



International Relations Research
—POLITIC5001—

Spring term 2020

Lectures: Wednesdays, 12-1pm
Joseph Black Building, C305 Carnegie

Seminar 1: Wednesdays, 1pm-2pm, 709 Boyd Orr

Seminar 2: Wednesdays, 2pm-3pm, 709 Boyd Orr

Seminar 3: Wednesdays, 3pm-4pm, 361 James Watt South

Dr Adrian Florea

Lecturer in International Relations
9 Lilybank Gardens, Room #403

Office hours: By appointment

Email: Adrian.Florea@glasgow.ac.uk

Web: <http://aflorea.weebly.com/>

Twitter: [@adrianflorea13](https://twitter.com/adrianflorea13)

Character of the course

This course introduces key arguments, research designs, and methodologies for studying and understanding cutting-edge research in International Relations. In particular, it investigates the roles of state and non-state actors in shaping international politics and examines the motivations for actor behaviour. The course explores these issues by analysing a number of examples and seeks to train students in how to apply their knowledge to current political challenges in international politics.

Format of teaching

The class is taught in ten sessions, which are intended to bring together elements of lecturing and student participation. Each class will start with a one hour lecture (for all students), followed by three one-hour seminars. Students only need to participate in the **one seminar** they were assigned to. Seminars will combine student input on the key arguments of each week's assigned readings, relate them to real world events and follow up with discussions and student group work. **Every student is expected to have completed all required readings prior to class** and be adequately prepared to contribute to discussions. As this class is research-intensive, detailed knowledge of the assigned readings is necessary and helps to ensure that this class is rewarding for everyone. Discussions will however be focused more on the arguments and the broader picture rather than technical details of the course readings.

Course content and dates

This course focuses on providing students with analytical tools to understand current developments in research in International Relations and apply these tools to real world events. Specifically, the course aims to provide a deep understanding of advanced theories and concepts from the International Relations literature.

The course consists of three parts. The first part (weeks 1/2) introduces students to both qualitative and quantitative research designs as applied to contemporary research in IR. The second part (weeks 3/4), analyses how modern sovereignty norms emerged and were institutionalized and how the nation-state became the dominant actor in international politics. The third part (weeks 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10) examines key topics related to international conflict and civil war. There is **no class** in week 6, which is the reading week.

The one-hour seminar is intended to be a workshop, not a lecture. Everyone is expected to have completed the required readings prior to the seminar and to participate in class discussions. During the seminar, we will challenge the required readings rather than summarise them, so be prepared to raise conceptual, theoretical, and methodological questions.

Part I: Research designs in International Relations

Week 1: 15 January — Qualitative research designs

Week 2: 22 January — Quantitative research designs

Part II: The state

Week 3: 29 January — Sovereignty

Week 4: 5 February — War and state making

Part III: Conflict

Week 5: 12 February — International Conflict

Week 6: 19 February — Reading week (no class)

Week 7: 26 February — Civil Wars

Week 8: 4 March — Rebel group behaviour

Week 9: 11 March — Crime and civil war

Week 10: 18 March — Nonviolent conflict

Week 11: 25 March — The future of conflict

Aims

The course aims are as follows:

- To critically examine and apply different approaches to understanding international politics and policy in IR research.
- To identify and assess the behaviour of state and non-state actors in international politics.
- To explore the nature and causes of contemporary challenges that are beyond the capacity of individual states to address.
- To consider appropriate international responses to dealing with these challenges and explore the opportunities and obstacles for effective multilateral cooperation.

Intended learning outcomes

By the end of the course, through essays, seminar preparation, and presentations, students should be able to:

- demonstrate a command of key concepts for understanding international politics and cutting-edge research in international relations;
- analyse the nature of and evaluate the significance of state and non-state actors in international relations;
- explore and assess the range, nature, extent, and causes of contemporary challenges in international politics, including the reasons for their complexity;
- construct their own understanding, both theoretically and in terms of research design, of the most appropriate policy responses to dealing with these challenges and explore associated trade-offs.

In addition, through seminar presentations and discussions and through essay writing, students should also acquire the following transferable skills:

- the ability to access and make effective use of bibliographical and electronic sources of knowledge and information;
- the ability to analyse written texts and prepare, articulate, and defend reasoned answers to set questions;
- written communication skills, conveying information and ideas fluently to form sustained arguments;
- presentation skills, conveying information and ideas succinctly and effectively by using visual support and handouts and by keeping within prescribed time-limits;
- working collaboratively with others to reach and sustain convincing lines of argument;
- self-motivation and time-management in order to meet specified deadlines;
- experience of how to use empirical data to evaluate theoretical claims.

Assessment

Assessment comprises formative (optional and non-assessed) and **summative (required and assessed)** assessments.

Formative assessment: Coursework essay outline

The written formative assessment is a **one page outline** of the final essay assignment. This outline should provide sufficient context so that it becomes clear what your main argument and conclusions are going to be. The formative assessment is **not graded** but it will help you prepare for the main summative assessment, so you should take this opportunity for feedback very seriously.

Summative assessment:

The summative assessment consists of two essays: a **research design assignment** (1,000 words; 20% of the final grade) and a **final essay** (4,000 words, 80% of the final grade).

For the **research design assignment**, students need to answer **one** of the following three questions:

- (1) Some scholars claim that states engaged in rivalries over disputed territory are more likely to go to war with one another compared with states that are not engaged in such rivalries. Think of an appropriate research design that allows you to empirically test this proposition.
- (2) The “Democratic Peace Theory” argues that democracies interact more peacefully than their autocratic counterparts. Describe and defend a qualitative or quantitative research design that would allow you to rigorously test this claim.
- (3) Some scholars posit that countries with discriminated minorities are more susceptible to experiencing civil wars. Think of a qualitative or quantitative research design that allows you to empirically test this hypothesis.

The **research design assignment** is due on **Monday, 24 February 2020 by 12:00 (noon)**.

The **final essay** (4,000 words) comprises of an answer to one of the following questions:

- (1) How does the organizational structure of rebel groups influence civil conflict outcomes, such as duration or termination? Discuss with reference to one or two ongoing insurgencies.
- (2) Besides fighting against government forces or against other insurgents, many rebel groups engage in governance activities, such as taxation or public goods provision (e.g. local administration; healthcare; schooling). Why do some rebels undertake the onerous task of governing the territory they control while others don't? Discuss with reference to one or two ongoing or past insurgencies.
- (3) On the European continent, warfare has historically been a key driver behind state consolidation. Is this process visible in other regions as well? Why (not)?
- (4) What are the key mechanisms through which criminal activities undertaken by insurgents affect civil conflict processes, such as duration, severity, or termination? Discuss with reference to at least two insurgencies.
- (5) Why do some nonstate actors pursue nonviolent strategies while others adopt extremely violent strategies in pursuit of their overarching objective(s)? Discuss with reference to at least two insurgencies.

The **final essay** is due on **Monday, 20 April 2020 by 12:00 (noon)**.

Word limits for summative assessment are strictly enforced; penalties apply if you go more/less than **10%** over the word count. Tables/figures and references are not included in the word count. Please see the information provided below and consult the MSc/MRes in International Relations and the School Postgraduate Student Handbooks for details on **submission of assessed work, Turnitin, marking conventions, penalties, extensions** and other matters. Exchange or disability students should contact the instructor to make special arrangements. Please contact us immediately if you have any questions or concerns.

Good essays show consistency of argumentation together with acknowledgement of rival arguments, clear structure, simple and direct writing, good punctuation, and evidence of wide reading. I suggest you start working on your answers early on to avoid end-of-term essay congestion.

Essay submission

You must respect the following guidelines when you submit an assessed essay:

- Submit **two hard copies** to the postgraduate office;
- Complete an essay cover sheet for each hard copy of the essay; do not put your name on your essay or cover sheet, just your matriculation number.
- Essays should be typed or word-processed, double-spaced in 12pt type and should have a one-and-a-half inch margin (3.81 cm).
- **Word limits** for all assessed work include footnotes but do not include tables/figures and references. Students should clearly state the word count on the cover sheet of their assessed work. Students who exceed the word limit will be penalised as follows: 1 point for exceeding/being under the word limit by 10-15%, 2 points for 15-20%, 3 points for 20-25%, 4 points for 25-30%, 5 points for 30-35%, and so on.
- For all Politics postgraduate courses, you are required to upload an electronic version of your essay to Turnitin before handing in the two hard copies. Do make sure to use your student ID as filename when uploading to Turnitin.

Turnitin

General information:

For this course, you are required to upload your essay to Turnitin. Note that hard copy submissions are not a substitute for this. Turnitin is intended to support students in their avoidance of plagiarism and to support staff in their detection and prevention. Information about Turnitin, how to upload your work, and how to interpret your originality reports is available here:

<https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/leads/students/plagiarism/usingturnitin/>.

Please read this material thoroughly before submission and note that if you want to submit a draft version to Turnitin, you **must** do this at least 24 hours in advance, or it is highly likely you will not be able to see the originality report before the submission deadline.

Failing to upload a copy before the deadline might mean that your essay is considered as not submitted; it will be considered late and penalised. Moreover, the draft you upload to Turnitin to check plagiarism Turnitin scores does not replace the submission of the final version. If you only submit the draft, we might use this version for grading. If there is no submission to Turnitin, we will not grade the essay.

You **must** label the file containing your essay with your student number (GUID) and **not** your name. It is essential that you note the Turnitin Reference ID number, and retain it (this is found on the right of your essay file on the Turnitin analysis report).

Problems with Turnitin will **not** be considered a valid reason to grant an extension. You still must submit the hard copy before the deadline. There are FAQs available online at <https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/leads/students/plagiarism/usingturnitin/>.

Interpreting your Turnitin report:

Turnitin reports are interpreted using several different indicators, so there is no “magic number” that means all is well. We are definitely not looking for a 0% similarity index, as that would in fact most likely suggest a weak essay with no references to other research.

In any case, whatever the results on Turnitin it is only a tool. In the end, avoiding plagiarism means understanding how to reference properly and in what circumstances you must do this, always being careful to correctly attribute ideas and evidence to their original sources, and not using another person's words or statements too directly unless they are being given as an acknowledged quotation.

Turnitin will also help your tutors and Course Convenors decide whether a piece of work should be flagged up for essay writing skills support, or investigated for possible plagiarism. Please note that **plagiarism will not be tolerated** and will be reported to the University Senate for further action.

You can also get advice on how to improve your writing at:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/leads/students/writingstudyadvice/socialsciences/>. They will put you in touch with an Effective Learning Adviser who can talk to you about the academic implications of your Turnitin Reports and how to interpret them for improving your future work. You can also contact the course teacher during office hours.

Guide to essay marking

Grade	Mark	Description
A1	22	Excellent performance is characterised by most but necessarily all of the following: Clear, comprehensive answer that displays sound critical thinking and insights Relevant evidence and readings from the course, and perhaps beyond, are cited accurately with very few errors.
A2	21	
A3	20	
A4	19	
A5	18	

		All key points are addressed fully Originality, creativity, and independent judgement are present
B1 B2 B3	17 16 15	Very good performance is characterised by most but not necessarily all of the following: Clear answer that fully addresses the key points Sound reasoning that displays a good understanding of the subject matter Relevant evidence and course readings are used with few errors Less critical thinking, originality, and insight than in an excellent performance
C1 C2 C3	14 13 12	Good performance is characterised by most but not necessarily all of the following: Answer displays a basic understanding of the subject matter Evidence of reading from course materials, but some points may not be fully relevant Little in the way of an argument or critical thinking Some errors may be present
D1 D2 D3	11 10 9	Satisfactory performance is characterised by most but not necessarily all of the following: Only a modest understanding of the subject matter is displayed Modest evidence of reading from course materials, with the inclusion of a few relevant points Many errors may be present
E1 E2 E3	8 7 6	Weak performance is characterised by most but not necessarily all of the following: Failure to answer question, though there may be an answer to a similar question Little evidence of any understanding of the subject matter is displayed Significant errors may be present
F1 F2 F3	5 4 3	Poor performance is characterised by most but not necessarily all of the following: Failure to answer question directly Very little evidence of any understanding of the subject matter is displayed Many significant errors are likely to be present
G1 G2	2 1	Very poor performance is characterised by most of the following: Failure to answer question No evidence of any understanding of the subject matter is displayed
H	0	Absence of positive qualities

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is **presenting someone else's ideas (including lectures) or written work (including Internet material, books, articles, theses, dissertations, and essays) as if one's own, without proper acknowledgement**. Remember that even paraphrasing someone else's ideas means that you must give proper credit to your source to avoid plagiarism.

The University Calendar says that it is “considered as an act of academic fraudulence and is an offence against University discipline.” The University Calendar sets out the procedure that a Head of Subject must follow if plagiarism of assessed work is suspected. The presentation of someone else's essay is obviously fraudulent, but the dividing line between your own work and that of your sources is less clear. The solution is always to acknowledge your sources and to use quotations when repeating exactly what someone else has said. Generally you should avoid excessive paraphrasing of others' writings, even with acknowledgement; it does not demonstrate that you have understood the material you are reproducing. If in doubt seek guidance from your teachers. For more information about plagiarism please visit: <http://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/leads/students/plagiarism/>

Course requirements

- Regular attendance at seminars: a record of your attendance will be kept.
- Completion of all required readings. Identifying and sharing additional material relevant to the class (e.g. news items) is strongly encouraged.
- Participation in class discussions and completion of assigned tasks in-between weeks, as requested by the lecturers.
- Submission of the research design assignment (1,000 words, 20% of the final grade).
- Submission of the final essay (4,000 words, 80% of the final grade).

Feedback

This course will offer a range of opportunities for feedback on your performance throughout the course. Feedback is given in various formats and from different sources:

- You will receive ongoing verbal feedback from the instructor and your peers in class discussions and student presentations; this, of course, requires active participation in lectures and seminars.
- You will receive written feedback on the written formative and summative assessments. In line with University policy, written feedback is returned within three working weeks. It is your responsibility to carefully read your feedback and consider recommendations for how you can improve your work.
- You can make use of a range of tailored support for postgraduate students made available by Student Learning Services, including the Writing Centre's Academic Skills Writing Programme or one-to-one appointments with writing advisers. More information is available from their website: <http://www.gla.ac.uk/services/sls/offer/writing/>

Penalties and extensions

Penalties for late submission:

Failure, without good reason, to submit your essay on time will result in the loss of 2 grade points per working day (not including weekends) up to five working days. After five working days, failure to submit the essay will result in the award of an 'H' grade (0) for the essay and may result in the refusal of credit for the course. **You must submit an essay if you want to get credit for this course.** For more information, please check the new university-wide penalty system which is available here:

<http://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/senateoffice/policies/assessment/codeofassessment/guide/>

Extensions:

In exceptional circumstances, students may need to apply to defer their coursework deadline (or to have late penalties lifted). Note, however, that extensions, even short ones, are **not** an entitlement. They are to be granted only if the person responsible for granting the extension is satisfied that the "candidate submitting the application has been prevented by circumstances beyond his or her control from submitting the relevant work on time" (University Calendar, 16.28b). Extension requests will be considered only when a medical or serious personal problem that stands in the way of timely submission can be convincingly demonstrated. Essay deadline 'congestion' or computer problems will **not** be considered. Late requests will be accepted only "where the circumstances preventing the candidate from submitting work on time have also prevented application for a deferral of the deadline for submission" (University Calendar, 16.28d).

Submission of extension or good cause request:

When requesting an extension, students need to submit a completed extension request form, as well as relevant medical or other appropriate evidence.

- To request a coursework extension for up to 5 working days, submit an extension request form available on the Moodle SPS PGT Common Room and submit via MyCampus.
- To request a coursework extension for longer than 5 days, submit a Good Cause Claim on MyCampus: go to your 'Student Centre' and select 'My Good Cause' from the Academics menu. Guidance for students on reporting good cause is available online: https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_420013_en.pdf. Please include any important or sensitive information---it will be treated sympathetically and confidentially.
- If you miss an examination due to adverse circumstances you should submit a Good Cause Claim instead of an Absence report. Student Guidance on the Absence Policy and Reporting is at <https://www.gla.ac.uk/myglasgow/senateoffice/policies/studentssupport/absencepolicy/> and further guidance can be found at https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_129312_en.pdf. This sets out whether you need to submit an absence report or whether you need to submit a good cause claim.

Readings and how to use the reading list

The weekly readings for this class are listed below. **You are expected to read all of the required readings in advance of every seminar**, so that you can contribute to class discussions. The required readings are taken from widely cited journal articles or books and are available on Moodle. For the essays and class discussions, you will need to draw on the recommended readings which can be accessed through the Library. Students should use Moodle for access to seminar notes and other additional resources, including unpublished readings and links to news articles. Please note that copyright of these pieces, unless otherwise stated, remains with the author/s of the piece.

If you have difficulty getting hold of any of the items listed, you are expected to use your initiative and look for other appropriate materials or to contact the lecturer. You are also encouraged to make use of the internet and newspapers to gain relevant information and keep up with current developments in international politics.

Finally, there are several security and international relations journals available in the library. You are strongly advised to look for relevant articles in them. Particularly useful journals include: *American Journal of Political Science*, *American Political Science Review*, *British Journal of Political Science*, *International Organization*, *International Security*, *International Studies Quarterly*, *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *Journal of Peace Research*, *Journal of Politics*, *Review of International Organizations*, *Security Studies*, *World Politics*.

I strongly encourage you to **read the required readings in the order listed below**. Readings indicated with an asterisk ‘[*]’ are the ones I recommend you complete after you have done the required readings. The recommended readings will be extremely useful for your final essay.

Week 1 (15/1): *Qualitative research designs*

Module 1 offers an introduction to the course, and discusses the core elements of qualitative research designs.

Required readings:

- George, A.L., and A. Bennett. 2004. *Case Studies and Theory Development in the Social Sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Chapter 4.
- Levy, J.S. 2008. Case Studies: Types, Designs, and Logics of Inference. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 25: 1-18.

- Gerring, J. 2010. Causal Mechanisms: Yes, But... *Comparative Political Studies* 43: 1499-1526.
- Mahoney, J., and G. Goertz. 2006. A Tale of Two Cultures: Contrasting Quantitative and Qualitative Research. *Political Analysis* 14: 227-249.

Recommended readings:

- Brady, H.E. 2008. Causation and Explanation in Social Science. In the *Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 217-270.
- [*] Falletti, T.G., and Lynch, G.F. 2009. Context and Causal Mechanisms in Political Analysis. *Comparative Political Studies* 42: 1143-1166.
- Kellstedt, P.M., and G.D. Whiten. 2009. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Evera, S. 1997. *Guide to Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Week 2 (22/1): Quantitative research designs

This module discusses quantitative research designs for international relations research. We will focus on problems of selection, endogeneity, and identification to appreciate the importance of research design for causal inference with observational data. The students are expected to consult prior to class the datasets discussed in the required readings.

Required readings:

- Pettersson, T., and P. Walensteen. 2015. Armed Conflicts, 1946-2014. *Journal of Peace Research* 52(4): 536-550.
- Vogt, M. et al. 2015. Integrating Data on Ethnicity, Geography, and Conflict: The Ethnic Power Relations Data Set Family. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(7): 1327-1342.
- Chenoweth, E. et al. 2018. Days of Rage: Introducing the NAVCO 3.0 Dataset. *Journal of Peace Research* 55(4): 524-534.
- Braithwaite, J.M., and K.G. Cunningham. 2019. When Organizations Rebel: Introducing the Foundations of Rebel Group Emergence (FORGE) Dataset. Forthcoming in *International Studies Quarterly*.

Recommended readings:

- [*] Fearon, J. 1991. Counterfactuals and Hypothesis Testing in Political Science. *World Politics* 43(2): 169-195.
- [*] Brady, H.E., and D. Collier (eds). 2010. *Rethinking Social Inquiry: Diverse Tools, Shared Standards (2nd edition)*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Chaudoin, S., J. Hays, and R. Hicks. 2018. Do We Really Know the WTO Cures Cancer? *British Journal of Political Science* 48(4): 903-928.
- Lupu, Y. 2013. The Informative Power of Treaty Commitment: Using the Spatial Model to Address Selection Effects. *American Journal of Political Science* 57(4): 912-25.
- Carnegie, A. and N. Marinov. 2017. Foreign Aid, Human Rights, and Democracy

Promotion: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *American Journal of Political Science* 61(3): 671-683.

- Gschwend, T., and F. Schimmelfennig. 2007. *Research Design in Political Science: How to Practice What They Preach*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- King, G. 1995. Replication, Replication. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 28(3): 444-452.
- [*] King, G., R.O. Keohane, and S. Verba, S. 1994. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*. Princeton, NY: Princeton University Press.
- —. 1995. The Importance of Research Design in Political Science. *American Political Science Review*. 89(2): 475-481.
- King, G., and L. Zeng. 2007. When Can History Be Our Guide? The Pitfalls of Counterfactual Inference. *International Studies Quarterly* 51(1): 183-210.
- [*] Lieberman, E.S. 2005. Nested Analysis as a Mixed-Method Strategy for Comparative Research. *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 435-452.
- Schrodtt, P.A. 2007. Of Dinosaurs and Barbecue Sauce: A Comment on King and Zeng. *International Studies Quarterly* 51(1): 211-215.
- Sekhon, J.S., and R. 2012. When Natural Experiments are Neither Natural nor Experiments. *American Political Science Review* 106(1): 35-57.
- Simmon, B. and D.J. Hopkins. 2005. The Constraining Power of International Treaties: Theory and Methods. *American Political Science Review* 99(4): 623-631.
- von Stein, J. 2005. Do Treaties Constrain or Screen? Selection Bias and Treaty Compliance. *American Political Science Review* 99(4): 611-22.
- [*] Salehyan, I. 2015. Best Practices in the Collection of Conflict Data. *Journal of Peace Research* 52(1): 105-109.
- [*] Powner, L.C. 2015. *Empirical Research and Writing*. Washington DC: CQ Press.

Week 3 (29/1): Sovereignty

Module 3 explores how sovereignty norms were established, how they became institutionalised in the post-World War II environment, and how they are challenged by contemporary state and non-state actor practices.

Required readings:

- Krasner, S.D. 1999. *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Chapter 1.
- Branch, J. 2011. Mapping the Sovereign State: Technology, Authority, and Systemic Change. *International Organization* 65(1): 1-36.
- Clunan, A.L. and H.A. Trinkunas, eds. 2010. *Ungoverned Spaces: Alternatives to State Authority in an Era of Softened Sovereignty*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Chapter 1.
- Lewis-Kraus, G.. 2015. Welcome to Liberland, the World's Newest Country (Maybe). The New York Times Magazine. Available online: <https://goo.gl/3HQyZe>

- Madsen, W. 2018. De-recognition of Kosovo. Strategic Culture Foundation. Available online: <https://www.strategic-culture.org/news/2018/12/02/de-recognition-of-kosovo-us-tries-to-stem-the-tide.html>

Recommended readings:

- Agnew, J. 2005. Sovereignty Regimes: Territoriality and State Authority in Contemporary World Politics. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 95: 437-461.
- Barkin, S. and B. Cronin. 1994. The State and the Nation: Changing Norms and the Rules of Sovereignty in International Relations. *International Organization* 48: 107-130.
- Bartleson, J. 2001. *The Critique of the State*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [*] Butcher, C.R, and R. Griffiths. 2017. Between Eurocentrism and Babel: A Framework for the Analysis of States, State Systems, and International Orders. *International Studies Quarterly* 61(2): 328-336.
- Caporaso, J.A. 2000. Changes in the Westphalian Order: Territory, Public Authority, and Sovereignty. *International Studies Review* 2: 1-28.
- Jackson, R.H. 1990. *Quasi-States: Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [*] Jenkins, J. 2016. The Man Who Created a Tiny Country He Can No Longer Enter. BBC News Magazine. Available online: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-37941931>
- Kratochwil, F. 1986. Of Systems, Boundaries, and Territoriality: An Inquiry into the Formation of the State System. *World Politics* 39(1): 27-52.
- [*] Lake, D. 2003. The New Sovereignty in International Relations. *International Studies Review* 5: 303-323.
- [*] Spruyt, H. 2002. The Origins, Development, and Possible Decline of the Modern State. *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 127-149.
- [*] Spruyt, H. 1994. *The Sovereign State and Its Competitors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Week 4 (5/2): War and state making

This module investigates the mechanisms through which warfare is related to the birth and consolidation of modern states.

Required readings:

- Tilly, C. 1990. *Coercion, Capital, and European States, AD 990-1990*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. Chapter 1.
- Centeno, M.A. 2002. *Blood and Debt: War and the Nation-State in Latin America*. University Park, PA: Penn State University Press. Chapter 1.
- Rasler, K. and W. R. Thompson. 2012. *War Making and State Making: How and*

Where Does It Fit into the Bigger Picture? In *What Do We Know About War?* 2nd edition, pages 237-255. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Abramson, S. 2017. The Economic Origins of the Territorial State. *International Organization*. 71(1): 97-130.

Recommended readings:

- Atzili, B. 2012. *Good Fences, Bad Neighbors: Border Fixity and International Conflict*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [*] Barrett, R.. 2014. *The Islamic State*. New York: The Souffan Group.
- Carter, D.B., and H.E. Goemans. 2011. The Making of the Territorial Order: New Borders and the Emergence of Interstate Conflict. *International Organization* 65(2): 275-309.
- [*] Desch, M.C. 1996. War and Strong States, Peace and Weak States? *International Organization* 50(2): 237-268.
- Koubi, V. 2005. War and Economic Performance. *Journal of Peace Research* 42(1): 67-82.
- [*] Levy, S.J., and W.R. Thompson. 2011. *The Arc of War: Origins, Escalation, and Transformation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rasler, K., and W.R. Thompson. 1994. *The Great Powers and Global Struggle, 1490-1990*. Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky.
- Schwarz, R. 2013. *War and State Building in the Middle East*. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.
- Taylor, B.D., and R. Botea. 2008. Tilly Tally: War-Making and State-Making in the Contemporary Third World. *International Studies Review* 10: 27-56.
- Thies, C. 2005. War, Rivalry, and State Building in Latin America. *American Journal of Political Science* 49(3): 451-465.
- —. 2007. The Political Economy of State Building in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Journal of Politics* 69(3): 716-731.
- Wimmer, A. 2013. *Waves of War: Nationalism, State Formation, and Ethnic Exclusion in the Modern World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Week 5 (12/2): *International Conflict*

This module discusses core theories of international conflict.

Required readings:

- Fearon, J.D. Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.
- Powell, R. 2002. Bargaining Theory and International Conflict. *Annual Review of Political Science* 5: 1-30.
- Hassner, R.E. 2003. 'To Halve and to Hold:' Conflicts over Sacred Space and the Problem of Indivisibility. *Security Studies* 12(4): 1-33.
- Goddard, S.E. 2006. Uncommon Ground: Indivisible Territory and the Problem of Legitimacy. *International Organization* 60: 35-68.

Recommended readings:

- Goertz, G., and P.F. Diehl. 1993. Enduring Rivalries: Theoretical Constructs and Empirical Patterns. *International Studies Quarterly* 37(2): 147-171.
- [*] Thompson, W.R. 2001. Identifying Rivals and Rivalries in World Politics. *International Studies Quarterly* 45(4): 557-586.
- Colaresi, M., and W.R. Thompson. 2002. Strategic Rivalries, Protracted Conflict, and Crisis Escalation. *Journal of Peace Research* 39(3): 263-287.
- [*] Senese, P.D., and J.A. Vasquez. 2005. Assessing the Steps to War. *British Journal of Political Science* 35: 607-633.
- Powell, R. 2006. War as a Commitment Problem. *International Organization* 60(1): 169-203.

Week 6 (19/2): Reading week (no class)

Week 7 (26/2): *Civil Wars*

This module provides an introduction to contemporary research on civil wars.

Required readings:

- Kalyvas, S.N. 2009. Civil War. In *Oxford Handbook of Comparative Politics*.
- Walter, B.F. 2009. Bargaining Failures and Civil War. *Annual Review of Political Science* 12: 243-261.
- Walter, B.F. 2017. The New New Civil Wars. *Annual Review of Political Science* 20: 469-486.
- Fearon, J.D. 2017. Civil War and the Current International System. *Daedalus* 146(4): 18-32.

Recommended readings:

- [*]Walter, B.F. 1997. The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement. *International Organization* 51(3): 335-364.
- [*]Gates, S. 2002. Recruitment and Allegiance: The Microfoundations of Rebellion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 46(1): 111-130.
- [*]Fearon, J.D., and D.D. Laitin. 2003. Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War. *American Political Science Review* 97(1): 75-90.
- [*]Collier, P., and A. Hoeffler. 2004. Greed and Grievance in Civil War. *Oxford Economic Papers* 56: 563-595.
- [*] Blattman, C., and E. Miguel. 2010. Civil War. *Journal of Economic Literature* 48(1): 3-57.
- [*]Kalyvas, S.N. 2006. *The Logic of Violence in Civil War*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- [*]Kalyvas, S.N., and L. Balcells. 2010. International System and Technologies of Rebellion: How the End of the Cold War Shaped Internal Conflict. *American Political Science Review* 104(3): 415-429.
- [*]Staniland, P. 2012. States, Insurgents, and Wartime Political Orders. *Perspectives of Politics* 10(2): 243-264.

- [*] Cederman, L.E., and M. Vogt. 2017. Dynamics and Logics of Civil War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(9): 1992-2016.

Week 8 (4/3): Rebel Group Behaviour

This module investigates important questions about the behaviour of armed rebel groups: why they enter alliances with other insurgent organizations, when they are more likely to fragment, why some are more resilient than others, and why some engage in governance activities.

Required readings:

- Pearlman, W., and K.G. Cunningham. 2012. Nonstate Actors, Fragmentation, and Conflict Processes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56(1): 3-15.
- Christia, F. 2012. *Alliance Formation in Civil Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 2.
- Arjona, A. 2011. *Armed Groups' Governance in Civil War: A Synthesis*. New York: CUNY, Program on States and Security.
- Revkin, M. 2018. What Explains Taxation by Resource-Rich Rebels? Evidence from the Islamic State in Syria. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3023317

Recommended readings:

- Bapat, N., and K.D. Bond. 2012. Alliances between Militant Groups. *British Journal of Political Science* 42(2): 793-824.
- Hazen, J.M. 2013. *What Rebels Want: Resources and Supply Networks in Wartime*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fjelde, H., and D. Nilsson. 2012. Rebels Against Rebels: Explaining Violence between Rebel Groups. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 56(4): 604-628.
- Gazzini, C. 2017. *Traversing the Tribal Patchwork of Libya's South West*. International Crisis Group.
- Marten, K. 2012. *Warlords: Strong-Arm Brokers in Weak States*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- [*] Matanock, A., and P. Staniland. 2018. How and Why Armed Groups Participate in Elections. *Perspectives on Politics* 16(3): 710-727.
- Salehyan, I. 2009. *Rebels without Borders: Transnational Insurgencies in World Politics*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Sinno, A. 2008. *Organizations at War in Afghanistan and Beyond*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Staniland, P. 2012. Organizing Insurgency: Networks, Resources, and Rebellion in South Asia. *International Security* 37: 142-177.
- Vlassenroot, K. et al. 2016. *Contesting Authority: Armed Rebellion and Military Fragmentation in Walikale and Kalehe, North and South Kivu*. London: Rift Valley Institute.
- Weinstein, J.M. 2007. *Inside Rebellion: The Politics of Insurgent Violence*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Week 9 (11/3): *Organised Crime and Conflict*

This module discusses the links between clandestine political economies and internal conflict.

Required readings:

- Kalyvas, S.N. 2015. How Civil Wars Help Explain Organized Crime—and How They Do Not. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(8): 1517-1540.
- Andreas, P. 2004. The Clandestine Political Economy of War and Peace in Bosnia. *International Studies Quarterly* 48(2): 29-51.
- Cornell, S.E., and M. Jonsson. eds. 2014. *Conflict, Crime, and the State in Postcommunist Eurasia*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press. Chapter 1.
- Barnes, N. 2017. Criminal Politics: An Integrated Approach to the Study of Organized Crime, Politics, and Violence. *Perspectives on Politics* 15(4): 967-987.

Recommended readings:

- Andreas, P. 2013. *Smuggler Nation: How Illicit Trade Made America*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [*] Asal, V., H.B. Milward, and E.W. Schoon. 2015. When Terrorists Go Bad: Analyzing Terrorist Organizations' Involvement in Drug Smuggling. *International Studies Quarterly* 59(1): 112-123.
- Bakker, R.M., J. Raab, and H.B. Milward. 2012. A Preliminary Theory of Dark Network Resilience. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 31(1): 33-62.
- Collier, P. 2000. Rebellion as a Quasi-criminal Activity. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(6): 839-853.
- [*]Cornell, S.E. 2007. Narcotics and Armed Conflict: Interaction and Implications. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 30: 207-227.
- Kego, A., and A. Molcean. 2011. Russian Speaking Organized Crime Groups in the EU. Stockholm: Institute for Security and Development Policy.
- [*] Koivu, K.L. 2016. In the Shadow of the State: Mafias and Illicit Markets. *Comparative Political Studies* 49(2): 155-183.
- [*]Lessing, B. 2015. Logics of Violence in Criminal War. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 59(8): 1486-1516.
- [*]Shortland, A., and F. Varese. 2016. State Building, Informal Governance, and Organised Crime: The Case of Somali Piracy. *Political Studies* 64(4): 811-831.
- Skaperdas, S. 2001. The Political Economy of Organized Crime: Providing Protection When the State Does Not. *Economics of Governance* 2: 173-202.
- Zohar, E. 2016. A New Typology of Contemporary Armed Non-State-Actors: Interpreting the Diversity. *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism* 39: 423-450.
- Ahmad, Aisha. 2015. The Security Bazaar: Business Interests and Islamist Power in Civil War Somalia. *International Security* 39(3): 89-117.
- [*]Andreas, P. 2019. Drugs and War: What Is the Relationship? *Annual Review of Political Science* 22: 57-73.

Week 10 (18/3): *Nonviolent Conflict*

This module provides an introduction to recent works on nonviolent conflict.

Required readings:

- Chenoweth, E., and M.J. Stephan. 2012. *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press. Chapter 1.
- Nepstad, S.H. Nonviolent Civil Resistance and Social Movements. *Sociology Compass* 7: 590-598.
- White, B. et al. 2015. Nonviolence as a Weapon of the Resourceful: From Claims to Tactics in Mobilization. *Mobilization* 20(4): 471-491.

Recommended readings:

- Chenoweth, E., and M.J. Stephan. 2008. Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict. *International Security* 33(1): 7-44.
- Chenoweth, E., and J. Ulfelder. 2017. Can Structural Conditions Explain the Onset of Nonviolent Uprisings? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(2): 298-324.
- [*]Griffiths, R.D., and L.M. Wasser. 2019. Does Violent Secessionism Work? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 63(5): 1310-1336.
- [*]2017. Symposium on the Arab Uprisings and International Relations Theory. *PS: Political Science and Politics* 50(3).

Week 11 (25/3): *The Future of Conflict*

This module discusses current debates about the future of conflict.

Required readings:

- Pinker, S. 2011. *The Better Angels of Our Nature: Why Violence Has Declined*. New York: Viking (selections).
- Braumoeller, B.F. 2019. *Only the Dead: The Persistence of War in the Modern Age*. New York: Oxford University Press (selections).
- Fazal, T.M., and P. Poast. 2019. War Is Not Over: What the Optimists Get Wrong About Conflict. *Foreign Affairs* 98(6).
- Gleditsch, K.S. 2019. An Ever More Violent World. *Political Studies Review* 17(2): 99-114.

Recommended readings:

- [*]Fazal, T.M. 2014. Dead Wrong? Battle Deaths, Military Medicine, and Exaggerated Reports of War's Demise. *International Security* 39(1): 95-125.
- Watts, S. et al. 2017. *A More Peaceful World? Regional Conflict Trends and U.S. Defense Planning*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- [*]Zeitsoff, T. 2017. How Social Media Is Changing Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 61(9): 1970-1991.
- Gohdes, A.R. 2018. Studying the Internet and Violent Conflict. *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 35(1): 89-106.