

Dartmouth College

PBPL 7

Winter 2013

2A: T/Th 2:00-3:50pm

x-hour: W 4:15-5:05pm

Classroom: Rockefeller 208

Rockefeller Center for Public Policy

Professor Timothy J. Ruback

Office: Rockefeller 205

Phone: 603-646-0650

email: Timothy.J.Ruback@Dartmouth.edu

Office Hours: T 4:00-5:00pm

Th 10:00am-12pm

& by appointment

FYS: LEADERSHIP & FOREIGN POLICY DECISION-MAKING

Men decide far more problems by hate, love, lust, rage, sorrow, joy, hope, fear, illusion, or some other inward emotion, than by reality, authority, any legal standard, judicial precedent, or statute.

—Cicero

The Presidency is... preeminently a place of moral leadership. All our great Presidents were leaders of thought at times when certain historic ideas in the life of the nation had to be clarified. That is what the office is – a superb opportunity for reapplying, applying in new conditions, the simple rules of human conduct to which we always go back. Without leadership alert and sensitive to change, we are all bogged up or lose our way.

—Franklin Delano Roosevelt

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Do heads of state matter when it comes to making foreign policy decisions? We certainly act as if they do and we vote as if they do. But it's also possible that sometimes, structural conditions render leaders irrelevant – that any leader, when faced with the same constraints, could not help but make the same decision. Any responsible study of foreign policy will pay attention to questions of the conditions under which leaders matter as well as the constraints on foreign policy leadership. Therefore, in this course, we will study the essence of foreign policy decision-making with a special emphasis on the sorts of decisions that leaders can and do make. As we do so we will be introduced to a number of tools and models to help explain the process of foreign policy decision-making. These tools, concepts, and models will broadly include the political psychology of foreign policy decision-making, the dangers of decision-making during times of great crisis, and the role that various organizations play in foreign policy decisions.

Arriving at a better understanding of the foreign policy decision-making process is our key substantive goal. This is co-equal to this course's primary pedagogical goal. As a first-year writing seminar, this course is also designed to help students practice and develop their skills as analytical writers. Therefore, readings and course discussions will also focus on the craft of

academic writing. This is not at the expense of our conversations about foreign policy; rather it is to complement and improve our ability to communicate effectively about this topic. Because this is a seminar, the course is designed to unfold as a conversation about the material. Lectures will be infrequent, and will rarely take up significant class time. Instead our course meetings are devoted to a shared exploration of the ideas raised by our readings.

It is the objective of this course to provide a setting in which the student can develop skills in sustained, critical analytic writing, through the close scrutiny of foreign policy. To do this effectively requires a readiness to engage a variety of theoretical conversations already underway; a readiness to question prevailing assumptions, including one's own; and a willingness to critically self-reflect on one's own writing. This is no easy task, but it is, as I think you'll find, a most engaging and rewarding one. Toward this end, no prior knowledge of theories of international politics or foreign policy is required; however, some basic knowledge of U.S. and world history, combined with serious attention to current events, will be quite helpful. Finally, the background provided by this course should prepare you for additional coursework in these areas, or, if that is not one of your goals, simply make you more attentive to international events and better equipped to understand and evaluate world news.

COURSE GOALS:

By the end of this course, you will have learned about:

- The psychological profile of foreign policy leaders
- The ways in which risk can influence foreign policy decisions
- The dangers of groupthink
- The importance of organizational structure in decision-making
- The principles of leadership in the context of global public policy
- Ways to evaluate foreign policy decisions and avoid foreign policy mistakes

You also will have practiced the following writing skills:

- Writing rigorous, economical, and crisp prose
- Making and supporting a causal argument
- Locating, using, and properly citing evidence, including primary-source material
- Effective self-editing, peer-review, and revising
- Using the resources at the Baker-Berry Library
- Overcoming obstacles to clear writing, including problems like: procrastination, writer's block, or poor organization

COURSE POLICIES:

Attendance:

Regular and punctual attendance is expected. Students are held accountable for knowledge of all materials covered in class and all announcements delivered in class *whether or not they are in attendance*. To encourage your regular attendance, roll will be taken at the start of each class session. Recurrent absenteeism will result in a lesser grade for the course. Egregious absenteeism will result in a failing grade for the course. Beyond the expectation that students attend class, students are expected to be attentive, and to come prepared for each class. Remember, attendance is logically prior to participation, but it does not constitute participation.

X-hours:

This course will make use of its x-hours to focus on the writing process. This will take two basic forms. First, during some x-hours, we will all meet together in a workshop format, to discuss researching and writing techniques. But other x-hours will be left free, as an opportunity for you to meet in small groups and peer-review one another's writing.

Classroom Courtesy & Decorum:

In a course such as this one, with such important subject matter, disagreements will necessarily occur, perhaps even heated disagreements. Students are, of course, encouraged to disagree—to raise scholarly concerns, to voice nagging doubts, to offer counter-points, to expose logical absurdities, etc.—with the arguments offered by the texts, by each other, and (especially) by their instructor. Nevertheless, such disagreements *must* fall within the grounds of appropriate classroom decorum. Inappropriate classroom disruptions, disregard for speakers, and/or personal attacks will not be tolerated. Students acting in violation of these principles will be reprimanded, and may be asked to leave the classroom. Severe and/or repeated infractions may result in a failing grade. In short, always show respect to your fellow students and scholars.

Laptops & Gadgets:

Please turn all cell phones, blackberries, laptops, etc. off during class. Engage in the social fiction that our classroom is akin to an ascending airplane: any portable device with an on/off switch should be set in the off position. I ask this of you because I have found that students are very adept at multi-tasking, but have fewer opportunities for deep focus and concentration on a single subject. Think of our time together as an exercise in deep concentration. If special circumstances require you to use an electronic device regularly, please speak with me at some point during the first two weeks of class.

Papers:

All written assignments must be typed, in 12 pt. Times New Roman, double-spaced, with normal margins and numbered pages. Make certain that your name, the course number, and a title appears somewhere on the first page of your paper. Failure to meet these formatting guidelines may result in a penalty to your grade.

Late Work:

Except in cases of documented emergencies, or cases in which we have worked out alternate arrangements in advance, late assignments will be downgraded by 10% per day (or part of day). After four late days (weekends are included here), late work will no longer be accepted. Because they connect so fundamentally to our Tuesday course discussions, late Reading Reaction Response papers will not be accepted under any circumstances.

First Paper Rewrites:

Because this course is designed to develop your writing skills, and because revisions are a crucial part of the writing process, this class offers many opportunities for you to draft and improve your work. But, for the first paper, we will not yet have had much practice in editing and revising papers. Therefore, for the first paper (and *only* the first paper) you are permitted to submit a rewritten version, if you are unsatisfied with your performance on that assignment. Your revised paper must be submitted within 2 weeks from the date that the paper was returned to you. Your revised paper will be read carefully for improvements, and graded accordingly. The new grade will not replace the old grade, but the two will be averaged for a single composite grade for that assignment.

Academic Honesty:

The Academic Honor Principle applies to all Dartmouth students at all times. You can find the Honor Principle at the following web address:

<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~reg/regulations/undergrad/acad.honor.html>

Please make certain that you are familiar with the Academic Honor Principle, as you will be expected to conform to it. As part of our conversations on writing, we will discuss plagiarism and proper citation of sources. Nevertheless, you will be expected to conform to this code at all times, even before this conversation takes place. So, if you ever have doubts as to whether you are in compliance with the Academic Honor Principle, it is a good idea to speak with me before you hand in your work.

STUDENT SERVICES:

Student Needs:

Students with disabilities enrolled in this course who may need disability-related accommodations are encouraged to make an appointment to see me before the end of the second week of the term. All discussions will remain confidential, although the Student Accessibility Services (SAS) office may be consulted to discuss appropriate implementation of any accommodation requested. Find out more about Dartmouth's SAS office, and how it may be able to help you, here: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~accessibility/current/index.html>

Moreover, students desiring other accommodations that do not fall under the purview of the SAS, such as students who may need to miss classes due to religious observances (or other reasons), are also encouraged to consult with me during the first two weeks of the term.

Academic Development

Dartmouth College has student resources (including scholarships, internship information, honor societies, and information about opportunities for study abroad) that you may not be aware of, so don't hesitate to ask about things that can make your academic experience more rewarding. If I do not know the answer to your question, I will connect you with the right person who can help you find the answers you need.

Academic Support

The Student Center for Research, Writing and Information Technology (RWiT) is a place where you can meet with an undergraduate tutor to discuss a paper or project at any phase of the process. Although we will be discussing writing in this course, and you will be peer-reviewing each others' papers, you are encouraged to use the resources at RWiT to help you to create finished work of which you can be proud. Find out more at: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~rwit>
The Academic Skills Center (ASC) is open to the entire Dartmouth Community. Here are some common reasons why you might visit the ASC:

- You're getting B's but want to get A's
- You don't feel comfortable talking in class
- You're attending class regularly, but feel like you're missing important points
- You feel like you're a slow reader
- You feel like you don't have enough time to get everything done
- You're not sure how to take notes
- You're not sure if you should get tested for a learning disability

Find out more at: <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~rwit>

GRADING:

Overview:

Class Participation	15%
Reading Reaction Responses	20%
Short Essay 1	15%
Short Essay 2 (Draft Version)	10%
Short Essay 2 (Final Version)	15%
Research Paper Proposal	05%
Research Paper	20%

Class Participation:

This includes 1) regular participation in class discussion; 2) one office-hour meeting in the first two weeks of the semester and; 3) engaged participation in the peer-review process

First, for our course meetings, I regularly expect the following:

- Preparation — your contributions demonstrate that you carefully read the assignment and understand the key points.
- Quality of Argument — you contribute accurate, relevant evidence with sound and insightful reasoning.
- Quality of Expression — your contributions are clear, concise, audible, and directed to your peers.
- Contribution to the Process — your contributions demonstrate that you are listening to others' comments, building upon their ideas, responding to them, respecting them, constructively criticizing them, or asking constructive questions.
- Critical Thought — your contributions show critical awareness, and avoid basic logical fallacies.

Second is our office hour meeting. Before the first essay is due, I expect you to come to my office hours for a meeting. At that meeting, we will get to know each other better, we will talk about your previous writing experience, and we will set personalized goals for improving your writing. At this time, we can talk about elements of your prose that will be obvious to the reader – that is to say, we will discuss ways in which you might improve the clarity, economy, and crispness of your prose. But we will also have the opportunity to discuss any other obstacles you may have to clear writing, including (but not limited to) problems such as procrastination, perfectionism, writer’s block, poor organization, or the difficulties simply getting started with your writing.

Finally, I expect your engaged participation in the peer-review process. This involves your regular commitment to reading to and responding to your peers’ work. It also involves revising your own work based on the feedback that you get from your peers. As we will discuss, the peer-review process is more than proofreading for typographical errors. You’re expected to engage the ideas and the structure of the paper, as well as its style and presentation. More information on the peer review process, and how we will use it this term, will be provided in class.

Reading Responses

For these short assignments, you are asked to write a one-page (200-300 word) response to the readings. Each reading response will address one (and only one) of the following three writing prompts:

- 1) What did you learn from today’s reading?
- 2) What confused you about today’s reading?
- 3) What additional questions did today’s reading raise for you?

In writing these responses, clarity and brevity are your goals. These are not expected to be comprehensive summaries of the readings. Instead, your purpose is to explain clearly some element of the reading: something that you thought was important (and why), something that you found wrongheaded or confusing (and why), or some idea that you’d like to extend beyond the author’s initial reach.

These reading responses will be given a mark between 1-4. This is not equivalent to a letter grade scale: 4s may be given rarely, to paper that display mastery over the grading criteria described in the appendix. 3s will be given when reports demonstrate strong effort in all those criteria. 2s are given to papers that show opportunities for improvement towards some of those criteria. 1s will (hopefully) be given rarely; they indicate evidence that the texts have not been read carefully, and that the paper does not meet the standards described in the appendix.

The 1-4 marking system is designed to reduce anxiety about submitting your writing to be discussed. You can potentially do very well in this course without ever scoring a 4. If, at any time, you’re concerned about your performance in these reading responses, please come discuss it with me.

These papers are due each Monday in my email inbox, starting in Week 2, no later than 11:59pm. During our Tuesday session, I will distribute selected (and anonymized) papers that will guide our discussion for the first half of class. The discussion will address both the substance (ideas) and the presentation (writing) of the papers. Everyone's paper will be selected for discussion at least once, although no one need ever know which paper is yours.

Short Essay 1

Essay 1 is a short (900-1200 word) analytical essay. In it you will analyze the film *13 Days* (watched on your own or during our x-hour) according to the theoretical principles we have discussed about foreign policy decision-making. More information about this essay will be provided in class.

Short Essay 2

Essay 2 is a medium length (1500-1800 word) analytical essay. In it, you will be invited to respond to your choice from a series of questions about foreign policy decision-making, which will offer you an opportunity to analyze and evaluate a specific foreign policy decision. More information about this essay will be provided in class.

Research Paper

The Final Exam is a longer (3500-4500 word) take-home assignment due at the end of the term. In it you will be invited to analyze a foreign policy decision-making of your choosing, which you have independently researched. You will provide the facts of the case, describe how the decision was made, and analyze whether it could have been made more effectively. This assignment comprises three elements. First, you will write a research proposal, in which you write a short paragraph or two explaining what you want to focus on, and an initial bibliography of sources – due no later than 22 February. You are encouraged to submit this earlier, if you are ready to do so. Second, you will write a rough draft, complete enough for your peers to read and respond. Finally, you will write the finished product, due on the last day of the term. The final version of the research paper will be a culmination of all the writing that you've done this semester. In it I will be reading carefully for content. But I will also be looking for how effectively you've made and supported a causal argument, how effectively you've used and cited evidence (including primary source material) and how clearly and carefully you have presented your ideas. More information about this research paper, and the steps that you should be undertaking along the way to complete it, will be provided in class.

READING:

Students are expected to have read their assignments before class and to be prepared to discuss them. Toward that end, you must bring your texts with you to class each week. Although I have taken care not to overload the reading list, the total pages for any given class session will vary, and may occasionally be heavy. Therefore, you should be sure to look ahead so that your reading is not left for the last moment.

As we move through the readings, we will discuss the key points that each author makes, so it is important for you to come to class prepared to discuss the authors' arguments, and the questions those arguments raise for you. But in addition to reading for content, we will also be reading for style, method, and clarity. After all, we are interested in the clear presentation of arguments. So you should also be prepared to discuss *how* the authors present their ideas, not just *what* their ideas are.

The following required texts should be available at the Dartmouth College Bookstore:

- Malici, Akan & Stephen Walker (2012) *U.S. Presidents & Foreign Policy Mistakes*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- McDermott, Ruth (1998) *Risk-Taking in International Politics: Prospect Theory in American Foreign Policy*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Schafer, Mark & Scott Critchlow (2010) *Groupthink vs. High-Quality Decision Making in International Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, Joseph & Gregory Colomb (2012) *Style: The Basics of Clarity and Grace*. Boston: Longman.

There are a set of additional readings for this course that are not in any of our textbooks. These articles and book chapters will be available in our course's Blackboard website. These readings are noted in the syllabus with a bolded letter B in brackets: **[B]**. They are as follows:

- Allison, Graham (1969) "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis" *American Political Science Review*, 63(3):689-718.
- Booth, Robert (2003) "Full Disclosure on Leaks" *New York Times*, 10/23/2003.
- Burns, James MacGregor (1978) "Executive Leadership" in *Leadership*. New York: Perennial.
- George, Alexander (2003) "Analysis and Judgment in Policymaking." In *Good Judgment in Foreign Policy*, edited by S. Renshon and D. Larson. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Hermann, Margaret et. al. (2001) "Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals" *International Studies Review*
- Jervis, Robert (2004) "The Implications of Prospect Theory for Human Nature and Values" *Political Psychology*, Vol. 25, No. 2 pp. 163-176
- Klarevas, Louis (2004) "The Law: The CIA Leak Case Indicting Vice-President Cheney's Chief of Staff" *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 36(2):309-322.
- Larson, D. (2003) "Good Judgment in Foreign Policy: Social Psychological Perspectives." In *Good Judgment in Foreign Policy*, edited by S. Renshon and D. Larson. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Levy, Jack (1994) "Learning and Foreign Policy: Sweeping a Conceptual Minefield." *International Organization* 48: 279-312.
- Lustick, Ian (1996) "History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias" *American Political Science Review* Vol. 90, No. 3 pp. 605-618.
- Lustick, Ian (2000) Not Exactly, Mr. President: Speaking Truth, Sort of, to Power Theory," *Polity* Vol. 23, no. 3 pp. 319-325.
- Orwell, George (1946) "Politics and the English Language"

Robinson, Piers (1999) "The CNN Effect: Can the News Media Drive Foreign Policy?" *Review of International Studies*, 25(2):301-309.

Snyder, R., H.W. Bruck, and B. Sapin (Eds.) (1954) "The Decision-Making Approach to International Politics". In J. Rosenau, ed., *International Politics and Foreign Policy*, pp. 199-207. New York: Free Press

Van Evera, Stephen (1999) *Guide To Methods for Students of Political Science*. Ch. 1-2.

Updike, John (1975) "6 Rules for Reviewers" in *Picked Up Pieces*. New York: Knopf.

COURSE SCHEDULE:

Week 01: Introduction to Foreign-Policy Decision Making

Thu 07 Jan no reading required

Wed 08 Jan *Writing Reading Reaction Papers: Best Practices*
Orwell (1946) [B]

Thu 09 Jan Lustick (2000) [B]
Larson (2003) [B]

Week 02: Leadership & Learning in US Foreign Policy Decisions

Tue 15 Jan Hermann et. al. (2001) [B]
Burns (1978)

Wed 16 Jan *Writing, Proofreading & Peer-Reviewing More Effectively*
Updike (1975) [B]

Thu 17 Jan Levy (1994) [B]

Week 03: Organizations & US Foreign Policy

Tue 22 Jan Snyder et. al. (1959) [B]
Allison (1969) [B]

Wed 23 Jan *watch "13 Days" on your own*

Thu 24 Jan Schafer & Critchlow (2010) Ch 1-3

Week 04: High Quality Decision Making in a Bureaucracy

Tue 29 Jan Schafer & Critchlow Ch 4-5

Wed 30 Jan *open, to be used for peer-review*

Thu 31 Jan Schafer & Critchlow (2010) Ch 6-7, 9

[Fri 01 Feb Essay 1 due at my office no later than 5:00pm]

Week 05: Leadership, Bureaucracies, and Foreign-Policy Leaks

Tue 05 Feb Robinson (1999) [B]
Klarevas (2004)

Wed 06 Feb *Working and Writing for the State Department*
no reading required

Thu 07 Feb **Guest Speaker: Robert Booth, US Department of State (Ret.)**
Booth (2003)
Additional Reading TBA

Week 06: Foreign Policy Mistakes I

Tue 12 Feb Walker & Malici Ch 1-3

Wed 13 Feb *open, to be used for peer review*

Thu 14 Feb Walker & Malici Ch 4-6

[Fri 15 Feb Essay 2 Draft due at my office no later than 5:00pm]

Week 07: Foreign Policy Mistakes II

Tue 19 Feb Walker & Malici (2012) Ch 7-8

Wed 20 Feb *Using Sources Effectively*
Lustick (1996) [B]

Thu 21 Feb Walker & Malici (2012) Ch 9-11
George (2003) [B]

[Fri 22 Feb Research Paper Proposal due at my office no later than 5:00pm]

Week 08: Risk-Taking & Prospect Theory

Tue 26 Feb McDermott (1998) Ch 1-2

Wed 27 Feb *open, to be used for peer review*

Thu 28 Feb McDermott (1998) Ch 3-4

[Fri 01 Mar Essay 2 due at my office no later than 5:00pm]

Week 09: Assessing Prospect Theory – Analyses & Lessons

Tue 05 Mar McDermott (1998) Ch 5
 Jervis (2004) [B]

***Wed 06 Mar** Writing Analytical Papers*
Van Evera (1999) Ch 1-2 [B]

Thu 07 Mar McDermott (1998) Ch 6-7

Week 10: Finals

[Wed 14 Mar Research Paper Due at my office by 5:00pm]

**THIS DOCUMENT IS IMPORTANT. DO NOT LOSE IT.
AND BE SURE TO REFER TO IT REGULARLY THROUGHOUT THE SEMESTER.**

APPENDIX A: GRADING CRITERIA

When I'm reading your written work, I'm generally looking for four qualities. We might call them **Engagement**, **Creativity**, **Discipline**, and **Care**. I contend that these are the key criteria that form the building-blocks of clear, crisp, and effective written communication. Please keep these qualities in mind as you prepare your written work for this class. Moreover, we will use these qualities as an analytic schema for evaluating the articles and book chapters we read together.

Engagement refers to the extent to which the author's written work responds both directly and in full to the question asked. Have you written a response to the question posed to you, or do your comments seem to meander or address a different question? Have you answered the question in full, or have you ignored some crucial element? That's what I'm looking to evaluate here. In short: is your paper on point?

Creativity covers the ways in which the author uses the texts at hand to craft her responses. Do you generally follow arguments already made in the articles, or articulated in class lectures? Or, alternatively, do you take the material available to you, and draw connections between them in new and interesting ways? In looking for creativity, I'm looking for those flashes of insight, in which you move beyond retelling an argument that we all already know, and provide your own insights into the material. In short: have you brought your own insight to bear upon this topic?

Discipline refers to the rigor in which the author makes her key points. Does your paper follow a logical flow, in which paragraphs come together to support a well-articulated argument? Is the paper free from digressions and irrelevant asides? Do you provide the necessary textual evidence to show that your key claims about texts aren't assertions? Is the textual evidence properly contextualized and explained? In short, does the argument cohere?

Care refers to the attention to detail in the presentation of the paper. Is it well-organized, with a clear intro & conclusion? Do the intro & conclusion contradict, or is the paper logically coherent? Does the paper cut to the point, or is there a bunch of flowery stalling up front? Is the writing free from excessive jargon or thoughtless cliché? Is it free from grammatical mistakes, word omissions, and spelling errors? Does each paragraph convey only 1 main idea? Do the paragraphs follow one another? Is there more than one huge paragraph? Have you avoided made-up words? In short: have you revised and proofread this paper effectively?