

INTR 8068: Making Foreign Policy
Semester One, 2013
Sessions: Tues, 3-5pm, HBC3
(NB: April 16 only: 3.30-5.30pm).

What determines a state's foreign and security policy? Which domestic political factors matter, and how do they matter? How do features of the international system affect the foreign and security policies pursued by states? The purposes of this course are twofold. First, it aims to familiarize you with the major variables political scientists have identified as influencing foreign and security policy. Second, it aims to equip you with the necessary tools to conduct research and complete a research paper of your own.

The course begins by considering the utility of theories of international relations in explaining the foreign and security policy choices of individual states. Next, we consider the kind of research design and methodology we should employ when studying foreign and security policy. We then move to the substantive part of the course and read cutting-edge research conducted across ten categories of variables, ranging from the domestic to the supranational and the ideational to the material. Each session will be comprised of student-led presentations that summarize the material we've read and generate discussions of the research designs, findings, and methodologies employed therein. The empirical focus of the course is on security policy, broadly defined.

Instructor: Dr. Amy Catalinac

Email: amy.catalinac@anu.edu.au

Office: Hedley Bull, 2.09.

Office Hours: Wed, 5-7pm, or by appointment.

Course Objectives: In taking this course, students are expected to acquire:

1. An understanding of the major theories of international relations and how they can (and cannot) be used to study the foreign and security policies of individual states.
2. An understanding of the variables political scientists have identified as influencing foreign and security policy decisions.
3. The capacity to summarize and critically appraise the research designs, findings, and methodologies of cutting-edge research in the field.
4. The capacity to make an oral presentation on the research designs, methodologies, and conclusions of this research.
5. The capacity to conduct original research and write a research paper.

Course Requirements: This course depends heavily on your participation. You are expected to read the assigned material each week and come prepared to discuss the research designs, findings, and methodologies contained therein. Each session will be comprised of student-led presentations on the assigned material, followed by a discussion in which all students are expected to participate. The schedule of presentations will be decided in the first session. If you cannot attend the first session, please email me in advance. The number of times each student presents will depend on the number of students taking the course. Your performance in the presentations will comprise 30% of your grade for the course. In addition, you are required to complete an in-class, closed-book mid-term examination (on April 16, worth 30% of your grade), which will examine material taught in weeks 1-6 and a 2,500-3,000-word research essay (due May 30 at 11.59pm, worth 40% of your grade), in which you will identify a research question and answer it with evidence. See below for more details.

Grade Breakdown:

Participation (presentations)	30%
Mid-term Exam	30%
Research Essay	40%

Presentations: Your job is to put together a presentation with power point slides that summarizes the assigned material and raises questions for discussion. The schedule of presentations and the material to be covered in each presentation will be decided in or immediately after the first session. In your summary, you are expected to address the research question posed in the material, the answer offered by the author(s), any alternative answers that were considered, and the evidence the author presents in support of his/her claims. I want you to be especially attentive to the research design (how the author went about testing his/her hypothesized answer), as well as the data and methodology used. Your questions for discussion can focus on any aspect of the material you find interesting. In the weeks you are presenting, you may either bring your slides to lecture in a USB memory stick or send me your slides via email. If you choose the latter, you must email me your slides at least two hours before the session is scheduled to start. In addition, you are required to upload your slides to a shared drop box after you have presented, so that students can view your slides. To do this, all students need to register for a free dropbox account at www.dropbox.com. Please do this now. More details about the presentations will be given in the first session. Presentations will start in week 3.

Research Essay: Your task for the research essay is to think of a question related to the foreign or 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 your own answer to this question, perhaps gleaned from the variables we study in the course but perhaps not, and provide evidence, gleaned from as many sources as you can, that your answer is correct. You are also expected to come up with other possible answers to your question and provide evidence that those answers 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. The goal of the essay is to have you conduct some original research, so you will do better if you use primary material (for example, government documents, newspaper articles, interviews, government data, etc.).

The essay should be between 2,500-3,000 words and should be submitted via www.turnitin.com before 11.59pm on May 30. The IPS Guidelines for Undergraduate Assessment describes the rules regarding format, submission, referencing style, penalties for late submission, penalties for not

keeping within the word limit, and extension requests. Each of these policies will be followed in this course also, so please consult this guide.

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

Assigned Readings: The assigned readings for each week have been scanned and are available on the course website. Supplementary material for each session is also noted. This is only for your reference and is not required.

Important Dates:

Presentations (to be scheduled).
Mid-term Exam Tuesday, April 16
Research Paper Due Thursday May 30 (11.59pm)

COURSE OUTLINE

PART I: TOOLS FOR STUDYING FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY

Feb 19 (Week One): Theoretical (IR Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis)

What is foreign and security policy? Can IR theory help explain the foreign and security policies of states? Which factors do these theories suggest matter most, system-level or unit-level factors? If we're interested in foreign and security policy, why should we study East Asia? What country/set of countries are you most interested in, and why? What kind of questions are you most interested in, and why? Please read the assigned material and think about your answers to these questions.

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

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

Alastair Iain Johnston. What (If Anything) Does East Asia Tell Us About International Relations Theory? *Annual Review of Political Science*, 15:5378, 2012.

For Reference:

Valerie Hudson. Foreign policy analysis: Actor-specific theory and the ground of international relations. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 1:1–30, 2005.

Feb 26 (Week Two). Practical (research design, data, and methodology).

What is a good research question? How can we come up with possible answers? What are good strategies for evaluating the validity of those answers? What should we be doing, building theories of foreign and security policy or testing specific hypotheses about why a state chose a particular course of action at a particular time? What is an eclectic explanation, and is this what we should be aiming for? Please read the assigned material and think about your answers to these questions.

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.

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.

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt. Leaving Theory Behind: Why Hypothesis Testing Has Become Bad for IR. *HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series*, pages 1–55, 2013.

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.

PART II: DRIVERS OF FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY

Mar 5 (Week Three). Supranational (material).

Gideon Rose. Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy. *World Politics*, 51(1):144–172, 1998.

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

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

Richard J. Samuels. Japan’s Goldilocks Strategy. *The Washington Quarterly*, 29(4):111–127, 2006.

For Reference:

John J. Mearsheimer. Structural Realism. In Tim Dunne et al, editor, *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*, pages 72–82. Oxford University Press, Oxford, United Kingdom, 2006.

Alastair Iain Johnston. Is China a Status Quo Power? *International Security*, 27(4):5–56, 2003.

Colin Elman. Horses for Courses: Why Not Neorealist Theories of Foreign Policy. *Security Studies*, 6(1), 1996.

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

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

Tsuyoshi Kawasaki. Postclassical Realism and Japanese Security Policy. *The Pacific Review*, 14:221–240, 2001.

Mar 12 (Week Four). Supranational (ideational).

Ted Hopf. The logic of habit in International Relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 16(4):539–561, 2010.

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

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.

Alastair Iain Johnston. Treating international institutions as social environments. *International Studies Quarterly*, 45(4):487–515, 2001.

For Reference:

Alastair Iain Johnston. *Social states: China in international institutions, 1980-2000*, chapter 1, pages 1–44. Princeton University Press, 2008.

Alexander Wendt. Collective identity formation and the international state. *American Political Science Review*, 88(2):384–396, June 1994.

Mar 19 (Week Five). Regime Type.

Bruce Bueno da 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.

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.

For Reference:

Randall L. Schweller. Domestic Structures and Preventative War: Are Democracies More Pacific? *World Politics*, 44(2):235–269, 1992.

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

Mar 26 (Week Six). Domestic Political Institutions.

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.

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

Jacques E.C. Hymans. Veto Players, Nuclear Energy, and Nonproliferation. *International Security*, 36(2):154189, 2011.

For Reference:

M. Taylor Fravel. Regime Insecurity and International Cooperation: Explaining China's Compromises in Territorial Disputes. *International Security*, 30(2):46–83, 2005.

Tomohito Shinoda. Japan's Top-Down Policy Process to Dispatch the SDF to Iraq. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 7(1):71–91, 2006.

Apr 16 (Week Seven). No Lecture. In-class mid-term exam.

Apr 23 (Week Eight). Public Opinion and the Media.

John H. Aldrich, Christopher Gelpi, Peter Feaver, Jason Reifler, and Kristin Thompson Sharp. Foreign Policy and the Electoral Connection. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 9:477–502, 2006.

Sarah Kreps. Elite Consensus as a Determinant of Alliance Cohesion: Why Public Opinion Hardly Matters for NATO-led Operations in Afghanistan. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 6(3):187–215, 2010.

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

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:

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.

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

Michael Horowitz and Matt Levendusky. When Backing Down is the Right Decision: Partisanship, New Information, and Audience Costs. *Journal of Politics*, pages 1–16, 2012.

Matthew A. Baum and Philip B.K. Potter. The Relationships Between Mass Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 11:39–65, 2008.

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

Apr 30 (Week Nine). Identities.

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

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

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

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

For Reference:

Jacques Hymans. *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation*, chapter 5, pages 16–46. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2006.

Zheng Wang. National Humiliation, History Education, and the Politics of Historical Memory: Patriotic Education Campaign in China. *International Studies Quarterly*, 52:783–806, 2008.

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

May 7 (Week Ten). Domestic norms and cultures.

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.

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.

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 C. Rathbun. Before hegemony: Generalized trust and the creation and design of international security organizations. *International Organization*, 65:243–273, 2011.

For Reference:

Michael P. Fischerkeller. David versus Goliath: Cultural judgments in asymmetric wars. *Security Studies*, 7(4):1–43, 1998.

Alastair Iain Johnston. Thinking About Strategic Culture. *International Security*, 19(4):32–64, 1995.

May 14 (Week Eleven). Leaders, leadership style, and personality.

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.

Akan Malici and Johnna Malici. The Operational Codes of Fidel Castro and Kim Il Sung: The Last Cold Warriors? *Political Psychology*, 26(3):387–412, 2005.

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

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

For Reference:

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.

Rose McDermott. *Presidential leadership, illness, and decision making*, chapter 1, pages 1–44. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2008.

Jonathan Renshon. When Public Statements Reveal Private Beliefs: Assessing Operational Codes at a Distance. *Political Psychology*, 30(4):649–661, 2009.

May 21 (Week Twelve). Bureaucracies and military organizations.

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.

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

Jonathan Bendor and Thomas H. Hammond. Rethinking Allison’s models (Graham Allison’s Cuban missile crisis study). *American Political Science Review*, 1992.

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

May 28 (Week Thirteen). Territory and Demography.

Harvey Starr and G. Dale Thomas. The Nature of Borders and International Conflict: Revisiting Hypotheses on Territory. *International Studies Quarterly*, 49:123–139, 2005.

Stacie E. Goddard. Uncommon Ground: Indivisible Territory and the Politics of Legitimacy. *International Organization*, 60:35–68, January 2006.

Ron Hassner. To Halve and to Hold: Conflicts Over Sacred Space and the Problem of Indivisibility. *Security Studies*, 12(4):1–33, 2003.

Valerie M. Hudson and Andrea Den Boer. A Surplus of Males: A Deficit of Peace: Security and Sex Ratios in Asia's Largest States. *International Security*, 26(4):5–38, 2002.

For Reference:

Thomas Homer-Dixon. On the threshold: environmental changes as causes of acute conflict. *International Security*, pages 76–116, Fall 1991.

Mark L. Haas. A Geriatric Peace: The Future of US Power in a World of Aging Populations. *International Security*, 32(1):112–147, 2007.
