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Course Description and Aims
This course is open to students at both the PhD and MA levels. The main purpose of the course is to provide an overview of the field of Security Studies, but with particular attention being given to the so-called ‘critical turn’ in the discipline.

In its broadest sense, ‘Critical Security Studies’ can be seen as a collection of approaches united by virtue of their various dissatisfactions with ‘Traditional’ Security Studies. In short, Critical Security Studies seeks to question, though not always entirely do away with previously dominant state- and military-centric disciplinary foundations. And this course deals explicitly with a number of such approaches; from the more ‘conventional’ Constructivists, through the ‘Copenhagen’ and ‘Aberystwyth’ Schools, to Gender and other more ‘radical’ Constructivist positions. In doing so, the goal is not only to evaluate the main assumptions underpinning each of the approaches, but also to give thought to the very meanings of ‘traditional’ and ‘critical’. While the course is thus predominantly theoretical in its orientation, great emphasis is also given to empirical application; that is to say, just what is the utility of security theories?

Teaching Method
For this course, there are no lectures; instead, students will participate in seminars where they are expected to form (possibly re-form) and exchange opinion through a critical examination of the given readings. Seminar discussion will be structured around a short presentation of the topic, where students will (briefly) summarise and critique the readings. For each seminar there will be one such key text.
**Methods of Assessment**

Each student will be assessed through a combination of seminar contribution and written work.

For both PhD and MA students, in terms of seminar contribution a number of oral presentations are required (the exact number being dependent on the overall class size). In addition, PhD students are also required to write four ‘critiques’, each approximately 1,500-2,000 words in length (see guidelines below). For MA students, the number of required critiques is three.

**Guidelines for the ‘Critique’**

The purpose of the ‘Critique’ is essentially two-fold: one, to situate the chosen key text within the wider debate(s); and two, to make a critique of the key text explicitly informed by the existing literature.

Any text can be situated in a wider debate: its theoretical/conceptual standpoint and the more specific arguments that derive from that standpoint can only be properly understood when set against other works. Together, these texts collectively constitute a written conversation. Some texts may exemplify a particular debate; others might be read as belonging to several, overlapping written conversations. The ‘Critique’ thus demands that students not only identify the general context within which the key text can be situated, but are also clear as to the specific nature of the debate according to which they will structure their critique.

In terms of structure, one or two introductory paragraphs should be devoted to the above task (context and debate). Following on from this, the main body should then put in place a coherent and sustained, critical evaluation of the key text. Some concluding paragraph is also warranted, although the exact content of that paragraph is dependent on the purpose of the critique. The main points of the critical evaluation should derive explicitly from the wider literature. Given the length of the ‘Critique’: just 1,500-2,000 words, it is reasonable to expect that no more than 4-5 other works are utilized, likewise informing no more than just a couple of major critical points.

Please keep in mind that the key text remains the focus of the critique, and will thus serve to structure both the general nature of the debate and the specifics of the critical evaluation.
Week 1/Seminar 1. Introduction
In this introductory class, discussion will be concerned with the nature of the course itself; what is expected from students in terms of seminar contribution and written work. Here, initial oral presentations will be assigned.

Week 1/Seminar 2. No Class
As there is no class scheduled here, time should be spent engaging in the initial readings for the following weeks.

Traditional Security (Strategic) Studies

Week 2/Seminar 3. Theorising the Security Dilemma
Key Text:

Week 2/Seminar 4. Offence-Defence Theory
Key Text:

Week 3/Seminar 5. The Security Dilemma in Practice
Key Text:

Further Reading for 2/3, 2/4 & 3/5:

**Week 3/Seminar 6. The Theory and Practice of Deterrence**

**Key Text:**
Further Reading:


Constructivist Security Studies

Week 4/Seminar 7. Strategic Culture

Key Text:


Further Reading:


**Week 4/Seminar 8. Strategy and Morality: Dresden, Morality, and ‘Supreme Emergency’**

**Key Texts:**


**Further Reading:**


*Just and Unjust Wars: 30 Years On, Journal Of Military Ethics* (Special Issue), vol.6, no.2, 2007:


Anne Schwenkenbeuchen, ‘Collateral Damage and the Principle of Due Care’, *Journal of Military Ethics*, vol.13, no.1, 2014.
Week 5/Seminar 9. Security Communities

Key Text:

Further Reading:
Emmanuel Adler & Michael Barnett (eds.), Security Communities (Cambridge: CUP, 1999)

The Continuing Utility Strategic Studies (?)

Week 5/Seminar 10. Deterring Terrorism

Key Text:

Further Reading:

**Week 5/Seminar 11. Cybersecurity**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**

**Reflexive Security Studies**

**Week 6/Seminar 12. Ontological Security**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**
**The Copenhagen School**

**Week 7/Seminar 13. Securitization**

**Key Text:**

Week 6/Seminar 11. ‘Second Generation’ Securitization

**Week 7/Seminar 14. ‘Second Generation’ Securitization**

**Key Text:**

Further Reading for 7/13 & 7/14:
Collins (ed.), *Contemporary Security Studies*, Chapter 9: Ralf Emmers, ‘Securitization’.

**Week 8/Seminar 15. The Ethics of Securitization**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**

**Week 8/Seminar 16. No Class**

**The Paris School**

**Week 9/Seminar 17. Securitization as Practice**

**Further Reading:**

**Whether Copenhagen or Paris…**

**Week 9/Seminar 18. Desecuritisation**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**
Mark Salter, ‘Securitization and Desecuritization: A Dramaturgical Analysis of the Canadian Air Transport Authority’, *Journal of International Relations and Development*, vol.11, no.4, 2008.
Kristian Atland, ‘Mikhail Gorbachev, the Murmansk Initiative, and the Desecuritization of Interstate Relations in the Arctic’, *Cooperation and Conflict*, vol.43, no.3, 2008.
**Reflexive Security Studies**

Week 10/Seminar 19. From Threats to Risk

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**

**The Aberystwyth School**

Week 10/Seminar 20. Security as Emancipation

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**


**Gender and(in) Security**

**Week 11/Seminar 21. Militarised Feminities**

**Key Text:**


**Further Reading:**

Laura Sjoberg & Caron E. Gentry, ‘Reduced to Bad Sex: Narratives of Violent Women from the Bible to the War on Terror’, *International Relations*, vol.22, no.1, 2008.


**Week 11/Seminar 22. The Gendering of Terrorism**

**Key Text:**


Further Reading:


**Week 12/Seminar 23. ‘Positive-’, ‘Negative-’, and ‘Anti-Security’**

**Key Text:**

**Further Reading:**


**A Provocation for Conclusion**


**Key Text:**
