

PREDICTING THE FUTURE AND PRESCRIBING FOR THE FUTURE:
WHAT LOOMS AHEAD? WHAT POLICIES SHOULD THE U.S. ADOPT?

I. COURSE THEORIES: DID THEY PASS/FLUNK TESTS? WHAT DID THEY EXPLAIN?

Which theories survived confrontation with the evidence, and which did not? How much history do they explain? What evaluative conclusions follow from our answers? (E.g., did the U.S. overlook valid theories? Place false faith in false ones?)

A. Offense-defense (security dilemma) theory: US foreign policy as a test and a case to explain.

1. Variant #1 (Threat variant): the greater the security threat states face, the more aggressive they become.
2. Variant #2 (Opportunity variant): the more easily states can conquer, the more aggressive they become.

Does U.S. activism correlate with America's sense of insecurity? Of opportunity? Was American policy driven by the search for security (or exploitation of opportunity)? Were America's adversaries driven by security concerns, or tempted by opportunity? Was the U.S. in fact insecure? Was it sufficiently aware of others' security concerns and their likely reaction to a U.S. threat?

B. Alliance theories:

1. Balance of threat theory: can it explain the Cold War's structure? What policy implications follow?
2. Birds of a feather: did they fly together? How often did the common U.S. expectation that birds of a feather would fly together prove accurate?

C. Spiral model vs. Deterrence: which model explains more? (Does either explain much?) Possible spirals: the US vs. 3rd World; USSR vs. Western Europe. Possible deterrence failures: US vs. Iraq 1991.

D. Foreign Policy Elite theories: did elite values/personalities matter?

E. Marxist theories: do they explain anything? U.S. entry into WWI? Guatemala 1954?

II. EVALUATING US FOREIGN POLICIES

A. U.S. policies toward Europe, 1914-present.

1. Effects on Europe: did the U.S. help or do harm?
2. Effects on the U.S.: was European involvement a wasteful adventure or a wise investment?

B. U.S. policies toward the Third World, 1898-present.

1. Effects on Third World: was the U.S. an "evil empire" or white knight?
2. Effects on the U.S.: was Third World involvement a "bungle in the jungle" or a smart stratagem?

C. Overall quality of U.S. foreign policymaking process: how closely does it match the rational-legal scientific ideal? Is American foreign policy made by strategic wizards or by blundering bureaucrats and ignoramus voters?

III. PREDICTING THE FUTURE / PRESCRIBING FOR THE FUTURE

A. Are geopolitical threats gone forever? If they aren't, should the U.S. act to avert them?

1. The rise of China: should the U.S. try to hamper China's growth? Break China up? Help

China grow, on the theory that this will promote Chinese democracy? On what theoretical or moral assumptions does the issue rest?

2. The rise of other states: Japan; Russia; Germany. Should the U.S. try to stop their rise?
3. Should the U.S. fight to stop the rise of WMD proliferators--e.g., North Korea and Iran?

Key issues in the debate:

- i. What tactics are most likely to end the North Korean and Iranian nuclear programs?
 - a. Coercing them into dropping their nuclear programs by economic sanctions?
 - b. Preventing them from exporting their nuclear weapons by blockade?
 - c. Somehow overthrowing their regimes by economic pressure and/or covert action?
 - d. Weaning them from their nuclear programs by positive inducements?
 - e. Or is war necessary?

The Bush administration seems to be putting all its chips on regime change plus blockading the export of weapons. Let's hope this works!

- ii. If N. Korea and/or Iran seek nukes, what threat does this pose and what benefits would war to disarm them provide?
 - a. Will N. Korea or Iran hand WMD to terrorists?
 - b. Will N. Korea or Iran launch regional aggression under their nuclear umbrellas, believing it protects them from countermeasures?
 - c. Will removing their WMD by force deter or dissuade proliferation by other WMD-seekers? Or might it frighten these WMD seekers to seek WMD more actively?

- iii. Are N. Korea or Iran the greatest threat? We should set priorities among threats and deal most urgently with the worst.

--What about Al Qaeda? Specifically, will confrontation with N. Korea or Iran impede the war on Al Qaeda by consuming resources and national attention?

--What about Russian loose nukes and biological weapons? Russia is where terrorists will get their WMD! Bush isn't locking them down!

--What about unstable Pakistan? Terrorists may gain WMD there too. Let's stabilize it!

A possible answer: we must address all four problems urgently.

- iv. At what cost could such wars be won? And could the U.S. manage the occupations of N. Korea or Iran?
- v. Is arms control an answer to nuclear proliferation? Is U.S. nuclear restraint or disarmament an answer? (Perkovich).
- vi. How should the U.S. address the longer-term danger posed by emerging destructive technologies (biotechnology, nanotechnology) as described by Martin Rees, Our Final Hour. We need answers to this question!!

- B. Peacemaking: the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Could the U.S. impose peace on Israel and the Palestinians?

What if the U.S. endorsed a specific final status agreement and bribed/coerced both sides toward it with large carrots and sticks?

What if the U.S. moved more forcefully to stop the current violence, specifically by persuading the Europeans, Saudis and Egyptians to threaten to cut off aid to Arafat unless he took all measures against it? And by persuading Israel to reciprocate with more moderate policies if the violence ended?

Polls show that a plurality of both the Israeli and Palestinian publics favor a two-state solution. The terms of such a solution are well known, after years of negotiations, as

expressed in the 2000 Clinton Plan, the 2002 Abdullah Plan, the 2003 Geneva Accord and the 2003 Peoples' Voice (Ayalon-Nusseibeh) Plan. The major Arab states--most notably Egypt and Saudi Arabia--now want peace. The post-Arafat Palestinian leadership declares its desire to negotiate a settlement. If so why isn't peace now possible?

How much does the continuation of this conflict injure American standing in the Islamic world? How much does it impede the war on Al Qaeda?

- C. New Wars in Eurasia: Will they break out? Will we see a clash of civilizations? Of ethnic groups? Would such conflicts threaten the U.S.? Can/should the U.S. act to avert them? Is the U.S. wise enough to avert them or will U.S. interference only make things worse?
1. The West vs. Islam, along the lines of Samuel Huntington's "Civilizations will clash: it will be 'the West against the Rest'." This is what Osama bin Laden wants. But will it happen? What U.S. policies could best avert it? We know how to deflect states from aggression--we did it to Germany and Japan--but how can religions be deflected from aggressive or murderous programs or ideas?
An opposite view from Francis Fukuyama: "history is ending."
 - a. Fukuyama variant: "liberal ideas are causing a global democratic revolution. The democratic worldview is winning the war of ideas."
 - b. Robert Dahl/Seymour Martin Lipset variant: "economic growth is causing a global democratic revolution."Corollary: democracy ---> peace.
 2. Chas. Freeman's scenario for war between the U.S. and China: could Taiwan suck the U.S. into war with the mainland? And compare with Robert Kagan's scenario for war between the U.S. and China: could the U.S. appease its way into a war with the mainland?
 3. Other possible wars, in Eurasia (former Soviet Union or the Balkans) or elsewhere:
 - a. Does the U.S. have an interest in averting new Eurasian wars? Could such wars produce a new Eurasian hegemon? Could such wars spread to engulf the U.S.?
 - b. What about Africa? In the 1980s and 1990s the United States turned a blind eye toward the bloody rampages of Liberian dictators Samuel K. Doe and Charles Taylor. They then ignited vicious wars that spread to the wider West African region. See Howard French (assigned). Now there are fears that terrorists may find haven in the shattered societies of the region.
 - c. Can the U.S. prevent such wars? If so, how? What are the lessons of World Wars I and II? Do these lessons apply here?
 - Minority rights: can they be protected?
 - Partition of multiethnic states (e.g., Bosnia, Serbia, Iraq): should the US use this as a last resort when minority rights doesn't solve things?
 - Lies in textbooks: can they be removed? Would it matter if they were?
 4. Policy tactics and tools: Unilateralism, NMD.
 - a. Unilateral foreign policy tactics: are they effective?
 - i. Unilateralists argue: multilateralism lets misguided allies tie America's hands and impede needed U.S. action. They also argue that others will be inspired to follow if the U.S. boldly leads alone.
 - ii. Others reply: America's main interests--especially controlling the spread of WMD, defeating terror, and preserving the global environment--are shared by other major powers and are best protected by common action. So let's work with others! Moreover, U.S. unilateralism scares and offends others, perhaps spurring them to coalesce against the U.S.
 - b. NMD (national missile defense): Will a U.S. deployment of national missile defense win the U.S. friends by showing strength or provoke the world to coalesce

against the U.S.?

- D. The struggle to save the global commons. Is the growing threat to the global environment the real way that the world is shrinking? See Klinkenborg and Browne (assigned). Are we capable of solving such problems?
1. The "tragedy of the commons." Individual pursuit of self-interest won't preserve the environment. The environment is a "commons" or "collective good," so injuring it is in the individual interest of everyone--although this is not at all in their collective interest!
A danger: unchecked climate change could do great economic damage and displace scores or hundreds of millions of people. Those displaced will not have warm affections for the western industrial civilization that wrecked their communities. Will they turn to anti-western mega-terrorism?
The foreign policy problem: forging a broad international consensus on common action. Unilateral action will fail. Global warming will not be addressed except by common worldwide action.
 2. Inter-generational justice. Have we a broad human ethical system that requires each generation to treat later generations fairly and proscribes injuring later generations? If not can we hope that we will sacrifice to preserve the world for future generations?
Watch out grandchildren! We live for ourselves, not for you!
- E. Human rights: what about doing the right thing? "Those who really deserve praise are the people who, while human enough to enjoy power, nevertheless pay more attention to justice than they are compelled to do by their situation." (Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War, trans. Rex Warner [Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1972], p. 80.)
- F. Some Bush administration ideas and policies, for your evaluation:
1. Bandwagoning prevails over balancing in world affairs. Friends are better won by intimidation than by conciliation. Displays of American power and shows of American force will gather allies for America. (Evidence for the Bush view: The U.S. now has good relations with China, Russia, and India. They are not aligning against the U.S.)
 2. Unilateral U.S. action is more effective than multilateral action.
 3. Terrorism is chiefly a game among states. To defeat terror the U.S. should focus on coercing states that harbor terrorists into crushing these terrorists, because states can control their domestic non-state actors. The U.S. should not spend much energy chasing terrorists itself--it should make others do it.
 4. Nationalism is weak, can often be overridden by U.S. action.
 5. Nuclear proliferation is best defeated by ousting the regimes of proliferators, through preventive war or other means.
 6. Markets will solve global commons problems.
 7. The Arab-Israel conflict isn't fuelling Al Qaeda recruitment or helping Al Qaeda find haven; hence dampening or solving that conflict is not an urgent U.S. national security need.