

PSCI 4820/001: International Conflict

Dr. Paul Hensel

Phone: 369-7330

phensel@unt.edu

<http://www.paulhensel.org>

Office: 165 Wooten Hall

Spring 2009

MWF 10:00-10:50 AM

219 Wooten Hall

Office Hours: M 1:00-3:00,

F 1:00-2:00

Course Description

The primary purpose of this course is to examine the conditions that make for war and peace in world politics, as well as the range of possible solutions that might help to prevent this problem in the future. The course begins with an examination of historical patterns and trends in modern warfare. Later sections of the course then examine the causes or correlates of war, the outcomes and consequences of war, and solutions that have been offered to help prevent or limit war.

Upon completion of this course, students should be familiar with many of the factors that seem to create, worsen, or reduce military conflict between nation-states. Students should be able to apply these factors in examining real-world scenarios, such as studying historical cases of war or assessing the prospects for future conflict in troubled areas of the world. Students are expected to finish the course readings before the class period for which they are assigned, attend class regularly, show up to class on time, and participate actively in class discussion. The course will also require a midterm, quizzes, a research paper, and a final exam.

Please note that this is essentially my version of UNT's International Conflict course (PSCI 4821). It was given this course number because I was hired at UNT after the course listings for the Spring 2009 semester were already determined; once the Political Science department determined that I would teach International Conflict, this course number provided the closest fit. Nonetheless, this course offers more coverage of conflict management and possible solutions to conflict than most PSCI 4821 courses.

Required Texts

- Patrick M. Morgan, *International Security: Problems and Solutions*, first edition. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2006. (Available at the usual Denton locations, or maybe cheaper through online bookstores -- but wherever you buy it, be sure to get the correct edition!)
- Richard K. Betts (ed.), *Conflict after the Cold War*, third edition. Boston: Pearson Longman, 2008. (Available at the usual Denton locations, or maybe cheaper through online bookstores -- but wherever you buy it, be sure to get the correct edition!)
- **JSTOR**: An academic journal service that UNT provides for us. Access is free through the UNT libraries web site; you can search for individual articles by author, title, or keyword, or browse by journal name and issue.
- **Web**: The remaining readings are available online. The online version of the syllabus has direct links to both Web and JSTOR resources. Be sure to access and print out these readings early in the semester, because Web pages frequently move or disappear at inconvenient times.

Course Requirements

(1) **Examinations:** two noncumulative essay exams are required. The first exam will be given during the regular class period on **Wednesday, March 11**; the second exam will be given in the regular class room on **Monday, May 11, from 8:00-10:00 AM** (the assigned time for the course's final exam). Each exam will be worth 25% of the total course grade.

(2) **Research Papers:** one 10-15 page research paper is required for this class; more details are provided at the end of this syllabus. This paper will be due **at the beginning of class on Wednesday, April 15** (papers turned in after class starts will be assessed a late penalty), and will count for 40% of the total course grade. Note that late papers will lose one full letter grade for each day that they are late, and no paper will be accepted more than one week after it was due.

(3) **Preparation, Attendance, and Participation:** Students are expected to complete the assigned readings before class, attend class regularly, and participate actively in class discussion. Class preparation will be measured through approximately 6-10 (unannounced) quizzes given at the very beginning or ending of class periods, which together will be worth 10% of the total course grade; each student's quiz grade will be determined by dropping the lowest quiz score.

Course Rules

(1) Make-up examinations are given only with prior instructor approval and with appropriate documentation, and take place only during final exam week. Note that the documentation must indicate why you could not be in class *at the exact time of the test*.

(2) Failure to complete any paper assignment or failure to take any exam will result in a failing grade for the entire course; a passing grade requires completion of all course requirements. Late work will be accepted up to one week after the assignment was originally due, but with a substantial penalty (one letter grade per day that it is late). Note that no assignments, documentation, or other items will be accepted after the course's final exam.

(3) Students must keep an extra copy of each assignment until the instructor has returned the graded copy of that assignment. Students must also keep graded, returned copies of all assignments. Failure to do so will invalidate any potential question or protest about grades.

(4) All students must treat the instructor, the other students, and the classroom setting with respect. This includes arriving on time and staying for the entire class (or notifying the instructor in advance if this will not be possible), turning off cell phones and similar devices during class, and refraining from reading, passing notes, talking with friends, and any other potentially disruptive activities. This also means showing respect for alternative opinions and points of view, listening when either the instructor or a fellow student is speaking to the class, and refraining from insulting language and gestures.

(5) The instructor's lecture notes and PowerPoint slides will not be posted online or otherwise handed out to students under any circumstances. If you are unable to attend one or more class

meetings, make arrangements with another student to borrow or copy their notes.

(6) Failure to abide by these policies will be dealt with in an appropriate manner, which may include a reduction in the course grade. Any exceptions are given at the instructor's discretion, only with prior approval where possible, and only with appropriate documentation.

(7) The instructor's teaching-related policies and expectations are described in more detail at <<http://www.paulhensel.org/teachgrade.html>>. Failure to visit that web site does not constitute a valid excuse for ignorance of these policies. In particular, note that I do not "round up" grades -- an 89.9 counts as a B rather than an A -- and the only extra credit opportunity will be offered in class on the last class period before Thanksgiving (for fall semesters) or spring break (for spring semesters).

(8) The content of this syllabus may be modified by the instructor at any time during the semester if deemed necessary.

Academic Integrity

Departmental Policy on Cheating and Plagiarism

The UNT Code of Student Conduct and Discipline defines cheating and plagiarism as the use of unauthorized books, notes, or otherwise securing help in a test; copying others' tests, assignments, reports, or term papers; representing the work of another as one's own; collaborating without authority with another student during an examination or in preparing academic work; or otherwise practicing scholastic dishonesty.

Normally, the minimum penalty for cheating or plagiarism is a grade of "F" in the course. In the case of graduate departmental exams, the minimum penalty shall be failure of all fields of the exam. Determination of cheating or plagiarism shall be made by the instructor in the course, or by the field faculty in the case of departmental exams.

Cases of cheating or plagiarism on graduate departmental exams, theses, or dissertations shall automatically be referred to the departmental Graduate Studies Committee. Cases of cheating or plagiarism in ordinary coursework may, at the discretion of the instructor, be referred to the Undergraduate Studies Committee in the case of undergraduate students, or the Graduate Studies Committee in the case of graduate students. These committees, acting as agents of the department Chair, shall impose further penalties, or recommend further penalties to the Dean of Students, if they determine that the case warrants it. In all cases, the Dean of Students shall be informed in writing of the case.

Students may appeal any decision under this policy by following the procedures laid down in the UNT Code of Student Conduct and Discipline.

Academic Integrity in My Courses

Students should bring possible violations of this student conduct code to the attention of the instructor as soon as possible, so that the violations (if any) may be stopped quickly. Violations include (but are not limited to) the use of unauthorized materials on course assignments or examinations, representing another's work or any part thereof (published or

unpublished) as one's own, using one's own work for more than one class, assisting another student in committing such an offense, and attempting to commit such an offense. I will act quickly to stop and punish any such offense, consistent with university and departmental guidelines, because these activities give the perpetrators an unfair advantage in course grades and represent a critical challenge to the educational process. At a minimum, the student will receive a failing grade on the assignment in question; depending on the nature and severity of the offense, the student may also receive an automatic failing grade for the course or be referred to appropriate university bodies for further disciplinary action. When in doubt, consult the Citations and Plagiarism page on the instructor's web site for advice on why, when, and how to cite sources consulted for research papers, in order to avoid committing plagiarism (whether intentionally or unintentionally).

Americans with Disabilities Act

The Political Science Department cooperates with the Office of Disability Accommodation to make reasonable accommodations for qualified students with disabilities. Please present your written accommodation request by the start of the second week of class.

Instructor's Web Site

The instructor maintains a web site at <<http://www.paulhensel.org>> that includes -- among other things -- teaching policies, solutions to common student writing problems, copies of syllabi for other courses, and Internet resources for students of international relations. Students are strongly encouraged to become familiar with this web site during the semester. The on-line version of this syllabus can be found at:

<<http://www.paulhensel.org/Teaching/psci4821.html>>.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Monday, Jan. 19: **NO CLASS (Martin Luther King, Jr., Day)**

2. Wednesday, Jan. 21: Introduction

3. Friday, Jan. 23: Studying Conflict and War

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Betts: Blainey ("Power, Culprits, and Arms": read the section on "Aims and Arms" only)

--Morgan: Chapter 1 ("An Introduction to Security in International Relations"), Chapter 2 ("The Problem of War in International Politics")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will introduce the scientific study of armed conflict. We will consider the definition of different types of conflict, as well as some important terminology that is used in studying conflict. After reading the assigned materials, come to class prepared to discuss the reasons that states choose to engage in conflict.

4. Monday, Jan. 26: Patterns of Conflict, Crisis, and War

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Web: Lotta Harbom and Peter Wallensteen (2007). "Armed Conflict, 1989-2006." *Journal*

of Peace Research 41, 5: 623-634 [Probably need to access from a UNT Internet connection]
<<http://jpr.sagepub.com/cgi/reprint/44/5/623>>

- *Discussion Points:* This class period will use the definitions introduced last time to study recent patterns and trends in armed conflict. Come to class prepared to discuss the patterns identified in the assigned reading, as well as even more recent changes since that article was published and your expectations about conflict in the near future.

II. CAUSES AND CORRELATES OF WAR

5. Wednesday, Jan. 28: Individual Level I: Human Nature

- *Assigned Reading:*

- Betts: Hobbes ("The State of Nature and the State of War"), Freud ("Why War?"), Mead "Warfare is Only an Invention - Not a Biological Necessity"), Milgram ("How Good People Do Bad Things")

- *Discussion Points:* This class period will begin investigating factors that have been suggested as causes of armed conflict. The assigned readings cover a variety of ways that human nature might contribute. Come to class prepared to discuss these approaches -- do you find them plausible and/or scientifically convincing? Why or why not?

6. Friday, Jan. 30: Individual Level II: Psychology and Misperception

- *Assigned Reading:*

- JSTOR: Robert Jervis (1988). "War and Misperception." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, 4: 675-700.

- Betts: Kahneman and Renshon ("Why Hawks Win")

- *Discussion Points:* This class period will focus on human psychology as an explanation for armed conflict, including factors ranging from misperception to psychological differences between "hawks" and "doves." Come to class prepared to discuss these approaches -- do you find them plausible and/or scientifically convincing? Why or why not?

- *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

- Ole R. Holsti (1965). "The 1914 Case." *American Political Science Review* 59, 2: 365-378.

- Robert Jervis (1982-1983). "Deterrence and Perception." *International Security* 7, 3: 3-30.

- Jack S. Levy (1983). "Misperception and the Causes of War: Theoretical Linkages and Analytical Problems." *World Politics* 36, 1: 76-99.

- Jack S. Levy (1997). "Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly* 41, 1: 87-112.

7. Monday, Feb. 2: Group Level I: Groupthink

- *Assigned Reading:*

- JSTOR: Mark Schafer and Scott Crichlow (1996). "Antecedents of Groupthink: A Quantitative Study." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40, 3: 415-435.

- *Discussion Points:* This class period will consider another psychological factor that some believe to be a cause of armed conflict, a dynamic of group decision-making called "groupthink." Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing? Why or why not?

- *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

- Gregory M. Herek, Irving L. Janis, and Paul Huth (1987). "Decision Making during International Crises: Is Quality of Process Related to Outcome?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 31, 2: 203-226.

- Stephen G. Walker and George L. Watson (1994). "Integrative Complexity and British Decisions during the Munich and Polish Crises." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38, 1: 3-23.

- Steve Smith (1985). "Groupthink and the Hostage Rescue Mission." *British Journal of Political Science* 15, 1: 117-123.

8-9. Wednesday, Feb. 4 - Friday, Feb. 6: Group Level II: Nationalism and Internal Conflict

- *Assigned Reading:*

- Betts: Gellner ("Nations and Nationalism"), Kaufmann ("Possible and Impossible Solutions to Ethnic Civil Wars"), Crenshaw ("The Logic of Terrorism")

- JSTOR: David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild (1996). "Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security* 21, 2: 41-75.

- *Discussion Points:* This topic will investigate nationalism, ethnicity, and similar factors as sources of both internal and interstate conflict. We will not have time for a full investigation of this topic, since UNT offers several entire courses that address this general area, but this will still give us a good understanding of what scholars think we know. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

- *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

- Stephen Van Evera (1994). "Hypotheses on Nationalism and War." *International Security* 18, 4: 5-39.

- Ted Robert Gurr (1994). "Peoples against States: Ethnopolitical Conflict and the Changing World System." *International Studies Quarterly* 38, 3: 347-377.

- David R. Davis and Will H. Moore (1997). "Ethnicity Matters: Transnational Ethnic Alliances and Foreign Policy Behavior." *International Studies Quarterly* 41, 1: 171-184.

- Nicholas Sambanis (2001). "Do Ethnic and Nonethnic Civil Wars Have the Same Causes?: A Theoretical and Empirical Inquiry (Part 1)." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45, 3: 259-282.

10 Monday, Feb. 9: Group Level III: Civilizations

- *Assigned Reading:*

- Betts: Huntington ("The Clash of Civilizations?"), Juergensmeyer ("Religious Radicalism and Political Violence")

- *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine an offshoot of the previous topic, Huntington's widely publicized notion that differences between grand "civilizations" will be the primary source of future conflict. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing? Why or why not?

- *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

- 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: 583-608.

- Jonathan Fox (2001). "Two Civilizations and Ethnic Conflict: Islam and the West."

Journal of Peace Research 38, 4: 459-472.

--Errol Henderson and Richard Tucker (2001). "Clear and Present Strangers: The Clash of Civilizations and International Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 4, 2: 317-338.

<<http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/bpl/isqu/2001/00000045/00000002/art00193>>

11. Wednesday, Feb. 11: National Level I: Diversionary Theory

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Web: CNN.com (8/20/1998), "Most Lawmakers Support Clinton's Military Strikes"

<<http://www.cnn.com/ALLPOLITICS/1998/08/20/strike.react/>>

--Web: BBC News (12/17/1998), "Scepticism and Support Swirl around Clinton"

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/events/crisis_in_the_gulf/latest_news/236582.stm>

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine domestic political motivations as explanations for armed conflict, focusing particularly on diversionary theory (also known as the "scapegoat hypothesis" or "Wag the Dog theory"). The assigned readings examine these motivations with respect to the 1998 military strikes ordered by President Bill Clinton during his impeachment crisis, which some argued to be a political ploy to divert attention from his domestic political problems. Thinking beyond this specific case, do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Richard J. Stoll (1984). "The Guns of November: Presidential Reelections and the Use of Force, 1947-1982." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 28, 2: 231-246.

--T. Clifton Morgan and Kenneth N. Bickers (1992). "Domestic Discontent and the External Use of Force." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36, 1L 25-52.

--Brett Ashley Leeds and David R. Davis (1997). "Domestic Political Vulnerability and International Disputes." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41, 6: 814-834.

--T. Clifton Morgan and Christopher J. Anderson (1999). "Domestic Support and Diversionary External Conflict in Great Britain, 1950-1992." *Journal of Politics* 61, 3: 799-814.

--Sara McLaughlin Mitchell and Brandon C. Prins (2004). "Rivalry and Diversionary Uses of Force." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48: 937 - 961.

12. Friday, Feb. 13: National Level II: Organizations and Groups

• *Assigned Reading:*

--JSTOR: Scott D. Sagan (1986), "1914 Revisited: Allies, Offense, and Instability." *International Security* 11, 2 (Autumn): 151-175.

--Betts: Levy ("The Offensive/Defensive Balance of Military Technology")

--Morgan: Chapter 4 ("Seeking Cheap Victories")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period moves from domestic politics to the professional military as an explanation for conflict, focusing on war plans and military doctrines as factors that might lead countries into war. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Stephen Van Evera (1984). "The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World

War." *International Security* 9, 1: 58-107.

--Jack S. Levy (1986). "Organizational Routines and the Causes of War." *International Studies Quarterly* 30, 2: 193-222.

--Charles L. Glaser (1992). "Political Consequences of Military Strategy: Expanding and Refining the Spiral and Deterrence Models." *World Politics* 44, 4: 497-538.

13. Monday, Feb. 16: NO CLASS (Dr. Hensel at International Studies Association conference in New York)

14. Wednesday, Feb. 18: Lateral Pressure and Conflict over Resources

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Betts: Cooley ("The War over Water"), Homer-Dixon ("Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will consider the widely repeated, but rarely tested, argument that resource scarcity will be a major source of armed conflict. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Nazli Choucri and Robert C. North (1972). "Dynamics of International Conflict: Some Policy Implications of Population, Resources, and Technology." *World Politics* 24, Supplement (Spring): 80-122.

--Peter H. Gleick (1993). "Water and Conflict: Fresh Water Resources and International Security." *International Security* 18, 1: 79-112.

--Thomas F. Homer-Dixon (1994). "Environmental Scarcities and Violent Conflict: Evidence from Cases." *International Security* 19, 1: 5-40.

--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.

15-16. Friday, Feb. 20 - Monday, Feb. 23: Territorial Claims

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Web: Paul R. Hensel (2000). "Territory: Theory and Evidence on Geography and Conflict." In John A. Vasquez, ed., *What Do We Know about War?* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000, pp. 57-84.

<<http://www.paulhensel.org/Research/terr2000.pdf>>

• *Discussion Points:* This topic will examine disagreements over territorial sovereignty as explanations for armed conflict. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Alexander B. Murphy (1990). "Historical Justifications for Territorial Claims." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 80, 4: 531-548.

--Tuomas Forsberg (1996). "Explaining Territorial Disputes: From Power Politics to Normative Reasons." *Journal of Peace Research* 33, 4: 433-449.

--Paul R. Hensel (2001). "Contentious Issues and World Politics: Territorial Claims in the Americas, 1816-1992." *International Studies Quarterly* 45, 1 (March 2001): 81-109. [on my web site, not JSTOR: <<http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~phensel/Research/isq01.pdf>>]

--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: 275-298

17-18. Wednesday, Feb. 25 - Friday, Feb. 27: Anarchy, the Security Dilemma, and Arms Races

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Morgan: re-read Chapter 1

--Betts: Huntington ("Arms Races: Prerequisites and Results")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will return to political realism as an explanation for armed conflict. Many critics of realism suggest that when leaders follow realist policies, they make conflict much more likely. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Michael D. Wallace (1979). "Arms Races and Escalation: Some New Evidence." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 23, 1: 3-16.

--Susan G. Sample (1997). "Arms Races and Dispute Escalation: Resolving the Debate." *Journal of Peace Research* 34, 1: 7-22.

--Paul F. Diehl and Mark J.C. Crescenzi (1998). "Reconfiguring the Arms Race-War Debate." *Journal of Peace Research* 35, 1: 111-118.

--Douglas M. Gibler, Toby J. Rider, and Marc L. Hutchison (2005). "Taking Arms Against a Sea of Troubles: Conventional Arms Races During Periods of Rivalry." *Journal of Peace Research* 42, 2: 131-147.

19. Monday, Mar. 2: Crisis Bargaining

• *Assigned Reading:*

--JSTOR: Russell J. Leng (1984). "Reagan and the Russians." *American Political Science Review* 78 (June): 338-355.

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine how states' interactions within an ongoing crisis affect the likelihood that the crisis will escalate to full-scale war. Much like the previous topic, much of the debate on this subject involves the relative value of realist advice, with critics suggesting that following realist principles can greatly increase the risk of war. Do you find this argument to be plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Charles S. Gochman and Russell J. Leng (1983). "Realpolitik and the Road to War: An Analysis of Attributes and Behavior." *International Studies Quarterly* 27, 1: 97-120.

--Paul Huth and Bruce Russett (1988). "Deterrence Failure and Crisis Escalation." *International Studies Quarterly* 32, 1: 29-45.

--Russell J. Leng (1993). "Reciprocating Influence Strategies in Interstate Crisis Bargaining." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37, 1: 3-41.

- James D. Fearon (1994). "Signaling versus the Balance of Power and Interests: An Empirical Test of a Crisis Bargaining Model." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 38, 2: 236-269.
- James D. Fearon (1995). "Rationalist Explanations for War." *International Organization* 49, 3: 379-414.

20. Wednesday, Mar. 4: Balance of Power Theory

- *Assigned Reading:*

- Betts: re-read Blainey ("Power, Culprits, and Arms")
- Morgan: Chapter 3 ("The Appropriate Distribution of Power")

- *Discussion Points:* This class period will evaluate yet another principle of realism that can be seen as either a source of major conflict or a solution that prevents such conflict: balance-of-power policies by the world's great powers. Do you find these policies to be plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict, or are they more likely to be a useful way to prevent major conflict?

- *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

- Ernst B. Haas (1953). "The Balance of Power: Prescription, Concept, or Propaganda." *World Politics* 5, 4: 442-477.
- Stephen M. Walt (1988). "Testing Theories of Alliance Formation: The Case of Southwest Asia." *International Organization* 42, 2: 275-316.
- Paul W. Schroeder (1992). "Did the Vienna Settlement Rest on a Balance of Power?" *American Historical Review* 97, 3: 683-706.
- For more details on balance of power see Hans Morgenthau (any edition), *Politics among Nations*, and Kenneth Waltz (1979), *Theory of International Politics*.

21. Friday, Mar. 6: Power Transition Theory

- *Assigned Reading:*

- Betts: Gilpin ("Hegemonic War and International Change"), Betts and Christensen ("China: Can the Next Superpower Rise Without War?")
- JSTOR: Douglas M. Lemke (1997). "The Continuation of History: Power Transition Theory and the End of the Cold War." *Journal of Peace Research* 34, 1 (February): 23-36.

- *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine a major challenge to balance of power policies, in the form of power transition theory. A number of scholars have suggested that the balance of power theorists have the story reversed, and that an even balance between competing powers is the most dangerous situation rather than the most peaceful. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not?

- *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

- Jack S. Levy (1987). "Declining Power and the Preventive Motivation for War." *World Politics* 40, 1: 82-107.
- Henk Houweling and Jan G. Siccoma (1988). "Power Transitions as a Cause of War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 32, 1: 87-102.
- Douglas Lemke and Suzanne Werner (1996). "Power Parity, Commitment to Change, and War." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, 2: 235-260.
- For more details on power transition see A.F.K. Organski and Jacek Kugler (1980), *The*

War Ledger; and Kugler and Lemke (1996), *Parity and War*.

22. Monday, Mar. 9: International System Structure

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Betts: Waltz ("The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory")

--JSTOR: Karl W. Deutsch and J. David Singer (1964). "Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability." *World Politics* 16, 3: 390-406.

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will conclude our investigation of causes of conflict by examining a topic that received a great deal of scholarly attention during the Cold War and may be returning to relevance in today's world: the structure of the international system. Waltz and Deutsch/Singer offered a prominent exchange of opposing views on the subject in 1964 that is still widely read by graduate students who are studying conflict. Which of their views about polarity do you find most convincing -- is bipolarity or multipolarity likely to be more stable, and why?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Bruce Bueno de Mesquita (1978). "Systemic Polarization and the Occurrence and Duration of War." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 22, 2: 241-267.

--Frank Whelon Wayman (1984). "Bipolarity and War: The Role of Capability Concentration and Alliance Patterns among Major Powers, 1816-1965." *Journal of Peace Research* 21, 1: 61-78.

--Edward D. Mansfield (1993). "Concentration, Polarity, and the Distribution of Power." *International Studies Quarterly* 37, 1: 105-128.

23. Wednesday, Mar. 11: MIDTERM EXAM

III. OUTCOMES AND CONSEQUENCES OF WAR

24. Friday, Mar. 13: Costs of War

• *Assigned Reading:* None

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will move away from causes of conflict to consider the outcomes and consequences of conflict, focusing first on the most obvious consequences: who wins or loses, how many people die, and what type of long-run environmental effects result from the conflict.

25-27. Mar. 16-20: NO CLASS (Spring Break)

28-29. Monday, Mar. 23 - Wednesday, Mar. 25: Political & Economic Consequences

• *Assigned Reading:*

--JSTOR: A.F.K. Organski and Jacek Kugler (1977), "The Costs of Major Wars: The Phoenix Factor." *American Political Science Review* 71, 4: 1347-1366.

• *Discussion Points:* This topic will consider our investigation of the consequences of conflict by considering both political and economic consequences. What sorts of political and economic effects seem likely to follow war? Which kinds of countries seem most likely to be affected, and under which conditions?

30-31. Friday, Mar. 27 - Monday, Mar. 30: Recurrent Conflict and Rivalry

• *Assigned Reading:*

--JSTOR: Russell J. Leng (1983). "When Will They Ever Learn? Coercive Bargaining in Recurrent Crises." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 27, 3: 379-419.

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine one final consequence of conflict, which is the outbreak of further conflict against the same opponent. When do the same countries seem most or least likely to keep engaging in future conflict, and what (if anything) can be done to try to stop this?

• *Recommended Additional Reading for Research Papers:*

--Gary Goertz and Paul F. Diehl (1993). "Enduring Rivalries: Theoretical Constructs and Empirical Patterns." *International Studies Quarterly* 37, 2: 147-171.

--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.

--D. Scott Bennett (1996). "Security, Bargaining, and the End of Interstate Rivalry." *International Studies Quarterly* 40, 2: 157-183.

--Paul R. Hensel (1999). "An Evolutionary Approach to the Study of Interstate Rivalry." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 17, 2 (Fall 1999).

<<http://www.paulhensel.org/Research/cmpps99.pdf>>

IV. PREVENTION AND LIMITATION OF WAR

32-33-34. Wednesday, Apr. 1 - Friday, Apr. 3 - Monday, Apr. 6: Proliferation & Deterrence

• *Assigned Reading:*

--JSTOR: Paul K. Huth (1988), "Extended Deterrence and the Outbreak of War." *American Political Science Review* 82, 2 (June): 423-443.

--Morgan: Chapter 5 ("Deterrence and Arms Control") -- read pp. 77-94 only

--Betts: Waltz ("The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Be Better")

• *Discussion Points:* This topic will begin the final section of the course, focusing on ways that conflict or war might be prevented. We begin with military deterrence and with proliferation, focusing on both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction. Are you more convinced by the realists who argue that proliferation is a force for peace, or by the critics who argue that proliferation and deterrence policies make the world a more dangerous place? Why?

35-36-37. Wednesday, Apr. 8 - Friday, Apr. 10 - Monday, Apr. 13: Arms Control & Disarmament

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Morgan: Chapter 5 ("Deterrence and Arms Control") -- read pp. 94-107 only

--Betts: Fairbanks and Shulsky ("Arms Control: The Historical Experience")

• *Discussion Points:* This topic examines the preferred view of many who criticize proliferation as a source for peace, by considering the idea of removing or controlling weapons rather than expanding them. Do you find these approaches -- whether the more limited arms control or the more far-reaching disarmament -- to be important forces for peace, or are they dangerous steps

that seem to make future conflict even more likely? Why?

38. Wednesday, Apr. 15: Democratic Peace

*****Research Papers Due!**

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Betts: Kant ("Perpetual Peace"), Doyle ("Liberalism and World Politics"), Mansfield and Snyder ("Democratization and War")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine a widely studied finding in the IR literature, which has noted repeatedly that democracies do not fight each other. Do you find this to be a convincing force for peace in the modern world? Should this be a major element in countries' foreign policies, and if so, how should it be pursued?

39. Friday, Apr. 17: Liberal Peace

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Betts: Angell ("The Great Illusion"), Blainey ("Paradise is a Bazaar"), Keohane and Nye ("Power and Interdependence")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine an offshoot of democratic peace theory, which focuses more on the economic dimensions of liberalism than on political democracy itself. Do you find trade and interdependence to be convincing forces for peace in the modern world? Are these factors more or less important than democracy, or are they so closely related as to be inseparable?

40-41. Monday, Apr. 20 - Wednesday, Apr. 22: Integration and Institutions

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Morgan: Chapter 8 ("Complex Multilateralism and Integration")

• *Discussion Points:* This topic will examine another of political liberalism's solutions to armed conflict, focusing on political and/or economic integration and institutions. Do you find these factors to be convincing forces for peace in the modern world? Are these factors more or less important than democracy, or are they so closely related as to be inseparable?

42-43. Friday, Apr. 24 - Monday, Apr. 27: Diplomacy and International Law

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Morgan: Chapter 9 ("Negotiation and Mediation")

• *Discussion Points:* This topic will examine the processes of negotiation, mediation, and international law that have been suggested by many to be vital in the effort to stop conflict. How successful do these processes seem likely to be in limiting or preventing conflict? Are there certain kinds of conditions where they are likely to be most successful, or certain techniques that seem likely to be more effective than others?

44. Wednesday, Apr. 29: Collective Security

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Morgan: Chapter 6 ("The Great-Power Concert"), Chapter 7 ("Wilsonian Collective Security")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will return to the idea that states -- whether the great powers or all states -- can act in concert to maintain peace and stability in IR, and to prevent military challenges. These ideas have been put into practice in at least limited ways in post-Napoleonic Europe as well as in the League of Nations and United Nations. Do you find this approach to offer a convincing path to peace in the modern world? Why or why not?

45. Friday, May 1: Peacekeeping

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Morgan: Chapter 10 ("Peacekeeping")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine another way that international organizations or institutions can help to prevent conflict, focusing on the deployment of lightly armed peacekeepers between two enemies to prevent them from restarting their armed conflict. How successful does this approach seem likely to be? Are there certain conditions where it seems likely to be more or less effective?

46. Monday, May 4: Ending Civil Wars: Peace Imposition, Peace Enforcement, and Peacebuilding

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Morgan: Chapter 11 ("Peace Enforcement and Peace Imposition"), Chapter 12 ("Peacebuilding")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will follow up on the discussion of peacekeeping by examining related techniques that have been used to try to end civil wars and other internal conflicts. Think about each of the techniques discussed in the reading, considering how effective it is likely to be: Are the combatants in a civil war likely to agree to allow the technique to be used? If it is used, does the technique seem likely to succeed, or are there important obstacles that make it unlikely to work?

47. Wednesday, May 6: Is War Obsolete?: Optimistic and Pessimistic Views on the Future

• *Assigned Reading:*

--Betts: Fukuyama ("The End of History?"), Mueller ("The Obsolescence of Major War"), Mearsheimer ("Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War")

--Web: Benjamin Barber (1992), "Jihad vs. McWorld." *The Atlantic* (March): 53-65.

<<http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/199203/barber>>

--Morgan: Chapter 13 ("Conclusion")

• *Discussion Points:* This class period will examine a variety of different scholars' views about the future of armed conflict and war. Think about which of these views you find most or least convincing and why -- particularly in light of the many causes of conflict and solutions to conflict that we have discussed in this course.

48. Friday, May 8: Review (attendance is optional under UNT rules)

FINAL EXAM: Monday, May 11, 8:00 - 10:00 AM (in the regular classroom)

Research Paper Assignment

This course involves a 10-15 page research paper, on a topic to be approved by Dr. Hensel. Each student must study a different crisis or war; there are more eligible crises and wars than students in this class. You should note that the page requirement is based on standard fonts and margins, and does not include materials such as a title page, index, bibliography, or appendices. Failure to comply with the page requirements (whether too short, too long, or only meeting the requirements by manipulating fonts or margins) will be penalized by at least one letter grade.

Choosing a War

The end of this syllabus includes a list of all eligible crises and wars from the past two centuries. You must list your top five topic preferences (in the order of preference), and I will try to assign you your highest choice possible. Be aware, though, that many of the students in this class may request the same topics, so you may not be able to receive your first choice.

Notes on Sources and Citations

The most useful reference source for most of these topics is the library's book collection; useful books may include specific histories of the crisis or war of interest, diplomatic or military histories of each participant in the crisis/war, and more general histories of countries, regions, or the entire world. For example, if your topic involves Bolivia, it would be useful to run a subject search for "Bolivia--foreign relations", "Bolivia--boundaries", "Bolivia--history", "Bolivia--politics and government", and appropriate subheadings under each of those categories, as well as books specifically about the crisis or war itself. For many of these topics, the most useful information may come from histories of the involved countries rather than books specifically about the crisis/war (if books about the case itself even exist in our library). Post-World War II cases will also be helped by major reference sources like *Keesing's Contemporary Archives* or *Facts on File*, the printed indexes and microfilm archives of major world newspapers like the *New York Times* or the *Times of London*, and news archive services such as the Lexis-Nexis Academic Universe. Additionally, information on the specific dates, participants, and fatalities for each war are available online from the Correlates of War project, although such information is not available for the sub-war crises in this list. My web site also offers numerous suggestions on appropriate sources at <<http://www.paulhensel.org/teachpaper.html>>.

Please be aware that most Internet sources, CD-ROMs, and encyclopedias are not appropriate for an upper-division college research paper such as this one, and as such may not be used without my explicit permission. If you plan to use electronic sources, you must read and follow the guidelines presented at <<http://www.paulhensel.org/teachnet.html>>; note in particular that you must fill out a one-page request (and receive my written permission) before the source can be used, and that even then you must add a paragraph in the bibliography evaluating each electronic source used in your paper. Furthermore, you must properly footnote and cite all sources that you use; guidelines are available at <<http://www.paulhensel.org/teachcite.html>>. Failure to follow these guidelines will be penalized by a deduction of up to five letter grades.

Regarding the theories that you will be evaluating in this paper, you should note that the syllabus includes references to a number of recommended readings on each theory that was covered in class; each of these readings is available through JSTOR. For each theory that you will be using in your paper, you should look into these readings, as well as some of the resources that they each cite on the same topic. You may also want to consult the references from my graduate-level International Conflict syllabus, which includes a considerably longer list of references on these topics: <<http://www.paulhensel.org/Teaching/gradconflict.html>>.

Paper Requirements

The research paper will involve two distinct sections, each of which is worth 50% of the overall paper grade. The first section is meant to familiarize you with the crisis or war and its participants. This section will involve (1) an overview of the events leading up to the crisis/war (focusing on the five years before the war began, but also touching on significant events from earlier times), as well as (2) a brief summary [2-3 pages] of major events during the crisis/war itself. You will also be expected to (3) identify the consequences of the crisis/war for each participant (casualties, destruction, lost territory, political leaders losing power, economic recession, etc.), and (4) consider the overall outcome and consequences of the crisis/war (including your judgment of the winners and losers and your justification for this decision, the impact of the crisis/war on future relations between the same countries, and any other relevant consequences). Please note that both sections of the paper should focus primarily on the interstate portion of the crisis/war -- you should still mention important events that involved non-state actors, but your history and particularly your discussion of the causes should focus on the state-to-state elements.

The second section of the paper allows you to analyze the causes of your crisis/war and to speculate on the prospects for renewed conflict. You must (1) identify three theoretical factors (or "causes") that contributed to the outbreak of the crisis/war, at least two of which must be drawn from the topics covered in class. For each factor chosen, (a) explain the theoretical logic of why that factor is thought to be a cause of conflict/crisis/war in general, and (b) demonstrate how it applies to your case in particular (i.e., work through the general logic, making specific references to your case to show how each part of the logic applies to this crisis or war). Finally, you should (2) make (and justify) a projection about the likelihood that the same adversaries will become involved in another crisis or war sometime in the next decade after this paper is due. This should be based on your understanding of the three causes -- have they changed, or do they seem likely to produce another crisis/war? -- as well as on any other information that you consider relevant.

Interstate Wars

Mexican-American (1846-1848): US vs. Mexico

First Schleswig-Holstein (1848-1849): Prussia vs. Denmark

Crimean (1853-1856): Turkey, UK, France, Italy vs. Russia

Italian Unification (1859): Piedmont-Sardinia, France vs. Austria

Spanish-Moroccan (1859-1860): Spain vs. Morocco

Franco-Mexican (1862-1867): France vs. Mexico
Ecuadorean-Colombian (1863): Ecuador vs. Colombia
Second Schleswig-Holstein (1864): Prussia, Austria vs. Denmark
War of the Triple Alliance [Lopez War] (1864-1870): Paraguay vs. Brazil, Arg., Uruguay
Spanish-Chilean (1865-1866): Spain vs. Peru, Chile
Seven Weeks (1866): Prussia (and allies) vs. Austria (and allies)
Franco-Prussian (1870-1871): Prussia (and allies) vs. France
Russo-Turkish (1877-1878): Russia vs. Turkey
War of the Pacific (1879-1883): Chile vs. Bolivia, Peru
First Sino-Japanese (1894-1895): China vs. Japan
Spanish-American (1898): US vs. Spain
Russo-Japanese (1904-1905): Russia vs. Japan
Italo-Turkish (1911-1912): Italy vs. Turkey
First Balkan (1912-1913): Serbia, Bulgaria, Greece vs. Turkey
Russo-Polish (1919-1920): Russia vs. Poland
Lithuanian-Polish (1919-1920): Lithuania vs. Poland
Hungarian-Allies (1919): Czechoslovakia, Rumania vs. Hungary
Greco-Turkish (1919-1922): Greece vs. Turkey
Sino-Soviet (1929): China vs. USSR
Manchurian (1931-1933): Japan vs. China
Chaco (1932-1935): Bolivia vs. Paraguay
Italo-Ethiopian [Abyssinian] (1935-1936): Italy vs. Ethiopia
Second Sino-Japanese (1937-1941): China vs. Japan
Nomonhan (1939): Russia, Mongolia vs. Japan
Russo-Finnish (1939-1940): Russia vs. Finland
Palestine (1948-1949): Israel vs. Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq
Korean (1950-1953): North Korea, China vs. South Korea, US (and allies)
Russo-Hungarian (1956): Russia vs. Hungary
Suez/Sinai (1956): Egypt vs. Israel, UK, France
Sino-Indian (1962): China vs. India
Vietnamese (1965-1975): North Vietnam vs. South Vietnam, US (and allies)
Second Kashmir (1965): India vs. Pakistan
Six Day (1967): Israel vs. Egypt, Syria, Jordan
War of Attrition (1969-1970): Israel vs. Egypt
Football (1969): Honduras vs. El Salvador
Bangladesh (1971): India vs. Pakistan
Yom Kippur [October War] (1973): Israel vs. Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq, Saudi Arabia
Turco-Cypriot (1974): Turkey vs. Cyprus
Vietnamese-Cambodian (1975-1979): Vietnam vs. Cambodia
Ogaden (1977-1978): Ethiopia vs. Somalia
Ugandan-Tanzanian (1978-1979): Uganda vs. Tanzania
First Sino-Vietnamese (1979): China vs. Vietnam
Iran-Iraq (1980-1988): Iran vs. Iraq

Falklands/Malvinas (1982): Argentina vs. UK
Israel-Syrian War in Lebanon (1982): Israel vs. Syria
Gulf War (1990-1991): Iraq vs. Kuwait, USA, many others
Croatian War (1992-1995): Serbia vs. Croatia
Bosnian War (1992-1995): Serbia vs. Bosnia-Herzegovina vs. Croatia
Eritrea-Ethiopia (1998-1999): Ethiopia vs. Eritrea
Kosovo (1999): USA (and allies) vs. Yugoslavia
Iraq War (2003): USA (and allies) vs. Iraq

Interstate Crises

Fashoda (1898): Britain vs. France
First Moroccan Crisis (1905): France vs. Germany
Bosnian Crisis (1908-1909): Austria, Germany vs. Serbia, Russia, Turkey
Agadir (Second Moroccan) Crisis (1911): France, Britain vs. Germany
Teschchen (1918-1920): Czechoslovakia vs. Poland
Rhineland (1936): Germany vs. France, UK, Belgium
Munich (Czechoslovakian) Crisis (1938): Germany vs. France, UK, Czechoslovakia
Danzig (pre-WWII) Crisis (1938-1939): Germany vs. Poland, Britain
Polish-Lithuanian Crisis (1938): Lithuania vs. Poland
Ecuador-Peru Conflict (1941): Ecuador vs. Peru
Berlin Blockade (1948): USSR vs. US, UK, France
Trieste Crisis (1953-1954): Italy vs. Yugoslavia
Taiwan Straits (Quemoy & Matsu) Crisis (1954-1955): China vs. US, Taiwan
Honduran Border Dispute (1957): Nicaragua vs. Honduras
Kuwaiti Independence Crisis (1961): Iraq vs. Britain, Kuwait
Cuban Missile Crisis (1962): US vs. USSR, Cuba
Jordanian Civil War (1970): Syria vs. Jordan / Israel vs. Syria
"Cod Wars" (1975-1976): Britain vs. Iceland
Beagle Channel Dispute (1977-1979): Argentina vs. Chile
Libya - Chad Crisis (1983): Libya vs. Chad, France
Grenada Invasion (1983): US, Caribbean states vs. Grenada
"Line of Death" Incidents (1986): US vs. Libya
Panama Invasion (1989-90): US vs. Panama
Cordillera del Condor (1995): Ecuador vs. Peru
Taiwan Missile Crisis (1995-1996): China vs. Taiwan
Estai Seizure (1995): Canada vs. Spain
Kargil Crisis (1999): India vs. Pakistan
"Two States" Crisis (1999): China vs. Taiwan
Isla de Perejil / Parsley Island (2002): Morocco vs. Spain