This course explores strategic interaction and interstate bargaining from both theoretical and practical perspectives. It is first and foremost a political science course: We will cover theoretical and policy studies on such topics as nuclear disarmament, trade, and human rights.

But theory and policy are fundamentally driven by real world situations and dynamics. That leads to the second purpose of this course: To elucidate theory through simulation. Each class will begin with a brief discussion of the readings. We will then conduct an hour to hour and a half simulation drawn from historical events, current policy challenges, and my own political experience. This provides you with an opportunity to test out theories and approaches, understanding how strategic interaction generates the concepts and causal chains scholars discuss.

Finally, the third purpose of this course is to identify your negotiating style and allow you to understand and shape it. In addition to the theoretical work, each week I have assigned selections from two seminal negotiation books. The simulations are excellent opportunities to practice these lessons while also learning about statecraft.

Attendance

Much of our time in class will be spent doing actual negotiations (12 of them), so attending every class is mandatory. If you cannot make this commitment, please do not take the class. Because the roles in the cases are carefully assigned, missing a class hurts everyone’s learning, not just yours. Each class (or part thereof) missed except for verified illness, religious holiday, death in the family, or other serious situations (approved, if possible, in advance) will result in a course grade reduction of one level (i.e., from B- to C+). Missing two unexcused classes will result in a failing grade. In addition, if you intend to drop the course for any reason, I ask that you do so before the third class meeting or risk having your transcript show that you “Withdrew.” In other words, for this class to work, you must make it one of your top priorities this semester in terms of class attendance. Please take this into account in making a final decision to enroll in this section of the course. Finally, the class may not be taken Pass/Fail.

Readings

Grading
A principal aim of this course is to allow you the space to discover what type of negotiator you are. In that endeavor, there are no wrong answers. However, a second objective is to use negotiations, strategic interaction, and bargaining to understand foreign policy and interstate dynamics. In addition, negotiators are typically only as good as their reputations. While “hard bargaining” can be helpful in one-off situations, it can leave a lasting impression on others which hurts in the long-run.

This course’s evaluation opportunities are designed to assess your progress on both of these objectives. They are:

1. 2 Short Papers (20%)
   - Evaluation of Personal Negotiating Style and Lessons Learned (10%)
   - Negotiation Strategy on Present Policy Problem (10%)
2. Original Simulation Design (30%)
3. Peer Evaluation (15%)
4. Midterm (15%) covering theoretical material up to 10/15.
5. Final Exam (20%) covering theoretical material from 10/22 onwards.

To expand on points 2 and 3:

Creating a Simulation
Recent research has found that the process of creating a simulation carries even greater educational benefits than participating in one. Each student will choose a concept or theory in international relations and/or comparative politics and develop an original simulation with the goal of illuminating that concept. You also have the option to work in pairs, although once you form a team, you will be evaluated together, no exceptions.

Peer Feedback on Overall Contribution and Earned Respect
15 percent of your grade comes from peer evaluations. Each student will rate each other student on a 1 (bottom) – 10 (top) scale based on that peer’s overall, demonstrated contribution to the class’s learning and development. In addition, each student will identify five fellow students as people who gained exceptional respect during the semester as negotiation partners or teammates and exhibited skill at and reputations for simultaneously managing both relationships and transactional success. Scores for this ranking will go from 10 (top) – 6 (bottom). The resulting rankings will then be combined and averaged. The class will be divided into top-, middle-, and bottom-ranked groups. The top group will receive 15 points. The middle group will receive between 10–15 points and the lower group between 1–9 points, based on the instructor’s evaluations of student performance and rankings. I will notify the class of the five people who achieve the highest total scores for gaining respect for their negotiation skills at the end of the semester.
Schedule

NOTE: Prior to the first session, please:

1. Review the personality types:

2. Take one of the following personality tests and bring your result to class:

Week 1 (8/27):
- Introduction: Personal Styles of Negotiation
- Fisher, Ch. 2-6.
- *Simulation*: Expanded, Iterated Prisoner’s Dilemma

Week 2 (9/3): Nuclear Weapons and Disarmament
- *Simulation*: Two-party negotiation over conventional arms, nuclear arms, and nuclear disarmament.

Week 3 (9/10): Causes of War
- *Simulation*: Five party negotiation on alliances and war initiation.

Week 4 (9/17): Major War Settlements
- John Ikenberry, *After Victory*, Ch. 1, 2, 5.
- *Debate*: “The U.S. should have established a new international order after WW1.”

Week 5 (10/1): Asymmetric Warfare

• Simulation: Six-party negotiation over public support for guerilla movement.

Week 6 (10/8): Trade


• Debate: “Free trade benefits most, if not, all people.”

Week 7 (10/15): Midterm

Week 8 (10/22): Aid


• Easterly, William Russell. 2006. The white man's burden : why the West's efforts to aid the rest have done so much ill and so little good. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, Ch. 1.


• Simulation: Four party negotiation on military assistance, trade, aid, and government policy.

Week 9 (10/29): Human Rights


• Simulation: Four party negotiation over human rights charter, with student structural feedback.

Week 10 (11/5): Democratic Design
• Simulation: Six party negotiation on electoral and constitutional design.

Week 11 (11/12): Current Policy Challenges: The Iranian Nuclear Program
• Jeffrey Goldberg, “The Point of No Return,” The Atlantic (September 2010). [SKIM TECHNICAL PARTS, BUT BE SURE TO UNDERSTAND THE MAIN ARGUMENT.]
• James M. Lindsay and Ray Takeyh, “After Iran Gets the Bomb,” Foreign Affairs vol. 89, no. 2 (March/April 2010), pp. 33-49.
  http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/65732/graham-allison/nuclear-disorder
• Kenneth Waltz, “Why Iran Should Get the Bomb.” Foreign Affairs. July/August 2012. [SKIM TECHNICAL PARTS, BUT BE SURE TO UNDERSTAND THE MAIN ARGUMENT.]
  http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137732/kenneth-n-waltz/why-iran-should-get-the-bomb
• Simulation: SWOT analysis and four party negotiation over Iranian nuclear program.
• Debate: “Iran should get the bomb.”

Week 12 (11/19): Possible Policy Challenges
• Strobe Talbott. “Dealing with the Bomb in South Asia.” Foreign Affairs. March/April 1999. [SKIM TECHNICAL PARTS, BUT BE SURE TO UNDERSTAND THE MAIN ARGUMENT.]
  http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/54391/jaswant-singh/against-nuclear-apartheid
• Simulation: Pakistan Loose Nukes Simulation.

Week 13 (12/3): Original Simulation Discussion