

# **PSCI 120: America and the World**

**Williams College  
Spring 2017**

**Professor Galen Jackson  
Schapiro 226  
Email: 09gej@williams.edu  
Telephone: X2607  
Office Hours: By Appointment**

## **Course Description**

The goal of this class is to provide students with an understanding of the role played by the United States in the world. As the lone superpower in the international system, the United States has the capacity to shape global events in a way that no other country can, which makes the study of American foreign policy critically important to the development of a broader comprehension of international politics. In this course, we will examine a number of major debates, both historical and contemporary, about U.S. national interests and objectives, and how Washington should go about achieving them. Students will be forced to grapple with crucial questions related to a number of specific policy topics, including how the United States has traditionally structured its foreign relations; how domestic politics interacts with strategic priorities to produce policy outcomes; the tension between idealism and morality on the one hand, and realism on the other, in U.S. foreign policy; nuclear proliferation and disarmament; the American role in the Arab-Israeli conflict; the geopolitics of energy and climate change; humanitarian intervention; the Arab Spring; terrorism; neoconservative thought and the Iraq War; the relationship between civil liberties and national security; immigration as a foreign policy problem; the challenges posed by the rise of China and Russia; the proper grand strategic posture for the United States; and the future of the U.S. role in the world under President Donald Trump. Students will be exposed to these issues and debates from both a political science and historical perspective. By the end of the course, students will have not only gained insight into these specific topics but, more importantly, will have developed an ability to think critically and analytically about the logic and evidence of the varying perspectives espoused by the different schools of foreign policy thought across the American political spectrum.

## **Course Requirements and Format**

Despite its size, this is *not* a “lecture” course. Although I will begin most class sessions by providing some background and context related to the day’s topic and readings, class participation is critically important and expected of each and every student. Class discussion is *the heart of this course*—it is during these discussions that we will really wrestle with the fundamental issues at stake. Students should come to class ready to talk, having thought seriously about the major concepts raised in the readings. If you really want to get something out of this course, you must be prepared to think and talk about the course topics in a serious way. The basic format for each session will be “Socratic,” meaning I will ask questions and structure

debate to get students to express key ideas and to think analytically. The goal of this method is to teach students *how* to think and argue, rather than *what* to think and argue. I expect all students to come to class prepared and on time, having done the assigned reading and ready to participate in constructive debate. Because of its importance, **class participation will account for 25 percent of the final grade.**

Students will also be required to write three analytical papers, five to six pages in length, each of which will deal with a particular topic we will cover in class. Students will be given a choice of several topics to write about for each paper. Students will be evaluated based on the quality of their writing; demonstrated knowledge of the subject material and readings; and, above all, the persuasiveness and clarity of the analytical argument they make in these papers. It is much better to write a paper with a bad argument than one with no argument at all. Likewise, papers that merely summarize the material we have discussed—even though they may demonstrate that one has carefully done the assigned reading—will not fare as well as papers that incorporate less of the subject matter but that take a clear position. The most important thing in these papers is for students to advance a clear, thoughtful, compelling, and *analytical argument*. I will go over in class more thoroughly what I am expecting for each paper prior to the deadline.

These papers will not require any additional research beyond the assigned readings (please see me ahead of time if you are thinking about using any outside sources; in general, I tend to discourage students from doing this). Papers must include references to the readings using properly formatted citations. This can be done either through footnotes or parenthetical notation, and I will go over in class how to do this. There is also an excellent citation guide on the College's library website. I encourage students to take advantage of the Writing Workshop—a truly wonderful resource—to get feedback on their writing mechanics and paper structure.

The first paper is due on March 15 (the Wednesday before Spring Break). The second paper is due on Wednesday, April 26. We will not meet for class on either of those days because I want to give you time to focus on your papers. As a result, please do not ask for extensions. The final paper will be due during the final exam period—I will let you know the exact date as we near the end of the semester. **Each of these papers will be worth 25 percent of the final grade.** Late papers will be penalized a half letter grade per day past the deadline.

## **How to Read and Write for this Course**

A key goal of this course is to help students improve their ability to read critically. Everything we will read advances a basic point. While doing the assigned reading, students should ask themselves a series of questions: What is the author's basic argument? What is the logic that supports that argument? Is the evidence that she/he brings to bear compelling? Students who read actively in this way will not only absorb the material more thoroughly, but will also come to class ready to participate with greater confidence. The goal should be to dissect the piece—to understand its logical and empirical weaknesses/strengths and to comprehend its significance in conceptual and policy terms.

Writing development is also an important objective for this course. The ability to write well is an invaluable skill, one that will benefit students well into the future. Each of the analytical essays

must have a clear thesis statement (typically stated in the first paragraph) and the logical/empirical arguments students include in their papers should be geared toward supporting that statement. Each paper assignment will differ slightly in order to help students develop a versatile set of writing skills. I am happy to discuss the structure, logic, and evidence relating to student essays during office hours, but I will not read rough drafts.

## **Office Hours**

I will not have regularly scheduled office hours, but **I am almost always available during the week**. Please feel free to send me an email to set up an appointment. I am happy to talk about anything related to the course, to answer any questions you might have, and to discuss how to approach the papers. In my experience, office hours can present an excellent opportunity for students to enhance their comprehension of the concepts we discuss in class and to develop a framework for their papers, so I encourage everyone who feels they need help—or is simply interested in further discussion of the class material—to set up a meeting.

## **Academic Integrity and the Honor Code**

All submitted work must be your own. I take plagiarism and cheating extremely seriously and will not hesitate to pursue the maximum penalty allowed under the Williams College Honor Code. If you are confused about what might constitute plagiarism or cheating, feel free to ask me or consult the many resources that the College provides to help students in this area.

## **Course Reading**

All of the reading for this course will be available in a course reading packet. I reserve the right to make changes to the assigned reading if I think it will contribute to the course. The reading will approximate 55-60 pages per class session.

## **Class Schedule**

### **February 3: Introduction to the Course**

### **February 6: International Anarchy, Realism, and Strategy (58 pages)**

The United States conducts its foreign policy within the context of an enormously complex international system. With that in mind, it is critical that we understand some of the basic concepts in international relations theory, especially the principle of anarchy. The Mearsheimer chapter will highlight the importance of this concept, as well as present the fundamentals of realist theory. The Brands article uses the Obama administration's foreign policy to explain why formulating and evaluating grand strategic choices can be so difficult. The Kennedy chapter highlights the importance of keeping means in line with ends and shows how difficult it can be to assess U.S. strategic strengths and weaknesses.

John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2001), pp. 29-54.

Hal Brands, "Breaking Down Obama's Grand Strategy," *The National Interest*, June 23, 2014.

Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (New York: Vintage, 1987), pp. 514-535.

### **February 8: American Foreign Policy Traditions and Perspectives (67 pages)**

What are the principal sources of U.S. foreign policy? To what extent do liberal and idealistic considerations, as opposed to power political ones, impact American strategic decisions? Scholars and practitioners alike continue to argue about these questions, as well as their normative implications. Mearsheimer, Morgenthau, and Lind offer three distinct perspectives on this divide, while the Beinart op-ed presents an implicit challenge to the very nature of the debate. The addresses by Washington, Adams, Monroe, and Eisenhower are foundational documents in the history of American foreign relations, with relevance for contemporary debates about America's place in the world.

Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, pp. 14-27.

Hans J. Morgenthau, "The Mainsprings of American Foreign Policy: The National Interest vs. Moral Abstractions," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 44, No. 4 (1950), pp. 833-854.

Michael Lind, *The American Way of Strategy: U.S. Foreign Policy and the American Way of Life* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2006), pp. 23-40.

Peter Beinart, "The Isolation Pendulum," *Washington Post*, January 22, 2006.

President George Washington's 1796 Farewell Address

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams's Independence Day Address to the House of Representatives, July 4, 1821

Excerpt of President James Monroe's Seventh Annual Address to Congress, December 2, 1823

President Dwight Eisenhower's Farewell Address, January 17, 1961

### **February 13: Institutions, Domestic Politics, and the Foreign Policy Process (57 pages)**

How does the American domestic political system affect the country's foreign relations? What role do public opinion and Congress play in constraining the executive branch's ability to craft a coherent grand strategy? Is U.S. foreign policy merely an amalgamation of competing domestic interests, or is it possible to discern consistent strategic priorities in the way the United States formulates its approach to foreign affairs that override politics at home? These readings will introduce you to some of the ways in which the White House can (and has) overcome domestic

limitations to implement its preferred policy choices and outline the specific institutional arrangements that govern U.S. foreign policy.

David Samuels, "The Aspiring Novelist Who Became Obama's Foreign-Policy Guru," *New York Times Magazine*, May 5, 2016.

Louis Fisher, "Deciding on War Against Iraq: Institutional Failures," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 118, No. 3 (2003), pp. 389-410.

1973 War Powers Resolution

Damian Paletta, "Treaties vs. Executive Agreements: When Does Congress Get a Vote?" *Wall Street Journal*, March 10, 2015.

### **February 15: Woodrow Wilson, Liberalism, and the First World War (58 pages)**

Many experts claim that U.S. foreign policy is animated by liberal internationalism, a conceptual framework most clearly articulated by President Woodrow Wilson during and after the First World War. What are the principal arguments that foreign policy liberals make about the role of the United States in the world? Does liberal internationalism dominate U.S. foreign policy discourse and substance? What sorts of critiques do realists, like Kennan, make of Wilson? What are the key principles Wilson espouses in these three speeches and what is your assessment of them?

Henry Kissinger, *Diplomacy* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1994), pp. 29-55.

George F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), pp. 55-73.

President Woodrow Wilson's Address to the Senate, January 22, 1917

President Wilson's Address to a Joint Session of Congress Requesting a Declaration of War Against Germany, April 2, 1917

President Wilson's Address to the Senate on the Versailles Peace Treaty, July 10, 1919

### **February 20: Containment, Bipolarity, and the Cold War (70 pages)**

The coming of the Cold War radically altered the U.S. role in the world and led directly to the creation of the American national security state. The United States, of course, pursued containment as its guiding grand strategic principle throughout its protracted conflict with the Soviet Union, but what were the primary causes of this rivalry? Was the problem essentially power political in nature, or did ideology play an important role? Just how stable was the Cold War system? Was the so-called "long peace" that followed the Second World War basically robust, and can it serve as a helpful guide to America's future engagement with great power competitors? Or was the situation actually far more dangerous? And how is U.S. involvement in

certain Cold War conflicts, especially the Vietnam War, to be understood? The Kennan article represents the classic conceptual framework for the doctrine of containment, but what do you think he thought about Truman's historic address in March 1947? Read in light of the Trachtenberg piece, what do you make of Lind's argument about the necessity of Vietnam?

George Kennan, "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (1947), pp. 566-582.

President Harry Truman's Address to a Joint Session of Congress, March 12, 1947

Marc Trachtenberg, "The Structure of Great Power Politics, 1963-1975," in Melvyn P. Leffler and Odd Arne Westad, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, Vol. 2: *Crisis and Détente* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), pp. 482-502.

Michael Lind, *Vietnam: The Necessary War* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999), pp. 256-284.

## **February 22: Nuclear Weapons I—The Global Zero Debate (44 pages)**

No one would disagree that nuclear weapons have fundamentally transformed international politics. Yet the questions of whether they make the world a safer or more dangerous place and whether the United States should seek a world without nuclear weapons are far from settled. The readings will outline some of the risks and opportunities that the nuclear revolution has created, as well as introduce some of the advantages and disadvantages of global disarmament.

Remarks by President Barack Obama in Prague, April 5, 2009

Watch: Trailer to "Nuclear Tipping Point," available at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k3WTdQ0qDBs>

Scott Sagan and Kenneth Waltz, "The Great Debate: Is Nuclear Zero the Best Option?" *The National Interest* (2010), pp. 88-96.

"US Nearly Detonated Atomic Bomb Over North Carolina," *The Guardian*, September 20, 2013.

William J. Broad, "U.S. Ramping Up Major Renewal in Nuclear Arms," *New York Times*, September 21, 2014.

David E. Sanger and William J. Broad, "Obama Unlikely to Vow No First Use of Nuclear Weapons," *New York Times*, September 5, 2016.

Michael D. Shear and James Glanz, "Trump Says the U.S. Should Expand Its Nuclear Capacity," *New York Times*, December 22, 2016.

Matthew Kroenig, "Think Again: American Nuclear Disarmament," *Foreign Policy*, September/October 2013, pp. 44-49.

## **February 27: Nuclear Weapons II—Nonproliferation, South Asia, and Iran (65 pages)**

How great a risk does the spread of nuclear weapons pose to American national security? Should the United States maintain its robust opposition to nuclear proliferation, or would the country benefit from a relaxation of its posture in this area? During the 2016 presidential campaign, President Trump drew renewed attention to these questions. While his comments were the subject of much derision, the question is perhaps more complex than many observers seem to think. For instance, do you think that the nuclearization of South Asia has promoted stability or instability? These issues are especially important in light of the new president's expressed opposition to the 2015 Iran nuclear deal, which could be in jeopardy depending on how Trump decides to approach the problem. With that in mind, the readings will raise the key issues related to the agreement, as well as the options available to Washington if it does not survive.

Watch: Anderson Cooper's Interview with Nominee Donald Trump on Nuclear Proliferation, March 29, 2016, available at, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EEsBoRVIWXU>

Gene Gerzhoy and Nick Miller, "Donald Trump Thinks More Countries Should Have Nuclear Weapons—Here's What the Research Says," *Washington Post Monkey Cage*, April 6, 2016.

Christopher Layne, "Hillary Clinton and Nuclear Weapons: More Dangerous Than Trump?" *The National Interest*, October 31, 2016.

Vipin Narang, "Posturing for Peace? Pakistan's Nuclear Postures and South Asian Stability," *International Security*, Vol. 34, No. 3 (2009-2010), pp. 55-76.

John J. Mearsheimer, "India Needs the Bomb," *New York Times*, March 24, 2000.

Watch: "The Iran Nuclear Deal Explained" on *Wall Street Journal* website

Barry R. Posen, "We Can Live With a Nuclear Iran," *New York Times*, February 27, 2006.

Kenneth N. Waltz, "Why Iran Should Get the Bomb: Nuclear Balancing Would Mean Stability," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (2012), pp. 2-5.

Eric S. Edelman, Andrew F. Krepinevich, and Evan Braden Montgomery, "The Dangers of a Nuclear Iran: The Limits of Containment," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 1 (2011), pp. 66-81.

Suzanne Maloney, "Whither the Iran Deal Under Trump?" *The Atlantic*, November 20, 2016.

Letter from Nuclear Scientists and Engineers to President-elect Trump, January 2, 2017

## **March 1: The United States and the Arab-Israeli Conflict I (49 pages)**

The United States since the end of the Second World War has been the primary external power involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict. Having a sense of the history of the American role in the Middle East's most intractable dispute is crucial to understanding the U.S. approach to the issue today and to determining whether the United States has the capability to promote its peaceful resolution. The Ball article offers a controversial framework for how Washington should seek to settle the conflict, while the Pundak and Shikaki pieces will give you a sense of how and why the Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations during the 1990s ultimately collapsed. What were the key obstacles to a solution? And could the United States have done more to achieve one?

George W. Ball, "How to Save Israel in Spite of Herself," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 55, No. 3 (1977), pp. 453-471.

Ron Pundak, "From Oslo to Taba: What Went Wrong?" *Survival*, Vol. 43, No. 3 (2001), pp. 31-45.

Khalil Shikaki, "Peace Now or Hamas Later," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 4 (1998), pp. 29-43.

### **March 6: The United States and the Arab-Israeli Conflict II (46 pages)**

Many observers now contend that a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is effectively dead and that this is, in part, the fault of the United States. Is this charge justified? Has Washington been too passive for the past decade and a half? Or is the structure of the problem simply too difficult? Are we on the verge of witnessing a "crisis" in American-Israeli relations? Or will the tensions that have strained the alliance in recent years dissipate under President Trump?

Barry Rubin, "Arafat's Poisoned Legacy," *The National Interest*, No. 79 (2005), pp. 53-61.

Daniel Byman, "How to Handle Hamas: The Perils of Ignoring Gaza's Leadership," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 5 (2010), pp. 45-62.

Jeffrey Goldberg, "The Crisis in U.S.-Israel Relations is Officially Here," *The Atlantic*, October 28, 2014.

Philip Gordon, "The Crisis in U.S.-Israel Relations: Are Washington and Jerusalem Drifting Apart?" *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 95, No. 6 (2016), pp. 132-138.

Bill Turque, "Could Obama's Golfing Options Depend on His Middle East Policy?" *Washington Post*, January 13, 2017.

Thomas L. Friedman, "Bibi Netanyahu Makes Trump His Chump," *New York Times*, December 28, 2016.

### **March 8: Energy, Geopolitics, and Climate Change I (58 pages)**

The energy question is among the most important challenges confronting the United States today. A stable, secure supply of energy is central to the health of the American and global economies. Moreover, access to energy is a major national security concern. Yet, the consumption of energy raises serious questions, given the threat posed by climate change. What are acceptable tradeoffs between economic growth, national security, and environmental concerns? What mix of energy sources should the United States depend on? Is it possible to overcome not only domestic resistance to climate change initiatives but, perhaps more significantly, international collective action problems to promote a more sustainable future? What would be the best way to achieve that goal?

Daniel Yergin, *The Prize: The Epic Quest for Oil, Money, and Power* (New York: Free Press, 1991), pp. 570-614.

Robert D. Blackwill and Megan L. O’Sullivan, “America’s Energy Edge: The Geopolitical Consequences of the Shale Revolution,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 93, No. 2 (2014), pp. 102-114.

### **March 13: Energy, Geopolitics, and Climate Change II (66 pages)**

Daniel Yergin, *The Quest: Energy, Security, and the Remaking of the Modern World* (New York: Penguin, 2011), pp. 471-487.

William D. Nordhaus, “A New Solution: The Climate Club,” *New York Review of Books*, June 4, 2015.

Ralph Vartabedian, “California’s Climate Fight Could Be Painful—Especially on Job and Income Growth,” *Los Angeles Times*, December 11, 2016.

Michael Levi, “America’s Energy Opportunity: How to Harness the New Sources of U.S. Power,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92, No. 3 (2013), pp. 92-104.

Richard K. Morse, “Cleaning Up Coal: From Climate Culprit to Solution,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 4 (2012), pp. 102-112.

Coral Davenport, “Donald Trump Could Put Climate Change on Course for ‘Danger Zone,’” *New York Times*, November 10, 2016.

### **March 15: FIRST PAPER DUE—NO CLASS**

### **SPRING BREAK**

### **April 3: Dilemmas of Humanitarian Intervention (73 pages)**

The end of the Cold War put the United States in a position to intervene in conflict-ridden states in order to protect human rights and prevent mass atrocities. With this power, however, comes a set of major dilemmas. Is it Washington’s responsibility to use military power for humanitarian

purposes? Does doing so undercut the principle of sovereignty? What happens after the United States has applied military force? How can we square criticism of President Bill Clinton's failure to stop the Rwandan genocide with President Barack Obama's claim that his Libyan intervention was among the worst mistakes of his time in office?

Samantha Power, *A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide* (New York: Basic, 2002), pp. 329-389.

Alan J. Kuperman, "Obama's Libya Debacle: How a Well-Meaning Intervention Ended in Failure," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 94, No. 2 (2015), pp. 66-77.

#### **April 5: The Obama Administration and the Arab Spring (55 pages)**

The uprisings that broke out in the Arab world in 2010-2011 raised hopes that the Middle East would soon be on the path to democracy. Six years later, however, the Arab Spring seems to have turned into an Arab Winter, with Egypt back under military rule and Libya and Syria in chaos. Was this a missed opportunity for the United States to help transform the region into a stable, democratic area? Should we blame the Obama administration for failing to take advantage of the uprisings to promote U.S. interests and values in the Middle East? Or were the challenges simply too immense?

Shadi Hamid, "Islamism, the Arab Spring, and the Failure of America's Do-Nothing Policy in the Middle East," *The Atlantic*, October 9, 2015.

Amy Hawthorne and Michele Dunn, "Remember That Historic Arab Spring Speech?" *Foreign Policy*, May 21, 2013.

Akbar Shahid Ahmed, "Barack Obama Reminds GOP Critics He Didn't Start the Arab Spring," *Huffington Post*, December 18, 2015.

Eric Trager, "The Unbreakable Muslim Brotherhood: Grim Prospects for a Liberal Egypt," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 5 (2011), pp. 114-126.

Daniel Byman, "Six Bad Options for Syria," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No. 4 (2016), pp. 171-186.

Helene Cooper and Eric Schmitt, "Syrian President Calls Donald Trump a 'Natural Ally' in Fight Against Terrorism," *New York Times*, November 16, 2016.

#### **April 10: Terrorism—Al-Qaeda and ISIS (67 pages)**

What constitutes terrorism? Can we define the term easily? Do we simply "know it when we see it"? Or is it actually a quite slippery concept? What exactly causes terrorism? Ideology? Religion? Radicalization? Grievances against certain policies? How big of a threat is ISIS, and how does it differ from organizations like Al Qaeda? And what should the United States do to combat the terrorist threat?

Rick Gladstone, “Many Ask, Why Not Call Church Shooting Terrorism?” *New York Times*, June 18, 2015.

Lawrence Wright, *The Looming Tower: Al-Qaeda and the Road to 9/11* (New York: Knopf, 2006), pp. 7-31.

Michael Scheuer, “The Zawahiri Era,” *The National Interest*, September/October 2011, pp. 18-26.

Simon Cottee, “What Motivates Terrorists?” *The Atlantic*, June 9, 2015.

Daniel Byman and Jennifer Williams, “ISIS vs. Al Qaeda: Jihadism’s Global War,” *Brookings*, February 24, 2015.

Joby Warrick and Souad Mekhennet, “Inside ISIS: Quietly Preparing for the Loss of the ‘Caliphate,’” *Washington Post*, July 12, 2016.

Ramzy Mardini, “Don’t Defeat ISIS, Yet,” *New York Times*, September 27, 2016.

John Mueller, “Is There Still a Terrorist Threat? The Myth of the Omnipresent Enemy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 85, No. 5 (2006), pp. 2-8.

#### **April 12: The Neoconservatives, September 11, and the Iraq War (43 pages)**

The Bush administration’s decision to go to war in Iraq represents perhaps the most consequential U.S. foreign policy event of this century. The effects of the overthrow of Saddam Hussein’s regime are still being felt today. How is the war to be understood? What were the key beliefs and assumptions that led the United States into the conflict? Was the war a mistake, or were U.S. forces simply not given sufficient time to help consolidate Iraq’s transition to a stable democracy?

Bernard Lewis, “The Roots of Muslim Rage,” *The Atlantic Monthly*, Vol. 266, No. 3 (1990), pp. 47-60.

Charles Krauthammer, “The Unipolar Moment,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 70, No. 1 (1990-1991), pp. 23-33.

Kenneth M. Pollack, “Next Stop Baghdad?” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 2 (2002), pp. 32-47.

James Traub, “The Mess Obama Left Behind in Iraq,” *Foreign Policy*, October 7, 2016.

#### **April 17: Morality and the Conduct of American National Security Policy (78 pages)**

What role does morality play in shaping American foreign policy? Should the United States refrain from taking certain measures—such as targeting civilians in war, employing drones against enemy combatants, or using torture to try to obtain valuable information—even if it

means that the achievement of certain political and military objectives will be more difficult? Are these strategies effective and how would we know? Do the ends not justify the means?

W. Todd Groce, "Rethinking Sherman's March," *New York Times*, November 17, 2014.

Paul Fussell, *Thank God for the Atom Bomb* (New York: Summit, 1988), pp. 13-37.

Jo Becker and Scott Shane, "Secret 'Kill List' Proves a Test of Obama's Principles and Will," *New York Times*, May 29, 2012.

Daniel Byman, "Why Drones Work: The Case for Washington's Weapon of Choice," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92, No. 4 (2013), pp. 32-43.

Letter from 176 Retired Generals and Admirals to President-elect Donald Trump on the Use of Torture, January 6, 2017.

James Risen and Sheri Fink, "Trump Said 'Torture Works': An Echo is Feared Worldwide," *New York Times*, January 5, 2017.

Albert M. Calland, Porter J. Goss, Michael V. Hayden, Stephen R. Kappes, John E. McLaughlin, and George J. Tenet, "Ex-CIA Directors: Interrogations Saved Lives," *Wall Street Journal*, December 10, 2014.

John Yoo, "Dianne Feinstein's Flawed Torture Report," *Los Angeles Times*, December 13, 2014.

#### **April 19: Civil Liberties and National Security (55 pages)**

The need to balance national security with the protection of individual liberties has been a challenge for U.S. leaders since the country's earliest days. The acts from 1798 and 1917 show that this is by no means a new problem and that the American government has been willing in the past to curtail civil liberties in fairly substantial ways due to concerns about security. Likewise, the readings about the Supreme Court's infamous *Korematsu* decision raise major questions about whether U.S. institutions, during times of crisis, are capable of striking the proper balance. And what should Americans think about Edward Snowden and his decision to leak highly classified information about the National Security Agency's controversial surveillance program? In an age when the nature of the threat to national security has grown extraordinarily complex, is it not reasonable for the government to utilize such a program?

1798 Alien Enemies and Sedition Acts

1917 Espionage Act and 1918 Sedition Act

Stephen Breyer, *Making Our Democracy Work: A Judge's View* (New York: Knopf, 2010), pp. 172-193.

Matt Ford, "The Return of *Korematsu*," *The Atlantic*, November 19, 2015.

Dianne Feinstein, “Continue NSA Call-Records Program,” *USA Today*, October 20, 2013.

Peter Nicholas and Siobhan Gorman, “Obama Defends Surveillance,” *Wall Street Journal*, June 8, 2016.

John Arquilla, “In Defense of PRISM,” *Foreign Policy*, June 7, 2013.

Unclassified Executive Summary of the Review of the Unauthorized Disclosures of Former National Security Agency Contractor Edward Snowden, September 15, 2016.

Letter Signed by Members of the House Select Committee on Intelligence to President Obama, September 15, 2016.

Michael German, “Edward Snowden is a Whistleblower,” *American Civil Liberties Union*, August 2, 2013.

Barton Gellman, “The House Intelligence Committee’s Terrible, Horrible, Very Bad Snowden Report,” *The Century Foundation*, September 16, 2016.

#### **April 24: Immigration and National Security (60 pages)**

Immigration has become a major issue in American politics. But the debate about it is not typically framed as a foreign policy matter. Since the country’s founding, however, debates over immigration have been directly linked to questions of national security. Is the United States stronger, both materially and culturally, because it is an immigrant nation? Is there a particular “American creed” that all immigrants ought to be required to accept? Does the latest wave of immigration pose a threat, both to national security and to American identity?

Robbie Totten, “National Security and U.S. Immigration Policy, 1776-1790,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (2008), pp. 37-64.

Max Bearak, “Trump and Sessions Plan to Restrict Highly Skilled Foreign Workers—Hyderabad Says to Bring it On,” *Washington Post*, January 8, 2017.

Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America’s National Identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004), pp. xv-xvii, 221-256.

#### **April 26: NO CLASS—SECOND PAPERS DUE**

#### **May 1: The Future of Great Power Politics I—Russia and NATO (60 pages)**

Russia’s annexation of the Crimean Peninsula and military intervention in Ukraine in 2014 have catapulted the country back to the top of the American strategic agenda. There remains, however, no consensus as to what caused President Vladimir Putin to order these missions or as to what the proper U.S. response should be. Were Russia’s moves somewhat understandable, or was this

simply the result of the Kremlin practicing “nineteenth century diplomacy”? Should Washington respond forcefully and reinvigorate its commitment to NATO, or would a strategy of trying to accommodate Moscow’s concerns be more appropriate?

Joshua R. Itzkowitz Shiffrin, “Deal or No Deal? The End of the Cold War and the U.S. Offer to Limit NATO Expansion,” *International Security*, Vol. 40, No. 4 (2016), pp. 7-44.

John J. Mearsheimer, “Getting Ukraine Wrong,” *New York Times*, March 13, 2014.

Ivo Daadler et al., “Preserving Ukraine’s Independence, Resisting Russian Aggression: What the United States and NATO Must Do,” Report of the Brookings Institution, February 1, 2015.

Uri Friedman, “What If Russia Invaded the Baltics—And Donald Trump Was President?” *The Atlantic*, July 27, 2016.

Ted Galen Carpenter, “Is it Time for America to Quit NATO?” *The National Interest*, March 29, 2016.

Stephen M. Walt, “Stealing Elections is All in the Game,” *Foreign Policy*, January 10, 2017; and Marc Trachtenberg, “A Double Standard?” *Foreign Policy*, January 10, 2017.

### **May 3: The Future of Great Power Politics II—The Rise of China (61 pages)**

Does China’s rise necessarily represent a substantial threat to American national security? Will Beijing overtake Washington as the premier power in the international system in the near future? Or can the United States maintain its position at the top of the hierarchy and simultaneously avoid a confrontation with China? These questions are the subject of fierce debate among foreign policy experts, and the way one answers them has major policy implications for American grand strategy. They are especially relevant today, given the tension that has arisen since President Trump’s election over the issue of Taiwan.

Aaron Friedberg, “Hegemony with Chinese Characteristics,” *The National Interest* (July/August 2011), pp. 18-27.

Thomas J. Christensen, *The China Challenge: Shaping the Choices of a Rising Power* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2015), pp. 37-62.

Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, “The Once and Future Superpower: Why China Won’t Overtake the United States,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 95, No. 3 (2016), pp. 91-104.

David A. Graham, “So, Why Can’t You Call Taiwan?” *The Atlantic*, December 2, 2016.

“Taiwan Carries Out Drills Amid Rising Fears of Chinese Invasion,” *The Guardian*, January 18, 2017.

J. Michael Cole, "Don't Let China Swallow Taiwan," *The National Interest*, April 23, 2015.

Hugh White, "Would America Risk a Nuclear War with China over Taiwan?" *The National Interest*, May 5, 2015.

### **May 8: The Changing World Order and U.S. Grand Strategy (68 pages)**

American grand strategists will have to grapple with a set of major questions in the coming years. Is the United States in decline, or are its best days still ahead of it? Even if its power is beginning to wane, can it continue to shape the international system in ways that benefit its values and interests? Should the country pursue a more "restrained" foreign policy, one that involves it in fewer problems abroad? Given the scope of U.S. power and influence, the way these questions get answered will have critical implications around the world.

Barry R. Posen, "The Case for Restraint," *The American Interest*, Vol. 3, No. 1 (2007), pp. 7-17.

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 (2012-2013), pp. 7-51.

G. John Ikenberry, "The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism After America," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 3 (2011), pp. 56-68.

### **May 10: Foreign Policy under the Trump Administration**

Pundits are uncertain about what a Trump presidency means for U.S. foreign policy. Will the United States withdraw substantially from international affairs in pursuit of an "America first" strategy? What will happen to NATO? Will nuclear nonproliferation remain a core tenet of U.S. grand strategy? How will Trump approach Russia and China? Will the new president adhere to the Iran deal, alter the U.S. approach to the Arab-Israeli conflict, and downgrade climate change as a priority? How will he handle terrorism and threats that affect civil liberties? During our final class, we will openly debate these questions and try to understand how Trump's policies will shape the American position in the world.

Micah Zenko and Rebecca Friedman Lissner, "Trump Is Going to Regret Not Having a Grand Strategy," *Foreign Policy*, January 13, 2017.

Additional Readings TBD