I. NATIONAL SECURITY GRAND STRATEGIES, COLD WAR ERA (1947-1989)
A. The "Whether to Contain" Debate: Isolation vs. Containment vs. Rollback (1947-1964). The debate turned on four questions:
1. How "cumulative" are industrial resources? (Can a conqueror convert them into military power, then use them to take more?)
   Isolationists: "resources are not cumulative--empires bleed their owners."
   Rollbackers: "resources are very cumulative--empires strengthen their owners."
2. How easy is conquest? (How easy for the USA to conquer the USSR? Vice versa?)
   Isolationists: "conquest is very hard"; Rollbackers: "conquest is easy."
3. How aggressive is the USSR? (Is war with the USSR inevitable?)
   Isolationists: "The Soviets are moderately aggressive, war is avoidable."
   Total Rollbackers: "The Soviets are very aggressive, war is inevitable."
4. Will offensive action against the USSR provoke it or calm it down?
   Rollbackers: "offensive policies will provoke Soviet retaliation and war."
   Partial Rollbackers: "offensive policies will scare the Soviets into a standdown."
B. The "How to Contain" Debate: Europe First ("Asialationist") vs. Global Intervention (1965-1991). Four key questions underlay this debate:
1. Size of Soviet threat to Third World: can the Soviets seize it?
   a. By direct military intervention?
   b. By victory of local Marxist proxies?
2. How "cumulative" are Third World resources? (Would a Soviet empire in the 3rd World tilt the global balance of power toward the USSR?)
   a. Value of 3rd world military bases?
   b. Does US economy depend on 3rd world raw materials?
   c. Domino theory--is it true?
   d. Credibility theory--are commitments interdependent?
   e. Does the nuclear revolution make conventional-era cumulativity arguments obsolete, by making conquest so hard that no Third World gains could position the USSR to conquer the USA?
3. Can US interventions against the 3rd world left succeed?
4. Would independent communist states threaten US security?

II. NATIONAL SECURITY GRAND STRATEGIES, POST-COLD WAR ERA (1989-)
A. Six post-Cold War U.S. grand strategies:
1. Isolation: the USA comes home. The game is over, we won, it's Miller time.
2. Neo-containment Type #1: the USA identifies & contains the new potential Eurasian hegemon (Russia? China? Germany?) The USA would contain the potential hegemon's imperial expansion, and might
also try to hamper its economic growth.

3. **Neo-containment Type #2**: the USA identifies & contains the world's most crazy or hostile states, e.g., by limiting their control of power-assets (weapons of mass destruction, oil resources) and lowering US dependence on their products (oil). Question: Should preventive war be among America's means of counterproliferation?

4. **Selective pacification**: USA prevents interstate conflict/war in industrial regions (Europe, E. Asia, Persian Gulf.) "War elsewhere hurts the USA, let's prevent it."

5. **Global pacification/New World Order**: the USA prevents interstate conflict/war everywhere. The US could do this:
   a. Unilaterally: the USA as global policeman; or
   b. Multilaterally: the USA acts with allies or in a collective security system.

6. **Global domestic reform**: the USA takes on the task of preventing civil war, protecting human rights, and spreading democracy and market economics around the world. In short, the USA tells the rest of humanity how to live. The rationale is partly security: "civil wars tend to spread to entangle us" and "democracies seldom fight other democracies, hence the US enjoys more peace in a democratic world." Example: Clinton policy of "engagement and enlargement" of the zone of democracy. (Questions: is democracy good for everyone? Can the US export it?)

B. **Sam Huntington, "Economic Primacy"**: "We must remain the #1 economy."
   Questions:
   1. What matters more: relative or absolute prosperity?
   2. How can relative prosperity be maximized? By hard-line (trade restrictions, subsidies to US industries, etc.) or soft-line foreign economic policies?

C. **Steven David, "The Third World Matters."** David argues:
   1. "The US must pacify the Third World--otherwise the USA will get caught in the crossfire of wars in the Third World." True?
   2. "The U.S. must contain the power of the Third World (prevent nuclear proliferation, reduce US dependence on oil from Third World.)" True?

III. SECONDARY INTERESTS & STRATEGIES (COLD WAR AND POST-COLD WAR ERAS)
   A. **Human rights**: Civil & Political rights vs. Economic, Social & Cultural rights.
   B. **Environmental interests**: preventing global warming, saving the ozone layer, and more.
   C. **Economic interests**: preserving access to raw materials? defending US overseas investments? promoting free trade/fair trade?
   D. **Defending America's cultural/historic kin**: Israelis, S. Koreans, Africans, Filipinos.
   E. **Miscellaneous**: controlling drugs, migrants, terrorists.
FOUR AMERICAN GRAND STRATEGIES (COLD WAR ERA)

I. ISOLATIONISM

II. CONTAINMENT

DEFENDING AGAINST WHO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Soviet Union</th>
<th>Soviet Union Plus</th>
<th>Other Leftists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas--esp.</td>
<td>W. Lippmann</td>
<td>JCS in 1940s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe &amp; Japan</td>
<td>G. Kennan</td>
<td>on Korea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Morgenthau</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Waltz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEFENDING WHAT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACES?</td>
<td>#3</td>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Kissinger?</td>
<td>NSC 68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entire World</td>
<td>(re. China)</td>
<td>Walt Rostow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Haig?</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(re. China)</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. ROLLBACK

PURPOSE OF ROLLBACK?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tactical--a threat to use to implement</th>
<th>Strategic--pursued as a worthwhile goal Containment in itself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partial--</td>
<td>#1</td>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Eastern Europe or Third World Only)</td>
<td>S. Huntington</td>
<td>D. Acheson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOPE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. AMERICAN DEFENSE PERIMETER/SPHERE OF INFLUENCE

Defense perimeter = Monroe Doctrine ("Europe must not colonize the Western hemisphere.")

Sphere of influence = Roosevelt Corollary ("To forestall European colonization, the US will intervene in the Western hemisphere.")