

POL 14, 2020-21

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**

Stephen E. Ambrose and Douglas G. Brinkley, *Rise to Globalism: American Foreign Policy since 1938*, 9th edition (New York: Penguin, 2011).

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**

The New Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations—esp. Vol. 4, *Challenges to American Primacy, 1945 to the Present* by Warren Cohen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013); **available as an electronic resource.**

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/>)
- 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/>)

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)
- ❖ Johnathan Monten, “The Roots of the Bush Doctrine: Power, Nationalism, and Democracy Promotion in U.S. Strategy,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (2005), pp. 112-56 (social progressivism and U.S. foreign policy).

Recommended:

- ❖ McDougall, *Promised Land, Crusader State*, chs. 5-8 (criticizing the liberalism of the “New Testament” of U.S. foreign policy)
- ❖ Colin Dueck, *Reluctant Crusaders: Power, Culture, and Change in American Grand Strategy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2006), chs. 1-2 (liberalism and variations in international threats interact to inform grand strategy) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Henry R. Nau, *At Home Abroad: Identity and Power in American Foreign Policy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002), chs. 1-2 (is American identity opposed to the “Old World”?)
- ❖ Brendan Rittenhouse Green, “Two Concepts of Liberty: US Cold War Grand Strategies and the Liberal Tradition,” *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 2 (2012), pp. 9-43 (invoking Isiah Berlin’s concepts of negative and positive liberty to explain shifts in US foreign affairs strategy).
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ John G. Ruggie, “Past as Prologue? Interests, Identity, and American Foreign Policy,” *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 4 (1997), pp. 89-125 (how identity informs U.S. foreign policy at critical historical junctures)
- ❖ Tony Smith, *America’s Mission: The United States and the Worldwide Struggle for Democracy in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), pt. 1 (attributing the global spread of democracy to U.S. engagement in foreign affairs) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Michael Clarke and Anthony Ricketts, “Shielding the Republic: Barack Obama and the Jeffersonian Tradition of American Foreign Policy,” *Diplomacy and Statecraft*, Vol. 28, No. 3 (2017): 494-517 (an alternative to the Jacksonian paradigm described by Mead)
- ❖ Michael Clarke & Anthony Ricketts, “Donald Trump and American foreign policy: The return of the Jacksonian tradition” *Comparative Strategy* 36/4 (2017), pp.366-379.

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 incoherency?) [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)
- ❖ Daniel H. Deudney, “The Philadelphian System: Sovereignty, Arms Control, and Balance of Power in the American States-Union, circa 1787–1861,” *International*

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)
- ❖ Andrew Preston, *Sword of the Spirit, Shield of Faith: Religion in American War and Diplomacy* (New York: Anchor Books, 2012), part I (how Christian religious thought shapes U.S. foreign relations)
- ❖ Scott Silverstone, *Divided Union: The Politics of War in the Early American Public* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2004), ch. 2 (how institutional constraints explain U.S. participation, or lack thereof, in 19th-century conflicts)

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

- ❖ Christopher Hemmer and Peter J. Katzenstein, “Why is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism,” *International Organization*, Vol. 56, No. 3 (2002), pp. 575-608 (how do racial attitudes stack up as an explanation for U.S. security commitments to different regions post-1945?)
- ❖ Srdjan Vucetic, “A Racialized Peace? How Britain and the U.S. Made Their Relationship Special,” *Foreign Policy Analysis* Vol. 7, No. 4 (2011), pp. 403-22 (unpacking Anglo-American relations)
- ❖ Michael C. Desch, “America’s Liberal Illiberalism: The Ideological Origins of Overreaction in U.S. Foreign Policy,” *International Security* Vol. 32, No. 3 (2007/2008), pp. 7-43 (how liberal ideology can spur international conflict)
- ❖ Doug Stokes, “Trump, American Hegemony and the Future of the Liberal International Order,” *International Affairs*, Vol. 94, No. 1 (2018): 133-150 (the end of an era?)

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)
- ❖ Roxanne Lynn Doty, “Foreign Policy as Social Construction: A Post-positivist Analysis of US Counterinsurgency Policy in the Philippines,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (1993), pp. 297-320 (how ideas about racial hierarchy made certain otherwise unthinkable practices possible)
- ❖ Cynthia Enloe, *Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*, second edition (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2014), ch. 4 (how women’s labour props up U.S. hegemony)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Christopher Layne, *The Peace of Illusions: American Grand Strategy from 1940 to the Present* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006), ch. 1 (‘extra-regional’ hegemony in pursuit of access to foreign markets)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Reinhold Niebuhr, *The Irony of American History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008 [1952]), chs. 1-2, 8 (a Christian realist takes on the hubris of liberal foreign policy)
- ❖ Dov H. Levin, “When the Great Power Gets a Vote: The Effects of Great Power Electoral Interventions on Election Results,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 60, No. 2 (2016): 189-202 (the U.S. and USSR interfered in numerous elections in other countries during the Cold War)
- ❖ 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?)
- ❖ Kevin Narizny, “Anglo-American Primacy and the Global Spread of Democracy: An International Genealogy,” *World Politics*, Vol. 64, No. 2 (2012), pp. 341-73 (the intersection of liberalism and great-power politics)
- ❖ 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).
- ❖ Rogers M. Smith, “Beyond Tocqueville, Myrdal, and Hartz: The Multiple Traditions in America,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 87, No. 3 (1993): 549-66 (American political culture understood as the contradictory product of liberal and illiberal traditions)
- ❖ Weber, Cynthia, *Faking It: U.S. Hegemony in a Post-Phallic Era*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999 [Gendered take on US foreign policy and the narratives/complexes behind it]

4. Schools of American Foreign Policy – Mark Shirk

- ❖ Fukuyama, *America at the Crossroads*, ch. 2 (a former neoconservative analyzes its ideological and political impact)
- ❖ Michael C. Williams, “What is the National Interest? The Neoconservative Challenge in IR Theory,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 11, No. 3 (2005), pp. 307-37 (neoconservatism vs. realpolitik)
- ❖ John Williamson, “A Short History of the Washington Consensus,” in *The Washington Consensus Reconsidered: Towards a New Global Governance*, edited by Narcís Serra and Joseph E. Stiglitz (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), ch. 2 (historical overview)
- ❖ 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:

- ❖ Colin Dueck, *Hard Line: The Republican Party and U.S. Foreign Policy since World War II* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), chs. 6, 8 (conservatism and U.S. foreign policy) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Henry R. Nau, *Conservative Internationalism: Armed Diplomacy under Jefferson, Polk, Truman, and Reagan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2013), ch. 1 (argues that international engagement is not only a priority for liberals)
- ❖ Wendy Brown, “American Nightmare: Neoliberalism, Neoconservatism, and De-

democratization,” *Political Theory*, Vol. 34, no. 6 (2006): 690-714 (a stinging critique comparing both ideologies)

- ❖ Aaron Rapport, “Unexpected Affinities? Neoconservatism’s Place in IR Theory,” *Security Studies* Vol. 17, No. 2 (2008), pp. 257-93
- ❖ 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]
- ❖ Miles Kahler and David Lake, eds., *Politics in the New Hard Times* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013), ch. 1 (after the 2008 recession, what hath neoliberalism wrought?)
- ❖ Kagan, Robert, and William Kristol. 2000. *Present Dangers: Crisis and Opportunity in American Foreign and Defense Policy*. San Francisco, Calif.: Encounter Books, Introduction (Edited volume with many contributors that would work in the Bush Administration just a year later. A very good capsule of Neoconservative thought just before they reached power).

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 neoconservatism 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:

- ❖ Andrew J. Bacevich, ed., *The Long War: A New History of U.S. National Security Policy since World War II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2007), chs. 1, 4, 6, 8 (collection of essays edited by a leading conservative and anti-interventionist)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Harvey Sapolsky, Eugene Gholz, and Caitlin Talmadge, *U.S. Defense Politics: The Origins of Security Policy*, third edition (New York: Routledge, 2017), chs. 1-2 (a leading textbook on the nuts and bolts of America’s defense politics)
- ❖ Douglas T. Stuart, *Creating the National Security State* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2008), chs. 1, 6-7 (historical overview of the passage and implementation of the 1947 National Security Act) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Andrew Preston, “Monsters Everywhere: A Genealogy of National Security”,

Diplomatic History 38/3(2014), pp. 477–500. (Critiquing the impact of the emergence of the concept of “national security” in the 1940s)

- ❖ Dexter Fergie, “Geopolitics Turned Inwards: The Princeton Military Studies Group and the National Security Imagination” *Diplomatic History* 43/4 (2019) 644-670. (Considerable further insight into the origins of the concept of “national security”)
 - Conveniently summarized in Dexter Fergie, [“The Strange Career of National Security”](#), *The Atlantic*, 29 September 2019.

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 Condone 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)
- ❖ Aid, “The National Security Agency and the Cold War”, *Intelligence and National Security*, 16/1 (2001), pp.27-66.
- ❖ 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)
 - See also: Zakia Shiraz, “Review: CIA Intervention in Chile and the Fall of the Allende Government in 1973”, *Journal of American Studies* 45/3 (2011), pp. 603-613. (Review of a trio of works on the fall of Allende, including Gustafson’s)
- ❖ “Anglo-American Intelligence and the Soviet War Scare: The Untold Story”, *Intelligence and National Security* 27/1 (2012), pp.75-92. (a good case study of the US-UK intelligence alliance in practice)
- ❖ 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.
- ❖ Russell, *Sharpening Strategic Intelligence*, (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- ❖ Dana Priest & William M. Arkin, *Top Secret America: The Rise of the New American Security State*. (A three-part article series originally published in the *Washington Post* on the explosion of US intelligence since 9/11; accessible only in book form, not available online because of GDPR)
- ❖ 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.)

- ❖ Daniel Larsen, “Creating an American Culture of Secrecy: Cryptography in Wilson-Era Diplomacy”, *Diplomatic History* 44/1 (2020), pp. 102-132 (Skip pp. 116-126—a study of the origins of US secrecy and a critique of the impact of the concept of “national security” on secrecy)
 - Conveniently summarized in Daniel Larsen, [“How U.S. Foreign Policy from Iran to Ukraine Became Shrouded in Secrecy”](#), *Washington Post*, 7 January 2020.
- ❖ 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:

- ❖ John H. Aldrich, Christopher Gelpi, Peter Feaver, Jason Reifler, and Kristin Thompson Sharp, “Foreign Policy and the Electoral Connection,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 9 (2006), pp. 477-502 (why and when voters care about foreign policy, and how that shapes politicians’ behavior)
- ❖ Michael A. Bailey, Judith Goldstein, and Barry R. Weingast, “The Institutional Roots of American Trade Policy: Politics, Coalitions, and International Trade,” *World Politics*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (1997), pp. 309-38 (how Congress’s decision to give the president more authority over trade altered the domestic balance of economic power and weakened protectionists)
- ❖ Brandice Canes-Wrone, William G. Howell, and David E. Lewis, “Toward a Broader Understanding of Presidential Power: A Reevaluation of the Two Presidencies Thesis,” *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (2008), pp. 1-16. (does the president have more influence over foreign rather than domestic policy? For the original thesis, see Aaron Wildavsky, “The Two Presidencies,” *Society*, Vol. 35, No. 2 (1998), pp. 23-31).
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Helen V. Milner and Dustin Tingley, *Sailing the Water's Edge: The Domestic Politics of American Foreign Policy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2015), chs. 1-2 (cutting-edge theory emphasizing the importance of domestic politics to foreign policy-making)

- ❖ David Mitchell, “Centralizing Advisory Systems: Presidential Influence and the U.S. Foreign Policy Decision-Making Process,” *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (2005), pp. 181-206 (a good complement to Haney’s book)
- ❖ William Newmann, “Causes of Change in National Security Processes: Carter, Reagan, and Bush Decision Making on Arms Control.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (2001), pp. 69-103 (when and why do presidents change course on national security matters?)
- ❖ William G. Howell and Jon C. Pevehouse, “Presidents, Congress, and the Use of Force,” *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. 1 (2005), pp. 209-32 (a good complement to Kriner’s book)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Elizabeth Saunders, “Transformative Choices: Leaders and the Origins of Intervention Strategy,” *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (2009), pp. 119-61 (the importance of president’s personal beliefs for military conflicts)
- ❖ Peter Trubowitz, *Politics and Strategy: Partisan Ambition and American Statecraft* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011), chs. 1-2 (how parties affect presidential ambition in foreign policy)
- ❖ Stephen G. Walker and Akan Malici, *U.S. Presidents and Foreign Policy Mistakes* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2011), ch. 2 (presidential mistakes? Gee, I can’t think of any...)
- ❖ 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

- Graham T. Allison, “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (1969), pp. 689-718 (seminal article arguing that disjointed bureaucratic politics affects foreign policy more than rational models expect)
- David A. Welch, “The Organizational Process and Bureaucratic Politics Paradigms: Retrospect and Prospect,” *International Security*, Vol. 17, No. 2 (1992), 112-46 (questioning Allison’s argument two decades later)
- 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?)
- Amy Zegart, “September 11 and the Adaption Failure of U.S. Intelligence Agencies,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 4 (2005), pp. 78-111 (analysis of a major surprise attack using a bureaucratic politics framework)

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)
- ❖ Jonathan Bendor and Thomas H. Hammond, “Rethinking Allison’s Models,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 86, No. 2 (1992), pp. 301-22 (two economists explore the logical gaps in Allison’s work)
- ❖ Stephen D. Krasner, “Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison Wonderland),” *Foreign*

- Policy*, No. 7 (Summer 1972), pp. 159-79 (more beating up on Allison)
- ❖ 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]
 - ❖ Peter D. Feaver, “The Civil-Military Problematique: Huntington, Janowitz, and the Question of Civilian Control,” *Armed Forces & Society*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (1996): 149-78 (how to make sure the guys with guns respect civilian authority)
 - ❖ Morton H. Halperin and Priscilla A. Clapp, *Bureaucratic Politics & Foreign Policy*, second edition (Washington, DC: Brookings, 2006 [1974]), chs. 2-3 (a classic on par with Allison)
 - ❖ Justin Hart, *Empire of Ideas: The Origins of Public Diplomacy and the Transformation of U.S. Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), ch. 4 (how WWII changed the way U.S. diplomats thought about who their target audience should be) [available as an electronic resource]
 - ❖ Andrew F. Krepinevich, *The Army and Vietnam* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986), ch. 7 (how bureaucratic rigidity arguably affected military performance in Vietnam)
 - ❖ Robert Jervis, *Why Intelligence Fails: Lessons from the Iranian Revolution and the Iraq War* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2010), chs. 1, 4 (good complement to Betts and Zegart with theory from psychology)
 - ❖ 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)
 - ❖ Stefano Recchia, *Reassuring the Reluctant Warriors: US Civil-military Relations and Multilateral Intervention* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015), ch. 2 (top military officers’ concerns about burden-sharing affect the composition of U.S.-led coalitions)
 - ❖ Scott Sagan, *The Limits of Safety: Organizations, Accidents, and Nuclear Weapons* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), chs. 1, 5-6 (how technological complexity, organizational interdependence, and small but predictably regular errors can have catastrophic consequences)

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

- Ole R. Holsti, “Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus.” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 36 (1992): 439–66 (are Americans as uninformed and unreflective about foreign policy as rumor might have it?)
- [Benjamin I. Page](#) and [Jason Barabas](#), “[Foreign Policy Gaps between Citizens and Leaders](#),” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 44, No. 3 (2000), pp. 339-64 (why don’t political representatives’ foreign policy preferences overlap that well with those of voters?)
- Smith, *Foreign Attachments*, ch. 2 (how America’s multi-ethnic society affects organized interest groups and foreign policy)
- Lawrence Jacobs and Benjamin Page, “Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 99, No. 1 (2005), pp. 107-23 (big business, as it turns out).

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'?)
- ❖ John H. Aldrich, John L. Sullivan, and Eugene Borgida, "Foreign Affairs and Issue Voting: Do Presidential Candidates 'Waltz before a Blind Audience?'" *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 83, No. 1 (1989), pp. 123-41 (the contingent importance of foreign policy for presidential elections)
- ❖ Matthew A. Baum, "Sex, Lies, and War: How Soft News Brings Foreign Policy to the Inattentive Public," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 96, No. 1 (2002), pp. 91-109 (how I learned about the Balkans by watching Oprah Winfrey)
- ❖ Adam J. Berinsky, "Assuming the Costs of War: Events, Elites, and American Public Support for Military Conflict," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 69, No. 4 (2007), pp. 975-97 (party elites send the public "cues" on whether or not to support a foreign intervention)
- ❖ 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"?)
- ❖ Marc Hetherington and Elizabeth Suhay, "Authoritarianism, Threat, and Americans' Support for the War on Terror," *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 55, No. 3 (2011): 546-60 (increasingly relevant line of research)
- ❖ Bruce W. Jentleson, "The Pretty Prudent Public: Post-Vietnam American Opinion on the Use of Military Force," *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (1992), pp. 49-74. (argues that Americans are reasonably and reliably more skeptical of some types of military objectives than others)
- ❖ Chaim Kaufman, "Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas: The Selling of the Iraq War," *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (2004), pp. 4-48 (a strong contrast to Sobel and Jentleson)
- ❖ 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).
- ❖ Benjamin Fordham, "Economic Interests and Public Support for American Global Activism," *International Organization*, Vol. 62, No. 1 (2008), pp. 163-82 (those with better access to capital, who depend on exports, are reliably more supportive of internationalist policy)
- ❖ Jeff Frieden, "Sectoral Conflict and Foreign Economic Policy, 1914-1940," *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No. 1 (1988), pp. 59-90 (a good complement to Fordham's article; the clash of protectionist and internationalist economic interests)

- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Robert C. Lieberman, “The ‘Israel Lobby’ and American Politics,” and John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, “The Blind Man and the Elephant in the Room: Robert Lieberman and the Israel Lobby,” both in *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 7, No. 2 (2009), pp. 235-69 (nothing controversial, just debating how much Israel and American Jews influence U.S. policy towards the Middle East. Duck and cover.)
- ❖ 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 (Hrebennar 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)
- Nicholas van de Walle, “U.S. Policy towards Africa: The Bush Legacy and the Obama Administration,” *African Affairs*, Vol. 109, issue 434 (2010), pp. 1-21 (U.S. policy after Clinton)
- Nicholas Westcott, “The Trump Administration’s Africa Policy”, *African Affairs* 184/473 (2019), pp.737-749.

Recommended:

- ❖ Walter Clarke and Jeffrey Herbst, “Somalia and the Future of Humanitarian Intervention,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (January/February 1996), pp. 70-85 (one of the early post-Cold War interventions led by the U.S.)
- ❖ Chris Alden, “From Neglect to ‘Virtual Engagement’: The United States and its New Paradigm for Africa,” *African Affairs*, Vol. 99, issue 396 (2000), pp. 355-71 (growing U.S. interest in Africa before September 11, 2001)
- ❖ Robert G. Blanton and Shannon Lindsey Blanton, “Democracy, Human Rights, and US-Africa Trade,” *International Interactions*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (2001), pp. 275-95 (finding that neither democratic governance nor human rights conditions significantly affect U.S. trade with African states. Has anything changed?)
- ❖ David J. Francis, ed., *U.S. Strategy in Africa: AFRICOM, Terrorism and Security Challenges* (New York: Routledge, 2010), chs. 1, 4-5, 9 (9/11 changed U.S. threat perception in Africa a lot).
- ❖ Cary Fraser, “Crossing the Color Line in Little Rock: The Eisenhower Administration and the Dilemma of Race for US Foreign Policy,” *Diplomatic History*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (2000): 233-64 (how U.S. treatment of African-Americans mattered for foreign policy during the Cold War)
- ❖ Jeffrey Herbst, “Responding to State Failure in Africa,” *International Security* Vol. 21, No. 3 (1997), 120-44 (U.S. concerns about “failed” or “weak” African states need to account for the historical development of sovereignty on the continent).
- ❖ Audie Klotz, “Norms Reconstituting Interests: Global Racial Equality and US Sanctions against South Africa,” *International Organization*, Vol. 49, No. 3 (1995), 451-78 (how did the U.S. contribute to the end of apartheid?)
- ❖ Dambisa Moyo, *Dead Aid: Why Aid Is Not Working and How There Is Another Way for Africa* (New York: Penguin Books, 2009), pt. 1. (the road to hell is paved with good intentions and U.S. dominance of the World Bank)
- ❖ Ebere Nwaubani, *The United States and Decolonization in West Africa, 1950-1960* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2001), chs. 1-2, 4 (did the U.S. act as a neo-colonial power?)
- ❖ Gorm Rye Olsen, “Fighting Terrorism in Africa by Proxy: The USA and the European Union in Somalia and Mali,” *European Security*, Vol. 23, No. 3 (2014), pp. 290-306 (good complement to Francis’s edited volume)
- ❖ 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 J. Schraeder, “Cold War to Cold Peace: Explaining U.S.-French Competition in Francophone Africa,” *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 115, No. 3 (2000): 395-419 (old imperial ties versus the U.S. “hyperpuissance”)
- ❖ Robert Vitalis, *White World Order, Black Power Politics: The Birth of American International Relations* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2015), intro, chs. 7-9 (African-American scholars challenge colonial assumptions driving early International Relations theory)
- ❖ 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)
- Lars Schoultz, *Beneath the United States: A History of U.S. Policy Toward Latin America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), Chs. 17-19. (arguing a history of U.S. contempt toward Latin Americans) AND/OR Mark Gilderhus, *The Second Century: U.S.—Latin American Relations Since 1889* (Wilmington: SR Books, 2000.) Chs. 5-6 (a more balanced argument)

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)
- ❖ Martha Finnemore, *The Purpose of Intervention: Changing Beliefs about the Use of Force* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2003), ch. 2 (how U.S. activism challenged European interventionism in Latin America when collecting on debts)
- ❖ Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 6
- ❖ Emilie Hafner-Burton and James Ron, “The Latin Bias: Regions, the Anglo-American Media, and Human Rights,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 3 (2013), pp. 474-91 (the U.S. media disproportionately focuses on human rights violations in Latin America)
- ❖ William LeoGrande, *Our Own Backyard: The United States in Central America, 1977-1992* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), part I (an in-depth look at the nature and consequences of US anti-communism in El Salvador and Nicaragua near the Cold War’s end)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Carlos Oliva Campos and Gary Prevost, “The Trump Administration in Latin America: Continuity and Change” *International Journal of Cuban Studies* 11/1 (2019), pp. 13-23

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)
- David A. Lake, “Beyond Anarchy: The Importance of Security Institutions,” *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 1 (2001), pp. 129-60 (comparing the NATO and Warsaw Pact alliances)

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 on U.S. policy 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”)
- ❖ John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), chs. 1-2 (Gaddis is one of the preeminent historians of Cold War foreign policy) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Gene Gerzhoy, “Alliance Coercion and Nuclear Restraint: How the United States Thwarted West Germany's Nuclear Ambitions,” *International Security* Vol. 39, No. 4 (2015): 91-129 (ala Trachtenberg, Germany’s nuclear ambitions threatened to turn the Cold War “hot”, to the great fear of the U.S. and Soviet Union)
- ❖ Deborah Welch Larson, *Origins of Containment: A Psychological Explanation* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1985), ch. 2 (what can the psychological dispositions of Harry Truman and his advisors tell us about the causes of the Cold War?)
- ❖ Melvyn P. Leffler, *A Preponderance of Power: National Security, the Truman Administration, and the Cold War* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), introduction (great complement to Gaddis).
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Andrew Moravcsik, *The Choice for Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), ch. 3 (French competition with the U.S. for international prestige helps to drive European integration)
- ❖ Brian C. Rathburn, “Before Hegemony: Generalized Trust and the Creation and Design of International Security Organizations,” *International Organization*, Vol. 65, No. 2 (2011), pp. 243-73 (more psychological theory, here used to explain why conservatives and liberals in the U.S. had such different preferences regarding security commitments to Europe)
- ❖ Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, “Power, Globalization, and the End of the

Cold War: Reevaluating a Landmark Case for Ideas,” *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (2000/01), pp. 5-53 (and responses).

Holiday Break!!!!

Lent Term

13. Europe after the Cold War – Mark Shirk

- Michael Cox, “Beyond the West: Terrors in Transatlantia,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (June 2005), pp. 203-34 (Nobody could be worse for U.S.-European relations than George W. Bush, right? Wait a second...)
- Frank Schimmelfennig, “NATO Enlargement: A Constructivist Explanation,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 8, Nos. 2-3, pp.198-234 (the alliance gets bigger, but not necessarily for reasons pertinent to defense)
- Dan Reiter, “Why NATO Enlargement Does Not Spread Democracy,” *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (2001), pp. 41-67 (arguing NATO membership is at best incidental to democratization)
- 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:

- ❖ Kay, Sean I. “Realist Foreign Policy and Transatlantic Security Institutions.” *Security Studies* 29, no. 3 (May 26, 2020): 493–514. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09636412.2020.1761442>. (more on the expansion of NATO in the 1990s).
- ❖ Alan J. Kuperman, “The Moral Hazard of Humanitarian Intervention: Lessons from the Balkans,” *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 52, No. 1 (2008), pp. 49-80 (did the U.S. and its allies accidentally encourage more bloodshed in the former Yugoslavia in the 1990s?)
- ❖ Vincent Pouliot, “The Alive and Well Transatlantic Security Community: A Theoretical Reply to Michael Cox,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (March 2006), pp. 119-27.
- ❖ Mats R. Berdal, “Fateful Encounter: The United States and UN Peacekeeping,” *Survival*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (1994), pp.30-50 (an expert on peacekeeping critiques the Clinton administration)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Barry R. Posen, “European Union Security and Defense Policy: Response to Unipolarity?” *Security Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2 (2006), pp. 149-86 (has Europe been hedging against the risk of U.S. abandonment/belligerence/instability?)
- ❖ 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]

- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Rebecca Stefenson, *Managing EU-US Relations: Actors, Institutions and the New Transatlantic Agenda* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2005), chs. 2-3 (U.S. relations with the supranational body)
- ❖ Steven McGuire and Michael Smith, *The European Union and the United States: Competition and Convergence in the Global Arena* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2008), ch. 8 (complementing Stefenson)

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)
- Christopher Hemmer and Peter J. Katzenstein, “Why is There No NATO in Asia? Collective Identity, Regionalism, and the Origins of Multilateralism,” *International Organization*, Vol. 56, No. 3 (2002), pp. 575-608 (how do racial attitudes stack up as an explanation for U.S. security commitments to different regions post-1945?)
- Nina Silove, “The Pivot before the Pivot: U.S. Strategy to Preserve the Power Balance in Asia,” *International Security*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (2016), pp. 45-88 (good complement to Cha)

Recommended:

- ❖ John W. Dower, *Ways of Forgetting, Ways of Remembering: Japan in the Modern World* (New York: New Press, 2012), ch. 8 (the U.S. had a huge influence on Japan’s domestic and foreign policy orientations after WWII)
- ❖ Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 9
- ❖ [Natasha Hamilton-Hart](#), *Hard Interests, Soft Illusions: Southeast Asia and American Power* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012), chs. 1-2 (argues that, despite the Vietnam War, leaders in much of Southeast Asia view the United States as a relatively benign power)
- ❖ David A. Hollinger, *Protestants Abroad: How Missionaries Tried to Change the World but Changed America* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2017), chs. 1, 6-8 (how American missionaries’ experience overseas, especially in Asia, led to changes in attitudes about race and colonialism in the US).
- ❖ G. John Ikenberry and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *International Relations Theory and the Asia-Pacific*, edited by (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), chs. 1, 9 (analysis of U.S.-Japan relations)
- ❖ Van Jackson, *Rival Reputations: Coercion and Credibility in US-North Korea Relations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), chs. 2, 7 (a superpower versus a weak state in the nuclear age) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Peter Katzenstein, *A World of Regions: Asia and Europe in the American Imperium* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005), chs. 4, 7 (further comparison of U.S. policy towards the two continents)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Fredrik Logevall, *Choosing War: The Lost Chance for Peace and the Escalation of War in Vietnam* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), ch. 9 (how Lyndon

Johnson could have avoided war, but didn't)

- ❖ Gareth Porter, *Perils of Dominance: Imbalance of Power and the Road to War in Vietnam* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004), chs. 1, 8 (argues that U.S. military strength relative to the USSR and China helped produce the Vietnam War)
- ❖ Er-Win Tan, *The U.S. versus the North Korean Nuclear Threat: Mitigating the Nuclear Security Dilemma* (London: Routledge, 2014), chs. 4, 7 (this issue isn't going away)

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?)
- F. Gregory Gause III, “The Future of U.S.-Saudi Relations,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 95, No. 4 (July/August 2016) (a leading scholar on Saudi Arabia and U.S. foreign policy weighs in)
- 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)
- Russell A. Burgos, “Origins of Regime Change: ‘Ideapolitik’ on the Long Road to Baghdad, 1993- 2000,” *Security Studies*, Vol 17, No. 2 (2008): 221-56 (the war before the war)

Recommended:

- ❖ David W. Lesch and Mark L. Haas, eds., *The Middle East and the United States: History, Politics, and Ideologies*, fifth edition (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2012), chs. 14-15, 17-18, 28 (excellent text)
- ❖ Rachel Bronson, *Thicker Than Oil* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). [On Saudi Arabia-US relations]
- ❖ Steve Coll, *Ghost Wars: The Secret History of the CIA, Afghanistan, and Bin Laden, from the Soviet Invasion to September 10, 2001* (New York: Penguin Books, 2004), chs. 5-8 (did the U.S. “make” the Taliban and al Qaeda? It's not that simple).
- ❖ Lloyd C. Gardner, *The Road to Tahrir Square: Egypt and the United States from the Rise of Nasser to the Fall of Mubarak* (New York: New Press, 2011) [a look at U.S. influence—or lack of influence—on Egyptian politics]
- ❖ Fawaz Gerges, *America and Political Islam: Clash of Cultures or Clash of Interests?*
 - (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)
- ❖ Marc Lynch, “Anti-Americanisms in the Arab World,” in *Anti-Americanisms in World Politics*, edited by Peter J. Katzenstein and Robert O. Keohane (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2007), 196-224 (again, it's complicated)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Aaron David Miller, *The Much Too Promised Land: America's Elusive Search for Arab-Israeli Peace* (New York: Bantam Books, 2008) [account of unrealistic expectations in the peace process by someone who has participated in it]
 - ❖ 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')
 - ❖ Barbara Slavin, *Bitter Friends, Bosom Enemies* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 2007) [US-Iran relations]
 - ❖ William Quandt, *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-Israeli Conflict since 1967* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2001) [a good complement to Miller's book by another person experienced in the peace process]
 - ❖ Robert Vitalis, *America's Kingdom: Mythmaking on the Saudi Oil Frontier* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2006), chs. 1, 8 (oil, race, and U.S.-Saudi relations)

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

- Yuen Foong Khong, "Primacy or World Order? The United States and China's Rise," *International Security*, Vol. 38, No. 3 (2014): 153-75 (great review essay on the present and future of U.S.-China relations)
- Thomas Christensen, "Fostering Stability or Creating a Monster? The Rise of China and U.S. Policy toward East Asia," *International Security* Vol. 31, No. 1 (2006), pp. 81–126 (good complement to Khong)
- Cooley, Alexander, and Daniel Nexon. *Exit from Hegemony: The Unraveling of American Global Order*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020. Ch. 4

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?)
- ❖ Charap, Samuel and Timothy J. Colton, *Everyone Loses: The Ukraine Crisis and the Ruinous for Post-Soviet Eurasia*. London: Routledge, 2018
- ❖ Menon, Rajan and Eugene B. Rumer, *Conflict in Ukraine: The Unwinding of the Post-Cold War Order*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2015.
- ❖ 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-*

- Communism* 65, no. 6 (2018): 373-84.
- ❖ Randall Schweller and Xiaoyu Pu, “After Unipolarity China’s Visions of International Order in an Era of U.S. Decline”, *International Security*, Vol. 36, No. 1 (Summer 2011): 41–72.
 - ❖ John J. Mearsheimer, “The Gathering Storm: China’s Challenge to US Power in Asia,” *Chinese Journal of International Politics*, Vol. 3 (2010).
 - ❖ G. John Ikenberry, “The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive?” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87 No. 1 (Jan/Feb 2008). [Mearsheimer and Ikenberry have been having a proxy argument about China’s rise for decades...]
 - ❖ Yaqing Qin. "International society as a process: institutions, identities, and China’s peaceful rise." *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 3.2 (2010): 129-153.
 - ❖ David C. Kang & Xinru Ma, “Power Transitions: Thucydides Didn’t Live in East Asia, *The Washington Quarterly* 41:1 (2018): 137-154
 - ❖ 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/>
 - ❖ Kroenig, Matthew. *The Return of Great Power Politics: Democracy vs. Autocracy from the Ancient world to the U.S. and China*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2020.
 - ❖ Mead, Walter Russell, “The Return of Geopolitics”, *Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2014).

17. Nuclear Weapons – Mark Shirk

- Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press, “The End of MAD? The Nuclear Dimension of US Primacy,” *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (2006), pp. 7-44 (what if the U.S. were to achieve a viable “first strike” nuclear capability?)
- Michael S. Gerson, “No First Use: The Next Step for US Nuclear Policy,” *International Security* Vol. 35, No. 2 (2010), pp. 7-47 (assessing the pros and cons of a controversial nuclear doctrine)
- Bruno Tertrais, “The Illogic of Zero,” *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 2 (2010), pp. 125-38 (or, just stop worrying and learn to Love the Bomb)
- 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?)
- ❖ Campbell Craig, “American Power Preponderance and the Nuclear Revolution,” *Review of International Studies* 35.01 (2009): 27-44 (how nuclear weapons cast doubts on the long-term viability of U.S. global leadership)
- ❖ Thomas J. Christensen, “The Meaning of the Nuclear Evolution: China's Strategic Modernization and US-China Security Relations,” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (2012), pp. 447-87 (how will advances in China’s nuclear arsenal affect its relations with the U.S.?)
- ❖ John Lewis Gaddis, “The Long Peace: Elements of Stability in the Postwar International System,” *International Security*, Vol. 10, No. 4 (1986), pp. 99-142 (nuclear weapons were just one element of several factors that prevented superpower conflagration. What lessons should we draw for the contemporary era?)
- ❖ Francis J. Gavin, “Blasts from the Past: Proliferation Lessons from the 1960s,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (2005), pp. 100-35 (good complement to the

Gaddis article immediately above)

- ❖ Matthew Kroenig, "Nuclear Superiority and the Balance of Resolve: Explaining Nuclear Crisis Outcomes," *International Organization*, Vol. 67, No. 1 (2013): 141-71; read in conjunction with Todd S. Sechser and Matthew Fuhrmann, "Crisis Bargaining and Nuclear Blackmail," *International Organization* Vol. 67, No. 1 (2013), pp. 173-95 (do nuclear weapons help the U.S. coerce other states or not?)
- ❖ 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

- John Mueller and Mark G. Stewart, "The Terrorism Delusion: America's Overwrought Response to September 11," *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2012), pp. 81-110 (arguing that U.S. counter-terrorism policy is irrational)
- Michael J. Boyle, "The Costs and Consequences of Drone Warfare," *International Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 1 (2013), pp. 1-29 (assessing a major tool in the U.S. counter-terror arsenal)
- Krebs, Ronald R., and Jennifer K. Lobasz. "Fixing the Meaning of 9/11: Hegemony, Coercion and the Road to War in Iraq." *Security Studies* 16, no. 3 (2007): 409–51. [argues that the Bush Administration was effective in rhetorically coercing its domestic opposition into supporting the Iraq war using 9/11 and the War on Terror].
- Lyon, *Surveillance after Snowden*, chs. 1-2 [available as an electronic resource] (the high-tech version of the garrison state?)

Recommended:

- ❖ Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Just War against Terror: The Burden of American Power in a Violent World* (New York: Basic Books, 2003), chs. 3-4 (drawing on Just War Theory to advocate an aggressive counter-terrorist strategy)
- ❖ 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]
- ❖ Laura K. Donohue, *The Costs of Counterterrorism: Power, Politics, and Liberty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), chs. 1-2, 4 (how counter-terrorism injures civil liberties and the rule of law) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Michael Freeman, "Democracy, Al Qaeda, and the Causes of Terrorism: A Strategic Analysis of US Policy," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (2008), pp. 40-59 (a skeptical take on the argument that democracy promotion will work against terrorism)
- ❖ Daniel Byman, "Why Drones Work: The Case for Washington's Weapon of Choice," *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 92, No. 1 (January/February 2013), pp. 32-43 (compare and contrast with Boyle)
- ❖ Patrick B. Johnston and Anoop K. Sarbahi, "The Impact of US Drone Strikes on Terrorism in Pakistan," *International Studies Quarterly* Vol. 60, No. 2 (2016), pp. 203-219 (findings that suggest drone strikes reduce the frequency and lethality of terrorist attacks)
- ❖ Tim Krieger and Daniel Meierrieks, "The Rise of Capitalism and the Roots of Anti-

American Terrorism,” *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 52, No. 1 (2015), pp. 46-61 (how the spread of market-based economics can generate hostilities)

- ❖ Risa A. Brooks, “Muslim ‘Homegrown’ Terrorism in the United States: How Serious is the Threat?” *International Security*, Vol. 36, No. 2 (2011), pp. 7-47 (the author’s conclusion: not very).
- ❖ Glenn Greenwald, *No Place to Hide: Edward Snowden, the NSA, and the US Surveillance State* (New York: Penguin, 2014), ch. 4 (good complement to Lyon)
- ❖ Michael Mousseau, “Market Civilization and Its Clash with Terror,” *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 3 (2002/03), pp. 5-29 (a less statistical complement to the Krieger and Meirrieks article)
- ❖ David Sobek and Alex Braithwaite, “Victim of Success: American Dominance and Terrorism,” *Conflict Management and Peace Science*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (2005), pp. 135-48 (the paradox of power, or Goliath’s curse)
- ❖ Steve A. Yetiv, *The Petroleum Triangle: Oil, Globalization, and Terror* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011), intro, ch. 1 (more analysis of the economic sources of terrorism—see also Duffield’s book below)

19. Climate Change – Mark Shirk

- Stacy D. VanDeveer and Henrik Selin, “Re-Engaging International Climactic Governance: Challenges and Opportunities for the United States,” in *Greenhouse Governance: Addressing Climate Change in America*, edited by Barry G. Rabe (Washington DC: Brookings, 2010), pp. 313-36 (a general diplomatic framework, post Copenhagen and pre-Paris Agreements)
- Elizabeth R. DeSombre, “Domestic Sources of U.S. Unilateralism,” in *The Global Environment: Institutions, Law, and Policy*, edited by Regina S. Axelrod and Stacy D. VanDeveer (Thousand Oaks, CA: CQ Press, 2015), pp. 133-56 (especially relevant following the Trump administration’s exit from the Paris Agreement)
- Joshua W. Busby, “Who Cares about the Weather? Climate Change and US National Security,” *Security Studies*, Vol. 17, No. 3 (2008), pp. 468-504 (the “securitization” of climate-change policy)
- 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]
- ❖ John S. Duffield and Charles R. Hankla, “The Efficiency of Institutions: Political Determinants of Oil Consumption in Democracies,” *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (2011), pp. 187-205 (decentralized political systems like that in the U.S. have a harder time reducing oil dependency)
- ❖ Robert O. Keohane and David G. Victor, “The Regime Complex for Climate Change,” *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 9, No. 1, 2011, pp. 7-23 (a look at how international institutions affect climate policy by two leading IR scholars)
- ❖ Varun Sivaram and Teryn Norris, “The Clean Energy Revolution,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.

95, No. 3 (May/June 2016) (can climate change be tackled by U.S.-led technological innovation?)

- ❖ Michael Thomas, *The Securitization of Climate Change: Australian and United States' Military Responses, 2003-2013* (Springer, 2017), chs. 3, 6 (good complement to Busby

The Global Economy – Mark Shirk

- Jacob J. Lew, “America and the Global Economy: The Case for U.S. Leadership,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 95, No. (May/June 2016), pp. 56-68 (Obama’s secretary of the Treasury weighs in)
- Michael Mastanduno, “System Maker and Privilege Taker: U.S. Power and the International Political Economy,” *World Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (2009), pp. 121-54 (the U.S. triumph in the Cold War has paradoxically given it less economic leverage internationally)
- 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)
- John Bellamy Foster and Robert W. McChesney, “The Endless Crisis,” *Monthly Review*, Vol. 64, No. 1 (2012), available for download at <http://monthlyreview.org/2012/05/01/the-endless-crisis/> (contra Drezner, argues that the U.S.-led economic system is the source of crisis, not the solution)

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]
- ❖ Helen V. Milner and Dustin H. Tingley, “Who Supports Global Economic Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy,” *International Organization*, Vol. 65, No.1 (2011), pp. 37-68 (the sources of trade and aid preferences in the U.S. Congress)
- ❖ Carla Norloff, “Dollar Hegemony: A Power Analysis,” *Review of International Political Economy*, Vol. 21, No. 5 (2014), pp. 1042-1070 (good complement to Eichengreen)
- ❖ Louis W. Pauly, “The Political Economy of Global Financial Crises,” in *Global Political Economy*, third edition, edited by John Ravenhill (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), pp. 198-222 (complementing Kahler and Lake)

The United Nations and International Law – Mark Shirk

- Erik Voeten, (2001), “Outside Options and the Logic of Security Council Action,” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 95, No. 4, pp. 845–58 (a disproportionately powerful state like the US can get its way in the UN in part because it can pursue alternative avenues when executing policy)
- Corneliu Bjola, “Legitimizing 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)
- Johan Steyn, “Guantanamo Bay: The Legal Black Hole,” *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, Vol. 53, No. 1 (2004), pp. 1-15 (perhaps the most infamous aspect of the “war on terror”)
- Marlene Wind, “Challenging Sovereignty? The USA and the Establishment of the International Criminal Court,” *Ethics & Global Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 2 (2009), 83-108 (looking at U.S. objections to the ICC)

Recommended:

- ❖ Putnam, *Courts without Borders*, chs. 1, 3 [available as an electronic resource] (U.S. courts regulating practices far beyond America’s borders)
- ❖ Alexander Thompson, “Coercion Through IOs: The Security Council and the Logic of Information Transmission,” *International Organization*, Vol. 60, No. 1 (2006), pp. 1-34 (why the U.S. turns to the UN to validate its interventions despite its unilateral preferences and disproportionate strength)
- ❖ Timothy J. McKeown, “How US Decision-makers Assessed their Control of Multilateral Organizations, 1957–1982,” *Review of International Organizations*, Vol. 4, No. .3 (2009), pp. 269-91 (three theoretically-informed case studies on the topic).
- ❖ Paul Kennedy, *Parliament of Man: The Past, Present, and Future of the United Nations* (New York: Penguin, 2006), ch. 1 (work by one of the leading historians on the topic)
- ❖ Bruce Cronin, “The Paradox of Hegemony: America’s Ambiguous Relationship with the United Nations,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 7, No. 1 (2001): 103-130 (the conflict between U.S. short-term and long-term interests, played out in the UN)
- ❖ Foot et al., *US Hegemony and International Organizations*, ch. 3 (on the UN)
- ❖ Mark Mazower, *No Enchanted Palace: The End of Empire and the Ideological Origins of the United Nations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009), introduction (Britain hoped the UN could preserve its empire post-1945. The U.S. had other plans) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ Gary J. Bass, *Stay the Hand of Vengeance: The Politics of War Crime Tribunals* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), ch.5 (on the Nuremberg Trials)
- ❖ 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]
- ❖ Leila N. Sadat, “Extraordinary Rendition, Torture and Other Nightmares from the War on Terror,” *George Washington Law Review*, Vol. 75, No. 5/6 (2007): 101-149 (complement to Steyn)
- ❖ Shirley V. Scott, *International Law, U.S. Power: The United States’ Quest for Legal Security* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), chs. 1, 5-6 [available as an

electronic resource]

- ❖ Colin H. Kahl, “In the Crossfire or the Crosshairs? Norms, Civilian Casualties, and US Conduct in Iraq,” *International Security*, Vol. 32, No. 1 (2007), pp. 7-46 (the tensions between legal, ethical conduct in war, and military doctrines on force protection).
- ❖ Henry A. Kissinger, “The Pitfalls of Universal Jurisdiction,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 5 (July/August 2001), pp. 86-96; and in response, Kenneth Roth, “The Case for Universal Jurisdiction,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 80, No. 5 (September/October 2001), pp. 150-154 (a debate between a Nobel Peace Prize winner/war criminal—take your pick— and the head of Human Rights Watch)
- ❖

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)
- Daniel H. Nexon and Thomas Wright, “What’s at Stake in the American Empire Debate?” *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 101, No. 2 (2007), pp. 253-71 (a structural analysis of the concept of “empire”)
- Jack Donnelly, “Sovereign Realities and Hierarchy under Anarchy: American Power and International Society,” *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 12, No. 2 (2006), pp. 139-70 (empires, spheres of influence, protectorates... a typology of hierarchical international arrangements)
- David A. Lake, “Legitimizing Power: The Domestic Politics of U.S. International Hierarchy,” *International Security*, Vol. 38, No. 2 (2013), pp. 74-111 (the social contract of American imperium)

Recommended:

- ❖ Andrew J. Bacevich, ed., *Imperial Tense: Prospects and Problems of American Empire* (Chicago: Ivan R. Dee, 2003) (collection of essays on the empire question)
- ❖ Michael Barnett and Raymond Duvall, “Power in International Politics,” *International Organization*, Vol. 59, No. 1, (2005), pp. 39-75 (a multi-pronged perspective on the way U.S. power operates internationally)
- ❖ Ian Clark, *Hegemony in International Society* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), ch. 6, conclusion (distinguishing between material “primacy” and social “hegemony”)

[available as an electronic resource]

- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Michael Cox, “Empire, Imperialism and the Bush Doctrine,” *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (2004): 585-608.
- ❖ Niall Fergusson, *Colossus: The Price of America’s Empire* (New York: The Penguin Press, 2004), pt. 1 (complement to Mandelbaum by a leading historian and former advisor to Senator John McCain)
- ❖ Chalmers Johnson, *The Sorrows of Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2004), chs. 1-2 (strong contrast to Mandelbaum and Fergusson)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Nuno P. Monteiro, “Unrest Assured: Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful,” *International Security* Vol. 36, No. 3 (2011), pp. 9-40 (stability ≠ peace)
- ❖ 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”)

21. U.S. Decline? – Mark Shirk

- Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan*, chs. 7-8 (the U.S.-led order is in trouble, but ultimately will survive)
- Sean Starrs, “American Economic Power Hasn’t Declined—It Globalized! Summoning the Data and Taking Globalization Seriously,” *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 57, No. 4 (2013), pp. 817-830 (perceptions of American economic decline/growth depend heavily on which metrics you use; globalized production chains make GDP outdated)
- 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]
- Abramowitz, Alan I., and Steven W. Webster. “Negative Partisanship: Why Americans Dislike Parties But Behave Like Rabid Partisans.” *Political Psychology* 39, no. S1 (2018): 119–35. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12479>. [domestic reasons why the US is in decline, and not just Trump]

Recommended:

- ❖ Beckley, Michael. *Unrivaled: Why America Will Remain the World's Sole Superpower*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2018. [optimistic take on future of US power looking at non-traditional markers of international power]
- ❖ Wright, Thomas J. *All Measures Short of War: The Contest for the Twenty-First Century and the Future of American Power*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017. Ch. 5 [competition in an interdependent world]
- ❖ Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, "Don't Come Home, America: The Case against Retrenchment," *International Security* Vol. 37, No. 3 (2012), pp. 7-51 (the costs of U.S. "overreach" have been exaggerated, and the benefits neglected)
- ❖ 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
- ❖ Robert J. Lieber, *Power and Willpower in the American Future: Why the United States Is Not Destined to Decline* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012), chs. 1, 5-6 (similar to Singh's book) [available as an electronic resource]
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Fared Zakaria, *The Post-American World* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011), chs. 1-3 (the rise of "the rest" outside of The West)
- ❖ Joshua Busby and Jonathan Monten, "Without Heirs? Assessing the Decline of Establishment Internationalism in U.S. Foreign Policy," *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 6, No. 3 (2008): 451-472 (have U.S. political elites become less cosmopolitan? How does this argument stack up in the era of Trump [see Doug Stokes' and Mead's articles on Trump from Part I]?)
- ❖ Stephen Chaudoin, Helen V. Milner, and Dustin H. Tingley, "The Center Still Holds: Liberal Internationalism Survives," *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 1 (2010): 75-94 (again, how does this argument stand up almost a decade after it was made?)

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:

- ❖ Schake, Kori, “Back to Basics: Making Right What Trump Gets Wrong,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 98, No.3 (2019)
- ❖ 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)
- ❖ Robert J. Art, *A Grand Strategy for America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013), chs. 4, 7 (a realist case for “selective engagement”)
- ❖ Cooley and Nexon, *Exit from Hegemony*, Ch. 8
- ❖ Rapp-Hooper, Mira and Rebecca Lissner, *An Open World: How America Can Win the Contest for the Twenty-First Century*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020. [Book version of article above]
- ❖ Porter, Patrick. *The False Promise of Liberal Order: Nostalgia, Delusion, and the Rise of Trump*. London: Polity Press, 2020.

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