**INTLPOL 306: Foreign Policy Decision-Making in International Relations**

Spring 2022 Syllabus

**Instructor:** Jeffrey Ding **Location:** Bldg 160, Rm 124: Wallenberg Learning Theater

**Meeting Times:** T, Th 1:30-3:00pm **Instructor’s Office Hours:** Th 3:00-5:00pm (Encina C230E)

**E-mail:** jding99@stanford.edu

**Course Overview**

Foreign Policy Decision-Making in International Relations examines the factors that shape how actors develop and implement foreign policy in a comparative context. How do bureaucratic politics and interagency processes across different country contexts facilitate and constrain leaders' decisions? This course draws on scholarship from political science, psychology, history, sociology, and economics to analyze how choices made by individuals, small groups, or coalitions representing nation-states result in policies or strategies with international outcomes. Students will learn how to leverage various social science theories and methodologies to explore and assess how leaders across the world weigh different policy options when responding to international problems. Enrollment is limited to students in the Master’s in International Policy (MIP).

**Learning Objectives**

By the end of the course, students will be:

* Prepared to analyze the causal processes behind foreign policy decision-making and/or international politics (at the level of individuals, groups, larger structures, or combinations of various levels).
* Fluent in the major debates in the field of foreign policy decision-making, including how they map onto broader schools of theoretical and empirical thought in international relations (e.g., realism and constructivism)
* Equipped to apply insights from foreign policy decision-making research to specific, present-day policy problems

**Grading & Assignments**

Grades will be based on weekly attendance and participation (10%), discussion memos (20%), a diagnostic case study (30%), and a research paper (40%).

* **Classroom participation** (10%): Just like having water balloon fights, thinking through complex issues is most productive and fun when done in the company of others. Students are expected to demonstrate their engagement with the readings by actively listening and contributing to in-class discussions.
* **Discussion memos** (20%): For two of the weeks, students will submit a memo (~500 words) to the course discussion board that substantively discusses the reading material. You could identify key points of contention among the week’s readings, connections between the material and previous course readings, or weaknesses of evidence or logic. Students will sign up for the weeks they plan to cover during the first class. *Please post your memo by 11:59PM Pacific Time the day before class.*
* **Diagnostic case study** (30%): Conduct a diagnostic case study of a foreign policy decision (made by any state at any time) that you think of as either a success or failure. The objective of the case study is to identify which aspects of the foreign policy decision-making process contributed to this success or failure. This case study should cover: 1) a summary of the foreign policy decision; 2) an evaluation of the factors that contributed to this “success” or “failure”; 3) an argument for why your “diagnosis” should be preferred to other possible explanations. Your analysis should draw from concepts and debates covered in course readings. These case study write-ups should be roughly five single-spaced pages (2,500 words). *Due May 1at 11:59PM Pacific Time.*
* **Research Paper** (40%): This research paper will:

1. Identify a problem in the foreign policy decision-making process of a particular country (“Country A”)
2. Compare how that issue has been addressed or attempted to be solved in another country (“Country B”)
3. Analyze the opportunities and obstacles for translating Country B’s approach on this issue to Country A.

As with the diagnostic case study, the papers should engage with key concepts and points of contention in the course readings. Your papers should be roughly five single-spaced pages (2,500 words). Please bring a draft outline of your paper to class on May 12, as we will hold a peer review workshop then. Final paper due by June 5, at 11:59 Pacific Time.

**Course Schedule (abbreviated)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Week** | **Class Dates** | **Weekly Topics** |
| 1 | 3/29, 3/31 | Introduction and course overview |
| 2 | 4/5, 4/7 | Methods and approaches for studying foreign policy decision-making |
| 3 | 4/12, 4/14 | Schools of thought |
| 4 | 4/19, 4/21 | Group level of analysis |
| 5 | 4/26, 4/28 | Individual level of analysis/more climate and tech  **Diagnostic case study due (May 1)** |
| 6 | 5/3, 5/5 | Technology; case study discussions |
| 7 | 5/10, 5/12 | Use of history; research paper workshop |
| 8 | 5/17, 5/19 | Specific cases of consequential decisions |
| 9 | 5/24, 5/26 | Chinese foreign policy decision-making |
| 10 | 5/31 | General course reflections  **Research Paper due (June 5)** |

**Full Course Schedule & Readings**

The course subject demands a diversity of types of knowledge (academic articles, books, technical manuals, blogs, etc.) and diversity of knowledge producers (demographics, background, technical expertise, geographic location). The readings reflect this demand. *\*Nearly all assigned readings should be accessible via Stanford Libraries. For those that are not, I will post the relevant sections as pdf files on Cavans.*

**Week 1. Introduction and course overview**

**March 29: Course overview and expectations**

**March 31: Contemporary issues**

* Scott Sagan, “The World’s Most Dangerous Man,” *Foreign Affairs*, available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/russian-federation/2022-03-16/worlds-most-dangerous-man>
* “How Putin Controls Russia,” Q&A with Masha Lipman, *New Yorker*, available at: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/q-and-a/how-putin-controls-russia>
* Kseniya Kizlova and Pippa Norris, “What do ordinary Russians really think about the war in Ukraine?” LSE blog, available at: <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2022/03/17/what-do-ordinary-russians-really-think-about-the-war-in-ukraine/>

**Week 2. Methods and approaches for studying foreign policy decision-making**

**April 5: Theoretical approaches**

* James D. Fearon, “Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 1 (1998), 289-313.
* Valerie M. Hudson, “Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor-Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations,” *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 1, no. 1 (2005), 1-30.

**April 7: Quantitative and qualitative methods**

* Jost et al. “Advisers and Aggregation in Foreign Policy Decision-Making,” Working Paper. Available at: <https://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~jkertzer/Research_files/adviser_hawkishness_web.pdf>
* Rathbun et al. “Homo Diplomaticus: Mixed-Method Evidence of Variation in Strategic Rationality,” *International Organization* (2017).
* Iver B. Neumann. *At Home with the Diplomats: Inside a European Foreign Ministry.* Cornell University Press. \*Focus on Introduction and Chapters 3 and 5. Book is available online via Stanford searchworks.

**Week 3. Schools of Thought**

**April 12: Constructivism, liberalism, and realism**

* Robert Snyder, “Bridging the Realist/Constructivist Divide: The Case of the Counterrevolution in Soviet Foreign Policy at the End of the Cold War,” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 1 (2005), 55-71.
* Colin Elman, “Horses for Courses: Why Not Neorealist Theories of Foreign Policy?” *Security Studies* 6 (1996), 7-53.
* David Patrick Houghton, “Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach,” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 3 (2007), 24-45.

**April 14: Rational actor model**

* Hermann, Margaret G. "How decision units shape foreign policy: A theoretical framework." *International Studies Review* 3, no. 2 (2001): 47-81.
* Keren Yahri-Milo. “After Credibility: American Foreign Policy in the Trump Era.” *Foreign Affairs* (2018).
* Jervis, R. (1976), “Deterrence, the Spiral Model, and Intentions of the Adversary,” ch. 3 in *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. **Available as pdf on Canvas.**

**Week 4. Group level of analysis**

**April 19: Bureaucratic and organizational politics**

* Graham T. Allison and Morton H. Halperin, “Bureaucratic Politics: A Paradigm and Some Policy Implications,” *World Politics* 24 (Spring 1972), 40-79.
* Saunders, Elizabeth N. “No Substitute for Experience: Presidents, Advisers, and Information in Group Decision Making.” International Organization 71.S1 (2017): S219–S247.
* Kellerman, Barbara. “Allison Redux: Three More Decision-Making Models.” Polity 15.3 (1983): 351–367.

**April 21: Other groups**

* Alex Mintz, “Foreign Policy Decision Making in Familiar and Unfamiliar Settings: An Experimental Study of High-Ranking Military Officers,” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (2004).
* Chukwuemeka Ojieh, “Popular Diplomacy in an Autocracy – Public Opinion and Foreign Policy Decision-Making under the Military in Nigeria,” *Ufahamu: A Journal of African Studies* (2015).
* Paul t'Hart, "Irving L. Janis' Victims of Groupthink," *Political Psychology* 12 (1991), 247-277.

**Week 5. Individual level of analysis**

**April 26: Individual leaders and psychology**

* Daniel Byman and Kenneth Pollack, “Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesman Back In,” *International Security* 25 (Spring 2001), 107-146.
* James M. Goldgeier and Philip E. Tetlock, “Psychology and International Relations Theory,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4 (2001), 67-92.
* Janice Gross Stein, “The Micro-Foundations of International Relations Theory: Psychology and Behavioral Economics.” *International Organization*, 71, S1 (2017), S249-S263.

**April 28: Supplemental week on climate and emerging technology**

* Grant Wyeth and Larissa Stünkel, “First Fiji, Then the World.” *Foreign Policy* (2021), available at: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/02/15/first-fiji-then-the-world/>
* Lin-Greenberg, E. and Milonopoulos, T., 2021. Private eyes in the Sky: emerging technology and the political consequences of eroding government secrecy. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 65(6), pp.1067-1097.
* Brendan McCord and Zoe Weinberg, “Emerging Technology & The Future of The National Security Council,” Center for International Security and Cooperation, available at: <https://fsi-live.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/emerging_technology_and_the_future_of_the_nsc_-_final.pdf>

**\*Reminder: Diagnostic Case Study Due on May 1**

**Week 6. Technology and Diagnostic Case Study Discussions**

**May 3: Technology**

* Buch, Amanda et al. “Engineering Diplomacy: How AI and Human Augmentation Could Remake the Art of Foreign Relations,” available at: <https://www.sciencediplomacy.org/perspective/2022/engineering-diplomacy-how-ai-and-human-augmentation-could-remake-art-foreign>.
* Astrid Ziebarth and Jessica Bither, “Automating Decision-making in Migration Policy: A Navigation Guide,” German Marshall Fund, November 18, 2021, available at: https://www.gmfus.org/news/automating-decision-making-migration-policy-navigation-guide .
* Kiran Stacey and Caitlin Gilbert, “Big Tech increases funding to US foreign policy think-tanks,” *Financial Times*, available at: <https://www-ft-com.stanford.idm.oclc.org/content/4e4ca1d2-2d80-4662-86d0-067a10aad50b>.

**May 5: Discuss diagnostic case studies in small groups**

**Week 7. Use of history in decision-making**

**May 10: Use of history in decision-making**

* *Analogies at War*. Yuen Khong. 1992. Chapters 1 and 2. Available as pdf on Canvas
* Yaacov Vertzberger "Foreign Policy Decision-makers as Practical-Intuitive Historians: Applied History and its Shortcomings," International Studies Quarterly 30 (1986), 223-247.
* Risse, T. (2012). Identity matters: Exploring the ambivalence of EU foreign policy. Global policy, 3, 87-95.

**\*Please upload a draft outline of your research paper by 11:59 Pacific Time, May 10.**

**May 12: Mid-point workshop on research paper:** we’ll hold an in-class peer review session where students can get feedback from the peers and the instructor on their research papers.

**Week 8. Specific cases of consequential decisions**

**May 17: War**

* Leslie H. Gelb, “Vietnam: The System Worked,” Foreign Policy, no. 3 (Summer 1971), pp. 140- 167
* Kevin Woods, James Lacey, and Williamson Murray, “Saddam’s Delusions: The View from the Inside,” Foreign Affairs, vol. 85, no. 3 (May/June 2006), pp. 2-26
* Chaim Kaufmann, “Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas: The Selling of the Iraq War,” *International Security* 29 (Summer 2004), 5-48.

**May 19: Climate change**

* Vieira, Marco A. "Brazilian foreign policy in the context of global climate norms." Foreign Policy Analysis 9, no. 4 (2013): 369-386.
* Jianqiang Liu. “Analysis: Nine key moments that changed China’s mind about climate change,” Carbon Brief, available here: <https://www.carbonbrief.org/analysis-nine-key-moments-that-changed-chinas-mind-about-climate-change>.
* Barkdull, John, and Paul G. Harris. "Environmental change and foreign policy: a survey of theory." Global Environmental Politics 2, no. 2 (2002): 63-91.

**Week 9. Beyond U.S. foreign policy-decision-making**

**May 24: Chinese foreign policy decision-making**

* *New Directions in the Study of China’s Foreign Policy*. Edited by Alastair Iain Johnston and Robert S. Ross. 2006, chapter 4 (“China’s Decision for War with India in 1962”), available at: <https://www.chinacenter.net/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/china-decision-for-war-with-india-1962.pdf>
* Bonnie S. Glaser and Evan S. Medeiros, “The Changing Ecology of Foreign Policy-Making in China: The Ascension and Demise of the Theory of ‘Peaceful Rise’,” *The China Quarterly* 190(Jun. 2007), p. 291-310.
* Jakobson, Linda, and Knox, Dean. 2010. “New foreign policy actors in China,” SIPRI Policy Paper, chapter 1 (“introduction”) and chapter 4 (“foreign policy actors on the margins”), available at: <https://www.sipri.org/publications/2010/sipri-policy-papers/new-foreign-policy-actors-china>

**May 26: Small states**

* Klaus Brummer. “Advancing foreign policy analysis by studying leaders from the global South,” *International Affairs* 97 (March 2021).
* Maurice A. East. “Foreign Policy-Making in Small States: Some Theoretic Observations Based on a Study of the Uganda Ministry of Foreign Affairs,” *Policy* (1973).
* Sverrir Steinsson and Baldur Thorhallsson, “The Small-State Survival Guide to Foreign Policy Success,” *National Interest* (2017), available at: <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/the-small-state-survival-guide-foreign-policy-success-22526>.

**Week 10. General course reflections**

**May 31:** We’ll reflect on the class together, think about future applications of lessons learned, and share insights from research papers.

**Reminder: research papers due June 5, at 11:59 Pacific Time.**

**Additional Course Policies**

**Attendance and Late Submissions:** Being 15 minutes or more late to a class or section counts as an absence. If an absence is excused, students must make up any work due at that class/section. Students who anticipate persistent challenges to participating in class or submitting work on time should share this with the course instructor as soon as possible.

**Academic Accommodations:** Stanford is committed to providing equal educational opportunities for disabled students. Disabled students are a valued and essential part of the Stanford community. We welcome you to our class. If you experience disability, please register with the Office of Accessible Education (OAE). Professional staff will evaluate your needs, support appropriate and reasonable accommodations, and prepare an Academic Accommodation Letter for faculty. To get started, or to re-initiate services, please visit oae.stanford.edu. If you already have an Academic Accommodation Letter, please share your letter with me. Academic Accommodation Letters should be shared at the earliest possible opportunity so we may partner with you and OAE to identify any barriers to access and inclusion that might be encountered in your experience of this course.

**Plagiarism:** For purposes of the Stanford University Honor Code, plagiarism is defined as the use, without giving reasonable and appropriate credit to or acknowledging the author or source, of another person's original work, whether such work is made up of code, formulas, ideas, language, research, strategies, writing or other form(s). Moreover, verbatim text from another source must always be put in (or within) quotation marks.”

If you are in doubt about what constitutes plagiarism in the context of a particular assignment, talk with the instructor. Additional sources on plagiarism:

* Council of Writing Program Administrators: “Defining and Avoiding Plagiarism: The WPA Statement on Best Practices”
* Dartmouth College: “Sources and Citations at Dartmouth”
* Georgetown University: “What is Plagiarism?”
* Northwestern University: “How to Avoid Plagiarism”
* Purdue University Online Writing Website: “Avoiding Plagiarism” and "Plagiarism and Paraphrasing"
* University of California, Davis: “Avoiding Plagiarism: Mastering the Art of Scholarship”

**Privacy statement:** As noted in the University’s [recording and broadcasting courses policy](https://library.stanford.edu/using/copyright-reminder/common-situations/recording-broadcasting-courses), students may not audio or video record class meetings without permission from the instructor (and guest speakers, when applicable). If the instructor grants permission or if the teaching team posts videos themselves, students may keep recordings only for personal use and may not post recordings on the Internet, or otherwise distribute them. These policies protect the privacy rights of instructors and students, and the intellectual property and other rights of the university. Students who need lectures recorded for the purposes of an academic accommodation should contact the [Office of Accessible Education](https://oae.stanford.edu/students).

**Additional learning resources:**

* [Writing tutors](https://undergrad.stanford.edu/tutoring-support/hume-center) from the Hume Center for Writing and Speaking, to sharpen your essay-writing skills
* [Academic coaches](https://ctl.stanford.edu/student-learning-resources/support-your-students/academic-skills-coaching) from the Center for Teaching and Learning, to help you manage your time and work effectively during online and remote learning
* [Study halls](https://studentlearning.stanford.edu/study-halls/virtual-study-hall), organized by the Center for Teaching and Learning, to work and learn in quiet companionship with other students

## **Active reading:**

Paraphrasing a mentor of mine, Allan Dafoe: There are more informative papers and books than you could ever possibly read; therefore there must be some selection process about what pages and words you read. Authors do not write articles and books optimized exactly to your objectives. Again, then, there are gains if you can gain some sovereignty over your own reading attention. “Active reading” is my term for reading in a deliberate way, optimized for your goals. Sometimes it involves you proceeding very slowly, interrogating a single sentence at length, carefully pondering every word used, following up on the author’s footnotes, working through their logic step-by-step, etc... Other times, it involves skimming work. Read only the lead sentence of paragraphs for less relevant sections, or skip some sections all together. You will be expected in this course to have actively read all the required readings. You will know that you are reading the material with minimally sufficient care if you can restate the author’s arguments, the empirical and theoretical justification for these claims, and can identify some nuance, insights, problems, or possible extensions. I will expect from every participant the ability to provide this level of understanding in every class.

## **Respect for diversity and commitment to inclusion:** It is my intent that this course serves students from all diverse backgrounds, perspectives, and situations. I aim to present materials and activities that are respectful of diversity, which may include but not limited to: gender, sexuality, disability, age, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, race, religion, political affiliation, and culture. I recognizes that there is likely to be disparities in access to resources among students and plan to support all of you as best as I can. In addition, if any of our class meetings conflict with your religious events, please let me know so that we can make adjustments.