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PAPER DESCRIPTION

By most measures, 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.

The first two supervision topics in Michaelmas term will be chosen by your supervisor, covering Parts I and II. The third supervision will be on a topic of your chosen that we have covered in that term. In Lent term, the three supervisions should cover Parts III-V, one each. For Part III, students should do a case study on a specific region. Supervisors will choose topics but students can do a different topic if they choose. Please see the suggested supervision questions at the end of each Part.

In Easter term, we will have one revision lecture, one 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. Prior exams, as well as questions of the kind that would appear on a final exam, are available on Moodle. 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. Additional assigned readings can either be found online via electronic journals to which the Cambridge University Library subscribes, or will be copied and made available as electronic
files on Moodle. I have tried to note each instance in which a primary reading from a book is available as an electronic resource via the University, so you can easily access it. Recommended readings (also denoted below) do not need to be read prior to class, but may prove valuable to you as you revise supervision essays and prepare for the final exam. For recommended readings, I have listed what I believe to be the most important chapters in books, though you are free to read more from titles you find especially relevant and interesting. You cannot possibly cover all the material listed here. Think of it as a useful bibliography, parts of which you will investigate more deeply than others.

**General Overviews**
The following books don’t appear in the readings associated with lectures, but rather are good reference sources concerning the history of U.S. foreign policy if you need them:

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


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


**Books Appearing with Lecture Topics**


Roger Buckley, *The United States in the Asia-Pacific since 1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); **available as an electronic resource**


Dianne Pfundstein Chamberlain, *Cheap Threats: Why the United States Struggles to Coerce Weak States* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2016); **available as an electronic resource**


David C. Hendrickson, *Union, Nation, or Empire: The American Debate over International Relations, 1789–1941* (Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press, 2009)


Tom Long, *Latin America Confronts the United States: Asymmetry and Influence* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015); available as an electronic resource


Travers McLeod, *Rule of Law in War: International Law and United States Counterinsurgency in Iraq and Afghanistan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015); electronic resource


Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World* (New York: Routledge, 2002); available as an electronic resource


Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); 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/](https://uwdc.library.wisc.edu/collections/FRUS/))
- The National Security Archive (declassified documents from U.S. intelligence and other sources; nsarchive.gwu.edu)
- ProQuest Digital National Security Archive (an e-resource available through the UL website, quite similar to the source immediately above)
- War on the Rocks (“A platform for analysis, commentary, debate and multimedia content on foreign policy and national security issues through a realist lens”; warontherocks.com)
- The Monkey Cage (articles from political scientists on a range of different topics, including foreign policy; [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/))

**LECTURE TOPICS & ACCOMPANYING READINGS**

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

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

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

   **Recommended:**
   - McDougall, *Promised Land, Crusader State*, chs. 5-8 (criticizing the liberalism of the “New Testament” of U.S. foreign policy)


Thomas J. Knock, *To End All Wars: Woodrow Wilson and the Quest for a New World Order* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), chs. 7-8 (a biography of the quintessential American liberal internationalist)


2. Themes from the Revolutionary Era (lecture to be given by Prof. Brendan Simms)

   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)

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


3. Illiberal Tendencies of a Liberal State (lecture to be given by Prof. Brendan Simms)


Recommended:


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

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


Walter 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?)


4. The “Neos”: Neoconservatism and Neoliberalism – Mark Shirk

Fukuyama, *America at the Crossroads*, ch. 2 (a former neoconservative analyses its ideological and political impact)


Rodrik, *The Globalization Paradox*, ch. 9 (the “trilemma” of democracy, sovereignty, and globalization introduced by neoliberalism: you only get to pick two) [available as an electronic resource]

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

Supervision questions for Part I:

1. Would it be accurate to say that US foreign policy is guided by a fundamentally liberal political philosophy?
2. How important were religious beliefs for U.S. foreign policy doctrine in the 19th and early 20th century?
3. Do neoconservatism and neoliberalism have anything of significance in common?
4. Have America’s liberal tendencies had a pacifying effect on its foreign policy, or have they primarily been a cause of violent conflict?
5. How might the U.S-UK relationship be different if they did not share cultural and racial identities?
6. Is American Exceptionalism fundamentally anti-European?

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

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

- Philip A. Russo and Patrick J. Haney, “Intermestic Politics and Homeland Security,” in *Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 16 [available as an electronic resource] (blurring the lines between domestic and foreign policy)

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

- Andrew, *For the President’s Eyes Only* (London, 1995), esp chs. 5, 7, 9, 12 (Trailblazing study of the history of U.S. intelligence)
- Richelson, *The U.S. Intelligence Community* (7th Edition, New York, 2016), chs. 1-2 and 8 (a very 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)

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)
- Andrew, *The Secret World* (Penguin, 2018), chs. 29-30 (a seminal account of intelligence throughout all of human history)
- Blight and Welch (eds.), *Intelligence and the Cuban Missile Crisis* (Frank Cass, 1998), ch. 2.
- Gustafson, *Hostile Intent* (Washington, 2007), esp. ch. 7. (an account of the CIA and the 1973 coup in Chile that, contrary to popular belief, argues that the CIA had little to do with the coup)
on the explosion of US intelligence since 9/11; accessible only in book form, not available online because of GDPR)

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

7. The Executive-Legislative Balance – Dan Larsen

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

Recommended:

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


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


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

### 8. Bureaucracy – Daniel Larsen


**Recommended:**

- Terry M. Moe, “The New Economics of Organization,” *American Journal of Political Science, Vol. 28, No. 4* (1984): 739-777 (though not explicitly about foreign policy, this is an excellent overview of the limitations that prevent political leaders from seamlessly translating bureaucratic resources into power and influence)
- Stephen D. Krasner, “Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison Wonderland),” *Foreign 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]
- Robert J. McMahon, *Dean Acheson and the Creation of an American World Order* (Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2009), ch. 3 (on one of the most influential Secretaries of State)
- Milner and Tingley, *Sailing the Water’s Edge*, ch. 5
- Paul R. Pillar, *Intelligence and U.S. Foreign Policy: Iraq, 9/11, and Misguided Reform* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2011), chs. 5-6 (by the former head of the CIA’s counter-terrorism center)

9. Public Opinion (note: this literature is MASSIVE) – Mark Shirk

- 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)

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)

- Milner and Tingley, *Sailing the Water’s Edge*, ch. 6
- Dominic Johnson and Dominic Tierney, *Failing to Win: Perceptions of Victory and Defeat in International Politics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2006), chs. 2-3, 6 (does the public engage in objective ‘score-keeping’ when it evaluates military campaigns, or does spin from media and political leaders lead people to engage in biased ‘match-fixing’?)
- Peter D. Feaver, Christopher Gelpi, and Jason Reifler “Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq,” *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (2005/06), pp. 7-46 (are Americans “casualty phobic” or “defeat phobic”?)
Joshua D. Kertzer and Thomas Zeitzoff, “A Bottom-Up Theory of Public Opinion about Foreign Policy,” *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 61, No. 3 (2017), pp. 543-58 (compare to Berinsky; per Page and colleagues, if public opinion about foreign policy is such an elite-driven process, why does the public often disagree with what leaders have to say?)


Christopher Wlezien, “The Public as Thermostat: Dynamics of Preferences for Spending,” *American Journal of Political Science*, Vol. 39, No. 4 (1995), pp. 981-1000 (when it comes to defense spending and other issues, the public acts like a thermostat, pulling policy back to the center when it goes too far in one direction or the other).

10. **Interest Groups – Mark Shirk**

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

Recommended:
- 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)
- Milner and Tingley, *Sailing the Water’s Edge*, ch. 3
- Peter Trubowitz, *Defining the National Interest: Conflict and Change in American Foreign Policy* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998), ch. 1 (different regions of the country have different economic interests, and by extension, foreign policy preferences).
Allan J. Cigler and Burdett A. Loomis, eds., *Interest Group Politics*, 8th edition (London: CQ Press, 2012), chs. 13-14 (Hrebenar and Thomas on the ‘China Lobby’ and McCormick on ethnic interest groups, respectively) [most recent edition also available as an electronic resource, though only accessible on designated computers in the UL]

**Supervision questions for Part II:**

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

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

11. **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]
- Trachtenberg, *A Constructed Peace*, chs. 1-2 [available as an electronic resource] (the U.S., USSR, and the “German question”)
- Risse-Kappen, *Cooperation among Democracies*, ch. 2 and conclusion (a constructivist argument for why European allies had more influence on U.S. policy than realists would expect)

**Recommended:**

- 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”)
- 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)
2005), chs. 1-2 (Gaddis is one of the preeminent historians of Cold War foreign policy) [available as an electronic resource]


- 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)


12. Europe after the Cold War – Mark Shirk


Recommended:


Rosemary Foot, S. Neil MacFarlane, and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *US Hegemony and International Organizations* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), ch. 9 (good complement to Cox and Pouliot) [available as an electronic resource]

Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 7

James M. Goldgeier, *Not Whether but When: The U.S. Decision to Enlarge NATO* (Washington, DC: Brookings, 1999), chs. 1, 3 (NATO expansion from inside the Clinton White House)

Frank Schimmelfennig, *The EU, NATO, and the Integration of Europe: Rules and Rhetoric* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pt. 1 (more developed version of Schimmelfennig’s article) [available as an electronic resource]

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)


13. Asia – Mark Shirk

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

Recommended:

- Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 9
- Peter Katzenstein, *A World of Regions: Asia and Europe in the American Imperium*
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* (Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 1999), ch. 9 (how Lyndon Johnson could have avoided war, but didn’t)


14. The Middle East – Mark Shirk

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

- Fawaz Gerges, *America and Political Islam: Clash of Cultures or Clash of Interests?* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), chs. 2-3 (contrast with Haas)
- Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 8
- Alex Roberto Hybel and Justin Matthew Kaufman, *The Bush Administrations and Saddam Hussein: Deciding on Conflict* (Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2006), chs. 2, 4, 6 (psychological analysis of decision-making by father and son)
- Rashid Khalidi, *Sowing Crisis: The Cold War and American Dominance in the Middle East* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2009), chs. 1, 4-5 (legacies of the Cold War for the Middle East)
- Stephen Kinzer, *All the Shah’s Men: An American Coup and the Roots of Middle East Terror* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons, 2008), chs. 1, 8-10 (U.S.-UK collaboration to overthrow Iranian Prime Minister Mossadegh and install the Shah in power in the 1950s)
- Mahmood Mamdani, *Good Muslim, Bad Muslim: America, the Cold War, and the Roots of Terror* (New York: Three Leaves Press, 2004), chs. 1, 3 (it’s not Islam, it’s American interventionism)
- Donnette Murray, *U.S. Foreign Policy and Iran: American-Iranian Relations since the Islamic Revolution* (London: Routledge, 2010), intro, ch. 1 (helpful overview)
- Thomas Ricks, *Fiasco: The American Military Adventure in Iraq* (New York: Penguin Press, 2006), part II (see especially chapters 8 & 9 on ‘How to Create an Insurgency’)
15. Africa – Daniel Larsen

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

Recommended:

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

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

16. Latin America – Daniel Larsen

- Kinzer, *Overthrow*, chs. 6, 8 (U.S. covert actions to overthrow regimes in Guatemala and Chile)
- Long, *Latin America Confronts the United States*, chs. 1, 4-5 (showing how even relatively weak states can influence US policy in cooperative endeavors) [available as an electronic resource]
- Sikkink, *Mixed Signals*, chs. 3, 6-7 (arguing that strident U.S. anti-communism eventually made room for human rights concerns in relations with Latin America)

Recommended:

- 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)
- Gries, *Politics of American Foreign Policy*, ch. 6
Gary Prevost and Carlos Oliva Campos, eds., *Neoliberalism and Neopanamericanism: The View from Latin America* (New York: Palgrave, 2002), chs. 1, 9 (ideology and globalization in America’s near abroad)

Gregory B. Weeks, *U.S. and Latin American Relations*, second edition (West Sussex: John Wiley, 2015), chs. 8, 10 (on the movement of people and goods in the Americas; entire book is a good overview source) [available as an electronic resource]

Coletta A. Younger and Eileen Rosin, eds., *Drugs and Democracy in Latin America: The Impact of U.S. Policy* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2005), chs. 1, 4 (focusing on Colombia)

**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. Will the U.S. be willing and able to peacefully accommodate China’s rising economic and military power?
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?
7. Would anything about U.S. foreign policy be significantly different if the UN didn’t exist?

**Part IV: Specific Contemporary Issues**

17. **Nuclear Weapons – Daniel Larsen**

- 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?)


- 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)


18. Terrorism – Mark Shirk


- 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]

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


19. Climate Change – Mark Shirk

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

Recommended:

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

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

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


Recommended:

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


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


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

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


- 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]


Supervision questions for Part IV:

1. Could the U.S. peacefully tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran?
2. Can the use of drones and advanced surveillance in counter-terrorist efforts be reconciled with traditional U.S. anti-statism?
3. Discuss: If the U.S. is to get serious about climate change, it will have to be because of national security concerns.
4. Does the U.S. deserve more blame or praise for its involvement in the great 2008 economic recession?
5. Has international law had any effect on U.S. counter-terrorism efforts?

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

22. U.S. Dominance – Daniel Larsen

- 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]

Recommended:

- 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)
- 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)
- 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)


Nuno P. Monteiro. Theory of Unipolar Politics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), longer version of Monteiro’s article above [available as an electronic resource]

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

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

Recommended:

- Ian Clark, Hegemony in International Society (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), ch. 6, conclusion (distinguishing between material “primacy” and social “hegemony”) [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)
- 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)
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- Ikenberry, Liberal Leviathan, chs. 7-8 (the U.S.-led order is in trouble, but ultimately will survive)
- 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)
- 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:

- Andrew Bacevich, Washington Rules: America's Path to Permanent War (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2010), chs. 1-2 (overstretch leads to decline)
- 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?)
- Paul Kennedy, The Rise and Fall of Great Powers (New York: Random House, 1987); a modern classic
- Clyde Prestowitz, The Betrayal of American Prosperity (New York: Free Press, 2010), chs. 2-3 (the U.S. has declined economically because of its faith in free trade)
- Fareed Zakaria, The Post-American World (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011), chs. 1-3 (the rise of “the rest” outside of The West)

**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’
MOCK EXAM

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

SECTION A (pick at least one)

1. Why has it been argued that it is more apt to describe U.S. foreign policy in the 18th and 19th centuries as “unilateralist” and not “isolationist”? Is unilateralism a fitting label for U.S. foreign policy in those years?

2. Have neoconservatism and neoliberalism been discredited as frameworks for designing U.S. foreign policy?

3. How significantly did the 1947 National Security Act affect relations between the president and the U.S. Congress?

4. Has the U.S. Constitution become outdated in terms of its ability to guide, facilitate, and constrain the foreign policy actions of elected officials?

5. Does the ethnic diversity of the United States make the adoption of stable, coherent strategy in foreign affairs nearly impossible?

6. Does the U.S. abide by international law only when doing so enhances its immediate security or economic interests?

7. Is fossil fuel dependence the primary factor inhibiting U.S. policy to address climate change?

8. Assess the following statement: The United States is an imperial power, and as a result the world has been relatively peaceful from 1945 onward.
SECTION B (pick at least one)

9. How much influence did America’s European allies have over its foreign policy after 1945? [You may focus your answer on the Cold War era, post-Cold War, or both]

10. Why is there no NATO in Asia—and should there be?

11. What role did liberal ideology play in the U.S. decision to invade Iraq in 2003?

12. How have ideas about “failed states” shaped U.S. foreign policy towards Africa since the 1990s?

13. Assess the following statement: The “Monroe Doctrine” has been the fundamental principle guiding U.S. foreign policy towards Latin America since it was articulated.

14. What are the foundations and consequences of Americans’ distrust of the United Nations?

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.

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