

STATECRAFT PAPER ASSIGNMENTS

IMPORTANT NOTES FOR PROFESSORS

- The following questions can either be used individually for paper assignments (or essay exams) or “mixed and matched” to create longer paper assignments. For example, Prof. Keller uses a final paper assignment that includes three of these questions and specifies that students should spend about a page answering each one (similar to a take-home exam).
- Many of these questions overlap with the discussion questions included on the lecture outlines—so if you will be using one of these questions for a paper assignment you’ll probably want to wait on an in-depth class discussion of the question until after students have worked through these issues on their own in their papers.
- Many of these questions are best answered *after the simulation has been completed* (those that ask students to reflect on the entire simulation experience) while others can be dealt with at any point after students have begun to immerse themselves in Statecraft (after a few turns).
- Most of these questions focus on having students (1) apply IR concepts and theories in the realm of Statecraft and (2) compare their Statecraft experience with the dynamics of real world politics. So they are more exercises in critical thinking and application than actual research projects. But these questions can be easily modified to require outside research on specific cases if the instructor wishes (for example, instead of asking students to consider generally the correspondence between trade dynamics in Statecraft and the real world—question #5 under Theoretical Perspectives—you could ask students to explore these issues in the context of the U.S.-China trade relationship and require them to cite a certain number of scholarly sources, etc.).

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES & LEVELS OF ANALYSIS

- 1) Realism and idealism offer very different visions of world politics. Seven important areas of controversy between realists and idealists are listed below. CHOOSE 3 OF THESE 7 AREAS. For each of your three chosen areas, a) briefly describe the views of realists vs. idealists, then b) make an argument about whether Statecraft is best captured by realism or idealism in that particular area (be sure to use examples from your simulation experience where appropriate to support your arguments).
 - a. Key actors in world politics
 - b. The role of international institutions
 - c. States' priorities
 - d. Human nature
 - e. Relative vs. absolute gains
 - f. The nature of the international system
 - g. The prospects for cooperation among states

- 2) Which country in your Statecraft world has most clearly pursued a realist approach to foreign policy? Which country has adhered most closely to the idealist/liberal perspective? Provide examples to support these claims. Which of these two countries was more successful in the simulation, and can this success be attributed to its foreign policy approach? What are the implications for real world politics?

- 3) How would you describe the *polarity* of your Statecraft world? Justify your choice with specific examples. Did this power structure appear to be stabilizing or destabilizing, and why? How have countries in your world responded to powerful states: with bandwagoning, balancing, or some combination of these strategies? Provide examples. What are the strengths and weaknesses of these approaches?

- 4) How were the most powerful states in your Statecraft world perceived? Was it their capabilities, their actions, or their rhetoric (or some combination of these) that produced these perceptions? Do you find parallels to America's experience as the world's only superpower? If you were advising the President of the United States, what advice would you give about the way power should be exercised to minimize resentment or hostility?

- 5) Have trade ties in your Statecraft world led to greater interdependence, cooperation, and peace (as commercial liberals expect)? Or have these ties produced asymmetric dependence and exploitation (as some realists and Marxists would predict)? Give specific examples and explain precisely *how* trade has produced these outcomes. Are these Statecraft outcomes reflective of trade dynamics in the real world? Why or why not?

- 6) Have IGOs in your Statecraft world facilitated cooperation by increasing transparency, reducing transaction costs, etc. (as liberal institutionalists would expect)? Or have they been ineffective and/or dominated by the most powerful states (as realists would predict)? Give specific examples from your Statecraft experience to support your claims. Should we expect

these same dynamics to exist in real world politics, or does the world of Statecraft have different incentives that overvalue or undervalue IGOs?

- 7) What norms have you noticed in your Statecraft world? Be specific: try to identify at least three different norms. Where did these norms come from? Were these norms universally followed or occasionally violated? What are the implications, if any, for the role of norms in world politics?
- 8) Compare the norms of your Statecraft world with international norms in the real world. How are they different (or similar), and what accounts for these differences or similarities? Be sure to discuss at least two norms from each “world.”
- 9) Which countries in your Statecraft world represent the wealthy, developed “core” and which are part of the “periphery”? Describe relations between the core and the periphery: is there an element of exploitation, and how have the exploited actors responded? Give examples.
- 10) Do the actions of male and female leaders (particularly Chief Decision-Makers) in Statecraft better support the arguments of difference feminists or liberal feminists? Focus on such areas as conflict resolution, styles of communication, and decision-making methods. Provide specific examples to support your claims.
- 11) Describe a case in Statecraft in which different individuals had very different views of the same situation. Can these different perceptions be traced to different backgrounds, experiences, and ideologies (e.g., cultural, gender, conservative/liberal, or hawk/dove differences)? What are the implications for real world politics and for our ability to describe IR objectively?
- 12) Choose an important event in your Statecraft world (e.g., the outbreak of war, a pivotal treaty, etc.). Now identify one factor at each level of analysis (system, state, individual) that you believe played some role in shaping this outcome, and explain precisely *how* that factor influenced the outcome. Which of these factors seemed to be most important in shaping the outcome? What (if anything) does this suggest about the importance of this level of analysis in Statecraft? In the real world?
- 13) Did system-level, state-level, or individual-level variables appear to have the most impact on what happened in your Statecraft world? Or were variables at two or more levels equally important? Defend your answer with specific examples. Do you think the relative importance of these levels of analysis in Statecraft parallel these levels’ importance in real world politics? Why or why not?
- 14) Suppose that as a political scientist you were interested in explaining precisely why things unfolded the way they did in your Statecraft world (wars, international agreements, alliances, etc.). How much importance would you attach to each of the following factors as causal forces driving these events? Explain why. (You don’t need to discuss all of these, but pick those you think were particularly important or surprisingly insignificant). Conclude by

discussing whether or not these factors' importance in Statecraft accurately reflects their real world importance, and why.

- a. Geography
- b. Countries' starting resource endowments
- c. Individual leaders' personalities and beliefs
- d. Groups' foreign policy beliefs (e.g., "hardliners" vs. "accommodationists," etc.)
- e. Domestic factions' demands
- f. The United Nations and other IGOs
- g. Countries' regime types and attributes
- h. System structure (e.g., anarchy and power distributions)
- i. Norms
- j. ANY OTHER FACTORS YOU THINK WERE IMPORTANT

FOREIGN POLICY

- 1) Over the past 8 weeks, you have had an opportunity to serve as a high-level foreign policy decision-maker and to make important policy choices for your country concerning national goals, trade, diplomacy, and war and peace. Based on your experience, **choose TWO of the following concepts that you think can help explain decision-making within your own country.** Explain in some detail precisely how each of your chosen two proved to be relevant for Statecraft decision-making (citing specific perceptions, processes, or choices where possible). **Your examples must be complete enough to demonstrate that you understand the concepts you are applying.**
 - a. Cognitive Consistency
 - b. Motivated Biases
 - c. Attribution Biases
 - d. Prospect Theory
 - e. Choice Shift
 - f. Mirror Imaging
 - g. Groupthink
- 2) How have you experienced two-level games in Statecraft? Be specific, citing the international level and domestic level constraints that interacted to frame your choices. Did these constraints simply make it harder to reach an acceptable outcome, or did constraints at one level give you bargaining leverage at the other level? How were the demands you faced both similar and different from the types of constraints that confront real-world policymakers? Be specific.
- 3) Choose an important policy action taken by another country during the Statecraft simulation (e.g., offering a nonaggression pact, attacking Sapphire Island, etc.). Now provide three separate explanations for this action, using Allison's models as a template: (a) a rational actor explanation, (b) an organizational process explanation, and (c) a bureaucratic politics explanation. Which of these explanations best appears to capture the process that led to this action?
- 4) Students frequently experience bureaucratic politics in Statecraft. What recurring differences can you identify in the priorities and concerns of different members of your Statecraft country? To what degree do these policy differences match up with the organizational identities or roles of different officials? Give examples. Overall, would you say that "where you stand" on issues in Statecraft is greatly influenced by "where you sit" in terms of your role?
- 5) In what ways have countries in your Statecraft world behaved as unitary, rational actors? In what ways have they not? Give specific examples. What does this suggest about the strengths and weaknesses of the rational actor model for analyzing and predicting countries' behavior?

- 6) Give an example of a decision that was the result of bargaining, coercion, or compromise among members of your Statecraft country. Describe the process by which the decision was reached. Did this decision promote the national interest, the parochial interests of one or more bureaucracies, or no one's interests at all? Which of Allison's 3 models (rational actor, organizational process, bureaucratic politics) best describes this decision process?
- 7) Did your Statecraft country's Chief Decision-Maker behave more as a "constraint respecter" (pursuing a participatory, consensual decision-making process) or a "constraint challenger" (pursuing his/her preferred policies despite opposition from other domestic or international actors)? Do you think this decision-making style was a product of this leader's personality or was it dictated by the situation he/she confronted? Did the leader's decision-making style depend on the issue under consideration? What were the positive and negative consequences of this decision-making style?
- 8) In your Statecraft country, was the Chief Decision-Maker like a "king," able to command and enforce compliance with his/her wishes, or was it necessary for this official to bargain and persuade fellow government officials to get his/her way? Provide examples. Did the Chief Decision-Maker's power depend on the issue that was under consideration, or was it constant across all issue areas? Explain. Are these observations consistent with the predictions of the bureaucratic politics model?
- 9) Describe a crisis situation that you faced in Statecraft (it must meet all three conditions of a crisis: high threat, short decision time, and surprise). How was your decision-making process different (if at all) in this situation as opposed to non-crisis situations? Would this "crisis-induced process" be likely to produce better or worse decisions than the normal process?
- 10) Using Herrmann's image theory as a guide, identify the images you held of specific countries in Statecraft (possible options: ally, enemy, colony, degenerate, imperial, barbarian, and rogue). How did these images lead to specific policy actions toward those countries? Be specific. Were these links between images and policies consistent with the predictions of image theory?
- 11) Mirror-imaging has been cited as an important cause of intelligence failure. Describe a case in which you or other members of your country engaged in mirror imaging during the simulation and wrongly assumed that others shared your values, perceptions, or calculations. What were the consequences? How might you have avoided mirror imaging, and what are the implications for real world decision-makers?
- 12) To what degree did your Statecraft country exhibit symptoms of groupthink (overestimation of group power/morality, incomplete survey of information/options/risks, and pressures toward uniformity)? If you experienced several of these symptoms, what explains why your decision-making group fell victim to groupthink? If you largely avoided these symptoms, what explains your group's success in resisting groupthink? Be specific.

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY & JUST WAR THEORY

- 1) With no higher authority above states, the world of Statecraft meets the realists' definition of anarchy. Explain precisely how the anarchic nature of the simulation affected the interactions between states (using specific examples from your experience). Is it possible to (at least partially) overcome the negative effects of anarchy in Statecraft? If so, how? What are the implications for real world politics?
- 2) Have you observed the security dilemma operating in your Statecraft world? If so, describe the relevant sequence of perceptions and events in some detail and discuss how the actors might have avoided this dilemma (if this is possible). If you have not observed the security dilemma in Statecraft, explain why you think your world has been able to avoid or minimize this dilemma. What are the implications for real world politics?
- 3) (**NOTE: Only use this question if one or more countries have developed nuclear weapons in the Statecraft world). How has the presence of nuclear weapons affected countries' calculations and behavior in the world of Statecraft? Be specific. How have you sought to protect your country from nuclear annihilation? Does the presence of nuclear weapons make the world of Statecraft more stable or less stable? Do nuclear weapons have this same effect in the real world?
- 4) Give an example of how you have experienced problems of credible commitment in Statecraft. In this case, why wasn't the commitment believable? What could be done (or have you done) to overcome this problem? Is it easier to overcome problems of credible commitment in Statecraft or in the real world? Explain.
- 5) How have countries in your Statecraft world used the strategy of conventional (non-nuclear) deterrence? Provide specific examples of successful and unsuccessful deterrence attempts, if available. What conditions appear to lead to deterrence success or failure? (Either cite actual events in Statecraft or speculate about these factors if you haven't observed them).
- 6) (**NOTE: Only use this question after the OLF has made its nuclear threats, as revealed in a news message on Turn 6). At the start of Turn 6, General Drax claimed to have a nuclear weapon and threatened to use it if Orion was not freed. Do you think the OLF would actually use it? Why or why not (think about their goals). Is there any way to deter terrorist organizations that have no territory to hold under threat? What other options are open to countries targeted by such groups?
- 7) How have countries in your Statecraft world used the strategy of compellence? Provide specific examples of successful and unsuccessful compellence attempts, if available. What conditions appear to lead to compellence success or failure? (Either cite actual events in Statecraft or speculate about these factors if you haven't observed them).
- 8) Choose an example of a war that either (a) occurred in your Statecraft world or (b) was seriously contemplated by your country or others. Evaluate this actual or potential war in

terms of the following principles of Just War Theory: just cause, right intention, last resort, legitimate authority, reasonable chance of success, proportionality, and discrimination. On which criteria does the war “pass the test,” and where does it fall short? Overall, would you say this was a just war or not?

- 9) Is Statecraft “just a game” in which anything goes, or should students adhere to some basic ethical practices such as honesty and not harming others since their classmates’ grades may be affected by what happens in the simulation? Justify your position.

INTERNATIONAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

- 1) Which actions in Statecraft would indicate a *mercantilist* approach by a country? Be specific. Do any countries in your world fit this profile? What are the advantages and disadvantages of mercantilism in Statecraft? Overall, how successful is a mercantilist approach in Statecraft? In the real world? (Explain any major differences between the two realms).
- 2) How does resource production and trade in Statecraft illustrate the doctrine of comparative advantage? In your answer, be sure to consider the following: countries' resource endowments, resource-enhancement structures, and the effects of regime types and countries' attributes.
- 3) Which actions in Statecraft would indicate a *liberal/capitalist* approach by a country? Be specific. Do any countries in your world fit this profile? What are the advantages and disadvantages of economic liberalism in Statecraft? Overall, how successful is this approach in the world of Statecraft? In the real world? (Explain any major differences between the two realms).
- 4) (**NOTE: this question duplicates #9 under Theoretical Perspectives). Which countries in your Statecraft world represent the wealthy, developed "core" and which are part of the "periphery"? Describe relations between the core and the periphery: is there an element of exploitation, and how have the exploited actors responded? Give examples.
- 5) How do the rules of Statecraft make it tempting to attack Sapphire Island or weaker countries to seize their resources? Do what degree are these rules replicated in real world politics? (In your answer, consider whether the sources of wealth have changed over time, and any implications of these changes for armed conflict).
- 6) In what ways has your country experienced interdependence with other countries in Statecraft? Be specific. Are these relationships balanced or are they asymmetric (meaning one party needs the other more)? What are the benefits and drawbacks of these relationships?
- 7) To what degree is the world of Statecraft a globalized world, in the areas of security, economics, health, the environment, and culture? In those areas that are characterized by a high degree of globalization, what are the positive and negative consequences of this integration? Provide specific examples from your experiences in Statecraft.
- 8) To answer this question your country needs to have joined the WTO (or you need to get this information from a country that has joined the WTO). What was the reaction of the nationalist, socialist, and environmentalist factions to the decision to join the WTO? How were their arguments similar or different? Be specific. Are these valid critiques of the WTO? How would WTO supporters respond?

- 9) (NOTE: This question will work best if most countries in the simulation have joined the WTO and experienced its dynamics). What are the incentives to raise tariffs and give domestic subsidies in Statecraft? If you are a member of the WTO, how do these actions affect other WTO members, and what will be their likely reaction? How do these conflicts parallel real-world disagreements among WTO members? Be specific.

IGOS, HUMAN RIGHTS, & THE ENVIRONMENT

- 1) Discussion question: All told, how effective has the UN proven to be in helping you to achieve global cooperation on key issues in Statecraft? (If its effectiveness varies by issue, explain how). What are the limits of the UN in your Statecraft world? Be specific. Is there any way to overcome these limits? What are the implications for real world politics?
- 2) What potential problems exist regarding the International Criminal Court's objectivity and enforcement powers in the world of Statecraft? Be specific. To what extent do these same concerns apply to the real ICC? Are these concerns sufficient, in your view, to justify the United States decision not to participate in the ICC?
- 3) Give at least three examples of international law in your Statecraft world and identify their sources (treaties, custom, or general principles of law). How effective has international law been in constraining states' behavior in your world? What explains this success or failure? Be specific. What are the implications for international law in the real world?
- 4) What international norms have developed in your Statecraft world? Through what process did they develop? Why these expectations and not others? Have countries felt constrained by these norms or have there been violations? If you have observed violations, what do these events suggest about the conditions that favor norm violation?
- 5) What examples of public goods can you identify in Statecraft? Explain how these goods are non-rivalrous and non-excludable. Has your world experienced difficulties in the production of these goods (as is frequently the case)? If so, explain the incentives that led to these problems; if not, explain how you were able to overcome these very common problems.
- 6) Most Statecraft worlds fail to build the Globe of Frost until serious flooding has begun to damage all countries. (A) If this describes your world, why did you wait so long to build the Globe of Frost, despite the risks of inaction? Describe the conversations countries have had about this issue and any efforts to collaborate to research and construct the Globe of Frost. What obstacles to action did you encounter, and is this an example of a collective action problem? Why or why not? Is there any way to overcome this problem in Statecraft? (B) If your world succeeded in building the Globe of Frost before serious flooding occurred, explain how you were able to achieve this elusive goal.