INTA 6103
INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
Georgia Institute of Technology
Spring 2025

Dr. Jenna Jordan
Associate Professor and Associate Chair
Sam Nunn School of International Affairs
jenna.jordan@inta.gatech.edu

Course Information

Time: Tuesday, 6:30 pm – 9:15 pm
Room: Habersham G-17

Office Hours: by appointment

Course Description

This course focuses on the intersection of international relations and security policy. Students will examine the theoretical underpinnings of major policy debates about important issues confronting the international system. The objectives are to introduce and critique the main theories of international conflict, and to discuss specific threats. emphasis is placed on analyzing these issues systematically to uncover the implicit assumptions and logic behind decisions to threaten or to use force, and to tie these assessments to real-world concerns and contemporary policy debates. The course will cover the following topics: deterrence theory, coercion, emerging technologies, nuclear proliferation, terrorism, ethnic and religious conflict, civil wars, and human security.

Course Requirements

Class attendance and participation: 15%

Students must attend and participate actively in every class. Silence is not an option, as students are expected to engage each other in analyzing the reading and arguments presented in class. Your success in this course depends on careful preparation for and active engagement in seminar discussions. You are expected to read and study all assigned materials, come to class prepared to contribute to the seminar, and engage in thoughtful and critical discussions with your classmates and instructor. Attendance is mandatory and a prerequisite for participation. Moreover, it is important to emphasize that good participation is measured not by the quantity of times you speak, but by the quality of your contribution, with your comments demonstrating not only comprehension of the course materials but also critical thinking skills.

Presentation and Analytical Paper: 20%

Each student is required to deliver one presentation with an accompanying writeup. Each student must sign up for a week in which she/he is particularly interested in the topic, complete the reading for the week, and present a critical synthesis to draw analytical links and fill gaps in a specific debate in the literature. Each student must draft a 3-5 page paper that discusses the logical (in)consistencies of these arguments; presents empirical evidence to support or contradict a theory or set of arguments; and uncovers the practical implications of this analysis. You should not summarize the readings. The author of the write-up will succinctly present her/his findings: introducing the debate, elaborating on several analytical points, discussing specific cases, teasing out policy implications, and raising questions to extend the debate. Each formal presentation should take no more than 15 minutes and must be accompanied by a visual aid (PowerPoint). Write-ups and presentations are to serve as the springboard for further discussion and analysis by the rest of the class. Therefore, these assignments should be well conceived and should contain relevant information that is well organized and articulated.

Policy Memo: 25%

Each student is required to write a five page policy memo that engages with the policy relevance of the core hypotheses/arguments of a set of readings. It must be a different set of readings from the analytical paper.

Final Paper: 40%

Each student is required to write a research paper (10-15 pages) to address a contemporary international security issue with policy implications. The topic must be approved by the instructor in advance.

Your final grade will be assigned as a letter grade according to the following scale:

A 90-100%
B 80-89%
C 70-79%
D 60-69%
F 0-59%

Subject to Change Statement

The syllabus and course schedule may be subject to change. Changes will be communicated via email and/or Canvas announcement tool. It is the responsibility of students to check email messages and course announcements to stay current in their online courses.

Plagiarism & Academic Integrity

Georgia Tech aims to cultivate a community based on trust, academic integrity, and honor. Students are expected to act according to the highest ethical standards. All students enrolled at Georgia Tech, and all its campuses, are to perform their academic work according to standards set by faculty members, departments, schools and colleges of the university; and cheating and plagiarism constitute fraudulent misrepresentation for which no credit can be given and for which appropriate sanctions are warranted and will be applied. For information on Georgia Tech's Academic Honor Code, please visit http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/policies/honor-code/ or Academic Honor Code.

Any student suspected of cheating, plagiarizing, or using any AI software on a quiz, exam, or assignment will be reported to the Office of Student Integrity, who will investigate the incident and identify the appropriate penalty for violations.

Students are prohibited from submitting written work generated by and written by artificial intelligence tools such as ChatGPT or Grammarly. Asking ChatGPT to write a response for you is plagiarism for the simple reason that you did not write the answer or the essay. Furthermore, ChatGPT generates a written response using the writing of others without any credit or citations of the authors or websites. Student papers flagged as having been AI generated will be reported to the Office of Student Integrity.

Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

If you are a student with learning needs that require special accommodation, contact the Office of Disability Services at (404)894-2563 or http://disabilityservices.gatech.edu/, as soon as possible, to make an appointment to discuss your special needs and to obtain an accommodations letter. Please also e-mail me as soon as possible in order to set up a time to discuss your learning needs.

Student-Faculty Expectations Agreement

At Georgia Tech we believe that it is important to strive for an atmosphere of mutual respect, acknowledgement, and responsibility between faculty members and the student body. See http://www.catalog.gatech.edu/rules/22/ for an articulation of some basic expectation that you can have of me and that I have of you. In the end, simple respect for knowledge, hard work, and cordial interactions will help build the environment we seek. Therefore, I encourage you to remain committed to the ideals of Georgia Tech while in this class.

University Use of Electronic Email

A university-assigned student e-mail account is the official university means of communication with all students at Georgia Institute of Technology. Students are responsible for all information sent to them via their university-assigned e-mail account. If a student chooses to forward information in their university e-mail account, he or she is responsible for all information, including attachments, sent to any other e-mail account. To stay current with university information, students are expected to check their official university e-mail account and other electronic communications on a frequent and consistent basis. Recognizing that some communications may be time-critical, the university recommends that electronic communications be checked minimally twice a week.

Readings

All readings can be found in the "Reading List" tab in canvas. This will take you to the library with online access to resources. If a reading in the not in the reading list, it will be under files in canvas.

Learning Outcomes

1. Students will be able to apply research skills to address problems in the field of international affairs.

2. Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of principal contemporary global challenges in the field of international security.

3. Students will demonstrate knowledge of the influences that drive security policy formulation and execution.

SYLLABUS SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Course Schedule

January 7: Introduction and lecture on International Relations

January 14: The Origins of Security Studies and Realism

- Carr, E. H. (2021). The Realist Critique. In *The Twenty Years' Crisis 1919–1939, an introduction to the study of international relations* (2nd Edition ed., pp. 62–83). Macmillan and Co. Limited.
- Kenneth N. Waltz, "Anarchic orders and balances of power," in *Theory of International Politics* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1979), chapter 6.
- John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: Norton, 2001), chapters 1 and 2.
- Stephen Walt, "The Renaissance of Security Studies," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (June 1991), 211-239.

January 21: The Security Dilemma and Causes of War

- Robert Jervis, "Cooperation under the Security Dilemma," *World Politics* 30:2 (January 1978): 167-214.
- Rosato, S. (2015). The Inscrutable Intentions of Great Powers. *International Security*, 39(3), 48–88.
- Stephen van Evera, "Offense, Defense, and the Causes of War." *International Security* 22: 4 (Spring 1998): 5-43.
- Fearon, James D., "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization*, vol. 49, 1995, p. 379–414

January 28: Power and Polarity

- John J. Mearsheimer, [*The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*](#) (New York: Norton, 2001), Chapter 3.
- Joseph S. Nye, "Soft Power." *Foreign Policy*, no. 80 (1990): 153–71.
- William Wohlforth, "The stability of a unipolar world." *International Security*, 24(1):5–41, 1999.
- Nuno Monteiro, "Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful," *International Security*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (2011/12), pp. 9-40.
- Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall. (2005). "Power in International Politics," *International Organization* 59 (1): 39–75.

February 4: Coercive Diplomacy and Signaling

- Thomas C. Schelling, "The Diplomacy of Violence," in *Arms and Influence* (Yale University Press, 1966), pp. 1–34.
- Thomas Schelling, "The treat that leaves something to chance," in *The Strategy of Conflict* (Harvard University Press, 1981), pp. 187–203.
- Robert Art and Kelly Greenhill, "Coercion" in *Coercion: The Power to Hurt*, eds. Kelly Greenhill and Peter Krause (Cambridge University Press, 2020).
- Todd S. Sechser. "Militarized Compellent threats, 1918-2001." *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 28(4):377–401, 2011.
- Austin Carson and Keren Yarhi-Milo, "Covert Communication: The Intelligibility and Credibility of Signaling in Secret," *Security Studies*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (2017): 124-156.

February 11: Regime Type and the Democratic Peace

- Charles Lipson, *Reliable Partners: How Democracies Have Made a Separate Peace* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), chapter 1.
- Dan Reiter and Allan C. Stam, III, "Democracy, War Initiation, and Victory," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol 92:2 (June 1998), pp. 377-89.
- Daniel W Drezner, "The Death of the Democratic Advantage?" *International Studies Review*, Vol.24, No.2 (2022).
- Caitlin Talmadge, "Different Threats, Different Militaries: Explaining Organization Practices in Authoritarian Armies," *Security Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (2016), pp. 111-141.
- Sarah E. Kreps, "Just Put it on our Tab: War Financing and the Decline of Democracy," *War on the Rocks,* May 28, 2018.

February 18: Status – guest lecture by Dr Lincoln Hines.

- TBD

February 25: **Today's nuclear challenges**

- Sagan, S. D. (1996). "Why do states build nuclear weapons? Three models in search of a bomb," *International Security*, *21* (3), 54.
- Kroenig, M. (2013). "Nuclear superiority and the balance of resolve: Explaining nuclear crisis outcomes," *International Organization* 67(1), 141-171.
- Rachel Elizabeth Whitlark, "Nuclear Beliefs: A Leader-Focused Theory of Counter-Proliferation," *Security Studies,* Vol. 26, No.4 (2017), pp. 545-574.
- Nuno P. Monteiro and Alexandre Debs, "The strategic logic of nuclear proliferation." *International Security,* 39(2):7–51, 2014.

March 4: ISA - no class

March 11: Grand Strategy and National Interest

- Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth. *America Abroad: The United States' Global Role in the 21st Century.* Oxford University Press, 2016. Chapters 1-2.
- W. Drezner, D., R. Krebs, R., & Schweller, R. The end of grand strategy. *Foreign Affairs*. (2020, April 29).
- Francis J. Gavin, "Blame it on the Blob? How to Evaluate American Grand Strategy," *War on the Rocks*, August 21, 2020
- Charles L. Glaser, "Washington Is Avoiding the Tough Questions on Taiwan and China," *Foreign Affairs,* April 28, 2021.
- Betts, R. K. (2019). The grandiosity of grand strategy. *The Washington Quarterly*, *42* (4): 7–22.

March 18: Spring Break – no class

March 25: Terrorism

- Phillips, B. J. (2014). What Is a Terrorist Group? Conceptual Issues and Empirical Implications. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, *27*(2), 225–242.
- Martha Crenshaw, "The logic of terrorism: Terrorist behavior as a product of strategic choice," in Walter Reich, ed. *Origins of Terrorism*, Ch.1 (1991).
- Andrew H. Kydd and Barbara F. Walter, "The Strategies of Terrorism," *International Security*, Vol. 31, No.1 (2006): 49-80.
- Jordan, J., Kosal, M. E., & Rubin, L. (2016). The strategic illogic of counterterrorism policy. *The Washington Quarterly*, *39*(4), 181–192.

April 1: Civil Wars, Intervention, and Peacekeeping

- Ahmad, A. (2015). "The security bazaar: Business interests and Islamist power in civil war Somalia," *International Security*, *39* (3), 89–117.
- Fortna, V. P. (2015). "*Do terrorists win? Rebels' use of terrorism and civil war outcomes,*" *International Organization*, 69 (3), pp. 519 – 556
- *Virginia Page Fortna, "Scraps of Paper? Agreements and the Durability of Peace," International Organization, Vol. 57, No. 2 (2003), pp. 337–372.*
- Staniland, P. (2012). "Organizing insurgency: Networks, resources, and rebellion in south Asia," *International Security*, *37* (1), 142–177.

April 8: Religion and International Affairs

- Dima Adamsky, *Russian Nuclear Orthodoxy*, selections.
- Monica Toft, "Getting *Religion?* The Puzzling Case of Islam and Civil War." *International Security* 31:4 (Spring 2007): 97-131
- Ron Hassner "To Halve and to Hold: Conflicts over Sacred Space and the Problem of Indivisibility," *Security Studies* 12:4 (Summer 2003), pp.1-33. 2003), pp.1-33.
- Michael C. Horowitz. "Long Time Going: Religion and the Duration of Crusading." *International Security* 34:2 (2009): 162-193.

April 15: Emerging Technologies

- Horowitz, M. C. (2020). Do emerging military technologies matter for international politics? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 23(1), 385–400.
- Sechser, T. S., Narang, N., & Talmadge, C. (2019). Emerging technologies and strategic stability in peacetime, crisis, and war. *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 42(6), 727–735.
- Tong Zhao, "Conventional Challenges to Strategic Stability: Chinese Perceptions of Hypersonic Technology and the Security Dilemma, in *The End of Strategic Stability?: Nuclear Weapons and the Challenge of Regional Rivalries*, Lawrence Rubin and Adam N. Stulberg, eds.
- Matthew Kroenig, "Will Emerging Technology Cause Nuclear War: Bringing Geopolitics Back in," *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Winter 2022)
- Gamberini, S. J., & Rubin, L. (2021). "Quantum sensing's potential impacts on strategic deterrence and modern warfare," *Orbis*, *65* (2), 354–368.

April 22:   Cybersecurity

- Erik Gartzke and Jon Lindsay, "Thermonuclear Cyberwar," *Journal of Cybersecurity* 3:1 (2017) 37-48.
- Joseph Nye, 'Deterrence and Dissuasion in Cyberspace." *International Security* 41:3 (2017/2017): 44-71.
- Jackie Schneider, "Deterrence in and Through Cyberspace," in *Cross Domain Deterrence*. 2019.
- Valeriano, Jensen, and Maness, "How rival states employ cyber strategy," in *Cyber Strategy: The Evolving Character of Power and Coercion.* Oxford University Press: 2018. Chapter 2
- Josh Rovner, "[Warfighting in CyberSpace](#)," *War on the Rocks*, March 17, 2021