

Government 94ac:
War and Peace: Actors, Institutions and Foreign Policy
Fall 2014
Mon 4-6pm, CGIS Knafel K107

How do actors and institutions influence states' decisions for war or peace? Which actors and institutions matter more, those located at the domestic or international level? This course aims to familiarize students with the major paradigms in international relations and the actors and institutions highlighted in those paradigms as being particularly consequential for states' security policies. Sessions will be comprised of student-led presentations that summarize the material we have read and generate discussion of the research designs, findings, and methodologies employed therein, as well as their application to contemporary security policy challenges. The course aims to equip students with the necessary tools to conduct research on foreign security policy, complete a final research paper, and deliver a presentation to the class summarizing their findings.

Instructor: Professor Amy Catalinac

Email: acatalinac@fas.harvard.edu

Office: CGIS North 423.

Office Hours: Thu, 2-4pm.

Course Website: <http://isites.harvard.edu/k106732>.

Course Requirements:

1. Participation (20%)

This course depends on your participation. You are expected to read the assigned material each week and come prepared to discuss the research questions, research designs, findings, and methodologies contained within and their relevance for contemporary foreign policy challenges.

2. Presentation on Assigned Material (20%)

Beginning in the second session, each session will be comprised of one or more student-led presentations on the assigned material. The schedule of presentations and material to be covered in each presentation will be decided in or immediately after the first session (Sep 8). If you cannot attend the first session, please email me. Your task is to summarize the material assigned to you, raise questions for discussion, and where possible, connect it to current events in world politics. You are expected to meet with me the week before your presentation to go over its content and submit your presentation slides to me before delivering your presentation. You will be graded on your ability to deliver a clear, concise, and visually appealing presentation.

3. Research Prospectus (10%)

For the final paper, your task is to think of a research question related to the foreign security policy of a state or group of states. The question should identify a puzzle, of which the answer is not obvious. You are to offer an answer to this question, perhaps taken from the variables we study in the course but perhaps not, and provide evidence, gleaned from as many sources as possible, that your answer is correct. You are also expected to come up with other possible answers to your question and provide evidence that they are incorrect. You will be graded on your ability to identify a research question, construct an answer to that question, and provide evidence in support of your answer. In preparation for the paper, you are expected to submit a research prospectus to me via email by 5pm on October 27. This will describe the question you are planning to focus on in your final paper and why it matters, offer several possible answers to this question, and suggest ways of evaluating those. It must be less than five double-spaced pages and should be submitted in pdf form. This gives me the opportunity to provide feedback for your in your writing of the final paper.

4. Final Paper Presentation (10%)

The final session (on December 1) will be comprised of student presentations summarizing the main findings of their final research papers. Other students are encouraged to comment on their classmates’ research.

5. Final Research Paper (40%)

The final paper should be between 20-25 double-spaced pages and should be submitted to me via email in pdf format before 5pm on December 10. Typically, your paper will include references to secondary sources such as academic journal articles and books pertaining to your subject area, as well as primary sources, such as newspaper articles, policy statements, and blogs. Please consult the [Harvard Guide to Using Sources](#) for information about referencing. Either citation style is fine, as long as you are consistent.

Grade Breakdown:

Participation	20%
Presentation(s) on Assigned Material	20%
Research Prospectus	10%
Final Paper Presentation	10%
Final Research Paper	40%

Required Texts: There are no required textbooks for this course.

Assigned Readings: The assigned readings for each week are available through the course website. Supplementary material for each session is also noted. This is only for your reference and is not required. There may be minor adjustments to the assigned readings as the course progresses, which will be communicated well in advance.

Policy on Collaboration: You are encouraged to discuss with one another your approach to the presentation and final paper, but you must ensure that any material submitted to meet the requirements of the course (including your presentation slides, research prospectus, and final paper) is your own work.

Accommodation for Students with Disabilities: Students needing academic adjustments or accommodations because of a documented disability must present their Faculty Letter from the [Accessible Education Office](#) and speak with the professor by the end of the second week of the semester. Failure to do so may result in the instructor's inability to respond in a timely manner.

Important Dates:

Presentation on Assigned Material (to be scheduled).
Research Prospectus Due October 27 (at 5pm)
Final Paper Presentation December 1
Final Research Paper Due December 10 (at 5pm)

COURSE OUTLINE

Sep 8 (Week 1): Theoretical and Empirical Tools in the Study of War and Peace.

Stephen Walt. International Relations: One World, Many Theories. *Foreign Policy*, Spring:29–46, 1998.

Paul M. Kellstedt and Guy D. Whitten. *The Fundamentals of Political Science Research*, chapter 1, pages 1–21. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2009.

For Reference:

Walter Carlsnaes. Foreign Policy. In Thomas Risse Walter Carlsnaes and Beth A. Simmons, editors, *Handbook of International Relations*, pages 331–349. London.

Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba. *Designing Social Inquiry: Scientific Inference in Qualitative Research*, chapter 1, pages 3–33. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N. J., 1994.

Sep 15 (Week 2). Actor: The State.

Thomas J. Christensen. China, the U.S.-Japan Alliance, and the Security Dilemma in East Asia. *International Security*, 23(4):49–80, Spring 1999.

Victor D. Cha. Abandonment, Entrapment, and Neoclassical Realism in Asia: The United States, Japan, and Korea. *International Studies Quarterly*, 44(2):261–291, 2000.

Deborah Welch Larson and Alexei Shevchenko. Status Seekers: Chinese and Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy. *International Security*, 34(4):63–95, Spring 2010.

For Reference:

M. Taylor Fravel. Power Shifts and Escalation: Explaining Chinas Use of Force in Territorial Disputes. *International Security*, 32(3):44–83, 2007.

Jennifer Lind. Pacifism or Passing the Buck? Testing Theories of Japanese Security Policy. *International Security*, 29(1):92–121, 2004.

Sep 22 (Week 3). Actor: Leaders.

Elizabeth N. Saunders. Transformative Choices: Leaders and the Origins of Intervention Strategy. *International Security*, 34(2):119–161, 2009.

Douglas C. Foyle. Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Elite Beliefs as a Mediating Variable. *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(1):141–170, 1997.

Jacques Hymans. *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation*, chapter 2, pages 16–46. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2006.

For Reference:

Daniel L. Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack. Let Us Now Praise Great Men (and Women): Restoring the First Image? *International Security*, 25(4):107–147, Spring 2001.

Jonathan W. Keller. Leadership Style, Regime Type, and Foreign Policy Crisis Behavior: A Contingent Monadic Peace? *International Studies Quarterly*, 49:205–231, 2005.

Andrew Bingham Kennedy. *The International Ambitions of Mao and Nehru: National Efficacy Beliefs and the Making of Foreign Policy*, chapter 2. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2012.

Brian C. Rathbun. Hierarchy and Community at Home and Abroad: Evidence of a Common Structure of Domestic and Foreign Policy Beliefs in American Elites. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51(3):379–407, 2007.

Sep 29 (Week 4). Institution: Democracy.

John M. Owen. How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace. *International Security*, 19(2):87–125, 1994.

Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, Randolph Siverson, and Alastair Smith. An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review*, 93:791–807, December 1999.

Kenneth Schultz. Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform?: Contrasting Two Institutional Perspectives on Democracy and War. *International Organization*, 53:233–266, 1999.

For Reference:

James Fearon. Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes. *American Political Science Review*, 88(3):577–592, 1994.

Michael R. Tomz and Jessica L. P. Weeks. Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review*, 107(4):849–865, 2013.

Oct 6 (Week 5). Institution: Autocracy.

Jessica L. Weeks. Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve. *International Organization*, 62(1):35–64, 2008.

Jessica Chen Weiss. Authoritarian Signaling, Mass Audiences, and Nationalist Protest in China. *International Organization*, 67(1):1–35, 2013.

Christopher Way and Jessica L. P. Weeks. Making It Personal: Regime Type and Nuclear Proliferation. *American Journal of Political Science*, 58(3):705–719, 2014.

Oct 13 (Week 6). No meeting. Columbus Day.

Oct 20 (Week 7). Actor: The Public.

Joshua D. Kertzer and Kathleen M. McGraw. Folk Realism: Testing the Microfoundations of Realism in Ordinary Citizens. *International Studies Quarterly*, 56(2):245–258, 2012.

John H. Aldrich, John L. Sullivan, and Eugene Borgida. Foreign Affairs and Issue Voting: Do Presidential Candidates "Waltz Before A Blind Audience?" *American Political Science Review*, 83(1):123–141, 1989.

Benjamin E. Goldsmith and Yusaku Horiuchi. In Search of Soft Power: Does Foreign Public Opinion Matter for US Foreign Policy? *World Politics*, 64(3):555–585, 2012.

For Reference:

Thomas Risse-Kappen. Public Opinion, Domestic Structure, and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies. *World Politics*, 43(4):479–512, 1991.

Oct 27 (Week 8). Actor: The Media.

Matthew A. Baum. Circling the Wagons: Soft news and Isolationism in American Public Opinion. *International Studies Quarterly*, 48:313–338, 2004.

Danny Hayes and Matt Guardino. The influence of foreign voices on u.s. public opinion. *American Journal of Political Science*, 55(4):830–850, 2011.

Matthew A. Baum. The Iraq Coalition of the Willing and (Politically) Able: How Party Systems, the Press and Public Influence on Foreign Policy. *American Journal of Political Science*, 0(0):1–17, 2012.

For Reference:

Scott L. Althaus and Devon M. Largio. When Osama Became Saddam: Origins and Consequences of the Change in America’s Public Enemy Number 1. *PS. Political Science and Politics*, 4:795–799, 2004.

Nov 3 (Week 9). Institution: Identity and Culture.

Christopher M. Hemmer and Peter J. Katzenstein. Why Is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism. *International Organization*, 56(3):575–607, 2002.

Thomas U. Berger. Norms, Identity, and National Security in Germany and Japan. In Peter J. Katzenstein, editor, *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, pages 317–356. Columbia University Press, New York, 1996.

Jarrod Hayes. Securitization, Social Identity, and Democratic Security: Nixon, India, and the Ties That Bind. *International Organization*, 66:63–93, 2012.

For Reference:

Alastair Iain Johnston. Cultural Realism and Strategy in Maoist China. In Peter J. Katzenstein, editor, *The Culture of National Security: Norms and Identity in World Politics*, pages 216–268. Columbia University Press, New York, 1996.

Rawi Abdelal, Yoshiko Herrera, Alastair Iain Johnston, and Rose McDermott. Identity as a Variable. *Perspectives on Politics*, 4(4):695–711, 2006.

Donald Kinder and Cindy Kam. *Us Against Them*, chapter 4, pages 73–104. Chicago University Press, Chicago, Il., 2010.

Nov 10 (Week 10). Actor: The Military.

Eric Heginbotham. The Fall and Rise of Navies in East Asia: Military Organizations, Domestic Politics and Grand Strategy. *International Security*, 27(2):86–125, 2002.

Michael C. Horowitz and Allan C. Stam. How Prior Military Experience Influences the Future Militarized Behavior of Leaders. *International Organization*, 68(3):527–529, 2014.

Vipin Narang. Posturing for Peace? Pakistan’s Nuclear Postures and South Asian Stability. *International Security*, 34(3):38–78, 2009.

For Reference:

Jeffery Legro. Military Culture and Inadvertant Escalation in World War II. *International Security*, Spring 1994.

Stephen Van Evera. The Cult of the Offensive and the Origins of the First World War. *International Security*, pages 58–107, Summer 1984.

Nov 17 (Week 11). Actor: Sub-national and Supra-national.

Nina Tannenwald. The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use. *International Organization*, 53(3):433–468, Summer 1999.

Amitav Acharya. How Ideas Spread: Whose Norms Matter? Norm Localization and Institutional Change in Asian Regionalism. *International Organization*, 58(2):239–275, Spring 2004.

Brian Rathbun. Steeped in International Affairs?: The Foreign Policy Views of the Tea Party. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 9:21–37, 2013.

For Reference:

Emmanuel Adler. The emergence of cooperation: national epistemic communities and the international evolution of the idea of nuclear arms control. *International Organization*, 46(1):101–146, 1992.

Nov 24 (Week 12). Institution: Domestic Political.

William G. Howell and Jon C. Pevehouse. Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force. *International Organization*, 59(1):209–232, 2005.

Juliet Kaarbo and Ryan K. Beasley. Taking It to the Extreme: The Effect of Coalition Cabinets on Foreign Policy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 4(1):67–81, January 2008.

Jacques E.C. Hymans. Veto Players, Nuclear Energy, and Nonproliferation. *International Security*, 36(2):154–189, 2011.

For Reference:

Phillip K. B. Potter and Matthew A. Baum. Looking for Audience Costs in all the Wrong Places: Electoral Institutions, Media Access, and Democratic Constraint. *Journal of Politics*, 76(1):167–181, 2014.

Amy Catalinac. Pork to Policy: The Rise of National Security in Elections in Japan. unpublished manuscript, 2013.

Dec 1 (Week 13). Student Presentations on Final Research Paper.
