

**DOMESTIC POLITICS AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**  
**POLI 577, FALL 2018**  
**Monday 2:00-4:50 PM, 126 Herzstein Hall**

**INSTRUCTOR:**

Professor Ashley Leeds  
119 Herzstein Hall, (713) 348-3037  
leeds@rice.edu  
www.ruf.rice.edu/~leeds  
Office Hours: by appointment

**COURSE CONTENT:**

This seminar is intended to provide Ph.D. students with an opportunity to read and discuss a range of scholarly literature on the links between domestic and international politics and to plan their own research projects on related topics. Students will be expected to demonstrate their ability to evaluate arguments and empirical evidence, to recognize linkages among studies and identify scientific progress, and to develop their own research designs. You should leave this course with a basic familiarity with current research on the role of domestic politics in international relations, a completed research paper, and improved skills in analytical thinking, writing, and oral presentation.

**CONNECTION TO PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES:**

This course contributes to all four program learning outcomes for the political science Ph.D.:

Demonstrate advanced knowledge of theoretical and empirical research in two of the following three sub-fields of Political Science: American politics, comparative politics, and international relations.

Learn and apply social science research design and methodologies, including advanced statistical techniques.

Demonstrate the ability to communicate their research effectively through multiple mediums including scholarly writing, oral presentation, and poster sessions.

Demonstrate their competence as political scientists through research, teaching, and professional development activities.

**EVALUATION:**

Grades will be determined in the manner described below. The Rice University Honor Code applies to all assignments for this course.

## **25% -- Class Participation and Attendance**

The quality of a graduate level seminar depends to a great extent on the efforts of the students. You play a big role in creating your course. I expect that you will come to class each week prepared to discuss the assigned material and that you will share your ideas, questions, and views actively. Because class participation is vital to your performance in this course, please see me at once if you feel uncomfortable speaking in class.

Please leave ample time to read the work assigned for each week carefully. While you are reading, you should consider the following questions:

**What is the purpose of the study?** Does the author intend to describe the state of the world or the state of the literature? Does the author intend to advance a new theory? Does the author intend to provide an empirical test of an existing theory? How well does the author accomplish his or her goal?

**What is the author's argument?** What research question is the author trying to answer, and how does he or she answer it? What are the assumptions (explicit and implicit) upon which the author's argument is based? What are the independent and dependent variables, and what is the logic that links them together?

**Is the theory logically consistent?** Is it plausible?

**Is the theory empirically relevant?** Is the empirical record commensurate with expectations drawn from the theory? If the author provides empirical tests, are the research design, the operational measures of the concepts, and the methods of analysis appropriate? What further evidence would you use to evaluate the argument? What further testable hypotheses follow from this theory? How would you design a study that could determine the empirical relevance of the author's approach in comparison to other approaches?

**Is the research interesting?** How does this argument fit into the literature? What does this study tell us that we didn't already know? What should it tell us that it doesn't? What questions still need to be answered?

**What policy recommendations would you make based on this study?**

**How do the selections we read this week fit together?** How do they fit into the course as a whole? Are we seeing progress in this research area?

I hope that we will engage in vigorous academic debate, but during these class discussions, classroom etiquette is vital. Please work to ensure that you make comments in ways that invite discussion. Our classroom contains members with various life experiences, divergent perspectives, varying levels of experience with political science research, and different strategies for defending their views. Please state your opinions constructively and respectfully, listen carefully when your colleagues are speaking, and speak to me if you are offended by something that is said in class.

Obviously it is impossible to participate in a seminar discussion if you are not in attendance. I expect no absences in the course, and I encourage you to discuss any circumstances with me that will preclude you from attending class. I also expect you to arrive on time. If you do need to miss class, please contact me ahead of time to let me know that you will not be able to attend and to make arrangements to complete an alternate assignment.

Grades for participation will be assigned at the end of the semester, but you may ask for feedback on your performance at any time. If you have concerns about the quality and quantity of your participation in the course, I hope you will speak to me.

### **25% – Weekly Memos on Readings**

Each week for which there are reading assignments, each student must submit a memo on the assigned reading. Your memo should combine a brief summary of the work with a reaction to it. You should distill the main point(s) of the set of readings and integrate the week's work coherently. I will be looking for evidence that you (1) understand the main arguments and conclusions of the articles/books, (2) see how the assigned readings for the week relate to one another and to the course, (3) can think about where the field should go from here and what needs to be done next. Memos that are well organized, clear, concise, demonstrate an understanding of the assigned readings, and offer insightful analysis will receive the highest grades. Your memo must be double spaced with one inch margins on all sides, written with proper grammar and spelling, and in a font size no smaller than 11 point. The memo must not exceed three pages; I will not accept longer papers. Memos are due by **8:00 am** on the day of class. They should be submitted by email as attachments in .pdf or Microsoft Word format.

I will not accept any memos after the class meets unless you have made special arrangements with me ahead of time. You will receive a letter grade for each memo. At the end of the term I will drop your lowest grade and average the grades for the remaining memos to determine your final memo grade.

### **45% – Research Paper**

*Research Question – due September 10 (2:00 pm)*

*Argument – due October 19 (8:00 am) – 10%*

*Gradable Draft – due November 26 (2:00 pm) – 10% (draft to reviewer November 19)*

*Final Draft and Memo Addressing Review – due December 12 (12:00 pm) – 25%*

Your major written assignment for the semester is to prepare a research paper that analyzes a question of interest to you. The paper should consider (in some way) both domestic and international politics. You may choose to complete a full research paper or a research design (the full paper except for the empirical analysis). The result should be similar to a political science journal article (perhaps minus the empirical analysis). You should explain why your question is important, review the existing scholarly literature that provides the basis for your study, develop your argument and hypotheses, present a research design for evaluating your hypotheses empirically, present your analysis of the data (optional), and discuss the implications your study will have for future research and for policy. More details about writing a research paper will be provided in a separate handout.

The paper will be due in several stages. You must turn in a paragraph long description of the topic/research question you plan to study on **September 10**. While I will not grade this description, you will lose credit on your final project if you fail to hand it in. By **October 19**, you must submit the

introduction, literature review, and argument portion of your paper for grading. This section must explain the question you are addressing and provide a critical review of the literature that will provide a basis for your argument and study. It must also develop your argument and list your hypotheses. This draft should be accompanied by a bibliography and should include appropriate citations. A complete draft of your paper is due to your reviewer/discussant (see below) on **November 19** and to me on **November 26**. This should be a version of your paper that is ready to be graded (presumably not your first draft—you should edit on your own first). I will grade these papers and return them to you with comments, so you will have an opportunity to make improvements if you choose before the final draft is due on **December 12**. You will also need to turn in a memo explaining how you have addressed the comments of your reviewer with the final draft. These due dates are firm. Late papers will be penalized one half letter grade per day, including weekends, unless an extension has been granted by the instructor prior to the due date.

At our last class meeting, each student will present his or her research to the class as a whole. The presentation should be no more than fifteen minutes. The presentation will be followed by comments from the discussant and then discussion with the class as a whole. The quality of your presentation will influence your grade for class participation. We may decide to invite other faculty and students to attend the presentations.

I encourage you to work closely with me on your individual papers throughout the semester. You need not wait for due dates to get feedback on your work. I am happy to help you at every stage of the process from identifying a topic, to locating background literature, to developing your argument, to setting up the research design and locating relevant data sources, to evaluating the analysis. It will be easier for me to help you, however, if you begin early and plan ahead. I am unlikely (for instance) to be in my office and available to help at 10:00 pm the night before the paper is due!

### **5%-- *Review of Colleague's Research Paper***

Near the end of the semester, each of you will be assigned to serve as a reviewer and discussant for another student's research paper. On **November 19**, you will receive a draft of the paper. You must write a review of the paper as if you were serving as a referee for an academic journal. In other words, your job is to provide an evaluation of the paper for an editor, and also to provide constructive advice to the author that can be useful in the next revision. You should explain (a) the contribution of the paper (that is, how the paper moves knowledge forward); (b) the strengths of the study and the current draft; (c) the weaknesses of the study and the current draft; (d) your advice for revision. The review is due on **November 26**.

At our last class meeting, you will serve as discussant following the presentation of the paper you reviewed. You should spend approximately five minutes summarizing your review for the class. This presentation will influence your grade for class participation. Keep in mind that the goal is not to "attack" the paper (or certainly the author!). The goal is to help the author identify both strengths and weaknesses and to offer suggestions for improvement.

When you turn in the final draft of your research paper, you must also turn in a memo in which you explain how you have addressed the comments you have received on your earlier draft from your reviewer and from me. This memo should explain what changes you have made to the paper and why you have not made other recommended changes. For advice in the reviews that you do not accept, you should either (a) explain why you disagree with the advice given, or (b) explain why, although you

think the idea is a good one, it needs to be postponed for future research rather than incorporated into this project. The quality of this memo will influence your grade on your final draft of your research paper.

### **SPECIAL PROVISIONS:**

Students with documented disabilities who require special accommodations should express their needs to the instructor during the first two weeks of class. All discussions will remain confidential. Students with disabilities must also contact Disability Support Services in the Allen Center. The Department of Political Science is happy to do whatever we can to assure each student full and rewarding participation in classes.

### **DISCUSSION SCHEDULE:**

In crafting this syllabus, I had to make some decisions about what “Domestic Politics and International Relations” is. First, I take seriously the “domestic politics” in the title. This course focuses on how political institutions, behavior, and processes within countries relate to international relations. It does not focus on works that primarily concentrate on the psychology, demographic characteristics, or backgrounds of leaders, except when these are related directly to the political incentives the leaders face. Second, I take seriously the “international relations” component and try hard to separate this course from a course on foreign policy. We focus mostly on works that consider how domestic politics affects the interactions of states in the international system, rather than how an individual state chooses its foreign policy. Finally, this syllabus focuses mostly on how domestic politics affect international relations, rather than the other way around. Certainly there are lots of ways in which international politics affects domestic politics as well.

This syllabus should not be viewed as a comprehensive listing of all scholarly literature on the influence of domestic politics on international relations, nor of all the “good” or “important” work; that would be impossible to cover in one semester. The reading selections are skewed towards works that employ statistical analysis and/or formal modeling, since these are the methodological approaches emphasized at Rice in our graduate training, and more towards security than to economic issue areas. Some issue areas and approaches are not well represented due to constraints of time; it is impossible to devote time to every issue area in which there has been substantial research in a single semester. Even for the topics that are covered, you will read only a representative sample of the existing literature. This selection of readings, however, should serve to provide a good introduction to our scholarly understanding, and the readings included herein should point you in profitable directions for future study on topics that you wish to pursue further.

The readings listed for each date are those that will be discussed during that class period. Thus, you should complete these readings and your memo related to them before the class meeting.

#### **Week #1: August 20: Introduction to Course**

Review syllabus thoroughly.

Fearon, James D. 1998. Domestic Politics, Foreign Policy, and Theories of International Relations. *Annual Review of Political Science* 1: 289-313.

**Week #2: August 27: Domestic Institutions and International Conflict**

- Maoz, Zeev, and Bruce Russett. 1993. Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946–1986. *American Political Science Review* 87 (3): 624-638.
- Schultz, Kenneth A. 1998. Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises. *American Political Science Review* 92 (4): 829-844.
- Schultz, Kenneth A. 1999. Do Democratic Institutions Constrain or Inform? *International Organization* 53 (2): 233-266.
- Reiter, Dan, and Allan C. Stam III. 1998. Democracy, War Initiation, and Victory. *American Political Science Review* 92 (2): 377-389.
- Valentino, Benjamin A., Paul K. Huth, and Sarah E. Croco. 2010. Bear Any Burden? How Democracies Minimize the Costs of War. *Journal of Politics* 72 (2): 528-544.
- Tomz, Michael R. and Jessica L. P. Weeks. 2013. Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review* 107 (4): 849-865.
- Rosato, Sebastian. 2003. The Flawed Logic of Democratic Peace Theory. *American Political Science Review* 97 (4): 585-602.
- Weeks, Jessica L. 2012. Strongmen and Straw Men: Authoritarian Regimes and the Initiation of International Conflict. *American Political Science Review* 106 (2): 326-347.

**Week #3: September 3: No Class; Labor Day****Week #4: September 10: Selectorate Theory**

- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce, Alastair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson, and James D. Morrow. 2003. *The Logic of Political Survival*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, chapters 1-3, 6, 8-9.
- Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce and Alastair Smith. 2009. A Political Economy of Aid. *International Organization* 63 (2): 309-340.
- Research Topic due in class.**

**Week #5: September 17: Domestic Conditions and International Conflict**

- Ostrom, Charles W. and Brian L. Job. 1986. The President and the Political Use of Force. *American Political Science Review* 80 (2): 541-566.
- Howell, William G. and Jon C. Pevehouse. 2005. Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force. *International Organization* 59 (1): 209-232.
- Tarar, Ahmer. 2006. Diversionary Incentives and the Bargaining Approach to War. *International Studies Quarterly* 50: 169-188.
- Clark, David H., Benjamin O. Fordham, and Timothy Nordstrom. 2011. Preying on the Misfortune of Others: When do States Exploit Their Opponents' Domestic Troubles? *Journal of Politics* 73 (1): 248-264.
- Pickering, Jeffrey and Emizet F. Kisangani. 2010. Diversionary Despots? Comparing Autocracies' Propensities to Use and Benefit from Military Force. *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (2): 477-493.
- Chiozza, Giacomo and H.E. Goemans. 2011. *Leaders and International Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press, chapters 2-4.
- McManus, Roseanne W. 2017. *Statements of Resolve: Achieving Coercive Credibility in International Conflict*. New York: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-41.

**Week #6: September 24: Crisis Bargaining and Audience Costs**

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

- Schultz, Kenneth A. 2001. Looking for Audience Costs. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 45 (1): 32-60.
- Tomz, Michael. 2007. Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach. *International Organization* 61 (4): 821-840.
- Jack Snyder and Erica D. Borghard. 2011. The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, Not a Pound. *American Political Science Review* 105 (3): 437-456.
- Levendusky, Matthew S., and Michael C. Horowitz. 2012. When Backing Down is the Right Decision: Partisanship, New Information, and Audience Costs. *Journal of Politics* 74 (2): 323-338.
- Levy, Jack S. , Michael K. McCoy, Paul Poast, and Geoffrey P.R. Wallace. 2015. Backing Out or Backing In? Commitment and Consistency in Audience Costs Theory. *American Journal of Political Science* 59 (4): 988-1001.
- Kertzer, Joshua D., and Ryan Brutger. 2016. Decomposing Audience Costs: Bringing the Audience Back into Audience Cost Theory. *American Journal of Political Science* 60 (1): 234-249.
- Weeks, Jessica L. 2008. Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve. *International Organization* 62, no. 1 (2008): 35-64.

### **Week #7: October 1: Leadership Turnover and International Relations**

- Wolford, Scott. 2007. The Turnover Trap: New Leaders, Reputation, and International Conflict. *American Journal of Political Science* 51 (4): 772-788.
- Park, Jong Hee and Kentaro Hirose. 2013. Domestic Politics, Reputations, Sanctions, and International Compliance. *International Theory* 5 (2): 300-320.
- Croco, Sarah E. 2011. The Decider's Dilemma: Leader Culpability, War Outcomes, and Domestic Punishment. *American Political Science Review* 105 (3): 457-477.
- McGillivray, Fiona and Alastair Smith. 2008. *Punishing the Prince*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, chapters 1-3, 5-6.
- Mattes, Michaela, Brett Ashley Leeds, and Royce Carroll. 2015. Leadership Turnover and Foreign Policy Change: Societal Interests, Domestic Institutions, and Voting in the United Nations. *International Studies Quarterly* 59 (2): 280-290.
- Grieco, Joseph M., Christopher F. Gelpi, and T. Camber Warren. 2009. When Preferences and Commitments Collide: The Effect of Relative Partisan Shifts on International Treaty Compliance. *International Organization* 63 (2): 341-355.

### **Week #8: October 8: No class, Fall Break**

### **Week #9: October 15: Domestic Interests, Public Opinion, and International Relations**

- Narizny, Kevin. 2007. *The Political Economy of Grand Strategy*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, chapters 1 and 8.
- Solingen, Etel. 1998. *Regional Orders at Century's Dawn*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, chapters 2, 3, and 8.
- Guisinger, Alexandra. 2017. *American Opinion on Trade: Preferences without Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press, chapters 1,3, and 9.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1991. Public Opinion, Domestic Structure, and Foreign Policy in Liberal Democracies. *World Politics* 43(4): 479-512.
- Saunders, Elizabeth N. 2015. War and the Inner Circle: Democratic Elites and the Politics of Using Force. *Security Studies* 24 (3): 466-501.
- Tomz, Michael, Jessica Weeks, and Keren Yarhi-Milo. 2018. Public Opinion and Decisions about Military Force in Democracies. *Working Paper*.

### **Week #10: October 22: Domestic Politics and International Cooperation**

- Martin, Lisa L. 2000. *Democratic Commitments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, chapter 2.
- Mattes, Michaela, and Mariana Rodriguez. 2014. Autocracies and International Cooperation. *International Studies Quarterly* 58 (3): 527-538.
- Mattes, Michaela. 2012. Democratic Reliability, Precommitment of Successor Governments, and the Choice of Alliance Commitment. *International Organization* 66 (1): 153-172.
- Chiba, Daina, Jesse C. Johnson, and Brett Ashley Leeds. 2015. Careful Commitments: Democratic States and Alliance Design. *Journal of Politics* 77 (4): 968-982.
- Stasavage, David. 2004. Open Door or Closed Door? Transparency in Domestic and International Bargaining. *International Organization* 58: 667-703.
- Goldstein, Judith and Lisa L. Martin. 2000. Legalization, Trade Liberalization, and Domestic Politics: A Cautionary Note. *International Organization* 54 (3): 603-632.
- Dai, Xinyuan. 2005. Why Comply? The Domestic Constituency Mechanism. *International Organization* 59: 363-398.

### **Week #11: October 29: Domestic Politics and Conflict Resolution**

- Colaresi, Michael. 2004. When Doves Cry: International Rivalry, Unreciprocated Cooperation, and Leadership Turnovers. *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (3): 555-570.
- Schultz, Kenneth A. 2005. The Politics of Risking Peace: Do Hawks or Doves Deliver the Olive Branch? *International Organization* 59 (1): 1-38.
- Clare, Joe. 2014. Hawks, Doves, and International Cooperation. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 58 (7): 1311-1337.
- Mattes, Michaela, and Jessica L.P. Weeks. *Forthcoming*. Hawks, Doves, and Peace: An Experimental Approach. *American Journal of Political Science*.
- Kreps, Sarah E., Elizabeth N. Saunders, and Kenneth A. Schultz. *Forthcoming*. The Ratification Premium: Hawks, Doves, and Arms Control. *World Politics*.
- Yarhi-Milo, Keren. 2013. Tying Hands Behind Closed Doors: The Logic and Practice of Secret Reassurance. *Security Studies* 22 (3): 405-435.

### **Week #12: November 5: Domestic Politics and International Organizations**

- Fang, Songying. 2008. The Informational Role of International Institutions and Domestic Politics. *American Journal of Political Science* 52 (2): 304-321.
- Simmons, Beth A. and Allison Danner. 2010. Credible Commitments and the International Criminal Court. *International Organization* 64: 225-256.
- Milner, Helen V. 2006. Why Multilateralism? Foreign Aid and Domestic Principal-Agent Problems. In *Delegation and Agency in International Organizations*, ed. Darren G. Hawkins, David A. Lake, Daniel L. Nielsen, and Michael J. Tierney. New York: Cambridge University press, pp. 107-139.
- Todd L. Allee and Paul K. Huth. 2006. Legitimizing Dispute Settlement: International Adjudication as Domestic Political Cover. *American Political Science Review* 100 (2): 219-234.
- Kreps, Sarah. 2010. Elite Consensus as a Determinant of Alliance Cohesion: Why Public Opinion Hardly Matters for NATO-led Operations in Afghanistan. *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6 (3): 191-215.
- Fang, Songying and Randall W. Stone. 2012. International Organizations as Policy Advisors. *International Organization* 66 (4): 537-569.

**Week #13: November 12: Where Domestic and International Politics Meet: The Peculiar Case of Human Rights**

Hathaway, Oona A. 2007. Why Do Countries Commit to Human Rights Treaties? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51 (4): 588-621.

Vreeland, James Raymond. 2008. Political Institutions and Human Rights: Why Dictatorships Enter into the United Nations Convention Against Torture. *International Organization* 62 (1): 65-101.

Powell, Emilia Justyna and Jeffrey K. Staton. 2009. Domestic Judicial Institutions and Human Rights Treaty Violation. *International Studies Quarterly* 53 (1): 149-174.

Hendrix, Cullen S. and Wendy H. Wong. 2012. When is the Pen Truly Mighty? Regime Type and the Efficacy of Naming and Shaming in Curbing Human Rights Abuses. *British Journal of Political Science* 43 (3): 651-672.

Conrad, Courtenay R. and Emily Hencken Ritter. 2013. Treaties, Tenure, and Torture. *Journal of Politics* 75 (2): 397-409.

Kreps, Sarah and Sarah Maxey. 2018. Mechanisms of Morality: Sources of Support for Humanitarian Intervention. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 62 (8): 1814-1842.

**Week #14: November 19: Research Day**

***Draft of Research Paper due to Reviewer/Discussant by 2:00 pm.***

**Week #15: November 26: Presentation of student research and course wrap-up.**

***Draft of Research Paper and Review of Colleague's Paper due in class.***

***December 12: Final Draft of Research Paper and Memo Addressing Review due by 12:00 pm***