

GOV 85.45: Psychology of International Security

Dartmouth College, Spring 2023

Dr. Caleb Pomeroy

Office: Zoom or 351 Haldeman (Dickey Center)

Office Hours: Mon 1:30-2:30pm, Thu 11am-12pm

Time: Mon/Wed, 3:30-5:20pm

X period: Mon, 5:30-6:20pm

Seminar Location: Reed 108

Course Description. This course provides an in-depth engagement with the political psychology of international security. The course consists of three parts. We first take up fundamental political questions – like “what is power?” and “what is war?” – and engage the diverse answers that psychological IR scholarship currently provides. Noting that war is the most destructive invention in human history, we then use these lenses to critically engage the value-add of psychological theories for why states fight, which necessarily entails consideration of why states *don’t* fight. The final third of the course uses all of this theoretical and empirical knowledge to examine security and war in our lifetime, beginning with the emergence of “terrorism” as a security issue in the post-Cold War world and looking forward to questions like China’s reemergence.

Introductory-level knowledge of international relations (e.g., GOV 5) is recommended but not a required prerequisite. An additional course on international security (e.g., GOV 50.04, 50.16, 53) would also be useful but is not a prerequisite. Given this course’s emphasis on international security, students who have already taken GOV 50.08 (Psychology and International Politics) should feel welcome to take this course, which provides a more focused engagement with the causes of war in particular. Knowledge of basic statistics will be helpful since some of the readings contain quantitative analyses, but Gov 10 is not a required prerequisite. The course does not require or presume any background in psychology. Students are encouraged (but not required) to follow current events in foreign affairs through periodicals, such as *Foreign Affairs* and *Foreign Policy*. There is no required textbook for the course. All readings will be posted on the course’s online Canvas page (<https://canvas.dartmouth.edu/>).

Course Format. Each seminar session engages a different question or topic in the political psychology of international security. We’ll open each seminar with a brief summary of the readings, and I will add some high-level context for how that reading fits into the field’s development. Then, the majority of the meeting time will be devoted to a discussion of the readings, centered around guiding questions.

Course Requirements and Assessment. The course uses an “Oxford-inspired” approach to assessment. This teaching philosophy treats you as a fellow researcher and policy advocate. Rather than regurgitating “facts,” this approach instead values your ability to take the week’s material and communicate your unique and creative ideas about that material through written and oral rhetoric. This provides an opportunity to sharpen skills that will benefit you well into the future.

The final grade is assessed on the following:

1. Policy essay (25%), due via Canvas Friday, April 28 by noon.

→ In the first third of the course, we engage questions that have occupied political thinkers for centuries. In this *Foreign Affairs*-style essay (approximately 3,500 words), you will provide your own answer to one question and use that answer to shed light on a pressing policy issue today. Examples and details will be discussed in class and provided on Canvas.

2. Research paper (45%), due via Canvas Monday, June 5 by noon.

→ For the course's term paper, you will write a short academic research paper (approximately 6,500 words) that applies a theoretical perspective from the course to a topic of your choice, selected in consultation with the instructor. *Original research is required*, but the form that this research takes is flexible and the expectations will be reasonable within the constraints of a single term. As examples, you might qualitatively assess the use of moral language in leaders' public versus private statements about a specific war. Or, you might conduct a basic quantitative analysis of U.S. public opinion data on China's reemergence. More examples will be provided and more details to follow.

3. Discussion participation (30%).

→ This seminar is primarily discussion-based. Attendance will be recorded at each meeting, and you must contact the instructor for an excused absence. The expectation is that you have read each assigned reading for that session and arrive prepared with thoughtful opinions about each reading. In addition to participation in the reading discussion throughout the semester (20%), you will provide short (6-8 minute) summaries of two readings in order to help kick-off discussion at the beginning of class (5% each). My goal is to let each student choose the two readings they would like to introduce.

Grading Policy. I define grades according to Dartmouth's official description, posted on the Registrar's website (https://www.dartmouth.edu/~reg/transcript/grade_descriptions). Notably, A grades denote "excellence" (by definition not of average or common quality), B suggests "good" work, C suggests "acceptable" performance, D conveys "deficient" work, and E "seriously deficient" work. The Government Department has established a norm under which median grades in seminars shall not exceed A-. Therefore, the median grade in our seminar will not be higher than an A-.

Late Work Policy. Extensions will not be granted except in the case of medical emergencies. All work is due at the time listed in the syllabus and/or on Canvas unless otherwise noted. Late work will receive a 10% reduction for each day it is submitted after the deadline. I recognize that our current circumstances are challenging for many students. Please contact me immediately if there are circumstances beyond your control that affect your ability to submit work on time.

Syllabus Structure. Each session engages a specific question or theme from varying intellectual perspectives. The "required" readings are, obviously, required. However, each session lists optional readings for students who want to dig deeper into that session's material. These readings are truly optional for that session. However, the expectation is that the optional readings for the relevant session(s) selected for your essay and term paper will receive engagement in your essay and term paper. Further, if you plan to pursue graduate education in political science, it is highly recommended that you explore some of the optional readings. If you plan to pursue further graduate education, please also feel free to get in touch with me for thoughts and strategic advice on doing so.

Academic Honor Principle. As a Dartmouth student, you have agreed to abide by the College's Academic Honor Principle (<http://www.dartmouth.edu/judicialaffairs/honor/index.html>). Students should be aware of proper citation practices (<https://writing-speech.dartmouth.edu/learning/materials/sources-and-citations-dartmouth>). Lack of knowledge about what constitutes plagiarism does not excuse a violation – take the time to learn about it, and if anything is unclear, please consult with me. Unless noted otherwise, students should not work together on course assignments – the expectation is

that your work is your work alone.

Student Accessibility and Accommodations. Students requesting disability-related accommodations and services for this course are required to register with Student Accessibility Services (SAS; Getting Started with SAS webpage: <https://students.dartmouth.edu/student-accessibility/students/where-start/apply-services>; student.accessibility.services@dartmouth.edu; 1-603-646-9900) and to request that an accommodation email be sent to me in advance of the need for an accommodation. Then, students should schedule a follow-up meeting with me to determine relevant details such as what role SAS or its Testing Center (<https://students.dartmouth.edu/student-accessibility/services/testing-center>) may play in accommodation implementation. This process works best for everyone when completed as early in the quarter as possible. If students have questions about whether they are eligible for accommodations or have concerns about the implementation of their accommodations, they should contact the SAS office. All inquiries and discussions will remain confidential.

Your Mental Health. The academic environment at Dartmouth is challenging, our terms are intensive, and classes are not the only demanding part of your life. There are a number of resources available to you on campus to support your wellness, including your undergraduate dean (<http://www.dartmouth.edu/upperde/>), Counseling and Human Development (<http://www.dartmouth.edu/chd/>), and the Student Wellness Center (<http://www.dartmouth.edu/~healthed/>).

But, seriously. Being a student can be hard at times (and there's a lot going on in the world), so please also feel free to reach out to me directly or the resources mentioned above if you need a hand – we're in this together.

Commitment to a Diverse and Inclusive Learning Environment. This seminar seeks to foster an inclusive space built on sensitivity, understanding, and mutual respect. If you have a name and/or set of pronouns that differ from those that appear in your official college records, please let me know.

Discrimination against any individual based on protected status, which is defined as age, color, disability, gender identity or expression, national origin, race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, or veteran status, will not be tolerated. The world is a complicated place so be kind and show respect for others' views. We learn and grow through exposure to alternative ways of thinking, not by convergence on a single right answer. When we talk over others, it shuts down debate rather than facilitating it. We need to tackle some really important issues in the 21st century, and we need to hear and consider the fullest possible range of ideas to do so.

Further, students at Dartmouth come from a variety of socioeconomic backgrounds with varied lived experiences. If you encounter financial challenges related to this class, please let me know.

Religious Observances. Some students may wish to take part in religious observances that occur during this academic term. If you have a religious observance that conflicts with your participation in the course, please meet with me before the end of the second week of the term to discuss appropriate accommodations.

Course Outline and Reading List

Note: Material subject to change at instructor's discretion

Session 1 (Mar 27) – The big questions, or why are we here?

- No required readings. We'll discuss the reasons you should take this course, one reason being that war is the most destructive invention in human history. And, to understand war, we need to understand human psychology.
- If you have not taken GOV 5 (or if it has been a while), be sure to read the following before the next session:
 - Snyder, Jack. (2004) "One world, rival theories." *Foreign Policy*, 145: 52-62.
- For background on the "behavioral revolution" in the social sciences (including in IR), see the below optional readings. In short, it's a very vibrant time to do psychological IR.
 - Thaler, R. H. (2016). Behavioral economics: Past, present, and future. *American economic review*, 106(7), 1577–1600
 - 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
 - Kertzer, J. D., & Tingley, D. (2018). Political psychology in international relations: Beyond the paradigms. *Annual review of political science*, 21, 319–339
 - Davis, J. W., & McDermott, R. (2021). The past, present, and future of behavioral IR. *International organization*, 75(1), 147–177

Session 2 (Mar 29) – What is rationality?

Common wisdom suggests that enlightened rational capacity – our propensities for logic and reason – makes humans unique among animals. What does it mean to be "rational," and are rationality and psychology necessarily opposites?

Reading:

- Kahneman, D. (2003). Maps of bounded rationality: Psychology for behavioral economics. *American economic review*, 93(5), 1449–1475
- Rathbun, B. C., Kertzer, J. D., & Paradis, M. (2017). Homo diplomaticus: Mixed-method evidence of variation in strategic rationality. *International organization*, 71(S1), S33–S60

Optional:

- Fearon, J. D. (1995). Rationalist explanations for war. *International organization*, 49(3), 379–414
- Mercer, J. (2005). Rationality and psychology in international politics. *International organization*, 59(1), 77–106

PART I.

The first third of this course engages fundamental political questions, beginning with the observation that IR lacks a formal sovereign. Some scholars suggest that this gives international politics a unique flavor in comparison to domestic politics.

Session 3 (Apr 3) – What binds human groups together, and is anarchy a useful concept?

International politics lacks a factor present in domestic politics: a final arbiter. Some argue that this lack of Leviathan above the state gives IR a pessimistic quality. Other IR scholars disagree. Intergroup psychologists have thoughts.

Reading:

- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2004). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In *Political psychology* (pp. 7–24). Psychology Press
- Rousseau, D. L., & Garcia-Retamero, R. (2007). Identity, power, and threat perception: A cross-national experimental study. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 51(5), 744–771

Optional:

- Mercer, J. (1995). Anarchy and identity. *International organization*, 49(2), 229–252
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of social issues*, 55(3), 429–444
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Rios, K. (2016). Intergroup threat theory. In T. D. Nelson (Ed.), *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination* (pp. 255–278). Psychology Press
- Thayer, B. A. (2000). Bringing in Darwin: Evolutionary theory, realism, and international politics. *International security*, 25(2), 124–151

Session 4 (Apr 5) – What is “law” without a sovereign?

Given that sovereigns enforce laws, and given that IR lacks a formal sovereign, how do states “regulate” bad behavior?

Reading:

- Shannon, V. P. (2000). Norms are what states make of them: The political psychology of norm violation. *International studies quarterly*, 44(2), 293–316
- Kertzer, J. D., Powers, K. E., Rathbun, B. C., & Iyer, R. (2014). Moral support: How moral values shape foreign policy attitudes. *Journal of politics*, 76(3), 825–840

Optional:

- Rathbun, B. C., & Pomeroy, C. (2022). See no evil, speak no evil? Morality, evolutionary psychology, and the nature of international relations. *International organization*, 76(3), 656–689
- DeScioli, P., & Kurzban, R. (2013). A solution to the mysteries of morality. *Psychological bulletin*, 139(2), 477

- Fiske, A. P., & Tetlock, P. E. (1997). Taboo trade-offs: Reactions to transactions that transgress the spheres of justice. *Political psychology*, 18(2), 255–297
- DeScioli, P., & Kurzban, R. (2009). Mysteries of morality. *Cognition*, 112(2), 281–299

Session 5 (Apr 10) – What is power?

Norms and moral cognition help to check most of our worst impulses, most of the time. Humans are an incredibly cooperative species. But, given that these norms are not enforceable laws in IR, sometimes the buck stops with “power.” Here, we assess the psychological dynamics of this central IR variable.

Reading:

- Winter, D. G. (2010). Power in the person: Exploring the motivational underground of power. In A. Guinote & T. K. Vescio (Eds.), *The social psychology of power* (pp. 113–140). Guilford Press
- Pomeroy, C. “Hawks Become Us: How the Sense of Power Shapes Public Attitudes Towards International Security,” *Security Studies*, Forthcoming.

Optional:

- Fettweis, C. (2018). *Psychology of a superpower: Security and dominance in US foreign policy*. Columbia University Press
- Winter, D. G. (1993). Power, affiliation, and war: Three tests of a motivational model. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 65(3), 532
- Herrmann, R. K., Voss, J. F., Schooler, T. Y., & Ciarrochi, J. (1997). Images in international relations: An experimental test of cognitive schemata. *International studies quarterly*, 41(3), 403–433
- Guinote, A. (2017). How power affects people: Activating, wanting, and goal seeking. *Annual review of psychology*, 68, 353–381

Session 6 (Apr 12) – What is security, and how do we identify threats to our security?

If states and leaders can use their power unchecked – regardless of our definition of power – why exactly is that a problem?

Reading:

- Stein, J. G. (2013). Threat perception in international relations. *The oxford handbook of political psychology*
- Búzás, Z. I. (2013). The color of threat: Race, threat perception, and the demise of the Anglo-Japanese alliance (1902–1923). *Security studies*, 22(4), 573–606

Optional:

- McDoom, O. S. (2012). The psychology of threat in intergroup conflict: Emotions, rationality, and opportunity in the Rwandan genocide. *International security*, 37(2), 119–155
- Yarhi-Milo, K. (2013). In the eye of the beholder: How leaders and intelligence communities assess the intentions of adversaries. *International security*, 38(1), 7–51

- Friedman, J. A. (2019). Priorities for preventive action: Explaining Americans' divergent reactions to 100 public risks. *American journal of political science*, 63(1), 181–196
- Hatemi, P. K., McDermott, R., Eaves, L. J., Kendler, K. S., & Neale, M. C. (2013). Fear as a disposition and an emotional state: A genetic and environmental approach to out-group political preferences. *American journal of political science*, 57(2), 279–293

Session 7 (Apr 17) – What is war?

We often know war “when we see it.” But, when we think harder about it, what exactly is war? How do we define it, know it, and experience it?

Reading:

- Choi, J.-K., & Bowles, S. (2007). The coevolution of parochial altruism and war. *Science*, 318(5850), 636–640
- Ginges, J., & Atran, S. (2011). War as a moral imperative (not just practical politics by other means). *Proceedings of the royal society b: biological sciences*, 278(1720), 2930–2938

Optional:

- Lopez, A. C. (2017). The evolutionary psychology of war: Offense and defense in the adapted mind. *Evolutionary psychology*, 15(4), 1474704917742720
- Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2010). Groups in mind: The coalitional roots of war and morality. *Human morality and sociality: evolutionary and comparative perspectives*, 191–234
- Hall, J., Kovras, I., Stefanovic, D., & Loizides, N. (2018). Exposure to violence and attitudes towards transitional justice. *Political psychology*, 39(2), 345–363
- Böhm, R., Rusch, H., & Gülerk, Ö. (2016). What makes people go to war? defensive intentions motivate retaliatory and preemptive intergroup aggression. *Evolution and human behavior*, 37(1), 29–34

PART II.

The first third of this course started with the lack of final arbiter above the state, ending with the observation that this makes war possible. But, this does not imply that war is necessary or even likely. In the next third of the course, we'll investigate why states do and don't fight from a political psychological perspective.

Session 8 (Apr 19) – To Survive: Deterrence and Coercion

Historically, one of the most-cited reasons for war is the pursuit of security and survival.

Reading:

- McDermott, R., Lopez, A. C., & Hatemi, P. K. (2017). 'Blunt not the heart, enrage it': The psychology of revenge and deterrence (November 2017). *Texas national security review*

- Powers, K. E., & Altman, D. (2022). The psychology of coercion failure: How reactance explains resistance to threats. *American journal of political science*

Optional:

- Jervis, R. (1982). Deterrence and perception. *International security*, 7(3), 3–30
- Jervis, R., Lebow, R. N., & Stein, J. G. (1989). *Psychology and deterrence*. JHU Press

Session 9 (Apr 24) – To Thrive: Status and Aggrandizement

Beyond our basic survival needs, humans often want to thrive. Although greed is seldom “good” even in interpersonal relations and domestic politics, why might greed be a problem in the context of IR?

Reading:

- Larson, D. W., & Shevchenko, A. (2010). Status seekers: Chinese and Russian responses to US primacy. *International security*, 34(4), 63–95
- Barnhart, J. (2021). The consequences of defeat: The quest for status and morale in the aftermath of war. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 65(1), 195–222

Optional:

- Dafoe, A., Renshon, J., & Huth, P. (2014). Reputation and status as motives for war. *Annual review of political science*, 17(1), 371–393
- Renshon, J. (2016). Status deficits and war. *International organization*, 70(3), 513–550
- 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
- Magee, J. C., & Galinsky, A. D. (2008). Social hierarchy: The self-reinforcing nature of power and status. *Academy of management annals*, 2(1), 351–398

Session 10 (Apr 26) – By Accident: Misperceptions and Miscalculations

Thus far, we have focused on relatively conscious reasons that leaders might intentionally engage in war. Unfortunately, sometimes states accidentally slide into wars that no one seems to want. What are the causes of these wars, and how do we avoid them?

Reading:

- Jervis, R. (1988). War and misperception. *Journal of interdisciplinary history*, 18(4), 675–700
- Johnson, D. D., & Tierney, D. (2011). The rubicon theory of war: How the path to conflict reaches the point of no return. *International security*, 36(1), 7–40

Optional:

- Jervis, R. (1976). *Perception and misperception in international politics*. Princeton University Press
- Levy, J. S. (1983). Misperception and the causes of war: Theoretical linkages and analytical problems. *World politics*, 36(1), 76–99

- Johnson, D. D., & Tierney, D. (2018). Bad world: The negativity bias in international politics. *International security*, 43(3), 96–140
- Friedman, J. A., & Zeckhauser, R. (2018). Analytic confidence and political decision-making: Theoretical principles and experimental evidence from national security professionals. *Political psychology*, 39(5), 1069–1087
- Flynn, D., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2017). The nature and origins of misperceptions: Understanding false and unsupported beliefs about politics. *Political psychology*, 38, 127–150

———— Policy Essay Due Friday, April 28 By Noon. ————

Session 11 (May 1) – With Purpose: Virtuous Violence

Morality – our sense of right and wrong – is a key way that humans detect and respond to threats. When does morality restrain our worst impulses, and when does morality sharpen them?

Reading:

- Slovic, P., Mertz, C., Markowitz, D. M., Quist, A., & Västfjäll, D. (2020). Virtuous violence from the war room to death row. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences*, 117(34), 20474–20482
- Atran, S., & Ginges, J. (2012). Religious and sacred imperatives in human conflict. *Science*, 336(6083), 855–857

Optional:

- Pomeroy, C., & Rathbun, B. C. (2023). Just business? Moral condemnation and virtuous violence in the American and Russian mass publics. *Journal of peace research*
- Fiske, A. P., & Rai, T. S. (2014). *Virtuous violence: Hurting and killing to create, sustain, end, and honor social relationships*. Cambridge University Press

Session 12 (May 3) – No Formal Meeting (Details to follow)

Session 13 (May 8) – For “Us”: Nationalism and National Identity

Human psychology primes us to sort individuals into “ingroup” and “outgroup” categories. In the modern era, this perceptual tendency has both advantages (e.g., identifying allies versus threats) and disadvantages (e.g., racial prejudice, feelings of cultural superiority). Here, we’ll discuss how different dimensions of national identity can temper or amplify tendencies towards conflict.

Reading:

- Herrmann, R. K., Isernia, P., & Segatti, P. (2009). Attachment to the nation and international relations: Dimensions of identity and their relationship to war and peace. *Political psychology*, 30(5), 721–754

- Powers, K. E. (2022). *Nationalisms in international politics*. Princeton University Press (pp 1–31).

Optional:

- Li, Q., & Brewer, M. B. (2004). What does it mean to be an American? Patriotism, nationalism, and American identity after 9/11. *Political psychology*, 25(5), 727–739
- Herrmann, R. K. (2017). How attachments to the nation shape beliefs about the world: A theory of motivated reasoning. *International organization*, 71(S1), S61–S84

———— Ungraded Research Paper Outline Due Monday, May 8 By Noon. ————

PART III.

Thus far, we have learned about some unique challenges posed by war in the context of IR, as well as leading explanations for the occurrence of war. In the final third of the course, we pivot to war in our lifetime, beginning with the U.S.’s post-cold war focus on “terrorism” to emerging security questions in the 21st century, like China’s reemergence.

Session 14 (May 10) – “Terrorism”

Much of U.S. foreign policy over the past two decades centered on combatting “terrorism.” What makes this supposed threat so psychologically salient for some?

Reading:

- Huddy, L., Feldman, S., Taber, C., & Lahav, G. (2005). Threat, anxiety, and support of antiterrorism policies. *American journal of political science*, 49(3), 593–608
- Kam, C. D., & Kinder, D. R. (2007). Terror and ethnocentrism: Foundations of American support for the war on terrorism. *Journal of politics*, 69(2), 320–338

Optional:

- Hetherington, M., & Suhay, E. (2011). Authoritarianism, threat, and Americans’ support for the war on terror. *American journal of political science*, 55(3), 546–560

Session 15 (May 15) – The Iraq War, 2003

Some IR scholars argue that the U.S.’s longest war provides some of the strongest evidence to date for the need for a behavioralist theory of war.

Reading:

- Lake, D. A. (2010). Two cheers for bargaining theory: Assessing rationalist explanations of the Iraq War. *International security*, 35(3), 7–52

- Duelfer, C. A., & Dyson, S. B. (2011). Chronic misperception and international conflict: The US-Iraq experience. *International security*, 36(1), 73–100

Optional:

- Dyson, S. B., & Raleigh, A. L. (2014). Public and private beliefs of political leaders: Saddam Hussein in front of a crowd and behind closed doors. *Research & politics*, 1(1), 2053168014537808

Session 16 (May 17) – Nuclear Weapons

War has been a feature of human relations throughout evolutionary history. But, some argue that nuclear weapons fundamentally alter the nature of war. What does political psychology have to say?

Reading:

- Hymans, J. E. (2006). *The psychology of nuclear proliferation: Identity, emotions and foreign policy*. Cambridge University Press (pp 1–46)
- 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

Optional:

- Pauly, R. B., & McDermott, R. (2023). The psychology of nuclear brinkmanship. *International security*, 47(3), 9–51
- Whitlark, R. E. (2017). Nuclear beliefs: A leader-focused theory of counter-proliferation. *Security studies*, 26(4), 545–574
- Dolan, T. M. (2013). Unthinkable and tragic: The psychology of weapons taboos in war. *International organization*, 67(1), 37–63
- Saunders, E. N. (2019). The domestic politics of nuclear choices—a review essay. *International security*, 44(2), 146–184

Session 17 (May 22) – U.S.-China Relations

As we saw in earlier sessions, the U.S. has enjoyed a great deal of leeway in foreign policy since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Many argue that those days are over. Here, we consider a new era of U.S.-China relations.

Reading:

- Gries, P. H. (2005). Social psychology and the identity-conflict debate: Is a ‘China threat’ inevitable? *European journal of international relations*, 11(2), 235–265
- Kertzer, J. D., Brutger, R., & Quek, K. (2019). Perspective taking and the security dilemma: Cross-national experimental evidence from China and the United States

Optional:

- Weiss, J. C. (2019). How hawkish is the Chinese public? Another look at “rising nationalism” and Chinese foreign policy. *Journal of contemporary china*, 1–17

Session 18 (May 22 X Period) – Emerging Issues in International Security

Reading:

- Read ONLY pp 1–5: Shandler, R., Gross, M. L., & Canetti, D. (2023). Cyberattacks, psychological distress, and military escalation: An internal meta-analysis. *Journal of global security studies*, 8(1), ogac042
- Read ALL four pages: Van der Linden, S., Maibach, E., & Leiserowitz, A. (2015). Improving public engagement with climate change: Five “best practice” insights from psychological science. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 10(6), 758–763

Memorial Day (May 29) – No Class

Session 19 (May 31) – Review Discussion

- No required readings. The majority of this meeting will be devoted to your final term papers – how the papers are going, any outstanding questions, etc.

————— Research Paper Due Monday, June 5 By Noon. —————

Good luck on finals in other courses!