**Political Science 455 Seminar US Foreign Policy**

**Fall, 2022 Professor Volgy**

**Tuesdays, 1:00-3:30 PM Social Sciences 311**

**SYLLABUS**

**Office Hours**: Wednesday/Thursday 11:00-12:30 and by appointment

**Office**: Social Sciences 330

**E-mail**: volgy@email.arizona.edu

**Web page**: [www.volgy.org](http://www.volgy.org)

**How to reach my office hours:** I expect to do in-person office hours. If due to the pandemic you are reluctant to come to my office in person, we can always arrange to have us talk instead via zoom, as long as you give me advance notice and I can then set up a zoom meeting instead of an in-person one.

***First, about the “elephant in the room*”: As I am assembling this syllabus, the coronavirus pandemic is fluctuating in Arizona and Tucson. It may be better or worse by the time we start the semester. However, given projections, I am expecting that we will meet in person during the fall semester. The pandemic continues to be serious, even for those of us who have been vaccinated and boosted.**

**Therefore, I ask for the following cautions in class: 1) please come to class with a mask and wear it during class; 2) feel free to remove it when you are speaking; 3) if you are ill, do not come to class and please get a test for the virus. I will do likewise. Also, if you come to my office, please wear a mask (so will I). I cannot require you to do any of this, but I am asking you to do so in case there are immunocompromised people in our class.**

 **Some of you may wish to zoom rather than attend in person. Unfortunately, we don’t have the technology in this classroom to make that happen, and therefore I need to ask that all of us attend in person, unless something terrible happens (if the pandemic accelerates again), and then we will all go to option B (I’m still trying to figure out option B).**

**With all of that in mind, let’s turn to the nature of this course, requirements, and plan of study:**

**Course Organization and Rationale**

This course proceeds in four stages. First, we will investigate the actors involved in the making of US foreign policy. Second, we will examine alternative theoretical conceptions and approaches to foreign policy. Third, we will examine a number of foreign policies, within the context of these actors and explanations. Finally, you will be asked to write a paper that integrates these different stages into a coherent examination of one U.S. foreign policy of interest to you.

We will be looking at US foreign policy at an unprecedented time: the dramatic movement of foreign policy from the Trump to the Biden Administration. Such changes are not novel in the history of US foreign policy. In fact, transitions of such type are the norm in democracies. What makes this an unprecedented time is that it is the first in memory when the outgoing President a) lacked both any experience in government, and certainly any experience in the handling of U.S. foreign policy; b) had made campaign commitments, both in domestic and foreign policy (e,g., “to drain the swamp”), which are at variance with not only the incoming administration but as well with his own party; and c) took a series of actions through his last two months in office to make it incredibly difficult for the incoming administration to change policy direction. Through this course, we will be able to trace a) what, if any, fundamental changes are being made to the actors who direct foreign policy; b) the conceptual structure(s) that drives foreign policy; and c) any actual, substantial changes to extant foreign policy. ***So, an implicit (and explicit) dimension to everything we will do in this course will be to focus on these changes as they continue to unfold before us***. Our primary objective will be to try to explain why these changes are occurring (or not occurring if change was promised).

A second, but related issue is that we will be viewing U.S. foreign policy while the country is still in the midst of a pandemic, facing strong inflationary and economic pressures, and incredibly deep social and political divisions in society. How these conditions impact U.S. foreign policy is also a critical question we will need to address.

**How to Get to our Goals**

We will do so several ways. Part of the work involves reading, and the assignments are noted below. If you need a text, one decent one is Cox and Stokes, *US Foreign Policy* (3nd edition). Its online version is available from the publisher or a hard copy can be had from Amazon much cheaper than the bookstore. However, I will not require it. Instead, I’ve put together a series of articles as required readings and I will have those available for you on my web page ([www.volgy.org](http://www.volgy.org)) under Pol 455. You can click on the reading and it will download. However, if I’ve listed a reading followed by its url address, it means it could not be downloaded and you will need to go to that address to do the reading. **CAUTION: I’m not using D2L for the required readings, so please don’t look for the materials there**.

Much of our efforts will involve seminar work: Since this is an actual seminar, deliberately restricted to less than 15 of us, a substantial part of our responsibilities will revolve around our classroom discussions. I expect all of us to come to class, well prepared to discuss the week’s subject matter. The responsibility in all seminars belongs jointly to the faculty member and the student. I expect that I will learn from you and you will learn from each other as much if not more than what you will learn from me. ***To do so requires not only doing the readings in advance of the seminar, but thinking critically about their contents, and coming to the seminar ready and prepared to discuss them.***

In addition, I will ask you to sign up for a series of “assignments” where you will be asked to take over the course (either individually or in groups of two), and expand on our discussion with an application to the changes going on in Washington. I will have a sign-up sheet when we first meet to give you plenty of time to prepare for your sessions.

Finally, a substantial portion of this seminar will be devoted to not only analyzing the knowledge of others, but in creating our own knowledge base. Each of you will be asked to write an original paper, focusing on an aspect of the core theme of the seminar. To do a good job, we will talk extensively about ***social science methods*** and you will be expected to dirty your hands with actual data and its analysis.

------------------------------------------

***Expected learning outcomes***: In this course we have two major learning outcomes. The first is to demonstrate research and writing skills relevant to the field of political science. This will be assessed through the major research paper that focuses on both research competence and the ability to write coherently regarding your research effort.

Second, to demonstrate critical thinking about political issues by assessing competing arguments and developing proficiency in communicating arguments in oral and written forms. Much of this will be assessed by your ability to analyze and compare critically alternative theories of foreign policy and apply your analysis to both classroom discussion and on your major research paper.

**General Expectations**

***Please keep in mind that the syllabus acts as a contract between the faculty member and the student. By taking this course, you agree to read the requirements noted in the syllabus and agree to abide by them. By passing out the syllabus, likewise I agree to its terms with you. Changes to the syllabus then should only occur through mutual consent, and both instructor and student agree to act accordingly.***

***Class participation*:** This is an upper division seminar based on the discussion method. Therefore, I expect that you will come to class well prepared. By this, I mean that not only have you read the materials that are due for that day but also that a) you will have thought about them; and b) you are ready to discuss them. I have limited the readings so that you will not be reading a large number for most sessions; in turn, I expect that you will read what is assigned closely, and critically.

 ***Specifically, you are asked to do the following with respect to the readings:***

1. You need to read each assigned reading closely, and critically. By critically, I’m asking you to ask yourself at each major argument: Why is this? What evidence is there for this assertion? Can I think of an example that weakens this argument? To what extent is the argument refuted or contradicted by what we’ve discussed/read earlier? How good is the quality of evidence being used?
2. You need to take notes ***before class*** on both the key concepts/issues/ideas in the readings and on your criticism of them;
3. Your notes should be sufficiently thorough and clear to allow you to use them to: a) respond to questions/challenges/issues raised in class about the readings; and b) as the source with which to review the readings later without going back to the actual readings;
4. If you have to start looking back at the actual readings when class is taking place, you have not done a good enough job of taking notes!
5. Consult your notes ***before*** coming to class; this allows you to prepare for our class discussions. ***Think about the day’s subject before class starts***!
6. Keep current with current events regarding US foreign policy. I anticipate that the foreign policy world will be changing dramatically as we proceed through the course. A good way to do this is to read the *New York Times* daily (electronic version).

These basic points will allow you to do a good job in discussing the materials in class; they will allow you as well a strategy of getting the most out of the readings we have. It is a strategy all graduate students use in the social sciences. Participation in class discussions is incredibly important in a seminar, and if you like hiding in class I do reserve the right to call on you if you are not participating.

***Examination policy:***There is a mid-term exam, scheduled for Week 8 (October 11). There is a time and place scheduled for a final exam, but the ***final is*** ***optional***: ***I have the option*** of requiring you to take it if our class discussions do not turn out as well as I expect and I’m having trouble evaluating you on your in-class performance. Otherwise, ***if I make it optional***, ***you may choose to take it*** if you feel that taking it would compensate for deficiencies either on the mid-term, class participation, or on the paper that is due. For more information on these exams, see the section on Grades (p.7).

I assume that you will plan your schedule according to the schedule for the exams and will take these exams on the assigned dates. If you cannot, for any reason, attend the midterm or the final (assuming that you wish to take it or if I choose to make it non-optional), you must notify me at least one week **prior** to the exam. I will not give make-up exams unless your failure to take the exam involved an extremely unusual hardship or unavoidable circumstance.

***Attendance policy:*** I consider what goes on during class to be a crucial component of this course. Just as importantly, as a 400 level seminar, missing a class is a serious “no-no”. Missing class will mean that it will be virtually impossible for you to do well in the course. This problem is further compounded by the fact that we only meet once a week, and if you miss one class you will have missed a week’s worth. Therefore, it is assumed that you will be here for every class. The UA’s policy concerning class attendance is available at: <http://catalog.arizona.edu/2015-16/policies/classatten.htm>. Absences pre-approved by the UA Dean of Students (or Dean designee) will be honored. See <http://hr.arizona.edu/policy/appointed-personnel/7.04.02>. The UA policy regarding absences on and accommodation of religious holidays is available at <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/policies-and-codes/accommodation-religious-observance-and-practice>.

***So, please COME PREPARED and THINKING ABOUT THE WEEKLY ASSIGNMENT; COME ON TIME; COME EVERY WEEK, and while in class, ENGAGE the topic every week.***

 ***Plagiarism***: I’m assuming that you are well aware of the University’s policies regarding plagiarism. In the academic world, stealing the work of others, or failing to give full credit where it is due (and not using full citations), is a capital, criminal offense, punishable—if not by guillotine—by expulsion from the course, and depending on the severity of the crime, from the University. If you don’t know what plagiarism is…or you are in doubt at any point in your work…feel free to ask before it is too late. The University’s plagiarism policy is located at: <http://deanofstudents.arizona.edu/academic-integrity/students/academic-integrity>. Assistance with what is and what is not plagiarism is provided at: <http://www.library.arizona.edu/help/tutorials/plagiarism/>

***Other issues***: I hope I don’t need to remind you of this, but just in case, it is expected that we treat each other with respect and dignity. University policies regarding these issues can be found at: <http://policy.arizona.edu/human-resources/nondiscrimination-and-anti-harassment-policy> and at: <http://policy.arizona.edu/education-and-student-affairs/threatening-behavior-students> . Additionally, respect for all of us includes not coming to class late and interrupting others; turning off cell phones before class, ***not using laptops during class session for anything unrelated specifically to the materials being addressed that day in class***, etc.

You will see that often I will use power points. I do this only because I have terrible handwriting and my scribbling is difficult to read. So, it is a shorthand…outline…for what we are discussing. **WARNING**: there is nothing more dangerous than power points for learning…they are just an outline of ideas or a shorthand for ideas, not the ideas themselves. So, please be careful with them, and take notes on the ideas behind the outline. This is also why I don’t put the power points on my web page and please don’t ask for a copy of them

 On another note: if you need assistance or looking for support with special needs, they can be located at either the S.A.L.T center (<http://www.salt.arizona.edu/>) or at the Disability Resources center ([**http://drc.arizona.edu/**](http://drc.arizona.edu/)**). It is the University’s goal that learning experiences be as accessible as possible.  If you anticipate or experience physical or academic barriers based on disability or pregnancy, please let me know immediately so that we can discuss options.  You are also welcome to contact Disability Resources (520-621-3268) to establish reasonable accommodations.**

**GRADES:** Grades are unavoidable, even in seminars. In this one, the final grade will be based on the following:

***Exams*:** the midterm (and the possible final exam) will count for 30% of the course grade.

***Final paper****:* this paper is designed to synthesize what you’ve learned, and apply it to an important, substantive case in international politics; it will be worth 40% of the course grade.

***Class participation****:* I am serious about the discussion format for this course. Therefore, the **quality** of your class participation will be worth 30% of the course grade. This also includes the sessions you will lead. During all class periods come prepared to discuss the materials and to raise critical objections to the materials.

**CHOICES for grading: *In graduate level seminars there are typically no exams, only work in the seminar and on the paper. If you wish, I can give you that option, but it will have to be up to the class to so choose. If you choose that option, then your grade will be as follows: 45% participation in the seminar; 55% on the paper. We will talk about this the first day of class.***

**Seminar Paper:**

You are being asked to write a research paper on a key phenomenon in U.S. foreign policy. Your choice of topics is up to you, but with two suggestions: First, before proceeding, you clear the topic with me, and in the paper you will need to justify the topic/puzzle as a salient issue for international politics. Second, there is always a default option: What will be, and what should be the role of the United States in international politics? You may choose this option if you can’t find another, more salient puzzle to pursue. But you will need to justify this one as well, and the justification needs to be based on a theoretical framework that provides a broad explanation about how U.S. foreign policy works.

 The purpose of this paper is to give you an opportunity to synthesize and apply the materials—both theoretical and empirical—we developed in the course. You will need to have a good command of U.S. foreign policy (and this of course depends on the theoretical approach you choose to understand it), and data to back up your assertions and/or hypotheses.

 This assignment becomes manageable if you will do two things: First, decide about what will be your topic of choice, very early in the semester. You can then use it as a skeletal device on which to hang alternative theoretical perspectives. Second, at the end of each week’s seminar, you should think about how the topic, our discussions, and how our common readings can apply to your paper.

I will evaluate your paper on the following criteria:

* How well did you synthesize and apply our readings and discussion to the topic?
* How well did you demonstrate your understanding of alternative theoretical approaches for US foreign policy and the criteria used to choose among them?
* How well did you integrate data/observations with your theoretical perspective in your essay and apply our “steps in a research design” discussion?
* How creative and insightful were you in developing your answer, while keeping within the bounds of what can be realistically expected in the new US administration?

**Schedule of Classes**

**DATE TOPIC and READINGS**

**Week 1**

(August 23) **Introduction to course: objectives and requirements**

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 2**

(August 30) **Who Are the Actors That Make US Foreign Policy?**

***As you read and think about the section on “Actors”, please focus on the following questions: 1) How have the key actors changed after the 2020 elections (from Trump to Biden)? 2) What do we want to know about the key actors making foreign policy? 3) What is the likely impact of these changing actors on US foreign policy and in what areas?***

**READINGS**: Colgan (2013). “Domestic Revolutionary Leaders and International Conflict.” *World Politics*.

Saunders (2017). “No Substitute for Experience…” *International Organization*

 Bacevich, A. (2011) “The Tyranny of Defense Inc.” *Atlantic Magazine*.

Cohen (2017) “Live and Learn: Availability Biases and Beliefs about Military Power.” *Foreign Policy Analysis*

Keller et al. (2020) “Presidential Risk Propensity and Intervention in Interstate Conflicts.” *Foreign Policy Analysis*.

Optional: Astor (2019) “How much political experience does it take to be elected President?” *New York Times*

**Week 3**

(September 6) **Actors (continued): Congress, the Media and Public Opinion**

**READINGS:** Berinsky, A. (2007) “Assuming the Costs of War: Events, Elites and American Support for Military Conflict,” *Journal of Politics*, Vol.69.

 Baum (2013) “The Iraq Coalition of the Willing and (Politically) Able…” *American Journal of Political Science*

 Jacobs and Page (2005) “Who Influences US Foreign Policy?” *APSR*

 Baum and Potter (2019) “Media, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy in the Age of Social Media, *Journal of Politics*.

 Tama (2018) “The Multiple forms of Bipartisanship: Congress.” *Social Science Research Council*

Optional (but recommended): Milner and Tingley (2011) “Who Supports Global Economic Engagement? The Sources of Preferences in American Foreign Economic Policy.” *International Organization*

Optional: for data on recent public opinion toward U.S. foreign policy, see: <https://www.thechicagocouncil.org/issue/public-opinion> and

<https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/icpsrweb/ICPSR/series/4>

 ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 4**

(September 13) **Actors: the Principal-Agent Problem**

 **READINGS**: Bueno de Mesquita, *Principles of International Politics*, pps. 157-170

 Groves, 2015. “Principal-Agent Problems…,” *International Journal of Political Science and Development*.

 Blinken and Kagan (2019) “America First is Only Making Things Worse…” *The Washington Post.*

 Drezner (2019) “Present at the Destruction…” *Journal of Politics*

DeYoung, Karen (2015) “How the Obama White House Runs Foreign Policy”.

Optional: Donald Trump’s Foreign Policy appointments: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/graphics/politics/trump-administration-appointee-tracker/database/> And a comment by The Economist[[1]](#footnote-1)

Optional: Tenpas et. al. (2020). “Tracking Turnover in the Trump Administration.” *Brookings* <https://www.brookings.edu/research/tracking-turnover-in-the-trump-administration/>

**REMINDER**: ***By no later than today you need to email me a brief (paragraph or so) statement of what you wish to focus on for your paper. See appendix B for further information.***

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 5**

(September 20) **Biden versus Trump Administration Personnel**

***Student Presentations***

Points to address: 1) Key characteristics of new vs. Trump personnel?

 2) Consequences of these changes for foreign policy?

-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 6**

(September 27) **Explanations of US Foreign Policy: Realism**

 **READINGS**: Schmidt, B. & Williams, M. (2008) “Bush Doctrine & the Iraq War: Neoconservatives vs. Realists.” *Security Studies*. April: 191-220.

Lobell (2010) “Structural Realism…” *Oxford Encyclopedia of International Relations* at <https://oxfordre.com/internationalstudies/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190846626.001.0001/acrefore-9780190846626-e-304>

 Brooks and Wohlforth (2015) “The Rise and Fall of Great Powers in the 21st Century.” *International Security*

Optional (but recommended): Waltz (2000) “Structural Realism after the Cold War.” *International Security*

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 7**

(October 4) **Explanations of US Foreign Policy**: **Liberalism and NeoConservativism**

**READINGS:**

 Ikenberry, G. John (2009) “Liberal Internationalism 3.0: America and the Dilemma of Liberal World Order.” *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 7, pp. 71-87.

 Amorim Neto and Malamud (2015) “Who Determines Foreign Policy in Latin America?” *Latin American Politics and Society* 57, 4.

 Gordon and Shapiro, 2020. “How Trump Killed the Atlantic Alliance.” *Foreign Affairs*.

 The Economist (2020) “China v America.”

Brook, Yaron and Epstein, Alex (2007) “Neoconservative Foreign Policy: An Autopsy.” The Objective Standard. (Summer). [https://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2007-summer/neoconservative-foreign-policy/#](https://www.theobjectivestandard.com/issues/2007-summer/neoconservative-foreign-policy/)

Optional: Moravcsik (1997) “Taking Preferences Seriously: A Liberal Theory of International Politics.” *International Organization*

Optional: Lew (2016) “America and the Global Economy: The Case for US Leadership.” *Foreign Affairs*

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 8**

(October 11) **Midterm Exam**

 **Alternative: Steps in Research design for Research papers**

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 9**

(October 18) **Explanations (continued): Decision Making Models**

 **READINGS**:

 (Rational Model) Bergen, P. (2009) “The Account of How We Nearly Caught Osama bin Laden in 2001”, *New Republic*. December. <https://newrepublic.com/article/72086/the-battle-tora-bora>

 (Bureaucratic Model) Marsh, K. (2013) “Obama’s Surge: A Bureaucratic Politics Analysis of the Decision to Order a Troop Surge in the Afghanistan War.” *Foreign Policy Analysis* (February).

(Comparing Models) Yahi Milo (2013) “In the Eye of the Beholder…” I*nternational Security*

-----------------------------------------------------

**Week 9 (Part 2)**

(October 18) **Constructivism, Identity, and Global Leadership**

**READINGS**: Verma (2020). “Pompeo Says Human Rights Policy Must Prioritize Property Righs and Religion.” *New York Times*.

 Smith (2020) “Missing in Analysis: Women in Foreign Policy-Making.” *Foreign Policy Analysis*

 Wendt (1992) “Anarchy is what states make of it…” *International Organization*

 Corn, David (2016) “Donald Trump Says He Doesn’t Believe in ‘American Exceptionalism’” <https://www.motherjones.com/politics/2016/06/donald-trump-american-exceptionalism/>

**Week 10**

(October 25) **Explanations (continued): Strategic/Elite Survival Theory**

 **READINGS**: Bueno de Mesquita, “Selectorate Theory.” In *Principles of International Politics*.

 Siverson and Bueno de Mesquita. 2017. “The Selectorate Theory and International Politics,” in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Empirical International Relations Theory*

--------------------------------------------------

**Week 10 (Part 2)**

(October 25) **Is There a Grand Strategy to US Foreign Policy?**

 **READINGS:** Feaver (2009) “What is Grand Strategy and why do we need it?”

 Drezner (2011) “Does Obama Have a Grand Strategy?”

 Ferguson (2016) “Donald Trump’s New World Order.” *The American Interest*

Drezner et al. (2020) “The End of Grand Strategy,” *Foreign Affairs*

Optional: Monaghan (2013) “Russia’s Grand Strategy.”

 Optional: Miller (2012) “Global Politics and Strategy…Five Pillars.”

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**Week 11**

(November 1) **Geography Based Foreign Policy: A Framework for approaching Regions in World Politics**

 **READINGS:** Volgy et al. (2017) “Conflict, Regions, and Regional Hierarchies,” In William R. Thompson, ed., *Oxford Encyclopedia of Empirical International Relations Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.

**--------------------------------------**

**Geography based Foreign Policy: The Middle East**

 **READINGS:** Charountaki (2014) “US Foreign Policy in Theory and Practice: From Soviet Era Containment to the Era of Arab Uprising(s).” *American Foreign Policy Interests*.

 The Economist (2022) “Change You Can’t Believe In: Joe Biden’s Middle East Policy Looks a Lot Like his Predecessors”

**--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Week 12**

(November 8) **Geography Based Foreign Policy: China and Asia**

 **READINGS**: Johnson (2022) “Biden’s Grand China Strategy: Eloquent but Inadequate,” Council on Foreign Relations, at: <https://www.cfr.org/in-brief/biden-china-blinken-speech-policy-grand-strategy>

Bader (2022) “Biden’s China Policy Needs to be More than just Trump Lite,” *Brookings*.

Optional: Blinken (2022) “The Administration’s Approach to the Peoples Republic of China,” at: <https://www.state.gov/the-administrations-approach-to-the-peoples-republic-of-china/>

---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**Week 13**

(November 15) **Discussion of Research Papers**

**--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Week 14**

(November 22) **NO CLASS: THANKSGIVING RECESS**

**---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Week 15**

(November 28) **Research paper presentations**

**------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**Week 16**

(December 6) **Research paper presentations (continued)**

 **Wrap-up and discussion of the final exam**

**-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------**

**December 13: Final Paper due no later than today**

**FINAL EXAM**: Evidently the final exam date for this course is scheduled at the same time and day as the final exam for Pol 365. A couple of you are in both courses, and so am I. Since we don’t have a cloning machine (yet), I am proposing that we hold the final exam for this course on a mutually agreed date and time (to be discussed in class).

====================================================================

**Appendix A: Additional Resources:**

Cockburn (2016) “The New Red Scare.” *Harpers*.

“Global Trends, 2030.” A Publication of the National Intelligence Council

Hooker (2014) “The Grand Strategy of the United States.”

Hooker (ed.) (2016) *Charting a Course: Strategic Choices for a New Administration*. National Defense University Press.

Martel (2012) “Why America Needs a Grand Strategy.” The Diplomat

McDougal (2010) “Can The United States Do Grand Strategy? FPRI

Miller (2012) “Global Politics and Strategy.” *Survival*

Norpoth and Sidman (2007) “Mission Accomplished: The Wartime Election of 2004.” *Political Behavior*

Norrlof and Wohlforth (2016) Is US grand strategy self-defeating? Deep engagement, military spending and sovereign debt.” *Conflict Management and Peace Science*.

Pentagon (2014) “Quadrennial Defense Review.” Then, see the National Defense Strategy that replaced it (the latest is for 2022, at: <https://media.defense.gov/2022/Mar/28/2002964702/-1/-1/1/NDS-FACT-SHEET.PDF>

State Department (2015) “Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review”

Allison (2021) “The Great Military Rivalry: China vs. the US,” at: <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/great-military-rivalry-china-vs-us>

Allison (2022). “The Great Economic Rivalry: The US versus China,” at: <https://www.belfercenter.org/publication/great-economic-rivalry-china-vs-us>

Allison (2022) “The Great Tech Rivalry: China vs the US,” at: <https://www.belfercenter.org/sites/default/files/GreatTechRivalry_ChinavsUS_211207.pdf>

V-Dem Institute (2022). Democracy Report 2022, at: <https://v-dem.net/media/publications/dr_2022.pdf>

China Briefing (2022) “U.S. China Relations in The Biden Era: A Timeline” at: <https://www.china-briefing.com/news/us-china-relations-in-the-biden-era-a-timeline/>

Stratfor (2011) *The Geopolitics of the United States*.

“U.S. National Security Strategy, 2015.” U.S. White House

“U.S. National Security Strategy, 2017.” U.S. White House (available on my web page)

The annual budgets of the United States: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/Overview>

Stratfor 2017 “2017 Annual Forecast” (on the possibility of a Trump Grand Strategy)

*Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2019 issue)

For discussions and analyses of the effects of U.S. trade agreements, see:

<https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/ec201406a.pdf>

<http://www.cfr.org/trade/naftas-economic-impact/p15790>

<https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42965.pdf>

<http://papers.nber.org/tmp/37109-w21906.pdf>

<http://www.epi.org/publication/standard-models-benchmark-costs-globalization/>

<http://papers.nber.org/tmp/13487-w21027.pdf>

<https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2018/12/12/business/economy/tariff-man-origin-story.html>

**APPENDIX B: The Research Paper**

For this project you should focus on one of two types of policies: either a geography-based policy (i.e. US/Russian relations, US relations towards the Middle East, etc.), or on a subject-based foreign policy (i.e. US foreign policy regarding climate change, or, international trade, or human rights, etc.).

There are several objectives for this paper:

1. Synthesize and apply the theoretical frameworks we discussed in class to a specific foreign policy area. Doing so will require you to choose among competing theoretical approaches, by first developing a set of criteria as to which theoretical approach would be most useful; then, applying that approach to the issue at hand.
2. Show how you can generate data/evidence to make your arguments;
3. Apply the research design outline we will discuss in class to your assignment

Sooner or later the nasty question of “What’s the length limit of this paper?” arises. I don’t have a good answer for you since some of you write very succinctly while others of you (like me) take much longer to communicate in writing. In general, I would offer the following: a) no one has done well on this paper writing less than about seven to eight pages; and b) I will not read anything longer than 20 pages.

I will evaluate your paper on the following criteria:

* How well did you synthesize and apply our readings and discussion to the topic?
* How well did you integrate data/observations with your theoretical perspective in your essay, including our “steps in a research design” discussion?
* How creative and insightful were you in developing your answer, while keeping within the bounds of what can be realistically expected in the new US administration?

CAUTION: 1) You will need permission from me before finalizing your choice of topics. This should occur early in the semester, and ***no later than the fourth week of class***;

 2) Don’t leave this assignment sitting there until the end of the semester. The best way to be successful on this paper is to ask yourself each week of our class: “How does this apply to my topic? How can I use it to construct a thorough essay and analysis of my topic?

The paper is due no later than on ***December 13th***. You are, of course, encouraged to turn it in earlier if possible. I will need you to send me the final version of the paper in WORD, and as an attachment via email to volgy@email.arizona.edu

1. **From the Economist (December 24, 2016): “**As the Trump era dawns in America, the composition of the cabinet and inner circle taking shape around Donald Trump is too ideologically incoherent to define the next president’s policy agenda. There are bomb-throwers and hardliners…and an alarming number of men who see no harm in threatening a trade war or two. But it also has figures from the oak-panelled, marble-pillared heart of the Republican establishment. When it comes to national security, Mr Trump’s nominee to run the Pentagon is a retired general, James Mattis, who has called Russia’s annexation of Crimea a “severe” threat and accused President Vladimir Putin of wanting to “break NATO apart”. His pick to run the State Department, Rex Tillerson, is CEO of an oil firm, ExxonMobil, who argued against sanctions imposed on Russia after the Crimean invasion. It is equally easy to imagine headlines, years from now, that call President Trump a revolutionary who took America down the path to hard-edged nationalism, as it is to imagine a hapless incompetent paralysed by factional in-fighting and plunging poll ratings. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)