

# PSCI 4821: International Conflict

**Dr. Paul Hensel**

phensel@unt.edu

<http://www.paulhensel.org>

Office: 165 Wooten Hall (Hours: MW 8:30-9:30 AM, F 1-2)

**Spring 2018**

MWF 10:00-10:50 AM

050 Business Leadership Bldg.

## Course Description

This course is meant 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 between nation-states, the outcomes and consequences of war, and a variety of 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.

## Required Texts

- **Books:** All of these should be available at the usual Denton locations, or maybe cheaper through online bookstores -- but wherever you buy them, be sure to get the correct editions!

- Patrick M. Morgan (2006), *International Security: Problems and Solutions*, 1st ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

- Richard Overy (2011), *1939: Countdown to War*. New York: Penguin Books.

- **Blackboard:** The remaining readings are made available through this course's Blackboard page.

## Course Requirements

(1) **Examinations:** two noncumulative essay exams are required. The first exam will be given in class; the second exam will be given in the regular class room on the day and time that UNT assigns for the course's final exam. Each exam will be worth 25% of the total course grade. Be sure to be on time; once the first student leaves the exam, anybody else who enters to take the exam will lose five letter grades.

(2) **Research Papers:** one 10-15 page research paper is required for this class, which will count for 40% of the total course grade; more details are provided at the end of this syllabus. This paper will be due **at the beginning of class** on the due date, and must be turned in through TurnItIn (accessible through the Blackboard site for this course); papers turned in after class starts will be assessed a late penalty. Note that late papers will lose one full letter grade for each day that they are late, with the penalty increasing at midnight each day.

(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 his/her lowest quiz score.

## Course Rules

(1) Makeup exams, whether for full credit or not, can take place only on UNT's designated "Reading Day" at the end of the last week of classes. Only one time slot on Reading Day will be offered for all makeup exams in

any of the instructor's courses; students seeking to take a makeup exam in this time slot must contact the instructor no later than 5 PM on Tuesday of the last week of classes. Makeup exams will only be offered as essay examinations (regardless of the type of exam that is being made up) over the same material that would have been covered by the original exam.

Full-credit makeup examinations are given only with prior instructor approval (if at all possible) and with appropriate documentation. Note that the documentation must indicate why you could not be in class *at the exact time of the originally scheduled test*. If appropriate documentation is not provided, any makeup examination that might be offered will face a grade penalty of five letter grades, equivalent to showing up late at the original exam after one or more students have already finished and left the room.

(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 assessed a substantial penalty (one letter grade per day that it is late), based on when the instructor receives the assignment, so it is in your interest to email a copy to the instructor as soon as it is completed; as long as you turn in an identical printed copy at the next class meeting, the late penalty will be based on when the email was received.

Note that the scheduled final exam time represents the conclusion of the course. No late assignments or documentation will be accepted after the conclusion of this two-hour period, and no makeup exams will be offered after this time.

(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.

Also, students are responsible for maintaining backups of any written work for this course, preferably in a location away from the main computer that is being used (such as online backup through Dropbox). No extensions will be granted for work that is not turned in on time because of computer, hard drive, or printer failure, theft, power surge, or similar causes.

(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.

Following departmental policy, any student engaging in unacceptable behavior may be directed to leave the classroom. Additionally, the instructor may refer the student to the Center for Student Rights and Responsibilities to consider whether the student's conduct violated UNT's Code of Student Conduct (which may be found at <http://deanofstudents.unt.edu/conduct>).

(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.

Also be aware that any PowerPoint slides presented to the class will not contain all material that will be necessary for an "A" grade on course exams. The instructor's verbal lecture will also include important information that is not presented directly on the slides, so students should be careful to take notes on verbal lecture material as well as the brief overviews presented on the slides.

(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.

Before asking for an exception, be aware that I will not grant exceptions that might be perceived as giving one student an unfair advantage or an opportunity that was not available to the remaining students who followed the rules correctly, turned in their work on time, and so on.

(7) The instructor's teaching-related policies and expectations are described in more detail at <<http://www.paul-hensel.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) Consistent with UNT rules, instructors (whether professors, teaching fellows, or teaching assistants) may not discuss student grades over email, telephone, or in any other setting that is not face-to-face due to privacy and security concerns. If you have questions about your grades, you may meet with me during office hours, or I will be glad to make an appointment at a more convenient time.

(9) I will never cancel class on my own for weather-related reasons; unless you hear official word through UNT's Eagle Alert service, class will be held at the regular time and place. Students who are unable to make it to class due to weather are still responsible for any material covered in lecture that day. If class is canceled, the next class meeting after school resumes will cover the material that would have been covered in the canceled class meeting, and a revised syllabus will be posted as soon as practical to adjust the schedule of remaining class meetings. More detail on the instructor's weather-related policies is provided at <<http://www.paul-hensel.org/teaching.html>>.

(10) The content of this syllabus may be modified by the instructor at any time during the semester if deemed necessary. Any such changes will be announced in class as well as via Blackboard's class email list; students are responsible for making sure that they check the email account that is on file with Blackboard.

### **Academic Integrity**

Academic integrity is defined in the UNT Policy on Student Standards for Academic Integrity, which is located at: <<http://policy.unt.edu/policy/06-003>>. This includes such issues as cheating (including use of unauthorized materials or other assistance on course assignments or examinations), plagiarism (whether intentional or negligent), forgery, fabrication, facilitating academic dishonesty, and sabotage. All students should review the policy carefully; failure to read or understand the policy does not protect you from sanctions for violating it.

Any suspected case of academic dishonesty will be handled in accordance with current University policy and procedures. Possible academic penalties range from a verbal or written admonition to a grade of "F" in the course; further sanctions may apply to incidents involving major violations. You will find the policy and procedures at <<http://faculty.unt.edu/academic-integrity>>.

### **Americans with Disabilities Act**

The University of North Texas makes reasonable academic accommodation for students with disabilities. Students seeking reasonable accommodation must first register with the Office of Disability Accommodation (ODA) to verify their eligibility. If a disability is verified, the ODA will provide you with a reasonable accommodation letter to be delivered to faculty to begin a private discussion regarding your specific needs in a course. You may request reasonable accommodations at any time, however, ODA notices of reasonable accommodation should be provided as early as possible in the semester to avoid any delay in implementation. Note that students must obtain a new letter of reasonable accommodation for every semester and must meet with each faculty member prior to implementation in each class. Students are strongly encouraged to deliver letters of reasonable accommodation during faculty office hours or by appointment. Faculty members have the authority to ask students to discuss such letters during their designated office hours to protect the privacy of the

student. For additional information see the Office of Disability Accommodation website at <<http://www.unt.edu/oda>>. You may also contact them by phone at (940) 565-4323.

### **Sexual Discrimination, Harassment, and Assault**

UNT is committed to providing an environment free of all forms of discrimination and sexual harassment, including sexual assault, domestic violence, dating violence, and stalking. If you (or someone you know) has experienced or experiences any of these acts of aggression, please know that you are not alone. The federal Title IX law makes it clear that violence and harassment based on sex and gender are Civil Rights offenses. UNT has staff members trained to support you in navigating campus life, accessing health and counseling services, providing academic and housing accommodations, helping with legal protective orders, and more.

UNT's Dean of Students web site at <<http://deanofstudents.unt.edu/resources>> offers a range of on-campus and off-campus resources to help support survivors, depending on their unique needs. The Student Advocate may be reached through email at [SurvivorAdvocate@unt.edu](mailto:SurvivorAdvocate@unt.edu) or by calling the Dean of Students' office at (940) 565-2648. You are not alone; we are here to help.

### **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, syllabi for my 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 online version of this syllabus can be found at:

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

---

### **Schedule of Topics and Assigned Readings**

*Please note that for some topics that take more than one day to cover, I have separated the assigned readings by day, to allow students to focus on material that will be relevant to each day's class. Where I do not list separate readings for each day of a multi-day topic, you are expected to complete the entire assigned reading before the first day of that topic.*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Wednesday, Jan. 17: Introduction / Overview of Course

2-3. Friday, Jan. 19 - Monday, Jan. 22: Studying Conflict and War

• Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: Carl von Clausewitz (1832), "What is War?" Chapter 1, Book I of *On War*. (focus on sections 2, 11, 23, and 24)

--*Blackboard*: Joshua S. Goldstein and Steven Pinker (12/17/2011). "War Really Is Going Out of Style." *New York Times*.

• Assigned Reading (day 2): Morgan: Chapters 1 ("An Introduction to Security in International Relations") and 2 ("The Problem of War in International Politics")

• *Discussion Points*: This topic 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 and some recent patterns and trends in armed conflict. After reading the assigned materials, come to class prepared to discuss the reasons that countries choose to engage in conflict, as well as your expectations about patterns of conflict in the near future.

## **II. CAUSES AND CORRELATES OF WAR**

### **A. Individual-Level Causes of War**

4-6. Wednesday, Jan. 24 - Monday, Jan. 29: Human Nature and Psychology

• Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: Thomas Hobbes (1651). "Of the Natural Condition of

Mankind as Concerning Their Felicity and Misery." Chapter 13, Book 1 of *The Leviathan*.

--*Blackboard*: Sigmund Freud and Albert Einstein (1932). "Why War?" correspondence.

• Assigned Reading (day 2): *Blackboard*: Robert Jervis (1988). "War and Misperception." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, 4: 675-700.

• Assigned Reading (day 3): *Blackboard*: Daniel Kahneman and Jonathan Renshon (2007). "Why Hawks Win." *Foreign Policy* 158 (January-February): 34-38.

• *Discussion Points*: This topic will begin our investigation of factors that have been suggested as causes of armed conflict. The first day's 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? If they are right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war? After that, we 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? If they are right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

## **B. State/Domestic-Level Causes of War**

7-8. Wednesday, Jan. 31 - Friday, Feb. 2: Groups in Government: Groupthink and Military Doctrines

• Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: Mark Schafer and Scott Crichlow (1996). "Antecedents of Groupthink: A Quantitative Study." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 40, 3: 415-435.

• Assigned Reading (day 2): Morgan: Chapter 4 ("Seeking Cheap Victories")

• *Discussion Points*: This topic will examine several ways that political or military groups might be responsible for the outbreak of armed conflict. We will start with another psychological factor, a dynamic of group decision-making called "groupthink." Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing? Why or why not? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

We will then move 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? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

9-10. Monday, Feb. 5 - Wednesday, Feb. 7: Diversionary Theory

• Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: CNN.com (8/20/1998), "Most Lawmakers Support Clinton's Military Strikes"

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

• Assigned Reading (day 2): [none]

• *Discussion Points*: This topic 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? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

11-13. Friday, Feb. 9 - Wednesday, Feb. 14: Nationalism and Civilizations

• Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: David A. Lake and Donald Rothchild (1996).

"Containing Fear: The Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict." *International Security* 21, 2: 41-75.

• Assigned Reading (day 2): [none]

• Assigned Reading (day 3): *Blackboard*: Samuel P. Huntington (1993). "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs* 72, 3 (Summer): 22-49.

• *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 internal conflict or terrorism, since UNT offers several entire courses that address this topic, but this will still give us a introduction to what scholars think we know. Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict within and/or between states? Why or why not? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

After that we will examine an offshoot of this topic, Huntington's controversial notion that differences between grand "civilizations" will be the primary source of future conflict. Do you find this argument to be plausible and/or scientifically convincing? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

### **C. International-/Dyadic-Level Causes of War**

14-16. Friday, Feb. 16 - Wednesday, Feb. 21: Conflict over Resources and/or Territory

- Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: Thomas F. Homer-Dixon (1991). "On the Threshold: Environmental Changes as Causes of Acute Conflict." *International Security* 16, 2 (Autumn): 76-116.
- Assigned Reading (day 2): *Blackboard*: Paul R. Hensel (2013). "Projecting the Danger of Territorial Claims: Lessons from Two Centuries of Conflict." Revised version of paper presented at the 2013 Joint Meeting of the Peace Science Society (International) and the International Studies Association, Budapest, Hungary.
- Assigned Reading (day 3): [none]
- *Discussion Points*: The first class meeting on this topic will consider the widely repeated, but rarely tested, argument that resource scarcity is (or 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? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

We will then 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? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

17. Friday, Feb. 23: Anarchy, the Security Dilemma, and Arms Races

- Assigned Reading: Morgan: re-read Chapter 1  
--*Blackboard*: Douglas M. Gibling, 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 (March): 131-147
- *Discussion Points*: This topic 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? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

18. Monday, Feb. 26: Crisis Bargaining

- Assigned Reading: *Blackboard*: Russell J. Leng (1984). "Reagan and the Russians." *American Political Science Review* 78 (June): 338-355.
- *Discussion Points*: This topic will examine how states' interactions during 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? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

### **D. Global/Systemic-Level Causes of War**

19-21. Wednesday, Feb. 28 - Monday, Mar. 5: The International System

- Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: 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.

• Assigned Reading (day 2): *Blackboard*: Karl W. Deutsch and J. David Singer (1964). "Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability." *World Politics* 16, 3: 390-406.

• Assigned Reading (day 3): *Blackboard*: Kenneth N. Waltz (1988). "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18, 4 (Spring): 615-628.

• *Discussion Points*: This topic will consider how the international system itself might be a cause of armed conflict. We will begin by examining a topic that has been more prominent since the Cold War ended, in the form of power transition theory. A number of scholars have suggested that the great powers might well fight major wars over hegemony, or leadership of the international system. This has gotten particular attention with respect to China, which is now seen as the most likely challenger to U.S. hegemony (a role previously filled by Russia and Japan). Do you find this approach plausible and/or scientifically convincing as an explanation for conflict? Why or why not? If it is right, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

We will then examine 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? (And do you think unipolarity would be safer or more dangerous?) If any particular kind of polarity is a major cause of war, what possible solutions -- if any -- might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

## **22. Wednesday, Mar. 7: MIDTERM EXAM (during the regular class period)**

### **III. OUTCOMES AND CONSEQUENCES OF WAR**

23. Friday, Mar. 9: Costs of War

• Assigned Reading: *Blackboard*: Colin Powell (2001). "Powell's Doctrine, in Powell's Words." *Washington Post*, October 7.

--*Blackboard*: Thomas James Brennan (2012). "Ending a Life, and a Part of Yourself, for the First Time." *New York Times*, December 14.

--*Blackboard*: Elisabeth Bumiller (2013). "For 2 Nominees, Vietnam Bred Doubts on War." *New York Times*, January 8.

• *Discussion Points*: This topic will move away from causes of conflict to consider the outcomes and consequences of conflict. We begin by focusing on the most obvious consequences: who wins or loses, and how many people die? Be ready to discuss how the countries in your research paper topic fared in this respect. We will also consider the impact of war on the individual combatants themselves -- think about how soldiers' wartime experiences might continue to affect them after the shooting stops.

## **24-26. March 12-16: NO CLASS (Spring Break)**

27-29. Monday, Mar. 19 - Friday, Mar. 23: Consequences of War

• Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: A.F.K. Organski and Jacek Kugler (1977), "The Costs of Major Wars: The Phoenix Factor." *American Political Science Review* 71, 4: 1347-1366.

• Assigned Reading (day 2): *Blackboard*: Paul R. Hensel (1999). "The Evolution of the Franco-German Rivalry." In William R. Thompson, ed., *Great Power Rivalries*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, pp. 86-121.

• Assigned Reading (day 3): none

• *Discussion Points*: This topic will move beyond death and destruction to consider other consequences of conflict: long-term environmental effects, political and economic changes, and recurrent conflict or even decades-long rivalry against the same opponent. 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? 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?

#### IV. PREVENTION AND LIMITATION OF WAR

30-31. Monday, Mar. 26 - Wednesday, Mar. 28: Proliferation & Deterrence

- Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): Morgan: Chapter 5 ("Deterrence and Arms Control") -- read pp. 77-94 only

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

- Assigned Reading (day 2): none

- *Discussion Points*: This topic will begin the final section of the course, focusing on ways that conflict or war might be prevented. We start 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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

32-33. Friday, Mar. 30 - Monday, Apr. 2: Arms Control & Disarmament

- Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): Morgan: Chapter 5 ("Deterrence and Arms Control") -- read pp. 94-107 only

- Assigned Reading (day 2): none

- *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 ambitious disarmament -- to be important forces for peace, or are they dangerous steps that seem to make future conflict even more likely? Why? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

34-35. Wednesday, Apr. 4 - Friday, Apr. 6: Democratic Peace and Liberal Peace

**\*\*\*RESEARCH PAPERS DUE -- must be turned in using TurnItIn (through Blackboard), before the start of class on the first day of this topic. Be sure to save/print a copy of the screen with the receipt showing when you submitted your paper; without this receipt, no "but I turned it in on time!" excuses can be accepted.\*\*\***

- Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): *Blackboard*: Michael W. Doyle (1986). "Liberalism and World Politics." *American Political Science Review* 80, 4 (December): 1151-1169.

- Assigned Reading (day 2): Morgan: Chapter 8 ("Complex Multilateralism and Integration")

- *Discussion Points*: This topic 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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

After finishing with democracy, we will examine an offshoot of democratic peace theory, which focuses more on the economic dimensions of liberalism and on international integration and institutions 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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution? What about 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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

36-37. Monday, Apr. 9 - Wednesday, Apr. 11: Diplomacy and International Law



- Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): Morgan: Chapter 9 ("Negotiation and Mediation")
- Assigned Reading (day 2): none
- *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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

### 38. Friday, Apr. 13: Balance of Power

- Assigned Reading: Morgan: Chapter 3 ("The Appropriate Distribution of Power")
- *Discussion Points*: This topic will consider 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? If they are a source of conflict, what possible solutions might be tried to prevent conflict/war?

### 39. Monday, Apr. 16: Collective Security

- Assigned Reading: Morgan: Chapter 6 ("The Great-Power Concert"), Chapter 7 ("Wilsonian Collective Security")
- *Discussion Points*: This topic will return to the idea that states -- particularly the great powers -- 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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

### 40-41. Wednesday, Apr. 18 - Friday, Apr. 20: Peacekeeping

- Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic): Morgan: Chapter 10 ("Peacekeeping")
- Assigned Reading (day 2): none
- *Discussion Points*: This topic 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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

### 42. Monday, Apr. 23: Peace Imposition, Peace Enforcement, and Peacebuilding

- Assigned Reading: Morgan: Chapter 11 ("Peace Enforcement and Peace Imposition"), Chapter 12 ("Peacebuilding")
- *Discussion Points*: This topic will go beyond peacekeeping to examine several related techniques. Think about each of the techniques discussed in the reading, considering how effective it is likely to be: Are the combatants 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? Which causes of war, if any, seem most likely to be addressed by this solution?

### 43. Wednesday, Apr. 25: Application to WWII: Onset of German-Polish War

- Assigned Reading: Overy: pp. 1-68 ("Prologue", "Time Running Out", "Poland in the Middle")
- *Discussion Points*: The next two class periods will attempt to apply the theories covered in this course to help understand the outbreak of World War II in Europe. We will begin by considering the outbreak of war between Germany and Poland on Sept. 1, 1939. While doing this assigned reading, think about which causes of war that we covered in this course seem to be at work (as well as any causes that we didn't cover). Also think about

which solutions were attempted, how well they did or didn't work, and why (as well as any solutions that we didn't cover). Finally, are there any solutions that you think might have been more effective?

44. Friday, Apr. 27 : Application to WWII: Escalation to World War

- **Assigned Reading:** Overy: pp. 69-124 ("Local War or World War?", "The Failure of Peace", "Conclusion")
- **Discussion Points:** As in the previous class, today we will attempt to apply topics from this course to understand the escalation of the German-Polish war into a world war by drawing in Great Britain, France, and Russia. Think about which causes seem to be at work in this escalation, as well as which solutions were attempted, and any other solutions that you think might have been more effective.

45-46. Monday, Apr. 30 - Wednesday, May 2: Is War Obsolete?: Optimistic and Pessimistic Views on the Future

- **Assigned Reading (day 1 of this topic):** Re-read the Goldstein/Pinker article from the first week of class  
--**Blackboard:** John Mueller (1990). "The Obsolescence of Major War." *Bulletin of Peace Proposals* 21, 3: 321-328.
- **Assigned Reading (day 2):** Morgan: Chapter 13 ("Conclusion")  
--**Blackboard:** John J. Mearsheimer (1990). "Why We Will Soon Miss the Cold War." *Atlantic Monthly* 266, 2 (August): 35-50.
- **Discussion Points:** This class will conclude by examining a variety of views on the future of armed conflict and war -- some quite optimistic, and others quite pessimistic. 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.

47. Friday, May 4: **NO CLASS (UNT Reading Day)**

**FINAL EXAM: Saturday, May 5, 8:00 - 10:00 AM (in the regular classroom)**

- *The final exam is held on the day during Final Exam Week that is assigned by UNT, based on the time when our class meets: <<http://registrar.unt.edu/exams/final-exam-schedule>>*

---

### **Research Paper Assignment**

This course requires a 10-15 page research paper on an interstate crisis or war, on a topic to be approved by Dr. Hensel. In the course of writing this paper you should come to understand the events that led to the outbreak of a specific historical case of conflict, as well as applying three theories about the causes of conflict to this case and speculating about the possibility of future conflict between the same adversaries. This paper must be a serious scholarly analysis of the history, causes, and aftermath of the crisis/war; this should not be a political statement that takes sides by supporting or criticizing the combatants' respective arguments or claims.

### **Choosing a Topic**

This syllabus includes a list of all eligible crises and wars; each student must study a different topic. You must list your top five topic preferences (in the order of preference), and I will try to assign you the 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.

### **Paper Requirements**

This paper will require four sections:

*Section 1: History of the Crisis/War (40% of paper grade, approximately 4-7 pages)*

The first section will involve (1) an overview of the events leading up to the crisis/war (focusing on the five years before it began, but also touching on relevant earlier events and background), as well as (2) a summary

(no more than 3-4 pages) of major battles, peace initiatives, and other important events during the crisis/war.

*Section 2: Outcome and Consequences (10%, approximately 1-2 pages)*

You will need to describe the consequences of the crisis/war both overall (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) and for each participant (casualties, destruction, lost territory, leaders losing power, economic recession, etc.).

*Section 3: Causes of the Crisis/War (40%, approximately 4-7 pages)*

The next section asks you to analyze the causes of your crisis/war. You must 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 cause, (a) explain the theoretical logic of why that factor is thought to be a cause of conflict/crisis/war in general (citing appropriate sources such as those listed on the syllabus), 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 theory applies to this case).

Note that this requires three *distinct* theories/causes; two different theories about the impact of arms races (such as the tinderbox and spiral model) would not qualify because they are both part of arms race theory, and two different theories about the impact of territorial claims (such as tangible and intangible salience) would not qualify because they are both part of territorial claims theory. Also, if one of your causes is something that we did not cover in class, you still need to explain the general theoretical logic (with appropriate citations) before applying it to your specific case.

*Section 4: Projection about the Future (10%, approximately 1 page)*

Finally, you need to make and justify a projection about the likelihood that the same adversaries will become involved in another crisis/war in the next decade after this paper is due. This should be based on your understanding of the three causes discussed in your paper (have one or more of these causes changed, or do they all still seem likely to produce another crisis/war?) as well as on any other information that you consider relevant.

**Technical Notes**

- 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 meet this requirement (such as turning in a paper that is too short/too long or only meets the requirements by manipulating fonts or margins) will be penalized by at least one letter grade.
- Papers must be turned in through TurnItIn, accessible through the course's Blackboard page. This will record the exact date and time on which the paper was turned in, as well as checking for possible plagiarism from published sources or earlier student papers. If Blackboard or TurnItIn is not available at the time the paper is due, students may turn in a hard copy of the paper in class, before turning it in normally through TurnItIn once it is working again; as long as there have been no changes to the paper, there will be no late penalty for doing this.
- Late papers will be penalized severely, based on the time when the paper was submitted to TurnItIn. Papers turned in after the start of lecture on the due date will lose 1 point, while those turned in between the end of class and midnight on the due date will lose 3 points (1/3 letter grade). Papers turned in after that time will be penalized 10 points (1 letter grade) per day, compounding at midnight each day.
- Technical failures, such as stolen computers or dead hard drives/flash drives or printers, do not constitute valid excuses for late papers. Students are expected to maintain backups of their papers while writing them, ideally off-site through Dropbox or some similar service, so that they do not lose all of their work if their computer or related equipment dies or disappears.
- Students must cite all materials used in researching the paper, in order to give appropriate credit to the original

authors. This includes listing the source and page(s) for all historical facts that the student did not personally observe, all analysis and theories that the student did not personally develop, and so on -- even if you did not quote the exact words from the original source in your paper. Failure to give such credit constitutes plagiarism, and will be penalized severely. 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.

- Students are expected to use a minimum of five (5) serious scholarly sources (typically books or academic journal articles) on the conflict itself, as well as at least one or two (1-2) academic sources for each theory used to explain the war. If you are in danger of not finding enough sources, see the note below about sources and citations, and consult with the instructor if you still do not have enough.

- Please be aware that most online sources (particularly Wikipedia) are not appropriate for an upper-division college research paper, and as such may not be used without my explicit permission. If you plan to use one or more 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 formal 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.

### **Appropriate Scholarly Sources**

#### *(1) For the history of the crisis/war:*

The most useful source for most of these topics is the library's book collection; useful books may include specific histories of the crisis/war, diplomatic or military histories of each participant, 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 (which may not even exist in our library). Where there are not many relevant books, you may find a number of useful academic journal articles by searching for the names of the countries and/or the territory on JSTOR (note that Geography and History journals may be at least as useful as Political Science for a paper like this). 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 dates, participants, and fatalities for each war are available online from the Correlates of War project, although such information is not available for the crises in this list. My web site also offers numerous source suggestions at <<http://www.paulhensel.org/teachpaper.html>>.

#### *(2) For the causes of the crisis/war:*

This syllabus includes references to a number of recommended readings on each theory that was covered in class; almost all are available through JSTOR. For each theory that you will be using in your paper, you will need to cite appropriate academic sources to explain the logic behind the theory; these sources (as well as the assigned readings on each topic from earlier in the syllabus) are likely to be helpful for this purpose. You may also want to consult the references from my graduate-level International Conflict syllabus, which includes a considerably longer list of references on most of these topics: <<http://www.paulhensel.org/Teaching/gradconflict.html>>.

- Please note that class lecture notes are only appropriate as a last resort -- that is, you should only cite lecture notes for topics that are not covered by the assigned readings or by any of the recommended readings listed below. If you choose to write on, say, territorial claims or arms races and you only cite the class lecture notes, this is a sign that you have not done a good job of researching and understanding that particular cause (because the syllabus lists numerous readings), and your work will be graded accordingly.

- Also note that you are expected to cite historical sources (usually the ones you used for section I of the paper)

to show how each of these three causes of war applied to your topic.

*Examples of relevant readings on each theory:*

#### Human Nature

- Don't use this in your papers -- it isn't very convincing or useful in any scientific sense.

#### Psychology / Misperception / Crisis DMing

- 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.

#### Great Man Theory

- There really aren't any good academic sources on this topic. If you choose to use this in your paper, you should cite my lecture notes from class the day we covered this.

#### Groupthink

- 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.

#### Military Doctrines

- Stephen Van Evera (1984). "The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War." *International Security* 9, 1: 58-107.
- Scott D. Sagan (1986), "1914 Revisited: Allies, Offense, and Instability." *International Security* 11, 2 (Autumn): 151-175.
- 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.

#### Nationalism/Identity Claims

- Stephen Van Evera (1994). "Hypotheses on Nationalism and War." *International Security* 18, 4: 5-39.
- David R. Davis and Will H. Moore (1997). "Ethnicity Matters: Transnational Ethnic Alliances and Foreign Policy Behavior." *International Studies Quarterly* 41, 1: 171-184.
- Stephen M. Saideman and R. William Ayres (2000). "Determining the Sources of Irredentism: Logit Analyses of Minorities At Risk Data," *Journal of Politics* 62, 4 (November): 1126-1144.
- Stephen M. Saideman (2002). "Discrimination in International Relations: Examining Why Some Ethnic Groups Receive More External Support Than Others." *Journal of Peace Research*. 39, 1 (January): 27-50.
- Paul R. Hensel and Sara McLaughlin Mitchell (2017). "From Territorial Claims to Identity Claims: The Issue Correlates of War (ICOW) Project." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 34 2 (March): 126-140.

#### Civilizations

- 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.

#### Diversionsary Theory

- 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 Diversionsary External Conflict in Great Britain, 1950-1992." *Journal of Politics* 61, 3: 799-814.
- Sara McLaughlin Mitchell and Brandon C. Prins (2004). "Rivalry and Diversionsary Uses of Force." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48: 937 - 961.

#### Lateral Pressure / Resources

- 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.
- Paul R. Hensel, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, and Thomas E. Sowers II (2006). "Conflict Management of Riparian Disputes: A Regional Comparison of Dispute Resolution." *Political Geography* 25, 4 (May): 383-411.
- Stephen C. Nemeth, Sara McLaughlin Mitchell, Elizabeth A. Nyman, and Paul R. Hensel (2014). "Ruling the Sea: Managing Maritime Conflicts through UNCLOS and Exclusive Economic Zones." *International Interactions* 40, 5: 711-736.

#### Territorial Claims

- 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 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.
- Bryan Frederick, Paul R. Hensel, and Christopher Macaulay (2017). "The Issue Correlates of War Territorial Claims Data, 1816-2001: Procedures and Description." *Journal of Peace Research* 54, 1 (January): 99-108.

#### Arms Races

- 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.

### Crisis Bargaining

- 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.

### Power Transition

- Jack S. Levy (1987). "Declining Power and the Preventive Motivation for War." *World Politics* 40, 1: 82-107.
- Henk Houweling and Jan G. Siccamo (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*.

### Systemic Theories: Anarchy/Security Dilemma

- Robert Jervis (1978). "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma." *World Politics* 30, 2: 167-214.
- Joseph M. Grieco (1988). "Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism." *International Organization* 42, 3: 485-507.
- Charles L. Glaser (1997). "The Security Dilemma Revisited." *World Politics* 50, 1: 171-201
- Karen Ruth Adams (2003/2004). "Attack and Conquer? International Anarchy and the Offense-Defense-Deterrence Balance." *International Security* 28, 3: 45-83.
- For more details on anarchy and the security dilemma see Hans Morgenthau (any edition), *Politics among Nations*; Kenneth Waltz (1979), *Theory of International Politics*; and readings on arms race theory, which often discuss the security dilemma.

### Systemic Theories: Polarity

- 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.

### Rivalry

- 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: 179-206.

### **Eligible Topics: Interstate Wars**

**Cisplatine** (1825-1828): Argentina/United Provinces vs. Brazil

**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

**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

**Second Balkan** (1913): Bulgaria vs. Serbia, Greece, and allies

**Russo-Polish** (1919-1920): Russia vs. Poland

**Lithuanian-Polish** (1919-1920): Lithuania vs. Poland

**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 [Israeli Independence]** (1948-1949): Israel vs. Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq

**Korean** (1950-1953): North Korea, China vs. South Korea, US (and allies)

**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 vs. Bangladesh

**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  
**Libya - Chad ["Toyota War"]** (1983-1987): Libya vs. Chad, France  
**Nagorno-Karabakh** (1988-1994): Armenia vs. Azerbaijan  
**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

### **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  
**Teschen** (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  
**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  
**Cordillera del Condor** (1995): Ecuador vs. Peru  
**Taiwan Missile Crisis** (1995-1996): China vs. Taiwan  
**Kargil Crisis** (1999): India vs. Pakistan  
**Isla de Perejil / Parsley Island** (2002): Morocco vs. Spain  
**Heglig** (2012): Sudan vs. South Sudan