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Contact information

David Yamanishi  
Office: 304 South Hall, x4300  
Email: dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu

Office hours: I am generally on campus from about 8:30am to 4:30pm Monday to Friday, and tend to be in my office most of the time between 9-11 and 1-3 when I’m not with you. Let me know if you’d like to talk and we can set up an appointment if you don’t want to just take a stab at catching me in my office.

Office phone: 895-4300. A great way to figure out whether I’m there! I should warn you that I have an unfortunate tendency to forget to check my office voicemail. Email’s better than leaving a voice message.

Email: dyamanishi@cornellcollege.edu. The best way to reach me.

Consulting Librarian: Mikki Smith, 308 Cole Library, x4256, msmith@cornellcollege.edu.

Writing Studio: 125 Cole Library, hours: Monday-Thursday, 9am-5pm and 6-11pm; Friday, 9am-5pm; Sunday, 1-5pm and 6-11pm. I have discussed each assignment with Laura Farmer in particular, but Laura, Shawn, and the student workers can all be helpful.

I’m here to help, as are Mikki and the Writing Studio folks. Please take advantage of us.

There is a Moodle site for this class. I will post copies of all handouts there, and I will pay attention to the questions forum if you use it.

Overview

This is a class on the analysis of American foreign relations. By “analysis,” I mean that we will focus on explaining how and why policymakers and policymaking institutions act as they do. We will largely not focus on assessing whether the outcomes of the policymaking process are good or bad, nor will we spend much time talking about current events as they tend to be difficult to analyze impartially. I do, however, encourage you to keep up with international events during the course so that we can try to fit them into historical and theoretical context during our discussions.

We will start with an overview of the history of American foreign relations, then look at the various policymaking institutions and personnel, as well as the public’s influence upon foreign policymaking, in detail. We will then look at the principal contending analytic approaches for
explaining decisionmaking in American foreign policy through two case studies: the Cuban Missile Crisis and the first Gulf War. Finally, we will look at American foreign policy from the point of view of the sharp end of the foreign policy stick: a soldier’s perspective.

**Disabilities**

If you have a disability registered with the college that will require special accommodations for any assignments, please let me know by Wednesday, April 8.

If you have a disability that is not registered with the college that will require special accommodations for any assignments, please register it (!) and then let me know by Wednesday, April 8.

**Feedback**

I am very interested in your suggestions for improvement of this class and my teaching generally. Please email comments to me as you think of them or share them with me at my office, if you would like to see your thoughts have immediate effect. I also pay very close attention to course-end evaluations.

**Grading**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in class</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>due daily at 8am on days with readings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First test</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Friday, April 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second test</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougall paper</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>due at 5pm on Thursday, April 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research paper plan</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>due at 8pm on Saturday, April 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research paper</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>due at 2pm on Saturday, April 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research paper rewrite</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>due at 4pm on Wednesday, April 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Monday or Tuesday, April 27 or 28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the particular things I’m looking for vary to some degree by assignment, in general an A on an assignment means that your work is outstanding in terms of:

- addressing the assigned question and avoiding digression,
- having a well-structured argument,
- expressing your argument clearly and effectively,
- making appropriate and properly cited use of material on the syllabus and other well-selected sources,
- and demonstrating thoughtful integration and interpretation of the course material and discussions.

Lower grades mean that you have not done all of these things or have done one or more of them less well that you could have. The order of items on the above list should not be taken to indicate their order of importance in determining your grade on an assignment, nor should you suppose that the items will carry equal weight on an assignment or invariant weight across assignments. Moreover, I expect your work to improve during the course and across courses.
To simplify communication about grades, I grade all assignments using the same marks that appear on your academic transcripts: letter grades. When I combine assignment grades to produce your course grade, I will do so using the same numbers that the college uses to determine your GPA (A = 4.0, A- = 3.7, B+ = 3.3, etc.). I will always round-up from the midpoint between grades (for example, a 3.85 rounds to an A, while a 3.84 does not). I may raise grades from what the raw numbers indicate in deserving cases, but I will never change the rank order of students’ grades in the class in doing so.

**Instructions for assignments**

All journals and papers should be submitted by email. Please *do not* use an attachment for journals. Please *do* use an attachment for papers.

**Participation:** If you punctually attend every class, appear to me to be paying attention, and rarely make a contribution to our common discussion, you will receive a C for participation. To get a grade higher than a C for participation, you must participate orally with regularity. I assess participation more by thoughtfulness and attentiveness to the flow of the conversation than by quantity of oral communication. I do, however, expect you to contribute regularly. Office visits help your participation grade, but are not a substitute for class attendance and participation. This is a seminar class that depends upon participation, so having more than one unexcused absence will result in a heavy penalty.

**Journals:** Each day of the course that we have readings (that is to say, days 2-3, 5-9, and 11-17), you should submit a journal entry by 8am via email. You might consider one or more of the reading note questions that I’ve distributed or reflect upon how the readings for the day relate to earlier material and/or current events in the news. Feel free to offer your personal reactions to each piece, but I do want you to offer some interpretation or analysis of some kind in each journal entry. You might also pose a question for discussion in class. Your entries should not exceed 500 words per day nor fall short of 300 words per day. Journals will be graded according to (thoughtful) completion. That is to say: if you finish all of them and take them reasonably seriously, you will receive an A for the journal component of the course grade.

**Tests:** There will be two tests. The second test will require knowledge about the first two weeks’ worth of material, but will not ask questions that are exclusively about that material. You might use the reading notes that I hand out as a study guide, although you should keep in mind that many of the reading notes are factual or organizational in nature but the test questions will always have an interpretive or analytic component. I may hand out potential test questions in advance. I may permit you to use notes and texts to help you during the test. But you should plan on neither.

**McDougall paper:** The paper on the McDougall book should address the following question: “Reconsider McDougall’s central argument: do his ‘New Testament’ principles represent a departure from his ‘Old Testament’ principles? How so, or not? Consider and weigh arguments for both sides of the issue.” Your paper should not exceed 1500 well-chosen words.

**Research paper:** The research paper should address an incident or theme in American foreign policy, either contemporary or historical. Your goal is to explain why the incident happened the way that it happened (or that the theme persistently recurs across a number of discrete incidents); in other words, you should make an argument as to the causes of the effect (the
incident or theme) and the mechanisms by which the causes produced the effect that you have observed. You should deal primarily with the policymaking process rather than the policy outcome. That is to say: your question should be along the lines of “How and why did the United States go to war in Vietnam?” rather than “Was it a good thing that the United States went to war in Vietnam?” You might use the analytical perspectives offered in our texts: historical vs. institutional vs. social influences upon policymaking, for example, or rational actor vs. group politics. You should explore the literature about your incident or theme of interest, and respond directly to what other scholars have said.

We will work on the paper in several stages.

First, you should pick a few incidents or themes (so that we can avoid duplication) by the start of class on Thursday, April 9. You should pick an incident or theme that scholars have explained in different ways, although this may not become obvious till you have read the literature about your topic. If you find later that your incident or theme is not a subject of scholarly controversy, you may change topics, and you will not need to re-submit any work already submitted on the older topic (although you will need to write the relevant sections for the final, aggregated paper). You should probably not pick an incident or theme that occurred in past year or two, as it is unlikely that you will find a range of scholarly work on the subject.

Second, you should write a plan for your paper. Your plan should do three things:

*Flesh out your problem:* You should indicate what puzzle you will address in your larger paper and give some indication of your problem’s context: why it matters and what we need to know about it to understand what you’re asking about when you ask your question. You might think of this as the opening paragraph of your larger paper. This part of your plan should not exceed 300 well-chosen words.

*Describe your sources:* You should describe each source that you have identified for your project, explain what its author argues, what sort of argument or mechanism its author offers to relate cause(s) and effect(s), and what sorts of evidence its author offers to support the argument. Finally, you should explain what role the source will play in your project. Each bibliographic entry should not exceed 300 well-chosen words. Your most important sources should be limited to scholarly work published by reputable academic or commercial presses or journals. In that spirit, you should search for scholarly reviews of your sources in order to find out what other scholars have made of them. Journalistic and literary sources may be used to frame the problem, but should not be mistaken for scholarly work, in large part because they do not receive the systematic attention from peer reviewers that scholarly work does. I have no set number of sources to recommend, but you should try to get a feel for the literature on your topic. Whatever the number of major perspectives upon your problem, you should look into each of them, and it may also be worth looking into related problems or other countries that have experienced the same problem.
Outline your paper: Your outline should spell out the structure of your project. In addition to your work on the proposal, you should add an explanation of the competing perspectives that you will address, and indicate how you will structure your interpretive analysis of the competing perspectives that you address. You should also describe, in a preliminary way, any discussion of specific evidence that you will bring to bear on your problem, as well as how you will bring it into your argument, structurally speaking. Your outline need not be structured as a coherent paper, but you should not simply offer a list of topics to be addressed. It should be detailed enough to make it clear what you will say in each section of your paper and why the sections of your paper will appear in the order that they do. Your outline should not exceed 1000 well-chosen words.

Your final paper should present your puzzle, explain how competing scholars understand the phenomenon in question, and analyze the competing explanations to identify the roots of their disagreement and to assess why one or more perspectives are right and the other(s) wrong. I will grade the paper according to three principal criteria: the quality of your discussion of how your problem has been and/or might be explained by scholars from different perspectives, the quality of your analysis of what fundamentally unites and distinguishes the competing perspectives that you address, and the coherence with which you establish a clear thesis about your problem and make each part of your paper make sense in terms of that thesis. Your paper should not exceed 3000 well-chosen words.

Finally, your rewrite should make a serious effort to address my comments on your paper (which I will return by email as quickly as circumstances permit). If you make merely cosmetic changes, your grade on the rewrite may be lower than the original grade.

Presentation: Your presentation should address your paper project. You should present your puzzle, the explanations that other scholars have offered of it, your analysis of their advantages and shortcomings, and your own analysis in about 15 minutes. After each presentation, I will select another student (or students) in the class to serve as a discussant who will briefly summarize the presentation and ask one or more critical questions about it. I may ask you to serve as a discussant more than once. After the discussant(s) speaks, other students may ask questions and make comments. Your presentation grade will depend on your effectiveness in presenting your argument in a clear way to the class and your facility and thoughtfulness in answering questions about your work, as well as quality of your formal comments on other students’ presentations. Informal comments about other students’ presentations will affect your participation grade rather than your presentation grade. You may, but do not need to, use presentation aids such as PowerPoint.

Attendance, lateness, and 15th day drop policy

To avoid a penalty on your participation grade for missing class, you must ask the campus clinic (in a health emergency) or the dean of students or other relevant campus official (in other types of emergencies) to send me an explanation on your behalf. You may miss only one class without providing documentation before absences begin to affect your grade. Persistent tardiness may be recorded as partial or complete absence for one or more days.
I will lower the grade on work submitted late by 1% per hour late. Work turned in that meets the minimum expectations of the assignment will receive at least a D regardless of lateness, so you should turn in every assignment even if you are very late.

Except in cases of documented disability or emergency, I will not, on grounds of fairness, offer an extension to one student without offering it to everybody, and given the tightness of the block plan schedule, I simply can’t afford to do that. Please do not experiment with my generosity.

To drop on the 15th day, you must complete every assignment due by the end of the 14th day of class and meet the attendance condition noted above (that is to say, you must miss no more than one class without a documented excuse). In other words, if you are likely to sleep through class on more than one occasion, you should drop during the first three days, because you will not be able to do so later. You must have put in a good-faith effort to drop on the 15th day.

**Books to Buy**

The following books are available at the bookstore in the Commons.


**Readings and Assignments**

Class meets 9:15-11am, except where noted (varying times are underlined).

**Monday, April 6**

Introductions, administrivia, library resource tour

Recommended: Getry Agizah, “Grassroots Reconciliation after the Post-Election Violence in Kenya,” Shaw, 4pm

**Tuesday, April 7**

McDougall, Introduction and Part I (98 pp.)

**Wednesday, April 8**

McDougall, Part II and Conclusion (125 pp.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date, April</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Thursday, April 9: No class meeting. McDougall paper due at 5pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Friday, April 11: Rosati &amp; Scott, Chapters 2-3 (52 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Monday, April 13: Rosati &amp; Scott, Chapters 4-6 (98 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 14: Rosati &amp; Scott, Chapters 7-9 (110 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 15: Rosati &amp; Scott, Chapters 11-13 (106 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended: Jane Fortson, “The Economic Consequences of HIV/AIDS,” Hedges, 3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended: Erica Field, “Power of a Pill: Iodine Deficiency, Schooling Attainment, and Economic Development,” Ringer, 7pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Thursday, April 16: Rosati &amp; Scott, Chapters 14-16 (101 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fog of War</em> at 12:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Friday, April 17: First Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Saturday, April 18: Research paper plan due at 8pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Monday, April 20: Allison &amp; Zelikow, Introduction and Chapters 1-2 (142 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Thirteen Days</em> at 12:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 21: Allison &amp; Zelikow, Chapters 3-4 (112 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Wednesday, April 22: Allison &amp; Zelikow, Chapters 5-7 (153 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended: Irene Furst, “Remembrances of a Holocaust Survivor,” Hedges, 11am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Thursday, April 23: Yetiv, Introduction-Chapter 6 (137 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended: Tanya Golash-Boza, “The Human Cost of Immigration Policies,” Shaw, 3:30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Friday, April 24: Yetiv, Chapter 7-Postscript (95 pp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Saturday, April 25: Research paper due at 2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Monday, April 27: Buzzell, pp. 1-178 (skim)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Presentations, 1-3pm

Tuesday, April 28  Buzzell, pp. 179-354 (skim)
Presentations, 1-3pm

Wednesday, April 29  Second test
Rewrite of research paper due at 4pm

**Recommended Reading**

*International Security, International Politics, World Politics, International Organization,* and *International Studies Quarterly* are some of the more respected scholarly journals that focus upon international relations and often address American foreign policy. These are peer-reviewed, scholarly journals, and articles found in them are likely to be useful for your papers. More general journals such as the *American Political Science Review* and *British Journal of Political Science* also contain foreign policy articles, but more rarely. Most of these titles are available in JSTOR, Project Muse, Ebscohost, or other databases available through the library.

The journals *Foreign Affairs* and *Foreign Policy* are more popularly oriented (but still reasonably high quality) journals that are available at most decent bookstores. There are many other popular journals in which significant articles appear from time to time, such as *The National Interest* and *World Policy Journal*, but *Foreign Affairs* and *Foreign Policy* are especially widely read and influential. Note that articles in this class of journal are typically not peer-reviewed, and rarely contain well vetted evidence for their assertions. These journals often print articles by diplomats and pundits with a partisan point of view to propagate.

For a detailed, linear overview of US foreign policy history, I strongly recommend *The Cambridge History of American Foreign Relations*, in four volumes:


There are many histories of American foreign policy. This is, in my view, among the most nuanced and thoughtfully written. I prefer the single-author approach (at least within each period) to a multi-author volume. The latter tend to fit together less well than the editors might hope.
A good source for more theoretical material is G. John Ikenberry, *American Foreign Policy: Theoretical Essays (5th Edition)*, Pearson Longman, 2005, ISBN 032115973X. This collection of essays does an admirable job of studying foreign policy at a bit of a remove from the day-to-day hustle of most analysts' efforts either to influence current policy or to focus on a particular problem.

Naturally I also recommend keeping up with events. The *New York Times* is available online for free (on the same day, at any rate), and has excellent coverage of foreign affairs and foreign policymaking. If you prefer a slightly slower pace of news intake, I strongly recommend the *Economist*, a weekly news magazine published in the UK but available at our library and online. It’s advisable to get your news on foreign policy from more than one source, and especially to find out how people abroad view our choices.

**Honesty in Academic Work (from the Compass)**

The College considers Cornell students to be responsible persons whose maturity will develop in a community that encourages free inquiry. The College expects the highest degree of personal integrity in all relationships. Any form of dishonesty is a violation of this spirit and of College rules.

A student is expected to explicitly acknowledge ideas, claims, observations, or data of others, unless generally known. When a piece of work is submitted for credit, a student is asserting that the submission is her or his work unless there is a citation of a specific source. If there is no appropriate acknowledgement of sources, whether intended or not, this may constitute a violation of the College’s requirement for honesty in academic work and may be treated as a case of academic dishonesty.

Dishonesty in academic work includes both cheating and plagiarism.

*Cheating* refers to the use of unauthorized sources of information on examinations or any attempt by students to deceive the evaluator of an examination, paper, or project.

*Plagiarism* is the act of taking the work of another and presenting it as one’s own, without acknowledgement of the original source.

There is not one set of rules for the acknowledgement of sources that is appropriate across all disciplines. For this reason, students are always encouraged to consult their professors and guidelines included in their syllabi. However, in general the appropriate acknowledgement of sources involves meeting the following requirements:

*Quotations and Paraphrasing.* All direct quotations, even if mingled with original words and ideas, must be placed within quotation marks and accompanied by a specific citation for the source of the quotation. Unless the information is generally known, all phrases that are not original to the author - even two or three words - must be placed in quotation marks and cited.
If an existing idea is used but paraphrased or summarized, both the original author's words and sentence structure must be changed and a specific citation for the source must still be made. It is always the responsibility of the student to provide precise sources for all ideas, information, or data he or she has borrowed or adapted. Simply listing sources in a bibliography is not sufficient. Students who use information from the World Wide Web are expected to follow these same guidelines for the citation of sources.

Failure to cite sources properly constitutes academic dishonesty, whether the omission is intentional or not.

*Ideas and Data.* All students are required to acknowledge the ideas of others. Every student is expected to do her or his own work in the completion of an assignment or an examination unless either (a) the sources for these ideas are explicitly cited, or (b) the instructor explicitly allows such collaboration. In addition, a person giving unauthorized assistance to another on an examination is just as guilty of cheating as the person who accepts or solicits such aid.

Submitting revisions of academic work previously submitted, either in the current course or in previous courses, qualifies as academic dishonesty unless the student obtains the explicit permission of all of the instructors involved.

All data sources must be cited accurately. It is dishonest to fabricate or alter research data included in laboratory reports, projects, or other assignments.

A safe guide is to provide a full citation for every source consulted. Sources may include, but are not limited to, published books, articles, reviews, Internet sites, archival material, visual images, oral presentations, or personal correspondence. In addition, students should always keep previous drafts of their work in order to provide documentation of their original work. Finally, due to disciplinary differences, students should consult their professor, a librarian, and/or the Teaching and Learning Center for specific instructions on properly providing citations for sources.

*Procedures for Dealing with Dishonesty in Academic Work (from the Compass)*

If an instructor judges that a student has violated the College's policies on academic honesty, the student may be charged with academic dishonesty and assigned an F either for the particular examination, paper, report, or project, or for the course. The instructor shall notify the student in writing of the charge and the penalty and shall include a statement of the circumstances which precipitated the action. A copy of the instructor's letter along with a copy of the paper shall be sent to the Registrar. The Registrar shall then advise the student in writing of the right to appeal. Within ten (10) days of notification, the student may appeal the charge and/or the penalty by submitting a letter to the Dean of the College requesting that he or she appoint an ad hoc committee consisting of three (3) faculty members, one of whom may be nominated by the student. The recommendation of this committee is advisory only and is not binding upon the instructor.
All material and information relative to the charge of academic dishonesty shall be kept by the Registrar in a special file during the period in which the student is enrolled at Cornell College, serving only as a statement of record if the student is charged a second time with academic dishonesty. In the case of an appeal after the first offense, the file shall be destroyed if the committee finds the student not guilty and the instructor concurs; otherwise, the recommendation of the committee shall be inserted into the special file. If there are no further charges, the file will be destroyed at the time of the student's graduation from Cornell.

Should a subsequent charge of academic dishonesty be brought against a student, the Registrar shall notify the Dean of the College who shall convene a committee consisting of the Dean of the College, the Dean of Students, and the Chair of the Academic Standing Committee, who shall determine the status of the student. The normal penalty for a second offense is indefinite suspension from the College.