

POLI420A: Seminar on the Politics of US Foreign Policymaking  
University of British Columbia  
Spring 2022

Instructor: Gyung-Ho Jeong, PH.D.  
Office: Buchanan C307  
Phone: 604-822-2831  
Email: gyung-ho.jeong@ubc.ca  
Office hours: By appointment only

Class Time: Wednesdays 2PM - 4:50PM

### **COURSE DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES**

This is a course on the politics of US foreign policy. We will examine domestic sources of the U.S. foreign policymaking: the main players (President, Congress, bureaucrats, political parties, interest groups, and the public) and policymaking processes. This course is not a course on international relations. We will not study specific US foreign policies, such as US nuclear policy or US policy toward the Middle East or any region. Two exceptions are trade and immigration policies.

There are two main objectives of this course. First, its main goal is to provide students with conceptual tools that will allow students to engage in intellectual discussion on the politics of US foreign policy. For this reason, discussion will be a key part of this course. Reading assignments and my lecture will be prepared to help your intellectual discussion. Thus, you should do the readings **before** you come to class. Your active and intellectual discussion will be reflected in your final grade. Also, there will be many opportunities and incentives for active interactions among class members to facilitate your participation.

Second, the best way to understand a theory or concept of political science is to see how the theory applies to real-world cases. Accordingly, we will frequently apply theories or conceptual tools to current or past events. Additionally, students will have an opportunity to do independent research of their own. Writing a paper (see below) in this course is intended to make you experience the process of applying academic theories/concepts to real-world politics.

### **COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND GRADING**

1. Participation and Attendance (20%)
2. Discussion Memos (20%)
3. Reviewer Service (5%)
4. Take-Home Final Exam (15%)
5. Research Project (40%)

1. **Participation and Attendance.** You are expected to participate in class discussion actively. Participation should be based on the readings. Any comments that are not based on (and related to) the readings do not count as active participation, no matter how often you speak. Two or more unexcused absences will bring down your final grade by one letter grade (e.g. An A- will be a B-.) Your **participation** in class discussion will be reflected in your grade based on the following criteria:

#### **Participation Grade Criteria**

- A. (18-20%): This grade is awarded when students regularly initiate discussion based on the assigned readings. This means coming to class thoroughly familiar with the assigned reading and, therefore, prepared to raise critical questions, to identify puzzles in the readings, and actively to engage other students in the discussion.
- B. (15-17%): This grade is awarded to those who participate on a regular, but less frequent basis than the A student. B discussants will be prepared for class, but their contributions will indicate that less thought has been given to assigned materials.
- C. (11-14%): This grade is awarded to those who participate infrequently (one or two times per class). Also, their contributions will indicate that less thought has been given to assigned materials.
- F. (0%): None of the above. **If you come to class regularly but rarely speak in class, this will be your grade.** There will be no D grade.

2. **Discussion memos.** Students will be divided into two groups. Students in the first group will submit a memo of discussion topics in Weeks 2, 4, 6, and 10. Students in the second group two will submit a memo in Weeks 3, 5, 9, and 11. In this memo, you should identify discussion topics or questions from the readings and explain why they deserve our discussion (no more than 250 words). Good discussion topics and questions arise from identifying the contradictions within or between the readings or the gap between the theories and the real-world cases. Simply asking some concepts or theories in the readings or bringing up some cases that are not relevant to the readings is NOT a good discussion memo. Summarizing the readings is NOT a good memo, either. This memo should be posted on Canvas by 7:00PM the day before class.

3. **Reviewer Services.** Each student will serve as a reviewer of a research paper by other students in this course (see below for the details of research projects). You will be assigned to a research paper by the instructor. As a reviewer of the paper, you will write a critical but constructive memo on the paper (one-page; double-spaced) and lead the Q&A session when the paper is presented.

4. There will be a **take-home final exam**. You will be asked to respond to a question that is designed to help you reflect on the entire course (single-spaced; one-page). The exam is due one week after the final day of class. While you are free to refer to any articles, lecture notes, or books, you cannot discuss the exam with others.

## 5. Research Project

Three or four students will form a group and write a 20-page research paper that seeks an answer to one of the research questions provided by the instructor. In the paper, each group should provide 1) a thesis statement, 2) a theory that supports your thesis statement, and 3) three case studies (four cases for a group of four) that support your thesis. This paper should be no longer than 20 pages (double-spaced; 12 font-size; 1-inch margins). Groups will be formed based on your preference for research question. Toward the end of the term, groups will present their paper in class (15-minute presentation followed by 30-minute discussion). These presentations will be peer-reviewed. That is, other students in class will grade your presentation. The average of the peer-evaluation scores on the presentation will determine 30% of the group project grade. The instructor's evaluation on the final paper will determine 40% of the group project grade. The remaining 30% of the grade will be determined by the instructor's evaluation on individual case studies (That is, you will be individually responsible for your case study.). The final version is due two days after the final day of class.

## **COURSE POLICIES ON MAKE-UP EXAMS AND WRITTEN ASSIGNMENTS**

1. To request any academic concession (such an extension on any assignment), students need to contact Arts Academic Advising (Buchanan D111; 604.822.4028). I will grant academic concessions only when they approve your request. Without their approval, I will not consider your request. There is no exception to this policy. Also, you should do this within two weeks of the missed deadline.
2. All written assignments, including discussion memos, should adhere to the page limits and due dates. Violation of the page limits will be penalized by 1% per line. Late papers will not be accepted.

## **READINGS**

1. Most journal articles are available from the library website.
2. Any readings not available online will be made available by the instructor.

## TENTATIVE SCHEDULE and READINGS ASSIGNMENTS (It is subject to change)

Note: The readings marked by • are for both undergraduate and graduate students. The readings marked by \*\*\* are for graduate students only. Each graduate student should present two of these readings. The readings marked by # are for those interested in the topic and want to do more in-depth research.

### **Week 1 (Jan 11): Introduction and Doing a Political Science Research**

- L. J. Zigerell. “Rookie Mistakes: Preemptive Comments on Graduate Student Empirical Research Manuscripts.” *PS: Political Science and Politics* 46 (2013): 142-6.

### **Week 2 (Jan 18): Historical Overview of US Foreign Policy**

- Bernard Fensterwald, Jr. 1958. “The Anatomy of American ‘Isolationism’ and Expansionism. Part I”, *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 2:111-139.
- Walter Mead, 2011, “The Tea Party and American Foreign Policy,” *Foreign Affairs* 90/2: 28-44
- Bear Braumoeller. 2010. “The Myth of American Isolationism,” *Foreign Policy Analysis* 6: 349–371
- Charles A. Kupchan. 2020. “Isolationism Is Not a Dirty Word”. [The Atlantic: https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/09/virtue-isolationism/616499/](https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/09/virtue-isolationism/616499/)
- \*\*\* Benjamin Fordham. 2017. “Protectionist Empire: Trade, Tariffs, and United States Foreign Policy, 1890–1914.” *Studies in American Political Development*, 31(2), 170-192.
- # Gyung-Ho Jeong. 2017. “The Supermajority Core of the US Senate and the Failure to Join the League of Nations,” *Public Choice*, 173(3-4): 325-343.

### **Week 3 (Jan 25): Public Opinion and Electoral Politics of Foreign Policy**

- John H. Aldrich, Christopher Gelpi, Peter Feaver, Jason Reifler, and Kristin Thompson Sharp, 2006, “Foreign Policy and the Electoral Connection,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 9:477–502.
- Adam Berinsky. 2007. “Assuming the Costs of War: Events, Elites, and American Public Support for Military Conflict,” *Journal of Politics* 69: 975-997.
- Douglas C. Foyle, 2004, “Leading the Public to War? The Influence of American Public Opinion on the Bush Administration's Decision to go to War in Iraq,” *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 16/3: 269-294.
- \*\*\* Guisinger Alexandra, Elizabeth Saunders. 2017. “Mapping the Boundaries of Elite Cues: How Elites Shape Mass Opinion across International Issues.” *International Studies Quarterly* 61 (2): 425–41.
- \*\*\* Shana K. Gadarian. 2010. “Foreign Policy at the Ballot Box: How Citizens Use Foreign Policy to Judge and Choose Candidates.” *Journal of Politics* 72:1046–62.
- # Tim Groeling and Matthew A. Baum. 2008. “Crossing the Water's Edge: Elite Rhetoric, Media Coverage and the Rally-Round-the-Flag Phenomenon.” *Journal of Politics* 70: 1065-1085.
- # Cavari Amnon, Freedman Guy. 2019. “Partisan Cues and Opinion Formation on Foreign Policy.” *American Politics Research* 47 (1): 29–57.
- # Ronald Krebs. 2015. “Tell Me a Story: FDR, Narrative & the Making of the Second World War.” *Security Studies* 24 (1): 131–70.

### **Week 4 (Feb 1): Presidents and Foreign Policy**

- Brandice Canes-Wrone, William G. Howell, and David E. Lewis. 2008, “Toward a Broader Understanding of Presidential Power: A Reevaluation of the Two Presidencies Thesis,” *Journal of Politics* 70 (1): 1-16.
- Verlan Lewis. 2017. “The President and the Parties’ Ideologies: Party Ideas about Foreign Policy Since 1900.” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 47: 27-61.
- Jordan Tama. 2013. “From Private Consultation to Public Crusade: Assessing Eisenhower’s Legislative Strategies on Foreign Policy,” *Congress & the Presidency* 40: 41-60.
- William Howell. 2008. “Wartime Judgments of Presidential Power: Striking Down but Not Back,” *Minnesota Law Review* 93: 1778-1819.

\*\*\* Lee, Frances E. 2008. "Dividers, Not Unifiers: Presidential Leadership and Senate Partisanship, 1981-2004," *Journal of Politics* 70: 914-928.

\*\*\* William Howell, Saul Jackman, and Jon Rogowski. 2012. "The Wartime President: Insights, Lessons, and Opportunities for Continued Investigation." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 42: 791-810.

# William Howell. 2011. "Presidential Power in War," *Annual Review of Political Science*. 14: 89-105.

### **Week 5 (Feb 8): Congress and Foreign Policy**

• Frédéric Gagnon. 2018. "The Most Dynamic Club: Vandenberg, Fulbright, Helms, and the Activism of the Chairman of the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 14(2): 191-211

• Jordan Tama. 2020. "Forcing the President's Hand: How the US Congress Shapes Foreign Policy through Sanctions Legislation," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 16(3): 397-416.

• Julian Zelizer. 2010. "Congress and the Politics of Troop Withdrawal." *Diplomatic History* 34: 529-541.

\*\*\* Svensen, E. P. (2019). Structured-Induced Deference or Equal and Coordinate Actor: Congressional Influence on American Foreign Policy. *American Politics Research*, 47(1), 88-118.

\*\*\* Robert David Johnson. 2003. "The Unexpected Consequences of Congressional Reform: The Clark and Tunney Amendments and U.S. Policy toward Angola," *Diplomatic History* 27: 215-243.

# William Howell and Douglas Kriner. 2009. "Congress, the President, and the Iraq War's Domestic Political Front." In L. Dodd and B. Oppenheimer, *Congress Reconsidered*, Vol. 9. Congressional Quarterly Press.

### **Week 6 (Feb 15): Ideology, Party Parties, and Foreign Policy**

• Ken Schultz. 2017. "Perils of Polarization for US Foreign Policy." *Washington Quarterly* 40 (4): 7-28.

• Patrick Cronin and Benjamin O. Fordham. 1999. "Timeless Principles or Today's Fashion? Testing the Stability of the Linkage between Ideology and Foreign Policy in the Senate." *Journal of Politics* 61:967-998.

• Benjamin Fordham & Michael Flynn. 2022. "Everything Old Is New Again: The Persistence of Republican Opposition to Multilateralism in American Foreign Policy." *Studies in American Political Development*, 1-18. doi:10.1017/S0898588X22000165

\*\*\* Gyung-Ho Jeong and Paul Quirk. 2019. "Division at the Water's Edge: The Polarization of Foreign Policy," *American Politics Research*. 47(1): 58-87.

\*\*\* Benjamin Fordham. 2007. "The Evolution of Republican and Democratic Positions on Cold War Military Spending," *Social Science History* 31: 603-636.

# Peter Beinart. 2007. "When Politics No Longer Stops at the Water's Edge: Partisan Polarization and Foreign Policy," in Pietro S. Nivola ed. *Red and Blue Nation? Volume 2: Consequences and Correction of America's Polarized Politics*. (Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution Press)

### **Week 7 (Feb 22): Midterm Break – No Class**

### **Week 8 (Mar 1): Individual Meetings To Discuss Research Paper – No Class**

### **Week 9 (Mar 8): Domestic Interests and Foreign Policy**

• William Martin. 1999. "The Christian Right and American Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy* (Spring).

• Benjamin Fordham. 2019. "The Domestic Politics of World Power: Explaining Debates over the United States Battleship Fleet, 1890-91." *International Organization* 73(2): 435-468.

• Joseph A. Fry. 2012. "Place Matters: Domestic Regionalism and the Formation of American Foreign Policy," *Diplomatic History* 36: 451-482.

\*\*\* Helen Milner and Dustin H. Tingley. 2010. "The Political Economy of U.S. Foreign Aid: American Legislators and the Domestic Politics of Aid," *Economics & Politics* 22: 200-232

\*\*\* Trevor Rubenzer. 2011. "Campaign Contributions and U.S. Foreign Policy Outcomes: An Analysis of Cuban American Interests." *American Journal of Political Science* 55: 105-116.

\*\*\* Rosenson, B. A., Oldmixon, E. A. and Wald, K. D. 2009. "U.S. Senators' Support for Israel Examined Through Sponsorship/Cosponsorship Decisions, 1993–2002: The Influence of Elite and Constituent Factors." *Foreign Policy Analysis* 5: 73–91.

### **Week 10 (Mar 15): The Bureaucracy and Foreign Policy**

- Michael Desch, 2007, "Bush and the Generals," *Foreign Affairs* 86 May/June:97-108.
- Amy Zegart, 2005, "September 11 and the Adaptation Failure of U.S. Intelligence Agencies," *International Security*, 29: 78-111.
- Elizabeth Saunders. 2017. "No Substitute for Experience: Presidents, Advisers, and Information in Group Decision Making." *International Organization*, 71: 219-247.
- \*\*\* Amy Zegart. 1999. *Flawed by Design: The Evolution of the CIA, JCS, and NSC* (Stanford University Press). Chapters 1 and 2.
- # Lock Johnson. 2005. "Accountability and America's Secret Foreign Policy: Keeping a Legislative Eye on the Central Intelligence Agency," *Foreign Policy Analysis* 1: 99-120.

### **Week 11 (Mar 22): Trade Policy**

- Douglas A. Irwin, 2006, "Historical Aspects of U.S. Trade Policy," NBER Report. Available at: <http://www.nber.org/reporter/summer06/irwin.html>
- The Economist, "The Battle of Smoot-Hawley," December 20, 2008. Available at: <http://www.economist.com/node/12798595>
- Michael Bailey, Judith Goldstein, and Barry Weingast. 1997. "The Institutional Roots of American Trade Policy: Politics, Coalitions, and International Trade," *World Politics* 49: 309–38.
- \*\*\* Michael J. Hiscox. 2002. "Commerce, Coalitions, and Factor Mobility: Evidence from Congressional Votes on Trade Legislation." *American Political Science Review* 96:593-608.
- \*\*\* In Song Kim. 2017. "Political Cleavages within Industry: Firm-level Lobbying for Trade Liberalization." *American Political Science Review* 111: 1–20

### **Week 12 (Mar 29): Immigration Policy**

- Jens Hainmueller and Daniel J. Hopkins. 2014. "Public Attitudes Toward Immigration," *Annual Review of Political Science* 17: 225-249.
- Daniel Tichenor. 2016. "The Historical Presidency: Lyndon Johnson's Ambivalent Reform: The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 46: 691-705.
- Zoltan Hajnal and Michael Rivera. 2014. "Immigration, Latinos, and White Partisan Politics: The New Democratic Defection." *American Journal of Political Science* 58: 773–789.
- \*\*\* Gyung-Ho Jeong, Gary Miller, Camilla Schofield, and Itai Sened. 2011. "Cracks in the Opposition: Immigration as a Wedge Issue for the Reagan Coalition," *American Journal of Political Science* 55:511-525.
- \*\*\* Jungkun Seo. 2011. "Wedge-issue dynamics and party position shifts: Chinese exclusion debates in the post-Reconstruction US Congress, 1879-1882." *Party Politics* 17:823 – 847

### **Week 13 (Apr 5): Presentations I**

- Each student presenting this week should circulate his/her draft at least two days before class. This draft should include a thesis statement, supporting theory, and a brief description of the cases (10-15 pages).
- Each of the students presenting this week will assign one journal article related to its research project.
- Designated reviewers should write a critical but constructive review on the draft of a group assigned by the instructor.

### **Week 14 (April 12): Presentations II**