

Fall 2018

Comparative Foreign Policy

Ann Marie Murphy
Seton Hall University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarship.shu.edu/diplomacy-syllabi>

Recommended Citation

Murphy, Ann Marie, "Comparative Foreign Policy" (2018). *Diplomacy Syllabi*. 202.
<https://scholarship.shu.edu/diplomacy-syllabi/202>

COMPARATIVE FOREIGN POLICY
DIPL 6180 AA/NA
FALL 2018

Professor: Ann Marie Murphy
E-mail: annmarie.murphy@shu.edu
Phone: 973-275-2258

Section AA/AB Wed., 2-4; 5-7
Office Hours: Wed, 10-12, & by appt.
Office: 135 McQuaid Hall

Course Description and Objectives

This course examines leading theoretical approaches to the study of foreign policy and their application to a variety of states and issue areas. The goal of this course is to provide students with an understanding of the key concepts necessary to address the fundamental question of foreign policy analysis: how do states define and pursue their national interests in international affairs? During the semester, we will explore some of the key debates in foreign policy analysis. Do differences in the characteristics of states (large versus small, democratic versus authoritarian, industrialized versus developing) lead to differences in their foreign policies? Or are the important differences not between countries but within them according to issue areas, for example security versus human rights policy? Students will have an opportunity to evaluate these debates for themselves through a series of case studies.

In addition to providing students with substantive knowledge of foreign policy, this class also aims to hone students' analytical, writing, and oral communication skills, all of which are key student learning objectives of the School of Diplomacy. The ability to analyze international events from a variety of perspectives is a critical skill when attempting to understand why foreign leaders adopted a certain course of action and why other states respond as they do. Oral and written communication skills are important to all post-Seton Hall professional endeavors. Writing helps students improve their ability to relate evidence to argument. Oral communication skills are necessary not only to convey information, but also to persuade others of your interpretation of an issue, a critical negotiation skill.

A guideline for writing effective essays can be found in the information section of the class blackboard site. A list of academic resources at SHU, including information on the writing center, is available in the same place.

Requirements

Students are expected to come to class prepared to engage in substantive discussion of the assigned readings. All readings are available in electronic form on the class blackboard site. As events unfold over the course of the semester that illustrate how concepts and theories studied in class can make important contributions to foreign policy analysis, they will be added to the blackboard site and students will be responsible for reading them. The instructor conducts this class using a modified form of the Socratic method, therefore constructive class participation is critical to success in this class. A discussion of what constitutes effective class participation is appended to this syllabus.

All students must complete four analytical writing assignments for this class. A take home midterm containing two essays will be handed out on October 3 and due October 10. A policy brief analyzing a key issue facing the United States, using Congressional Research Service Reports will be due on December 5. The take home final will be handed out on December 5 and due December 12.

Grades for this course will be determined as follows: each essay will count for 22% of your grade. The remaining 12% will consist of a combination of class attendance, participation and improvement.

In addition to the assigned readings, students should keep abreast of current foreign policy issues by reading the *New York Times*, *Wall Street Journal* or *Financial Times* on a daily basis. Magazines with a strong international focus, such as the *Economist* are also recommended. The instructor will make extensive use of current events to illustrate the utility of concepts discussed in the readings and will presume that students are familiar with these issues.

Grading Scale

A \geq 94	A- \geq 90	B+ \geq 87	B \geq 84	B- \geq 80	C+ \geq 77
C \geq 74	C- \geq 70	D+ \geq 67	D \geq 64	D- \geq 60	F \leq 59

Computer Use Policy

The use of computers for discrete note-taking is permissible in class. The use of computers for other purposes such as checking e-mail or surfing the internet is not permissible. Inappropriate computer use is not only disruptive to fellow students who are attempting to concentrate on class discussion, but it also tends to lead to lower grades for students engaged in non-class activity. Students who choose not to abide by this policy will be asked to leave class.

Academic Integrity

Plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty will be reported to the administration, and may result in a lowered or failing grade for the course and up to possible dismissal from the School of Diplomacy. A guide to avoiding plagiarism is available in the information section of the class blackboard site. See University and School standards for academic conduct here:

<<https://www.shu.edu/student-life/upload/Student-Code-of-Conduct.pdf>>

<<http://www.shu.edu/academics/diplomacy/academic-conduct.cfm>>

Students with Disabilities

It is the policy and practice of Seton Hall University to promote inclusive learning environments. If you have a documented disability you may be eligible for reasonable accommodations in compliance with University policy, the Americans with Disabilities Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and/or the New Jersey Law against Discrimination. Please note, students are not permitted to negotiate accommodations directly with professors. To request accommodations or assistance, please self-identify with the Office for Disability Support Services (DSS), Duffy Hall, Room 67 at the beginning of the semester. For more information or to register for services, contact DSS at (973) 313-6003 or by e-mail at DSS@shu.edu.

Policy on Incompletes

Incompletes will be given only in exceptional cases for emergencies. Students wishing to request a grade of Incomplete must provide documentation to support the request accompanied by a Course Adjustment Form (available from the Diplomacy Main Office) to the professor *before* the date of the final paper submission. If the incomplete request is approved, the professor reserves the right to specify the new submission date for all missing coursework. Students who fail to submit the missing course work within this time period will receive a failing grade for all missing coursework and a final grade based on all coursework assigned. Any Incomplete not resolved within one calendar year of receiving the Incomplete or by the time of graduation (whichever comes first) automatically becomes an “FI” (which is equivalent to an F). It is the responsibility of the student to make sure they have completed all course requirements within the timeframe allotted. Please be aware that Incompletes on your transcript will impact financial aid and academic standing.

Citation Style

The School of Diplomacy has adopted the Chicago citation style for all class. Papers should utilize one of the *Chicago Manual of Style* citation formats: Author-Date or Notes and Bibliography. The guidelines for these formats are on the course Blackboard site in the information folder.

Class 1 Aug. 29 Introduction: What is Foreign Policy and Why Should We Study It?

Juliet Kaarbo, Jeffery S. Lantis, and Ryan K. Beasley, “The Analysis of Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective,” in Beasley, Kaarbo, Lantis and Snarr, Eds, *Foreign Policy in Comparative Perspective* (Washington: CQ Press, 2012), pp. 1-23.

Class 2 Sept. 5 Levels of Analysis & Worldviews

Required:

Karen Mingst and Ivan Arreguin-Toft, *Essentials of International Relations* (New York: Norton & Company, 2011) chapter 3, pp. 65-92.

Jack Snyder, “One World, Rival Theories,” *Foreign Policy* November-December 2004.

Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976) pp. 13-31.

Hans Morganthau, *Politics Among Nations* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1963), pp.3-15.

John Mearshimer, “Why the Ukraine Crisis is the West’s Fault: The Liberal Delusions that Provoked Putin” *Foreign Affairs*, Sept/Oct 2014, p. 77-89.

“What World are We Living In” special section on Realist, Liberal, Marxist and Tribal Worlds, *Foreign Affairs* Vol, 91, No. 4 July/August 2018.

Recommended:

Ole R. Holsti, “Models of International Relations and Foreign Policy,” in G. John Ikenberry, ed., *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays* second edition (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), pp. 66-92.

J. David Singer, "The Level-of Analysis Problem in International Relations," *World Politics*, Vol. 14, No 1, October 1961, pp. 77-92.

Kenneth Waltz, *Man, the State and War*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1959)

Key Questions: What are the different levels of analysis? Under what type of conditions do theories from the various levels of analysis have greatest explanatory power? Why? In what way do theories of international relations (IR) differ from explanations of foreign policy? To what extent is an understanding of broad IR theories necessary for foreign policy analysis? Why does Morgenthau contend that foreign policy should simply be the pursuit of national interests defined in terms of power? What are the risks of countries making foreign policy based on moral factors?

Application: How would realists, liberals and Marxists explain the U.S. war against Iraq? Provide an explanation for North Korea's nuclear program using factors from each level of analysis. Does China's rise create a threat or opportunity for the U.S.? What aspects of international politics in the post-9/11 world does Snyder contend each worldview helps explain? What are their blind spots? Do you agree? What arguments do the authors of *Foreign Affairs* special report "What World is it?" make to support their arguments that realism, liberalism, Marxism and Tribalism are the best overarching concepts through which to understand current shifts in international politics? Why does Mearshimer argue that Russia's invasion of Ukraine is the product of a liberal Western Delusion?

Class 3 Sept. 12 The International Level of Analysis

Required:

Karen Mingst and Ivan Arreguin-Toft, *Essentials of International Relations* (New York: Norton & Company, 2011) chapter 3, pp. 93-114.

Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 85-96.

Robert Gilpin, *The Political Economy of International Relations* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1987), pp. 72-92.

Stephen M. Walt, "Testing Theories of Alliance Formation: The Case of Southwest Asia," *International Organization*, Vol. 42, No. 2 (Spring 1988), 275-316.

Robert Jervis, "The Compulsive Empire" *Foreign Policy* July-August 2003, 1-7.

Kori Schake and Anja Manuel, "How to Manage a Rising Power or Two" *The Atlantic*, May 24, 2016.

Graham Alison, "The Thucydides Trap" *Foreign Policy*, June 9, 2017.

Recommended:

Kenneth Waltz, "Anarchic Orders and Balances of Power," in G. John Ikenberry, ed., *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), pp. 95-118.

Key Questions: What are the strengths and weaknesses of systemic variables for explaining foreign policy outcomes? What is the underlying logic of balance of power theory and how does it differ from Gilpin's theory of hegemonic war in the security realm and hegemonic stability in the economic one? What are the policy prescriptions that flow from these theories? Why does

Walt contend that it is critical to understand whether balancing or bandwagoning is the dominant tendency in the international system? Walt argues that states balance against threats, how does Walt define threats? Do you agree with Jervis's argument that power unchecked always expands? The articles by Schake and Manuel and Alison both discuss options available to the United States for dealing with a rising China. To what extent are their analyses realist and liberal and which one do you find more persuasive?

Class 4 Sept. 19 The Rational State, Domestic Resources and Foreign Policy

Required:

Michael Mastanduno, David A. Lake, G. John Ikenberry, Toward a Realist Theory of State Action, in G. John Ikenberry, ed., *American Foreign Policy, Theoretical Essays* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), pp. 119-140.

Michael Barnett and Jack Levy, "Domestic Sources of Alliances and Alignments," *International Organization* Vol. 45, No. 3, Spring 1991, pp. 369-395.

Thomas Friedman, "The First Law of PetroPolitics" in Mingst and Snyder, pp. 543-550, handout.

Lawrence Wright, The Double Game: The Unintended Consequences of American Funding to Pakistan, *The New Yorker*, May 16, 2011.

Max Fisher, "North Korea: Far From Crazy, All Too Rational" *The New York Times*, September 10, 2016.

Recommended:

Robert Putnam, "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: the Logic of Two Level Games" *International Organization*, Vol. 42 No. 3, 1988.

Key Questions: What is meant by "state strength" and "rational actor?" How does state strength affect the opportunities and constraints facing foreign policy executives? Are the foreign policy predicaments of developing countries different from those of advanced capitalist countries in degree of magnitude or of type? What factors impede a state's ability to devise and implement "rational" policy?

As you read the Mastanduno, Lake and Ikenberry article, try to identify different states who may/not be able to "mobilize and extract domestically" and who may therefore look to foreign sources to secure them. What is Friedman's first law of petro politics and how, if it does it impact the domestic politics and foreign policy choices of pivotal states. What are the implications of Friedman's argument for US foreign policy, particularly toward the countries of the Middle East? What does Wright argue are the unintended consequences of US aid to Pakistan? If you were a Pakistani leader, how, if at all, would you make the case for continued aid? Is North Korea a rational actor?

Class 5 Sept. 26 Bureaucratic Politics, Organizational Processes & Nuclear Weapons

Required:

Graham T. Allison, "Conceptual Models and the Cuban Missile Crisis" in G. John Ikenberry, ed., *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays* (New York: HarperCollins, 1996), pp. 415-457.

Stephen Krasner, "Are Bureaucracies Important? (Or Allison Wonderland)" *Foreign Policy*, No. 7, Summer 1972.

Scott D. Sagan, "The Perils of Proliferation: Organization Theory, Deterrence Theory, and the Spread of Nuclear Weapons," *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 4 (Spring 1994) pp. 66-107.

Andrew Bast, "Pakistan's Nuclear Surge" *Newsweek*, May 28, 2011.

Victor Cha, Congressional Testimony on North Korea, 2011

North Korea or Iran TBD

Key Questions: To what extent do you find the insights from bureaucratic and organization processes useful? How compelling is Krasner's critique of Allison? In what types of cases and under what conditions are bureaucratic political explanations of foreign policy most likely to yield useful insights? To what extent do you find Sagan's application of organizational process model to the issue of nuclear proliferation insightful? Do you believe that the spread of nuclear weapons is a force for peace or a catalyst for conflict?

As you read the articles on North Korea and Pakistan, ask yourself whether the insights from Sagan lead you to be optimistic or pessimistic regarding a) the possibility that these countries will give up nuclear weapons; b) the implications for peace and stability and U.S. interests; and c) what, if anything can the international community do about it?

Class 6 Oct. 3 Regime Type & Foreign Policy

***Midterm handed out**

Required:

John Owen, "How Liberalism Produces Democratic Peace," *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Autumn, 1994) pp. 87-125.

Michael Doyle, "Liberalism and World Politics," *The American Political Science Review*, Vol., 80, No. 4 (Dec., 1986) pp. 1151-1169.

Jack Snyder, *From Voting to Violence*, (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2000) pp. 15-43.

Igor Blazevic, "Burma Votes for Change: the Challenges Ahead" *Journal of Democracy*, Vol. 27, No. 2, 2016.

Peter Galbraith, "Make Walls Not War" *The New York Times*, October 3, 2007.

Introduction to NSS 2002, 2006, 2010, 2015, and 2017, available in folder for class 14.

Recommended:

Randall Schweller, "Domestic Structure and Preventative War: Are Democracies More Pacific?" *World Politics* 44/2 January 1992.

Key Questions: Why do proponents of the democratic peace argument contend that democracies do not fight one another? What are the underlying propositions involved in Owen's structural

versus normative strands of the democratic peace? By what means does Doyle claim that Kant's liberal internationalism, Machiavelli's liberal imperialism, and Schumpeter's liberal pacifism produce democratic peace? Why does Jack Snyder claim that transitions to democracy can lead to violence? What are the implications of his argument for Iraq and Myanmar? What policy prescriptions does Snyder made for the U.S and other countries that want to promote democracy? Why does Galbraith argue that the Biden Plan to partition Iraq is a good idea? How has the emphasis that the US places on democracy promotion changed over time according to the NSS advanced by different US administrations, from Bush, to Obama and Trump?

Class 7 Oct. 10 Midterm Due. No Reading, Discussion of midterm & policy paper

Class 8 Oct.17 Public Opinion, Interest Groups, and the Media

Required:

Ole Holsti, "Public Opinion and Foreign Policy," *International Studies Quarterly*, 36/4 December 1992, pp. 439-66.

Chaim Kaufmann, "Threat Inflation and the Failure of the Marketplace of Ideas" *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Summer 2004).

James Lindsay, "The New Apathy" *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 79, No. 5 2000.

Laura Neack, *The New Foreign Policy*, pp. 75-85 on the CNN effect.

Trump and Syria Airstrike, NYT

Fake news and foreign policy, TBD.

Recommended:

Eytan Gilboa, "Global Television News and Foreign Policy: Debating the CNN Effect," *International Studies Perspectives* 6, no. 3 (August 2005): 325-41.

Key Questions: How do public opinion and interest groups influence foreign policy? How do realists and liberals view the objective impact and the normative desirability of public opinion on foreign policy? Do interest groups influence all aspects of a country's foreign policy equally? What is the marketplace of ideas and what role does public opinion play in it? Why does Kaufman argue that it failed in the decision to invade Iraq? What is the CNN effect? Do you think it has validity? Does the CNN effect help us understand Trump's decision to launch an airstrike against Syria?

Class 9 Oct. 24 The Individual Level of Analysis

Required:

Daniel L. Byman and Kenneth M. Pollack, "Let Us Now Praise Great Men: Bringing the Statesmen Back In," *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 4 (Spring 2001) pp. 107-146. Skim historical parts and focus on the analytical argument and the Hussein and Assad cases.

Jerel Rosati, "Cognition in International Relations and Foreign Policy," *International Studies Review*

Yuen Foong Khong, "Seduction by Analogy in Vietnam: The Malaya and Korea Analogies," in Ikenberry, pp 554-564.

Eric Etheridge, "The Vietnam War Guide to Afghanistan" *The New York Times*, October 12, 2009.

Mark Galeotti and Andrew Bowman, "Putin's Empire of the Mind" *Foreign Policy*, April 21, 2014.

Trump and Foreign Policy, TBD

Recommended:

Jack L. Snyder, "Rationality at the Brink: the Role of Cognitive Processes in Failures of Deterrence," *World Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 3, April 1978, pp. 345-365.

Robert Jervis, *Perception and Misperception in International Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976)

Jack S. Levy, "Misperception and the Causes of War," *World Politics*, Vol 36, No. 1, October 1983, pp. 76-99.

Philip E. Tetlock and Charles B. McGuire, Jr., "Cognitive Perspectives on Foreign Policy," in Ikenberry, pp 536-548.

Key Questions: Under what international and domestic conditions does the nature of individual leaders matter most for foreign policy outcomes? What is cognition and how do cognitive models of decision-making differ from the rational actor model? What types of methods do policy-makers use to deal with information overload? What are the relative advantages and disadvantages of tools that political leaders use to simplify the complexity inherent in foreign policy decisions? What are analogies and how do they influence foreign policy? How have memories of the Vietnam War influences the Afghan war? Would Russian foreign policy be less expansionist if Putin were not in power?

Class 10 Oct. 31 Foreign Policy Decision-Making: The Group and Intelligence

Failures

Required:

Irving Janis, "Escalation of the Vietnam War: How Could It Happen?" in Ikenberry, pp. 593-621.

Alexander George and Eric Stern, "Harnessing Conflict in Foreign Policy Making: from Devil's to Multiple Advocacy" *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, September 2002,

Richard K. Betts, "Analysis, War and Decision: Why Intelligence Failures are Inevitable," *World Politics*, Vol. 31, No. 1 (Oct. 1978), pp. 61-89.

Richard K. Betts, "The New Politics of Intelligence: Will Reforms Work This Time?" *Foreign Affairs*, May/June 2004, pp. 2-8.

Robert Jervis, "Why Intelligence and Policy-Makers Clash" *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. 125, No. 2, 2010.

Article on the politicization of intelligence and foreign policy. TBA.

Recommended:

The 9/11 Commission Report, available at www.9-11commission.gov.

Key Questions: In what way do group dynamics impede rational policy-making? What can be done to overcome these problems according to George and Stern? What role does intelligence play in foreign policy-making? What different types of intelligence failures does Betts identify and how, if at all, can they be prevented? Why does Jervis contend that intelligence and policy-makers necessarily clash? What is the impact of the politicization of intelligence on foreign policy?

Class 11 Nov. 7 Ideas and Foreign Policy: the Debate over Intervention

Required:

Judith Goldstein & Robert O. Keohane, *Ideas & Foreign Policy* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1993) pp. 3-30.

Jon Western, "Sources of Humanitarian Intervention," *International Security*, Vol. 26, No. 4 (Spring 2002), pp. 112-142.

A.J Kuperman, "Obama's Libya Debacle: How a Well-Meaning Intervention Ended in Failure," *Foreign Affairs* 2015

John Straus, "Darfur and the Genocide Debate" *Foreign Affairs*, January-February, 2005.

Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aal, eds, *Turbulent Peace : the Challenges of Managing International Conflict*, Washington, D.C. : United States Institute of Peace Press, 2001. Chapter 17, Stanley Hoffman, The Debate About Intervention, & Chapter 18 Richard Betts, The Delusion of Impartial Intervention.

Article on Myanmar policy toward Rohingya, TBD

Key Questions: What different types of ideas are discussed in the readings? How do ideas influence foreign policy? Under what conditions are new ideas most likely to lead to foreign policy change? Were normative or realist ideas the key factor driving US intervention in Somalia? What is genocide and how should the international community respond to it? Under what conditions, if any, should countries undertake humanitarian interventions? What is just war theory and how does it help provide guidelines for humanitarian interventions?

Class 12 Nov.14 The Challenges of Terrorism and Counter-Insurgency

Required:

Audrey Kurth Cronin, "Behind the Curve," *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 3. (Winter 2002/03).

Daniel Byman, "Friends Like These: Counterinsurgency and the War on Terrorism," *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2, Fall 2006.

Seth Jones, The Rise of Afghanistan's Insurgency, *International Security*, 32, Number 4, Spring 2008.

Audrey Kurth Cronin, "ISIS is not a Terrorist Group: Why Counter-Terrorism Won't Stop the Latest Jihadi Threat" *Foreign Affairs*, March-April 2015.

Daniel Byman, "ISIS Goes Global" *Foreign Affairs*, March-April 2016.

Lisa Monaco, "Preventing the Next Attack: A Strategy for the War on Terrorism" *Foreign Affairs* Vol. 96, No. 6, Nov/December 2017.

Stanley McChrystal, Sadat Kosh, "Staying the Course in Afghanistan: How to Fight the Longest War" *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 96 No. 6, 2017.

Trump's Afghan Strategy, TBD

Key Questions: What are terrorism and globalization? How are these phenomena related and what challenges do they pose for policy-makers? How does Byman contend that the war on terrorism is linked to counterinsurgency? What lessons does Byman contend that past counterinsurgency strategies hold for the current war on terror? What factors does Jones argue led to the rise of the Afghan insurgency? To what extent do these factors mirror those posed by Byman? What policy recommendations does he contend are necessary to redress the insurgency? Why does Cronin contend that ISIS is not a terrorist group and counter-terrorist strategies will not work? What policy prescriptions do Cronin, Byman and Monaco advocate to meet the ISIS threat and the broader terrorist threat? Do you agree with McChrystal's argument that the US should stay the course in Afghanistan?

No Class Nov. 21 Thanksgiving Day Holiday

Class 13 Nov. 28 Primacy and the Future of U.S. Grand Strategy

Required:

Benjamin Schwarz and Christopher Layne, "A New Grand Strategy" *The Atlantic Monthly*, January 2002.

John Mearsheimer and Stephen Walt, "The Case for Offshore Balancing" *Foreign Affairs* July/August 2016.

Stephen Brooks, John Ikenberry and William Wohlforth, "Don't Come Home America: the Case Against Retrenchment" *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 3, Winter 2012.

James Foley, "The Waning of American Primacy" *American Interest*, Nov. 2016.

Fareed Zakaria, "The Post-American World: Rise of the Rest" *Newsweek International*, May 3, 2008.

Articles on Trump and US Primacy, TBD

Article on Chinese Grand Strategy TBD

National Security Strategy of the United States 2002, 2006, 2010, 2015, and 2017 available at www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/.—Read the 2 page intro, focusing on what it says about primacy.

Recommended:

Daniel Drezner, "Military Primacy Doesn't Pay (Nearly as Much as You Think)" *International Security*, Volume 38, No. 1, Summer 2013.

Key Questions: What is US primacy? On what bases of power does it rest? Can US primacy be maintained? Should primacy be a goal of US foreign policy? What is the rise of the rest? Does Zakaria view the rise of the rest as a threat to U.S. power? Is Zakaria's analysis liberal or realist? What has changed since he wrote that article in 2008? In the debate over retrenchment, how does Walt's argument that balancing is the dominant tendency in the international system help us understand the potential consequences of US retrenchment? How, if at all, does China's grand strategy influence the US debate over retrenchment and primacy?

Class 14: Dec. 5 Debates over Current Foreign Policy Issues
***Policy Brief due & final handed out**

This class will apply the concepts studied in the class to key foreign policy issues, such as the North Korea's nuclear program, the genocide against the Rohingya, and the rise of China and disputes in the South China Sea. Students will be expected to discuss the topics chosen for their policy brief.

DIPLOMACY 6180

What I am Looking For in "Good" Class Discussion?

1. Preparation:

Evidence of careful preparation including knowledge of the reading material and cases if applicable.

2. Quality of argument:

Logical consistency, appropriateness of the discussion, use of relevant evidence in the arguments; originality and creativity; and makes connections with course material

3. Quality of expression:

Comments that are clear, concise, fluent, enthusiastic, and civil;

4. Contribution to Process:

Comments contribute to the process of the discussion, such as building on the ideas of others, providing constructive criticism, asking constructive questions, or indicating a careful listening to others, timeliness, and asking constructive questions.

In sum, be clear (speak simply), be concise (make sure every word you say carries its weight and every idea adds to your argument), be logical (make sure one sentence follows from another and one statement follows from another.)

I recognize that class discussion comes more easily for some people than for others. By temperament, culture or habit, some are "talkers" while others are "listeners." Learning to be both is an important goal of this class, and a needed skill in life beyond this classroom. Comments that are not relevant to the ongoing discussion, that are off the point, that are disruptive to discussion, that are insensitive to others, or that attempt to dominate the discussion will not be rewarded! I prefer that you volunteer to participate, but will call on you if necessary to bring you into the conversation. If you are uncomfortable with speaking in class, please come by and talk with me. I can offer you some tips which may help.

(Adapted from Dr. Deborah Gerner, University of Kansas, US Foreign Policy Syllabus, August 1994.)