

INR 5014: Contexts and International Relations

Dr. Paul R. Hensel

Phone: 644-7318

phensel@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/>

Spring 2007

Wed 12:30-3:15 PM

113 Bellamy Bldg.

Office: 563 Bellamy

Description

Most political scientists study international relations "in a vacuum," without reference to the geographic and historical context in which events take place. The central goal of this course is to consider the impact of geography and history, and to study the many ways that such contextual forces can influence international processes. This goal will be pursued through a variety of theoretical and empirical readings on the impact of geography and history, in-class presentations on weekly topics, and a research paper dealing with contextual effects in international relations.

It must be emphasized that this is not a course in geography or history, but rather a course that examines the ways that geographic and historical factors influence international relations. Students seeking a course in geography or history are advised to look to FSU's Geography and History departments for courses such as Economic Geography, Military Geography, Political Geography, or any of a variety of history courses, because they will certainly be disappointed with this course. We will not examine the geography or history of specific countries or regions; we will focus on theoretical and analytical applications of geographic and historical influences on traditional international relations topics such as international conflict and trade; and the readings for this course were primarily written by and intended for political scientists. Furthermore, this course will not be post-modern or constructivist in its approach (although several of the readings may draw from such theoretical frameworks); like the rest of FSU's Political Science department, this course will focus on the development and (largely quantitative) testing of systematic theories on political phenomena.

This course is part of the Political Science Ph.D. program, but is open to graduate students from any department or program at FSU. The course will involve intensive reading of advanced scholarly research; nearly every reading that is assigned involves quantitative data analysis, formal mathematical models, 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 this type of work. Students who are unable to do so or who are unwilling to accept the validity of quantitative analyses of human activities are advised to 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

This is a heavily article-focused course, with only three books being required. The following books have not been listed with any of the campus bookstores, but can be ordered from any online bookstore (such as amazon.com, barnesandnoble.com, half.com, or powells.com). Feel free to order the paperback rather than hardcover edition, and/or to order a used rather than new copy if desired.

- Michael T. Klare (2001). *Resource Wars*. New York: Owl Books.
- Walter Mattli (1999). *The Logic of Regional Integration: Europe and Beyond*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jared Diamond (1999). *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

All other readings may be borrowed for personal usage from Dr. Hensel's office (563 Bellamy). The readings will be made available outside my office door at least one week before they are needed for class; please return them as soon as possible for other students' use. Many of the readings are also available through JSTOR or FSU's other e-journal subscriptions.

Course Requirements

(1) Attendance and Participation

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. Class participation will count for 20% of the overall course grade. 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

Beyond regular class attendance and active participation in class discussion, each student is expected to make 3-5 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. 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"), 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. Each presentation should be described in a roughly 3-to-4-page paper to be handed in for evaluation. Together, these presentations will count for 20% of the course grade.

The following general grading scale will be used for participation and presentations:

- A to A-: 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-: 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+ 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 was filled with mistakes and inaccuracies.
- F: 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 application of a (geographic or historical) contextual approach to some IR problem of the student's choosing. 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 paper should attempt to test hypotheses about contextual processes or contextual influences in world politics (focusing on geographic or historical contexts except with the permission of the instructor). 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, such as the department's first year paper requirement; if there is any question please talk to me about it and bring me a copy of the other paper (or turn it in to me along with this paper).

A proposal for each student's paper topic must be submitted to the instructor for approval no later than **February 21**. This proposal -- which must be primarily theoretical (the research design and data issues can be addressed later) -- will involve a brief (2-3 pages) description of the paper topic, including a statement of what the student plans to study and a discussion of the basic theoretical logic and hypotheses. A research design (8-10 pages) must be turned in by **March 21**, involving more detailed discussion of the paper's hypotheses, spatial-temporal domain, data sources, and similar topics; at this point the basic ideas of the paper should be finalized, with only the implementation and writeup remaining to be done. The completed paper is due at the start of the last class (**April 18**), at which point each student will make a short presentation on his or her paper to the rest of the class. This paper project will count for a total of 40% of the overall course grade, of which 5% each will be based on the initial proposal and the research design. The paper will be graded on the clarity and contribution of the theory as an addition to the literature on geographic or historical contexts and international relations, as well as on the appropriateness of the analyses as a test of this theory.

(4) Take-home final exam

The course will conclude with a take-home final exam, which is meant to assess your understanding and integration of the topics covered throughout the semester. The questions for this final exam will be handed out in the last regular class meeting, and answers will be due no later than the scheduled exam time for this course (**Thursday, April 26, between 10 AM - Noon**). The final exam will count for 20% of the overall course grade.

COURSE OUTLINE

1. Wednesday, Jan. 10: Introduction / Overview of Course

During this introductory meeting, we will go over the syllabus and discuss the basic outline of the course, the research papers, and my expectations for how each meeting of the class should work. There will be no assigned reading for the first meeting.

I. Geographic Contexts and International Relations

2. Wednesday, Jan. 17: Geography as a Facilitating Condition

The central theme of this course is the study of contexts in international relations, drawing from over four decades of theoretical and empirical work. Much of this work is general enough to cover almost any type of context, whether geographic, historical, political, or otherwise. The Sprouts produced some of the earliest work to think about contexts in international relations, and heavily influenced Starr's later work on opportunity and willingness (as well as, more implicitly, the remainder of the readings covered in this course). This 1957 article is one of their many interesting works in this area.

The organizing theme of the next several weeks involves a distinction that Paul Diehl has drawn between "geography as a facilitating condition for conflict" and "geography as a source of conflict." The notion of geography as a facilitating condition for conflict (or for any other IR phenomenon) suggests that geographic factors can make it easier or more difficult for actors to engage in conflict (or trade, etc.) -- often echoing contextual notions of "possibilism," "probabilism," and "opportunity" -- and political scientists have examined this approach in a variety of different ways. Diehl summarizes much of the early work on borders and contiguity, while the rest of the readings advance beyond these basic approaches. Kopstein and Reilly examine the impact of distance on the diffusion of political and economic reforms, and Gleditsch and Ward discuss a variety of issues in the measurement of proximity/distance. Lemke's article (later expanded in an entire book covering the entire world) goes beyond simple measures of contiguity or distance and suggests that terrain and technology have an impact on states' abilities to project their military forces. Finally, Starr and Thomas use geographic information systems (GIS) to study specific details of each border.

Today's meeting should consider each of these approaches to measuring the impact of geography, both theoretically and empirically. Is the author's theoretical argument convincing? Is the author's measure of geography (contiguity, distance, terrain, etc.) an appropriate way to capture the hypothesized impact of geography? Are the empirical analyses and results convincing? What has not been done, or done well, and what could be done to improve this line of research in the future?

- Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout (1957). "Environmental Factors in the Study of International Politics." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 1, 4 (December): 309-328.
- Paul F. Diehl (1991). "Geography and War: A Review and Assessment of the Empirical Literature." *International Interactions* 17, 1: 11-27.
- Jeffrey S. Kopstein and David A. Reilly (2000). "Geographic Diffusion and the Transformation of the Postcommunist World." *World Politics* 53 (1): 1-37.
- Kristian S. Gleditsch and Michael D. Ward (2001). "Measuring Space: A Minimum-Distance Database and Applications to International Studies." *Journal of Peace Research* 38, 6. (November): 739-758.

- Douglas Lemke (1995). "The Tyranny of Distance: Redefining Relevant Dyads." *International Interactions* 21, 1: 23-38.
- Harvey Starr and G. Dale Thomas (2002). "The 'Nature' of Contiguous Borders: Ease of Interaction, Salience, and the Analysis of Crisis." *International Interactions* 28: 213-235.

Additional Readings (Contexts):

- Gary Goertz (1992). "Contextual Theories and Indicators in World Politics." *International Interactions* 17, 4: 285-303.
- Gary Goertz (1994). *Contexts of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- R. Robert Huckfeldt (1986). *Politics in Context: Assimilation and Conflict in Urban Neighborhoods*. New York: Agathon Press. (you can also search J-STOR for a variety of other work related to contexts in American politics by Huckfeldt, John Sprague, and their co-authors, as well as work in such fields as sociology, psychology, and criminology)
- R. Robert Huckfeldt and John Sprague (1993). "Citizens, Contexts, and Politics." In Ada W. Finifter (ed.), *Political Science: The State of the Discipline II*. Washington, D.C.: American Political Science Association, pp. 281-303.
- Benjamin Most and Harvey Starr (1989). *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. (especially Chapter 2: "Opportunity and Willingness: A Pre-Theoretic Framework").
- Harold Sprout (1963). "Geopolitical Hypotheses in Technological Perspective." *World Politics* 15, 2 (January): 187-212.
- Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout (1956). *Man-Milieu Relationship: Hypotheses in the Context of International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Center of International Studies, Research monograph.
- Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout (1960). "Geography and International Politics in an Era of Revolutionary Change." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 4, 1 (March): 145-161.
- Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout (1965). *The Ecological Perspective on Human Affairs*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout (1968). *An Ecological Paradigm for the Study of International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Center of International Studies, Research monograph 30.
- Harold Sprout and Margaret Sprout (1969). "Explanation and Prediction in International Politics." In James N. Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, rev ed. New York: Free Press, pp. 60-72. (*excerpts from the 1956 Man-Milieu Relationship research monograph, which is not widely available and is not in FSU's library*)
- Harvey Starr (1978). "Opportunity and Willingness as Ordering Concepts in the Study of War." *International Interactions* 4, 4: 363-387.
- Harvey Starr (1992). "Joining Political and Geographic Perspectives: Geopolitics and International Relations." *International Interactions* 17, 1: 1-9.

Additional Readings (Facilitating Condition):

- Special Issue of *Political Analysis* on Spatial Methods in Political Science. Summer 2002.
- Luc Anselin and John O'Loughlin (1992). "Geography of International Conflict and Cooperation: Spatial Dependence and Regional Context in Africa." In Michael Don Ward, ed., *The New Geopolitics*. Philadelphia: Gordon and Breach, pp. 39-75.
- Kenneth Boulding (1962). *Conflict and Defense*. New York: Harper and Brothers.

- Stuart A. Bremer (1992). "Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate War, 1816-1965." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36, 2 (June): 309-341.
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita (1981). *The War Trap*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Alan V. Deardorff (1998). "Determinants of Bilateral Trade: Does Gravity Work in a Neoclassical World?" In Jeffrey A. Frankel, ed., *The Regionalization of the World Economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 7-31.
- Paul F. Diehl (1985). "Contiguity and Escalation in Major Power Rivalries, 1816-1980." *Journal of Politics* 47, 4 (November): 1203-1211.
- William Easterly and Ross Levine (1998). "Troubles with the Neighbors: Africa's Problem, Africa's Opportunity." *Journal of African Economies* 7, 1 (March): 120-142.
- Andrew J. Enterline (1998). "Regime Changes, Neighborhoods, and Interstate Conflict, 1816-1992." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42, 6. (December): 804-829.
- Jeffrey A. Frankel and David Romer (1999). "Does Trade Cause Growth?" *American Economic Review* 89, 3 (June): 379-399.
- David Garnham (1976). "Dyadic International War, 1816-1965: The Role of Power Parity and Geographic Proximity." *Western Political Quarterly* 29: 231-242.
- Kristian S. Gleditsch (2002). *All International Politics is Local: The Diffusion of Conflict, Integration, and Democratization*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Kristian S. Gleditsch and Michael D. Ward (2001). "Measuring Space: A Minimum Distance Database and Applications to International Studies." *Journal of Peace Research* 38:739-58
- Nils Petter Gleditsch and J. David Singer (1975). "Distance and International War, 1816-1965." In M. R. Kahn, ed., *Proceedings of the International Peace Research Association, Fifth General Conference*. Oslo: International Peace Research Association.
- Charles S. Gochman (1991) "Interstate Metrics: Conceptualizing, Operationalizing, and Measuring the Geographic Proximity of States since the Congress of Vienna." *International Interactions* 17 (1): 93-112.
- Douglas Lemke and William Reed (2001). "The Relevance of Politically Relevant Dyads." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45, 1 (February): 126-145.
- Benjamin Most and Harvey Starr (1980). "Diffusion, Reinforcement, Geopolitics, and the Spread of War." *American Political Science Review* 74, 4 (December): 932-946.
- Benjamin Most, Harvey Starr, and Randolph Siverson (1988). "The Logic and Study of the Diffusion of International Conflict." In Manus Midlarsky, ed., *Handbook of War Studies*. Boston: Unwin Hyman, pp. 111-139.
- John O'Loughlin, Michael D. Ward, Corey L. Lofdahl, Jordin S. Cohen, David S. Brown, David Reilly, Kristian S., Gleditsch, and Michael Shin. (1998). "The Diffusion of Democracy, 1946-1994." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 88, 4: 545-574.
- Frederic S. Pearson (1974). "Geographic Proximity and Foreign Military Intervention." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 18, 3 (September): 432-460.
- Randolph M. Siverson and Harvey Starr (1990). "Opportunity, Willingness, and the Diffusion of War." *American Political Science Review* 84, 1: 47-67.
- Randolph M. Siverson and Harvey Starr (1991). *The Diffusion of War: A Study of Opportunity and Willingness*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Harvey Starr (1991). "Democratic Dominoes: Diffusion Approaches to the Spread of Democracy in the International System." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 35, 2: 356-381.
- Harvey Starr (2001). "Using Geographic Information Systems to Revisit Enduring Rivalries: The Case of Israel." *Geopolitics*.

- Harvey Starr (2001). "Opportunity, Willingness, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS): Reconceptualizing Borders in International Relations." *Political Geography*.
- Harvey Starr and William W. Bain (1995). "The Application of Geographic Information Systems to International Studies." *International Studies Newsletter* 20, 2: 1-8.
- Harvey Starr and Benjamin A. Most (1976). "The Substance and Study of Borders in International Relations Research." *International Studies Quarterly* 20: 581-620.
- Harvey Starr and Benjamin Most (1978). "A Return Journey: Richardson, Frontiers, and War in the 1945-1965 Era." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 22, 3 (September): 441-462.
- Harvey Starr and Benjamin Most (1983). "Contagion and Border Effects on Contemporary African Conflicts." *Comparative Political Studies* 16, 1 (April): 206-229.
- Harvey Starr and Benjamin Most (1985). "The Forms and Processes of War Diffusion: Research Update on Contagion in African Conflict." *Comparative Political Studies* 18, 2 (July): 206-229.
- Michael D. Ward and Kristian S. Gleditsch (2002). "Location, Location, Location: An MCMC Approach to Modeling the Spatial Context of War and Peace." *Political Analysis* 10: 244-60.

3. Wednesday, Jan. 24: Geography as a Source of Conflict I: Territorial Issues

The next topic involves what Diehl referred to as "geography as a source of conflict," or the idea that geography plays a more active role in promoting conflict than simply making it easier or more difficult to fight a certain opponent. Here, the idea is that geography itself provides the reason that two (or more) states become involved in armed conflict. This week focuses on conflict over territory, which has often been described as the most salient of all contentious issues in international relations, and next week will examine the related yet distinct topic of conflict over resources. Hensel's 1996 article and Senese attempt to establish the empirical importance of territorial issues relative to other types of issues. Hensel's 2001 article, Allee and Huth, and Mitchell and Hensel examine the management of territorial issues. Finally, Walter's article uses territorial theory to understand intrastate rather than interstate conflict.

Today's meeting should begin by thinking about the arguments about territory relative to other issues. Are these scholars' arguments convincing? Are there other issues that might be even more salient than territorial issues, at least under some circumstances? Beyond these introductory questions, we will also spend a great deal of time on the various attempts to study territorial claims. Hensel (1996), Senese, and Walter used data on the issues involved in militarized conflict; Hensel (2001), Allee and Huth, and Mitchell and Hensel attempt to measure territorial claims directly and to study non-militarized as well as militarized dimensions of their management. Is each of these approaches satisfying intellectually, and what (if anything) could be done to improve it? Finally, we will consider all of these studies' hypotheses and analyses on the (militarized or non-militarized) management of territorial claims. Are the hypotheses credible, are the tests appropriate, and are the results convincing? What could be done to improve these tests, and what else could be done in studying territorial issues in world politics?

- Paul R. Hensel (1996). "Charting a Course to Conflict: Territorial Issues and Interstate Conflict, 1816-1992." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15, 1 (Fall 1996): 43-73.
- Paul D. Senese (2005). "Territory, Contiguity, and International Conflict: Assessing a New Joint Explanation." *American Journal of Political Science* 49, 4 (October).
- Paul R. Hensel (2001). "Contentious Issues and World Politics: The Management of Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 1 (March).

- Todd L. Allee and Paul K. Huth (2006). "Legitimizing Dispute Settlement: International Legal Rulings as Domestic Political Cover." *American Political Science Review* 100: 219-234.
- Sara McLaughlin Mitchell and Paul R. Hensel (2006). "International Institutions and Compliance with Agreements over Contentious Issues." Resubmitted to *American Journal of Political Science* (September 2006).
- Barbara F. Walter (2003). "Explaining the Intractability of Territorial Conflict." *International Studies Review* 5, 4 (December): 137-153.

Additional Readings:

- *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 23, 4 (2006): special issue on Territorial Conflict Management
- Giacomo Chiozza and Ajin Choi (2003). "Guess Who Did What: Political Leaders and the Management of Territorial Disputes, 1950-1990" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 47, 3: 251-278.
- Paul F. Diehl (1992). "What are they Fighting for? The Importance of Issues in International Conflict Research." *Journal of Peace Research*, 29(3): 333-344.
- Paul F. Diehl (ed.). *A Road Map to War: Territorial Dimensions of International Conflict*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1999.
- Paul F. Diehl and Gary Goertz (1988). "Territorial Changes and Militarized Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 32, 1 (March): 103-122.
- Douglas M. Gibler (1996). "Alliances that Never Balance: The Territorial Settlement Treaty," *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 16, 1.
- Douglas M. Gibler (1997). "Control the Issues, Control the Conflict: Resolving Territorial Issues Through Alliances, 1815-1980." *International Interactions* 22, 4.
- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1992). *Territorial Changes and International Conflict*. New York: Routledge.
- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1990). "Territorial Changes and Recurring Conflict." In Charles S. Gochman and Alan Ned Sabrosky, eds., *Prisoners of War? Nation-States in the Modern Era*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, pp. 57-72.
- Paul R. Hensel (2000). "Territory: Theory and Evidence on Geography and Conflict." In John A. Vasquez, ed., *What Do We Know about War?* New York: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 57-84.
- Paul R. Hensel and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (2005). "Issue Indivisibility and Territorial Claims." *GeoJournal* 64, 4 (December): 275-285.
- Kalevi J. Holsti (1990). *Peace and War: Armed Conflicts and International Order, 1648-1989*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paul K. Huth (1996). *Standing Your Ground: Territorial Disputes and International Conflict*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Paul K. Huth (1996). "Enduring Rivalries and Territorial Disputes. 1950-1990." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15, 1 (Spring): 7-42.
- Paul K. Huth (2000). "Territory: Why are Territorial Disputes between States a Central Cause of International Conflict?" In John A. Vasquez, ed., *What Do We Know about War?* New York: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 85-110.
- Paul K. Huth and Todd Allee (2002). *The Democratic Peace and Territorial Conflict in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paul K. Huth and Todd Allee (2002). "Domestic Political Accountability and the Escalation and Settlement of International Disputes," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46, 6 (December): 754-90.
- Arie M. Kacowicz (1994). *Peaceful Territorial Change*. Columbia: University of South

Carolina Press.

- Stephen Kocs (1995). "Territorial Disputes and Interstate War, 1945-1987." *Journal of Politics* 57, 1: 159-175.
- Robert Mandel (1980). "Roots of the Modern Interstate Border Dispute." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 24, 3: 427-454.
- Sara McLaughlin Mitchell and Brandon C. Prins. (1999). "Beyond Territorial Contiguity: Issues at Stake in Democratic Militarized Interstate Disputes." *International Studies Quarterly* 43:169-183.
- David Newman (1999). "Real Places, Symbolic Spaces: Interrelated Notions of Territory in the Arab-Israeli Conflict." In Paul F. Diehl, ed., *A Road Map to War*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, pp. 3-34.
- Paul D. Senese (1996). "Geographical Proximity and Issue Salience: Their Effects on the Escalation of Militarized Interstate Conflict." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 15, 1 (Fall 1996): 133-161.
- Paul D. Senese and John A. Vasquez (2003). "A Unified Explanation of Territorial Conflict: Testing the Impact of Sampling Bias, 1919-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 47, 2 (June): 275-298
- Beth A. Simmons (1999). "See You in 'Court?': The Appeal to Quasi-Judicial Legal Processes in the Settlement of Territorial Disputes." In Paul F. Diehl, ed., *A Road Map to War*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, pp. 205-237.
- Beth A. Simmons (2002). "Capacity, Commitment, and Compliance: International Institutions and Territorial Disputes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46, 6 (December): 829-856.
- Jaroslav Tir (2006). *Redrawing the Map to Promote Peace*. New York: Lexington Books.
- Jaroslav Tir (2005). "Keeping the Peace After Secessions: Territorial Conflict Between Rump and Secessionist States." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49: 713-741.
- Jaroslav Tir (2003). "Never-Ending Conflicts? Territorial Changes as Potential Solutions for Territorial Disputes." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 20: 59-84.
- Jaroslav Tir (2003). "Averting Armed International Conflicts Through State-to-State Territorial Transfers." *Journal of Politics* 65: 1235-1257.
- Monica Duffy Toft (2003). *The Geography of Ethnic Violence: Identity, Interests, and the Indivisibility of Territory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- John P. Vanzo (1999). "Border Configuration and Conflict: Geographical Compactness as a Territorial Ambition of States." In Paul F. Diehl, ed., *A Road Map to War*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, pp. 73-112.
- John A. Vasquez (1993). *The War Puzzle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- John A. Vasquez (1995). "Why Do Neighbors Fight? Proximity, Interaction, or Territoriality." *Journal of Peace Research* 32, 3: 277-293.
- John A. Vasquez and Marie T. Henahan (2001). "Territorial Disputes and the Probability of War, 1816-1992." *Journal of Peace Research* 38, 2: 123-138.

4. Wednesday, Jan. 31: Geography as a Source of Conflict II: Other Issues

This week's readings concern other geographic sources of conflict, focusing on conflict over natural resources such as oil, fresh water, and fish. This topic overlaps somewhat with last week's topic of territorial issues, because some resource-related conflicts involve questions of sovereignty over territory containing the resources in question, but in many other cases (particularly with international rivers and migratory fish stocks) the question is over the usage of

the resource rather than the ownership of specific land. The Klare book examines a number of different conflicts over resources, although not in the most rigorous fashion, and offers a good starting point for this topic. The other readings represent attempts to begin analyzing these types of questions more systematically, although much work remains to be done in these areas.

Unfortunately, this topic has not (yet) received as much serious scholarly attention as the topics we have already examined in this course, so today's discussion will have to be more speculative and focus more on what can/should be done in future work than on what has been done so far. We should discuss each specific resource type discussed by Klare and the other readings, such as oil, fresh water, fish, and valuable minerals, as well as any additional resources that might be appropriate for future research. Are the authors' theoretical arguments convincing? Are the examples convincing, or to the extent that more systematic evidence has been brought to bear, the relevant findings? Is this topic conceptually distinct from work on territory and conflict, or is it best incorporated into that (larger) body of research? What could be done to improve this line of research in the future?

- Klare: all
- Paul R. Hensel, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers II, and Clayton L. Thyne (2006). "Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues." Submitted to *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (November 2006).
- Aaron Wolf (1998). "Conflict and Cooperation along International Waterways." *Water Policy* 1, 2: 251-265.
- Paul R. Hensel, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Thomas E. Sowers II (2006). "Conflict Management of Riparian Disputes: A Regional Comparison of Dispute Resolution." *Political Geography* 25, 4 (May 2006): 383-411.
- Nils Petter Gleditsch, Kathryn Furlong, Håvard Hegre, Bethany Lacina, and Taylor Owen (2006). "Conflicts over shared rivers: Resource scarcity or fuzzy boundaries?" *Political Geography* 25, 4 (May): 361-382.
- Jennifer Bailey (1996). "Hot Fish and Bargaining Chips." *Journal of Peace Research* 33: 257-262.

Additional Readings (General):

- A rapidly expanding literature has begun to examine geography or resources as factors contributing to internal conflict or civil wars. See recent articles by Nils Petter Gleditsch, Scott Gates, Halvard Buhaug, and Paul Collier, among others.
- Lester R. Brown (annual). *The State of the World*. New York: Norton.
- Nazli Choucri and Robert C. North (1975). *Nations in Conflict*. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Nazli Choucri and Robert North (1989). "Lateral Pressure and International Relations: Concept and Theory." In Manus Midlarsky, ed., *Handbook of War Studies*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 289-326.
- Susan L. Cutter (1994). "Exploiting, Conserving, and Preserving Natural Resources." In George J. Demko and William B. Wood, *Reordering the World: Geopolitical Perspectives on the 21st Century*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, pp. 123-140.
- Paul F. Diehl and Nils Petter Gleditsch, ed. (2001). *Environmental Conflict*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Jaroslav Tir and Paul F. Diehl (1998). "Demographic Pressure and Interstate Conflict: Linking

Population Growth and Density to Militarized Disputes and Wars, 1930-89." *Journal of Peace Research* 35, 3: 319-339.

- Nils Petter Gleditsch, ed. (1997). *Conflict and the Environment*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- Paul R. Hensel, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Thomas E. Sowers II (2002). "Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, River, and Maritime Issues in the Western Hemisphere." Manuscript, Florida State University.
- Thomas Homer-Dixon (1991). "On the Threshold: Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict." *International Security* 16, 2 (Fall 1991): 76-116.
- Thomas Homer-Dixon (1994). "Environmental Scarcity and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases." *International Security* 19: 5-40.
- Thomas Homer-Dixon and Jessica Blitt, eds. (1998). *Ecoviolence: Links among Environment, Population, and Security*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Jessica Tuchman Matthews (1989). "The Environment and International Security." *Foreign Affairs* 68, 2.
- World Resources Institute (biannual). *World Resources*. New York: Elsevier.
- Gary Zuk (1985). "National Growth and International Conflict: A Reevaluation of Choucri and North's Thesis." *Journal of Politics* 47, 1. (February): 269-281.

Additional Readings (Maritime Issues):

- Juraj Andrassy (1970). *International Law and the Resources of the Sea*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Barry Buzan (1978). *A Sea of Troubles? Sources of Dispute in the New Ocean Regime*. London: International Institute for Strategic Studies.
- Bruce P. Chadwick (1995). "Fisheries, Sovereignties, and Red Herrings." *Journal of International Affairs* 48: 558-584.
- Jonathan I. Charney (1994). "Progress in International Maritime Boundary Delimitation Law." *American Journal of International Law* 88, 2 (April): 227-256.
- Jonathan I. Charney (1994). "Central East Asian Maritime Boundaries and the Law of the Sea." *American Journal of International Law* 89, 4. (October): 724-749.
- Simon Fairlie, Mike Hagler, and Brian O'Riordan (1995). "The Politics of Overfishing." *The Ecologist* 25: 47-73.
- Michael Parfit (1995). "Diminishing Returns: Exploiting the Earth's Bounty." *National Geographic* 188, 5 (November).
- J.R.V. Prescott (2005). *The Maritime Political Boundaries of the World*. Leiden: Nijhoff.
- J. Ashley Roach and Robert W. Smith (1994). *Excessive maritime claims*. Newport, R.I. : Naval War College.

Additional Readings (River Issues):

- *Political Geography* 25, 4 (May 2006): Special Issue on Conflict and Cooperation over International Rivers
- Arun Elhance (1999). *Hydropolitics in the Third World: Conflict and Cooperation in International River Basins*. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press,
- Mark F. Giordano, Meredith A. Giordano, and Aaron T. Wolf (2005). "International Resource Conflict and Mitigation." *Journal of Peace Research* 42, 1: 47-65.
- Peter H. Gleick (1993). "Water and Conflict: Fresh Water Resources and International

Security." *International Security* 18, 1 (Summer): 79-112.

- Peter H. Gleick (biannual). *The World's Water*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Jesse Hamner and Aaron Wolf (1998). "Patterns in International Water Resource Treaties: The Transboundary Freshwater Dispute Database." *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy*, 1997-98 Yearbook.
- Stephen Libiszewski (1999). "International Conflicts over Freshwater Resources." In Mohamed Suliman, ed., *Ecology, Politics, and Violent Conflict*. New York: Zed Books, pp. 115-138.
- Robert Mandel (1992). "Sources of International River Basin Disputes." *Conflict Quarterly* 12, 4 (Fall): 25-56.
- Hans Petter Wollebaek Toset, Nils Petter Gleditsch, and Havard Hegre (2000). "Shared Rivers and Interstate Conflict." *Political Geography* 19: 971-996.
- Peter Wallensteen and Ashok Swain (1997). "International Fresh Water Resources: Conflict or Cooperation?" Part of the Stockholm Environment Institute series *Comprehensive Assessment of the Freshwater Resources of the World*.

5. Wednesday, Feb. 7: Geography as a Regional Setting for Conflict

The final week on geography and conflict focuses on the regional setting as a context for conflict, which draws in some ways from both geography as a facilitating condition for conflict and geography as a source of conflict. This type of approach has a long tradition among both scholars and policy makers, but it has not received a great deal of systematic empirical analysis until recently. Unstead's article is typical of early research on shatterbelts, while Hensel and Diehl attempted to evaluate this research seventy years later. Kacowicz' article involves a more peaceful regional setting, that of "zones of peace," a topic that remains underdeveloped so far both theoretically and empirically (much like the literature on shatterbelts several decades ago). Enterline examines the impact of a state's immediate geographic neighborhood. Finally, Huntington's 1993 article has generated a firestorm of controversy, but it is widely read and influential; Henderson and Tucker and Chiozza are among a number of studies attempting to test its controversial predictions empirically.

Today's meeting should examine each of these lines of research -- shatterbelts, zones of peace, neighborhoods, and civilizational faultlines -- separately as part of an effort to assess this larger approach to conflict. Are the theoretical arguments, and the examples that are used to support them, credible and convincing in a scholarly fashion? Where systematic empirical analyses have been undertaken, have these been appropriate for testing the initial theories, and have their results been convincing? Finally, where (if anywhere) should future research go?

- John F. Unstead (1923). "The Belt of Political Change in Europe." *The Scottish Geographical Magazine* 34: 183-192.
- Paul R. Hensel and Paul F. Diehl (1994). "Testing Empirical Propositions about Shatterbelts." *Political Geography* 13, 1 (January): 33-52.
- Arie Kacowicz (1995). "Explaining Zones of Peace: Democracies as Satisfied Powers?" *Journal of Peace Research* 32, 3 (August): 265-276.
- Andrew J. Enterline (1998). "Regime Changes, Neighborhoods, and Interstate Conflict, 1816-1992." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42, 6. (December): 804-829.
- Samuel Huntington (1993). "The Clash of Civilizations." *Foreign Affairs* 72, 3 (Summer): 22-49

- Errol Henderson and Richard Tucker (2001). "Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 45: 317-338.
- Giacomo Chiozza (2002). "Is There a Clash of Civilizations? Evidence from Patterns of International Conflict Involvement, 1946-97." *Journal of Peace Research* 39/6 (November): 711-734

Additional Readings:

- For earlier work on shatterbelts and related concepts, see the sources cited by Hensel and Diehl.
- Jonathan Fox (2001). "Two Civilizations and Ethnic Conflict: Islam and the West." *Journal of Peace Research* 38, 4: 459-472.
- Ted Robert Gurr (1994). "Peoples against the States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System." *International Studies Quarterly* 38, 2: 347-377.
- Errol A. Henderson (1998). "The Democratic Peace through the Lens of Culture, 1820-1989." *International Studies Quarterly* 42, 4: 461-484.
- Samuel P. Huntington (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster. (there have also been numerous other articles and books responding to Huntington's basic argument, far too many to list here; unfortunately, few of them have attempted any systematic empirical analyses)
- Errol A. Henderson (2004). "Mistaken Identity: Testing the Clash of Civilizations Thesis in Light of Democratic Peace Claims." *British Journal of Political Science* 34: 539-563.
- Arie Kacowicz (1998). *Zones of Peace in the Third World: South America and West Africa in Comparative Perspective*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- David Reilly (2001). "Shatterbelts and Conflict Behavior: The Effect of Globalization on 'At Risk' States." *Geopolitics* 5 (3)
- Philip G. Roeder (2003). "Clash of Civilizations and Escalation of Domestic Ethnopolitical Conflicts." *Comparative Political Studies* 36, 5, 509-540.
- Bruce M. Russett, John R. Oneal, and Michaelene Cox (2000). "Clash of Civilizations, or Realism and Liberalism Deja Vu? Some Evidence." *Journal of Peace Research* 37, 5 (September): 583-608.
- William R. Thompson (1973). "The Regional Subsystem: A Conceptual Explication and a Propositional Inventory." *International Studies Quarterly* 17, 1: 89-117.
- Andrej Tusicisny (2004). "Civilizational Conflicts: More Frequent, Longer, and Bloodier?" *Journal of Peace Research* 41, 4, 485-498.

6. Wednesday, Feb. 14: Geography and Economics I: Development

This week's topic offers the first of two weeks on the economic impact of geographic contexts. In the endless debates among policy makers and academics on how best to develop economically, one important topic has been the relative importance of geographic contexts instead of "culture," leadership, specific policy choices, and many other factors. Perhaps surprisingly, though, this topic has not received a great deal of systematic scholarly attention. The Diamond book has generated a great deal of debate and controversy, while Gallup et al.'s article is one of the first attempts to study this type of question quantitatively, and Hausmann attempts to draw from their article as well as others on the same topic. There has subsequently been a variety of work examining the possibility of a "resource curse" as suggested by Gallup et al.; some of these studies are listed in the Additional Readings section.

Today's meeting should consider the extent to which geography actually seems to affect

patterns of development. Is Diamond's sweeping view of history a convincing explanation for the observed patterns of political and economic development, and why or why not? Could this argument, or portions of it, be tested systematically? How about Gallup et al. or Hausmann -- are their theoretical arguments and (where relevant) empirical evidence convincing? How could this work be improved or extended? It is also worth considering how this topic relates to the work from earlier weeks on the gravity model and the "facilitating" side of geography. (Note that this week's discussion papers are not allowed to focus on Hausmann, because that is primarily a literature review rather than an original scholarly contribution.)

- *Diamond*: all
- John Luke Gallup, Jeffrey D. Sachs, and Andrew D. Mellinger (1999). "Geography and Economic Development." *International Regional Science Review* 22,2 (August): 179-232.
- Ricardo Hausmann (2001). "Prisoners of Geography." *Foreign Policy* (January/February 2001): 45-53.

Additional Readings:

- The special issue of *International Regional Science Review* (August 1999) in which Gallup and Sachs' article appears includes a variety of other work on the same topic, including an article by Paul Krugman and responses to Krugman's and Gallup / Sachs' articles.
- David E. Bloom and Jeffrey D. Sachs (1999). "Geography, Demography, and Economic Growth in Africa." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, volume 1.
- Jared Diamond (1998). "The Evolution of Guns and Germs." In A. C. Fabian, ed., *Evolution: Society, Science, and the Universe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 46-63.
- Brian Fagan (1999). *Floods, Famines, and Emperors: El Niño and the Fate of Civilizations*. New York: Perseus Books.
- David S. Landes (1999). *The Wealth and Poverty of Nations: Why Some Are So Rich And Some So Poor*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- E. L. Jones (1987). *The European Miracle: Environments, Economies, and Geopolitics in the History of Europe and Asia*, 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paul Knox and John Agnew (1989). *The Geography of the World Economy*, second edition. New York: Edward Arnold (as well as any subsequent editions).
- William H. McNeill (1998). *Plagues and Peoples*, updated edition. New York: Anchor Press.
- Halvor Mehlum, Karl Moene, and Ragnar Torvik (2006). "Institutions and the Resource Curse." *Economic Journal* 116, 508 (January): 1-20.
- Andrew D. Mellinger, Jeffrey D. Sachs, and John L. Gallup (2000). "Climate, Coastal Proximity, and Development." In Gordon L. Clark, Maryann P. Feldman, and Meric S. Gertler, eds., *Oxford Handbook of Economic Geography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 169-194.
- Manus I. Midlarsky (1995). "Environmental Influences on Democracy: Aridity, Warfare, and a Reversal of the Causal Arrow." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39, 2 (June): 224-262.
- Jeffrey Sachs, Andrew Mellinger, and John Gallup (2001). "The Geography of Poverty and Wealth." *Scientific American* (March): 71-75.
- Jeffrey Sachs and Andrew Warner (2001). "The curse of natural resources." *European Economic Review* 45, 4 (May 2001): 827-838.

7. Wednesday, Feb. 21: Geography and Economics II: Regionalism

The second economic topic involves regional effects, rather than state-level questions of

development of dyadic-level questions of trade patterns (although that work, such as the gravity model and other work from the "facilitating" side of geography, is clearly relevant here). Mattli's book addresses the logic behind regional economic integration, as well as examining some cases where integration has been attempted. Eichengreen/Frankel, Mansfield/Bronson, and Mansfield/Pevehouse are three examples of a growth industry in research on the impact of integration. Mansfield and Milner attempt to summarize and integrate this burgeoning literature.

Today's meeting should address the reasons for integration, its potential benefits and drawbacks, and the extent to which these benefits and drawbacks seem to be experienced in the real world. For example, how convincing is Mattli's discussion of the (political and economic) logic behind integration? Furthermore, drawing from Mattli's case studies or the articles' analyses, how effective has integration been so far? Have the justifications given for integration been supported, do the drawbacks seem to have outweighed the benefits in practice, and have there been any additional impacts that were not anticipated? Is integration a universal solution, or does it seem likely to be successful only in certain conditions?

• Mattli: all

- Edward D. Mansfield and Helen Milner (1999). "The New Wave of Regionalism." *International Organization* 53, 3 (Summer): 589-626.
- Barry Eichengreen and Jeffrey Frankel (1995). "Economic Regionalism: Evidence from Two 20th Century Episodes." *North American Journal of Economics and Finance* 6, 2 (Fall): 89-106.
- Edward D. Mansfield and Rachel Bronson (1997). "Alliances, Preferential Trading Arrangements, and International Trade." *American Political Science Review* 91, 1 (March): 94-107.
- Edward D. Mansfield & Jon C. Pevehouse (2000). "Trade Blocs, Trade Flows, and International Conflicts." *International Organization* 54, 4: 775-808.

Additional Readings:

- Richard E. Baldwin (1997). "The Causes of Regionalism." *World Economy* 20, 7 (November): 865-888.
- Tamim Bayoumi and Barry Eichengreen (1998). "Is Regionalism Simply a Diversion? Evidence From the Evolution of the EC and EFTA." In Takatoshi Ito and Anne Krueger (eds.), *Regionalism versus Multilateral Trade Arrangements*, University of Chicago Press, pp. ??-??.
- Jagdish Bhagwati, Pravin Krishna, and Arvind Panagariya (1997). *Trading Blocs: Alternative Approaches to Analyzing Preferential Trade Agreements*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jagdish Bhagwati, David Greenaway, and Arvind Panagariya (1998). "Trading Preferentially: Theory and Policy." *Economic Journal* 148, 449 (July): 1128-1148.
- Kerry A. Chase (2003). "Economic Interests and Regional Trading Arrangements: The Case of NAFTA." *International Organization* 57 (Winter): 137-174.
- Louise Fawcett and Andrew Hurrell, eds. (1995). *Regionalism in World Politics: Regional Organization and International Order*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Louise Fawcett (2004). "Exploring Regional Domains: A Comparative History of Regionalism." *International Affairs* 80, 3: 429-46
- Jeffrey A. Frankel, Ernesto Stein, Shang-Jin Wei (1997). *Regional Trading Blocs in the World Economic System*. Institute for International Economics.
- Andrew Gamble and Anthony Payne, eds. (1996). *Regionalism and World Order*. New York:

St. Martin's Press.

- John F. Helliwell (1998). *How Much Do National Borders Matter?* Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Miles Kahler (1995). *International Institutions and the Political Economy of Integration*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Paul Krugman (1991). *Geography and Trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Paul Krugman (1999). *Development, Geography, and Economic Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Edward D. Mansfield (1998). "The Proliferation of Preferential Trading Arrangements," *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42, 5 (October): 523-543.
- Edward D. Mansfield and Eric Reinhardt (2003). "Multilateral Determinants of Regionalism: The Effects of GATT/WTO on the Formation of Preferential Trading Arrangements." *International Organization* 57, 4 (Fall): 829-862
- Edward D. Mansfield and Helen Milner (1997). *The Political Economy of Regionalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Edward D. Mansfield, Helen V. Milner, and B. Peter Rosendorff (2002). "Why Democracies Cooperate More: Electoral Control and International Trade Agreements." *International Organization* 56 (Summer): 477 – 513.
- Walter Mattli (1999). "Explaining Regional Integration Outcomes." *Journal of European Public Policy* 6, 1 (March): 1-27.
- Andrew Moravcsik (1998). *The Choice for Europe*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Kenichi Ohmae (1995). *The End of the Nation State: The Rise of Regional Economies*. New York: Free Press. (and other works on the same topic by Ohmae)
- Maurice Schiff and L. Alan Winters (2003). *Regional Integration and Development*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank Publications.
- Fredrik Soderbaum and Timothy M. Shaw, eds. (2003). *Theories of New Regionalism: A Palgrave Reader*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Etel Solingen (1998). *Regional Orders at Century's Dawn*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- John Whalley (1998). "Why Do Countries Seek Regional Trade Agreements?" In Jeffrey A. Frankel, ed., *The Regionalization of the World Economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 63-83.
- World Bank (2000). *Trade Blocs*. World Bank Policy Research Report.

II. Historical Contexts and International Relations

8. Wednesday, Feb. 28: History as a Context / Learning from History

The rest of the course will examine historical contexts in international relations. We will begin this section of the course by considering what history is, along with its potential benefits (for scholars as well as policymakers) and its potential pitfalls. Michael Howard and Eric Hobsbawm, two of the more eminent historians of the past century, address many of these issues in the beginning chapters of much larger books on the topic. Jervis' chapter on learning by decision-makers is still a classic more than a quarter-century later, while Vertzberger and Reiter offer more recent studies on similar topics. Finally, Levy discusses a number of central issues in studying learning systematically.

An initial reaction to Howard or Hobsbawm might be that they are historians, not political scientists -- and certainly not quantitative scholars of international relations -- so their

work is of little relevance for this course. This view is far from the truth, though, and we could learn a lot from historians. For one thing, many of the theories that we will be examining over the rest of this course explicitly rest upon historical factors, making an understanding of history vital to the development and assessment of such theories. Most of the data sets that we use (and that will be collected for future use) must be constructed from historical records and other historical sources. Furthermore, while we may use different methodologies, both historians and political scientists are often concerned with questions of causal connections and with the explanation of events or patterns.

Our discussion this week should consider the general points that are raised by Howard and Hobsbawm, as well as the more specific points raised by the political scientists. For example, we should discuss the problems faced by scholars as well as leaders in identifying and interpreting history -- is there a single objective "history" or "historical lesson" that can be agreed, or is each observer doomed to his/her own subjective interpretation? Do personal biases and goals interfere with the analysis of history -- and should they? What are some obstacles in leaders' attempts to learn from history, and (how?) can they be addressed? What are some obstacles in scholars' attempts to learn from history, and (how?) can they be addressed? This should not be taken as a complete list of topics to be discussed, of course; feel free to raise any other questions or issues that arise from your reading of these sources.

- Michael Howard (1994). *The Lessons of History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 6-20 (chapter 1: "The Lessons of History").
- Eric Hobsbawm (1997). *On History*. New York: The New Press, pp. 1-9 (chapter 1: "Outside and Inside History").
- Robert Jervis (1976). *Perception and Misperception in International Relations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, chapter 6 ("How Decision-Makers Learn from History.").
- Yaacov Y. I Vertzberger (1986). "Foreign Policy Decisionmakers as Practical-Intuitive Historians: Applied History and Its Shortcomings." *International Studies Quarterly* 30: 223-247.
- Dan Reiter (1995). "Political Structure and Foreign Policy Learning: Are Democracies more Likely to Act on the Lessons of History?" *International Interactions* 21, 1: 39-62.
- Jack S. Levy (1994). "Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield." *International Organization* 48, 2: 279-312.

Additional Readings:

- Lloyd Etheredge (1985). *Can Governments Learn? American Foreign Policy and Central American Revolutions*. Elmsford, NY: Pergamon Press.
- Karl-Georg Faber (1978). "The Use of History in Political Debate." *History and Theory* 17, 4: 36-67.
- David Hackett Fischer (1970). *Historians' Fallacies: Toward a Logic of Historical Thought*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Glenn P. Hastedt (1988). "Learning from the Past." In Hastedt, *American Foreign Policy: Past, Present, Future*, 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, pp. 37-68.
- Eric Hobsbawm (1997). *On History*. New York: The New Press.
- Ole R. Holsti and James N. Rosenau (1980). "Does Where You Stand Depend on When You Were Born? The Impact of Generation on Post-Vietnam Foreign Policy Beliefs." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 44: 1-22.

- Michael Howard (1984). "The Use and Abuse of Military History." In Howard, *The Causes of Wars*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1984.
- Yuen Foonh Khong (1992). *Analogies at War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May (1986). *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dan Reiter (1996). *Crucible of Beliefs : Learning, Alliances, and World Wars*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Barbara Tuchman (1982). *Practicing History*. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Yaacov Y. I Vertzberger (1990). *The World in Their Minds*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

9. Wednesday, March 7: No Class (Spring Break)

10. Wednesday, March 14: The Impact of Crises and Wars

This week we will begin attempting to apply the general understanding of history as discussed last time, by examining historically-oriented theories in international relations. The first set of theories to be addressed involves the wide-ranging impact of crises and wars. Leng, Fortna, and Werner and Yuen analyze the impact of militarized disputes, crises, or wars, which might depend on details of the adversaries, the conflict itself, or the way it was settled. Levy & Morgan and Pickering examine the often-asserted but rarely tested "war weariness" phenomenon. Finally, Bueno de Mesquita and Siverson examine the impact of war on political leaders' survival in office.

Today's meeting should consider each of the empirical readings both on its own merits and as a piece in the larger puzzle of the effects of past crises or wars. Are the author's hypotheses credible? Are the research designs appropriate, and the results convincing? What more could be done to improve this particular piece, or to extend beyond it in future research? Alternatively, are there any worthwhile topics related to the impact of crises and wars that are not addressed systematically in these readings, and how could/should these be studied?

- Russell J. Leng (1983). "When Will They Ever Learn? Coercive Bargaining in Recurrent Crises." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 27, 3 (September): 379-419.
- Virginia Page Fortna (2003). "Inside and Out: Peacekeeping and the Duration of Peace after Civil and Interstate Wars." *International Studies Review* 5, 4: 97-.
- Suzanne Werner and Amy Yuen (2005). "Making and Keeping Peace." *International Organization* 59: 261-292.
- Jack S. Levy and T. Clifton Morgan (1986). "The War-Weariness Hypothesis: An Empirical Test." *American Journal of Political Science* 30, 1: 26-49.
- Pickering, Jeffrey (2002). "War-Weariness and Cumulative Effects: Victors, Vanquished, and Subsequent Interstate Intervention." *Journal of Peace Research* 39/3 (May): 313-337
- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Randolph M. Siverson (1995). "War and the Survival of Political Leaders: A Comparative Study of Regime Types and Political Accountability." *American Political Science Review* 89, 4: 841-855.

Additional Readings:

- Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, Randolph M. Siverson, and Gary Woller (1992). "War and the Fate of Regimes." *American Political Science Review* 86, 3 (September): 635-646.

- Cynthia A. Cannizzo (1980). "The Costs of Combat: Death, Duration and Defeat." In J. David Singer, ed., *The Correlates of War II*. New York: Free Press, pp. 233-57
- Paul F. Diehl, Jennifer Reifschneider, and Paul Hensel (1996). "United Nations Intervention and Recurring Conflict." *International Organization* 50: 683-700.
- Virginia Page Fortna (2004). *Peace Time: Cease-Fire Agreements and the Durability of Peace*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Virginia Page Fortna (2004). "Interstate Peacekeeping: Causal Mechanisms and Empirical Effects." *World Politics* 56, 4 (July).
- Virginia Page Fortna (2004). "Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War." *International Studies Quarterly* 48, 2 (June): 269-92.
- Virginia Page Fortna (2003). "Scraps of Paper? Agreements and the Durability of Peace." *International Organization* 57, 2 (Spring): 337-72.
- David Garnham (1986). "War-proneness, War-Weariness and Regime Type, 1816-1980." *Journal of Peace Research* 23, 3: 279-285.
- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1990). "Territorial Changes and Recurring Conflict." In Charles S. Gochman and Alan N. Sabrosky (eds.), *Prisoners of War? Nation-States in the Modern Era*. Lexington: D.C. Heath.
- Gary Goertz, Bradford Jones, and Paul F. Diehl (2005). "Maintenance Processes in International Rivalries." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 49, No. 5, 742-769
- Joseph Grieco (2001). "Repetitive Military Challenges and Recurrent International Conflicts, 1918-1994." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 2: 295-316.
- Paul R. Hensel (1994). "One Thing Leads to Another: Recurrent Militarized Disputes in Latin America, 1816-1986." *Journal of Peace Research* 31, 3 (August): 281-298.
- Richard Ned Lebow (1981). *Between Peace and War*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, chapter 9 ("Crisis as a Learning Experience").
- Russell J. Leng (2000). *Bargaining and Learning in Recurrent Crises: The Soviet-American, Egyptian-Israeli, and Indo-Pakistani Rivalries*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Zeev Maoz (1984). "Peace by Empire? Conflict Outcomes and International Stability, 1816-1976." *Journal of Peace Research* 21, 3: 227-241.
- T. Clifton Morgan and Jack S. Levy (1990). "Base Stealers versus Power Hitters: A Nation-State Level Analysis of the Frequency and Seriousness of War." In Charles S. Gochman and Alan Ned Sabrosky (eds.), *Prisoners of War? Nation-States in the Modern Era*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, pp. 43-56.
- A. F. K. Organski and Jacek Kugler (1977). "The Costs of Major Wars: The Phoenix Factor." *American Political Science Review* (December): 71, 4.
- Karen Rasler and William R. Thompson (1988). "War and the Economic Growth of Major Powers." *American Journal of Political Science* 513-538.
- Karen Rasler and William R. Thompson (1989). *War and State Making: The Shaping of the Global Powers*. Boston: Unwin-Hyman, 1989.
- Paul D. Senese and Stephen L. Quackenbush (2003). "Sowing the Seeds of Conflict: The Effect of Dispute Settlements on Durations of Peace." *Journal of Politics* 65, 3: 696-.
- Arthur A. Stein and Bruce Russett (1980). "Evaluating War: Outcomes and Consequences." In T. R. Gurr, ed., *Handbook of Political Conflict*. New York: Free Press, pp. 399-422.
- Richard J. Stoll (1984). "From Fire to Frying Pan: The Impact of Major-Power War Involvement on Major-Power Dispute Involvement, 1816-1975." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 7, 2: 71-82.

- William R. Thompson (1994). "The Consequences of War." *International Interactions* 19, 1-2: 125-147
- Dirk Van Raemdonck and Paul F. Diehl (1989). "After the Shooting Stops: Insights on Postwar Economic Growth." *Journal of Peace Research* 26, 3: 249-264.
- Suzanne Werner (1999). "The Precarious Nature of Peace: Resolving the Issues, Enforcing the Settlement, and Renegotiating the Terms." *American Journal of Political Science* 43, 3: 912-934.

11. Wednesday, March 21: Interstate Rivalry I: Measuring Long-Term Relationships

The topic of rivalry -- sometimes called "enduring rivalry" or "interstate rivalry" -- has received a great deal of attention in the past decade, and will receive two weeks of coverage in this course. The first week focuses on the variety of definitions and theoretical approaches that have been proposed so far, while next week will emphasize empirical findings on the dynamics of rivalry. Goertz and Diehl have been the most prominent scholars of rivalry, with a large number of articles and several books; their definition and data set have gotten the most use so far. Their theoretical approach (the "basic rivalry level" or "punctuated equilibrium" model) has spawned several challengers, such as Hensel's "evolutionary" conception of the beginnings of rivalry and Bennett's work on rivalry termination. Thompson has proposed a different conceptualization of rivalry based on the perceptions of leaders rather than on observable armed conflict data, while Crescenzi and Enterline suggest a more dynamic model of interstate relations that does not rely so much on thresholds or categories. More controversially, Gartzke and Simon have suggested that the entire rivalry literature may be based on a statistical artifact, and proposed a stochastic model that they claim can account for the same observed "rivalry" processes.

Today's meeting should focus primarily on the apparent importance of the rivalry concept in general, the different conceptualizations and measures of rivalry addressed in these readings, and the authors' different theoretical arguments about rivalry. For example, does Goertz and Diehl's measure -- the dominant measure in the study of rivalry so far -- seem appropriate, and how does it compare to Hensel's more evolutionary conception of conflict/rivalry processes or Bennett's measurement of termination? What about Thompson's more perceptual conception and Crescenzi and Enterline's more dynamic approach? What might be the relative advantages and disadvantages of each approach, and for which purposes might it be most useful? We will also need to evaluate Gartzke and Simon's potentially fatal critique. Does their argument appear to be correct, and if so, which approach(es) to rivalry appear to suffer the most? How might their critique of the rivalry literature be examined empirically, beyond the simulation that they run in their article?

- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1992). "The Empirical Importance of Enduring Rivalries." *International Interactions*, 18(2): 151-163.
- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1993). "Enduring Rivalries: Theoretical Constructs and Empirical Patterns." *International Studies Quarterly*, 37(2): 147-171.
- Paul R. Hensel (1999). "An Evolutionary Approach to the Study of Interstate Rivalry." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 17, 2 (Fall): 179-206.
- D. Scott Bennett (1997). "Measuring Rivalry Termination, 1816-1992." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41, 2: 227-254.
- William R. Thompson (2001). "Identifying Rivals and Rivalries in World Politics." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 4: 557-586.

- Mark J. C. Crescenzi and Andrew J. Enterline (2001). "Time Remembered: A Dynamic Model of Interstate Interaction." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 3: 409-431.
- Erik Gartzke and Michael Simon (1999). "'Hot Hand': A Critical Analysis of Enduring Rivalries." *Journal of Politics* 61, 3 (August): 777-798.

Additional Readings:

- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (2000). "(Enduring) Rivalries." In Manus I. Midlarsky, ed., *Handbook of War Studies II*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, pp. 222-267.
- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (2000). "Rivalries: The Conflict Process." In John A. Vasquez, ed., *What Do We Know about War?* Boulder, CO: Rowman and Littlefield, pp. 197-217.
- Paul R. Hensel (1997). "Interstate Rivalry and the Study of Militarized Conflict." In Frank Harvey and Ben D. Mor, eds., *Conflict in World Politics: Advances in the Study of Crisis, War and Peace*. New York: St. Martin's Press [for International Political Science Association], 1998, pp. 162-204.
- William R. Thompson (1994). "Principal Rivalries." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 39: 195-223.

12. Wednesday, March 28: Interstate Rivalry II: Studying Rivalry Dynamics

This topic follows up on the more conceptual coverage of rivalry from last week by examining research on the dynamics of rivalries -- i.e., what makes them start, continue, and end? Goertz and Diehl's political shocks article offered one incomplete but powerful insight into the origins and management of rivalries. Hensel's article offers a different take on the origins of rivalry, while Bennett's article offers a different take on the termination of rivalries. Rasler and Thompson, as well as Lemke and Reed, consider which rivalries escalate to war at least once, while Greig examines conflict management within ongoing rivalries.

Today's meeting should consider each reading both on its own merits (i.e., in terms of theory, research design, and empirical analyses) and in relation to the conceptual issues addressed last week. For example, which approach to rivalry (if any) is best supported -- or called into question -- by the results? Are any of these studies' results compatible with Gartzke and Simon's critique, or do any of them cast doubt on that critique? Furthermore, how could the study of rivalry's origins, continuation, or ending be improved further?

- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1995). "The Initiation and Termination of Enduring Rivalries: The Impact of Political Shocks." *American Journal of Political Science* 39, 1: 30-52.
- Paul R. Hensel (2001). "Evolution in Domestic Politics and the Development of Rivalry: The Bolivia-Paraguay Case." In William R. Thompson, ed., *Evolutionary Interpretations of World Politics*. New York: Routledge, pp. 176-217.
- D. Scott Bennett (1998). "Integrating and Testing Models of Rivalry Termination." *American Journal of Political Science* 42: 1200-1232.
- Karen Rasler and William R. Thompson (2000). "Explaining Rivalry Escalation to War: Space, Position, and Contiguity in the Major Power Subsystem." *International Studies Quarterly* 44, 3: 503-530.
- Douglas Lemke and William Reed (2001). "War and Rivalry among Great Powers." *American Journal of Political Science* 45/2 (April): 457-469
- J. Michael Greig (2001). "Moments of Opportunity: Recognizing Conditions of Ripeness for International Mediation between Enduring Rivals." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45, 6:

December 2001.

Additional Readings:

- Pelle Andersen, Justin Baumgardner, J. Michael Greig, and Paul F. Diehl (2001). "Turning Down the Heat: Influences on Conflict Management in Enduring Rivalries." *International Interactions* 27, 3: 239-274.
- Tony Armstrong (1993). *Breaking the Ice: Rapprochement between East and West Germany, the United States and China, and Israel and Egypt*. Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, chapter 5 ("Principles of Icebreaking").
- D. Scott Bennett (1996). "Security, Bargaining, and the End of Interstate Rivalry." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, 2: 157-183.
- D. Scott Bennett 1997. "Democracy, Regime Change, and Rivalry Termination." *International Interactions*, 22(4): 369-397.
- Jacob Bercovitch and Paul F. Diehl. 1997. "Conflict Management of Enduring Rivalries: The Frequency, Timing, and Short-term Impact of Mediation." *International Interactions* 22 (4): 299-320.
- Michael Colaresi and William R. Thompson (2002). "Strategic Rivalries, Protracted Conflict, and Crisis Escalation." *Journal of Peace Research* 39/3 (May): 263-287.
- Michael Colaresi and William R. Thompson (2002). "Hot Spots or Hot Hands? Serial Crisis Behavior, Escalating Risks, and Rivalry." *Journal of Politics* 64, 4 (November): 1175-1198.
- Derek D. F. Cornwell and Michael P. Colaresi (2002). "Holy Trinities, Rivalry Termination, and Conflict." *International Interactions* 28, 4 (October-December).
- Paul F. Diehl, ed. (1996). *The Dynamics of Enduring Rivalries*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Paul F. Diehl and Gary Goertz (2000). *War and Peace in International Rivalry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Goertz, Gary and Patrick M. Regan. 1997. "Conflict Management and Enduring Rivalries." *International Interactions*, 22(4): 321-330.
- Paul R. Hensel, Gary Goertz, and Paul F. Diehl (2000). "The Democratic Peace and Rivalries." *Journal of Politics* 62, 4 (November): 1173-1188.
- Paul K. Huth and Bruce Russett (1993). "General Deterrence between Enduring Rivals: Testing Three Competing Models." *American Political Science Review* 87, 1: 61-73.
- Robert E. Kuenne (1989). "Conflict Management in Mature Rivalry." *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 33: 554-566.
- Zeev Maoz and Ben D. Mor (1996). "Enduring Rivalries: The Early Years." *International Political Science Review* 17, 2: 141-160.
- Zeev Maoz and Ben D. Mor (2002). *Bound by Struggle: The Strategic Evolution of Enduring International Rivalries*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Michael Dean McGinnis and John T. Williams (2001). *Compound Dilemmas: Democracy, Collective Action, and Superpower Rivalry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ben D. Mor (1997). "Peace Initiatives and Public Opinion: The Domestic Context of Conflict Resolution." *Journal of Peace Research* 34, 2: 197-216.
- Karen Rasler and William R. Thompson (2001). "Rivalries and the Democratic Peace in the Major Power Subsystem." *Journal of Peace Research* 38/6 (November): 659-683
- William R. Thompson, ed. (1998). *Great Power Rivalries*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

- William R. Thompson (2003). "A Street Car Named Sarajevo: Catalysts, Multiple Causation Chains, and Rivalry Structures." *International Studies Quarterly* 47/3 (September): 453-474.
- John A. Vasquez (1993). *The War Puzzle*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- John A. Vasquez (1996). "Distinguishing Rivals That Go to War from Those That Do Not: A Quantitative Comparative Case Study of the Two Paths to War." *International Studies Quarterly* 40: 531-558.

13. Wednesday, April 4: The Legacy of Colonialism

For many states in today's developing world, the most important historical context is the legacy of colonial rule. Most of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East was ruled by foreign powers for decades or centuries, and has experienced relatively short periods of independence since the end of colonialism. These readings examine the impact of colonial rule on the newly independent states' economic, political, and military prospects. Topics addressed include post-independence economic relations with the former colonizer (Athow and Blanton), economic development (Acemoglu et al.), foreign aid (Alesina and Dollar), political stability (Blanton et al. and Bernhard et al.), and territorial claims (Hensel et al.).

Today's meeting should consider these very different readings as a group, as well as individually. For example, what is it about colonialism that seems likely to affect the future -- do all colonial legacies work the same, or are there important differences? Are all colonial legacies negative, or can some have a positive impact? Is there any way that the former colonies can adapt or overcome these legacies, or are they all doomed to the same fate?

- Brian Athow and Robert Blanton (2002). "Colonial Style and Colonial Legacies: Trade Patterns in French and British Africa." *Journal of Third World Studies* 19, 1 (Spring): 219-243.
- Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson (2002). "Reversal of Fortune: Geography and Institutions in the Making of the Modern World Income Distribution." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117, 4 (November): 1231-1294.
- Alberto Alesina and David Dollar (2000). "Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?." *Journal of Economic Growth* 5, 1 (March): 33-63.
- Robert Blanton, T. David Mason, and Brian Athow (2001). "Colonial Style and Post-Colonial Ethnic Conflict in Africa." *Journal of Peace Research* 38, 4 (July): 219-243.
- Michael Bernhard, Christopher Reenock, and Timothy Nordstrom (2004). "The Legacy of Western Colonialism on Democratic Survival." *International Studies Quarterly* 48, 1 (March): 225-250.
- Paul R. Hensel, Michael Allison, and Ahmed Khanani (2007). "The Colonial Legacy and Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-2001." Revised version of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Studies Association, Montreal, March 2004, and the Annual Meeting of the Peace Science Society (International), Ann Arbor, Michigan, November 2003. *(Note that this paper is currently under revision, and an updated version will be made available as the assigned week approaches.)*

Additional Readings (colonial legacies):

- Daron Acemoglu, Simon Johnson, and James A. Robinson (2001). "The Colonial Origins of Comparative Development: An Empirical Investigation." *American Economic Review* 91, 5: 1369-96.
- J. Barron Boyd, Jr. (1979). "African Boundary Conflict: An Empirical Study." *African Studies*

Review 22, 3 (December): 1-14.

- Paul Cammack, David Pool, and William Tordoff (1993). *Third World Politics: A Comparative Introduction*, 2nd edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 15-55. (chapter 1: "The Heritage of the Past")
- Stanley L. Engerman and Kenneth M. Sokoloff (2002). "Factor Endowments, Inequality, and Paths of Development among New World Economies." *Economia* 3, 1: 41-109.
- Robin M. Grier (1999). "Colonial Legacies and Economic Growth." *Public Choice* 98 3-4 (March): 317-335.
- Paul Knox and John Agnew (1994). *The Geography of the World Economy: An Introduction to Economic Geography*. London: Edward Arnold, pp. 269-303. (chapter 9, "The Dynamics of Interdependence: Transformation of the Periphery")
- Steven R. Ratner (1996). "Drawing a Better Line: *Uti Possidetis* and the Borders of New States." *American Journal of International Law* 90, 4 (October): 590-624.
- Kenneth M. Sokoloff and Stanley L. Engerman (2000). "History Lessons: Institutions, Factor Endowments, and Paths of Development in the New World." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14, 3 (Summer): 217-232.
- Saadia Touval (1967). "The Organization of African Unity and African Borders." *International Organization* 21, 1 (Winter): 102-127.

Additional Readings (history and economics):

- Ha-Joon Chang (2002). *Kicking away the Ladder: Development Strategy in Historical Perspective*. London: Anthem Press.
- Daniel Chirot, ed. (1989). *The Origins of Backwardness in Eastern Europe*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barry Eichengreen and Douglas A. Irwin (1998). "The Role of History in Bilateral Trade Flows." In Jeffrey Frankel, ed., *The Regionalization of the World Economy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Alexander Gerschenkron (1962). *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

14. Wednesday, April 11: Evolving Historical Norms

Another factor related to historical contexts is the evolution of historical norms in the international system. Almost by definition, norms vary in strength over time, as more countries decide whether or not to accept the norm and whether or not to follow it in practice; the strength of the norm at any given point in time can thus be thought of as part of that time's historical context. A variety of literature in the past two decades has discussed norms, but the empirical analysis of norms has been plagued by serious difficulties. Axelrod, Goertz / Diehl, and Finnemore / Sikkink have all attempted to address these issues, whether attempting to specify how norms are created and evolve over time, or attempting to improve the empirical testing of hypotheses related to norms. Norms have been receiving a much greater amount of scholarly attention since the emergence of the democratic peace research agenda, as scholars have argued that democracies share certain norms that help to account for the democratic peace; recent articles by Dixon and by Mitchell (among others) examine these supposed democratic norms, and Zacher examines another supposed norm regarding territorial integrity in IR.

Today's meeting should begin with the basic idea of what norms are, how they begin / evolve / end, and how they can be studied. Most of the time, though, should be spent analyzing

the various attempts to examine norms empirically -- ranging from Goertz and Diehl's work on the decolonization norm to Dixon's, Mitchell's, and Zacher's recent analyses. Is the author's description of the norm reasonable? Is the empirical analysis appropriate, and the conclusion convincing? How could the work be improved? Finally, beyond these existing attempts to study norms, we should also be prepared to discuss other norms that might usefully be studied.

- Robert Axelrod (1986). "An Evolutionary Approach to Norms." *American Political Science Review* 80: 1095-1111.
- Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1992). "Toward a Theory of International Norms: Some Conceptual and Measurement Issues." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36, 4: 635-664.
- Martha Finnemore and Kathryn Sikkink (1998). "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, 4 (Autumn): 887-917.
- William J. Dixon (1994). "Democracy and the Peaceful Settlement of International Conflict." *American Political Science Review* 88, 1 (March): 14-32.
- Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (2002). "A Kantian System? Democracy and Third Party Conflict Resolution." *American Journal of Political Science*, 46(4): 749-759.
- Mark W. Zacher (2001). "The Territorial Integrity Norm: International Boundaries and the Use of Force." *International Organization* 55, 2 (Spring): 215-250.

Additional Readings:

- William J. Dixon (1993). "Democracy and the Management of International Conflict." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37: 42-68.
- Ann Florini (1996). "The Evolution of International Norms." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, 3: 363-389.
- Christopher Gelpi (1997). "Crime and Punishment: The Role of Norms in Crisis Bargaining." *American Political Science Review* 91, 2 (June): 339-360.
- Gary Goertz (1994). *Contexts of International Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Charles W. Kegley, Jr., and Gregory A. Raymond (1990). *When Trust Breaks Down : Alliance Norms and World Politics*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.
- Zeev Maoz and Bruce Russett. "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986." *American Political Science Review* 87, 3. (September): 624-638.
- John Mueller (1989). *Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War*. New York: Basic Books.
- John R. Oneal, Frances H. Oneal, Zeev Maoz, and Bruce Russett (1996). "The Liberal Peace: Interdependence, Democracy, and International Conflict, 1950-85." *Journal of Peace Research* 33, 1 (February): 11-28.
- James Lee Ray (1989). "The Abolition of Slavery and the End of International War." *International Organization* 43 (Summer): 405-439.
- Gregory A. Raymond (1994). "Democracies, Disputes, and Third-Party Intermediaries." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38, 1. (March): 24-42.

15. Wednesday, April 18: Paper Presentations

The final class meeting is devoted to the presentation of each student's original research paper. As such, this is basically an opportunity to conclude the course with a week on "contextual effects not covered in the syllabus" or "other contextual topics that really interest the

students in this course," rather than a week to read and discuss yet another set of already-published work. I will also hand out the take-home final exam at this last class meeting; it will be due at the scheduled exam time for this course.

Thursday, April 26: TAKE-HOME FINAL EXAM DUE (at my office, by Noon)