

BSS 185/485

US. Foreign & Security

Policy

Professor Schuyler Foerster
Fulbright Distinguished Chair in Social Studies
Department of Political Science
Masaryk University

Monday 11:30 am – 1:00 pm
20 February – 15 May
[NOT 17 April ... 1 May ... 8 May]

Course Objectives

- ✓ **How historical traditions and the persistent debate between values and interests have informed and shaped U.S. foreign policy throughout American history.**
- ✓ **The evolution of U.S. foreign policy following World War II to the present, as the U.S. attempts to adapt to radically changing international political environments.**
- ✓ **The domestic context of U.S. foreign policy, including the roles played by the executive and legislative branches of government.**
- ✓ **Critical analysis of U.S. past and current global and regional policies through case studies.**

Course Requirements

- ✓ **Written essays (60%) – 4 x 15 points ~ 500 words**
- ✓ **Case study point papers (15%)**
 - ✓ 1-page *individual* point paper (bullet paper) – 10 points
 - ✓ 1-page *team* point paper (bullet paper) – 5 points
- ✓ **Case study presentation (10%) – 10 points – team**
- ✓ **Seminar preparation, engagement, participation (15%)**
 - ✓ **Prepare**
 - ✓ **Engage**
 - ✓ **Participate**

A – 90-100%

B – 80-89%

C – 70-79%

D – 60-69%

E – 50-59%

F – 0-49%

Main Textbooks

- ✓ **Hook**, Steven W., & **Spanier**, John. *American Foreign Policy Since World War II*, 20th edition (CQ Press, Sage Publications, 2016)
- ✓ **McCormick**, James M. (ed). *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence*, 6th edition (Rowman & Littlefield, Publishers, 2012)
- ✓ **Other readings distributed electronically through IS**

Course Overview I

- ✓ **20.2: The United States in a Changing World: What Role?**
- ✓ **27.2: Competing Visions for U.S. Foreign Policy**
 - ✓ **Essay #1 [in the syllabus] Due in Class**
- ✓ **3.6: Ambivalent America: U.S. Policy Before the Cold War**
- ✓ **13.3: Pax Americana: U.S. in the Cold War**
- ✓ **20.3: End of Innocence: Vietnam & *Realpolitik* of *Détente***
- ✓ **27.3: Cold War to Post-Cold War: Strategic Confusion**
 - ✓ **Essay #2 [in the syllabus] Due in Class**

Course Overview II

- ✓ **3.4: Making Policy: Constitution & Separation of Powers**
- ✓ **10.4: Making Policy: War Powers**
 - ✓ **Essay #3 [in the syllabus] Due in Class**
- ✓ **17.4: Domestic Factors in U.S. Foreign Policy**
[Holiday]
- ✓ **24.4: America at War: U.S. Policy in a Post-9.11 World**
 - ✓ **Essay #4 [in the syllabus] Due in Class**
- ✓ **1.5: Case Studies of 21st Century Conflicts [Holiday]**
- ✓ **8.5: Case Studies of 21st Century Conflicts [Holiday]**

Course Overview III

- ✓ In TEAMS: choose ONE of the following conflicts:
 - ✓ Afghanistan – Iraq – Libya – Syria – Ukraine
- ✓ **15.5 Lessons Learned: Prospects for American Leadership**
 - ✓ **Individual Point Paper Due in Class – 1 page “bullet” paper**
 - ✓ **Summary of conflict, America’s role**
 - ✓ **TEAM Point Paper Due in Class – 1 page “bullet” paper**
 - ✓ **Team assessment of “lessons learned”**
 - ✓ **TEAM Presentations on Conflicts [10 minutes each]**
 - ✓ **Discussion**

The United States in a Changing World: What Role?

Session I

20 February 2017

Global Trends 2035

- ✓ **Author – National Intelligence Council**
- ✓ **“Trends” are not “predictions”**
- ✓ **Theme – “Paradox of Progress”**
 - ✓ **“The achievements of the industrial and information ages are shaping a world that is both more dangerous and richer in opportunity than ever before”**
 - ✓ **Rising tensions within and between countries**
 - ✓ **States remain relevant: China & Russia emboldened**

The Paradox ... and Challenge

- ✓ **“The progress of past decades is historic—connecting people, empowering individuals, communities, and states, and lifting a billion people out of poverty....**
- ✓ **But it also spawned shocks like the Arab Spring, 2008 Global Financial Crisis, and populist, anti-establishment politics.”**
- ✓ **Fragile achievements ... deep shifts in global landscape ... uncertain future**

Choices ... [not predictions]

- ✓ **How will individuals, groups, and governments renegotiate their expectations of one another to create political order?**
- ✓ **To what extent will major state powers, as well as individuals and groups, craft new architectures of international cooperation and competition?**
- ✓ **To what extent will governments, groups, and individuals prepare now for multifaceted global issues like climate change and transformative technologies?**

Key Trends

- ✓ **The rich are aging, the poor are not**
- ✓ **The global economy is shifting**
- ✓ **Technology accelerates progress but causes discontinuities**
- ✓ **Ideas and identities drive a wave of exclusion**
- ✓ **Governing is getting harder**
- ✓ **Nature of conflict is changing**
- ✓ **Climate change, environment, health issues need focus**

Trends converging at unprecedented pace

Look-Ahead to 27.2

- ✓ Reading from *Foreign Affairs* by Richard Betts [pp. 69-80]
 - ✓ “*Conflict or Cooperation: Three Visions Revisited*” [2010]
 - ✓ Francis Fukuyama, *End of History & the Last Man* [1992]
 - ✓ Samuel Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations* [1996]
 - ✓ John Mearsheimer, *Tragedy of Great Power Politics* [2001]
- ✓ Essay #1 Due in Class [15 points; ~ 500 words]
 - ✓ Summarize the three visions offered by Fukuyama, Huntington, and Mearsheimer. Which do you think is most accurate today and why?

Competing Visions for U.S. Foreign Policy

Session II

27 February 2017

Pick up from last week ...

- ✓ **If not here last week ... name, program, nationality**
- ✓ **Not registered yet?**
- ✓ **Essays ...**
 - ✓ **Turn in hard copy**
 - ✓ **Feedback is more important than the grade**
 - ✓ **Next essay due 27 March**
- ✓ **Pick case study – Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya, Syria, Ukraine**
- ✓ **Questions from last week?**

“Three Visions Revisited”

- ✓ Francis Fukuyama
 - ✓ *The End of History & the Last Man* (1992)
- ✓ Samuel Huntington
 - ✓ *The Clash of Civilizations & the Remaking of World Order* (1996)
- ✓ John Mearsheimer
 - ✓ *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (2001)

Betts: “Each outlines a course toward peace and stability if statesmen make the right choices—but none offers any confidence that the wrong choices will be avoided.”

Francis Fukuyama

- ✓ **Optimistic visionary:**
 - ✓ **Global consensus on democracy and capitalism**
 - ✓ **Globalization of Western liberalism [define]**
 - ✓ **“Homogenization” of societies ~ technology, wealth**
- ✓ **“Liberal democracy remains the only coherent political aspiration that spans different regions and cultures across the globe.”**
- ✓ **History not “ended” – process – still conflicts ... trendline**

John Mearsheimer

- ✓ “Unregenerate realist”
 - ✓ Power – not ideas – matter
 - ✓ Competition for power & conflict are inevitable
 - ✓ Peace & stability through “balance of power”
- ✓ “There are no status quo powers ... save for the occasional hegemon that wants to maintain its dominating position.”
- ✓ “Status quo” vs “revisionist” powers?
- ✓ “Realist” vs “idealist” vs “neoconservative”?

Samuel Huntington

- ✓ **Cautionary**
 - ✓ Globalization is not the same as “westernization”
 - ✓ “Soft power is power only when it rests on a foundation of hard power.”
 - ✓ West vs. “the rest” [*also Niall Ferguson, Fareed Zakaria*]
- ✓ “Western belief in the **universality of Western culture** suffers from three problems: it is **false** ... it is **immoral** ... and it is **dangerous**.”

Implications for U.S. Policy

- ✓ Different “**lenses**” – some things in focus ... others not
 - ✓ Values – Power – Culture
 - ✓ What do we see? What do we not see?
- ✓ Different “**prescriptions**”
 - ✓ Promote values
 - ✓ Secure power and block competitors
 - ✓ Recognize limitations ... avoid hubris ... stay out
- ✓ Who decides? “Elite”? “Populist masses”? Who should?

Look-Ahead to 6.3

- ✓ “An Ambivalent America” – *‘values’ vs ‘interests’*
- ✓ U.S. Foreign Policy Before the Cold War
- ✓ Begin chronological overview of US foreign policy
 - ✓ Hook & Spanier, Chapters 1-2 (pp. 1-45) – *FSS Library*
 - ✓ Paul Carrese, “*American Power and the Legacy of Washington: Enduring Principles for Foreign and Defense Policy*” [*.pdf in IS*]
- ✓ Note: Essay #2 due on 27.3 [not 6.3]:
 - ✓ Summarize how the U.S. approach to its role in the world evolved Assess whether there is continuity or discontinuity

An Ambivalent America: U.S. Policy Before the Cold War

**Session III
6 March 2017**

Preliminaries

- ✓ **Need case study choice (Afghan, Iraq, Lib, Syr, Ukraine)**
- ✓ **Essays**
 - ✓ **First attempt ... all satisfactory (range 8-15)**
 - ✓ **Best essays:**
 - ✓ **Thesis paragraph & statement focused on question**
 - ✓ **Clear organization**
 - ✓ **Complete answering of MY questions**
 - ✓ **Logical analysis & evidence**
- ✓ **And a note on Huntington & ISIS ...**

Core & Enduring Debates

- ✓ **“Values” vs. “Interests”**
- ✓ **“Enlightened self-interest” vs. “Pragmatism”**
- ✓ **“American Primacy” – what & how**
- ✓ **“Isolationism” vs. “Engagement”**
- ✓ **“Regionalism” vs. “Globalism”**

America's Early Worldview

- ✓ **Constitutional foundations – a maritime power:**
 - ✓ “raise and support” an army (with state militias)
 - ✓ “provide and maintain” a navy
- ✓ **Carrese: Washington’s “five principles”**
 - ✓ Republic rooted in justice, guided by transcendent values
 - ✓ Subordination of military to civil authority
 - ✓ Balance liberty and security – free of “passions”
 - ✓ Importance of statesmanship – expertise & integrity
 - ✓ Pursuit of interests within rule of law, just war theory

Washington's Farewell Address

- ✓ *“It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel **example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence.**”*
- ✓ *“Nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others should be excluded and that in place of them just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave ... to its animosity or to its affection, **either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest.**”*

19th Century Priorities

- ✓ **Preserve the Union**
 - ✓ Domestic focus ... block foreign interference (UK)
- ✓ **Keep foreign powers out of the Hemisphere**
 - ✓ Monroe Doctrine, 1823
- ✓ **Expand and settle the continent – Manifest Destiny**
 - ✓ War with Mexico, 1848
- ✓ **Maintain freedom of the seas**
 - ✓ Barbary Pirates in Mediterranean
 - ✓ Open trade with Asia – inherit Spanish colonies by 1898

World Wars I & II

- ✓ **By 20th century, US was by any measure a “great power”**
 - ✓ **But a “status quo” power intent on preserving principles of non-interference and freedom of the seas**
- ✓ **World War I**
 - ✓ **German submarine warfare against US shipping**
 - ✓ **Wilson: “make the world safe for democracy” ... but 1917**
 - ✓ **Postwar League of Nations & Versailles blocked by Senate**
- ✓ **World War II**

American Exceptionalism?

- ✓ Republic founded deliberately on democratic principles
- ✓ From the beginning, sense of “being special”
- ✓ Uniqueness stems also from geopolitical realities
 - ✓ Self-sufficiency on a vast continent
 - ✓ No serious or sustained external security threats
 - ✓ Separated from others by vast oceans
 - ✓ Friendly (or non-threatening) neighbors
- ✓ 20th Century advent of “globalization” changed reality

Look-Ahead to 13.3

- ✓ “Pax Americana” – *providing “collective goods”*
- ✓ U.S. Foreign Policy During the Cold War
- ✓ Continue chronological overview of US foreign policy
 - ✓ Hook & Spanier, Chapter 3 (pp. 46-71) – *FSS Library*
 - ✓ George Kennan, “The Sources of Soviet Conduct” (1947) *[.pdf in IS]*
- ✓ Note: Essay #2 due on 27.3:
 - ✓ Summarize how the U.S. approach to its role in the world evolved Assess whether there is continuity or discontinuity

Pax Americana? U.S. Policy During the Cold War

Session IV
13 March 2017

Looking Back

- ✓ **U.S. entered World War I in April 1917**
 - ✓ **Troops didn't really arrive in Europe until spring 1918**
- ✓ **U.S. entered World War II in December 1941**
 - ✓ **D-Day/Normandy invasion not until June 1944**
- ✓ **Post World War II debate about U.S. role**
 - ✓ **Range from “pastoralization” (Morgenthau) to “war” (Patton)**
 - ✓ **UN Charter (1945) – Yes**
 - ✓ **Massive demobilization (3 million in Europe) until Korea**
 - ✓ **“Entice Russia to play a constructive role in world affairs”**

Backdrop to “containment”

- ✓ **West sought to build postwar liberal world order**
 - ✓ **Democracy, free markets, human rights, trade, rule of law**
- ✓ **1947-8 turning points ~ no reconciliation w/USSR**
 - ✓ **Truman Doctrine & Marshall Plan**
 - ✓ **Fall of Prague ... Berlin blockade**
- ✓ **Vandenberg Resolution in US Senate (1948)**
 - ✓ **Principle of “self-help and mutual aid”**
- ✓ **NATO Treaty (1949) – unprecedented U.S. commitment**

Feb 1946 “Long Telegram”

- ✓ **George Kennan – Chargé in Moscow – 8,000 word reply:**
 - ✓ *“Why did Moscow support the UN but not the International Monetary Fund or World Bank?”*
 - ✓ *“In summary, we have here a political force committed fanatically to the belief that with the U.S. there can be no permanent modus vivendi, and that it is desirable and necessary that the internal harmony of our society be disrupted, our traditional way of life be destroyed, the international authority of our state be broken, if Soviet power is to be secure.”*

What to do?

- ✓ *“We must have courage and self-confidence to cling to our own methods and conceptions of human society.”*
- ✓ *“The greatest danger that can befall us in coping with this problem of Soviet communism is that we shall allow ourselves to become like those with whom we are coping.”*
- ✓ **“X” Article was based on Long Telegram ... drafted as private paper to Secretary of Defense ... decision to “float” the concept in *Foreign Affairs* [hence: “X”]**

The “X” Article (1947)

- ✓ **Conclusions about Soviet behavior:**
 - ✓ **Innate antagonism between capitalism and socialism**
 - ✓ **Infallibility of the Kremlin ~ Communist Party discipline**
 - ✓ **No ideological compulsion for urgency**
 - ✓ **Soviet diplomacy both easier and more difficult to deal with**
 - ✓ **Intransigent ... and flexible**
- ✓ ***“[T]he main element of any U.S. policy toward the Soviet Union ... must be that of **long-term, patient but firm and vigilant containment** of Russian expansive tendencies.”***

Paradox of Power

- ✓ Late 1940's: U.S. 55% of global GDP ... most powerful military ... political leadership within “the West”
- ✓ Yet, there are limits to that power:

“We are great and strong; but we are not great enough or strong enough to conquer or to change or to hold in subjugation by ourselves all ... hostile or irresponsible forces. To attempt to do so would mean to call upon our own people for sacrifices which would in themselves completely alter our way of life and our political institutions, and would lose the real objectives of our policy in trying to defend them.” (Kennan,1948)

The NSC 68 Critique

- ✓ Paul Nitze ... January 1950 ... after “changes” of 1949
 - ✓ Soviet test of atomic bomb + PRC Revolution
 - ✓ *“Containment not enough ... “In a shrinking world, which now faces the threat of atomic warfare, it is not an adequate objective merely to seek to check the Kremlin design.”*
 - ✓ *“Kremlin is able to select means We have no such freedom of choice, least of all in the use of force. Resort to war is not only a last resort for a free society; it is also an act which cannot definitively end the fundamental conflict in the realm of ideas.”*

Nuclear Weapons & War

- ✓ **Bernard Brodie, The Absolute Weapon (1946):**
“Thus far the chief purpose of our military establishment has been to win wars. From now on its chief purpose must be to avert them. It can have almost no other purpose.”
- ✓ **Deterrence and the “Usability Paradox”**
 - ✓ *If weapons are too destructive to be used in war, how can their threat of use be credible in the prevention of war?*
 - ✓ *... Especially on behalf of allies (extended deterrence)*
- ✓ **But “defense” may not be either **desirable** or **affordable****

The Strategic “See-Saw”

- ✓ **Truman – NSC 68, Korean War, NATO buildup (Lisbon)**
- ✓ **Eisenhower / Dulles – The “New Look”**
 - ✓ **“Battlefield” nuclear weapons ... fewer conventional forces ... reduce defense budget ... avoid military-industrial complex**
 - ✓ **Credibility & instability? Berlin 1958**
- ✓ **Kennedy / Johnson / McNamara – Flexible Response**
 - ✓ **Rely less on nuclear weapons ... inflexible & destabilizing**
 - ✓ **Impact of Cuban Missile Crisis (1962) → arms control**
 - ✓ **Stability through Mutual Assured Destruction (MAD)**
 - ✓ **Flexibility to deal with “limited wars” around the world**

Genesis of Arms Control

- ✓ 1957 – Antarctica Treaty
 - * *Cuban Missile Crisis October 1962* *
- ✓ 1963 – Partial Test Ban Treaty
- ✓ 1963 – Hot Line Agreement
- ✓ 1965 – Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty negotiations
- ✓ 1967 – Johnson & Kosygin @ Glassboro NJ – SALT ?
- ✓ 1968 – NPT signed
- ✓ 1969 – Nixon ... (re)start SALT I ... out of Vietnam

“Essential Equivalence”

- ✓ **Parity in nuclear weapons ~ geopolitical stability?**
- ✓ **Avoidance of nuclear war, major war between major powers**
- ✓ **Complicates alliances (extended deterrence)**
- ✓ **Enables use of force in ways that do not threaten to escalate**
- ✓ **Does not “end” war ... but “channels” it to be “acceptable”**
- ✓ **Parallel = “balance of power”**

What if “balance of power” exists in “zero-sum” context?

The End of Innocence: Vietnam & the *Realpolitik* of *Détente*

Session V

20 March 2017

Look-Ahead to 20.3

- ✓ **End of Innocence: Vietnam & the *Realpolitik* of *Détente***
 - ✓ *Vietnam*: reasons? ... costs? ... implications?
 - ✓ *Détente*: successes? ... failures? ... false expectations?
- ✓ **Continue chronological overview of US foreign policy**
 - ✓ Hook & Spanier, Chapter 4-5 (pp. 72-125) – *FSS Library*
- ✓ **Note: Essay #2 due on 27.3:**
 - ✓ Summarize how the U.S. approach to its role in the world evolved ... Assess whether there is continuity or discontinuity

Vietnam – End of Innocence

- ✓ **“Third World” conflicts seen as part of global struggle against communism ~ SEA, Africa, Latin America**
- ✓ **“Domino Theory” – unitary globalization of containment**
- ✓ **Emphasis on ideological struggles created a “blindspot”**
 - ✓ **Underestimate nationalism as driving force**
 - ✓ **Underestimate political nature of the conflict**
 - ✓ **“Status quo” power in face of revolutionary movements**
 - ✓ **Exaggerate our ability to “compel” change in behavior**
 - ✓ **Never possible to define or visualize “victory”**

Slipping into the Quagmire

- ✓ **1946: Free Vietnam opposed by VietMinh**
- ✓ **1954: DienBienPhu & Geneva Accords (17th parallel)**
- ✓ **1961: JFK ... 16,500 “military advisors” to SVN**
- ✓ **1964: Gulf of Tonkin ~ Gulf of Tonkin Resolution**
 - ✓ **“all necessary means ... to prevent further aggression”**
- ✓ **1965: “Rolling Thunder” ... + 200,000 troops**
- ✓ **1968: Tet Offensive ... LBJ declines to run for reelection**
- ✓ **1969: Nixon elected ... troop levels over 500,000**

Stuck in the Quagmire

- ✓ **1970: Cambodian “incursion” – Kent State killings**
- ✓ **October 1972: Kissinger – “peace is at hand”**
- ✓ **December 1972: Bombing of Hanoi & Haiphong**
- ✓ **January 1973: End of war in Vietnam**
- ✓ **March 1973: End of war in Laos**
- ✓ **August 1973: End of war ~ Mansfield Resolution**
- ✓ **1974: Nixon resigns (Watergate scandal)**
- ✓ **1975: Saigon falls ... renamed “Ho Chi Minh City”**

Meanwhile ... Détente

- ✓ From the French = “**détendre**” ... to relax tension
 - ✓ Pragmatic policy ... public confusion – neither friend, enemy
- ✓ Build a “bridge” between East and West, but ...
 - ✓ For Germans ... facilitate unification
 - ✓ For French & many in Eastern Europe ... reduce superpowers
 - ✓ For US & USSR ... control events and respective alliances
 - ✓ Stability was key ... for both US & USSR
 - ✓ Strategic arms control ... **not disarmament**

Accomplishments of Détente

- ✓ Proceed on the basis of *shared common interests* [*~Vietnam?*]
- ✓ Strategic Arms Control
 - ✓ SALT I & ABM Treaty (1972)
 - ✓ Treaty on Prevention of Nuclear War (1973)
 - ✓ SALT II (1979) – never ratified
- ✓ Ostpolitik (1970-73)
 - ✓ German treaties with USSR ... Poland ... Czechoslovakia
 - ✓ Quadripartite Treaty on Berlin
 - ✓ Basic Treaty (Grundlagenvertrag) – FRG/GDR

The Middle East – immune?

- ✓ **Parallel to Cold War – Arab-Israeli conflicts**
 - ✓ 1947-49 – Israeli war of independence
 - ✓ 1956 – Suez Crisis
 - ✓ 1967 – “Six Day War” – occupation & UNSCR 242
 - ✓ 1973 – Yom Kippur War
- ✓ **Rule #1: Do not let this conflict escalate to US-Soviet war**
- ✓ **Rule #2: Re-read rule #1 !**
- ✓ **Irony ... détente ... arms control, Vietnam, 73 war**

The End of Détente

- ✓ *The end of shared interests ...*
- ✓ **Skepticism about arms control**
 - ✓ Soviet buildup of MIRVed ICBMs ~ first strike?
 - ✓ Soviet introduction of SS-20s to target Western Europe
 - ✓ Soviet continued conventional superiority in Europe
- ✓ **Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979)**
- ✓ **US perceived vulnerability and weakness**
 - ✓ Economic “stagflation”
 - ✓ Iranian revolution & hostage crisis (1979)

The 1980's "Turnaround"

- ✓ **From frigid Cold War to a rapid thaw ...**
 - ✓ **Reagan changed American self-perception**
 - ✓ **Soviet self-perception declining ... Gorbachev 1986+**
- ✓ **REAL reductions in arms control**
 - ✓ **INF**
 - ✓ **START**
 - ✓ **CFE**
- ✓ **Collapse of the Soviet Empire 1989-1991**

Look-Ahead to 27.3

- ✓ **Note: Essay #2 due on 27.3:**
 - ✓ **Summarize – using bullet points – how the U.S. approach to its role in the world evolved (a) from before the Cold War, to (b) during the Cold War, to (c) the period following the Cold War. Assess [prose] whether there is continuity or discontinuity in this evolution.**
- ✓ **From Cold War to Post-Cold War: Strategic Confusion**
 - ✓ **After 45 years of consensus on containment ... what now?**
 - ✓ **Interests vs. Values? Fukuyama – Huntington – Mearsheimer**

From Cold War to Post- Cold War: Strategic Confusion

Session VI

27 March 2017

Reconsidering Essays

- ✓ **Essay #3 due in class on 10 April:**
 - ✓ *Evaluate the concept of “separation of powers” in the U.S. Constitutional system as it applies to foreign and security policy.*
 - ✓ *What does the concept mean?*
 - ✓ *How well does it function? Benefits and disadvantages?*
- ✓ **Essay #4 due in class on 24 April:**
 - ✓ *Assess the debate [post 9.11] between Krauthammer & Layne ... has either been shown to be correct?*
 - ✓ *Summarize debate*
 - ✓ *Apply to current situation – draw heavily on “your” case study*

The Cold War Legacy

- ✓ **The bad news** – the Cold War was a frigid standoff
 - ✓ Kennan ... “final militarization” of the line through Europe
 - ✓ Berlin ... Cuba ... Budapest ... Prague ... Warsaw ... etc
 - ✓ Crises – escalatory threats and ultimatums – crushing freedom
 - ✓ NATO doctrine ~ dilemmas of **extended deterrence**
- ✓ **The good news** – Cold War stayed “cold” ... “thawed”
 - ✓ No major war between major powers
 - ✓ Reasonably good record of U.S.-Soviet crisis management

After 1991 ... “now what?”

- ✓ **NATO’s world had fundamentally changed:**
 - ✓ Reunified Germany in NATO (4+2 Agreement)
 - ✓ Warsaw Pact dissolved ... Soviet forces out of Europe
 - ✓ Soviet Union dissolved (December 1991)
 - ✓ US draws down NATO troop levels after Desert Storm
 - ✓ US pulls out almost all nuclear weapons from Europe
- ✓ **NATO’s chronic, insoluble strategic dilemma**
seemingly ended
 - ✓ No more dominant conventional threat on its borders
 - ✓ No more need to reassure Allies on US deterrent

Post-Cold War Priorities

- ✓ Consolidation of US domestic position
 - ✓ *“It’s the economy, stupid”* [which is why Bush lost in 1992]
 - ✓ 27% global GDP ... 5% population ... only 10% through trade
 - ✓ “Unipolar moment”? [cf. Krauthammer vs Layne]
- ✓ Enlargement of western liberal democratic “space”
 - ✓ Tony Lake (NSC): *“The successor to a doctrine of containment must be a strategy of enlargement ...of the world’s free community of market democracies.”* [1993]
 - ✓ Work with “newly independent states” ~ privatization
 - ✓ Partnership for Peace ... then NATO [and EU] enlargement

But there were challenges...

- ✓ **Iraq** ~ the residue from Desert Storm's 43 day war
- ✓ **Israel-Palestine** ~ extremism takes over
- ✓ **Somalia** ~ humanitarian missions gone bad
- ✓ **Haiti** ~ so near but yet so far
- ✓ **Rwanda** ~ what genocide?
- ✓ **Bosnia** ~ "we don't have a dog in this fight"
- ✓ **Kosovo** ~ "the indispensable nation"?
- ✓ *...and then came Putin ... rising oil prices ... assertive Russia ...*

Humanitarian Interventionism

- ✓ ***“In an increasingly interdependent world, Americans have a growing stake in how other countries govern or misgovern themselves.”***

(Deputy Secretary of State Strobe Talbott, *Foreign Affairs*, November 1996)

- ✓ ***“We can then say to the people of the world, whether you live in Africa, or Central Europe, or any other place, if somebody comes after innocent civilians and tries to kill them en masse because of their race, their ethnic background, or their religion, and it is within our power to stop it, we will stop it.”***

(President Clinton, speech in Macedonia, June 22, 1999)

Neoconservatism

“Today, America sits at the summit. Our military strength is the envy of every nation on earth It would be tragic indeed if we did not use this extraordinary historical moment to promote the ideals at the heart of our national enterprise and, by so doing, take the steps that will ensure stability and the steady growth of freedom throughout the world.”

(William J. Bennett, in Kagan & Kristol [eds], *Present Dangers*, 2000)

Realism

*“Some Americans, exulting in their country’s power, **urge the explicit affirmation of a benevolent American hegemony.** But such an aspiration would impose on the the U.S. a burden no society has ever managed successfully for an indefinite period of time ... would gradually **unite the world against the U.S.** and force it into positions that would eventually leave it **isolated and drained.**”*

*(Henry A. Kissinger, **Does America Need a Foreign Policy?**, 2000)*

Lessons Learned ... [yet]?

- ✓ **Successive post-Cold War US National Security Strategies**
 - ✓ Promote **security & stability** ... **democracy-and-free-markets**
- ✓ *Strategy is the calculated relationship between ends and means ... know your purpose, know your limits, understand & adapt ...*
- ✓ **Strategic disconnect in 1990's ... and still?**
 - ✓ **Military means** ... **political ends**
 - ✓ **Diplomacy, Information policy, Military force, and Economic investment (DIME)** are **not exclusive choices**

Taking Stock

- ✓ **Shift to focus on Making US foreign & security policy**
 - ✓ 3 & 10 April classes ... 17 April readings
- ✓ **Examine U.S. in a Post-9.11 world**
 - ✓ Another “tectonic shift”
 - ✓ Krauthammer vs Layne debate ~ compare to debate between Fukuyama, Huntington, & Mearsheimer
- ✓ **Prepare for Case Study presentations on 15 May**
 - ✓ Remember “**lessons learned**” in thinking about today’s issues

Look-Ahead to 3.4

- ✓ **Making U.S. Foreign & Security Policy**
 - ✓ **The U.S. Constitution & separation of powers**
- ✓ **Readings:**
 - ✓ *United States Constitution, Articles I & II [.pdf in IS]*
 - ✓ *Lindsay, “The Shifting Pendulum of Power” [McCormick, Chapter 15 ... in FSS Library]*
- ✓ **Note: Essay #3 due on 10.4:**
 - ✓ **Evaluate the concept of “separation of powers” in the U.S. Constitutional system as it applies to foreign and security policy.**

Case Study Selections

Afghanistan

1. Bonamy
2. Confavreux
3. Kling
4. Marsande
5. Massinon
6. Morrier
7. Nguyen
8. Rolland
9. Rougon
10. Soussi

Iraq

1. Aldin
2. Apaydin
3. Bouklis
4. Burda
5. Grabka
6. Keller-Draveny
7. Kozáková
8. Kralovec
9. Rothová
10. Špaček

Libya

1. Berkovich
2. Janičatová
3. Levíček
4. Přikryl
5. Pulchartová
6. Sojka
7. Stupková
8. Vinkler
9. Žilinčík

Syria

1. Blaha
2. Cecchi
3. Chihada
4. Hons
5. Krejčí
6. Kučera
7. Podrazil
8. Šídlová

Ukraine

1. Bahlei
2. Brezden
3. Burba
4. Chlustinová
5. Jacobczyk
6. Mezhenskaya
7. Radaviciute
8. Tomešová
9. Unger

Case Study Instructions

- ✓ Each TEAM researches its conflict *[divide it up]*:
 - ✓ **Causes** of the conflict – why did it happen?
 - ✓ **Role** of the U.S., other countries, international organizations
 - ✓ **Consequences** of the conflict – what happened ... what effect?
- ✓ Each **student**: Submit 1-page “bullet point” summary of research
- ✓ Each **TEAM**: Submit 1-page “bullet point” assessment of U.S. policy—goals, means, & results—with respect to the conflict

Making U.S. Foreign Policy: The Constitution & Separation of Powers

Session VII

3 April 2017

Looking Ahead

- ✓ 3.4 & 10.4 – Making U.S. Foreign & Security Policy
 - ✓ Essay #3 due on 10.4:
 - ✓ *Evaluate the concept of “separation of powers” in the U.S. Constitutional system as it applies to foreign and security policy.*
- ✓ 17.4 – no class
- ✓ 24.4 – U.S. in a Post-9.11 World
 - ✓ Essay #4 due on 24.4:
 - ✓ *Assess the debate between Krauthammer and Layne and whether either of them has been shown to be correct ~ apply this debate to your conflict*
- ✓ 1.5 & 8.5 – no class

“An Invitation to Struggle”

- ✓ Edwin Corwin (1955)
 - ✓ “overwhelming importance of Presidential initiative...”
 - ✓ “ever increasing dependence .. on Congressional cooperation and support
- ✓ “Invitation to struggle” among **competing ideas**, among **competing centers of power**, and among **competing responsibilities** in the exercise of governmental authority
- ✓ Executive vs. legislative prerogatives in tension
- ✓ Also ... limiting the power of government in general

The U.S. Constitution

Article I – Legislative Branch

- ✓ “All legislative powers **herein granted** shall be vested in the Congress of the United States ...
- ✓ House vs. Senate
 - ✓ **Composition** – district vs. 2-per-state
 - ✓ **Qualifications** – 25 vs. 30 years
 - ✓ **Term** – 2 years vs. 6 years
 - ✓ **Selection** – district election vs. state legislature (initially)
 - ✓ *[note counting rule for “freed persons” vs. “others”]*

Enumerated Legislative Powers

Article I, Section 8

- ✓ “To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas and offenses against the Law of Nations”
- ✓ “**To declare War**, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water”
- ✓ “**To raise and support Armies**, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years”
- ✓ “**To provide and maintain a Navy**”
- ✓ “To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces”
- ✓ “To provide for calling forth the Militia ...”

The “Elastic Clause”

Article I, Section 8, last paragraph

*“To make all Laws which shall be **necessary and proper** for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.”*

- ✓ **National Security Act 1947**
 - ✓ Department of Defense
 - ✓ Establishment of the Air Force
 - ✓ National Security Council
- ✓ **Goldwater-Nichols Act 1986**
 - ✓ Chairman, JCS; obligation of Combatant Commanders

Other Article I Provisions

- ✓ “The Privilege of the Writ of **Habeas Corpus** shall not be suspended, unless when in Cases of Rebellion or Invasion the public Safety may require it.”
- ✓ “**No Money shall be drawn** from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law....”
- ✓ “To Title of Nobility shall be granted by the United States; And no Person holding any Office of Profit or Trust under Them shall, without the Consent of the Congress, accept of any present, **Emolument, Office, or Title, of any kind whatever**, from any King, Prince, or foreign State.”

The U.S. Constitution

Article II – Executive Branch

- ✓ **“The executive Power shall be vested in a President....”**
 - ✓ Four year term ... later limited to two consecutive terms
- ✓ **“The President shall be **Commander in Chief** of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several states when called into the actual Service of the United States.”**
- ✓ **“... shall take Care that the Laws be faithfully executed...”**

Enumerated Executive Powers

Article II, Sections 2-3

- ✓ To grant Reprieves & Pardons for Offenses ... except impeachment
- ✓ To make Treaties (*provided 2/3 of Senators present concur*)
- ✓ To appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers & Consuls, Judges ..., and all other Officers [*with advice & consent of Senate*]
- ✓ Give to the Congress information on the State of the Union
- ✓ Receive Ambassadors and other public Ministers
- ✓ Commission all the Officers of the United States

Checks and Balances

Legislature vs. Executive

- ✓ **Civilian control over the military** [*George Washington*]
- ✓ **Senate advice & consent on nominations (civilian & military)**
- ✓ **All laws governing the military come from Congress**
- ✓ **“Power of the purse”**
- ✓ **Accountability – Committee hearings & mandated reports**
- ✓ **Impeachment & conviction re “treason, bribery, or other high Crimes and Misdemeanors”**
- ✓ ***Declaration of war ~ authorization to use military force***
[next week]

Checks on Government ~ Freedom

The Bill of Rights – 1st Amendment

- ✓ *“Congress shall make no law **respecting an establishment of religion**, or **prohibiting the free exercise thereof**; or abridging the freedom of **speech**, or of the **press**, or of the right of the people peaceably to **assemble**, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”*
- ✓ Immigration
- ✓ Press ... sourcing
- ✓ Protests

Checks on Government ~ Military

The Bill of Rights – 2nd & 3rd Amendments

- ✓ *“A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, **the right of the people to keep and bear Arms** shall not be infringed.”*
- ✓ *“No Soldier shall, in time of peace be **quartered in any house**, without the consent of the Owner, nor in time of war, but in a manner prescribed by law.”*
- ✓ **Gun laws ~ availability to terrorists**

Checks on Government ~ Privacy

The Bill of Rights – 4th Amendment

- ✓ ***“The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no Warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause ... and particularly describing the place to be searched and the persons or things to be seized.”***
- ✓ **Electronic eavesdropping, “warrantless” wiretapping**

Checks on Government ~ Due Process

The Bill of Rights – 5th Amendment

- ✓ *... nor shall any person ... be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law ...*
- ✓ **World War II internment of Japanese, including U.S. citizens**
- ✓ **Detainment of immigrants, suspects**
- ✓ **Targeted killing of “enemy combatants”**
- ✓ **And “catch-all” 9th Amendment:**
“The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.”

Key Points

- ✓ **Separation of powers ... checks and balances**
 - ✓ **3 branches of government**
 - ✓ Executive ... Legislative ... Judicial
 - ✓ **Role of the states**
 - ✓ Constrained in foreign policy ... role in domestic policy
 - ✓ **Citizens rights**
 - ✓ Bill of Rights
 - ✓ Protected by law ... and courts
 - ✓ Role of public opinion

Look-Ahead to 10.4

- ✓ **Making U.S. Foreign & Security Policy**
 - ✓ **War Powers – executive vs. legislative prerogatives**
- ✓ **Readings – from McCormick [in FSS library]:**
 - ✓ **Fisher, “Presidents Who Initiate Wars” [Chapter 10]**
 - ✓ **Jervis, “Why Intelligence & Policymakers Clash” [Chapter 15]**
- ✓ **Note: Essay #3 due IN CLASS on 10.4:**
 - ✓ **Evaluate the concept of “separation of powers” in the U.S. Constitutional system as it applies to foreign and security policy.**

Making U.S. Security Policy: War Powers

**Session VIII
10 April 2017**

U.S. Declarations of War

7 declarations – 5 wars – 11 countries

- ✓ 1812 - UK
- ✓ 1846 – Mexico
- ✓ 1898 – Spain
- ✓ 1917 – Germany & Austro-Hungarian Empire
- ✓ 1941 – Japan & Germany & Italy
- ✓ 1942 – Bulgaria & Hungary & Romania

Authorizations to Use Military Force

19th Century & Cold War

- ✓ 1798 – **France** – defend & protect shipping (attack & seize)
- ✓ 1802 – **Tripoli** – defend & protect shipping (attack & seize)
- ✓ 1815 – **Algeria** – defend & protect shipping (attack & seize)
- ✓ 1819-1823 – **Suppression of Piracy** – defend & protect shipping

- ✓ 1955 – **Formosa (Taiwan)** – secure and protect *[repealed 1974]*
- ✓ 1957 – **Middle East** – military assistance ... use force **if requested**
- ✓ 1964 – **Southeast Asia** – “all necessary measures to **repel** armed attack *[against U.S. forces]*... and to **prevent further**

Authorizations to Use Military Force

Iraq (1991) & Counter-Terrorism (2001)

- ✓ 1991– **Iraq** – authority to implement UNSC Resolution 678
 - ✓ End Iraqi occupation of Kuwait & relevant UNSC Resolutions
 - ✓ Bush requested congressional “support,” not “authorization”
- ✓ 2001 – response to 9.11 terrorist attacks
 - ✓ **Preamble:** *President **has authority under the Constitution to take action** to deter and prevent acts of international terrorism against the [U.S.]”*
 - ✓ **Authority:** *“to use all necessary and appropriate force against those **nations, organizations, or persons** [the President] determines planned, authorized, **committed**, or **aided** the terrorist attacks, or **harbored** such organizations or persons ...to **prevent any future acts** of international terrorism against the U.S. by such nations, organizations, or persons.”*

Authorizations to Use Military Force

Iraq (2002) and Syria (??)

- ✓ 2002 – **Iraq** – authority:
 - ✓ “To defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq; and
 - ✓ “Enforce **all relevant** UNSC resolutions regarding Iraq.”
 - ✓ Effective until Dec 2011 withdrawal from Iraq?? **Never repealed**
- ✓ 2015 – **Syria** – proposed new AUMF – **Congress never acted**
 - ✓ Authority to conduct military operations against ISIS
 - ✓ Re airstrikes: “**existing statutes provide me with authority...**”
 - ✓ **NOT** “long term ground combat operations” – look to local forces

Declaration of War vs. AUMG

International Law

- ✓ **War = distinctive relationship between states**
 - ✓ Declaration of war provides clarity ... war begins; war ends
 - ✓ Implications for commerce, neutrality, etc.
 - ✓ Conduct of war (*jus in bello*) – treatment of prisoners
- ✓ **AUMF does not create an international “state of war”**
 - ✓ No provisions for “neutrals,” non-combatant countries
 - ✓ Rules for combatants & prisoners still apply
- ✓ ***In effect, little differentiation today in international law***

Declaration of War vs. AUMG

Domestic U.S. Law

- ✓ **Declaration of war triggers substantial changes in U.S. law**
 - ✓ **Interdiction of trade**
 - ✓ **Order/seize manufacturing plants to produce armaments**
 - ✓ **Control transportation systems**
 - ✓ **Alien Enemy Act to deport nationals of Enemy State**
 - ✓ **Right to enhanced electronic surveillance**
 - ✓ **Extend enlistments in the military until end of the war**
 - ✓ **Put Coast Guard under the Navy; call up National Guard**
- ✓ ***AUMF does not do any of this automatically***

War Powers Resolution (1974)

- ✓ Enacted by Congress after Vietnam over presidential veto
- ✓ Specifies President's authority as Commander-in-Chief if:
 - ✓ Declaration of war
 - ✓ Specific statutory authorization
 - ✓ National emergency from attack on U.S. territory, armed forces
- ✓ Report within 48 hours if U.S. armed forces introduced "into hostilities or ... imminent involvement in hostilities ..."
 - ✓ Terminate after 60 days if no congressional authorization
 - ✓ 30 days extension if "unavoidable military necessity"
 - ✓ "Legislative veto" if 2/3 concurrent resolution to withdraw

Application of War Powers Act

- ✓ **No President has accepted its constitutionality ... but typically reported “consistent with the provisions of the WP Resolution”**
 - ✓ **No advance reporting ... report without reference to obligation**
 - ✓ VN Evac, Mayaquez, El Salvador, Honduras, Grenada, Panama
 - ✓ **Bush (Iraq, '91) ... requested congressional **support**, not **authority****
 - ✓ Enforcement of ceasefire in 1990's deemed extension of initial authority
 - ✓ **Bush/Clinton (Somalia '94-'95) ... no Congressional action**
 - ✓ **Clinton (Bosnia '94-'95; Kosovo '99) ... no Congressional action**
 - ✓ **Obama (Libya '11) ... military operations distinct from**

Syria 2013 & 2017

- ✓ **Syria 2013**
 - ✓ August 2012 “redline”
 - ✓ August 2013, Assad uses CW at Ghouta
 - ✓ Obama seeks congressional authorization – **no action**
 - ✓ “Authorization for the Use of Military Force against the Government of Syria to Respond to the Use of Chemical Weapons
 - ✓ September 13 – Syria accepts US-Russian deal to remove CW
- ✓ **Syria 2017**
 - ✓ *What is the authorization?*
 - ✓ *What is the broader purpose/strategy?*

Look-Ahead to 17.4 & 24.4

[no class 17.4]

pay attention to Syria, North Korea

- ✓ **Domestic Factors in U.S. Policy [McCormick, Ch. 3 & 7]**
 - ✓ *Mead, “The Tea Party, Populism & Domestic Culture”*
 - ✓ *Berinsky, “Events, Elites, & Public Support for Military Conflict”*
- ✓ **America at War: The U.S. in a Post-9.11 World**
 - ✓ *Krauthammer, “Unipolar Moment Revisited” [.pdf in IS]*
 - ✓ *Layne, “Unipolar Illusion Revisited” [.pdf in IS]*
- ✓ **Note: Essay #4 due IN CLASS on 24.4:**
 - ✓ *Assess the debate between Krauthammer and Layne and whether either of them has been shown to be*

America at War: The U.S. in a Post-9.11 World

**Session IX
24 April 2017**

Charles Krauthammer

The Unipolar Moment

- ✓ Three characteristics (from 1990 article)
 - ✓ Unipolarity – U.S. primacy... disparity of power
 - ✓ *“If today’s American primacy does not constitute unipolarity, then nothing will.”* [Brooks & Wohlfort, 2002]
 - ✓ 9.11 ~ U.S. vulnerability, but also resilience
 - ✓ 1990’s expansion of NATO, realignment w/RU, CH, IN
 - ✓ Resurgent American isolationism
 - ✓ Instead ... U.S. engagement globally *[reluctant?]*
 - ✓ Increased threat of war ... rogue states w/WMD
 - ✓ *Did we anticipate fracturing of societies, terrorism, other trends?*
- ✓ *“Unipolarity, managed benignly, is more likely to keep the peace.”*

Christopher Layne

The Unipolar Illusion

- ✓ **Presumption of American hegemony ... but enduring?**
 - ✓ **Is the U.S. insulated from challenge as 'benevolent' hegemon?**
 - ✓ *Other states DO see U.S. hegemony as threatening*
 - ✓ **Do other states seek to balance the U.S.?**
 - ✓ *Other states have incentives to balance, even if not directly threatened*
 - ✓ **How long is U.S. hegemony going to last?**
 - ✓ *Not indefinite – need 'off-shore' balancing strategy of self-restraint*
- ✓ **American hegemony an existential threat?**
 - ✓ *Ikenberry: "reluctant, open, and highly institutionalized ... liberal"*
 - ✓ *Multilateral institutions to reinforce legitimacy ~ shared*

A new balance of power?

- ✓ **Hegemony has its limits ~ does the hegemon recognize them?**
- ✓ **Counterbalancing strategies:**
 - ✓ **Traditional “hard balancing” with military force**
 - ✓ **Soft balancing ... economic pre-balancing ... “leash-slipping”**
- ✓ **Offshore balancing – Multilateral**
 - ✓ **Reassure **allies** of will to defend ... and to exercise restraint**
 - ✓ **Reassure **potential adversaries** that deterrence is not a threat**
- ✓ **Offshore balancing – Unilateral**

Grand Strategy Options

1. Pursue unipolarity as hegemonic power
 - ✓ Self-reliance with “coalitions of willing” ~ sustainability?
2. Reinforce legitimacy of hegemonic power
 - ✓ Engage international institutions [*Ikenberry*] ~ control?
 - ✓ Work through regional alliance structures ~ credibility?
 - ✓ Multilateral offshore balancing
3. Manage decline of hegemonic power
 - ✓ Self-restraint in transition from unipolarity ~ manageability?
 - ✓ Unilateral offshore balancing
4. Retreat into relative isolationism
 - ✓ Fortress America ~ illusory?

Look-Ahead to 15.5

[no class 1.5 & 8.5]

- ✓ **Case Studies of 21st Century Conflicts – Lessons Learned??**
- ✓ *Goldgeier, “NATO Expansion” [McCormick, 21]*
- ✓ *Western, “Sources of Humanitarian Intervention” [McCormick, 22]*
- ✓ *Foerster, “Ukraine Crisis & NATO Extended Deterrence” [.pdf in IS]*
- ✓ *McMaster, “Pipe Dream of an Easy War” [.pdf in IS]*
- ✓ *Walt, “The End of the American Era” [.pdf in IS]*
- ✓ *Goldberg, “The Obama Doctrine” [.pdf in IS]*
- ✓ *Foerster & Raymond, “Balanced Internationalism” [.pdf in IS]*

Final Essay

- ✓ **Select a conflict or potential conflict**
- ✓ **Briefly summarize [bullets] nature of conflict ... Issues? Significance?**
- ✓ **Briefly summarize [bullets] U.S. role in conflict. What has U.S. done ... why?**
- ✓ **Briefly assess whether U.S. strategy is/was effective and why/why not.**
- ✓ **Come prepared to discuss “lessons learned”**
 - ✓ *Implications for U.S. ... for your countries?*

- ✓ **Afghanistan**
- ✓ **Iraq**
- ✓ **Libya**
- ✓ **North Korea**
- ✓ **South China Sea**
- ✓ **Syria**
- ✓ **Ukraine**

Lessons Learned: Prospects for American Leadership

**Session X
15 May 2017**