

POLn4111 & POLb1142

**U.S. Politics &
America's Changing Global Role**

Professor Schuyler Foerster

Visiting Professor

Department of Political Science

Masaryk University

Spring 2021

Course Objectives

- ✓ **Evolution of America's global role** -- 19th, 20th, & 21st centuries
- ✓ How **America's global role has been shaped** by:
 - ✓ the changing structure of the international system
 - ✓ transformation of international relations due to globalization
 - ✓ changing nature of state power
 - ✓ Influence of American domestic politics on America's worldview
- ✓ **Critical analysis** of U.S. past and current global and regional policies through case studies that demonstrate these changes.
- ✓ **Implications** of these developments for the U.S. and the world.

Course Assessment

- ✓ **Weekly written essays (90%)**
 - ✓ Week 1 – 20 points – 500 words
 - ✓ Week 2 – 30 points – 750 words
 - ✓ Week 3 – 40 points – 1,000 words
- ✓ **Seminar – Prepare – Engage – Participate (10%)**
 - ✓ 9-10 points
 - ✓ 7-8 points
 - ✓ 5-6 points
 - ✓ 4-6 points
 - ✓ 0-4 points

A – 90-100%

B – 80-89%

C – 70-79%

D – 60-69%

E – 50-59%

F – 0-49%

Essays

- ✓ **Three weekly analytic essays ... 500-750-1,000 words**
 - ✓ **Too short to ramble on aimlessly**
 - ✓ **Too long simply to express an opinion**
 - ✓ **Thesis – roadmap – argument – conclusion**
 - ✓ **Your work ... document sources ... plagiarism unacceptable**
 - ✓ **Late essay submissions will be penalized**
- ✓ **Essay questions provided at beginning of each week**
- ✓ **Essays due (by email) by 6:00 pm each Friday**

Course Readings

- ✓ All required readings distributed electronically through IS.
- ✓ **Suggest** supplemental text on history of U.S. foreign policy
 - ✓ Hook & Spanier, *American Foreign Policy Since World War II*
- ✓ **Hints:**
 - ✓ Read to understand main ideas & argument
 - ✓ Compare arguments ... critically assess assumptions
 - ✓ You are not expected to memorize or regurgitate on test
 - ✓ You are expected to analyze arguments and apply ideas

Course Overview – Week 1

Evolution of U.S. Foreign Policy Through the 20th Century

- ✓ **1.3: Course Introduction**
- ✓ **2.3: Evolution of U.S. Foreign Policy: Founding Principles**
- ✓ **3.3: Evolution of U.S. Foreign Policy: Taking on a Global Role**
- ✓ **3.4: Evolution of U.S. Foreign Policy: Post-Cold War Strategic Confusion**
- ✓ **3.5: No Class – Essay #1 Due 6:00 pm CET**

Course Overview – Week 2

U.S. Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Period

- ✓ **8.3: Competing Prescriptions for American Foreign Policy**
- ✓ **9.3: A Changing World: Will it Cooperate?**
- ✓ **10.3: America After 9.11: The Bush Doctrine**
- ✓ **11.3: Beginning of Retrenchment: The Obama Doctrine**
- ✓ **12.3: No Class – Essay #2 Due 6:00 pm CET**

Course Overview – Week 3

Domestic Politics & U.S. Foreign Policy

- ✓ **15.3: Foundations of American Politics: Structure & Values**
- ✓ **16.3: American Foreign Policy & Domestic Politics**
- ✓ **17.3: From Trump to Biden: A New Normal?**
- ✓ **18.3: America's Global Role: Looking Forward**
- ✓ **19.3: No Class – Essay #1 Due 6:00 pm CET**

Essay – Week 1

Due by Friday, 5 March, 1800 CET

Context:

By the beginning of the 20th century, the United States had already become a global power. Soon it was (1) drawn into World War I, (2) retreated from the world stage after 1919, (3) returned to a dominant position in World War II that endured through the Cold War, and—in the second half of the 20th century—(4) assumed a leadership role in rebuilding the international system after World War II and again after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Question:

Some argue that the U.S. took on a global role with enthusiasm, driven by values. Others argue that the U.S. took on a global role with reluctance, bowing to compelling interests. Probably, both are correct. Discuss, with examples.

Look-Ahead

Tuesday, 2 March

Evolution of U.S. Foreign Policy: Founding Principles

- ✓ Examine the early foundations of U.S. foreign policy, from the end of the 18th century into the early 20th century

Assignment:

- ✓ Carrese, *American Power & the Legacy of Washington: Enduring Principles for Foreign and Defense Policy*
- ✓ George Washington, *Farewell Address*
- ✓ Woodrow Wilson, *Fourteen Points*

***Evolution of U.S. Foreign
Policy:
Founding Principles***

Tuesday, 2 March 2021

Core & Enduring Debates

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

America's Early Worldview

- ✓ **Constitutional foundations – a maritime power:**
 - ✓ “raise and support” an army (with state militias)
 - ✓ “provide and maintain” a navy
- ✓ ***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.**”*
- ✓ ***American Exceptionalism? ~ geopolitical realities***

19th Century Priorities

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

World War I

- ✓ **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**
- ✓ **Isolationism until 1917**
 - ✓ **German submarine warfare against US shipping**
 - ✓ **Lusitania sinking**
 - ✓ **Zimmerman Telegram**
 - ✓ **Wilson: “make the world safe for democracy” ... but 1917**
 - ✓ **100,000 US casualties in final 6 months of war**
- ✓ **Return to isolationism in 1919**
 - ✓ **League of Nations & Versailles blocked by Senate**

Look-Ahead

Wednesday, 3 March

Evolution of U.S. Foreign Policy: Taking on a Global Role

- ✓ Focus on America's entry into World War II and the early debates about America's role in a post-1945 "Cold War"

Assignment:

- ✓ Kennan, *Sources of Soviet Conduct*
- ✓ NSC 68 [*skim*]

***Evolution of U.S. Foreign
Policy:
Taking on a Global Role***

Wednesday, 3 March 2021

World War II

- ✓ **Resilient isolationism as war clouds gathered**
 - ✓ **“America First” tinged with anti-Semitism**
 - ✓ **FDR & Lend Lease – commitment to UK survival in 1940**
 - ✓ **Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor ... 1941, not 1939**
- ✓ **US emerged as Alliance leader**
 - ✓ **FDR-Churchill “special relationship”**
 - ✓ **Defeat Fascism ... and guard against Soviet Union**
 - ✓ **Division of Europe and Asia (Korea)**
 - ✓ **Occupation of Germany & Japan**
 - ✓ **1945 UN Charter**

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**

Kennan's "X" Article (1947)

"Sources of Soviet Conduct," *Foreign Affairs*

- ✓ **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 ... moral & 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.”*

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

Look-Ahead

Thursday, 4 March

Evolution of U.S. Foreign Policy: Post-Cold War Strategic Confusion

- ✓ Consider how the relative simplicity of a “bipolar” Cold War gave way to a more complex security environment

Assignment:

- ✓ Book Reviews, *War in a Time of Peace & A Problem from Hell*
- ✓ Foerster, *The American National Security Debate: Values vs Interests*

***Evolution of U.S. Foreign
Policy:
Post-Cold War Strategic
Confusion***

Thursday, 4 March 2021

Post-Cold War Priorities

- ✓ **Consolidate U.S. domestic position**
 - ✓ ***“It’s the economy, stupid”*** [which is why Bush 41 lost in 1992]
 - ✓ **27% global GDP ... 5% population ... only 10% through trade**
- ✓ **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**

The 1990's brought 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"?
- ✓ **Strategic Response ... or disconnect?**
 - ✓ **Promote democracy & free markets**
 - ✓ **Promote stability & security**

Essay – Week 1

Due by Friday, 5 March, 1800 CET

Context:

By the beginning of the 20th century, the United States had already become a global power. Soon it was (1) drawn into World War I, (2) retreated from the world stage after 1919, (3) returned to a dominant position in World War II that endured through the Cold War, and—in the second half of the 20th century—(4) assumed a leadership role in rebuilding the international system after World War II and again after the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Question:

Some argue that the U.S. took on a global role with enthusiasm, driven by values. Others argue that the U.S. took on a global role with reluctance, bowing to compelling interests. Probably, both are correct. Discuss, with examples.

Look-Ahead

Monday, 8 March

Competing Visions & Prescriptions for American Foreign Policy

- ✓ Set the first week's discussions in a broader framework, comparing the views of Francis Fukuyama, Samuel Huntington, and John Mearsheimer

Assignment:

- ✓ Betts, *Conflict or Cooperation: Three Visions Revisited*

Competing Visions & Prescriptions for American Foreign Policy

Monday, 8 March 2021

Course Overview – Week 2

U.S. Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War Period

- ✓ **8.3: Competing Prescriptions for American Foreign Policy**
- ✓ **9.3: A Changing World: Will it Cooperate?**
- ✓ **10.3: America After 9.11: The Bush Doctrine**
- ✓ **11.3: Beginning of Retrenchment: The Obama Doctrine**
- ✓ **12.3: No Class – Essay #2 Due 6:00 pm CET**

Essay – Week 2

Due by Friday, 12 March, 1800 CET

Context:

After the Cold War, the U.S. found itself in a much more complex world, with no consensus on either the nature of the new international order or what role the U.S. should play. The 9.11 attacks galvanized American public opinion to take a much more assertive and militarized role, but both the Bush and Obama Administrations discovered that the costs were high, success was elusive, and retrenchment was politically and strategically difficult.

Question:

How has the world changed since the end of the Cold War? What do global trends suggest about the nature of conflict over the next two decades? What are the implications of these trends for America's global role?

Beatts: *Three Visions Revisited*

- ✓ Fukuyama, *The End of History & the Last Man* (1992)
 - ✓ **Ideas matter**
- ✓ Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations* (1996)
 - ✓ **Culture matters**
- ✓ Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (2002)
 - ✓ **Power matters**

“None of the three visions won out as the new conventional wisdom

....

“Yet all three ideas remain beacons ... even practical policymakers who shun ivory-tower theories still tend to think roughly in terms of one of them, and no other visions have yet been offered that match their scope and depth. 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.”

Fukuyama (1992)

Ideas matter

- ✓ Post-Cold War “consensus” on democracy & capitalism
- ✓ *“Homogenization of all human societies”*
 - ✓ Convergence ~ technology & wealth [*means*]
 - ✓ Enabling achievement of human dignity [*end*]
- ✓ *“Liberal democracy remains the only coherent political aspiration that spans different regions and cultures across the globe.”*
- ✓ Rejected inevitability of war
- ✓ Recognized that conflicts remain ... progress not linear

Huntington (1996)

Culture matters

- ✓ Modernization ≠ Westernization
 - ✓ Conflict ... not convergence
 - ✓ Conflict may or may not mean war
- ✓ *“Forces of integration are real ... generating counterforces of cultural assertion.”*
- ✓ *“Western belief in the universality of Western culture suffers from three problems: it is **false** ... it is **immoral** ... and it is **dangerous**.”*
- ✓ West vs. “the rise of the rest”
- ✓ Focused on China ... but later fed post-9.11 notions of West vs. Islam

Mearsheimer (2002)

Power matters

- ✓ End of the Cold War was not the end of great power politics ... not the end of the “state”
- ✓ **Conflict ... competition for power ... the prospect of war – all remain an inevitable part of international relations**
 - ✓ Includes both military and economic power
 - ✓ Nuclear weapons changed the way the game is played but not “the game” itself.
- ✓ *“There are no status quo powers ... save for the occasional hegemon that wants to maintain its dominating position.” [e.g., the U.S.]*
- ✓ Emerging powers (China most of all) more than declining powers (e.g. Russia) ... ***Simply a matter of time***

Back to Betts ...

“The most significant similarity, and a dispiriting one, is that **all three authors were out of step with the attitudes that have dominated U.S. foreign policy** and made it **overreach** after the Cold War. ...

✓ “First, in different ways, all three saw beyond **Davos-style liberalism** and recognized that non-economic motives would remain powerful roiling forces. ...

✓ “Second, none supported **crusading neoconservatism**. ...

*“The problem is that **Davos-style liberalism and militant neoconservatism** have both been more influential than the three more profound and sober visions of Fukuyama, Huntington, and Mearsheimer.”*

✓ *Why is that? – we’ll examine that tomorrow ...*

Idealism vs. Realism

Idealism

- ✓ **What “ought to be”**
- ✓ **Means**
- ✓ **Values / Ideals**
- ✓ **Isolationism/Retrenchment?**
 - ✓ US dominance is arrogant; others should have power
- ✓ **Internationalism/Engagement?**
 - ✓ Democracy, free markets, human rights worth fighting for

Realism

- ✓ **What “is”**
- ✓ **Ends**
- ✓ **Interests / Power**
- ✓ **Isolationism/Retrenchment?**
 - ✓ US stretched too thin; others must share burden
- ✓ **Internationalism/Engagement?**
 - ✓ Dominance in US interests; need access to global markets, resources

Look-Ahead

Tuesday, 9 March

A Changing World: Will it Cooperate?

- ✓ Look at broad global trends and consider how those trends affect international politics and state power

Assignment:

- ✓ Atlantic Council, *Global Risks 2035: The Search for a New Normal*
 - ✓ *Executive Summary ... skim remainder*
- ✓ U.S. National Intelligence Council, *Global Trends: Paradox of Power*
 - ✓ *“The Future Summarized” ... “The Map of the Future” ... Trends Transforming the Global Landscape” ... skim remainder*

A Changing World: Will it Cooperate?

Tuesday, 9 March 2021

Two Global Trend Studies

- ✓ **Atlantic Council (2016)**
 - ✓ *Global Risks 2035: The Search for a New Normal*
- ✓ **National Intelligence Council (2017)**
 - ✓ *Global Trends: Paradox of Progress*
- ✓ *What is the difference between “trends” & “predictions”?*
- ✓ *Does the “authorship” matter?*

Global Trends – The Good News

Economics

1. Globalization & the information age have enabled an explosion of global wealth and a reduction in extreme poverty.
 - ✓ Since the 1970s ... **global population has risen about 50%** (from 5 billion to 7.5 billion) ... But the number of people in the world living in **extreme poverty has been reduced by 50%** (from almost 2 billion to under 1 billion).
 - ✓ Principal “**winners**” have been:
 - ✓ **Middle classes** in emerging economies, especially China, India
 - ✓ The **most affluent** in the developed “post-industrial” world (including **10-15%** of U.S. population, **5%** in W Europe, Japan)

Global Trends – The Bad News

Economics

1. Expansion of global wealth has been accompanied by **greater gaps between rich and poor**, both in actual wealth and opportunities to access wealth
 - ✓ Principal “losers” in this global wealth expansion:
 - ✓ The **very poor** in sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Middle East ... [*The Bottom Billion*, Collier, 2007]
 - ✓ Citizens of rich countries with stagnating incomes, much of the population of former communist countries ... **exacerbated by changing nature of work**, less access to quality **education** & retraining, dependence on **debt** during 2008 financial crisis
 - ✓ **Both create a crisis of expectations, in both rich & poor societies**

Global Trends – The Good News

Demographics

2. Overall global **population growth rate is declining** after almost 50% growth in last half-century ... 7.6 billion today ... 8.6 billion (2030) ...9.7 billion (2050) ... 11.2 billion (2100)
- ✓ Declining fertility rates
 - ✓ Improved maternal and post-natal health (after baby boom)
 - ✓ Increasing numbers of women seeking employment out of the home
 - ✓ Growing urbanization
 - ✓ Higher life expectancy worldwide

Global Trends – The Bad News

Demographics

2. Changing distribution of global demographics will add stress – in different ways – to all countries.
 - ✓ Bulk of population growth in future decades confined to the **poorest countries** least able to cope with that growth
 - ✓ Africa ... Over 50% of global growth by 2050 ... Nigeria 3rd most populous country after India & China
 - ✓ “**Youth bulges**” persist in Africa, South Asia, Arab world
 - ✓ In **wealthy countries** – **population aging, working-age populations decreasing** ... Increased burdens on support systems for aging
 - ✓ People in distress will **migrate** to places where they perceive opportunities for a better life for themselves and their children

Global Trends – The Good News

Technology

- 3. Rapid technological growth has enabled:**
- ✓ Explosive economic growth
 - ✓ Transformations in manufacturing and energy
 - ✓ Democratized access to information
 - ✓ New frontiers in healthcare and the fight against disease
 - ✓ People across boundaries and cultures to interact
 - ✓ An end to major conflict between major powers *[so far]*

Global Trends – The Bad News

Technology

3. Technology is a **value neutral tool** – for every benefit and advantage, there is also **vulnerability to its exploitation**:
- ✓ Socioeconomic dislocation as a result of the changing nature of work and increased automation
 - ✓ Proliferation – and fragmentation – of information and media place new burdens on the consumer to assess reliability, think critically
 - ✓ Advances in biotechnology raise difficult ethical & moral issues
 - ✓ Interconnectedness heightens localism & populism as people believe their identities are being threatened – **institutions lose legitimacy**
 - ✓ New weapons technologies ⁴⁷ [e.g. cyber, bio, etc] enable even

Global Trends – The Good News

Politics

4. End of the 20th century witnessed an unprecedented rise in democratic governance and pluralist political institutions
 - ✓ Defeat of Fascism and Soviet Communism as credible contending models of development and governance
 - ✓ Collapse of empires – imperial structures that had been the principal model of international relations for centuries
 - ✓ Even among autocratic regimes, the “vocabulary” and “edifices” of democratic governance were essential both at home and abroad
 - ✓ Projections of the “End of History” (Fukuyama) plus growth of information technologies foreshadowed **converging interests globally and increased cooperation to tackle shared**

Global Trends – The Bad News

Politics

4. Globalization brought winners & losers ... *the losers fought back!*
 - ✓ **Democratic governance is hard** ... it takes generations to develop the “civic virtues” that make pluralism work & **can't be imposed**
 - ✓ **Socioeconomic dislocation** reaped by globalization create fear, anxiety, and impatience with which governments can't cope
 - ✓ **More actors mean more voices** seeking to be heard – and frustrated by the result – but institutions are weak and exploitable
 - ✓ **Challenges to good governance increase beyond the capacity of most systems to cope ...**⁴⁹ so governments cultivate distractions

Implications – “Top Ten”

1. Industrial & information revolutions created transformative opportunities ... heightened expectations ... seeded dangers
2. The global economy – and the nature of work – are shifting (*again*)
3. Societies – both rich and poor – are unraveling at home
4. The rich are aging ... the poor aren't (*but they ARE urbanizing*)
5. Technology accelerates progress ... but creates disruptive discontinuities

Can you “feel” the paradox?

Implications – “Top Ten”

6. Ideas and identities can create **new communities** ... but they can also drive a wave of **exclusion & intolerance**
7. Governing is getting more **necessary** ... but **harder**
8. Conflict is more **lethal** – blurring civilian/military lines ... also more **likely** ... and less **manageable**
9. **Societies and institutions** are more vulnerable to **systemic risks** – interdependence of complex systems (environmental, financial, informational, etc)
10. 20th century **“liberal world order”** – and the institutions that sustained it – is breaking down

Look-Ahead

Wednesday, 10 March

America After 9.11: The Bush Doctrine

- ✓ Consider the impact of 9.11, the onset of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, and an expansionist, “neo-conservative” doctrine of U.S. foreign and security policy

Assignment:

- ✓ Gregg, *George W. Bush: Foreign Affairs*
- ✓ Leffler, *Think Again: Bush's Foreign Policy*

America After 9.11: The Bush Doctrine

Wednesday, 10 March 2021

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 **if 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*

*“Today, the United States enjoys a position of **unparalleled military strength and great economic and political influence**. ... We seek ... to create a **balance of power that favors human freedom**: conditions in which all nations and all societies can choose for themselves the rewards and challenges of political and economic liberty.*

U.S. National Security Strategy, September 17, 2002

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 Kissinger, **Does America Need a Foreign Policy?**, 2000)*

✓ Stephen Walt (2014) ... **“Realists are the new doves.”**

Injected into this debate ...

9.11

“September 11th did not so much change the world as show how the world had changed, while our means of managing it had not.”

-- David Gompert, RAND Corporation, November 2001

- ✓ No more “illusion of invulnerability”
- ✓ Instinct for unilateral U.S. solutions ~ **overreach?**
 - ✓ **Afghanistan 2001 ... Iraq 2003**
 - ✓ **UN to legitimize U.S. actions??**
- ✓ Strategic disconnect – military means / political ends?
 - ✓ **Democracy/free markets ... security/stability?**

Look-Ahead

Thursday, 11 March

The Beginning of Retrenchment: The Obama Doctrine

- ✓ Examine how the Obama Administration sought to uphold American “values,” while accommodating the constraints of American power abroad [*“values” vs. “interests”*]

Assignment:

- ✓ Beinert, *Obama’s Idealists: American Foreign Policy in Theory and Practice*
- ✓ Goldberg, *The Obama Doctrine*

***The Beginning of
Retrenchment:
The Obama Doctrine***

Thursday, 11 March 2021

Obama ... idealism + restraint

- ✓ *“America must always lead on the world stage. If we don’t, no one else will. The military ... is, and always will be, the backbone of that leadership.”*
- ✓ *“But U.S. military action cannot be the only – or even primary – component of our leadership in every instance. **Just because we have the best hammer does not mean that every problem is a nail.**”*
 - President Barack Obama, West Point commencement, 28 May 2014
- ✓ Focus on allies, engagement, support for multilateralism
 - ✓ But still *“the indispensable nation”*?
 - ✓ Afghanistan ... Iraq ... Libya ... Ukraine ... Syria

Essay – Week 2

Due by Friday, 12 March, 1800 CET

Context:

After the Cold War, the U.S. found itself in a much more complex world, with no consensus on either the nature of the new international order or what role the U.S. should play. The 9.11 attacks galvanized American public opinion to take a much more assertive and militarized role, but both the Bush and Obama Administrations discovered that (1) the costs were high, (2) success was elusive, and (3) retrenchment was politically and strategically difficult.

Question:

How has the world changed since the end of the Cold War? What do global trends suggest about the nature of conflict over the next two decades? What are the implications of these trends for America's global role?

Look-Ahead

Monday, 15 March

Foundations of American Politics: Structure & Values

- ✓ Examine the Constitutional structure of the U.S. Government and the core values that inform that structure

Assignment:

- ✓ *U.S. Constitution*, Articles 1-3, plus Amendments 1-10
- ✓ *The Federalist Papers*: Federalist #10
- ✓ *The Federalist Papers*: Federalist #51

***Foundations of American
Politics:
Structure & Values***

Monday, 15 March 2021

Course Overview – Week 3

Domestic Politics & U.S. Foreign Policy

- ✓ **15.3: Foundations of American Politics: Structure & Values**
- ✓ **16.3: American Foreign Policy & Domestic Politics**
- ✓ **17.3: From Trump to Biden: A New Normal?**
- ✓ **18.3: America's Global Role: Looking Forward**
- ✓ **19.3: No Class – Essay #1 Due 6:00 pm CET**

Essay – Week 3

Due by Friday, 19 March, 1800 CET

Context:

In recent decades, American “leadership” in the world has been questioned both at home and abroad. In the closing readings, Stephen Wertheim argues that *“America Shouldn’t Dominate the World,”* while Thomas Wright argues that *“America Shouldn’t Withdraw from the World.”* Perhaps there are more than these two options.

Question:

What do you think is the appropriate role for the United States in the world? Should the U.S. “lead,” and what does that leadership look like? Are there other states or institutions that should play a leadership role, either instead of the U.S. or in partnership with the U.S.? Why?

U.S. Constitution

- ✓ Followed 1776 Articles of Confederation
- ✓ 1787 Constitutional Convention
 - ✓ Compromises re slavery, large states vs small states, etc
 - ✓ Preamble: “We the People ...”
 - ✓ Signed September 1787 (Rhode Island missing)
 - ✓ *Federalist Papers* against “Anti-Federalists” in New York
 - ✓ Ratified by 9 states by June 1788, 11 by July
 - ✓ In operation September 1788
 - ✓ Washington inaugurated first president April 1789
 - ✓ North Carolina (November 1789) & Rhode Island (May 1790) ratified
- ✓ Bill of Rights added December 1791 – promised during ratification

U.S. Constitution – Art I

Legislative Branch

- 1. All legislative Powers herein granted ... vested in Congress ...**
 - ✓ Sections 2 & 3: selection (Senate later amended)
 - ✓ Sections 4-6: procedures ... separation of office
 - ✓ Section 7: law-making (revenue bills start in House) & veto
- 8. The “Powers herein granted” enumerated**
 - ✓ Define & punish piracies & felonies on high seas, Law of Nations
 - ✓ Declare war
 - ✓ Raise & support Armies ... no appropriation for longer than 2 years
 - ✓ Provide and maintain a Navy
 - ✓ “Make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for ...”

U.S. Constitution – Art II

Executive Branch

1. **“The executive Power shall be vested in a President ...”**
 - ✓ **Remainder is about qualifications, election – amended**
2. **Powers ...**
 - ✓ **Commander in Chief**
 - ✓ **Grant reprieves and pardons**
 - ✓ **Make treaties (with 2/3 advice and consent of Senate)**
 - ✓ **Make appointments (with advice and consent of Senate)**
3. **“Shall take care that the Laws be faithfully executed”**
4. **Impeachment & conviction**

U.S. Constitution – Art III

Judicial Branch

1. “The judicial Power ... vested in one supreme Court”
2. Judicial powers and jurisdiction outlined:
 - ✓ “... all cases, in Law and Equity, arising under this Constitution ...”
 - ✓ **Judicial review** implied
3. Treason

Bill of Rights

10 Amendments – ratified 15 Dec 1791

1. Freedom of religion, speech, press, assembly
2. Right to bear arms
3. No quartering of soldiers
4. Right against unreasonable search and seizures
5. No double jeopardy, no self-incrimination; due process
6. Right to speedy and public trial, confront witnesses, right to counsel
7. Trial by jury
8. Prohibition of excessive bail, cruel or unusual punishment
9. Enumeration of rights does not limit those “retained by the people”
10. “Powers not delegated to the US, nor prohibited to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people.”

Federalist Papers

Federalist #10

- ✓ “... to break and control the violence of **faction.**”
- ✓ **Faction = majority or minority united by passion/interest**
“adverse to the rights of other citizen, or to the ...
community.”
- ✓ **Remove its causes ... ?**
 - ✓ “Liberty is to faction what air is to fire.”
 - ✓ “Most common and durable source ... variable and unequal
distribution of property.”
- ✓ **Or ... Control its effects?**
 - ✓ **Republic rather than direct democracy**
 - ✓ **Size of country ... numerous competing factions & players**

Federalist Papers

Federalist #51

- ✓ **“Ambition must be made to counter ambition.”**
- ✓ **“But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature?”**
 - ✓ **“If men were angels, no government would be necessary.”**
 - ✓ **“If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.”**
 - ✓ **“In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men ... you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige itself to control itself.”**
- ✓ **Solution: accept factions ... create so much diversity of interests to “render an unjust combination of a majority ... improbable.”**

Understanding American Politics

- ✓ “Manure Theory of Politics”
- ✓ “Invitation to struggle” among **competing ideas**, among **competing centers of power**, and among **competing responsibilities** in the exercise of governmental authority
 - ✓ Edwin Corwin (1955)
- ✓ Separation of Powers
 - ✓ Executive – Legislative – Judicial
- ✓ Federalism
 - ✓ States vs Federal Government

Shared powers
Ambiguity
Contest

Checks and Balances

Legislature vs. Executive

- ✓ **Civilian control over the military** [*George Washington*]
- ✓ **Senate advice & consent on treaties (2/3 majority)**
- ✓ **Senate advice & consent on nominations (civilian & military)**
- ✓ **All laws governing the military come from Congress**
- ✓ **“Power of the purse”** [*Vietnam*]
- ✓ **Accountability – Committee hearings & mandated reports**
- ✓ **Impeachment & conviction**
- ✓ **War Powers**

War Powers

Executive-Legislative Tensions

- ✓ **Declarations of War (7)**
 - ✓ **1812 UK; 1848 Mexico; 1898 Spain; 1917 Germany, Austria/Hungary; 1941 Japan, Germany, Italy; 1942 Bulgaria, Hungary, Romania**
 - ✓ **Triggers substantial changes in U.S. law (trade, civil rights, property)**
- ✓ **Authorizations to Use Military Force (11)**
 - ✓ **1798 France; 1802 Tripoli; 1815 Algeria; 1819-23 Anti-Piracy; 1955 Formosa; 1957 Middle East; 1964 Southeast Asia; 1982 Lebanon; 1991 Iraq; 2001 Counterterrorism; 2002 Iraq**
 - ✓ **Does not create “state of war” in international law**
 - ✓ **2001 & 2002 AUMF’s still in force ... Congress abdicating its role?**

Authorizations to Use Military Force

Still in Force as of March 2021

- ✓ 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.”*
- ✓ 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.”

Look-Ahead

Tuesday, 16 March

American Foreign Policy & Domestic Politics

- ✓ Look at conflicting pressures in American politics and how they impacted foreign policy in the Trump Administration

Assignment:

- ✓ Hannah, *Worlds Apart: Foreign Policy & American Public Opinion*
- ✓ Mead, *The Jacksonian Revolt: American Populism and the Liberal World Order*
- ✓ Tarrance, *Public Opinion & U.S. Engagement with the World*

American Foreign Policy and Domestic Politics

Tuesday, 16 March 2021

Mead – Jacksonian Revolt?

- ✓ **“Hamiltonians” – U.S. core of world order**
 - ✓ **Rebuild economic & security architecture post-1945**
- ✓ **“Wilsonians” – U.S. model of democracy, rule of law**
 - ✓ **Spawned both “liberal internationalists” & “neoconservatives”**
- ✓ **“Jeffersonians” – retrenchment to secure U.S. interests**
 - ✓ **Avoid “entangling alliances”; non-intervention abroad**
- ✓ **“Jacksonians” – populist nationalism**
 - ✓ **Protect American “way of life”: values, culture, & identity against external and internal threats**

No Public Consensus

- ✓ **Eurasia Group Foundation polling (Hannah, February 2019)**
 - ✓ **Public: more restraint – Experts: greater engagement**
 - ✓ **Threats: external (great powers, terrorism) vs. internal (identity)**
 - ✓ **P. 18 ... Mead typology**
- ✓ **Gallup polling (Tarrance, April 2019)**
 - ✓ **Hawks – U.S. leadership ... more military ... unilateralist**
 - ✓ **Status Quo Moderates – U.S. leadership ... comfortable**
 - ✓ **Liberals ... U.S. leadership ... less military ... multilateralist**
 - ✓ **Populists ... reduce U.S. role ... more military ... unilateralist**
 - ✓ **Doves ... reduce U.S. role ... less military ... ambivalent**

Trump – “America First”

*“The American people elected me to make America great again. I promised that my Administration would put the safety, interests, and well-being of our citizens first ... That we would **revitalize the American economy, rebuild our military, defend our borders, protect our sovereignty, and advance our values.** ...*

*“My Administration’s National Security Strategy lays out a strategic vision for protecting the American people and preserving **our** way of life, promoting **our** prosperity, preserving peace through strength, and advancing **American** influence in the world. We will pursue this **beautiful vision—a world of strong, sovereign, and independent nations, each with its own cultures and dreams, thriving side-by-side in prosperity, freedom, and peace**—throughout the upcoming year.”*

-- President Donald Trump, U.S. National Security Strategy, December 2017

“Principled Realism”?

- ✓ Defining a world of **zero-sum competition** ... elevating “sovereignty” to a formula for peace and cooperation.
- ✓ Rejecting the presumed premise of globalization – that inclusion and multilateralism promote cooperation.
 - ✓ *But presuming that others’ culturally unique “prosperity, freedom and peace” always align with U.S. interests.*
- ✓ Emphasizing **hard power** ... De-emphasizing diplomacy
- ✓ Retreating from global commitments

Critiques

- ✓ **Walter Russell Mead**: *The challenge for international politics in the days ahead is therefore less to complete the task of liberal world order building along conventional lines than to find a way to **stop the liberal order's erosion and reground the global system on a more sustainable basis.***
- ✓ **Andrew Bacevich**: *As for the United States ... preeminence does not imply hegemony. Washington's calling should be not to impose a Pax Americana but to promote mutual coexistence. **Compared with perpetual peace and universal brotherhood, stability and the avoidance of cataclysmic war may seem like modest goals, but achieve that much, and future generations will be grateful.***

Look-Ahead

Wednesday, 17 March

From Trump to Biden: A New Normal?

- ✓ Consider the impact of the Trump Administration on America's role in the world and the challenges facing the new Biden Administration

Assignment:

- ✓ Biden, *Why America Must Lead Again: Rescuing U.S. Foreign Policy After Trump*
- ✓ Drezner, *This Time is Different: Why U.S. Foreign Policy Will Never Recover*
- ✓ White, *What's So Great About American World Leadership?*

From Trump to Biden: A New Normal?

Wednesday, 17 March 2021

Drezner – No Going Back

- ✓ **“Liberal internationalism” is a challenged thesis**
- ✓ **Populist nationalism at home & abroad more entrenched**
- ✓ **U.S. credibility and “moral suasion” damaged**
- ✓ **Allies hedging against U.S. retrenchment**
- ✓ **Domestic political polarization**
- ✓ **Distrust in traditional “foreign policy elite”**
- ✓ **Gutting of diplomatic corps**
- ✓ **Institutional checks on presidency disappearing**

White – So What?

- ✓ **Challenges to America’s “global vision”**
 - ✓ **Middle East**
 - ✓ **Asia (China)**
 - ✓ **Central and Eastern Europe**
- ✓ *America is not as overwhelmingly preponderant as most people thought it would be, but it remains an exceptionally powerful country ...”*
- ✓ *America can do little without partners—real partners, not followers.*
- ✓ *America ... will have no choice but to share power, which will mean constant compromise and accommodation of conflicting views and aims. The alternative to dealing with other major powers as equals is to confront them as rivals.*

2021 is not 2016

- ✓ **Russia & China (among others) more assertive**
- ✓ **Iran more conservative, moving beyond nuclear deal**
- ✓ **Executive-legislative stalemate**
- ✓ **U.S. domestic politics more polarized**
 - ✓ **Ideological divide among Democrats**
 - ✓ **Republican Party solidified under Trump**
- ✓ **... *and there's a pandemic & a severely weakened economy***
- ✓ **For the near term, domestic priorities**
 - ✓ **But cannot avoid international challenges ... new opportunities?**

Biden on Foreign Policy

- ✓ **Global challenges:**
 - ✓ Climate change, mass migration, technological disruption, infectious diseases
 - ✓ Rapid advance of authoritarianism, nationalism, illiberalism
 - ✓ Democracies polarized, difficulty in delivering
- ✓ **Priorities**
 - ✓ Renewing democracy at home ~ U.S. “can lead again”
 - ✓ Global Summit for Democracy ~ corruption, human rights
 - ✓ Foreign policy for middle class ~ R&D, infrastructure, innovation
 - ✓ Credibility in diplomacy ~ climate change, nonproliferation

Jake Sullivan – NSC Advisor

- ✓ Resilience in the international system
 - ✓ Passing of U.S. dominance ≠ loss of U.S. leadership
- ✓ International arrangements becoming more flexible
 - ✓ “Coalitions of the willing”
 - ✓ Informal multilateral agreements (not treaties) – JPCOA
 - ✓ Regional trade arrangements (TPP, TTIP)
- ✓ On China: “pro-democracy, not anti-China” ~ not containment
- ✓ On Middle East: “regional diplomacy” ~ presence without troops
- ✓ Domestic constraints on political power – U.S. and abroad

Key Themes

- ✓ **Internationalist ... balancing values & interests**
 - ✓ **“Multilateralism is back. Diplomacy is back.”**
- ✓ **“Restorationists”**
 - ✓ **U.S. leadership & standing ... alliances ... commitments**
 - ✓ **Support globalization & free trade**
 - ✓ **Explore bilateral cooperation with Russia, China**
- ✓ **“Reformists”**
 - ✓ **Emphasis on climate change, global health, info technology**
 - ✓ **More assertive vis-à-vis China, Russia, Iran**
 - ✓ **Focus on human rights ~ more “value” orientation**

Look-Ahead

Thursday, 18 March

America's Global Role: Looking Forward

- ✓ Examine the question of what role the U.S. should play in the world, and whether that is sustainable

Assignment:

- ✓ Wertheim, *The Price of Primacy: Why America Shouldn't Dominate the World*
- ✓ Wright, *The Folly of Retrenchment: Why America Can't Withdraw From the World*

America's Global Role: Looking Forward

Thursday, 18 March 2021

U.S. Shouldn't Dominate

Wertheim: "Price of Primacy"

- ✓ **U.S. pursuit of "primacy" has been counterproductive internationally and self-destructive domestically**
 - ✓ **Excessive reliance on military instrument**
 - ✓ **Erosion of U.S. economic stability, moral authority**
 - ✓ **Indifference to real global challenges**
 - ✓ **Climate change, economic development, human rights**
- ✓ **"America First" vs "Liberal World Order" = false choice**
 - ✓ **Define interests more narrowly and precisely**
 - ✓ **Not all "adversaries" are existential (e.g. Russia, China, Iran)**

America Can't Withdraw

Wright: "Folly of Retrenchment"

- ✓ **"Global Retrenchment" would be a grave mistake**
 - ✓ **Dissolving alliances destabilize European & Asian security**
 - ✓ **Removing U.S. security guarantees encourage nuclear proliferation**
- ✓ **Great power competition replaced "unipolar moment"**
 - ✓ **U.S. military power prevents military conflict w/Russia, China**
 - ✓ **Allies look to U.S. for security, regional stability**
 - ✓ **Retrenchment creates political vacuum, including Middle East**
- ✓ **U.S. engagement can be more selective (but how?)**
- ✓ **What role on global challenges (e.g., climate change)?**

Is there a Third Way?

- ✓ **Policy is not a binary choice among extremes**
 - ✓ **Realism vs idealism**
 - ✓ **Values vs interests**
 - ✓ **Primacy vs retrenchment**
- ✓ **Are there real alternatives?**
 - ✓ **How should the U.S. define/discriminate interests?**
 - ✓ **What does “U.S. leadership” look like?**
 - ✓ **A new global agenda: opportunity or pitfall?**
 - ✓ **Does American political polarization get in the way?**

Essay – Week 3

Due by Friday, 19 March, 1800 CET

Context:

In recent decades, American “leadership” in the world has been questioned both at home and abroad. In the closing readings, Stephen Wertheim argues that *“America Shouldn’t Dominate the World,”* while Thomas Wright argues that *“America Shouldn’t Withdraw from the World.”* Perhaps there are more than these two options.

Question:

What do you think is the appropriate role for the United States in the world? Should the U.S. “lead,” and what does that leadership look like? Are there other states or institutions that should play a leadership role, either instead of the U.S. or in partnership with the U.S.? Why?