

INTL 8205: Foreign Policy Decision Making
Spring 2025.

Dr. Jeffrey D. Berejikian
jberejik@uga.edu

Introduction:

Our goal in this seminar is to anchor the study of foreign policy to the reality of human decision making. Specifically, we will explore strategies for integrating cognitive insights into foreign policy analysis. Foreign policy outcomes are the direct result of human choices; ultimately, it is individuals who act. The governing model of decision making currently deployed in international relations, whether implicit or explicit, comes to us from economics. Here, states, elites, leaders, and domestic pressure groups are assumed to be substantively and procedurally rational, and theories concerning state behavior begin from this premise.

However, across the social sciences, we are in the process of a profound break with the past. The empirical study of human decision making in the fields of cognitive psychology, behavioral economics, and neuroscience have produced important and novel insights into the mechanisms human decision making. Most importantly, deviations from classical rationality are now understood to be *predictable and stable* aspects of human choice. Foreign policy decisions should, therefore, be pattered and explainable even when they are not strictly rational. This proposition sits as the core motivation in the drive to develop a new approach to foreign-policy analysis broadly termed “behavioral international relations.”

In applying this approach to the study of foreign policy decision making, critical questions emerge: Which psychological models of decision making are most appropriate and useful in the study of foreign policy? How do we incorporate cognitive models into our existing foreign policy frameworks? When we use cognitive models what, if anything, do we learn about foreign policy that we didn't already know?

Assignments and Grading:

[Note: Our seminar attracts students from various programs, including Ph.D., MIP, and MA. While this class is structured as a traditional Ph.D. research seminar, I acknowledge the diverse perspectives and career goals that each of you brings to the table. In your class discussions and the assignments below, I encourage you to engage with the course material by examining it through the lens of scientific advancement within your subfield of our academic discipline and/or from an applied or practical perspective.]

Weekly Summaries - Weekly summaries are due at the beginning of each class. These summaries provide a brief (300 word maximum) overview of each of the assigned readings and then provide a brief, original, discussion of how this material is potentially useful (or not). In making this assessment, students can define usefulness broadly to include advancing our scientific

knowledge on given topics, its practical utility to policymakers, or even how it help us diagnose pathologies or problems in our politics and foreign policy.

The model for these summaries (not the original assessment) is akin to an annotated bibliography. For guidance see on how to construct a proper annotated bibliography see: https://sites.umuc.edu/library/libhow/bibliography_tutorial.cfm

Due prior to class each week (7 summaries for a total of 350 points.)

Do **not** write weekly summaries on weeks when you submit a critical essay (as it would include the relevant material) or on weeks when you lead a seminar.

Review Essays - You will write (3) analytical essays (approximately 3,000 word max). Due prior to class. These essays are to be synthetic and critical. The model for these assignments is akin to a literature review in which you use assigned and supplemental readings to, for example, make an affirmative argument, derive a research question, critique an established theory/concept. There are four opportunities for critical essays identified in the reading list below (3 essays for a total of 300 points) Important: the best essays go beyond the required readings to incorporate the supplemental material as well.

- For guidance on how the various purposes of a literature review see: Knopf, Jeffrey W. "Doing a literature review." PS: Political Science & Politics 39, no. 1 (2006): 127-132.

Seminar Presentation

Each student will be responsible for leading a seminar discussion (150 points). When leading a seminar, the expectations are as follows:

- Presenters must develop a mastery of the material and be able to guide the class through a meaningful discussion of the topic. This includes familiarity with at least some of the supplemental material identified for that week, as needed for context.
- Presenters must develop a clear understanding of the arguments, empirical analysis, and broader implications/applications of the research, as well as how their topic connects to other topics covered in class.
- The presenters' primary goal is to lead the class through a critical discussion of the material—rather than delivering a lecture—and they should be prepared to answer questions and provide feedback to students.
- Presenters must circulate a set of discussion questions and/or topics to the class by 5:00 PM on the Wednesday prior to their seminar. (Note: Students are expected to reflect on this material, come to class prepared to discuss it, and bring their own questions.)

Given the above, I **strongly** encourage presenters to begin their preparation *prior to* the week they are scheduled to lead the seminar.

Presentation Schedule

Week 3: Sarah

Week 4: Mallory

Week 5: Cooper
Week 6: Julian & Alyssa
Week 7: Simon
Week 8: Paul
Week 9: Ella
Week 10: Carolyn
Week 11: Anitesh
Week 12: Hasan
Week 13: Lou

Participation - Your active participation is necessary for a successful seminar. The participation grade has two components. The first requires consistent engagement in class discussions regarding the material, the second pertains the quality of your constructive comments about each student's research (150 points)

Research Funding Proposal - The funding proposal should focus on some aspect of foreign policy in a manner that explicitly incorporates a cognitive model of decision making and motivated by the relevant academic literature (approximately 5,000 words, not including budget references, or supplemental materials). The proposal must be responsive to the specifics of a funding call that I will circulate in class along with a rubric of necessary components. There are no other requirements with respect topic or methodological approach (500 points). The funding call will be distributed by the 5th week of class.

Research Proposal Presentations - Each student will present the results of their research to the class. Throughout the course, you will be asked to update the class on your progress. These updates will serve as a primary source of feedback and constructive criticism on your project (150 points).

Academic Integrity Statement and Policy

The UGA Student Honor Code states: "I will be academically honest in all of my academic work and will not tolerate academic dishonesty of others." A Culture of Honesty, the University's policy and procedures for handling cases of suspected dishonesty, can be assessed here: <https://honesty.uga.edu>. Any student caught cheating or plagiarizing will be referred to Judicial Affairs, as required by university policy.

All course work must be done on an individual basis, including exams, unless the syllabus clearly indicates that the assignment is team graded.

Mental Health and Wellness Resources:

- *If you or someone you know needs assistance, you are encouraged to contact Student Care and Outreach in the Division of Student Affairs at 706-542-7774 or visit <https://sco.uga.edu>. They will help you navigate any difficult circumstances you may be facing by connecting you with the appropriate resources or services.*

- UGA has several resources for a student seeking mental health services (<https://www.uhs.uga.edu/bewelluga/bewelluga>) or crisis support (<https://www.uhs.uga.edu/info/emergencies>).
- If you need help managing stress anxiety, relationships, etc., please visit BeWellUGA (<https://www.uhs.uga.edu/bewelluga/bewelluga>) for a list of FREE workshops, classes, mentoring, and health coaching led by licensed clinicians and health educators in the University Health Center.
- Additional resources can be accessed through the UGA App.

Please note that faculty and staff are obligated to report any knowledge of sexual assault and/or relationship violence to UGA's Equal Opportunity Office.

Course Schedule:

All readings are available on-line, unless otherwise indicated.

A number of the readings utilize experimental methods. Please see this volume for a background in this approach. Druckman, J. N., Greene, D. P., Kuklinski, J. H., & Lupia, A. (Eds.). (2011). *Cambridge handbook of experimental political science*. Cambridge University Press.

Week 1 (1/9): Introduction to Class, Core Concepts and Assignments

Week 2 (1/16): Foundations: Behavioral International Relations and Foreign Policy

Valerie Hudson. "Foreign Policy Analysis: Actor Specific Theory and the Ground of International Relations" *Foreign Policy Analysis* (2005):1-30

Hafner-Burton, E. M., Haggard, S., Lake, D. A., & Victor, D. G. (2017). "The behavioral revolution and international relations. *International Organization*, 71(S1), S1-S31.

Stein, Janice Gross. "The micro-foundations of international relations theory: Psychology and behavioral economics." *International Organization* 71, no. S1 (2017): S249-S263.

Supplemental:

- Jacobi, Daniel, and Annette Freyberg-Inan. "The forum: Human being(s) in International Relations." *International Studies Review* 14, no. 4 (2012): 645-665.
- Kertzer, J. D. (2017). Microfoundations in international relations. *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 34(1), 81-97.

Week 3 (1/23): Early Cognitive Approaches

Michael Shapiro, Matthew Bonham (1973) "Cognitive Processes and Foreign Policy Decision Making" *International Studies Quarterly* 17:2 147-174

Suedfeld, Peter, and Philip Tetlock. "Integrative complexity of communications in international crises." *Journal of conflict resolution* 21.1 (1977): 169-184.

Levinson, Daniel J. "Authoritarian personality and foreign policy." *Conflict Resolution* (1957): 37-47.

Holsti, Kalevi J. "National role conceptions in the study of foreign policy." *International Studies Quarterly* (1970): 233-309.

Week 4: (1/30): Personality/Operational Code

Schafer, Mark. "Issues in assessing psychological characteristics at a distance: An introduction to the symposium." *Political Psychology* 21.3 (2000): 511-527.

Allen, S. H., & Gallagher, M. E. (2022). Is He Speaking Our Language? Donald Trump's Leadership Traits in Comparison with Previous Presidents. *Political Science Quarterly*, 137(3), 539-568.

Macdonald, Julia, and Jacquelyn Schneider. "Presidential Risk Orientation and Force Employment Decisions: The Case of Unmanned Weaponry." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* (2015)

McDermott, Rose, and Peter K. Hatemi. "The relationship between physical aggression, foreign policy and moral choices: Phenotypic and genetic findings." *Aggressive behavior* 43, no. 1 (2017): 37-46.

Supplemental:

- Gallagher, Maryann E., and Susan H. Allen. "Presidential personality: Not just a nuisance." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10.1 (2014): 1-21.
- Herrmann, Richard K., et al. "Images in international relations: An experimental test of cognitive schemata." *International Studies Quarterly* 41.3 (1997): 403-433.
- Hermann, M. G. (1980). "Explaining foreign policy behavior using the personal characteristics of political leaders". *International Studies Quarterly*, 24, 7-46.
- *Beliefs and leadership in world politics: Methods and applications of operational code analysis*, eds. Mark Schafer and Stephen G. Walker (2006): 25-53.

Critical Essay #1: *Critically evaluate the degree to which the early cognitive approaches and personality/operational code studies meet the goals set forth by the behavioral IR approach? Where do they fall short? How can these shortcomings be addressed, if at all? What are the practical implications of this?*

ISSUE FRAMING

Week 5: (2/6): Legal Framing on Foreign Policy Preferences

Wallace, G. P. (2019). Condemning or Condoning the Perpetrators? International Humanitarian Law and Attitudes Toward Wartime Violence. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 44(1), 192-226.

Chilton, A. S., & Versteeg, M. (2016). International law, constitutional law, and public support for torture. *Research & Politics*, 3(1), 2053168016636413.

Kreps, S. E., & Wallace, G. P. (2016). International law, military effectiveness, and public support for drone strikes. *Journal of Peace Research*, 53(6), 830-844.

Berejikian, J., & Justwan, F. (2022). Defense treaties increase domestic support for military action and casualty tolerance: Evidence from survey experiments in the United States. *Contemporary security policy*, 43(2), 308-349.

Week 6: (2/13) Moral Framing on Foreign Policy Preferences

Kertzer, J. D., Powers, K. E., Rathbun, B. C., & Iyer, R. (2014). Moral support: How moral values shape foreign policy attitudes. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(3), 825-840.

Heinrich, T., & Kobayashi, Y. (2020). How do people evaluate foreign aid to 'nasty' regimes?. *British Journal of Political Science*, 50(1), 103-127.

Smetana, M., & Vranka, M. (2021). How moral foundations shape public approval of nuclear, chemical, and conventional strikes: new evidence from experimental surveys. *International Interactions*, 47(2), 374-390.

Rathbun, B. C., & Stein, R. (2020). Greater goods: morality and attitudes toward the use of nuclear weapons. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 64(5), 787-816.

Week 7 (2/20): Populism and Foreign Policy Preferences

Destradi, S., Cadier, D., & Plagemann, J. (2021). Populism and foreign policy: a research agenda (Introduction). *Comparative European Politics*, 19(6), 663-682.

Friedrichs, G. M. (2022). Populist minds think alike? national identity conceptions and foreign policy preferences of populist leaders. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 18(2), orac004.

Fouquet, S., & Brummer, K. (2023). Profiling the personality of populist foreign policy makers: a leadership trait analysis. *Journal of International Relations and Development*, 26(1), 1-29.

Lacatus, C. (2021). Populism and President Trump's approach to foreign policy: An analysis of tweets and rally speeches. *Politics*, 41(1), 31-47.

Supplemental

- Giurlando, P. (2021). Populist foreign policy: the case of Italy. *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, 27(2), 251-267.
- Hall, J. (2021). In search of enemies: Donald Trump's populist foreign policy rhetoric. *Politics*, 41(1), 48-63
- Jenne, E. K. (2021). Populism, nationalism and revisionist foreign policy. *International affairs*, 97(2), 323-343.
- Wicaksana, I. G. W., & Wardhana, A. (2021). Populism and foreign policy: The Indonesian case. *Asian Politics & Policy*, 13(3), 408-425.
- Ostermann, F., & Stahl, B. (2022). Theorizing populist radical-right foreign policy: Ideology and party positioning in France and Germany. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 18(3), orac006.
- Cadier, D. (2021). Populist politics of representation and foreign policy: evidence from Poland. *Comparative European Politics*, 19(6), 703-721.
- Wajner, D. F., & Giurlando, P. (2023). Introduction to Populist Foreign Policy (PFP). In *Populist Foreign Policy* (pp. 1-35). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Özdamar, Ö., & Ceydilek, E. (2020). European populist radical right leaders' foreign policy beliefs: An operational code analysis. *European journal of international relations*, 26(1), 137-162.
- Wojczewski, T. (2020). Trump, populism, and American foreign policy. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 16(3), 292-311.

Critical Essay #2 Given the research, how much does issue framing matter? Be succinct and provide evidence. What are the implications of this for the study and/or practice of foreign policy?

SOCIAL MOTIVATIONS AND PREDISPOSITIONS

Week 8: (2/27): Group/Social Identity

Mummendey, Amelie, Andreas Klink, and Rupert Brown. "Nationalism and patriotism: National identification and out-group rejection." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 40, no. 2 (2001): 159-172.

Hanania, R., & Trager, R. (2021). The prejudice first model and foreign policy values: racial and religious bias among conservatives and liberals. *European Journal of International Relations*, 27(1), 204-231.

Golan, G. J., Waddell, T. F., & Barnidge, M. (2021). Competing identity cues in the hostile media phenomenon: Source, nationalism, and perceived bias in news coverage of foreign affairs. *Mass Communication and Society*, 24(5), 676-700.

George Marcus et al. "Linking Neuroscience to Political Intolerance and Threat" *Politics and the Life Sciences*. V.17 n.2 1998

Lee, Yueh-Ting, and Victor Ottati. "Attitudes toward US immigration policy: The roles of in-group-out-group bias, economic concern, and obedience to law." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 142, no. 5 (2002): 617-634.

Supplemental

- Emile Bruneau and Rebecca Saxe "Attitudes Toward the Outgroup are Predicted by Activity in the Precuneus in Arabs and Israelis" *Neuroimage* v.52 n4 2010.
- Grit Hein, et al. "Neural Responses to Ingroup and Outgroup Members' Suffering Predict Individual Differences in Costly Helping" *Neuron* v.68 n.1 2010
- Cikara, Mina, Matthew M. Botvinick, and Susan T. Fiske. "Us versus them social identity shapes neural responses to intergroup competition and harm." *Psychological science* (2011).
- Belle Derks and Michael Inzlicht "The Neuroscience of Stigma and Stereotype Threat" *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* v.11 n.2 2008
- Elizabeth Phelps and Laura Thomas. "Race, Behavior and the Brain: The Role of Neuroimaging in Understanding Complex Social Behaviors" *Political Psychology* v.24 n.4 2003
- Seul, Jeffrey R. "Ours is the way of god': Religion, identity, and intergroup conflict." *Journal of peace research* 36, no. 5 (1999): 553-569.

****MARCH 6 SPRING BREAK****

Week 9 (3/13) Status Seeking

(note: This week it is particularly important to familiarize yourself with the supplemental readings on the microfoundations of status seeking in humans)

He, K., & Feng, H. (2022). Role status and status-saving behaviour in world politics: the ASEAN case. *International Affairs*, 98(2), 363-381.

Viskupič, F. (2020). More Valuable than Blood and Treasure? Experimental Evidence on the Impact of Status on Domestic Preferences for Military Intervention. *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy*, 26(4).

Powers, R., & Renshon, J. (2023). International status concerns and domestic support for political leaders. *American Journal of Political Science*, 67(3), 732-747

Jakobsen, Peter Viggo, Jens Ringsmose, and Håkon Lunde Saxi. "Prestige-seeking small states: Danish and Norwegian military contributions to US-led operations." *European Journal of International Security* 3, no. 2 (2018): 256-277.

Supplemental:

Micro Foundations:

- Ruff, Christian C., and Ernst Fehr. "The neurobiology of rewards and values in social decision making." *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 15.8 (2014): 549-562.
- Levy, Dino J., and Paul W. Glimcher. "The root of all value: a neural common currency for choice." *Current opinion in neurobiology* 22.6 (2012): 1027-1038.
- Rebecca Saxe, Johannes Haushofer "For Love or Money: A Common Neural Currency for Social and Monetary Reward" *Neuron*, Volume 58, Issue 2, 24 April 2008, Pages 164-165)

Status and Realism

- Wohlforth, William C. "Unipolarity, status competition, and great power war." *World politics* 61.01 (2009): 28-57.
- Larson, Deborah Welch, and Alexei Shevchenko. "Status seekers: Chinese and Russian responses to US primacy." *International Security* 34.4 (2010): 63-95.

Week 10: 3/20: Trust

Aaron Hoffman. "A Conceptualization of Trust in International Relations" *European Journal of International Relations* v.8 n.3 2002

Lacina, B., & Lee, C. (2013). Culture clash or democratic peace?: Results of a survey experiment on the effect of religious culture and regime type on foreign policy opinion formation. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 9(2), 143-170.

Isani, M., & Silverman, D. (2016). Foreign policy attitudes toward Islamic actors: An experimental approach. *Political Research Quarterly*, 69(3), 571-582.

Justwan, Florian, and Sarah K. Fisher. "Generalized Social Trust and International Dispute Settlement." *International Interactions* 43, no. 5 (2017): 717-743.

Supplemental

- *Data Set:* Justwan, F., Bakker, R., & Berejikian, J. D. (2018). Measuring social trust and trusting the measure. *The Social Science Journal*, 55(2), 149-159.
- Brooks Kind-Casas, et al. "Getting to Know You: Reputation and Trust in a Two-person Economic Exchange" *Science*, Vol.308 N.5718 2005

- Jian Li, et al. "Neural responses to sanction threats in two-party economic exchange" *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 29 September 2009: 16835-16840.
- Frank Krueger, Kevin McCabe, Jorge Moll, Nikolaus Kriegeskorte, Roland Zahn, Maren Strenziok, Armin Heinecke, Jordan Grafman. Neural correlates of trust. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, Volume 104, Number 50 (December 2007), pp. 20084-20089
- Paul Zak et al "The Neuroeconomics of Distrust: Sex Differences in behavior and Physiology" *The American Economic Review* v.95 n.2 2005

Critical Essay #3: To what extent can/are human dispositions with respect to identity, trust and status manipulated by political leaders. What are the implications, theoretically and/or practically?

COGNITIVE HUERISTICS AND BIASES

Week 11 (3/27) Loss Aversion

Robert Jervis, "The Political Implications of Loss Aversion" 1992 *Political Psychology* 13:2

Johnson, D. D., & Tierney, D. (2018). Bad world: The negativity bias in international politics. *International Security*, 43(3), 96-140.

Berejikian, Jeffrey D., and Bryan R. Early. "Loss aversion and foreign policy resolve." *Political Psychology* 34.5 (2013): 649-671.

Nincic, Miroslav. "Loss aversion and the domestic context of military intervention." *Political Research Quarterly* 50.1 (1997): 97-120.

Supplemental: Micro Foundations

- Tom, Sabrina M., et al. "The neural basis of loss aversion in decision-making under risk." *Science* 315.5811 (2007): 515-518.
- De Martino, Benedetto, Colin F. Camerer, and Ralph Adolphs. "Amygdala damage eliminates monetary loss aversion." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107.8 (2010): 3788-3792.
- Rick, Scott. "Losses, gains, and brains: Neuroeconomics can help to answer open questions about loss aversion." *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 21: 453-463 2011.

Week 12 (4/3) Prospect Theory, Framing, and Risk

Vis, Barbara, and Dieuwertje Kuijpers. "Prospect theory and foreign policy decision-making: Underexposed issues, advancements, and ways forward." *Contemporary Security Policy* 39, no. 4 (2018): 575-589. [skim for overview of core concepts, do not need to read in detail]

Berejikian, J. D. (2002). A cognitive theory of deterrence. *Journal of peace research*, 39(2), 165-183.

Taliaferro, Jeffrey W. "Quagmires in the periphery: Foreign wars and escalating commitment in international conflict." *Security Studies* 7.3 (1998): 94-144.

Berejikian, J., & Zwald, Z. (2020). Why language matters: Shaping public risk tolerance during deterrence crises. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 1-34.

Linde, Jona, and Barbara Vis. "Do politicians take risks like the rest of us? An experimental test of prospect theory under MPs." *Political Psychology* 38, no. 1 (2017): 101-117.

Supplemental:

- Kowert, Paul A., and Margaret G. Hermann. "Who takes risks? Daring and caution in foreign policy making." *Journal of conflict Resolution* 41, no. 5 (1997): 611-637.
- Berejikian, Jeffrey D. "A cognitive theory of deterrence." *Journal of peace research* 39.2 (2002): 165-183.
- Kahneman, Daniel, and Amos Tversky. "Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk." *Econometrica: Journal of the econometric society* (1979): 263-291.
- Quattrone, George A., and Amos Tversky. "Contrasting rational and psychological analyses of political choice." *The American political science review* (1988): 719-736.
- McDermott, R. (2004). Prospect theory in political science: Gains and losses from the first decade. *Political Psychology*, 25(2), 289–312.
- Trepel, Christopher, Craig R. Fox, and Russell A. Poldrack. "Prospect theory on the brain? Toward a cognitive neuroscience of decision under risk." *Cognitive Brain Research* 23.1 (2005): 34-50.
- De Martino, Benedetto, et al. "The neurobiology of reference-dependent value computation." *The Journal of Neuroscience* 29.12 (2009): 3833-3842.

Week 13 (4/10) Fairness [or alternative proposed below]

Sanfey, Alan G., et al. "The neural basis of economic decision-making in the ultimatum game." *Science* 300.5626 (2003): 1755-1758. [note: While many of us are fully equipped to follow the methodology, read carefully to understand the experimental design and the results]

Powers, K. E., Kertzer, J. D., Brooks, D. J., & Brooks, S. G. (2022). What's fair in international politics? Equity, equality, and foreign policy attitudes. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 66(2), 217-245.

Kapstein, E. B. (2008). Fairness considerations in world politics: lessons from international trade negotiations. *Pol. Sci. Q.*, 123, 229

Sohn, I., & Quek, K. (2023). Asymmetrical fairness in trade preferences. *Research & Politics*, 10(3), 20531680231188298.

Supplemental:

- Albin, C. (2003). Negotiating international cooperation: global public goods and fairness. *Review of International Studies*, 29(3), 365-385.
- Rathbun, B., Rathbun, N. S., & Pomeroy, C. (2022). No fair! Distinguishing between the pursuit of status and equity in international relations. *International Studies Quarterly*, 66(1), sqac002.
- Efrat, A., & Newman, A. L. (2016). Deciding to defer: The importance of fairness in resolving transnational jurisdictional conflicts. *International Organization*, 70(2), 409-441.
- OOSTERBEEK, HESSEL, RANDOLPH SLOOF, AND GIJS VAN DE KUILEN. 2004. "Cultural Differences in Ultimatum Game Experiments: Evidence from a Meta-Analysis." *Experimental Economics* 7 (2): 171–88

[ALTERNATIVE TOPIC SUGGESTION]

Lopez, A. C., McDermott, R., & Petersen, M. B. (2011). States in mind: Evolution, coalitional psychology, and international politics. *International Security*, 36(2), 48-83.

Alford, John R., and John R. Hibbing. 2004. "The Origin of Politics: An Evolutionary Theory of Political Behavior." *Perspectives on Politics* 2 (4).

Shaw, R. Paul, and Yuwa Wong. 1987. "Ethnic Mobilization and the Seeds of Warfare: An Evolutionary Perspective." *International Studies Quarterly* 31 (1): 5-31.

Kanazawa, Satoshi. 2009. "Evolutionary Psychological Foundations of Civil Wars." *Journal of Politics* 71 (1): 25-34.

Supplement: Cosmides, Leda, and John Tooby. 1994. "Evolutionary Psychology and the Invisible Hand." *American Economic Review* 84 (2): 327-332.

- Thayer, Bradley A. 2007. "Thinking about Nuclear Deterrence Theory: Why Evolutionary Psychology Undermines Its Rational Actor Assumptions." *Comparative Strategy* 26 (4): 311-323.
- Thayer, Bradley A. 2000. "Bringing in Darwin: Evolutionary Theory, Realism, and International Politics." *International Security* 25 (2): 124-51.

Critical Essay #4: How well do we understand risk-taking and conflict?

Week 14: 4/17

Research Presentations (A)

Week 15: 4/24

Research Presentations (B)

Final research proposals are due Friday, May 3 at 12pm.