

Problems of American Foreign Policy (Online)
Political Science 359

Professor: Steven B. Redd
Office: NWQ B 5414
Office Hours: TR 11:00-12:00 noon
(and by appointment)
Phone: 414-229-4741
Email: sredd@uwm.edu

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Spring 2012
Prerequisite: Junior Standing

TA: Hayam Kim
Office: NWQ B 5578
Office Hours: M 1:00-3:00 PM
Office Phone: 414-229-5331
Email: hayamkim@uwm.edu

COURSE DESCRIPTION: With the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Soviet threat, there has been an ongoing debate concerning the future direction and priorities of U.S. foreign and national security policy. The more recent “War on Terrorism” has further complicated the debate about U.S. foreign and national security policy. This course will join and examine this debate, focusing on national interests, national power, and the global security environment from the perspective of the United States. We will also address domestic actors in the foreign and national security policymaking process. At the end of the course, students will have an understanding of U.S. foreign and national security interests and the policy-making process, and be able to determine and analyze threats to those interests and propose policy options for handling those threats.

REQUIRED TEXTS:

Sarkesian, Sam C., John Allen Williams, and Stephen J. Cimbala. 2008. *U.S. National Security: Policymakers, Processes, and Politics*. 4th ed. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner. [hereafter referred to as Sarkesian]

Carter, Ralph G., ed. 2011. *Contemporary Cases in U.S. Foreign Policy: From Terrorism to Trade*. 4th ed. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Rochester, J. Martin. 2008. *U.S. Foreign Policy in the 21st Century: Gulliver's Travails*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

There will also be reserve readings available through UWM electronic reserve.

All three texts are available in the university bookstore. You are expected to keep up with the readings. Getting an A or B in this course is highly contingent on reading the assigned chapters and keeping up with what's going on in and out of class. Along these lines, I recommend reading a national newspaper, watching some form of national news on TV, or accessing national news

via the internet or radio. We will be discussing current issues as they relate to U.S. foreign and national security policy throughout the semester and it is in your best interest to keep up with late-breaking news.

FLOW OF THE CLASS: For our purposes this semester, a week will start on Monday at 12:00 AM and end on Sunday at 11:59 PM. The syllabus denotes the reading assignments for each week. There are no exams in this course, and thus, no lecture notes. We will approach this course from the standpoint of a seminar, wherein there will be plenty of reading, discussion and writing.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS: Your grade will be based on a research project, four group projects, and discussion question responses. The calculation of your grade will be determined as follows:

RESEARCH PROJECT: 40%
GROUP PROJECTS: 40% (2 @ 20% each)
DISCUSSION QUESTIONS: 20%

94%-100% = A	90%-93% = A-	
87%-89% = B+	84%-86% = B	80%-83% = B-
77%-79% = C+	74%-76% = C	70%-73% = C-
67%-69% = D+	64%-66% = D	60%-63% = D-
0%-59% = F		

RESEARCH PROJECT: This assignment is based on the skills and knowledge you gain from the four group exercises, as well as from the reading assignments and discussions. In other words, you should view this project as a combination of “term paper” and “final exam.” The project will take the form of a policy analysis paper, i.e., a briefing document, memorandum, or report prepared for presentation to a policy maker (e.g., the president). It will address all possible concerns that a policy maker may have: e.g., diplomatic, military, economic, and political. In general, the paper should be 8-10 pages of text, and should include a bibliography as well as in-text citations (typed, numbered, double-spaced, 12 pt. font, 1” margins). Any paper that does not contain in-text citations, or does so haphazardly, will receive a failing grade. Please refer to a style manual (e.g., Turabian or APSA) for instructions on how to cite both in text as well as in a bibliography. All students are required to follow the format as outlined below. *No exceptions!*

A.) *Define the issue.* State and define the issue as it pertains to U.S. foreign and national security policy. Ensure that the issue is specific and narrow in focus. Do not choose an issue that is overly broad or general.

B.) *Analyze the issue.* Analyze how this particular issue affects U.S. national security. How does the issue affect U.S. interests? What sort of interests are they, in terms of relative importance to the United States? Does this issue pose a threat to U.S. interests? If so, what type of threat is it, how serious is the threat, and what are the consequences of this threat? Be sure to include a thorough discussion of how this issue relates to the “national interest.”

C.) *Develop courses of action.* Develop distinct, viable, and realistic courses of action to address this issue. As a general rule, there should be at least three and no more than five courses of action. While doing nothing may, in fact, be a realistic course of action, do not use this simply to fill out your list.

D.) *Analyze courses of action.* Analyze each course of action, paying particular attention to the diplomatic, military, economic, and political dimensions. Consider the specific advantages and disadvantages posed by each. What are the benefits, limitations, resource requirements, and constraints associated with each course of action? Each proposed course of action should be analyzed independently of all other courses of action.

E.) *Recommend a course of action.* Based upon your analysis, recommend a specific course of action that should be implemented.

F.) *Justify recommendation.* Justify your recommendation as to why your proposed course of action should be implemented as part of U.S. foreign and national security policy. Do not simply restate your analysis of this course of action and the relative advantages and disadvantages. Instead, state and discuss how this specific course of action furthers U.S. goals and objectives, both with respect to the particular issue being studied as well as in general terms (i.e., overall U.S. foreign and national security policy).

G.) *Conclusions.* What are your conclusions about this issue, your recommended course of action, and U.S. foreign and national security policy?

In order to help you succeed in conducting and writing this research project, I am breaking the project down into smaller assignments. The first assignment will consist of a one-page proposal. This proposal should clearly explain the policy issue and its importance. It should also contain a clearly explicated research question/topic. **You should consult with me or my TA about possible research topics the first two weeks of class in order to ensure that you are on the right track.** The second assignment is an annotated bibliography containing at least five scholarly sources. By scholarly sources I mean peer-reviewed journal articles and university press or mainline press books and book chapters. If you have questions about your sources, please ask. Ideally, each annotation will contain two paragraphs: the first will contain a summary of the book or journal article, while the second will describe/justify why the source is important for your research. Thus, each annotation should describe the content of the piece (including its major themes and findings), and should especially highlight the relevance to the student's research topic. The third assignment will be a first/rough draft of your research project. This first/rough draft should not be a finished project but neither should it merely be a few hastily thrown together pages. The more thorough your first/rough draft, the greater the likelihood that you will be able to write a better final research project. The fourth and final assignment is the research paper itself. The breakdown of grading and due dates for the research project is as follows:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Counts</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
Proposal:	3%	2/12
Annotated Bibliography:	7%	3/11
First Draft:	10%	4/8
Final Research Project:	20%	5/6

All assignments, given their form and purpose, will be graded not only for substantive content, rational thought-process, and logical argument, but also for format, style and *professionalism* of presentation. In other words, spelling, grammar, clarity, the ease with which the paper can be read and understood, the proper use of figures, charts, graphs, tables, etc., will also be of paramount importance. Therefore, I highly recommend the use of spell checks on word processors as a first step and some type of style manual for help with grammar, style, and

other questions dealing with the use of English in written form. **No late assignments will be accepted.** If you have any questions at all please feel free to ask me or my TA.

GROUP PROJECTS: The class will be divided roughly into groups of 3-4 students, each tasked with defining and analyzing a particular national security policy issue or crisis from a diplomatic, military, economic, or political point of view. The details of the issue or crisis will be provided to the class 1-2 weeks in advance of the assignment week. The group will (1) provide me with a brief written statement (about 3 pages, typed, double-spaced, 12 pt. font, 1" margins, with any and all necessary citations, footnotes, and references) defining and analyzing the issue/crisis (use parts A – G from the section above on the format for the research project to guide your work); (2) prepare a Powerpoint presentation of the statement to be uploaded to the D2L site. This Powerpoint presentation should be at least 12-15 slides long, include a title page (be sure to include the names of all group members and which perspective your group is analyzing the crisis from, i.e., political, economic, diplomatic, or military) with an introduction and conclusion; and (3) be prepared to engage the instructor and the rest of the class in a discussion and debate on the best course(s) of action for handling that issue/crisis in the context of preserving or enhancing the interests of your particular (diplomatic, military, economic, and/or political) point of view. The entire exercise will be handled as though it were a formal briefing session for an important policy maker, i.e., the president. Therefore, the more detailed, specific, and professional you are with both your written and Powerpoint presentations, the better you will do on your grade. Free riding on the work of others in your group is a very bad idea and I strongly urge you not to try it. Conversely, please don't be one of those kinds of people who try to control everything and dictate how others in the group will participate. Be kind, courteous, and responsive to, and respectful of, everyone's ideas and opinions and then work together to produce quality work. I reserve the right to direct specific questions to individual members of a group, and I expect each member of each group to be well-versed in all of the group's material, and to be a full participant in presenting and defending the group's positions on the issue being discussed.

The paper and the Powerpoint presentation should be uploaded to the D2L site by Tuesday at 11:59 pm of each week in which there is a group project. That will then give everyone the opportunity during the rest of the week to then read the four papers and view the four Powerpoint presentations and begin commenting on and discussing the policy recommendations of each group: political, economic, diplomatic and military. More specifically, I and my TA will pose questions to each group as a way to get discussion going. Everyone is welcome, and in fact strongly encouraged, to join the discussion and pose questions, responses, and well thought out opinions concerning each of the crises. **No late assignments will be accepted.**

DISCUSSION FORUM: I will post a discussion question pertaining to the reading for weeks 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15 (they will be posted at the beginning of each week and you will then have the rest of the week to do the reading and then post your response to the question). You are to respond to each question in the "Discussion Questions Forum" on the D2L site with a well thought out posting of approximately 2-3 paragraphs (200-400 words). Your answers should include specific information and arguments related to these questions as contained in the readings for that week. Also, over the course of the semester, I would like you to respond to the posting of other students. Doing so will provide the basis for interesting and productive discussions of these important issues and problems in American foreign policy. Your purpose is not only to criticize and critique, but also to add something to the online discussion. From time

to time, I and my TA may also post our own responses as a way to provoke discussion and critical thinking; although we will make every effort not to dominate the discussion boards. We want the discussion boards to be a venue where all can express their thoughtful opinions. There are ten total discussion questions. Each will be worth 10 points (total 100 points).

Keep in mind that all responses and postings on the Discussion Questions forum should follow the rules of behavior we would observe in a face-to-face classroom. Your responses to the discussion questions should address the question itself and demonstrate that you understand the topic under discussion. When you respond to someone else's post, do so with respect and thought. Personal attacks or excessive opinion-spouting will not be tolerated. You should engage each other's ideas and respond in a thoughtful, informed manner.

*****Important***:** When you are posting your response to the discussion question, put your name, DQ, and the number of that week in the subject line. For example, I might put the following in the subject line: Redd, DQ, Week 7. Your responses to the discussion questions are due each week by Sunday at 11:59 pm (but, remember, you can post any time you want up until that time). I would encourage everyone to read the assigned reading in the previous week so that you will be able to post your DQ responses early in the week they're due, which will give other students the chance to respond and we will then have an actual online discussion during each week. If everyone waits until the last minute to read and then post their responses at the end of the week, then there won't be any discussion of the readings. So, for example, read week two's readings during week one and then post your response at the beginning of week 2, and so forth. I have included a grading rubric in the Content section of D2L that we will use to evaluate discussion question responses and your responses to the postings of other students.

A NOTE ON POSTING: When writing your answers to discussion questions or responses to other students' postings, it is generally easier to write in your regular word-processing program and then copy/paste the text into the discussion forum rather than writing directly on the screen in the discussion. This procedure protects you from losing what you have written if your connection is interrupted.

UWM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee has several policies concerning students with disabilities, accommodations for religious observances, students called to active military duty, incompletes, discriminatory conduct and so forth available for you to read using the following link: <http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/SyllabusLinks.pdf>. I strongly encourage you to access this link and familiarize yourself with these policies and procedures. I specifically address the issue of academic conduct and plagiarism below.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND PLAGIARISM: Plagiarism is not a game, although many students treat it as such. You cheat, get caught, what's the worst thing that could happen? A stern talking to? Failing the paper? You can probably keep a straight face during the stern talking to. Heck, maybe you could even squeeze out a tear. And you might have failed anyway, so why not give it a try? Actually, failing the paper is the best thing that could happen, and it is not very likely. Far more likely is that I will fail you for the course and notify the appropriate university authorities. If you want to play the "game," please be very clear on what happens when you lose.

Plagiarism is a representation of other people's work as your own (for example, in directly quoting another source without using quotation marks). Plagiarism can be defined by using Alexander Lindley's definition:

Plagiarism is the false assumption of authorship: the wrongful act of taking the product of another person's mind, and presenting it as one's own (Plagiarism and Originality [New York: Harper, 1957], p. 2). Plagiarism may take the form of repeating another's sentences as your own, adopting a particularly apt phrase as your own, or even presenting someone else's line of thinking in the development of a thesis as though it were your own. In short, to plagiarize is to give the impression that you have written or thought something that you have in fact borrowed from another.

I strongly urge you to access the following link to read a discussion of what plagiarism is and looks like <http://www.ctlw.duke.edu> (In the left-hand column, click on Programs, then UWP, then Plagiarism Tutorial). Another useful link concerning plagiarism as well as information pertaining to grammar and writing can be found by accessing the following link: <http://webster.comnet.edu/mla/plagiarism.shtml>. See the Wisconsin Administrative Code, Chapter UWS 14, entitled "Student Academic Disciplinary Procedures," for a discussion and range of available penalties. Severe penalties (up to the maximum allowed by the university) should be expected for plagiarism or other forms of cheating.

If you have any questions regarding citation, please talk to me. While I am not looking for excuses to accuse you of plagiarism, and therefore you need not be worried about honest mistakes, you should be aware that the following, and other similar, excuses will not work:

- **"I didn't know that I had to use quotation marks when I borrowed someone else's prose."**
- **"I used footnotes; I just didn't use quotation marks."**
- **"But I changed every fourth word."**
- **"I didn't realize that I couldn't turn in the same paper for more than one class."**
- **"I didn't know how to reference internet sources, so I just pretended the words and ideas were my own."**

TOPICS, READING ASSIGNMENTS, AND SCHEDULE: (Tentative and subject to change. Students should have read the assigned material by the class date shown); ER=Electronic Reserve

Week 1 – January 23: Introductions on Discussion Board

Part I. Introduction: Definitions and Basic Concepts

Week 2 – January 30: The International Landscape and Geopolitical Context

- Sarkesian 12
- Rochester 1

National Interests and National Security

- Sarkesian 1, 2, 3
- Rochester 2, 3, 4

- George, Alexander L., and Robert O. Keohane. 1980. "The Concept of National Interests: Uses and Limitations." In *Presidential Decisionmaking in Foreign Policy: The Effective Use of Information and Advice*, Alexander L. George. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. *ER*

Part II. The National Security Establishment: System and Process

Week 3 – February 6: The Executive Branch, and the Military and Intelligence Establishments

- Sarkesian 4, 5, 6, 8

Week 4 – February 13: The President and Congress

- Sarkesian 9, 10
- Rockman, Bert A. 2000. "Reinventing What for Whom? President and Congress in the Making of Foreign Policy." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 30:133-154. *ER*
- Banks, William C., and Jeffrey D. Straussman. 1999. "A New Imperial Presidency? Insights from U.S. Involvement in Bosnia." *Political Science Quarterly* 114: 195-217. *ER*
- Auerswald, David P., and Peter F. Cowhey. 1997. "Ballotbox Diplomacy: The War Powers Resolution and the Use of Force." *International Studies Quarterly* 41:505-528. *ER*

Week 5 – February 20: The Domestic Political Context

- Sarkesian 11
- Holsti, Ole R. 1992. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus." *International Studies Quarterly* 36: 439-466. *ER*
- Wood, B. Dan, and Jeffrey S. Peake. 1998. "The Dynamics of Foreign Policy Agenda Setting." *American Political Science Review* 92:173-184. *ER*

Part III. Foreign Policy Problems

Week 6 – February 27: Group Project #1

Week 7 – March 5: Intervention: (Low-level Conflicts/Humanitarian Operations, Peacekeeping and Peacemaking, etc.)

- Blechman, Barry M., and Tamara Cofman Wittes. 1999. "Defining Moment: The Threat and Use of Force in American Foreign Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 114: 1-30. *ER*
- Patrick, Stewart. 2006. "Weak States and Global Threats: Fact or Fiction?" *Washington Quarterly* 29: 27-53. *ER*
- Western, Jon, and Joshua S. Goldstein. 2011. "Humanitarian Intervention Comes of Age." *Foreign Affairs* 90: 48-59. *ER*
- Valentino, Benjamin A. 2011. "The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention: The Hard Truth About a Noble Notion." *Foreign Affairs* 90: 60-73. *ER*
- Carter 1, 2
- Rochester, pp. 148-154

Week 8 – March 12: Group Project #2

Week 9 – March 19: **Spring Break – No Class**

Week 10 – March 26: Immigration

- Ting, Jan C. 2006. “Immigration and National Security.” *Orbis* 50: 41-52. *ER*
- Kurth, James. 2002. “Domestic Security and Muslim Immigrants.” *Journal of the Historical Society* 2: 409-419. *ER*
- Segovia, Francine, and Renatta Defever. 2010. “The Polls—Trends: American Public Opinion on Immigrants and Immigration Policy.” *Public Opinion Quarterly* 74: 375-394. *ER*
- Alden, Edward, and Bryan Roberts. 2011. “Are U.S. Borders Secure? Why We Don’t Know and How to Find Out.” *Foreign Affairs* 90: 19-26. *ER*
- Carter 9

Week 11 – April 2: Terrorism, Weapons of Mass Destruction and Proliferation

- Posen, Barry R. 2001. “The Struggle Against Terrorism: Grand Strategy, Strategy, and Tactics.” *International Security* 26:39-55. *ER*
- Mueller, John. 2004. “An Alternative Policy Perspective on Terrorism.” Paper presented at the annual conference of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 15-18. *ER*
- Betts, Richard K. 1998. “The New Threat of Mass Destruction.” *Foreign Affairs* 77: 26-41. *ER*
- Carter 4, 5
- Rochester 132-139

Week 12 – April 9: Group Project #3

Part IV. Regional Threats to National Security: Two Selected Cases

Week 13 – April 16: China/Taiwan

- Dodge, Paul. 2005. “China’s Naval Strategy and Nuclear Weapons: The Risks of Intentional and Inadvertent Nuclear Escalation.” *Comparative Strategy* 24: 415-430. *ER*
- Hughes, James H. 2002. “China’s Ballistic Missile Threat.” *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies* 27:3-22. *ER*
- Hickey, Dennis Van Vranken. 2004. “Continuity and Change: The Administration of George W. Bush and US Policy Toward Taiwan.” *Journal of Contemporary China* 13:461-478. *ER*
- Redd, Steven B. 2006. “Explaining U.S. Policy Toward China and Taiwan.” In *Identity and Change in East Asian Conflicts: The Cases of China, Taiwan, and the Koreas*, eds. Shale Horowitz, Uk Heo, and Alexander C. Tan. New York, NY: Palgrave-Macmillan. *ER*

- Tucker, Nancy Bernkopf, and Bonnie Glaser. 2011. "Should the United States Abandon Taiwan?" *Washington Quarterly* 34: 23-37. *ER*

Week 14 – April 23: Iran

- Lindsay, James M., and Ray Takeyh. 2010. "After Iran Gets the Bomb: Containment and Its Complications." *Foreign Affairs* 89: 33-49. *ER*
- Posen, Barry R., Barry Rubin, James M. Lindsay, and Ray Takeyh. 2010. "The Containment Conundrum: How Dangerous is a Nuclear Iran?" *Foreign Affairs* 89: 160-168. *ER*
- Maloney, Suzanne. 2010. "Sanctioning Iran: If Only it Were So Simple." *Washington Quarterly* 131-147. *ER*
- Kroenig, Matthew. 2012. "Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike is the Least Bad Option." *Foreign Affairs* 91: 76-86. *ER*

Part V. Low Politics → High Politics?

Week 15 – April 30: Economic, Environmental, and Legal Issues

- Bergsten, C. Fred. 2004. "Foreign Economic Policy for the Next President." *Foreign Affairs* 83: 88-101. *ER*
- Auerswald, Philip E. 2006. "The Myth of Energy Insecurity." *Issues in Science and Technology* 22: 65-70. *ER*
- Pollack, Kenneth M. 2003. "Securing the Gulf." *Foreign Affairs* 82: 2-16. *ER*
- Klare, Michael T. 2001. "The New Geography of Conflict." *Foreign Affairs* 80: 49-61. *ER*
- Peterson, Peter G. 2004. "Riding for a Fall." *Foreign Affairs* 83: 111-125. *ER*
- Carter 10, 13, 14

Week 16 – May 7: Group Project #4