U.S. Foreign Policy: Foundations and Consequences

Paper Organiser
Dr. Mark Shirk
Department of Politics and International Studies
Alison Richard Building 132
mas291@cam.ac.uk

Lecturer
Dr. Daniel Larsen
Department of Politics and International Studies
Alison Richard Building 102
drl37@cam.ac.uk

Supervisors
Supervisor 1
Supervisor 2
Supervisor 3

PAPER DESCRIPTION

By almost any measure, the United States has been the most powerful country in the world since 1945. Due to its standing, the U.S. is centrally involved with almost every important international political issue, ranging from the international security and economic arenas to transnational issues such as climate change and human rights regimes. For these reasons, the factors which shape U.S. foreign policy are of concern to people around the globe. This paper is designed to develop students’ understanding of these factors, both historically and in their present state. It will familiarize students with important literature and debates on the intellectual and cultural foundations of U.S. foreign policy, including anti-statism, liberalism, and illiberal assumptions used to legitimize continental and, eventually, hemispheric domination. It will address the development of American political institutions and their involvement in foreign affairs. This includes the balance between the presidency and the Congress as established in the Constitution and practice; workings of the foreign policy bureaucracy; the impact of public opinion on political leaders and vice versa; and the sometimes pluralistic, sometimes oligarchic constellation of interest groups which foreign policymakers must heed. It will examine significant aspects of U.S. foreign policy towards different regions of the world, especially since 1945. The role the U.S. plays vis-à-vis five pertinent contemporary issues will be discussed: nuclear weapons, terrorism, climate change, the global economy, and international law. Lastly, the paper will cover debates over the nature and consequences of U.S. power and the potential decline of the U.S. relative to other states.
OBJECTIVES

• to understand how multiple different intellectual traditions, some complementary and some competing, have shaped U.S. foreign policy
• to appreciate the multi-level impacts that individuals, domestic institutions, and the international political system have had on U.S. foreign policy, and vice versa
• to familiarise students with different theories with which to interpret evidence that might explain how U.S. foreign policy has developed and operates at present
• to discern the relative strengths and weaknesses of different theories that purport to explain various episodes of U.S. foreign policy
• to introduce students to different methods used to analyze U.S. foreign policy, from historical case studies to quantitative analysis of public opinion
• to gain detailed knowledge of U.S. relations with at least two global regions
• to teach students how to situate their own arguments within wider debates related to U.S. power and influence in the world, while distinguishing their arguments from those on which they draw

MODE OF TEACHING & ASSESSMENT

In Michaelmas, students will have 3 supervisions and 1 seminar. Students will be allocated a supervisor at the beginning of Michaelmas term, and should contact the course organizer if any problems occur. For each supervision, students should prepare a 2000 word essay. For the seminar, there is no written work but students should be prepared to discuss the readings. Supervision topics will be chosen by or in concert with your supervisor. All essays will be from the supervision topics listed at the end of each module. If you want to go beyond this please discuss with your supervisor.

In Easter term, we will have a revision seminar, and each student will have one revision supervision. Powerpoint slides and will have been uploaded to the Moodle website throughout Michaelmas and Lent, available to all students enrolled in the paper.

Students will be assessed via a divided three-hour essay examination, from which students will be asked to answer three questions. There will be two sections, and students must answer at least one question from each section. Section A will consist of questions from Parts I, II, and V of the paper. Section B will have questions on the different regions and issues discussed in Parts III and IV. There is also a sample exam at the end of this paper guide.

READINGS

The following books should be available at your college libraries or the Seeley Library. Primary readings for the class from each (denoted below) will appear at some point in the paper guide. Given the circumstances, I realize that many of you are looking to do readings online. All journal articles and many books are available without going into a library. If you are not comfortable going into a library, your supervisor and I will work with you to either get you a particular reading OR suggest some good alternatives from the recommended readings list.

Recommended readings (also denoted below) do not need to be read prior to class, but may prove valuable to you as you revise supervision essays and prepare for the final exam. For recommended readings, I have listed what I believe to be the most important chapters in books, though you are free to read more from titles you find especially relevant and interesting. You cannot possibly cover all the material listed here. Think of it as a useful bibliography, parts of which you will investigate more deeply than others.
General Overviews
The following books don’t appear in the readings associated with lectures, but rather are good reference sources concerning the history of U.S. foreign policy if you need them:

George C. Herring, *From Colony to Superpower: U.S. Foreign Relations since 1776* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); available as an electronic resource


Steven W. Hook and John W. Spanier, *American Foreign Policy since World War II* [multiple editions] (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press); most recent edition also available as an electronic resource, though only accessible on designated computers in the UL


In addition to the primary and recommended readings, the following websites and “e-resources” may be useful for finding supplementary information:

- The Council on Foreign Relations (articles from *Foreign Affairs*, amongst many other useful pieces; cfr.org)
- Foreign Policy (a nominal subscription fee is required; foreignpolicy.com)
- Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS, an edited series of primary documents on U.S. diplomacy; [https://uwdc.library.wisc.edu/collections/FRUS/](https://uwdc.library.wisc.edu/collections/FRUS/))
- The National Security Archive (declassified documents from U.S. intelligence and other sources; nsarchive.gwu.edu)
- ProQuest Digital National Security Archive (an e-resource available through the UL website, quite similar to the source immediately above)
- War on the Rocks (“A platform for analysis, commentary, debate and multimedia content on foreign policy and national security issues through a realist lens”; warontherocks.com)
- The Monkey Cage (articles from political scientists on a range of different topics, including foreign policy; [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/))

**LECTURE TOPICS & ACCOMPANYING READINGS**

**Michaelmas Term**

*Part I: Intellectual Traditions Shaping U.S. Foreign Policy*

1. Changing Notions of “American Exceptionalism” - Lecturer Mark Shirk

- McDougall, *Promised Land, Crusader State*, chs. 3-4 (looking at and complicating the Monroe Doctrine and “manifest destiny”)
- Hendrickson, *Union, Nation, or Empire*, pt. 8, “A Commission from God” (moral crusading and forceful acquisition of territory in the early 20th century)
Recommended:

- McDougall, *Promised Land, Crusader State*, chs. 5-8 (criticizing the liberalism of the “New Testament” of U.S. foreign policy)
- Thomas J. Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), chs. 7-8 (a biography of the quintessential American liberal internationalist)

2. Themes from the Revolutionary Era – Dan Larsen

- McDougall, *Promised Land, Crusader State*, chs. 1-2 (looking at and complicating themes of “exceptionalism” and “isolationism”)
- Mead, *Special Providence*, ch. 2 (do the multiple ideologies informing U.S. foreign policy make for incoherence?) [available as an electronic resource]
- Hendrickson, *Union, Nation, or Empire*, pt. 2, “The Age of Revolution and War” (neat historical overview)

Recommended:

- Washington’s Farewell Address, avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp (no foreign entanglements! Unilateralism or isolationism?)
- Alexander Hamilton, Federalist 70, avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/fed70.asp (the importance of a “unitary executive” for action)
- Patrick J. Garrity, “The Pacificus-Helvidius Debates,” www.claremont.org/crb/basicpage/the-pacificus-helvidius-debates/ (does the president or Congress have the authority to declare the U.S. a neutral party to a dispute? Even Hamilton and Madison couldn’t agree)
Organization, Vol. 49, No. 2 (1995), pp. 191-228 (the American answer to the problem of simultaneously defending against threats abroad and tyranny at home)

- Brian Loveman, No Higher Law: American Foreign Policy and the Western Hemisphere since 1776 (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), chs. 1, 12-13 (nothing debunks the idea of U.S. isolationism faster than reviewing the history of its foreign policy towards its neighbours)


3. Liberal?: Race and US Foreign Policy – Dan Larsen


Recommended:

- Max Boot, The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power (New York: Basic Books, 2002), preface, chs. 5-6 (acquiring dominance in the Western Hemisphere wasn’t a pretty process)

- David Campbell, Writing Security: United States Foreign Policy and the Politics of Identity (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1992), intro, ch. 1 (writing the Cold War into existence in the National Security Council)


- Hendrickson, Union, Nation, or Empire, pt. 5, “Empire and Its Discontents” (debates over intervention and non-intervention amidst 19th century war, massacre, and expansion)

- Michael H. Hunt, Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009), ch. 3 (more on racial hierarchy and foreign policy)


- Walter LeFeber, The American Age: U.S. Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad 1750 to
the Present, second edition (New York: W.W. Norton, 1989), chs. 7-9 (more on how corporate interests drive U.S. foreign policy)

- Nagamitsu Miura, John Locke and the Native Americans: Early English Liberalism and its Colonial Reality (Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013) chs. 2, 6 (the relationship between liberalism and colonialism in America)
- Walter R. Mead, “The Jacksonian Revolt: American Populism and the Liberal Order,” Foreign Affairs Vol. 96, (Mar-Apr 2017), pp. 2-7 (is Donald Trump continuing a foreign policy tradition started by President Andrew Jackson?)
- Alex Ross, “How American Racism Influenced Hitler,” The New Yorker, April 30 (2018). Available Online at https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2018/04/30/how-american-racism-influenced-hitler (a review article of historical research; not the kind of exemplarism a liberal democracy should aspire to).

4. Schools of American Foreign Policy – Mark Shirk

- Fukuyama, America at the Crossroads, ch. 2 (a former neoconservative analyzes its ideological and political impact)
- Rodrik, The Globalization Paradox, ch. 9 (the “trilemma” of democracy, sovereignty, and globalization introduced by neoliberalism: you only get to pick two) [available as an electronic resource]

Recommended:

- Wendy Brown, “American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism, and De-
democratization,” *Political Theory*, Vol. 34, no. 6 (2006): 690-714 (a stinging critique comparing both ideologies)

- David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), ch. 3 (one of neoliberalism’s leading chroniclers from a Marxist perspective) [available as an electronic resource]

**Supervision questions for Part I:**

1. How has American Exceptionalism influenced US Foreign Policy?
2. How, if at all, has race influenced US Foreign Policy?
3. Do neconservatism a form of liberal foreign policy?
4. Have America’s liberal tendencies had a pacifying effect on its foreign policy, or have they primarily been a cause of violent conflict?
5. How might the U.S-UK relationship be different if they did not share cultural and racial identities?
6. Is American Exceptionalism fundamentally anti-European?

**Part II: Institutions, Domestic Politics, and U.S. Foreign Policy**

5. **Anti-Statism and the U.S. Security State – Daniel Larsen**
   - Friedberg, *In the Shadow of the Garrison State*, chs. 1-3 [available as an electronic resource] (how anti-statism informed national security strategy in the Cold War)
   - Koh, *The National Security Constitution*, ch. 3 (how interpretations of the Constitution’s national security provisions changed over time)
   - Zegart, *Flawed by Design*, chs. 1, 6-7 (arguing that the enhancement national security was not necessarily the principle guiding the design of the CIA and other bodies)

**Recommended:**

- Philip A. Russo and Patrick J. Haney, “Intermestic Politics and Homeland Security,” in *Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 16 [available as an electronic resource] (blurring the lines between domestic and foreign policy)
Diplomatic History 38/3(2014), pp. 477–500. (Critiquing the impact of the emergence of the concept of “national security” in the 1940s)


6. U.S. Intelligence and Secrecy – Daniel Larsen

- Christopher Andrew, For the President’s Eyes Only (London, 1995), esp chs. 5, 7, 9, 12 (Trailblazing study of the history of U.S. intelligence)
- David Pozen, “The Leaky Leviathan: Why the Government Condemns and Condones Unlawful Disclosures of Information,” Harvard Law Review 127, no. 2 (2013), pp.512-521, 528-534, 542-551, 558-589, 594-596, 633-635. (A fascinating study of the ecosystem of leaks in the U.S. government—the page numbers have been selected to skip the more legalistic parts of the article)

Recommended:

- Andrew, Aldrich, and Wark (eds.) Secret Intelligence: A Reader (two editions, one in 2009, and the second in 2019) In the first edition: see esp. chs. 1-2, 8, 11-13 (an excellent standard intelligence reader, produced by the leading figures in intelligence studies)
- Christopher Andrew, The Secret World (Penguin, 2018), chs. 29-30 (a seminal account of intelligence throughout all of human history)
- Blight and Welch (eds.), Intelligence and the Cuban Missile Crisis (Frank Cass, 1998), ch. 2.
- Gustafson, Hostile Intent (Washington, 2007), esp. ch. 7. (an account of the CIA and the 1973 coup in Chile that, contrary to popular belief, argues that the CIA had little to do with the coup)
  
- Richelson, The U.S. Intelligence Community (7th Edition, New York, 2016), chs. 1-2 and 8 (a useful nuts-and-bolts handbook for the organization of the intelligence community; older editions of this book are also fine—please read the first two chapters and the chapter on signals intelligence)
- Dahl, Intelligence and Surprise Attack (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 2013), chs. 5-8.
- Gardner, The War on Leakers (New York, 2016) vs. Schoenfeld, Necessary Secrets
(New York, 2010). (Two very contrasting works, with Gardner attacking U.S. governmental secrecy and Schoenfeld broadly sympathetic to it.)

- Denys Myers, “The Control of Foreign Relations,” *American Political Science Review* 11, no. 1 (1917), pp.41-58, esp. pp.45-50 (though a century old, this is a short, fascinating study of how American diplomacy used to be almost completely transparent—inviting the question of how much secrecy is actually needed)

7. The Executive-Legislative Balance – Dan Larsen

- Zakaria, *From Wealth to Power*, chs. 1, 3-4 (U.S. military power lagged behind its economic largesse because of a weak executive branch; skim empirical chapters) [available as an electronic resource]
- Kriner, *After the Rubicon*, chs. 1-2, 4 (the president is commander-in-chief, but legislators still influence how military force is used) [available as an electronic resource]
- Silverstein, *Imbalance of Powers*, intro, pt. 3 (a good complement to Koh, taking the courts to task for allowing the president disproportionate influence over foreign policy)

Recommended:
- Patrick J. Haney, *Organizing for Foreign Policy Crises: Presidents, Advisers and the Management of Decision Making* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1997), ch. 3 (how the organization of leading advisors affects the information provided to presidents)
- James M. Lindsay, “The Shifting Pendulum of Power: Executive-Legislative Relations on American Foreign Policy,” and Michael Nelson, “Person and the Office: Presidents, the Presidency, and Foreign Policy,” in *Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy* [available as an electronic resource] (both good general essays)


Richard E. Neustadt, Presidential Power and the Modern Presidents (New York: The Free Press, 1990), ch. 3 (a classic; Neustadt argues that presidential power is the power to persuade, not bully)


Jeremi Suri, The Impossible Presidency: The Rise and Fall of America’s Highest Office (New York: Basic Books, 2017), [read especially in conjunction with research on the bureaucracy; Suri explores the paradoxes of political power in the tradition of Lowi’s The End of Liberalism]

8. Bureaucracy – Daniel Larsen

- Daniel Drezner, “Ideas, Bureaucratic Politics, and the Crafting of Foreign Policy.” American Journal of Political Science 44 (October 2000): 733-49 (why do some bureaucracies succeed in influencing foreign policy and others fail?)

Recommended:
- Terry M. Moe, “The New Economics of Organization,” American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 28, No. 4 (1984): 739-777 (though not explicitly about foreign policy, this is an excellent overview of the limitations that prevent political leaders from seamlessly translating bureaucratic resources into power and influence)
- Stephen D. Krasner, “Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison Wonderland),” Foreign
Richard K. Betts, *Enemies of Intelligence* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), ch. 2 (intelligence agencies have inherent limitations, and strategic surprise is inevitable)

Michael P. Colaresi, *Democracy Declassified: The Secrecy Dilemma in National Security* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2014), chs. 2-3 (how congressional oversight of secretive security bureaucracies can work to enhance national security) [available as an electronic resource]


Robert J. McMahon, *Dean Acheson and the Creation of an American World Order* (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2009), ch. 3 (on one of the most influential Secretaries of State)

Milner and Tingley, *Sailing the Water’s Edge*, ch. 5

Paul R. Pillar, *Intelligence and U.S. Foreign Policy: Iraq, 9/11, and Misguided Reform* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), chs. 5-6 (by the former head of the CIA’s counter-terrorism center)


9. **Outside Influences: Public Opinion and Interest Groups – Dan Larsen**

- Smith, Foreign Attachments, ch. 2 (how America’s multi-ethnic society affects organized interest groups and foreign policy)
Recommended:

- Douglas C. Foyle, *Counting the Public In: Presidents, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), ch. 1 and any of the subsequent case studies (some presidents think public opinion is important when making foreign policy, and some don’t)
- Gries, *The Politics of American Foreign Policy*, chs. 1-2 [available as an electronic resource] (examining the left-right divide in the public’s foreign policy positions)
- Dominic Johnson and Dominic Tierney, *Failing to Win: Perceptions of Victory and Defeat in International Politics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), chs. 2-3, 6 (does the public engage in objective ‘score-keeping’ when it evaluates military campaigns, or does spin from media and political leaders lead people to engage in biased ‘match-fixing’?)
- Peter D. Feaver, Christopher Gelpi, and Jason Reifler “Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq,” *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (2005/06), pp. 7- 46 (are Americans “casualty phobic” or “defeat phobic”?)
- Joshua D. Kertzer and Thomas Zeitzoff, “A Bottom-Up Theory of Public Opinion about Foreign Policy,” *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 61, No. 3 (2017), pp. 543-58 (compare to Berinsky; per Page and colleagues, if public opinion about foreign policy is such an elite-driven process, why does the public often disagree with what leaders have to say?)
- Christopher Wlezien, “The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending,” *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (1995), pp. 981-1000 (when it comes to defense spending and other issues, the public acts like a thermostat, pulling policy back to the center when it goes too far in one direction or the other).
Kevin Narizny, “Both Guns and Butter, or Neither: Class Interests in the Political Economy of Rearmament,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 97, No. 2 (2003), pp. 203-20 (the left and the right may not be as consistently dovish/hawkish as we tend to think)


Peter Trubowitz, *Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998), ch. 1 (different regions of the country have different economic interests, and by extension, foreign policy preferences).

Allan J. Cigler and Burdett A. Loomis, eds., *Interest Group Politics*, 8th edition (London: CQ Press, 2012), chs. 13-14 (Hrebenar and Thomas on the ‘China Lobby’ and McCormick on ethnic interest groups, respectively) [most recent edition also available as an electronic resource, though only accessible on designated computers in the UL]

**Supervision questions for Part II:**

1. Did the national security institutions created after World War II represent a major departure from previous U.S. policy traditions?
2. In what ways, if any, can the U.S. Congress check presidential foreign policy initiatives?
3. How influential are presidential advisors when it comes to crafting foreign policy?
4. How do bureaucratic standard operating procedures help and hinder efforts to secure the state?
5. How do U.S. intelligence agencies inform U.S. foreign policy, and what role do they play in carrying it out?
6. How important is secrecy in effectively carrying out U.S. foreign policy?
7. Is the U.S. foreign policy bureaucracy so large and unwieldy that it does more to hinder presidential power than enhance it?
8. When are members of the American public likely to be most and least supportive of U.S. military action abroad?
9. Assess the following statement: The less influence American public opinion has on U.S. foreign policy, the better.
10. Does big business exert disproportionate influence over U.S. foreign policy?

**Part III: US Foreign Policy around the World**

**10. Africa – Daniel Larsen**

- Noer, *Cold War and Black Liberation*, ch. 2
- Westad, *The Global Cold War*, chs. 1, 6 [available as an electronic resource] (despite their ideological conflict, both superpowers agreed that “third world” African countries could be remade in their respective images)
Recommended:


- Samantha Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic Books, 2002), ch. 10 (the book that made Obama’s ambassador to the UN famous)


- Peter Woodward, *U.S. Foreign Policy and the Horn of Africa* (New York: Routledge, 2016), chs. 1, 5-7 (U.S. military power, ethnic conflict, and terrorism makes for a combustible trio)
11. Latin America – Daniel Larsen

- Long, Latin America Confronts the United States, chs. 1, 4-5 (showing how even relatively weak states can influence US policy in cooperative endeavors) [available as an electronic resource]
- Sikkink, Mixed Signals, Chs. 3, 6-7 (arguing that strident U.S. anti-communism eventually made room for human rights concerns in relations with Latin America)

Recommended:
- Peter Andreas, Border Games: Policing the U.S.-Mexico Divide (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000), chs. 1, 5 (somewhat dated due to the ebbing of Mexican immigration to the U.S.)
- Hal Brands, Latin America's Cold War (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), intro, ch. 5 (The “Cold” War was anything but as far as Latin America was concerned)
- Martha Cottam, Images and Intervention: U.S. Policies in Latin America (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1994), ch. 5 (Reagan and Bush vis-à-vis Central America)
- Michael C. Desch, When the Third World Matters: Latin America and United States Grand Strategy (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), ch. 1 (the importance of Latin America for U.S. strategy)
- Gries, Politics of American Foreign Policy, ch. 6
- Gary Prevost and Carlos Oliva Campos, eds., Neoliberalism and Neopanamericanism: The View from Latin America (New York: Palgrave, 2002), chs. 1, 9 (ideology and globalization in America’s near abroad)
- Gregory B. Weeks, U.S. and Latin American Relations, second edition (West Sussex: John Wiley, 2015), chs. 8, 10 (on the movement of people and goods in the Americas; entire book is a good overview source) [available as an electronic resource]
- Coletta A. Younger and Eileen Rosin, eds., Drugs and Democracy in Latin America: The Impact of U.S. Policy (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005), chs. 1, 4 (focusing on Colombia)
- Kinzer, Overthrow, chs. 6, 8 (U.S. covert actions to overthrow regimes in Guatemala and Chile)
12. Europe and the Cold War – Daniel Larsen

- Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan*, ch. 5 (one of the leading liberal theorists of international relations assesses how the U.S. and its European allies built the postwar order) [available as an electronic resource]
- Jackson, Patrick Thaddeus. 2006. Civilizing the Enemy: German Reconstruction and the Invention of the West. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, Chs. 4, 5 (Book on the creation of ‘western civilization’ as a tool to bring Germany into Europe following WWII)
- Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation among Democracies*, ch. 2 and conclusion (a constructivist argument for why European allies had more influence on U.S. policy than realists would expect)

Recommended:
- Anne Pierce, *Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman: Mission and Power in American Foreign Policy* (Westport, Praeger Publishers, 2003), Chs. 5-6, 9-10 (Emphasizes the Wilsonian influences at the outset of the Cold War)
- George Kennan’s “Long Telegram”, nsarchive.gwu.edu/coldwar/documents/episode-1/kennan.htm (primary document constituting one of the cornerstones of the Cold War doctrine of “containment”)
- Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace*, chs. 1-2 [available as an electronic resource] (the U.S., USSR, and the “German question”)
- James McAllister, *No Exit: America and the German Problem, 1943-1954* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), chs. 1, 4 (Franklin Roosevelt didn’t want the U.S. to get “stuck” in Europe, but it may have been the only way to avoid World War III)

Holiday Break!!!!!

**Lent Term**

13. **Europe after the Cold War – Mark Shirk**

- Rapp Hooper, Mira. Shields of the Republic: The Triumph and Peril of America’s Alliances. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. 2020. Intro, Ch.6. [Rapp Hooper argues that the success of US alliances has been their downfall, a newly relevant argument given the strain between Europe and the US in the Trump Administration]

**Recommended:**
- Rosemary Foot, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *US Hegemony and International Organizations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), ch. 9 (good complement to Cox and Pouliot) [available as an electronic resource]
- Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 7
- James M. Goldgeier, *Not Whether but When: The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO* (Washington, DC: Brookings, 1999), chs. 1, 3 (NATO expansion from inside the Clinton White House)
- Frank Schimmelfennig, *The EU, NATO, and the Integration of Europe: Rules and Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pt. 1 (more developed version of Schimmelfennig’s article) [available as an electronic resource]
18

- John Peterson and Mark A. Pollack, eds., *Europe, America, Bush: Transatlantic Relations in the Twenty-First Century* (London: Routledge, 2003), chs. 6, 9 (Russia, unilateralism v. multilateralism)

14. Asia – Mark Shirk

- Buckley, *The United States in the Asia-Pacific since 1945*, chs. 2, 5-6 (the Korean War; post-Vietnam War; and post-Cold War) [available as an electronic resource]
- Cha, *Powerplay*, chs. 2-3 [available as an electronic resource] (why the U.S. opted for a bilateral “hub and spokes” system of alliance in Asia, unlike the multilateral system created in Europe. Contrast with Hemmer and Katzenstein’s article)

Recommended:

- Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 9
- Robert G. Sutter, *The United States and Asia: Regional Dynamics and Twenty-First-Century Relations* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2015), chs. 2-4 (fairly up to date text)
Johnson could have avoided war, but didn’t


15. The Middle East – Mark Shirk

- Pressman, *Warring Friends*, chs. 1, 4 [available as an electronic resource] (how does the U.S. relationship with Israel constrain the latter?)
- Haas, *The Clash of Ideologies*, chs. 1-2 [available as an electronic resource] (somewhat controversial take on the way ideological conflict shapes Middle Eastern countries' relations with the United States)

Recommended:

- Fawaz Gerges, *America and Political Islam: Clash of Cultures or Clash of Interests?* o (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chs. 2-3 (contrast with Haas)
- Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 8
- Alex Roberto Hybel and Justin Matthew Kaufman, *The Bush Administrations and Saddam Hussein: Deciding on Conflict* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), chs. 2, 4, 6 (psychological analysis of decision-making by father and son)
- Rashid Khalidi, *Sowing Crisis: The Cold War and American Dominance in the Middle East* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2009), chs. 1, 4-5 (legacies of the Cold War for the Middle East)
- Stephen Kinzer, *All the Shah’s Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons, 2008), chs. 1, 8-10 (U.S.-UK collaboration to overthrow Iranian Prime Minister Mossadegh and install the Shah in power in the 1950s)
- Mahmood Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror* (New York: Three Leaves Press, 2004), chs. 1, 3 (it’s not Islam, it’s American
interventionism)

- Donnette Murray, *U.S. Foreign Policy and Iran: American-Iranian Relations since the Islamic Revolution* (London: Routledge, 2010), intro, ch. 1 (helpful overview)
- Thomas Ricks, *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq* (New York: Penguin Press, 2006), part II (see especially chapters 8 & 9 on ‘How to Create an Insurgency’) 

Supervision questions for Part III:

1. Was U.S. involvement crucial for maintaining the peace in Europe after World War II?
2. Were defense-related concerns or something else the major factors driving NATO enlargement?
3. What has been the US approach to Asia, why does it differ from Europe?
4. Which is more unshakeable: U.S. ties to Israel or Saudi Arabia?
5. How has U.S. foreign policy towards Africa changed since the 1990s?
6. Is discourse on human rights just window-dressing for hemispheric dominance as far as U.S. relations with Latin America are concerned?

Part IV: Specific Contemporary Issues

16. Great Power Rivalry: China and Russia – Mark Shirk


Recommended

- David C. Kang, *China Rising: Peace, Power, and Order in East Asia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), chs. 8-9 (what would Asia look like with China replacing the U.S. as the leading regional power?)
- Krickovic, Andrej and Yuval Weber, “Commitment Issues: The Syrian and Ukraine Crises as Bargaining Failures of the Post-Cold War International Order”, *Problems of Post-
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Communism 65, no. 6 (2018): 373-84.

- Wright, Thomas, “The Return of Great Power Politics was Inevitable”, Brookings.com: https://www.brookings.edu/opinions/the-return-to-great-power-rivalry-was-inevitable/

17. Nuclear Weapons – Mark Shirk

- James Lindsay and Ray Takeyh, “After Iran Gets the Bomb: Containment and Its Complications,” Foreign Affairs Vol. 89, No. 2 (2010), pp. 33-49 (contingency planning for a nuclear Middle East)

Recommended:

- Richard K. Betts, American Force: Dangers, Delusions, and Dilemmas in National Security (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012), ch. 4 (has the willingness to use nuclear weapons increased even as the number of warheads has dropped?)
Gaddis article immediately above)


- John Mueller, *Atomic Obsession: Nuclear Alarmism from Hiroshima to Al-Qaeda* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), chs. 10-11 (or, the nuclear revolution was not as revolutionary as normally claimed)

- Kenneth N. Waltz, "Why Iran Should Get the Bomb," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (July/August 2012), pp. 2-6; and as a rebuttal, Colin H. Kahl, "Iran and the Bomb: Would a Nuclear Iran Make the Middle East More Secure?" *Foreign Affairs* 91, No. 5 (September/October 2012), pp. 157-63 (complement to Lindsay and Takeyh)

18. War on Terror – Mark Shirk


- Lyon, *Surveillance after Snowden*, chs. 1-2 [available as an electronic resource] (the high-tech version of the garrison state?)

Recommended:


- McLeod, Rule of Law in War, chs. 1-2 (how international law affected the development of U.S. COIN policy; also highly applicable to lecture 21 below) [available as an electronic resource]


- Tim Krieger and Daniel Meierrieks, “The Rise of Capitalism and the Roots of Anti-


19. **Climate Change – Mark Shirk**

- Duffield, *Over a Barrel*, chs. 2, 5 (can’t understand climate change without looking at fossil-fuel dependence)

Recommended:

- Patrick Allitt, *A Climate of Crisis: America in the Age of Environmentalism* (New York: Penguin, 2014), chs. 9, 11 (climate change in the broader historical context of the environmental movement in America)
- Cinnamon P. Carlarne, *Climate Change Law and Policy: EU and U.S. Approaches* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), chs. 1-2 (whilst the EU favours “hard” emissions targets, U.S. policy has been much more flexible—or irresponsible) [available as an electronic resource]

The Global Economy – Mark Shirk

- Daniel W. Drezner, “The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession,” *World Politics* Vol. 66, No. 1 (2014), 123-64 (Drezner corners the market on optimism in this article)

Recommended:
- Barry Eichengreen, *Exorbitant Privilege: The Rise and Fall of the Dollar* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012) 1, 6-7 (the U.S. dollar’s role as the global reserve currency) [available as an electronic resource]
- Alexandra Guisinger, *American Opinion on Trade: Preferences without Politics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), chs. 1-3 (also useful for the week on public opinion) [available as an electronic resource]
- Kahler and Lake, *Politics in the New Hard Times*, ch. 9 (in-depth look at the Obama administration’s handling of the “Great Recession”)
- Kathryn C. Lavelle, *Money and Banks in the American Political System* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), chs. 1, 9 (the U.S. financial system in international context) [available as an electronic resource]
The United Nations and International Law – Mark Shirk


• Corneliu Bjola, “Legitimating the Use of Force in International Politics: A Communicative Action Perspective,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (2005), pp. 266-303 (the rhetorical strategies U.S. leaders use to persuade members of the UN matter)


Recommended:

- Putnam, *Courts without Borders*, chs. 1, 3 [available as an electronic resource] (U.S. courts regulating practices far beyond America’s borders)


- Foot et al., *US Hegemony and International Organizations*, ch. 3 (on the UN)


- Jack L. Goldsmith and Eric A. Posner, *The Limits of International Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), ch. 8 (how strong are America’s moral obligations to uphold international law?)

- Daniel Kanstroom, *Aftermath: Deportation Law and the New American Diaspora* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), chs. 1, 5-6 (the problems with the legal regime regulating immigration and deportation in the U.S.) [available as an electronic resource]


Supervision questions for Part IV:

1. How serious of a problem are Russia’s actions in Syria and Ukraine for the American led global order?
2. Is China’s ‘Belt and Road’ initiative a major threat to US hegemony?
3. Could the U.S. peacefully tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran?
4. Can the use of drones and advanced surveillance in counter-terrorist efforts be reconciled with traditional U.S. anti-statism?
5. Discuss: If the U.S. is to get serious about climate change, it will have to be because of national security concerns.
6. Does the U.S. deserve more blame or praise for its involvement in the great 2008 economic recession?
7. Has international law had any effect on U.S. counter-terrorism efforts?
8. Would anything about U.S. foreign policy be significantly different if the UN didn’t exist?

Part V: The Present and Future of U.S. Power

20. The U.S. Empire Debate – Mark Shirk

- Ikenberry, Liberal Leviathan, ch. 1 (skim) and chs. 2-4. (the consequences of unipolarity for the postwar U.S.-led global order)

Recommended:

- Ian Clark, Hegemony in International Society (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), ch. 6, conclusion (distinguishing between material “primacy” and social “hegemony”)
Alexander Cooley, Base Politics: Democratic Change and the U.S. Military Overseas (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2008), ch. 1, 6 (how overseas U.S. military bases affect, and are affected by, local political conditions)


Joseph S. Nye, Jr., Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics (New York: PublicAffairs, 2004), chs. 1, 5 (is the U.S. powerful because people find its popular culture appealing?)

Joseph E. Stiglitz, Globalization and Its Discontents (New York: W.W. Norton, 2002) chs. 6, 8 (by a former leader of the World Bank and award-winning economist who has become highly critical of the effects of U.S. economic policy abroad)

David Sylvan and Stephen Majeski, U.S. Foreign Policy in Perspective: Clients, Enemies, and Empire (New York: Routledge, 2009), chs. 1-2, 7 (a uniquely American mode of imperialism)

The World Politics special issue on unipolarity, Vol. 61, No. 1, 2009

Giocoma Chiozza, Anti-Americanism and the American World Order (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009), chs. 1, 7-8 (nobody loves you when you’re on top)

Michael Mandelbaum, The Case for Goliath (New York: PublicAffairs, 2005), chs. 1, 5 (American primacy as a global good)

Stephen M. Walt, Taming American Power: The Global Response to U.S. Primacy (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2006), chs. 1, 3-4 (the disproportionate power of the U.S. is bound to threaten other states, regardless of American intentions)


Michael E. Brown et al., eds., Primacy and its Discontents: American Power and International Stability (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009), chs. 1-2, 5, 8, 11 (a set of articles collected from one of the leading IR journals—complements Monteiro)

Elizabeth Cobbs Hoffman, American Umpire (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2013), Intro, Conclusion, Ch. 10. (Firmly rejects the “empire” characterization, arguing instead that the U.S. has primarily played the role of an international “umpire”)


• Ikenberry, Liberal Leviathan, chs. 7-8 (the U.S.-led order is in trouble, but ultimately will survive)


• Cooley and Nexon, Exit from Hegemony, ch. 3,5,6 [US order is unravelling, a look at some less traditional reasons why including transnational movements]

Recommended:

- Brooks and Wohlforth, America Abroad, chs. 2, 5 (arguing that the U.S. position atop the global hierarchy is less shaky than is commonly thought, and cautioning against “retrenchment”)
- Preble, The Power Problem, chs. 1-2 (a libertarian analysis of how U.S. military spending and interventionism has gone overboard) [available as an electronic resource]
- Christopher Layne, “This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana,” International Studies Quarterly, Vol. 56, No.1 (2012), pp. 203-213 (Ikenberry’s wrong! Layne has been pushing this argument since the end of the Cold War)
- Andrew Bacevich, Washington Rules: America’s Path to Permanent War (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2010), chs. 1-2 (overstretch leads to decline)
- Paul Kennedy, The Rise and Fall of Great Powers (New York: Random House, 1987); a modern classic
- Clyde Prestowitz, The Betrayal of American Prosperity (New York: Free Press, 2010), chs. 2-3 (the U.S. has declined economically because of its faith in free trade)
- Fareed Zakaria, The Post-American World (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011), chs. 1-3 (the rise of “the rest” outside of The West)

22. Future of U.S. Foreign Policy – Mark Shirk

Readings for this lecture will be filled in AFTER the 2020 election…

- Drezner, Dan, “This time is Different: Why U.S. Foreign Policy will Never Recover”, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 98, No.3 (2019)
- Rapp-Hooper, Mira and Rebecca Friedman Lissner, “The Open World: What America can Achieve After Trump,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 98, No.3 (2019) (These two articles are part of a special issue in Foreign Affairs on Donald Trump and the future of US Foreign Policy, I have also included a contribution from Kori Schake in the Recommended Section)
Recommended:

- Benjamin E. Goldsmith and Yusaku Horiuchi, “In Search of Soft Power: Does Foreign Public Opinion Matter for US Foreign Policy?” World Politics, Vol. 64, No. 3 (2012), pp. 555-85 (extending the “soft power” debate)
- Cooley and Nexon, Exit from Hegemony, Ch. 8

**Supervision questions for Part V:**

1. Is the main threat to U.S. dominance external challengers, or American domestic politics?
2. What would be the primary international consequences of the United States declining as the world’s leading military and economic power?
3. Is the U.S. position as the “unipole” and its behavior towards other countries collectively sufficient to categorize it as an imperial power?
4. Is it more accurate to say the U.S. destined to decline, or that other states are destined to “catch up”?
5. Is US decline structural or could it be arrested through ‘good policy’
Exam 2019-20

Students must answer a total of three of the following 14 questions. There are two sections; candidates must answer at least one question from each section.

Group 1
1. Outside of a short period at the turn of the 20th century, the United States has largely eschewed formal colonialism. But should/could we still think of it as an empire?
2. Have the conditions of America’s founding played any role in US foreign policy in the 21st century?
3. It has been said that neo-conservatism is a combination of liberal ideas and realist means. How accurate is this assessment?
4. Do American racial attitudes shape American Foreign Policy?
5. Assess the following statement: A President’s foreign policy is most effective and longest lasting when supported by the necessary congressional majorities. What does it mean for the future of US foreign policy?
6. What is the biggest threat to US hegemony today? Why is this threat greater than others?
7. Assess the following statement: the decline of American Hegemon has roots in its foreign policy decision-making in the decade following the end of the Cold War

Group 2
1. Assess the following quote: “It is as if in order to mobilize for the War on Terror you have to spread this shroud of secrecy over more and more of the government.”
2. Why did the United States pull out of both the Kyoto and Paris agreements on Climate Change?
3. Is the United States a champion or a threat to international law?
4. Why has the Obama Administration’s ‘Asia Pivot’ still have yet to take place?
5. Does a nuclear armed North Korea or Iran pose a greater threat to the United States? Why?
6. Answer the following question for either Africa or Latin America: The United States often justifies its foreign policy actions due to a concern for human rights. How seriously should we take these pronouncements?
7. Following Brexit, who will be a more important ally for the United States: the United Kingdom or the EU? Why?
EXAM 2018-2019

Students must answer a total of three of the following 14 questions. There are two sections; students must answer at least one question from each section. Note: This exam was written by someone else who was course organizer in 2018-19, so set up is a little different but the questions are still useful guides.

SECTION A (pick at least one question)

1. Did beliefs about ‘American Exceptionalism’ have substantial and consistent effects on U.S. foreign policy behaviour throughout the 19th Century?

2. Have racial attitudes in the United States tended to undermine the possibility of having the country’s foreign policy be guided by a liberal political philosophy?

3. Have concerns about national security become so great that the U.S. government no longer functions according to the constitutional principles set forth by the Framers?

4. Is the American public’s opinions about foreign policy primarily determined by what people know about the attitudes and beliefs of U.S. political leaders?

5. Have U.S. efforts to curtail nuclear proliferation done more harm than good?

6. Under what conditions would U.S. policymakers be most likely to commit to a major international agreement to address climate change?

7. Is the U.S. best characterised as a force for stability in the global economy, or the most worrisome potential source of international economic crisis?

8. Can the U.S. do much to affect how other states assess its reputation for strength and resolve—and does it even matter?

SECTION B (pick at least one question)

9a. Was the creation of NATO in 1949 necessary to maintain the peace in Europe, or did it provoke the USSR and worsen Cold War tensions in the years that followed?

OR

9b. Why did the U.S. promote the enlargement of the NATO alliance rather than pushing for it to be disbanded after the dissolution of the USSR?

10. In October 2017, Singapore’s Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong addressed U.S. relations with East Asia, asking “Do you want to be engaged, do you want to participate more, do you want to deepen your economic relations or do you want to find some other balance, which really will leave the determination of affairs to other participants in the region?” How likely is it that the U.S. deepens its engagement with Asia in the next decade or, conversely, leaves “the determination of affairs” in Asia to other countries?

11. Writing on U.S. relations with Middle Eastern states, David Lake (2013, p. 103) argues that since 1990 “The cost of stabilizing the region… has been enormous,” and furthermore “on net the gains by the United States appear small.” Do you mainly agree or disagree with this assertion, and why?
12. Is it accurate to say that U.S. interventions (military and otherwise) in Africa were driven more by security concerns during the Cold War and more by humanitarian concerns from the 1990s onward?

13. Are Latin American states ever able to meaningfully influence U.S. policy towards their region, despite the latter’s relative economic and military strength?

14. When the U.S. pursues its policy goals through the UN Security Council, does it do so despite the constraints the UN imposes, or—paradoxically—because these perceived constraints can actually work to America’s advantage?

END OF PAPER