

INTL 8230: International Conflict

University of Georgia, Department of International Affairs

Course Instructor Information:

Dr. Andrew Owsiak
Email: aowskiak@uga.edu
Office: 325 Candler Hall
Office Hours: Weds, 9:00-11:00am
(or by appointment)

Course Meeting Information:

Spring 2019
Wednesdays, 12:20-3:20pm
117 Candler Hall
<https://www.elc.uga.edu>

Course Description:

Why do actors go to war? This question has captivated the attention of politicians, philosophers, scholars, and citizens for centuries, and there is therefore no shortage of proposed answers to it. In this course, we examine many of these answers from a social scientific perspective. Towards this end, the course proceeds in three phases. First, we begin by grounding ourselves in a research tradition that examines international events through a scientific process – one that builds and evaluates theoretical and empirical models and constantly questions and assesses its own purpose. Second, we review conceptual definitions of conflict episodes (war, militarized conflict, crises, and rivalry), as well as the larger trends in these episodes over time. Finally, we examine the many factors that theoretically might lead to (a lack of) militarized conflict across numerous levels of analysis, including the systemic, dyadic, national, and individual levels. Our primary goal will be to dissect and analyze these various theoretical explanations. In the process, we will consider what conflict scholars do (i.e., theory construction), how they do it (i.e., research design and methods), what problems they face, and what they can do better.

Caveats:

Two points require clarification at the outset of the course. First, this is not a course on *conflict management*, *comparative political violence* (i.e., *civil war*), or *human rights*. This course is therefore not a substitute for those – although there will be some theoretical overlap between these various courses and this one. Second, this course is *not* a policy course. We will therefore not be writing policy briefs on current conflicts or other similar exercises. Rather, we will focus on understanding how scholars approach the study of international conflict, paying particular attention to the various theoretical explanations they advance for why conflict occurs. That said, these explanations undoubtedly have policy implications, and we will discuss those. Ultimately, understanding *why* conflict occurs (our goal) might help us better understand the world in which policy-makers find themselves and what they can or cannot do in pursuit of their foreign policy goals.

Course Objectives:

At the conclusion of this course, students should be able to:

- Identify and discuss the various theoretical explanations for why international conflict occurs;
- (De)Construct a theoretical argument and present it in oral and written form;
- Evaluate the merits of theoretical arguments using clearly specified criteria, articulating both the criteria used and criticisms of the arguments;
- Describe how various research traditions (e.g., issue-based and bargaining) fit together (or not); and
- Explain how scholars of international conflict conduct their work.

Course Reading Material:

We will read large sections of the following books, and I therefore encourage you to purchase them. If the library owns a copy of these books, I have also put them on reserve at the library:

- Blainey, Geoffrey. (1988) *The Causes of War*. New York: Free Press.
- Clark, Kevin A., and David M. Primo. (2012) *A Model Discipline*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Most, Benjamin A., and Harvey Starr. (1989) *Inquiry, Logic, and International Politics*. Columbia: South Carolina University Press.
- Valeriano, Brandon, Benjamin Jensen, and Ryan C. Maness. (2018) *Cyber Strategy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vasquez, John A. (2009) *The War Puzzle Revisited*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vasquez, John A., ed. (2012) *What Do We Know about Interstate War?*, 2nd edn. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

The following books are good supplemental texts, although we will not read and cover them in the classroom. You therefore need not purchase them for the purposes of this course:

- Cashman, Greg. (2014) *Causes of War?*, 2nd edn. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Levy, Jack S., and William R. Thompson. (2010) *Causes of War*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Midlarsky, Manus I., ed. (2000) *Handbook of War Studies II*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, and John A. Vasquez, eds. (2014) *Conflict, War, and Peace: An Introduction to Scientific Research*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, Paul F. Diehl, and James D. Morrow, eds. (2012) *Guide to the Scientific Study of International Processes*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.

The remaining readings will come from two sources: academic journals in the field and book chapters (from books not listed above). All required readings (beyond the first list of books noted above) will be made available electronically from the instructor. They can be accessed through the course eLearning Commons (eLC) website (log-in using UGA MyID at: <https://uga.view.usg.edu/>). If you do not find something on the course website, please access the material through the University of Georgia Library system and/or notify me.

Course Requirements:

Participation (20% of final grade)

As with any graduate course, attendance and participation are critical and required. My goal is to have you directly engage the course material, rather than passively hear about it. Therefore, I will conduct each class meeting as an open-ended discussion of the material assigned for that day, rather than a lecture. Students should prepare for class by reading the assigned material (before we meet), completing any assignments listed for the week (if any), and actively contributing to the class discussion. I will grade participation based on: (a) attendance, (b) frequency with which a student participates in discussion (i.e., quantity), (c) extent to which student comments contribute positively to the discussion (i.e., quality), (d) the extent to which a student identifies key points and raises appropriate questions, and (e) extent to which comments demonstrate that the student has thought about and processed the readings. Appropriate questions include those that critique, extend, or request clarification of readings, as well as those that connect various readings to one another.

(Note: During our discussions in the classroom, students may be called upon randomly using a lottery system in which I sample with replacement. I therefore encourage students to be prepared for our meetings.)

Models (15% for the first turned in, 20% each for the second and third):

Throughout the semester, students will write three (3) short papers (approximately 5-7 pages each) that: a) identify and summarize a model from our readings that explains why international conflict does or does not occur, b) situates the model within other works/research that we have covered, c) critiques the model, and d) offers some indication of how the model might be tested. For our purposes, a model consists of a specified relationship between an independent variable (X) and a dependent variable (Y), explained by theoretical logic.

A few guidelines:

- Be concise and clear in the presentation of your model. Ensure that you cover all the theoretical logic that connects the key independent variable to the key dependent variable.
- The discussion of possible model testing should not merely reiterate what the readings did. Rather, it should search for ways to evaluate, *inter alia*: a) further implications of the model (i.e., what has not yet been tested, but is consistent with the model's logic), b) model adjustments in light of criticisms raised (i.e., tests that shed light on the value of criticisms and whether the model holds up to them), or c) the merits of the model relative to other models (i.e., a way to distinguish the model's predictions from other models' predictions).
- Students may not work together on these assignments and will sign up for topics in class. One student can work on any given topic, and these are assigned on a first-come first-served basis.
- Papers are due on or before the class meeting during which we cover the paper's model in class. Because of this (and because there are three papers to write), students are encouraged to *not* wait until the end of the semester to write their papers.
- Students will present their model(s) to the class as part of our class discussion. This presentation will be part of your assignment grade.

Writing Resources:

Whether you plan for a job in academia or the public or private sphere, writing is an essential skill. We all need practice and help to improve our writing. The above assignments supply one form of practice, and my feedback on them should offer you advice on how to improve. Beyond this advice, I find that the following resources have helped me, my colleagues, or my students improve their writing. These resources are not available on the course website (for copyright reasons).

- Zinsner, William. 2006. *On Writing Well*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Strunk, William, and E.B. White. 2000. *The Elements of Style*. New York: Longman.
- Becker, Howard S. 1986. *Writing for Social Scientists*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lamott, Anne. 1995. *Bird by Bird: Some Instructions on Writing and Life*. New York: Anchor.

Final Exam (25% of final grade):

The course will conclude with a final exam, consisting of 1-2 questions that require about 8-10 pages of writing. It will draw on material covered throughout the entire semester. I will distribute this exam in class on Wednesday, April 24, 2019. Students will turn in a hard-copy of the exam to the instructor by 5:00pm on Thursday, May 2.

Special Events:

Throughout the semester, the department, school, and university will have special lectures and presentations. I encourage students to attend these events and will keep students aware of such opportunities. They generally will be advertised via the SPIA graduate student listserv.

Course Policies:

We will abide by two general policies throughout this course. First, as a University of Georgia student, you have agreed to follow the University's academic honesty policy ("A Culture of Honesty") and the Student Honor Code. All academic work must meet the standards contained in "A Culture of Honesty" (including policies that cover plagiarism; for more information, see: <http://www.uga.edu/honesty>). Students are responsible for informing themselves about these standards before performing *any* academic work and may direct any questions they have regarding the policy (or its application to course assignments) to the instructor.

Second, it should go without saying that we will treat everyone in the class (and their comments) with respect. It is normal to disagree in an academic setting. In fact, many of the scholars that we will read regularly disagree with one another. This disagreement, however, can (and must) occur respectfully. Furthermore, it is normal to make mistakes in the classroom, especially with this challenging material. Therefore, towards the goal of creating a respectful classroom environment, students are expected to: (a) use language that does not insult others or their point of view, (b) keep cell phones turned off *and* put away during class meetings, and (c) use laptops brought to the classroom for educational purposes *only*. Any student that does not follow these guidelines may be asked to leave the classroom and/or remove the distracting technology (including laptops). For more information, please see the University of Georgia's Code of Conduct (http://www.uga.edu/judicialprograms/code_of_conduct/codeofconduct.pdf) and its Non-Discrimination and Anti-Harassment Policy (<http://www.uga.edu/eoo/pdfs/NDAH.pdf>).

Note also that it is the policy and practice of the University of Georgia to create an inclusive learning environment. Students requiring accommodations should discuss such matters with the instructor at the outset of the course. Students requesting accommodations must register with the Disability Resource Center on campus (706-542-8719, <http://www.drc.uga.edu>).

Course Schedule:

The following pages contain a general plan for the course; deviations announced to the class by the instructor may be necessary.

I. Week 1: Course Introduction – January 9

- Most and Starr, Chapter 1
- Clark and Primo, Chapter 1
- Goertz, Gary. (2018) *Multimethod Research, Causal Mechanisms, and Case Studies*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 2.
- Morrow, James D. (1999) "The Strategic Setting of Choices: Signaling, Commitment and Negotiation in International Politics." In *Strategic Choices and International Relations*, edited by David A. Lake and Robert Powell. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 77-114.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph Siverson, and Alastair Smith. (2003) *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, p. 3-8 & Chapter 2.
- Fazal, Tanisha. (2018) *Wars of Law*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, Chapter 2.

Activity: Puzzles.

Recommended:

- Enterline, Andrew J. (2007) *A Guide to Writing Research Projects in Graduate Political Science Courses*.
- Lave, Charles A., and James G. March. (1993) *An Introduction to Models in the Social Sciences*. Lanham: University Press of America.

- Souva, Mark. (2007) Fostering Theoretical Thinking in Undergraduate Classes. *PS: Political Science & Politics*. 40(3):557-561.
- Stimson, James. (n.d.) Professional Writing in Political Science: A Highly Opinionated Essay.
- Zinnes, Dina A. (1980) Three Puzzles in Search of a Researcher. *International Studies Quarterly* 24(3):315-342.

II. Week 2: The Scientific Study of International Processes (SSIP) – January 16

- Clark and Primo, Chapter 2.
- Most and Starr, Chapters 2-3.
- Mahoney, James, and Rachel Sweet Vanderpoel. (2015) Set Diagrams and Qualitative Research. *Comparative Political Studies* 48(1):65-100.
- Goertz, Gary, and James Mahoney. (2012) A Tale of Two Cultures: Qualitative and Quantitative Research in the Social Sciences. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Ch. 5.
- Vasquez, John A. (1995) The Post-Positivist Debate: Reconstructing Scientific Enquiry and International Relations Theory After Enlightenment's Fall. In *International Relations Theory Today*, edited by Ken Booth, and Steve Smith. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, pp. 217-40.
- Lake, David A. (2013) Theory Is Dead, Long Live Theory: The End of the Great Debates and the Rise of Eclecticism in International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3):567-587.
- Mearsheimer, John J., and Stephen M. Walt. (2013) Leaving Theory Behind: Why Simplistic Hypothesis Testing Is Bad for International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations* 19(3):427-457.

Preparatory Assignment: 1. Find a puzzle (of any kind). 2. How should we evaluate theories?

Recommended:

- Kadera, Kelly M., and Dina Zinnes. (2012) The Origins and Evolution of SSIP. In Mitchell et al., Chapter 1.
- Hensel, Paul R. (2012) Review of Available Data Sets. In Mitchell et al., Chapter 3.

III. Week 3: Theoretical Models – January 23

a. **No class meeting. Please complete the following readings and assignment.**

- Clark and Primo, Chapters 3-5 (Chapters 6-7 optional).
- Blainey, Geoffrey, All.

Writing Assignment: Identify and describe Blainey's theoretical model(s) for the occurrence of war (maximum of 1 page, single-spaced). We will discuss this at the outset of the next class meeting.

IV. Concepts and Foundations

a. **Week 4: Conceptualizing Interstate Conflict – January 30**

- Vasquez, John (2009), Chapters 1-2.
- Most and Starr, Chapter 4.
- Levy, Jack S. (2012) The "Paths to War" Concept. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Wagner, R. Harrison. (2007) *War and the State*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Chapter 3.

- Staniland, Paul. (2017) Armed Politics and the Study of Intrastate Conflict. *Journal of Peace Research* 54(4):459-467.
- Colaresi, Michael P., Karen Rasler, and William R. Thompson. (2007). *Strategic Rivalries in World Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 2.

Preparatory Assignment: Are there international conflicts *not* captured by the readings? If so, what are they?

Recommended:

- Goertz, Gary. (2006) *Social Science Concepts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hewitt, J. Joseph. (2003) Dyadic Processes and International Crises. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47(5):669-692.
- Levy, Jack S. (1988) Analytic Problems in the Identification of War. *International Interactions* 14(2):181-186.
- Palmer, Glenn, Vito D’Orazio, Michael Kenwick, and Matthew Lane (2015) The MID4 Dataset, 2002-2010: Procedures, Coding Rules, and Description. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 32(2):222-242.
- Sarkees, Meredith R., and Frank W. Wayman, eds. (2010) *Resort to War*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Vasquez, John A., and Brandon Valeriano. (2010) Classification of Interstate Wars. *Journal of Politics* 72(2):292-309.

b. Week 5: Conflict Trends and Foundational Empirical Analyses – February 6

- Gat, Azar. (2013) Is War Declining – and Why? *Journal of Peace Research* 50(2):149-157.
- Pettersson, Therese, and Kristine Eck. (2018) Organized Violence, 1989-2017. *Journal of Peace Research* 55(4):535-547.
- Jenke, Libby, and Christopher Gelpi. (2017) Theme and Variations: Historical Contingencies in the Causal Model of Interstate Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(10):2262-2284.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, and Manuel Vogt. (2017) Dynamics and Logics of Civil War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(9):1992-2016.
- Houweling, Henk W., and Jan G. Siccamo. (1985) The Epidemiology of War, 1816-1980. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 29(4):641-663.
- Bremer, Stuart A. (1992) Dangerous Dyads: Conditions Affecting the Likelihood of Interstate War, 1816-1965. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 36(2):309-341.
- Maoz, Zeev. (2004) Pacifism and Fightaholism in International Politics: A Structural History of National and Dyadic Conflict, 1816-1992. *International Studies Review* 6(4):107-134.

Recommended:

- Hensel, Paul R. (2002) The More Things Change...: Recognizing and Responding to Trends in Armed Conflict. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 19(1):27-52.
- Pinker, Steven. (2011) *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. New York: Viking.

V. Week 6: Systemic Theories of Conflict – February 13

- Waltz, Kenneth N. (1979) *Theory of International Politics*. Boston: McGraw Hill, Chapter 6.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (2014) *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*. New York: W.W. Norton, Chapter 2.
- Vasquez, John A. (1997) The Realist Paradigm and Degenerative versus Progressive Research Programs: An Appraisal of Neotraditional Research on Waltz's Balancing Proposition. *American Political Science Review* 91(4):899-912.
- Braumoeller, Bear F. (2008) Systemic Politics and the Origins of Great Power Conflict. *American Political Science Review*. 102(1):77-93.
- Lake, David A. (2007) Escape from the State of Nature: Authority and Hierarchy in World Politics. *International Security* 32(1):47-79.
- Rasler, Karen, and William R. Thompson. (2012) War Making and State Making: How and Where Does It Fit in the Bigger Picture? In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Goddard, Stacie E. (2018) Embedded Revisionism: Networks, Institutions, and Challenges to World Order. *International Organization* 72:763-797.

Recommended:

- Bull, Hedley. (1977) *The Anarchical Society*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lake, David A. (2009) *Hierarchy in International Relations*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Tilly, Charles. (1992) *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1992*. Cambridge: Blackwell.

VI. Dyadic Theories of Conflict

a. Week 7: Polarity and Power – February 20

- Modelski, George. (1987) Long Cycles in World Politics. Seattle: University of Washington Press, Chapter 5 (Chapter 1 optional).
- Organski, A.F.K., and Jacek Kugler. (1980) *The War Ledger*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, Chapter 1.
- Gilpin, Robert. (1988) The Theory of Hegemonic War. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4):591-613.
- Copeland, Dale C. (2000) *The Origins of Major War*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, pp. 15-20, 23-28, and Chapter 2.
- Lemke, Douglas. (2002) *Regions of War and Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chapter 3.
- Most and Starr, Chapter 6.
- Sample, Susan G. (2018) Power, Wealth, and Satisfaction: When Do Power Transitions Lead to Conflict? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62(9):1905-1931.

Recommended:

- De Soysa, Indra, John R. Oneal, and Yong-Hee Park. (1997) Testing Power Transition Theory Using Alternative Measures of National Capabilities. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 41(4):509-528.
- DiCicco, Jonathan M., and Jack S. Levy. (1999) Power Shifts and Problem Shifts: The Evolution of the Power Transition Research Program. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43(6):675-704.
- Doran, Charles F. (1983) War and Power Dynamics. *International Studies Quarterly* 27(4):419-441.

- Houweling, Henk, and Jan G. Siccama. (1988) Power Transitions as a Cause of War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 32(1):87-102.
- Lebow, Richard N., and Benjamin Valentino. (2009) Lost in Transition: A Critical Analysis of Power Transition Theory. *International Relations* 23(3):389-410.
- Mearsheimer, John J. (1990) Back to the Future. *International Security* 15(1):5-56.
- Thompson, William R. Polarity, the Long Cycle, and Global Power Warfare.
- Wagner, R. Harrison. (1994) Peace, War, and the Balance of Power. *American Political Science Review* 88(3):593-607.

b. Week 8: Bargaining – February 27

- Fearon, James. (1995) Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49(3):379-414.
- Fearon, James D. (2018) Cooperation, Conflict, and the Costs of Anarchy. *International Organization* 72:523-559.
- Powell, Robert. (2006) War as a Commitment Problem. *International Organization* 60(1):169-203.
- Renshon, Jonathan, Julia J. Lee, and Dustin Tingley. (2017) Emotions and the Micro-Foundations of Commitment Problems. *International Organization* 71:S189-S218.
- Slantchev, Branislav L. (2003) The Power to Hurt: Costly Conflict with Completely Informed States. *American Political Science Review* 97(1):123-133.
- Wolford, Scott, Dan Reiter, and Clifford Carrubba. (2011) Information, Commitment, and War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55(4):556-579.
- Glaser, Charles L. (2010) *Rational Theory of International Politics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, Chapter 3.

Recommended:

- Arena, Philip, and Scott Wolford. (2012) Arms, Intelligence, and War. *International Studies Quarterly* 56(2):351-365.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. (1985) The War Trap Revisited: A Revised Expected Utility Model. *American Political Science Review* 79(1):156-177.
- Powell, Robert. (1999) *Bargaining in the Shadow of Power*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

c. Week 9: Issue-Based – March 6

- Hensel, Paul R. (2012) Territory: Geography, Contentious Issues, and World Politics. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Gibler, Douglas. (2012) The Implications of a Territorial Peace. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Vasquez, John (2009), Chapters 3-6.
- Gibler, Douglas M., and Andrew P. Owsiak. (2018) Democracy and the Settlement of International Borders, 1919 to 2001. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62(9):1847-1875.
- Kim, Nam Kyu. (2018) Are Military Regimes Really Belligerent? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62(6):1151-1178.
- Spaniel, William, and Peter Bills. (2018) Slow to Learn: Bargaining, Uncertainty, and the Calculus of Conquest. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62(4):774-796.

Recommended:

- Clay, K. Chad, and Andrew P. Owsiak. (2016) The Diffusion of International Border Agreements. *Journal of Politics* 78(2):427-442 & online appendix.
- Gibler, Douglas M. (2012) *The Territorial Peace*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hensel, Paul R., Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Thomas E. Sowers, and Clayton L. Thyne. (2008) Bones of Contention: Comparing Territorial, Maritime, and River Issues. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 52(1):117-143.
- Owsiak, Andrew P. (2019) Foundations for Integrating the Democratic and Territorial Peace Arguments. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 36(1):63-87.
- Senese, Paul R., and John A. Vasquez. (2008) *The Steps to War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

d. Week 10: Interstate Rivalries – March 20

- Valeriano, Brandon. (2012) Becoming Rivals: The Process of Rivalry Development. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Diehl, Paul F., and Gary Goertz. (2012) The Rivalry Process: How Rivalries Are Sustained and Terminated. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Stinnett, Douglas M., and Paul F. Diehl. (2001) The Path(s) to Rivalry: Behavioral and Structural Explanations of Rivalry Development. *Journal of Politics* 63(3):717-740.
- Maoz, Zeev and Mor, Ben D. (2002) *Bound by Struggle*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chapters 2-3.
- Rider, Toby J., and Andrew P. Owsiak (2013) Border Settlement, Commitment Problems, and the Causes of Contiguous Rivalry. *Journal of Peace Research* 52(4):508-521.
- Dreyer, David R. (2010) Issue Conflict Accumulation and the Dynamics of Strategic Rivalry. *International Studies Quarterly* 54(3):779-795.
- Uzonyi, Gary. (2018) Interstate Rivalry, Genocide, and Politicide. *Journal of Peace Research* 55(4):476-490.

Recommended:

- Diehl, Paul F., and Gary Goertz (2000) *War and Peace in International Rivalry*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Goertz, Gary, Bradford Jones, and Paul F. Diehl. (2005) Maintenance Processes in International Rivalries. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(5):742-769.
- Findley, Michael G., James A. Piazza, and Joseph K. Young. (2012) Games Rivals Play: Terrorism in Rivalries. *Journal of Politics* 74(1):235-248.
- Hensel, Paul R. (1999) An Evolutionary Approach to the Study of Interstate Rivalry. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 17(2):175-206.
- Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, and Cameron G. Thies. (2011) Issue Rivalries. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 28(3):230-260.

e. Week 11: Alliances – March 27 (International Studies Association Conference)

- Kang, Choong-Nam. (2012) Alliances: Path to Peace or Path to War? In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Walt, Stephen. (1987) *The Origins of Alliances* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Chapters 2, 5.
- Smith, Alastair. (1995) Alliance Formation and War. *International Studies Quarterly* 39(4):405-425.

- Johnson, Jesse. (2017) External Threat and Alliance Formation. *International Studies Quarterly* 61:736-745.
- Chiba, Daina, Jesse C. Johnson, and Brett Ashley Leeds. (2015) Careful Commitments: Democratic States and Alliance Design. *Journal of Politics* 77(4): 968-982.
- Kenwick, Michael R., John A. Vasquez, and Matthew A. Powers. (2015) Do Alliances Really Deter? *Journal of Politics* 77(4):943-954.
- Wolford, Scott. (2014) Showing Restraint, Signaling Resolve: Coalitions, Cooperation, and Crisis Bargaining. *American Journal of Political Science* 58(1):144-156.

Recommended:

- Vasquez, John (2009), Chapter 7.
- Gartner, Scott S., and Randolph M. Siverson. (1996) War Expansion and War Outcome. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40(1):4-15.
- Leeds, Brett Ashley. (2003) Do Alliances Deter Aggression? The Influence of Military Alliances on the Initiation of Militarized Interstate Disputes. *American Journal of Political Science* 47(3):427-439.
- Morrow, James D. (1991) Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances. *American Journal of Political Science* 35(4):904-933.
- Wolford, Scott. (2014) Power, Preferences, and Balancing: The Durability of Coalitions and the Expansion of Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 58(1):146-157.
- Zigler, Sean M. (2016) Competitive Alliances and Civil War Recurrence. *International Studies Quarterly* 60(1):24-37.

f. Week 12: Arms Races & Economics – April 3

i. Arms Races:

- Sample, Susan G. (2012) Arms Races: A Cause or Symptom? In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Rider, Toby J. (2013) Uncertainty, Salient Stakes, and the Causes of Conventional Arms Races. *International Studies Quarterly* 57(3):580-591.
- Adam, Antonis, and Petrod G. Sekeris. (2017) Self Containment: Achieving Peace in Anarchic Settings. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(1):173-203.

ii. Economics:

- Mousseau, Michael. (2012) A Market-Capitalist or Democratic Peace? In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Crescenzi, Mark J.C. (2003) Economic Exit, Interdependence, and Conflict. *Journal of Politics* 65(3):809-832.
- Gartzke, Erik. (2007) The Capitalist Peace. *American Journal of Political Science* 51(1):166-191.
- Simmons, Beth A. (2005) Rules over Real Estate: Trade, Territorial Conflict, and International Borders as Institutions. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 49(6):823-848.

Recommended:

- Barbieri, Katherine. (1996) Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or a Source of Interstate Conflict? *Journal of Peace Research* 33(1):29-49.
- Barbieri, Katherine, and Jack S. Levy. (1999) Sleeping with the Enemy: The Impact of War on Trade. *Journal of Peace Research* 36(4):463-479.

- Glaser, Charles. (2000) The Causes and Consequences of Arms Races. *Annual Review of Political Science* 2:251-276.
- Tomashevskiy, Andrey. (2017) Investing in Violence: Foreign Direct Investment and Coups in Authoritarian Regimes. *Journal of Politics* 79(2):409-423.

VII. Domestic Theories

a. Week 13: Political Regimes – April 10

- Most and Starr, Chapter 5.
- Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin. (2012) Norms and the Democratic Peace. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Colgan, Jeff D., and Jessica L.P. Weeks. (2015) Revolution, Personalist Dictators, and International Conflict. *International Organization* 69(1):163-194.
- Prorok, Alyssa K. (2016) Leader Incentives and Civil War Outcomes. *American Journal of Political Science* 60(1):70-84.
- Carter, Jeff, and Timothy Nordstrom. (2017) Term Limits, Leader Preferences, and Interstate Conflict. *International Studies Quarterly* 61:721-735.
- Carter, Jeff. (2017) The Political Costs of War Mobilization in Democracies and Dictatorships. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(8):1768-1794.
- Crisman-Cox, Casey, and Michael Gibilisco. (2018) Audience Costs and the Dynamics of War and Peace. *American Political Science Review* 62(3):566-580.

Recommended:

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, James D. Morrow, Randolph M. Siverson, and Alastair Smith. (1999) An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review* 93(4):791-807.
- Chiozza, Giacomo, and H.E. Goemans. (2011) *Leaders and International Conflict*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Debs, Alexandre, and Jessica C. Weiss. (2016) Circumstances, Domestic Audiences, and Reputational Incentives in International Crisis Bargaining. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60(3):403-433.
- Gelpi, Christopher. (2010) Performing on Cue? The Formation of Public Opinion toward War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 54(1):88-116.
- Huth, Paul K., and Todd L. Allee. (2002) *The Democratic Peace and Territorial Conflict in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kurizaki, Shuhei, and Taehee Whang. (2015) Detecting Audiences Costs in International Disputes. *International Organization* 69(4):949-980.
- Maoz, Zeev, and Bruce Russett. (1993) Normative and Structural Causes of the Democratic Peace, 1946-1986. *American Political Science Review* 87(3):624-638.
- Mitchell, Sara McLaughlin, and Brandon C. Prins. (2004) Rivalry and Diversionary Uses of Force. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(6):937-961.
- Peceny, Mark, Caroline C. Beer, and Shannon Sanchez-Terry. (2002) Dictatorial Peace? *American Political Science Review* 96(1):15-26.
- Rosato, Sebastian. (2003) The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory. *American Political Science Review* 97(4):585-602.
- Russett, Bruce, and John Oneal. (2001) *Triangulating Peace*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Wolford, Scott. (2012) Incumbents, Successors, and Crisis Bargaining: Leadership Turnover as a Commitment Problem. *Journal of Peace Research* 49(4):517-530.

VIII. Week 14: Individuals and Psychology – April 17

- Mintz, Alex. (2004) How Do Leaders Make Decisions? A Poliheuristic Perspective. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(1):3-13.
- Jervis, Robert. (1988) War and Misperception. *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18(4):675-700.
- Waite, Robert. (1990) Leadership Pathologies: The Kaiser and the Fuhrer and the Decisions for War in 1914 and 1939. In *Psychological Dimensions of War*, edited by Betty Glad. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, Chapter 6.
- Caprioli, Mary, and Mark A. Boyer. (2001) Gender, Violence, and International Crisis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45(4):503-518.
- Basedau, Matthias, Birte Pfeiffer, and Johannes Vullers. (2016) Bad Religion? Religion, Collective Action, and the Onset of Armed Conflict in Developing Countries. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 60(2):226-255.
- Kydd, Andrew H., and Roseanne W. McManus. (2017) Threats and Assurances in Crisis Bargaining. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(2):325-348.
- Sechser, Todd S. (2018) Reputations and Signaling in Coercive Bargaining. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62(2):318-345.

Recommended:

- Gat, Azar. (2009) So Why Do People Fight? Evolutionary Theory and the Causes of War. *European Journal of International Relations* 15(4):571-599.
- Levy, Jack S. (1997) Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 41(1):87-112.
- Stern, Eric. (2004) Contextualizing and Critiquing the Poliheuristic Theory. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(1):105-126.
- Tickner, Ann J. (2001) *Gendering World Politics*. New York: Columbia University Press, Chapter 2.

IX. EXTRA: Deterrence

- Benson, Brett V. (2012) ATOP Data and Deterrence. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Gartzke, Erik, and Matthew Kroenig. (2017) Social Scientific Analysis of Nuclear Weapons: Past Scholarly Successes, Contemporary Challenges, and Future Research Opportunities. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(9):1853-1874.
- Geller, Daniel S. (2012) Nuclear Weapons and War. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Gurantz, Ron, and Alexander V. Hirsch. (2017) Fear, Appeasement, and the Effectiveness of Deterrence. *Journal of Politics* 79(3):1041-1056.
- Huth, Paul K., and Bruce Russett. (1984) What Makes Deterrence Work? Cases from 1900-1980. *World Politics* 36(4):496-526.
- Harvey, Frank. (1998) Rigor Mortis, or Rigor, More Tests: Necessity, Sufficiency, and Deterrence Logic. *International Studies Quarterly* 42(4):675-707.
- Huth, Paul K., and Bruce Russett. (1993) General Deterrence Between Enduring Rivals: Testing Three Competing Models. *American Political Science Review* 87(1):61-73.
- Danilovic, Vesna. (2001) The Sources of Threat Credibility in Extended Deterrence. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45(3):341-369.
- Powell, Robert. (2015) Nuclear Brinkmanship, Limited War, and Military Power. *International Organization* 69(3):589-626.

- Rauchhaus, Robert. (2009) Evaluating the Nuclear Peace Hypothesis: A Quantitative Approach. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 53(2):258-277.
- Signorino, Curtis, and Ahmer Tarar. (2006) A Unified Theory and Test of Immediate Extended Deterrence. *American Journal of Political Science* 50(3):586-605.
- Tingley, Dustin H., and Barbara F. Walter. (2011) Can Cheap Talk Deter? An Experimental Analysis. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 55(6):996-1020.

X. Week 15: Cyber Conflict – April 24

- Valeriano et al., all.
- Gartzke, Erik. (2013) The Myth of Cyberwar: Bringing War in Cyberspace Back Down to Earth. *Security Studies* 38(2):41-73.
- Owsiak, Andrew P. (2019) Escalation and Deterrence in the Cyber Domain. Unpublished manuscript.

Recommended:

- Gartzke, Erik, and Jon R. Lindsay. (2015) Weaving Tangled Webs: Offense, Defense, and Deception in Cyberspace. *Security Studies* 24(2):316-348.

XI. EXTRA: Future Directions and Conclusion: the Study of Peace?

- Wallensteen, Peter. (2012) Future Directions in the Scientific Study of Peace and War. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Maoz, Zeev. (2012) Normal Science and Open Questions: Reflections on the Study of Peace and War, 2001-2011. In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Vasquez, John. (2012) What Do We Know about War? In Vasquez, John (2012).
- Vasquez, John (2009), Chapters 8.
- Goertz, Gary, Paul F. Diehl, and Alexandru Balas. (2016) *The Peace Puzzle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.