

Instructor: Dr. Zhang Baohui

Email; bzhang@ln.edu.hk

Office: WYL 313

POL3216 American Foreign Policy

Course Aims:

This course explores the historical, institutional, and political contexts within which foreign policies of the United States are formulated. It also studies America's role in the world and how its dominating political and military power once shaped international relations. The course will then analyze the challenges facing an America in relative decline. Finally, the course examines contemporary foreign policy issues for the United States, such as winning the war on terror, confronting a rising China, and deterring rogue states.

Learning Outcomes:

Students should be able to comprehend conflicting goals of American foreign policy and explain the causes of the changing positions of the United States in the international system. Moreover, students should become familiar with U.S. responses to various challenges to its national interests.

Teaching Method:

This course consists of lectures, classroom discussions, tutorials, presentations, and research and writing.

Assessment:

The final grade of students will be determined by the following: attendance and participation 10%, tutorial 10%, research paper 30%, final exam 50%. The paper needs to be at least 12 pages long but no more than 15. The paper is due on December 8, one week after the last class.

Required Readings:

There are no required textbooks. However, the course will use three chapters of Bruce W. Jentleson's *American Foreign Policy: the Dynamics of Choice in the 21st Century* (4th edition, 2010). A copy of the book is on reserve in the library. In addition, the course will use journal articles and selected book chapters, which will also be put on

reserve. However, most of the journal articles will be available through the E-journals collection of the university library.

Topics

Sept 5. Introduction

Sept 12. International and Domestic Contexts of American Foreign Policy

Bruce W. Jentleson, 2010. *American Foreign Policy*, Chapters 1 and 2. Library Reserve.

Ole R. Holsti. 2005. "Models of International Relations and Foreign Policy," in John Ikenberry, ed., *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*. Library Reserve.

Michael Matanduno. 2002. "The United States Political System and International Leadership: A 'Decidedly Inferior' Form of Government?" in John Ikenberry, ed. *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays*. Library Reserve.

James M. Lindsay. 2003. "Deference and Defiance: The Shifting Rhythms of Executive-Legislative Relations in Foreign Policy," *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3.

Sept 19. The Historical Context of American Foreign Policy

Bruce W. Jentleson. 2010. *American Foreign Policy*, Chapters 3, 4 and 5. Library Reserve.

Paul C. Avey. 2012. "Confronting the Soviet Power: US Policy during the Early Cold War," *International Security*, Vol. 36, No. 4. pp. 151-188.

William C. Wohlforth. 2004. "Economic Constraints and the Turn Toward Superpower Cooperation in the 1980s," in Olav Njolstad, ed., *From Conflict Escalation to Conflict Transformation: The Cold War in the 1980s*, at <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~govt/docs/EconomicConstraintsAndTheTurnTowards...PDF>.

Sept 26. The Post Cold War American Hegemony: Causes and Origins

Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth. 2002. "American Primacy in Perspective," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 4 (July/August), pp. 20-33.

Stephen M. Walt. 2005. *Taming American Power: The Global Response to U.S. Primacy*. Chapter 1.

Mortimer Zackerman. 1998. "A Second American Century." *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 77, No. 3 (May/June), pp. 18-31.

Oct 3. US Grand Strategy After the Cold War

John J. Meirsheimer. 2011. "Imperial by Design," *The National Interest*, January/February.

Benjamin Miller. 2010. "Explaining Changes in U.S. Grand Strategy: 9/11, the Rise of Offensive Liberalism, and the War in Iraq," *Security Studies*. Vol. 19, No. 1

Colin Dueck. 2004. "Ideas and Alternatives in American Grand Strategy, 2000-2004," *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 30, pp. 511-535.

Oct 10. The Bush Legacy

The White House. 2002. The National Security Strategy of the United States, at <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nss/2002/>.

G. John Ikenberry. 2002. "America's Imperial Ambition," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 5 (September/October), pp. 44-60.

Ivo H. Daalder and James James M. Lindsay. 2003. "Bush's Revolution," *Current History*, November.

Robert Kagan. 2008. "The September 12 Paradigm: America, the World, and George W. Bush," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 87, No. 5 (September/October), pp. 25-39.

Oct 17. Is the U.S. in Relative Decline?

The US National Intelligence Council. 2012. *Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds*.

Christopher Layne. 2013. "This Time It's Real: The End of Unipolarity and the Pax Americana," *International Studies Quarterly*, 56, pp. 203-213.

Steven Walt. 2011. "The End of the American Era," *The National Interest*, November-December.

Hal Brands. 2016. "The Era of American Primacy is Far from Over," *The National Interest*, August 24, at <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/the-era-american-primacy-far-over-17465>

Oct 24. Managing the US Relative Decline

Michael Lind. 2016. "Can America Share Its Superpower Status?" *The National Interest*, August 21, at <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/can-america-share-its-superpower-status-17427>

Bruce W. Jentleson. 2014. "Strategic Recalibration: Framework for a 21st Century National Security Strategy," *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 37, No. 1, pp. 115-136.

Gregory A. Daddis. 2015. "America: Addicted to War, Afraid of Peace," *The National*

Interest, June 15, at <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/america-addicted-war-afraid-peace-13085>

- Paul K. MacDonald and Joseph M. Parent 2011. “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment,” *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 4.
- Robert Kagan. 2014. “Superpowers Don’t Get to Retire: What Our Tired Country Still Owes the World,” *New Republic*, May 26.

Oct 31. The War on Terrorism

- Christopher M. Blanchard. 2016. “The Islamic State and U.S. Policy,” Congressional Research Service, June 27, at <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/R43612.pdf>
- Peter Bergen and Jennifer Rowland. 2013. “Drone Wars,” *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (Summer), pp. 7-26.
- Dallas Boyd. 2009. “Why Has the United States Not Been Attacked Again?” *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 3-19.
- Daniel Byman. 2009. “Talking with Insurgents: A Guide for the Perplexed,” *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 125-137.

Nov 7. Dealing with Rogue States

- Kenneth Katzman and Paul K Kerr. 2016. “Iran Nuclear Agreement,” Congressional Research Service, May 31, at <https://fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/R43333.pdf>
- Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. 2015. “The Iran Nuclear Deal: A Definitive Guide,” August, at <http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/IranDealDefinitiveGuide.pdf>
- Ian E. Rinehart and Mary Beth Nikitin. 2015. “North Korea: U.S. Relations, Nuclear Diplomacy, and Internal Situation,” Congressional Research Service, January 15, at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/R41259.pdf>
- Christopher Hill. 2013. “The Elusive Vision of a Non-Nuclear North Korea,” *The Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 36, No. 2, pp. 7-19.
- Joshua Stanton, Sung-Yoon Lee, and Bruce Klingner. 2017. “Getting Tough on North Korea,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 96, No. 3 (May/June), pp. 65-75.
- Charles A. Kupchan. 2010. “Enemies Into Friends: How the United States Can Court Its Adversaries,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 2 (March/April), pp. 120-134.

Nov 14. U.S. Relations with China

- Adam Liff and John Ikenberry. 2014. “Tracing toward Tragedy? China’s Rise, Military Competition in the Asia Pacific, and the Security Dilemma,” *International Security*, Vol. 39, No. 2, pp. 55-91.

- Robert D. Blackwell and Ashley Tellis. 2015. "Revising U.S. Grand Strategy Toward China," Council on Foreign Relations, April, at <http://www.cfr.org/china/revising-us-grand-strategy-toward-china/p36371>
- Jennifer Lind. 2017. "Asia's Other Revisionist Power," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 96, No. 2 (March/April), pp. 74-82.
- Robert A. Manning. 2015. "America's China Consensus Implodes," *The National Interest*, May 21, at <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/americas-china-consensus-implodes-12938>
- Jennifer M. Harris. 2016. "America's Fatal Flaw in its Competition With China Is Thinking Militarily, Not Economically," *Huffington Post*, April 18, at http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jennifer-m-harris/america-china-economic-military_b_9703672.html
- Nov 21. Relations with Other Major Powers: Japan, India, and Russia
- Emma Chanlett-Avery. 2015. "Japan-US Relations: Issues For Congress," Congressional Research Service, September 29, at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33436.pdf>
- Richard L. Armitage and Joseph S. Nye. 2012. *U.S.-Japan Alliance: Anchoring Stability In Asia*, at <http://csis.org/publication/us-japan-alliance-1>.
- Evan Feigenbaum. 2010. "India's Rise, America's Interests," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 89, No. 2 (March/April), pp. 76-91..
- Jim Nichol. 2014. "Russian Political, Economic, and Security Issues and U.S. Interests," Congressional Research Service, March 31, at <https://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/RL33407.pdf>
- Michael O'Hanlon. 2016. "U.S.-Russian Relations beyond Obama," The Brookings Institution, April 20, at <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2016/04/20/u-s-russian-relations-beyond-obama/>
- John Mearsheimer. 2014. "Why the Ukraine Crisis Is the West's Fault," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 93, No. 5 (September/October), pp. 77-89.
- Nov 28. Trump and the New World Order
- Stewart M. Patrick. 2017. "Trump and World Order," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 96, No. 2 (March/April), pp. 52-57.
- G. John Ikenberry. 2017 "The Plot Against American Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 96, No. 3 (May/June), pp. 2-9.

Jeff D. Colgan and Robert O. Keohane. 2017. "The Liberal Order Is Rigged,"

Foreign Affairs, Vol. 96, No. 3 (May/June), pp. 36-44.

Elliot Abrams. 2017. "Trump the Traditionalist," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 96, No. 4

(July/August), pp. 10-16.

Important Notes:

- (1) Students are expected to spend a total of 9 hours (i.e. 3 hours of class contact and 6 hours of personal study) per week to achieve the course learning outcomes.
- (2) Students shall be aware of the University regulations about dishonest practice in course work, tests and examinations, and the possible consequences as stipulated in the Regulations Governing University Examinations. In particular, plagiarism, being a kind of dishonest practice, is "the presentation of another person's work without proper acknowledgement of the source, including exact phrases, or summarised ideas, or even footnotes/citations, whether protected by copyright or not, as the student's own work". Students are required to strictly follow university regulations governing academic integrity and honesty.
- (3) Students are required to submit writing assignment(s) using Turnitin.
- (4) To enhance students' understanding of plagiarism, a mini-course "Online Tutorial on Plagiarism Awareness" is available on <https://pla.ln.edu.hk/>.

Rubric for Presentation and classroom discussions

Presentation (10%)	Arguments/ points	Clear stance and able to offer many cogent arguments/points	Clear stance and able to offer some major cogent arguments/points	Ambiguous stance without addressing a few major arguments/ points	Ambiguous stance leaving many major arguments/ points untouched	No stance at all and/or only descriptions
	Structure	Logical flow and systematic arrangements	Logical but not structured very systematically	Logical but the structure is very weak	Little evidence of a logical structure	No logical structure at all
	Language	Speaking fluently and writing grammatically	Clear but a few grammar or pronunciation problems	Clear but with some grammar and pronunciation problems	Only occasionally clear	Unable to express clearly
	Answering critics (presenters)	Answer all major criticisms squarely and cogently + Rebut with comments	Answer some major criticisms squarely and cogently	Address some minor criticisms selectively	Referring to some minor criticisms but not able to answer them	Skip all criticisms
Discussion (Q/A) (10%)	Posing questions (discussants)	Questions with potentials of shaking the major foundations of the opponents' arguments + Offering own views in the questions	Questions touching on some key weaknesses of the opponents' arguments + Offering own views in the questions	Questions being too general to reveal weaknesses of the opponents' arguments + No own views offered in the questions	Questions only to invite opponents to re-state/clarify their arguments + Raising very few questions	Raising no questions
	Examples	Citing appropriate and enough examples and elaborate them well	Citing some important and relevant examples, but not much elaboration	Examples cited are relevant but not that important	Examples cited, but not relevant or important	No example offered
	Manner	Show a high level of confidence, humbleness and clear-mindedness	Show some confidence and ability to reason but occasionally disturbed by emotions	Not enough confidence; some evidence of escaping reason and passivity; occasionally disturbed by emotions	Little confidence; difficulty of offering reasons; evidence of showing passivity	Failure to exercise self-control/ discipline and not able to participate at all

Topic : _____

Tutorial Group No. : _____

Students' Name : _____

Rubric for Research Paper

	Excellence – Good	Satisfactory	Fair	Poor	GRADE
	(Above 80)	(Above 70)	(Above 60)	(Below 60)	
Content (30%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most materials pertinent to the topic under research are well-covered and surveyed; ● Most facts, data, opinions, etc. are precisely reported, interpreted and discussed; ● Evidence of wide range of research; ● Well use of quotations and paraphrasing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some materials pertinent to the topic under research are covered and surveyed; ● Some facts, data, opinions, etc. are reported, interpreted and discussed; ● Evidence of reasonable research; ● Direct quotations may be overused or not used effectively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited materials pertinent to the topic under research are covered and surveyed; ● Limited facts, data, opinions, etc. are reported, interpreted and discussed; ● Evidence of limited understanding of the topic; ● Generally over reliance on direct quotation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Little materials pertinent to the topic under research are covered and surveyed; ● Little facts, data, opinions, etc. are reported, interpreted and discussed; ● No evidence of understanding of the topic. 	
Analysis (40%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Well focused; ● Good use of the ideas stated in the core reading to support your argument; ● Offer own viewpoints frequently; ● Critically examine others' viewpoints; ● Use materials critically. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reasonably focused but with some arguments unsupported and some material irrelevant; ● Ideas of the core reading are used effectively sometimes; ● Sometimes offer own viewpoints; ● Sometimes examine others' viewpoints critically; ● Use materials with some criticisms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited focus with many unsupported arguments; ● Ideas of the core reading are often not used effectively; ● Seldom offer own viewpoints; ● Seldom examine others' viewpoints critically; ● Use materials with limited criticisms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Almost no focus; ● Irrelevant sections; ● Almost no own viewpoints offered; ● Never examine others' viewpoints critically; ● Use materials without criticisms. 	
Coherence and Organization (20%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good overall organization with introduction and conclusion; ● Main body is clearly divided into sections with suitable paraphrasing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Organization generally clear but some limitations concerning the introduction, conclusion and paraphrasing; ● Reasonable use of subheadings and linking devices. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Organization unclear but some arguments are presented clearly; ● Subheadings used but not very reasonable sometimes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of logical organization; ● No discernable introduction/ conclusion. 	
Language Fluency & Presentation (10%)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Good/average command of academic language; ● Easy for readers to understand; ● Good presentation, in line with conventions, of cover page, reference list, appendices, page numbers and overall layout. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Some mistakes in use of language; ● Generally easy to read; ● Satisfactory. Some mistakes in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Limited communicative competence; ● Readers may struggle to understand some sections; ● Fair. Many mistakes in referencing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extremely limited communicative competence; ● Inability to use simple language accurately; ● Little or no attention paid to the presentation of cover page, reference list, and so on. 	
TOTAL					

Rubric for Final Exam

Criteria	Excellent	Proficient	Meets Minimum Standard	Below Standard	Marks
Comprehension of all the relevant concepts. (40%)	Demonstrates a deep insightful level of understanding (40)	Demonstrates a good surface level of understanding (30)	Demonstrates a fair level of surface understanding (20)	Demonstrates an inadequate level of understanding (0-10)	
Application of concepts to the problem posed. (40%)	Appropriate concepts are all applied correctly, (40)	Most concepts are applied correctly (30)	Some concepts are applied at too general a level or misapplied but the central ones are applied correctly and specifically (20)	Most concepts are applied at too general a level or misapplied (0-10)	
Extent to which ideas are expressed logically, accurately and clearly. (10%)	Expression of ideas is consistently accurate, logical and clear (10)	Expression of ideas is generally accurate, logical and clear with some minor lapses (8)	Expression of ideas is comprehensible but there are some major lapses (6)	Largely incomprehensible with some major inconsistencies and errors (0-3)	
Quality of English. (10%)	English is consistently excellent (10)	English is proficient with no major errors (8)	English conveys the essential meaning but contains a number of errors (6)	English is below acceptable university standard (0-3)	
Total Marks	A(above 85)	B(above 80)	C(above 70)	D(above 60), F(below 60)	