

Yale University
Department of Political Science

U.S. STRATEGY AFTER THE COLD WAR

Political Science S157
Summer 2014

Nuno P. Monteiro
www.nunomonteiro.org
nuno.monteiro@yale.edu

Syllabus
(April 22, 2014, version)

Class: Tue. & Thu. 1:00-4:15PM, Rosenkranz Hall #301;
Office Hours: Tue. & Thu. 4:30-5:30 or by appointment, Rosenkranz Hall #226.

COURSE OUTLINE AND OBJECTIVES

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, the United States has enjoyed a preponderance of power in the international system. With a quarter of the world's GDP; a military one order of magnitude greater than any other; a defense budget close to half of global defense expenditures; a blue-water navy superior to all others combined; a chance at nuclear superiority over its erstwhile foe, Russia; and a defense R&D budget that is almost twice the total defense expenditures of its most obvious future competitor, China; the United States has unprecedented relative power. Although several other states would likely be able to avoid defeat in case of a U.S. attack, none comes anywhere near its surplus of usable, globally-deployable power. The United States thus has incomparable freedom projecting its power around the world. It has no peer competitors, and none are likely to emerge in the near future.

What are the main threats facing the United States in this new environment? How should the United States behave in these different circumstances? What should U.S. grand strategy be? What, if any, are the constraints on American power? What are the challenges to American power? Are peer competitors rising?

The purpose of this course is to address each of these questions, encouraging students to form their own views on contemporary international politics and U.S. grand strategy. Readings encompass the theoretical and historical aspects of the post-Cold War world, including U.S. grand strategy and foreign policy, the evolution of power trends, and the recent history of armed conflicts.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING

There are no prerequisites for the course.

The course will consist of a series of seminar sessions with pre-assigned readings. Students are expected to do all the readings prior to each session, as well as attend and participate in all sessions. The bi-weekly sessions will focus on (i) laying out the main arguments of the assigned readings and (ii) critically discussing them. I will open up the session with a short lecture on the topic, laying out the main arguments in the readings. This will be followed by a class discussion of the week's topic. Each class session will end with a student presentation and Q&A on a particular topic of contemporary international politics.

Final grades will be assigned as follows:

- Seminar participation: 20%;
- Presentation: 20%;
- Book review: 20%;
- Four short papers: 40% (=4x10%).

Please note that in order to receive an overall passing grade, students must receive a passing grade in *all* four components of the final grade.

DESCRIPTION OF ASSIGNMENTS

Seminar Participation: Since the course will be conducted in a seminar format, students will take responsibility for leading much of the discussion. All students should be prepared to contribute to class discussion by doing all the readings in advance and bringing to class questions that stem from the readings. In order to encourage completion of the readings prior to each session, I may call on students during the class and ask them to lay out the basic argument of any piece assigned for that session. Attendance does not in and of itself guarantee a good participation grade.

Presentation: Each session will include a 15-minute presentation made by a team of two or more students (depending on course enrollment) analyzing a contemporary problem in international relations and laying out U.S. options in dealing with it. The presentation has two goals. First, you should lay out the current state of the problem in focus. To do so, you may want to browse the last six months of news on the topic from global news media such as the *New York Times*, the *Economist*, etc. Second, you should lay out U.S. options in dealing with this problem. Each presentation will be followed by a 30-minute Q&A on the topic. The presentation topics are noted after the readings for each session. Please coordinate your presentation with one other colleague -- the two of you should make one single presentation as a team. We will allocate students to presentation topics during the first session of the course.

Book review: On the last page of this syllabus, you will find a list of recent books on broad topics related to international politics and U.S. strategy. You should pick one and review it. The review should be at least eight pages long. You should accomplish two goals in your review. First, you should summarize the argument of the book. Second, you should criticize it, highlighting the shortcomings of the argument and of the evidence presented in its support. Both the summary and the criticism should be allocated similar importance and space. Please let me know by email which book you will be reviewing by Tuesday, July 16, at the beginning of class. The review is due by Tuesday, August 6, at midnight.

Short Papers: Over the course of the term, each student must turn in four four-page papers reacting to the readings for four different class sessions. Your response papers should be posted on the Classes*V2 server by 8:00PM the day before the class meeting in which we will discuss these readings. Papers received after the deadline but before the relevant seminar session begins will be dropped one full letter grade. Papers will not be accepted after the relevant seminar session starts. Each of the four short papers will be worth 10% of the final course grade.

These short papers should include an analysis of strengths or weaknesses of arguments made by the authors for the relevant week; questions with which you were left by the readings; or points of confusion that should be clarified. (You should *not* summarize the readings; assume that everybody else has done the reading as well and understands the basic arguments.) You do not have to discuss all of the readings assigned for

the session; you can discuss just one or two, or you can pick a broader range and compare them to each other (or to readings for earlier sessions). You are welcome to choose any four sessions in which to write reaction papers, though spacing things out over the duration of the course might be best.

Format for book review and short papers: Please use letter-sized paper, double-spaced text with 1-inch margins all around, and a size 12 standard font such as Arial, Calibri, or Times New Roman.

OTHER POLICIES

Policy on Plagiarism: All assignments except the presentation are non-collaborative and should be entirely your own work. Plagiarism is unacceptable and will result in penalties up to and including a failing grade for the assignment (and therefore the course) and referral to the university for disciplinary action. If you haven't done so yet, please familiarize yourself with the University's policy on academic honesty, including cheating, plagiarism, and document citation, at the following web location:

<http://yalecollege.yale.edu/content/cheating-plagiarism-and-documentation>. It is your responsibility to understand and abide by this policy. If you have any questions, please ask.

Policy on Electronic Devices: If it appears that the use of electronic devices is hindering class discussions, I reserve the right to ban from in the classroom. All cell phones must be turned off during class.

While all these policies will be strictly enforced, I know that emergencies and illnesses might arise during the term. If that happens to be the case, please let me know as soon as possible so that we can work out alternative arrangements for you to complete your work within a reasonable period of time. In emergency cases, you will need to present a "dean's excuse" in order to be excused from late work or a series of absences from class sessions.

READINGS

The selected texts were chosen to represent the literature on U.S. strategy after the Cold War from a variety of perspectives. They provide a wide range of views and differ in both the evidence they provide and their persuasiveness. As a whole, the selection is designed to encourage critical evaluation of existing academic literature. In order to best achieve this goal, keep in mind the following questions when doing the readings: What is the argument the author is trying to make? Why does it matter? What are its strengths and weaknesses? How convincing is it? What are possible counter-arguments? Above all, how does the argument advance our understanding of international politics?

The following books are required for the course and available for purchase at the Yale bookstore:

- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014);
- Scott Sagan and Kenneth Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1995).

All other readings will be available in PDF format on the Classes*v2 server. The readings below for each session are listed in the order you should do them.

COURSE SCHEDULE

Week 1

Session 1.1 (Tuesday, June 03) -- Unipolarity and the Post-Cold War World

- Charles Krauthammer, “The Unipolar Moment,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 70 (1990/91): 23-33;
- Kenneth Waltz, “The Emerging Structure of International Politics,” *International Security*, Vol. 18, No. 2 (1993): 44-79;
- Robert Jervis, “Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective,” *World Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (2009): 188-213;
- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Chapter 1.

Session 1.2 (Thursday, June 05) -- The Character of American Preponderance

- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Chapter 2;
- Barry Posen, “Command of the Commons,” *International Security*, Vol. 28, No. 1 (2003): 5-46;
- Richard K. Betts, “The Political Support System for American Primacy,” *International Affairs*, Vol. 81, No. 1 (2005): 1-14;
- G. John Ikenberry, “Democracy, Institutions, and American Restraint,” in Ikenberry (editor), *America Unrivaled: The Future of the Balance of Power* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2002), pp. 213-238;
- Stephen M. Walt, “Alliances in a Unipolar World,” *World Politics*, Vol. 61, No. 1 (2009): 86-120.
 - Presentation topic: The future of NATO.

Week 2

Session 2.1 (Tuesday, June 10) -- The Strategies of American Preponderance

- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Chapter 3;
- Barry Posen and Andrew Ross, “Competing Visions for U.S. Grand Strategy,” *International Security*, Vol. 21, No. 3 (1996/97): 5-53;
- Department of Defense, draft of “Defense Planning Guidance,” 1992;
- William Clinton, *A National Security Strategy of Engagement and Enlargement* (The White House, February 1995);
- Condoleezza Rice, “Campaign 2000: Promoting the National Interest,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 79 (January/February 2000), pp. 45–62;

- George W. Bush, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (The White House, September, 2002);
- Barack H. Obama, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (The White House, May, 2010);
- Stephen G. Brooks, G. John Ikenberry, and William C. Wohlforth, “Don’t Come Home, America: The Case against Retrenchment,” *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 3 (2012/13): 7–51;
- Barry Posen, “Pull Back: The Case for a Less Activist Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 92 (2012/13): 116-128.
 - Presentation topic: the Pacific Pivot.

Session 2.2 (Thursday, June 12) -- Small Wars

- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Chapters 6-7;
- Eliot A. Cohen, “A Revolution in Warfare,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 75 (1996): 37-54;
- Daryl G. Press, “The Myth of Air Power in the Persian Gulf War and the Future of Warfare,” *International Security*, Vol. 26 (2001): 5-44;
- Barry Posen, “The War for Kosovo: Serbia’s Political-Military Strategy,” *International Security*, Vol. 24 (2000): 39-84;
- Stephen Biddle, “Allies, Airpower, and Modern Warfare: The Afghan Model in Afghanistan and Iraq,” *International Security*, Vol. 30 (2005/06): 161-76.
 - Presentation topic: the future of Iraq.

Week 3

Session 3.1 (Tuesday, June 17) -- Occupation and Insurgency

- David M. Edelstein, “Occupational Hazards: Why Military Occupations Succeed or Fail,” *International Security*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (2004): 49-91;
- Jason Lyall and Isaiah Wilson III, “Rage Against the Machines: Explaining Outcomes in Counterinsurgency Wars,” *International Organization*, Vol. 63 (2009): 67-106;
- Stephen Biddle, Jeffrey A. Friedman, and Jacob N. Shapiro, “Testing the Surge: Why Did Violence Decline in Iraq in 2007,” *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2012): 7-40.
 - Presentation topic: the future of Afghanistan.

Session 3.2 (Thursday, June 19) -- Nuclear Proliferation

- Scott Sagan and Kenneth Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1995), selections;

- Nuno P. Monteiro and Alexandre Debs, “The Strategic Logic of Nuclear Proliferation,” Yale University mimeo;
- Craig Campbell, “American Power Preponderance and the Nuclear Revolution,” *Review of International Studies*, Vol. 35 (2009): 27-44;
- Matthew Kroenig, “Time to Attack Iran: Why a Strike Is the Least Bad Option,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91 (2012);
- Colin H. Kahl, “Not Time to Attack Iran: Why War Should Be a Last Resort,” *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 91 (2012);
- Alexandre Debs and Nuno P. Monteiro, “The Flawed Logic of Striking Iran,” *Foreign Affairs* online, January 18, 2012;
- Keir Lieber and Daryl Press, “The Next Korean War,” *Foreign Affairs* online, April 1, 2013;
 - Presentation topic: the Iranian nuclear program.

Week 4

Session 4.1 (Tuesday, June 24) -- Global Terrorism and Humanitarian Intervention

- Samantha Power, “Bystanders to Genocide: Why the United States Let the Rwandan Tragedy Happen,” *The Atlantic*, April 2001;
- Anne-Marie Slaughter, “Interests vs. Values? Misunderstanding Obama’s Libya Strategy,” *New York Review of Books* blog, March 30, 2011;
- Robert A. Pape, “When Duty Calls: A Pragmatic Standard of Humanitarian Intervention,” *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 1 (2012);
- Erica D. Borghard and Costantino Pischedda, “Allies and Airpower in Libya,” *Parameters*, Vol. 42, No. 1, 63.
 - Presentation topic: the situation in Syria.

Session 4.2 (Thursday, June 26) -- China as a U.S. Competitor?

- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Chapters 4-5;
- Thomas Christensen, “Fostering Stability or Creating a Monster? The Rise of China and U.S. Policy toward East Asia,” *International Security*, Vol. 31 (2006): 81-126;
- Michael Beckley, “China’s Century? Why the American Edge will Endure,” *International Security*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (2011/12): 41-78;
- Alastair Iain Johnston, “How New and Assertive Is China's New Assertiveness?” *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (2013): 7-48;

- Avery Goldstein, “First Things First: The Pressing Danger of Crisis Instability in U.S.-China Relations,” *International Security*, Vol. 37, No. 4 (2013): 49–89.
 - Presentation topic: the future rise of China and the Pacific pivot.

Week 5

Session 5.1 (Tuesday, July 01) -- The Domestic Politics of U.S. Decline

- Robert Pape, “Empire Falls,” *National Interest*, No. 99 (2009): 21-34;
- James Fallows, “How Can America Rise Again,” *The Atlantic*, January 2010;
- Joseph M. Parent and Paul MacDonald, “Graceful Decline? The Surprising Success of Great-Power Retrenchment,” *International Security*, Vol. 35, No. 4 (2011): 7-44;
- Barry R. Posen, “From Unipolarity to Multipolarity: Transition in Sight?” in Ikenberry and Wohlforth (editors), *International Relations Theory and the Consequences of Unipolarity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 317-341;
- Erik Voeten, “Unipolar Politics as Usual,” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 24 (2011): 121-128;
 - Presentation topic: the future of the U.S. defense budget.

Session 5.2 (Thursday, July 03) -- Does Power Preponderance Matter?

- Robert Jervis, “International Primacy: Is the Game Worth the Candle?” *International Security*, Vol. 17, No. 4 (1993): 52-67;
- Stephen Van Evera, “A Farewell to Geopolitics,” in Leffler and Legro (editors), *To Lead the World: American Strategy after the Bush Doctrine* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), pp. 11-35;
- Charles L. Glaser, “Why Unipolarity Doesn’t Matter (Much),” *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, Vol. 24 (2011): 135-147;
- Jeffrey W. Legro, “Sell Unipolarity? The Future of an Overvalued Concept,” in Ikenberry and Wohlforth (editors), *International Relations Theory and the Consequences of Unipolarity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 342-366;
- Nuno P. Monteiro, *Theory of Unipolar Politics* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), Chapter 8.
 - Presentation topic: global climate change.

LIST OF BOOKS FOR REVIEW

- Andrew Bacevich, *Washington Rules: America's Path to Permanent War* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2010);
- Zbigniew Brzezinski, *Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power* (New York: Basic Books, 2012);
- Francis Fukuyama, *America at the Crossroads: Democracy, Power, and the Neoconservative Legacy* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007);
- Robert Kagan, *The World America Made* (New York: Knopf, 2012);
- Charles A. Kupchan, *No One's World: The West, the Rising Rest, and the Coming Global Turn* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012);
- Joseph Nye, *The Future of Power* (New York: Public Affairs, 2011);
- David E. Sanger, *The Inheritance: The World Obama Confronts and the Challenges to American Power* (New York: Random House, 2009);
- Fareed Zakaria, *The Post-American World, Release 2.0* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2011).