
Political Science 441: Foreign Policy

Summer 2011

Department of Political Science
Boğaziçi University

Burak Kadercan
IB 502, phone: x6803
kadercan@uchicago.edu

Office Hours:
M / Thu 11-12
Or By Appointment

Teaching Assistant:
Gokcen Yilmaz
gkcnymz@gmail.com
IB 208, x6805

Course Definition

Modern international politics, despite the rising influence of non-state actors, is still an arena that is dominated by states and their interaction with each other. How states interact with each other, in turn, is a function of particular foreign policy preferences and choices. This course deals with a simple -- yet extremely important -- question: where do these foreign policy preferences and choices come from? In other words, how do states make foreign policy? Answering this question has been one of the priorities of students of international relations at least since the time of Thucydides (5th century BC). This almost elemental question, or problematique, of international politics involves addressing a number of key dynamics that may play into the foreign policy outcomes such as the relationship between rationality and psychological biases as well as emotions, the roles that organizational and bureaucratic dynamics play in policy choices, crisis diplomacy as well as the controversial concept of “coercive diplomacy”, the particular impacts of lobbying, leadership style, regime type, and culture on foreign policy.

While POLS 441 can be accepted as a rigorous introduction to the study of comparative foreign policy, we will spend considerable time and energy in applying the analytical tools that we cover to the case of Turkish foreign policy.

We will re-think our assumptions about the key players as well as about the roles that history and institutions, not to mention ideas and cultural trends, have played and continue to play in Turkish foreign policy. We will also tackle some of the “hard

questions” that Turkey faces in the 21 century, most of which involve its unique position -- both geostrategic and cultural -- as a bridge between the West and the East.

The course is organized in four main sections. The first section introduces the key concepts and frameworks that are utilized in the study and practice of foreign policy. In the second section, we will cover some of the prominent theories of and perspectives in foreign policy. The third section involves a detailed inquiry into the relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy decisions. The fourth and the final section focuses on the past, present, and future of Turkish foreign policy. In this final part of the course, we will make use of the insights extracted from the first three sections in order to construct analytical guidelines that will help us evaluate the challenges and opportunities that surround Turkish foreign policy in the 21st century.

Evaluation

The final grade will be determined by three factors: class participation (20%), analytical response papers (30%), and a final exam (50%).

1. *Participation* (20%)

There will be three components of the participation grade: i) attendance; ii) participation in class discussion; iii) student presentation.

Attendance: Regular attendance is mandatory. If you are absent or plan to be absent, please try to contact me within the same week. Serial and/or chronic absence – unless you provide a reasonable explanation (e.g., medical problems and family emergencies) – can significantly lower your participation grade. As a rule of thumb, more than 3 unexcused absences will work against your participation grade.

Discussion: This course is designed as half-lecture / half-seminar, which implies that you are expected to actively participate in class discussion. A very important objective of this course is to facilitate your skills in at least three areas: i) engaging others’ opinions; ii) voicing your own ideas in a convincing manner before your peers; iii) developing an “open mind” where you can learn from the experiences and ideas of your peers. Accordingly, I expect you to contribute to the on-going discussions in class. If you have a question about the reading material or if some concept or a statement during the discussion sounds confusing, do not hesitate to ask questions. If you have an opinion about a subject or if you want to share your experiences or your knowledge about an issue with your classmates do not hold back. Needless to say, all class discussions should take place in a constructive environment; you should not hesitate to – intellectually - challenge your friends or your instructor, but it is of utmost importance that you do it within the borders of empathy and mutual respect.

A NOTE OF CAUTION: I recognize that the reading material, especially given that most of you are not native-speakers of English, can sometimes be challenging. If you cannot understand an argument because of a concept or a word, your best friend would

be your dictionary. If you cannot completely digest an argument because of the language, you will not be a competitive discussant in class. This may be a challenge, but in order to succeed in this course, and in international relations, you need to develop excellent comprehensive skills. On a similar note - during the lectures, if you hear a concept/word/phrase from me that does not make sense, let me know immediately. I most definitely will not hold it against you.

Student Presentations: In selected sessions (marked in the syllabus), students will make presentations on select articles that focus on individual “case studies.” Details will be discussed as we go along.

2. Analytical Response Papers (30%)

You will be asked to write 3 short essays (3 pages each, double-spaced, standard font & borders) on 1 or more of the assigned readings for the week.

**These assignments will involve the task of connecting the class material to the past and present of Turkish foreign policy, so, while going over the reading material, make sure to constantly think about the possible implications of the reading material for making sense of Turkish foreign policy!*

Sample questions:

Example 1:

How can we make use of the three images of IR in order to explain the Turkish decision to send military forces to Cyprus in 1974? In other words, what would a first image, second image, and third image explanation look like?

Example 2:

Do you agree or disagree with the proposition that leadership actually matters in Turkish foreign policy? Position your answer vis-à-vis the case of Mavi Marmara; do you think that another leader, say, Bulent Ecevit or Suleyman Demirel, would have acted differently with respect to the crisis surrounding the flotilla?

Think of these assignments as sort of “pop quizzes” with a very long fuse; I will announce them in class on without warning and you will be required to turn them in the next 3 school-days (e.g., if you receive the question on Tuesday, it will be due by Friday). The syllabus includes some of the potential questions with regard to these short essays, but the actual questions or dates may differ. These essays will involve i) the material we just covered that week; ii) material for the next week; iii) or both – so make sure to stay on top of the readings.

No email submissions. Except for emergencies, I will accept only paper copies. Policy for unexcused late submissions is as follows: 1/3 of a letter grade will be reduced from

the overall paper grade for each day (e.g., from A to A-, per each day).

ALSO!..

I am assuming that you are all internet-literate! Websites that may be helpful in keeping up with the news of the day, which will come handy while tackling the analytical response papers:

- The New York Times, www.nytimes.com
- BBC World News, www.bbc.co.uk
- The Financial Times, www.ft.com
- The Wall Street Journal, www.wsj.com
- The Washington Post, www.washingtonpost.com
- National Public Radio, www.npr.org

3. Final Exam (50%)

Final exam will be in-class. Exam will be comprised of two parts: i) ID (identification) questions, where you are supposed to define a concept in context with a short paragraph; ii) essays. There will be 12 IDs on the exam and you will choose 10 to answer; you will have 3 essay questions, 2 of which you are supposed to answer. The exam will be comprehensive (another reason why it's a good idea to stay on top of readings and lectures & class discussion).

Grading Policy

There is no curve for this class.

Texts

There is no required textbook for this class. The course package will be available for purchase at **Günel Fotokopi**.

Study Tips

In simple terms, check the course website [blogspot page I will create for the class] regularly. Every weekend I will post short tips on how to tackle the reading material of the week.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of keeping up with the readings. If you encounter problems getting through the material, you are most welcome to come and see me during office hours.

Academic Honesty

As members of Bogazici University, I expect you to abide by the campus honor code on issues such as plagiarism and any other serious academic violation. There will be absolutely no tolerance for such violations.

Course Schedule

PART 1: CONCEPTS & FRAMEWORKS

1.a. Organizational Meeting and Overview

- Buzan, Barry. "The Levels of Analysis Problem in IR Reconsidered." In Ken Booth and Steve Smith eds., *International Relations Theory Today*. London: Polity Press, 1994.

1.b. Levels of Analysis: International System versus Domestic Politics

- Mearsheimer, John J. "Structural Realism." In Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith, eds., *International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Rose, Giddens. "Neoclassical Realism and Theories of Foreign Policy." *World Politics* 51.1 (1998): 144-72.

1.c. What is "decision-making"?

- Hagan, Joe D. "Does Decision Making Matter? Systematic Assumptions vs. Historical Reality in International Relations Theory." *International Studies Review* 3.2 (2001): 5-46.
- March, James G. "Limited Rationality." In March ed., *A Primer on Decision Making: How Decisions Happen*. New York: Free Press, 1994. (Chapter 1)
- Hudson, Valerie M. "Foreign Policy Decision-Making: A Touchstone for International Relations Theory in the Twenty-First Century." In Richard C. Snyder, H.W. Bruck, and Burton Sapin eds., *Foreign Policy Decision-Making*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

PART 2: THEORIES OF FOREIGN POLICY

2.a. Foreign Policy and International Relations Theory: An Overview

- Smith, Steve. "Theories of Foreign Policy: An Historical Overview." *Review of International Studies* 12.1 (1986): 13-29.
- Everyone should bring a newspaper to class, having read the foreign policy section!

2.b. Rational Actor Model

- Allison, Graham T., and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: Longman, 1999. (Intro & chapter 1)
- Hermann, Margaret G. and Charles F. Hermann, "Who Makes Foreign Policy Decisions and How: An Empirical Inquiry." *International Studies Quarterly* 33 (1989): 361-87.

2.c. Psychological Factors, Emotions, and Rationality

- Levy, Jack S. "Prospect Theory, Rational Choice, and International Relations." *International Studies Quarterly* 41.1 (1997): 87-112
- Jervis, Robert. *Perception and Misperception in International Politics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1976. (Chapter 1)
- Crawford, Neta C. "The Passion of World Politics: Propositions on Emotion and Emotional Relationships." *International Security* 24.4 (2000): 116-56.

2.d. Bureaucratic and Organizational Theories

- Allison, Graham T., and Philip Zelikow. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*. New York: Longman, 1999. (Chapter 3, 5, 7)
- Levy, Jack S. "Organizational Routines and the Causes of War," *International Studies Quarterly* 30. 2 (1986): 193-222.

2.e. Coercive Diplomacy

- Schelling, Thomas C. *Arms and Influence: with a New Preface and Afterward*. New Haven, CT: Yale UP, 2008. (Chapter 1)

- George, Alexander L., William E. Simons, David Kent. Hall, and Alexander L. George. *The Limits of Coercive Diplomacy*. Boulder: Westview, 1994. (Chapters 1, 2)

PART 3: DOMESTIC POLITICS OF FOREIGN POLICY

3.a. Do Leaders Matter?

- Hermann, Margaret G. and Joe D. Hagan. "International Decision Making: Leadership Matters." *Foreign Policy* 110 (1998): 124-137.
- Dyson, Stephen. "Personality and Foreign Policy: Tony Blair's Iraq Decisions", *Foreign Policy Analysis* 2. 3 (2006): 289-306
- Hermann, Margaret G., Thomas Preston, Baghat Korany, and Timothy M. Shaw. "Who Leads Matters: The Effects of Powerful Individuals." *International Studies Review* 3.2 (2001): 83-131.

3.b. Ideas, Culture, and Foreign Policy

- Houghton, David Patrick. "Reinvigorating the Study of Foreign Policy Decision Making: Toward a Constructivist Approach." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 3.1 (2007): 24-45.
- Checkel, Jeffrey. "Ideas, Institutions, and the Gorbachev Foreign Policy Revolution." *World Politics* 45 (1993): 271-300.
- Duffield, John S. "Political Culture and State Behavior: Why Germany Confounds Neorealism" *International Organization* 53.4 (1999): 765-803.

3.c. Regime Type: Are Democracies Different?

- Owen, John. "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace." *International Security* 19. 2 (1994): 87-125.
- Russett, B. 1993. *Grasping the Democratic Peace*. Chapters 1-2; pp. 3-42.

3.d. Public Opinion, Coalitions, and Lobbies

- Jacobs, Lawrence R., and Benjamin I. Page. "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *American Political Science Review* 99.01 (2005): 107-123.

- Kaufmann, Chaim. "Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas: The Selling of the Iraq War." *International Security* 29.1 (2004): 5-48.
- Walt, Stephen and John J Mearsheimer. "The Israel Lobby." *The London Review of Books* (2006). Available online.

3.e. Further Case Studies (Student Presentations)

- Kaarbo, Juliet. "Power and Influence in Foreign Policy Decision Making: The Role of Junior Coalition Partners in German and Israeli Foreign Policy." *International Studies Quarterly* 40. 4 (1996): 501-530.
- Ikenberry, G. John, David A. Lake, and Michael Mastanduno. "Introduction: Approaches to Explaining American Foreign Economic Policy." *International Organization* 42.01 (1988): 1-14.
- Bukkvoll, Tor. "Putin's Strategic Partnership with the West: The Domestic Politics of Russian Foreign Policy." *Comparative Strategy* 22.3 (2003): 223-248.:
- Waxman, Dov. "Israel's Dilemma: Unity or Peace?" *Israel Affairs* 12.2 (2006): 200-220..
- Berger, Thomas. "From Sword to Chrysanthemum: Japan's Culture of Anti-Militarism." *International Security* 17. 4 (1993): 119-50 .
- Bowen, Norman. "France, Europe, and the Mediterranean in a Sarkozy Presidency." *Mediterranean Quarterly* 18. 4 (2007): 1-16.

PART 4: TURKISH FOREIGN POLICY

4.a. Legacy of the Ottoman Empire

- Davison, Roderic. "Ottoman Diplomacy and Its Legacy." In Carl Brown ed., *Imperial Legacy*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1996.
- Hale, William M. *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000*. London: Frank Cass, 2000. [pp.16-60]

4.b. 1923-1947: Early Republican Era

- Hale, William M. *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000*. London: Frank Cass, 2000. [Chapter 3]
- Deringil, Selim. *Turkish Foreign Policy during the Second World War: An "active" Neutrality*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. [Introduction, Conclusion, Chapters 8 & 11]

4.c. 1947-1990: Turkey and the Cold War

- Kubicek, Paul. "Turkey's Inclusion in the Atlantic Community: Looking Back, Looking Forward." *Turkish Studies* 9.1 (2008), 21-36.
- Hale, William M. *Turkish Foreign Policy, 1774-2000*. London: Frank Cass, 2000. [Chapter 4 & 5]
- Leffler, MP. "Strategy, Diplomacy, and the Cold War: The United States, Turkey, and NATO, 1945-1952." *The Journal of American History* 71.4 (1985): 807-825.

4.d. 1990-present: Turkish Foreign Policy in the "New World Order" (student presentations)

- Sayarı, Sabri. "Turkey: The Changing European Security Environment and the Gulf Crisis." *The Middle East Journal* 46.1 (1992): 9-21.
- Makovsky, Alan. "The New Activism in Turkish Foreign Policy." *SAIS Review* 19.1 (1999): 92-113.
- Tayfur, M. Fatih and Korel Göymen. "Decision-Making in Turkish Foreign Policy: The Caspian Oil Pipeline Issue." *Middle Eastern Studies* 38.2 (2002): 101-22.
- Lesser, Ian O. "Turkey, the United States and the Delusion of Geopolitics." *Survival* 48.3 (2006): 83-96.
- Kinacıoğlu, Muge and Emel Oktay. "The Domestic Dynamics of Turkey's Cyprus Policy: Implications for Turkey's Accession to the European Union." *Turkish Studies* 7.2 (2006): 261-274.
- Hill, Fiona and Ömer Taspinar. "Turkey and Russia: Axis of the Excluded." *Survival* 48.1 (2006): 81-92.

- Sayarı, Sabri. “Turkish Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: The Challenges of Multi-Regionalism.” *Journal of International Affairs* 54.1 (2000): 169-182.

4.e. Current Issues and Debates: Moving towards the West, East, or Both? (student presentations)

- Davutoğlu, Ahmet. “Turkey’s New Foreign Policy Vision.” *Insight Turkey* 10. 1 (2008): 77-96.
- Kalaycıoğlu, Ersin. “Public Choice and Foreign Affairs: Democracy and International Relations in Turkey.” *New Perspectives on Turkey* 40 (2009): 57-81.
- Kirişçi, Kemal. “The Transformation of Turkish Foreign Policy: The Rise of the Trading State.” *New Perspectives on Turkey* 40 (2009): 29-56.
- Cagatay, Soner, “Sultan of the Muslim World: Why the AKP’s Turkey Will Be the East’s Next Leader.” *Foreign Affairs*, November 15, 2010.
<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/67009/soner-cagaptay/sultan-of-the-muslim-world>
- Cagatay, Soner, “Is Turkey Leaving the West?: An Islamist Foreign Policy Puts Ankara at Odds With Its Former Allies.” *Foreign Affairs*, October 26, 2009.
<http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65661/soner-cagaptay/is-turkey-leaving-the-west>