

GOV 2738: Political Psychology and International Politics

Professor Kathleen E. Powers

Spring 2023 *Draft syllabus, subject to change*

Email: kathleen.e.powers@dartmouth.edu

Office: TBD

Office hours: TBD

Class Meetings: Wednesdays 3:00-5:45pm, CGIS Knafel K108

Course Description

What, if anything, can psychology tell us about international relations? The IR subfield traditionally focuses on macro-level theorizing – states and the international system are primary units of analysis. How can research into human brains and social interactions inform what we know about war and peace? This course starts from the observation that international politics fundamentally involves humans interacting with one another. Heads of state, diplomats, members of the military, and mass publics are important parts of the political world, and psychology as a discipline is well-suited to explaining their attitudes and behavior.

This graduate seminar examines psychological approaches to international relations, with an emphasis on research related to international security and foreign policy. The course investigates the various ways that scholars use psychology to answer questions about world politics. The reading list includes a mix of foundational texts at the IR/psychology nexus alongside newer research. Topics include decision-making, personality, leadership, emotions, values, identities, status, groups, and intractable conflicts.

Course Format and Enrollment

This course is a discussion-based seminar. Students should attend class prepared to engage in deep and constructive discussion about the reading material. We will devote our class time to critical analysis. Students will contribute by both participating in and leading discussions.

Enrollment: This course does not have formal pre-requisites. The seminar is designed to be accessible to graduate students with some background in international relations, but neither requires nor assumes prior knowledge about political psychology.

Reading material: All required course readings will be available on the course Canvas site. The course does not require purchasing any books.

Requirements

Course grades depend on 4 elements:

- **In-class participation and facilitation** – 30%
- **Weekly online participation** – 10%
- **Response papers (x3)** – 20%
- **Final research paper** – 40%

In-class participation and facilitation (30%):

We will examine a range of material on the weekly topic during each class meeting. Our discussions will entail critical analysis of the reading material. At a broad level, our discussions will consider research design and execution, theoretical rigor, how each article contributes to larger theoretical and empirical debates in international relations, and additional implications or questions the material raises. To prepare for our discussion, I encourage you to consider the following questions as you read:

- What is the primary research question and argument, and how does it contribute to broader theoretical dialogues?
- What are the strengths of the research design or theory?
- What are the weaknesses of the research design or theory?
- How might the argument, research design, or implications be refined or improved?
- What additional research questions does the piece raise?

The in-class participation grade depends on 1) contributions in-class discussions, and 2) in-class presentations/facilitation. Each week, one student will provide a 3-4 minute introduction to each of the assigned readings. These introductions should summarize the main question, theory, and findings before offering comments to launch the discussion. Student facilitators should prepare at least 3 open-ended discussion questions to help guide the conversation.

Weekly online participation (10%):

We will use the course slack channel to facilitate online participation and engagement prior to class.

Students should post a reaction to the week's reading material by 12pm on the class meeting date (starting in week 2). For example, students should post a brief reaction (1 paragraph) to the week 2 reading material by Wednesday, February 1 at 12pm. You can skip one week throughout the term, no questions asked (and no need to alert me). The post should engage the material but you have significant latitude for the content. You might put multiple readings in conversation with each other, critique an aspect of one article, or propose a question for discussion alongside a brief rationale for the question. Responding to another student's question or post counts toward this assignment; indeed, I encourage it.

Response papers (20%):

Each student will write **three** short memos (1-2 single-spaced pages) that critically and constructively engage the week's material. These memos should not summarize the material. Rather, the paper should analyze a core issue raised by one or more reading assignments. You might compare and contrast arguments, critique research design choices and offer fruitful alternatives, discuss an article's implications for other debates in the field, articulate an argument's potential scope conditions, or propose future research on a topic (to name a few). These memos are due 24 hours before our class meeting (ie, Tuesdays at 3pm). You may choose any three weeks to write your memo.

Final research paper and presentation (40%):

You will complete a final 20-30 page research paper or proposal, due by **Friday, May 5 at 11:59pm**. Your paper should carry out or propose an original research project that relates to psychology and international relations. The paper should contain standard elements of a peer-reviewed journal article, including an introduction, research question, critical literature review, theory, research design, and findings or analysis plans. Your paper should be a novel project written explicitly for this course.

All students will complete a short (6-8 minute) formal in-class presentation during the last class session. Presentations will situate the research question, present the argument, and describe the research design and/or initial results — akin to academic conference presentations. The objective is to generate discussion and facilitate feedback on your project as you proceed.

Week 1: Introductions (Jan 25)

There is no required reading material this week. I recommended skimming one or more selection from the list below to acquaint yourself with the field.

Recommended:

- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton University Press
- Kertzer, J. D. and Tingley, D. (2018). Political psychology in international relations: beyond the paradigms. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 21:319–339
- Stein, J. G. (2013). Threat perception in international relations. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford University Press
- Levy, J. S. (2013). Psychology and foreign policy decision-making. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford University Press
- Goldgeier, J. M. and Tetlock, P. E. (2001). Psychology and international relations theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 4(1):67–92
- McDermott, R. (2004). *Political psychology in international relations*. University of Michigan Press
- Hafner-Burton, E. M., Haggard, S., Lake, D. A., and Victor, D. G. (2017). The behavioral revolution and international relations. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S1–S31
- Schildkraut, D. J. (2004). All politics is psychological: A review of political psychology syllabi. *Perspectives on Politics*, 2(4):807–819
- Mintz, A., Redd, S. B., and Vedlitz, A. (2006). Can we generalize from student experiments to the real world in political science, military affairs, and international relations? *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 50(5):757–776
- Stein, J. G. (2017). The micro-foundations of international relations theory: Psychology and behavioral economics. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S249–S263
- McDermott, R. (2011). New directions for experimental work in international relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 55(2):503–520
- Kaarbo, J. and Beasley, R. K. (1999). A practical guide to the comparative case study method in political psychology. *Political psychology*, 20(2):369–391

Week 2: Psychology, rationality, and irrationality (Feb 1)

- Mercer, J. (2005). Rationality and psychology in international politics. *International organization*, 59(1):77–106
- Hafner-Burton, E. M., Haggard, S., Lake, D. A., and Victor, D. G. (2017). The behavioral revolution and international relations. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S1–S31
- Davis, J. W. (2022). Better than a bet: good reasons for behavioral and rational choice assumptions in ir theory. *European Journal of International Relations*, page 13540661221137037
- Rathbun, B. C., Kertzer, J. D., and Paradis, M. (2017). Homo diplomaticus: Mixed-method evidence of variation in strategic rationality. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S33–S60
- Fuhrmann, M. (2020). When do leaders free-ride? business experience and contributions to collective defense. *American Journal of Political Science*, 64(2):416–431
- Rho, S. and Tomz, M. (2017). Why don't trade preferences reflect economic self-interest? *International Organization*, 71(S1):S85–S108

For further reading:

- Henrich, J., Boyd, R., Bowles, S., Camerer, C., Fehr, E., Gintis, H., and McElreath, R. (2001). In search of homo economicus: behavioral experiments in 15 small-scale societies. *American Economic Review*, 91(2):73–78
- Powell, R. (2017). Research bets and behavioral IR. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S265–S277
- Rathbun, B. (2018). The rarity of realpolitik: What Bismarck's rationality reveals about international politics. *International Security*, 43(1):7–55
- Riker, W. H. (1995). The political psychology of rational choice theory. *Political Psychology*, pages 23–44

Week 3: Cognition, processing, and learning (Feb 8)

- Levy, J. S. (1994). Learning and foreign policy: Sweeping a conceptual minefield. *International organization*, 48(2):279–312
- Khong, Y. F. (1992). Analogies at war. In *Analogies at War*. Princeton University Press (chapters 2 and 5 pp. 19-46; 97-148)
- Yarhi-Milo, K. (2013). In the eye of the beholder: How leaders and intelligence communities assess the intentions of adversaries. *International Security*, 38(1):7–51
- Johnson, D. D. (2020). *Strategic instincts: The adaptive advantages of cognitive biases in international politics*. Princeton University Press (chapters 1 and 4 pp. 12-28; 85-114)
- Rapport, A. (2012). The long and short of it: Cognitive constraints on leaders' assessments of "postwar" Iraq. *International Security*, 37(3):133–171
- Kikuta, K. and Uesugi, M. (2022). Do politically irrelevant events cause conflict? the cross-continental effects of european professional football on protests in africa. *International Organization*, pages 1–38

For further reading:

- Tversky, A. and Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases: Biases in judgments reveal some heuristics of thinking under uncertainty. *science*, 185(4157):1124–1131
- Maoz, I., Ward, A., Katz, M., and Ross, L. (2002). Reactive devaluation of an "israeli" vs. "palestinian" peace proposal. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 46(4):515–546
- Johnson, D. D. and Tierney, D. (2011). The rubicon theory of war: How the path to conflict reaches the point of no return. *International Security*, 36(1):7–40
- Jervis, R. (1986). Representativeness in foreign policy judgments. *Political Psychology*, pages 483–505
- Bordalo, P., Conlon, J. J., Gennaioli, N., Kwon, S. Y., and Shleifer, A. (2023). Memory and probability. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 138(1):265–311
- McDermott, R. (2002). Arms Control and the First Reagan Administration: Belief-Systems and Policy Choices. *Journal of Cold War Studies*, 4(4):29–59

Week 4: Prospect theory (Feb 15)

- Levy, J. S. (1997). Prospect theory, rational choice, and international relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 41(1):87–112
- McDermott, R. (1992). Prospect theory in international relations: The iranian hostage rescue mission. *Political Psychology*, pages 237–263
- Poznansky, M. (2021). The psychology of overt and covert intervention. *Security Studies*, 30(3):325–353
- Perla, H. (2011). Explaining public support for the use of military force: The impact of reference point framing and prospective decision making. *International Organization*, 65(1):139–167
- Kowert, P. A. and Hermann, M. G. (1997). Who takes risks? daring and caution in foreign policy making. *Journal of conflict Resolution*, 41(5):611–637
- Boettcher III, W. A. and Cobb, M. D. (2009). “don’t let them die in vain” casualty frames and public tolerance for escalating commitment in Iraq. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 53(5):677–697

For further reading:

- Farnham, B. (1992). Roosevelt and the munich crisis: Insights from prospect theory. *Political Psychology*, pages 205–235
- McDermott, R. (1992). Prospect theory in international relations: The iranian hostage rescue mission. *Political Psychology*, pages 237–263
- Schaub Jr, G. (2004). Deterrence, compellence, and prospect theory. *Political Psychology*, 25(3):389–411
- Camerer, C. F. (2004). Prospect theory in the wild: Evidence from the field. In Camerer, C. F., Loewenstein, G. F., and Rabin, M., editors, *Advances in behavioral economics*, pages 148–161. Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Quattrone, G. A. and Tversky, A. (1988). Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice. *American Political Science Review*, 82(3):719–736
- Linde, J. and Vis, B. (2017). Do politicians take risks like the rest of us? an experimental test of prospect theory under mps. *Political Psychology*, 38(1):101–117

- Berejikian, J. D. and Early, B. R. (2013). Loss aversion and foreign policy resolve. *Political Psychology*, 34(5):649–671
- Fuhrmann, M. and Early, B. R. (2008). Following start: Risk acceptance and the 1991–1992 presidential nuclear initiatives. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 4(1):21–43
- He, K. and Feng, H. (2009). Leadership, regime security, and china’s policy toward taiwan: prospect theory and taiwan crises. *The Pacific Review*, 22(4):501–521
- Gal, D. and Rucker, D. D. (2018). The loss of loss aversion: Will it loom larger than its gain? *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 28(3):497–516
- Taliaferro, J. W. (2004). Power politics and the balance of risk: Hypotheses on great power intervention in the periphery. *Political Psychology*, 25(2):177–211
- Butler, C. K. (2007). Prospect theory and coercive bargaining. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 51(2):227–250

Week 5: Perceptions, stereotypes, motivations (Feb 22)

- Castano, E., Bonacossa, A., and Gries, P. (2016). National images as integrated schemas: subliminal primes of image attributes shape foreign policy preferences. *Political Psychology*, 37(3):351–366
- Lee, S.-y. and Chou, K.-l. (2020). How nation building backfires: Beliefs about group malleability and anti-Chinese attitudes in Hong Kong. *Political Psychology*, 41(5):923–944
- Búzás, Z. I. (2013). The color of threat: Race, threat perception, and the demise of the anglo-japanese alliance (1902–1923). *Security Studies*, 22(4):573–606
- Duelfer, C. A. and Dyson, S. B. (2011). Chronic misperception and international conflict: The US-Iraq experience. *International Security*, 36(1):73–100
- Holmes, M. and Yarhi-Milo, K. (2016). The Psychological Logic of Peace Summits: How Empathy Shapes Outcomes of Diplomatic Negotiations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 61(1):107–122
- Herrmann, R. K. (2017). How attachments to the nation shape beliefs about the world: A theory of motivated reasoning. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S61–S84

For further reading:

- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., and Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Social Cognition*, pages 878–902
- Herrmann, R. K. (2013). Perceptions and image theory in international relations. In *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford University Press
- Herrmann, R. K. and Fischerkeller, M. P. (1995). Beyond the enemy image and spiral model: cognitive–strategic research after the cold war. *International Organization*, 49(3):415–450
- Kertzer, J. D., Rathbun, B. C., and Rathbun, N. S. (2020). The price of peace: Motivated reasoning and costly signaling in international relations. *International Organization*, 74(1):95–118
- Cottam, M. L. (1994). *Images and intervention: US policies in Latin America*. University of Pittsburgh Pre

- Jervis, R. (1988). War and misperception. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, 18(4):675–700
- Stein, J. G. (2013). Threat perception in international relations. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. O., and Levy, J. S., editors, *The Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*. Oxford University Press

Week 6: Emotions (March 1)

- Huddy, L., Feldman, S., Taber, C., and Lahav, G. (2005). Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies. *American Journal of Political Science*, 49(3):593–608
- Powers, K. E. and Altman, D. (2023). The psychology of coercion failure: How reactance explains resistance to threats. *American Journal of Political Science*, 67(1):221–238
- Pauly, R. B. and McDermott, R. (forthcoming). *International Security*
- Hall, T. H. (2011). We will not swallow this bitter fruit: Theorizing a diplomacy of anger. *Security Studies*, 20(4):521–555
- Lim, S. and Tanaka, S. (2022). Why Costly Rivalry Disputes Persist: A Paired Conjoint Experiment in Japan and South Korea. *International Studies Quarterly*, 66(4)
- Masterson, M. (2022). Catching fire: How national humiliation spreads hostile foreign policy preferences on chinese social media. Working paper

For further reading:

- Lerner, J. S. and Keltner, D. (2000). Beyond valence: Toward a model of emotion-specific influences on judgement and choice. *Cognition and Emotion*, 14(4):473–493
- Crawford, N. C. (2000). The Passion of World Politics: Propositions on Emotion and Emotional Relationships. *International Security*, 24(4):116–156
- Markwica, R. (2018). *Emotional choices: How the logic of affect shapes coercive diplomacy*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (chapter 2 pp. 36-94)

Week 7: Personality and Individual Differences (March 8)

- Selections from Alexander, L. and George, J. L. (1964). *Woodrow Wilson and Colonel House*. Dover Publications
- Renshon, J. (2008). Stability and change in belief systems: The operational code of George W. Bush. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52(6):820–849
- Dyson, S. B. (2006). Personality and foreign policy: Tony Blair’s Iraq decisions. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2(3):289–306
- Gallagher, M. E. and Allen, S. H. (2014). Presidential personality: Not just a nuisance. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 10(1):1–21
- Harden, J. P. (2021). All the world’s a stage: US presidential narcissism and international conflict. *International Studies Quarterly*, 65(3):825–837
- Rathbun, B. C. (2011). Before hegemony: Generalized trust and the creation and design of international security organizations. *International Organization*, 65(2):243–273

For further reading:

- Caprara, G. V. and Vecchione, M. (2013). Personality approaches to political behavior
- Renshon, J. (2009). When public statements reveal private beliefs: Assessing operational codes at a distance. *Political Psychology*, 30(4):649–661
- Kertzer, J. D. (2022). Re-assessing elite-public gaps in political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*, 66(3):539–553

Week 8: Morality (March 22)

- Friedman, J. A. (2019). Priorities for preventive action: Explaining americans' divergent reactions to 100 public risks. *American Journal of Political Science*, 63(1):181–196
- Rathbun, B. C. and Pomeroy, C. (2022). See no evil, speak no evil? morality, evolutionary psychology, and the nature of international relations. *International Organization*, 76(3):656–689
- Kertzer, J. D., Powers, K. E., Rathbun, B. C., and Iyer, R. (2014). Moral support: How moral values shape foreign policy attitudes. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(3):825–840
- Post, A. S. (2022). A point of principle: The role of moral language in international bargaining
- Rai, T. S. and Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological review*, 118(1):57
- Slovic, P., Mertz, C., Markowitz, D. M., Quist, A., and Västfjäll, D. (2020). Virtuous violence from the war room to death row. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(34):20474–20482
- Dill, J. and Schubiger, L. I. (2021). Attitudes toward the use of force: Instrumental imperatives, moral principles, and international law. *American Journal of Political Science*, 65(3):612–633

For further reading:

- Ryan, T. J. (2014). Reconsidering moral issues in politics. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(2):380–397
- Price, R. and Sikink, K. (2021). *International Norms, Moral Psychology, and Neuroscience*. Cambridge University Press
- Kreps, S. and Maxey, S. (2018). Mechanisms of morality: Sources of support for humanitarian intervention. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 62(8):1814–1842
- Lü, X., Scheve, K., and Slaughter, M. J. (2012). Inequity aversion and the international distribution of trade protection. *American Journal of Political Science*, 56(3):638–654
- Tomz, M. R. and Weeks, J. L. (2020). Human rights and public support for war. *The Journal of politics*, 82(1):182–194
- Gottfried, M. S. and Trager, R. F. (2016). A preference for war: How fairness and rhetoric influence leadership incentives in crises. *International Studies Quarterly*, 60(2):243–257

- Reifen Tagar, M., Morgan, G. S., Halperin, E., and Skitka, L. J. (2014). When ideology matters: Moral conviction and the association between ideology and policy preferences in the israeli–palestinian conflict. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(2):117–125
- Ryan, T. J. (2019). Actions versus consequences in political arguments: Insights from moral psychology. *The Journal of Politics*, 81(2):426–440
- Rai, T. S. and Fiske, A. P. (2011). Moral psychology is relationship regulation: moral motives for unity, hierarchy, equality, and proportionality. *Psychological review*, 118(1):57
- Fiske, A. P. and Rai, T. S. (2014). *Virtuous violence: Hurting and killing to create, sustain, end, and honor social relationships*. Cambridge University Press
- Levy, G. (2022). Evaluations of violence at the polls: Civilian victimization and support for perpetrators after war. *The Journal of Politics*, 84(2):783–797

Week 9: Groups (March 29)

- Janis, I. (1972). *Victims of Groupthink: A Psychological Study of Foreign Policy Decisions and Fiascoes*. Houghton-Mifflin (chapters 1 and 8)
- Turner, M. E. and Pratkanis, A. R. (1998). Twenty-five years of groupthink theory and research: Lessons from the evaluation of a theory. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 73(2-3):105–115
- Mintz, A. and Wayne, C. (2016). The polythink syndrome and elite group decision-making. *Political Psychology*, 37:3–21
- Saunders, E. N. (2017). No substitute for experience: presidents, advisers, and information in group decision making. *International Organization*, 71(S1):S219–S247
- Kertzer, J. D. (2022). Re-assessing elite-public gaps in political behavior. *American Journal of Political Science*, 66(3):539–553
- LeVeck, B. L. and Narang, N. (2017). The democratic peace and the wisdom of crowds. *International Studies Quarterly*, 61(4):867–880

For further reading:

- Gildea, R. J. (2020). Psychology and aggregation in international relations. *European Journal of International Relations*, 26(1_suppl):166–183

Week 10: Social identity (April 5)

- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of social issues*, 55(3):429–444
- Van Bavel, J. J., Cichocka, A., Capraro, V., Sjästad, H., Nezlek, J. B., Pavlović, T., Alfano, M., Gelfand, M. J., Azevedo, F., Birtel, M. D., et al. (2022). National identity predicts public health support during a global pandemic. *Nature communications*, 13(1):1–14
- Gries, P. H. (2005). Social psychology and the identity-conflict debate: Is a ‘china threat’ inevitable? *European Journal of International Relations*, 11(2):235–265
- Ko, J. (2023). *Popular Nationalism and War*. Oxford University Press, Oxford (chapters 1 and 4)
- Bertoli, A. D. (2017). Nationalism and conflict: Lessons from international sports. *International Studies Quarterly*, 61(4):835–849
- Wenzel, M., Mummendey, A., and Waldzus, S. (2007). Superordinate identities and intergroup conflict: The ingroup projection model. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18(1):331–372
- Curtis, K. A. (2014). Inclusive versus exclusive: A cross-national comparison of the effects of subnational, national, and supranational identity. *European Union Politics*, 15(4):521–546

For further reading:

- Johnston, A. I. (2016). Is Chinese nationalism rising? evidence from Beijing. *International Security*, 41(3):7–43
- Mercer, J. (1995). Anarchy and identity. *International organization*, 49(2):229–252
- Weiss, J. C. (2019). How hawkish is the chinese public? another look at “rising nationalism” and chinese foreign policy. *Journal of Contemporary China*, 28(119):679–695
- Hornsey, M. J. (2008). Social identity theory and self-categorization theory: A historical review. *Social and personality psychology compass*, 2(1):204–222
- Choi, D. D., Poertner, M., and Sambanis, N. (2022). *Native Bias: Overcoming Discrimination against Immigrants*, volume 33. Princeton University Press
- Bayram, A. B. (2017). Good europeans? how european identity and costs interact to explain politician attitudes towards compliance with european union law. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 24(1):42–60

- Mutz, D. C. and Kim, E. (2017). The impact of in-group favoritism on trade preferences. *International Organization*, 71(4):827–850
- Sambanis, N., Skaperdas, S., and Wohlforth, W. C. (2015). Nation-building through war. *American Political Science Review*, 109(2):279–296

Week 11: Status and recognition (April 12)

- Larson, D. W. and Shevchenko, A. (2010). Status Seekers: Chinese and Russian Responses to U.S. Primacy. *International Security*, 34(4):63–95
- Renshon, J. (2016). Status deficits and war. *International Organization*, 70(3):513–550
- Murray, M. (2010). Identity, insecurity, and great power politics: the tragedy of German naval ambition before the first world war. *Security Studies*, 19(4):656–688
- Wolf, R. (2019). Taking interaction seriously: Asymmetrical roles and the behavioral foundations of status. *European Journal of International Relations*, 25(4):1186–1211
- Barnhart, J. (2016). Status competition and territorial aggression: Evidence from the scramble for Africa. *Security Studies*, 25(3):385–419
- Chia, C. (2022). Social positioning and international order contestation in early modern Southeast Asia. *International Organization*, 76(2):305–336

For further reading:

- Ward, S. M. (2017). Lost in Translation: Social Identity Theory and the Study of Status in World Politics. *International Studies Quarterly*, 61(4):821–834
- Wolf, R. (2011). Respect and disrespect in international politics: the significance of status recognition. *International Theory*, 3(1):105–142
- Wohlforth, W. C., de Carvalho, B., Leira, H., and Neumann, I. B. (2018). Moral authority and status in international relations: Good states and the social dimension of status seeking. *Review of International Studies*, 44(3):526–546
- Wohlforth, W. C. (2009). Unipolarity, status competition, and great power war. *World Politics*, 61(1):28–57
- Ward, S. (2020). Status from fighting? reassessing the relationship between conflict involvement and diplomatic rank. *International Interactions*, 46(2):274–290

Week 12: Intractable issues & Territoriality (April 19)

- Johnson, D. D. and Toft, M. D. (2014). Grounds for War: The Evolution of Territorial Conflict. *International Security*, 38(3):7–38
- Fiske, A. P. and Tetlock, P. E. (1997). Taboo trade-offs: Reactions to transactions that transgress the spheres of justice. *Political Psychology*, 18(2):255–297
- Goddard, S. E. (2006). Uncommon ground: Indivisible territory and the politics of legitimacy. *International Organization*, 60(1):35–68
- Hall, T. H. (2021). Dispute inflation. *European Journal of International Relations*, 27(4):1136–1161
- Fang, S. and Li, X. (2020). Historical ownership and territorial disputes. *The Journal of Politics*, 82(1):345–360
- Assouline, P. and Trager, R. (2021). Concessions for concession’s sake: Injustice, indignation, and the construction of intractable conflict in israel–palestine. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 65(9):1489–1520

For further reading:

- Zellman, A. (2015). Framing consensus: Evaluating the narrative specificity of territorial indivisibility. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(4):492–507
- Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(11):1430–1453

Week 13: Research Presentations (April 26)

Final paper due Friday May 5 at 11:59pm

Course Policies

Academic Honor & Collaboration: *You are expected to comply with Harvard's Honor Code: Members of the Harvard College community commit themselves to producing academic work of integrity – that is, work that adheres to the scholarly and intellectual standards of accurate attribution of sources, appropriate collection and use of data, and transparent acknowledgement of the contribution of others to their ideas, discoveries, interpretations, and conclusions. Cheating on exams or problem sets, plagiarizing or misrepresenting the ideas or language of someone else as one's own, falsifying data, or any other instance of academic dishonesty violates the standards of our community, as well as the standards of the wider world of learning and affairs.* You must adhere to proper citation practices in your work; be vigilant, especially regarding quotes and paraphrasing. Discussion and the exchange of ideas are essential to academic work. For assignments in this course, you are encouraged to discuss course material with classmates and consult with your classmates on the choice of paper topics or to share resources. You may find it useful to discuss your research paper topic with your peers. However, you should ensure that any written work you submit for evaluation is the result of your own research and writing and that it reflects your own approach to the topic.

Attendance: You are expected to attend class in person. Discussion is a core component of the course. Our seminar will be most engaging with contributions from the full class. However, for the health and safety of our class community, please: do not attend class when you are sick, nor when you have been instructed by a medical professional or Harvard policies to stay home or isolated.

If you must miss a single class session due to illness/isolation, please complete an extra response paper for the week's material.

Of course, other stuff happens — please notify me in advance while recognizing that frequent absences for any reason will affect your course participation grade.