PL SC 370 – Theory of Intl Relations

Fall 2012

Section 001: 280 SWKT on M W F from 11:00 am - 11:50 am
Name: Darren Hawkins
Office Phone: (801) 422-5526
Office Location: 745 SWKT
Email: dhawkins@byu.edu

Course Information

Description
This course considers theoretical explanations for the patterns, trends, and events that occur among states or between states and non-state actors in the international arena. It surveys the most important theories and theoretical concepts that are employed to explain and understand international relations. Students will learn to evaluate these theories with respect to two principal criteria, with a focus on the first: 1) internal logic and persuasiveness; and 2) ability to explain real-world events. We will be concerned primarily with explanations of state cooperation and discord, including war.

Learning Outcomes

Political Process, Theory and Thought
Possess a knowledge of important concepts and theories in international relations

Critical Thinking and Analysis
Think critically, analytically, and synthetically in the context of international relations theories

Specific Outcomes
You should be able to define key concepts in international relations and illustrate them with examples.
You should be able to understand and to articulate major theoretical arguments in international relations.
You should be able to critique in verbal and written forms both the internal consistency and the external applicability of theoretical arguments.
You should be able to identify the similarities and differences between different theories and to group them into broader theoretical approaches.
You should be able to apply abstract theories to real-world events and, conversely, to identify patterns in international relations amenable to abstract reasoning.
You should develop critical thinking skills, analytical skills, and writing skills, especially as they apply to international
politics. Critical thinking and analytical skills involve the ability to identify patterns in specific facts, to compare and contrast patterns and concepts, to identify the implications of a particular argument, and to understand at least two different positions on each issue. Writing skills involve the ability to construct a persuasive argument by using logic, evidence, and good mechanics.

You should be able to describe the policy implications that flow from the theories we study and to critique the actions of policy makers by using these theories.

**Texts and Materials**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Price (new)</th>
<th>Price (used)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>THEORIES OF WAR &amp; PEACE – <em>Required</em></td>
<td>BYU Bookstore</td>
<td>$44.00</td>
<td>$33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by M, BROWN, ISBN: 9780262522526</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNATIONAL POLITICS 10E – <em>Required</em></td>
<td>BYU Bookstore</td>
<td>$90.60</td>
<td>$67.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUIDE TO METHODS FOR STUDENTS OF POL SCI – <em>Required</em></td>
<td>BYU Bookstore</td>
<td>$12.95</td>
<td>$9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by S, VANEVERA, ISBN: 9780801484575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading Policy**

I grade papers holistically. I don’t create different categories worth different amounts of points and then add up those points. Rather, I examine the overall strengths and weaknesses of a paper and reach a judgment about the overall merit of the paper. These are my general guidelines:

A: The paper has a clear thesis statement in the first paragraph or two (or in the first sentence for a short paper) in which you summarize your major arguments. You don’t straddle fences; you tell me clearly your main argument or claim. The paper employs good grammar and spelling, clearly and plainly communicates your thoughts, and is well-organized. It develops a clear causal logic and offers some empirical illustrations. The logic of the paper is sound and well-developed, offering evidence of original thought and analytical insights. The content of the arguments are sophisticated rather than simplistic.

B: Thesis statements are not as sophisticated, not well-developed, or somewhat unclear. In some cases, the thesis is discovered near the end of the paper. The logic is sometimes flawed or the evidence discussed does not clearly support
the argument. Often times, the paper does a nice job summarizing the arguments of others but offers relatively few additional arguments or insights of its own. The paper is relatively well-written and organized, with a low frequency of errors, but some awkwardness detracts.

C: The thesis statement is unclear, vague, or too simple. The logic is quite underdeveloped or somewhat contradictory. A discussion of empirical evidence is missing or contradicts the argument. The paper has frequent errors in word choice, grammar, etc. Often, the paper is largely descriptive rather than analytical. Analytical skills involve the ability to identify patterns in facts, to compare and contrast patterns and concepts, to identify the implications of a particular argument, and to understand different positions on each issue.

D: The thesis is largely missing. The paper is disorganized and/or illogical. Frequent grammatical errors detract significantly.

I will make relatively few markings on your papers. I will mostly restrict myself to “good” for especially fine writing, arguments and information that meets A-level criteria above and “?” for material that falls into the C-level category. I will resist marking grammar/style problems. I will attach a rubric to your papers (including the data papers but not the abstracts) with each category marked as high, medium or low. A list of general categories is below, though this may vary by assignment. If you wish further feedback and guidance on your papers, please come and see me in office hours or make another appointment with me. I’m happy to visit with you!

Thesis Clarity and Sophistication

Understanding of Course Readings

Development of Argument (fleshed out or underdeveloped)

Use of Specific Evidence

Quality of Causal Logic

Originality/Insight

Organization

Grammar/Spelling

Overall Clarity/Ability to Communicate Your Ideas

NOTE ON DUE DATES: Because I drop low scores, abstracts may NOT be made up or turned in late. Late papers will be heavily penalized at the rate of 10 percent of the points possible per day. Late exams will be heavily penalized at 30 percent. If you have an emergency, let me know as soon as possible. I will work with you.
## Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Readings and Abstracts</th>
<th>Papers and Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M - Aug 27</strong></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W - Aug 29</strong></td>
<td>How Important are Power Resources and Force? How do They Shape International Relations?</td>
<td>Mearsheimer, &quot;Back to the Future&quot; (BCLM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F - Aug 31</strong></td>
<td>No class. I'm at a professional conference.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M - Sep 03</strong></td>
<td>Labor Day</td>
<td>No class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W - Sep 05</strong></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Lebow, &quot;The Long Peace. . .&quot; (LS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F - Sep 07</strong></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Art, &quot;The Fungibility of Force&quot; (AJ); make sure you get the right Art reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M - Sep 10</strong></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Data Analysis: Great Powers. See data.worldbank.org</td>
<td>Data Paper 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W - Sep 12</strong></td>
<td>Theory and Method</td>
<td>Van Evera, pp. 7-26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F - Sep 14</strong></td>
<td>Theory and Method</td>
<td>Van Evera, pp. 27-48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M - Sep 17</strong></td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Pape, &quot;The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism&quot; (AJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Sep 19</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Jervis, &quot;Offense, Defense, and the Security Dilemma&quot; (AJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Sep 21</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Posen, &quot;A Nuclear-Armed Iran&quot; (AJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Sep 24</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Empirical/Policy Reading, To Be Announced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Sep 26</td>
<td>Exam 1 in class</td>
<td>Exam 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Sep 28</td>
<td>How does international anarchy shape state behavior?</td>
<td>Waltz, &quot;Anarchic Structure of World Politics&quot; (AJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Oct 01</td>
<td>Anarchy</td>
<td>Oye, &quot;Conditions for Cooperation in World Politics&quot; (AJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Oct 03</td>
<td>Anarchy</td>
<td>Wendt, &quot;Anarchy is What States Make of It&quot; (AJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Oct 05</td>
<td>How and why do ethnic identities and cultural differences contribute to war? How can we avoid these wars?</td>
<td>Lake and Rothchild, &quot;Containing Fear&quot; (BCLM)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Oct 08</td>
<td>Identities</td>
<td>Kaufmann, &quot;Possible and Impossible Solutions&quot; (AJ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Oct 10</td>
<td>Identities</td>
<td>Hudson, &quot;The Heart of the Matter&quot; (BB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Oct 12</td>
<td>Identities</td>
<td>Hudson, &quot;The Heart of the Matter&quot; (BB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Data Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Oct 15</td>
<td>Identities</td>
<td>Data Analysis: Non-state political conflict; How has it changed in the past decades? See <a href="http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm">http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm</a></td>
<td>Paper 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Oct 17</td>
<td>Theory and Method</td>
<td>Van Evera Book, pp. 49-88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Oct 22</td>
<td>Democratic Peace</td>
<td>Layne, &quot;Kant or Cant&quot; (BCLM)</td>
<td>Abstract 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Oct 24</td>
<td>Democratic Peace</td>
<td>Mansfield and Snyder, &quot;Democratization and the Danger of War&quot; (BCLM)</td>
<td>Abstract 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Nov 29</td>
<td>EXAM 2 in class</td>
<td></td>
<td>Exam 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Nov 02</td>
<td>How and why does interdependence and globalization affect international relations and state behavior?</td>
<td>Copeland, &quot;Economic interdependence and war&quot; (BCLM)</td>
<td>Abstract 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Nov 02</td>
<td>Interdependence</td>
<td>Empirical/Policy Reading. To Be Announced.</td>
<td>Summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Nov 07</td>
<td>International Institutions Origins</td>
<td>Moravcsik, &quot;The Origins of Human Rights Regimes&quot; (BB)</td>
<td>Abstract 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Reading/Source</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 09</strong></td>
<td>International Institutions Origins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 12</strong></td>
<td>What is the Impact of International Institutions on States?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 14</strong></td>
<td>Impact of International Institutions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 16</strong></td>
<td>How and why do nonstate actors influence international relations?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 19</strong></td>
<td>Nonstate Actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 20</strong></td>
<td>Flex Day, to be determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 21</strong></td>
<td>Thanksgiving Break, No Classes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Th -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 22</strong></td>
<td>Thanksgiving Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 23</strong></td>
<td>Thanksgiving Break, Thanksgiving Holiday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 26</strong></td>
<td>Nonstate actors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>W -</strong></td>
<td><strong>Nov 28</strong></td>
<td>Why and how do policies and practices spread internationally?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Hawkins, Lake, Nielson and Tierney, "Delegation under anarchy" (BB) 
- Checkel, "Why Comply?" (BB) 
- Pevehouse, "Democracy from the Outside In" (BB) 
- Keck and Sikkink, "Transnational Activist Networks" (AJ) 
- Risse and Sikkink, "The Socialization of International Human Rights Norms" (BB) 
- Simmons, Dobbin and Garrett, "Introduction: The International Diffusion of Liberalism" (BB) and Elkins, Guzman and Simmons, "Competing for Capital" (BB)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 30</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Goodliffe and Hawkins, &quot;Dependence networks and the diffusion of democracy&quot; (BB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Abstract 41</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Dec 03</td>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Empirical/Policy Reading. To Be Announced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Abstract 42</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Dec 05</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Jervis, &quot;The Era of Leading Power Peace&quot; (AJ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Abstract 43</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Dec 07</td>
<td>Exam Preparation Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M - Dec 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W - Dec 12</td>
<td>Final Exam:</td>
<td>280 SWKT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2:30pm - 5:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F - Dec 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assignment Descriptions**

**Abstract 1**
Aug 29
Due: Wednesday, Aug 29 at 11:00 am

For each article we read you should write an abstract of five to six sentences. The abstracts should summarize the major arguments (including independent and dependent variables), causal logic and evidence (including key observable implications) of that article. Bring these with you to class each day. I will ask for one of them each week without prior notice, on the day we consider that article. These will be graded on a 5-point scale and returned to you. You cannot make up a missed abstract, but I will drop the two lowest scores.

**Abstract 4**
Sep 05
Due: Wednesday, Sep 05 at 11:00 am

Abstract 5
Sep
07
Due: Friday, Sep 07 at 11:00 am

Abstract 9
Sep
17
Due: Monday, Sep 17 at 11:00 am

Abstract 10
Sep
19
Due: Wednesday, Sep 19 at 11:00 am

Abstract 11
Sep
21
Due: Friday, Sep 21 at 11:00 am

Abstract 14
Sep
28
Due: Friday, Sep 28 at 11:00 am

Abstract 15
Oct
01
Due: Monday, Oct 01 at 11:00 am

Abstract 16
Oct
03
Write a short research plan for testing additional observable implications of one of the last three authors' arguments (Lake and Rothchild; Kaufmann; Hudson).
Abstract 26
Oct
24
Due: Wednesday, Oct 24 at 11:00 am

Abstract 28
Oct
31
Due: Wednesday, Oct 31 at 11:00 am

Summary
Nov
02
Due: Friday, Nov 02 at 11:00 am

The brief paper should focus on a summary of the nature of the evidence presented, focusing on the content of that information. Although no explicit theory is ever presented, identify patterns in the evidence that could be used to create a theoretical argument.

Abstract 30
Nov
05
Due: Monday, Nov 05 at 11:00 am

Abstract 31
Nov
07
Due: Wednesday, Nov 07 at 11:00 am

Summary
Sep
24
Due: Monday, Sep 24 at 11:00 am

The brief paper should focus on a summary of the nature of the evidence presented, focusing on the content of that information. Although no explicit theory is ever presented, identify patterns in the
Van Evera defines important theoretical and methodological terms and identifies some strategies and methods for testing theories. Thus, you cannot produce an abstract as you do for other articles. Still, I would like a summary of his main points, in your own words.
Van Evera defines important theoretical and methodological terms and identifies some strategies and methods for testing theories. Thus, you cannot produce an abstract as you do for other articles. Still, I would like a summary of his main points, in your own words.

Exam 2
Oct
29
Due: Monday, Oct 29 at 11:59 am
Same format as Exam 1. Covers all material since Exam 1.

Exam 3
Dec
Exam 1
Sep 26
Due: Wednesday, Sep 26 at 11:59 am
We will have three exams, at dates signalled in the syllabus. These one-hour exams will test your knowledge through short essay questions. Each covers one-third of the class.

Research Design Paper
Nov 09
Due: Friday, Nov 09 at 11:59 pm
Write a four-page double-spaced paper that identifies observable implications of two different theories we’ve considered in class and identifies ways to test those implications empirically against each other. Remember that it is important to test theories against an alternative and not just against a null hypothesis. The two theories should have a similar dependent variable so the OIs can compete against each other.

This is a thought paper based on logic, but you will need to identify real-world cases (if doing a case study) or groups of cases (if doing a statistical study) and variables that would provide appropriate tests of the theories we’re considering. You should do some brief background research on those cases and variables so that your observable implications are clear and specific. If doing a quantitative study, you may wish to identify some existing measures of key variables and describe them specifically. If doing a qualitative study, you should identify as specifically as possible the nature of the evidence you plan to gather. You should have some confidence that evidence actually exists or could be gathered. Do not say, for example, that you will use government statistics about some phenomenon like riots in other countries when no government publishes such statistics (though others might).

Make sure you have a brief introductory paragraph that lays out your theories and key implications. This paper is not supposed to demonstrate the superiority of one theory over another. Rather, you are to make a plan to do research. You don’t actually do research or take a position on which theory is better. You make a plan. You don’t make a plan that has an obvious outcome that will favor your theory. You set up a fair fight between them, or between those theories and some other possibility.

Generally, when you do research, you don’t know what the outcome will be. You honestly test two theories against each other. You don’t favor one over the other. You should be uncommitted at this
stage of your academic career. If you say “I’m a realist” you are wrong. You don’t know enough to know whether you are a realist or not. You should be agnostic. There are lots of interesting theories out there. You have no idea which one is right. You want to figure it out. You write a research design to do so.

Make sure your first paragraph hits the main points:

Dependent variable

Theorists you are examining

Independent variables.

Major observable implications (OIs).

Type of evidence you will gather.

Your paper develops these, especially the OIs and the type of evidence you want to gather. This is an exercise in operationalizing concepts, defending OIs as fair and logical inferences from the theory, and thinking creatively and specifically about what kind of evidence would support the various OIs.

You are scientists. You don’t know what explanation is right. You want to figure it out, objectively and honestly. You devise a fair test. That is the point of this paper.

Theory Critique Paper
Dec 05
Due: Wednesday, Dec 05 at 11:00 am

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>To develop your critical reading, thinking and writing skills. To develop a deeper understanding of the problems and strengths of at least two theoretical arguments and to engage in independent theoretical thinking and writing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Assignment</td>
<td>The essay should compare and contrast two or more of the required articles for the course. The essays should evaluate the articles according to the internal reasoning and logic of their theoretical statements and the persuasiveness of their evidence. This essay is not a research papers and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
should not contain much empirical data. Rather, it should offer conceptual critiques of the theoretical reasoning and of the types of evidence employed in the articles you review. The essay might draw on empirical material as illustrations of your argument, but this is mostly a conceptual paper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possible Paths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| To complete this general assignment, you could take one of several possible paths, as follows:  

Compare one article with another addressing the same type of question and show how one is superior to the other.  

Combine two or more articles by showing how their theoretical reasoning and types of evidence they use can be complementary.  

Amend theories by suggesting the addition of other variables that could help resolve difficulties in the theoretical reasoning, and suggest why your additional variables make sense empirically (in the real world).  

Show how the theoretical reasoning of two different articles is sound, but points in fundamentally different directions. Suggest additional empirical tests that could help resolve differences between competing theories.  

Show how the theoretical reasoning and empirical tests of two different articles are deeply flawed and should be tossed out entirely. |

| Format | The assignment should be no longer than five double-spaced, computer-generated pages. You should only deal with a few authors we read in class and should simply cite them by name in the text. No bibliography or notes are needed. |
### Style
Write to an audience of your peers in this class, explaining to them the theoretical problems and possibilities that you see. Use relatively formal language but also feel free to use the personal “I,” as in, “I argue that . . .”

### Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>The paper has a clear thesis statement in the first paragraph or two in which you summarize your major arguments. You don’t straddle fences; you tell me clearly what you think are the major similarities and differences in the articles you review, and what is correct or incorrect about the theoretical reasoning and empirical application in those articles. The paper employs good grammar and spelling, is elegantly written, and is well-organized. It develops a clear causal logic and offers some empirical illustrations. The logic of the paper is sound and well-developed, offering evidence of original thought. The arguments are sophisticated and not obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Thesis statements are not as sophisticated, not well-developed, or somewhat unclear. In some cases, the thesis is discovered near the end of the paper. The logic is sometimes flawed or the evidence discussed does not clearly support the argument. Often times, the paper does a nice job summarizing the arguments of authors but offers relatively few additional arguments or insights of its own. The paper is relatively well-written and organized, with a low frequency of errors, but some awkwardness detracts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>The thesis statement is unclear, vague, or too simple. The logic is quite underdeveloped or somewhat contradictory. A discussion of empirical evidence is missing or contradicts the argument. The paper has frequent errors in word choice, grammar, etc. Often, the paper is largely descriptive, simply summarizing others sequentially without showing how the authors’ arguments interact with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The thesis is largely missing. The paper is disorganized and/or illogical. Frequent grammatical errors detract significantly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Data Paper 1**

Sep
Due: Monday, Sep 10 at 11:00 am

For each of these data papers, you will examine some data (sometimes quantitative, sometimes qualitative) and then write a brief one-page, single-spaced analysis. The analysis should include one chart, graph, or visual display of some sort within that one page. A hard copy of the paper is due in class on the day designated in the syllabus. You should also upload your paper to digitaldialog. I will select some visuals to display in class and you will be expected to explain them briefly. Think of this as a good blog post.

Data Paper 1. How many great powers exist in the world now? Using data available at data.worldbank.org, select some indicators to measure power. Explain how you aggregate those indicators to create a single score of power. Explain and justify your choice of indicators and aggregation strategy by referencing readings we've done in class. Compare your results to a measure of power that uses only GDP. State your main argument in the first sentence or two. This is more of a conceptual assignment than a math assignment, but you should include a brief explanation of how you do the math to calculate overall power. You need to choose a way to put these various indicators on a single scale. One of the most common is to rank the top state in a given indicator as 1 (or 100) and then take each state’s value on that indicator as a percentage of the top score. Other methods are possible, such as giving a certain number of points for the top score on a given indicator, fewer points for the next score, and so forth.

Data Paper 2
Oct 15
Due: Monday, Oct 15 at 11:00 am

What are the trends in non-state conflict over the past 20-30 years (or for whatever time period you have data)? Is there more or less conflict? Has it changed in any way? Use data available at http://www.systemicpeace.org/inscr/inscr.htm or at http://www.womanstats.org (requires registration first). What reasons might you suggest for the trends you see? Draw on our readings to speculate on possible reasons.

Data Paper 3
Oct 26
Due: Friday, Oct 26 at 11:00 am

Which process-tracing evidence is more persuasive, the evidence in favor of democratic peace or against it? Why? Refer to Van Evera’s ideas and standards in responding. Even though the evidence is qualitative, please still include a visual presentation of some sort.

Point Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignments</th>
<th>Percent of Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Writings</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract 1 0.44%
Abstract 4 0.44%
Abstract 5 0.44%
Abstract 9 0.44%
Abstract 10 0.44%
Abstract 11 0.44%
Abstract 14 0.44%
Abstract 15 0.44%
Abstract 16 0.44%
Abstract 17 0.44%
Abstract 18 0.44%
Abstract 19 0.44%
Abstract 20 0.44%
Abstract 22 0.44%
Abstract 23 0.44%
Abstract 25 0.44%
Abstract 26 0.44%
Abstract 28 0.44%
Summary 0.44%
Abstract 30 0.44%
Abstract 31 0.44%
Summary 0.44%
Abstract 32 0.44%
Abstract 33 0.44%
Summary 0.44%
Abstract 34 0.44%
Abstract 35 0.44%
Abstract 36 0.44%
Abstract 39 0.44%
Abstract 40 0.44%
Abstract 41 0.44%
Abstract 42 0.44%
Abstract 43 0.44%
Summary 0.44%
**Exams** 40%
Exam 2 13.33%
Exam 3 13.33%
Exam 1 13.33%
### University Policies

#### Honor Code

In keeping with the principles of the BYU Honor Code, students are expected to be honest in all of their academic work. Academic honesty means, most fundamentally, that any work you present as your own must in fact be your own work and not that of another. Violations of this principle may result in a failing grade in the course and additional disciplinary action by the university. Students are also expected to adhere to the Dress and Grooming Standards. Adherence demonstrates respect for yourself and others and ensures an effective learning and working environment. It is the university's expectation, and my own expectation in class, that each student will abide by all Honor Code standards. Please call the Honor Code Office at 422-2847 if you have questions about those standards.

#### Sexual Harassment

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination against any participant in an educational program or activity that receives federal funds. The act is intended to eliminate sex discrimination in education and pertains to admissions, academic and athletic programs, and university-sponsored activities. Title IX also prohibits sexual harassment of students by university employees, other students, and visitors to campus. If you encounter sexual harassment or gender-based discrimination, please talk to your professor or contact one of the following: the Title IX Coordinator at 801-422-2130; the Honor Code Office at 801-422-2847; the Equal Employment Office at 801-422-5895; or Ethics Point at http://www.ethicspoint.com, or 1-888-238-1062 (24-hours).

#### Student Disability

Brigham Young University is committed to providing a working and learning atmosphere that reasonably accommodates qualified persons with disabilities. If you have any disability which may impair your ability to complete this course successfully, please contact the University Accessibility Center (UAC), 2170 WSC or 422-2767. Reasonable academic accommodations are reviewed for all students who have qualified, documented disabilities. The UAC can also assess students for learning, attention, and emotional concerns. Services are coordinated with the student and instructor by the UAC. If you need assistance or if you feel you have been unlawfully discriminated against on the basis of disability, you may seek resolution through established grievance policy and procedures by contacting the Equal Employment Office at 422-5895, D-285 ASB.

#### Academic Honesty

The first injunction of the Honor Code is the call to "be honest." Students come to the university not only to improve their minds, gain knowledge, and develop skills that will assist them in their life's work, but also to build character. "President
David O. McKay taught that character is the highest aim of education" (The Aims of a BYU Education, p.6). It is the purpose of the BYU Academic Honesty Policy to assist in fulfilling that aim. BYU students should seek to be totally honest in their dealings with others. They should complete their own work and be evaluated based upon that work. They should avoid academic dishonesty and misconduct in all its forms, including but not limited to plagiarism, fabrication or falsification, cheating, and other academic misconduct.

Devotional Attendance

Brigham Young University's devotional and forum assemblies are an important part of your BYU experience. President Cecil O. Samuelson said, "We have special and enlightening series of devotional and forum assemblies...that will complement, supplement, and enrich what will also be a very productive period in your classrooms, laboratories, and libraries. We look forward to being with you each Tuesday...and hope that you will regularly attend and bring your friends and associates with you...A large part of what constitutes the unique 'BYU experience' is found in these gatherings where the Spirit has been invited and where we have the opportunity to discuss and consider things of ultimate worth and importance that are not afforded to the academic community on almost any other campus" (from the address "The Legacy of Learning", 30 August, 2005). Your attendance at each forum and devotional is strongly encouraged.

Plagiarism

Intentional plagiarism is a form of intellectual theft that violates widely recognized principles of academic integrity as well as the Honor Code. Such plagiarism may subject the student to appropriate disciplinary action administered through the university Honor Code Office, in addition to academic sanctions that may be applied by an instructor. Inadvertent plagiarism, which may not be a violation of the Honor Code, is nevertheless a form of intellectual carelessness that is unacceptable in the academic community. Plagiarism of any kind is completely contrary to the established practices of higher education where all members of the university are expected to acknowledge the original intellectual work of others that is included in their own work. In some cases, plagiarism may also involve violations of copyright law. Intentional Plagiarism-Intentional plagiarism is the deliberate act of representing the words, ideas, or data of another as one's own without providing proper attribution to the author through quotation, reference, or footnote. Inadvertent Plagiarism-Inadvertent plagiarism involves the inappropriate, but non-deliberate, use of another's words, ideas, or data without proper attribution. Inadvertent plagiarism usually results from an ignorant failure to follow established rules for documenting sources or from simply not being sufficiently careful in research and writing. Although not a violation of the Honor Code, inadvertent plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct for which an instructor can impose appropriate academic sanctions. Students who are in doubt as to whether they are providing proper attribution have the responsibility to consult with their instructor and obtain guidance. Examples of plagiarism include: Direct Plagiarism-The verbatim copying of an original source without acknowledging the source. Paraphrased Plagiarism-The paraphrasing, without acknowledgement, of ideas from another that the reader might mistake for the author's own. Plagiarism Mosaic-The borrowing of words, ideas, or data from an original source and blending this original material with one's own without acknowledging the source. Insufficient Acknowledgement-The partial or incomplete attribution of words, ideas, or data from an original source. Plagiarism may occur with respect to unpublished as well as published material. Copying another student's work and submitting it as one's own individual work without proper attribution is a serious form of plagiarism.

Respectful Environment

"Sadly, from time to time, we do hear reports of those who are at best insensitive and at worst insulting in their comments to and about others... We hear derogatory and sometimes even defamatory comments about those with different political, athletic, or ethnic views or experiences. Such behavior is completely out of place at BYU, and I enlist the aid of all to monitor carefully and, if necessary, correct any such that might occur here, however inadvertent or unintentional. "I worry particularly about demeaning comments made about the career or major choices of women or men either directly or about
members of the BYU community generally. We must remember that personal agency is a fundamental principle and that none of us has the right or option to criticize the lawful choices of another." President Cecil O. Samuelson, Annual University Conference, August 24, 2010 "Occasionally, we ... hear reports that our female faculty feel disrespected, especially by students, for choosing to work at BYU, even though each one has been approved by the BYU Board of Trustees. Brothers and sisters, these things ought not to be. Not here. Not at a university that shares a constitution with the School of the Prophets." Vice President John S. Tanner, Annual University Conference, August 24, 2010