

# DIPLOMACY AND NEGOTIATION

(POLITICAL SCIENCE 3581)



Class Time: Wednesdays, 2:35-5:25pm  
Classroom: Mona Campbell Bldg, Room 1108

Professor: **Brian Bow (brian.bow@dal.ca)**  
Professor's Office: Henry Hicks Academic Admin Bldg, Rm 343  
tel: 494-6629

Office Hours: Wednesdays, 10:00-12:00pm

## Introduction

POLI 3581 is a course on the theory and practice of international diplomacy and negotiation. The main focus is on the understanding, assessment, and application of various theoretical lenses for explaining bargaining strategies, processes and outcomes. Among the various themes to be discussed are: the evolution of the institution of diplomatic norms and practices, the nature of bargaining "power" in international politics, basic game theoretic and rational choice accounts of negotiation, and the role of culture and ideas in international bargaining. Each section of the course looks at a small number of abstract theoretical arguments or discussions, and a handful of more concrete applications of those theoretical ideas to specific historical episodes.

Prior coursework in International Relations (e.g., POLI 2520, 2530) is not a formal prerequisite for this course. However, basic familiarity with IR theory is extremely helpful in this course, and students with no background in IR should talk with me about ways they can "catch up" on the fundamentals.

## Resources

The Brightspace site is the main place to go for information about the course, and it will expand and evolve over the course of the semester. Students should have a good look around on the site at the beginning of the term, and then check it for updates **at least** once per week.

Main functions of the Brightspace site:

- Important course documents like the syllabus and (later in the term) instructions for the in-class simulation exercise.
- Copies of required readings. (There is no textbook for this course.)
- Updates and information from the prof and/or TA to students: e.g., general administrative information, like problems with access to readings or changes to discussion questions; possibly also more important updates like cancelation of class due to bad weather, etc. See the "Announcements" area of the site.

- Submission of some assignments (i.e., papers, simulation report) and posting of individual and class grades.
- Discussion forums for students to communicate with professor and with one another, particularly for the ABC simulation (see below).

### Assignments / assessment

Assignment	Due date	Share of final grade
Matrix (short) paper	February 5	15%
Research (long) paper outline	February 16	5%
Quiz 1	February 28	15%
Quiz 2	March 21	15%
Simulation participation	March 28	10%
Simulation report	April 4	10%
Research (long) paper	April 11	30%

**NOTE** that many of the deadlines for this course are in the last month. To manage your workload and avoid end-of-term disaster, you **must** start working on your research paper early in the term, and study for the two quizzes as we go along.

### Quizzes

This course has traditionally had an end-of-term exam, as a mechanism to reward students who do all of the course reading, and can explain what they've learned. Kind of old-school, and not especially popular, but—I thought—necessary, as a way to make sure students keep up with reading, and are prepared for class discussion. However, I've decided that the exam wasn't working as it should have, and a lot of students were still not consistently doing the reading, and instead relying on end-of-term cramming to get through the exam. This year, we're going to try in-class quizzes, as an alternative way to get everyone to keep up with the reading. There will be two quizzes, at the beginning of class, on **February 28** and **March 21**. For each, you will have 45 minutes to answer three short-answer questions. These questions will cover basic concepts and theories from previous classes. The quizzes should be the kind of thing that will be easy to do (and ought to bring your grades up), as long as you have been consistently keeping up with reading. More details about format and content of the quizzes will be provided on the Brightspace website.

### Matrix (short) paper

For this assignment, you will **use basic game theory to try to explain the process and outcome of bargaining in the Melian Dialogue**, an episode in Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War*. We'll talk about the Melian Dialogue in class on January 24, and about simple game theory in class on January 31. Basically, you'll need to try to figure out what the primary choice was for each of the two main players in the Melian Dialogue, put those choices into a 2x2 game matrix, characterize the bargaining "problem" in that 2x2 game, and then use that to explain the process and outcome of bargaining in this episode. Then, you'll reflect on what new insights your game-theoretic analysis might give us into Thucydides' account of

the Melian Dialogue and/or the limitations of simple 2x2 game theory as a way of understanding international diplomacy.

The matrix paper is due on **February 5**, a few days after the class on simple game theory. Your paper should be about four pages (average 1000 words, absolute maximum 1400 words). More detailed instructions and advice will be provided in the Brightspace site.

### Research (long) paper, and outline

For this assignment, you will **choose one well-documented diplomatic episode** (e.g., the Cuban Missile Crisis, the GATT Uruguay Round, etc.), **and use it as a vehicle for applying and “testing” two or three of the basic theoretical perspectives on bargaining reviewed in the course** (e.g., simple game theory, prospect theory, culture, etc.). Further details about the expectations for the term paper will be provided in the Brightspace site.

The full version of the research paper is due on **April 11**, a week after the final class meeting. Your paper should be about ten pages (average 2500 words, absolute maximum 3500 words). **You will decide for yourself which case study to research, and choose the theoretical perspectives you think most useful in understanding the process and outcome of the negotiations.** You should also offer your own views on the most important lesson(s) to be drawn from your chosen case study, both in terms of the development of general theories of international bargaining and in terms of general advice to diplomatic practitioners.

**You are required to submit two copies of your long paper—a hard copy to be submitted to the Political Science department office, and a digital copy to be submitted via the Brightspace site.** Both are to be submitted by 4:00pm on April 11.

Each student must submit a **one-page outline/proposal** for their term paper, by noon on **February 16**. The outline should be brief and to the point, but it should be presented as complete sentences, rather than bullet points (which are usually too vague). Your outline should provide the following information:

- identify the historical case you plan to examine, being as clear as possible about the relevant players, the issues/interests at stake, and the time period under consideration;
- identify the two or three theoretical perspectives or “factors” that you plan to apply to the case, with some indication as to how you might know whether/how each theory/factor is more or less “useful” to us in explaining the process and outcome in the historical episode you’re focusing on;
- list 5-10 of the most promising sources you’ve found so far.

The outline/proposal is not a binding contract; you can change the sources, theories, or even the case itself after you submit the outline. But it is important to get an early start on the paper, and to have worked your way through all of these questions as soon as possible. **Don’t wait until the outline is due to get started thinking about your paper; come and talk with me about your ideas, whether you feel like you are having a hard time with it or not.**

Do not mix up the short paper with the outline for the long paper. These are two different assignments. (See the “Assignments” table, above).

### Simulation exercise: preparation, participation and simulation report

The course features a number of small group exercises, a few quick “pop-up” simulations, and one 3-hour simulation exercise at the end of the semester. The major simulation is a crisis simulation game that I designed when I first started teaching this course (“the ABC game”). The game was originally designed for 30 students, and the course enrollment in the new format is about 60 students, so we will be splitting into two groups, which will play the game at the same time, in different rooms. (The locations for the two groups’ simulations will be announced later in the semester.)

General instructions for the simulation exercise will be posted on the Brightspace site in late January or early February. **Just after class on March 21, I will post additional information for the simulation, on the Brightspace site**, including more information about the basic game scenario, specific role assignments and personal instructions for each player, and some more practical, logistical information. **Important rule: no player is ever allowed to let other players see his or her role-specific instructions, before or during the simulation.** Not even team-mates or close allies. No one. Never. You can of course *tell* one another things, based on what’s in your instructions, but then it’s up to others to decide whether or not to believe you.

There will also be a set of **discussion forums** in the Brightspace site, to facilitate discussion among players during the period leading up to the simulation. Each student will have a list of other players they are allowed to contact during this period, and all will be encouraged to make contact with those other players, through the week leading up to the simulation, to exchange information and talk strategy with team-mates and allies, or to make preliminary reassurances, threats, etc., with others.

Your simulation participation grade will be based on the quality of your participation in the role-playing exercise, particularly as it reflects your preparation and strategic planning. You should play your role as accurately and effectively as you can, but remember that you don’t necessarily have to “win the game” to do well on this assignment.

After the simulation exercise, you will reflect on what happened in a **simulation report**, which is due by 4:00pm on **April 4**. This will be a **short essay** (1000-1500 words), summarizing what happened in the simulation, and why you think it turned out the way it did: What advantages did you (and your group, if you were part of a group) have at the outset? What disadvantages? What obstacles to effective communication did you experience, and how did you respond to them? What outcome did you expect, and how did that differ from the actual outcome? Etc.

In your simulation reports, try to look at what happened both from your own “first-person” perspective and, as much as possible, from the same kind of objective, “bird’s-eye-view” perspective that we usually take when we look back on real historical events. Make explicit connections, wherever you can, to some of the general theoretical perspectives that we have talked about in class.

**Simulation reports will be submitted on-line**, through the Brightspace site, and will be “published” there (i.e., posted where all students can read them) after they have been graded. If you don’t want your simulation report posted on the site, be sure to let me know that when you submit it.

### General policies concerning assignments, deadlines, and grades

The University Calendar makes plain that "[s]tudents are expected to complete class work by the prescribed deadlines. Only in special circumstances (e.g. the death of a close relative) may an instructor extend such deadlines." **Late assignments will be assessed a late penalty at the instructor's discretion.** Students who miss an assignment deadline on account of illness are expected to hand it in within one week of their return to class, with a medical certificate in hand, per academic regulations in the Dalhousie Calendar.

New university policy for 2017-18: Dalhousie students are asked to take responsibility for their own short-term absences (3 days or less) by contacting their instructor by phone or email prior to the academic requirement deadline or scheduled time and by submitting a completed Student Declaration of Absence to their instructor in case of missed or late academic requirements. Only 2 separate Student Declaration of Absence forms may be submitted per course during a term.  
[https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/dept/university\\_secretariat/policy-repository/StudentAbsenceRegulation\(OCT2017\)v2.pdf](https://cdn.dal.ca/content/dam/dalhousie/pdf/dept/university_secretariat/policy-repository/StudentAbsenceRegulation(OCT2017)v2.pdf)

Assignments not submitted directly to the professor must be submitted in person to the Political Science office between 9:00 and 4:00 on weekdays. (If you submit a paper at the department office, be sure to ask to have it stamped with the date and time.) Neither the professor nor the Department can assume responsibility for assignments submitted by mail, fax, or email.

**Plagiarism** (intentionally or unintentionally representing other people's ideas as your own) is a serious violation of academic ethics, and will be taken very seriously in this class. For more information on what counts as plagiarism, and how to avoid it, refer to the university's academic integrity site (<http://academicintegrity.dal.ca>).

Students are expected to carefully read the academic regulations in the University Calendar, and to make sure that they understand those which might pertain to them. In order to be fair to all students, all of the University's regulations, and all of the course policies outlined above, will be strictly enforced.

The grading thresholds are as follows:

90-100 = A+	77-79.9 = B+	65-69.9 = C+	50-55.9 = D
85-89.9 = A	73-76.9 = B	59-61.9 = C	50 > F
80-84.9 = A-	70-72.9 = B-	56-58.9 = C-	

### Disclaimer

This syllabus is intended as a general guide to course requirements. The instructor reserves the right to reschedule or revise assigned readings, assignments, lecture topics, etc., as necessary.

**CLASS SCHEDULE**

January 10	<b>WHAT IS DIPLOMACY?</b>
Topics/themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foreign policy, diplomacy, and negotiation</li> <li>• Diplomacy in theory and practice</li> </ul>
Required reading	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harold Nicholson, <u>Diplomacy</u> (3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Oxford, 1969), ch. 1.</li> <li>2. Giorgio Shani, "Toward a Post-Western IR: The Umma, Khalsa Panth, and Critical International Relations Theory" <u>International Studies Review</u> 10 (2008).</li> </ol>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Francois de Callieres, <u>On the Manner of Negotiating with Princes</u> (Notre Dame, 1963).</li> <li>• Adam Watson, <u>Diplomacy: The Dialogue Between States</u> (Methuen, 1982), Preface and ch. 1.</li> <li>• I. William Zartman, "Negotiation as a Joint Decision-Making Process" <u>Journal of Conflict Resolution</u> 21 (1977).</li> <li>• Christer Jönsson, "Diplomacy, Bargaining and Negotiation" in Walter Carlsnaes, Thomas Risse and Beth Simmons, eds., <u>Handbook of International Relations</u> (Sage, 2002).</li> <li>• Amitav Acharya, "Dialogue and Discovery: In Search of International Relations Theories Beyond the West" <u>Millennium</u> 39 (2011).</li> </ul>

January 17	<b>THE HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF DIPLOMACY</b>
Topics/themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Essential continuities which define diplomacy</li> <li>• Diplomacy as a way of solving problems specific to time and place</li> <li>• Different "modes" and practices of diplomacy in different historical eras</li> </ul>
In-class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion: Diplomacy, the State, and Citizen</li> </ul>
Required reading	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Harold Nicholson, <u>The Evolution of the Diplomatic Method</u> (Greenwood, 1977), ch. 4.</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Sasson Sofer, "Old and New Diplomacy: A Debate Revisited" <u>Review of International Studies</u> 14 (1998): 195-211.</li> <li>3. Steven Livingston, "The New Media and Transparency: What are the Consequences for Diplomacy?" in Evan H. Potter, ed., <u>Cyber-Diplomacy: Managing Foreign Policy in the Twenty-First Century</u> (McGill/Queens, 2002). [Dal eBook]</li> <li>4. Jan Melisson, "Public Diplomacy," in Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, and Ramesh Thakur, eds., <u>The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy</u> (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).</li> </ol>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Garrett Mattingly, <u>Renaissance Diplomacy</u> (Courier/Dover, 1988).</li> <li>• Henry Kissinger, <u>Diplomacy</u> (Simon and Schuster, 1994), chs. 4 &amp; 9.</li> <li>• Keith Hamilton and Richard Langhorne, <u>The Practice of Diplomacy: Its Evolution, Theory, and Administration</u> (Routledge, 1995), ch. 7.</li> </ul>

<b>January 24</b>	<b>POWER</b>
Topics/themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does power asymmetry make diplomacy irrelevant?</li> <li>• How do big states get what they want from small states? How do small states get what they want from big states?</li> </ul>
In-class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion: Defining "power"</li> </ul>
Required reading	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thucydides, "The Melian Dialogue," from <u>History of the Peloponnesian War</u> (Penguin, 1979).</li> <li>2. G. John Ikenberry, "Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Persistence of American Postwar Order," <u>International Security</u> 23 (1998).</li> <li>3. Michael Barnett &amp; Raymond Duvall, "Power in International Politics," <u>International Organization</u> 59 (2005).</li> <li>4. Gregory Chin, "The Economic Diplomacy of the Rising Powers," in Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, and Ramesh Thakur, eds., <u>The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy</u> (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).</li> </ol>

<p>Recommended reading</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I. William Zartman and Jeffrey Z. Rubin, "The Study of Power and the Practice of Negotiation," in Zartman and Rubin, eds., <u>Power and Negotiation</u> (Michigan, 2000), but only skim after the middle of p. 14.</li> <li>• Robert O. Keohane, "The Big Influence of Small Allies" <u>Foreign Policy</u> 2 (1971).</li> <li>• William Mark Habeeb, <u>Power and Tactics in International Negotiation</u> (Johns Hopkins, 1988), chs. 2, 4.</li> <li>• G. John Ikenberry and Charles A. Kupchan, "Socialization and Hegemonic Power" <u>International Organization</u> 44 (1990).</li> <li>• Thomas Risse-Kappen, <u>Cooperation among Democracies: The European Influence on US Foreign Policy</u> (Princeton, 1995).</li> <li>• John Ravenhill, "Cycles of Middle Power Activism: Constraint and Choice in Australian and Canadian Foreign Policies," <u>Australian Journal of International Affairs</u> 52 (1998).</li> </ul>
<p>Other stuff (recommended)</p>	<p>"The Mouse that Roared" (1959): A British comedy from the early Cold War era, which tells the story of a tiny European country which decides to cope with an economic crisis by declaring war on the United States. Generally pretty silly, but raises some interesting questions about the nature of power/leverage in international diplomacy.</p>

<p>January 31</p>	<p><b>RATIONAL CHOICE, PART 1: SIMPLE STRATEGIC BARGAINING</b></p>
<p>Deadline reminder</p>	<p>Matrix paper due February 5 (see above)</p>
<p>Topics/themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Negotiation as rational/strategic choice</li> <li>• Assessing and modifying "utilities"</li> </ul>
<p>In-class</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bargaining games: PD &amp; Chicken game series</li> </ul>
<p>Required reading</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thomas C. Schelling, "An Essay on Bargaining" in <u>The Strategy of Conflict</u> (Harvard, 1960).</li> <li>2. Kenneth A. Oye, "Explaining Cooperation under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies" <u>World Politics</u> 38 (1985).</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. R. Harrison Wagner, "Economic Interdependence, Bargaining Power, and Political Influence" <u>International Organization</u> 42 (1988).</li> <li>4. Stephen J. DeCanio and Anders Fremstad, "Game Theory and Climate Diplomacy," <u>Ecological Economics</u> 90 (2013): 177-187.</li> </ol>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fred C. Ikle and Nathan Leites, "Political Negotiation as a Process of Modifying Utilities" <u>Journal of Conflict Resolution</u> 6 (1962).</li> <li>• Arthur Stein, "The Politics of Linkage" <u>World Politics</u> 33 (1980).</li> <li>• Steven J. Brams, <u>Negotiation Games: Applying Game Theory to Bargaining and Arbitration</u> (Routledge, 2003), chs. 4, 5.</li> <li>• Kaveh Madani, "Modeling International Climate Change Negotiations More Responsibly: Can Highly Simplified Game Theory Models Provide Reliable Policy Insights?" <u>Ecological Economics</u> 90 (2013): 68-76. [reply to DeCanio &amp; Fremstad, above]</li> <li>• Ronald Brownstein, "How Donald Trump is Negotiating Like a Hostage-Taker," <u>CNN.com</u>, October 17, 2017. <a href="http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/17/politics/donald-trump-negotiating-strategy/index.html">http://www.cnn.com/2017/10/17/politics/donald-trump-negotiating-strategy/index.html</a></li> </ul>
Other stuff (recommended)	<p>"Dr. Strangelove" (1964): An American comedy from the early Cold War era, which reflects on the absurdities of nuclear deterrence. Useful for thinking about the connection between self-control and the credibility of commitments.</p>

<b>February 7</b>	<b>RATIONAL CHOICE, PART 2: COMPLEX STRATEGIC BARGAINING</b>
<b>Deadline reminder</b>	Matrix paper due February 5 (see above)
Topics/themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Domestic politics as constraint, leverage, complication</li> <li>• Re-thinking the relationship between I.R. theory and diplomacy</li> </ul>
In-class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bargaining games: Treaty Ratification game series</li> </ul>
Required reading	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Robert D. Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games" <u>International Organization</u> 42 (1988).</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. James D. Fearon, "Domestic Political Audience Costs and the Escalation of Disputes" <u>American Political Science Review</u> 88 (1994).</li> <li>3. James D. Morrow, "Signaling Difficulties with Linkage in Crisis Bargaining" <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 36 (1992).</li> </ol>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• James K. Sebenius, "Negotiation Arithmetic: Adding and Subtracting Issues and Parties" <u>International Organization</u> 37 (1983).</li> <li>• Frederick W. Mayer, "Managing Domestic Differences in International Negotiations: The Strategic Use of Internal Side-Payments" <u>International Organization</u> 46 (1992).</li> <li>• Janice Gross Stein, "The Political Economy of Security Agreements: The Linked Costs of Failure at Camp David" in Harold K. Jacobsen, et al., eds., <u>Double-Edged Diplomacy: International Bargaining and Domestic Politics</u> (California, 1993). [Dal eBook]</li> <li>• Jeffrey W. Knopf, "Beyond Two-Level Games," <u>International Organization</u> 47 (1993).</li> </ul>
Other stuff (recommended)	<p>"Gore vs Perot: The NAFTA Debate" (November 10, 1993): A special episode of <i>Larry King Live</i>, in which Vice President Al Gore debated upstart presidential candidate Ross Perot over NAFTA. Widely seen to have been a turning point for public attitudes toward the agreement, and the election itself. Useful for thinking about the shaping of domestic political constraints in connection with international negotiations.</p>

<b>February 14</b>	<b>PSYCHOLOGY</b>
<b>Deadline reminder</b>	term paper outline due February 16 (see above)
Topics/themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceptions and reality</li> <li>• Rationality, revisited</li> </ul>
In-class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bargaining games: Chicken game series, again</li> </ul>
Required reading	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Jack Snyder, "Rationality at the Brink: The Role of Cognitive Processes in Failures of Deterrence" <u>World Politics</u> 30 (1978).</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Mark L. Haas, "Prospect Theory and the Cuban Missile Crisis" <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 45 (2001).</li> <li>3. Esra Cuhadar and Bruce Dayton, "The Social Psychology of Identity and Inter-group Conflict: From Theory to Practice," <u>International Studies Perspectives</u> 12 (2011).</li> <li>4. Jonathan Mercer, "Emotion and Strategy in the Korean War," <u>International Organization</u> 67 (2013).</li> </ol>
<p>Recommended reading</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irving L. Janis, <u>Victims of Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Foreign Policy Decisions and Fiascoes</u> (1983), chs. 1-2.</li> <li>• Fen Osler Hampson, "The Divided Decision-Maker: American Domestic Politics and the Cuban Missile Crisis" <u>International Security</u> 9 (1984).</li> <li>• Jonathan Mercer, "Anarchy and Identity" <u>International Organization</u> 49 (1995).</li> <li>• Jack S. Levy, "Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations" <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 41 (1997).</li> </ul>
<p>Other stuff (recommended)</p>	<p>"Twelve Angry Men" (1957): An American courtroom drama, which tells the story of a jury struggling to agree on a verdict in the case of a young man accused of murdering his father. Brings up a number of different cognitive and affective distortions often seen in decision-making under stress.</p>

<p><b>February 21</b></p>	<p>STUDY BREAK – NO CLASS MEETING</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work on your term papers!</li> </ul>

<p><b>February 28</b></p>	<p><b>CULTURE</b></p>
<p><b>Quiz #1</b></p>	<p>History, power, rational choice, psychology, culture</p>
<p>Topics/themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do different countries have different approaches to diplomacy? If so, why? Are these differences important?</li> <li>• What are some of the theoretical, methodological, and ethical complications with using culture to explain the process and outcomes of international diplomacy?</li> </ul>

In-class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion: does culture matter? When/how?</li> </ul>
Required reading	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Raymond F. Smith, <u>Negotiating with the Soviets</u> (Indiana, 1989), chs. 1-2.</li> <li>2. Amitav Acharya, "Ideas, Identity and Institution-Building: From the ASEAN Way to the Asia-Pacific Way," <u>Pacific Review</u> 10 (1997).</li> <li>3. Robert Kagan, "Power and Weakness" <u>Policy Review</u> 113 (2002).</li> <li>4. Costas M. Constantinou, "Everyday Diplomacy: Mission, Spectacle and the Remaking of Diplomatic Culture," in Jason Dittmer &amp; Fiona McConnell, eds., <u>Diplomatic Cultures and International Politics</u> (Routledge, 2016).</li> </ol>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Raymond F. Cohen, <u>Negotiating Across Cultures: International Communication in an Interdependent World</u> (USIP, 1997), chs. 2-3.</li> <li>• Christopher Hemmer and Peter J. Katzenstein, "Why Is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism," <u>International Organization</u> 56 (2002): 575-607.</li> <li>• Denis Stairs, "The Political Culture of Canadian Foreign Policy," <u>Canadian Journal of Political Science</u> 15 (1982).</li> <li>• Leonard J. Schoppa, "The Social Context in Coercive International Bargaining" <u>International Organization</u> 53 (1999).</li> <li>• Joseph Nye, "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power," <u>Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science</u> 616 (2008).</li> </ul>
Other stuff (recommended)	<p>"Rising Sun" (1993): An American drama, which is a pretty terrible film, but which might be worth watching here, because it tries to think seriously about inter-cultural negotiation, and, as a bonus, has some points to make about race and politics.</p>

<b>March 7</b>	<b>MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATION</b>
Topics/themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is multilateral bargaining different from bilateral? If so, how, exactly?</li> <li>• How does "power" come into play in multilateral negotiations?</li> <li>• When is multilateral negotiation mostly likely to be successful?</li> </ul>
In-class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bargaining game: multilateral treaty negotiation game</li> </ul>

<p>Required reading</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lisa Martin, "Interests, Power, and Multilateralism" <u>International Organization</u> 46 (1992).</li> <li>2. Christophe Dupont, "Negotiation as Coalition-Building" <u>International Negotiation</u> 1 (1996).</li> <li>3. Michael Barnett &amp; Martha Finnemore, "The Politics, Power and Pathologies of International Institutions" <u>International Organization</u> 53 (1999).</li> <li>4. Margaret P. Karns and Karen A. Mingst, "International Organizations and Diplomacy," in Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, and Ramesh Thakur, eds., <u>The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy</u> (Oxford University Press, 2013).</li> </ol>
<p>Recommended reading</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Miles Kahler, "Multilateralism with Small and Large Numbers" <u>International Organization</u> 46 (1992).</li> <li>• Fen Osler Hampson, with Michael Hart, <u>Multilateral Negotiations: Lessons from Arms Control, Trade, and the Environment</u> (Johns Hopkins, 1995), chs. 1, 11.</li> <li>• Karen Mingst and Craig Warkentin, "What Difference Does Culture Make in Multilateral Negotiations?" <u>Global Governance</u> 2 (1996).</li> <li>• Kal Raustiala, "The Architecture of International Cooperation," <u>Virginia Journal of International Law</u> 43 (2002).</li> <li>• Norichika Kanie, "Leadership in Multilateral Negotiation and Domestic Policy: The Netherlands at the Kyoto Protocol Negotiation," <u>International Negotiation</u> 8 (2003).</li> </ul>

<p><b>March 21</b></p>	<p><b>THE FUTURE OF DIPLOMACY</b></p>
<p>Topics/themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Globalization, the State, and diplomacy</li> <li>• Transgovernmental networks</li> <li>• Technocracy vs democracy</li> </ul>
<p>In-class</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion: can we hold on to the classical model of diplomacy?</li> </ul>
<p>Required reading</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Crister Jönsson, et al., "Negotiations in Networks in the European Union," <u>International Negotiation</u> 3 (1998).</li> </ol>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Andrew Moravcsik, "In Defence of the 'Democratic Deficit': Reassessing Legitimacy in the European Union" <u>Journal of Common Market Studies</u> 40 (2002).</li> <li>3. Justin Rosenberg, "Globalization Theory: A Post-Mortem" <u>International Politics</u> 42 (2005).</li> <li>4. Leonard Seabrooke, "Diplomacy as Economic Consultancy" in O.J. Sending, Vincent Pouliot, and Iver Neumann, eds., <u>Diplomacy: The Making of World Politics</u> (Cambridge University Press, 2015).</li> </ol>
<p>Recommended reading</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stephen Gill, "Globalisation, Market Civilisation, and Disciplinary Neoliberalism" <u>Millennium</u> 24 (1995).</li> <li>• Leonard Seabrooke, "The Economic Taproot of US Imperialism: The Bush Rentier Shift" <u>International Politics</u> 41 (2004).</li> <li>• Geoffrey Allen Pigman, "The Diplomacy of Global and Transnational Firms," in Andrew F. Cooper, Jorge Heine, and Ramesh Thakur, eds., <u>The Oxford Handbook of Modern Diplomacy</u> (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).</li> </ul>

<p><b>March 21</b></p>	<p><b>FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE</b></p>
<p><b>Quiz #2</b></p>	<p>Everything (but <i>mostly</i> themes covered <i>after</i> Quiz #1)</p>
<p>Topics/themes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The relationship between theory &amp; practice</li> <li>• General "how-to" advice for negotiators</li> </ul>
<p>In-class</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion: "Getting to Yes" vs "The Art of the Deal"</li> </ul>
<p>Required reading</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Roger Fisher &amp; William Ury, "The Method" (Part II), in <u>Getting to Yes: Negotiating an Agreement without Giving In</u> (2nd ed., Random House, 1996).</li> <li>2. Natalie B. Florea, et al., "Negotiating from Mars to Venus: Gender in Simulated International Negotiations," <u>Simulation and Gaming</u> 34 (2003): 226-248.</li> <li>3. Peter Economy, "11 Winning Negotiation Tactics from Donald Trump's 'The Art of the Deal'" <u>inc.com</u>, May 7, 2016. <a href="https://www.inc.com/peter-">https://www.inc.com/peter-</a></li> </ol>

	<a href="#">economy/11-winning-negotiation-tactics-from-trump-s-art-of-the-deal.html</a>
Recommended reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Richard Ned Lebow, <u>The Art of Bargaining</u> (Johns Hopkins, 1996), esp. chs. 1-4.</li> <li>• Winston Churchill, <u>The Second World War, Vol. 2: The Gathering Storm</u> (Mariner, 1986).</li> <li>• Robert S. McNamara, <u>In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam</u> (Vintage, 1996).</li> <li>• Allan Gotlieb, <u>The Washington Diaries, 1981-1989</u> (McClelland &amp; Stewart, 2007).</li> <li>• Mark A. Boyer, et al. "Gender and Negotiation: Some Experimental Findings from an International Negotiation Simulation," <u>International Studies Quarterly</u> 53 (2009): 23-47.</li> <li>• "CEOs React to 'The Art of the Deal'," <u>Vanity Fair</u>, November 6, 2017. <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mCvyHzoNkA4&amp;feature=youtu.be">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mCvyHzoNkA4&amp;feature=youtu.be</a></li> </ul>
Other stuff (recommended)	"Thank You for Smoking" (2006): An American comedy, which touches on a variety of themes not easily accommodated within social science theories about negotiation: persuasion, principles/truth, deception, reputation, etc.

<b>March 28</b>	<b>CRISIS BARGAINING SIMULATION (CHEB 140 &amp; 150)</b>
Required reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GENERAL SIMULATION INSTRUCTIONS – Brightspace</li> <li>• ROLE-SPECIFIC SIMULATION INSTRUCTIONS – Brightspace</li> </ul>

<b>April 4</b>	<b>POST-SIMULATION / WRAP-UP</b>
	simulation report due April 8 (see above)
Topics/themes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What happened in the simulation exercise and why?</li> <li>• Course evaluations</li> </ul>

<p>Other stuff (recommended)</p>	<p>“Rashomon” (1950): A Japanese drama from the early post-war era, which explores subjectivity, trust, and human nature. Useful in connection with your simulation reports, for thinking about the divergence of players’ perceptions of the simulation, and how we can work out—collectively and individually—what happened and why.</p>
--------------------------------------	--

## Additional information on policies and resources

### University resources

- Catalogue of student services: [https://www.dal.ca/current\\_students.html](https://www.dal.ca/current_students.html)
- Library online research guides: <http://dal.ca.libguides.com/>
- Writing Centre: [https://www.dal.ca/campus\\_life/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills.html](https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills.html)

### Deadlines and submission requirements

The University Calendar makes plain that “[s]tudents are expected to complete class work by the prescribed deadlines. Only in special circumstances (e.g. the death of a close relative) may an instructor extend such deadlines.” **Late term papers will be assessed a penalty of one mark (out of 30) per day.** If you miss the term paper deadline on account of illness, you must hand it in within one week of your return to class, with a copy of a medical certificate, per academic regulations in the Dalhousie Calendar.

Essays not submitted directly to the professor must be submitted in person to the Political Science office (if the office is open, hand the paper to the secretary, and ask to have it stamped with date and time; if the office is not open, put the paper in the after-hours drop-box). Neither the professor nor the Department can assume responsibility for papers submitted by mail, fax, or email. Do not submit papers to teaching assistants.

Note that the deadline to drop the course *without* a “W” on your transcript is February 5; the deadline to drop the course *with* a “W” is March 12. For more information on dropping courses, see: [https://www.dal.ca/campus\\_life/academic-support/selecting-your-classes/dropping-classes.html](https://www.dal.ca/campus_life/academic-support/selecting-your-classes/dropping-classes.html)

### Accommodation Statement

Students may request accommodation as a result of barriers experienced related to disability, religious obligation, or any characteristic protected under Canadian human rights legislation.

Students who require academic accommodation for either classroom participation or the writing of tests and exams should make their request to the Advising and Access Services Center (AASC) prior to or at the outset of the regular academic year. Please visit [www.dal.ca/access](http://www.dal.ca/access) for more information and to obtain the Request for Accommodation form.

A note taker may be required as part of a student's accommodation. There is an honorarium of \$75/course/term (with some exceptions). If you are interested, please contact AASC at 902-494-2836 for more information or send an email to [notetaking@dal.ca](mailto:notetaking@dal.ca)

Please note that your classroom may contain specialized accessible furniture and equipment. It is important that these items remain in the classroom, untouched, so that students who require their usage will be able to fully participate in the class.

### Academic Integrity

At Dalhousie University, we are guided in all of our work by the values of academic integrity: honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility and respect (The Center for Academic Integrity, Duke University, 1999). As a student, you are required to demonstrate these values in all of the work you do. The University provides policies and procedures that every member of the university community is required to follow to ensure academic integrity.

At university, we advance knowledge by building on the work of other people. Academic integrity means that we are honest and accurate in creating and communicating all academic products. Acknowledgement of other people's work must be done in a way that does not leave the reader in any doubt as to whose work it is. Academic integrity means trustworthy conduct such as not cheating on examinations and not misrepresenting information. It is the student's responsibility to seek assistance to ensure that these standards are met.

We must all work together to prevent academic dishonesty because it is unfair to honest students. The following are some ways that you can achieve academic integrity; some may not be applicable in all circumstances.

- Make sure you understand Dalhousie's policies on academic integrity (<http://academicintegrity.dal.ca/Policies/>)
- Do not cheat in examinations or write an exam or test for someone else
- Do not falsify data or lab results
- Be sure not to plagiarize, intentionally or unintentionally, for example...
  - Clearly indicate the sources used in your written or oral work. This includes computer codes/ programs, artistic or architectural works, scientific projects, performances, web page designs, graphical representations, diagrams, videos, and images
  - Do not use the work of another from the Internet or any other source and submit it as your own
  - When you use the ideas of other people (paraphrasing), make sure to acknowledge the source
  - Do not submit work that has been completed through collaboration or previously submitted for another assignment without permission from your instructor (These examples should be considered only as a guide and not an exhaustive list.)

If you are ever unsure about any aspect of your academic work, contact the professor or TA. For more information and advice, consult:

- Academic Integrity website <http://academicintegrity.dal.ca/>: links to policies, definitions, online tutorials, tips on citing and paraphrasing
- Writing Centre ([http://www.dal.ca/campus\\_life/student\\_services/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills.html](http://www.dal.ca/campus_life/student_services/academic-support/writing-and-study-skills.html)): assistance with learning to write academic documents, reviewing papers for discipline-specific writing standards, organization, argument, transitions, writing styles and citations
- Dalhousie Libraries Workshops (<http://libraries.dal.ca/>): online tutorials, citation guides, Assignment Calculator, RefWorks
- Dalhousie Student Advocacy Service (<http://studentservices.dal.ca/services/advocacy.html>): assists students with academic appeals and student discipline procedures.
- Senate Office (<http://senate.dal.ca>): list of Academic Integrity Officers, discipline flowchart, Senate Discipline Committee

Instructors are required to report every suspected offence. The process is outlined in the Faculty Discipline Flow Chart

([http://senate.dal.ca/Files/AIO\\_/AcademicDisciplineProcess\\_Flowchart\\_updated\\_July\\_2011.pdf](http://senate.dal.ca/Files/AIO_/AcademicDisciplineProcess_Flowchart_updated_July_2011.pdf)) and includes the following:

- Each Faculty has an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) who receives allegations from instructors
- Based on the evidence provided, the AIO decides if there is evidence to proceed with the allegation and you will be notified of the process
- If the case proceeds, you will receive a PENDING grade until the matter is resolved
- If you are found guilty of an offence, a penalty will be assigned ranging from a warning, to failure of the assignment or failure of the class, to expulsion from the University. Penalties may also include a notation on your transcript that indicates that you have committed an academic offence. Updated August 2011.

When in doubt...

If you have questions about anything in the syllabus, or anything that's not in the syllabus, email the professor at [brian.bow@dal.ca](mailto:brian.bow@dal.ca)