

DRAFT**UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY**

Class Meetings: Mondays 9:00-10:50
Office Hours: Wednesdays 2:30-5:00,
or by appointment.
Telephone: 212-854-7325

Professor Richard K. Betts
Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies
Room 1328, International Affairs Building
E-Mail: rkb4@columbia.edu

This course is a topical review, emphasizing historical continuity and change, and current concerns, organized in terms of several principal functions and regions. Emphasis is on the national security component of foreign policy. Enrollment is limited and the instructor accepts only students who promise to honor all requirements. **Read this syllabus carefully before requesting admission.**

Requirements: General knowledge of the history of U.S. foreign policy, especially since 1940, and knowledge of current events on the level of careful daily reading of the *New York Times* or *Washington Post*, are assumed. In addition, students must:

- (1) Faithfully complete all assigned readings *before* class sessions in which they are discussed. Quizzes may occur at any time, and unprepared students will be downgraded.
- (2) Attend class meetings. Students are allowed a maximum of one absence. More than one absence for reasons other than *certified* medical excuse will incur a penalty in the final grade.
- (3) Participate sensibly in class discussions. Students who seldom contribute, or who blather ceaselessly, will be downgraded.
- (4) Write a research paper proposal done *strictly in the format stipulated* at the end of the syllabus, due by noon, February 21. The proposal will be graded and returned on February 25. Paper topics that overlap papers done for other courses are not acceptable. **Return the copy of the marked-up proposal to the instructor on March 3.**
- (5) Complete the paper, within a length limit of 25 pages (7,000 words *absolute maximum*). Papers that exceed the length limit will be penalized. Papers must have normal margins and *type size no smaller than 12-point*. In executing the paper follow the guidance on pp. 6-7 below. The paper is due at 12:00 P.M., May 6, 2008. **You must submit both a paper copy, in the instructor's mailbox, and an electronic copy via e-mail.** Write mailing address, phone number, and E-Mail address on the first page. The instructor is happy to take the time to provide comments, except for those who do not care if they get them. Students who want comments must attach a self-addressed 9x12 return envelope (postage not required).

Approximately two-thirds of the final grade will be based on the paper, the rest on participation in class discussions, quizzes, and paper proposal. Students may *NOT* take the course "Pass/Fail" or for "R" credit. Unofficial auditors are allowed if they sit quietly in the rear of the room.

I. *Introduction* 1/28/08

Eric A. Nordlinger, *Isolationism Reconfigured* (Princeton University Press, 1995), chaps. 1-3.

G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars* (Princeton University Press, 2001), chaps. 2, 7, 8.

Stephen Peter Rosen, "An Empire, if You Can Keep It," *National Interest* No. 71 (Spring 2003).

II. *Is American Foreign Policy Uniquely American?* 2/4/08

Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America* (Harcourt, Brace, 1955), chap. 11.

George F. Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (University of Chicago Press, 1951), chaps. 1-6.

Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence* (Knopf, 2002), chaps. 1, 2, 7.

Alexei Bogaturov, "The Sources of American Conduct," *Russia in Global Affairs* 3, no. 1 (January-March 2005).

III. *Ideals and Interests* 2/11/08

John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (W.W. Norton, 2001), chaps. 2-3, 9-10.

John D. Steinbruner, *Principles of Global Security* (Brookings Institution Press, 2000), chaps. 1, 6.

Andrew Bacevich, *American Empire* (Harvard University Press, 2002), chaps. 1, 4, 8.

Michael Mandelbaum, "Foreign Policy as Social Work," *Foreign Affairs* 75, no. 1 (January/February 1996).

IV. *Decline or Ascendancy* 2/18/08

Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers* (Random House, 1987), Introduction, pp. 514-535, and Epilogue.

Barry P. Bosworth and Robert Z. Lawrence, "America's Global Role: From Dominance to Interdependence," in John D. Steinbruner, ed., *Restructuring American Foreign Policy* (Brookings Institution, 1989).

William C. Wohlforth, "The Stability of a Unipolar World," *International Security* 24, no. 1 (Summer 1999).

Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment," *International Security* 31, no. 2 (Fall 2006).

V. *Strategic Planning Under Unipolarity*

2/25/08

Barry R. Posen and Andrew L. Ross, "Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy," *International Security* 21, no. 3 (Winter 1996/97).

The National Security Strategy of the United States of America (The White House, September 2002).

Lee Feinstein and Anne-Marie Slaughter, "A Duty to Prevent," *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 1 (January/ February 2004).

Mearsheimer, *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, chap. 4.

Robert J. Art, "The United States, the Balance of Power, and World War II: Was Spykman Right?" *Security Studies* 14, no. 3 (July-September 2005).

VI. *Terrorism and Counterterrorism*

3/3/08

Paul R. Pillar, *Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Brookings Institution Press, 2001), chaps. 3-6, 8.

The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (W.W. Norton, n.d. [2004]), chaps. 3, 11, 13.

Richard A. Posner, "The 9/11 Commission Report: A Dissent," *New York Times Book Review*, August 29, 2004.

John Mueller, *Overblown: How Politicians and the Terrorism Industry Inflate National Security Threats, and Why We Believe Them* (Free Press, 2006), Introduction.

VII. *Weapons of Mass Destruction*

3/10/08

James M. Lindsay and Michael E. O'Hanlon, *Defending America: The Case for Limited National Missile Defense* (Brookings Institution Press, 2001), chaps. 2-3.

Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press, "The End of MAD? The Nuclear Dimension of U.S. Primacy," *International Security* 30, no. 4 (Spring 2006).

Steinbruner, *Principles of Global Security*, chap. 2.

Gregory Koblenz, "Pathogens as Weapons," *International Security* 28, no. 3 (Winter 2003/04).

Jessica Stern, "Terrorist Motivations and Unconventional Weapons," in Peter R. Lavoy, Scott D. Sagan, and James J. Wirtz, eds., *Planning the Unthinkable* (Cornell University Press, 2000).

VIII. *Humanitarian Intervention and Civil-Military Relations*

3/24/08

Steinbruner, *Principles of Global Security*, chap. 4.

John Hillen, "Superpowers Don't Do Windows," *Orbis* 41, no. 2 (Spring 1997).

Richard Kohn, "Out of Control: The Crisis in Civil-Military Relations," *National Interest* No. 35 (Spring 1994).

Peter D. Feaver and Richard Kohn, "The Gap: Soldiers, Civilians and their Mutual Misunderstanding," *National Interest* No.61 (Fall 2000).

Colin L. Powell with Joseph Persico, *My American Journey* (Random House, 1995), pp. 558-586.

IX. *Political Intervention*

3/31/08

Morton H. Halperin, "Guaranteeing Democracy," *Foreign Policy* No. 91 (Summer 1993).

U.S. Senate Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities, Staff Report: *Covert Action in Chile 1963-1973*, 94th Cong., 1st sess., 1975.

Samuel P. Huntington, "Human Rights and American Power," *Commentary* 72, no. 3 (September 1981).

Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (Simon and Schuster, 1996), chap. 12.

X. *Economic Security*

4/7/08

Kenneth N. Waltz, "Globalization and American Power," *National Interest* No. 59 (Spring 2000).

Patrick J. McDonald and Kevin Sweeney, "The Achilles Heel of Liberal IR Theory? Globalization and Conflict in the Pre-World War I Era," *World Politics* 59, no. 3 (April 2007).

David A. Baldwin, *Economic Statecraft* (Princeton University Press, 1985), chaps. 7-9.

Robert A. Pape, "Why Economic Sanctions Do Not Work," *International Security* 22, no. 2 (Fall 1997).

Kimberly Ann Elliott, "The Sanctions Glass: Half Full or Completely Empty?" **and** Robert A. Pape, "Why Economic Sanctions *Still* Do Not Work," both in *International Security* 23, no. 1 (Summer 1998).

David A. Baldwin and Robert A. Pape, *Correspondence*: "Evaluating Economic Sanctions," *International Security* 23, no. 2 (Fall 1998).

XI. *Europe and Russia*

4/14/08

Robert Kagan, "Power and Weakness," *Policy Review* No. 113 (June/July 2002).

Mearsheimer, *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, pp. 386-396.

James Kurth, "The Next NATO," *National Interest* No. 65 (Fall 2001).

Michael E. Brown, "The Flawed Logic of NATO Expansion," *Survival* 37, no. 1 (Spring 1995).

Alexei G. Arbatov, "Russian National Interests," in Robert D. Blackwill and Sergei A. Karaganov, eds., *Damage Limitation or Crisis? Russia and the Outside World* (Brassey's, 1994).

Alexei Arbatov, "Is a New Cold War Imminent?" *Russia in Global Affairs* 5, no. 3 (July-September 2007).

William E. Odom, "Realism About Russia," *National Interest* No. 65 (Fall 2001).

Andrei Shleifer and Daniel Treisman, "A Normal Country," *Foreign Affairs* 83, no. 2 (March/April 2004).

Celeste A. Wallander, "Russian Transimperialism and Its Implications," *Washington Quarterly* 30, no. 2 (Spring 2007).

NB: Review Bogaturov, "The Sources of American Conduct."

XII. *Northeast Asia*

4/21/08

Edward Friedman, "The Challenge of a Rising China," in Robert J. Lieber, ed., *Eagle Adrift* (Longman, 1997).

Mearsheimer, *Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, pp. 396-402.

G. John Ikenberry, "The Rise of China and the Future of the West," *Foreign Affairs* 87, no. 1 (January/February 2008).

David Hale, "China's Growing Appetites," *National Interest* No. 76 (Summer 2004).

Thomas J. Christensen, "Fostering Stability or Creating a Monster? The Rise of China and U.S. Policy toward East Asia," *International Security* 31, no. 1 (Summer 2006).

Victor D. Cha and David C. Kang, "Can North Korea Be Engaged?" *Survival* 46, no. 2 (Summer 2004).

XIII. *The USA and the Arab-Israel Conflict*

4/28/08

A. F. K. Organski, *The \$36 billion Bargain: Strategy and Politics in U.S. Assistance to Israel* (Columbia University Press, 1990), pp. 1-6 and chaps. 2-4, 7, 9.

John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and U.S. Foreign Policy* (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2007), pp. 1-14, chaps. 1-3, and "Conclusion."

XIV. *Long, Frustrating, Small Wars*

5/5/08

Colonel C. E. Calwell, *Small Wars: Their Principles and Practice*, Third Edition (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1906), chap. 11.

Leslie H. Gelb with Richard K. Betts, *The Irony of Vietnam* (Brookings Institution, 1979), Introduction and chaps. 1, 3-5, 9, 11, 12.

Richard K. Betts, "Blowtorch Bob in Baghdad," *American Interest* 1, no. 4 (Summer 2006).

Advice on Research and Analytical Writing

Organize your analysis carefully. In the introduction, state clearly and concisely (1) what the question is that you are addressing; (2) why it is important; and (3) what your argument is. Make clear to the reader where you are going, but keep the introduction short. The conclusion to the paper should not simply repeat what you have said in summary form, but should weave together the strands in the body of the paper and show how the progression of the analysis leads to the two or three points that are the bottom line.

The bulk of the paper between the introduction and conclusion should marshal evidence to test your hypothesis. Figure out what evidence is both relevant and available for doing so. Evidence can be compilations of data on whatever phenomenon you are considering -- for example, trends in defense budgets, or foreign aid to certain countries, or GDPs of countries in question, and so forth. Evidence can also come from case studies of comparable events in the past. For example, if you are investigating the effectiveness of military intervention, you might compare some cases of success with some of failure and decide what similarities or differences among the cases best point to the most relevant conclusion.

How would one know whether what you believe is true or false? Does all the relevant evidence you have confirm your argument or lead to another conclusion? If the evidence is consistent with your explanation, is it consistent with different interpretations as well? Why are counterarguments to your position wrong or inadequate? Is there enough evidence available to reach a confident conclusion?

Research is not simple description, or simple assertion of opinion. It must involve some measure of theoretical description, explanation, or prediction. Theoretical description means identifying some taxonomy or *pattern* that clarifies understanding of a class of events. Explanation and prediction mean figuring out causes and effects -- why did certain things happen (explanation), or how can observed patterns or causes give clues to what is likely to happen under particular circumstances in the future (prediction)? If you want to assert an opinion, fine, but support it with analysis of the sort just mentioned -- that is, if you believe policy on issue "x" should be "y," show why the study of cases similar to "x" demonstrates the logic of "y" rather than of "a," or "b," or "c." Keep in mind the distinction between interesting data and relevant data. That is, the evidence you exploit must bear on the question you are asking.

Write clearly, directly, grammatically, and economically. Avoid cryptic or prolix constructions. Confusing prose indicates confused thought. See George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," which is reprinted in many collections, such as Peter Davison, ed., assisted by Angus and Sheila Davison, *The Complete Works of George Orwell*, vol. 17: *I Belong to the Left, 1945* (London: Secker and Warburg, 1998).

Citations must conform to normal academic forms. If you have the slightest doubt about what they are, consult a reputable style manual, or look at footnote form in a university press book or political science journal, or *look at the forms used on this syllabus*. Do not confuse the form for citation in footnotes with that for bibliographies. You may use any of the three standard alternatives, but the instructor's first preference is footnotes, second is endnotes, and last is the convention of

appending a bibliography and citing specific references with the author's name, date of publication, and page number in parentheses at the appropriate point in the text.

As you take notes in the course of research in the library, do not forget to jot down the complete citation for the source, and the page number for each point. You will not want to have to waste time later going back to find them when you need to cite points from that source in the paper. Do not try to get away with a practice that is becoming unfortunately common: citing sources without the page number(s) where the point referenced is made. The *only* time to do that is when you are referring to the general summary argument of the book or article, rather than a particular point made within it.

Unless you are very ambitious, you will probably be limited to using secondary sources and official documents in the Columbia library collections or on the Internet (but heed the reservations about the Internet noted below). The Senate and House committees on Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Intelligence publish many useful reports and hearings on issues that they address. The *Foreign Relations of the United States* series published by the State Department (available right downstairs in Lehman Library) is the invaluable source of declassified documents for any area of U.S. policymaking into the 1970s. The *Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense* (known informally as the "Posture Statement") contains official explanations of military force structure and programs. There are numerous other official sources you can reach through the library or Internet. Reference librarians should be able to assist you in finding appropriate documentary collections.

A *partial* list of periodicals likely to have useful articles for various topics in foreign policy:

Academic Journals

World Politics
International Security
Diplomatic History
Security Studies
Journal of Strategic Studies
Defense Analysis
Armed Forces and Society
Peacekeeping
International Journal of Intelligence and Counterintelligence
Intelligence and National Security
International Organization

Journals of Commentary and Opinion

Foreign Affairs
The National Interest
The American Interest
Survival
Washington Quarterly
Foreign Policy
Orbis
Commentary
World Policy Journal

Specialized Professional and Trade Journals

Foreign Service Journal
Naval War College Review
U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings

Parameters: Journal of the Army War College
Military Review
Army
Air University Review [to 1988]
Airpower Journal [after 1988]
JFQ: Joint Force Quarterly
Armed Forces Journal International
Defense Week
Defense News
Inside the Pentagon
Jane's Defense Weekly
Studies in Intelligence [unclassified issues]

Of course much valuable material can be obtained on the Internet, but your research cannot *under any circumstances* rely completely on the Internet. Do *not* indulge in the slothful mistake (which is now unfortunately common among students) of browsing the Internet as a *substitute* for library research. Most of the material on the Internet is very recent; only ignoramuses or fools believe that “old” sources are *ipso facto* inferior or irrelevant. Moreover, the vast bulk of material on the Internet is garbage, much of it trivial and irrelevant, much of it of unreliable provenance. It is easy to waste vast amounts of time surfing through it – time that should be spent reading relevant published material – and to be duped into accepting false or idiosyncratically posted material as valid. *The Internet is not a library*; you cannot count on material found there to remain there, and to be retrievable, forever. If you rely on anything from the Internet as evidence to cite, *be sure to print and keep a hard copy of it.*

For a colloquium paper you are not expected to display all the systematic methodological consciousness of a professional social scientist. The more rigorous your approach, however, the more impressive your paper will be. For those of you who are academically ambitious there are numerous guides to research methods and epistemological issues. Recent examples appropriate for graduate students in political science include Gary King, Robert O. Keohane, and Sidney Verba, *Designing Social Inquiry* (Princeton University Press, 1994) and Stephen Van Evera, *Guide to Methodology for Students of Political Science* (Cornell University Press, 1997). A shorter and more lively and readable classic, one likely to be appreciated by non-professional scholars, is E. H. Carr, *What Is History?* (Vintage, 1961).

Guidelines for the Research Paper Proposal Due February 21

Begin thinking about your research paper topic *immediately*. **You may have to order many of the books you need through Inter-Library Loan, which normally takes at least two weeks and sometimes much longer**, so delay in formulating your research plan and getting the lay of the land for what material is available may preclude access to sources that would optimize your analysis. If later sessions of the course are on subjects within which you think a topic of interest might lie, skip ahead to those sections of the syllabus and scan the assigned readings to help spur your thinking. If you have a general idea of the subject area that interests you, but are unsure about a specific topic or how to formulate a researchable question, consult the instructor for advice (do not wait until shortly before the proposal is due if you want considered recommendations). Your paper topic may be on anything concerning U.S. foreign policy, whether it lies in the subject areas on the syllabus or not. *Any paper, however, should apply and refer to whatever items in the assigned readings for the course help to illuminate the context of the question you are investigating.*

Under no circumstances later than February 10 go to the library and investigate the range of books and other sources that bear on the potential topics you have in mind. (Do not, however, spend time in the first stage carefully reading such books or documents. Scan them quickly to see what may be helpful, look more carefully at anything that seems exactly on point, but wait until you have a firmer sense of your topic before investing substantial time in lengthy specific sources.) As you go along in focusing your topic, compile a bibliography of sources that you intend to use.

Paper proposals will be graded Good, Satisfactory, or Unsatisfactory. *Proposals that do not adhere strictly to the following directions will be downgraded. **The proposal may NOT be more than 350 words*** (excluding bibliography). The purpose is not to present a preliminary version of the paper, but to indicate that you know what you are doing as you begin the process of developing it. Write only what is necessary to demonstrate that with clarity, simplicity, and directness. The proposal must be presented under these four headings:

- (1) **Question and Issue:** What are you investigating and why should anyone care? This section should normally be no more than fifty words.
- (2) **Hypotheses or Tentative Argument:** Which potential answer to the question seems likely to be correct? (As you develop the paper you are of course free to reach conclusions different from those anticipated at this stage. That is the purpose of research.) Be sure that your argument is a direct answer to the question posed in (1). This section should be less than 100 words.
- (3) **Research Plan:** How do you intend to analyze the question? What evidence – historical cases or data compilations – will you use to test hypotheses and illustrate your argument? ***This is the most important part of the proposal, and the one that usually proves most deficient.*** Do not state questions or arguments here – they belong in (1) and (2). The purpose of this section is to show that you have a plan for exploring and using empirical material that will answer your question. The point is to show that you know how to go beyond assertion to investigation, analysis, and proof. This section should constitute close to two-thirds of the prose proposal (excluding bibliography), and the bibliography should reflect the plan.
- (4) **Bibliography:** What sources have you consulted or do you intend to consult to guide your research and provide data? These should normally include some combination of books, articles, and official publications (e.g., congressional hearings, departmental reports, or declassified document collections).

The substance of the final paper may deviate from the proposal in light of subsequent research and analysis, but changes in topic must be approved by the instructor.

Papers on topics not approved will not be accepted.

Where your topic relates to issues, debates, or ideas that figure in the assigned readings for the course, you should engage the relevant elements of those readings, and demonstrate how the themes in the course are evoked or addressed by the question with which you deal.