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 UNT's Geography and History departments, 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 most of UNT's Political Science department, this course will focus on the development and 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 who have the necessary background. 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 two books being required. The following books should be available at any of the campus bookstores, and will probably be cheaper from any online bookstore (such as amazon.com, barnesandnoble.com, half.com, or powells.com). Where possible, feel free to order the paperback rather than hardcover edition or to order a used rather than new copy if desired.


Most of the other readings are available through JSTOR (https://libproxy.library.unt.edu/login?url=http://www.jstor.org/search) or UNT's other e-journal subscriptions (http://iii.library.unt.edu/search/y#ejournals); the ones that are not will be made available on the Blackboard page for this course.
Course Requirements

(1) Attendance and Participation (20% 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 (20% of course grade)
Beyond regular class attendance and active participation in class discussion, each student is expected to make approximately 4-6 presentations to the rest of the class on the weekly topics (with the exact number 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 3-to-4-page paper to be handed in for evaluation.

The following general grading scale will be used for both 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 were 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 at least 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 4 (Tuesday, Feb. 9), 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 relevant research has found, 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 (Tuesday, Mar. 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 hypotheses as well as a statement and justification of your spatial-temporal domain, data sources, and similar topics. 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 12 (Tuesday, Apr. 5), 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 (Tuesday, Apr. 19), Reviews (10%):** 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 useful advice on how the paper can be improved. *Bring two (2) copies of your review of each paper, one with your name on top and one without.* The course instructor will grade the named copy, while the anonymous copy will be distributed to the paper author as feedback to help with the completion of the final paper.

**Week 16 (Tuesday, May 3), 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 (Tuesday, May 10), Final Paper (30%):** The final version of your research paper must be
turned in through the TurnItIn link on the course's Blackboard 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.

**Academic Integrity**

Academic integrity is defined in the UNT Policy on Student Standards for Academic Integrity, which is located at: [http://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/untpolicy/pdf/7-Student_Affairs-Academic_Integrity.pdf](http://policy.unt.edu/sites/default/files/untpolicy/pdf/7-Student_Affairs-Academic_Integrity.pdf). 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](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](http://www.unt.edu/oda). You may also contact them by phone at (940) 565-4323.

**COURSE OUTLINE**

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 can 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. Tuesday, Jan. 19: 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. Tuesday, Jan. 26: 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 works 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 Diehl's article draws 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. Gleditsch and Weidmann discuss a variety of data sources, techniques, and issues in the spatial analysis of international relations; Starr and Thomas offer an early example of using geographic information systems (GIS) to improve the study of contiguity by measuring specific details of each border. Hegre examines the gravity model of international trade, a widely used application of geography. Finally, Braumoeller and Carson conclude these readings by examining the concept of "politically relevant dyads," which many scholars have used to exclude distant states from their studies.

Today's meeting will begin by considering the basic idea of studying contexts, drawing from the Sprouts and Diehl articles as well as other early work cited by the other articles. After that we will consider the remaining readings' approaches to studying the impact of geography, both theoretically and empirically. Is the author's theoretical argument about the role of geography 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?


Additional Readings (Contexts):


Additional Readings (Proximity and Interstate Conflict):


21, 1: 23-38.

Additional Readings (Proximity and Intrastate Conflict):
Tuesday, Feb. 2: 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. My review article discusses (among other things) work on the salience and conflict-proneness of territorial issues, and Hassner supplements this by examining the conditions under territorial issues become intractable. My 2001 article and Allee/Huth then examine the peaceful rather than militarized management of territorial issues, a topic that hasn't gotten as much scholarly attention but turns out to be quite important. Gibler/Tir and Owsiak conclude by examining the impact of settling borders on future conflict and democratization.

Today's meeting will begin by examining the basic idea of an issues approach to world politics, as laid out in my 2001 article. We will consider the arguments about the salience of 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? After these introductory questions, we will examine the various attempts to identify and study territorial issues, which range from studying the issues in armed conflicts to territorial changes or explicit territorial claims, and which include a range of both peaceful and militarized attempts to manage these issues. 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?


Additional Readings:


4. Tuesday, Feb. 9: 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. 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 Hensel et al. article attempts to categorize and compare different issue types, focusing on territorial, river, and maritime issues. The other readings represent attempts to begin analyzing these types of questions more systematically by looking at the management individual types of resources, although much work remains to be done in these areas. Dinar, Tir/Stinnett, and Brochmann examine rivers, while Nemeth et al. offer a rare examination of maritime issues, and Colgan examines oil.

Unfortunately, as these articles indicate, this topic has not (yet) received as much serious scholarly attention as the topics covered in this course so far, so today's discussion will have to be more speculative and consider what can/should be done in future work as much as (or more than) what has been done so far. We should discuss each specific resource type addressed by the readings (rivers/fresh water and maritime areas/fish), as well as any additional resources that might be appropriate for future research (perhaps oil?). 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?


**Additional Readings (General):**

**Additional Readings (River Issues):**
- *Political Geography* 25, 4 (May 2006): Special Issue on Conflict and Cooperation over International Rivers


• 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.*


**Additional Readings (Maritime Issues):**


Additional Readings (Other Resources):
• See also the readings under the "Geography and Civil Conflict" section of this syllabus

5. Tuesday, Feb. 16: 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. Hensel and Diehl attempted to evaluate decades of less-than-systematic thought about "shatterbelt" regions. 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, Fazal, Gleditsch/Ward, and Buhaug/Gleditsch then examine the impact of a state's immediate geographic neighborhood.

Today's meeting should examine each of these lines of research -- shatterbelts, zones of peace, and neighborhoods -- 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 -- is there a foreseeable path for productive work, or should the topic be dropped?


Additional Readings (regions, shatterbelts, zones of peace):
• For earlier work on shatterbelts and related concepts, see the sources cited by Hensel and Diehl.

Additional Readings (civilizations):
• Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" argument is sometimes considered from a geographic perspective, since it focuses on the "fault lines" or "bloody borders" between civilizations, but it is not included in this week's readings. There have been numerous other articles and books responding to Huntington's basic argument, far too many to list here, although surprisingly few have used systematic empirical analyses to try to test the basic argument.
• Samuel P. Huntington (1996). The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order. New York:
6. Tuesday, Feb. 23: Geography and Internal Conflict

While the focus of this course is on international relations, geography has played a very important role in recent research on civil wars and internal conflict, so any consideration of geographic influences on world politics would be incomplete without examining this literature. Regan and Toft draw explicitly from the interstate literature on territorial salience and armed conflict in studying separatist conflicts, while Cunningham and Weidmann examine the geographic distribution of groups as a source of conflict. A number of articles have recently examined the question of greed (resources) vs. grievance as sources of civil war, represented here by le Billon and Lujala. There is also research on cross-border sources and consequences of civil conflict, reflected here in the Gleditsch et al. article on the spread of civil wars to interstate conflict and the Forsberg piece on ethnic ties and conflict contagion.

Today’s meeting should examine each of these lines of research -- territory, resources, and proximity -- as part of an effort to assess this approach. Does this seem to be a useful application of interstate concepts/tools, or does it offer a new set of concepts/tools that could be applied fruitfully to the study of interstate phenomena? 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 -- is there a foreseeable path for productive work, or should the topic be dropped?

Additional Readings (Territory/Ethnicity):


Additional Readings (Resources):


Indra de Soysa (2002). "Ecoviolence: Shrinking Pie or Honey Pot?." *Global Environmental Politics* 2, 3: 1-34.


7. Tuesday, Mar. 1: 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

**Additional Readings:**
8. Tuesday, March 8: 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 seeks to explain the relative success of integration efforts around the world, while most of the other readings examine the impact of such efforts. Eichengreen/Frankel and Kono look at primarily economic dimensions of integration, while Mansfield/Bronson and Mansfield/Pevehouse focus more on the international political impact of integration. Mansfield and Solingen 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 the articles' discussion of the (political and economic) logic behind integration? Furthermore, drawing from 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? (Note that this week's discussion papers are not allowed to focus on Mansfield and Solingen, because that is primarily a literature review rather than an original scholarly contribution.)


Additional Readings:
- Jeffrey A. Frankel, Ernesto Stein, Shang-Jin Wei (1997). Regional Trading Blocs in the World Economic

9. **Tuesday, March 15: NO CLASS (Spring Break)**

**II. Historical Contexts and International Relations**

**10. Tuesday, March 22: 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. Margaret MacMillan, a well-known historian, addresses many of these issues in a recent book. Vertzberger examines the use of history by decision-makers, while Horowitz examines the ways that a leader's personal experience with the military (if any) affects his/her leadership.

An initial reaction to MacMillan might be that she is an historian, not a political scientist (and certainly not a quantitative scholar of international relations) so her 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 MacMillan, 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.

- MacMillan: all

Additional Readings:

11. Tuesday, March 29: 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. Levy & Morgan and Pickering examine the often-asserted "war weariness" phenomenon to determine whether one war makes another less likely, while Grossman et al.
approach the same basic question from the perspective of individuals rather than states. Leng examines the impact of past crises on subsequent bargaining behavior, and Fortna and Werner/Yuen examine the impact of details of the settlement of the past conflict, including the terms of treaties as well as peacekeeping operations. Finally, Debs and Goemans 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?


**Additional Readings (Recurrent Conflict):**


**Additional Readings (Conflict Management):**


**Additional Readings (Political and Economic Consequences):**


**12. Tuesday, April 5: Interstate Rivalry I: Measuring Long-Term Relationships**

*The topic of rivalry -- sometimes called "enduring rivalry" or "interstate rivalry" -- has received a great...*
deal of scholarly attention, 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. Hensel's "evolutionary" conception of the beginnings of rivalry and Bennett's work on rivalry termination offer additional conceptions of what rivalry is, when it begins, and when it ends. Thompson has proposed a different conceptualization of rivalry based on the perceptions of leaders rather than on observable armed conflict data, while Crescenzi et al. suggest a more dynamic model of interstate relations that does not rely so much on thresholds or categories. Carter and Signorino conclude the readings with a more methodological perspective on how to incorporate the impact of past relations between the same states.

Today's meeting should focus on the different conceptualizations and measures of rivalry discussed in these readings, as the authors present very different approaches to studying the beginning, continuation, and ending of rivalry. For example, how do these scholars differ in conceptualizing "rivalry" or "rivals," and which conceptual elements seem most or least appropriate? Turning from conceptualization to measurement, does Klein, Goertz, and Diehl's measure seem appropriate, and how does it compare to Bennett's measurement of termination, Hensel's more evolutionary measurement of rivalry processes, Thompson's more perceptual measurement, Crescenzi et al.'s more dynamic approach, or Carter and Signorino's more methodological approach? What might be the relative advantages and disadvantages of each approach, and for which purposes might it be most useful?


Additional Readings:
13. Tuesday, April 12: 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? Hensel and Stinnett/Diehl examine the origins of rivalry, while Bennett' and Owsiak offer different takes on the termination of rivalries. Rasler and Thompson consider which rivalries escalate to war at least once, while Greig examines conflict management within ongoing rivalries and Mitchell and Prins use rivalry to help study the diversionary use of force.

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? Furthermore, how could the study of rivalry's origins, continuation, or ending be improved further?


Additional Readings:
For many states in today's developing world, the most important historical context is the legacy of colonial rule. Most states in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East were ruled by foreign powers for
decades or centuries, and have 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/Blanton and Head et al.), economic development (Acemoglu et al.), 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 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?

• Paul R. Hensel, Michael Allison, and Ahmed Khanani (2012). "Colonial Legacies and Territorial Conflict." *(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):**


Additional Readings (history and economics):

15. Tuesday, April 26: 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; Mitchell examines these supposed democratic norms, and Zacher and Hensel et al. examine 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.


**Additional Readings:**

**16. Tuesday, May 3: 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. Each student must present his/her research paper in no more than 10-15 minutes (this time limit will be strictly enforced - but note that it will be set based on the number of students enrolled in the course), followed by questions from the rest of the students; handouts are allowed, but PowerPoint presentations are not, so that we don't spend half of the class period dealing with computer or projector problems.

**Tuesday, May 10: FINAL PAPERS DUE (via TurnItIn, by 3:30 PM)**

The final version of your research paper must be turned in through the TurnItIn link on the course's Blackboard 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.