

PLS 433-533

Homeland Security

Nazarbayev University
Fall 2021
Tuesdays, 1:30 to 4:20PM

Charles J. Sullivan
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science and International Relations
School of Sciences and Humanities
charles.sullivan@nu.edu.kz
Office Hours By Appointment

Course Description:

This course seeks to acquaint students with the academic literature on unconventional threats, emergency response, disaster politics, and crisis management. This course examines topics such as intelligence, anti-terrorism, insurgency, disinformation campaigns, cyber security, and the politics of disasters, pandemics, civil unrest, mass murder attacks, CBRN defense, surveillance, and hostage negotiations. This is an advanced writing-intensive course offered at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Course requirements differ according to the level it is offered to students. This course is intended to enhance students' knowledge of homeland security issues from a theoretical perspective.

Course Outcomes:

This course is designed to enhance students' critical-analytical skills so that they are able to effectively:

- Identify various homeland security challenges in historical and contemporary contexts;
- Evaluate the development and conduct of crisis planning and response through a critical lens;
- Compose a research paper based upon a detailed analysis of a contemporary security issue.

Course Readings:

All assigned readings are available via syllabus hyperlinks, the NU Library, or NU's online databases.

Course Objectives

- Identify homeland security challenges in both country-specific and regional/global contexts;
- Critically evaluate the conduct of crisis planning and response via comparative analyses;
- Compose a research paper based upon an analysis of an important homeland security issue.

Course Requirements:

PLS 433 – Undergraduate Level

1. **THREE** take-home quizzes will be assigned during the semester. The class days on which take-home quizzes are assigned will be chosen by the professor. Students will be tasked with responding to a set of questions related to the assigned readings for the next upcoming class. Students should incorporate all of the assigned readings for the next upcoming class into their written responses. Quizzes are to be submitted by **1:30 PM** via Moodle on the day of the next class meeting and should consist of 1,250 words (approximately 5 pages). Students who do not submit their take-home quizzes on time will automatically lose 25 points. Students who do not submit their quizzes 24 hours after the deadline will receive a score of 0. Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font in writing their take-home quizzes. Take-home quizzes are worth 50 points each and are graded according to standards in the following rubric:

Grading	Assessment
45-50 A	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is very extensive and clear; written response is cogent and creative; usage of proper citation format; question posed by the professor is answered by student in its entirety.
40-44 B	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is commendable yet also somewhat incomplete; written response is intelligible but lacks creativity; citation format is evident but not fully consistent either; question posed by the professor is largely answered by student.
35-39 C	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is intelligible but is evidently lacking; written response demonstrates that the student possesses only a cursory grasp of the assigned readings; citation format is inconsistent and rather unprofessional; question posed by the professor is answered in a satisfactory manner.
30-34 D	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is poor and lacking; written response is largely unintelligible; question posed by the professor is largely unanswered by the student.
0-29 F	Student's understanding of the assigned readings is very poor or nonexistent; written response is virtually unintelligible; question posed by the professor is not answered at all.

2. Students will be tasked with watching ALL assigned video relating to certain aspects of security politics and composing ONE policy brief of 1,500 words (approximately 6 pages) on a selected video. Policy briefs are to be based on the videos assigned in the syllabus (**not the assigned articles for the same week**) and a question posed by the professor. Briefs are worth 50 points and students can only write ONE brief. Students must use 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font in composing their briefs. **Footnotes are not required.** Policy briefs are to be submitted via Moodle by **1:30 PM** on the day for which the video has been assigned. Policy briefs submitted after the deadline will receive a score of 0. Students must sign-up for the video on which they intend to write their policy briefs. Only **THREE** students may sign-up to write a policy brief for a given week.

3. Students will be tasked with writing a short essay of 2,000 words (approximately 8 pages) in the form of a critical reaction memo focusing on all of the assigned readings for a given week. Students must sign-up for the week on which they intend to write their reaction memos. No more than **FOUR** students may write their critical reaction memos on a given week and no one is permitted to write memos on Weeks 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, or 14. Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. Students need to analyze and synthesize **ALL** of the assigned readings for a given week. **It is not necessary to conduct a review of other scholarly works outside of the syllabus.** Reaction memos are to be submitted by the start of class (**1:30 PM**) via Moodle on the day of the week in which students have signed up for to write memos. Students who do not submit memos on time will lose 50 points. Students who do not submit reaction memos 24 hours after the deadline will receive a score of 0. **A bibliography is required.**

4. Students will be tasked with writing a research essay of 3,000 words (approximately 12 pages) on a topic concerning some aspect of homeland security. Students will select a topic for analysis, formulate a research question which relates to some aspect of homeland security, and conduct case study research. **All research essays require an introduction, research question, literature review, hypothesis, research findings, and a conclusion section.** Students need to correspond with the professor to discuss topic ideas and must receive topic approval by **10-8**. **Students are required to include scholarly references not listed in the syllabus in their research essays.** Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. Research essays are to be submitted via Moodle by **11-29 at 5:00 PM**. Students who do not submit essays on time will lose a full letter grade. A full letter grade will thereafter also be deducted for **EACH DAY** past the deadline. **Students must include a bibliography for this assignment.**

Both the reaction memo and the research essay will be graded according to the following rubric:

Grading	Assessment
135-150 A	Student writes in a very coherent and creative manner; usage of proper citation format; research essay/memo adheres to professor's guidelines; few/no grammatical/spelling errors in student's work; student references scholarly articles/texts outside of the syllabus to supplement his/her essay and critically analyzes the works of other scholars/authors.
120-134 B	Student writes in an intelligible manner but his/her work is also somewhat lacking in creativity; citation format is evident but not fully consistent either; research essay/memo adheres to professor's guidelines to a considerable extent but not completely; noticeable grammatical/spelling errors; student references some scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus to supplement his/her essay and analysis of scholarly works is adequate.
105-119 C	Student barely writes in a satisfactory manner; research essay/memo is lacking in terms of adherence to professor's guidelines; citation

	format is inconsistent; grammatical/spelling errors are prevalent; few references to scholarly works outside of syllabus readings; critical analysis of other works is inadequate.
90-104 D	Student writes in an unsatisfactory manner; citation format suffers from serious flaws; research essay/memo does not adhere to professor's guidelines; grammatical/spelling errors; few references to works outside of syllabus; minor critical analysis of other works.
0-89 F	Student writes in an unintelligible manner; citation format is wholly nonexistent; research essay/memo does not adhere to the professor's guidelines at all; multiple grammatical/spelling errors; few/no references to scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus readings; critical analysis of scholarship is inadequate.

Grading:

3 Take-Home Quizzes	150 (50 Points Each)
Policy Brief	50
Critical Reaction Memo	150
Research Essay	150
Total	500 Points

Scale:

	A: 475-500	A-: 450-474
B+: 425-449	B: 400-424	B-: 375-399
C+: 350-374	C: 325-349	C-: 300-324
D+: 275-299	D: 250-274	F: 249 and below

PLS 533 – Graduate Level

1. Active participation is essential for students at the graduate level. As such, graduate students will be tasked with writing **TWO** discussion questions each for a total of **10 weeks** over the course of the semester. Graduate students may choose the weeks on which they intend to write their discussion questions. Discussion questions should clearly demonstrate that a student has read the assigned readings for a given week. The main points of assigned readings should be explained in about 5-7 sentences in detail and followed by a question. Discussion questions should be designed to challenge authors' findings, data, or reasoning. This exercise is designed to enhance graduate students' critical-analytical skills. Students are to submit their questions via email by **1:30 PM** the day before class.
2. Graduate students will be tasked with watching ALL assigned videos relating to certain aspects of security politics and composing TWO policy brief of 1,500 words (approximately 6 pages) on a selected video. Policy briefs are to be based on the videos assigned in the syllabus (**not the assigned articles for the same week**) and a question posed by the professor. Briefs are worth 50 points each and students can only write ONE brief. Students must use 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font in composing their briefs. **Footnotes are not required.** Briefs are to be

submitted via Moodle by **1:30 PM** on the day for which the video has been assigned. Briefs submitted after the deadline will receive a score of 0. Students must sign-up for the video on which they intend to write their briefs. Only **THREE** students may sign-up to write a policy brief for a given week.

3. Students will be tasked with writing a short essay of 2,000 words (approximately 8 pages) in the form of a critical reaction memo focusing on all of the assigned readings for a given week. Students must sign-up for the week on which they intend to write their reaction memos. No more than **FOUR** students may write their critical reaction memos on a given week and no one is permitted to write memos on Weeks 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 13, or 14. Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. Students need to analyze and synthesize **ALL** of the assigned readings for a given week. **It is not necessary to conduct a review of other scholarly works outside of the syllabus.** Reaction memos are to be submitted by the start of class (**1:30 PM**) via Moodle on the day of the week in which students have signed up for to write memos. Students who do not submit memos on time will lose 50 points. Students who do not submit reaction memos 24 hours after the deadline will receive a score of 0. **A bibliography is required.**

4. Students will be tasked with writing a research essay of 3,500 words (approximately 14 pages) on a topic concerning some aspect of homeland security. Students will select a topic for analysis, formulate a research question which relates to some aspect of homeland security, and conduct case study research. **All research essays require an introduction, research question, literature review, hypothesis, research findings, and a conclusion section.** Students need to correspond with the professor to discuss topic ideas and must receive topic approval by **10-8**. **Students are required to include scholarly references not listed in the syllabus in their research essays.** Students must use footnotes for citations (any style), 1-inch margins, double-spaced pages, and any legible 12-point size font. Research essays are to be submitted via Moodle by **11-29 at 5:00 PM**. Students who do not submit essays on time will lose a full letter grade. A full letter grade will thereafter also be deducted for **EACH DAY** past the deadline. **Students must include a bibliography for this assignment.**

Both the reaction memo and the research essay will be graded according to the following rubric:

Grading	Assessment
<p style="text-align: center;">135-150 A</p>	<p>Student writes in a very coherent and creative manner; usage of proper citation format; research essay/memo adheres to professor's guidelines; few/no grammatical/spelling errors in student's work; student references scholarly articles/texts outside of the syllabus to supplement his/her essay and critically analyzes the works of other scholars/authors.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">120-134 B</p>	<p>Student writes in an intelligible manner but his/her work is also somewhat lacking in creativity; citation format is evident but not fully consistent either; research essay/memo adheres to professor's guidelines to a considerable extent but not completely; noticeable grammatical/spelling errors; student references some scholarly articles/texts outside</p>

	of syllabus to supplement his/her essay and analysis of scholarly works is adequate.
105-119 C	Student barely writes in a satisfactory manner; research essay/memo is lacking in terms of adherence to professor's guidelines; citation format is inconsistent; grammatical/spelling errors are prevalent; few references to scholarly works outside of syllabus readings; critical analysis of other works is inadequate.
90-104 D	Student writes in an unsatisfactory manner; citation format suffers from serious flaws; research essay/memo does not adhere to professor's guidelines; grammatical/spelling errors; few references to works outside of syllabus; minor critical analysis of other works.
0-89 F	Student writes in an unintelligible manner; citation format is wholly nonexistent; research essay/memo does not adhere to the professor's guidelines at all; multiple grammatical/spelling errors; few/no references to scholarly articles/texts outside of syllabus readings; critical analysis of scholarship is inadequate.

Grading:

20 Discussion Questions in 10 Weeks	100 (Each Question is Worth 5 Points)
Policy Briefs	100 (50 Points Each)
Critical Reaction Memo	150
Research Essay	150
Total	500 points

Scale:

	A: 475-500	A-: 450-474
B+: 425-449	B: 400-424	B-: 375-399
C+: 350-374	C: 325-349	C-: 300-324
D+: 275-299	D: 250-274	F: 249 and below

Student Attendance Notice and Assignment Extension Policy:

All enrolled students need to attend ALL seminar meetings. Students are required to submit a valid medical note to SSH within 3 business days of returning to health after missing a class. Students who fall ill also need to contact the professor **BEFORE** the due dates of assignments. Extensions on any assignments can only be given if the student in question can provide a valid medical excuse or present a very convincing explanation.

Academic Integrity:

Students are required to ensure that the work which they submit for grading is their own. Students must provide citations in the form of footnotes when referencing the works of other scholars. Instances of plagiarism will result in receiving a score of **0** for an assignment. All instances in which plagiarism is suspected will be referred to SSH for disciplinary committee review. **Copying, rephrasing of text w/o citations, as well as submitting**

unoriginal work constitutes plagiarism. All students are also expected to treat one another with dignity, courtesy, and respect. Students are encouraged to voice their opinions in a professional and courteous manner.

Class Schedule:

Week 1 – The “Cassandra Curse”

8-17

J. Foxwell, “Too Many Cassandras Ignored,” *American Foreign Policy Interests* 28.1 (2006): 69-77.

S. Fried, “The Founders’ Plague – And Ours,” *Foreign Affairs* (2021).

R.L. Ostergard, “The West Africa Ebola Outbreak (2014-2016): A Health Intelligence Failure,” *Intelligence & National Security* 35.4 (2020): 477-492.

VIDEO: “Outbreak,” *PBS Frontline* (2015).

Week 2 – Terrorism

8-24

A.H. Kydd and B. Walter, “The Strategies of Terrorism,” *International Security* 31.1 (2006): 49-80.

Robert A. Pape, “The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism,” *APSR* 97.3 (2003): 343-361.

Max Abrahms, “Why Terrorism Does Not Work,” *International Security* 31.2 (2006): 42-78.

T. Bacon, “Preventing the Next LeT Attack,” *The Washington Quarterly* 42.1 (Spring 2019): 53-70.

VIDEO: Brian Ross, “Boston Bombing - Day 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,” *ABC News* (April 2016).

Week 3 – Anti-Terrorism

8-31 – Quiz 1 Due

A. Zegart, “September 11 and the Adaptation Failure of U.S. Intelligence Agencies,” *International Security* 29.4 (2005): 78-111.

M. Kroenig and B. Pavel, “How to Deter Terrorism,” *The Washington Quarterly* 35.2 (2012): 21-36.

P.J. Shannon, “Fingerprints and the War on Terror: An FBI Perspective,” *JFQ* 43.4 (2006): 76-82.

John D. Woodward, Jr., “Sharing Fingerprints and DNA in the Antiterror Fight,” *The Wall Street Journal* (January 13, 2016).

VIDEO: “The Man Who Knew,” *PBS Frontline* (2002).

Week 4 – Hostage Negotiations

9-7

K. Bloomfield, “Hostage Taking and Government Response,” *RUSI Journal* 146.4 (2001): 23-27.

A. Dolnik and K.M. Fitzgerald, “Negotiating Hostage Crises with the New Terrorists,” *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 34.4 (2011): 267-294.

D. Byman, “The Decision to Begin Talks with Terrorists: Lessons for Policymakers,” *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 29.5 (2006): 403-413.

C. Miller, “Is It Possible and Preferable to Negotiate with Terrorists?” *Defence Studies* 11.1 (2011).

S. Cantey, “Beyond the Pale? Exploring Prospects for Negotiations with Al Qaeda and the Islamic State,” *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 41.10 (2018): 757-775.

J.P. Federer, “We Do Negotiate with Terrorists: Navigating Liberal and Illiberal Norms in Peace Mediation,” *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 12.1 (2019): 19-39.

VIDEO: “Waco: The Inside Story,” *PBS Frontline* (1995).

VIDEO: “Moscow Siege,” *Situation Critical* (2007).

Week 5 – Insurgency and Counterinsurgency

9-14 – Quiz Due

James D. Fearon and David Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War," *American Political Science Review* 97.1 (2003): 75-90.

Ivan Arreguin-Toft, "How the Weak Win Wars: A Theory of Asymmetric Conflict," *International Security* 26.1 (2001): 93-128.

Seth G. Jones and Patrick B. Johnston, "The Future of Insurgency," *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 36.1 (2013): 1-25.

Daniel Byman, "Friends Like These: Counterinsurgency and the War on Terrorism," *International Security* 31.2 (2006): 79-115.

Daniel Byman, "'Death Solves All Problems': The Authoritarian Model of Counterinsurgency," *The Journal of Strategic Studies* 39.1 (2016): 62-93.

Week 6 – Cyber Security: A New Kind of Warfare?

9-21

T. Rid and P. McBurney, "Cyber-Weapons," *RUSI Journal* 157.1 (2012): 6-13.

W. Hoffman, "Is Cyber Strategy Possible?" *The Washington Quarterly* 42.1 (2019): 131-152.

T. Rid, "Cyber War Will Not Take Place," *Journal of Strategic Studies* 35.1 (2012): 5-32.

J. Stone, "Cyber War Will Take Place!" *Journal of Strategic Studies* 36.1 (2013): 101-108.

J.R. Lindsay, "Stuxnet and the Limits of Cyber War," *Security Studies* 22.3 (2013): 365-404.

J. Farwell and R. Rohozinski, "Stuxnet and the Future of Cyber War," *Survival* 53.1 (2011): 23-40.

J. Farwell and R. Rohozinski, "The New Reality of Cyber War," *Survival* 54.4 (2012): 107-120.

Week 7 – Cyber Security: Disinformation and Counter-Disinformation Strategies

9-28 – Quiz 3 Due

H.J. Ingram, "The Strategic Logic of State and Non-State Malign 'Influence Activities'," *RUSI Journal* 165.1 (2020): 12-24.

A. Zegart and M. Morell, "Spies, Lies, and Algorithms," *Foreign Affairs* 98.3 (2019): 85-96.

R.A. Clarke and R. Knake, "The Internet Freedom League," *Foreign Affairs* 98.5 (2019): 184-192.

Y. Yiu, "Battling Online Bots, Trolls and People," *Inside Science* (August 31, 2018).

L. Rosenberger, "Making Cyberspace Safe for Democracy," *Foreign Affairs* 99.3 (2020): 146-159.

A. Polyakova, "The Kremlin's Plot against Democracy," *Foreign Affairs* 99.5 (2020): 140-149.

Week 8 – Threats to Domestic Order

10-12

Z. Iqbal and C. Zorn, "The Political Consequence of Assassination," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52.3 (2008): 385-400.

"Lethal Ethnic Riots: Lessons from India and Beyond," *USIP Special Report* (February 13, 2003).

A. Chua, "A World on the Edge," *The Wilson Quarterly* (Winter 2014).

S. Mettler and R.C. Liberman, "The Fragile Republic," *Foreign Affairs* 99.5 (2020): 182-195.

VIDEO: "American Patriot: Inside the Armed Uprising against the Federal Government," *PBS Frontline* (2017).

VIDEO: "Trump's American Carnage," *PBS Frontline* (2021).

Week 9 – Disaster Politics

10-19

M. Pelling and K. Dill, "Disaster Politics: Tipping Points for Change in the Adaptation of Sociopolitical Regimes," *Progress in Human Geography* 34.1 (2010): 21-37.

A. Quiroz and A. Smith, "Leader Survival and Natural Disasters," *BJPS* 43.4 (2013): 821-843.

J. Sainz-Santamaria and S.E. Anderson, "The Electoral Politics of Disaster Preparedness," *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy* 4.4 (2013): 234-249.
O. Roeder and A. Jones-Rooy, "Disaster Politics Can Get in the Way of Disaster Preparedness," *FiveThirtyEight* (August 31, 2017).
T. Dickinson, "The Spill, the Scandal and the President," *Rolling Stone* (June 8, 2010).
VIDEO: "Storm that Drowned a City," *NOVA - PBS* (2005)
VIDEO: "The Spill," *PBS Frontline* (2010).

Week 10 – Pandemics

10-26

J.F. Moxnes and O.A. Christophersen, "Counter-Attacking Pandemic H5N1 Bird-Influenza by Counter-Pandemic," *Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease* 18.1 (2006): 4-25.
P. Kouřil and S. Ferenčuhová, "'Smart' Quarantine and 'Blanket' Quarantine: The Czech Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic," *Eurasian Geography and Economics* (2020).
H. Markel, "America's Coronavirus Endurance Test," *The New Yorker* (August 6, 2020).
M.A. Peters, S. Hollings, B. Green, and M.O. Ogunniran, "The WHO, the Global Governance of Health, and Pandemic Politics," *Educational Philosophy and Theory* (2020).
VIDEO: "The Virus: What Went Wrong?" *PBS Frontline* (2020).

Week 11 – Mass Protests, Civil Unrest, and Crackdowns

11-2

"Hong Kong's Protests," *Strategic Comments* 25.6 (2019): xi-xiii.
M. Purbrick, "A Report of the 2019 Hong Kong Protests," *Asian Affairs* 50.4 (2019): 465-487.
J. Lowe and E.Y.H. Tsang, "Hong Kong's Umbrella Movement and the Promotion of Deviance," *Deviant Behavior* 40.9 (2019): 1068-1079.
T. Ting, "From 'Be Water' to 'Be Fire': Nascent Smart Mob and Networked Protests in Hong Kong," *Social Movement Studies* 19.3 (2020): 362-368.
J. Perlez, "One Country, Two Systems, No Future," *Foreign Affairs* 99.5 (2020): 203-208.
VIDEO: "Battle for Hong Kong," *PBS Frontline* (2020).

Week 12 – Mass Murder Attacks

11-9

"Mass Violence in America: Causes, Impacts, and Solutions," *N.C. for Behavioral Health* (2019).
B. Carey, "What Experts Know About People Who Commit Mass Shootings" *New York Times* (2019).
"Understanding Gun Violence and Mass Shootings," *Columbia University Irving Med. Cen.* (2019).
K. Foote, "On the Edge of Memory: Uneasy Legacies of Dissent, Terror, and Violence in the American Landscape," *Social Science Quarterly* 97.1 (2016): 115-122.
VIDEO: "The D.C. Snipers," *Crimes of the Century* (2013)
VIDEO: "Unabomber," *The FBI Files* (1999).

Week 13 – CBRN Defense/Response

11-16

A.B. Carter, M.M. May, and W.J. Perry, "The Day After: Action Following a Nuclear Blast in a U.S. City," *The Washington Quarterly* 30.4 (2007): 19-32.
R.L. Garwin, "A Defense That Will Not Defend," *The Washington Quarterly* 23.3 (2000): 109-123.
A.A. Nehorayoff, B. Ash, and D.S. Smith, "Aum Shinrikyo's Nuclear and Chemical Weapons Development Efforts," *Journal of Strategic Security* 9.1 (2016): 35-48.
VIDEO: "The Anthrax Files," *PBS Frontline* (2011).
VIDEO: "Inside Japan's Nuclear Meltdown," *PBS Frontline* (2012).

Week 14 – Surveillance and Civil Liberties

11-23

J. Harman, “Disrupting the Intelligence Community,” *Foreign Affairs* 94.2 (2015): 99-107.

D. Byman and B. Wittes, “Reforming the NSA,” *Foreign Affairs* 93.3 (2014): 127-138.

A. Kendall-Taylor, E. Frantz, and J. Wright, “The Digital Dictators: How Technology Strengthens Autocracy,” *Foreign Affairs* 99.2 (2020): 103-115.

VIDEO: “United States of Secrets, Part I and II,” *PBS Frontline* (2014).