

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 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 policy making 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. try to stop WMD proliferation? If so, how?

- i. What threat would a nuclear Iran or even-more-nuclear North Korea pose? 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?
 - ii. 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--trade agreements or security guarantees?
 - e. Or is war necessary? (Or might even war be futile?)

Regarding Iran, the George W. Bush administration put all its chips on regime change. This didn't work. Obama has tried to cut a deal with Iran. This hasn't worked either. What to do??
 - iii. Will removing Iranian or North Korean WMD by force deter or dissuade proliferation by other WMD-seekers? Or might it frighten these WMD seekers to seek WMD more actively?
 - iv. Are N. Korea or Iran the greatest threat? We should set priorities among threats and deal most urgently with the worst.
 - What about Russian loose nukes and biological weapons? Or poorly secured nuclear material at research reactors? Al-Qaeda or other terrorists may get their WMD from Russia or research reactors! Let's finish securing this stuff!
 - What about unstable Pakistan? Al-Qaeda uses Pakistan as a haven, and the Afghan Taliban uses Pakistan as a base for its rampaging in Afghanistan. Some in the Pakistan military are religious extremists. And **Pakistan has 40-60 nuclear weapons**. So terrorists might gain WMD there too. So let's stabilize it! But how??? Serious thought is needed. Some analysts think **Pakistan is the most dangerous place in the world**. But the U.S. has no plan to address it.

A possible answer: we must address all three problems urgently.
 - v. At what cost could such wars be won? And could the U.S. manage the occupations of N. Korea or Iran?
 - vi. Is arms control an answer to nuclear proliferation? Is U.S. nuclear restraint or disarmament an answer? (Perkovich).
 - vii. 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. How large is the WMD terror threat? How should it be addressed? The big current question: will a large US military counterinsurgency effort to defeat the Afghan Taliban help or hurt US efforts to defeat al-Qaeda? Obama has decided to send a large force to fight the Afghan Taliban, Let's hope he's right!
- C. Peacemaking.
- 1. 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?

Polls show that a plurality of both the Israeli and Palestinian publics favor a similar two-state solution. Its terms are well known after years of negotiations. They are: Israeli withdrawal to the 1967 borders (with minor changes) in exchange for full peace. These terms were framed in the 2000 Clinton Plan, the 2002 and 2007 Saudi peace plans, 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. Palestinian President Abu Mazen declares his desire to negotiate a settlement. The radical Palestinian Hamas group opposes peace but has lost popularity and perhaps can be dealt with. 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?

2. The India-Pakistan conflict. This conflict is fuelling Islamic terrorism, radicalism in Pakistan, and Pakistani support for the Taliban insurgency in Afghanistan. Is it time for the U.S. to push for a peace settlement? Could the U.S. achieve one?
- D. 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'." Osama bin Laden wants such a war of civilizations. But will it happen? What U.S. policies could best avert it?
 - a. 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?
 - b. How can Americans prevent themselves from unwittingly spiralling into conflict with Islam? Robert Jervis warns that states tend to underestimate their own role in provoking others hostility. Surely Americans, like others, are prone to this error. Does this make the U.S. ripe for a conflict spiral with Islam? Could the U.S. be led or baited into such a spiral? Warning: Osama Bin Laden wants one!

The central problem in the war against Al Qaeda: how to destroy Al Qaeda without, by one's means of warfare, provoking a wider Islamic war against the U.S.

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. Re: U.S. and China: could Taiwan suck the U.S. into war with the mainland? And compare this possibility 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 such as Richard Perle and John Bolton 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.?
 - E. The struggle to save the global commons, especially the environment. Unchecked climate change could do great economic damage and displace scores or hundreds of millions of people. See Klinkenborg and Browne (assigned). Can we solve this problem?

Climate change can probably be halted by phasing in a steep global carbon tax. Such a tax would spark the creation of vast new clean energy technologies that are unimagined today. These technologies would push carbon-based energy products out of the marketplace. This solution would cost rather little--far less than 1 percent of gross world product per year. Ominously, however, five imposing problems make it unlikely that we will halt climate change.

 - (1) The individual pursuit of self-interest makes the problem worse, not better. The environment is a "commons" or "collective good," so individuals are rewarded by taking actions that harm it--although the group as a whole is injured. **Market forces therefore cannot solve this problem.**
 - (2) Global warming pits a concentrated special interest--the oil and coal industries--against the general global public interest, which is harmed by warming. Special interests almost always defeat the general interest because they are better organized. So Exxon Mobil, which opposes action against climate change, has more influence than the broad public.
 - (3) Western moral and religious traditions (unlike others, e.g. the Iroquois¹) give short shrift to the rights of future generations. Instead our ethics assume that each generation must solve its own

¹ The Great Law of the Iroquois Confederacy required that: "In our every deliberation, we must consider the impact of our decisions on the next seven generations."

problems. Hence we see little duty to sacrifice to preserve the world for future generations. Watch out grandchildren! We live for ourselves, not for you!

(4) Americans widely resist spending money to solve problems that are not yet manifest. We act only after we begin feeling the pain. Problem: sometimes the pain is delayed. By the time we hurt it is too late. The cigarette smoker that finds she gave herself cancer cannot undo the damage by quitting smoking. Likewise, the human race may unleash irreversible climatic calamity before the first signs of that calamity become clear.

(5) Solutions to global warming require international cooperation. The world's major states must jointly agree to implement a carbon tax. But governments are bad at cooperation, and bad at solving problems that require cooperation with others.

- Bottom line: global warming has a clear solution but the human race is probably incapable of implementing that solution. Oh dear!
- F. 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.)
- G. Some Bush 43 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.
 - a. Regime change by means short of force (e.g., economic strangulation or subversion) is feasible.
 - b. Regime change by confrontational means (e.g., economic strangulation or subversion) works better than regime change by engagement--cultural and political exchanges designed to sow subversive ideas in opposing elites.
 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.
- H. What ideas shape Obama administration policies? Obama's ideas and grand strategy remain ill-defined. The Obama team seems to be drawn to a concert strategy, under which the U.S. would lead in forming a broad coalition of all major powers to combat WMD terror and climate change. But they have left their strategy essentially undefined so far.

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

17.40 American Foreign Policy: Past, Present, Future
Fall 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.