

Political Science 597.01: Nationalism and Interdependence
Theme: Mass-Elite Interactions in Foreign Policy-Making

Autumn Quarter 2005

Instructor: Thomas M. Dolan

Class: Tuesday-Thursday 10:30-12:18, 2019 McPherson Laboratory

Office: 2012 Derby Hall, Office Phone: 292-9492

E-mail: dolan.42@osu.edu

Office Hours: Tuesday-Thursday 1:00-2:00 and by appointment

Polls, “the street,” activists of great variety, and the everyday acts of the citizen/consumer are frequently described as having influence, sometimes great influence, on the foreign policies that states pursue. But, how great is that influence, and how does it vary from state to state and issue to issue? Can we predict, or at least explain, their responses to the decisions and acts of states? How much can politicians and others guide and manipulate these manifestations of non-elite sentiment, and to what degree are they constrained by their inability to control what the masses say (and not say) and do (and fail to do)? After a quick introduction to the institutional politics of foreign policy decision-making, this course will examine how elites and non-elites think about themselves, others, and foreign policy. It will then focus on how opinions about and responses to particular events are formed among the public. Next the course focuses on how non-elites respond to war, integration, trade, terrorism, and moral causes, and how these responses shape outcomes in these fields of action. Last it considers some normative issues: being that we understand the nature of non-elite responses, how should politics and the foreign policy process work?

Instructor’s Goals

The presentation of this course, and the evaluation of students’ efforts in it, will be tailored to the following aims:

- Students will acquire understandings of the responses of non-elites in international politics, and their nature, dynamics, and effects on foreign policy outcomes
- Students will improve their ability to critically analyze events and trends in social interactions both past and present, and to draw conclusions about them effectively grounded in evidence
- Students will improve written and oral communication skills

The presentation of this course is designed with the acknowledgement that students bring different backgrounds to it. While we will move far beyond the basic concepts of political science into our particular topic, when appropriate (and particularly in the first few weeks of class) these basic concepts will be addressed as needed.

The University extends the course and any requirements associated with it because “Thematic upper-division course work, drawing upon multiple disciplines, enriches students’ experiences of the contemporary world.” It expects you to do the following things:

1. Students synthesize and apply knowledge from diverse disciplines to contemporary issues.
2. Students write about or conduct research on the contemporary world.

Note that these general goals are encompassed by my specific goals for the course.

Please note that none of these goals involve the advancement of anyone's political or policy opinions (including those of the instructor). While I encourage political activity and the fulfillment of one's citizenship duties outside of the classroom, a political science course is not a proper forum for the airing of one's personal politics.

Course Design

Coursework consists of a series of readings, attendance at and participation in class, one in-class exam, and four out-of-class writing assignments. Students are expected to have completed assigned readings prior to class meetings, and be willing and able to discuss it as requested by the instructor. These readings, which were carefully selected, vary in purpose: sometimes they provide the main conceptual basis for a lecture/discussion, sometimes they introduce it by discussing a particular case. Lecture/discussion in class meetings is oriented to ensuring that students understand some key ideas from the reading, introducing additional ideas and experiences, considering competing ideas, addressing applicable evidence, and exploring the implications of these ideas. The exam is intended to evaluate students' substantive knowledge of the concepts, events, and facts about the real world covered in the readings and class meetings. Out-of-class assignments are focused on extending that knowledge, critically evaluating it, and applying it.

Readings

Readings are available on-line through the University library and (in some, noted cases) other websites. Some readings are relatively lengthy; however, in these cases, instructions tending to focus students efforts may be given.

Access instructions: Within the University Library system, readings may be found in a few different places. Notations in the reading list indicate where to go.

E-Reserves: Go to <http://library.osu.edu/index.php>. Select "reserves by course" or "reserves by professor". Follow appropriate links. Texts are in .pdf format. **Note:** Because the library must scan these texts, and because we do not require them for some time, they may not be available in the first week or so.

Online journal articles: JSTOR, Ohiolink, etc.: Go to <http://library.osu.edu/index.php>. Select "E-journals". Search for the name of the journal, for example "American Political Science Review." Follow the links as appropriate to the year of the article you need. In order to sign-in for off-campus access, go to the above address, click "off-campus Sign-in" and follow the instructions.

Assignments

Each student has the opportunity to complete four out-of-class assignments and one final examination. Out-of-class assignments are to be turned in on the due date, or before. For each day that an assignment is late without a previously approved excuse, 5% of the credit due that assignment will be lost, to a limit of 40%. If you need to reschedule the final, please inform the instructor of the need prior to the date of the final.

Assignment 1: 10% of final grade
(2 pages) Respond to *Power and Weakness*; **Due 6 Oct**

Assignment 2: 15% of final grade

(4 pages) With the dispositions and worldviews discussed in class and the readings in mind, and also some sense of what masses can do to influence elites, on what sorts of foreign policy issues are masses most likely to be influential in politicians' decision-making process? On what sorts of issues are they less likely to be influential? Or, if masses are just pawns of competing elites, when will they be useful allies and when will they be rather useless as the allies of leaders? Do not assume that regime type explains it all. **Due 25 Oct**

Assignment 3: 15% of final grade

(4 pages) Since the ways in which masses respond to particular events are key to their influence, make an argument about how that happens: do they have a level of autonomy or not, and how right are they apt to be? **Due 8 Nov**

Assignment 4: 30% of final grade

(10 pages) Look at the mass-elite response to some particular foreign policy issue in depth. What happened? What does it tell us about the interactions between masses and elites in the foreign policy domain? Based on your careful research, does it show any author to be wrong, any to be right? **Substantive proposal due 20 Oct, paper due 22 Nov**

Final Exam: 20% of grade

Thursday, December 8, 9:30-11:18 AM

Participation: 10% of final grade

Participation is evaluated in terms of both attendance at class and engagement with course materials. Attendance is taken and is a key factor in this grading. Engagement with course materials is evaluated on the basis of discussions *both* in and out of the classroom evincing both knowledge of course material and thought about them. Thus, if discussion inside the classroom is difficult for you, discussion during office hours *et cetera* is an alternative. At mid-quarter, an evaluation of your first half participation will be given.

Grades

Grades are assigned to both individual pieces of work and cumulatively. The grade scale I use for both is below (note that "g" refers to the numerical grade you receive). I do not usually curve grades, but reserve the right to do so if I deem it necessary. All material is graded on its own terms, rather than through comparison with other students' work. For the cumulative grades, I do not round: what you get is what you get.

100>g≥93: A	90>g≥88: B+	80>g≥78: C+	70>g≥68: D+	60>g: E
	88>g≥83: B	88>g≥73: C	68>g≥63: D	
93>g≥90: A-	83>g≥80: B	73>g≥70: C-	63>g≥60: D	

The numbers, of course, have a substantive meaning as well. My meanings are based in the university rules (see the Board of Trustees Website, <http://trustees.osu.edu/rules8/ru8-21.html>), but are more specific to the assignments I give. Prior to the due dates for each assignment, detailed statements of instruction will be given, describing the requirements I expect you fulfill in the assignments. In response to specific proposals, I may be willing to be flexible on some

requirements (relating to the elements of the paper or its topic, NOT to length, sources, effort required, pedagogical intent, etc.) BUT you must get **approval** for deviations PRIOR to the due date in order to avoid being subject to the general requirements. Often, people have excellent ideas they would like to explore through paper writing, and I encourage this. However, doing so without prior approval can lead to a lower grade on a good paper because it does not meet key requirements.

"A," "A-" The instructor judged the student to have satisfied the stated objectives in an excellent manner. This means that you met all of the basic requirements at an at least uniformly good level AND some in a very good (or better) level.

"B+," "B," "B-" The instructor judged the student to have satisfied the stated objectives in an above-average manner. This means that you met all of the basic requirements, and at least some at a good level or better.

"C+," "C," "C-" The instructor judged the student to have satisfied the stated objectives in an average manner. This means that you met the basic requirements.

"D+," "D" The instructor judged the student to have satisfied the stated objectives in a low but acceptable manner. You fulfilled at least some, but perhaps not all requirements.

"E" The instructor judged the student not to have satisfied the stated objectives. Few, if any, requirements were fulfilled.

Cheating and plagiarism are, of course, unacceptable, and appropriate action will be taken if it is suspected. Proper citations and standards of integrity are not optional. If you have questions about what this means, please ask the instructor.

Note on disabilities:

Students with disabilities that have been certified by the Office of Disability Services will be appropriately accommodated, and affected students should contact the instructor to inform him of their needs as soon as possible.

Changes to the Syllabus:

In the event that there is a need for there to be any changes to the syllabus, an e-mail will be sent to all students' name.xx@osu.edu e-mail accounts (as maintained by the registrar's list), and will be mentioned in class at two class meetings. Changes become effective immediately after their second mention in class, or the sending of the e-mail, whichever comes last.

Cancellation of Class: In the event that the instructor needs to cancel class, an e-mail will be sent to all students' name.xx@osu.edu e-mail accounts (as maintained by the registrar's list) prior to class time.

Schedule of Class Meetings and Readings

WEEK ONE

22 September: Introduction
Reading: Handout

WEEK TWO

27 September: Institutions of Government and Foreign Policy-making
Readings:

Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization*, v. 42 issue 3, 1988, p. 427. (JSTOR)

Two constitutions from the following list: France (5th Republic/1958), Peoples' Republic Of China (1982), German Basic Law (1949), and Spain (1978). They are readily available online. Do not read both Germany and Spain, as they are relatively more similar.

29 September: Dispositions and worldviews 1: Power
Reading:

Robert Kagan, "Power and Weakness," *Policy Review*, June 2002. online at <http://www.policyreview.org/JUN02/kagan.html>

WEEK THREE

4 October: Dispositions and Worldviews 2: assertiveness and cooperativeness

Eugene R. Wittkopf, "Internationalism in Transition" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 1994, VOL. 38, #4. (Ohiolink)

6 October: Dispositions and Worldviews 3: Trust

Paul Brewer, "International Trust And Public Opinion About World Affairs," *American Journal of Political Science*. 2004 #1. (Ohiolink)

WEEK FOUR

11 October: Worldviews and Dispositions 4: Nationalism

Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, (1991) "Introduction," pp. 1-7 (E-reserves)

Rogers Smith, *Stories of Peoplehood*, (2003) pp. 32-42 and 57-70 (e-reserves)

Suggested: E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, (1983) pp. 19-52. (e-reserves)

Suggested: H. Morgenthau, *Politics Among Nations*, "Universal Morality vs. Nationalistic Universalism," pp. 220-234 (E-reserves)

13 October: Nationalism continued...

Etel Solingen, *Regional Orders at Century's Dawn*, (1998) pp. 18-48 (e-reserves)

WEEK FIVE

18 October: Worldviews and Dispositions 5: Religion

Giles Kepel, *Jihad* (2002) pp. 23-42 (E-reserves)

20 October: Mass-elite worldview gaps

Benjamin Page and Jason Barabas, "Foreign Policy Gaps Between Citizens and Leaders", *International Studies Quarterly*, (2000) #3 (Ohiolink)

WEEK SIX

25 October: Responding to Events 1: Lippmann and the Media

Walter Lippmann, "Public Opinion In War and Peace," *The Public Philosophy* (1995/1955) pp. 16-27 (E-reserves)

Piers Robinson, "The CNN Effect: Can the News Media Drive Foreign Policy?" *Review of International Studies* (1999), Vol 25 pp. 301-309 (Ohiolink)

27 October: Responding to Events 2: A Rational Public?

Robert Shapiro and Benjamin Page, "Foreign Policy and the Rational Public," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, (1988) Vol. 32, #2 (JSTOR)

WEEK SEVEN

1 November: Responding to Events 3: Cognitive Interactionism

R. Herrmann, P. Tetlock, and P. Visser, "Mass Public Decisions To Go To War," *American Political Science Review*, (1999) 93(3):553-573. (Ohiolink)

3 November: Responding to Events 4: Social Constructions

Ted Hopf, *Social Construction of International Politics*, (2002) (E-reserves)

WEEK EIGHT

8 November: War 1

Nial Ferguson, *Pity of War*, (1998) "The Myth of War Enthusiasm" pp 174-211 (E-reserves)

10 November: War 2

Hein Goemans, *War and Punishment*, (2000), pp. 19-52 (e-reserves)

WEEK NINE

15 November: Integration and Peace

K. W. Deutsch, *Political Community and the North Atlantic Area* (1957) (E-reserves)

17 November: Trade

Thomas Friedmann, "The Lexus and the Olive Tree," (1999) pp. 327-47 (e-reserves)

WEEK TEN

22 November: Terrorism

Robert Pape, "The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism," *American Political Science Review* (2003)
Vol. 97, # 3 (Ohiolink)

WEEK ELEVEN

29 November: Activism

Ronald Diebert, "International Plug'n Play? Citizen Activism, the Internet, and Global Public Policy" *International Studies Perspectives*, 2000 (Vol1, #3) (Ohiolink)

1 December: Normative Issues

Christopher Hill, "World Opinion and the Empire of Circumstance," *International Affairs*, 1996
Vol 72, #1. (Ohiolink)

WEEK TWELVE

8 December: Final Exam, 9:30-11:18 AM