Course Description
This course examines theoretical and empirical work on the causes and consequences of militarized conflict between nation-states. We will consider causes from a variety of different levels of analysis (ranging from individual psychology to national attributes or interactions and the structure of the entire global system) and a variety of different theoretical perspectives (including work drawing from realism, institutionalism, and everything in between). After taking the course, students should be familiar with the scientific literature on militarized conflict, should be able to evaluate this literature in a critical yet constructive fashion, and should be able to begin producing their own research in this area.

It should be noted that this will not be a history course, and we will not be discussing or examining individual wars. The assigned readings emphasize generalizable theories and quantitative evidence on general patterns of conflict involvement across time and space, and this will be the focus of our discussions in this course. Students wishing to study or discuss specific conflicts/wars or current events are encouraged to take courses from the History department or to form their own discussion groups, as we will not be discussing these types of topics in this course.

This course is an important part of the Political Science Ph.D. program, and will thus be aimed at preparing Ph.D. students to pass their qualifying exams and to become serious scholars of conflict. Students from other departments or programs are welcome to take the course, as long as they can keep up with a course taught at this level. It must be emphasized that this course will involve intensive reading of advanced scholarly research; nearly every reading that is assigned involves formal mathematical models, quantitative data analysis, or both. While students are not necessarily expected to be able to produce their own quantitative and/or formal research, they must be able to understand and discuss it. Students who are unable to do this or who are unwilling to accept the validity of quantitative analyses of conflict patterns should avoid this course, as they will be wasting both their own time and that of their classmates, and their grades for participation and for the discussion papers will reflect this.

Required Texts
The following two books are required. They have been ordered from the campus bookstores, and they should also be available at such locations as amazon.com, barnesandnoble.com, or half.com:

One other book is optional. No material in this book will be required for this course, but it contains a lot of useful material that may be valuable to anybody interested in doing further research (or taking field exams) in this area:

Most of the other readings are available through JSTOR or UNT’s other e-journal subscription; the ones that are not will be made available on the Canvas page for this course.

Course Requirements
1) Attendance and Participation (25% of course grade)
Because this is a graduate seminar, the instructor will not run class meetings as a lecture; all students are expected to come to each class meeting prepared to discuss the readings. This will involve spending the time to
read each book or article on the reading list, and thinking about what each reading contributes to the weekly topic. Class discussion every week will focus on such issues as the theoretical arguments being made (explicitly or implicitly), the empirical evidence that is marshaled to test these arguments, weaknesses or shortcomings of the work so far, and potential directions for future research. Note that coming to class late, or missing class without documentation of a very pressing concern, is completely unacceptable in a graduate seminar and will be penalized accordingly.

(2) In-Class Presentations (25% of course grade)
Beyond regular class attendance and active participation in class discussion, each student is expected to make 4-5 presentations to the rest of the class on the weekly topics (with the total depending on the number of students taking the course). The presentations should involve identifying one or more important questions related to the week's topic that have been left unanswered or answered incompletely by the readings (and offering tentative suggestions on how such gaps might be filled in future research), and/or proposing some extension of the week's readings to a new question or area. The discussion questions suggested in the syllabus offer a good place to begin in thinking about these presentations (but don't feel limited to these suggestions; feel free to head off in a different direction). Each presentation should be described in a 3-to-4-page paper to be handed in for evaluation.

These presentations are meant to help focus the class discussion on new directions from the week's readings, and to help identify interesting directions for future research (perhaps even for this course's research paper). They should be written from a research-oriented, academic perspective, rather than a literature review or a Siskel-and-Ebert-style review (“I liked/hated this article” or "thumbs up/down"), and should be constructive; criticisms of assigned readings should be accompanied by one or more suggestions about how to overcome the problems, with appropriate discussion of the implications of these suggestions for the body of research. It is not recommended that these discussion papers focus on an assigned reading that was primarily a literature review (as with many of the chapters in the required books), as those are similar in format to these papers; if you are going to focus on a review article/chapter, the discussion paper will need to focus on ways to extend the literature beyond what the original article/chapter already suggested.

The following general grading scale will be used for both participation and presentations:
• A to A- (90-100): The student made a very strong contribution to the course. Class discussion, comments, and/or presentations reflected a great deal of thought about the material, and were constructive (for example, not only identifying current weaknesses and showing how these weaknesses limit the current literature, but suggesting useful future directions that could help to overcome these weaknesses or to extend the literature in important ways).
• B+ to B- (80-89): The student contributed meaningfully to the course. Class participation and/or presentations went beyond repeating the assigned material, perhaps identifying weaknesses in the current literature, but did not make many constructive suggestions about how these weaknesses might be overcome or how the literature might usefully be extended in the future.
• C+ to C- (70-79) or lower: The student did not contribute meaningfully. Class participation and/or presentations were limited to repeating the assigned material rather than making connections or extensions, or were filled with mistakes and inaccuracies.
• D or F (69 or lower): The student was a net drain on the course, rarely if ever speaking in class or failing to make the required number of presentations.

(3) Research Paper
Another requirement is an original research paper, involving the development and systematic testing of one or more hypotheses on the causes, management, or consequences of militarized interstate conflict. This paper may be quantitative or qualitative in nature, depending on the nature of the question and the student's methodological training, but in any case it must be analytical and theoretical in nature rather than descriptive. The final paper must be 20-30 pages in length, and should be comparable to an academic journal article in style. Please note that this must be an original paper for this course, and can not overlap in any substantial way with a paper
written for another course; if there is any question please talk to me about it and bring me a copy of the other paper.

The paper will be written in a number of stages, each of which will be graded separately:

**Week 5, Paper Proposal (5% of course grade):** Submit a 2-3 page proposal for your paper topic. This proposal must be primarily theoretical (the research design and data issues can be addressed later) and will involve a brief description of the paper topic, including a statement of what the student plans to study, a summary of what has been found in relevant research on related topics, and a discussion of the basic theoretical logic and hypotheses that will be tested here. This proposal will be evaluated and graded based on the appropriateness of the topic for this course, as well as the completeness and coherence of the theoretical logic and hypotheses to be tested. An 'A' grade will require that the topic be appropriate for this course, the general theoretical approach be explained well, and the hypotheses be testable and clearly related to this theoretical approach.

**Week 8, Research Design (5%):** Submit a 5-7 page research design laying out the details of how you will approach your paper topic. This will involve more detailed discussion of the paper's overall theoretical approach and your specific hypotheses than in the original proposal, as well as a statement and justification of how these hypotheses will be tested. Regardless of the methodological approach being used, you will need to specify and justify your spatial-temporal domain (which cases will be studied), your dependent variable or variables (what you will be trying to explain), your independent variables (the variables from your hypotheses that you will be using to try to explain the dependent variables), any control variables that you will also be considering to increase confidence in your tests by ruling out alternative explanations, and an explanation of how each of these variables will be measured (including the needed data sources as well as specific details of measurement).

At this point the basic ideas of the paper should be finalized and it should be clear how all of the hypotheses will be tested, leaving the rest of the semester to carry out these tests and write up the results and conclusions. This research design will be evaluated and graded based on the theoretical logic and hypotheses (as with the initial proposal but presumably developed further by this point), as well the completeness of the research design and the appropriateness of this design for testing the specific hypotheses that are laid out. An 'A' grade will require that the theoretical logic and hypotheses be complete and well thought out, the spatial-temporal domain and case selection for the analyses be appropriate, and reasonable measures and data sources be provided for each variable to be used in the study (including all dependent, independent, and control variables).

**Week 13, First Draft (10%):** Submit a complete first draft of your research paper. By this time, every part of the paper should be completed -- introduction, literature review, theory/hypotheses, research design, analysis, conclusions, and references. This will be graded like the final version of the paper (as described below), but with the recognition that it may not be as well-developed as the final version will, and the goal of giving each student feedback to make the final version of the paper better.

*Bring three (3) copies of your paper draft.* The course instructor will grade one copy, while the other two will be assigned to two students in the course so that they can write an anonymous review of the paper.

**Week 14, Reviews (5%):** An important part of academic careers is the peer review process, for both getting feedback on your own research and providing feedback to other scholars as they seek to publish their research. Each student in this course will provide an anonymous review to two fellow students, giving feedback on the first draft of the paper as well as constructive suggestions on how to improve the project before the final paper is due. More detailed instructions and examples will be distributed in class no later than the time that the first drafts of the paper are due. Your reviews will be graded based on the quality of the feedback offered to the authors of the two papers. An 'A' grade will require that the review accurately summarize what the author has attempted to do, give useful feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the current version of the paper, and offer constructive advice on how the paper can be improved.

*Email an electronic copy of each of your reviews to the instructor before the beginning of class*
(preferably in an editable format like .doc, .docx, or .rtf so that all reviews of each paper can be combined into a single review document).

Week 16, Presentation: The final class meeting of the semester will give each student an opportunity to present his/her research paper to the entire class. More details are provided at the end of this syllabus; these presentations will be graded as part of the class participation grade.

Final Exam Period, Final Paper (25%): The final version of your research paper must be turned in through the TurnItIn link on the course's Canvas page no later than the scheduled final exam period for this course. This final version of the paper must include a memo describing the changes that have been made in response to the written reviewers' comments.

The final paper will be graded on the clarity and contribution of the theory as an addition to the relevant scholarly literature, as well as on the appropriateness of the analyses as a test of this theory. An 'A' grade will require that the literature review, theory, and hypotheses be clear and complete, the analyses be conducted appropriately for testing these hypotheses (given the student's level of research training at this point in his/her studies), and the results and conclusions be related appropriately to this paper's theory/hypotheses as well as to the broader scholarly literature and (where appropriate) to implications for policy makers.

Please note that the memo responding to the reviews of your paper is important here, just as it is for manuscripts at professional journals. Be sure to take the reviews seriously, and explain in the memo how you addressed each point that they raised. If you did not feel that a particular point was relevant or appropriate, justify in this memo why you felt this was the case. Just as reviewers will consider the previous review when evaluating a paper that has been revised and resubmitted, your final paper will be graded on responding to the earlier review as well as on its own merits.

Academic Integrity
Academic integrity is defined in the UNT Policy on Student Standards for Academic Integrity, which is located at: <http://policy.unt.edu/policy/06-003>. This includes such issues as cheating (including use of unauthorized materials or other assistance on course assignments or examinations), plagiarism (whether intentional or negligent), forgery, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty, and sabotage. All students should review the policy carefully; failure to read or understand the policy does not protect you from sanctions for violating it.

Any suspected case of academic dishonesty will be handled in accordance with current University policy and procedures. Possible academic penalties range from a verbal or written admonition to a grade of “F” in the course; further sanctions may apply to incidents involving major violations. You will find the policy and procedures at <http://facultysuccess.unt.edu/academic-integrity>.

Americans with Disabilities Act
The University of North Texas makes reasonable academic accommodation for students with disabilities. Students seeking reasonable accommodation must first register with the Office of Disability Accommodation (ODA) to verify their eligibility. If a disability is verified, the ODA will provide you with a reasonable accommodation letter to be delivered to faculty to begin a private discussion regarding your specific needs in a course. You may request reasonable accommodations at any time, however, ODA notices of reasonable accommodation should be provided as early as possible in the semester to avoid any delay in implementation. Note that students must obtain a new letter of reasonable accommodation for every semester and must meet with each faculty member prior to implementation in each class. Students are strongly encouraged to deliver letters of reasonable accommodation during faculty office hours or by appointment. Faculty members have the authority to ask students to discuss such letters during their designated office hours to protect the privacy of the student. For additional information see the Office of Disability Accommodation website at <http://www.unt.edu/oda>. You may also contact them by phone at (940) 565-4323.

Sexual Discrimination, Harassment, and Assault
UNT is committed to providing an environment free of all forms of discrimination and sexual harassment, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. If you (or someone you know) has experienced or experiences any of these acts of aggression, please know that you are not alone. The federal Title IX law makes it clear that violence and harassment based on sex and gender are Civil Rights offenses. UNT has staff members trained to support you in navigating campus life, accessing health and counseling services, providing academic and housing accommodations, helping with legal protective orders, and more.

UNT’s Dean of Students website at <http://deanofstudents.unt.edu/resources> offers a range of on-campus and off-campus resources to help support survivors, depending on their unique needs. Renee LeClaire McNamara, UNT’s Student Advocate, may be reached through email at SurvivorAdvocate@unt.edu or by calling the Dean of Students’ office at (940) 565-2648. You are not alone; we are here to help.

Outline of Course

The “Additional Readings” section lists further research on each topic that was not assigned for this course. Students may find this section to be a useful source of material for their research papers. This syllabus could not hope to list every relevant article on each topic, of course, unless it was over 100 pages long. These readings represent a combination of the seminal work in each area and some of the more interesting or innovative recent articles; students are encouraged to look through the bibliographies of these articles for references to additional work.

1. Monday, Jan. 14: Overview of Course
   • No assigned readings

2. Monday, Jan. 21: NO CLASS (MLK Day)

   Use this week to make sure that you have downloaded/printed all of the assigned readings for the semester, and to think about your topic for your research paper. In thinking about your paper topic, it would be useful to consult the following classic article to help frame your research question:

3. Monday, Jan. 28: Conceptualizing and Studying Conflict

   The first substantive meeting of the course focuses on the most fundamental building block for any course on conflict: our understanding of what conflict is. This includes both conceptual and methodological concerns. Conceptually, we need to consider what “conflict,” “war,” and similar concepts mean as forms of human interaction. Methodologically, we need to consider how we can measure these concepts for the purposes of empirical analysis; this will require examining some of the major data sets that have attempted to measure conflict, discussing some of their strengths and weaknesses, and perhaps suggesting our own improvements or alternatives.

   Vasquez and Diehl both discuss a number of issues that arise in conceptualizing, measuring, and studying armed conflict and war. Ghosn et al. and Palmer et al. discuss the COW militarized interstate dispute (MID) data, which is more widely used today and offers important advances beyond the war data. Gleditsch et al. then discuss the PRIO/Uppsala armed conflict data, which includes more than just interstate armed conflicts, while Hensel & Mitchell discuss the ICOW project and broaden the focus to contentious issues (not all of which are militarized). Hensel's Guide to SSIP chapter discusses major data sets used in research in the field. Finally, Bennett discusses the notion of “politically relevant dyads,” an important approach that is widely used in empirical studies of conflict.

   While doing these readings, think about the issues discussed by the three conceptual readings at the start of this week's reading list. How well have these data sets dealt with these issues, and are there any other important issues that these readings (or these data sets) have not addressed? Are there any other ways that we could improve the conceptualization or measurement of conflict? Also, how much of a difference might we
expect if one data set is used rather than another -- do empirical results seem likely to differ, and if so, how and why?

Required Readings:
• Guide to SSIP: chapter by Hensel (data sets)

Optional Readings:
• Levy & Thompson: Chapter 1 ("Introduction to the Study of War")

Additional Readings:
• Conflict Management and Peace Science 2002 special issue on the future study of war, 2002 (volume 19 issue 1)
4. Monday, Feb. 4: Systemic Theories

A good place to start our consideration of causes of conflict is with the structure of the international system. In this week we focus on largely static analysis of the system, including theories about polarity and hegemony; next week we will examine the more dynamic topic of power transitions. Some of the earliest quantitative research on international conflict addressed the impact of polarity or of other dimensions of the international system's structure, and work in this area progressed substantially over several decades.

Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey's chapter was one of the most prominent early quantitative studies of conflict. That chapter, when compared to the more recent studies assigned here, helps illustrate many of the problems that plagued early work on polarity -- vastly different ways to conceptualize and measure both polarity and war, vastly different results, and the dreaded "inter-century difference." Bueno de Mesquita, Wayman, Kadera et al., and Braumoeller offer improvements in one or more areas; think about each of their measures of system structure and war, their research design, and their results when trying to evaluate this body of work. Thinking about all of these readings, has the systemic study of conflict and war really advanced (and if so, how), or have things stayed where they were (and if so, why)?

Required Readings:
- Guide to SSIP: chapter by Rasler and Thompson (systemic theories)

Optional Readings:
- Levy & Thompson: Chapter 2 ("System-Level Theories")

Additional Readings:
Polarity/System Structure

**Hegemony**

• Bruce Russett (1985). "The Mysterious Case of Vanishing Hegemony; or Is Mark Twain Really Dead?"

Long Cycles / Power Cycles / Business Cycles
- Handbook of War Studies II: chapter by Rasler & Thompson (long cycles)
5. Monday, Feb. 11: Power Transition Theory and Power Parity

***Note that the research paper proposals are due today***

This topic considers more explicitly dynamic work on systemic causes of war, focusing on fluctuations in specific countries’ military and/or economic power, and includes both power transition theory and work on various types of cycles. Power transition theory was introduced by Kenneth Organski in 1958’s book World Politics, and its best-known exposition came from Organski and his student Jacek Kugler in 1980’s The War Ledger. Kugler’s student Lemke has in turn been responsible for some interesting developments since then, when they have argued that the topic might better be termed power parity theory.

In line with this emphasis on power parity, Weede’s article is an early attempt to consider the pacifying effects of relative capabilities. Kim’s article considers the impact of alliances, rather than just two states’ own capabilities. The chapters from Lemke’s book then offer an extension to regional adversaries rather than continuing to focus solely on the top great powers.

Required Readings:

Additional Readings:

**Power Transition Theory**


Parity/Preponderance

6. Monday, Feb. 18: Rational Choice Approaches

A nice contrast to the previous two weeks’ emphasis on broad structures involves the study of decisions by individual leaders. Rational choice entered into the mainstream study of international conflict due to the work of scholars like Bueno de Mesquita in the 1970s and 1980s, and the field has advanced greatly as additional scholars have incorporated rational choice in their own work. Bueno de Mesquita has written two pathbreaking books in this area, with 1981’s *The War Trap* and (with David Lalman) 1992’s *War and Reason*; his 1988 article reviews the basics of expected utility theory and demonstrates some of the early contributions that this approach made with respect to international conflict (and IR more generally). It should be noted that this week's topic could easily be split up across various other weeks' readings, since rational choice is more of a method for theorizing than a separate topic, and many of the readings throughout the semester use rational choice to help develop their theories.

Fearon’s pathbreaking article considers when leaders could rationally start a war (a topic that has been the subject of debate over the years), while Powell expands on the commitment problem discussed by Fearon and Ramsay reviews research using the bargaining model of conflict that relates to the information problem. Bueno de Mesquita et al. use rational choice to try to understand conflict behavior, using their well-known "selectorate theory." Finally, Bell and Johnson use a rationalist model to exam the role of future expectations and preventive war. While reading each of these articles, try to focus on the basic structure of the author’s model (what are leaders trying to achieve, and how/when/why can wars start as they try to do this?). Also consider the tests that are offered, if any (does the test seem to offer a fair and appropriate evaluation of the basic model? does the evidence leave you convinced that the model is useful?). Finally, think about what (if anything) rational choice has contributed to our understanding of these topics; have these models produced surprising hypotheses or new insights that might not have been revealed with traditional approaches, or have these articles basically amounted to much mathematical ado about nothing?

Required Readings:
- *Guide to SSIP*: chapter by Zagare and Slantchev (game theory/modeling)

Additional Readings:
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Alastair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson, and James D. Morrow (2003). *The Logic of
• James D. Morrow game theory chapter in Midlarsky's Handbook of War Studies II.

7. Monday, Feb. 25: Psychological Approaches

Another important contrast comes from comparing the rational choice approaches from last week with work suggesting that psychological issues can prevent truly rational decision-making. This approach is embodied most prominently in academic research on misperception and on “prospect theory,” although some of the additional readings listed below have gone beyond these two areas. If this approach is correct, then rational choice models of decision-making (as well as other approaches that implicitly depend on rationality) might be flawed, and any understanding of conflict based on such models might be incomplete or misleading.

Levy's articles and the Goldgeier and Tetlock review discuss how our understanding of the causes of war could be improved by considering misperception and prospect theory, a psychologically based challenge to traditional rational choice approaches. Much of the work on both prospect theory and misperception, though, has been based on either psychological laboratory studies or on intensive analyses of individual cases. Herek et al., Kaufmann, and Kim and Bueno de Mesquita all suggest different ways that these types of studies can be
applied in larger-N analyses of conflict patterns. Does any of these three approaches offer a convincing way to evaluate the impact of psychological processes on conflict (and if not, why not)? Is there anything that they have left out that needs to be studied or anything that you feel has not been done convincingly, and if so, how would you propose to improve the literature?

**Required Readings:**

**Optional Readings:**
- Levy & Thompson: Chapter 5 ("Decision-Making: The Individual Level"), Chapter 6 ("Decision-Making: The Organizational Level")

**Additional Readings:**
- *Handbook of War Studies II*: chapter by Levy (prospect theory)

**8. Monday, March 4: Arms Races and Conflict**

***Note that the research designs are due today***

The impact of arms races has spawned a long debate among scholars, which has lasted several decades and helped propel several careers. The seminal study of arms races and war came from Michael Wallace in 1979, and was quickly followed by a number of both theoretical and empirical challenges such as Diehl's article. Diehl and Kingston and Gibler et al. extended the study of arms races by looking at their possible impact on the initiation of armed conflict, rather than its escalation (as studied by Wallace and by the majority of other work in this area).

After a period of relative neglect, the study of arms races reemerged at the end of the 1990s as several scholars returned to the old debate. Work by such scholars as Sample and Gibler has tried to improve the empirical study of the arms race-conflict linkage, including both theory and research design, while Rider looks at the origins of the arms races themselves. Finally, Owsiak reviews the larger "steps to war" theory developed by Vasquez, putting arms races into a broader theoretical context. In reading this literature, one thing to consider (and a major emphasis of most of the past work) is the appropriateness of the various data sets and measures that are used. At least as important, though, think about this research theoretically. How (if at all) does each piece contribute theoretically to our potential understanding of arms races and conflict? What does each piece add to the literature, and how well is it supported by the empirical analyses that are conducted?

**Required Readings:**
• What Do We Know About War?, 2nd edition: chapter by Sample (arms races)

**Optional Readings:**
• Levy & Thompson: Chapter 3 ("The Dyadic Interactions of States"): "Steps to War" section

**Additional Readings:**
• Note that this list covers empirical research on arms races and war, but does not include the vast literature on formal/dynamic models of arms races.
Peace Research 39, 6 (November): 669-691

9. Monday, March 11: NO CLASS (Spring Break)

10. Monday, March 18: Deterrence, Bargaining, and Crisis Escalation

Although the subject of deterrence received considerable attention by both scholars and leaders during the Cold War, it did not become the subject of frequent quantitative analyses until the 1980s. Huth offers the best quantitative assessment of immediate deterrence theory up to this point in time (the late 1980s), although Lebow and Stein challenge his approach, and Fearon tests a somewhat different theoretical model. Huth and Russett, Johnson et al., and Morrow attempt to study the much more difficult topic of general deterrence, where the set of cases is not as clear. Finally, Gartzke and Kroenig focus specifically on the impact of nuclear weapons, a subject that comes up in some of the earlier articles.

When reading these articles, consider each one in relation to the work that has come before. Has each article advanced the field? Does each article offer an appropriate test of deterrence/crisis bargaining theory? How could each article be improved?

Required Readings:

Optional Readings:
• Levy & Thompson: Chapter 3 ("The Dyadic Interactions of States"): "Bargaining Model" section

Additional Readings:
• Note that this list covers empirical research on deterrence and war, but does not include much of the vast literature on formal models of deterrence or policy-based analyses.
Deterrence
• Schelling, Thomas. Arms and Influence.
Nuclear Deterrence
• What Do We Know About War?, 2nd edition: chapter by Geller (nuclear weapons)

Crisis Bargaining / Escalation
• Handbook of War Studies II: chapter by Wilkenfeld & Brecher (interstate crises)
• Russell Leng chapter in John Vasquez, ed. (2000), What Do We Know About War? (1st edition).


No topic in the study of conflict has received more scholarly attention in the past decade than the so-called “democratic peace.” What began in the 1970s and early 1980s with the simple observation that political democracies rarely if ever fight wars against each other has spawned thousands of books, articles, and working papers. Portions of this work has attempted to determine whether the democratic peace applies in different spatial-temporal domains, whether democracies behave differently with regard to other dependent variables besides war, why democracies seem to behave differently, and whether the apparent democratic peace can actually be explained by some other factor(s).

This week's readings address the pacific nature of democracy itself. Munck and Verkuilen offer a conceptualization of democracy and compare how widely used data sets measure the concept. The Maoz & Russett article was one of the most influential works in the topic’s early days as it was just reaching prominence. Bueno de Mesquita et al. offer a different approach to the topic, while Bennett and Weeks both address a possible broadening of the relationship between regime type and peace. Orsun et al. examine the critique that democratization is an especially dangerous time before democracy is safely consolidated, while Mitchell summarizes evidence on the normative side of democracy and Gibler presents a more recent challenge in the form of a "territorial peace." Consider for each reading how convincing the theory is, as well as how appropriate (and how convincing) the empirical analyses are. Are you convinced that democracy is associated with peace, and that these authors understand why? If not, why not?

Required Readings:

**Optional Readings:**

- *What Do We Know About War*, 2nd edition: chapters by Mitchell (norms/dem. peace), Gibler (territorial peace)

**Additional Readings:**

**Democracy and Armed Conflict**

- John Vasquez, ed. (2000), *What Do We Know About War? (1st edition)*: chapter by Ray (democratic peace)


**Democratization and Armed Conflict**

**Territorial Peace**
  - (more coming soon)

**Considering Variation among Authoritarian States**
  - (more coming soon)

**Democracy and Other Phenomena**
Organization, 50: 109-139.


• Li, Quan, and Adam Resnick (2003). "Reversal of Fortunes: Democratic Institutions and Foreign Direct Investment Inflows to Developing Countries." *International Organization* 57/1 (Winter): 175-211


12. Monday, April 1: Liberal Peace II: Trade and Institutions

This week's readings extend beyond last week's by considering whether there is a broader "Kantian" or "liberal" peace, which either supplements/reinforces or supplants/replaces the democratic peace. One important body of literature in this vein examines trade and interdependence -- reflected here in an influential article by Oneal and Russett as well as later contributions by Morrow and Gartzke et al.). Other work addresses economic development (Mousseau), economic systems (Gartzke), and shared membership in international institutions (Pevehouse & Russett). Hegre then seeks to reevaluate the impact of democracy in light of many of these challenges.

Consider for each reading how convincing the theory is, as well as how appropriate (and how convincing) the empirical analyses are. Are you convinced that economic factors and/or institutions are associated with peace, and that these authors understand why? If not, why not? Based on this evidence, are you convinced that these factors replace or supplement the democratic peace (as some authors contend), or do they primarily reinforce or strengthen then effect of democracy?

Required Readings:

• *What Do We Know About War*, 2nd edition: chapter by Mousseau (market-capitalist peace)


**Optional Readings:**
• Levy & Thompson: Chapter 3 ("The Dyadic Interactions of States"): "Economic Interdependence" section

**Additional Readings:**
• *Handbook of War Studies II*: chapter by Russett and Starr (Kantian peace)
• *Journal of Peace Research* special issue on trade and conflict: July 1999, 36(4).
Although the democratic peace has gotten the most scholarly attention, the last two decades have also seen the emergence of a large literature on other connections between domestic politics and international conflict. Much of this literature is related to the famous (but weakly supported) "diversionary theory" of conflict. Morgan and Bickers examine support in the president's own party. Leeds and Davis offer an alternative explanation based on strategic interaction that they test on a wider set of cases, and Mitchell/Prins and Haynes examine relations with a particular rival rather than general conflict propensities. Finally, Williams and Carter & Nordstorm focus on more specific details of the leader's political situation.

In evaluating these readings, consider the impact that domestic pressures have on armed conflict. Are you convinced by the theoretical arguments? How about the empirical evidence? What could be done to improve these studies, or to extend this general body of research to areas that have not been covered yet?

Required Readings:
• Guide to SSIP: chapter by Moore and Tarar (domestic-international linkages)

Additional Readings:
• Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce (2002). “Domestic Politics and International Relations.” International Studies Quarterly 46/1 (March) 1-9

14. Monday, April 15: Geography and Issues

***Note that the reviews of your colleagues’ research papers are due today - email to Dr. Hensel, preferably in an editable format like .doc, .docx, or .rtf***

Another development in the last decade or so has been the emergence of work on geography and issues as influences on conflict behavior. The Hensel chapter in Vasquez’ book reviews earlier literature on contiguity or proximity and conflict. The remaining readings for this week emphasize territorial issues as sources of conflict behavior, making the argument that the most important impact of geography lies in the specific issues over which states contend rather than in the simple geographic location of states. Hensel’s chapter examines the differences between militarized disputes over territorial and other issues, and finds strong evidence of a conflictual impact of territory; Senese and Vasquez expand on this with more sophisticated methodology and a somewhat different data set. Hensel, Allison, and Khanani examine the evidence over a supposed territorial integrity norm; Huth et al. examine the peaceful settlement of territorial issues; and Carter & Goemans examine the impact of different types of borders. Finally, the Hensel chapter in the Oxford Research Encyclopedia summarizes the state of play of the broader literature on contentious issues, including additional work beyond territory.

Note that much more detail on issues is available on my Contexts and IR syllabus, which is available on my web site. That syllabus spends a full week each on territorial issues and other types of contentious issues plus several other weeks on the various impacts of geography on conflict and cooperation, so there are many more items in the additional readings section.

Required Readings:
• *What Do We Know About War*, 2nd edition: chapter by Hensel (geography/territory)
• Guide to SSIP: chapter by Tir and Vasquez (territory)

**Additional Readings:**

**Geography and Conflict**
• Special Issue of *Political Analysis* on Spatial Methods in Political Science. Summer 2002.
Territorial Issues

- John Vasquez, ed. (2000), *What Do We Know About War? (1st edition)*: chapters by Hensel and Huth (territory)
15. Monday, April 23: Conflict Consequences and Aftermath

Having spent most of the semester looking at causes of conflict behavior, we will now spend a week on its consequences. This includes consequences for political leaders (Croco and Weeks) and demographic and economic impacts (Kugler et al.), as well as longer-term consequences such as future conflict patterns (Garnham on war weariness and the two What Do We Know About War chapters on rivalry).

Note that much more detail on recurrent conflict, rivalry, and other consequences of conflict is available on my Contexts and IR syllabus, which is available on my web site. That syllabus spends two entire weeks on the problem of rivalry and recurrent conflict plus another on the various impacts of crises and wars, so there are many more items in the additional readings section.

Also note that Michael Greig regularly teaches a seminar on conflict management that addresses the role of mediators or other outside parties in the settlement or management of conflict, so I have not covered that material in this course.

Required Readings:
- What Do We Know About War, 2nd edition: chapters by Valeriano, Goertz & Diehl (rivalry)
- Guide to SSIP: chapters by Prorok and Huth (consequences of war), Hartzell and Yuen (duration of peace)

Additional Readings:
Conflict Outcomes


**Conflict Duration / Termination**


**Other Conflict Consequences**


**Recurrent Conflict**


**Interstate Rivalry**

- John Vasquez, ed. (2000), *What Do We Know About War? (1st edition)*: chapters by Goertz & Diehl and Wayman (rivalries)
***Note that everyone must present a brief summary of his/her research paper today***

We will begin this final meeting by allowing each student to present a brief (no more than 5 minute) summary of his/her research paper. Please, no PowerPoints! After that, we will move on to the scheduled readings, as we try to wrap up the semester and set the stage for future research.

This wrapup will begin by considering the global applicability of research on armed conflict. Most of our theories have been designed and tested as general theories that should (in principle) be relevant across time and space. Yet there is reason to believe that many of these theories may not be very appropriate for many countries or types of countries (and may be inappropriate for entire regions of the world). Or in the words of Most and Starr, we may need "nice" laws rather than general, universal theories that explain all of time and space. Thinking back through all that we have covered this semester, how useful is the idea of pursuing globally applicable theories, and how confident are you that the major findings we have discussed would hold up under regional, temporal, or other sub-analyses rather than focusing on the great powers or the entire international system?

Also consider the conclusions and suggestions of Wallensteen, Maoz, and Levy from the Vasquez book. Do they seem to have summarized the existing literature well? Do they seem to offer useful suggestions for future research? Which other directions would you like to see future research go in trying to understand the causes and consequences of interstate conflict?

Required Readings:
• What Do We Know About War, 2nd edition: chapters by Wallensteen, Maoz, Levy (future directions)

Additional Readings:
Some Methodological or Research Design Issues in Studying Conflict
• Special feature in International Studies Quarterly on the promise and pitfalls of dyadic research designs in international studies, June 2016.
S. International Studies Quarterly 47/3 (September): 417-429

Taking Stock / Lit Reviews
• Guide to SSIP: chapter by Kadera and Zinnes (how methods met models)
• John Vasquez, ed. (2000), What Do We Know About War? (1st edition): chapters by Bremer, Levy, Midlarsky, Vasquez
• Handbook of War Studies (any of the three volumes)

Monday, May 6: FINAL PAPERS DUE  (via TurnItIn, no later than 1:30-3:30 PM)

The final version of your research paper must be turned in through the TurnItIn link on the course's Canvas page no later than the scheduled final exam period for this course. This final version of the paper must include a memo describing the changes that have been made in response to the written reviewers' comments.