

Seminar in American Foreign Policy
Political Science 953
Section 001

Professor: Steven B. Redd
Office: Bolton 628
Office Hours: TR 11:00-12:00 noon
(and by appointment)
Email: sredd@uwm.edu

University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Spring Semester 2022
Thursday 4:30-7:10 PM
Bolton Hall 657

COURSE DESCRIPTION: This seminar will concentrate on several aspects of American foreign policy. We will begin by briefly reviewing the historical course of American foreign policy and the philosophical origins of AFP. We will discuss the national interest and analyze the impact of the Cold War as well as the transition into the post-Cold War world on AFP. We will also examine the position of the United States in the international system after the Cold War as well as consider the current debate over the country's appropriate role in the future. Substantial attention will also be given to American institutions and processes as they pertain to foreign policy. In addition, we will devote attention to regional issues and hot topics such as terrorism and WMD.

Required Text:

None

Reserved Readings: The bulk of the readings for this class will be in the form of individual chapters, convention papers, and journal articles. All readings will be available using standard or electronic reserve through the Golda Meir Library and Canvas.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS: Grades will be based on the following:

Participation and Discussion:	20%
Presentation & Integrative Summaries:	20%
Lit. Review/Annotated Bibliography/Propositional Inventory:	20%
Term Paper:	40%

PARTICIPATION AND DISCUSSION: The course will be organized as a research seminar and will include weekly presentations and discussions of the readings. However, some class time will also be spent on brief lectures and on discussion of students' research projects.

Everyone is expected to read all of the assigned readings and participate in all class discussions! Failure to participate in class discussions will be taken as an indicator that the student is not adequately prepared to do so. Relatedly, failure to be adequately prepared for class discussions is a good indicator that the individual is not well equipped for graduate school.

PRESENTATION & INTEGRATIVE SUMMARIES: A number of readings on a particular subject matter will be assigned for each class period. Though all students are expected to carefully read all pieces and prepare to discuss them in class, each piece will be assigned to one

student who will prepare a one-page, single-spaced written summary for distribution to the entire class. The summary should begin with a complete citation (APSA style) of the piece at the top of the page and should end with the student's name and date at the bottom of the page. The summary itself should include the basic theory, concepts, methodology, findings, etc. The summary should not include editorial comments, but should instead be limited to the content of the reading itself. An additional, clearly identified, critical paragraph or two should be included after the summary (normally on the reverse side of the page). The critical paragraph may include positive and negative evaluative statements. The presenter is responsible for bringing enough copies for distribution to the entire class. One copy should be placed in my mailbox by 12:00 pm on the Tuesday preceding our class.

To help you prepare for class discussions (and for preliminary examinations for Ph.D. students), you will also be required to write an integrative summary for each week's readings. Each integrative summary should be one page, single-spaced, with the heading "Integrative Summary for Week # _____ Readings" at the top, and with the student's name and date at the bottom of the page. The integrative summary should convey how the readings for the week are linked to one another, i.e., what common issues are being addressed, what questions are being neglected by these articles, and what it is that each reading adds to the collection. This should be an integrative summary; it should not consist simply of a listing of paragraph-length descriptions of each reading. Each week, the integrative summaries should be placed in my mailbox by 10:00 am on Thursday, the day of class. These summaries will not, on a regular basis, be distributed to the other students in the class. Please also include at the end of your integrative summary two questions that could help spur in-class discussions of the readings. These questions could be of a theoretical, methodological, inferential, etc. nature—anything that will help facilitate class discussion.

LIT. REVIEW/ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY (w/PROPOSITIONAL INVENTORY): In consultation with the instructor, each student will select an area of concentration within the literature on American foreign policy. Please start thinking about topics early and discuss your ideas with me. You will then do a thorough search for the relevant literature, preparing a collection of two-paragraph summaries (annotations) along the way. Collectively, these annotations (12-20 in number, covering articles, books, chapters, etc.) will be organized into an annotated bibliography. Ideally, each annotation will contain two paragraphs: the first will contain a summary of the book, book chapter, 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. This collection of annotations will be preceded by a 4-5-page literature review highlighting the major themes within that literature [What questions have been dealt with in this literature? What questions remain to be dealt with? Etc.]. This literature review should be organized by themes/theories/concepts, etc., NOT by author. Immediately following this 4-5-page literature review, you should include an "inventory" of 4-6 key propositions found in the annotated literature. Each proposition should be stated in the form of a testable statement linking two variables/concepts and should be accompanied by a complete citation to at least one source of the proposition within the literature. Of course, this 4-5-page literature review/introduction will also include the major research question(s) that you plan on addressing in your research paper.

TERM PAPER: Each student's term paper will be on the same topic as the literature review/annotated bibliography, and will be written as a research design, empirical paper, or conceptual analysis. The term paper itself is expected to be between 20 and 25 pages in length. A research design should be for an empirically based research paper on some aspect of American foreign policy that is grounded in some of the literature discussed in this class (and could later serve as an MA paper, a dissertation chapter, or conference paper in which the empirical analysis will actually be carried out). The research design should consist of the following sections: Introduction, Literature Review, Theory and Hypotheses, Methods, Data and Measurement. An empirical paper includes the former but would then actually analyze the data and report findings. A conceptual analysis paper provides a critical review of the literature and provides new ways to organize knowledge and raises new theoretical questions.

DEADLINES:

Choose Topic by	February 17
Lit. Review/Annotated Bibliography Due	March 17
Term Paper Due	May 5

[Note: Papers must be completed by May 5, and no later, since students will briefly present their own papers and then critique and discuss one another's papers on May 12.]

PLAGIARISM: 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 <https://plagiarism.duke.edu>. Another useful link concerning plagiarism as well as information pertaining to grammar and writing can be found by clicking on the following link: <http://www.plagiarism.org>. 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) should be expected for plagiarism or other forms of cheating. Along these lines, you may NOT use a paper that you have written previously, or are currently writing for another course, for this class unless you clear it with me first. Doing so without first consulting me is considered academic misconduct and will be dealt with accordingly.

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, academic misconduct, and so forth available for you to read using the following link:

<http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SecU/SyllabusLinks.pdf>. I encourage you to access this link and familiarize yourself with these policies and procedures.

COURSE OUTLINE:

The following is a tentative outline for the semester, including topics and reading assignments.

I. INTRODUCTION

January 27 (Week 1): Introduction and History of AFP

Historical overview of American Foreign Policy

Hermann, Charles F. 1978. "Foreign Policy Behavior: That Which is to be Explained." In *Why Nations Act: Theoretical Perspectives for Comparative Foreign Policy Studies*, ed. Maurice A. East, Stephen A. Salmore, and Charles F. Hermann. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Putnam, Robert D. 1988. "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games." *International Organization* 42:427-460.

Melanson, Richard A. 2000. *American Foreign Policy Since the Vietnam War: The Search for Consensus from Nixon to Clinton*. 3d ed. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe. Skim pp. 43-287, read pp. 293-309.

February 3 (Week 2): International Politics

Theoretical approaches to understanding foreign policy at the macro level

Background:

Zakaria, Fareed. 1998. *From Wealth to Power: The Unusual Origins of America's World Role*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. pp. 13-43 and pp. 181-192.

More specific:

Zakaria, Fareed. 1992. "Realism and Domestic Politics: A Review Essay." *International Security* 17:177-198.

Myers, Robert J. 1997. "Hans Morgenthau's Realism and American Foreign Policy." *Ethics and International Affairs* 11:253-270.

Walt, Stephen M. 1998. "International Relations: One World, Many Theories." *Foreign Policy* 110: 29-44.

Legro, Jeffrey W., and Andrew Moravcsik. 1999. "Is Anybody Still a Realist?" *International Security* 24:5-55.

Schmidt, Brian C. 2004. "Realism as Tragedy." *Review of International Studies* 30:427-441.

Rathbun, Brian C. 2008. "Does One Right Make a Realist? Conservatism, Neoconservatism, and Isolationism in the Foreign Policy Ideology of American Elites." *Political Science Quarterly* 123:271-299.

II. FOUNDATIONS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

February 10 (Week 3): U.S. National Interests

Philosophical and other roots of AFP

Background:

Plischke, Elmer. 1988. *Foreign Relations: Analysis of Its Anatomy*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press. pp. 9-141.

Clinton, W. David. 1994. *The Two Faces of National Interest*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press. pp. 3-98.

Morgenthau, Hans J. 2000 (1951). "The Mainsprings of American Foreign Policy." In *Perspectives on American Foreign Policy: Readings and Cases*, ed. Bruce W. Jentleson. New York, NY: W. W. Norton and Company. pp. 3-8.

Nau, Henry R. 2002. *At Home Abroad: Identity and Power in American Foreign Policy*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press. pp. 15-85.

More specific:

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. pp. 217-237.

Nincic, Miroslav. 1992. *Democracy and Foreign Policy: The Fallacy of Political Realism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. pp. 157-170.

Trubowitz, Peter. 1992. "Sectionalism and American Foreign Policy: The Political Geography of Consensus and Conflict." *International Studies Quarterly* 36:173-190.

Weldes, Jutta. 1996. "Constructing National Interests." *European Journal of International Relations* 2:275-318.

Huntington, Samuel P. 1997. "The Erosion of American National Interests." *Foreign Affairs* 76:28-49.

Nye, Joseph S., Jr. 2002. *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World's Only Superpower Can't Go It Alone*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. pp. 137-171.

February 17 (Week 4): Cold War and the End of the Cold War

Background:

Kennan, George. 1947. "The Sources of Soviet Conduct." *Foreign Affairs* 25:566-576.

Gaddis, John Lewis. 1992. *The United States and the End of the Cold War: Implications, Reconsiderations, Provocations*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Gaddis, John Lewis. 1997. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

More specific:

Posen, Barry R., and Andrew L. Ross. 1996. "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy." *International Security* 21:5-53.

Bueno de Mesquita, Bruce. 1998. "The End of the Cold War: Predicting an Emergent Property." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42:131-155.

- Wohlforth, William C. 1998. "Reality Check: Revising Theories of International Politics in Response to the End of the Cold War." *World Politics* 50:650-680.
- Scott, James M., and A. Lane Crothers. 1998. "Out of the Cold: The Post-Cold War Context of U.S. Foreign Policy." In *After the End: Making U.S. Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War World*, ed. James M. Scott. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Ikenberry, G. John. 2002. "America's Liberal Grand Strategy: Democracy and National Security in the Post-War Era." In *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*, 4th ed. Edited by G. John Ikenberry. New York, NY: Longman.
- Patrick, Stewart. 2006. "Weak States and Global Threats: Fact or Fiction?" *Washington Quarterly* 29:27-53.

III. ACTORS AND INSTITUTIONS IN AFP

February 24 (Week 5): President and Congress

Background:

U.S. Constitution: <http://www.archives.gov/index.html> (read the whole thing, but concentrate on foreign policy aspects pertaining to executive and legislative branches)

Lindsay, James M. 1994. *Congress and the Politics of U.S. Foreign Policy*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press. pp. 1-8, 11-32, 140-160.

Henehan, Marie T. 2000. *Foreign Policy and Congress: An International Relations Perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. pp. 145-164.

Rockman, Bert A. 2000. "Reinventing What for Whom? President and Congress in the Making of Foreign Policy." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 30:133-154.

More specific:

Meernik, James. 1993. "Presidential Support in Congress: Conflict and Consensus on Foreign and Defense Policy." *Journal of Politics* 55:569-587.

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.

Wittkopf, Eugene R., and James M. McCormick. 1998. "Congress, the President, and the End of the Cold War: Has Anything Changed?" *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42:440-466.

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.

Scott, James M., and Ralph G. Carter. 2002. "Acting on the Hill: Congressional Assertiveness in U.S. Foreign Policy." *Congress & the Presidency* 29:151-169.

Meernik, James, and Elizabeth Oldmixon. 2004. "Internationalism in Congress." *Political Research Quarterly* 57:451-465.

March 3 (Week 6): White House and Federal Agencies

Background:

- George, Alexander L. 1980. *Presidential Decisionmaking in Foreign Policy: The Effective Use of Information and Advice*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. pp. 81-108.
- George, Alexander L. 1980. *Presidential Decisionmaking in Foreign Policy: The Effective Use of Information and Advice*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press. pp. 145-168.
- Haney, Patrick J. 1997. *Organizing for Foreign Policy Crises: Presidents, Advisers, and the Management of Decision Making*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. pp. 1-22.
- Burke, John P., and Fred I. Greenstein. 1989. *How Presidents Test Reality: Decisions on Vietnam, 1954 and 1965*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation. pp. 2-24.
- Shoemaker, Christopher C. 1991. *The NSC Staff: Counseling the Council*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

More specific:

- Hermann, Margaret G., and Thomas Preston. 1999. "Presidents, Leadership Style, and the Advisory Process." In *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence*, 3rd ed. Edited by Eugene R. Wittkopf and James M. McCormick. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Preston, Thomas. 2001. *The President and His Inner Circle: Leadership Style and the Advisory Process in Foreign Affairs*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press. pp. 5-31.
- Cohen, David B., Chris J. Dolan, and Jerel A. Rosati. 2002. "A Place At the Table: The Emerging Foreign Policy Roles of the White House Chief of Staff." *Congress & the Presidency* 29:119-149.
- Haney, Patrick J. 2005. "Foreign-Policy Advising: Models and Mysteries from the Bush Administration." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 35:289-302.
- Flynn, Michael E. 2014. "The International and Domestic Sources of Bipartisanship in U.S. Foreign Policy." *Political Research Quarterly* 67:398-412.
- Saunders, Elizabeth N. 2017. "No Substitute for Experience: Presidents, Advisers, and Information in Group Decision Making." *International Organization* 71:S219-S247.

March 10 (Week 7): Public Opinion, Media, Interest Groups, etc.

Background:

- Holsti, Ole R. 1992. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: Challenges to the Almond-Lippmann Consensus." *International Studies Quarterly* 36:439-466.
- Holsti, Ole R. 1998. "Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy after the Cold War." In *After the End: Making U.S. Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War World*, ed. James M. Scott. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- McCormick, James M. 1998. "Interest Groups and the Media in Post-Cold War Foreign Policy." In *After the End: Making U.S. Foreign Policy in the Post-Cold War World*, ed. James M. Scott. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Strobel, Warren P. 1999. "The CNN Effect: Myth or Reality." In *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence*, 3rd ed. Edited by Eugene R. Wittkopf and James M. McCormick. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Mueller, John. 1999. "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy: The People's 'Common Sense.'" In *The Domestic Sources of American Foreign Policy: Insights and Evidence*, 3rd ed. Edited by Eugene R. Wittkopf and James M. McCormick. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Sobel, Richard. 2001. *The Impact of Public Opinion on U.S. Foreign Policy Since Vietnam: Constraining the Colossus*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. pp. 3-47.

Klarevas, Louis. 2002. "The 'Essential Domino' of Military Operations: American Public Opinion and the Use of Force." *International Studies Perspectives* 3: 417-437.

More specific:

Lian, Bradley, and John R. Oneal. 1993. "Presidents, the Use of Military Force, and Public Opinion." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37:277-300.

Jentleson, Bruce W., and Rebecca L. Britton. 1998. "Still Pretty Prudent: Post-Cold War American Public Opinion on the Use of Military Force." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42:395-417.

Wood, B. Dan, and Jeffrey S. Peake. 1998. "The Dynamics of Foreign Policy Agenda Setting." *American Political Science Review* 92:173-184.

Meernik, James, and Michael Ault. 2001. "Public Opinion and Support for U.S. Presidents' Foreign Policies." *American Politics Research* 29: 352-373.

Jacobs, Lawrence R., and Benjamin I. Page. 2005. "Who Influences U.S. Foreign Policy?" *American Political Science Review* 99: 107-123.

Rubenzler, Trevor, and Steven B. Redd. 2010. "Ethnic Minority Groups and US Foreign Policy: Examining Congressional Decision Making and Economic Sanctions." *International Studies Quarterly* 54: 755-777.

IV. POLITICS OF FOREIGN POLICY/FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

March 17 (Week 8): Psychology

Background:

Holsti, Ole. 1976. "Foreign Policy Formation Viewed Cognitively." In *Structure of Decision*, ed. Robert Axelrod. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vertzberger, Yaacov Y. I. 1990. *The World in Their Minds: Information Processing, Cognition, and Perception in Foreign Policy Decisionmaking*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. pp. 7-50.

Voss, James F., and Ellen Dorsey. 1992. "Perception and International Relations: An Overview." In *Political Psychology and Foreign Policy*, ed. Eric Singer and Valerie Hudson. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Rosati, Jerel A. 1995. "A Cognitive Approach to the Study of Foreign Policy." In *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation*, ed. Laura Neack, Jeanne A. K. Hey, and Patrick J. Haney. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tetlock, Philip E., and Charles B. McGuire, Jr. 2002. "Cognitive Perspectives on Foreign Policy." In *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*, 4th ed. Edited by G. John Ikenberry. New York, NY: Longman.

More specific:

Wayne, Stephen J. 1993. "President Bush Goes to War: A Psychological Interpretation from a Distance." In *The Political Psychology of the Gulf War: Leaders, Publics, and the Process of Conflict*, ed. Stanley A. Renshon. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

- Walker, Stephen G., Mark Schafer, and Michael D. Young. 1999. "Presidential Operational Codes and Foreign Policy Conflicts in the Post-Cold War World." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 43:610-25.
- Taylor-Robinson, Michelle, and Steven B. Redd. 2002. "Framing and the Poliheuristic Theory of Decision: The United Fruit Company and the 1954 U.S.-Led Coup in Guatemala." In *Integrating Cognitive and Rational Theories of Foreign Policy Decision Making*, ed. Alex Mintz. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Foster, Dennis M., and Jonathan W. Keller. 2010. "Rallies and the 'First Image': Leadership Psychology, Scapegoating Proclivity, and the Diversionary Theory of Force." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 5: 417-441.
- Keller, Jonathan W. and Dennis M. Foster. 2012. "Presidential Leadership Style and the Political Use of Force." *Political Psychology* 33: 581-598.
- Foster, Dennis M., and Jonathan W. Keller. 2014. "Leaders' Cognitive Complexity, Distrust, and the Diversionary Use of Force." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 10: 205-223.

March 24 (Week 9): Spring Break

March 31 (Week 10): Models of FP Analysis

Background:

- Janis, Irving L. 1982. *Groupthink*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. pp. 174-197.
- Khong, Yuen Foong. 1990. *Analogies at War: Korea, Munich, Dien Bien Phu, and The Vietnam Decisions of 1965*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 3-46.
- Hermann, Charles F. 1995. "Epilogue: Reflections on Foreign Policy Theory Building." In *Foreign Policy Analysis: Continuity and Change in Its Second Generation*, ed. Laura Neack, Jeanne A. K. Hey, and Patrick J. Haney. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hudson, Valerie M. (with Christopher S. Vore). 1995. "Foreign Policy Analysis Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow." *Mershon International Studies Review* 39:209-238.

More specific:

- Allison, Graham T. 1969. "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis." *American Political Science Review* 63:689-718.
- Farnham, Barbara. 1992. "Roosevelt and the Munich Crisis: Insights from Prospect Theory." *Political Psychology* 13:205-35.
- Mintz, Alex. 1993. "The Decision to Attack Iraq: A Noncompensatory Theory of Decision Making." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 37:595-618.
- Mintz, Alex, and Nehemia Geva. 1997. "The Poliheuristic Theory of Foreign Policy Decisionmaking." In *Decisionmaking on War and Peace: The Cognitive-Rational Debate*, ed. Nehemia Geva and Alex Mintz. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Geva, Nehemia, James Mayhar, and J. Mark Skorick. 2000. "The Cognitive Calculus of Foreign Policy Decision Making: An Experimental Assessment." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44:447-71.
- Goertz, Gary. 2004. "Constraints, Compromises, and Decision Making." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48:14-37.

V. REGIONAL ISSUES

April 7 (Week 11): Europe, Russia, and NATO

Background:

Wiarda, Howard J., ed. 1996. *U.S. Foreign and Strategic Policy in the Post-Cold War Era: A Geopolitical Perspective*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

More specific:

Sloan, Stanley R. 1995. "U.S. Perspectives on NATO's Future." *International Affairs* 71:217-231.

Chase, Robert S., Emily B. Hill, and Paul Kennedy. 1996. "Pivotal States and U.S. Strategy." *Foreign Affairs* 75:33-51.

Gladkyy, Oleksandr. 2003. "American Foreign Policy and U.S. Relations with Russia and China after 11 September." *World Affairs* 166:3-23.

Cimbalo, Jeffrey L. 2004. "Saving NATO from Europe." *Foreign Affairs* 83:111-120.

Auerswald, David P. 2004. "Explaining Wars of Choice: An Integrated Decision Model of NATO Policy in Kosovo." *International Studies Quarterly* 48:631-662.

Haass, Richard N. 2017. "Where to Go From Here: Rebooting American Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* 96:2-9.

April 14 (Week 12): Middle East, Asia, and Latin America

Ross, Dennis. 2005. "The Middle East Predicament." *Foreign Affairs* 84:61-74.

Asmus, Ronald D., Larry Diamond, Mark Leonard, and Michael McFaul. 2005. "A Transatlantic Strategy to Promote Democratic Development in the Broader Middle East." *Washington Quarterly* 28:7-21.

De Castro, Renato Cruz. 2000. "Whither Geoeconomics? Bureaucratic Inertia in U.S. Post-Cold War Foreign Policy toward East Asia." *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 26:201-221.

Christensen, Thomas J. 2001. "Posing Problems without Catching Up: China's Rise and Challenges for U.S. Security Policy." *International Security* 25:5-40.

Hsiang, Antonio C. 2003. "Bush's Policy toward Latin America." *Orbis* 47:59-72.

Thies, Cameron. 2017. "Role Theory and Foreign Policy Analysis in Latin America." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 13:662-681.

April 21 (Week 13): Iran

Lindsay, James M., and Ray Takeyh. 2010. "After Iran Gets the Bomb: Containment and Its Complications." *Foreign Affairs* 89:33-49.

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.

Maloney, Suzanne. 2010. "Sanctioning Iran: If Only it Were So Simple." *Washington Quarterly* 33:131-147.

Kroenig, Matthew. 2012. "Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike is the Least Bad Option." *Foreign Affairs* 91:76-86.

Pillar, Paul R. 2013. "The Role of Villain: Iran and U.S. Foreign Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 128:211-231.

VI. POST-COLD WAR ISSUES

April 28 (Week 14): Intervention

Background:

Gilboa, Eytan. 1995. "The Panama Invasion Revisited: Lessons for the Use of Force in the Post-Cold War Era." *Political Science Quarterly* 110:539-562.

Haass, Richard N. 1999. *Intervention: The Use of American Military Force in the Post-Cold War World*. Washington, DC: Brookings.

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.

Western, Jon. 2005. *Selling Intervention and War: The Presidency, the Media, and the American Public*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Western, Jon, and Joshua S. Goldstein. 2011. "Humanitarian Intervention Comes of Age." *Foreign Affairs* 90:48-59.

Valentino, Benjamin A. 2011. "The True Costs of Humanitarian Intervention: The Hard Truth About a Noble Notion." *Foreign Affairs* 90:60-73.

More specific:

Burk, James. 1999. "Public Support for Peacekeeping in Lebanon and Somalia: Assessing the Casualties Hypothesis." *Political Science Quarterly* 114:53-78.

Butler, Michael J. 2003. "U.S. Military Intervention in Crisis, 1945-1994." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 47:226-248.

Paul, Christopher. 2004. "The U.S. Military Intervention Decision-Making Process: Who Participates, and How?" *Journal of Political and Military Sociology* 32:19-43.

Boettcher, William A., III. 2004. "Military Intervention Decisions Regarding Humanitarian Crises: Framing Induced Risk Behavior." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 48:331-355.

Peceny, Mark. 1999. "Forcing Them to Be Free." *Political Research Quarterly* 52:549-582.

Walker, Scott, and Frederic S. Pearson. 2007. "Should We Really 'Force Them to Be Free?' An Experimental Examination of Peceny's Liberalizing Intervention Thesis." *Conflict Management and Peace Science* 24:37-53.

May 5 (Week 15): Nuclear Weapons, WMD, and Terrorism

Background:

Barash, David P. 1987. *The Arms Race and Nuclear War*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. pp. 110-131.

Pillar, Paul R. 2001. *Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings.

More specific:

Posen, Barry R. 2001. "The Struggle Against Terrorism: Grand Strategy, Strategy, and Tactics." *International Security* 26:39-55.

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.

Glaser, Charles L., and Steve Fetter. 2001. "National Missile Defense and the Future of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy." *International Security* 26:40-92.

Press, Daryl G., Scott D. Sagan, and Benjamin A. Valentino. 2013. "Atomic Aversion: Experimental Evidence on Taboos, Traditions, and the Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons." *American Political Science Review* 107:188-206.

May 12 (Week 16): Term Paper Presentations and Critiques