

THE UNITED STATES IN WORLD POLITICS

PSC 4230 – Fall 2021

University of Colorado, Colorado Springs

Tuesday, 10:50am – 1:30pm

Columbine Hall 105

Professor: David Arceneaux

E-mail: garcenea@uccs.edu

Office: ACAD 230

Office Hours: Tuesday, 2:00pm – 3:00pm; Thursday, 9:00am – 10:00am

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This course explores historical and contemporary issues in U.S. foreign policy. In this class, students will learn a range of theoretical perspectives on the United States' role in world politics. Ultimately, this course provides students with the ability to substantively and critically engage with major foreign policy debates in the U.S. political discourse.

The course contains four major sections. First, the course covers the theoretical and historical foundations necessary for analyzing U.S. foreign policy. Second, the course discusses the sources of U.S. foreign policy, with a particular focus on the domestic drivers of foreign policy decision-making. Third, the course evaluates the range of tools available to U.S. policymakers when pursuing foreign policy goals, including military, economic, and political tools. Finally, the course concludes by analyzing a range of contemporary challenges to U.S. foreign policy, such as nuclear proliferation and challenges to the existing international order.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES

By the end of this course, students will be able to:

- Apply political science concepts, theories, and/or philosophies to explain current political issues and policy debates
- Communicate in written and oral form about politics in a way that demonstrates the ability to organize ideas, create and defend an argument, and use and cite sources properly
- Evaluate political research and evaluate the extent to which arguments are well-reasoned and/or empirically supported
- Improve writing skills through course assignments

COURSE AND UNIVERSITY POLICIES

GRADING POLICY

In the case of grading disputes, students must e-mail the professor a 500-word written rationale for the dispute within 48 hours of receiving the contested grade to request clarification and reevaluation. If the instructor deems the justification for re-grading as compelling, the instructor will then re-grade the disputed work and may assign a grade that is higher, lower, or the same as the original.

LATE ASSIGNMENT POLICY

Assignments that are turned in 1 minute to 24 hours late after their due date will be penalized by 1/3 of a letter grade. Assignments will be marked down a full letter grade for each additional 24-hour period they are late. Assignments will not be accepted more than 72 hours after the due date.

When submitting assignments electronically, it is the student's responsibility to ensure that the correct file is attached and submitted on time. Failing to attach a file or attaching the wrong file will result in a penalty as identified above. Students should also adopt the practice of saving files on multiple platforms, as corrupted files, crashed computers, etc. will not be exempted from the late assignment policy.

TECHNOLOGY POLICY

The use of cell phones during class is prohibited. Students using cell phones will be asked to leave class for the day and will receive a 0 for that day's attendance.

Students may use laptops and tablets for readings or note-taking. However, if a student is using their laptop for purposes not related to class (social media, e-mail, etc.), that student will be asked to leave class for the day and will receive a 0 for that day's attendance.

For those who are interested, recent research has demonstrated that taking notes by hand significantly improves the long-term retention and understanding of concepts. For summaries of such analyses, see:

<http://www.chronicle.com/article/The-Benefits-of-No-Tech-Note/228089/>

<http://www.vox.com/2014/6/4/5776804/note-taking-by-hand-versus-laptop>

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

The University of Colorado, Colorado Springs academic honor code holds students accountable for the integrity of the work they submit. The university policy governs several forms of academic dishonesty, including plagiarism, cheating, fabrication and falsification, multiple submission, misuse of academic materials, and complicity in academic dishonesty. The presumptive penalty for a first offense by an undergraduate student is course failure, accompanied by a transcript notation indicating that the failure resulted from a violation of the academic integrity policy. Students should be familiar with the policy and know that it is their responsibility to learn about course-specific expectations, as well as about university policy.

DISABILITY-RELATED ACCOMMODATIONS

If you are a student with a disability and believe you will need accommodations for this class, it is your responsibility to register with Disability Services and provide them with documentation of your disability. They will work with you to determine what accommodations are appropriate for your situation. To avoid any delay, you should contact Disability Services as soon as possible. Please note that accommodations are not retroactive and disability accommodations cannot be provided until a Faculty Accommodation Letter has been given to the professor. Please contact Disability Services for more information at Main Hall, room 105, 719-255-3354, or dservice@uccs.edu.

RELIGIOUS OBSERVANCE POLICY

The University of Colorado, Colorado Springs upholds the principle that a climate of respect for cultural and ideological diversity extends to the diversity of religious practices observed by members of our campus community. The religious observance policy protects the rights of students, faculty, and staff to observe religious holidays according to their tradition. Students are required to provide advance notification—preferably during the first week of classes—to the professor regarding necessary absences for religious or spiritual observances. Students are responsible for making up any work or exams according to an agreed-upon schedule between the student and professor.

COVID-19 POLICIES

Students in this class are expected to adhere to university policies regarding COVID-19 mitigation strategies. The University of Colorado, Colorado Springs currently requires face coverings inside all buildings and facilities. Students that refuse to wear a face covering will be dismissed from class without credit for attendance. A refusal to comply will result in additional disciplinary action in accordance with the student code of conduct. See the university's executive order for further details.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EVALUATION

GRADING

Grades are comprised of five components:

Participation	30%
Reading questions	10%
Response paper 1	15%
Response paper 2	15%
Policy memo	30%

PARTICIPATION (30%)

As an upper-division course, this class is reading intensive. The course is built around readings and discussion, rather than lecture. Accordingly, active participation is required to accomplish the objectives of the course. Students are expected to read all material before each class and arrive prepared to actively discuss the readings. All readings are available in PDF form on Canvas. Students will be graded for each class on the following scale:

3 points	Thoughtful engagement with readings and class discussion
2 points	Satisfactory participation and engagement
1 point	Present for class, but lack of preparation and engagement
0 points	Absent or dismissed from class

READING QUESTIONS (10%)

Before each class, students are required to submit two reading questions via Canvas. These questions should engage the readings directly and serve as useful points of discussion during class. These questions should engage the concepts, arguments, and/or evidence presented in the readings.

Reading questions are due via by 8:00am MT on the day of class. Because students' questions will be used to structure class discussion, reading questions will not be accepted after the beginning of class. Questions received after the submission deadline but before the beginning of class are subject to the late assignment policy. Questions will be graded on the following scale:

2 points	Clear and substantive engagement with readings
1 point	Generally relevant questions, but lack of direct engagement with readings
0 points	Failure to submit questions or no obvious engagement with readings

RESPONSE PAPERS (30%)

Each student will complete two short written assignments during the course that engage with the assigned readings. Each essay is worth 15% of the student's final grade. These papers should address several questions, including:

- (1) What are the main themes discussed in the readings?
- (2) What are the points of agreement and/or disagreement between the readings?
- (3) What empirical and/or theoretical problems can you observe in the readings?
- (4) Which readings are most persuasive, and why?
- (5) What do these readings offer for understanding a contemporary policy issue?

Response papers should be 1,000-1,200 words in length, produced in Microsoft Word, and written in Times New Roman, 12-point font with 1-inch margins. There is no required citation format; however, students should clearly source any quotations or references that appear in the paper with consistent citation format (MLA, Chicago, APA, etc.).

Students may write on any two topics of their choosing. Essays are due to the instructor via Canvas by 10:49am MT (before class begins) on the day that the topic is discussed in class. This serves to guarantee that only the student's original thoughts appear in the essay, rather than a summary of discussion in class. Once a topic has been covered in class, students may no longer write a response paper on that topic.

POLICY MEMO (30%)

Students will produce a policy memo that addresses an important contemporary policy issue in U.S. foreign policy. The memo should build upon insights from the course material during the semester to address several questions, including:

- (1) What is the nature of the challenge facing the United States?
- (2) What U.S. interests are at stake in this issue area?
- (3) What should be the major U.S. foreign policy goals, how should they be prioritized, and why?
- (4) What are some policy options available to U.S. policymakers, and what are the potential costs and benefits of each option?

Policy memos should be 2,000-3,000 words in length, produced in Microsoft Word, and written in Times New Roman, 12-point font with 1-inch margins. There is no required citation format; however, students should clearly source any quotations or references that appear in the paper with consistent citation format (MLA, Chicago, APA, etc.).

Students must discuss their proposed topic and plans for the assignment with the professor during office hours before the Thanksgiving break. This discussion will serve to guarantee that the student has chosen a relevant and viable project. The final memo is due via Canvas by 1:30pm MT on Tuesday, December 14.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Note: all readings will be posted as PDFs to Canvas at least one week before class. Be sure to read all material for the week before arriving to class.

I. FOUNDATIONS

WEEK 1 (AUGUST 24) – U.S. FOREIGN POLICY IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

1. Stephen M. Walt, “International Relations: One World, Many Theories,” *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 110 (Spring 1998), pp. 29-44.
2. Jack Snyder, “One World, Rival Theories,” *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 145 (November/December 2004), pp. 53-62.
3. Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy,” *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (Winter 1996/97), pp. 5-43, 51-53.

WEEK 2 (AUGUST 31) – CHANGE AND CONTINUITY IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Note: this section serves as a brief overview of the history of U.S. foreign policy, ranging from the colonial era to present. The list of readings is long, but most readings are very short. These readings largely draw upon primary source material to reflect key debates in the minds of policymakers over time. As you read through this week’s material, focus on identifying core themes of U.S. foreign policy and any patterns of change and/or continuity over time as the United States evolved from a colony to a global superpower.

1. John Winthrop, “A Model of Christian Charity” speech, 1630.
2. Thomas Paine, “Thoughts on the Present State of American Affairs,” 1776.
3. George Washington, “Presidential Farewell Address,” 1796.
4. John Quincy Adams, “Monsters to Destroy” speech, July 4, 1821.
5. James Monroe, “The Monroe Doctrine,” annual message to Congress, December 2, 1823.
6. James K. Polk, “Inaugural Address,” March 4, 1845.
7. Thomas Corwin, “Speech to United States Senate on the Mexican War,” February 11, 1847.
8. Theodore Roosevelt, “The Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine,” annual message to Congress, December 6, 1904.
9. Woodrow Wilson, “Fourteen Points” speech, January 8, 1918.
10. George Kennan, “The Sources of Soviet Conduct,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (July 1947), excerpts.
11. “NSC-68: United States Objectives and Programs for National Security,” April 7, 1950.
12. George F. Kennan, “A Fateful Error,” *New York Times*, February 5, 1997.

13. William J. Clinton, "Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on the Enlargement of NATO," February 24, 1997.
14. "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," September 2002.
15. Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World* (New York, N.Y.: Routledge), pp. 79-96.

WEEK 3 (SEPTEMBER 7) – NO CLASS: LABOR DAY HOLIDAY

II. SOURCES OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

WEEK 4 (SEPTEMBER 14) – RATIONALIST MODELS AND REALIST THEORIES OF FOREIGN POLICY

1. Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, *Causes of War* (Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 130-133.
2. Graham T. Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis," *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 63, No. 3 (September 1969), pp. 689-696.
3. Colin Elman, "Horses for Courses: Why Not Neorealist Theories of Foreign Policy?" *Security Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Autumn 1996), pp. 7-21.
4. Kenneth N. Waltz, "International Politics Is Not Foreign Policy," *Security Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 1 (Autumn 1996), pp. 54-57.
5. Steven E. Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, "Introduction: Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy," in Steven E. Lobell, Norrin M. Ripsman, and Jeffrey W. Taliaferro, eds., *Neoclassical Realism, the State, and Foreign Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), pp. 1-31.

WEEK 5 (SEPTEMBER 21) – PRESIDENTS AND CONGRESS

1. Alexander Hamilton, "Federalist 74: The Command of the Military and Naval Forces, and the Pardoning Power of the Executive," March 25, 1788.
2. Alexander Hamilton, "Federalist 75: The Treaty-Making Power of the Executive," March 26, 1788.
3. U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8; Article II, Section 2; Article III, Sections 1-3; Article VI.
4. Michael Nelson, "Person and Office: Presidents, the Presidency, and Foreign Policy," in James M. McCormick, ed., *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence*, 7th ed. (Lanham, M.D.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018), pp. 173-182.
5. James M. Lindsay, "Deference and Defiance: The Shifting Rhythms of Executive-Legislative Relations," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3 (September 2003), pp. 530-546.

6. William G. Howell and Jon C. Pevehouse, "When Congress Stops Wars: Partisan Politics and Presidential Power," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 86, No. 5 (September/October 2007), pp. 95-107.
7. U.S. Congress, "War Powers Resolution," November 7, 1973.

WEEK 6 (SEPTEMBER 28) – MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS

1. Jack S. Levy and William R. Thompson, *Causes of War* (Chichester, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), pp. 168-180.
2. Richard K. Betts, *Soldiers, Statesmen, and Cold War Crises* (Cambridge, M.A.: Harvard University Press, 1977), pp. 1-15.
3. Todd S. Sechser, "Are Soldiers Less War-Prone than Statesmen?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Vol. 48, No. 5 (October 2004), pp. 746-751, 770-771.
4. Scott D. Sagan, "SIOP-62: The Nuclear War Plan Briefing to President Kennedy," *International Security*, Vol. 12, No. 1 (Summer 1987), pp. 22-40.

WEEK 7 (OCTOBER 5) – PUBLIC OPINION AND THE MEDIA

1. Matthew A. Baum and Philip B. K. Potter, "The Relationships Between Mass Media, Public Opinion, and Foreign Policy: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis," *Annual Review of Political Science*, Vol. 11 (2008), pp. 39-59.
2. Brian J. Gaines, James H. Kuklinski, Paul J. Quirk, Buddy Peyton, and Jay Verkuilen, "Same Facts, Different Interpretations: Partisan Motivation and Opinion on Iraq," *Journal of Politics*, Vol. 69, No. 4 (2007), pp. 957-965, 969-974.
3. Christopher Gelpi, Peter D. Feaver, and Jason Reifler, "Success Matters: Casualty Sensitivity and the War in Iraq," *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 3 (Winter 2005/06), pp. 7-17, 40-45.

III. TOOLS OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

WEEK 8 (OCTOBER 12) – MILITARY FORCE

1. Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, [1832] 1976), pp. 75-89.
2. Robert J. Art, "To What Ends Military Power?" *International Security*, Vol. 4, No. 4 (Spring 1980), pp. 3-14.
3. Barry R. Posen, "Command of the Commons: The Military Foundations of U.S. Hegemony," *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (Summer 2003), pp. 5-10, 22-24, 42-46.
4. Kenneth M. Pollack, "Why Iraq Can't Be Deterred," *New York Times*, September 26, 2002.

5. John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "An Unnecessary War," *Foreign Policy*, Vol. 134 (January/February 2003), pp. 51-59.
6. Jeffrey Record, "Back to the Weinberger-Powell Doctrine?" *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Fall 2007), pp. 79-82, 90-94.
7. Patrick Porter, "The Weinberger Doctrine: A Celebration," *Infinity Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 3 (Summer 2013), pp. 8-11.

WEEK 9 (OCTOBER 19) – ECONOMIC LEVERS

1. Robert A. Pape, "Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work," *International Security*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (Fall 1997), pp. 90-106, 109-110.
2. Kimberly Ann Elliott, "The Sanctions Glass: Half Full or Completely Empty?" *International Security*, Vol. 23, No. 1 (Summer 1998), pp. 50-60.
3. Daniel W. Drezner, "The Hidden Hand of Economic Coercion," *International Organization*, Vol. 57, No. 3 (Summer 2003), pp. 643-656.
4. Michael R. Pompeo, "Trump Administration Pressure is Weakening Iran's Regime," *USA Today*, August 6, 2019.
5. Nicholas Miller, "Maximum Pressure is Failing: Fact-Checking Pompeo on Iran," *War on the Rocks*, August 15, 2019.
6. Elliott Abrams, "Did the 'Maximum Pressure' Campaign Against Iran Fail?" *Council on Foreign Relations*, blog post, July 12, 2021.
7. Daniel W. Drezner, "The United States of Sanctions: The Use and Abuse of Economic Coercion," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 100, No. 5 (September/October 2021).

WEEK 10 (OCTOBER 26) – COERCIVE DIPLOMACY

1. Thomas C. Schelling, *Arms and Influence* (New Haven, C.T.: Yale University Press, 1966), pp. 2-6, 99-105, 116-125.
2. Daryl G. Press, "The Credibility of Power: Assessing Threats during the 'Appeasement' Crises of the 1930s," *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 3 (Winter 2004/05), pp. 136-142, 168-169.
3. Alex Weisiger and Keren Yarhi-Milo, "Revisiting Reputation: How Past Actions Matter in International Politics," *International Organization*, Vol. 69, No. 2 (Spring 2015), pp. 473-482, 492-493.
4. Gideon Rachman, "Joe Biden's Credibility Has Been Shredded in Afghanistan," *Financial Times*, August 13, 2021.
5. Stephen M. Walt, "Afghanistan Hasn't Damaged U.S. Credibility," *Foreign Policy*, August 21, 2021.
6. Evan Montgomery, "Credibility Controversies: The Implications of Afghanistan for the Indo-Pacific," *War on the Rocks*, September 7, 2021.

WEEK 11 (NOVEMBER 2) – NO CLASS: PROF. ARCENEUX AT CONFERENCE

IV. SPECIAL TOPICS IN U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

WEEK 12 (NOVEMBER 9) – NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION AND COUNTERPROLIFERATION

1. Francis J. Gavin, “Strategies of Inhibition: U.S. Grand Strategy, the Nuclear Revolution, and Nonproliferation,” *International Security*, Vol. 40, No. 1 (Summer 2015), pp. 9-12, 25-34, 41-46.
2. Sarah E. Kreps and Matthew Fuhrmann, “Attacking the Atom: Does Bombing Nuclear Facilities Affect Proliferation?” *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 2 (April 2011), pp. 161-184.
3. Matthew Kroenig, “Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike Is the Least Bad Option,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 1 (January/February 2012), pp. 76-86.
4. Colin H. Kahl, “Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91, No. 2 (March/April 2012), pp. 166-173.

WEEK 13 (NOVEMBER 16) – COUNTERINSURGENCY AND TERRORISM

1. David Kilcullen, *Counterinsurgency* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 1-13.
2. Sarah Sewall, “A Radical Field Manual,” in Department of the Army, *FM 3-24: Counterinsurgency Field Manual* (Chicago, I.L.: University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. xl-xliii.
3. Gian P. Gentile, “A Strategy of Tactics: Population-Centric COIN and the Army,” *Parameters*, Vol. 39 (Autumn 2009), pp. 5-16.
4. Joe Biden, “Remarks by President Biden on the Drawdown of U.S. Forces in Afghanistan,” transcript of speech delivered at White House, July 8, 2021.
5. Michael Hirsh, “U.S. Military Concedes It’s Unready to Fight Terrorism From ‘Over the Horizon’,” *Foreign Policy*, September 30, 2021.
6. Robert Malley and Jon Finan, “The Long Shadow of 9/11: How Counterterrorism Warps U.S. Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 97, No. 4 (July/August 2018), pp. 58-69.

WEEK 14 (NOVEMBER 23) – NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING HOLIDAY

WEEK 15 (NOVEMBER 30) – ALLIANCES AND COMMITMENTS

1. Stephen M. Walt, “Alliance Formation and the Balance of World Power,” *International Security*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (Spring 1985), pp. 3-18.

2. Glenn H. Snyder, "The Security Dilemma in Alliance Politics," *World Politics*, Vol. 36, No. 4 (July 1984), pp. 461-471, 491-495.
3. Barry R. Posen, "What's the U.S. Role in NATO?" *New York Times*, March 11, 2019.
4. Seamus Daniels and Kathleen Hicks, "Redefining NATO Security Investment: Moving Beyond 2 Percent," *War on the Rocks*, July 11, 2018.
5. James Goldgeier and Garrett Martin, "NATO's Never-Ending Struggle for Relevance," *War on the Rocks*, September 3, 2020.

WEEK 16 (DECEMBER 7) – THE FUTURE OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

1. Barry R. Posen, "Pull Back: The Case for a Less Activist Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92, No. 1 (January/February 2013), pp. 116-128.
2. Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, "Lean Forward: In Defense of American Engagement," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92, No. 1 (January/February 2013), pp. 130-142.
3. Joseph R. Biden, Jr., *Interim National Security Strategic Guidance*, March 2021.