Course Description

The Asia-Pacific region is vitally important to America’s long-term prosperity and security. The world’s most dynamic economies, the largest U.S. export markets, and the largest U.S. trade deficits are in East Asia. Three times during the 20th Century the U.S. went to war in the region. In the post-Cold War era, the U.S. is widely viewed as an essential balancing force in East Asia and a guarantor of stability in a region where territorial disputes, nuclear proliferation, civil war, terrorism and other concerns warrant our attention.

There is a fundamental, even if artificial and unnecessary, divide between international relations scholars and practitioners. This is probably the case because “in theory, theory and practice are the same thing, but in practice they are not.” Therefore, academics are often uninterested in policy-relevant questions and research; policy-makers rarely take the time to examine complex theories of international relations before making decisions. One goal of this course is to bridge this scholar/practitioner gap. A good theoretical foundation will help practitioners formulate sound policy; careful analysis of real-world case studies will help academics refine theory. Hopefully, the gap between theory and practice will be narrowed. Therefore, this course is designed with three objectives in mind: to help advanced students develop problem solving and analytic skills necessary in making and managing foreign policy; to help students integrate knowledge of specific cases with general theoretical concepts; and to develop good writing skills.

A number of cases of American policy toward Asian countries will be carefully studied in order to identify generic problems in U.S. foreign policy analysis, formulation, and implementation. The cases illustrate chronic dilemmas inherent in U.S. foreign policy “engineering” and are intended to provide in depth examples of the types of problems confronted by policy makers.

Students are required to complete several shorter writing assignments that have specific objectives and write a major case study of a particular foreign policy decision.

Course Procedures

Especially prepared case studies will be used. Students are expected to carefully study the cases and be prepared to engage in an intensive discussion of the material. Consideration of the assigned cases will proceed along both realistic and theoretical lines. This course will be an intensive “active learning” experience—students will “digest” information about a particular case and then think through the rationale behind a particular policy. Each student has a responsibility to other members of the class to be prepared and participate in the analysis of the case. On occasion, students will be divided into teams and assigned a specific “role” to play. This will enhance understanding of the “politics” of foreign policy making.
Weekly Reading and Participation

- Students are required to complete the assigned reading before class and prepare to discuss the reading in the assigned textbook—Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory*
- Students are required to complete their study of each case before class and actively participate in discussions.
- Students are required to send me a weekly E-mail report assessing the case discussed in class and evaluating their own preparation on a scale from a low of 1 to a high of 5.

The “General Supplementary Reading” listed under each Issue Area and the “Supplementary Reading” listed under each topic is recommended background reading and will be useful in preparing written assignments. Students should do supplementary reading if they are unfamiliar with the background of a particular case, and use the supplementary reading in preparing written work.

Major Writing Assignments

Students are required to complete five major writing assignments: two 5 page memoranda (that cannot exceed five double-spaced pages using 1 inch margins and 12 font type); a 2-page proposal of your case that briefly characterizes the case’s contents and emphasizes the heuristic utility of the case; a 5-page theoretical analysis of your case that links the case study to the theoretical literature in the social sciences; and an 15-page case study. The guidelines for the memos and writing a case are given below.

Major Writing Assignment Due Dates

**Jan. 12**, Korean War memorandum; **Feb. 2**, Case proposal; **Feb. 23**, Theoretical Analysis; **March 9**, China Human Rights memorandum; **March 30**, Case Study first draft; **April 6**, Peer Review; **April 20**, Case Study Final Draft.

Grading

The course grade will be based 50 percent on your final paper, 25 percent on participation (both student and teacher assessment), and 25 percent on other written work. A weekly self-assessment of participation should be reported to the teacher and periodic class assessments will be made. The teacher will also assess student participation. Attendance is required and any absence will be counted against your grade. *Successful completion of this course (along with PlSc 200) with a final paper grade of C- or better fulfills the GE Advanced Writing requirements.*

**WRITING ASSIGNMENTS**

During the semester I require you to complete 5 major writing assignments, four of which I will grade, and your peer review that is not graded, but counts toward your grade. All writing assignments are included in your final grade calculation. Following is a short description of major writing assignment and the peer review. For the two memos and the capstone paper see “guidelines” below.
1. Korean War Options Memorandum The sudden outbreak of the Korean War caught the U.S. by surprise. President Truman requested many of his top advisors to prepare an Options Memo. What are the United States’ options? Your assignment is to “Think in Time” and write such a memo no longer than five pages. Forget how the war unfolded and turned out. Place yourself in the shoes of one of the president’s advisors. What do you believe are the president’s realistic options? (25 points—7%)

Following the “Guide for Writing Memoranda” complete parts 1-5. You should not write parts 6-7; I only want to know the “options,” not what your recommendation is.

2. Case Proposal An proposal is a concise description of the paper that you plan to write, with an appended bibliography. The proposal should make clear what the main issue in the case is, what are the key policy considerations, complicating factors, etc., and the case’s heuristic utility.

Knowing where you are going is very helpful in getting you there. Writing is much the same way. By writing an proposal before you write the case, you can establish a general overview of the case and narrow your focus. Attached to the proposal you must have a bibliography of sources that you will use (but of course more sources will be found as your research unfolds). Of course, the initial proposal may not be exactly the paper you write because after you have researched the case more fully, your ideas will change. But, by first doing some preliminary research and writing a proposal for your case, you will set a course that will eventually lead to a completed case study. (ungraded, but counts 2%)

3. Theoretical Analysis We use cases to illustrate or “test” theory. When writing your case, you should have a “theoretical framework” in mind. This will help you identify the key issues, policy questions, and guide the presentation of the “facts” as the case unfolds.

Start by spelling out a theory (a set of assumptions and propositions) that helps to explain and analyze the case you will write. Then, illustrate the theory by using it to briefly analyze a few key features of your case. Limit this theoretical analysis to five pages. (25 points—7%)

A good place to go to start identifying a theory is our text, Valerie M. Hudson, Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory, and also James E. Dougherty and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., eds. Contending Theories of International Relations.

4. China Human Rights Policy Memorandum The United States faces a policy dilemma regarding how best to promote human rights. The time is the present and the president wants a recommendation. What are the options? What option do you recommend, and why? Complete all seven steps of the “Guide to Writing Memoranda.” The crux of the memo is the “rationale” for your recommendation. You should be direct and persuasive. Remember you are trying to convince the president to adopt a policy about which you have strong convictions. (25 points—7%)

5. Peer Review of an assigned paper A careful reading and thoughtful one page written comments on another student’s draft. (ungraded, but counts 2%)

6. Final Capstone Paper is worth 200 point (50% of final grade).
Commenting on Maya Angelou’s poetry someone once said, “that is good reading!” She responded, “good reading is hard writing!” Writing well is not easy for most of us, but by being conscientious we can nurture “good writing” if we follow some basic principles. Good writing is not a “product,” it is a “process” that is painful for most people. However, if we follow some basic guidelines, we can ease the pain and learn to be better writers, and to enjoy it.

Suggested Writing Strategy

Following a four-stage process of Plan, Draft, Revise, and Edit will help you write better. Too often, students adopt a two-step process: draft and proofread (if they have time). On the other hand, good writers focus their energy on planning and revising, but go through the other steps of drafting and editing. You should begin with the end in mind. Such an approach will help you shift from a draft/proofread mode to a plan/revise mode.

Orientation and perspective are keys to good writing. Clearly identifying your orientation and perspective in the planning stage will help you think in an orderly way that will be reflected in your writing. I recommend you follow the SOAP formula: identify the Subject, the Occasion, the Audience, and determine the Purpose. This will set your rhetorical stance. Getting this right will make a big difference as you write, moving you from “writer-based writing” to “reader-based writing.”

Especially when writing memoranda, you must be direct and clearly express what you want the reader to KNOW, what you want the reader to THINK, and what you want the reader to DO. But, this is a good thing to keep in mind in most writing.

Students who are the best writers generally share some common traits. All of them “liked their topic,” relied heavily on peer critiques, revised their papers several times, and, let the paper “sit” for a significant period before revising each draft.

Style and Grammar

A well written thesis statement, or overview statement is probably the most common problem for students. A thesis, or overview statement, should show the central purpose of the essay and indicate the line of argument the writer will follow. Do not leave the reader to discover your argument as she reads through the entire essay.

Good grammar is a very important part of writing. Grammar and writing were a major focus of PLSc 200. This focus will continue during this course.

Good grammar helps establish a writer’s credibility. Poor grammar not only is distracting, but it reduces the writer’s credibility in the eyes of the reader. At the university level we assume that everybody has mastered the fundamentals of grammar. This is frequently not so. Often, if writers are conscientious about the most common problems, they can avoid errors. Following is a list of the twenty most common errors: missing comma after an introductory element; missing comma in a compound sentence; missing comma(s) with a nonrestrictive element; unnecessary comma(s) with a restrictive element; comma splice; missing comma in a series; vague pronoun reference; dangling or misplaced modifier; wrong word; wrong or missing verb ending; wrong or missing preposition; missing or misplaced possessive apostrophe (e.g.
its/it’s confusion); unnecessary shift in tense; wrong tense or verb form; lack of agreement between pronoun and antecedent; unnecessary shift in pronoun; sentence fragment; and fused sentence. Watch carefully for grammatical errors as you edit your work.

Punctuation is the single most important thing in making things easier to read. The correct punctuation helps the reader follow your argument and not have to go back and reread a sentence to find out what you mean. Correct use of commas is one of the most common problems. For example, can you make sense of the following sentence with misplaced commas? “The Panda, a large black and white mammal native to China, eats, shoots, and leaves.” (see Lynn Truss, *Eats, Shoots & Leaves: The Zero Tolerance Approach to Punctuation*) Following are six comma rules: put a comma before and, but, for, or, nor, yet, so, when they connect two independent clauses; put a comma between items in a series; put a comma after an introductory expression or afterthought that does not flow smoothly into the sentence; put commas around the name of a person spoken to; put commas around an interrupter, like however, moreover, etc.; put commas around nonessential material. The apostrophe is also a common problem. What do you make of this sentence? “Those things over there are my husbands.” (see Lynn Truss) Be careful to distinguish between the possessive “its” and the contraction “it’s”. I recommend two style guides: Lynn Quitman Troyka, *Handbook for Writers*, or *The Merriam-Webster Dictionary of English Usage*.

Finally, as you draft, revise, and edit your papers, keep the following advice in mind. Don Norton (BYU English faculty) recommends: “One should always choose the common, familiar word, unless the ‘big’ word clearly is more precise in meaning” because “the best writing is simple, concise, and direct.” Another writer argues that “clear simple writing is a reflection of depth of thought.” People expend mental energy reading things and you need to write to minimize their effort to understand or they will not read what you write. As you edit your drafts you may discover that some words or phrases you used do not really say anything and the meaning is unchanged by just deleting them.

Writing is important. One major objective of this course is to help students improve their writing. Your writing will make a difference in your grade for this course, but more important, it will affect your career after graduation more than you may now imagine.

(Little in this short essay on writing represents my original thinking. I am indebted to Gary Hatch, English Composition Coordinator, Deirdre Paulsen, Writing Fellows Director, and all of the participants in the summer 1997 Advanced Writing Seminar for faculty.)

**PREPARING WRITING ASSIGNMENTS**

1. Prepare writing assignments very carefully. This will require you to know the case well.

2. Follow the Guide to Writing Memoranda or the Guidelines for Case Writing.

3. Writing assignments are individual projects. You should not cooperate with other students while writing the assignment. However, you are encouraged to explore ideas and discuss your thoughts with others or your study group before writing your first draft. Seeking peer criticism of your work before you write the final draft is strongly recommended. Peer review of your capstone paper is required.

4. Computer or printer error is not an acceptable excuse for late or poorly presented work.
5. Essays are evaluated on the basis of both substance and style. (Should you grammar inhibits my ability to get what you are saying, you gotta pwablem!) Therefore, use good organization, clear and coherent sentences, and paragraphs, and follow the common canons of good grammar (complete sentences, agreement between subject and verb, appropriate use of commas, etc.). Always carefully proofread your work before handing it in; simply “spellchecking” is not the same as carefully proofreading.

GUIDE TO WRITING MEMORANDA

I. FORMAT

Usually options memoranda should include the following seven parts, in the order listed:

1. **Issue**: What is the policy question to be answered, and why must it be answered now? A few sentences will suffice.

2. **Background**: What is the setting for this issue? State the relevant facts of history necessary to understand the present milieu (but don’t write a long historical narrative).

3. **Objectives**: What are the objectives? Avoid enumeration of vague or tangential goals. This list should not be unwieldy. Usually some objectives will conflict with others.

4. **Analysis**: What is the nature of the problem? Go beyond the background facts to state and justify assumptions, and lay the analytical groundwork for delineation of the options and their pros and cons.

5. **Options**: What are the major alternatives for action? List the pros and cons of each?

6. **Recommendation**: Which option should be adopted? A short statement is adequate.

7. **Rationale**: Why this recommendation? Why do the pros outweigh the cons? This is the major section and should clearly justify the recommended option.

II. GUIDELINES

1. **Incentive**: Let the decisionmaker know why he should be concerned with this issue now. Why is it an important issue? Why can’t it wait?

2. **Assumptions**: Specify broad assumptions that frame and limit the memo. Why are some things in or out of the memo? (E.g., “Assuming Congress would not . . .”)

3. **Options**: Present a clear choice of options. Make sure all major options are considered. Omit options (1) that are irrelevant; (2) that are unrealistic; (3) that no reasonable policymaker would support; (4) that no reasonable policymaker would oppose. If necessary, justify why some options are not included, or not elaborated. The presentation of options should be pointed enough to confront the decisionmaker with the hard choices.
that the issue demands. Identify sub-options, if any. Make sure the decisionmaker can quickly observe how options differ from one another.

4. **Fallback**: Remember Murphy’s Law and prepare the decisionmaker for the worst. Identify the costs if a preferred option fails. What are the fallbacks? Beware of recommending an option that is most attractive, but that is probably infeasible or that carries a high risk of failure.

5. **The Big Picture**: How does this issue relate to other issues under consideration? Will the development of this issue and the consequences of action taken be importantly affected by developments on other fronts? Keep in mind the Big Picture to avoid getting bogged down in irrelevant or trivial details. Place the immediate issue in a longer-term timeframe.

6. **Brevity**: Be brief. Don’t tell the decisionmaker what he already knows. Don’t tell him everything you know about the issue. Put yourself in his place: what is the minimum amount of information he needs to decide? Avoid overly elaborate analysis and temptations to show off technical skill (use appendices if necessary).

7. **Bias**: You cannot avoid having a personal point of view, but you can avoid slanting the assumptions or options. Your expression of your preferences will be more credible if it is openly disclosed, and if you have fully and fairly presented alternative views. And remember your audience. Tell him what he needs to hear, but tailor it to his sensitivities.

Adopted from The Crisis Game Video Case, Study Guide (Harvard University, 1986).

**GUIDELINES FOR CASE WRITING**

Your case should provoke critical thinking, critical responses, and critical judgment. Drawing the reader into the “drama” of real-world foreign policy dilemmas and decisions can accomplish this. I have no formula of detailed and rigid rules that gives a failsafe guide to success. But, some general guidelines, if followed, will be helpful:

1. A compelling overview to “hook” the reader.

2. Sufficient background material to orient the reader to the policy issue considered.

3. Clear subsections with subheadings that identify major turning points.

**General principles of good case writing:**

1. Tell a compelling story that engages the reader in the policy dilemma: cost and benefits of a particular policy, contradictory preferences and priorities, tradeoffs, etc.

2. Have a clear idea of what the heuristic objectives of the case are: This is an example (or case) of. . . From this case we learn. . . Etc.

3. Highlight the ambiguities of the issue under consideration.
Specific techniques of good case writing:

1. Structure the case to provide a sequence of events that develops the story of a decisionmaking dilemma. Accomplish this using quotations and reflections of principal actors and articulating the tensions caused by policy options over which reasonable people can disagree.

2. Weave the narrative and analysis to bring the reader to a “decision-forcing” point.

3. Conclude by revealing how the policy makers came to terms with the dilemma—attempted to balance costs and benefits, made value judgments, and justified priorities. End with a sequel describing the consequences of the actions taken.

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE CAPSTONE SEMINAR PAPER

STANDARDS:

1. Title Page, Abstract, and Works Cited pages

2. Turabian (Chicago Manual of Style) style used:
   a. Quotations appropriately cited
   b. Arguments properly and correctly cited.

3. Subheadings used

4. Spelling and punctuation correct

5. Pages numbered

6. Paper is approximately 6-7,000 words.

SUBSTANTIVE REQUIREMENTS:

1. Well written paper that incorporates writing skills learned in PlSc 200 and in other courses over the years.

PREPARING FOR CASE DISCUSSIONS

We will be using case studies as the basis for class discussions. As noted in the syllabus, participation represents a significant portion of your final grade. The following guidelines and suggestions will help you achieve your best performance.

1. Read the assigned case meticulously.
   a) Skim the entire case without underlining or highlighting. You will become familiar with the basic structure of the case and where the main information is.
b) Make a brief outline. Who is involved in the case? What problems do they face? What is their situation?

c) What issues does the case raise?

d) Reread the case. Focus on the important information located while skimming. Highlight, underline, or make marginal notes to organize the details and record new thoughts or questions generated as you reread.

e) Reformulate the problem. What is the case really about? What issues are central to the problem? What conflicts between ideas, perspectives, or values are involved in deciding what action to take? Whose interests are really at stake? What are the alternatives?

2. Form a study group or participate in an on-line discussion to help you prepare for class discussions.

a) Experience and research both show that preparing cases alone is not as productive (nor as interesting) as doing it in groups. Not only do study groups help to improve your own skills, you also can learn from other students’ analysis and problem-solving styles.

b) Use the study group to present your analysis to others, to practice articulating your ideas, to get feedback on both the ideas and presentation, to compare different views, to refine and rethink positions, and to build confidence for making contributions to the case discussion with the whole class.

SUGGESTIONS FOR CLASS DISCUSSIONS
(Rules of Engagement)

1. If you are a quiet person, understand that good listening is as important as talking, but that contributing your ideas is critical to your learning as well as to that of your classmates. Take “freefall” risks by expressing your views without prejudging them. We want to hear what you have to say because you may have that golden perspective that helps break through confusion and ignorance.

2. If you are a talkative person, understand that active listening is as important as talking, and that rambling speeches, clever comments, and raw opinions can inhibit your learning and that of your classmates. In other words, stay in tune and think before you speak, but do speak!

3. Try to make comments that connect course material with knowledge you have acquired from other sources and that connect ideas from one case to another.

4. Understand that your right to an opinion does not include the right to have it taken seriously by others. Nor is having an opinion necessarily laudable. An opinion is only as good as the evidence and logic that it is based upon.

5. The fact that an “expert” says something does not necessarily make it true! Experts can and often do make mistakes and are subject to bias. They often disagree with other experts. All this is true of your professors and case authors as well.

6. Beware of the tendency to view questions in either-or/all-or-none terms. The world is a complex, messy place where absolute answers are hard to find, where gray is more common than black and white, and contradictory things are often in the same package.
7. Realize that when our emotions are aroused our brain wants to take orders from them. It is essential, therefore, to be willing to disconnect one’s brain from one’s gut and heart long enough to render due process to ideas, particularly those that are unpopular or personally distasteful. Try not to offend others intentionally, but (more importantly) do not take offence.

8. Value tentativeness. It is OK to admit that you are unsure. It is OK to change your mind. As in life, for many questions there are often no right answers. Credit is given for answers that demonstrate thoughtfulness, careful reading, originality, and good analysis.

9. Understand that learning through discussion a process that takes time. It is different for each of us just as writing skills are different for each of us, and it requires us to depend on others for ideas, not just on ourselves or on a teacher. Yet what you learn in this way you will remember far longer. Also, the interactive skills you learn in this process will be more valuable to you than the skills of memorization and passive listening which most of you have already mastered.

Source: Howard Gabennesch, “Creating Quality Class Discussion,” *The Teaching Professor* (November 1992):5-6 as adapted and extended by Vicky Golich, Department of Political Science, California State University, San Marcos and edited by Eric Hyer, Department of Political Science, Brigham Young University.

**GENERAL BACKGROUND READING**

If you feel you need to refresh your understanding of the political science literature on “politics of policy making,” the following books are recommended:

Graham T. Allison, *The Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.*

I.M. Destler, Leslie H. Gelb, and Anthony Lake, *Our Own Worst Enemy: The Unmaking of American Foreign Policy.*

Morten H. Halperin, *Bureaucratic Politics and Foreign Policy.*


If you feel you need a review of the history of international relations in East Asia or U.S. foreign policy, the following books are recommended:


John Lewis Gaddis, *We Know Now: Rethinking Cold War History*, ch.3.

Gerald L. Houseman, *America and the Pacific Rim: Coming to Terms with New Realities.*


Roger C. Thompson, *The Pacific Basin since 1945.*

THEORY READING

Specific chapters from Valerie M. Hudson, *Foreign Policy Analysis: Classic and Contemporary Theory* will be assigned most every week and class will begin with a discussion of the assigned reading before considering the assigned case for that particular class period.

**Reading Schedule:**

January 5, Hudson, Ch. 1; “Foreign Policy Engineersing” (Course Materials)

January 12, Hudson, Ch. 2

February 2, Hudson, Ch. 7

February 9, Hudson, Ch. 6

February 16, Hudson, Ch. 8

February 23, Hudson, Ch. 3

March 2, Hudson, Ch. 5

March 9, Hudson, Ch. 4
CASE DISCUSSION SCHEDULE

I. Security Policy

General Supplementary Reading:
Dean Acheson, Present at the Creation: My Years in the State Department.
Douglas Brinkley, Dean Acheson: the Cold War Years: 1953-71.
John Lewis Gaddis, Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of Postwar
American National Security.
Young Whan Kihl and Lawrence E. Grinter, eds., Security, Strategy, and Policy
Responses in the Pacific Basin.
Richard Leaver and James L. Richardson, Charting the Post-Cold War Order.
Michael Mendelbaum, ed. The Strategic Quadrangle: Japan, China, Russia, and the
United States in East Asia.
Robert S. Ross, ed., China, the United States, and the Soviet Union: Tripolarity and
Policy Making in the Cold War.

January 5  Course Introduction and Writing Across the Curriculum, Read George Orwell
(Course Materials)

January 12/19 The U.S. Involvement in the Korean Conflict.
Due January 12  Memorandum on U.S. Options in the Korean War (only parts 1-5).

Case Reading: 1/12 “Korea and the Thirties,” and 1/19 “Korean War Aims” (Kennedy
Cases); and assigned Theory Reading (see above)

Supplementary Reading:
Dean Acheson, The Korean War.
Doug Bandow, Ted Carpenter, eds. The U.S.-South Korean Alliance: Time for Change.
Qingzhao Hua, From Yalta to Panmunjom: Truman’s Diplomacy and the Four Powers,
1945-1953.
David McCullough, Truman, pp. 773-808.
Glenn Paige, The Korean Decision.

January 26/February 2 U.S. Involvement in the Vietnam Conflict
Due February 2  Case Proposal

Case Reading: 1/26 “Americanization of the Vietnam War” (Kennedy Case) and 2/2
“Nixon Administration and Vietnam: A Case Study in Negotiation and War Termination”
(Pew Case)
Supplementary Reading:
Douglas Allen and Ngo Vinh Long, eds., Coming To Terms: Indochina, the United States, and the War.
George Ball, The Past Has Another Pattern.
Larry Berman, Planning a Tragedy.
Chen Min, The Strategic Triangle and Regional Conflict: Lessons from the Indochina Wars.
Clark Clifford, Council to the President, Ch. 24-25.
Henry Kissinger, White House Years, Chs. 8 and 12.
Fredrik Logevall, Choosing War.
Fredrik Logevall, The Origins of the Vietnam War (Concise history of pre-1965 war)
David G. Marr, Vietnam 1945: The Quest for Power.
Robert S. McNamara, Argument Without End: In Search of Answers to the Vietnam Tragedy.

February 9/16 U.S.-China Rapprochement.

Case Reading: “The Negotiations to Normalize U.S.-China Relations” (Pew Case)

Supplementary Reading:
Tony Armstrong, Breaking the Ice: Rapprochement Between East and West Germany, the United States and China, and Israel and Egypt.
Harry Harding, A Fragile Relationship: The United States and China since 1972.
Robert G. Sutter, China-Watch: Sino-American Reconciliation.
Robert G. Sutter, U.S. Policy Toward China: The Role of Interest Groups.
John W. Garver, China’s Decision for Rapprochement with the United States.
Parris H. Chang and Martin Lasater, eds., If China Crosses the Taiwan Strait: The International Response.

February 23 U.S.-Japan Security Cooperation.
Due February 23 Theoretical Analysis

Case Reading: “U.S.-Japan FSX Fighter Agreement” (Pew Case).

Supplementary Reading:
Michael Blaker, Paul Giarra, and Ezra Vogel, Case Studies in Japanese Negotiating Behavior, Ch. 4 (FSX case study).
Gerald Curtis, ed., Japan’s Foreign Policy After the Cold War.
Francis Fukuyama and Kongdan Oh, The U.S.-Japan Security Relationship After the Cold War.

Donald M. Snow and Eugene Brown, *Puzzle Palaces and Foggy Bottom,* Ch. 8 (FSX case study).


Mark Lorell, *Rising Sun Fighter: Japan, America, and the Struggle over FSX.*

**II. Economic Policy**

*General Supplementary Reading:*


Eric Jones, Lionel Frost, and Colin White, *Coming Full Circle: An Economic History of the Pacific Rim.*

James W. Morley, ed., *Driven by Growth: Political Change in the Asia-Pacific Region.*


**March 2** “Managing” U.S.-Japanese Trade.

**Case Reading:** “The Reagan Administration, the Auto Producers, and the 1981 Agreement with Japan” (Pew Case).

*Supplementary Reading:*

Dennis J. Encarnation, *Rivals Beyond Trade: American versus Japan in Global Competition.*


**III. Promoting “American” Values**

*General Supplementary Reading:*


David L. Cingranelli, *Ethics, American Foreign Policy, and the Third World.*

Miroslav Nincic, *Democracy and Foreign Policy: The Fallacy of Political Realism.*
William Korey, *The Promises We Keep: Human Rights, the Helsinki Process and American Foreign Policy.*
Sara Steinmetz, *Democratic Transition and Human Rights: Perspectives on U.S. Foreign Policy.*
R.J. Vincent, *Foreign Policy and Human Rights: Issues and Responses.*

**March 9** Sanctions against China following the Tiananmen Square Massacre, 1989.

**Due March 9** Memorandum on U.S.-China Human Rights policy.

**Case Reading:** “Values versus Interests: The United States’ Response to the Tiananmen Massacre” (Pew Case)

**Supplementary Reading:**


James R. Lilly and Wendell L. Willkie II, eds. *Beyond MFN: Trade with China and American Interests.*

**March 16 and 23** I will schedule individual consultations with each student.

**March 30/April 6 & 13** Case Presentations; **Due March 30** Case Study draft; **Due April 6** Peer Review; **Due April 20** Case Study Final Draft.