

SYLLABUS AND READING LIST*
PSCI 222
AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Jim Ray (Office Hours, Wednesdays, 2:00-3:30 PM,
Thursdays, 2:00-3:30 PM. In Calhoun 327.)

Tel: 322-6235 (o) 463-7715 (h)

email: james.l.ray@vanderbilt.edu

Homepage for course:

http://sitemason.vanderbilt.edu/site/cy4eTS/new_page_builder_10

Electronic Reserves: <http://eres.library.vanderbilt.edu/>

Spring 2004
Vanderbilt

COURSE OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this course is to enhance your understanding of American Foreign Policy with a view toward making you a well-informed and articulate critic of the foreign policies of the United States. It will be intended to develop your problem solving and analytical skills, improve your capacity to think independently, to strengthen your proficiency in reading, listening, speaking and writing, to scrutinize policy choices in politically and ethically difficult situations, and to increase your knowledge about key library and electronic resources relevant to the analysis of foreign policy issues.

The course will address a series of key, basic questions. (1) What are those factors that have been, and are the most important in determining the content of American foreign policies? (2) What are the major goals of American Foreign Policy in the most important issue areas? (3) Have past policies been well-designed to achieve those goals, and are current policies likely to help the United States achieve its foreign policy goals in the future? (4) Could past policies have been, and should current policies be modified in ways designed to increase the probability that American foreign policy goals are achievable? (5) Are there foreign policy goals that have been or are overlooked, avoided, or under-emphasized by American foreign policy makers?

PSCI 222 will begin with a brief historical overview of American Foreign Policy. We will then analyze some basic approaches to evaluating and understanding American Foreign Policy. This will be followed by an examination of fundamental foreign policy issues in recent history, such as the beginning and ending of the Cold War, economics and US foreign policy, and the Vietnam War. Part of the course will be devoted to American efforts to deal with various geographic areas of the world. There will be, for example, portions of the course devoted to US Policy for Latin America, U.S-European Relations, and US Policy for the Middle East. The course will conclude with an examination of several contemporary, particularly pressing or fundamental foreign policy problems. We will, for example, examine the US conduct of the Persian Gulf War. We will also deal with the crisis and ensuing war in the Kosovo region of Yugoslavia. The relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China will receive special attention. Finally, we will discuss various viewpoints regarding the future of American Foreign Policy.

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Students should complete the assigned readings on time, attend class, and take the examinations at the scheduled times. Students should come to class prepared to discuss the topic for the day, and the assigned readings. There will be two midterm examinations during the semester, and a comprehensive final examination during finals week. The first midterm is scheduled for **Friday, February 20, 2004**. The second midterm is scheduled for **Friday, March 26, 2004**. If you must miss an exam, please notify me in advance, by phone or by email. No makeup exams will be given without documentation of a legitimate excuse, such as a death in the family, or your own illness. The final examination for the course will be administered **once**, according to the **PRIMARY** final examination schedule. That means that the final examination for this course is scheduled for **Saturday, May 1, 2004 from 9 AM until 11 AM**. This means also that there will be no final exam offered during according to the alternate final examination schedule. Please make all travel arrangements and all other plans for your end of the semester activities accordingly.

The exams will be based on a combination of short essay questions, and short answer or identification items. They will be designed to evaluate your ability to comprehend and assimilate the readings, and to integrate them with the discussions and materials covered in course lectures, as well as debates/discussions that will be scheduled for most weeks (on Fridays).

Your grade will be based on the two midterm exams (20 % each), one 10-page (double-spaced, 12 point font) paper and accompanying verbal presentation (20%), participation in the debates/discussions (10%), and the final examination (30%). (No “Incompletes” can be given without the permission of the Dean of the College.)

Objectives of Debates/Discussions

These weekly meetings of the class will be devoted primarily to informal debates/discussions of issues assigned for Fridays during the semester. Starting with the class on January 30th, two (or possibly more) students will be assigned to each side of these issues. (For the class on January 23rd the class will focus on the topic for the day in a class-wide discussion, without any formal debate structure.) They will each give 5-minute verbal presentations to the class on the topic to which they have been assigned. It is crucial that the presenters ***talk to***, rather than read at the students in the class. Students should rely during their presentations, in other words, only on an outline of what they intend to say, and ***not*** a full text, word for word, of their presentations. About 5% of your grade (out of the 20% allocated to the paper assigned to students in this course) will be based on an evaluation of the verbal presentation. Students assigned to the same side of each topic should coordinate their presentations so they are not redundant. The first student to speak for each side should discuss briefly the division of labor between the speakers defending their side of the issue. In other words, she should describe the separate contributions that each speaker on her side will make to that side’s arguments in defense of their position in the debate. (To ensure that this division of labor takes place,

and to encourage the students on the same side to communicate before the day of their presentations, part of this assignment will involve an email to me from each student assigned to the debate the next day. By 5 PM the day before that debate takes place, each student should email me at james.l.ray@vanderbilt.edu and describe specifically how their presentations will differ from and be complementary to the presentations by other students making presentations on the same side of the issue.) These verbal presentations will be evaluated first on the extent to which they are delivered in a conversational style appropriate to such verbal presentations, and on how organized and persuasive they are. The final portion of these projects/papers/debates will involve questions that students on each side should prepare to ask the students on the other side after the verbal presentations by each side are completed. In other words, the first questions to be discussed after the presentation will be those prepared in advance by each side to ask the other.

At the first meeting of the class on January 14th, 2004, students will be asked to indicate on note cards the debate/discussion topics to which they would prefer to be assigned, and to which side. Students will be informed about their assignments on the second day of class, Friday, January 16th. Every attempt will be made to assign students to the topic, and the side they prefer. But that may not be possible in every case, depending on how the choices of topics are distributed among the students in the class. (If all 40 students want to be assigned to the same topic, for example, obviously that would not be possible.) After January 16th, mutually agreed students may exchange topics, as long as I am notified about the exchange.

Students in the class not assigned to a make a presentation for the day *are expected to do the assigned readings*, AND, to be prepared to ask questions of the students who have made presentations that day. Those students not making presentations should bring with them every Friday a **Debate evaluation form**, copies of which are obtainable at the class web site. Every week, they should fill out the first portion of the debate evaluation form on line before they come to class, so that their input can be recorded in print on the form. (Your class participation grade will depend in part on the consistency with which you bring these forms to class on Fridays with printed input. That input on those forms establishes that you have done some thinking about the issue for the day before the class meets on Fridays. Those forms also will comprise a record of your attendance at the meetings of the discussion section.) Students not assigned presentations for a Friday class should complete the second part of the form, evaluating the debate for the day, at the end of the class on Fridays. Those students should also designate at the bottom of the form which student, in their opinion, made the most valuable contribution to the debate/discussion of that day. (The student receiving the most votes in this poll will receive an “A” for their presentation that day.) All the presentations together should only take about 25 minutes of the class time on Fridays. The remainder of the class time on those days will be devoted to questions and discussion regarding the topic for the day. 10% of your grade for the course will be based on your participation in these discussions. To repeat, that 10% will be based on the **Debate Evaluation Forms** that you will hand in at the end of every class on Fridays, as well as the quality of the questions you are prepared to ask when you attend the discussions/debates. The quality of your contribution

to the discussions/debates on Fridays will not necessarily be directly related to the *quantity* of your contributions. In fact, if it is entirely obvious to every one in the class that you consistently provide the highest number of verbal comments on Fridays during the debates/discussions, then it is probably true that you are talking more than you should.

Papers

Each student giving presentations for the debates in the discussion sections will be asked to write a 10 page double-spaced (12-point font) paper on the topic to which they are assigned. These papers may defend the side of the issue to which the student has been assigned for the debate/discussion, or that side which the student happens to prefer. (To repeat, attempts will be made to assign students to the side of the issue they personally prefer, but this may not always be possible.) These papers will be due at the beginning of the class the topic the paper addresses is to be discussed. Late papers will be ineligible for a grade of "A," and *papers more than one day late will be penalized an additional one half grade for each additional day's delay.* (Students who are assigned to the topic to be discussed on January 30th may have until February 6th to turn in their papers. Students assigned to topics the week after a midterm may also have one week beyond the date of their debate/discussion to turn in their papers. Specifically, this means that students making presentations on February 27th, 2004 on the topic, "Should the United States Ratify the International Criminal Court Treaty," will have until Friday March 5th to hand in their papers, while students making presentations on Friday, April 2nd, 2004 will have until Friday, April 9th, 2004 to hand in their papers.)

A typical structure for these papers would be as follows: (1) State the issue or question the paper addresses. (2) Summarize *briefly* and criticize opposing arguments on both sides of the issue or question, and (3) state your opinion on the issue in question, and within the limits of the short time and space available to you, support it with logic and evidence. Ideally, at least half the paper will be devoted to this analytical purpose. This is only a typical outline, and creativity in organizing your paper is encouraged. However the paper is organized, though, at least half of it should focus on your own analysis and criticism, rather than your description of other people's ideas.

Your paper should begin with a *cover page*. Put your name on it, and a title, at least. *Number your pages*, and use headings, and perhaps even subheadings. Citations of articles and books, as well as the list of references at the end of your papers should adhere to the format used by the journal *International Studies Quarterly*. Basically this means that in the body of the text when you cite a source, it should be cited in the following form: (Smith, 1998: 34-35). In other words, provide the name of the author (or authors), the date of the publication, and the page numbers from which you have lifted a direct quotation, or a specific point. At the end of the paper, you should cite books and articles in the following (*ISQ*) format:

KINSELLA, D. (1995) Nested Rivalries: Superpower Competition, Arms Transfers, and Regional Conflict, 1950-1990. *International Interactions* **21**:109-125.

CORTES, F., A. PRZEWORSKI, AND J. SPRAGUE. (1974) *Systems Analysis for Social Scientists*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

GOERTZ, G., AND P.F. DIEHL. (1998) "The 'Volcano Model' and Other Patterns in the Evolution of Enduring Rivalries." In *The Dynamics of Enduring Rivalries*, edited by P.F. Diehl, pp. 98-125. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Sources found on the WWW should include the name of the person providing the information if there is one, the title of the webpage, the URL, and finally the date on which that particular website was accessed for the purposes of writing the paper.

Do not rely entirely in writing these papers on the readings in *Taking Sides*. Integrate when possible materials from class lectures and discussions, as well as other readings from the course. Extensive research is not expected, but ideally at least one source cited will be a book (or edited volume) found at the library, as opposed to sources located electronically. Nevertheless, you may well find that the best single source of materials for your papers can be located through **Proquest**. Such "Research Databases" at the Central Library can be found at

<http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?ReqType=301&UserId=IPAuto&Passwd=IPAuto&JSEnabled=1&TS=1073833381>

This electronic research databases can also be accessed through the web page for the course. *At least two sources cited in your papers should be articles from academic journals, found through Proquest*, or possibly even an actual, physical trip to the library. (For those who may have forgotten where it is, a map showing the location of the library can be found at <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/map/map.cgi?mode=1&bldg=library.html>).

You may also find useful sources through the Public Affairs Information Service, Project MUSE, or Lexis-Nexis. You are of course welcome to use any source you can locate through any system or process you devise.

These papers will be evaluated first on the quality of the writing. That is, your papers should be free of spelling errors, grammatical errors, or poorly structured sentences and paragraphs. They will also be evaluated according to the extent to which they adhere to the formal structure described above. The number and quality of sources cited other than *Taking Sides* or other materials directly related to the course will be taken into account. Finally, the papers will be evaluated according to the extent to which they make a persuasive and well-informed case in favor of the position they defend.

If you need course accommodations due to a disability, if you have emergency medical information to share with me, or if you need special arrangements in case the building must be evacuated, please make an appointment to see me as soon as possible.

REQUIRED READING MATERIALS

All the required readings will be in three books, (with the exception of George Washington's "Farewell Address" and George Bush's "National Security Strategy"), on electronic reserves at the Central Library, or in the *New York Times*.

Hook Steven W., and John Spanier. 2000. AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY SINCE WORLD WAR II. Washington, D.C. CQ Press.

Ambrose, Stephen E., and Douglas G. Brinkley. 1997. RISE TO GLOBALISM: American Foreign Policy Since 1938. New York: Penguin.

Rourke, John T. 2002. TAKING SIDES: Clashing Views on Issues in American Foreign Policy, 2nd ed. Guilford, CT: Dushkin/McGraw Hill. (This volume contains the required readings for the debates/discussions on Fridays.)

RESERVE READINGS. Electronic Reserves, Central Library.
<http://eres.library.vanderbilt.edu/> (Accessible through the Course web page.)

There will also be periodic reading assignments in the *New York Times* during the semester. You are encouraged in general to read news stories on American Foreign Policy in the *Times* at www.nyt.com. On occasion I will assign specific articles or editorials in the *New York Times*. These selections from the *New York Times* will be emailed to you, and/or posted on the course web page. You should print and keep organized these items from the *New York Times* as the course progresses so that you can refer to them as you prepare for the examinations. You can also use the *New York Times* as a source for your class papers.

OUTLINE AND SCHEDULE FOR THE COURSE

January 14th. First Day. Getting organized.

I. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Friday, January 16th

Excerpt from George Washington's "Farewell Address." Accessible from the Course web page at http://sitemason.vanderbilt.edu/site/cy4eTS/new_page_builder_10
Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 1, "The Twisting Path to War," pp. 1-14.

Monday, January 19th

Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 2, "The War in Europe," pp. 15-34.

Wednesday, January 21st

Douglas Porch, "Occupational Hazards," The National Interest, No. 72 (Summer 2003), pp. 35-47.
(Electronic Reserve)

Friday, January 23rd

Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 3, "The War in Asia," p. 35-51.

Debate/Discussion Topic: January 23rd

Should the United States Resist Greater Global Governance?

John T. Rourke, "Issue Summary," Taking Sides, pp. 2-3
Marc A. Thiessen, "When Worlds Collide: Out With the New," Taking Sides, pp. 4-9.
Mark Leonard, "When Worlds Collide: Soybeans and Security," Taking Sides, pp. 10-14.
John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, p. 15.

I. EVALUATING AND EXPLAINING US FOREIGN POLICY

Monday, January 26th

Hook and Spanier Ch. 1, "The 'American Approach to Foreign Policy,'" pp. 1-23.
George W. Bush, "The National Security Strategy of the United States of America," accessible on the course webpage at http://sitemason.vanderbilt.edu/site/cy4eTS/new_page_builder_10

Wednesday, January 28th

Samir Amin, "Confronting the Empire," Monthly Review, 55/3 (July/August 2003), pp. 15-22.
Samuel Huntington, "Conservatism and Foreign Policy: Robust Nationalism," The National Interest, No. 58, (Winter 1999/2000), pp. 31-40. (Electronic Reserves)

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, January 30th

"Should the United States Seek Global Hegemony?"

John T. Rourke, "Issue Summary," Taking Sides, pp. 16-17.
Robert Kagan, "The Benevolent Empire," Taking Sides, pp. 18-25.
Charles William Maynes, "The Perils of (and for) an Imperial America," Taking Sides, pp. 26-34.
John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, p. 35

II. THE BEGINNING OF THE COLD WAR

Monday, February 2nd

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 2., "From World War to Cold War," pp. 24-51.

Wednesday, February 4th

Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 4, "The Beginnings of the Cold War," pp. 52-74.

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, February 6th

"Is Russia Likely to Become an Antagonistic Power?"

John T. Rourke, "Issue Summary," Taking Sides, pp. 76-77
Ariel Cohen, "Putin's Foreign Policy and U.S.-Russian Relations," Taking Sides, pp. 78-89.
Anatol Lieven, "Against Russophobia," Taking Sides, pp. 90-98.
John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, pp. 99.

III. THE END OF THE COLD WAR

Monday, February 9th

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 9, "The End of the Cold War," pp. 214-240.

Wednesday, February 11th

Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 16, "The End of the Cold War," pp. 352-380.

IV. ECONOMICS AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, February 13th

"Is Economic Globalization a Positive Trend for the United States?"

John T. Rourke, "Is Economic Globalization a Positive Trend for the United States?" Taking Sides, pp. 208-209.
Murray Weidenbaum, "Globalization is Not a Dirty Word," Taking Sides, pp. 210-217.

Robert Kuttner, "Globalism Bites Back," Taking Sides, pp. 218-221.
John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, pp. 222-223.

Monday, February 16th

Kenneth N. Waltz, "Globalization and American Power," The National Interest, No. 59 (Spring 2000), pp. 46-56. (Electronic Reserves)
Niall Ferguson and Laurence J. Kotlikoff, "Going Critical," The National Interest, No. 73, (Fall 2003), pp. 22-32.

Wednesday, February 18th

Review for First Midterm examination

Friday, February 20th
First Midterm Examination.

v. THE VIETNAM WAR

Monday, February 23rd

Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 11, "Vietnam: Paying the Costs of Containment," pp. 190-223.
Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 12, "Nixon, Détente and the Debacle of Vietnam," pp. 224-253.

Wednesday, February 25th

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 5, "Vietnam and the Cost of Containment," pp. 112-137.
Gregg Easterbrook, "Was It Worth It?" The Washington Monthly (November 1999), pp. 42-45.
(Electronic Reserves)

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, February 27th

"Should the United States Ratify the International Criminal Court Treaty?"

John T. Rourke, "Issue Summary," Taking Sides, pp. 332-333.
Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, "Statement of the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights," Taking Sides, pp. 334-338.
John R. Bolton, "Statement of John R. Bolton," Taking Sides, pp. 339-345.
John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, pp. 346-347.

VII. US POLICY FOR LATIN AMERICA

Monday, March 1st

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 4, "Developing Countries in the Crossfire," pp. 81-111.
Michael Shifter, "A Shaken Agenda: Bush and Latin America," Current History 101/652 (February 2002), pp. 51-57

Wednesday, March 3rd

Steven Levitsky and Maria Victoria Murillo, "Argentina Weathers the Storm," Journal of Democracy 14/4 (October 2003), pp. 152-166.
William M. LeoGrande, "From Havana to Miami: U.S. Cuba Policy as a Two-Level Game," Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs 40/1 (Spring 1998), pp. 67-86. (Electronic Reserves)

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, March 5th

"Should the United States Move to Substantially Ease Current Sanctions Against Cuba?"

John T. Rourke, "Issue Summary," Taking Sides, pp. 116-117..

Richard E. O'Leary, "Statement," US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade, *Hearing on Trade Policy Toward Cuba*, May 7, 1998, Taking Sides, pp. 118-122.
Michael Ranneberger, "Statement," US House of Representatives, Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Trade, *Hearing on Trade Policy Toward Cuba*, May 7, 1998, Taking Sides, pp. 123-131.
John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, pp. 132-133.

MARCH 6-14. SPRING BREAK!!!!

VIII. US-EUROPEAN RELATIONSHIPS

Monday, March 15th

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 12, "The Shifting European Landscape," 295-323.

Stephen M. Walt, "The Ties That Fray: Why Europe and America are Drifting Apart," National Interest, No. 54, (Winter 1998/99), pp. 3-11. (Electronic Reserves)

Wednesday, March 17th

Robert E. Hunter, "Maximizing NATO: A Relevant Alliance Knows How to Reach," Foreign Affairs 78/3 (May/June 1999), pp. 190-203. (Electronic Reserves)

Michael E. Brown, "Minimalist NATO: A Wise Alliance Knows When to Retrench," Foreign Affairs 78/3 (May/June 1999), pp. 204-218. (Electronic Reserves)

Friday, March 19th

No class

IX.

Monday, Debate/Discussion Topic: March 22nd

"Is U.S. Membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Still Advisable?"

John T. Rourke, "Issue Summary," Taking Sides, pp. 58-59.

Ronald D. Asmus, "Statement of Ronald D. Asmus," Taking Sides, pp. 60-65.

Christopher Layne, "Death Knell for NATO?" Taking Sides, pp. 66-73.

John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, pp. 74-75.

Wednesday, March 24th

Review for Second Midterm Examination

Friday, March 26th

Second Midterm Examination

X. US POLICY FOR THE MIDDLE EAST

Monday, March 29th

Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 13, "America in the Middle East and Africa," pp. 254-270

Norman Podhoretz, "Israel and the United States: A Complex History," Commentary 105/5 (May 1998), pp. 28-43. (Electronic Reserves)

Abdou Filali-Ansary, "Muslims and Democracy," Journal of Democracy, 10/3 (July 1999), pp. 18-32. (Electronic Reserves)

Wednesday, March 31st

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 13, "America Under Fire," pp. 324-351.

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, April 2nd

“Is There Great Danger from Chemical and Biological Terrorism?”

John T. Rourke, “Issue Summary,” Taking Sides, pp. 284-285.

James K. Campbell, “Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information, Committee on Intelligence, U.S. Senate (April 22, 1998), Taking Sides, pp. 286-302.

Jonathan B. Tucker, “Chemical and Biological Terrorism: How Real a Threat?” Taking Sides, pp. 303-312.

John T. Rourke, “Postscript,” Taking Sides, pp. 313-314.

XI. THE CLINTON ADMINISTRATION AND THE WAR IN KOSOVO

Monday, April 5th

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 10, “America’s ‘Unipolar Moment,’” pp. 241-267.

Ambrose and Brinkley, Ch. 18, “Clinton and Democratic Enlargement,” pp. 398-428.

Wednesday, April 7th

Michael Mandelbaum, “A Perfect Failure: NATO’s War Against Yugoslavia,” Foreign Affairs, 78/5 (September/October 1999), pp. 2-8. (Electronic Reserves)

James B. Steinberg, “A Perfect Polemic: Blind to Reality on Kosovo,” Foreign Affairs 78/6 (November/December 1999), pp. 128-133. (Electronic Reserves)

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, April 9th

“Did U.S. Military Action Against Yugoslavia Violate Just War Theory?”

John T. Rourke, “Issue Summary,” Taking Sides, pp. 316-317.

William T. DeCamp III, “The Big Picture: A Moral Analysis of Allied Force in Kosovo,” Taking Sides, pp. 318-322.

Bill Clinton, “Interviews with President Bill Clinton,” Taking Sides, pp. 323-330.

John T. Rourke, “Postscript,” Taking Sides, pp. 331.

XII. US-CHINA RELATIONS

Monday, April 12th

“Determinants of Chinese National Security Behavior,” Ch. 2 in The United States and a Rising China, RAND Corporation Report MR-1082-AF, 1999, pp. 3-36. (Electronic Reserves.)

Wednesday, April 14th

Zbigniew Brzezinski, “Living With China,” National Interest, No. 59 (Spring 2000), pp. 5-21. (Electronic Reserves)

Aaron L. Friedberg, “Will We Abandon Taiwan?” Commentary, 109/5 (May 2000), pp. 26-31. (Electronic Reserves)

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, April 16th

“Should the United States Give Greater Support to Taiwan Against China?”

John T. Rourke, “Issue Summary,” Taking Sides, pp. 100-101

James P. Doran, “U.S. Defense Policy Toward Taiwan: In Need of an Overhaul,” Taking Sides, pp. 102-108.

Stanley O. Roth, “Statement of Stanley O. Roth,” Taking Sides, pp. 109-114.

John T. Rourke, “Postscript,” Taking Sides, p. 115.

XIII. THE FUTURE OF US FOREIGN POLICY

Monday, April 19th

Hook and Spanier, Ch. 14, "A World of Trouble," pp. 352-377.

Wednesday, April 21st

Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Eagle Has Crash Landed," Foreign Policy, No. 131 (July/August 2002), pp. 60-68. (Electronic Reserves)

Debate/Discussion Topic: Friday, April 23rd

"Is Building a Ballistic Missile Defense System a Wise Idea?"

John T. Rourke, "Issue Summary," Taking Sides, pp. 266-267.

Paul D. Wolfowitz, "Testimony of Paul D. Wolfowitz," Taking Sides, pp. 268-275.

John F. Tierney, "Administration's Policy on National Missile Defense," Taking Sides, pp. 276-282.

John T. Rourke, "Postscript," Taking Sides, p. 283.

XIV. THE END

Monday, April 26th

Catching up, Finishing Up. Review for Final Examination.

→→←←→→←←→→←←→→←←→→←←→→←←→→←←→→←←→→←←→→←←