading. **The Essential reading has been designed to ensure that it is all read. You are also encouraged to read more from the Recommended Reading list, but also in connection with your own questions and curiosity.**

### Suggested books for additional background reading

A number of textbooks on security theories have been published over the years and you may find it useful to consult one or two of these when you find a particular theory more challenging, when you are preparing your presentations or your essay. The following textbooks are the most highly recommended, frequently used and a number of copies are held in the university library:

- Peoples, C. and Vaughan-Williams, N. (2014) *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London: Routledge.
- Collins, A. (ed.) *Contemporary Security Studies*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shepherd, L.J. (2013) *Critical Approaches to Security*, London: Routledge.
- Williams, P. (ed.) *Security Studies. An Introduction*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, London: Routledge.
- Fierke, K.M. (2007) *Critical Approaches to International Security*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Sheehan, M. (2004) *International Security: An Analytic Survey*, London: Lynne Rienner.
- Krause, K. and Williams, M.C. (eds.) (1997) *Critical Security Studies. Concepts and Cases*, London: Routledge.

## Electronic Journals

In addition to hard copy journals, the library subscribes to a vast number of electronic journals. Most of the following are not in the library in hard copy. Where the journal is electronic only, no library shelfmark is (or indeed can) be given in the syllabus below. The most relevant journals for this unit are *Security Dialogue*,

*International Organization, Review of International Studies, Millennium, International Political Sociology, International Security, Cooperation and Conflict, British Journal of Politics and International Relations, European Journal of International Relations, European Journal of International Security, International Relations, New Political Science, Globalizations, Political Studies, Third World Quarterly, International Affairs, World Politics, Social Justice, Alternatives, American Political Science Review, International Studies Quarterly, International Journal of Human Rights, Globalizations, Journal of Global Ethics, Ethics and International Affairs, International Peacekeeping, Global Governance, Australian Journal of International Affairs and New Left Review.*

There is also lots of value in more specialised and regionally specific journals. Please feel free to investigate these journals and their articles. Where in doubt on the appropriateness of a source, please email me or speak to the subject librarian at the Arts and Social Sciences library.

Electronic journals are accessible through the library's home page at <http://www.bris.ac.uk/is/library>.

It is a good idea to supplement and update the assigned material by reading current newspapers/periodicals. **Browsing through the contents pages of these journals is a great way of finding unexpected valuable angles on issues.**

A growing number of sources are available on the web and some and some are listed in this syllabus. As with all sources you should treat items posted on the web critically and you should not rely solely on sources taken from the Internet when preparing for seminar presentations and writing essays

#### **BEWARE WIKIPEDIA!**

Wikipedia comes high in online searches. However, entries vary drastically in their reliability and hence you should not rely on it for facts or interpretations. It has come to light that corporations, government bodies and many others have been editing entries anonymously. See – and search - for yourself at <http://wikiscanner.virgil.gr/>. **DO NOT USE Wikipedia for citation.**

## Week 1: UNIT INTRODUCTION: Pictures of security: theory, practice, politics

This first week we introduce the content of the unit, and go over the presentation schedule, content and format. We discuss the best way to prepare for seminars, and begin our conversation on security, security theory and the politics of thinking through theory.

**Key concept:** theory/practice; pictures of international politics and security; (referent) objects and subjects of security; actors of security;

**Key questions:** How have understandings of the concept of security changed over the decades? Why are security theories important? To what extent are security theories political? Do more theories mean better theories and therefore more security, or are more theories a hindrance? How are theories related to political practice?

### Essential readings

1. Smith, S. (1999) 'The increasing insecurity of security studies: Conceptualizing security in the last twenty years', *Contemporary Security Policy*, 20:3, pp.72-101. (30pp)
2. Zalewski, M. (1996) 'All these theories yet the bodies keep piling up': theories, theorists, theorising', in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and Marysia Zalewski (eds) *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.340-353. (13)
3. Huysmans, J. (1998) 'Security! What do you mean? From concept to thick signifier', *European Journal of international relations*, 4:2, pp.226-255. (29)

### Exercise: Using the Implosion

READ: Dumit, J. (2014) 'Writing the Implosion: Teaching the World One Thing at a Time,' *Cultural Anthropology*, 29:2, pp.344-362. (18)

DO: Identify an object and using DUMIT for inspiration 'implode' its security dimensions. Be prepared to discuss your object, the exercise, and what you found in class.

### Recommended readings:

- Barkawi, B. (2011) 'From War to Security: Security Studies, the Wider Agenda, and the Fate of the Study of War', *Millennium*, 39:3, pp.701-716.
- Bourbeau, P. (2015) 'Introduction', in Phillippe Bourbeau (ed.) *Security: Dialogue Across Discipline*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.1-21. (21)
- Browning, C.S. and McDonald, M. (2013) 'The future of critical security studies: Ethics and the politics of security', *European Journal of International Relations*, 19:2, pp.235-255.
- Buzan, B. and Hansen, L. (2009) *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Collins, A. (2013) 'Introduction: What is security studies?' in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies*, pp.1-9.
- Haftendorn, H. (1991) 'The Security Puzzle: Theory-Building and Discipline-Building in International Security', *International Studies Quarterly*, 35:1, pp.3-17.
- Jarvis, L. and Lister, M. (2013) 'Vernacular securities and their study: a qualitative analysis and research agenda', *International Relations*, 27:2, pp.158-179.
- Kolodziej, E.A. (1992) 'Renaissance in Security Studies? Caveat Lector!', *International Studies Quarterly*, 36:4, pp.421-38.
- Kolodziej, E.A. (2000) 'Security Studies for the Next Millennium: Quo Vadis?', in Stuart Croft and Terry Terriff (eds.), *Critical Reflections on Security and Change*. London: Routledge, pp.18-38.
- Kolodziej, E.A. (2007) *Security and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krause, K. and Williams, M. C. (1996) 'Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies', *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40, pp.229-254.
- Lipschutz, R.D. (ed.) *On Security*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Shepherd, L.J. (ed.) (2012) *Critical Approaches to Security: An introduction to theories and methods*. London: Routledge.
- Waeber, O. and Buzan, B. (2013) 'After the Return to Theory: The Past, Present, and Future of Security Studies', in Alan Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies*, pp.393-410.
- Walt, S. (1991) 'The Renaissance of Security Studies', *International Studies Quarterly*, 35:2, pp.211-39.
- Williams, P. (2013) 'Security Studies: An Introduction', in Paul Williams (ed.), *Security Studies. An Introduction*, pp.1-12.

## Week 2: Security, violence, and peace: peace studies and pacifism

**Key concepts:** physical versus structural violence; pacifism; peace studies

**Key questions:** What are the multiple meanings of the security? Is violence just a synonym for insecurity? What do accounts of violence tell us about security and security theory? What do theories of non-violence, pacifism and peace tell us about security and security theory? Is there a role for pacifism in global politics?

### Essential readings:

1. Richmond, O. (2008) 'Reclaiming Peace in International Relations' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 36(3): 439-470
2. Galtung, J. (1990) 'Cultural Violence' *Journal of Peace Research* 27(3): 291-305
3. Llewellyn, J. (2017) 'Building emancipatory peace through anarcho-pacifism' *Critical Studies on Security* [Advance online]: 1-14
4. Jackson, R. (2017) 'Pacifism: the anatomy of a subjugated knowledge' *Critical Studies on Security* (Advanced online publication): 1-16

### Exercise: Critical Reading

For each Essential reading, identify key definitions, the core argument, and a question for further discussion. Do you agree with the definitions? Do you agree with the core argument? Do these authors agree amongst themselves? Do they disagree?

### Recommended readings:

- Barash, D.P. and Webel, C.P. (2013) *Peace and Conflict Studies*, London: SAGE
- Buzan, B. (1984) 'Peace, power, and security: contending concepts in the study of International Relations' *Journal of Peace Research* 21(2): 109-125
- Cady, D. (2010) *From Warism to Pacifism: A moral continuum*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Cockburn, C. (2004) 'The Continuum of Violence: A Gender Perspective on War and Peace', in W. M. Giles and J. Hyndman (eds.) *Sites of Violence: Gender and Conflict Zones*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp.24-44.
- Collins, R. (1974) 'Three faces of cruelty: towards a comparative sociology of violence', *Theory and Society*, 1, pp.415-440.
- Collins, R. (2008) *Violence: A micro-sociological theory*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Coward, M. (2006) 'Against Anthropocentrism: The Destruction of the Built Environment as a Distinct Form of Political Violence', *Review of International Studies*, 32, pp.419-37
- Demmers, J. (2012) 'Violence and Structures' in *Theories of Violent Conflict: An Introduction*, London: Routledge, pp.54-76. (22)
- Galtung, J. (2004) 'Violence, War, and Their Impact On Visible and Invisible Effects of Violence', *Polylog: Forum for Intercultural Philosophy* 5, available online at: <http://them.polylog.org/5/fgien.html>
- Galtung, J. (2010) 'Peace Studies and Conflict Resolution: The Need for Transdisciplinarity' *Transcultural Psychiatry* Vol 47(1): 20-32
- Grossman, Neil (2004) *On Killing: The Psychological Cost of Learning to Kill in War and Society*, London: Little, Brown.
- Howes, D.E. (2013) 'The failure of pacifism and the success of nonviolence,' *Perspectives on Politics*, 11:02, pp.427-446. (19)
- Hutchings, K. (2017) 'War and moral stupidity' *Review of International Studies* (Advanced online): 1-18
- Jackson, R. (2014) 'Bringing Pacifism Back into International Relations', *Social Alternatives*, 33:4, pp.63-66.
- Keohane, R.O (2002), 'The Globalization of Informal Violence, Theories of World Politics, and the 'Liberalism of Fear'', *Dialog-International Organization*, pp. 29-43.
- Kołodziejczyk, K. and Szymanowicz, A. (2011) 'Pacifism variously understood', *Zeszyty Naukowe Wsowl*, 3, pp.232-237.
- Levin, J. and Rabrenovic, G. (2007) 'The Sociology of Violence', in C. D. Bryant and D. L. Peck (eds.) *21st century sociology* (Vol. 2), Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd., pp.321-328.
- Malešević, S. (2010) *The Sociology of War and Violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Owens, P. (2007) 'Violence and Power, Politics and War' in *Between War and Politics: International Relations and the Thought of Hannah Arendt*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.14-32.
- Turpin, J. E. and Kurtz, L.R. (1997) *The Web of Violence: from interpersonal to global*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Walby, S. (2013) 'Violence and society: Introduction to an emerging field of sociology', *Current Sociology*, 61, pp.95-111.
- Wallace, M. (2016) *Security Without Weapons: Rethinking Violence, Violent Action, and Civilian Protection*, London: Routledge.
- Young, N. (2013) 'Concepts of peace: from 1913 to the present', *Ethics & International Affairs*, 27:02, pp.157-173.

**Week 3: Cold War realism and liberalism: security as deterrence vs cooperation**

**Key concepts:** national security; classical/structural/neo-realism; anarchy; competition; offensive vs defensive realism; nuclear deterrence; security dilemma; balance of power; liberal internationalism; institutionalism; interdependence; neoliberalism; collective security; republican security theory; democratic peace; global governance; cosmopolitanism

**Key questions:** What different pictures of the world do realism and liberalism offer? What are the underlying assumptions about the world and security actors? Do they share any theoretical commitments? Who or what is being secured and how? Are these theories pessimistic or optimistic about security? What is the role of the nation state? Does it matter who makes theory? Can/should we strive towards scientific objectivity when theorizing security?

**Essential readings:**

1. Peoples, C. (2010) 'Ch18 Strategic Studies and its Critics' in Baylis, J. et al *Strategy in the Contemporary World: and introduction to Strategic Studies* [Oxford; Oxford University Press]: 341-357
2. Deudney, D. (2007) 'Republican Security Theory', *Bounding Power: Republican Security Theory from the Polis to the Global Village*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp.27-60
3. Cohn, C. (1987) 'Sex and death in the rational world of defense intellectuals', *Signs*, 12:4, pp.678-718.
4. And **ONE** of either (i) Mearsheimer, J. (1994) 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security* 19(3):5-49 **OR** (ii) Crawford, B. (1994) 'The New Security Dilemma under International Economic Interdependence' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 23(1):25-55

**Exercise: Comparing pictures of international relations and security**  
 Based on this week's readings, create a list of definitions of key realist and liberal security terms. Complete a version of the accompanying table to compare and contrast the core assumptions of realist security theories with liberal security theories. Be prepared to discuss the table in seminar. We will revisit this table, and the questions it asks us to think through, in later weeks.

SECURITY THEORY			
Key Author			
ONTOLOGY Structure comes from... and matters because... The referent object of security is...			
The most important actors are...			
Power comes from...			
(in)security comes from...and security is achieved by...			
EPISTEMOLOGY i.e. what is their account of the nature of knowledge and truth? Where does it come from?			
METHOD Based on the ontology and epistemology, what methods are suggested for the study and practice of security?			
ETHICS AND POLITICS			
SCALE(S)			

## Recommended readings:

- Ayoob, M. (1997) 'Defining Security: A Subaltern Realist Perspective' in K. Krause and M.C. Williams (eds.) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, London: UCL Press, pp.121-146.
- Ayoob, M. (2002) 'Inequality and Theorizing in International Relations: The Case for Subaltern Realism', *International Studies Review*, 4:3, pp.27-48.
- Baldwin, D. (1997) 'The Concept of Security', *Review of International Studies*, 23:1, pp.5-26.
- Beck, U. and Levy, D. (2013) 'Cosmopolitanized nations: re-imagining collectivity in world risk society', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 30:2, pp.3-31
- Beitz, C.R. (1999) 'Social and cosmopolitan liberalism', *International Affairs*, 75:3, pp.515-529
- Betts, R.K. (1997) 'Should Strategic Studies Survive?', *World Politics*, 50:1, pp.7-33.
- Booth, K. (1997) 'Security and Self: Reflections of a Fallen Realist,' in K. Krause and M.C. Williams (eds.) *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, London: UCL Press, pp.83-119
- Booth, K. and Wheeler, N. (2008) 'Rethinking the Security Dilemma,' in P D Williams (ed.), *Security Studies: An Introduction*, London: Taylor & Francis, pp.131-150. (20)
- Chandler, David C. (2014) 'Beyond neoliberalism: resilience, the new art of governing complexity', *Resilience: International Policies, Practices and Discourses*, 2:1, pp.47-63
- Chatterjee, P. (1972) 'The Classical Balance of Power Theory', *Journal of Peace Research*, 9:1, pp.51-61
- Claude, I.L. (2006) 'Collective Security as an Approach to Peace' in Donald M. Goldstein, Phil Williams, and Jay M. Shafritz (eds), *Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in International Relations*, Belmont CA: Thomson Wadsworth, pp.289-302
- Collins, A. (2014) 'Escaping a security dilemma: Anarchy, certainty and embedded norms', *International Politics*, 51:5, pp.561-576
- Doyle, M. (1997) 'Conclusion: Liberals and Realists: Explaining the Differences', in Doyle, M., *Ways of War and Peace: Realism, Liberalism and Socialism*, New York: W. W. Norton, pp.301-312
- Doyle, M.W. (2011) *Liberal Peace: Selected essays*, London: Routledge
- Fearon, J.D. (1995) 'Rationalist Theories of War', *International Organization*, 49:3, pp. 379-401.
- Gilpin, R. (1988) 'The Theory of Hegemonic War', *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18:4, pp.591-613.
- Glaser, C. (1997) 'The Security Dilemma Revisited', *World Politics*, 50:1, pp.171-201.
- Grieco, J.M. (1988) 'Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism,' *International Organization*, 42:3, pp.485-507
- Hansen, L and Buzan, B. (2009) 'Strategic, Studies, Deterrence and the Cold War', in *The Evolution of International Security Studies* (Cambridge University Press, 2009) pp39-65
- Harrington, A.I. (2016) 'Power, violence, and nuclear weapons', *Critical Studies on Security*, 4:1, pp.91-112.
- Hopf, T. (1991) 'Polarity, The Offense Defense Balance, and War', *The American Political Science Review*, 85:2, pp.475-493.
- Howard, M. (1976) 'The Strategic Approach to International Relations', *British Journal of International Studies*, 2, pp.67-75
- Ikenberry, G.J. (2010) 'The Liberal International Order and its Discontents', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 38:3, pp.509-521
- Jervis, R. (2001) 'Was the Cold War a Security Dilemma?', *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 3:1, pp.36-60
- Keohane, Robert O (1988) 'International institutions: Two approaches', *International Studies Quarterly*, 32:4, pp.379-396.
- Keohane, R.O. and Martin, L.L. (1995) 'The Promise of Institutionalist Theory,' *International security*, 20(1), pp.39-51
- Kupchan, C., and Kupchan, C. (1995) 'The Promise of Collective Security', *International Security*, 20(1), pp.52-61.
- Little, R. (1989) 'Deconstructing the Balance of Power: Two Traditions of Thought,' *Review of International Studies*, 15:2, pp.87-100.
- Lebow, Richard Ned (1994) 'The Long Peace, The End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism', *International Organization*, 48:2, pp.249-277
- Mabee, B. (2003) 'Security Studies and the 'Security State': Security Provision in Historical Context', *International Relations*, 17:2, pp.135-151.▣
- Mearsheimer, J. (2001) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W.W. Norton, pp.55-67, 234-238 and 250-266.
- Neocleous, M. (2006) 'From Social to National Security', *Security Dialogue*, 37:3, pp.363-84
- Oren, I. (1995) 'The subjectivity of the " democratic" peace: Changing US perceptions of imperial Germany', *International Security*, 20:2, pp.147-184
- Owen, John M. (1994) 'How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace,' *International Security*, 19:2, pp.87-125
- Richardson, J.L. (1997) 'Contending liberalisms: Past and Present', *European Journal of International Relations*, 3:1, pp.5-33
- Sheehan, M. (1996) *Balance of Power: history and theory*, London: Routledge.
- Sheehan, M. (2004) 'Realism and Security' in *International Security: An Analytic Survey*, London: Lynne Rienner, pp.5-32
- Van Evera, S. (1998) 'Offense, defense and the causes of war,' *International Security*, 22:4, pp.5-44
- Walt, S. (1985) 'Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power', *International Security*, 9:4, pp.3-43
- Waltz, K. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*, Boston: Addison-Wesley.

## Week 4: Post-Cold War security I: broadening the agenda and securitisation

**Key concepts:** Speech acts; Securitisation Theory; securitisation and desecuritisation; politicisation; social construction; constructivism; state-centrism; security sectors; broadening and deepening; new security threats;

**Key questions:** How has the analysis of security 'broadened and deepened' since the Cold War? What is at stake in this broadening and deepening of the security agenda? How are issues 'securitised'? Is everything open to securitisation? What are the consequences of securitization and should we aim to desecuritize? What is the role of the securitisation theorist? Is it a conservative theory?

**Essential reading:**

1. Krause, K & Williams, M. C. (1996) 'Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods' *Mershon International Studies Review* 40(2): 229-254
2. Buzan, B. (1997) 'Rethinking security after the Cold War' *Cooperation and Conflict* 32(1): 5-28.
3. Balzacq, T., Léonard, S. & Ruzicka, J. (2016) 'Securitization' revisited: theory and cases' *International Relations* 30(4): 494-531
4. Hansen, L. (2000) 'The Little Mermaid's Silent Security Dilemma and the Absence of Gender in the Copenhagen School' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 29(2): 285-306

**Exercise: UK National Security Strategy 2010**

Read the Foreword to the UK National Security Strategy 2010 (pp3-6) (available online: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/61936/national-security-strategy.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/61936/national-security-strategy.pdf)).

Prepare answers for the following questions and bring along to the seminar for discussion:

- 1) What security threats are identified in the NSS?
- 2) What is the referent object of security and who are they key actors?
- 3) To what extent does the NSS offer a broadened and/or deepened understanding of security?
- 4) How have issues been securitised here? Are there any problems with how this has happened?

**Recommended readings**

- Adler, E. (2008) 'The Spread of Security Communities: Communities of Practice, Self-Restraint, and NATO's Post-Cold War Transformation', *European Journal of International Relations*, 14:2, pp.195-230.
- Balzacq, T. (2005) 'The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context', *European Journal of International Relations*, 11:2, pp.171-201.
- Balzacq, T. (ed.) (2010) *Securitization Theory: how security problems emerge and dissolve*, London: Routledge
- Balzacq, T., Léonard, S. & Ruzicka, J. (2016) 'Securitization' revisited: theory and cases' *International Relations* 2016, Vol. 30(4) 494-531
- Barany, Z. and Rauchhaus, R. (2011) 'Explaining NATO's Resilience: Is International Relations Theory Useful?', *Contemporary Security Policy*, 32:2, pp.286-307
- Beck, U. (2002) 'The Terrorist Threat: World Risk Society Revisited', *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19:4, pp.39-55
- Browning, C.S. and Joenniemi, P. (2016) 'Ontological security, self-articulation and the securitization of identity', *Cooperation and Conflict*, 52(1):31-47
- Buzan, B. Waever, O. and de Wilde, J. (1998) *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*, London: Lynne Rienner
- Buzan, B. (2015) 'The English School: A neglected approach to International Security Studies', *Security Dialogue*, 46:2, pp.126-143.
- Elbe, S. (2006) 'Should HIV/AIDS Be Securitized? The Ethical Dilemmas of Linking HIV/AIDS and Security', *International Studies Quarterly*, 50:1, pp.119-44
- Eriksson, J. (1999) 'Observers or Advocates? On the Political Role of Security Analysts' *Cooperation and Conflict* 34(3): 311-330)
- Gheciu, A. (2005) 'Security Institutions as Agents of Socialisation? NATO and the 'New Europe', *International Organization*, 59:4, pp.973-1012
- Hansen, L. (2011) 'Theorizing the image for security studies: Visual securitization and the Muhammad cartoon crisis', *European Journal of International Relations*, 17:1, pp.51-74.
- Hansen, L. (2013) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*, London: Routledge
- Huysmans, J. (2011) 'What's in an act? On security speech acts and little security nothings', *Security Dialogue*, 42(4-5), pp.371-383
- McDonald, M. (2008) 'Securitization and the Construction of Security', *European Journal of International Relations*, 14:4, pp.563-587.
- McSweeney, B. (1996) 'Identity and Security: Buzan and the Copenhagen School', *Review of International Studies*, 22,1, pp.81-93.
- Taureck, R. (2006) 'Securitisation Theory and Securitisation Studies', *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 9:1, pp.53-61
- Wæver, O. (1995) 'Securitization and Desecuritization,' in Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed.), *On Security* New York: Columbia University Press, pp.46-86
- Wæver, O. (2011) 'Politics, security, theory', *Security Dialogue*, 42:4, pp.465-480
- Williams, M.C. (2003) 'Words, Images, Enemies: Securitization and International Politics' *International Studies Quarterly*, 47: 511-31

## Week 5: Post-Cold War security II: human security and security as emancipation

**Key concepts:** Critical Theory; Marxism; Critical Security Studies (Welsh School); radicalism and revolution; capitalism, the state, and war; emancipation; human security; policy-relevance and problem-solving theory vs radical critique and revolution.

**Key questions:** How do Human Security and Critical Security Studies 'broaden' and/or 'deepen' the concept of security? What are the key issues for Human Security and Critical Security Studies? How are they different (think ontology, epistemology, methodology)? Who/what needs securing? How is security to be achieved? What is at stake politically in the debate over 'policy-relevance'? How should theory inform security practice? Does security require revolution?

### Essential Reading:

1. Paris, R. (2001) 'Human Security: Paradigm Shift or Hot Air?' *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp. 87–102
2. Chandler, D. (2008) 'Human Security: The Dog That Didn't Bark', *Security Dialogue*, Vol.39, No.4
3. Booth, K. (1991) 'Security and Emancipation', *Review of International Studies*, 17:4, pp. 313-326. (13)
4. Nelson, K.L., Olin, S.C. and Olin Jr, S.C. (1980) 'Radical Ideology and Theory about the Causes of War', in *Why War?: ideology, theory, and history*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp.69-91

### Exercise: Radicalism and emancipation

#### Angela Davis

Watch this short extract from an interview with Angela Davis on violence and revolution:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2HnDONdvJVE> How does Davis offer an understanding of violence as structural? What would security as emancipation look like here?

#### Slazoj Zizek

Watch an extract from Salvo Zizek and Sophie Fiennes' (2012) *A Pervert's Guide to Ideology*, 'What is Ideology?', available at: <https://youtu.be/5Ch5ZCGi0PQ> How does Zizek understand ideology and by extension insecurity? How is security as emancipation produced?

### Recommended readings

- Alker, H. (2005) 'Emancipation and the Critical Security Studies Project', in Ken Booth (ed.), *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*, London, Lynne Rienner
- Acharya, A. (1997) 'The Periphery as the Core: The Third World and Security Studies' in K. Krause and M. C. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies*, London: UCL Press
- Basu S (2011) Security as emancipation: A feminist perspective. In: Tickner JA and Sjoberg L (eds) *Feminism and International Relations: Conversations About the Past, Present and Future* [Abingdon: Routledge]: 98–114
- Beate, J. (2009) 'Liberal Internationalism: from ideology to empirical theory – and back again', *International Theory*, 1(3): 409-438
- Bellamy, Alex J. and McDonald, M. (2002) 'The Utility of Human Security: Which Humans? What Security? A Reply to Thomas and Tow', *Security Dialogue* 33(2): 373-377
- Bilgin, P. (2013) 'Critical Theory' in Paul Williams (ed.), *Security Studies. An Introduction*, London: Routledge, pp. 90-106
- Bilgin, P., Booth, K. and Jones, R.W. (1998) 'Security studies: the next stage?', *Nacao e Defesa*, 84:2, pp.131-157
- Booth, K. (2005) *Theory of World Security*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brincat, S., Lima, L. and Nunes, J. (eds.) (2012) *Critical Theory in International Relations and Security Studies: interviews and reflections*, London: Routledge
- Browning, C. & McDonald, M. (2013) 'The future of critical security studies: *International Relations*, 19: 235-255
- Burgess, J. Peter and Taylor Owen, (eds.) (2004) 'Special Section: What Is "Human Security"?' *Security Dialogue*, Vol.35, No.3: from page 345 onwards
- Busumtwi-Sam, J. (2002) 'Development and Human Security: Whose Security, and from What?', *International Journal* 57(2): 253-272
- Cox, R. (1981) 'Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory', *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10: 126-155
- Giddens, A., (1987) *A Contemporary Critique of Historical Materialism: the Nation-State and Violence* (Vol. 2), Berkeley: University of California Press, pp.294-331
- Howard-Hassmann, R.E. (2012) 'Human Security: Undermining Human Rights?' *Human Rights Quarterly* 34(1): 88-112
- Krahmann, E. (2008) 'Security: Collective good or commodity?', *European Journal of International Relations*, 14:3, pp.379-404

- Neocleous, M. (2006) 'From social to national security: On the fabrication of economic order', *Security Dialogue*, 37:3, pp.363-384
- Newman, Edward (2010) 'Critical human security studies' *Review of International Studies* Vol. 36: 77-94
- Nunes, J. (2012) 'Reclaiming the political: Emancipation and critique in security studies', *Security Dialogue*, 43:4, pp.345-361. (16)
- O'Tuathail, G. (2003) "'Just Out Looking for a Fight": American Affect and the Invasion of Iraq' *Antipode* 35:5, pp.856-870
- Owens, P. (2012) 'Human Security and the Rise of the Social' *Review of International Studies*, 38(3): 547-567
- Peoples, C. (2011) 'Security After Emancipation? Critical Theory, Violence and Resistance', *Review of International Studies*, 37:3, pp.1113-1135
- Short, N. (2012) 'Militarism, New Wars, and the political economy of development: A Gramscian critique', in Stavrianakis, A. and Selby, J. (eds.) *Militarism and International Relations: political economy, security and theory*, London: Routledge, pp.45-58
- Stavrianakis, A. (2011) 'Small arms control and the reproduction of imperial relations', *Contemporary Security Policy*, 32:1, pp.193-214
- Thomas, C. (2001) 'Global Governance, Development and Human Security: Exploring the Links', *Third World Quarterly*, 22:2, pp.159-175
- Thomas, N. and Tow, W. T. (2002) 'The Utility of Human Security: Sovereignty and Humanitarian Intervention', *Security Dialogue*, Vol.33, No.2, pp.177-192
- UNDP Human Development Report 1994 (UNDP, New York: 1994). Chapter 2: New Dimensions of Human Security (available from [http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr\\_1994\\_en\\_complete\\_nostats.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/reports/255/hdr_1994_en_complete_nostats.pdf))
- Wyn Jones, Richard (1995) 'Message in a bottle'? Theory and praxis in critical security studies, *Contemporary Security Policy*, 16:3, 299-319
- Wyn Jones, R. (1999) *Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory*, London: Lynne Rienner.
- Wyn Jones R (2005) On emancipation: Necessity, capacity and concrete utopias. In: Booth K (ed.) *Critical Security Studies and World Politics*. London and Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 215–235

**Week 6: READING WEEK (no teaching)**

## Week 7: Critical approaches: poststructuralism, identity, and (in)security

**Key concepts:** (in)security; discourse; subjectivities (as opposed to identities); logocentrism; truth regimes; power/knowledge; performativity; subjectivity and identity; statecraft; biopolitics; governmentality; inside/outside; exclusion; excess; uncertainty; deconstruction; genealogy; resistance

**Key questions:** How are security and insecurity constructed together? Does this make it any less 'real'? How is security framed/written in international politics, and who is missing from these frames? How are power, subjectivity, and discourse related? How do states 'perform' security? How is representation political?

### Essential reading:

1. Campbell, D. (1998) 'Introduction: On dangers and their interpretation' in *Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity*, revised edition [Manchester; Manchester University Press]: 1-16
2. Stern, M. (2006) "'We' the subject: the power and failure of (in)security' *Security Dialogue* 37(2): 187-205
3. Wibben, A. T. R. (2016) 'Opening security: recovering critical scholarship as political' *Critical Studies on Security* 4(2): 137-153
4. Weber, C. (1998) 'Performative states' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 27(1): 77-95

### 1. Exercise: Discourse Analysis: Getting Started with binary pairs

2. Using the text of the speech delivered by President George W. Bush on September 20, 2001 to the Joint Session of Congress, conduct an analysis of the binary pairs presented in the speech. Who is the 'us' and how are 'we' constructed? Who is 'the Other' and how are 'they' constructed? What is the excluded?
3. Speech available: [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress\\_092001.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/nation/specials/attacked/transcripts/bushaddress_092001.html)
4. What were the policies and legacies of the Global War on Terror as a result of this construction? How have we (Anglo-Americans) been asked to 'govern' ourselves? What is the in/security produced? What is the excess?

### Alternative Exercise: Visual Analysis: Getting Started with content analysis

One of the key dimensions of post-structural approaches is that discourse is also constituted through the visual and material, and the practices that bring language, material and visual into being (language is also visual and material for example). In/security is a result of these discursive practices. To understand how the visual makes security meaning, try reading one or both of the following 'iconic' images for their content (as opposed to the practices that produce the images, their circulation, or their reading by audiences). What can you see and what might it mean? What (visual) histories do these images reflect? Who are the subjects in these images and how are they constructed and juxtaposed visually? Who is the 'we'? Who is 'the Other'? What is the excluded? Is there in/security in reproducing these images?



## Recommended readings

- Aradau, C., (2010) 'Security that matters: Critical infrastructure and objects of protection', *Security Dialogue*, 41:5, pp.491-514
- Burke, A. (2002) 'Aporias of security' *Alternatives* 27: 1-27
- Burke, A. (2007) *Beyond Security, Ethics and Violence: War Against the Other*, London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (2013) *Liquid Fear*, Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons.
- Bialasiewicz, L., Campbell, D., Elden, S., Graham, S., Jeffrey, A. and Williams, A.J. (2007) 'Performing security: The imaginative geographies of current US strategy,' *Political Geography*, 26:4, pp.405-422
- Bilgin, P. (2003) 'Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security,' *International Studies Review*, 5:2, pp.203-222
- Browning, C.S. and McDonald, M. (2013) 'The future of critical security studies: Ethics and the politics of security', *European Journal of International Relations*, 19:2, pp.235-255.
- Butler, J. (2009) *Frames of War: when is life grievable?* [London; Verso] (especially the introduction). See also this lecture: <http://www.cccb.org/en/multimedia/videos/state-violence-war-resistance/212266>
- Campbell, D. (2005) 'The biopolitics of security: oil, empire, and the sports utility vehicle', *American Quarterly*, 57:3, pp.943-972
- Campbell, D. and Shapiro, M.J. (2007) 'Geopolitics and visuality: sighting the Darfur conflict', *Political Geography*, 26:4, pp.357-82.
- Cavelty, M.D., Kaufmann, M. and Kristensen, K.S. (2015) 'Resilience and (in) security: Practices, subjects, temporalities,' *Security Dialogue*, 46:1, pp.3-14.
- Chandler, D. (2008) 'Review Article: Theorising the Shift from Security to Insecurity - Kaldor, Duffield and Furedi', *Conflict, Security & Development* 8, pp.265-76
- Chandler, D. & Hynek, N. (2013) 'No emancipatory alternative, no critical security studies' *Critical Studies on Security* 1(1): 46-63
- Connolly, W. E. (1989) 'Identity and difference in global politics,' in J. Der Derian and M. J. Shapiro (eds.) *International/Intertextual Relations: Postmodern Readings of World Politics*, Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, pp.323-342.
- Der Derian, J. (1995) 'The Value of Security: Hobbes, Marx, Nietzsche, and Baudrillard', in Lipschutz, R.D. (ed.) *On Security*, New York: Columbia University Press, pp.25-42.
- Dillon, M. (2002) *Politics of Security: Towards a Political Philosophy of Continental Thought*, London: Routledge.
- Dillon, M. (2010) 'Biopolitics of Security' in J. Burgess (ed.) *Handbook of New Security Studies*, London: Routledge, pp.61-71.
- Dillon, M. and Reid, J. (2001) 'Global Liberal Governance: Biopolitics, Security and War', *Millennium – Journal of International Studies*, 30:1, pp.41-66.
- Duffield, M. (2010) 'The Liberal Way of Development and the Development—Security Impasse: Exploring the Global Life-Chance Divide', *Security Dialogue*, 41:1, pp.53-76
- Edkins, J. (2003) 'Security, cosmology, Copenhagen' *Contemporary Politics* 9(4): 361-370
- Heath-Kelly, C. (2015) 'Securing through the failure to secure? The ambiguity of resilience at the bomb site', *Security Dialogue*, 46:1, pp.69-85.
- Lundborg, T. (2016) 'The virtualization of security: Philosophies of capture and resistance in Baudrillard, Agamben and Deleuze', *Security Dialogue*, 47:3, pp.255-270.
- Mustapha, J. (2013) 'Ontological theorizations in critical security studies: making the case for a (modified) post-structuralist approach', *Critical Studies on Security*, 1:1, pp.64-82.
- Neocleous, M. (2008) *Critique of Security*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Peoples, C. and Vaughan-Williams, N (2014) 'Poststructuralism and international political sociology', in *Critical Security Studies: An Introduction*, London: Routledge, pp.62-74.
- Rathbun, B.C. (2007) 'Uncertain about uncertainty: understanding the multiple meanings of a crucial concept in international relations theory', *International Studies Quarterly*, 51:3, pp.533-557.
- Van Veen, E. (2011) 'Captured by the camera's eye: Guantanamo and the shifting frame of the Global War on Terror', *Review of International Studies*, 37:04, pp.1721-1749
- Van Veen, E. (2014) 'Materialising US Security: Guantanamo's Object Lessons and Concrete Messages', *International Political Sociology*, 8:1, pp.20-42
- Walker, R.B.J. (1997) 'The Subject of Security', in K. Krause and M.C. Williams (eds.), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases*, London: Routledge, pp.61-82.
- Weber, C. (2010) 'Citizenship, security, humanity', *International Political Sociology*, 4:1, pp.80-85
- Weldes, J., Laffey, M., Gusterson, H., Duvall, R. (1999) 'Introduction: Constructing Insecurity', *Cultures of Insecurity: States, communities, and the production of danger*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp.1-34

## Week 8: Feminism: security as gendered, embodied, everyday

**Key concepts:** liberal and radical feminist security theories; gender; practice; embodiment; affect; intersectionality; marginalisation; everyday life; patriarchy; male-centrism; gender mainstreaming; militarisation and masculinity; feminisation of labour and private/public dichotomy

**Key questions:** What key questions do feminist analyses of international security ask and what are some of the key security issues they look at? How do feminist analyses of gender, the everyday, and marginalisation challenge 'mainstream' understandings of international politics and security? Can we just 'add women and stir'?

### Essential reading:

1. Enloe, C. (2000) 'How Do they Militarize a Can of Soup', in *Manoeuvres: The International Politics of Militarizing Women's Lives*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp.1-34
2. Sjoberg, L. (2009) 'Introduction to Security Studies: Feminist Contributions' *Security Studies* 18(2): 183-213
3. hooks, b. (1990) 'Chapter 15: Choosing the margin as a space of radical openness' *Yearning: race, gender, and cultural politics* [Boston; South End Press]: 145-153
4. Zalewski, M. (1995) 'Well, what is the feminist perspective on Bosnia?' *International Affairs* 71(2): 339-356

### Exercise 1: One feminism or many?

Drawing on the readings, produce a list of different feminist approaches to security, identifying what they see as (i) the object of security (ii) the cause(s) of insecurity and how insecurity manifests, and (iii) the way to achieve security.

### Exercise 2: Sexual violence and security

Drawing on the readings for this week, watch the two video clips below and prepare answers to the following questions ready for discussion in the seminar:

- 1) How is sexual violence represented as a security issue?
- 2) Where is sexual violence seen as taking place?
- 3) Who are presumed to be the victims/perpetrators?
- 4) What response is suggested?
- 5) Is there anything problematic about these representations of gender and security?

### 'Soldiers for Women'

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b4aiso6pvRE>

### 'Stop Rape Now'

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=woW1\\_xT0gq8](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=woW1_xT0gq8)

### Recommended readings

- Adler, E. (2008) 'The Spread of Security Communities:  
Ackerly, Brooke, A, Maria Stern and Jacqui True (eds.) (2006) *Feminist Methodologies for International Relations* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press]
- Bajc, Vida, and Willem De Lint (eds.) (2011) *Security and Everyday Life*, London: Routledge
- Blanchard, B. (2003) 'Gender, International Relations, and the Development of Feminist Security Theory', *Signs*, 28:4, pp.1289-1312
- Busumtwi-Sam, J. (2002) 'Development and Human Security: Whose Security, and from What?', *International Journal*, 57:2, pp.253-272
- Butler, J. (2004) *Undoing Gender* [New York: Routledge]
- Cockburn, C. (1998) *The Space Between Us: Negotiating Gender and National Identities in Conflict*, London: Zed Books
- Cohn, Carol, "War, Wimps and Women: Talking Gender and Thinking War", in: Cooke, Miriam and Angela Woollacott, *Gendering war talk* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 1993), 277-46
- Crawford, N. (2000) 'The passion of world politics', *International Security*, 24: 4, pp.116-156.
- de Goede, M., Leander, A. and Sullivan, G. (2016) 'Introduction: The politics of the list', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34:1, pp.3-13
- Enloe, C. (2004) *The Curious Feminist: Searching for women in a new age of empire*, Berkeley: University of California Press
- Goldstein, J. (2001) *War and Gender: How Gender Shapes the War System and Vice Versa*. [Cambridge; Cambridge University Press]

- Highgate, P. & Henry, M. (2004) 'Engendering (in)security in peace support operations' *Security Dialogue* 35: 481-498
- Howard-Hassmann, R.E. (2012) 'Human Security: Undermining Human Rights?', *Human Rights Quarterly*, 34:1, pp.88-112
- hooks, b. (1984) *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Centre* (Cambridge, MA: South End Press)
- Hudson, H. (2005) "'Doing" Security As Though Humans Matter: A Feminist Perspective on Gender and the Politics of Human Security' *Security Dialogue* 36(2): 155-174
- Hudson, V.M., Caprioli, M., Ballif-Spanvill, B., McDermott, R. and Emmett, C.F. (2009) 'The Heart of the Matter: The Security of Women and the Security of States,' *International Security*, 33:3, pp.7-45
- Hutchings, K. (2008) 'Making Sense of Masculinity and War' *Men and Masculinities* 10(4): 389-404
- MacKenzie, M. (2009) 'Securitization and desecuritization: female soldiers and the reconstruction of women in post-conflict Sierra Leone' *Security Studies* 18(2): 241-261
- Manchanda, R. (2001) 'Redefining and Feminising Security,' *Economic and Political Weekly*, 36:22, pp.1956-1963.
- Masco, J. (2014) *The Theater of Operations: National Security Affect from the Cold War to the War on Terror*, Durham: Duke University Press
- Masters, C. (2005) 'Bodies of technology' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 7(1): 112-132
- McLeod, L. (2011) 'Configurations of Post-Conflict: Impacts of Representations of Conflict and Post-Conflict upon the (Political) Translations of Gender Security within UNSCR 1325' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13(4):594-611
- Meger, S. (2016) 'The fetishization of sexual violence in international security' *International Studies Quarterly* 60: 149-159
- Mohanty, C. T. (1991) "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses", in: Chandra Talpade Mohanty et al. (ed.), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press 1991), 51-80. Also *Feminist Review* 30 (1988), 61-88
- Peterson, V. Spike (1999) *Gendered states: feminist (re) visions of international relations theory* [Boulder: Lynne Rienner]
- Puar, J.K. (2007) *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*, Durham: Duke University Press
- Pratt, N. & Richter-Devroe, S. (2011) 'Critically Examining UNSCR 1325 on Women, Peace and Security' *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 13(4): 489-503
- Rowley, C. and Weldes, J. (2012) The Evolution of international security studies and the everyday: Suggestions from the Buffyverse', *Security Dialogue*, 43:6, pp.513-530
- Shepherd, L. J (ed.) (2010) *Gender matters in global politics: a feminist introduction to international relations* [London; Routledge]
- Shepherd, Laura J. 'The State of the Discipline: A Security Studies Forum' In *Special Issue: Feminism in International Relations. International Studies Perspectives* 14.4 (2013): 436-462
- Sjoberg, L. (ed.) (2011) *Gender and International Security* [New York and London: Routledge]
- Sjoberg, L. and Lobasz, J. K. (eds.) (2011) *Special Issue: The State of Feminist Security Studies: A Conversation. Politics & Gender* 7(4): 573-604
- Stears, J. (2003) "Engaging from the Margins: Feminist Encounters with the 'Mainstream' of International Relations", *British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 5: 428-53
- Stern, M. & Wibben, A. (eds.) 2014. 'A decade of feminist security studies revisited' (all the articles are highly recommended): <http://sdi.sagepub.com/site/Virtuallspecialissues/GenderStudies.xhtml>
- Stevens, D. and Vaughan-Williams, N. (2016) 'Vernacular Theories of Everyday (In)Security: The Disruptive Potential of Non-Elite Knowledge', *Security Dialogue*, 47:1, pp.40-58
- Sylvester, C. (2010) 'Tensions in Feminist Security Studies.' *Security Dialogue* 41(6 ): 607-614
- Sylvester, C. (2013) 'Experiencing war: a challenge for international relations' *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26(4): 669-674
- Tickner, A. J. (1990) *Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspectives on Achieving Global Security* (New York: Columbia University Press]
- Wibben, A.T.R. (2008) 'Security as narrative', *Feminist Security Studies: A Narrative Approach*, London: Routledge, pp.65-85
- Wibben, A. T. R. (2011) *Feminist security studies: a narrative approach* [Abingdon; Routledge]

## Week 9: Postcolonialism: security as eurocentrism, racism, and imperialism

**Key concepts:** Eurocentrism/Western-centrism; colonialism/neo-colonialism; decolonisation; North-South relations; core-periphery; history; geography; humanitarian intervention; responsibility to protect doctrine; development; 'good governance' and 'failed states'; liberal imperialism; race; racism.

**Key questions:** How is the study and practice of security western-centric? Is the history of colonialism still relevant today? Is contemporary security *post-* or *neo-*colonial? Is liberal intervention a modern form of imperialism? How are narratives of international security racialised?

### Essential reading:

1. Barkawi, T. & Laffey, M. (2006) 'The Postcolonial Moment in Security Studies' *Review of International Studies* 32: 329-352
2. Orford, A (1999) 'Muscular Humanitarianism: Reading the Narratives of the New Interventionism,' *European Journal of International Law* 10(4): 679-712
3. Bilgin, P. (2010) The 'Western-Centrism' of Security Studies: 'Blind Spot' or Constitutive Practice? *Security Dialogue*, Vol. 41 no. 6 615-622
4. Gruffydd Jones, B. (2013) "'Good governance" and "state failure": genealogies of imperial discourse' *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 26(1): 49-70

### Exercise: Humanitarianism, intervention, and imperialism

Do some research online on an example of a post-Cold War humanitarian intervention (e.g. Libya, Syria, Rwanda, Congo, Kosovo). Have a look at UN, NATO, and NGO websites, newspaper reports, etc.

Think about the following questions and prepare for a discussion in the seminar:

- 1) What does 'humanitarian' mean? Is it a 'western-centric' concept?
- 2) How was intervention justified and carried out? By whom?
- 3) Does humanitarian intervention increase security? For whom? Who is left out?
- 4) In what ways, if any, did the narratives and practices of the intervention reflect histories of colonialism and racism?

### Recommended readings

- Abrahamsen, R. (2005) 'Blair's Africa: the politics of securitization and fear' *Alternatives* 30: 50-80
- Ayoob, M. (1995) *The Third World Security Predicament: State Making, Regional Conflict, and the International System* [Boulder; Lynne Rienner]
- Barkawi, T. (2016) 'Decolonizing war' *European Journal of International Security* 1(2): 199-214
- Bilgin, Pinar (2010) 'Identity/Security' in Burgess, P. (ed) *The Routledge Handbook of New Security Studies*, London: Routledge, pp. 81-89
- Biswas, S. (2001) 'Nuclear apartheid' as political position: race as a postcolonial resource?', *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 26:4, pp.485-522.
- Chandler, David, (2002), *From Kosovo to Kabul: human rights and international intervention*, London: Pluto Press
- Chandler, D. (2011) 'The Uncritical Critique of Liberal Peace', *Review of International Studies*, 36: 137-155
- Chowdhry, G. & Rai, S. M. (2009) 'The geographies of exclusion and the politics of inclusion: race-based exclusions in the teaching of international relations' *International Studies Perspectives* 10: 84-91
- Darby, P. (2009) 'Rolling back the frontiers of empire: practising the postcolonial' *International Peacekeeping* 16(5): 699-716
- Doty, R. (1996) *Imperial Encounters: The Politics of Representation in North-South Relations* [Minneapolis; University of Minnesota Press]
- Duffield, M. (2005) 'Getting savages to fight barbarians: development, security and the colonial present' *Conflict, security & development* 5(2): 141-159
- Fanon (2001) *The Wretched of the Earth* (trans. Constance Farrington) [London; Penguin]
- Fanon, F. (2008) *Black Skin, White Masks* (Trans. Richard Philcox) [New York; Grove Press]
- Hobson, J. M. (2007) 'Is critical theory always for the white west and for western imperialism? Beyond Westphalia towards a post-racist critical IR' *Review of International Studies* 33: 91-116
- Honke, J. & Muller, M-M. (2012) 'Governing (in)security in a postcolonial world: transnational entanglements and the wordliness of "local" practice' *Security Dialogue* 43(5): 383-401
- Jabri, V. (2011) 'Cosmopolitan politics, security, political subjectivity' *European Journal of International Relations* 18(4): 625-644
- Jabri, V. (2011) *The Postcolonial Subject: Claiming Politics/Governing Others in Late Modernity* [London; Routledge]

- Krause, K. (1998) 'Theorizing security, state formation and the "third world" in the post-Cold War world' *Review of International Studies* 24: 125-136
- Kirshna, S. (1999) *Postcolonial Insecurities: India, Sri Lanka, and the Question of Nationhood* [Minnesota; University of Minnesota Press]
- Krishna, S. (2001) 'Race, Amnesia, and the Education of International Relations' *Alternatives* 26: 401-424
- Mbembe, A. (2003) 'Necropolitics' trans. Libby Meintjes *Public Culture* 15: 11-40
- Mgbeoji, I. (2006) 'The civilised self and the barbaric other: imperial delusions of order and the challenges of human security', *Third World Quarterly*, 27:5, pp.855-869
- Muppidi, H. (1999) 'Postcoloniality and the Production of International Insecurity' in Weldes, J., Laffey, M., Gusterson, H., and Duvall, R. (eds.) *Cultures of Insecurity*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp.119-146
- Said, E. (1995) *Orientalism* [London; Penguin]
- Sherene H. Razack, *Dark Threats & White Knights: The Somalia Affair, Peacekeeping and the New Imperialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2004)
- Shilliam, R. (2008) 'What the Haitian revolution might tell us about development, security, and the politics of race' *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50(3): 778-808
- Sidaway, J. (2012) 'Subaltern geopolitics: Libya in the mirror of Europe', *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 178, No. 4 (December 2012): 296-301
- Slater, D. (1998) 'Post-colonial questions for global times' *Review of International Political Economy* 5(4): 647-678
- Sylvester, C. (2006) 'Bare life as a development/postcolonial problematic' *Geographical Journal* 172: 66-77
- Wilkin, P. (2002) 'Global poverty and orthodox security' *Third World Quarterly* 23: 633-645
- Wilkinson, Claire. (2007) 'The Copenhagen School on Tour in Kyrgyzstan: Is Securitization Theory Useable Outside Europe?' *Security Dialogue* vol. 38 no. 1 5-25

## Week 10: International Political Sociology: security as risk, governance, technology, assemblage, and biopolitics

**Key concepts:** practice; dispositive; assemblage; global; technology; surveillance; species life; sovereignty; biopolitics; statecraft

**Key questions:** What is a security assemblage or dispositive? What does this approach tell us about who the actors are in security? Where agency lies? On what scale do 'security as assemblage' and 'security as in/security' theories operate? Where does security take place?

### Essential Reading:

1. Jabri, V. (2006) 'War, security and the liberal state', *Security Dialogue*, 37:1, pp.47-64. (17)
2. Amoore, L. & de Goede, M. (2005) 'Governance, risk and dataveillance in the war on terror' *Crime, Law & Social Change* 43: 149-173
3. Dillon, M. & Lobo-Guerrero, L. (2008) 'Biopolitics of security in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: an introduction' *Review of International Studies* 34: 265-292
4. Weber, J. (2016) 'Keep adding: On kill lists, drone warfare and the politics of databases', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34:1, pp.107-125\*\*

\*\* See also <https://christopherjmiles.com/2016/10/17/drone-reading-list/> for a detailed list of critical readings on drones technology and warfare.

### Exercise: Practicing the art of synthesis

Synthesize a review of the Essential readings into a single paragraph with an argument (underline your argument statement) and be prepared to circulate this and discuss within the group.

\*See also the Exercise for next week for discussion at the end of this week.

### Recommended readings

- Abrahamsen, R. and Williams, M.C. (2009) 'Security Beyond the State: Global Security Assemblages in International Politics', *International Political Sociology*, 3:1, pp.1-17
- Adey, P. (2009) 'Facing airport security: affect, biopolitics, and the preemptive securitisation of the mobile body', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 27:2, pp.274-295.
- Amoore, L. (2013) *The Politics of Possibility: Risk and security beyond probability*, Durham: Duke University Press.
- Anderson, B. (2010) 'Morale and the affective geographies of the "war on terror"', *Cultural Geographies*, 17, pp.219-36
- Aradau, C., Lobo-Guerrero, L. and Van Munster, R. (2008) 'Security, Technologies of Risk, and the Political', *Security Dialogue*, 39:2/3, p.147-154

- Basaran, T. Bigo, D. Guittet, E-P, & Walker, R.B.J (eds) (2017) *International Political Sociology: Transversal Lines* [Abingdon; Routledge] \*\* Excellent current summary of IPS
- Bellanova, R. and Fuster, G.G. (2013) 'Politics of disappearance: Scanners and (unobserved) bodies as mediators of security practices', *International Political Sociology*, 7:2, pp.188-209.
- Bigo, D. & Walker, R.B.J. (2007) 'Political sociology and the problem of the international' *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 35(3): 725-739
- Bonelli, L. and Ragazzi, F. (2014) 'Low-tech security: Files, notes, and memos as technologies of anticipation', *Security Dialogue*, 45:5, pp.476-493
- Boyle, P. and Haggerty, K.D. (2009) 'Spectacular security: mega-events and the security complex', *International Political Sociology*, 3:3, pp.257-274.
- Cavelty, M.D., Kaufmann, M. and Kristensen, K.S. (2015) 'Resilience and (in) security: Practices, subjects, temporalities', *Security Dialogue*, 46:1, pp.3-14
- Cudworth, E. and Hobden, S. (2015) 'The posthuman way of war', *Security Dialogue*, 46:6, pp.513-529. (16)
- De Goede, M. (2008) 'Beyond risk: Premediation and the post-9/11 security imagination', *Security Dialogue*, 39:2-3, pp.155-176
- Dillon, M. (2008) 'Underwriting security', *Security Dialogue*, 39:2-3, pp.309-332.
- Haggerty, K.D. and Ericson, R.V. (2000) 'The surveillant assemblage', *The British Journal of Sociology*, 51:4, pp.605-622.
- Hier, S.P. (2002) 'Probing the Surveillant Assemblage: on the dialectics of surveillance practices as processes of social control', *Surveillance & Society*, 1:3, pp.399-411.
- Holmqvist, C. (2013) 'Undoing war: War ontologies and the materiality of drone warfare', *Millennium-Journal of International Studies*, 41:3, pp.535-552
- Muller, B.J. (2008) 'Securing the political imagination: Popular culture, the security dispositif and the biometric state', *Security Dialogue*, 39(2-3), pp.199-220
- Neocleous, M. (2014) *War Power, Police Power*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Salter, M.B. (2008) 'Imagining numbers: Risk, quantification, and aviation security', *Security Dialogue*, 39:2-3, pp.243-266.
- Van Veeren, E. (2014) 'Materializing US Security: Guantanamo's Object Lessons and Concrete Messages', *International Political Sociology*, 8:1, pp.20-42.
- Walters, W. (2014) 'Drone strikes, *dingpolitik* and beyond: Furthering the debate on materiality and security', *Security Dialogue*, 45:2, pp.101-118
- Weber, C. & Lacey, M. (2011) 'Securing by design' *Review of International Studies* 37: 1021-1043
- Weizman, E. (2004) 'Strategic Points, Flexible Lines, Tense Surfaces, Political Volumes: Ariel Sharon and the Geometry of Occupation', *The Philosophical Forum*, 35:2, pp.221-244.

## Week 11: Security theories review and conclusions

This week is a review week, allowing us to **revisit key ideas and theories** that need or deserve a second glance as determined by the group. For example, as agreed in week 10, we can set a reading or idea that we collectively return to, or divide into groups to revisit different readings or ideas.

We may also agree to share **sample introductions or sample pieces of writing** (no more than a single page per person or by prior agreement) amongst ourselves for discussion and comment in order to move forward our essay planning.

During the course of the seminar, you may also be asked to complete a **key concepts grid**, reviewing the unit through a compare and contrast exercise that spans all weeks.

Good luck with you essays!

# Appendix A

## Instructions on how to submit essays electronically

1. Log in to Blackboard (<https://www.ole.bris.ac.uk/>) and select the Blackboard course for the unit you are submitting work for. If you cannot see it, please e-mail [f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk) with your username and ask to be added.
2. Click on the "Submit Work Here" option on the left hand menu and then find the correct assessment from the list.
3. Select 'view/complete' for the appropriate piece of work. It is your responsibility to ensure that you have selected both the correct unit and the correct piece of work.
4. The screen will display 'single file upload' and your name. Enter your candidate number as a submission title, and then select the file that you wish to upload by clicking the 'browse' button. Click on the 'upload' button at the bottom.
5. You will then be shown the essay to be submitted. Check that you have selected the correct essay and click the 'Submit' button. This step must be completed or the submission is not complete.
6. You will be informed of a successful submission. A digital receipt is displayed on screen and a copy sent to your email address for your records.

### Important notes

- You are only allowed to submit one file to Blackboard (single file upload), so ensure that all parts of your work – references, bibliography etc. – are included in one single document and that you upload the correct version. You will not be able to change the file once you have uploaded.
- Blackboard will accept a variety of file formats, but the School can only accept work submitted in .rtf (Rich Text Format) or .doc/.docx (Word Document) format. If you use another word processing package, please ensure you save in a compatible format.
- By submitting your essay, you are confirming that you have read the regulations on plagiarism and confirm that the submission is not plagiarised. You also confirm that the word count stated on the essay is an accurate statement of essay length.
- If Blackboard is not working email your assessment to [f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk) with the unit code and title in the subject line.

### How to confirm that your essay has been submitted

You will have received a digital receipt by email and if you click on the assessment again (steps 1-4), you will see the title and submission date of the essay you have submitted. If you click on submit, you will not be able to submit again. This table also displays the date of submission. If you click on the title of the essay, it will open in a new window and you can also see what time the essay was submitted.

## **Appendix B**

### **Summary of Relevant School Regulations**

**(Further details are in the Postgraduate taught handbook, which takes precedence)**

#### **Attendance of Seminars**

SPAIS takes attendance of and participation in seminars very seriously. Seminars form an essential part of your learning and you need to make sure you arrive on time, have done the required reading and participate fully. Attendance at all seminars is monitored, with absence only condoned in cases of illness or for other exceptional reasons.

If you are unable to attend a seminar you must inform your seminar tutor. You should also provide evidence to explain your absence, such as a self-certification and/or medical note, counselling letter or other official document. If you are ill or are experiencing some other kind of difficulty which is preventing you from attending seminars for a prolonged period, please contact the Postgraduate Office or the Graduate Administration Manager who can advise on how to proceed.

#### **Requirements for credit points**

To be awarded credit points for a taught unit, students must:

- Have a satisfactory attendance record.
- Pass the summative assessment

Where there are multiple summative assessments in a unit, students must achieve the pass mark for the weighted average of the assessments (i.e. in the mark for the unit overall). They do not need to pass each individual piece of assessment.

If any of these conditions are not met, then your ability to progress through your degree may be affected.

#### **Presentation of written work**

Coursework must be word-processed. As a guide, use a clear, easy-to-read font such as Arial or Times New Roman, in at least 11pt. You may double-space or single-space your essays as you prefer. Your tutor will let you know if they have a preference.

All pages should be numbered. Ensure that the essay question appears on the first page.

Students are required to complete and include a cover page for essay/summative submissions – the template cover page will be available via the online submission point for students to complete.

Candidate numbers are required on summative work in order to ensure that marking is anonymous. Note that your candidate number is not the same as your student number. This number can be viewed in StudentInfo (<https://www.bris.ac.uk/studentinfo>). You should regard this number as personal to you and not share it with anyone else. The number is used to ensure that the marking of a student's work is done anonymously. Please ensure that you memorise your candidate number as you will need to write it on every assessment.

#### **Assessment Length**

Each piece of coursework must not exceed the stipulated maximum length for the assignment (the 'word count') listed in the unit guide. Summative work that exceeds the maximum length will be subject to penalties. **The word count is absolute (there is no 10% leeway, as commonly rumoured)**. Five marks will be deducted for every 100 words or part thereof over the word limit. Thus, an essay that is 1 word over the word

limit will be penalised 5 marks; an essay that is 101 words over the word limit will be penalised 10 marks, and so on.

The word count includes all text, tables, numbers, footnotes/endnotes, Harvard referencing in the body of the text and direct quotes. It excludes the cover page, bibliography, headers and appendices. However, appendices should only be used for reproducing documents, not additional text written by you.

Students are advised that any attempt to circumvent word count limits by changing essay format, e.g. by removing spaces in references, will be investigated. In these cases, penalties will be applied if the actual word count is exceeded and further disciplinary action may be taken.

*Students should be aware that word count penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.*

### **Referencing and Plagiarism**

Students are required to reference the source materials used to inform their submitted work. Students are expected to use the Harvard referencing system as set out in the relevant section of the SPAIS *Study Guide*. Unless otherwise stated, essays must contain a bibliography. Students should consult the SPAIS *Study Guide* for full details (students can access this via the SPAIS MSc-Dip Admin Blackboard site).

Inadequate referencing in submitted work can run the risk of plagiarism. Plagiarism is the unacknowledged inclusion in a student's work of material derived from the published or unpublished work of another. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional. "Work" includes internet sources as well as printed material.

Plagiarism is a serious academic offence and penalties will be applied in such cases, as is set out in the SPAIS *Postgraduate taught handbook*. See also the relevant section of the School *Study Skills Guide* for more information.

*Please note that plagiarism may lead to penalties that may prevent students found guilty of such an offence from progressing in their programme of study.*

### **Extensions**

Extensions to coursework deadlines will only be granted in exceptional circumstances. If you want to request an extension, complete a Coursework Extension Request Form (available at Blackboard/SPAIS MSc/Dip Administration/forms) and submit the form with your evidence (e.g. medical certificate, death certificate, or hospital letter) to Faye Cooper in the Postgraduate Office, 11 Priory Road or [f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:f.cooper@bristol.ac.uk).

Extension requests will not be considered if there is no supporting evidence.

All extension requests should be submitted at least 72 hours prior to the assessment deadline. If the circumstance occurs after this point, then please either telephone or see the Graduate Administration Manager in person. In their absence you can contact Faye Cooper in the PG Office, again in person or by telephone.

Extensions can only be granted by the Graduate Administration Office. They cannot be granted by unit convenors or seminar tutors.

You will receive an email to confirm whether your extension request has been granted or not.

### **Submitting Essays/Work for assessment**

Formative work: Where applicable, details on how to submit formative work for assessment will be contained in this unit guide.

Summative work: All summative submissions ***must be submitted electronically via Blackboard.***

Electronic copies enable an efficient system of receipting, providing the student and the School with a record of exactly when an essay was submitted. It also enables the School to systematically check the length of submitted essays and to safeguard against plagiarism.

### **Late Submissions**

Penalties are imposed for work submitted late without an approved extension. Any kind of computer/electronic failure is **not** accepted as a valid reason for an extension, so make sure you back up your work on another computer, memory stick or in the cloud (e.g. One Drive, Dropbox or another equivalent system). Also ensure that the clock on your computer is correct. The following schema of marks deduction for late/non-submission is applied to both formative work and summative work:

- Up to 24 hours late, or part thereof *Penalty of 10 marks*
- For each additional 24 hours late, or part thereof *A further 5 marks deduction for each 24 hours, or part thereof*
- Assessment submitted over one week late *Treated as a non-submission: fail and mark of zero recorded. This will be noted on your transcript.*
- The 24 hour period runs from the deadline for submission, and includes Saturdays, Sundays, bank holidays and university closure days.
- If an essay submitted less than one week late fails solely due to the imposition of a late penalty, then the mark will be capped at 50 and recorded as a second attempt.

*Students should be aware that late penalties will incur a mark reduction that may in turn impact their progress and/or overall qualification.*

### **Marks and Feedback**

In addition to an overall mark, students will receive written feedback on their assessed work.

In accordance with the Faculty's Regulations and Code of Practice for Taught programmes, marks and feedback are typically returned within fifteen working days of the relevant submission deadline, unless exceptional circumstances arise in which case

students will be informed of the deadline for return. The process of marking and providing detailed feedback is a labour-intensive one, with most 4000 word essays taking at least 45 minutes to assess and comment upon. Summative work also needs to be checked for plagiarism and length and moderated by a second member of staff to ensure marking is fair and consistent.

If work is submitted late, then it may not be possible to return feedback within fifteen working days.

### **Fails and Resits**

If you fail the unit overall, you will normally be required to resubmit or resit unless you do not meet the progression requirements for your programme. Your School Office will contact you if this is the case.

## Appendix C

### Level 7 Marking and Assessment Criteria (Postgraduate)

All MSc/Diploma marking in the School is out of 100 on the following scale and with the following classifications:

70 and above Distinction

60-69 Merit

50-59 Pass

Below 50 Fail

Work within each of the classifications is expected to demonstrate the following attributes. Please note that markers do not weight each of these attributes equally when finalising the mark. Markers may also take into account the extent to which achievement of unit-specific intended learning outcomes (see unit guide) has been demonstrated when assessing work and arriving at the mark.

#### **70-100: DISTINCTION**

##### *Addresses the Question Set*

The work is a highly appropriate response to the question or assignment task that has been set. Coverage and selection of content is exemplary. There is clear analysis of the question or topic. Clear ability to analyse and synthesize ideas is demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in (where appropriate) its incorporation and use of empirical evidence/theoretical frameworks/methodological approaches in addressing the question.

##### *Contains coherent structure and argument*

The assignment is internally consistent, extremely coherent, concise and well-structured. The introduction is well focused and provides a clear indication of the rationale, key literature base used and organisation of the work. The central argument/structure of the work has a clear and logical sequence of progression. The conclusion draws insights which are logically developed from the analysis. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will be outstanding in the extent to which the structure facilitates the answer to the question.

##### *Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data*

A detailed understanding of key concepts and/or data will be demonstrated. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+) sustained evidence of critical understanding of concepts and/or critical analysis of data will be demonstrated.

##### *Supports argument with appropriate evidence*

The assignment demonstrates that an excellent knowledge of the topic has been gained from careful research and wide ranging reading that goes well beyond the prescribed reading list. The selection, interpretation, comparison, evaluation, and integration of evidence and source material to support the argument is extremely effective. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), work will indicate outstanding ability to deal with complexity, contradictions or gaps in the existing academic literature.

##### *Demonstrates critical evaluation*

Work at this level will indicate a detailed and critical understanding of central theoretical and/or methodological issues as appropriate. At the upper end of the distinction range

(marks of 80+) work will show extensive evidence of coherence, creativity, originality and imagination in addressing the question or topic.

*Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format*

The work is extremely well presented, with minimal grammatical or spelling errors. It is written in a fluent and engaging style that demonstrates sufficient background reading, with exemplary referencing and bibliographic formatting in accordance with the required conventions. At the upper end of the distinction range (marks of 80+), the work will be virtually error-free in these respects.

**60-69: MERIT**

*Addresses the Question Set*

The work is a very appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. The question is addressed comprehensively, and a convincing and coherent argument is maintained in doing so. There is very good coverage of content and some evidence of an ability to think critically in relation to the question or topic will be shown. Where appropriate, the work will illustrate good comprehension of the theoretical implications of the set question or assignment.

*Contains coherent structure and argument*

The structure of the assignment is sound. The introduction is relevant and provides the reader with a clear guide to the central argument and the overall structure of the work. The conclusion will highlight and reflect upon the key points of argument developed within the main body of the essay and relative to the set question or assignment.

*Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data*

A sound understanding of relevant key concepts and/or data has been developed and demonstrated, with key related issues and debates identified and discussed.

*Supports argument with appropriate evidence*

Overall there is a very good selection and use of sources which are well integrated, interpreted and evaluated. The work will demonstrate the ability to be selective in the range of material used. Some independent reading and research that goes beyond the prescribed reading list will be demonstrated, although the range of evidence used will be more restricted in comparison with an assignment awarded a higher grade.

*Demonstrates critical evaluation*

The work will clearly demonstrate a capacity to synthesise and critically evaluate source materials and/or debates in relation to the set question or assignment rather than simply describe or summarise them.

*Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format*

The work is clear and fluent and largely conforms to referencing and bibliographic conventions. It has been well edited and demonstrates sufficient background reading. Proof-reading has resulted in there being few grammatical or spelling errors.

**50-59: PASS**

*Addresses the Question Set*

The work is a reasonably appropriate response to the set question or assignment task. All aspects of the set question or topic have been addressed. The work will show some

comprehension of the underlying theoretical/methodological implications of the question where appropriate, but there may be limitations in the understanding of how these issues relate to the question.

*Contains coherent structure and argument*

The assignment has been effectively structured, although more careful editing may have improved the overall coherence of argument. The introduction is well focused and provides a sense of the central argument and overall organisation. The conclusion provides a summary of the discussion, although may be primarily descriptive in nature and may fail to reflect upon or support the argument fully.

*Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data*

A basic level of understanding of relevant key concepts and/or data has been demonstrated, though there may be some errors and/or gaps in the knowledge and understanding. Key related issues have been identified and discussed but without many significant insights being developed.

*Supports argument with appropriate evidence*

The argument will be supported by reference to and incorporation of some relevant evidence, but with scope for greater range and depth of evidence. The work will indicate a generally clear understanding of appropriate evidence, but this may be presented in an uncritical/descriptive manner and/or insufficiently incorporated into the overall argument in response to the set question or assignment task.

*Demonstrates critical evaluation*

A good range of relevant content has been covered, and there is some attempt at analysis but a tendency to be descriptive rather than critical. Work in this classification may also exhibit a tendency to assert/state points of argument rather than argue on the basis of reasoning and evidence.

*Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format*

The style of writing is appropriate and presents few comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment is not as fluently written as it might have been, and there may be scope for improvement in spelling and grammar. There is evidence of sufficient background reading. Referencing and bibliographic formatting generally conform to the conventions, but there may be scope for further improvement in accuracy and consistency in accordance with the required conventions.

**0-49 FAIL**

*Addresses the Question Set*

Although some attempt will have been made, the work largely fails to address and/or significantly misunderstands the set question or assignment task. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no understanding of the set question or assignment task in evidence.

*Contains coherent structure and argument*

The work does not contain a sufficiently structured argument, and may be ineffectively organised. The introduction may lack a clear rationale or statement of argument, and/or may lack a clear outline of the overall structure of the assignment. The conclusion may lack any indication of insights in relation to the set question or assignment task. At the

lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the structure of the work may be incoherent or illogical, and/or the work may lack a clearly developed argument.

*Demonstrates understanding of key concepts and/or data*

There is limited knowledge and understanding of key concepts and/or data, with significant errors and/or omissions in this respect. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there may be significant lack of awareness or understanding of key concepts and/or data.

*Supports argument with appropriate evidence*

Few key points of appropriate evidence are identified and/or there may be very little attempt at analysis of evidence, with the work tending towards excessive description. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) evidence referred to and included in the work may not be relevant to the addressing the set question or assignment task.

*Demonstrates critical evaluation*

The approach is typified by a general lack of critical evaluation in relation to relevant literature and issues. Work that simply asserts rather than argues a case may also fall into this classification. The use of sources may be excessively derivative of existing work, with little or no indication of an ability to independently analyse relevant material. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) there is little or no evidence of critical evaluation.

*Writing, Background Reading, Referencing and Bibliographic format*

The standard of writing presents difficulties for the reader, with frequent grammatical and spelling errors to a degree that inhibits communication. The range and depth of background reading may be insufficient. The approach to referencing and bibliographic formatting does not follow the required conventions to a sufficiently consistent level. At the lower end of the fail range (marks of 0-40) the use of language may present considerable comprehension difficulties for the reader. The assignment may not meet stipulations in terms of layout and/or length, and the approach to referencing may not meet expected conventions