

Speech and Diplomacy in World Politics

Summer Session II

Instructor: Abigail Post

Office Hours: Mon-Fri, 9:00-10:00 AM and 1:00-2:00 PM

Office: Gibson #S-252

Email: asn9dp@virginia.edu

Class Meetings: Mon-Fri 10:30 AM – 12:45 PM

Seminar Room: Nau Hall 241

This seminar surveys international diplomacy and government speechmaking, historically and today in the 21st century. This course examines the efficacy of public versus private diplomacy in international relations. It analyzes prominent and not-so-prominent theories in international relations regarding the impact of speech and diplomacy on international interactions. This is *not* a course in public speaking, how to conduct diplomacy, on entering the foreign service, or how to negotiate a better bargain at the car dealership.

People in daily conversation often assume that speech and diplomacy matter in international relations. However, until recently, international relations theory dismissed speech and diplomacy as inconsequential in most contexts. This course challenges both the common consensus (“diplomacy matters”) and the theoretical understanding (“cheap talk”). As we study existing theories of language, we also delve into historical case studies in an effort to better understand the role of diplomacy in the historical context. The course proceeds in three sections. First, we examine the role of public versus private diplomacy according to traditional theories of international relations. Second, we explore language as more of an attempt to persuade international actors, according to constructivist theories of international relations. Third, we turn to new research challenging these lines of scholarship, evaluating the role of psychology in the sending and receiving of verbal signals. The last week looks at special topics in speech and diplomacy that do not fall naturally into these three categories.

Objectives

By the end of this course, students should be able to:

1. Use international relations theory to understand the impact of communication and speech on international relations. Students should be able to answer specific questions such as: What was the impact of Kennedy’s choice to make a public threat rather than a private one during the Cuban Missile Crisis?
2. Apply international relations theory to current events to make sense of nations’ complex interactions (and policymakers’ difficult decisions). For example, why can’t leaders just believe one another? How does language help or hurt trust? How can psychology help us understand the importance of symbolic speech?

3. Conduct rigorous research, which includes finding and citing appropriate sources, thinking critically about international relations, and writing both clearly and persuasively.

General Requirements

1. *Attendance.* I expect you to show up to class every day, on time. Given the condensed nature of this course, there will be no unexcused absences. Any absences therefore will result in point and/or grade deductions. Students are responsible for all missed work, regardless of the reason for absence. It is also the absentee's responsibility to get all missing notes or materials (usually from another member of the class).
2. *Complete the Readings.* Please come to class with all of the assigned readings read, in order to contribute to discussion. Effective participation requires a thorough and critical reading of all assigned materials.
3. *Participation.* This course will be largely run as a seminar, with student participation an absolutely vital component. Discussion is not designed to put you on the spot; it's an effort to help you learn the material more thoroughly. Thus, participation will not only affect your participation grade but will also improve your understanding of the material. I will assign tasks to facilitate dialogue but expect you to pose questions, insightful comments, and the like. In a seminar like this, I am mostly here to *facilitate* discussion rather than lecture on the material. Students learn just as much (if not more) from each other than they do from their instructors.

Assignments and Evaluation

Detailed instructions for each assignment are available on Collab.

- Participation (20%). Every class I will grade the quality of your participation on a 0–10 point scale. You will receive 7 points for attendance. I will assign additional points to those who participate. A 10 is reserved those who analyze the readings exceptionally well and offer novel analysis of the material. The quality of your participation is much more important than the quantity, although I take both into account.
- Critical Review Essay (20%). Synthesizing the first week's readings, compare and contrast the relative effectiveness of public versus private diplomacy in international relations.
- "Puzzles in Diplomacy" (20%). Because understanding political phenomena requires deep historical understandings, one pair of students will present some background regarding the case and/or theory for ten of the twenty days of class. Students will provide a co-authored write-up of the case, along with a detailed bibliography, due the day of the presentation.

- Reflective Essay (10%). Students will conduct a brief reflective writing assignment speculating on diplomacy among developing nations.
- Final Paper (30%). Write a research paper and/or research design building on one of the earlier assignments.

Professionalism, Ethics, and Other Policies

1. *In-class distractions.* Remember to turn off/silence and put away your phones prior to the beginning of class. If there is an emergency which requires you to keep your ringer on, please inform me before class begins. You may use your laptops during class, but please do not surf the Internet, text, or chat when class is in session. If you violate this policy, you will be marked absent for the day. Please do not eat lunch in class.
2. *Email.* Face-to-face communication is best. Students should ask questions before, during, and after class; or during office hours. Please type all emails in a professional manner. Although I will try to respond quickly, I will be unable to respond to emails after 9 PM.
3. *Academic Integrity.* The honor code is, as always, important to remember as any cheating or plagiarism risk failing the course and being reported to the Honor Committee. Please see www.virginia.edu/honor or e-mail me if you have any questions.
4. *SDAC.* If you have (or suspect you have) a learning or other disability that requires academic accommodations, you should contact the Student Disability Access Center as soon as possible. The instructor will be happy to make whatever accommodations students need to be successful in the course. Please be sure that necessary accommodations are properly documented by the SDAC. Be sure to provide the instructor with enough notice to make appropriate arrangements.
5. *Grades.* Grades in the **C** range represent performance that **meets** expectations. Grades in the **B** range represent performance that is **substantially better** than the expectations. Grades in the **A** range represent work that is **excellent**.
 - Note: I do not discuss grades through email. If you have any questions/concerns about your grade, you must set up an appointment with me. This is primarily due to privacy concerns.
6. *Grade appeals:* Hopefully there will be no reason to contest a grade. However, I will accept grade appeals no sooner than 48 hours and no later than 5 days after students receive their graded assignments. I provide detailed comments on graded assignments. Take the time to read and consider these comments before lodging an appeal. Grade appeals must include a written statement that addresses my comments on the assignment and indicates specifically why the student feels the grade is inappropriate. If a grade appeal is made, I reserve the right to adjust the grade either upward or downward, so I strongly recommend that you not lodge grade appeals frivolously.

7. *Late Assignments.* Under most circumstances, late assignments will not be accepted; only in the case of a serious medical emergency with documentation from a physician will they be considered. In case of computer failures, I highly recommend that all files be backed up through some variety of cloud-based services, such as Dropbox, Google Drive, Box, etc.
8. *Dropping or Withdrawing.* The deadline to drop this course is Thursday, June 22nd by midnight; after that point, you have to withdraw from the course. The deadline to withdraw from the course is Friday, June 30th. For more details, please see <http://summer.virginia.edu/registration-and-academic-procedures>.

Schedule of Readings and Discussion

All readings are available through Collab identified by “Author Year” format. Any changes to the readings will be announced a minimum of 2 days ahead of the affected reading assignment.

Week 1: Rationalism & Public vs. Private Diplomacy

1. June 12: Introduction

Topic: Introductions, overview of research methods, and rationalist theories of international relations.

- Scroggs, Matt K.J. (2015) “Interpreting Statistical Analysis.”
- Fearon, James D. (1995) “Rationalist Explanations for War.” *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.
 - Recommended: Trager, Robert F. (2016) “The Diplomacy of War and Peace.” *Annual Review of Political Science* 19: 205-228.

2. June 13: Audience Costs I

Topic: How can governments make their threats and promises credible?

Case study: Cuban Missile Crisis

- Schelling, Thomas C. (1966) *Arms and Influence*. New Haven: Yale. Chapter 2.
- Fearon, James D. (1994) “Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes.” *American Political Science Review* 88(3): 577-592.
- Kennedy, John F. (October 22, 1962) “Address on the Buildup of Arms in Cuba.” <http://archive.millercenter.org/president/kennedy/speeches/speech-3372>.
- “Kennedy-Khrushchev Exchanges” (1962), Documents 60–70, in *Foreign Relations of the United States, 1961–1963*.

3. June 14: Audience Costs II

Topic: Do government elites actually suffer audience costs when they act inconsistently?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #0: Did leaders incur audience costs during the Suez Crisis?

- Tomz, Michael. (2007) “Domestic Audience Costs in International Relations: An Experimental Approach.” *International Organization* 61(4): 821-840.
- Snyder, Jack, and Erica D. Borghard. (2011) “The Cost of Empty Threats: A Penny, not a Pound.” *American Political Science Review* 105(3): 437-456.
- Weeks, Jessica L. (2008) “Autocratic Audience Costs: Regime Type and Signaling Resolve.” *International Organization* 62(1): 35-64. (*skim entire.*)

4. June 15: Reputation & Communication

Topic: How can reputation impact the credibility of state communications?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #1: Why didn't the U.S. believe China's threat to enter the Korean War?

- Sartori, Anne E. (2002) “The Might of the Pen: A Reputational Theory of Communication in International Disputes.” *International Organization* 56(1): 121-149.
- Press, Daryl G. (2006) “The Credibility of Power: Assessing Threats during the Appeasement Crises of the 1930s.” *International Security* 29(3): 136-169.

5. June 16: Private vs. Public Negotiations

Topic: When do leaders choose to go “private” with their diplomacy?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #2: Why did Nixon choose to go “private” with China? What effect did these private negotiations have on Chinese-U.S. relations?

- Baum, Matthew A. (2004) “Going Private: Public Opinion, Presidential Rhetoric, and the Domestic Politics of Audience Costs in US Foreign Policy Crises.” *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48(5): 603-631.
- Yarhi-Milo, Keren. (2013) “Tying Hands Behind Closed Doors: The Logic and Practice of Secret Reassurance.” *Security Studies* 22(3): 405-435.

Week 2: Constructivism & the Importance of Framing

1. June 19: Norms & Persuasion I

*** Critical Review Essay due by 10:30 AM in class and through Collab**

Topic: Can ethical arguments persuade domestic audiences?

Case study: How did ethical argument (versus changing costs and benefits) persuade governments to abolish slavery?

- Crawford, Neta. (2002) *Argument and Change in World Politics: Ethics, Decolonization, and Humanitarian Intervention*. Cambridge University Press. Introduction and Chapter 4.
- Movie (in-class): *Amazing Grace*

2. June 20: Norms & Persuasion II

Topic: How can normative arguments persuade international audiences?

Case study: How do TANs operate?

- Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. (2001) "Taking Stock: The Constructivist Research Program in International Relations and Comparative Politics." *Annual Review of Political Science* 4(1): 391-416. (***skim most; carefully read pages 391-393 and 402.***)
- Keck, Margaret E., and Kathryn Sikkink. (1998). *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Cornell University Press. Chapters 1 & 3.

3. June 21: Communicative Action

Topic: How does language shape identities in world politics?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #3: How did language and diplomacy influence the end of the Cold War?

- Kydd, Andrew. (2000) "Trust, reassurance, and cooperation." *International Organization* 54.(2): 325-357.
- Risse, Thomas. (2000) "Let's argue!": communicative action in world politics." *International Organization* 54.(1): 1-39.

4. June 22: Rhetorical Coercion

Topic: How can rhetoric coerce a bargaining opponent?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #4: How did Hitler use rhetoric to stave off a balancing coalition in 1938?

- Krebs, Ronald R., and Patrick Thaddeus Jackson. (2007) "Twisting Tongues and Twisting Arms: The Power of Political Rhetoric." *European Journal of International Relations* 13(1): 35-66. (***read pages 35-48, skim case study.***)
- Goddard, Stacie E. (2009) "When Right Makes Might: How Prussia Overturned the European Balance of Power." *International Security* 33(3): 110-142.
- Goddard, Stacie E. (2015) "The Rhetoric of Appeasement: Hitler's Legitimation and British Foreign Policy, 1938-39." *Security Studies* 24(1): 95-130.

5. June 23: Sacred Rhetoric

Topic: How does moral language influence bargaining?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #5: How has language made it difficult to find a compromise for Jerusalem?

- Tetlock, Philip E. (2003) “Thinking the Unthinkable: Sacred Values and Taboo Cognitions.” *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7(7): 320-324.
- Goddard, Stacie E. (2006) “Uncommon Ground: Indivisible Territory and the Politics of Legitimacy.” *International Organization* 60(1): 35-68. (**read pages 35-49, skim case study.**)
- Atran, Scott, and Robert Axelrod. (2008) “Reframing Sacred Values.” *Negotiation Journal* 24(3): 221-246.
- Marietta, Morgan. (2008) “From My Cold, Dead Hands: Democratic Consequences of Sacred Rhetoric.” *The Journal of Politics* 70(3): 767-779.

Week 3: Affect and Psychology in Diplomacy

1. June 26: Cognitive Bias & the Misinterpretation of Signals

Topic: How do cognitive biases influence the interpretation of signals?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #6: How did diplomacy contribute to the breakout of WWI?

- Lebow, Richard Ned. (1984) “Cognitive Closure and Crisis Politics” in *Between Peace and War: The Nature of International Crisis*. Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Mercer, Jonathan. (2005) “Rationality and Psychology in International Politics.” *International Organization* 59(1): 77-106. (**read pages 92–100.**)

2. June 27: Face-to-face Communication

Topic: What is the impact of face-to-face interactions on diplomacy?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #7: Why was the Concert of Europe successful?

- Holmes, Marcus. (2013) “The Force of Face-to-face Diplomacy: Mirror Neurons and the Problem of Intentions.” *International Organization* 67(4): 829-861.

3. June 28: Emotions & Analogies

Topic: How do emotions and analogies influence information processing?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #8: How does the Munich Analogy influence decisionmaking?

- Khong, Yuen Foong. (1992) *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and the Vietnam Decisions of 1965*. Princeton University Press. Chapter 2.
- Khong, Yuen Foong. (1987) “Seduction by analogy in Vietnam: The Malaya and Korea analogies.” In *Institutions and Leadership: Prospects for the Future*.
- Mercer, Jonathan. (2013) “Emotion and Strategy in the Korean War.” *International Organization* 67(2): 221-252.

4. June 29: Insults, Honor, & Humiliation

Topic: How can insults hurt state relations?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #9: How have insults shaped the relationship between North Korea and the United States?

- O'Neill, Barry. (1999) *Honor, Symbols, and War*. University of Michigan Press. Chapter 9. (**read pages 139-154.**)
- Dafoe, Allan, and Devin Caughey. (2016) "Honor and War." *World Politics* 68(2): 341-381. (**read pages 1-17, skim 18-34.**)
- Gottfried, Matthew S., and Robert F. Trager. (2016) "A Preference for War: How Fairness and Rhetoric Influence Leadership Incentives in Crises." *International Studies Quarterly* 60(2): 243-257.

5. June 30: Apologies

Topic: How do apologies influence state relations?

Puzzles in Diplomacy #10: How did Japan's and Germany's apologies impact relations with the injured party?

- O'Neill, Barry. (1999) *Honor, Symbols, and War*. University of Michigan Press. Chapter 11.
- Lind, Jennifer. (2009) "Apologies in International Politics." *Security Studies* 18(3): 517-556.

Week 4: Special Topics in Rhetoric and Reality

1. July 6: Diplomacy in Developing Nations

*** Reflective Essay due by 1:00 PM through Collab**

Topic: How does diplomacy among developing nations differ from diplomacy between great powers?

- No readings.
- Discuss reflective essays on how to apply theories of international relations to developing nations.

2. July 4: No class

3. July 5: Personality & Speechmaking

Topic: Can we evaluate personality type using at-a-distance speech analysis?

- Medhurst, Martin J. (2004) "Presidential Speechwriting: Ten Myths that Plague Modern Scholarship." In Ritter, Kurt. *Presidential Speechwriting: From the New Deal to the Reagan Revolution and Beyond*. Texas A&M University Press.

- Winter, David G. (2007) “The Role of Motivation, Responsibility, and Integrative Complexity in Crisis Escalation: Comparative Studies of War and Peace Crises.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 92(5): 920–937.
- Renshon, Jonathan. (2009) “When Public Statements Reveal Private Beliefs: Assessing Operational Codes at a Distance.” *Political Psychology* 30(4): 649-661.

4. July 6: Rhetoric in the Era of Trump

- Selected speeches by American Presidents available through Collab.

5. July 7: Elites, Partisanship & Domestic Public Opinion

Topic: What is the impact of public opinion on foreign policy rhetoric?

- Berinsky, Adam J. (2007) “Assuming the Costs of War: Events, Elites, and American Public Support for Military Conflict.” *Journal of Politics* 69(4): 975-997.
- Trager, Robert F., and Lynn Vavreck. (2011) “The Political Costs of Crisis Bargaining: Presidential Rhetoric and the Role of Party.” *American Journal of Political Science* 55(3): 526-545.

6. July 8: Exam Day

*** No final exam but Final Paper due in mailbox and through Collab by 1:00 PM, no exceptions.**

* The instructor reserves the right to make changes to the syllabus at any time during the course.