

PPS 501 • HST 567 • PS 562
American Grand Strategy

Duke University

Sanford School of Public Policy

Fall 2017

151 Rubenstein Hall

Tuesdays, 1:25pm–3:55pm

Syllabus revised 5 September 2017.

Items for which you are no longer responsible and other changes
have been ~~crossed out~~.

Prof. Bruce Jentleson

Email: bwj7@duke.edu
Office: 122 Rubenstein Hall
Telephone: (919) 613-9208
Office hours: Wednesdays, 1:30pm–3:00pm
Or by appointment

Prof. Simon Miles

Email: simon.miles@duke.edu
Office: 130 Rubenstein Hall
Telephone: (919) 613-9560
Office hours: Mondays, 2:00pm–3:30pm
Or by appointment

COURSE OVERVIEW

This course examines the global challenges and opportunities confronting the United States and the efforts of US policy-makers to craft a grand strategy that adequately addresses them. It covers key historical junctures in the development of American Grand Strategy, from the early Republic to the present, concentrating on post–World War II to the present. The class will examine both the theory and the practice of grand strategy, and it will consider both defenses and critiques of the choices US leaders have made.

This class is designed to be the capstone course for advanced undergraduates who have had extensive preparation in international relations, international security, and American foreign policy. It is also designed to be an interdisciplinary seminar for graduate students, especially those in political science, history, and public policy.

The course will be augmented by the American Grand Strategy (AGS) program with its a vigorous year-long colloquium, involving visiting speakers, workshops, and conferences. For students enrolled in the course, attendance at these events is expected and will be factored into your grade for class participation. Please pay close attention to the AGS email notices to stay informed of the schedule. Students are strongly encouraged to continue attending these events even after the course is over.

Our principal objectives are threefold:

1. Develop an analytic framework and historical context for understanding contemporary US foreign policy.
2. Enhance your capacity to evaluate competing analyses — theories, historical interpretations, political arguments — arguments about US foreign policy.
3. Strengthen your policy analysis research, writing and oral communication skills.

RESPONSIBILITIES & GRADING

Students taking this course should expect to be graded rigorously. While we do not adhere strictly to a curve, you should expect the normal distribution of grades to be something approximating the following: A-range grades reserved for exceptional work, B-range grades reserved for students who perform consistently and well throughout the semester, and C-range and below grades reserved for students whose work is lacking in quality, consistency, or both. If a final course grade is at the cusp (e.g., between A- and B+), progression over the semester will be taken into account.

The course includes undergraduates, Masters and Ph.D. students. The main difference in course requirements is on the final paper; Ph.D. students will have a different assignment (see below). Your final grade will be comprised of the following portions:

1. Class contribution (30%)
2. Op-ed assignment (10%)
3. Seminar paper (20%)
4. Final paper and presentation (40%)

Each assignment will be graded on a 100-point scale and weighted as above.

In all your work you are expected to be familiar with and abide by all rules and norms for academic integrity, particularly those established in the Duke Community Standard: <https://studentaffairs.duke.edu/conduct/about-us/duke-community-standard>. The Duke Library also provides helpful research guidelines for research, including for avoiding plagiarism: <http://library.duke.edu/research/guides/citing/>. Plagiarism is a serious violation and will be treated as such.

CLASS CONTRIBUTION

Class contribution refers to the preparation, participation, and quality of input each student gives to the course. We teach this course as a seminar, encouraging, relying on, and requiring consistent, committed, and creative student engagement. We read a lot. We write a lot. We discuss a lot. Expectations are for attendance at all classes and for consistent, intensive and creative engagement. That means doing the reading as assigned, reading each other's final papers as part of your preparation for class, introducing your own thinking into discussions, and

generally “digesting” not just “ingesting” the materials. While personal styles vary, all students are expected to be active participants in the course. This is not necessarily measured by “quantity” — quality matters too, including demonstration of analytic thinking, engaging in constructive critiques (of lectures, readings, student papers), and others. Students also should consistently attend the related AGS programs, including speakers, colloquia, and field trips.

Our scale for grading class contribution is:

- 95–100: Substantially exceeds expectations.
- 90–94: Moderately exceeds expectations.
- 85–89: Meets expectations.
- 80–84: Consistent attendance, participation below expectations.
- 70–79: Inconsistent attendance and/or participation substantially below expectations.
- Below 70: You’ll know.

Current Events Discussion

Most weeks, we will open the class time with a brief (10–15 minutes) discussion of current events insofar as they intersect the key themes of the course. Students should regularly read a quality newspaper that covers world events in depth, as well as other informed commentary. Each week, we will select a student or two to start off this current events discussion; everyone will get to do this at least once; students will not be asked to do this the week they have prepared a seminar paper.

AGS Events and Activities

The American Grand Strategy program will bring to Duke a range of visiting speakers. Attendance will be open to a wider group but is mandatory for students in the AGS course. We will also arrange for students to meet with visitors in smaller groups and will make every effort to match students up with visitors of particular interest to them. Pay attention to email notices about upcoming speakers.

Students also are expected to participate in at least one AGS field trip during the Fall or Spring semester. The field trip may include a battlefield staff ride or a visit to a military installation. Details on these activities will be forthcoming.

WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

General Instructions

All submissions are to be made electronically via the course’s Sakai site as Word documents (12-point conventional font, double-spaced) and not as PDFs as we will grade and comment electronically.

Papers exceeding the specified maximum lengths will be penalized.

Any paper submitted any later than the specified deadline (both date and time) will incur a 10% penalty, and another 10% for every further 24-hour period it is late.

Clear and concise prose is essential to effective presentation and analysis. Students will be graded not simply on the content of their papers, but also on the clarity with which they convey that content. Accordingly, all papers should be edited and proofread thoroughly before submission.

Op-Ed

10% of your final grade.

~~*Due Monday, 4 September at 8:00pm in your Sakai dropbox.*~~

Due Thursday, 7 September at 5:00pm in your Sakai dropbox.

Op-eds (originally the opinion articles opposite the editorial line of a newspaper) seek to inform and persuade in a concise manner on important and often controversial issues about politics and policy (as well as other topics). They are published in newspapers or posted online. Their length is in the range of 700–850 words. An effective op-ed can take many forms, but generally it makes a single overarching point that could be put in a simple declarative sentence, provides facts and arguments in support of the main point, takes on the strongest counterarguments, and is written in a style that appropriately engages a busy reader. If you are not familiar with the genre, look at examples in the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal*, or another quality newspaper.

With the above guidelines in mind and within the 700–850 word limit, write an op-ed on a current foreign policy issue making the case for what US foreign policy should be. This may be an issue we discuss in the first class, but it should not be one that you intend to write your final paper on.

Seminar Paper

20% of your final grade.

Due 12:00pm on the Monday preceding the relevant class in your Sakai dropbox.

Students will also write a paper to be presented in class based on that week's readings. Seminar papers have two main goals, summary and analysis. The summary conveys key points the authors make and the ways the papers fit together in terms of common themes, complementary focuses or in other ways. The analysis dives down into arguments and points that you consider particularly important, agreeing and/or disagreeing with the author(s). The overall paper must not be longer than 4000 words, of which no more than half should be pure summary.

Students will sign up in the second class (5 September) for two students per week starting on 12 September and continuing through the rest of the semester (other than on 17 October, the date of the Vietnam simulation, and 21 and 28 November due to group presentations).

Paper-writers will present to the class in ways that help lead and facilitate class discussion. The rest of the class is not required to read these papers but is expected to have done the readings on which they are based and be ready to engage in the discussion.

UNDERGRADUATE & MASTERS FINAL PAPERS

40% of your final grade.

These are research papers with the objective of developing policy recommendations. You will need to delve into the history of an issue as well as the range of theories, strategies, and arguments that bear on the current policy debate. On the basis of your research and analysis you will recommend a policy for the United States to follow.

These are individual papers coordinated as a group for class presentation. There are four main policy areas into which students will be grouped:

1. Russia
2. Climate Change
3. China
4. The Middle East

Within these groups, students will choose particular issues. For example, within the Russia group, one paper could be on Ukraine, another on hacking, one on relevant nuclear issues, etc. For China, papers could deal with the South China Sea, trade, North Korea, etc. For the Middle East, consider issues such as Syria, Israel-Palestine, relations with Saudi Arabia, etc. For climate change, you might address opening access to the Arctic, the debate over the Paris agreement, food scarcity, etc.

The key is a “Goldilocks” delineation of a topic: not too big to deal with in a 20-page paper, not so small as to not warrant detailed and lengthy treatment — just right. We will discuss this more in class, and you should work with Professors Jentleson and Miles to make sure your chosen topic is the right size.

Topic Selection

Sign-ups in class on 5 September.

We will ask you for a first choice and a second choice. There will be 4–5 students in each group with a mix of undergrads and Masters students. We will try to accommodate first choices within these parameters.

Paper Proposal

Due 28 September at 5:00pm (or sooner) in your Sakai dropbox.

The proposal has two components:

1. Define the central focus of the paper and provide an initial discussion of the policy debate (1 page, single-spaced).

2. An initial annotated bibliography of at least six major sources. Annotated means a brief description of the utility of each source for your research. This doesn't require having fully read each source but does require sufficient knowledge of it to briefly convey its value to your research. Major means the kind of sources that can provide the building blocks for the whole project: e.g., books, scholarly and policy journal articles, government documents, think tank and NGO studies, not newspaper or newsmagazine articles (you eventually will use these, but they are not major sources). Remember that Googling is not the best way to do policy research. See also: <http://guides.library.duke.edu/international-relations>.

Paper Submission and Presentation

Due Sunday, 19 November at 8:00pm for those in the Russia and Climate Change groups and Sunday, 26 November at 8:00pm for those in the China and Middle East groups. Submit your paper in Sakai's Forum Section in the designated folders so everyone can read it before your presentation.

Paper presentations: 21 November: Russia and Climate Change
28 November: China and Middle East

Each group will have half of one class period to present. Presenting means teaching, conveying important information, stimulating and leading discussion. Your papers will be the assigned reading for the week.

Grading: 80% for the paper
20% for the presentation (group cohesion and individual contribution)

Final Product

Your paper should be...

1. Well-researched, meaning that it builds a strong research base drawn from a mix of quality sources (which does not necessarily correspond to what comes up most readily on Google and other non-specialized search engines).
2. Brings to bear concepts and other material from the rest of the course, as appropriate.
3. Analysis that digests, not just ingests, shows strong command of relevant policy debates while also presenting student's own insights and arguments.
4. Provides relevant data, quantitative and/or qualitative, and uses the data effectively, particularly so as not to assert without substantiation.
5. Makes clear, well-supported and viable policy proposals: no need for purist or absolutist answers, but no fence-sitting either.
6. Professionally presented, including use of tables and figures as enhances your paper, and proper use of citations (whichever of the standard formats you prefer) and bibliography. Any professional citation method and bibliography format may be used, so long as used consistently and properly. See the Perkins Library Guide, Citing Sources, <http://library.duke.edu/research/citing>.

7. Well written: Write, rewrite, and rewrite again.
8. In-class presentations that are well organized, effective as teaching bringing out key points and stimulating discussion, and manage well the allotted time.

PH.D. FINAL PAPER

40% of your final grade.

Due Monday, 4 December at 8:00pm in your Sakai dropbox.

The Ph.D. candidates have two options for their final papers:

1. An original research paper on a topic approved by Professors Jentleson and Miles. Paper length is roughly 30 pages.
2. A thematic bibliographical literature review (20–30 pages) based on the syllabus material (including the “recommended reading”). The goal here is to prepare a historiographical analysis of the readings in the course and explain how this literature intersects with the student’s field.

SEMINAR SCHEDULE & READINGS

The reading load is fairly heavy. There is no single text for this course, nor is it feasible to buy all the books and journals used in the course. That means we will rely heavily on reserves.

Two books are required for the course. We recommend purchasing them at the Duke Book Store or elsewhere:

- Robert Kagan, *Dangerous Nation: America's Place in the World from Its Earliest Days to the Dawn of the Twentieth Century* (Vintage, 2007).
- Hal Brands, *What Good is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Grand Strategy from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

Other readings are on the course Sakai Website and/or E-Reserves.

29 Aug. What is Strategy and Grand Strategy?

In addition to the general topic of strategy and grand strategy, we will have a kick-off discussion. Come to class prepared to engage on the following question: What is one Trump foreign policy with which you agree, and why? One with which you disagree, and why? No formal written submission is required, but be prepared to make your case in class discussion.

Readings on Strategy and Grand Strategy

Richard K. Betts, "Is Strategy an Illusion?," *International Security*, vol. 25, no. 5 (2000): pp. 5–50.

Hal Brands, *What Good is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

- Intro., "The Meaning and Challenge of Grand Strategy," pp. 1–16.

Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*, ed. and trans. Michael Howard and Peter Paret (Princeton University Press, 1976).

- Michael Howard, "The Influence of Clausewitz," pp. 27–44.
- Book 1, chap. 1, pp. 75–89.
- Book 1, chap. 3–8, pp. 100–123.
- Book 8, chap. 1–4, pp. 577–600.
- Book 8, chap. 6, pt. B, pp. 605–610.

Hew Strachan, *The Direction of War: Contemporary Strategy in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).

- Chap. 2, “The Meaning of Strategy: Historical Perspectives,” pp. 26–45.

Marc Trachtenberg, *The Craft of International History: A Guide to Method* (Princeton University Press, 2006).

- Chap. 2, “Diplomatic History and International Relations Theory,” pp. 30–50.

Stephen M. Walt, “The Relationship Between Theory and Policy in International Relations,” *Annual Review of Political Science*, vol. 8, no. 1 (2005): pp. 23–48.

Further Reading

Kimberly Kagan, “Redefining Roman Grand Strategy,” *Journal of Military History*, vol. 70, no. 2 (2006): pp. 333–362.

Paul Kennedy, “Grand Strategy in War and Peace: Toward a Broader Definition,” in *Grand Strategies in War and Peace*, ed. Paul Kennedy (Yale University Press, 1991), pp. 1–7.

Edward N. Luttwak, *The Grand Strategy of the Roman Empire: From the First Century CE to the Third*, rev. ed. (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2016).

Richard E. Neustadt and Ernest R. May, *Thinking in Time: The Uses of History for Decision Makers* (The Free Press, 1986).

5 Sept. “Past is Prologue”: Pre–Twentieth Century American Grand Strategy

Robert Kagan, *Dangerous Nation: America’s Foreign Policy from Its Earliest Days to the Dawn of the Twentieth Century* (Vintage, 2007).

John Winthrop, “City Upon a Hill,” 1630, available at: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/winthrop.htm>.

President George Washington, “Farewell Address,” 19 Sept. 1796, available at: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp.

Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, “Go Not Abroad in Search of Monsters to Destroy,” 4 Jul. 1821, available at: <http://www.theamericanconservative.com/repository/she-goes-not-abroad-in-search-of-monsters-to-destroy/>.

President James Monroe, “Message at the Commencement of the First Session of the Eighteenth Congress (The Monroe Doctrine),” 2 Dec. 1823, available at: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/19th_century/monroe.asp.

John O’Sullivan, “Manifest Destiny,” Nov. 1839, available at: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/osulliva.htm>.

Further Reading

Jonathan R. Dull, *A Diplomatic History of the American Revolution* (Yale University Press, 1985).

Charles N. Edel, *Nation Builder: John Quincy Adams and the Grand Strategy of the Republic* (Harvard University Press, 2014).

Eliga Gould, *Among the Powers of the Earth: The American Revolution and the Making of a New World Empire* (Harvard University Press, 2012).

Alan Taylor, *The Civil War of 1812: American Citizens, British Subjects, Irish Rebels, and Indian Allies* (Alfred A. Knopf, 2010).

12 Sept. The Twentieth Century Before World War II

Michael H. Hunt, *Ideology and US Foreign Policy*, rev. ed. (Yale University Press, 2009).

– Chap. 4, “The Perils of Revolution,” pp. 92–124.

Richard H. Immerman, *Empire for Liberty: A History of American Imperialism from Benjamin Franklin to Paul Wolfowitz* (Princeton University Press, 2012).

– Chap. 4, “Henry Cabot Lodge and the New American Empire,” pp. 128–163.

Erez Manela, *The Wilsonian Moment: Self-Determination and the International Origins of Anticolonial Nationalism* (Oxford University Press, 2007).

– Part 1, “A Spring of Upheaval,” pp. 3–53.

Emily S. Rosenberg, *Spreading the American Dream: American Cultural and Economic Expansion, 1890–1945* (Hill and Wang, 1982).

– Chap. 8, “The Cooperative State of the 1920s,” pp. 138–160.

– Chap. 9, “Depression and War: 1932–1945,” pp. 161–201.

President William McKinley, “The Imperial Gospel,” 1899, available at: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5575/>.

Mark Twain, “The Battle Hymn of the Republic, Updated,” 1900, available at: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Battle_Hymn_of_the_Republic,_Updated.

“The Platt Amendment to the Constitution of Cuba,” 2 Mar. 1901, available at: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/platt.htm>.

President Theodore Roosevelt, “Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine,” 6 Dec. 1904, available at: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/platt.htm>.

President Woodrow Wilson, “Safe for Democracy,” 2 Apr. 1917, available at: <http://historymatters.gmu.edu/d/4943/>.

“The Atlantic Charter,” 14 Aug. 1941, available at: <http://avalon.law.yale.edu/wwii/atlantic.asp>.

Further Reading

Andrew Buchanan, *American Grand Strategy in the Mediterranean During World War II* (Cambridge University Press, 2014).

William Roger Louis, *Imperialism at Bay: The United States and the Decolonization of the British Empire, 1941–1945* (Oxford University Press, 1987).

Margaret MacMillan, *Paris 1919: Six Months That Changed the World* (Random House, 2002).

Emily S. Rosenberg, *Financial Missionaries to the World: The Politics and Culture of Dollar Diplomacy, 1900–1930* (Duke University Press, 2004).

19 Sept. Present at the Creation: Establishing Cold War Strategy

Hal Brands, *What Good is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

- Chap. 1, “The Golden Age Revisited: The Truman Administration and the Evolution of Containment,” pp. 17–58.

~~John Lewis Gaddis, *George F. Kennan: An American Life* (Penguin Press, 2011).~~

- ~~– Chap. 11, “A Grand Strategic Education: 1946,” pp. 225–248.~~
- ~~– Chap. 12, “Mr. X: 1947,” pp. 249–275.~~

‘X’ (George Kennan), “The Sources of Soviet Conduct,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 25, no. 4 (1947): pp. 566–582.

Melvyn P. Leffler, "The United States and the Strategic Dimensions of the Marshall Plan," *Diplomatic History*, vol. 12, no. 3 (1988): pp. 277–306.

Wilson D. Miscamble, "Roosevelt, Truman, and the Development of Postwar Grand Strategy," *Orbis*, vol. 53, no. 4 (2009): pp. 553–570.

National Security Council Report 68, "United States Objectives and Programs for National Security," 14 Apr. 1950, available at: https://www.trumanlibrary.org/whistlestop/study_collections/coldwar/documents/pdf/10-1.pdf.

General Secretary Iosef V. Stalin, "Bolshoi Speech," 9 Feb. 1946, available at: <http://soviethistory.msu.edu/1947-2/cold-war/cold-war-texts/stalin-election-speech/>.

President Harry S. Truman, "The Truman Doctrine," 12 Mar. 1947, available at: http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/trudoc.asp.

Samuel F. Wells Jr., "Sounding the Tocsin: NSC 68 and the Soviet Threat," *International Security*, vol. 4, no. 2 (1979): pp. 116–158.

Geoffrey Roberts, *Stalin's Wars: From World War to Cold War, 1939–1953* (Yale University Press, 2008).

– Chap. 10, "The Lost Peace: Stalin and the Origins of the Cold War," pp. 296–320.

Further Reading

Frank Costigliola, *Roosevelt's Lost Alliances: How Personal Politics Helped Start the Cold War* (Princeton University Press, 2012).

Sheila Fitzpatrick, *On Stalin's Team: The Years of Living Dangerously in Soviet Politics* (Princeton University Press, 2015).

Oleg Gorlizki, *Cold Peace: Stalin and the Soviet Ruling Circle, 1945–1953* (Oxford University Press, 2004).

Michael Hogan, *The Marshall Plan: America, Britain and the Reconstruction of Western Europe, 1947–1952* (Cambridge University Press, 1989).

William Inboden, *Religion and American Foreign Policy, 1945–1960: The Soul of Containment* (Cambridge University Press, 2008).

26 Sept. Executive Branch Politics: Inter-Agency & Civil-Military Relations

David C. Kozak and James M. Keagle, *Bureaucratic Politics and National Security: Theory and Practice* (Lynne Rienner, 1988).

- Chap. 1, “The Bureaucratic Politics Approach: The Evolution of the Paradigm,” pp. 3–15.
- Chap. 2, “Introduction and Framework,” pp. 16–25.

Irving L. Janis, *Groupthink: Psychological Studies of Policy Decisions and Fiascoes* (Houghton Mifflin, 1982).

- Chap. 1, “Why So Many Miscalculations?,” pp. 2–13.

Ivo H. Daalder and I.M. Destler, *In the Shadow of the Oval Office: Profiles of the National Security Advisers and the Presidents They Served — From JFK to George W. Bush* (Simon and Schuster, 2011)

- Chap. 1, “The President Needs Help,” pp. 1–11.
- Chap. 9, “Trust Is the Coin of the Realm,” pp. 299–328.

~~Samuel Huntington, “Interservice Competition and the Political Roles of the Armed Services,” *American Political Science Review*, vol. 55, no. 1 (1961): pp. 40–52.~~

Peter D. Feaver, *Armed Servants: Agency, Oversight and Civil-Military Relations* (Harvard University Press, 2003).

- Intro., pp. 1–15.
- Chap. 1, “Huntington’s Cold War Puzzle,” pp. 16–53.
- Chap. 2, “The Informal Agency Theory,” pp. 54–95.

~~Eliot Cohen, “The Unequal Dialogue: The Theory and Reality of Civil-Military Relations and the Use of Force,” in *Soldiers and Civilians: The Civil-Military Gap and American National Security*, ed. Peter D. Feaver and Richard H. Kohn (MIT Press, 2001), pp. 429–458.~~

Kori Schake and Defense Secretary Jim Mattis, “Ensuring a Civil-Military Connection,” in *Warriors and Citizens: Americans Views of Our Military*, ed. idem. (Hoover Institution Press, 2016), pp. 287–326.

Further Reading

Morton H. Halperin and Arnold Kanter, “The Bureaucratic Perspective: A Preliminary Framework,” in *Readings in American Foreign Policy*, ed. Morton H. Halperin and Arnold Kanter (Little, Brown, and Company, 1973), pp. 1–42.

Graham Allison and Philip Zelikow, *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis*, 2nd ed. (Pearson, 1999).

Gordon Adams and Cindy Williams, *Buying National Security: How America Plans and Pays for Its Global Role and Safety at Home* (Routledge, 2010).

Risa Brooks, *Shaping Strategy: The Civil-Military Politics of Strategic Assessment* (Princeton University Press, 2008).

Samuel Huntington, *The Common Defense: Strategic Programs in National Policy* (Columbia University Press, 1961).

3 Oct. Nuclear Deterrence, the Arms Race, and Project Solarium

Bernard Brodie, ed., *The Absolute Weapon: Atomic Power and World Order* (Yale Institute of International Studies, 1946).

- Chap. 1, “The Weapon,” pp. 14–56.
- N.B. This is Eisenhower’s personal copy. The margin notes are his own from early 1946, when he was Chief of Staff of the Army.

John Lewis Gaddis, “The Long Peace: Elements of Stability in the Postwar International System,” *International Security*, vol. 10, no. 4 (1986): pp. 99–142.

National Security Council Memorandum, “Project Solarium,” 22 Jul. 1953, available at: <https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v02p1/d80>.

William Stueck, “Reassessing US Strategy in the Aftermath of the Korean War,” *Orbis*, vol. 53, no. 1 (2009): pp. 571–590.

Marc Trachtenberg, “A Wasting Asset: American Strategy and the Shifting Nuclear Balance, 1949–1954,” *International Security*, vol. 13, no. 3 (1988): pp. 5–49.

Albert Wohlstetter, “The Delicate Balance of Terror,” RAND Corporation Report P-1472 (1958), available at: <https://www.rand.org/about/history/wohlstetter/P1472/P1472.html>.

Vladislav M. Zubok, "Stalin and the Nuclear Age," in *Cold War Statesmen Confront the Bomb: Nuclear Diplomacy Since 1945*, ed. John Lewis Gaddis, Philip Gordon, Ernest May, and Jonathan Rosenberg (Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 39–61.

Further Reading

Robert Bowie and Richard Immerman, *Waging Peace: How Eisenhower Shaped an Enduring Cold War Strategy* (Oxford University Press, 1998).

Campbell Craig and Sergey Radchenko, *The Atomic Bomb and the Origins of the Cold War* (Yale University Press, 2008).

Saki Dockrill, *Eisenhower's New-Look National Security Policy, 1953–1961* (St. Martin's Press, 1996).

David M. Holloway, *Stalin and the Bomb: The Soviet Union and Atomic Energy, 1939–1956* (Yale University Press, 1994).

10 Oct. Fall Break

The class will not meet.

17 Oct. The Vietnam War: Simulation Exercise of the 1965 Escalation Decision

This class will meet for longer than the normal class period. Other readings and assignments related to the simulation will be distributed beforehand.

Frances FitzGerald, *Fire in the Lake* (Little, Brown, and Company: 1972)

– Chap. 1, "States of Mind," pp. 2 (map), 3–31.

Leslie Gelb, "Vietnam: The System Worked," *Foreign Policy*, no. 3 (1971): pp. 140–167.

Memorandum, National Security Advisor McGeorge Bundy to President Lyndon Johnson, "The Situation in Vietnam," 7 Feb. 1965, available at: http://www.digitalhistory.uh.edu/active_learning/explorations/vietnam/escalate14.cfm.

Memorandum, Under Secretary of State George Ball to Secretary of State Dean Rusk et al., 29 Jun. 1965, available at: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pentagon4/doc258.htm>.

Memorandum, Under Secretary of State George Ball to President Lyndon Johnson, "A Compromise Solution in South Vietnam," 1 Jul. 1965, available at: <https://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/pentagon4/doc260.htm>.

George C. Herring, *America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950–1975*, 9th ed. (McGraw-Hill, 2014).

- Chap. 4, "Enough, But Not Too Much: Johnson's Decisions for War, 1963–1965," pp. 135–176.

Mark Atwood Lawrence, "Explaining the Early Decisions: The United States and the French War, 1945–1954," in *Making Sense of the Vietnam Wars: Local, National, and Transnational Perspectives*, ed. Mark Philip Bradley and Marilyn B. Young (Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 23–44.

H.R. McMaster, *Dereliction of Duty: Lyndon Johnson, Robert McNamara, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Lies that Led to Vietnam* (HarperCollins, 1997).

- Chap. 11, "The Foot in the Door," pp. 217–242.
- Chap. 12, "A Quicksand of Lies," pp. 243–261.
- Chap. 15, "Five Silent Men," pp. 300–321.
- Epilogue, pp. 323–334.

~~Mark Moyar, *Triumph Forsaken: The Vietnam War, 1954–1965* (Cambridge University Press, 2006).~~

- ~~– Chap. 15, "Invasion: November–December 1964," pp. 330–349.~~
- ~~– Chap. 16, "The Prize for Victory: January–May 1965," pp. 350–391.~~
- ~~– Chap. 17, "Decision: June–July 1965," pp. 392–416.~~

Further Reading

Mark Atwood Lawrence, *The Vietnam War: A Concise International History* (Oxford University Press, 2008).

Fredrik Logevall, *Choosing War: The Lost Chance for Peace and the Escalation of War in Vietnam* (University of California Press, 2001).

Lien-Hang T. Nguyen, *Hanoi's War: An International History of the War for Peace in Vietnam* (University of North Carolina Press, 2012).

24 Oct. Détente: Success or Failure?

Hal Brands, *What Good is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

- Chap. 2, “Travails of the Heroic Statesmen: Grand Strategy in the Nixon-Kissinger Years,” pp. 59–101.

Raymond L. Garthoff, *Soviet Leaders and Intelligence: Assessing the American Adversary During the Cold War* (Georgetown University Press, 2015).

- Chap. 3, “Brezhnev: Engagement and Détente, 1965–79,” pp. 37–56.

Jussi Hanhimäki, “Conservative Goals, Revolutionary Outcomes: The Paradox of Détente,” *Cold War History*, vol. 8, no. 4 (2008): pp. 503–512.

Bruce Jentleson, “Kissinger, Nixon and the US-China Opening, 1971–1972,” in *The Peacemakers: Lessons Learned from 20th Century Statesmanship* (Forthcoming 2018).

Simon Miles, “Envisioning Détente: The Johnson Administration and the October 1964 Khrushchev Ouster,” *Diplomatic History*, vol. 40, no. 4 (2016): pp. 722–749.

Michael Morgan and Daniel Sargent, “Helsinki, 1975: Borders and People,” in *Transcending the Cold War: Summits, Statecraft, and the Dissolution of Bipolarity in Europe, 1970–1990*, ed. David Reynolds and Kristina Spohr (Oxford University Press, 2016), pp. 95–121.

Mark Moyar, “Grand Strategy After the Vietnam War,” *Orbis*, vol. 53, no. 4 (2009): pp. 591–610.

Further Reading

Raymond L. Garthoff, *Détente and Confrontation: American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan*, 2nd ed. (Brookings Institution Press, 1994).

Henry Kissinger, *White House Years* (Little, Brown, and Company, 1979).

Daniel J. Sargent, *A Superpower Transformed: The Remaking of American Foreign Relations in the 1970s* (Oxford University Press, 2014).

Jeremi Suri, *Power and Protest: Global Revolution and the Rise of Detente* (Harvard University Press, 2003).

31 Oct. **The End of the Cold War**

Hal Brands, *What Good is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

- Chap. 3, “Was There a Reagan Grand Strategy?: American Statecraft in the Late Cold War,” pp. 102–143.

Bruce Jentleson, “Mikhail Gorbachev: Ending the Cold War, 1985–1991,” in *The Peacemakers: Lessons Learned from 20th Century Statesmanship* (Forthcoming 2018).

Thomas M. Nichols, “Carter and the Soviets: The Origins of the US Return to a Strategy of Confrontation,” *Diplomacy & Statecraft*, vol. 13, no. 2 (2002): pp. 21–42.

Joshua R. Itzkowitz Shiffrin, “Deal or No Deal?: The End of the Cold War and the U.S. Offer to Limit NATO Expansion,” *International Security*, vol. 40, no. 4 (2016): pp. 7–44.

Sarah Snyder, “‘No Crowing’: Reagan, Trust, and Human Rights,” in *Trust, but Verify: The Politics of Uncertainty and the Transformation of the Cold War Order, 1969–1991*, ed. Martin Klimke, Reinhild Kreis, and Christian F. Ostermann (Stanford University Press, 2016), pp. 42–62.

Bartholomew H. Sparrow, “Realism’s Practitioner: Brent Scowcroft and the Making of the New World Order, 1989–1993,” *Diplomatic History*, vol. 34, no. 1 (2010): pp. 141–175.

Further Reading

Robert Hutchings, *American Diplomacy and the End of the Cold War: An Insider’s Account of US Policy in Europe, 1989–1992* (Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1997).

Jack F. Matlock, *Reagan and Gorbachev: How the Cold War Ended* (Random House, 2004).

Condoleezza Rice and Philip Zelikow, *Germany Unified and Europe Transformed: A Study in Statecraft* (Harvard University Press, 1995).

James Graham Wilson, *The Triumph of Improvisation: Gorbachev’s Adaptability, Reagan’s Engagement, and the End of the Cold War* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

7 Nov. The 1990s Unipolar Moment & 9/11

Francis Fukuyama, “The End of History?,” *The National Interest*, no. 16 (1989): pp. 3–18.

Department of Defense Memorandum, “Defense Planning Guidance, FY 1994–1999,” 29 Feb. 1992, available at: <http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nukevault/ebb245/doc04.pdf>.

Joseph Nye, *The Paradox of American Power: Why the World’s Only Superpower Can’t Go It Alone* (Oxford University Press, 2002).

- Chap. 1, “The American Colossus,” pp. 1–40.
- ~~Chap. 5, “Redefining the National Interest,” pp. 137–172.~~

Michael Mandelbaum, *The Case for Goliath: How America Acts as the World’s Government in the 21st Century* (Public Affairs, 2005)

- Chap. 1, “The World’s Government,” pp. 1–30.
- ~~Chap. 5, “The Future,” pp. 187–226.~~

Michael Mandelbaum, “Foreign Policy as Social Work,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 75, no. 1 (1996): pp. 16–32.

Samantha Power, *“A Problem From Hell”: America and the Age of Genocide* (Basic Books, 2002)

- Preface, pp. xi–xxi.
- Conclusion, pp. 503–516.

Samuel Huntington, “The Clash of Civilizations?,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol 72, no. 3 (1993): pp. 22–49.

Peter Bergen, “What Were the Causes of 9/11?,” *Prospect*, 24 Sept. 2006, available at: <https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/magazine/whatwerethecausesof911>.

The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (W.W. Norton, 2004)

- Executive Summary, available at: http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/911/report/911Report_Exec.htm.

Jeremi Suri, “American Grand Strategy from the Cold War’s End to 9/11,” *Orbis*, vol. 53, no. 4 (2009), pp. 611–629.

Further Reading

Derek Chollet and James Goldgeier, *America Between the Wars: From 11/9 to 9/11* (Public Affairs, 2009).

Lawrence Wright, *The Looming Tower: Al Qaeda and the Road to 9/11* (Alfred A. Knopf, 2006).

14 Nov. The Iraq War to Obama

President George W. Bush, Graduation Speech at the US Military Academy at West Point, 1 Jun. 2002, available at: <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/06/20020601-3.html>.

George W. Bush, *Decision Points* (Crown, 2010).

– Chap. 8, “Iraq,” pp. 223–271.

George Packer, *The Assassins’ Gate: America in Iraq* (Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2005).

– Chap. 2, “Fevered Minds,” pp. 39–65.

– ~~Chap. 4, “Special Plans,” pp. 100–148.~~

Paul R. Pillar, *Intelligence and U.S. Foreign Policy: Iraq, 9/11 and Misguided Reform* (Columbia University Press, 2011).

– ~~Chap. 2, “Weapons of Mass Destruction and the Iraq War,” pp. 13–42.~~

– Chap. 3, “Alternative Visions of the Iraq War,” pp. 43–68.

Hal Brands, *What Good is Grand Strategy?: Power and Purpose in American Statecraft from Harry S. Truman to George W. Bush* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

– Chap. 4, “The Dangers of Being Grand: George W. Bush and the Post-9/11 Era,” pp. 144–189.

John Mueller and Mark Stewart, “The Terrorism Delusion: America’s Overwrought Response to 9/11,” *International Security*, vol. 37, no. 1 (2012), pp. 81–110.

~~President Barack Obama, Nobel Peace Prize Lecture, “A Just and Lasting Peace,” 10 Dec. 2009, https://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2009/obama-lecture_en.html.~~

Obama Administration Exit Memoranda, 5 January 2017.

- Secretary Ashton Carter, Department of Defense, <http://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/cabinet/exit-memos/department-defense>.
- Secretary John Kerry, Department of State, available at: <http://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/cabinet/exit-memos/department-state>.
- Ambassador Samantha Power, US Mission to the United Nations, available at: <http://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/administration/cabinet/exit-memos/united-states-mission-united-nations>.

Gideon Rose, “What Obama Gets Right: Keep Calm and Carry the Liberal Order On,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 94, no. 5 (2015), available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/what-obama-gets-right>.

Bret Stephens, “What Obama Gets Wrong: No Retreat, No Surrender,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 94, no. 5 (2015), available at: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/what-obama-gets-wrong>.

Jeffrey Goldberg, “The Obama Doctrine,” Apr. 2016, *The Atlantic*, available at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2016/04/the-obama-doctrine/471525/>.

~~Kori Schake, “Obama: Fighting Wars He Believes Unwinnable,” 14 Mar. 2016, *The Atlantic*, available at: <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/03/obama-doctrine-wars-military/473550/>.~~

Further Reading

Colin Dueck, *The Obama Doctrine: American Grand Strategy Today* (Oxford, 2015).

Derek Chollet, *The Long Game: How Obama Defied Washington and Redefined America’s Role in the World* (Public Affairs, 2016).

21 Nov. Group Project Presentations: Russia & Climate Change

Prepare by reading the papers, posted in the Sakai forum.

28 Nov. Group Project Presentations: China & The Middle East

Prepare by reading the papers, posted in the Sakai forum.

5 Dec. **Twenty-First Century American Grand Strategy**

Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth, *America Abroad: The United States' Global Role in the 21st Century* (Oxford University Press, 2016).

- Chap. 1, “Assessing America’s Global Position,” pp. 14–47.
- ~~Chap. 2, “Assessing Change in a One-Superpower World,” pp. 48–72.~~

Barry R. Posen, *Restraint: A New Foundation for U.S. Grand Strategy* (Cornell University Press, 2014).

- Chap. 2, “The Case for Restraint,” pp. 69–134.

G. John Ikenberry, *Liberal Leviathan: The Origins, Crisis, and Transformation of the American World Order* (Princeton University Press, 2011).

- Chap. 8, “The Durability of Liberal International Order,” pp. 333–360.

Charles A. Kupchan, *No One’s World: The West, the Rising Rest, and the Coming Global Turn* (Oxford University Press, 2012).

- Chap. 5, “Alternatives to the Western Way,” pp. 86–145.
- ~~Chap. 7, “Managing No One’s World,” pp. 182–205.~~

Anne-Marie Slaughter, “How to Succeed in the Networked World,” *Foreign Affairs*, vol. 95, no. 6 (2016): pp. 76–89.

National Intelligence Council Report, *Global Trends 2035: Paradox of Progress* (Office of the Director of National Intelligence, 2017), available at: <https://www.dni.gov/files/documents/nic/GT-Full-Report.pdf>.

Once issued, we will read the Trump Administration’s National Security Strategy as well.

Further Reading

What are your nominees? Suggest articles for the class to read.