Formal Models in International Relations

POLI 247B

Syllabus, with links to readings and summaries.

Branislav L. Slantchev

Office: SSB 387

Hours: by appointment

Winter 2011 Thu 9:00a—11:50a SSB 104

Description

This course is intended for advanced graduate students who are interested in the formal analysis of international relations. The goal is to familiarize students with the practical aspects of modeling various substantive ideas by exposing the advantages and limitations of mathematical formalization. To accomplish this, students will (i) derive or prove results from the selected readings, (ii) identify the contributions of their authors, and (iii) find ways to improve the research or extend the insights. This course concentrates on the theoretical aspects of formal research and complements POLI 247A: Quantitative Approaches to IR, where students investigate statistical modeling and empirical testing, and POLI 247C: History of International Relations, where students explore diplomatic and military history of Europe from 1618 to 1945. Students are expected to have taken courses in international relations (e.g. the core seminar), and game theory (e.g. POLI 204C).

Requirements

There are three requirements for this course:

- 1. Formal presentation of one of the papers to the class (35%). Each student will be responsible for presenting and critiquing one of the articles he or she will be assigned during our organizational meeting. The presentation will consist of: (i) a summary of the article's main points, (ii) a careful exposition of the proofs and the intuition behind them, (iii) an evaluation of the substantive importance of the contribution, (iv) a critique of the paper, and (v) questions for discussion. Presenters must be prepared to lead discussion, which means that they should identify the broad themes underlying the reading, establish links to other literatures, suggest improvements for flaws in modeling or research design, derive testable hypotheses, and have ideas about their empirical testing.
- 2. Written referee report (45%). Students will select one paper from the list of recommended/background readings (i.e., not a paper that will be discussed in class), and write a formal referee report. The paper must be cleared with me first. It is best to select one as early as possible because I will not allow more than one student to write on the same paper. Come with one or two alternative choices. The report must summarize (in one paragraph) the contributions of the paper, discuss their importance, and then provide a critique/discussion, in which the referee must analyze deficiencies in the model,

possible extensions and improvements, and perhaps outline alternative approaches to the problem. Students must be aware that *every* model is deficient in some ways, and must not fall back on common, but vacuous criticisms of formal models. Instead, students must approach this task as if they are writing suggestions for a colleague or even for themselves (possible venues for research). The reports must be at least three single-spaced pages long (at 11pt font size). These are due to me by noon on Friday of finals week. You can read about writing a referee report from the excellent book by William Thomson. I have scanned the <u>relevant chapter</u>, but I highly recommend you buy this slim volume for reference.

3. Participation in class discussions (20%). Everyone will be expected to have read the articles before coming to class. Presenters will provide the starting point for class discussion and other students will be expected to contribute actively.

Guidelines

Modern research in international relations tends to be methodologically sophisticated, and even though the formal models are not quite up there with the bleeding edge of the area, they are far from the toy examples of Prisoner's Dilemma and Chicken games that used to dominate the field. This means that you should expect to spend quite a bit of time reading each article, which is why we shall rarely discuss more than a handful each week. There is no set way to approach reading formal papers, but I strongly suggest you utilize the following strategy:

- 1. Begin by reading the introduction and conclusion (and perhaps the literature review). What is the article about? What is its central point? Write down a list of claims (propositions) that you would like to see and that you would need to see to be persuaded of the validity of the article's argument. (And I mean, *write these down!*)
- 2. Read the description of the formal model. Construct a dictionary for the notation: that is, write down a table with the symbols and their meanings. (As you will quickly see, there is no standard notation in game theory and that results in a lot of notational clutter, so keeping it straight is always a challenge.) Identify the players, their strategies, their payoffs, and the sequence of moves. Is this a game of complete, perfect, and symmetric information? If not, what is it? Why has the author chosen to model it that way? How closely does the formalization match the substantive motivation for the model? What are some of the simplifying assumptions that might be distorting? Why? What solution concept will the author use? Is it appropriate? Recall now your answers to the previous step: do you think this model will be able to address the puzzle adequately?
- 3. Read the analysis. What propositions does the author present? How do they correspond to your wishlist? Are they stronger, deeper, more satisfying? Or trivial and disappointing? How do they correspond to the author's own claims? Does the author "stretch" their interpretation? How general are these results? Can you recall similar claims from different models? Or contradictory claims from similar models? Do you think there is a general underlying dynamic common to this and other models?
- 4. (Difficult step.) Satisfy yourself that the claims are valid and the proofs work. Due to journal space constraints, many editors have now taken to insisting that authors leave our parts of (or sometimes even entire) proofs. This is most unfortunate and shows deep misunderstanding about what the value is of a formal article. The whole point of using

mathematics is to verify the validity of conclusions and internal consistency, but without the proofs, one must essentially rely on the author to have done it correctly (bad idea, we all make mistakes, and not rarely either) or reconstruct the proofs themselves (a very time-consuming and often non-trivial task). If the article includes the proofs, then make sure you understand them fully. What is each step designed to accomplish? What is the intuition behind the sequence of steps taken? Are you satisfied that they produce the desired result? Draw pictures to illustrate claims, or to attempt to disprove them. Solve a simple case by assigning numbers to the parameters. If the article does not include the proofs, try to locate a working paper version online (sometimes these have all the math in them). If that fails, try to think of a strategy for a proof of the claim. Think of counterexamples, can you find one? Draw pictures! Look at similar models and observe how the authors have solved them.

- 5. Evaluate the generalizability of the results. Which assumptions do you think are crucial for the results? Do you think the results are likely to extend if we relax them? Why or why not? Which part(s) of proofs will no longer hold? What do you think would happen instead? Are the implications serious for our substantive interpretations? What are some of the questions and new puzzles that this article raises (perhaps the author mentions some, but most often these will arise from your own reading). What type of article do you think would best handle these questions? Is it on the syllabus or does it need to be written? How does this model fit in the modeling enterprise?
- 6. Step back and look at the conclusions: what have we learned that we did not know before? How does this relate to the other readings, both formal and non-formal that you have seen? Does it contradict some "received wisdom," modify and limit general claims, or support and extend others? What is the general abstract idea to take away? Is it applicable in other contexts, not necessarily IR-related? Which ones and how? If it needs slight modifications to be applicable, what would these be?
- 7. What are some empirical hypotheses that this model suggests? Are they testable or is the model at such a high level of abstraction that it is difficult to see how to apply it? If they are testable, what sort of research design would you adopt? What variables would you need? Do the hypotheses differ from ones used in previous empirical studies? Do they suggest that the previous research design was flawed? In what ways? How would you improve upon it?

One thing I should make abundantly clear is that this course will deal with *game-theoretic* formal models. There are many other mathematical formalizations (differential equations, agent-based models, general equilibrium models) but they are not as useful for most of the topics we shall be dealing with because they are unable to account for strategic interdependence of decision-making.

Presentation Schedule

The schedule of presentations for Winter 2010 is <u>here</u>.

Readings

No.	Topic
1.	Rational Choice, Game Theory, and International Relations
2.	Bargaining and the Inefficient Use of Power
3.	Crisis Bargaining and Escalation
4.	Conventional and Nuclear Deterrence
5.	Arms Races and Power Transition
6.	Alliances, Balance of Power, and Intervention
7.	Diplomacy, Cheap Talk, and Mediation
8.	Domestic Politics: Constraints, Signaling, Guns versus Butter
9.	Civil Wars and Ethnic Conflict
10.	Sanctions, Enforcement, and Cooperation
11.	<u>International Institutions</u>
12.	Trade and Trade Agreements
13.	Exchange Rates, Debt Crises, and Size of Nations

Rational Choice, Game Theory, and International Relations

Rigor or Rigor Mortis? Rational Choice and Security Studies

Stephen Walt. International Security, Vol. 23, No. 4. (Spring, 1999), pp. 5-48.

The Modeling Enterprise and Security Studies

Robert Powell. International Security, Vol. 24, No. 2. (Fall, 1999), pp. 97-106.

How Not To Criticize Rational Choice Theory: The Pathologies of Commonsense

James Johnson. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 26, No. 1. (Mar, 1996), pp. 77-91.

What Rationality Assumption? Or, How "Positive Political Theory" Rests on a Mistake James Johnson. *Political Studies*, forthcoming.

<u>Useful Fiction or Miracle Maker: The Competing Epistemological Foundations of Rational</u> Choice Theory

Paul K. MacDonald. *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (Nov., 2003), pp. 551-565.

Rational Choice Theory and Explanation

Frank Lovett. Rationality and Society, Vol. 18, No. 2. (2006), pp. 237-272.

Modernizing Political Science: A Model-Based Approach

Kevin A. Clarke; David M. Primo. *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 4. (Dec, 2007), pp. 741-753

Comments on the Interpretation of Game Theory

Ariel Rubinstein. Econometrica, Vol. 59, No. 4. (Jul, 1991), pp. 909-924.

Rational Choice and Interpretive Evidence: Caught between a Rock and a Hard Place?

Iain Hampsher-Monk; Andrew Hindmoor. Political Studies, fortchiming in 2010.

Recommended and Background Readings

On the Value of Game Theory in Social Science

Roger Myerson. Rationality and Society, Vol. 4, No. 1. (Jan, 1992), pp. 62-73.

An Introduction to Applicable Game Theory

Robert Gibbons. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 11, No. 1. (Winter, 1997), pp. 127-149.

International Relations: A Strategic Choice Approach

David Lake; Robert Powell. *Strategic Choice and International Relations*, Princeton UP, 1999, pp. 3-20.

Rationality and the Foundations of Positive Political Theory

Mathew D. McCubbins; Michael Thies. Working paper, 1996, University of California, San Diego.

Rationalizing Politics: The Emerging Synthesis of International, American, and Comparative Politics

Helen V. Milner. *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 4. (Autumn, 1998), pp. 759-786.

The Role of Formal Models

Robert Powell. *In The Shadow of Power*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999, pp. 22-38.

Bargaining and the Inefficient Use of Power

Bargaining in the Shadow of Power

Robert Powell. *In The Shadow of Power*, Princeton University Press, 1999, Chapter 3. If you do not have the book, you can read the following two articles instead:

- <u>Bargaining in the Shadow of Power.</u> *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol. 15, No. 2. (Aug, 1996), pp. 255-289.
- <u>Stability and the Distribution of Power.</u> *World Politics*, Vol. 48, No. 2. (Jan, 1996), pp. 239-267.

Does Private Information Lead to Delay or War in Crisis Bargaining?

Bahar Leventoglu and Ahmer Tarar. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 52 (2008), pp. 533-553.

(This version includes the technical supplement.)

The Principle of Convergence in Wartime Negotiations

Branislav L. Slantchev. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 4. (Nov, 2003), pp. 621-632.

Corrected proof.

Fighting Rather Than Bargaining

James D. Fearon. Working paper, Stanford University, 2007.

Uncertainty and Incentives in Crisis Bargaining: Game-Free Analysis of International Conflict

Mark Fey and Kristopher Ramsay. Working paper, University of Rochester and Princeton University, 2007.

The Inefficient Use of Power: Costly Conflict with Complete Information

Robert Powell. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 98, No. 2. (May, 2004), pp. 231-241.

War as a Commitment Problem

Robert Powell. International Organization, 60(Winter): 169-203, 2006.

Bargaining over Objects that Influence Future Bargaining Power

James D. Fearon. Working paper, Stanford University, 1996. <u>Figures 1 and 2 missing from this paper</u>.

The Armed Peace: A Punctuated Equilibrium Theory of War

Bahar Leventoglu and Branislav L. Slantchev. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 4. (Oct, 2007), pp. 755-771.

The Power to Hurt: Costly Conflict with Completely Informed States

Branislav L. Slantchev. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 1. (Feb, 2003), pp. 123-133.

Recommended and Background Readings

War is in the Error Term

Erik Gartzke. *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 3. (Jul, 1999), pp. 567-587. Correction, <u>Testing War in the Error Term</u>, *International Organization*, Vol. 57, No. 2. (Apr, 2003), pp. 445-448.

Rationalist Explanations for War

James D. Fearon. *International Organization*, Vol. 49, No. 3. (Summer, 1995), pp. 379-414.

Bargaining Theory and International Conflict

Robert Powell. Annual Review of Political Science, Vol. 5. (Jun, 2002), pp. 1-30.

Bargaining and Learning While Fighting

Robert Powell. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 48, No. 2. (Apr, 2004), pp. 344-361.

Conflict without Misperceptions or Incomplete Information: How the Future Matters

Michelle R. Garfinkel; Stergios Skaperdas. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 44, No. 6. (Dec, 2000), pp. 793-807.

Bargaining and War

R. Harrison Wagner. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 44, No. 3. (Jul, 2000), pp. 469-484.

How War Ends: A Rational Model Approach

Donald Wittman. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 23, No. 4. (Dec, 1979), pp. 743-763.

Crisis Bargaining and Escalation

Equilibrium Behavior in Crisis Bargaining Games

Jeffrey S. Banks. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 34, No. 3. (Aug, 1990), pp. 599-614.

Capabilities, Perception, and Escalation

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, and Ethan R. Zorik. *American Political Science Reivew*, Vol. 91, No. 1. (Mar, 1997), pp. 15-27.

Military Capabilities and Escalation: A Correction to Bueno de Mesquita, Morrow and Zorick, M. Christina Molinari. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 94, No. 2. (Jun, 2000), pp. 425-427.

Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes

James D. Fearon. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 88, No. 3. (Sep, 1994), pp. 577-592.

Signaling Foreign Policy Interests: Tying Hands versus Sinking Costs

James D. Fearon. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 41, No. 1. (Feb, 1997), pp. 68-90.

Capabilities, Uncertainty, and Resolve: A Limited Information Model of Crisis Bargaining

James D. Morrow. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 33, No. 4. (Nov, 1989), pp. 941-972.

Military Coercion in Interstate Crises

Branislav L. Slantchev. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 4. (Nov, 2005), pp. 533-547.

Military Threats: The Costs of Coercion and the Price of Peace

Branislav L. Slantchev. Cambridge University Press, forthcoming in 2010.

Feigning Weakness

Branislav L. Slantchev. *International Organization*, forthcoming in 2010.

Game Theory and the Spiral Model

Andrew Kydd. World Politics, Vol. 49, No. 3. (Apr, 1997), pp. 371-400.

Mutual Optimism and War

Mark Fey; Kristopher Ramsay. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 51, No. 4. (Oct, 2007), pp. 738-754.

<u>Mutual Optimism as a Rationalist Explanation for War</u>, Branislav L. Slantchev; Ahmer S. Tarar. Working paper, UCSD, 2009.

Strategic Uncertainty as a Cause of War

Adam Meirowitz; Anne E. Sartori. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 3, No. 4. (Dec, 2008), pp. 327-352.

Recommended and Background Readings

A Theory of Escalation and International Conflict

Lisa J. Carlson. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 39, No. 3. (Sep, 1995), pp. 511-534.

Rational Appeasement

Daniel Treisman. International Organization, Vol. 58, No. 2. (Apr, 2004), pp. 345-373.

A Theory of Brinkmanship, Conflicts, and Commitments

Michael Schwarz; Konstantin Sonin. Working paper, UC, Berkeley, 2004.

Conventional and Nuclear Deterrence

Selection Effects and Deterrence

James D. Fearon. *International Interactions*, Vol. 28, No. 1. (2002), pp. 5-29.

Credibility, Uncertainty, and Deterrence

Marc D. Kilgour; Frank C. Zagare. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 35, No. 2. (May, 1991), pp. 305-334.

Rational Deterrence in an Imperfect World

Barry Nalebuff. World Politics, Vol. 43, No. 3. (Apr, 1991), pp. 313-335.

Crisis Bargaining, Escalation, and MAD

Robert Powell. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 81, No. 3. (Sep. 1987), pp. 717-736.

Nuclear Deterrence and the Strategy of Limited Retaliation

Robert Powell. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 83, No. 2. (Jun, 1989), pp. 503-519.

Nuclear Brinkmanship with Two-Sided Incomplete Information

Robert Powell. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 82, No. 1. (Mar, 1988), pp. 155-178.

Nuclear Deterrence Theory, Nuclear Proliferation, and National Missile Defense

Robert Powell. International Security, Vol. 27, No. 4. (Mar, 2003), pp. 86-118.

Asymmetric Deterrence

Frank C. Zagare; Marc D. Kilgour. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 1. (Mar, 1993), pp. 1-27.

Recommended and Background Readings

Rational Deterrence Theory and Comparative Case Studies

Christopher Achen; Duncan Snidal. World Politics, Vol. 41, No. ?. (Jan, 1989), pp. 143-169.

Nuclear Weapons, Deterrence and Crisis Escalation

Daniel Geller. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 34, No. 2. (Jun, 1990), pp. 291-310.

Deterrence and Foreign Policy

Alexander George; Richard Smoke. World Politics, Vol. 41, No. 2. (Jan, 1989), pp. 170-182

Deterrence and International Conflict

Paul Huth. Annual Review of Political Science, Vol. 2. (Jun, 1999), pp. 25-48.

Rational Deterrence: Theory and Evidence

Robert Jervis. World Politics, Vol. 41, No. 2. (Jan, 1989), pp. 183-207.

Rational Deterrence and Crisis Stability

Jean-Pierre P. Langlois. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 35, No. 4. (Nov, 1991), pp. 801-832.

Modeling Deterrence and International Crises

Jean-Pierre P. Langlois. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 33, No. 1. (Mar, 1989), pp. 67-83.

Minimal Nuclear Deterrence

Barry Nalebuff. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 32, No. 3. (Sep, 1988), pp. 411-425.

Deterrence and Bargaining

R. Harrison Wagner. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 26, No. 2. (Jun, 1982), pp. 329-358.

The Nuclear Revolution and the Problem of Credibility

Robert Powell. Nuclear Deterrence Theory, Cambridge UP, 1990, Chapter 2.

Arms Races and Power Transition

Conflict, War, and Redistribution

Dagobert L. Brito; Michael D. Intriligator. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 79, No. 4. (Dec, 1985), pp. 943-957.

Can Arms Races Lead to the Outbreak of War?

Michael D. Intriligator; Dagobert L. Brito. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 28, No. 1. (Mar, 1984), pp. 63-84.

Arms Races and Arms Control: Modeling the Hawk Perspective

Andrew Kydd. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 44, No. 2. (Apr, 2000), pp. 228-244.

A Twist of Truth: A Reexamination of the Effects of Arms Races on the Occurrence of War

James D. Morrow. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 33, No. 3. (Sep, 1989), pp. 500-529.

Uncertainty, Shifting Power, and Appeasement

Robert Powell. American Political Science Review, Vol. 90, No. 4. (Dec, 1996), pp. 749-764.

Arms Races and Negotiations

Sandeep Baliga; Tomas Sjöström. *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 71, No. 2. (Apr, 2004), pp. 351-370.

Free Trade and Arms Races

Rafael Reuveny; John Maxwell. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 42, No. 6. (Dec, 1998), pp. 771-803.

Recommended and Background Readings

Messenger or Message?: Military Buildups and the Initiation of Conflict

Paul F. Diehl; Jean Kingston. *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 49, No. 4. (Aug, 1987), pp. 789-799.

Reconfiguring the Arms Race-War Debate

Paul F. Diehl; Mark J. Crescenzo. *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 35, No. 1. (Jan, 1998), pp. 111-118.

An Introduction to Lewis Fry Richardson and His Mathematical Theory of War and Peace G. D. Hess. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 14, No. 1. (??, 1995), pp. 77-113.

Arming as a Strategic Investment in a Cooperative Equilibrium

Michelle R. Garfinkel. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 80, No. 1. (Mar, 1990), pp. 50-68.

Cooperation, Conflict, and Power in the Absence of Property Rights

Stergios Skaperdas. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 82, No. 4. (Sep. 1992), pp. 720-739.

Alliances, Balance of Power, and Intervention

Stable Alliance Formation in Distributional Conflict

Michelle R. Garfinkel. *European Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 20, No. 4. (Nov, 2004), pp. 829-852.

Alliances and Asymmetry: An Alternative to the Capability Aggregation Model of Alliances

James D. Morrow. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 35, No. 4. (Nov, 1991), pp. 904-933.

Alliances, Credibility, and Peacetime Costs

James D. Morrow. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 38, No. 2. (Jun, 1994), pp. 270-297.

Alignment Decisions in the Shadow of Power

Robert Powell. In The Shadow of Power, Princeton, 1999, Chapter 5.

Alliance Formation and War

Alastair Smith. International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 39, No. 4. (Dec, 1995), pp. 405-426.

To Intervene or Not to Intervene: A Biased Decision

Alastair Smith. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 40, No. 1. (Mar, 1996), pp. 16-40.

Alliance Formation and General Deterrence

Gerald L. Sorokin. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 38, No. 2. (Jun, 1994), pp. 298-325.

Recommended and Background Readings

The Dynamics of Alliances in Anarchy

Songying Fang; Kristopher Ramsay. Working paper, University of Rochester, 2004.

Instability, Intervention, and Inter-Power Politics

Stephen E. Gent. Working paper, University of Rochester, 2004.

An Economic Theory of Alliances

Mancur Olson; Richard Zeckhauser. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 48, No. 3. (Aug, 1966), pp. 266-279.

Alliances: Why Write Them Down?

James D. Morrow. Annual Review of Political Science, Vol. 3. (Jun, 2000), pp. 63-83.

The Theory of Games and the Balance of Power

R. Harrison Wagner. World Politics, Vol. 38, No. 4. (Jul, 1986), pp. 546-576.

Diplomacy, Reputation, and Mediation

Which Side Are You On? Bias, Credibility and Mediation

Andrew Kydd. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 47, No. 4. (Oct, 2003), pp. 597-611.

Honest Threats: The Interaction of Reputation and Political Institutions in International Crises

Alexandra Guisinger; Alastair Smith. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 46, No. 2. (Apr., 2002), pp. 175-200.

Politics at the Water's Edge: Crisis Bargaining and Electoral Competition

Kristopher Ramsay. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 48, No. 4. (Aug, 2004), pp. 459-486.

The Might of the Pen: A Reputational Theory of Communication in International Disputes

Ann E. Sartori. International Organization, Vol. 56, No. 1. (Feb, 2002), pp. 121-149.

Recommended and Background Readings

Cheap Talk Can Matter in Bargaining

Joseph Farrell; Robert Gibbons. *Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 48, No. 1. (Jun, 1989), pp. 221-237.

Cheap Talk

Joseph Farrell; Matthew Rabin. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 10, No. 3. (Spring, 1996), pp. 103-118.

Cheap Talk with Two Audiences

Joseph Farrell; Matthew Rabin. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 79, No. 5. (Dec, 1989), pp. 1214-1223.

Predation, Reputation, and Entry Deterrence

Paul Milgrom; John Roberts. *Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 27, No. 2. (Aug, 1982), pp. 280-312.

Reputation and Imperfect Information

David M. Kreps; Robert Wilson. *Journal of Economic Theory*, Vol. 27, No. 2. (Aug, 1982), pp. 253-279.

Is Talk Really Cheap? Prompting Conversation Between Critical Theory and Rational Choice

James Johnson. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 1. (Mar, 1993), pp. 74-86.

Domestic Politics: Constraints, Signaling, Guns versus Butter

An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita; James D. Morrow; Randolph M. Siverson; Alastair Smith. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 93, No. 4. (Dec, 1999), pp. 791-808.

Conflict, Agency, and Gambling for Resurrection: The Principal-Agent Problem Goes to War George W. Downs; David M. Rocke American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 38, No.

2. (May, 1994), pp. 362-380.

When and How Do Domestic Constraints Matter? Two-Level Games with Uncertainty

Keisuke Iida. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 37, No. 3. (Sep, 1993), pp. 403-426.

Domestic Political Structure and War Behavior: A Game-Theoretic Approach

Marc D. Kilgour. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 35, No. 2. (Jun, 1991), pp. 266-284.

Domestic Politics and International Trade Negotiations

Helen V. Milner; Peter Rosendorff. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 41, No. 1. (Feb, 1997), pp. 117-146.

<u>Domestic Institutions and International Bargaining: The Role of the Agent Veto in Two-Level</u> Games

Jongryn Mo. American Political Science Review, Vol. 89, No. 4. (Dec, 1995), pp. 914-924.

Arms Versus Allies: Trade-Offs in the Search for Security

James D. Morrow. *International Organization*, Vol. 47, No. 2. (Spring, 1993), pp. 207-233.

Guns, Butter, and Anarchy

Robert Powell. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 1. (Mar, 1993), pp. 115-132.

Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises

Kenneth A. Schultz. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 92, No. 4. (Dec, 1998), pp. 829-844.

International Crises and Domestic Politics

Alastair Smith. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 92, No. 3. (Sep, 1998), pp. 623-639.

Risky but Rational: War as an Institutionally Induced Gamble

Hein E. Goemans; Mark Fey. *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 71, No. 1. (Jan, 2009), pp. 35-54 Efficient Secrecy: Public versus Private Threats in Crisis Diplomacy

Shuhei Kurizaki. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 101, No. 3. (Aug, 2007), pp. 543-558.

Recommended and Background Readings

Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations

James D. Fearon. Annual Review of Political Science, Vol. 1. (Jun, 1998), pp. 289-313.

Pre-negotiation Public Commitment in Domestic and International Bargaining

Bahar Leventoğlu; Ahmer Tarar. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 3. (Aug, 2005), pp. 419-433.

This version includes the technical supplement.

<u>Do Domestic Institutions Constrain or Inform?</u>: Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War

Kenneth A. Schultz. *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 2. (Apr, 1999), pp. 233-266.

Looking for Audience Costs

Kenneth A. Schultz. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 45, No. 1. (Feb, 2001), pp. 32-60.

Politicians, the Media, and Domestic Audience Costs

Branislav L. Slantchev. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 50, No. 2. (Jun, 2006), pp. 445-477.

The Logic of Two-Level Games with Endogenous Domestic Coalitions

Jongryn Mo. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 38, No. 3. (Sep, 1994), pp. 402-422.

International Bargaining with Two-Sided Domestic Constraints

Ahmer Tarar. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 45, No. 3. (Jun, 2001), pp. 320-340.

Domestic Politics and International Conflict

Michelle R. Garfinkel. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 84, No. 5. (Dec, 1994), pp. 1294-1309.

Civil Wars, Ethnic Conflict, and Terrorism

Conciliation, Commitment, and Counterterrorism

Ethan Bueno de Mesquita. International Organization, forthcoming, 2005.

Why Do Some Civil Wars Last so Much Longer than Others?

James D. Fearon. Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 41, No. 3. (May, 2002), pp. 275-302.

Vicious Cycles: Endogenous Political Extremism and Political Violence

Rui de Figueiredo; Barry R. Weingast. Working paper, University of California, Berkeley, 2001.

Sabotaging the Peace: The Politics of Extremist Violence

Andrew Kydd; Barbara F. Walter. *International Organization*, Vol. 56, No. 2. (Apr, 2002), pp. 263-296.

Defending against Terrorist Attacks with Limited Resources

Robert Powell. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 101, No. 3. (Aug, 2007), pp. 527-541.

Allocating Defensive Resources with Private Information about Vulnerability

Robert Powell. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 101, No. 4. (Nov, 2007), pp. 799-809.

Sequential, Nonzero-Sum "Blotto": Allocating Defensive Resources Prior to Attack

Robert Powell. *Games and Economic Behavior*, Vol. 67, No. 2. (Nov, 2009), pp. 611-615.

General Blotto: Games of Allocative Strategic Mismatch

Russell Golman; Scott E. Page. *Public Choice*, Vol. 138, No. 3-4. (Mar, 2009), pp. 279-299.

Economic Shocks and Civil War

Sylvain Chassang; Gerard Padró i Miquel. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 4, No. 3. (Oct, 2009), pp. 211-228.

Recommended and Background Readings

Global Threats and the Domestic Struggle for Power

Michelle R. Garfinkel. *European Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 20, No. 2. (Jun, 2004), pp. 495-508.

How Civil Wars End: A Rational Choice Approach

David T. Mason; Patrick J. Fett. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 40, No. 4. (Dec, 1996), pp. 546-568.

Sanctions, Enforcement, and Cooperation

Ending Economic Sanctions: Audience Costs and Rent–Seeking as Commitment Strategies

Han Dorussen; Jongryn Mo. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 45, No. 4. (Aug, 2001), pp. 395-426.

Bargaining, Enforcement and International Cooperation

James D. Fearon. *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 2. (Spring, 1998), pp. 269-305.

The Theory of International Economic Sanctions: A Public Choice Approach

William H. Kaempfer; Anton D. Lowenberg. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 78, No. 4. (Sep, 1988), pp. 786-793.

Trust, Reassurance, and Cooperation

Andrew Kydd. International Organization, Vol. 54, No. 2. (Apr, 2000), pp. 325-357.

Trust and Cooperation through Agent Specific Punishments

Fiona McGillivray; Alastair Smith. *International Organization*, Vol. 54, No. 4. (Oct, 2000), pp. 809-824.

Modeling the Forms of International Cooperation: Distribution vs. Information

James D. Morrow. *International Organization*, Vol. 48, No. 3. (Summer, 1994), pp. 387-423.

Are Sanctions Effective? A Game-Theoretic Analysis

George Tsebelis. Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 34, No. 1. (Mar, 1990), pp. 3-28.

Engineering Cooperation: A Game Theoretic Analysis of Phased International Agreements

Jean-Pierre P. Langlois; Catherine C. Langlois. *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 45, No. 3. (Jul, 2001), pp. 599-619.

Arms Control and Other Games Involving Imperfect Detection

Donald Wittman. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 83, No. 3. (Sep, 1989), pp. 923-945.

Recommended and Background Readings

Loosening the Ties that Bind: A Learning Model of Agreement Flexibility

Barbara Koremenos. *International Organization*, Vol. 55, No. 2. (Jun, 2001), pp. 289-325.

Coordination, Commitment, and Enforcement: The Case of the Merchant Guild

Avner Greif; Paul Milgrom; Barry R. Weingast. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 102, No. 4. (Aug, 1994), pp. 745-776.

Sanctions

Jonathan Eaton; Maxim Engers. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 100, No. 5. (Oct, 1992), pp. 899-928.

Sanctions: Some Simple Analytics

Jonathan Eaton; Maxim Engers. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 89, No. 2. (May, 1999), pp. 409-414.

Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma

Robert Jervis. World Politics, Vol. 30, No. 2. (Jan, 1978), pp. 167-214.

Credibility, Costs, and Institutions: Cooperation on Economic Sanctions

Lisa L. Martin. World Politics, Vol. 45, No. 3. (Apr, 1993), pp. 406-432.

Fools Suffer Gladly: The Use of Economic Sanctions in International Crises

T. Clifton Morgan; Valerie L. Schwebach. *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 41, No. ?. (Mar, 1997), pp. 27-50.

Absolute and Relative Gains in International Relations Theory

Robert Powell. American Political Science Review, Vol. 85, No. 4. (Dec, 1991), pp.

Relative Gains and the Pattern of International Cooperation

Duncan Snidal. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 85, No. 3. (Sep, 1991), pp. 701-726.

International Institutions

Reputation and Hegemonic Stability: A Game-Theoretic Analysis

James E. Alt; Randall L. Calvert; Brian D. Humes. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 82, No. 2. (Jun, 1988), pp. 445-466.

Domestic Policies, National Sovereignty and International Economic Institutions

Kyle Bagwell; Robert Staiger. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 116, No. 2. (May, 2001), pp. 519-562.

Managing the Evolution of Multilateralism

George W. Downs; David M. Rocke; Peter N. Barsoom. *International Organization*, Vol. 52, No. 2. (Spring, 1998), pp. 397-419.

<u>Is There a Broader-Deeper Trade-off in International Multilateral Agreements?</u>

Michael J. Gilligan. *International Organization*, Vol. 58, No. 3. (Jul, 2004), pp. 459-484.

The Role of Multilateral Institutions in International Trade Cooperation

Giovanni Maggi. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 89, No. 1. (Mar, 1999), pp. 190-214. An Economic Theory of GATT

Kyle Bagwell; Robert Staiger. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 89, No. 1. (Mar, 1999), pp. 215-248.

Recommended and Background Readings

The Rational Design of International Institutions

Barbara Koremenos; Charles Lipson; Duncan Snidal. *International Organization*, Vol. 55, No. 4. (Oct, 2001), pp. 761-800.

Bargaining and International Policy Cooperation

Kenneth Rogoff. American Economic Review, Vol. 80, No. 2. (May, 1990), pp. 139-142.

<u>Constitutions and Commitment: The Evolution of Institutional Governing Public Choice in</u> Seventeenth-Century England

Douglass C. North; Barry R. Weingast. *Journal of Economic History*, Vol. 49, No. 4. (Dec, 1989), pp. 803-832.

The Role of Institutions in the Revival of Trade

Paul Milgrom; Douglass North; Barry Weingast. *Economics and Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 1. (Mar, 1990), pp. 1-23.

Trade and Trade Agreements

A Coalition Formation Approach to Equilibrium Federations and Trading Blocs

John B. Burbidge; James A. DePater; Gordon M. Myers; Abhijit Sengupta. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 87, No. 5. (Dec, 1997), pp. 940-957.

Retaliation, Bargaining, and the Pursuit of 'Free and Fare' Trade

Kishor Gawande; Wendy Hansen. *International Organization*, Vol. 53, No. 1. (Jan, 1999), pp. 117-159.

Trade Wars and Trade Talks

Gene Grossman; Elhanan Helpman. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 103, No. 4. (Aug, 1995), pp. 675-708.

The Value of Trade Agreements in the Presence of Political Pressures

Giovanni Maggi; Andres Rodriguez-Clare. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 106, No. 3. (Jun, 1998), pp. 574-601.

Endogenous Tariff Formation

Wolfgang Mayer. American Economic Review, Vol. 74, No. 5. (Dec, 1984), pp. 970-985.

Recommended and Background Readings

Free to Trade: Democracies, Autocracies, and Intenational Trade

Edward D. Mansfield; Helen V. Milner; Peter Rosendorff. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 94, No. 2. (Jun, 2000), pp. 305-321.

Political Regimes and International Trade: The Democratic Difference Revisited

Xinyuan Dai. American Political Science Review, Vol. 96, No. 1. (Mar, 2002), pp. 159-165.

Replication, Realism, and Robustness: Analyzing Political Regimes and International Trade

Edward D. Mansfield; Helen V. Milner; Peter Rosendorff. *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 1. (Mar, 2002), pp. 167-169.

Why Democracies Cooperate More: Electoral Control and International Trade Agreements

Edward D. Mansfield; Helen V. Milner; Peter Rosendorff. *International Organization*, Vol. 56, No. 3. (Aug, 2002), pp. 477-513.

Exchange Rates, Debt Crises, and Size of Nations

On the Number and Size of Nations

Alberto Alesina; Enrico Spolaore. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 112, No. 4. (Nov, 1997), pp. 1027-1056.

The Breakup of Nations: A Political Economy Analysis

Patrick Bolton; Gerard Roland. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 112, No. 4. (Nov, 1997), pp. 1057-1090.

A Constant Recontracting Model of Sovereign Debt

Jeremy Bulow; Kenneth Rogoff. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 97, No. 1. (Feb, 1989), pp. 155-178.

The Political Choice of the Exchange Rate Regime

L. J. Ruland; J. M. Viaene. *Economics and Politics*, Vol. 5, No. 3. (??, 1993), pp. 271-284.

Recommended and Background Readings

Economic Integration and Political Disintegration

Alberto Alesina; Enrico Spolaore; Romain Wacziarg. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 90, No. 5. (Dec, 2000), pp. 1276-1296.

The Wealth and Size of Nations

Donald Wittman. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 44, No. 6. (Dec, 2000), pp. 868-884.