

Vertiefungsseminar, WS 2011/2012, Do 14-16 Uhr, Raum 141/143 (Invalidenstr. 110)

## Democracy and International Security

This seminar introduces students to some of the major debates and issues surrounding democracies and the use of force in international politics. We begin by situating the topic in the context of both classical and contemporary international relations and security studies theory. The ensuing sessions provide students with an overview of the state of the art in several distinct avenues of current empirical research. In terms of international politics, we examine democracies as security actors, considering democratic peace theory, democracies at war, and the challenges facing democracies as members of military alliances. On the domestic level we investigate party competition and public opinion on security policy with literature on the United States and Europe. Addressing current normative debates, we turn to issues regarding the parliamentary control of military deployments, wars of democratization, and humanitarian military interventions. Throughout the course, students will have the opportunity to apply approaches in the literature to recent cases like the wars in Kosovo, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Libya.

Reader: Available at Sprintout, Georgenstraße/Universitätsstraße (Reader 33).

Moodle: "Democracy and International Security", Key: "democraticpolitics" (<http://moodle.hu-berlin.de/>).

Semesterapparat: Several books are made available at the Grimm-Zentrum (4. OG).

### 20.10. Introductory Session

In our first session we discuss the course's themes and learning goals. Since Vertiefungsseminare are designed to prepare students for writing their B.A. Thesis, we will also discuss how we incorporate academic writing practice into the seminar. We then move on to review our existing knowledge and form some hypotheses about the relationship between democracy and international security. Finally, we will begin exploring the subject at hand by looking at how a classic predecessor of modern international relations theory addressed the issue.

- Thucydides. 1996. "History of the Peloponnesian War." In *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to the Peloponnesian War*. Trans. Richard Crawley. Ed. Robert B. Strassler. New York: Free Press. 2.59-2.65 (p. 123-127); 6.24 (p. 375); 8.1 (p. 481).

### 27.10. Theoretical Framework

Set against the historical backdrop of classical arguments on democracy and security, this session locates contemporary research on these issues within the fields of international relations and security studies. We outline overarching themes, research agendas, and prevalent approaches to the study of democracy and international security.

- Everts, Philip P. 2002. *Democracy and Military Force*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 1-27.
- Hudson, Valerie M. 2007. *Foreign Policy Analysis. Classic and Contemporary Theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. 3-33.
- Buzan, Barry and Lene Hansen. 2009. *The Evolution of International Security Studies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 8-38. [recommended]

### 3.11. Research Design & Writing Session

In this session we will discuss questions regarding research design and the writing of a research paper. Specifically, we will address how to frame a research problem appropriately for a B.A. thesis, how to conduct a literature review, and which methods to apply to answer your initial research question. Please prepare for this session by thinking about your research problem and how you seek to address it in your seminar paper.

- [No readings]

### **10.11. Democratic Peace: What Difference Does Democracy Make?**

The research program on the democratic peace has yielded one of the most-researched findings in international relations, namely that stable democracies do not go to war against each other. In this session, we examine alternative theoretical explanations for the empirical finding of "democratic peace" and discuss current studies' contributions to the debate.

- Maoz, Zeev and Bruce M. Russett. 1993. "Normative and Structural Causes of Democratic Peace, 1946-1986." *American Political Science Review* 87 (3): 624–38.
- Risse-Kappen, Thomas. 1995. "Democratic Peace - Warlike Democracies? A Social Constructivist Interpretation of the Liberal Argument." *European Journal of International Relations* 1 (4): 491-517.

### **17.11. Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: A Misinformed and Dangerous Public?**

The relationship between citizens' preferences and policy-making stands at the heart of democratic politics. On foreign policy, however, public sentiment has long been regarded as unstable, misinformed, or outright dangerous. In this session, we will discuss divergent positions on the relationship between public opinion and foreign policy and examine the results of more recent empirical studies on the subject.

- Holsti, Ole R. 1992. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus." *International Studies Quarterly* 36 (4): 439-466.
- De Vreese, Claes H. and Anna Kandyla. 2009. "News Framing and Public Support for a Common Foreign and Security Policy." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 47 (3): 453-481.
- Drury, A. Cooper, L. Martin Overby, Adrian Ang, and Yitan Li. 2010. "Pretty Prudent or Rhetorically Responsive? The American Public's Support for Military Action." *Political Research Quarterly* 63 (1): 83-96.

### **24.11. Political Parties and Security Policy I: Partisan Divide or Foreign Policy Consensus?**

In the first of two sessions on political parties and security policy, we ask how parties form their positions in this area. Are preferences related to left-right positions on domestic socio-economic issues or do they constitute a separate dimension of competition? Are positions comparable between democracies or do geopolitical and cultural factors combine to create country-specific constellations of party competition on security policy? How has party competition changed as we've moved from the Cold War to a more complex security environment?

- Rosati, Jerel and John Creed. 1997. "Extending the Three and Four-Headed Eagles: The Foreign Policy Orientations of American Elites During the 80s and 90s." *Political Psychology* 18 (3): 583-618.
- Rathbun, Brian C. 2007. "Hierarchy and Community at Home and Abroad. Evidence of a Common Structure of Domestic and Foreign Policy Beliefs in American Elites." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 51 (3): 379-407.
- Reifler, Jason, Thomas J. Scotto, and Harold D. Clarke. 2011. "Foreign Policy Beliefs in Contemporary Britain: Structure and Relevance." *International Studies Quarterly* 55 (1): 245-266.

### **1.12. Democratic War: Are Democracies Janus-Faced?**

While most research has focused on the peaceful relations between democracies, their external conflict behavior toward non-democracies and non-state actors has received less attention. In this session, we address the use of military force by democracies against the backdrop of theoretical approaches to the democratic peace. How can these two phenomena be reconciled theoretically?

- Müller, Harald and Jonas Wolff. 2006. "Democratic Peace: Many Data, Little Explanation?" In *Democratic Wars. Looking at the Dark Side of Democratic Peace*, eds. Anna Geis, Lothar Brock, and Harald Müller. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 41–73.
- Daase, Christopher. 2006. "Democratic Peace - Democratic Wars. Three Reasons Why Democracies Are War-Prone." In *Democratic Wars. Looking at the Dark Side of Democratic Peace*, eds. Anna Geis, Lothar Brock, and Harald Müller. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 74–89.

## 8.12. Political Parties and Security Policy II: Using Security Themes to Distract Voters?

Political parties, by definition, are in competition with each other for political office. There have always been scholars and lay observers who theorize that parties use security policy competition to distract voters from economic problems at home. In this session, we look at the literature on "diversionary warfare" to judge if and when parties and their leaders have a tendency to use military force for electoral gains.

- Gowa, Joanne 1998. "Politics at the Water's Edge: Parties, Voters, and the Use of Force Abroad." *International Organization* 52 (2): 307-324.
- Brulé, David J. and Wonjae Hwang. 2010. "Diverting the Legislature. Executive-Legislative Relations, the Economy, and US Uses of Force." *International Studies Quarterly* 54 (2): 361-379.

## 15.12. Writing Workshop

For our last session before the holiday break we return to questions of research design and writing a term paper. We will discuss these issues based on your evolving research projects.

- [No readings]

## 5.1. Democracies and Military Victory: Between Military Effectiveness and Casualty Aversion

Democracy as a political system has several unique features that can impact a state's ability to successfully fight war. On the one hand, democratic leaders may tend to avoid risky wars because they know voters will punish them in the case of military defeat, meaning they only fight wars they know they can win. On the other hand, during war, governments find themselves constrained by their voters to limit casualties among their own troops and/or among civilians in the theater, which can lead them to pursue suboptimal military strategies.

- Downes, Alexander B. 2009. "How Smart and Tough are Democracies? Reassessing Theories of Democratic Victory in War." *International Security* 33 (4): 9-51.
- Lyatt, Jason. 2010. "Do Democracies Make Inferior Counterinsurgents? Reassessing Democracy's Impact on War Outcomes and Duration." *International Organization* 64 (1): 167-92.

## 12.1. Democratic Accountability: Checks and Balances or *Domaine Réservé*?

Democracies show remarkable differences when it comes to legislative constraints on executive decision-making regarding troop deployments. In addition, some countries have constitutional provisions on the range of military operations their forces are permitted to engage in. In this session, we examine existing varieties of institutional settings and investigate whether and how these differences affect countries' external conflict behavior.

- Damrosch, Lori F. 2003. "The Interface of National Constitutional Systems with International Law and Institutions on Using Military Forces." In *Democratic Accountability and the Use of Force in International Law*, eds. Charlotte Ku, and Harold K. Jacobson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 39–60.
- Dieterich, Sandra, Hartwig Hummel, and Stefan Marschall. 2009. "'Kriegsspielerverderber'? Europäische Parlamente und der Irakkrieg 2003." *Zeitschrift für Internationale Beziehungen* 16 (1): 7–40.

## 19.1. Democracies and Alliances: Free Riders or Reliable Allies?

Given that democracies hold regular elections, there is always the risk that electoral and party politics will conflict with international alliance commitments. The current government may reject committing troops to an alliance force to win an election, or a new government could renege on the alliance commitments of its predecessor. However, such behavior potentially comes at a high price, since a country's international reputation as a reliable ally is easily damaged and hard to repair. Does empirical evidence find democracies to be good allies or could autocracies actually be more reliable in alliances?

- Gaubatz, Kurt Taylor. 1996. "Democratic States and Commitment in International Relations." *International Organization* 50 (1): 109-139.
- Gartzke, Erik and Kristian Skrede Gleditsch. 2004. "Why Democracies May Actually Be Less Reliable Allies." *American Journal of Political Science* 48 (4): 775-795.
- Kreps, Sarah. 2010. "Elite Consensus as a Determinant of Alliance Cohesion. Why Public Opinion Hardly Matters for NATO-led Operations in Afghanistan." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6 (3): 191-215.

## **26.1. Democratization and War I: Imposing Democracy by Force?**

The spread of democracy as a policy goal is often tied to expectations of peaceful relations between democracies and a less conflictive international environment at large. However, the empirical regularity of “democratic peace” has also been abused as a normative justification for military intervention with the intent of regime change. In this session we investigate the empirical relationship between military intervention and democratization as well as its normative implications.

- Gleditsch, Nils Petter, Lene Siljeholm Christiansen, and Havard Hegre. 2007. "Democratic Jihad? Military Intervention and Democracy." *Post-Conflict Transitions Working Paper 15* (WPS 4242). The World Bank.

## **2.2. Democratization and War II: Are Emerging Democracies War-Prone?**

While scholars widely agree on the empirical regularity of the democratic peace, debates continue regarding the war-proneness of emerging democracies. Are countries in democratic transition more likely to encounter an outbreak of military conflict? In this session we revisit this ongoing debate including some of the more recent arguments made in the literature.

- Mansfield, Edward D. and Jack Snyder. 2002. "Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War." *International Organization* 56 (2): 297–337.
- Cederman, Lars-Erik, Simon Hug, and Andreas Wenger. 2008. "Democratization and War in Political Science." *Democratization* 15 (3): 509–24.

## **9.2. Humanitarian Military Intervention: Responsibility to Protect?**

Throughout the past decade, normative debates have challenged the principle of state sovereignty and begun to establish a norm that places a "responsibility to protect" (R2P) on governments and the international community of states. In this session, we will trace the theoretical origins of this emerging norm and investigate its track record in protecting populations from genocide and crimes against humanity.

- Seybolt, Taylor B. 2007. *Humanitarian Military Intervention. The Conditions for Success and Failure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-29.

## **16.2. Discussion of Research Projects**

The final session focuses again on your evolving research projects and specific questions that might have come up in the preceding weeks. We will also reserve some time to revisit some of the themes we discussed throughout the course and connect these to the overarching theme of democracy and international security.

- [No readings]