Mission Statement

The mission of the Mershon Center is to advance the understanding of national security in a global context. The center does this by fostering research on the use of force and diplomacy; the ideas, identities, and decisional processes that affect security; and the institutions that manage violent conflict.
About the Center

The Mershon Center for International Security Studies is the fulfillment of a bequest by Colonel Ralph D. Mershon to The Ohio State University for the exploration of matters pertaining to national security.

Ralph D. Mershon was a man of action in public life. He organized the American engineers for service in World War I and led a public effort to create legislation that was the forerunner of the Reserve Officer Training Corps in the United States. He also was a contemplative and inventive person who held a number of important patents for his work in electrical engineering. Col. Mershon died February 14, 1952, and is buried in Zanesville, Ohio.

The Mershon Center encourages collaborative, interdisciplinary research projects within the university and with other institutions around the world. Current projects include a comparative analysis of elections in 19 democracies, an examination of the dissent-repression cycle in the Middle East, and a history of the interactions between Islam and secularism in modern Turkey. Faculty from many departments and from across the university participate in these projects.

Mershon supports multidisciplinary teams and individual faculty research. The center hosts visiting scholars and postdoctoral fellows, and it supports student research. The Mershon Center also organizes conferences, symposia, and workshops that bring together scholars, government officials, and business leaders from around the world to discuss the latest research in national and international security affairs.

The Mershon Center is also supported by community gifts and grant money. The center’s mission is to advance the scholarly study and intellectual understanding of national security in a global context. The center does this by fostering research on three areas of focus:

- The use of force and diplomacy
- The ideas, identities, and decisional processes that affect security
- The institutions that manage violent conflict
The mission of the Mershon Center is to advance the understanding of national security in a global context. Rarely has that task seemed more urgent and complicated. Wars in Iraq and Afghanistan continue, and it has become increasingly clear that military force alone will not bring them to a close. There is a need for cultural, economic, and political expertise as well.

As the security agenda has grown, the Mershon Center has complemented its focus on the use of force and diplomacy with equal attention to the cultures and ideas that underpin security, and to the institutions that manage conflict. Projects sponsored by the center aim to explore fundamental questions such as:

- How can military force be used effectively to advance political aims? When and why will its use succeed on the battlefield but fail politically?
- What role do national and religious identities play in conflict? Are they immutable or can we devise strategies to ameliorate the conflicts they generate?
- What institutions have been successful in managing violent conflict? How can such institutions be built and sustained?

The Mershon Center promotes collaborative research on these themes among colleagues from more than 15 departments across Ohio State. It does this by funding multidisciplinary faculty and student research and undergraduate study abroad scholarships. The center also hosts numerous seminars and conferences, enriching intellectual life on campus by bringing some of the world’s leading scholars and practitioners to Ohio State.

The Mershon Center’s principal aim is to produce scholarship that has lasting value. This year we are especially proud of the recognition received by several of our colleagues for the work they have done. Allan Millett was awarded the 2008 Pritzker Military Library Literature Award for Lifetime Achievement in Military Writing. John Mueller received the Warren J. Mitofsky Award for Excellence in Public Opinion Research. Peter Shane was named executive director of The Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Communities in a Democracy.

The faculty members and the students they attract are the lifeblood of the Mershon Center and the main benefit of being its director. This year, I am particularly happy to welcome Dr. and Col. (ret.) Peter Mansoor as the Raymond E. Mason Jr. Chair in Military History. Peter is a highly decorated officer with more than 26 years of distinguished service. Prior to coming to Ohio State, he served as executive officer to Gen. David Petraeus in Baghdad. Peter holds a PhD in history and is author of *The GI Offensive in Europe* (Kansas, 1999). His most recent book is *Baghdad at Sunrise: A Brigade Commander’s War in Iraq* (Yale, 2008).

More information about the Mershon Center, along with photos and videos from many talks given here, are available on our web site at mershoncenter.osu.edu.
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BY THE NUMBERS

General
Number of faculty research projects supported: 27
Number of postdoctorate fellows and visiting scholars: 6
Number of graduate student travel and research grants given: 17
Number of undergraduate study abroad grants given: 13
Number of departments whose faculty and students were supported: 17

Students
Number of graduate student attendees at events: About 760
Number of research assistantships supported: 37 (25 percent each)
Number of undergraduate attendees at events: About 650
Number of undergraduate student employees: 8

Web Site
Average number of unique visitors per month: 3,779
Average number of visits per month: 5,333
Average number of page views per month: 15,115
Number of countries in which web site was viewed: 103
Percentage of visitors who bookmark web site in favorites: 46

Events
Number of speaker series organized: 8
Number of speaker events held: 40
Number of conference sponsored: 6
Total number of attendees: More than 3,100
Average number of people per event: 57
Number of collaborating colleges, departments, and centers: 30
Number of colleges, departments, and centers reached: 68

Streaming Videos
Number of visitors: 2,533
Number of video clips viewed: 24,490
Average number of video clips viewed per person: 9.7
Average number of video clips viewed per day: 67
Number of countries in which video clips were viewed: 51

Faculty
Number of books published: 20
Number of articles published: 157
Number of times quoted or cited in media (including blogs): 439
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Georgian demonstrators staged a protest in front of the United Nations in New York on August 11, 2008. Protesters used images of Adolph Hitler to characterize Russian President Vladimir Putin. The conflict began on August 8, when Georgia launched an offensive to recapture Tskhinvali, the capital of the breakaway republic of South Ossetia. In response, Russia invaded South Ossetia and a second breakaway province of Abkhazia, and shelled parts of central Georgia. (Photo by Emmanuel Dunand/AFP/Getty Images)

INSET: Pro-South Ossetians staged a protest outside the Georgian diplomatic mission in Ankara, Turkey, on August 13, 2008. Protesters used images of Adolph Hitler to characterize Georgian President Mikhail Saakashvili. South Ossetia and Abkhazia would like to declare independence from Georgia, possibly joining Russia. (Photo by Adem Altan/AFP/Getty Images)
Based on national surveys in the United States and Italy, Herrmann and his coauthors examine whether popular identification with the nation leads to more cooperative or conflictive foreign policy attitudes. In 2008 the authors will follow up on this research with a national survey in France that explores attitudes of both the majority and recent immigrants.

Currently Herrmann is working on “Explaining Preferences for Unilateral and Multilateral Foreign Policies: The Role Nationalism and Ideology Play in the United States.” In this project, he uses experiments embedded in a national survey to determine how large a role nationalism and ideology play in the foreign policy preferences of Americans.

Herrmann finds that liberals favor multilateral approaches in most situations, while conservatives favor unilateral approaches in some situations and multilateral approaches in others. This is because conservatives differentiate among other nations based on how they affect U.S. interests, while liberals tend to apply multilateral norms in a more universal fashion. These results suggest that ideology plays a larger role in foreign policy preferences of Americans than previously thought. However, it does not mean that Americans are polarized along conservative and liberal lines, since most people support multilateral strategies.

For his scholarship, Herrmann was named a Joan N. Huber Faculty Fellow by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences for 2007–10. In 2008, Ohio State President E. Gordon Gee presented him with the Faculty Award for Distinguished University Service recognizing his service not only as director of the Mershon Center, but also as chair of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and director of academic programs at the Office of International Affairs. In this role, taken on during the past year, Herrmann oversees activities at Ohio State’s five area studies centers.
John Mueller is the Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies at the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and a professor of political science at Ohio State. His interests include international politics, foreign policy, defense policy, public opinion, democratization, economic history, post-Communism, and terrorism.

Mueller is author or editor of 15 books, including:

- The Remnants of War (Cornell, 2004), winner of the Joseph P. Lepgold Prize for Best Book on International Relations from Georgetown University
- Capitalism, Democracy, and Ralph’s Pretty Good Grocery (Princeton, 1999)
- Quiet Cataclysm: Reflections on the Recent Transformation of World Politics (HarperCollins, 1995)
- Policy and Opinion in the Gulf War (University of Chicago, 1994)
- Retreat from Doomsday: The Obsolescence of Major War (Basic Books, 1989)

Mueller is currently working on a book project under contract with Oxford University Press called Atomic Obsession: Reactions and Overreactions to Terrorism. It argues that because of practical difficulties involved in developing, delivering, and detonating an atomic device, it is highly unlikely rogue states or terrorists will get their hands on a nuclear weapon. Even if they did, this does not mean they would use it, and even if they did use it, they could not inflict enough damage to destroy the United States.

However, Mueller argues, the obsessive quest to control nuclear proliferation has resulted not only in massive unnecessary expenditures on policing and protection, but in making the very terrorists and rogue states whom we are trying to keep from getting nuclear weapons want them even more. It has also led to far more casualties—through tactics like decades-long sanctions in Iraq that led to hundreds of thousands of civilian deaths—than all the weapons of mass destruction combined.

Mueller also regularly appears at seminars and workshops on national security. In September 2007, he and Mary Ellen O’Connell, professor of law at Notre Dame, organized “What Is War,” an interdisciplinary conference that sought to define when conflict, crime, or terrorism legally becomes war. He is chairing a panel for a conference on terrorism in January 2009 sponsored by the Cato Institute.

Mueller also shared his thoughts on the terrorist threat—or lack thereof—with 15 U.S. members of Congress at an Aspen Institute Congressional Program in April. Among those in attendance were Senators Sherrod Brown and George Voinovich of Ohio.

Mueller was interviewed by more than 65 major media outlets this year for his expertise on the Iraq war, war on terror, and war and public opinion. These include The New York Times, Chicago Tribune, The Christian Science Monitor, USA Today, BBC, and Voice of America.

One of his most talked-about pieces was “Dead and Deader” in the Los Angeles Times, in which Mueller measured the ever-rising death toll in the four Rambo films by charting such statistics as the number of bad guys killed by Rambo with his shirt on, number of bad guys killed by Rambo with his shirt off, and number of deaths per minute.
Peter Mansoor is the new Raymond E. Mason Jr. Chair in Military History, a joint appointment between the Mershon Center for International Security Studies and the Department of History at Ohio State. His research interests include modern U.S. military history, World War II, and counterinsurgency operations.

Mansoor is a highly decorated officer with more than 26 years of distinguished military service. Prior to coming to Ohio State, he served as executive officer to General David Petraeus, commander of the multinational forces in Iraq.

In this position, Mansoor assisted Petraeus with strategic planning for the U.S. war effort in Iraq and prepared him for meetings with top leaders such as President George W. Bush, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, and the National Security Council. Mansoor was one of the major authors of the Report on the Situation in Iraq, delivered by Petraeus to Congress in September 2007, and he also helped prepare the general for testimony before Congress about the state of the Iraq War in April 2008.

Prior to his most recent deployment, Mansoor served on a Council of Colonels that enabled the Joint Chiefs of Staff to reassess the strategy for the Iraq War. Based in part on this group’s deliberations, the United States began the “surge” strategy in 2007–08.

Mansoor is also founding director of the U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Center at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Under his leadership, the Counterinsurgency Center helped to revise the final version of Counterinsurgency Field Manual 3-24, which was published jointly by the Army and Marine Corps in December 2006. This document was the first revision of U.S. counterinsurgency doctrine in more than 20 years, incorporating lessons learned during conflicts throughout the 20th and 21st centuries.

Besides his military service, Mansoor also has a long record of scholarship. He is author of The GI Offensive in Europe: The Triumph of American Infantry Divisions, 1941–45 (University Press of Kansas, 1999), a comprehensive study of America’s infantry combat performance in Europe during World War II. Mansoor argues the Army succeeded by developing effective divisions that could not only fight and win battles but also sustain that effort over years of combat. It won the Society for Military History Book Award and the Army Historical Foundation Distinguished Book Award.

Mansoor’s most recent publication is Baghdad at Sunrise: A Brigade Commander’s War in Iraq (Yale University Press, 2008). This memoir is based on his 2003–04 command of the 1st Brigade Combat Team, 1st Armored Division, in Baghdad. After the April 2004 uprising of militia loyal to the Shiite cleric Muqtada Al-Sadr, Mansoor’s brigade combat team restored the holy city of Karbala to coalition control, an operation for which the organization was awarded a Presidential Unit Citation for collective valor in combat.

Mansoor graduated first in his class from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point in 1982 and received master’s and doctoral degrees in military history from The Ohio State University in 1992 and 1995. He also has a master’s in strategic studies from the U.S. Army War College.

The Mason Chair in Military History is endowed by Major General Raymond E. Mason Jr., a 1941 graduate of Ohio State who retired from military service in 1976. The previous holder of the Mason Chair was Allan R. Millett, now director of the Eisenhower Center for American Studies at the University of New Orleans.
Alexander Wendt

Alexander Wendt is the Ralph D. Mershon Professor of International Security Studies at the Mershon Center. His research interests include international relations theory, global governance, political and social theory, and the philosophy of social science.

Wendt is one of the most cited international relations scholars today. Based on a survey by the College of William and Mary of 2,000 international relations faculty, Foreign Policy named him the third-most influential scholar in the field over the past 20 years.

Wendt is so important because he was one of the first scholars to bring social constructivist theory to international relations. His book Social Theory of International Politics argues that international politics is determined not primarily by material concerns such as wealth and power, but by states’ perceptions of each other as rivals, enemies, and friends.

Social Theory of International Politics has been translated into seven languages and was named Best Book of the Decade by the International Studies Association in 2006.

Wendt is currently working on a new book project that explores the idea of a quantum social science. In Quantum Mind and Social Science, Wendt looks at the implications for social science of recent claims in neuroscience that human consciousness is a quantum mechanical phenomenon—in other words, it behaves as both wave and particle. If these claims are true, he argues, then social science must shift its foundation from classical to quantum mechanics because consciousness is key to the social construction of reality.

As part of this quantum project, Wendt is revising a separate paper suggesting that the international system is a hologram. Unlike photographs, holograms store all their information in every part of the image. Thus, if a hologram is cut into pieces, each piece will still contain a smaller but intact version of the original image.

Wendt argues the same is true of the international system. Each person represents one point in the international system, and as such has all the information needed to recreate the system as a whole in his or her own mind.

Also this year, Wendt and co-editor Duncan Snidal at the University of Chicago launched a new academic journal, International Theory: A Journal of International Politics, Law and Philosophy, published by Cambridge University Press, promotes theoretical scholarship about the positive, legal, and normative aspects of world politics.

International Theory (IT) is open to theory of all varieties and from all disciplines, provided it addresses problems of politics, broadly defined, and pertains to the international. IT welcomes scholarship that uses evidence from the real world to advance theoretical arguments. However, IT is intended as a forum where scholars can develop theoretical arguments without an expectation of extensive empirical analysis.

The journal’s goal is to promote communication and engagement across theoretical and disciplinary traditions. IT puts a premium on contributors’ ability to reach as broad an audience as possible, both in the questions they engage and in their accessibility to other approaches. IT is also open to work that remains within one scholarly tradition, although authors must explain how their arguments relate to other theoretical approaches.

IT is supported in part by a grant from the Mershon Center. It is now accepting submissions and will likely begin publishing in summer 2009.
Robert J. McMahon

Robert J. McMahon is Ralph D. Mershon Professor of History. A leading historian of U.S. diplomatic history, he is the author of several books on U.S. foreign relations, including *The Cold War: A Very Short Introduction*, *The Limits of Empire: The United States and Southeast Asia since World War II*, and *The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India, and Pakistan*.

This year, McMahon releases *Dean Acheson and the Creation of an American World Order* (Potomac Books, forthcoming). This biography critically assesses the life and career of Dean Acheson, one of America’s foremost diplomats and strategists. Acheson was a top State Department official from 1941 to 1947 and served as Harry S. Truman’s Secretary of State from 1949 to 1953.

McMahon expands on Acheson’s shaping of many U.S. foreign policy initiatives, including the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, rebuilding of Germany and Japan, America’s intervention in Korea, and its early involvement in the Middle East and Southeast Asia.

McMahon argues that Dean Acheson is the principal architect of the American Century. Acheson played an instrumental role in creating the institutions, alliances, and economic arrangements that, in the 1940s, brought to life an American-dominated world order. The remarkable durability of that world order is a tribute to Acheson’s diplomacy.

In addition to research, McMahon serves on the State Department’s Advisory Committee on Historical Diplomatic Documentation. He oversees publication of *Foreign Relations of the United States*, the nation’s official record of foreign affairs, and provides advice on sensitive issues surrounding the declassification of government documents.

This year, McMahon presented papers at several international research seminars, including “America’s ‘History Problem’: U.S.-East Asian Relations in the Aftermath of the Vietnam War” at Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo (March 2008), and “The United States, International Institutions, and the Political Economy of Asian Development, 1947–1965” at Tohoku Gakuin University in Sendai, Japan (March 2008).

In spring 2008, McMahon coordinated the conference “Cold War as the Periphery,” which explored how the diffusion of power away from Moscow and Washington transformed global politics in the 1960s and beyond.

The conference focused on three questions:

- How did the political and material terrain of the pan-European world change during this period?
- How did actors inside and outside government bureaucracies interpret and value these changes?
- How did geopolitical “flashpoints” in the global South rally, reflect, and reconstitute understandings of global power after 1960?

“Cold War as the Periphery” furthered McMahon’s examination of alternative visions of world order in the post-Cold War era—visions rooted in themes of racial justice, national sovereignty, and human rights.
Geoffrey Parker

Geoffrey Parker is Andreas Dorpalen Professor of History at Ohio State, as well as an associate of the Mershon Center for International Security Studies.


One of Parker’s major projects this year is to thoroughly revise *The Military Revolution*. The book argues that three key innovations in the 16th century—ships capable of firing a broadside, the artillery fortress, and volley fire by infantry—transformed the nature of European warfare, and that these innovations led to a decisive shift in the balance of power between the West and the rest of the world over the next two centuries.

Since it was published 20 years ago, Parker’s book has provoked ongoing discussion including publication of *The Military Revolution Debate: Readings on the Military Transformation of Early Modern Europe*, edited by Clifford Rogers, an Ohio State PhD. This debate has spurred Parker to do additional research that has appeared in other books and articles but has not yet been integrated with the material in the original book. He also plans to include new research on 16th-century military tactics in the Ottoman Empire and Japan.

Parker’s other current book project is *The World Crisis: Climate, Catastrophe, and State Breakdown in the 17th Century*, which looks at why the period between 1640 and 1660 saw more wars and state breakdowns around the world than any other before or since.

Parker explains this global crisis as an interaction of five factors: a sudden episode of “global cooling”; the emergence of vulnerable areas of economic specialization; a sharp increase in religious and fiscal pressure by many governments; the crumbling of the prevailing demographic regime; and the emergence of radical new ideologies. He examines not just ecological adversity, but also the varying human responses, especially noting the differences between states and communities that survived and those that perished.

Parker is a fellow of the British Academy, the highest honor open to scholars in the humanities. He is also a fellow of the Royal Historical Society, the Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Spanish American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the Royal Academy of History (Madrid). Parker is recipient of the Samuel Eliot Morison Prize from the Society for Military History, as well as two Guggenheim awards.

Parker’s work has also been recognized at Ohio State. In 2007 he received the Harlan Hatcher Memorial Award for Excellence in Teaching, Research, and Service. He also was named Distinguished University Professor, one of only 35 Ohio State faculty members who hold this title, the university’s highest honor.
Alexander Stephan

Alexander Stephan is an Ohio Eminent Scholar, professor in the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures, and senior fellow at the Mershon Center. He is author or editor of 26 books and more than 100 articles and chapters in Austria, France, Germany, Great Britain, and the United States.

Stephan’s work spans four major areas, including:

- **History** (security studies, Cold War, FBI and culture, Third Reich). One example of Stephan’s work in this area is *Communazis* (Yale University Press, 2000), which recounts how intellectuals who fled Nazi Germany to settle in the United States became the subjects of surveillance by the FBI, INS, and House Un-American Activities Committee.

- **Public diplomacy** (European-American relations, American culture and anti-Americanism in Europe and the developing world). Stephan’s work in this area includes edited volumes in both English and German such as *The Americanization of Europe: Culture, Diplomacy, and Anti-Americanism after 1945* (Berghahn Books, 2006), which explores the role of American culture and anti-Americanism in 11 European countries.

- **Migration and exile studies**. This area of Stephan’s work includes studies of expatriate German writers such as Anna Seghers and Lion Feuchtwanger. For example, *Exile and Otherness: New Approaches to the Experience of the Nazi Refugees* (Lang, 2005) explores the possibilities and limitations of concepts like diaspora, delocalization, and transit-culture for German and Austrian refugees who fled Nazi persecution.

- **Culture and area studies** (cultural politics, German cultural relations with Eastern Europe, Marxist aesthetics). In this category, among others, Stephan examines the work of authors like the East German novelists Christa Wolf and Anna Seghers, and the Swiss writer Max Frisch.

Stephan has also organized multiple conferences, symposia, and speaker series at the Mershon Center, many of which resulted in books. These include:


This past year, more than 30 of Stephan’s colleagues in the United States and Europe came together to contribute essays for a Festschrift in his honor called *Kulturpolitik und Politik der Kultur/Cultural Politics and the Politics of Culture* (Peter Lang, 2007).

The book reflects Stephan’s scholarly interests in the interaction of politics and culture in German-American relations as well as broader traditions of cultural mediation. Topics range from current concerns about public policy and cultural diplomacy, Americanization, and anti-Americanism to studies on European intellectuals who had significant impact on the politics of culture after World War II.

Contributors include John Mueller, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies; former Mershon Center director Richard Ned Lebow; and Mershon faculty associate Dorothy Noyes. The volume was edited by Helen Fehervary and Bernd Fischer, both professors of Germanic Languages and Literatures at The Ohio State University.
FACULTY SPOTLIGHT

Carole Fink

Carole Fink is Humanities Distinguished Professor of History and an associate of the Mershon Center for International Security Studies. She is author or editor of 12 books and more than 50 articles, chapters, and monographs on European international history and historiography.

Fink’s most recent book, edited with Bernd Schaeffer, is Ostpolitik, 1969–1974: European and Global Responses, forthcoming from Cambridge University Press. It examines the worldwide effects of West German Chancellor Willy Brandt’s Ostpolitik, the audacious and controversial policy of normalizing relations with East Germany, the Soviet Union, and other Eastern European states. Brandt’s goal was to end confrontation across the Iron Curtain and peacefully overcome Europe’s Cold War division.

Ostpolitik paralleled but also diverged from the U.S. détente, contributed to easing tensions in Europe, and ultimately led to the end of division in Germany and Europe. It also stimulated hopes and fears in places such as India, Korea, China, and South Africa for similar models of rapprochement with the enemy. The book is the product of a 2006 conference sponsored by the Mershon Center and German Historical Institute.

Fink is currently working on a new book, West Germany and Israel, 1966–74: The Transformation of the ‘Special Relationship.’ This book focuses on the impact of Brandt’s Ostpolitik on Israel, which had previously enjoyed a special relationship with the Bonn government based on the dark legacy of the Third Reich, a shared dependency on the United States, and a shared hostility from the Soviet Union.

Although Brandt never renounced his bonds with Israel, West Germany sought a policy of “evenhandedness” in the Middle East. It declared neutrality during the 1967 and 1973 wars, championed Palestinian rights, and called for Israel to withdraw from the conquered territories.

In implementing this new policy, Fink says, West Germany was not rejecting Israel but pursuing its own national interests and acting as a pillar of an expanding European community. Bonn and its neighbors needed an undisrupted oil supply, which required a stable Middle East. West Germany also sought to do business with the Soviet Union and other countries in Eastern Europe. Finally, Brandt’s government was responding to internal pressures demanding sympathy for the “victims of U.S. and Israeli imperialism.”

Fink’s scholarship has been widely recognized. She is two-time winner of the George Louis Beer Prize of the American Historical Association for the best work in European International History for The Genoa Conference: European Diplomacy, 1921–1922 (North Carolina, 1984) and Defending the Rights of Others: The Great Powers, the Jews, and International Minority Protection, 1878–1938 (Cambridge, 2004), which also won the Akira Ariye Prize for Best Book in International History from the Foundation for Pacific Quest. Her book Marc Bloch: A Life in History (Cambridge, 1989) has been translated into six languages.

Fink has also been recognized at Ohio State. In April 2004 she was named Distinguished Professor by the College of Humanities, and in 2007 she received a Distinguished Scholar Award from university president Karen Holbrook.

Besides her scholarship, Fink is also faculty sponsor of the Mershon Network of International Historians, managed by graduate student Ursula Gurney. More information about this project can be found under Research on Use of Force and Diplomacy.
Randall Schweller is a professor of political science at Ohio State. His research focuses on theories of world politics and international security.

Schweller is the author of *Unanswered Threats: Political Constraints on the Balance of Power* (Princeton University Press, 2006) and *Deadly Imbalances: Tripolarity and Hitler’s Strategy of World Conquest* (Columbia University Press, 1998), and he has publications in journals such as *World Politics, International Studies Quarterly, American Political Science Review, Review of International Studies*, and *Security Studies*.

Schweller approaches international politics from the theoretical perspective of a neo-classical realist. Realists believe that state behavior in the international playing field is primarily motivated by the desire for power and security, rather than by ideals or ethics.

Neo-classical realists believe that foreign policy is an outcome of the position of states in the international system and the domestic factors that limit each state, such as material resources. They focus on explaining the foreign policy actions of individual states.

In his book *Unanswered Threats: Political Constraints on the Balance of Power*, Schweller explores the phenomenon of “underbalancing” from a neo-classical perspective. When states fail to recognize dangerous threats, choose not to react to them, or respond in imprudent ways, they are considered to be underbalancing.

This behavior directly contradicts a core tenet of mainstream realism—that states confronted by dangerous threats act to restore the disrupted balance by creating alliances or increasing their military capabilities, or, in some cases, a combination of both.

Schweller concludes that countries most likely to underbalance are incoherent, fragmented states whose elites are constrained by political considerations. He argues that a country’s decision to balance is based on four variables:

- Elite consensus about the nature and extent of the threat
- Elite cohesion, or the degree of internal division in the central government’s leadership
- Social cohesion, or the degree of internal division among a country’s citizens
- Regime or government vulnerability to political opposition

Schweller theorizes that threatened states rating highly along these four dimensions will balance more effectively than those with lower ratings. Case studies of interwar France and Britain confirm his hypothesis. Both countries ranked low in Schweller’s four variables, and neither created alliances quickly enough to prevent Germany’s gain of power.

In his current research, Schweller explores the application of entropy, the second law of thermodynamics, to international relations. Entropy can be described as the tendency for all matter and energy in the universe to evolve toward a state of inert uniformity.

By applying entropy to international relations, Schweller examines the ways political systems tend to degrade into “most probable” patterns, as the various units of the system engage in random, disordered activity. An example of how political systems are degrading toward patterned uniformity today is globalization, which captures an array of phenomena driven by uncoordinated, stateless actors.

Schweller hopes to use the concept of entropy to explain the evolution of the international system and other political phenomena, such as the relatively disorganized alliance dynamics under the current international leadership of the United States.
Ted Hopf is an associate professor of political science at Ohio State and a research associate at the Mershon Center. His interests include international relations theory, identity, qualitative methodology, and the former Soviet space.

Hopf is author or editor of more than 30 articles and book chapters and five books, including Social Construction of International Politics: Identities and Foreign Policies, Moscow 1955 and 1999 (Cornell University Press, 2002), winner of the Marshall D. Shulman Award from the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies. In Social Construction of International Politics, Hopf uses a social constructivist approach to account for Soviet and Russian foreign policy in 1955 and 1999. He argues that a state’s domestic identity has an enormous effect on its international policies. To explore Russian identity, Hopf uses sources as varied as daily newspapers, official discourse, popular novels, film reviews, and memoirs. He finds that the different identities expressed in these materials shaped the worldviews of decision makers, with a profound effect on Soviet and Russian foreign policy.

Hopf’s latest edited volume is Russia’s European Choice (Palgrave, 2008). Produced during a five-year appointment at the Finnish Institute for International Affairs and Finnish Academy of Sciences, the book examines Russia’s relationship with Europe. From the early 1700s until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Europe and Moscow both relied on material power to balance against the other’s threat. Recently, Europe has adopted a strategy of making Russia non-threatening by seeing it as European. However, Russia has been resisting this mission of assimilation. Contributors to this volume wrestle with the question of whether the European project is feasible, desirable, or even ethical.

Hopf is currently working on a social constructivist account of the Cold War called Reconstructing the Cold War: Identities, Institutions, and Interests in Moscow’s Foreign Policy since 1945. Hopf is recreating Soviet and Russian national identities for the entire span of the Cold War, then determining whether these identities affect foreign policy choices made in relation to the United States, Eastern Europe, China, and the decolonizing world. Besides conducting research at Russian archives in Moscow, Hopf used archives at Harvard University’s Davis Center for Russian and Eurasian Studies, where he was senior research fellow in 2006–07.

Hopf has two other research projects in progress. In “Anarchy Is What Societies Make of It,” Hopf argues that systemic constructivism, or the idea that interaction among states produces meaningful national identities, is too blunt an instrument to explain the wide variety of relationships among states. For example, during the Cold War, the United States and Soviet Union cooperated on nuclear arms control in Europe while competing furiously in the decolonizing world. No single system-wide culture of anarchy could account for so much variety. Instead, a nation’s domestic identity, in interaction with other actors across the world, produces the variety in international politics. Thus, Hopf proposes a theory of societal constructivism that emphasizes national identity.

In “The Logic of Habit in International Relations,” Hopf examines several explanations for social action including cost-benefit calculation, cultural values and norms, emotional considerations, and tradition. International relations theorists usually explain events as conscious choices by states based on cost-benefit analysis. However, Hopf argues that many foreign policy decisions are a result of habit. Because habits are unconscious and automatic, theorists must take into account how they are formed, how they can be broken, and their implications for international relations.
Pamela Paxton

Pamela Paxton is an associate professor of sociology and political science at Ohio State. Her research interests include political sociology, women in politics, and social capital.

Paxton is coauthor of Women, Politics, and Power: A Global Perspective (Sage, 2007). This book explores gender in politics using broad statistical overviews and case studies from around the world. According to her research, the United States ranks “middle of the pack” when it comes to political equality for women.

Gender equality in politics was measured by calculating the proportion of women in a country’s legislature or parliament, looking for female heads of state, or noting the year when women got the right to vote. Rwanda ranked highest for number of women in positions of political power, while Sweden came in second.

Why do some countries exemplify greater gender equality than others? The reasons are varied, including cultural perceptions, socialization patterns, or even gender quotas. For instance, after gender quotas were included in the new constitution in Iraq, the number of women in the legislature grew from 7 percent to 25 percent.

In 2007, Paxton was awarded the Carrie Chapman Catt Prize for Research on Women in Politics for her paper “How Women Attain Political Power: Understanding Women’s Representation in Parliaments, 1893–2003.” The competition is designed to encourage and reward scholars embarking on significant research in the area of women and politics.

In 2004, Paxton worked with graduate student Rumi Morishima to evaluate spending of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). When looking at USAID money directed specifically to democracy development from 1993 to 2001, they discovered a positive relationship.

Paxton’s other main focus this year was on social capital—the idea that individuals and groups can gain resources from their connections with one another. These resources, including trust and social networks, can then be used to produce certain goods, such as public safety, community associations, and efficient democratic processes.

Paxton’s research on social capital has shown that non-democracies such as Yugoslavia have strong trust within individual associations. However, these associations remain isolated and display weak external trust among one another. By contrast, associations in democratic nations such as the United States tend to display both strong internal and external trust, working with other associations to reach common goals and develop public goods.

In her work with James Moody, a sociologist at Duke University, Paxton is exploring links between social networks and social capital. Their publication “Social Capital and Social Networks: Bridging Boundaries” is forthcoming in a two-volume special issue of American Behavioral Scientist.

As of the 2006 elections, there were 16 women serving in the U.S. Senate, an all-time high for the 109-person body. Pictured are (standing, l to r): Blanche Lincoln (D-Ark.), Kay Bailey Hutchison (R-Texas), Barbara Boxer (D-Calif.), Hillary Clinton (D-N.Y.), Mary Landrieu (D-La.), Debbie Stabenow (D-Mich.), Susan Collins (R-Maine), Barbara Mikulski (D-Md.), Elizabeth Dole (R-N.C.), Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), Patty Murray (R-Wash.), (seated, l to r): Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.), Dianne Feinstein (D-Calif.), Maria Cantwell (D-Wash.), Lisa Murkowski (R-Alaska), and Olympia Snow (R-Maine).
Sean Kay

Sean Kay is a professor of politics and government and chair of International Studies at Ohio Wesleyan University. He specializes in international politics, international security, international organizations, and U.S. foreign and defense policy. Kay is also a nonresident fellow at the Eisenhower Institute in Washington, D.C., specializing in international security.

At the Mershon Center, Kay provides research analysis, speaker programming, and long-term planning. In 2007–08, he organized high-profile visits to The Ohio State University and Ohio Wesleyan by such speakers as:

- Strobe Talbott, president of the Brookings Institution
- General John P. Abizaid, former commander of U.S. Central Command
- Anthony Cordesman, Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy at the Center for Strategic and International Studies

Kay is the author of:

- Global Security in the Twenty-First Century: The Quest for Power and the Search for Peace (Rowman and Littlefield, 2006)
- NATO After 50, ed. with S. Victor Papacosma and Mark Rubin (Scholarly Resources, 2001)

Kay has published more than 40 journal articles, book chapters, and book reviews in journals such as Contemporary Security Policy, Current History, Cambridge Review of International Affairs, and Security Dialogue. His most recent publications include:

- “Is NATO an Alliance for the 21st Century?” in NATO’s Current and Future Challenges, ed. by S. Victor Papacosma (Kent State University, Occasional Papers VI, 2008)
- “NATO and Counterinsurgency: Tactical Asset or Strategic Liability?” (Contemporary Security Policy, 2007)

Kay speaks widely about international affairs at academic and professional associations. This year, he was the featured speaker in the panel “Returning Realism to NATO: What Afghanistan Tells Us about the Atlantic Community” at the Conference on War and Reconstruction in Afghanistan at the University of Toronto’s Munk Centre for International Studies.

Kay also spoke on “NATO’s Transformation: Forged and Tested in Afghanistan” during a panel with Lt. Gen. Andrew Leslie, former commander of Task for Kabul, at the 53rd Meeting of the Atlantic Treaty Association in Ottawa, Canada.

Kay is regularly interviewed by the media, including Reuters, CNN, BBC, Voice of America, Agence-France Presse, and The Washington Post. Locally, he is a frequent guest on WOSU-AM’s Open Line with Fred Andrle.

During summer 2007, Kay conducted research on education and national security as a visiting scholar at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. He is also in the early stages of a new book on liberal and realist understandings of NATO’s contemporary transformation, coauthored with Ryan Hendrickson of Eastern Illinois University.
Col. Peter Mansoor (left) spoke with (l to r) Gen. David Petraeus, commander of the Multi-National Force-Iraq; Ali Khedery, special assistant to the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq; Ryan Crocker, U.S. Ambassador to Iraq; and Sadi Othman, translator for Gen. Petraeus; at the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad in May 2008. Mansoor served as executive officer to Petraeus before taking the Mason Chair in Military History at Ohio State. (Photo courtesy of Peter Mansoor)

Col. Peter Mansoor (standing left) worked with (l to r) Gen. David Petraeus, commander of the Multi-National Force-Iraq; Secretary of Defense Robert Gates; and Lt. Gen. Raymond Odierno, commander of the Multi-National Corps-Iraq; at the Al Faw Palace, Camp Victory, in Baghdad. Petraeus is now commander of U.S. Central Command, while Odierno will take Petraeus’s place as commander in Iraq. (Photo courtesy of Peter Mansoor)
Research on Use of Force and Diplomacy

Project:
If It Bleeds, It Leads: Assessing Media Effects on Transnational Terrorism

Principal Investigators:
Edward Crenshaw, J. Craig Jenkins, Department of Sociology

Do mass media make it more likely that terrorists will target democracies? Many scholars argue that, yes, terrorists target democracies because democracies have mass media that will cover these acts of violence and therefore spread the terrorists’ message.

Edward Crenshaw and J. Craig Jenkins, however, see a flaw in this logic. All the databases that list terrorist acts get their data from the mass media; therefore, these databases count only the acts of terrorism that the media happen to cover. This means that media selection bias could skew the results of any research based on the data.

To address this flaw, Crenshaw and Jenkins propose a new way to measure the role of mass media in terrorist attacks.

First, to control for media selection bias, they look at total press capacity, or the total number of news stories originating in a country, whether these stories are about terrorism or not. By crossing this measure with the database of terrorist attacks, they can determine the extent to which the media emphasize terrorism in their reporting.

Second, to gauge access to a large audience, they measure Western media presence, or the number of Western press bureaus in a country. By using both media indicators to explain terrorist attacks across nations, they can get a better sense of whether terrorists are targeting a particular country because it has a large mass media presence.

Crenshaw and Jenkins measure press capacity by using two databases: the Protocol for the Analysis of Nonviolent Direct Action at Harvard University’s Weatherhead Center, which runs from 1984–1994, and the Integrated Data for Events Analysis project, which covers 1990–2004. They are also seeking data from the 1970s. They are measuring the number of Western press bureaus in more than 200 countries using the Europa World Yearbook, which has data covering several decades.

Preliminary results show that terrorism in general, and Islamic terrorism in particular, is significantly correlated with the presence of Western media outlets. This suggests that the theatrical aspects of terror are important to Islamic terrorists.

Another preliminary result shows that once media presence is taken into account, democracies are no more or less likely to be sites for terrorist attacks than non-democracies. This suggests the common notion that democracies are more prone to terrorism may be entirely due to press freedom and media coverage, a possibility that warrants more study.

Edward Crenshaw and J. Craig Jenkins are examining whether media bias plays a role in how terrorists choose targets for attacks. Preliminary results show that, while terrorists are no more likely to target democracies than non-democracies, they do choose targets based on how likely the attack is to be covered by the Western press.
How do terrorist organizations act as agents of change? Since September 11, there has been enormous interest in terrorist groups. Large amounts of data have been collected about the terrorists and their attacks. However, systematic, empirical data on terrorist organizations, along with data on political groups that choose not to use terrorism, have never been collected and analyzed.

Edward Crenshaw and J. Craig Jenkins, along with a multidisciplinary team, will examine data collected by the Minorities at Risk Organizational Behavior (MAROB) project at the University of Maryland’s Center for International Development and Conflict Management.

These data will be analyzed to study the birth and death of terrorist organizations as part of a larger social ecology. Research questions include:

- Why do terrorist organizations form?
- What allows a terrorist group to survive?
- Why do organizations choose violent tactics over non-violent means?
- How does group behavior evolve over time, including the decision to use or not to use violence?
- Why do terrorist organizations cease to operate?

Crenshaw and Jenkins define a terrorist organization as a group of at least 10 participants who over the period of at least one year have participated in or campaigned for terrorist actions. Organizations such as al-Qaeda, Hamas, and the Irish Republican Army are examples.

In their research, Crenshaw and Jenkins assume that organizations are a function of the context in which they exist, and that they in turn act as agents of change, shaping their own political and social environment. By applying social ecosystems theory to the data, the natural characteristics that spawn terrorist organizations can be identified and studied.

Crenshaw and Jenkins’s model draws on the idea in ecology of concentric shells, then applies it to a terrorism context. The outermost shell is the international system. The next shell is the regional or national system in which the organization exists. The innermost shell is the organization itself. These shells represent areas that both foster the growth of terrorist groups and in turn are ultimately affected by them.

Crenshaw and Jenkins will examine cross-national data to show the density of terrorist organizations in each country. Countries with a high density of terrorist groups often produce more lethal terrorist actions. The competition for resources and membership in a specific country often drives larger terrorist organizations to absorb smaller groups, which focuses and multiplies their capabilities.

By studying the increase in the lethality and geographic scope of terrorism in the past two decades, Crenshaw and Jenkins will analyze terrorist organizations’ innovations, plans, tactics, and weapons. This will lead to a greater understanding of the origins and behavior of terrorist organizations.

Figure 1. Applying the Ecosystem Perspective to the Study of Terrorist Organizations
Research on Use of Force and Diplomacy

Project:
Mershon Network of International Historians

Principal Investigators:
Carole Fink, Ursula Gurney, Department of History

Since 2003, the Mershon Network of International Historians (MNIH) has acted as a unique online association for scholars engaged in the study of 20th-century European international relations. The network’s mission has been to foster intellectual discussion, research, and teaching in the field of European diplomatic history.

Located at mnih.org, the network’s primary purpose is to promote collaborative research by scholars in international history. MNIH does this by announcing upcoming conferences around the world, listing recent publications in the field, publishing calls for papers, and publicizing fellowship and grant opportunities, prizes, and awards.

MNIH also performs two unique services. First, it provides researchers with one of the largest and most complete archival databases found on the Internet. Links to hundreds of archives around the world are posted, along with current information about many of them.

Second, scholars who join MNIH can request the names of other members working on a particular field or topic, or at a certain city or university. This promotes collaboration among scholars who otherwise might have no other way of meeting one another. Membership is free, and privacy is assured.

Ursula Gurney, PhD student in history, maintains this web site under the direction of MNIH founder Carole Fink. Drawing selectively from a variety of web-based and printed materials, Gurney and Fink constantly review and update the resources posted on MNIH.

In 2008, the MNIH site was expanded. One new section provides information for instructors of international history, including graduate and undergraduate course syllabi as well as documents and photographs. Another new section focuses on national and international historical societies that promote research and sponsor scholarly meetings.

MNIH also serves as a forum for announcements, highlighting featured articles, conferences, and links to the international press. A link to the Mershon Center for International Security Studies web site provides information about related programs and projects.

One of the measures of the usefulness of the MNIH web site is the number of people who use it. The network had more than 50,000 hits in 2007–08, an average of 4,280 per month. These visitors came from 38 countries, including the United States, Germany, Holland, Australia, Canada, and Britain, but also from as far away as the Ivory Coast, Ghana, Estonia, Lithuania, China, and Singapore.
The Russian Revolution, which seemed to promise liberation and equality for all people, resulted not in a Communist utopia but rather a Stalinist dictatorship, complete with collectivization, bloody purges, and unprecedented state intervention.

How do historians explain these events? Most attribute Soviet policies to things unique to Russian and Soviet society, such as the Marxist ideology, autocratic political traditions, or Stalin’s personality. Mershon associate and professor of history David Hoffmann, however, sees Soviet state interventionism not as unique but as an integral part of world history.

In his book *Cultivating the Masses: Soviet State Intervention in its International Context, 1914–39*, under contract with Cornell University Press, Hoffmann argues that the Soviet system was one response to a challenge facing all European countries after World War I—how to prepare and mobilize the population for mass warfare.

During this period, Hoffmann argues, the driving force for social policy across Europe was World War I, the first global war with 40 million casualties. After the war, many countries enacted policies meant to create a large, physically fit, and politically reliable population. The goal was to build up vast reserves of military manpower.

The end of World War I was a formative moment in Soviet history because it occurred at the same time as the Russian Revolution. While in other countries state interventionism after the war was constrained by a pre-existing order, it took on an extreme form in the Soviet Union as wartime policies became the building blocks of a new society.

Hoffmann’s book has five chapters. The first examines new forms of social science and medical knowledge that led reformers to see the population as an entity to be studied and managed. It also looks at why, given the rise of mass warfare, such management was increasingly taken on by the state.

Chapter Two looks at the highly centralized Soviet public health system, which treated disease as a social rather than individual problem. While this perspective might appear to be a product of socialism, Hoffmann argues it was common across Europe and was more a product of medical knowledge at the time.

Chapter Three discusses attempts to control reproduction, as the state outlawed abortion and offered financial incentives to women to have children. Hoffmann argues that such practices were common across Europe, reflecting a new form of population politics. Where the Soviet Union differed was in emphasizing women’s role in the workforce.

Chapter Four looks at surveillance and propaganda. Although many European countries practiced surveillance during World War I, Hoffmann argues that in the Soviet Union this wartime practice expanded to become a permanent feature of government.

Chapter Five examines excisionary violence, or state attempts to remove segments of the population considered harmful to the whole. Deportations and internments were used across Europe during World War I, Hoffmann argues. The Soviet Union differed in that it used these methods to refashion society during peacetime. Thus, the scale and objectives of Soviet state violence were far more extreme.
Research on Use of Force and Diplomacy

Project: Passport: Newsletter of the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations

Principal Investigators:
Peter Hahn, Mitchell Lerner, Department of History

Since 1969, the newsletter for the Society for Historians of American Foreign Relations (SHAFR) has provided a forum for the discussion of issues related to the practice of American diplomacy, while also presenting historians of U.S. foreign policy with a reliable source of professional information.

In 2003, the newsletter was renamed Passport, and editorship passed to Peter Hahn and Mitch Lerner, with support from the Mershon Center. Passport’s purpose is:

• To print essays on substantive issues related to the study of American diplomacy, particularly those focusing on newly opened archival materials
• To host debates among scholars
• To offer detailed information regarding new publications, scholarly competitions and awards, calls for papers and contributions, and other relevant resources

During the 2007–08 academic year, Passport included such articles as:

• “The Manufacture of Fear: U.S. Politics Before and After 9/11,” by Scott Lucas of the University of Birmingham, addressing the “culture of fear” that has affected the making of U.S. foreign policy decisions, both currently and historically
• “Key Sources for Nixon’s Foreign Policy,” by Edward C. Keefer, general editor for the Foreign Relations of the United States series
• “Researching in the Beloved Country: Archives and Adventure in South Africa,” by Eric J. Morgan of the University of Colorado at Boulder, on the little-studied archival collections of South Africa that provide insight on the Cold War and global race relations in the 20th century
• “The Vietnam Oral History Project: A Corrective for Historical Analogies,” by Christy Jo Snider of Berry College, on methods for effective use of historical analogies in foreign policy courses


In Passport, SHAFR distributes conference notifications, meeting notes, and survey results regarding the teaching of American diplomatic history. This society also compiles articles about methods for teaching foreign relations courses.

In producing Passport, Hahn and Lerner aspire to provide historians of American diplomacy with a forum that educates them about the field, the profession, and the fundamental issues surrounding U.S. foreign policy in the international arena.
Research on Use of Force and Diplomacy

Project:
Information, Intelligence, and Negotiation: The Atlantic European Diplomatic World, 1558–1585

Graduate Student:
Denice Fett, Department of History

In a September 1561 dispatch sent from Madrid to English Secretary of State Sir William Cecil, ambassador Sir Thomas Chaloner noted that he has remained so long without letters or contact from England that he could not fulfill his duties as an ambassador to Spain.

Chaloner could not effectively negotiate with King Phillip II of Spain about English policy decisions, trade strategies, or positions on foreign affairs, simply because he lacked the necessary information. His predicament reflects the importance of reliable communications networks to develop, transmit, and implement foreign policy initiatives.

Denice Fett examines the development of a diplomatic communications system that depended on gathering and transmitting information and intelligence during the late 16th century. While some scholars have explored international diplomacy from the perspective of a single nation, Fett’s dissertation draws from archival sources in five different countries and five different languages.

She focuses on the 27-year span between France and Spain’s plan to conquer England in 1558 and the commencement of an undeclared war between England and Spain in 1585. By studying the surviving diplomatic archives of English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Scottish governments, Fett examines the logistics of diplomacy including the creation of policy, communication through ambassadors, and use of force to support policy goals.

Funding from the Mershon Center allowed Fett to continue archival research at the Bodleian Library at Oxford University, British National Archives in Kew, Bibliothèque Nationale de France in Paris, and Professor De Lamar Jensen’s private microfilm collection in Provo, Utah.

Part of Fett’s work involved reconstructing the stories of people involved in the transmission of diplomatic information. She found that by studying these people’s lives, she was able to understand the workings of the larger diplomatic system.

Fett studied colorful tales of interactions between people from all levels of society—from kings and queens, to servants, secretaries, couriers, and assassins. Although the stories she uncovered are interesting in their own right, when placed in conversation with one another, they reveal the processes by which actors negotiated on a personal, political, diplomatic, and state level.

As she recreated the networks through which people acquired information, Fett studied the variety of ways political and diplomatic intelligence was transmitted. Methods ranged from sending couriers in disguise, avoiding risks of sabotage and even death, to relaying ciphered correspondence through clandestine networks. In order to develop relevant and viable policy initiatives, diplomats reached for creative solutions to secure the means of communicating intelligence gathered abroad to the home government.

Fett uses the stories of historical figures to show that the world of early modern negotiation, including the processes of information acquisition, dissemination, and utilization, was dominated by those involved in every step of the process.
Research on Use of Force and Diplomacy

Project:

Graduate Student:
Ursula Gurney, Department of History

When Richard Nixon became president in 1969, he attempted to manage America’s global Cold War with the policy of détente. This policy was designed to contain the spread of communism through negotiation rather than confrontation; however, American hegemony continued to be challenged by the Soviet Union, China, and Third World nationalists.

By the time Gerald Ford took office in 1974, détente had become synonymous with weakness. The 1970s were one of the most challenging decades for officials in Washington, as Nixon and Ford both faced the dilemma of managing America’s vulnerable position in a hostile and diverse international order.

Focusing on the theme of transition during the Cold War, Gurney examines the role played by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) and resulting Helsinki Accords of 1975 in restructuring American policies, transatlantic relations, and the East-West divide.

The CSCE was the first multilateral conference of the Cold War, offering hope that the shadow of confrontation, fear, and war would no longer loom over Europe. Although the United States was a reluctant participant, the conference provided an opportunity to engage in diplomatic negotiations. America sought to thwart Soviet advancements in Europe, negotiate with the Soviets over nuclear issues, limit Soviet activities in the Third World, improve damaged relationships with Western allies, and bolster the image of détente at home and abroad.

With Mershon Center funding, Gurney conducted research at the British National Archives in Kew to examine documents pertaining to Britain’s role in the construction of the CSCE and London’s relationship with Washington. She studied records of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, Cabinet Office, and Prime Minister’s Office. Gurney’s project fell just after the 30-year release for diplomatic documents, allowing her to investigate a wealth of unexplored information including documents on the follow-up conference to CSCE in 1977.

Gurney also traveled to Washington to research the records of the CIA and Departments of State, Defense, and Legislative Affairs. She also studied both print and oral sources in the Richard Nixon Presidential Materials at the National Archives.

Gurney focuses on four main issues in the relationship between the CSCE and the Helsinki conference and American policymaking:

- The role CSCE played in containing the Soviet Union
- The impact of the Helsinki conference on America’s relationship with its Atlantic partners, and the emergence of different strategies and competing visions for European stability among Britain and the United States
- The role Helsinki played in the formation of American Cold War strategy, especially how the United States dealt with a fluid world order it no longer controlled
- The domestic aspects of Helsinki, especially how Ford dealt with the negative perception of détente at home and why he pushed ahead to support the conference

Gurney will present her findings in her dissertation for the Department of History.
“At first I could not get angry enough at the Huns to want to kill them,” writes Samuel B. Yaffo in 1919, but “after I saw my pals fall in agony from their shells, I did the rest.”

Yaffo was speaking of the Germans he faced as a U.S. Army sergeant during World War I. Until Edward Gutiérrez found Yaffo’s words and similar writings from more than 2,000 other Connecticut soldiers in the Connecticut state archives, no one knew that these testimonies existed.

Gutiérrez discovered the texts, responses of Connecticut soldiers to a state-issued questionnaire, while working as an intern at the archives. Since then, over a chorus of archivists claiming to have nothing in their collections like the Connecticut discovery, Gutiérrez has uncovered similar questionnaires completed by soldiers from Virginia, Minnesota, and Utah.

Mershon funds enabled Gutiérrez to travel to each state and analyze all of these previously untouched testimonies. The thousands of questionnaires paint a picture of personal war experiences from minds still fresh from battle. The voices are young, proud, hot-blooded, and patriotic.

Gutiérrez’s dissertation will include another fascinating angle to the social history of the Great War: a comparison of veterans’ voices from 1919 with more testimonies collected in 1975. Mershon funds supported Gutiérrez on a trip to Carlisle, Pennsylvania, where Don Rickey of the U.S. Military History Institute collected 5,500 questionnaires from veterans then in their 70s, 80s, and, in some cases, 90s.

With age, Gutiérrez found, soldiers had changed. They were often more honest about their thoughts and feelings. “Most, with shaky pens and faded memories, expressed one key difference from the men of 1919,” Gutiérrez said. “These aged soldiers respected the enemy.” Some even claimed that the Germans were their superiors, a far cry from the despicable “Huns” they spoke of years before.

Gutiérrez’s research will become the core of his dissertation, “Sherman Was Right: The Experience of AEF Soldiers in the First World War.” The title comes from the questionnaires of approximately 400 veterans who wrote only “Sherman was right” on their forms—referring to Civil War General William T. Sherman who famously said, “There is many a boy here who looks on war as all glory but, boys, it is all hell.”
Research on Use of Force and Diplomacy

Project:
Race and Revolution: The International Dilemma of Apartheid, 1960–69

Graduate Student:
Ryan Irwin, Department of History

The 1960s saw a clash over how the international political system should relate to the Third World. The great powers of the United States and Soviet Union insisted on viewing the Third World as a proxy battleground for the Cold War, advancing a discourse dominated by the imperatives of order and national security.

At the same time, dozens of newly independent African and Asian states began to see the Cold War as a diversion from the true struggle—a struggle between the North and the South over colonialism, white racism, and economic exploitation. In place of order and national security, these countries demanded emancipation and justice.

The height of this clash, and the focal point of Ryan Irwin’s doctoral dissertation, is the transformation of South African apartheid into an international political crisis.

Irwin aims to discover how “race” became an alternative tool for understanding global politics during the Cold War, and why the use of this new paradigm was unable to achieve a swift end to apartheid. He also aims to show how the differences between the imperatives of “emancipation” in the South and “order” in the North reflected deeper divisions in the world system.

Using his grant from the Mershon Center, Irwin traveled to South Africa to access documents at the National Archives, Department of External Affairs, National Library, and Library of Parliament. While there, he found materials detailing nationalist perceptions of the apartheid debate. Even more than expected, these documents showed that the government conceived the anti-apartheid movement as a fight over global discourse.

With a belief in the power of social science to help de-legitimize narratives of anti-colonialism, the apartheid state waged an advertising campaign in an attempt to recoup its “lost status” among Western nations.

In conjunction with research trips to investigate government perspectives in the United States and Great Britain, as well as the stances of several multinational corporations based in the United States, Irwin aims to understand why progress on South Africa stalled through the 1960s. By doing so, Irwin hopes to show how the imperatives of global capitalism and Western hegemony continued to shape and restrain the Third World’s attempts to revolutionize an oppressive world order.
Chanting “Kosovo is the heart of Serbia,” more than 150,000 Serbian demonstrators gathered in front of Yugoslavia’s former parliament building in Belgrade during a rally on February 21, 2008, to protest Kosovo’s declaration of independence. The United States was among the countries that recognized Kosovo as a separate state. (Photo by Milos Peric/AFP/Getty Images)

INSET: Kosovo Albanians celebrated their declaration of independence from Serbia on February 17, 2008, in Mitrovica. Kosovo declared itself a nation amid bitter protest from Serbia and Russia. The area has been under United Nations occupation since NATO forces drove the Serbian military out in 1999. (Photo by Carsten Koall/Getty Images)
Research on Ideas, Identities, and Decisional Processes

Project:
Colonization in Reverse: Diaspora, Diplomacy, and the ‘People’s Art’

Principal Investigator:
Lesley Ferris, Department of Theatre

For modern multicultural societies to remain stable and secure, a variety of national and ethnic groups must negotiate their identities. Few events represent a successful negotiation as well as the Notting Hill Carnival, held each August in London.

The carnival’s immediate roots trace to the Caribbean island of Trinidad, but its ancestry goes back to Africa. During the 16th and 17th centuries, the British Empire was at the center of the slave trade, shipping people from Central and West Africa to work on plantations in the Caribbean, then carry sugar from the Caribbean back to Europe.

Enslaved Africans brought no possessions; families were split up and names were erased. But they did retain their own stories, rituals, and cultural forms such as music. After slavery was abolished in the British colonies in 1834, former slaves took to the streets in celebration, and the Caribbean tradition of carnival was born.

In this project, Lesley Ferris examines how Trinidadians used the carnival to negotiate their identity in modern Great Britain, a process poet Louise Bennett called “colonization in reverse.”

During the mid-20th century, immigrants from Trinidad settled in the London neighborhood of Notting Hill, where racial attacks were common, resulting in street riots in 1958. The next year, activist Claudia Jones organized the first Notting Hill Carnival as a way for West Indians to celebrate their identity.

In the 1970s and 1980s, the Notting Hill Carnival was heavily policed with many arrests and injuries. At the same time, costumes became more visually exciting while musicians became more varied and numerous.

By the 1990s, attendance swelled to over 1 million, and in 2001 a commission appointed by the mayor of London recognized the event’s cultural significance. In 2005, presentations about the Notting Hill Carnival helped London secure the 2012 Olympics.

Ferris’s project explored the ethnic and national identities expressed at the Notting Hill Carnival in several ways. First, Ferris worked with carnival scholar Ruth Tompsett to curate an exhibit called “Midnight Robbers: The Artists of Notting Hill Carnival,” which opened at City Hall in London in 2007 as part of the bicentennial recognition of the end of the British slave trade. The exhibit made its North American debut at The Ohio State University’s new Urban Arts Space in downtown Columbus.

Second, Ferris and Tompsett taught five winter and spring courses with the carnival theme for all levels at Ohio State, including freshman honors, junior and senior, and a graduate seminar. Carnival artists Ali Pretty and Carl Gabriel visited the classes and gave lectures on campus. In summer 2008, Ferris took 26 students to study theatre in London, including the role of the spectator at the Notting Hill Carnival.

Finally, the Center for Folklore Studies launched its spring colloquium “Urban Party Mix: Performing the Americas in the Metropole” at the carnival exhibition. Pretty and Tompsett were among the presenters, along with filmmaker Julian Henriques from the University of London.

“The Recruiter,” designed by Notting Hill Carnival artist Ali Pretty, tells the story of indentured servants from India recruited to work on plantations in Trinidad after Britain outlawed slavery in its colonies in India in 1834. The figure is based on the traditional carnival characters of the Midnight Robber and Death, showing the persuasion and subterfuge of recruiters who led Indians to hardship and deprivation in the Caribbean.
Immigration is a controversial issue, dividing Democratic and Republican parties in the United States and contributing to the emergence of far-right parties in Europe such as the National Front in France, Vlaams Beland in Belgium, and Dansk Folkeparti in Denmark.

Anthony Mughan sees the controversy over immigration as a product of globalization, and his research sheds light on it by using focus groups to uncover perceptions of immigrant assimilation.

Most focus groups on immigration have asked participants what immigrants do that make it less likely they will assimilate. Mughan and coresearcher Pamela Paxton recast this question to ask what immigrants should do to successfully assimilate.

Focus groups were held with American citizens in Los Angeles and Columbus, allowing participants to discuss their beliefs and opinions about successful assimilation, which they defined as “blending in” with American society and culture.

Three areas surfaced as the main criteria for successful blending in, in the United States:

- Speaking and using the English language
- Being a productive member of American communities, whether through employment or voluntary involvement in community activities
- Expressing commitment to citizenship in the United States, rather than expressing the desire to go back or send resources to the country of origin

The importance of speaking the English language could not be overstated. Participants emphasized expectations that immigrants should communicate effectively in English and that they would speak it in public places and in the company of native English speakers.

Some participants went so far as to say that immigrants should speak English at home. But even those with fewer expectations thought that learning English was necessary for practical reasons such as finding employment and traveling within the United States.

One surprise was how focus group participants felt about the treatment of women among immigrant groups. Most agreed that women should be treated in accordance with the customs and cultural norms of their country of origin, not those of American society.

The next step in Mughan’s research is to examine the cross-national effects of globalization and its ties to anti-immigrant sentiments. In November 2007, he submitted questions to the Australian Election Survey to expand his study of immigrant assimilation, and he is currently analyzing this data.
Since 2004, the Sudanese region of Darfur has been the scene of a violent conflict that the United Nations calls the world’s worst humanitarian crisis and the United States labels genocide.

According to reports, Arab Janjaweed militias hired by the Sudanese government have been launching raids, bombings, and attacks on villages in Darfur. Their targets are African-Muslim civilians who support rebel groups seeking political representation and economic reparations. The violence and destruction has led to hundreds of thousands of deaths and displaced more than two million people from their homes.

The tragic events in Darfur have attracted an unprecedented amount of international attention, yet this attention has focused on the human drama rather than analyzing the nature and root causes of the conflict. The Darfur tragedy has been simplified into accounts of “Arabs” killing “Africans,” sustaining old stereotypes about Africa as a “dark continent” that is uniquely afflicted by ethnic and tribal wars.

Missing in the discussion of Darfur is the perspective of the Sudanese people themselves. Ahmad Sikainga hopes to explore Sudanese views of and responses to this conflict, as well as potential solutions by interviewing Sudanese participants in political parties, civil society groups, and non-governmental organizations, as well as Sudanese citizens, intellectuals, activists, and journalists.

The Darfur conflict is part of a general trend across the African Sahel, a semi-tropical band stretching from the Atlantic Ocean to the Red Sea that forms the transition between the Sahara Desert to the north and more fertile regions toward the south. Decreasing rainfall over the past 20 years has turned grazing land into desert, forcing nomadic tribes south to find pasture and exacerbating tensions with farming groups.

The conflict is also a response to the end of the long civil war between northern and southern Sudan, Sikainga argues. These two areas were governed separately by the British and began fighting shortly after Sudan gained independence in 1956. The peace agreement of 2005 gave the south autonomy, merged armed forces, and split oil profits.

What the agreement did not address was the concerns of other areas in Sudan such as the Beja people to the east and Darfur to the west. To the Darfurians, the fundamental problem is the economic, political, and cultural dominance of the northern elite, and the marginalization of all the other regions. Hence, Sikainga argues, any solution must involve decentralization and redistribution of power and economic resources.

A grant from the Mershon Center has enabled Sikainga to travel to Darfur for six months of research. He plans to publish the results in a series of articles and book chapters accessible to both an academic and non-academic audience. He will also integrate this research into new courses on African identity and conflict in Africa.

The conflict in Darfur has led to hundreds of thousands of deaths and displaced more than two million people from their homes. Many have fled into neighboring Chad, where they live in refugee camps like this one.
Research on Ideas, Identities, and Decisional Processes

Project:
Radicals on the Road: Third World Internationalism and American Orientalism During the Viet Nam Era

Principal Investigator:
Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, Department of History

The Vietnam War was the longest conflict in American history, defining the political consciousness of a generation. In this book project, Judy Wu explores the lives of Americans who criticized their government’s intervention in Southeast Asia.

Because antiwar protesters were suspicious of information from the U.S. government, many traveled to Asia to see for themselves the effect of the war on the Vietnamese people. Although these activists were not official representatives of the United States, they were often treated like dignitaries and allowed to meet with high-ranking members of socialist governments. In this way, they acted as “citizen diplomats,” and the information they brought back helped fuel the antiwar movement at home.

These travelers did not come to Asia as blank slates. Rather, Wu argues, their preconceptions led them to extol the ways in which the revolutionary socialist nations of the East differed from the corrupt and imperialist West. Thus, American activists saw Asia through a lens of “radical Orientalism,” idealizing and seeking inspiration from Asian nations while at the same time defining their critique of the United States.

Wu’s book explores citizen diplomacy and radical Orientalism among American activists in Asia through three case studies. The first examines the travels and politics of African American economist Robert Span Browne.

Browne worked as a foreign aid advisor in Cambodia and Vietnam for six years, witnessing the decolonization of these countries while serving as an agent of the Cold War. This experience led him to become a critic of U.S. foreign policy. Browne also married and had a family with a Vietnamese woman, highlighting connections between the “personal” and “political.” At the end of his career, Browne turned his advocacy work from national liberation for Vietnam to black nationalism in the United States.

Wu’s second case study is the 1970 U.S. People’s Anti-Imperialist Delegation to North Korea, North Viet Nam, and the People’s Republic of China, led by Black Panther member Eldridge Cleaver. The 11-member delegation included people from the antiwar, women’s liberation, radical media, and Asian American movements. Wu is interested in examining how the delegates sought an alternative to American capitalism in Asia.

The third case is the Indochinese Women’s Conference held in Canada in 1971 as a forum for U.S. and Canadian women to meet with their “Asian sisters.” Wu examines conflicts between Women Strike for Peace, a coalition of American housewives who used their identities as mothers to oppose nuclear testing and the war in Vietnam, and other conference organizers over issues of age, race, class, and nationality. Wu also explores a women’s form of Orientalism, in which Americans either pitied Asian women for living under a repressive gender system, or saw the female liberation fighter, with a baby in one hand and a rifle in the other, as an ideal of revolutionary womanhood.
Research on Ideas, Identities, and Decisional Processes

Project:
Why Do People Riot? Understanding the Micro-Level Processes Motivating Hindu-Muslim Riots in India

Graduate Student:
Soundarya Chidambaram, Department of Political Science

Since its partition in 1947, India has experienced a rise in Hindu-Muslim violence. Despite the large social and economic strains that riots place on the Indian state and society, violence occurs frequently in India’s northern and western cities.

Soundarya Chidambaram explores the factors that provoke people to participate in ethnic violence. She investigates the causes and nature of such violence, asking:
• Why do people decide to riot?
• What factors determine why, when, and where riots are likely to occur?
• How do these factors shape people’s motivation to riot as members of an ethnic group?

Funding from the Mershon Center allowed Chidambaram to make a predissertation trip to New Delhi, India, to evaluate the validity of her focus, refine her theory through interviews, and collect initial data on specific cases of violence.

Chidambaram interviewed representatives of non-governmental organizations that help rehabilitate riot victims, journalists who write about riots in leading national daily papers, and political science faculty members at Jawaharlal Nehru University who study ethnic violence.

Chidambaram developed a fruitful relationship with Safdar Hashmi Memorial Trust (SAHMAT), an NGO based in New Delhi. This organization helps riot victims by providing economic and legal aid, as well as opportunities for victims to discuss their experiences in public forums to raise awareness about the nature, severity, and consequences of ethnic violence.

In 2002, SAHMAT sent several fact-finding teams to riot-torn districts in the immediate aftermath of violence in the western state of Gujarat. Chidambaram met with officials from these teams, gaining insight about the direct effects of rioting. SAHMAT members also gave her access to their library, which contains observer reports, first-person accounts by riot victims, and other documents of riot-related research.

Initial findings and interviews revealed the need for Chidambaram to re-evaluate her preliminary research focus. She realized the importance of studying the role that politics plays in rioting in India. In particular, she will focus on the links between riots and elections, political party strategies, and actions of political elites at the state level.

Evidence shows that Hindu-Muslim riots in India are often used as an electoral strategy, to influence election results and win victories for opportunistic parties, especially on the right of the political spectrum. Although most scholars agree that political elites often use violence to gain electoral advantage, such tactics have been studied as unique cases, not as part of an overall mass mobilization strategy.

Chidambaram wants to investigate the reasons political leaders choose to emphasize ethnic relations over policy issues, or decide to diffuse “hate propaganda” rather than information about party stances. By seeing political tactics as part of the reason behind rioting, Chidambaram will explore how the choices of political leaders can either escalate or stop the spread of ethnic violence in India.
Research on Ideas, Identities, and Decisional Processes

Project:

War, Propaganda, and Photography: The Chinese Photographer Sha Fei (1912–1950)

Graduate Student:

Eliza Ho, Department of History of Art

Eliza Ho’s dissertation explores the growth and development of prolific war photographer Sha Fei and how his work contributed to the rise of revolutionary, proletarian culture in China. She contends that his work demonstrates a progressive erasure of the boundaries between art and politics.

Sha Fei’s most critical pieces were shot over more than a decade of war from 1937 to 1949. He became a photographer for the Chinese Communist Party during the War of Resistance against Japan (1937–45) and later during the Civil War of 1945–49.

Ho’s dissertation divides Sha Fei’s work into four periods: 1) his membership in Heibei yingshe, the largest black-and-white photography society in 1930s Shanghai; 2) his solo exhibitions in Guangzhou and Guilin in 1936 and 1937; 3) his recruitment by the CCP to chronicle the life of the Eighth Route Army during the war; and 4) his founding of Jin-Cha-Ji huaboo, a wartime pictorial magazine that later became the major propaganda magazine of the People’s Republic of China.

Using Mershon funds, Ho traveled to Chinese museums, libraries, and archives in Shenzhen, Guangzhou, Beijing, and Taiyuan (in Shanxi Province). She was able to access an array of manuscripts and pictorial magazines, in addition to many photographs, many from the private collection of Gu Di, Sha Fei’s only surviving student.

Ho’s trip also provided an unexpected and invaluable collaboration that aided her research: Sha Fei’s daughter, Wang Yan, shared with Ho the results of 10 years’ work as the manager of the Sha family collection, and personal insights into her father’s life. The subsequent introductions to other museum and collection staff that Wang Yan provided proved extremely helpful in gaining access to additional materials.

Finally, Ho was touched on a personal level during her trip to China, her country since 1997 when Hong Kong was returned from British rule. She was impressed with easy access to resources at archives where researchers were once constrained by red tape, revealing the new openness of the Chinese state.

She also observed the construction of Olympic architectures in Beijing and how locals are adapting to environmental changes. According to Ho, “My experience convinced me that China and its people are, at their own paces, constantly re-inventing themselves to adapt to changes.”

Sha Fei gave this portrait of himself to his student Gu Di, which Gu Di passed on to Sha Fei’s daughter Wang Yan. The picture was probably taken in the early 1940s when Sha Fei had already become the official photographer for the Chinese Communist Party’s troops, fighting on the front lines of the Jin-Cha-Ji border region.
Research on Ideas, Identities, and Decisional Processes

Project:
From Boma to Boomtown: Extraction, Place, and Politics in Solwezi, Zambia

Graduate Student:
Rohit Negi, Department of Geography

In 2003, the northwestern province of Zambia witnessed the opening of the Kanshanshi and Lumwana copper mines. These mines employ more than 7,000 workers, most of whom live in the nearby town of Solwezi—a previously small boma, or administrative town.

Rohit Negi’s dissertation explores Solwezi’s transformation as a mining town, providing a valuable case study of social and political change brought about by economic development.

With a current population between 120,000 and 150,000, Solwezi is estimated to have more than tripled in size since 2000. The copper mining industry has caused not only rapid population influx but also haphazard expansion, making Solwezi a modern-day African “Wild West.”

Negi completed eight months of fieldwork in Zambia’s new frontier during 2007–08. He spent most of his time in Solwezi, but included a month of archival research at the National Archive in the capital of Lusaka. His work expanded on interviews he conducted last year with state officials, NGO representatives, and everyday Zambians from copper mining towns.

This year, Negi looked specifically into Solwezi’s changing infrastructure, housing, and economic activities, as well as explored the conceptual tools ordinary people draw upon to understand the town’s changes. His investigation focuses on three questions:

- What are the social and geographical effects of copper mining on Solwezi?
- How do people make sense of these changes?
- What can this case tell us about the claims by mining industries that they contribute to the development of the region?

One social effect Negi investigates is the redistribution of power in mining towns. The earlier domination of government activities in Solwezi is now being challenged and even replaced by copper mining. However, Negi finds little social or community reinvestment of profits by mining companies. The result is unplanned expansion and overstretched infrastructure.

In 2006, the Kansanshi mine generated $276 million in profits for its Canadian owners, yet only 0.26 percent of these profits were invested back into community initiatives for Solwezi. This suggests weak social links between the mines and the community.

To learn perceptions of the changes in Solwezi, Negi spoke with residents, workers, and officials in the town. The general view of the “new Solwezi” presented the town as an incomplete space, a “place-in-becoming” or “waking up from a deep sleep.” At the same time, residents lamented the erosion of “old Solwezi,” where people knew each other in a face-to-face community.

Negi will follow these and other lines of inquiry as he analyzes data collected during his fieldwork. He will present his results at a conference at Oxford University in September 2008.
It was a “free city.” An island of freedom in a sea of oppression. A symbol of the Cold War and its contrasts.

It was also the thorn in the side of the Western alliance; what Nikita Khrushchev called “the testicles” the Soviets could squeeze “to make NATO scream.”

And perhaps most important, it was the likeliest place where a war between the Soviet Union and the United States would start, and the likeliest place where that war would go nuclear. It was Berlin.

Mark Rice is investigating the Berlin Crisis and the diplomatic and strategic effects that NATO had on Western policy from 1958 to 1963. He hopes to show that NATO was not only a useful forum for the Western allies to develop a unified strategy toward the Soviet threat, but also that NATO had its own interests and goals and played a significant part in the formulation of that unified approach.

Mershon funds allowed Rice to travel to Brussels, home of the NATO Archives. Records there are crucial to show that NATO had its own agency and perspective on the Berlin Crisis.

Rice will use the documents to obtain a picture of what officials in NATO’s headquarters were thinking, relative not only to the situation in Berlin, but also to policy coming out of Washington, London, Paris, Bonn, and elsewhere.

Rice also spent time at the British National Archives in London. He focused on high-level government documents detailing the official response to the Berlin Crisis, as well as the relationship between Berlin and NATO.

Records from the Foreign Office detailed diplomatic conversation between British officials and their counterparts in allied states, while records in the Ministry of Defense gave insight into military planning for a possible war beginning in Berlin.

Rice notes that the Mershon grant enabled him to “collect more material than I originally expected, and from a wider range of sources than I had hoped to be able to look at in just four weeks.”
Research on Ideas, Identities, and Decisional Processes

Project:
The “Anglosphere”: A Genealogy of an Identity in International Relations

Graduate Student:
Srdjan Vucetic, Department of Political Science

The Bill of Rights. Trial by jury. Presumption of innocence. A man’s home is his castle. A man’s word is his bond. These are among the ideas that scholars who argue for the existence of the “Anglosphere” believe are taken for granted in a group of states that share the values and institutions associated with the historical experience of England.

How did the Anglosphere become possible and what effects does it have on international politics? Srdjan Vucetic sets out to answer these questions in his dissertation, which tells the story of how Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, and the United States came to share common expectations of dependence and cooperation in the area of international security.

Vucetic argues that relations among nations in the Anglosphere are seen as “special” and therefore exempt from the standard rules that govern international conflict and cooperation—practices such as sovereignty and intervention, alliances and coalitions, defection and punishment, appeasement and reciprocity, power-seeking and face-saving.

Using a theory of foreign policy based on the concept of national identity, Vucetic shows how English-speaking states have affected global security and prosperity for more than a century. Beginning with an analysis of the “great rapprochement” between the United States and Britain in the early 20th century, Vucetic examines the politics of international security cooperation among Anglosphere nations in Korea, Suez, Vietnam, and Iraq.

Vucetic then explores alternative explanations of the Anglosphere drawn from theories that stress more traditional causes such as rising military threats, common commercial interests, and shared regime type. He concludes with a discussion of policy implications and a postcolonial critique of Anglosphere discourse.

With funding from the Mershon Center, Vucetic was able to complete archival work in London by conducting research at the National Archives in Kew, the British Library at King’s Cross, and the British Library Newspapers at Colindale. This was compiled with his previous archival work in Ottawa, Canada, and Canberra, Australia.

A paper drawn from Vucetic’s dissertation was awarded honorary mention at the 2007 International Studies Convention. He hopes to turn his dissertation into a book during his upcoming junior research fellowship at the University of Cambridge.
An investor watched stock indexes at a securities company in Nanjing, China, on August 23, 2007. The Shanghai Composite Index closed that day at a record-setting 5032.49, the first time it climbed above 5,000 points. The index, which tracks the 300 most important companies listed in Shanghai and Shenzhen, had jumped 147 percent in 2007. (Photo by China Photos/Getty Images)
Research on Institutions that Manage Violent Conflict

Project:
Change in Personnel and Policy and the Legitimacy of the Supreme Court

Principal Investigator:
Gregory Caldeira, Department of Political Science and Moritz College of Law

Do ordinary Americans regard the Supreme Court as a political institution like Congress, in which decisions are subject to the ideology of its members? Or do they see the court as different, with judges who rule on the basis of impartial principles? And are people’s views changed by events like a controversial nomination?

Gregory Caldeira set out to answer these questions in research that has been supported by the Mershon Center since 2005. That year saw two Supreme Court nominations—John Roberts as chief justice and the controversial nomination of Samuel Alito. These events provided a golden opportunity for Caldeira and his research partner James Gibson, Sidney W. Souers Professor of Government at Washington University in St. Louis, to assess American knowledge about and attitudes toward the Supreme Court.

Previous researchers theorized that the more citizens learn about the Supreme Court, and courts in general, the more legitimacy they attribute. This is because these citizens are exposed to powerful judicial symbols that proclaim the court is different from other political institutions, and therefore more worthy of respect, deference, and obedience.

But what happens when people’s exposure to the Supreme Court takes place in a highly charged context such as a controversial nomination? Does their notion of the court as special and different change? Do they see the court as less legitimate?

To answer these questions, Caldeira drew upon a survey conducted by Gibson in 2005 before Senate hearings for Roberts and Alito took place. The survey, which included 90-minute face-to-face interviews with 1,000 people, asked about support for the rule of law, knowledge of the Supreme Court, and its legitimacy.

Using this survey as a baseline, Caldeira and Gibson re-interviewed 335 respondents in 2006 after Alito had been confirmed, asking specifically about the nomination process. A third wave of interviews asked many of the same questions as the first survey to see if perceptions of the court had changed.

Caldeira and Gibson’s research yielded two important results. First, they found that people exposed to television ads about the Supreme Court nominees came to see the court as more ideological and more like other branches of government. Those who watched the Senate hearings, however, continued to see the court as more impartial and different from other types of politics. This may be because the ads were inflammatory while the hearings were decorous, with senators who asked even challenging questions in a dignified manner, and nominees who couched answers in non-ideological terms.

Second, Caldeira and Gibson found that ordinary Americans know much more about the Supreme Court than previously documented. This is important because many states, including Ohio, elect rather than appoint the top justices. Some people argue that average citizens don’t know enough to cast these votes, but Caldeira’s research counters this idea.

So far this project has yielded two journal articles, one to be published by the *Journal of Politics*. But Caldeira is not stopping there. With further support from the Mershon Center, he added several questions about the Supreme Court to another large national survey done by Gibson in spring 2007. The results will allow him to gauge whether attitudes toward the court have changed two years after Roberts became chief justice.
How much does the type of government in a country affect the shape of its stock market? Are non-democratic regimes more likely to produce unstable financial markets? To begin answering these questions, Mary Cooper plans to compare the stock markets of China, India, and Taiwan. China and India not only have experienced dramatically booming stock markets in recent years, but also are among the world’s fastest-growing economies and are both of great strategic importance to the United States. Taiwan is smaller, but its complicated history and ongoing tensions with China make it significant.

Most research on financial markets falls into two camps: analyzing the causes of economic liberalization and covering its consequences. Few studies take regime type into account, and those that do use quantitative methods almost exclusively.

Cooper’s research goes beyond previous studies in several ways. First, she has a more complete concept of financial markets that looks not only at the extent of economic liberalization, but at other variables such as:

- Types of companies on the stock exchange
- Types of investors
- Mechanisms for openness to foreign capital
- The state’s role as regulator and/or participant
- The political foundation for creation and operation

Second, Cooper’s use of case studies allows a more detailed understanding to emerge. Combining quantitative data from stock markets and regulatory agencies with qualitative analysis that incorporates sources such as government officials, financial market participants, the media, think tanks, and local universities, her research will help clarify the political decisions that determine how and when a market is opened to foreign capital.

The project builds on Cooper’s previous research in which she found that China’s authoritarian political system had significant effects on the design of its stock market. Established in 1990, the Chinese stock exchange was designed not to promote a market economy but to strengthen the central government’s ability to allocate capital.

Market rules instituted a strict separation between different categories of investors including state, domestic corporate, domestic individual, and foreign shareholders. This arrangement has not only limited privatization, but also prevented foreign investors or domestic shareholders from gaining economic power independent of the state.

A grant from the Mershon Center has enabled Cooper to do research in Beijing at the China Securities Regulatory Commission and other agencies. She will also conduct interviews in Taiwan and India.

Cooper plans to publish two articles. In the first, comparing China and Taiwan, she finds that party and state play quite different roles in the financial markets. While in Taiwan the role of the Kuomintang Party eclipsed the role of the state, in China the state (rather than the Communist Party) is a key participant in stock markets. This trend has been reinforced since Taiwan began democratizing in the late 1980s.

Cooper’s second article will compare China and India, countries with a similar level of economic development but different political systems. She hopes to find out whether a democratic vs. authoritarian government produces different types of financial liberalization, and whether one financial system is more vulnerable to instability. Eventually Cooper plans to produce a book that expands her analysis of financial markets in Asia to include several additional cases.
Research on Institutions that Manage Violent Conflict

Project:
Comparative National Elections Project

Principal Investigator:
Richard Gunther, Department of Political Science

The Comparative National Elections Project (CNEP) is a multi-year, multi-country examination of how citizens in democracies around the world receive information about policies, parties, candidates, and politics during the course of election campaigns.

The project began in 1990 with a series of surveys in Germany, Britain, the United States, and Japan. It was expanded in 1993 to include eight more countries in South America, southern Europe, eastern Europe, and East Asia, and to include questions about support for democracy in newly emerging or re-established democratic regimes.

CNEP has recently expanded again to encompass 35 national election surveys in 21 countries including two in Africa as well as China. The surveys have also been expanded to include questions about the quality of democracy and corruption in the electoral process, the nature of identity in multi-cultural societies, and values that affect democracy or give rise to conflict. CNEP is now the third-largest international project of its kind.

Because CNEP collects so much information, its full potential could be realized only through a rigorously analytical and comparative collaboration of project participants.

The Mershon Center has made this possible by supporting a series of conferences at the University of Cape Town, South Africa; the Mateus Foundation in Vila Real, Portugal; the Yunnan Institute of Chinese Culture in Kunming, China; and, last year, in Trieste, Italy. Participants will meet again in Maputo, Mozambique, in 2008.

At the Trieste meeting, participants formed research teams to analyze data collected in areas such as:

- Attitudes toward democracy and citizenship
- Party identification and party ratings
- Information received through the media
- Information received through personal networks
- Information received through political parties
- Citizen interest, involvement, knowledge, and participation
- Values
- Demographics

Participants are now working to standardize data from all 35 surveys so they can make accurate cross-national comparisons. While these surveys asked many of the same questions, answers were often scored differently, making direct comparisons impossible.

Over the past year, many of the country team leaders and the data archiving staff in South Africa have been engaged in the massive task of standardizing response categories for each of the 35 surveys, some of which include up to 600 different variables. This will greatly facilitate analysis of these data, which form the basis of the project’s next book.

The 35 national surveys are all posted on the CNEP web site. Researchers can download macro reports, as well as questionnaires, SPSS data sets, and other information. These data sets are one of CNEP’s biggest contributions, providing the basis not only for the CNEP project itself, but for social science research around the world.

So far CNEP has produced more than 100 book chapters and journal articles and six books. For more information, please see the CNEP web site at cnep.ics.ul.pt.
Whether it’s the U.S. Congress debating the latest defense spending bill or the Iraqi parliament distributing oil revenues, one of the most important jobs of any legislature is to allocate government resources. Legislative bargaining models attempt to explain how legislators bargain with each other to allocate resources between competing needs.

To test these models, social scientists conduct legislative bargaining experiments in which players representing legislative parties make different proposals for splitting a finite budget, and then bargain with each other until they come to an agreement.

Last year, economics professor John Kagel used a Mershon grant to examine legislative bargaining on two dimensions—particularistic or private goods that benefit one district, and collective or public interest goods that benefit society as a whole.

Kagel ran a series of experiments in which differing values were placed on collective and particularistic goods. In some cases, public goods were valued highly, while in other cases private goods were given a high value. Other experiments saw values in between.

The goal was to test a model by Alan Wiseman and Craig Volden (American Political Science Review, 2007) with a counter-intuitive prediction. The model predicts that even when legislators place more value on private goods, they end up with a budget that contains lots of public goods. This happens because bargainers get private goods for themselves by voting for a budget that contains public goods for everybody else.

Unfortunately, in last year’s series of experiments run with students acting as legislators, many aspects of the model’s prediction did not pan out. But Kagel hasn’t given up.

Instead, this year he will run the same set of experiments using actual legislators recruited by former student Steven Lehrer, now at Queen’s University School of Public Policy in Canada. The school regularly employs retired politicians as adjunct faculty and appoints several as fellows. It also offers training programs for current politicians. These officials and their staffs will create a large pool of participants for the experiment.

Running the experiment with actual legislators will provide a more accurate test of the Wiseman-Volden model. But more importantly, it will allow Kagel to extend the model. In order to provide tractable results, many bargaining models and experiments simplify the conditions studied by making unrealistic assumptions. Kagel plans to talk with the legislators who go through his experiments to find out which elements were most unlike the real world, then create new models and experiments to address these issues.
Research on Institutions that Manage Violent Conflict

Project:
Dissent/Repression Nexus in the Middle East

Principal Investigators:
Katherine Meyer, Department of Sociology; J. Craig Jenkins, Department of Sociology; Phil Schrodt, University of Kansas; Mary Ann Tétreault, Trinity University; Jillian Schwedler, University of Massachusetts; Christian Davenport, University of Maryland; Deborah Gerner, University of Kansas (deceased)

Consultant:
Helen Rizzo, the American University, Cairo

The Middle East is often seen as caught in a cycle of dissent and repression, influencing almost all aspects of existence. This “dissent/repression nexus” is crucial because the Middle East lies at the crossroads of three continents and contains vast reserves of natural resources. Its conflicts have also spilled into other parts of the world.

Despite the importance of understanding contention in the Middle East, there has been little systematic study of conflict dynamics in the region. To address these gaps, an interdisciplinary, multi-university team has set out to study the dissent/repression nexus in the Middle East. The project focuses on Egypt, Israel/Palestine, Jordan, Kuwait, and Turkey from 1990 to the present.

Their questions include:
- How do dissent and repression influence one another?
- What kinds of repression produce what kinds of dissent and vice versa?
- How are contentious activities influenced by the dominant forces of economic and political globalization?

The team has just completed the third year of the project. This has included in-depth surveys in each of the six countries, with multiple sources of data, event analysis, and content analysis of newspapers using Lexis-Nexis. Essential has been the work of 17 graduate and undergraduate students who each worked in depth on one country.

In particular, they studied:
- The definition and importance of rentier status, both foreign aid and oil revenues, which creates internationally dependent states.
- The size and out-migration of both Kurdish and Palestinian populations within the Middle East, creating highly mobilized diaspora communities.
- The importance of remittances in diaspora communities, which spur global communication and the transnational transfer of capital.
- The importance of civil society and organizations (both religious and secular) in the region, which transform political opportunities and create networks among activists.
- The importance of global communication and networking among organizations and migrants, providing opportunity for cultural transformation, framing of grievances, and exchange of capital.

The team has found that diverse and unique factors fuel contention in each nation. Varieties of religious restriction and regulation, ideologies of gender equity, potential for protest, and colonial history all matter. Issue frames are important to understanding Israel and Palestine. The international stage, human rights pressures, policing, and security are all important to state action in Turkey. Civil society and organizations (both secular and religious) influence the development and sustainment of contentious activity in all nations.

The project is supported by a four-year $585,000 grant from the National Science Foundation, as well as grants from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Mershon. For more information, see the project web site at drnexus.osu.edu.
In 2005, President Bush signed the Read ID Act, requiring applicants for asylum to provide documentation of their identity and allowing judges to deny asylum to anyone whose family may be connected with a terrorist group. The act is one example of how political asylum policy is intertwined with international security issues.

In this project, Amy Shuman and coauthor Carol Bohmer of Dartmouth College examine how humanitarian concerns for refugees come into conflict with security concerns in the United States and Britain. While the goal of political asylum is to provide refuge for the applicant, the process must also protect the state. This contradiction is at the root of current problems in the system.

This project builds on previous Mershon-supported research by Shuman and Bohmer that resulted in Rejecting Refugees: Political Asylum in the 21st Century (Routledge, 2008). Using in-depth accounts by asylum applicants and interviews with lawyers and others involved, this book shows what it is like to apply for asylum in the United States and Great Britain and explores the central obstacles facing asylum applicants.

Political asylum requires applicants to prove a “well-founded fear of return” to their homeland. However, asylum applicants often flee without documentation of their persecution and without identity documents. To gain asylum, they must prove that they are who they say they are, that the events they report really happened to them, and that their experiences warrant asylum based on the legal categories.

Shuman and Bohmer argue that the political asylum process is designed not to find facts but to use interrogation as a deterrent to admitting unworthy applicants. The complexity of cultural situations, displaced subjects, and political alliances become opportunities to catch applicants in inconsistencies and question their credibility. In the guise of producing knowledge, the system actually works as a surveillance mechanism.

In the current project, Shuman and Bohmer are examining how the identity of asylum seekers is represented in the media and public policy, including asylum policy and security policy. Their data will include ethnographic observation of hearings, interviews with asylum applicants and lawyers, review of policies, and review of a wide variety of media from newspaper accounts to online postings by international aid agencies.

Shuman and Bohmer hope to answer two questions. First, why are asylum applicants under such suspicion? Their previous research found that although the system is vulnerable to abuse, terrorists prefer to stay under the radar and are not applying for asylum. Second, what is the relationship between asylum policy and foreign policy?

The researchers also hope to learn what types of documents are available to various populations in different countries. For example, education records; birth, marriage, and death certificates; medical records; and identity documents such as passports are not always available in each country. Proof of identity is increasingly important for anyone crossing borders, so it is important to know the limits people face in acquiring that proof.
Why do some people become leaders? Do group members see leaders as the same or different from themselves? Are leaders chosen because they are representative of the group, or do the actions of the group reflect the will of the leader?

Bruce Weinberg tackles these questions by examining the effect of leaders on group behavior. To measure this, Weinberg used the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, a data set covering more than 90,000 students in grades 7 through 12 in 132 schools nationwide. Schools make a great laboratory to study social interactions because the information is well defined and consistent from one school to the next.

Weinberg’s research team identified leaders by finding out who each student listed as friends; those nominated by the most students were classified as leaders. Then the team tried to quantify the influence these leaders had on their peers. Such quantification has been challenging because leaders can affect their peers in two ways: by influencing a large number of people, and by influencing each person intensively.

Another challenge has been to disentangle the process by which someone becomes a leader from the effects the leader has on the group. Most leaders emerge because their characteristics and behavior are highly representative of the group. Yet they also influence the group toward these same characteristics and behavior. Any research into the effect of group leaders must identify and separate these two variables.

Weinberg’s research team is using two strategies to address these issues. First, they are comparing leaders in the 9th grade to leaders in the 12th grade. If leaders are representative of their groups, the behavior of both sets of leaders should be similar because they come from the same school. However, the 12th-grade leaders should have greater influence on students in the lower grades than the 9th-grade leaders have on upperclassmen. This difference lets researchers quantify the effect of leaders on the group.

Second, the research team looks at the characteristics of people most and least often identified as friends. If people derive utility from associating with leaders, they should be willing to trade off similarity in a friend for status. This is because people usually associate with someone of low status if that person is similar to them, but they are willing to associate with someone of high status even if that person is quite different.

Weinberg’s research findings could help policymakers gain a better understanding of societies with strong leaders such as Osama bin Laden or Kim Jong Il. If a leader who operates against the interests of the United States is highly representative of his people, it may be difficult to dislodge him from power. But if the leader does not represent the people and rules only through force, his hold on power might be more tenuous.
Michael Ewers, PhD student in geography

American multinational corporations have done business in the Persian Gulf since the oil and construction boom of the 1970s. In recent years, however, the types of companies and their choices of where to locate have evolved.

With the explosion in oil prices since 1998, U.S. firms are increasingly choosing to locate in the smaller countries of the lower Gulf, particularly the United Arab Emirates (UAE). These countries have been using oil windfalls to expand their economies, creating new hubs for global corporations in non-oil sectors.

Michael Ewers’ project explores the decisions of U.S. corporations to locate in the Gulf, as well as corporate perceptions of security risks in these countries. The actions and perceptions of American firms in the Gulf can support or disrupt economic security in the region and affect the perceived security of U.S. commercial interests.

With Mershon Center funding, Ewers took a pre-dissertation trip to the UAE to research U.S. multinational corporations in one of the Gulf’s most successfully diversified economies. American companies have been drawn to the UAE to capitalize on financial and security incentives in Abu Dhabi and Dubai. Another attraction is the ability to serve markets in the Eastern Mediterranean, South and Central Asia, and East Africa. However, U.S. corporations also perceive a high security risk in the region, counteracting the positive draws.

Ewers discovered a cycle between perceived security risks and corporate responses. When U.S. firms made business decisions, Ewers found that the consequences sometimes coincided with or even created security threats. Resulting threats were then perceived by firms, causing corporate decision makers to alter their business strategies.

By conducting interviews in the UAE, Ewers analyzed perceptions of U.S. multinational corporations about security and the decisions that result from these perceptions. Using a database of global companies in the Gulf, Ewers scheduled interviews with corporate representatives and leaders of the UAE business community.

From these interviews, Ewers generated a web-based survey to be distributed in the UAE and possibly other Gulf countries. He found that creating the survey after preliminary interviews was useful because he had uncovered important themes, learned how to take economic and political sensitivities into account, and obtained contacts and references to begin recruiting participants. He also learned the importance of obtaining sponsorship from Gulf Chambers of Commerce.

As a result of his time in the UAE, Ewers refocused his project in specific ways. He broadened the focus of his dissertation to examine how Western corporations have affected Gulf economic security and diversification beyond oil. He also expanded his study period to include the past four decades. Ewers realized the need to conceptualize the operations of foreign firms in the Gulf from an evolutionary perspective, rather than as simply a function of current events.
Research on Institutions that Manage Violent Conflict

Project:
Problem Definitions: Understanding the NGO Response to Sex Trafficking

Graduate Student:
Marguerite Hernandez, Department of Sociology

The U.S. Department of State estimates that 600,000 to 800,000 people are trafficked across international borders each year. Of these, 80 percent are women and children, most of whom are trafficked for the purpose of sexual exploitation.

Marguerite Hernandez’s dissertation explores the efforts of non-governmental organizations and government agencies to curtail and combat human trafficking. Although NGOs must coordinate with each other and with government agencies, little research evaluates the effectiveness of these groups and their ability to work together.

Hernandez investigates this subject by interviewing NGO representatives and government officials involved in efforts to fight trafficking. Mershon funds allowed her to conduct interviews in southern California, northern California, St. Paul/Minneapolis, New York City, and Washington, D.C.

Through these interviews, Hernandez focused on three questions:
• How do organizations frame the problem of human trafficking?
• What successes do organizations have and what obstacles do they face?
• How effectively do organizations collaborate?

Hernandez found that NGOs frame the problem of human trafficking in different ways. One frame frequently held by feminist and religious NGOs claims that the primary cause of human trafficking is the demand for a commercial sex industry. A second frame holds that while the sex industry is part of the problem, a larger cause of human trafficking is the demand for cheap labor. A third perspective contends that it is not essential to understand the root causes of trafficking, but that helping the victims is more important.

Hernandez also found that how NGOs frame the problem of human trafficking affects the amount of funding and networking opportunities available to the organization. This is because a few established NGOs that believe the sex industry is the root cause of human trafficking have historically forged strong ties with state and federal agencies. These NGOs are frequently given large grants and told to share this money with other NGOs. Thus, other NGOs are willing to go along with the dominant frame to understand human trafficking in order to gain funding.

Frames, networks, funding, and law enforcement were major issues that NGOs identified in reaching common objectives. NGOs believe that government should require training on human trafficking for police officers and service providers. Often, these public employees are the first to come in contact with trafficking victims, yet they lack the ability to identify and direct victims to help.

Hernandez’s dissertation provides one of the first empirical views on relations between organizations and agencies combating human trafficking. She presented her findings at the 2008 Southern Sociological Meeting in Richmond, Virginia. Next, she plans to submit professional papers on her research to peer-reviewed sociology journals.
Research on Institutions that Manage Violent Conflict

Project: The Perils of Movement Parties: An Investigation of Political Parties in Mexico and Argentina

Graduate Student: Dag Mossige, Department of Political Science

In the United States and Western Europe, political parties are often placed along a left-right continuum. In Latin America, however, some parties defy this kind of categorization. Examples of such parties include the Partido Justicialista, or Peronist party, in Argentina and the Partido de la Revolución Democrática (PRD) in Mexico.

In his dissertation, Dag Mossige classifies the PRD and Peronist party as “movement parties” and explores the structure and development of these political organizations.

The term “movement party” was originally developed for the “antiparty” Green and extreme-right parties that surged in Europe in the 1980s. Mossige finds this term highly adaptable in the Latin American setting since movement parties straddle the line between social movements and more traditional party structures.

Movement parties in Latin America avoid formal organization and are often disdainful of traditional parties. They emphasize participation in “politics of the street” rather than the parliamentary arena and typically have few formal mechanisms for solving internal disputes. Such movement parties are often highly volatile and can challenge democratic stability.

Funding from the Mershon Center allowed Mossige to spend seven months in Mexico, exploring the nature of the PRD—the country’s second-largest political party. He poses the questions: What makes movement parties change, and when do they evolve into more stable political structures?

Mossige conducted more than 70 interviews with the top echelons of the PRD, including its principal leadership, former presidential candidates, senators, federal deputies, representatives in both houses of congress, and principal founders. He also held informal conversations with lower-ranking party members, who provided a perspective “on the ground.”

By gaining access to the party’s archives at the Instituto de Estudios de la Revolución Democrática, Mossige explored the history of the PRD. He attended party conferences and participated as an observer in the party’s highly contested internal elections held March 16, 2008, in which more than 1.5 million members voted.

In his preliminary analysis, Mossige argues that the loose structure and vague ideologies of movement parties thrive when a nation’s main political cleavage is not along the left-right continuum. Discourse tends to be framed in terms of friends vs. enemies, a hallmark of political parties in Latin America. However, when the position of a movement party’s leadership begins to crystallize on a left-right line, its structure moves toward a more formal organization.

Mossige claims that political elites hold the key to transforming parties through the mechanism of ideological crystallization. While external conditions do play a role, a movement party’s structure is largely determined by its internal leadership. Mossige will explore such findings in his doctoral dissertation in political science.
Research on Institutions that Manage Violent Conflict

Project:

Women At/On the Ballot: Examining the Effects of Tokenism and Quotas

Graduate Student:

Christina Xydias, Department of Political Science

By 2006, about 40 countries had legislated or constitutionally mandated gender quotas for candidates running for seats in the national legislature, and many more political parties had self-imposed such rules.

Proponents of quotas hail this trend, arguing they are necessary to achieve truly democratic forms of representation. Others, though, charge that any form of quotas conflicts with the basic tenets of liberal democracy.

All too absent from the debate is an understanding of if and how quotas actually change political outcomes. Christina Xydias aims to fill this gap by investigating whether female legislators pursue different policy agendas than their male counterparts, and if so, under what circumstances?

To gain a better understanding of how quotas work in a variety of settings, Xydias performed a comparative analysis of quotas in Greece, Germany, and France, paying particular attention to the phenomenon of tokenism, and how it varies across nations.

Tokenism exists when a few female legislators are elected, giving the illusion that women’s interests are represented while the small size of the female delegation in the overall legislature prevents any actual change in policy. A grant from the Mershon Center supported two legs of Xydias’s research: a trip to Greece in September 2007 and travels in Germany in November.

Xydias arrived in Greece on the tail of two unexpected events: a national emergency triggered by rampant wild fires, and a decision by the prime minister to call parliamentary elections six months ahead of schedule.

While these events significantly complicated her plans to interview legislators, they helped her identify a critical oversight in studies of women’s representation.

Because most researchers focus on agenda-setting, they fail to take a system-wide approach that examines how events unrelated to the number and identities of female legislators make it more or less likely that women’s issues will be viable topics of debate.

The agenda-setting perspective assumes relative political stability, while the frantic political environment in Greece shows how unrelated events can make it impossible for female legislators, no matter how numerous, to create space for their issues.

The remainder of her Mershon funds took Xydias to Berlin, where she interviewed members from four of the five major political parties. Her interviews identified patterns that varied by party affiliation and gender, which will feature prominently in her dissertation.

She also accessed stenographed copies of Bundestag plenary debates dating back to 1976 that are unavailable in the United States. Xydias is now able to code and analyze the debate content to more rigorously test the patterns identified in her interviews.
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BOOKS

Sarah Brooks, Assistant Professor of Political Science
Social Protection and the Market: The Transformation of Social Security Institutions in Latin America
(Cambridge University Press, forthcoming).
Social security institutions have been among the most stable postwar social programs around the world. Increasingly, however, these institutions have undergone profound transformation from public risk-pooling systems to individual market-based designs. Why has this “privatization” occurred? Why do some governments enact more radical pension privatizations than others? This book provides an account of privatization of national old-age pension systems. Quantitative analysis shows the degree of pension privatization around the world and explains reform outcomes. A comparative analysis of pension reforms in Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, and Uruguay suggests the causes of institutional change. Brooks argues that pension privatization emerges from political conflict rather than external pressures. The argument examines three dimensions: the double bind of globalization, contingent path-dependent processes, and the legislative politics of loss imposition.

Gregory Caldeira, Ann and Darrell Dreher Chair in Political Communication and Policy Thinking, and Professor of Law
The study of law and politics is one of the foundation stones of the discipline of political science, and it has been one of the productive areas of cross-fertilization among the various subfields of political science and between political science and other disciplines. This handbook provides a comprehensive survey of the field of law and politics in all its diversity, ranging from such traditional subjects as theories of jurisprudence, constitutionalism, judicial politics, and law-and-society to such re-emerging subjects as comparative judicial politics, international law, and democratization. The book gathers together leading scholars in the field to assess key literatures shaping the discipline today and help set the direction of research in the decade ahead.

Lesley Ferris, Professor of Theatre
Midnight Robbers: The Artists of Notting Hill Carnival, ed. with Adela Ruth Tompsett (Carnival Exhibition Group, 2007).
This 48-page full-color catalog accompanies the exhibit “Midnight Robbers: The Artists of Notting Hill Carnival,” which opened in London City Hall in 2007 and was the inaugural exhibition at The Ohio State University’s Urban Arts Space in 2008. The exhibition explores London’s Carnival, Europe’s most spectacular street performance. It marks the bicentennial of the abolition of slave trading in British colonies and reflects on slavery legacy of which Carnival is a significant part. The catalog includes more than 50 photos and carries a timeline of the Carnival’s history, a glossary of terms, interviews with four featured artists, and an essay on the art and heritage of the Carnival.

Carole Fink, Humanities Distinguished Professor of History
Recent studies of the Cold War transcend a narrow focus on four decades of superpower rivalry, recognizing that leaders and governments outside of Washington and Moscow also exerted political, economic, and moral influence. One striking example was the Ostpolitik policy of Chancellor Willy Brandt, which not only redefined Germany’s relation with its Nazi past, but also altered the global environment of the Cold War. The book examines the years 1969–74, when Brandt broke the Cold War stalemate in Europe by assuming responsibility for the crimes of the Third Reich and formally renouncing several major West German claims, while also launching an assertive policy toward his neighbors and conducting a deft balancing act between East and West. Not everyone applauds the ethos and practice of Ostpolitik, but no one can deny its impact on German, European, and world history.
BOOKS (continued)

Richard Gunther, Professor of Political Science
The Politics of Spain, with José Ramón Montero (Cambridge University Press, 2008). This book presents a comprehensive analysis of the emergence of modern, democratic Spain in a manner that is accessible to undergraduate students. It examines the political and social changes that enabled Spain to evolve from dictatorship to a completely normalized democracy. It systematically examines the basic characteristics of Spanish democracy today—its core political institutions, political parties and party systems (both regional and nationwide), patterns of electoral behavior, and evolution of its political culture. The book also explores public policy under both the former authoritarian and current democratic regimes, demonstrating some of the effects of democratic governance.

Partidos políticos: viejos conceptos y nuevos retos, ed. with José Ramón Montero and Juan J. Linz [Updated and revised Spanish-language edition of Gunther, Montero, and Linz, Political Parties: Old Concepts and New Challenges], (Editorial Trotta/Fundación Alfonso Martín Escudero, 2007). Several of the world’s leading scholars present critical analyses of important substantive themes on political parties in contemporary democracies. They critically re-examine the classic concepts and typologies that have guided research in this field over the past decades and explore new challenges faced by parties today.

Richard Hamilton, Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Political Science
President McKinley, War and Empire, Vol. 2: President McKinley and America’s ‘New Empire’ (Transaction Publishers, 2007). While Vol. 1 of President McKinley, War and Empire considered the origins of the Spanish-American War, President McKinley and America’s ‘New Empire’ is concerned with the war’s outcome, the settlement in which the United States gained an “empire.” It begins by reviewing various expansionist episodes in U.S. history and examining the work of expansionist writers said to have “driven” the 1898–99 movement, finding these claims to be questionable. Hamilton assesses McKinley’s decision making in regard to the settlement of the Spanish-American War and reviews its achievements: the size and character of the new American “empire,” the Philippine experience, and U.S. efforts in China—supposedly the prime goal of the new imperialism. Yet much American trade continued to be with Western Europe, while Canada became the nation’s biggest trading partner. In much historical writing, McKinley is portrayed as a “front man” for Mark Hanna, the businessman who led his presidential campaign. Hanna certainly was important, but Hamilton finds McKinley was far more than a figurehead.

Yana Hashamova, Associate Professor of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures
Pride and Panic: Russian Imagination of the West in Post-Soviet Film (University of Chicago Press, 2007). Since the fall of Communism, Russians have struggled to reconcile their social traditions with a flood of Western cultural imports. Contemporary Russian cinema has latched onto the resulting confusion and ambivalence, mining societal upheaval for revolutionary cinematic topics. This groundbreaking study examines cinematic representations of the unsettled Russian national consciousness and its complex cocktail of fear, anger, and uncertainty. Hashamova considers the works of both established and lesser-known Russian directors, drawing parallels between evolving social attitudes in contemporary Russia and the development of an individual human psyche. The cultural impact of globalization, evolution of the Russian national identity, and psychology of a society all intertwine in this study of the connections between film and political consciousness.
Theodore Hopf, Associate Professor of Political Science
Russia’s European Choice (Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
Russia has never been able to escape its relationship with Europe, nor Europe with Russia. Geography and history have conspired to make them both neighbors and unavoidable factors in each other’s daily lives. From the early 1700s until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, Europe and Moscow both relied on material power to balance against any threats emerging from East and West. More recently, Europe and the EU have adopted a different strategy: make Russia non-threatening by making it European, like “us.” Meanwhile, Russia’s resistance to Europe’s mission of assimilation has become increasingly robust, fueled by energy exports to Europe and the world. Contributors to this edited volume wrestle with the question of whether the European project is feasible, desirable, or even ethical.

J. Craig Jenkins, Professor of Sociology
Conflict is ubiquitous and inherent in organized social life. This volume examines the origins and regulation of violent identity conflicts. The core question the authors address is how violence is regulated and the social and political consequences of such regulation. One of the key findings is that conflicts involving religious, ethnic, or national identity are inherently more violence-prone and require distinctive methods of regulation. Identity is a question both of power and integrity. This means that both material and symbolic needs must be addressed in order to constrain or regulate these conflicts. This volume offers new ideas about the regulation of identity conflicts, at both the global and local level, that engage both tradition and modernization. It will be of interest to policymakers, political scientists, human rights activists, historians, and anthropologists.

Mei-Po Kwan, Professor of Geography
Geographies of Muslim Identities: Diaspora, Gender and Belonging, ed. with Cara Aitchison and Peter Hopkins (Ashgate Publishing, 2007).
In recent years, geographies of identities, including those of ethnicity, religion, race, and gender, have formed an increasing focus of contemporary human geography. The events of September 11 particularly illustrated the ways in which identities can be transformed across time and space by global and local events. Such transformations have also demonstrated the temporal and spatial construction of hate and fear, and increasing incidences of Islamophobia through the construction of Muslims as the Other. This timely book collects a range of contributions from the social, cultural, political, historical, and economic disciplines of geography, together with writings from gender studies, cultural studies, and leisure studies where research has revealed a strong spatial dimension to the construction, representation, contestation, and reworking of Muslim identities.

R. William Liddle, Professor of Political Science
Dari Columbus Untuk Indonesia: 70 Tahun Prof Bill Liddle Dari Murid dan Sahabat [From Columbus for Indonesia: 70 Years of Professor Bill Liddle from Students and Friends] (Freedom Institute, 2008).
This book contains commentary by friends and students about Professor R. William Liddle. Readers can find the views of his students and friends, most of whom are well-known intellectuals in Indonesia. Liddle, more familiarly known as Bill, is an American political observer who has long conducted social and political research in Indonesia. Contributors include Dodi Ambardi, Saiful Mujani, Yohanes Sulaiman, Eep Saefullah Fatah, Mohtar Mas’oed, Rizal Mallarangeng, Makarim Wibisono, Dewi Fortuna Anwar, Juwono Sudarsono, Ishadi S.K., Sarwono Kusumaatmaja, Jeffrie Geovanie, Samsu Rizal Panggabean, Ihsan Ali-Fauzi, Goenawan Mohammad, Dinna Wisnu, Ari A. Perdana, Hadi Soesastro, and Thee Kian Wie.
Peter R. Mansoor, Raymond E. Mason
Jr. Chair in Military History

Baghdad at Sunrise: A Brigade Commander’s War in Iraq (Yale University Press, 2008).
This book presents an unparalleled record of what happened after U.S. forces seized Baghdad in the spring of 2003. Army Col. Peter R. Mansoor, commander of the 1st Brigade, 1st Armored Division, describes his brigade’s first year in Iraq, from the sweltering, chaotic summer after the Ba’athists’ defeat to the transfer of sovereignty to an interim Iraqi government. Uniquely positioned to observe, record, and assess the events of that year, Mansoor explains what went right and wrong as the U.S. military confronted an insurgency of unexpected strength and tenacity. Drawing on his own daily combat journal as well as observations by embedded reporters, news reports, combat logs, archived e-mails, and other sources, Mansoor offers a record of the valor, motivations, and resolve of the 1st Brigade during Operation Iraqi Freedom. The book provides a detailed, nuanced analysis of U.S. counterinsurgency operations in Iraq, along with critical lessons for America’s military and political leaders.

Robert McMahon, Ralph D. Mershon
Professor of History

Dean Acheson and the Creation of an American World Order (Potomac Books, 2008).
This biography critically assesses the life and career of Dean Acheson, one of America’s foremost diplomats and strategists. Acheson was a top State Department official from 1941 to 1947 and served as Harry S. Truman’s Secretary of State from 1949 to 1953. McMahon expands on Acheson’s shaping of many U.S. foreign policy initiatives, including the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, rebuilding of Germany and Japan, America’s intervention in Korea, and its early involvement in the Middle East and Southeast Asia. McMahon argues that Dean Acheson is the principal architect of the American Century. Acheson played an instrumental role in creating the institutions, alliances, and economic arrangements that, in the 1940s, brought to life an American-dominated world order. The remarkable durability of that world order is a tribute to Acheson’s diplomacy.

In the 1970s, the United States faced challenges on several fronts. By nearly every measure, American power was no longer unrivaled. The task of managing America’s relative decline fell to President Richard Nixon, Henry Kissinger, and Gerald Ford. From 1969 to 1977, Nixon, Kissinger, and Ford reoriented U.S. foreign policy from the traditional poles of liberal interventionism and conservative isolationism into active but conservative engagement. In this book, the product of a Mershon Center conference, 17 leading historians show how they did it, where they succeeded, and where they took their strategy too far. Drawing on newly declassified materials, the authors provide authoritative analyses of Vietnam, détente, arms control, and U.S.-China rapprochement, creating the first comprehensive volume on American foreign policy in this pivotal era.

Geoffrey Parker, Andreas Dorrpalen Professor of History

Now in its 5th edition, The Times Compact History of the World is the most comprehensive, small-format single-volume historical atlas on the market. Beginning with the emergence of the first modern humans, the text traces the world’s history to the present day, presenting the most up-to-date information about the European Union, environmental issues, and the latest figures on wealth distribution, world population, and world economy. This new edition covers the entire spectrum of human development through an integrated approach of concise yet accessible text, rich and informative mapping, and vivid illustrations.
Amy Shuman, Professor of English and Anthropology
Rejecting Refugees: Political Asylum in the 21st Century, with Carol Bohmer (Routledge, 2008).
Many nations recognize the moral and legal obligation to accept people fleeing from persecution, but political asylum applicants in the 21st century face restrictive policies and cumbersome procedures. What counts as persecution? How do applicants translate their stories of suffering and trauma into a narrative acceptable to immigration officials? How can asylum officials weed out the fake from the genuine without resorting to inappropriate cultural definitions of behavior? Using in-depth accounts by asylum applicants and interviews with lawyers and others involved, this book takes the reader on a journey through the process of applying for asylum in the United States and Great Britain. It describes how the systems address the conflicting needs of the state to protect citizens from terrorists and hordes of economic migrants, while at the same time adhering to legal, moral, and treaty obligations to provide safe haven for those fleeing persecution.

Alexander Stephan, Ohio Eminent Scholar and Professor of Germanic Languages and Literature
Kulturpolitik und Politik der Kultur: Festschrift für Alexander Stephan (Cultural Politics and the Politics of Culture: Essays in Honor of Alexander Stephan), ed. by Helen Fehervary and Bernd Fischer (Peter Lang, 2007). This volume reflects the scholarly interests and achievements of Alexander Stephan, in whose honor it was conceived. The book presents essays by leading international scholars on the contours of politics and culture in German-American relations, as well as broader traditions of cultural mediation. Topics range from current concerns about public policy and cultural diplomacy, Americanization, and anti-Americanism, to historical considerations of Central European artists and writers who had significant impact on the politics of culture after World War II. Contributors include Volker R. Berghahn, John Mueller, Richard Ned Lebow, Dorothy Noyes, and Paul Michael Lützeler.

Hugh Urban, Professor of Comparative Studies
The Secrets of the Kingdom: Religion and Concealment in the Bush Administration (Rowman & Littlefield, 2007). The presidency of George W. Bush contains a fundamental paradox. On the one hand, Bush is the most outspokenly religious president in U.S. history—a man who claims to be called by God to lead our country. Yet this is also the most secretive administration in U.S. history. This book, the product of a 2004 conference at the Mershon Center, critically examines the complex relationship between faith and concealment in the Bush White House. Urban argues that religion and secrecy not only co-exist, but are intimately intertwined. Both are about power—power that comes from the appeal to a divine authority, and from the calculated control of valuable information. The result has been an unprecedented assertion of executive power and defiance of public or congressional oversight. Such a blend of religious faith and government secrecy has little in common with the model of democracy outlined in our Constitution.

Alexander Wendt, Ralph D. Mershon Professor of International Security
International Theory (IT) is open to theory of all varieties and from all disciplines, provided it addresses problems of politics, broadly defined, and pertains to the international. IT welcomes scholarship that uses evidence from the real world to advance theoretical arguments. However, IT is intended as a forum where scholars can develop theoretical arguments without an expectation of extensive empirical analysis. The journal’s goal is to promote communication and engagement across theoretical and disciplinary traditions. IT puts a premium on contributors’ ability to reach as broad an audience as possible, both in the questions they engage and in their accessibility to other approaches. IT is also open to work that remains within one scholarly tradition, although authors must explain how their arguments relate to other theoretical approaches.
ARTICLES, ESSAYS, AND BOOK CHAPTERS

Chadwick Alger, Professor Emeritus of Political Science


Nina Berman, Associate Professor of German Languages and Literatures

“Historische Phasen orientalisierender Diskurse in Deutschland,” in Orient- und IslamBilder, ed. by Iman Attia (Unrast, 2007). This article will be translated into Arabic and published in al-Turath al-Arabi, issued by the Arab Writers Union in Damascus.


Sarah M. Brooks, Assistant Professor of Political Science

“Embedding Neoliberalism in Latin America,” with Marcus J. Kurtz (World Politics, 2008).

“Globalization and Pension Reform in Latin America” (Latin American Politics and Society, 2007).


Gregory Caldeira, Dreher Chair in Political Communications and Policy Thinking


Amy Cohen, Assistant Professor of Law

“Rule of Law Cultures” (Buffalo Law Review, forthcoming).


Alice Conklin, Associate Professor of History


Mary Cooper, Assistant Professor of Political Science


Kevin R. Cox, Distinguished University Professor of Geography


“Land Reform in South Africa and the Colonial Present,” with Alistair Fraser (Social and Cultural Geography, 2007).

“Codec Spatialities of Fieldwork,” with Alistair Fraser (Area, 2007).


Edward Crenshaw, Professor of Sociology


Lesley Ferris, Professor of Theatre

“On the Streets of Notting Hill: Carnival as/is Theatre” (Theatre History Studies, 2005).


Carole Fink, Humanities Distinguished Professor of History


Richard Gunther, Professor of Political Science


“Los sentimientos antipartidistas en el Sur de Europa,” with Mariano Torcal and José Ramón Montero, in Partidos políticos: perspectivas teóricas y empíricas, ed. by José Ramón Montero, Richard Gunther, and Juan J. Linz (Editorial Trotta/Fundación Alfonso Martín Escudero, 2007).


Peter Hahn, Professor of History

Richard Hamilton, Professor Emeritus of Sociology and Political Science
“The ‘Special Relationship’ Between the United States and Great Britain Since 1940” (Edition Az-Zaman, forthcoming).

Richard Herrmann, Director of the Mershon Center
“Attachment to the Nation and International Relations: Probing the Dimensions of Identity and Their Relationship to War and Peace,” with Pierangelo Isernia and Paolo Segatti (Political Psychology, forthcoming).

Ted Hopf, Associate Professor of Political Science
“Introduction,” in Russia’s European Choice (Palgrave, 2008).


“Learning and Transfer in Signaling Games,” with David Cooper (Economic Theory, 2008).


Sean Kay, Mershon Associate

“NATO and Counterinsurgency: Tactical Asset or Strategic Liability?” (Contemporary Security Policy, 2007).


Book review of Russia and NATO since 1991: From Cold War to Cold Peace to Partnership? by Martin A. Smith (Slavic Review, 2007).

Marcus J. Kurtz, Associate Professor of Political Science
“Embedding Neoliberal Reform in Latin America,” with Sarah M. Brooks (World Politics, 2008).


Mei-Po Kwan, Professor of Geography


Mitchell Lerner, Associate Professor of History


“Biting the Land that Feeds You: The United States and North Korea in the Cold War and Beyond” (Diplomacy and Statecraft, 2007).

William Liddle, Professor of Political Science

“Karisma Obama?” [Obama’s Charisma?] (Kompas, 2008).


“Islamic Liberalism: Cause or Consequence of the Conservative Turn?” (Inside Indonesia, 2007).


Peter Mansoor, Raymond E. Mason Jr. Chair in Military History


Robert McMahon, Ralph D. Mershon Professor of History
“Security or Freedom? The Impact of the Korean War on America’s Quest for a Liberal World Order,” in America’s Wars and World Order, ed. by Hideki Kan (Tokyo, forthcoming).


Katherine Meyer, Professor of Sociology


Allan R. Millett, Raymond E. Mason Jr. Professor Emeritus of History
“Where Do We Find Such Men and Women? The Once and Future reserves in the U.S. Defense Policy,” in The U.S. Citizen-Soldier at War: A Retrospective Look and the Road Ahead conference proceedings (Virginia Military Institute, 2008).

Margaret Mills, Professor of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures

“South Asian Tales,” in Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folk and Fairy Tales, ed. by Donald Haase (Greenwood Press, 2008).


John Mueller, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies


“Terror, without terrorists” (Ottawa Citizen, April 25, 2008).

“Dead and deader” (Los Angeles Times, January 20, 2008).


“Radioactive Hype” (National Interest, Sept./Oct. 2007).


Anthony Mughan, Professor of Political Science

Irfan Nooruddin, Assistant Professor of Political Science


Dorothy Noyes, Associate Professor of English, Comparative Studies, and Anthropology
“Humble Theory” (Journal of Folklore Research, special issue on Grand Theory, 2008).


Geoffrey Parker, Andreas Dorpalen Professor of History

“Queen Elizabeth’s Instructions to Admiral Howard, 20 December 1587” (The Mariner’s Mirror, 2008).

Pamela Paxton, Associate Professor of Sociology and Political Science


Andrew A.G. Ross, Postdoctoral Fellow

Randall Schweller, Professor of Political Science
“A Neoclassical Realist Theory of Under-Expansion in the Age of Mass Politics,” in Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy, ed. by Steve Lobell, Jeffrey Taliaferro, and Norrin Ripsman (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

Peter Shane, Jacob E. Davis and Jacob E. Davis II Chair in Law


“Gonzales’ Troubling Legacy” (Jurist, August 27, 2007).

Amy Shuman, Professor of English and Anthropology


“Representing Trauma: Political Asylum Narrative” (Journal of American Folklore, 2004).

Allan Silverman, Professor of Philosophy


Mark Stewart, Visiting Scholar

Alexander Thompson, Assistant Professor of Political Science


Hugh Urban, Professor of Comparative Studies

• Michael Barkun, “Religion and Secrecy after September 11”
• Hugh B. Urban, “Fair Game: Secrecy, Security, and the Church of Scientology in Cold War America”
• Paul Christopher Johnson, “Secretism and the Apotheosis of Duvalier”


Daniel Verdier, Professor of Political Science

“Multilateralism, Bilateralism, and Exclusion in the Nuclear Proliferation Regime” (International Organization, forthcoming).

Bruce Weinberg, Associate Professor of Economics


Alexander Wendt, Ralph D. Mershon Professor of International Security Studies
“Sovereignty and the UFO,” with Raymond Duvall (Political Theory, 2008).

Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, Associate Professor of History

Paul Beck, chair of the Oversight Committee, received the Samuel J. Eldersveld Award from the Political Organizations and Parties section of the American Political Science Association in recognition of the outstanding contribution he has made to the field.

Mark Grimsley, associate professor of history, is Harold K. Johnson Visiting Professor of Military History at the U.S. Army War College in 2008–09.

Richard Herrmann, director of the Mershon Center, received the 2008 Faculty Award for Distinguished University Service. In presenting the award, Ohio State president E. Gordon Gee cited his service not only as director of the Mershon Center, but also as chair of the Faculty Senate Steering Committee and director of Academic Programs in the Office of International Affairs. In this role, taken on during the past year, Herrmann oversees programs and activities at Ohio State’s five area studies centers.

John Kagel, University Chaired Professor of Applied Microeconomics, received the 2008 Distinguished Scholar Award for work that spans the disciplines of economics and psychology, with major accomplishments in the research areas of rational decision making, auction strategy, and experimental game theory. Kagel has published in more than 80 economic, psychology, and biology journals and authored or co-edited six books. He has also received grant funding from the National Science Foundation since 1971.

Mitchell Lerner, associate professor of history, was named director of American History Documents, North Korean Document Initiative, for the Cold War International History Project at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars at Princeton University.

Katherine Meyer, professor of sociology, was elected president of the Society for the Scientific Study of Religion, which focuses on social scientific research about religious institutions and experiences.

Allan Millett, Raymond E. Mason Jr. Professor Emeritus of History, received the 2008 Pritzker Military Library Literature Award for Lifetime Achievement in Military Writing. The prize recognizes a living author for a body of work that has profoundly enriched the public understanding of American military history. Millett is author or coauthor of 10 books and editor of seven more books on military history, many examining the Korean War. In 2006 he became Stephen Ambrose Professor of Military History and director of the Eisenhower Center for American Studies at the University of New Orleans. The Pritzker Award, which carries a $100,000 honorarium, citation, and medallion, is sponsored by the Chicago-based Tawani Foundation.

John Mueller, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, received the inaugural Warren J. Mitofsky Award for Excellence in Public Opinion Research in recognition of his book *War, Presidents and Public Opinion*
(John Wiley, 1973) as a trailblazing work in the field of public opinion research. The book addresses fundamental issues of methodology and measurement and analyzes public opinion through World War I, World War II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. The Mitofsky Award is given annually by the Roper Center for Public Opinion Research at the University of Connecticut.

Anthony Mughan, professor of political science, received the Harlan Hatcher Memorial Award for Excellence from the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. The award recognizes faculty who have developed a noteworthy profile of distinguished, sustained, and balanced achievements in the areas of teaching, research, and service. Mughan also received the Joan N. Huber Faculty Fellowship from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, its highest recognition for scholarship.

Peter Shane, Jacob E. Davis and Jacob E. Davis II Chair in Law, was named executive director of The Knight Commission on the Information Needs of Communities in a Democracy. The high-level Knight Commission will look into whether the information needs of 21st-century American citizens and communities are being met and make recommendations for public policy and private initiatives that will help better meet community information needs. It is funded by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation and organized by the Aspen Institute.

Amy Shuman, professor of English and anthropology, received the College of Humanities Exemplary Faculty Award for scholarship that has carved out new territory for folklore research in her projects on conversational narrative, orality and literacy, folklore and feminist theory, and ethnicity studies.

Alexander Thompson, assistant professor of political science, received the Robert O. Keohane Award for best article published by an untenured scholar.

Hugh Urban, professor of comparative studies, spoke in the College of Humanities Inaugural Lecture Series. His lecture, delivered March 13, 2008, was on “Religion and Secrecy: From Colonial India to the Bush Administration.”

Bruce Weinberg, associate professor of economics, received a grant from the National Institutes of Health for “Geography and Competitiveness.”

Judy Tzu-Chun Wu, associate professor of history, was selected as a “Top Young Historian” by the History News Network. She has also received two Distinguished Diversity Enhancement Awards—in 2007 for her work in promoting Asian American studies, and in 2008 as part of the Department of History Faculty of Color Caucus.
Somali expatriates gathered to express their support for United States and European Union policy toward Somalia outside the Somali Studies International Congress, held at the Fawcett Center at The Ohio State University from August 16-18, 2007. Other conference-goers spoke against U.S. policy, which was a point of debate throughout the event. Columbus is home to the second-largest Somali community in the United States.

INSET: Jendayi E. Frazer, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs, spoke with attendees at the Somali Studies International Congress after her presentation on “U.S. Foreign Policy in the Horn of Africa.” Frazer said that the United States would support the Somali transitional government against the Islamic Courts Union, an alliance of Sharia law courts that took over much of the country in 2006. Previously, the United States has accused the ICU of harboring al-Qaida operatives, a charge its leaders denied.
Somali Studies in the 21st Century: Local and Global Perspectives  August 16–18, 2007

Organizers:
David Kraybill, Center for African Studies
Laura Joseph, Center for African Studies
Abdinur Mohamud, Ohio Department of Education
Abdi M. Kusow, Oakland University
Said M. Shire, Somali Studies International Association

Somalia is a very different society from what it was a decade ago. Changes in Somalia stem from political crisis within the country and unprecedented dispersion of the Somali people around the world. Such movement is buffered by affordable worldwide communication and technology like the Internet. The resulting transformations challenge the traditional Somali ways in which individual, group, and political identities have been understood.

At this conference, Somali Studies scholars and practitioners proposed ways of understanding the social and economic impacts of globalization on Somali communities, as well as the links between transnational Somali communities and their politically contested homeland. Reflecting on the changes, investigators addressed questions with contemporary political relevance and policy implications.

The Ohio State University was chosen as the site of this conference because Columbus has the second-largest Somali community in the United States.

Major Presenters
Abulkadir Aden Abdulle, Independent Scholar
Hussein Adam, College of Holy Cross
Lee Cassanelli, University of Pennsylvania
Michael B. Coleman, Mayor, City of Columbus
Omar A. Eno, Portland State University
Jendayi E. Frazier, U.S. Department of State
Charles Geshekter, University of California
John Johnson, Indiana University
Mohamed H. Mukhtar, Savannah State University
Ron Munia, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Refugee Resettlement
C.J. Prentiss, Senator, State of Ohio
Ahmed I. Samatar, Macalester College
Said Sh. Samatar, Rutgers University
Ted Strickland, Governor, State of Ohio

Ohio Gov. Ted Strickland welcomed participants to the Somali Studies International Congress in the Fawcett Center at The Ohio State University.
How should we define war? The most basic human rights—including the right to life, a trial, and to own property—depend on whether a conflict is legally definable as war. Governments often deny that fighting in their territories is war, arguing instead that it is “criminal activity.” After the September 11 attacks, the United States reversed the trend, declaring war where many would see crime. Currently, there is no clear legal line dividing crime and war.

This conference grew out of an International Law Association study group that addressed the legal challenges raised by the “global war on terror.” Grappling with different definitions of war and crime, conference participants examined the rights and duties of states, organizations, and individuals.

Participants
Masahiko Asada, Kyoto University
Jeremy Black, University of Exeter
Jutta Brunnée, University of Toronto
Pamela Constable, Washington Post
John Darby, University of Notre Dame
Michael W. Doyle, Columbia University
Larissa A. Fast, University of Notre Dame
Judith Gail Gardam, University of Adelaide
James Thuo Gathii, Albany Law School
Thomas B. Grassey, U.S. Naval War College
Christine D. Gray, University of Cambridge
Richard K. Herrmann, Director, Mershon Center for International Security Studies
Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, University of Notre Dame
Robert C. Johansen, University of Notre Dame
Kelly C. Jordan, University of Notre Dame
George A. Lopez, University of Notre Dame
James Gordon Meek, New York Daily News
Elzbieta Mikos-Skuza, University of Warsaw
Darrin D. Mortenson, Journalist-in-Residence, Mershon Center for International Security Studies
Williamson “Wick” Murray, U.S. Naval Academy
Major General William L. Nash, Georgetown University
Gerard F. Powers, University of Notre Dame
Sebastian Rosato, University of Notre Dame
General Sir Michael Rose, Kings College
Matthew V. Storin, University of Notre Dame
Ernest Torriero, Chicago Tribune
Peter Wallensteen, University of Notre Dame
Todd David Whitmore, University of Notre Dame
Sir Michael Wood, University of Cambridge
International Conference on Women in War
October 26–27, 2007

Organizers:
Yana Hashamova, Center for Slavic and East European Studies
Helena Goscilo, University of Pittsburgh

What is the role of women in war beyond their well-studied victimization? Can the often contradictory expectations of women and their traditional roles be rethought and reconstructed?

At this conference, an interdisciplinary group of scholars addressed the role of women in modern war, from World War II to 2006. Conference participants tackled the function of women and mothers in the clash between Islam and Christianity in the Balkans, Chechnya, and Central Asia. Topics included gender polarization and politicization during times of war, gender identities and positions in religious and military clashes, and the idea of motherhood and fatherhood in war.

Participants
Brian Baer, Kent State University
Snjezana Buzov, The Ohio State University
Angela Brintlinger, The Ohio State University
Ajla Demiragic, University of Sarajevo
Ramajana Hidic Demirovic, Indiana University
Jennifer Erickson, University of Oregon
Wendy Hesford, The Ohio State University
Trina Mamoon, University of Alaska-Fairbanks
Julie Mertus, American University
Aleksandra Milicevic, University of North Florida
Reshmi Mukherjee, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Dorothy Noyes, The Ohio State University
Natasha Olshanskaya, Kenyon College
Serguei Oushakine, Princeton University
Olha Rudich, The Ohio State University
Kirsten Rutsala, Oklahoma University
Amy Szabo, The Ohio State University
Ruby Tapia, The Ohio State University
Jessica Wienhold, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Yana Hashamova (left), interim director of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, and Helena Goscilo, University of Pittsburgh, welcomed participants to the International Conference on Women in War.

The Women in War conference included a panel on “The Yugoslav Wars and the Other.” Panelists were (l to r) Amy Szabo, The Ohio State University; Aleksandra Milicevic, University of North Florida; and Jennifer Erickson, University of Oregon.
EVENTS

CONFERENCES (continued)


Organizers:
Galal Walker, K–12 Chinese Flagship Program
Ruiye Li, K–12 Chinese Flagship Program

The China International Economic Trade and Arbitration Commission (CIETAC) is the most important arbitration institution in China. Headquartered in Beijing, CIETAC independently and impartially resolves economic and trade disputes through arbitration and mediation. Since it was founded in 1956, CIETAC has administered more than 10,000 cases. More than 700 cases are filed with CIETAC each year, most of which are international.

At this conference, the vice chair and secretary general of CIETAC, along with other internationally recognized experts, discussed their methodologies. CIETAC technique is marked by its combination of arbitration with mediation, which not only resolves disputes, but also renew positive business and personal relations between the parties.

Presenters
Shi Hong, Partner of Fangda Partners and CIETAC Arbitrator
Yu Jianlong, Vice Chair and Secretary General of CIETAC
Fei Ning, Partner of Haiwen & Partners and CIETAC Arbitrator
Oded Shenkar, Fisher College of Business
Dong Songgen, CEO of China International Exhibition Center Group Corporation
Zhu Yuefang, Secretary General of CIETAC
Mu Zili, Deputy Secretary General of CCPIT Mediation Center

Online Consultation and Public Policymaking: Democracy, Identity, and New Media

March 14–15, 2008

Organizers:
Peter Shane, Moritz College of Law
Stephen Coleman, University of Leeds

The Internet now offers the world an unprecedented capacity to foster the sharing of information and facilitate sustained, globalized communication. The networking of citizens with their governments, with each other, and with the organs of civil society has created opportunities for popular engagement in the public sphere. This conference functioned as an active, international workshop, featuring researchers from Australia, England, France, Israel, Italy, Korea, and Slovenia, as well as the United States, addressing a variety of e-democracy issues from a diverse interdisciplinary background and both theoretical and applied research.

Presenters
Steven J. Balla, George Washington University
Patrizia Bertini, European Internet Accessibility Observatory
Andrew Chadwick, University of London
Sungsoo Hwang, University of Pittsburgh
Laurence Monnoyer-Smith, University of Technology, Compiègne, France
Kerrie Oakes, Griffith University
Oren Perez, Bar-Ilan University
Alicia Schatteman, Rutgers University

Tim Erickson, forum development director at e-democracy.org, gave the keynote address on “Building Democracy Through Local Issues Forums.”

Beth Noveck (left), New York Law School, critiqued a presentation by Laurence Monnoyer-Smith, University of Technology in Compiègne, France.
Cold War as the Periphery: Global Change in the 1960s and Beyond  
April 18–19, 2008

Organizers:
Paul Chamberlin, Department of History
Ursula Gurney, Department of History
Ryan Irwin, Department of History
Robert McMahon, Ralph D. Mershon Professor of History

This conference explored how the “diffusion of power” from Washington and Moscow toward the developing world transformed global politics in the 1960s and beyond. Bringing together graduate students and junior faculty, it examined the connections between three broad conceptual questions: How did the political and material terrain of the pan-European world change during this period? How did actors inside and outside government bureaucracies interpret and value these changes? How did geopolitical “flashpoints” in the global South rally, reflect, and reconstitute understandings of world power after 1960? Taken together, these questions aimed to investigate the paradoxes of global change in the postcolonial era.

Participants
Chris Dietrich, University of Texas-Austin
Carole Fink, Humanities Distinguished Professor of History
Mark Lawrence, University of Texas-Austin
Alan McPherson, Howard University
Eric Morgan, University of Colorado
Paul Muehlenbeck, George Washington University
Thomas Robertson, Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Patrick Sharma, University of California-Los Angeles
Mytheli Sreenivas, Assistant Professor of Women’s Studies and History

David Webster, University of Toronto
Jonathan Winkler, Wright State University
Ursula Gurney, PhD Candidate, Department of History

Attendees of Cold War as the Periphery: Global Change in the 1960s and Beyond congregated before the conference began in the atrium of the Mershon Center.

Mark Lawrence, University of Texas, gave the plenary address on “Containing Globalism: Explaining U.S. Foreign Policy toward the Third World from Kennedy to Kissinger.”
Furniss Book Award

The Edgar S. Furniss Book Award is given annually to an author whose first book makes an exceptional contribution to the study of national and international security. This award commemorates the founding director of the Mershon Center, Edgar S. Furniss.

This year, the Furniss Book Award was given to Jacques E.C. Hymans, assistant professor of government at Smith College, for *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation: Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge, 2006).

In this book, Hymans explores why few states have acquired nuclear weapons even though dozens have long been capable of doing so. He finds that the key to this surprising historical pattern lies not in externally imposed constraints, but in state leaders’ conceptions of the national identity.

Kruzel Memorial Lecture

Each year the Mershon Center selects one lecture in honor of Joseph J. Kruzel, an Ohio State faculty member in political science who served in the U.S. Air Force as well as other posts in the federal government. Kruzel was killed in Sarajevo, Bosnia, while serving as deputy assistant secretary of defense for European and NATO Affairs.

This year’s Kruzel Lecture was given by Strobe Talbott, president of the Brookings Institution, the nation’s oldest think tank devoted to public service through research and education in the social sciences, particularly economics, government, and foreign policy. Talbott spoke at Mershon on “Election of the Century: The American Presidency and the World.”

Streaming videos, podcasts, and photos from these lectures can be found on our web site at mershoncenter.osu.edu
EVENTS

SPEAKER SERIES

National Security Speaker Series

This series, organized largely by Mershon associate Sean Kay, brings prominent experts from both academic and government backgrounds to discuss topics at the heart of the Mershon Center’s three areas of focus: the use of force and diplomacy; the ideas, identities, and decisional processes that affect security; and the institutions that manage violent conflict. The purpose is to foster interdisciplinary discussion and research among faculty and students.

Dennis Ross
Ziegler Distinguished Fellow, Washington Institute for Near East Policy
“Statecraft, and How to Restore America’s Standing in the World”
September 11, 2007

Thomas Homer-Dixon
Director, Trudeau Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Toronto
“A Theory of Societal Collapse: Convergent Shocks, Thermodynamic Disequilibrium, and Brittleness”
October 2, 2007

General John P. Abizaid outlined four main challenges in the Middle East: the rise of Sunni extremism with al-Qaida, the rise of Shi’a extremism in Iran, the corrosive effects of the Israel-Palestine conflict, and the global reliance on oil. He spoke to more than 300 students and faculty.

Dennis Ross served as director for policy planning in the State Department under George H.W. Bush and as special Middle East envoy under Bill Clinton.

Thomas Homer-Dixon is a leading scholar in the study of environmental security.
Ebrahim Yazdi said that before the United States and Iran can establish friendly relations, they need to move past the 1953 coup that put the Shah in power in Iran, and the 1979 Islamic Revolution that led to the taking of hostages at the U.S. Embassy.

Major General John P. Abizaid
Former Commander, U.S. Central Command
“Strategic Challenges in the Middle East”
February 20, 2008

Major General John D. Altenburg Jr.
Former Appointing Authority for Military Commissions
March 3, 2008

Ebrahim Yazdi
Secretary General, Freedom Movement of Iran
Former Foreign Minister of Iran
“Iranian Politics and U.S.-Iranian Relations”
April 21, 2008

Anthony Cordesman
Arleigh A. Burke Chair in Strategy, Center for Strategic and International Studies
“The Changing Nature of the Afghan-Pakistan War”
May 14, 2008

As former appointing authority for Military Commissions, Major General John D. Altenburg Jr. was responsible for reviewing charges and evidence against people held by the United States at Guantanamo Bay. He was a major force behind changes in Military Commission procedures.

Streaming videos, podcasts, and photos from these lectures can be found on our web site at mershoncenter.osu.edu
Director’s Speaker Series

This series brings to Ohio State practicing officials, scholars, and others who have made important contributions to international security studies but might not fit neatly into our other speaker series. Speakers are sponsored by a variety of Mershon faculty associates.

Warren Hoge
October 23, 2007

Birgit Brock-Utne
Director of Comparative and International Education, University of Oslo
“Women Protesting Against War, Writing and Acting for Peace”
November 13, 2007

Peter Liberman
Professor of Political Science, Queens College, N.Y.
“Just Deserts in Iraq: Vengeance for 9/11 and American Public Support for the Iraq War”
January 24, 2008

Richard Ned Lebow
James O. Freedman Presidential Professor of Government, Dartmouth College
“Forbidden Fruit: Counterfactuals and International Relations”
February 18, 2008
David Siegel studies how institutions mediate the interactions of people with different motivations, and how social networks, the media, and electoral institutions present information and alter the nature of collective action.

M.J. Peterson explores the elements of the authority relationship and examines how those elements have applied to the International Monetary Fund and World Bank since the 1950s.

Margaret Mills (left), professor of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures, with Soraya Sarhaddi Nelson. Nelson said that Afghans are losing faith in their government because of widespread corruption and incompetence among officials and a centralized power structure that allows no local authority.

Streaming videos, podcasts, and photos from these lectures can be found on our web site at mershoncenter.osu.edu
EVENTS

SPEAKER SERIES (continued)

Graduate Workshop in Diplomatic History

This series, organized by Ralph D. Mershon Professor of History Robert McMahon, invites distinguished scholars in the fields of diplomatic history and national security to give presentations for faculty and graduate students in history, political science, and other disciplines. Now running for 17 years, the series generates interdisciplinary discussion of international relations and U.S. security policy.

Odd Arne Westad
Professor of International History, London School of Economics
“The Global Cold War”
January 8, 2008

Melvyn Leffler
Edward Stettinius Professor of American History, University of Virginia
“For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War”
February 8, 2008

Sally Marks
Diplomatic Historian
October 5, 2007

Erez Manela
Dunahke Associate Professor of American History, Harvard University
March 28, 2008

Robert McMahon (left), Ralph D. Mershon Professor of History, and Erez Manela (center, on couch) spoke with diplomatic history graduate students in the atrium of the Mershon Center.

Robert McMahon (left) with Odd Arne Westad, winner of the 2006 Bancroft Prize for best book in international history for The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times (Cambridge, 2006).

Melvyn Leffler spoke on his latest book For the Soul of Mankind: The United States, the Soviet Union, and the Cold War. The book examines four crucial episodes when American and Soviet leaders considered modulating, avoiding, or ending hostilities and asks why they failed.

Sally Marks (left) spoke with Carole Fink, Humanities Distinguished Professor of History, during a seminar for faculty and graduate students.
Islam and Democracy Speaker Series

Mershon Center senior faculty fellow William Liddle works with Ohio State’s Honors and Scholars program, Middle East Studies Center, and Department of Political Science to bring together talented undergraduate students and guest speakers to look at the intersecting roles of religion and democracy in traditionally Islamic countries. Guest lecturers spoke at the center and led a special seminar for students taking the jointly sponsored course.

Fawaz Gerges
Christian A. Johnson Chair in International Affairs and Arab and Muslim Politics, Sarah Lawrence College
“The Future of Islamist Militancy: A Theoretical and Historical Footnote”
April 3, 2008

Shireen Hunter
Distinguished Scholar, Center for Strategic and International Studies Visiting Professor, Georgetown University
“Islam and Democracy: Are They Compatible?”
April 8, 2008

Fred Lawson
Rice Professor of Government, Mills College
“Syria’s Muslim Brothers: Shifting Fortunes, Changing Platforms”
May 1, 2008

Amaney Jamal
Assistant Professor of Politics, Princeton University
“Barriers to Democracy: The Other Side of Social Capital in Palestine and the Arab World”
May 15, 2008

Fawaz Gerges just returned from a 15-month field study in the Middle East, where he interviewed hundreds of civil society leaders, opinion makers, activists, and radical Islamists. He is currently working on two books, one comparing the “Iraq generation” of jihadis with earlier generations, and one investigating the role of religion in Muslim political identity.

Shireen Hunter’s areas of expertise include the Middle East, the Mediterranean, Russia, Central Asia, and the Caucasus, and she has done extensive work on North-South relations, energy, developing-country issues, and Islam. Hunter is author or editor of 19 books and monographs.

Bill Liddle (left), professor of political science, and Amaney Jamal shared a laugh while meeting with students in his Politics in Muslim Majority Countries class. Jamal spoke about democratization and the politics of civic engagement in the Arab World.

Streaming videos, podcasts, and photos from these lectures can be found on our web site at mershoncenter.osu.edu
Michael Tomz’s paper examined what makes threats and promises believable to international audiences. He focused on two strategies: announcing commitments to domestic and foreign audiences (the publicity mechanism), and embedding commitments in treaties (the legalization mechanism).

The GIES workshop, organized by Mershon faculty fellows Alexander Thompson and Sarah Brooks, provides a forum for faculty and graduate students to exchange ideas about broad themes in political economics, including global economic and political change, economic security, and the political dynamics of global integration within and among nations.

Michael Tomz
Assistant Professor of Political Science, Stanford University
“The Credibility of International Commitments”
February 1, 2008

Christina Davis
Assistant Professor of Politics, Princeton University
February 29, 2008

Layna Mosley
Associate Professor of Political Science, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
“Risk, Uncertainty, and Autonomy: Financial Market Constraints in Developing Nations”
May 12, 2008

Nita Rudra
Assistant Professor of International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh
“Have Governments Gone Too Far?”
May 23, 2008

Michael Tomz’s paper examined what makes threats and promises believable to international audiences. He focused on two strategies: announcing commitments to domestic and foreign audiences (the publicity mechanism), and embedding commitments in treaties (the legalization mechanism).

Layna Mosley’s research examines the influence of global capital markets on government policymaking, the politics of international financial regulation, and the relationship between multinational production and labor rights in developing nations. She is author of Global Capital and National Governments (Cambridge, 2003).
Citizenship Speaker Series

*Disciplina in Civitatem* is the motto of The Ohio State University, and Ralph D. Mershon asked that his gift promote the study of principles for good citizenship. To fulfill both the university’s mission and Mershon’s wishes, the center sponsors a Citizenship Speaker Series each year. Organized by professor of philosophy Allan Silverman, the series brings scholars to Ohio State to discuss the principles of citizenship from a variety of perspectives.

**Seana Shiffrin**  
Department of Philosophy and School of Law, University of California-Los Angeles  
“Promising, Intimate Relationships, and Conventionalism”  
October 26, 2007

**Dennis Thompson**  
Alfred North Whitehead Professor of Political Philosophy, Harvard University  
“Deliberative Democracy in Action: The Case of Citizens Assembly”  
November 9, 2007

**Richard Bauman**  
Distinguished Professor of Folklore, and Ethnomusicology, Communication and Culture and Anthropology, Indiana University-Bloomington  
“It’s Not a Telescope, It’s a Telephone: Encounters with the Telephone on Early Commercial Sound Recordings”  
April 4, 2008

Empire History Speaker Series

From the ancient Romans to the recent British, most of world history has seen the majority of people ruled by powerful empires. This series, organized by associate professor of history Alice Conklin, explores the rise, rule, and fall of empires around the world, and the consequences for both those in authority and those who are ruled.

**Derek Penslar**  
Director, Jewish Studies Program at the University of Toronto  
“When May We Kill our Brethren? Jews at War in Europe, 1848–1918”  
November 5, 2007

**Leonard Smith**  
Fredrick B. Artz Professor of History, Oberlin College  
“Who Gets to Be a People?: Reconfiguring the Ottoman Empire in the King-Crane Commission Report of 1919”  
January 28, 2008

**Maud Mandel**  
Associate Professor of History and Judaic Studies, Brown University  
“Each Algerian Must Feel Palestinian’: 1967, 1968, and Muslim/Jewish Relations in France”  
May 9, 2008

Ohio State graduate Alison Blosser (center) stood with the personal security detail for Governor Sayed Fazilullah Wahidi (in camouflage) and a national policeman (in gray uniform) on August 27, 2008, in front of the provincial administration building in Kunar province, Afghanistan. Blosser spent a year in Afghanistan as a State Department representative/political officer with the Provincial Reconstruction Team. This picture was taken just after the governor held a farewell breakfast for her. (Photo courtesy of Alison Blosser)

Elder leaders of the Safi tribe gathered in the Chapadara district of Afghanistan’s Kunar province to meet with the district administrator, provincial reconstruction team, and the maneuver force commander in November 2007. During the meeting, they discussed several security and development projects, including the construction of a new district center. The district administrator was living in a two-story mud house with a courtyard, where this meeting took place. Chapadara was one of the last five of Kunar’s 14 districts to build a new district center. (Photo courtesy of Alison Blosser)
In 2007–08, the Mershon Center established the Ralph D. Mershon Study Abroad Scholarship to support undergraduates who wish to enhance their educational experience by studying in a foreign country.

The scholarship supports students taking foreign language courses, especially those deemed critical for national security, such as Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Hindi, Farsi, and others. Priority is given to students who are preparing for a career related to international security studies.

This year, the Mershon Center awarded 13 study abroad scholarships. Winners and their courses of study include:

- **Alexa Bruder**
  Sophomore majoring in linguistics
  Intensive Chinese Language Program in Quindao, China

- **Vince Selip**
  Senior majoring in international studies and Arabic
  American University in Cairo

- **Megan Cairns**
  Sophomore majoring in Arabic and religious studies
  Arabic Language Institute in Fez, Morocco

- **Kristin Silver**
  Junior majoring in psychology and Slavic and Eastern European studies
  American Institute for Foreign Study in the Czech Republic

- **Michael Curtis**
  Junior majoring in international studies
  Koc International Exchange Program in Turkey

- **Robert Snyder**
  Senior majoring in international studies; and evolution, ecology, and organismal biology
  Minnesota Studies in International Development in Senegal

- **Sarah Gange**
  Junior majoring in Russian and comparative studies
  Russian Language and Area Studies Program at the KORA Language Institute in Vladimir

- **Aaron Taylor**
  Sophomore majoring in East Asian studies and Korean
  Soon Chun Huang University in Korea

- **Dana Grinshpan**
  Junior majoring in international studies and Arabic
  Hebrew University in Jerusalem

- **Lydia Thomas**
  Sophomore majoring in Chinese, Arabic, and international studies
  Intensive Chinese Language Program in Quindao, China

- **Timothy Hoffine**
  Senior majoring in international studies, journalism, and French
  Arabic Language Institute in Fez, Morocco

- **David Young**
  Sophomore majoring in international studies and Chinese
  International Chinese Language Program in Taiwan

- **Joshua Przybyla**
  Senior majoring in criminology
  Study Abroad Program on Central and Eastern Europe in Comparative Perspective in Warsaw, Poland

- **Vince Selip**
  Senior majoring in international studies and Arabic
  American University in Cairo

- **Kristin Silver**
  Junior majoring in psychology and Slavic and Eastern European studies
  American Institute for Foreign Study in the Czech Republic

- **Robert Snyder**
  Senior majoring in international studies; and evolution, ecology, and organismal biology
  Minnesota Studies in International Development in Senegal

- **Aaron Taylor**
  Sophomore majoring in East Asian studies and Korean
  Soon Chun Huang University in Korea

- **Lydia Thomas**
  Sophomore majoring in Chinese, Arabic, and international studies
  Intensive Chinese Language Program in Quindao, China

- **David Young**
  Sophomore majoring in international studies and Chinese
  International Chinese Language Program in Taiwan

- **Joshua Przybyla**
  Senior majoring in criminology
  Study Abroad Program on Central and Eastern Europe in Comparative Perspective in Warsaw, Poland
UNDERGRADUATE ACTIVITIES

Mershon Undergraduate Research Forum

The Mershon Center worked with the Ohio State Undergraduate Research Office to host the second annual Mershon Undergraduate Research Forum on November 14, 2007.

Robert McMahon, Ralph D. Mershon Professor of History, chaired an interdisciplinary forum on the basic ingredients of a good undergraduate research project. Panelists included Mershon associates Theodore Hopf, associate professor of political science, and Katherine Meyer, professor of sociology.

Panel members gave examples of good undergraduate research projects and addressed questions such as:

• How do you develop good research questions?
• What types of methodologies should you use in your research?
• What foundation do you need to have before undertaking a research project?
• How can undergraduates work with the Institutional Review Board?
• How can undergraduates make connections with faculty members?

About 45 students attended, with the vast majority giving the panel rave reviews. More than 80 percent found the panelists extremely knowledgeable and clear in presentation. “The blended panel was an excellent idea,” one student wrote. “Varied interests and varied approaches help students view the fields broadly—nice!”

Living Jerusalem

Last year, nine students enrolled in “Living Jerusalem: Bridge Blogging and Ethnography in Disputed Territory,” taught by Mershon faculty associate Amy Horowitz. In addition to weekly classes, readings, and assignments, the students engaged in ongoing dialogue through video conferences and a course weblog with Israeli and Canadian Jewish students at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Muslim and Christian Palestinian students at Al Quds University.

The course culminated in a week-long study tour in Jerusalem in 2007. The Ohio State students met their Israeli and Palestinian peers for face-to-face discussions. They also engaged in lectures by professors at Hebrew University and Al Quds University, and toured Jerusalem with guides from the communities they had studied—Muslim, Christian, Jewish, Palestinian, and Israeli.
Another component of the Living Jerusalem project was “Living Columbus: The Salaam, Shalom, Peace Project,” which brought together students from Catholic, Jewish, and Islamic day schools across the city. Fifth-graders gave each other tours of their schools and discussed their different faiths.

“The goal of the project is to have children at each school think about what is important to them about their schools,” Horowitz told The Columbus Dispatch. She believes in the benefits that may result when children from conflicting communities meet in a safe and constructive context.

Diplomatic Simulation

Students in Mershon director Richard Herrmann’s Foreign Policy Decision Making class conducted a diplomatic simulation in which they represented various countries and negotiated agreements, treaties, and contracts. Students then analyzed who won, who lost, and why, and applied theories and strategies they had learned in class to the game.

Denman Undergraduate Research Forum

More than 350 students, including 10 whose projects were advised by Mershon faculty associates, entered the 13th annual Denman Undergraduate Research Forum on May 14, 2008. The students were evaluated by faculty, corporate, and external judges on the quality of their posters, poise in discussion, and importance of the research. The forum is an opportunity to showcase outstanding student research at Ohio State and encourage all undergraduates to participate in research as a value-added element of their education.
Graduate Student Research

Each year, the Mershon Center hosts a competition for Ohio State graduate students who seek funding to conduct research on topics related to international security studies. Funds may be used for a variety of purposes, such as travel, food and lodging, and interview, library, or interpreter fees.

In 2007–08, the Mershon Center gave research grants to 13 graduate students working on dissertations in a variety of fields including political science, history, and sociology. As with faculty, funds support research in one of the Mershon Center’s three areas of focus: the use of force and diplomacy; the ideas, identities, and decisional processes that affect security; and the institutions that manage violent conflict.

Students supported and their projects include:

**Soundarya Chidambaram, Political Science**
Why Do People Riot? Understanding the Micro-Level Processes Motivating Hindu-Muslim Riots in India p. 35

**Michael Ewers, Geography**
Locational Decisions and Perceived Risk of U.S. Multinationals in the New Gulf Development States p. 48

**Denice Fett, History**
Information, Intelligence, and Negotiation: The Atlantic European Diplomatic World, 1558–1585 p. 26

**Ursula Gurney, History**

**Edward Gutiérrez, History**
Sherman Was Right: The Experience of AEF Soldiers in the First World War p. 28

**Marguerite Hernandez, Sociology**
Problem Definitions: Understanding the NGO Response to Sex Trafficking p. 49

**Eliza Ho, History of Art**
War, Propaganda, and Photography: The Chinese Photographer Sha Fei (1912–1950) p. 36

**Ryan Irwin, History**
Race and Revolution: The International Dilemma of Apartheid, 1960–69 p. 29

**Dag Mossige, Political Science**
The Perils of Movement Parties: An Investigation of Political Parties in Mexico and Argentina p. 50

**Rohit Negi, Geography**
From Boma to Boomtown: Extraction, Place, and Politics in Solwezi, Zambia p. 37

**Mark Rice, History**
The Alliance City: NATO and Berlin, 1958–63 p. 38

**Srdjan Vucetic, Political Science**
The “Anglosphere”: A Genealogy of an Identity in International Relations p. 39

**Christina Xydias, Political Science**
Women At/On the Ballot: Examining the Effects of Tokenism and Quotas p. 51

Descriptions of these projects can be found in the “Research” section at the front of this report.
Postdoctoral Fellows and Visiting Scholars

**Anja Jetschke, Postdoctoral Fellow**

Anja Jetschke was an assistant professor of international relations at the University of Freiburg in Germany. During her year at the Mershon Center, she completed “ASEAN – A Networked EU? Explaining the Institutional Characteristics of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.”

The paper explains the dissonance between the rhetoric of cooperation within the ASEAN and the actual practice between ASEAN members. Jetschke asks why there is such a pronounced gap between rhetoric and implementation.

She argues that previous explanations of the Asian approach to international cooperation do not take the diffusion of policies into account: ASEAN’s rhetoric of cooperation stems from an emulation of the European integration process, but the organization translated these policies into a network-based design. While emulation explains the gap between rhetoric and practice, network governance explains ASEAN’s resilience.


She has been awarded a five-year Margarate-von-Wrangel Fellowship by the Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts, Baden-Wuerttemberg, and the European Social Fund to work on her next book.

**Andrew A.G. Ross, Postdoctoral Fellow**

Andrew Ross is a broadly trained scholar of international relations, international law, and political theory. He completed a PhD in political science at The Johns Hopkins University and has taught at the universities of Oregon and Puget Sound.

During his year at Mershon, Ross worked on a book called *Beyond Hatred: Emotional Currents in International Politics*. The book offers an original account of emotions as social phenomena and investigates their role in the war on terror, ethnic conflict, and justice and social recovery in post-conflict societies.

From pragmatism to neuroscience, Ross mines theoretical resources not well understood in the field of international relations. Moving beyond a focus on the feelings of individuals, the book recasts emotions as social phenomena, showing how “circulations of affect” shape, inspire, and modify collective agency in international politics.

Ross applies this theory to familiar cases whose emotional dimensions are not yet well understood: conflicts in Rwanda, Bosnia, and South Africa; terrorist attacks on New York and Madrid; and protests surrounding America’s War on Terror. Finding powerful and unstable emotions at the heart of these conflicts, he calls for a new approach to justice and reconciliation attuned to its emotional roots.

After his fellowship at Mershon, Ross will take a position as assistant professor of political science at Ohio University in Athens.
Zachary Zwald, Postdoctoral Fellow

Zachary Zwald has a PhD in political science from the University of California-Berkeley.

While at the Mershon Center, Zwald revised his dissertation “Solving an Imaginary Problem: Why ‘Should’ Determines ‘Can’ on U.S. National Missile Defense,” for publication and will submit the manuscript this coming year.

The book goes beyond debates about the strategic prudence of creating a missile-defense system to consider how policymakers actually assess whether the technology can be built. Zwald finds that from 1983 to 2007, policymakers who argued that missile defense would enhance the U.S. nuclear deterrent believed that the necessary technology could be built, while those who contended that such a system would hurt the U.S. nuclear deterrent concluded that the technology could not be built.

Zwald’s book explains that due to limited data about what missile defense technology can do, as well as structural barriers to acquiring additional data, policymakers relied on their established beliefs about the conditions necessary for credible nuclear deterrence.

Zwald also completed “The Credibility Problem: Why Nuclear Proliferation Is What States Make of It,” which he presented at the American Political Science Association in August. He will teach political science at the University of California-Santa Cruz in 2008–09.

Anita Bucknam, CIA Officer in Residence

Anita Bucknam was the CIA Officer in Residence for 2006–07 and 2007–08 at the Mershon Center. Through this program, the CIA places experienced officers in universities across the country to teach, conduct research, and act as a resource for faculty and students.

During her residency, Bucknam taught a variety of intelligence-related courses, including “Introduction to Intelligence,” “Topics in Advanced Intelligence,” and a special topics course on “9/11: Truth, Lies, and Conspiracy Theories.”

Bucknam joined the CIA in 1992 to conduct analytic assessments of Russian economic and political issues. After the events of September 11, Bucknam transferred her analytic work to counterterrorism issues, particularly related to homeland security. She has also served short tours in the National Security Agency, the State Department, and the White House, and she served overseas in Moscow.

Bucknam was one of only four CIA Officers in Residence placed in the past two years; others were at Duke, Tufts, and the University of San Diego.
Julie Clemens, Peace Studies Coordinator

As peace studies coordinator, Julie Clemens is a point person in the search to fill the peace studies chair.

She is also working on her own dissertation, “The Politics of Peace in U.S. Higher Education.” In this project, she argues that although several hundred peace studies programs have been established on U.S. college campuses in the past 60 years, they are not politically, culturally, or institutionally valued, and peace studies curriculum and research remains on the margins of academic scholarship.

Clemens’ study analyzes the current conditions of peace studies scholarship in the fields of international relations and peace studies within U.S. higher education. The qualitative methods of questionnaire, interview, and document analysis are used to investigate the perspectives of the most influential scholars within the two academic fields.

Clemens argues that peace studies curriculum and research in U.S. higher education need to be reconstituted. Toward that end, her study offers a resource for understanding the politics of curriculum and program development within marginalized fields of study in U.S. higher education.

Mark Stewart, Visiting Scholar

Mark Stewart is professor of civil engineering and director of the Centre for Infrastructure Performance and Reliability at the University of Newcastle in Australia. Among many other publications, Stewart is author with R.E. Melchers of Probabilistic Risk Assessment of Engineering Systems (Kluwer Academic, 2003).

While visiting the Mershon Center, he worked with John Mueller, Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies, on “Assessing the Risks, Costs, and Benefits of United States Aviation Security Measures."

The report finds that hardened cockpit doors cost $800,000 per life saved, while the air marshal program costs $180 million per life saved. The Federal Aviation Administration considers any innovation less than $3 million per life saved to be cost-effective.

The study was discussed by Stephen J. Dubner, author of Freakonomics, in The New York Times and Matt Phillips, airline blogger for The Wall Street Journal, as well as cited by numerous other international security blogs throughout July.

Julie Clemens (right) listened to proceedings during Peace Matters: A Forum on the Discipline and Practice of Peace and Conflict Studies, held May 11–12, 2007, at the Mershon Center. Joyce Neu (left), then executive director of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice and professor of practice at the University of San Diego, is currently at the United Nations.
**Roxanna Sjöstedt, Visiting Doctoral Candidate**

*Roxanna Sjöstedt is a PhD candidate in peace and conflict studies at Uppsala University in Sweden.*

She visited the Mershon Center to work with Alexander Wendt, Ralph D. Mershon Professor of International Security, on her dissertation, which examines the social construction of threats and why issues sometimes are framed in terms of national security by the central decision-making units of states.

Sjöstedt analyzes how norms and identity formations at the international and domestic levels interact with the individual belief systems of decision makers in creating initial interest in a particular problem, as well as the subsequent securitization of it.

The more explicit focus of the dissertation project concerns the issues of HIV/AIDS and terrorism in the decision-making contexts of Russia and the United States.

**Marie-Jose Tayah, Visiting Fulbright Scholar**

*The completion of an academic training in a U.S. institution is the capstone of the Fulbright Scholarship in Conflict Resolution at the Center for Justice and Peacebuilding, Eastern Mennonite University.*

To fulfill this requirement, Marie-Jose Tayah visited the Mershon Center to gain interdisciplinary research experience in peace studies, international relations, and security studies.

Tayah used her fellowship at the Mershon Center to develop three peace-building classes geared toward international relations students. The syllabi merged conflict resolution and international relations paradigms.
OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

The director of the Mershon Center for International Security Studies, Richard Herrmann, reports to Dieter Wanner, Interim Associate Provost for International Affairs, and to a provost-appointed oversight committee. This year, the committee included:

Paul Beck, Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (chair)
Kenneth Andrien, Professor, Department of History
Kevin Cox, Distinguished University Professor, Department of Geography
Daniel Farrell, Professor, Department of Philosophy
Camille Hébert, Carter C. Kissell Professor of Law
David G. Horn, Chair, Department of Comparative Studies
Robert Kaufman, Professor, Department of Sociology
Lt. Col. Todd Miller, Commander, Army ROTC
Capt. Steven Noce, Commander, Navy ROTC
Col. Curtiss Petrek, Commander, Air Force ROTC
John Roberts, Dean, College of Humanities
Kazimierz Slomczynski, Professor, Department of Sociology
Herbert F. Weisberg, Chair, Department of Political Science
Michael Sherman, Vice Provost for Academic Administration (ex-officio)
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