

PL SC 442 - American Foreign Policy Spring 2007

Instructor: Navin Bapat, 231 Pond Building, 863.8859, email: nab12@psu.edu.

Time and Location: M W F 10:10-11:00; 367 Willard.

Office Hours: T 10:00-12:00 or by appt.

Introduction: Welcome to the study of American Foreign Policy. The goal of this class is to examine how foreign policy is formed and implemented within the United States. Specifically, we will address issues such as:

1. Who are the primary actors who work to form American foreign policy?
2. How well does American foreign policy reflect American values?
3. How does party competition affect the ability of the U.S. to conduct foreign policy?
4. How do U.S. institutions affect American bargaining with other states in the international system?

The course is divided into three basic parts. The first part introduces the branches of government that influence American foreign policy. Primarily, this involves the President, but Congress and sometimes, the Supreme Court, may also play parts in the formulation of foreign policy.

The second part of the course will introduce several theories of foreign policy. These theories are not restricted to the analysis of the United States. In order to understand U.S. foreign policy decision making, it is also necessary to understand the decision making of all governments throughout the system. We will examine how public preferences translate into policies in democratic governments, how interest groups affect foreign policy, and how the President and Congress respond to public demand. We will also examine how re-election incentives in democracies affect the decisions of government leaders.

The final part of the course will draw upon these theories to examine current situations in which the U.S. finds itself. We will examine how U.S. institutions perform when faced with international crises, bargaining over international trade, bargaining in international institutions, intervention opportunities, and conflict with non-state actors, including terrorist groups. The theoretical foundation of the second part of the course will give us a basis to explain the behavior of the U.S. and predict future U.S. action in similar situations.

I am assuming that you are familiar with basic American diplomatic history in the twentieth century. *It is important to note that this is not a history class!!* We therefore will not be spending much time on the history of the United States. If you are not familiar with U.S. history and need an overview, a good source is:

Stephen W. Hook and John Spanier. 2003. American Foreign Policy Since World War II. 16th edition. Congressional Quarterly: Washington DC.

More importantly, I assume that you are keeping up with current events. Though the theories of foreign policy are very general and abstract, the purpose of the course is to use these theories to explain U.S. behavior in the international system. For us to do so, you must be familiar with the contemporary foreign policy problems facing the world and the role of the U.S. in such situations. Quick news sources can be found on the web, such as:

<http://www.nytimes.com>

<http://www.cnn.com>

<http://www.foxnews.com>

<http://www.reuters.com>

Grading: Your final grade in the course will be determined as follows:

Analytical Papers	40% (2 @ 20% each)
First Exam	30%
Second Exam	30%

1. *Analytical Papers:* Each student is required to write two analytical papers discussing a current topic in U.S. foreign policy using some of the theoretical concepts introduced in the class. In each analytical paper, you will be expected to:

- Introduce a current foreign policy problem and briefly discuss the background leading to the problem.
- Utilize one of the theoretical concepts introduced in class to explain the source of the problem.
- Offer predictions as to what will happen next using the theoretical concept.
- Defend or critique this explanation as an appropriate way to understand the problem.

An example might be an explanation of how the Bush Administration is responding to North Korean nuclear threats using a Groupthink explanation. Someone using this topic would briefly introduce the background to the North Korean problem, introduce the concept of groupthink, explain the problem using groupthink, offer predictions, and subsequently justify why or why not it is appropriate to examine the problem in this way. These papers should be no longer than 6 pages (double spaced, 12 point font). Before you write your analytical paper, email me with your topic for approval. This way I can make sure you are on the right track. Your topics must be approved one week prior to handing in the assignment. If you turn in an assignment that has not been approved, you will lose 10 points. I am willing to accept most topics, so long as they are contemporary and relevant to American foreign policy. There are two deadlines for the analytical papers. **You may hand in your papers at any time during the semester, but at least one must be approved by February 19 and handed in by March 2. The second paper must be approved by April 23 and handed in by May 4.** If you have not turned in one analytical paper by March 2, you will lose one letter grade for each day that it is late (including weekends and holidays). The only exception to this rule will be in the case of documented emergencies, in which case I will need to see documentation. The same rule applies for the paper due on May 4. If the second paper is not handed in by the deadline, you will lose one letter grade for each day that it is late (including weekends and holidays).

2. *First and Second Exams:* You will be given two exams during the semester, one at the midpoint and one on the final day of class. **The first exam will be on February 23, the second exam will be on April 27.** Each exam will be given in class and will last one class period. There will be three essay questions on the exam. You will be required to answer two out of the three questions. The exams are designed to demonstrate how well you understand the material and your ability to analyze and critique arguments. You are required to bring a bluebook for both exams.

Special Provisions: Students with documented disabilities who require special accommodations should meet with me and express their needs during the first two weeks of the class. All discussions will remain confidential. I am happy to do whatever I can to assure each student full and rewarding participation in class.

Required Reading: There is one required text for this course:

G. John Ikenberry. 2004. *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*. 5th Ed.. New York: Longman.

The remaining readings are articles drawn from scholarly journals and books. The vast majority of the articles are available online through <http://www.jstor.org> or through the library's Online Journal section. To get most of these, you will need to use an on-campus computer. If you do so, you should be able to access the articles. For articles on JSTOR, you simply need to visit the website. For articles through the library, you can usually obtain them from ProQuest. In other cases, I will post the articles directly on ANGEL so you can get them.

Course Schedule and Reading List

January 17: Introduction. No Reading Assignment.

January 19: The Major Actors in U.S. Foreign Policy. Ikenberry 11; Eugene Witkopf and James R. McCormick. 1998. Congress, the President, and the End of the Cold War: Has Anything Changed? *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42(4): 440-466.

January 22: A Rational Public? Understanding American Values. Ikenberry 10.

January 24: Patterns in American Public Opinion. Ikenberry 12, 14; Eytan Gilboa. 2005. Global Television News and Foreign Policy: Debating the CNN Effect. *International Studies Perspectives* 6: 325-341.

January 26: Elites and Interest Groups. Ikenberry 7-8.

January 29: Interest Groups and Foreign Policy. Ikenberry 16-17.

January 31: The Bureaucracy. Daniel Byman. Strategic Surprise and the September 11 Attacks. *Annual Review of Political Science* 8: 145-170.

February 2: Film. *Dead Wrong: Inside an Intelligence Meltdown.*

February 5: Decision Making I: Presidential Character and the Lessons of History. Ikenberry 21-23.

February 7: Decision Making II: Allison's Models and Groupthink. Ikenberry 18-19; Steve A. Yetiv. 2003. Groupthink and the Gulf Crisis. *British Journal of Political Science* 33: 419-442.

February 9: Decision Making III: The Politics of Political Survival. Bruce Bueno de Mesquita, James D. Morrow, Randolph Siverson, and Alastair Smith. 1999. An Institutional Explanation of the Democratic Peace. *American Political Science Review* 93(4): 791-807.

February 12: The Diversionary Use of Force. Benjamin Fordham. 2005. Strategic Conflict Avoidance and the Diversionary Use of Force. *Journal of Politics* 67(1): 132-153.

February 14: Film. *Thirteen Days I.*

February 16: Film: *Thirteen Days II.*

February 19: Film. *Thirteen Days III.*

February 21: Review. Bruce Bueno de Mesquita. 2002. Domestic Politics and International Relations. *International Studies Quarterly* 46(1): 1-9. *Note: Class attendance is optional today.*

February 23: First Exam.

February 26-March 2: No Class. International Studies Association Conference.

March 5: Bargaining and Strategic Interaction. James D. Fearon. 1995. Rationalist Explanations for War. *International Organization* 49(3): 379-414.

March 7: Bargaining and International Conflict. James D. Fearon. 1994. Domestic Political Audiences and the Escalation of International Disputes. *American Political Science Review* 88(3): 577-592.

March 9: Democracy and War. Kenneth Schultz. 1998. Domestic Opposition and Signaling in International Crises. *American Political Science Review* 92(4): 829-845.

March 12-16: No Class. Spring Break!!!

March 19: The Internal Dynamics of U.S. Trade Policy. Susanne Lohmann and Sharyn O'Halloran. 1994. Divided Government and U.S. Trade Policy: Theory and Evidence. *International Organization* 48(4): 596-632.

- March 21: International Trade Negotiation.** Robert Putnam. 1988. Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two Level Games. *International Organization* 42(3): 427-460; Bahar Leventoglu & Ahmer Tarar. 2005. Prenegotiation Public Commitment in Domestic and International Bargaining. *American Political Science Review* 99(3): 419-433.
- March 23: The U.S., Multinational Firms, and Economic Sanctions.** T. Clifton Morgan and Navin Bapat. 2003. Imposing Sanctions: States, Firms, and Economic Coercion. *International Studies Review* 5(4): 65-79;
- March 26: International Institutions.** Ikenberry 2; Robert Axelrod and Robert Keohane. 1985. Achieving Cooperation Under Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions. *World Politics* 38(1): 226-254.
- March 28: The U.S. Role in International Institutions.** Barry R Posen. 2003. Command of the Commons: The Military Foundation of U.S. Hegemony. *International Security* 28(1): 5-46. Shahsi Tharoor. 2003. Why America Still Needs the United Nations. *Foreign Affairs* 82(5); Scott Straus. 2005. Darfur and the Genocide Debate. *Foreign Affairs* 84(1).
- March 30: Film.** *Isolating America.*
- April 2: Globalization.** Martin C. McGuire. 2000. Provision for Adversity: Managing Supply Uncertainties in an Era of Globalization. *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 44(6): 730-752.
- April 4: The U.S. and the integration of the world economy.** Jeffrey E. Garten. 2005. The Global Economic Challenge. *Foreign Affairs* 84(1); Niall Ferguson. 2005. Sinking Globalization. *Foreign Affairs* 84(2).
- April 6: Film.** *Globalization and Human Rights.*
- April 9: Development.** Philip Keefer. 2004. What Does Political Economy Tell Us About Development (and Vice-Versa)? *Annual Review of Political Science* 7: 247-272.
- April 11: The United States and the Developing World.** Nancy Birdsall, Dani Rodrik, and Arvind Subramanian. 2005. How to Help Poor Countries. *Foreign Affairs* 84(4).
- April 13: Intrastate Conflict.** Barbara Walter. 1997. The Critical Barrier to Civil War Settlement. *International Organization* 51(3): 335-364.
- April 16: Intervention into Civil Conflict.** Barbara F. Walter. 1999. Designing Institutions from Civil War: Demobilization, Democratization, and Commitments to Peace. *International Security* 24(1): 127-155
- April 18: Terrorism and Insurgency.** Navin Bapat. 2005. Insurgency and the Opening of Peace Processes. *Journal of Peace Research* 42(6): 699-717.
- April 20: "Wars" on Terrorism.** Navin Bapat. 2006. State Support for Terrorism and International Crisis. *Working Paper.*
- April 23: International Crime.** Ana Arana. 2005. How Street Gangs took Central America. *Foreign Affairs* 84(3).
- April 25: Review.**
- April 27: Second Exam.**
- April 30-May 4: Paper Writing Session.**
- Analytic Papers Due March 2 and May 4.*