

**PSCI 4606A  
American Foreign Policy  
Thursday 8:35 – 11:25  
Please confirm location on Carleton Central**

**Instructor:** Hakan Tunç  
**Office:** B646 Loeb  
**Office Hours:** Thursday 12:00 – 1:00 or by appointment  
**Office phone:** (613) 520-2600 x1598 (no voicemail)  
**E-mail:** htunc@connect.carleton.ca

**Course Description and Objectives**

This course is an introduction to the basic concepts, theoretical debates and major issues in American Foreign Policy. The course is divided into four parts. During the first part, we will analyze various theories that attempt to explain US foreign policy and traditions that inform US foreign policymaking, such as such as Idealism and Realism, and examine American foreign policy from the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century until the 1990s in light of theoretical approaches and traditions. The second part of the course covers major policy issues in contemporary US foreign policy since 9/11, focusing on the “war on terror” and the Iraq war. The third part looks at American foreign policy in the Middle East and Asia – two critical regions in America’s recent dealings with the world. The last part examines the institutions and processes in US policymaking, assessing the relative importance of the office of president, the Congress, the key bureaucracies, political parties and interest groups, and the media and public opinion.

The main objective of the course is to familiarize students with the recent history of American foreign policy and relate theoretical debates and traditions to key foreign policy developments that have occurred since the end of World War II. Students will also be expected to comprehend the major theoretical and policy debates surrounding contemporary American foreign policy and the institutions involved in the policy-making process.

Please Note: This course will be supported by the WebCT Course Management System. Course materials, including the course outline, reminders of deadlines, and links to suggested readings will be posted on WebCT. Please ensure that you have access to WebCT and consult it regularly. Students will be responsible for reading all information distributed to them through the WebCT course page.

## Readings and Texts

James M. McCormick, *American Foreign Policy and Process*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition (Thomson/Wadsworth, 2005). [Henceforth McCormick]

*Reading Package:* Available at the Carleton University Bookstore, on reserve at the library and in the reading room (C666 Loeb. Open M-F, 8:45am-4:15 pm). Readings with an ® below are in the reading package.

*Online Readings:* These are readings that are not included in the reading package. They are available online through the library catalogue and on reserve in the library. Readings with an @ below denote an article online.

## Evaluation

The final grade will be based on:

- A. Attendance and Participation...20%
- B. Oral Presentation..... 15% (Week of student's choice; Week 3 through Week 10)
- C. Short paper..... 25% (no later than November 13)
- D. Term paper proposal                    10 % (due October 14 via WebCT)
- E. Term paper ..... 40% (due November 27)

As per early feedback guidelines, the Term Paper Proposal will be returned by October 31<sup>st</sup>.

### A. Class attendance and participation (20 %)

Attendance is 12 %; class participation is 8 %. Attendance will be taken in every session during the term starting on September 11. Attending each class is worth 1 % towards your final grade. There are 12 sessions during the term. Students who attend all 12 sessions will obtain 12 %. Absence in 6 or more classes will result in a mark of 0 (zero) for attendance. Each class is a combination of lecture and discussion, so students are highly encouraged to ask questions and participate in the class discussions. It is necessary that you complete all reading assignments prior to coming to class so that you are fully prepared to discuss the assigned material. The grade for class participation will be determined by the quality and quantity of your comments and questions.

### B. In-class oral Presentation (15 %)

Each student will be required to give a presentation about one of the weekly debate questions that are drawn on the readings (except for the McCormick textbook) from Week 3 through Week 10. The debate questions can be found following each week's readings.

Each presentation will be maximum 12 minutes and will be followed by a Q & A period of maximum 8 minutes. The time limit for each presentation will be strictly imposed. Students will be able to choose their debate question in class during the second week (September 11, 2008). The presentation should include the following elements: (i) key arguments made by the author(s) of the readings pertinent to your debate question; (ii) clear position about either of these arguments; (iii) supporting evidence and logic.

You will be evaluated on the basis of the substance and style of the presentation as well as the quality of your responses to questions from your classmates and the instructor. (Please do not read your presentation). In particular, I will be looking for evidence that you have carefully read and thought about the readings related to your debate question.

#### C. Short paper (25 %)

Each student should submit one short paper about one of the weekly debate questions. The question of the short paper must be different than the question of the oral presentation.

The paper should be around 2,500 words in length (including footnotes) and double-spaced. It should have a clear argument supported by evidence, and should use at least three sources additional to the readings.

The paper can be submitted at any time during the term until November 13. Students should not submit a paper for the same week they are having a presentation. Please bring your paper to class or to my office during my hours.

#### D. Term paper proposal (10 %), via WebCT by 5:00 pm, Tuesday, October 14

You will be required to submit **via WebCT** a two-page (single spaced) research proposal that will describe your topic, your main argument(s) and the methodological approach you will use to substantiate these arguments; it should be accompanied by a preliminary bibliography (8-10 academic sources). Any topic on American Foreign Policy is acceptable.

The proposal will account for 10% of your final grade and is due on October 14. **A rough idea of your paper should be discussed with and approved by the instructor no later than October 9; the instructor will not accept your proposal unless your topic has been approved beforehand.** There will be no extensions for paper proposal submissions except under extraordinary circumstances (the validity of which is to be determined by the instructor). Students submitting late paper proposals without legitimate reasons will be penalized 1/10 mark per day. We will discuss proposals in class as the proposal date approaches.

#### E. Term paper (30 %), due November 27

The final paper should be 3,500-4,000 words in length, including footnotes and is **due in class on November 27**, but students are welcome to submit it before this date, if they prefer to do so.

### *Lateness policy*

For both the short paper and the final research paper, a late paper will be discounted by 10 per cent per weekday after the deadline. A student missing a session in which he/she is expected to give a presentation, will be penalized by 100 per cent, unless he/she provides documentation for not having attended that session.

### *Return of term work*

Students will receive their grades (with comments) for both the short paper and the research paper within a week following their submission. Research papers can be collected from my office on December 4 during my office hours.

## **Course Calendar/ Reading Schedule**

### **Week 1/September 4: Course introduction**

### **Week 2/September 11: Theorizing US Foreign Policy**

McCormick, Chapter 1

Brian Schmidt, "Theories of US foreign policy," in Michael Cox & Doug Stokes, eds. *US Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. 7-23. ®

Walter Russell Mead, *Special Providence: American Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World*, (New York and London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 86-98. ®

### **Week 3/September 18: America's Global Involvement and the Cold War Consensus**

McCormick, Chapter 2 & Chapter 3

Colin Dueck, "Realism, Culture and Grand Strategy: Explaining America's Peculiar Path to World Power," *Security Studies* 14, no. 2 (April-June 2005), pp. 195-231. @

Robert J. McMahon, "Credibility and World Power: Exploring the Psychological Dimension in Postwar American Diplomacy," *Diplomatic History*, vol. 15, no. 4 (Fall 1991), pp. 455-471. @

### Debate questions:

- 1) Was U.S. foreign policy after World War II driven by the logic of bipolarity or ideology? Was the Cold War the result of conflicting national ideologies or conflicting national interests?
- 2) To what extent did concerns for credibility and reputation play a major role in U.S. military interventions and in considerations about withdrawal from theatres of war during the Cold War?

### **Week4/ September 25: U.S. Foreign Policy After Vietnam: Carter and Reagan**

McCormick, Chapter 4

John Lewis Gaddis, "President Ronald Reagan's Successful Strategy of Negotiating from Strength," in Dennis Merrill and Thomas G. Peterson, editors, *Major Problems in American Foreign Relations*, Volume II, 6<sup>th</sup> ed. (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2005) pp. 520-528. ®

James M. Scott, *Deciding to Intervene: The Reagan Doctrine and American Foreign Policy* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1996), pp. 1-13. ®

Debate questions:

- 1) In what ways, if any, did Ronald Reagan's escalatory policies contribute to the end of the Cold War?
- 2) Do you believe that the main tenets of the Reagan Doctrine contradicted Reagan's proclaimed idealism in foreign policy?

### **Week 5/October 2: The Foreign Policies of the H. W. Bush and Clinton Administrations**

McCormick, Chapter 5

Josef Joffe, "Clinton's World: Purpose, Policy, and *Weltanschauung*," *The Washington Quarterly*" (Winter 2001), pp. 141-154. @

Max Boot, "In the Shadow of Vietnam: The Powell Doctrine and Small Wars in the 1990s," in *The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power*. New York: Basic Books, 2002, pp. 318-334. ®

Derek Cholet and James Goldgeier, "Liberal Bombs, Conservative Shields," (Ch. 8) in *America Between the Wars: From 11/9 to 9/11* (New York: Public Affairs), pp. 210-243. ®

Debate questions:

- 1) To what extent were the 1990s (1989-2001) a distinct phase in the history of US foreign policy? (See Joffe)
- 2) Is Max Boot justified in his criticisms of the Powell Doctrine?
- 3) What were the main arguments for and against Clinton's intervention in Kosovo? Which argument do you agree with? (See Cholet and Goldgeier pp. 210-234)
- 4) What are the pro and con arguments about missile defense? Which argument, in your opinion, is more persuasive and why? (See Cholet and Goldgeier pp. 234-243)

### **Week 6/October 9: The W. Bush Administration and its Response to 9/11**

McCormick, Chapter 6

Melvyn P. Leffler, "9/11 and American Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* (June 2005), pp. 395-413. @

John Lewis Gaddis, "A Grand Strategy" *Foreign Policy* (Nov/Dec 2002), pp. 50-57. @

Robert Jervis, "Understanding the Bush Doctrine," *Political Science Quarterly* 118 (Fall 2003): 365-388. @

Hakan Tunç, "Preemption in the Bush Doctrine: A Reappraisal," *Foreign Policy Analysis* (forthcoming, October 2008) @

Michael J. Mazarr, "George W. Bush, Idealist," *International Affairs* 79, no. 3 (2003), pp. 503-522. @

Recommended: *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September 20, 2002 (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.pdf>)

#### Debate questions:

- 1) Was the Bush administration justified in lumping together both terrorists *and* states that harbor and support them as the major threats post-9/11?
- 2) Does the Bush Doctrine represent a new grand strategy, as Gaddis argues, or more continuity than change in U.S. foreign policy, as Leffler claims?
- 3) To what extent did Bush's idealism contribute to foreign policy making after 9/11? (See Mazarr)
- 4) When formulating its preemption/prevention policies toward rogue states, was the Bush administration's goal regime change or behavioral change? (See Tunç)

#### **Week 7/October 16: The Iraq War and "Unilateralism"**

Hakan Tunç, "What Was It All About After All? The Causes of the Iraq War," *Contemporary Security Policy*, 26, no. 2 (August 2005), pp. 335-355. @

Andrew Flibbert, "The Road to Baghdad: Ideas and Intellectuals in Explanations of the Iraq War," *Security Studies* 15, no. 2 (April-June 2006): 310-352. @

Charles Krauthammer, "The Unipolar Moment Revisited," *The National Interest*, No. 70, (Winter 2002/03), pp. 5-17. @

John Ikenberry, "America's Imperial Ambition" *Foreign Affairs* (Sept-Oct 2002), pp. 44-60. @

David Skidmore, "Understanding the Unilateralist Turn in U.S. Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy Analysis*, 2 (2005), pp. 207-228. @

Adam Garfinkle, "Alone in a Crowd" *The American Interest* (Spring 2006), pp. 132-140. @

Debate questions:

- 1) What impact did neoconservatives have on the Bush administration's decision to go to war with Iraq and why? (See Flibbert)
- 2) Is Krauthammer correct in his assertion that because the US is the sole global hegemon, it must often act unilaterally and against the wishes of other states? Or, is Ikenberry's assessment more accurate – i.e., that the US has embarked upon a “neo-imperialist” program that is ultimately unsustainable and will make the US less secure?
- 3) Is there a unilateralist turn in US foreign policy, as Skidmore claims, or does the “unilateralist rap” not match the Bush administration's record, as Garfinkle argues?

**Week8/October 23: The Implications of the Iraq War for US Foreign Policy**

Philip Gordon, “The End of the Bush Revolution,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/Aug 2006), pp.75-86. @

Stanley A. Renshon, “Premature Obituary: The Future of the Bush Doctrine,” in Renshon and Peter Suedfeld (eds), *Understanding the Bush Doctrine* (New York and London: Routledge, 2007), pp. 289-318. @

Steven E. Miller, “The Iraq Experiment and US National Security,” *Survival* 48 no. 4 (Winter 2006–07), pp. 17–50. @

Mark Pecency, “Democracy Promotion and American Foreign Policy: Afghanistan, Iraq, and the Future,” in David P. Forsythe, Patrice C. McMahon, and Andrew Wedeman, (eds.) *American Foreign Policy in a Globalized World* (New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 215-239. @

Josef Joffe, “Stay to Win”

Paul Schroeder, “Leave or Lose”

Walter Russell Mead, “Morale Matters”

Robert D. Kaplan, “Winning Will Resonate”

Francis Fukuyama, “Lessons in Humility”

All essays above are from a Symposium on the Iraq War titled “Iraq: What If We Win,” *The American Interest* (March/April 2008) @

Debate questions:

- 1) Is the Bush Doctrine dead (Gordon) or does it still have relevancy for future US foreign policy (Renshon)?

- 2) How sincere has the Bush administration been in promoting democracy in Afghanistan and Iraq? (See Pecency)
- 3) Does the “Iraq experiment” mostly have negative consequences for US national security, as Miller argues, or are these negative consequences exaggerated and/or nonexistent?
- 4) What if the United States “wins” in Iraq? What would the consequences of such a “victory” be for the United States in the war on terror? (See the essays from *the American Interest*)

### **Week 9/October 30: US Foreign Policy in Critical Regions: The Middle East**

Toby Dodge, “US foreign policy in the Middle East,” in Michael Cox & Doug Stokes, eds., *US Foreign Policy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 213-235. ®

Steve A. Yetiv, “The Balance Sheet, So To Speak” (Ch. 10) in *The Absence of Grand Strategy: The United States in the Persian Gulf, 1972-2005* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2008), pp. 166-181. ®

Vali Nasr and Ray Takeyh, “The Costs of Containing Iran,” *Foreign Affairs* (January/February 2008), pp. 85-94. @

Aaron David Miller, “Israel’s Lawyers\*: How Domestic Politics Shapes America’s Arab-Israeli Diplomacy” in *The Much Too Promised Land* (New York: Bantam Books, 2008), pp. 75-124. ®

#### Debate questions:

- 1) Why has the United States not been able to formulate a grand strategy in the Persian Gulf? (See Dodge and Yetiv)
- 2) Do you agree with Nasr and Takeyh that containment of Iran would not work? If so, does their argument for “engaging Iran” make sense?
- 3) Is there an Israel lobby and, if so, how can we define it? In what ways, if any, does it have influence over American foreign policy towards the Middle East? (See Miller)

### **Week 10/November 6: US Foreign Policy in Critical Regions: Asia**

Robert J. Lieber, “Asia’s American Pacifier,” (Ch. 6) in *The American Era: Power and Strategy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005), pp. 157-175. ®

Victor D. Cha, “Winning Asia,” *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2007), pp. 98-113. @

Aaron L. Friedberg, “The Future of U.S.-China Relations: Is Conflict Inevitable?” *International Security* 30, No. 2 (Fall 2005), pp. 7–45. @

R. Nicholas Burns, "America's Strategic Opportunity With India," *Foreign Affairs* (November/December 2007), pp. 131-146. @

Debate questions:

- 1) Do you agree with Cha that the U.S. position in Asia is now stronger than ever?
- 2) Should the United States fear or welcome China's rise? (See Friedberg)
- 3) Does the United States have a strategic opportunity with India? (See Burns)

**Week 11/November 13: The President and Congress in Foreign Policy Making**

McCormick, Chapters 7 & 8

James M. Lindsay, "Deference and Defiance: The Shifting Rhythms of Executive-Legislative Relations in Foreign Policy," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* (September 2003), pp.530-546. @

**Week 12/November 20: Diplomatic, Military, and Intelligence Bureaucracies**

McCormick, Chapter s 9 & 10

David J. Rothkopf, "Inside the Committee That Runs the World," *Foreign Policy* (March/April 2005), pp.30-40. @

**Week 13/November 27: Political Parties, Interest Groups, the Media and Public Opinion**

McCormick, Chapters 11 & 12

Richard K. Betts, "The political support system for American primacy" *International Affairs*, 81, no. 1 (2005), pp.1-14. @

---

**Academic Accommodations**

**For students with Disabilities:** Students with disabilities requiring academic accommodations in this course must register with the Paul Menton Centre for Students with Disabilities (9500 University Drive) for a formal evaluation of disability-related needs. Registered PMC students are required to contact the centre, 613-520-6608, every term to ensure that I receive your letter of accommodation, **no later than two weeks before the first assignment is due or the first in-class test/midterm requiring accommodations.** If you require accommodation for your formally scheduled exam(s) in this course,

please submit your request for accommodation to PMC by **November 7, 2008**, for December examinations, and **March 6, 2009**, for April examinations.”

**For Religious Observance:** Students requesting accommodation for religious observances should apply in writing to their instructor for alternate dates and/or means of satisfying academic requirements. Such requests should be made during the first two weeks of class, or as soon as possible after the need for accommodation is known to exist, but no later than two weeks before the compulsory academic event. Accommodation is to be worked out directly and on an individual basis between the student and the instructor(s) involved. Instructors will make accommodations in a way that avoids academic disadvantage to the student. Instructors and students may contact an Equity Services Advisor for assistance ([www.carleton.ca/equity](http://www.carleton.ca/equity)).

**For Pregnancy:** Pregnant students requiring academic accommodations are encouraged to contact an Equity Advisor in Equity Services to complete a *letter of accommodation*. Then, make an appointment to discuss your needs with the instructor at least two weeks prior to the first academic event in which it is anticipated the accommodation will be required.

**Plagiarism:** The Undergraduate Calendar defines plagiarism as: "to use and pass off as one's own idea or product, work of another without expressly giving credit to another." The Graduate Calendar states that plagiarism has occurred when a student either: (a) directly copies another's work without acknowledgment; or (b) closely paraphrases the equivalent of a short paragraph or more without acknowledgment; or (c) borrows, without acknowledgment, any ideas in a clear and recognizable form in such a way as to present them as the student's own thought, where such ideas, if they were the student's own would contribute to the merit of his or her own work. Instructors who suspect plagiarism are required to submit the paper and supporting documentation to the Departmental Chair who will refer the case to the Dean. It is not permitted to hand in the same assignment to two or more courses. The Department's Style Guide is available at: <http://www.carleton.ca/polisci/undergrad/Essay%20Style%20Guide.html>

**Oral Examination:** At the discretion of the instructor, students may be required to pass a brief oral examination on research papers and essays.

**Submission and Return of Term Work:** Papers must be handed directly to the instructor and will not be date-stamped in the departmental office. Late assignments may be submitted to the drop box in the corridor outside B640 Loeb. Assignments will be retrieved every business day at **4 p.m.**, stamped with that day's date, and then distributed to the instructor. For essays not returned in class please attach a **stamped, self-addressed envelope** if you wish to have your assignment returned by mail. Please note that assignments sent via fax or email will not be accepted. Final exams are intended solely for the purpose of evaluation and will not be returned.

**Approval of final grades:** Standing in a course is determined by the course instructor subject to the approval of the Faculty Dean. This means that grades submitted by an instructor may be subject to revision. No grades are final until they have been approved by the Dean.

**Course Requirements:** Students must fulfill all course requirements in order to achieve a passing grade. Failure to hand in any assignment will result in a grade of F. Failure to write the final exam will result in a grade of ABS. FND (Failure No Deferred) is assigned when a student's performance is so poor during the term that they cannot pass the course even with 100% on the final examination. In such cases, instructors may use this notation on the Final Grade Report to indicate that a student has already failed the course due to inadequate term work and should not be permitted access to a deferral of the examination. Deferred final exams are available ONLY if the student is in good standing in the course.

**Connect Email Accounts:** The Department of Political Science strongly encourages students to sign up for a campus email account. Important course and University information will be distributed via the Connect email system. See <http://connect.carleton.ca> for instructions on how to set up your account.

**Carleton Political Science Society:** The Carleton Political Science Society (CPSS) has made its mission to provide a social environment for politically inclined students and faculty. Holding social events, debates, and panel discussions, CPSS aims to involve all political science students in the after-hours academic life at Carleton University. Our mandate is to arrange social and academic activities in order to instill a sense of belonging within the Department and the larger University community. Members can benefit through numerous opportunities which will complement both academic and social life at Carleton University. To find out more, please email [carletonpss@gmail.com](mailto:carletonpss@gmail.com), visit our website at [poliscisociety.com](http://poliscisociety.com), or come to our office in Loeb D688.