



AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

(POLITICAL SCIENCE 3574)

SEPTEMBER 3, 2013 VERSION

Class Time and Room: Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, 1:35 – 2:25pm
Henry Hicks Academic Admin Building (HHAAB), Room 217

Instructor: Prof. Brian Bow brian.bow@dal.ca

Instructor's Office: Henry Hicks Academic Administration Building, Room 355

Office Hours: Tuesdays, 10:00 – 12:00am, or by appointment

Introduction

This course is a general introduction to American foreign policy. It has four main parts: i. a brief overview of the course's main topics and goals, and a review of some of the most prominent theories used to explain US foreign policy; ii. a basic outline of the history of American foreign policy since 1776, with the emphasis on the post-1945 period, and particular attention post-Cold War events and developments; iii. a review of some of the essential themes and debates over the sources and purposes of American foreign policy; and iv. discussion of policy debates surrounding some of the main challenges facing the United States today.

There are a few important changes to this course since last year: i. the (unwanted) shift from TTh to MWF has (predictably) reduced the class' size, which should make in-class discussion more frequent and more lively, and will change the format and intensity of the simulation (see below); ii. I have decided not to use a textbook this year, and we will be going back to a collection of short readings available on-line (see below); and iii. the section from last year's version which looked at US foreign policy challenges in different regions of the world (e.g., Europe, Latin America) has been replaced by a section on contemporary policy debates (e.g., drones, climate change).

Assignments / assessment

Movie Homework	15%	Thursday, October 23
Simulation Participation, Report	15%	Tuesday, November 27
Term Paper	40%	Thursday, December 6
Final Exam	30%	Exam period (see below)

Movie Homework

The first assignment of the semester will be to watch a movie, and answer some questions about its interpretation of US foreign policy-making.

The film is "**Thirteen Days**" (2000, dir. Roger Donaldson), which retells the story of the Cuban Missile Crisis. The film will be shown on **October 16**, from 11:30 until 2:30pm. The room for this viewing has not yet been booked, and will be announced on the course website later in September. The movie is about three hours long, so you will have to check to make sure that this viewing time does not conflict with your class schedule. If you have another class right after the regular class time on October 16, you are welcome to download/rent the movie and watch it whenever you can fit it into your schedule.

The assignment is to watch the movie carefully, and answer six questions about its interpretation of the Kennedy administration's decision-making during the Cuban Missile Crisis. Read the questions carefully in advance, and take notes while the movie is playing. Your answers should be brief and to-the-point (i.e., one and a half single-spaced pages for the whole assignment). The assignment is **due October 23**.

This is an **on-line assignment**, to be administered through the OWL system. The homework questions will be available through the OWL system as of September 20, and the system can accept completed assignments on-line any time after that. Assignments submitted electronically after October 23 will be marked as late, and will incur a penalty of one point (out of 15) per day. The OWL system will not accept assignments submitted after October 27.

Foreign Policy Decision-Making Simulation

The simulation is a role-playing exercise in which students will argue over the content and presentation of a broad statement of American foreign policy priorities for the 2016 election. Some students will represent foreign policy advisors to one of the two major parties, and some will represent various think-tanks trying to influence the terms of the debate.

The (somewhat far-fetched) premise for the simulation is that each of the two parties is going to convene a meeting of foreign policy experts from prominent Washington think-tanks, to map out a set of foreign policy priorities for the next administration. The basic format and process will be as follows:

1. Each of the two party advisor groups meets, and works out an agenda for their meeting, with specific questions for think-tank teams to answer, and with notes about the format of the discussion itself (e.g., 5 main questions; for each question, each think-tank gives two-minute answer, then five minutes of general discussion...); each party advisor team emails this agenda to "their" think-tanks at least a week before the simulation;
2. Each of the think-tank teams meets, works out a division of labour for research and presentations (e.g., Mark does security issues, Mary does environment...);
3. Individual think-tank players do their own research and prepare talking points for the simulation meeting; individual players should be in contact with think-tank team-mates, by email, to share their ideas and make sure their efforts are in sync with one another;
4. During the simulation meeting itself, the party advisor teams will run the meeting as they see fit; they will need to find ways to give all groups an opportunity to be heard, but also keep things moving so that everything gets covered in the time available;

Roles will be assigned and posted on OWL on October 27. Once the roles have been assigned, students will be free to communicate with other members of their assigned group, by email and/or in face-to-face meetings. The simulation itself will take place, in class, on **November 18 and November 20**. Based on their discussions with the various think-tank groups, the party advisors will put together a set of "talking points" for their party's candidates; presidential advisors will put together the text of the new government's policy **statement**, which must be submitted to me, by email, at or before 4pm **the next day** (November 23); it will then be posted to OWL.

Over the next few days, all participants will write a brief **report** (750 words), reflecting on what was in the statement, what was left out, etc. In your report, you should be thinking about what you think the statement means, why it turned out the way it did, and how that "fits" with the perceptions and priorities of the group you were supposed to represent. Try to find a balance between thinking about your situation within the simulation and the "bigger picture" (i.e., what happened with the statement itself, and with other groups). Reports are to be **submitted electronically, through the OWL site**, on **November 27** (at or before 4:00pm). Late reports will be penalized 2 points per day (out of 15).

Term Paper

The term paper will be due on **December 6** (nine days after the simulation reports are due...). Each student's paper must be submitted in two formats: a digital copy, submitted on the course website (see below), and a hard copy, submitted in my mailbox in the Political Science department office. Both versions should be submitted by 4:00pm (when the department office closes for the day). Papers can only be submitted by email by special permission, and that permission will only be given in exceptional circumstances (e.g., course website crashed, Hicks building destroyed by meteor, etc.).

For the term paper, each student will **choose one of the following three clusters of questions**, and use it as the basis for a short research paper:

- Option #1: In US presidential elections, challengers almost always campaign on promises to correct their predecessors' mistakes, on both domestic and foreign policy. During the 2008 campaign and in the early years of his presidency, what "lessons" did Obama claim to have learned from George W. Bush's foreign policy errors, and how did he promise to apply those lessons to his own foreign policy choices? Looking back on Obama's actual foreign policy choices, has he lived up to those promises? Would it be best to say that he learned the lessons taught by Bush's errors, failed to learn them, or "over-learned" them (i.e., made foreign policy mistakes because he was too determined to do things differently)? For whichever answer you provide to this last question, why do you think this was so?
- Option #2: The United States has had a strange relationship with China over the last twenty years. On one hand, US policy-makers see China as a potential strategic rival, and a possible military threat to US allies in the Asia-Pacific region (esp. Taiwan, but also Japan, South Korea, and most of Southeast Asia). Many therefore maintain that the US is pursuing a policy of "containment" against China, similar to that against the USSR during the Cold War. On the other hand, China is one of the United States' most important commercial partners, in terms of trade, investment, currency holdings, and debt. Others therefore maintain that the US has been pursuing a policy of "engagement" with China. How do we explain this complicated and perhaps contradictory relationship? How does it fit with the expectations of Realism and Liberalism as theories of foreign policy? Thinking about future US-China relations, what difference (if any) do you think it will make whether Obama or Romney wins the upcoming presidential election?
- Option #3: The United States is often the most "indispensable" partner in any multilateral initiative, in the sense that its support or opposition can make or break a potential agreement. Particularly after the end of the Cold War, the US has often found itself taking the lead in pushing for a new global agreement, but then pulling back or even strongly opposing that agreement. Using a historical example (i.e., a specific treaty negotiation) from either the human rights or environmental issue-areas, describe the way that US policy has been contradictory and/or changeable during the course of the negotiations, and—with reference to some of the theories and concepts outlined in this course—try to explain why you think the US approach to this issue has played out as it did. Be especially attentive to whether these contradictory/changeable tendencies are better explained by the United States' international situation or by its domestic politics.

Whichever option you choose, be sure to be absolutely clear about: a. which one you are doing; b. how you are answering each question; and c. where and how your answers connect up to the general theories discussed in lectures and required readings. Your papers should give an overview of what others have said about the answers to your questions (i.e., literature review), but they should also advance a clear argument (i.e., your own answers to these questions). While I do want you to answer all of the questions for your option, I don't want a series of disconnected short-answer responses; I want you to try to put them together so that they form one coherent essay.

Your essay should be **between 2500 and 3000 words**, which generally works out to be **10-12 pages**, double-spaced, with normal fonts and margins. **Papers that go beyond 3500 words will not be accepted, except with the professor's specific, explicit permission.**

Additional information about the format and other requirements for the term papers will be made available through the OWL site.

Final Exam

The final exam will be scheduled by the University Registrar. The official exam period for the Fall 2013 semester is **December 5-16**. Do not make work or travel plans until after you know the official dates and times for all of your final exams. If you will be obliged to be absent from the final exam for some compelling reason (e.g., serious illness or injury, death in your immediate family), you must write to the department chair, and make a formal appeal for special accommodation.

For the final exam, you will be responsible for all of the ideas and issues raised in lectures and in required readings, through the entire semester. There will be some choice (e.g., answer 3 of 5 questions in this section) in all parts of the exam. Additional information will be available through the OWL site.

General policies concerning assignments, deadlines, and grades

The University Calendar makes plain that "[s]tudents are expected to complete class work by the prescribed deadlines. Only in special circumstances (e.g. the death of a close relative) may an instructor extend such deadlines." **Late term papers will be assessed a penalty of one mark (out of 35) per day.** If you miss the term paper deadline on account of illness, you must hand it in within one week of your return to class, with a copy of a medical certificate, per academic regulations in the Dalhousie Calendar.

Essays not submitted directly to the professor must be submitted in person to the Political Science office (if the office is open, hand the paper to the secretary, and ask to have it stamped with date and time; if the office is not open, put the paper in the after-hours drop-box). Neither the professor nor the Department can assume responsibility for papers submitted by mail, fax, or email. Do not submit any assignments to the teaching assistant.

Plagiarism (intentionally or unintentionally representing other people's ideas as your own) is a serious violation of academic ethics, and will be taken very seriously in this class. You can (and should) get information on what plagiarism is, how you can avoid it, and what the relevant university and departmental policies are, at <http://academicintegrity.dal.ca/>. Please also take note of the formal notice of university policy with respect to academic integrity posted on the course website.

The grading thresholds for this course are:

90-100 = A+	85-89.9 = A	80-84.9 = A-
77-79.9 = B+	73-76.9 = B	70-72.9 = B-
65-69.9 = C+	60-64.9 = C	55-59.9 = C-
50-54.9 = D	50 > F	

Resources

Pretty much everything you need for this course is, or will soon be, available through the course website, which is hosted by the university's OWL system. Login to OWL using the same ID and password that you use for your Dalhousie email. **Students are expected to check the OWL site for announcements and updates at least once per week.**

The main thing you'll use the OWL site for is to access course readings, which are stored in the site as pdf files. (There is no textbook for this course.) The OWL site also has a pdf copy of the course syllabus (which may be updated or corrected later) and general instructions and advice for the exams and term paper. Powerpoint slides from the lectures will be posted there (usually—but not necessarily always—in advance...).

You will also use the OWL site to submit three major assignments: the movie homework, the simulation report, and the term paper. Movie homework and simulation report are OWL-only, but you are required to submit both hard copy and digital copies of the term paper (see above).

Disclaimer

This syllabus is intended as a general guide to the course. The instructor reserves the right to reschedule or revise assigned readings, assignments, lecture topics, etc., as necessary.

Lectures and readings

Introduction	
Class meetings:	September 9, 11
Topics/themes:	SE06: CLASS CANCELED ; see course website for general orientation info SE09: (brief) general orientation; review of theories of US foreign policy SE11: review of theories, cont.; the meaning of September 11
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Brian Schmidt, "Theories of US Foreign Policy," in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, eds., <i>US Foreign Policy</i> (2nd ed., Oxford, 2012). 2. Henry R. Nau, "Why We Fight Over Foreign Policy," <i>Policy Review</i> 142 (2007).

History	
Class meetings:	September 13, 16, 18, 20, 23, 25
Topics/themes:	SE13: revolutionary foundations SE16: expansion and its dilemmas SE18: emergence as a world power, part 1 SE20: emergence as a world power, part 2 SE23: Cold War and after SE25: post-9/11
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Walter Russell Mead, "The American Foreign Policy Legacy," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 81 (2002). 2. Walter LaFeber, "The US Rise to World Power, 1776-1945," in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, eds., <i>US Foreign Policy</i> (2nd ed., Oxford, 2012). 3. Richard Saull, "American Foreign Policy during the Cold War," in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, eds., <i>US Foreign Policy</i> (2nd ed., Oxford, 2012). 4. Samuel P. Huntington, "The Lonely Superpower," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 78 (1999). 5. Charles Krauthammer, "Three Cheers for the Bush Doctrine," <i>Time</i>, March 7, 2005.

	6. Barack Obama, "Renewing American Leadership," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 86 (2007).
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Walter LeFeber, <i>The New Empire: An Interpretation of American Expansion, 1860-1898</i> (Cornell, 1998). • George Kennan, <i>American Diplomacy</i> (Expanded ed., Chicago, 1985). • Ernest R. May, 'Lessons' of the Past: <i>The Use and Misuse of History in US Foreign Policy</i> (Oxford, 1973). • William Appleman Williams, <i>The Tragedy of American Diplomacy</i> (50th Anniversary ed., Norton, 2009). • Melvyn P. Leffler, "9/11 and the Past and Future of American Foreign Policy," <i>International Affairs</i> 79 (2003). • Walter Russell Mead, <i>Special Providence: US Foreign Policy and How It Changed the World</i> (Routledge, 2002).

Power and principles, part 1	
Class meetings:	September 27, 30, October 2, 4
Topics/themes:	SE27: exceptionalism, isolationism, internationalism SE30: realism vs liberalism OC02: realism vs liberalism, cont. OC04: neoconservatism (and other hybrid ideas)
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Daniel Deudney & Jeffrey Meisner, "American Exceptionalism," in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, eds., <i>US Foreign Policy</i> (2nd ed., Oxford, 2012). 2. Hans Morgenthau, "The Mainsprings of American Foreign Policy," <i>American Political Science Review</i> 44 (1950). 3. G. John Ikenberry, "Liberalism in a Realist World," <i>International Studies</i> 46 (2009). 4. John Lewis Gaddis, "A Grand Strategy of Transformation," <i>Foreign Policy</i> 113 (2002). 5. G. John Ikenberry, "America's Imperial Ambition," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 81 (2002). 6. Barry Posen, "Pull Back: The Case for a Less Activist Foreign Policy," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92 (2013). 7. Stephen Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, "Lean Forward: In Defense of American Engagement," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92 (2013). 8. Richard W. Stevenson, "Rubio and Paul Embody Conservative Debate on Foreign Policy," <i>The Caucus</i> (New York Times blog), January 25, 2013.
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Declaration of Independence (1776): http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/declaration_transcript.html • George Washington, "Farewell Address" (1796). • Jeane Kirkpatrick, "Dictatorships and Double Standards," <i>Commentary</i>

	<p>(November 1979).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anthony Lake, “From Containment to Enlargement,” public lecture at Johns Hopkins SAIS, September 21, 1993. • Eugene Gholz, Daryl G. Press and Harvey M. Sapolsky, “Come Home America,” <i>International Security</i> 21 (1997). • Joshua Busby and Jonathan Monten, “Without Heirs? Assessing the Decline of Establishment Internationalism in US Foreign Policy,” <i>Perspectives on Politics</i> 6 (2008). • Walter Russell Mead, “The Jacksonian Tradition and American Foreign Policy,” <i>The National Interest</i> 58 (1999/2000).
--	---

Power and principles, part 2	
Class meetings:	October 7, 9, 11
Topics/themes:	<p>OC07: rise and decline OC09: multilateralism and unilateralism OC11: responsibility and its limits OC14: THANKSGIVING – UNIVERSITY CLOSED</p>
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Robert Kagan, “Power and Weakness,” <i>Policy Review</i> 113 (2002). 2. Fareed Zakaria, “The Future of American Power,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 87 (2008). 3. Christopher Layne, William Wohlforth & Stephen G. Brooks, “US Decline or Primacy? A Debate,” in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, eds., <i>US Foreign Policy</i> (2nd ed., Oxford, 2012). 4. Shashi Tharoor, “Why the US Still Needs the United Nations,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 82 (2002). 5. David Skidmore, “Understanding the Unilateralist Turn in US Foreign Policy,” <i>Foreign Policy Analysis</i> 1 (2005). 6. Michael Ignatieff, “The Burden,” <i>New York Times</i>, January 5, 2003. 7. Paul Richter, “Obama’s Nuanced Foreign Policy Evident in Libya vs Syria,” <i>LA Times</i>, April 1, 2011. 8. J.D. Gordon, “Libya, Syria Show Obama in Way Over his Head,” <i>Fox News</i>, August 20, 2011.
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • APSA Task Force on US Standing in World Affairs, <i>US Standing in World Affairs: Causes, Consequences and the Future</i> (American Political Science Association, 2009). • Michael C. Desch, “America’s Liberal Illiberalism,” <i>International Security</i> 32 (2007-08). • Daniel Drezner, “The Future of US Foreign Policy,” <i>Internationale Politik und Gesellschaft</i> 15 (January 2008). • Richard N. Haass, “The Age of Non-Polarity,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 87 (2008).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joseph S. Nye, Jr., “Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 88 (2009). • Walter Russell Mead, “The Carter Syndrome,” <i>Foreign Policy</i> 177 (2010). • Zbigniew Brzezinski, “After America,” <i>Foreign Policy</i> 191 (2012).
--	---

October 16: in-class screening of “Thirteen Days” (movie) – room TBA

Institutions and Processes	
Class meetings:	October 18, 21, 23
Topics/themes:	OC 18: Executive branch and Congress OC 21: Bureaucratic and civil-military OC 23: Regions, classes, sectors and groups
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eugene R. Wittkopf, Charles W. Kegley, and James M. Scott, “Presidential Leadership in Foreign Policy Making,” in <i>American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process</i> (5th ed., Wadsworth, 2003). 2. Michael Mastanduno, “The United States Political System and International Leadership: ‘A Decidedly Inferior’ Form of Government?” in G. John Ikenberry, ed., <i>American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays</i> (4th ed., Addison-Wesley, 2002). 3. Norman J. Ornstein and Thomas E. Mann, “When Congress Checks Out,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> (2006). 4. Graham Allison, “Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis,” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 63 (1969). 5. Rajiv Chandrasekaran, “A Brand New Military Headquarters in Afghanistan, and No One to Use It,” <i>Washington Post</i>, July 9, 2013. 6. Edward Luce and Daniel Dombey, “Waiting on a Sun King,” <i>Financial Times</i>, March 31, 2010. 7. Philip J. Powlick and Andrew Z. Katz, “Defining the American Public Opinion/Foreign Policy Nexus,” <i>Mershon International Studies Review</i> 42 (1998). 8. Doug Stokes, “The Heart of Empire?: Theorising US Empire in an Age of Transnational Capital,” <i>Third World Quarterly</i> 26 (2005).
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eugene R. Wittkopf, Charles W. Kegley, and James M. Scott, “Congress and Foreign Policy Making,” in <i>American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process</i> (5th ed., Wadsworth, 2003). • Richard C. Eichenberg, “Victory Has Many Friends,” <i>International Security</i> 30 (2005). • Joshua W. Busby, et al., “Congress is Already Post-Partisan,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92 (2013). • Stephen D. Krasner, “Are Bureaucracies Important? (or Allison Wonderland),” <i>Foreign Policy</i> 7 (1972).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • James Fallows, “Blind Into Baghdad,” <i>The Atlantic Monthly</i> 293 (Jan/Feb 2004). • Jeffrey A. Frieden, “Sectoral Conflicts and US Foreign Economic Policy, 1914-40,” <i>International Organization</i> 42 (1988). • Peter Trubowitz, “Regional Shifts and US Foreign Policy,” in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, eds., <i>US Foreign Policy</i> (2nd ed., Oxford, 2012).
--	--

Identity, Culture and Purpose	
--------------------------------------	--

Class meetings:	October 25, 28, 30
-----------------	--------------------

Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OC23: National identity and nationalism • OC25: Religion, ethnic lobbies • OC28: Values and choices
----------------	---

Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eugene R. Wittkopf, Charles W. Kegley, and James M. Scott, “American Values, Beliefs and Preferences,” in <i>American Foreign Policy: Pattern and Process</i> (5th ed., Wadsworth, 2003). 2. Minxin Pei, “The Paradoxes of American Nationalism,” <i>Foreign Policy</i> 136 (2003). 3. Sebastian Mallaby, “The Reluctant Imperialist,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 81 (2002). 4. Jonathan Monten, “The Roots of the Bush Doctrine,” <i>International Security</i> 29 (2005). 5. John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, “The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy,” <i>Middle East Policy</i> (Fall 2006). 6. Walter Russell Mead, “In God’s Country,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 85 (2006). 7. Ole R. Holsti, “A Return to Isolationism and Unilateralism?” in <i>Public Opinion and American Foreign Policy</i> (rev. ed., Michigan, 2009).
-------------------	--

Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Samuel P. Huntington, “American Ideals versus American Institutions,” <i>Political Science Quarterly</i> 97 (1982). • Alexander L. George, “Domestic Constraints on Regime Change in US Foreign Policy: The Need for Policy Legitimacy,” in Ole R. Holsti, ed., <i>Change in the International System</i> (Westview, 1980). • Leonard Seabrooke, “The Economic Taproot of US Imperialism,” <i>International Politics</i> 41 (2004). • Lawrence R. Jacobs and Benjamin I. Page, “Who Influences American Foreign Policy?” <i>American Political Science Review</i> 99 (2005). • Transcript of Obama’s speech in Cairo, <i>New York Times</i>, January 4, 2009. • Walter Russell Mead, “The Tea Party and American Foreign Policy,” <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 90 (2011). • David Rothkopf, “Is the US Incapable of Conducting a Moral Foreign Policy,” <i>Foreign Policy</i> (October 11, 2011).
----------------------	---

Contemporary Debates	
Class meetings:	November 1, 4, 6, 8, 11
Topics/themes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N001: globalization and economic crisis (and China) • N004: counter-terrorism and drones • N006: Syria (and Egypt) • N008: Mexico (and immigration) • N011: climate change • N013: university study day (no classes)
Required reading:	<p>* all readings in this section are subject to updating/replacement</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Paul Krugman, "Depression Economics Returns," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 72 (1999). 2. Roger C. Altman, "The Great Crash, 2008: A Geopolitical Setback for the West," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 85 (2009). 3. Roger C. Altman, "The Fall and Rise of the West," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92 (2013). 4. Daniel Byman, "Why Drones Work," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92 (2013). 5. Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Why Drones Fail," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 92 (2013). 6. Charlie Savage and Peter Baker, "Obama, in a Shift, to Limit Targets of Drone Strikes," <i>New York Times</i>, May 22, 2013. 7. "Obama Speaks on the US Counter-terrorism Strategy," whitehouse.gov, http://www.whitehouse.gov/photos-and-video/video/2013/05/23/president-obama-speaks-us-counterterrorism-strategy 8. "McCaul Bashes Obama on Counterterrorism Policy," homeland.house.gov, http://homeland.house.gov/news/cq-mccaul-bashes-obama-counterterrorism-policy 9. Tony Badran, "Obama Can Stop the Killing in Syria," <i>Foreign Policy</i> (June 14, 2011). 10. James P. Rubin, "The Real Reason to Intervene in Syria," <i>Foreign Policy</i> (June 4, 2012). 11. Joshua Landis, "Stay Out of Syria," <i>Foreign Policy</i> (June 5, 2012). 12. John P. Sullivan and Adam Elkus, "State of Seige: Mexico's Criminal Insurgency," <i>Small Wars Journal</i> 12 (2008). 13. Brian Bow, "Beyond Mérida?: The Evolution of the US Approach to Mexico's Security Crisis," in Brian Bow and Arturo Santa Cruz, eds., <i>The State and Security in Mexico</i> (Routledge 2012). 14. Ed O'Keefe, "Senate Approves Comprehensive Immigration Bill," <i>Washington Post</i>, June 27, 2013. 15. Theda Skocpol, "You Can't Change the Climate from Inside Washington," <i>Foreign Policy</i> (January 24, 2013). 16. Cass R. Sunstein, "The World versus the US and China?" <i>UCLA Law</i>

	<p>Review 55 (2008).</p> <p>17. "President Obama Speaks on Climate Change," whitehouse.gov, http://www.whitehouse.gov/photos-and-video/video/2013/06/25/president-obama-speaks-climate-change</p>
Recommended reading:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> plenty of stuff out there on all of these topics; try keyword searches in Google, Google News or Google Scholar...

Foreign Policy Simulation	
Class meetings:	<p>N015: Group 1 (Democrats), round 1 N018: Group 2 (Republicans), round 1 N020: Group 1 (Democrats), round 2 N022: Group 2 (Republicans), round 2 N025: post-simulation discussion (all students)</p>
Topics/themes:	See course website
Required reading:	See course website

The Future	
Class meetings:	November 27, 29
Topics/themes:	<p>N027: Obama's foreign policy in perspective N029: guesses about the future</p>
Required reading:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Martin S. Indyk, Kenneth G. Lieberthal, and Michael E. O'Hanlon, "Scoring Obama's Foreign Policy," <i>Foreign Affairs</i> 91 (2012). Hillary Clinton, "America's Pacific Century," <i>Foreign Policy</i> 189 (2011). Anatol Lieven, "The Future of US Foreign Policy," in Michael Cox and Doug Stokes, eds., <i>US Foreign Policy</i> (2nd ed., Oxford, 2012). 2016, from the left: http://thinkprogress.org/tag/election-2016/ 2016, from the right: http://www.commentarymagazine.com/topic/2016-presidential-election/

REVIEW	
Class meetings:	December 2
REMINDER	TERM PAPERS DUE THURSDAY, DECEMBER 6
Topics/themes:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Last-minute term paper advice Preparing for the final exam Course evaluations