

HERTOG POLITICAL STUDIES PROGRAM 2014 SUMMER FELLOWSHIP Washington, DC

Saturday, June 21, 2014

12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Arrival
------------------------	---------

Sunday, June 22, 2014

12:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Arrival
------------------------	---------

6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.	Arrival Reception and Dinner
-----------------------	------------------------------

WEEK 1 – MACHIAVELLI

Machiavelli is one of the most profound and challenging political thinkers. He cannot be understood merely by extracting generalizations. One has to take seriously his account of virtue and the low, but solid ground on which he recommends we construct our political regimes, and one must pay attention to particular characters, incidents, and key terms. The chronology (xxix–xxxi), index of proper names (pp. 145–151), and glossary (pp. 113–140) help one to do so. In particular, we explore the following themes and terms: founding, corruption, renewal, fortune vs. virtue, ordinary vs. extraordinary, appearance vs. truth, nature, necessity, acquisition, glory, and prudence. We read the entirety of *The Prince* along with excerpts from the *Discourses on Livy*.

Section 1 – Catherine Zuckert, professor, University of Notre Dame

Section 2 – Vickie Sullivan, professor, Tufts University

Section 3 – Alan Levine, professor, American University

Monday, June 23, 2014

8:00 a.m. – 8:45 a.m.	Group Breakfast
-----------------------	-----------------

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Introduction to *The Prince* and *Discourses on Livy***

- *The Prince*, Dedicatory Letter; Letter to Vettori, pp. 107–111
- *Discourses*, Dedicatory Letter; Book I: Preface

Questions:

1. What light do the dedicatory letter of *The Prince* and the dedicatory letter and the preface to Book I of the *Discourses* cast on the addressees and purposes of the two works?

2. Why does Machiavelli, according to the dedicatory letter of *The Prince* and the preface to Book I of the *Discourses*, acquire his political knowledge from both modern experience and ancient reading?
3. What light does the analogy to those who sketch landscapes in the dedicatory letter of *The Prince* cast on the distinction between the natures of princes and peoples and on Machiavelli's own status?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Hereditary and Mixed Principalities

- *The Prince*, Chs. 1–5
- *Discourses*, Book I, Chs. 16, 19, 20; Book II, Ch. 2, §§1, 3

Questions:

1. What is the underlying basis of the typology of states in *The Prince*, Chapter 1?
2. What light do *Discourses*, Book I, Chapters 19–20, cast on the issue of hereditary rule discussed in *The Prince*, Chapter 2, and the treatment of republics in Chapter 5?
3. What are the implications and the moral and political consequences of Machiavelli's assertion in *The Prince*, Chapter 3, that the desire to acquire is "a very natural and ordinary thing"?
4. Does Machiavelli stick to his announcement in *The Prince*, Chapter 2, that he will leave out reasoning on republics? Note the example he offers for wise princes to imitate in *The Prince*, Chapters 3–5.
5. What are the implications of the treatment of republics in *The Prince*, Chapter 5? Compare *Discourses*, Book I, Chapters 16 and 20, and Book II, Chapter 2.
6. Machiavelli uses the term "princes" in *Discourses* Book I, Chapter 20, for example, to include the leaders of a republic. What implications might this have for how to read *The Prince*?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

Tuesday, June 24, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. New Princes

- *The Prince*, Chs. 6–7
- *Discourses*, Book I, Chs. 9, 18, 25–26; Book III, Ch. 30, § 1
- *Discourses*, Book I, Chs. 9, 10 (§§ 1-3, 6), 18, 25–26, 37 (§ 2); Book III, Ch.30, § 1

Questions:

1. Why are founders the most important examples for Machiavelli? What can we learn from their examples that we might not learn otherwise?
2. How should we understand the treatment of Moses in *The Prince*, Chapter 6, and *Discourses*, Book III, Chapter 30, Section 1?
3. What is the point of the story of Remirro de Orco in *The Prince*, Chapter 7?

4. Is Cesare Borgia Machiavelli's model prince?
5. Do the distinctions between acquiring by one's own arms and virtue, and acquiring by the arms of others and fortune, hold up?
6. What sets Caesar and Romulus apart in Machiavelli's view?
7. What might Machiavelli mean when he says that Rome was never free after Caesar?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Criminal and Civil Principalities

- *The Prince*, Chs. 8–10
- *Discourses*, Book I, Ch. 27, 33, 46, 55 (§§ 4–5)

Questions:

1. Is crime compatible with virtue and glory?
2. Should a would-be prince in a republic seek to come to power with the support of the people or that of the great?
3. What is the ultimate distinction between the people and the great? Is it a difference of natures?
4. Why is the origin of tyranny so difficult to perceive?
5. How does Machiavelli propose overcoming corruption?

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Tour – U.S. Supreme Court

**3:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Speaker – U.S. Supreme Court
Justice Antonin Scalia, associate justice, U.S. Supreme Court**

Wednesday, June 25, 2014

**9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Ecclesiastical Principalities
and the Political Uses of Religion**

- *The Prince*, Ch. 11
- *Discourses*, Book I, Chs. 11–12, 14; Book II, Ch. 2, §§ 2, 5; Book III, Ch. 1, §§ 1–4

Questions:

1. How and why is Cesare Borgia's story told differently in *The Prince*, Chapters 6 and 11?
2. Is religion politically useful and even necessary, according to Machiavelli?
3. What for him are the politically relevant differences between the religious practices of ancient Rome and Christianity?

10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Arms and Politics; Morality and Politics

- *The Prince*, Chs. 12–15

- *Discourses*, Book I, Ch. 43

Questions:

1. How does the point of Machiavelli's story of David and Goliath differ from its point in the Bible?
2. Are war and arms all that matter and can laws be disregarded?
3. What is the role of writers, according to the end of *The Prince*, Chapter 14? How does this square with previous writers in Chapter 15?
4. What is Machiavelli's teaching about morality?
5. What is Machiavelli's teaching on "imaginary republics"? Who might he be implicitly attacking, and what are the revolutionary implications of this teaching?

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Speaker Harvey Mansfield , professor, Harvard University
------------------------------	--

Thursday, June 26, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Morality and Politics (continued)

- *The Prince*, Chs. 16–18
- *Discourses*, Book III, Chs. 40–42

Questions:

1. Does Machiavelli's teaching about morality serve only the prince or his subjects as well?
2. Does it matter what qualities a prince really has, or is appearance all that matters?
3. What are the similarities and differences, if any, between the teaching Machiavelli ascribes to the ancient writers in *The Prince*, Chapter 18, and his own teaching in that chapter?
4. How does the moral character of Machiavelli's advice to republics in *Discourses* Book III, Chapters 40–42, differ from that of his advice to princes in *The Prince*?

**10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Conspiracies, Soldiers, and Armed Subjects;
A Prince's Conduct, Ministers, and Advisers**

- *The Prince*, Chs. 19–23
- *Discourses*, Book II, Ch. 24, §§ 1–2; Book III, Ch. 35

Questions:

1. What is the point of the discussion of conspiracies in *The Prince*, Chapter 19?
2. What is the point of the discussion of the Roman emperors in *The Prince*, Chapter 19?
3. Do princes have to avoid being hated by the people?

4. What are the implications for the rule of princes of the advice in *The Prince*, Chapter 20, to arm their subjects and not build fortresses?
5. Does the end of Chapter 21 make Machiavelli a forerunner of modern liberalism?
6. How is it possible for a minister “never to think of himself but always of the prince,” given Machiavelli’s view of human nature?
7. What is the relation between the threefold typology of brains in *The Prince*, Chapter 22, and the distinctions between princes and peoples in the dedicatory letter and between the great and the people in Chapter 9?
8. What does Machiavelli’s discussion of advisers imply for his own role as a teacher or adviser of princes?

7:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m. Tour – National Monuments

Friday, June 27, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. Italy and Fortune

- *The Prince*, Chs. 24–26
- *Discourses*, Book II, Ch. 29; Book III, Chs. 9, 31

Questions:

1. What is Machiavelli’s teaching about virtue and fortune?
2. How should we understand the treatment of Moses in *The Prince*, Chapter 26?
3. Is the plea to liberate Italy in Chapter 26 the culmination or a contradiction of the overall argument of *The Prince*?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Machiavelli’s Constitution and Ours

- *Discourses*, Book I, Chs. 2–6, 30, 34–35, 58

Questions:

1. What kind of political order or constitution does Machiavelli favor? On what grounds does he favor it?
2. How does it compare to that of the United States?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

WEEK 2 – ARISTOTLE

Mindful of Machiavelli’s charge that “it is so far from how one lives to how one should live that he who lets go of what is done for what should be done learns his ruin rather than his preservation,” we turn to Aristotle, a teacher of what should be done. We focus especially on the relation between virtue and happiness and on the relation between virtue and politics. We devote most of the week to the *Nicomachean Ethics* and its study of the human good before following this study into the *Politics*, particularly its discussion

of the kind and quality of regimes.

Section 1 – Robert Bartlett, professor, Boston College

Section 2 – Mark Blitz, professor, Claremont McKenna University

Section 3 – Bryan Garsten, professor, Yale University

Monday, June 30, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *Nicomachean Ethics*

Ethics, Book I, Chs. 1–5, 7–9, 13

Questions:

1. The “Declaration of Independence” specifies the right to the pursuit, as distinguished from the attainment, of happiness. Aristotle in the opening chapters of the *Ethics* seems to go much further by suggesting that politics or “the political art” is intimately bound up with and may even secure “happiness,” understood as the superlative good that is the target of all our lesser strivings. What precisely is Aristotle’s argument concerning the relation of politics and happiness, and do you find it persuasive? Has it been superseded by modern liberal democracy, which seems to leave to each of us the right to pursue happiness as we think best?
2. Although we often use “happy” or “happiness” in very casual ways—“I’m not that happy with my sandwich”—Aristotle is at pains in Book 1 of the *Ethics* to flesh out our deepest hopes for happiness, together with the obstacles those hopes encounter. What is “happiness” according to Aristotle?
3. The distinction between means and ends seems to play an important role in Aristotle’s account of happiness. What exactly does Aristotle mean by an “end”?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

Tuesday, July 1, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *Nicomachean Ethics*

Ethics, Book II, Chs. 1, 5–7; Book III, Chs. 6–9; Book IV, Ch. 3

Questions:

1. Aristotle’s *Ethics* is probably best known for its doctrine of virtue as a “mean.” State clearly the principal features of that doctrine. Do you find it a helpful guide to correct action?
2. Only in the case of courage does Aristotle speak at length of the characteristics of soul that resemble it but in various ways fall short. Give a clear account of the crucial features of the real thing, while also supplying a guess at least as to why Aristotle spends so much time on the ersatz versions of it.

3. Do significant statesmen—say Washington or Churchill—exemplify the core of Aristotle’s discussion of greatness of soul? Or are there important differences?

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Speaker Vance Serchuk , adjunct senior fellow, Center for a New American Security
------------------------------	---

Wednesday, July 2, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *Nicomachean Ethics*

Ethics, Book V, Chs. 1–5, 10; Book X, Chs. 6–9

Questions:

1. How are reciprocity and equality related in Chapter 5 of Book V?
2. Why, according to Chapter 9 of Book X, are laws necessary?

Thursday, July 3, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *Politics*

Politics, Book I, Chs. 1–7; Book III, Chs. 6–13

Questions:

1. What is Aristotle’s final understanding of “natural” slavery? What relevance does his discussion of slavery have for the rest of his political thought?
2. What is the point of Aristotle’s discussion of flutes in Book III, Chapter 12?
3. What is the strongest part of the “oligarchic” claim to rule?

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	Speaker Amb. Anne Patterson , assistant secretary of state, U.S. Department of State
------------------------------	--

Friday, July 4, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *Politics*

Politics, Book IV; Book VII, Chs. 1–3

Questions:

1. If human beings are naturally political, why are there so many different kinds of political organization? Why don't humans fall naturally into one sort of society, as bees and other social animals seem to?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

WEEK 3 – AMERICAN POLITICS

In the third week of the program, we engage the ideas of modern liberal democracy, exploring how the American system has sought to balance the deepest themes of ancient political thought against the imperatives of individual freedom, security, and economic progress that are so central to modern liberal thought. We examine the relation of nature, reason, rights, and citizenship in forming the core of the American political ethos, and we assess the institutional designs of government shaped by the Founders. We inquire into the legacy of the Founding through the slavery crisis and the statecraft of Abraham Lincoln. Finally, we examine the underlying forces of a democratic society through a work that poses some of the most penetrating and troubling questions about the future of America, democracy, and civilization.

Section 1 – James Ceaser, professor, University of Virginia

Section 2 – Diana Schaub, professor, Loyola University Maryland

Section 3 – William Kristol, editor, *The Weekly Standard*

Monday, July 7, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Non-Liberal Republics or Democratic Systems**

- Plutarch, "Lycurgus," excerpts
- Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. 1, Part 1, Ch. 2, pp. 27–44
- Edmund Burke, selections from *Reflections on the Revolution in France* and *Letters on a Regicide Peace*
- *The Federalist*, Nos. 1, 14, 38, excerpts

Questions:

1. Would you like to live in Lycurgus's Sparta? In the colonial New England Puritan regime described by Tocqueville?
2. How do these systems differ from America's form of liberal democracy?
3. Alexander Hamilton asks in *Federalist* 1 whether it is possible to establish good government by "reflection and choice," or whether men are forever destined to depend for their political constitutions on "accident and force." Does Edmund Burke suggest that accident may be preferable to choice and that founding is something best to avoid?
4. In what way do America's founders believe that they made "improvements" on the ancient mode of "preparing and establishing regular plans of government" (*Federalist* 38)? Were Madison et al. seeking to replace Lycurgus as the greatest of founders?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Theoretical Underpinnings of the American Republic

- John Locke, *Second Treatise of Government*, excerpts
- United States Declaration of Independence
- Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Henry Lee, May 8, 1825, excerpt
- Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Major John Cartwright, June 5, 1824, excerpt
- Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Roger C. Weightman, June 24, 1826, excerpt

Questions:

1. John Locke was the most influential of the political theorists at the time of the American Revolution. How does he derive the ends and purposes of legitimate government? What does he mean by a state of nature and natural rights? When do men have the right to dissolve government?
2. The ultimate ground or foundation to which the Declaration appeals is stated to be the Laws of Nature and Nature's God. What were the possible alternative foundations, as mentioned in the letter to John Cartwright? What are the implications of making "nature" the main foundation?
3. What does the Declaration mean by a natural right to liberty? By the truth that "all men are created equal?"

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

2:30 p.m. – 5:30 p.m. Tour and Speaker Panel – House of Help/City of Hope
Shirley Holloway, founder, House of Help/City of Hope
Robert Woodson, president, Center for Neighborhood Enterprise
William Schambra, senior fellow, Hudson Institute

Tuesday, July 8, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. The Creation of the Constitution: The Debate over a Small versus a Large Republic; Federalists and Anti-Federalists; Some Structural Features of the New Government

- *The Federalist*, Nos. 10, 51
- Brutus, "Federal v. Consolidated Government," excerpt
- Centinel, "Number 1," excerpt
- *The Federalist*, No. 15, excerpts
- *The Federalist*, No. 23
- Herbert Storing, *What the Anti-Federalists Were For*, Ch. 3
- *The Federalist*, Nos. 47, 63, 70

Questions:

1. What type of citizen is necessary in the new republic? In what measure does the citizen need to possess virtue?

2. Why is the “extended republic” of the Constitution an innovation?
3. What were some of the main objections to the Constitution?
4. What were the Federalists’ chief arguments against the Articles of Confederation?
5. Why study the Anti-Federalists? Have the fears of the Anti-Federalists been borne out?
6. What are the purposes of the separation of powers? What particular qualities were sought from the senate and from the presidency?

Wednesday, July 9, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Constitutionalism**

- Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Major John Cartwright, June 5, 1824, excerpt
- Thomas Jefferson, Letter to James Madison, September 6, 1789, excerpt
- Thomas Jefferson, Letter to Samuel Kercheval, July 12, 1816, excerpt
- *The Federalist*, No. 49
- Constitution of the United States, Article V

Questions:

1. What is a written constitution? How did it revolutionize the relationship between government and the people? For good or for ill?
2. Is it a wise idea to “sunset” the Constitution every generation? What reasons does Jefferson give in favor of re-doing the Constitution every generation, and why does Madison oppose the plan? Whose position do you favor?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **The Slavery Crisis of the 1850s; Lincoln’s Statesmanship**

- Abraham Lincoln, Address to the Young Men’s Lyceum of Springfield, Illinois, January 27, 1838, excerpts
- Stephen Douglas, Lincoln-Douglas Debates, excerpts
- Abraham Lincoln, Lincoln-Douglas Debates, excerpts
- Abraham Lincoln, Speech on the Dred Scott Decision, June 26, 1857, excerpt
- Abraham Lincoln, Speech at Chicago, Illinois, July 10, 1858, excerpt
- Alexander Stephens, “Corner Stone” Speech, March 21, 1861, excerpt

Questions:

1. What are the direct and indirect consequences of mob rule, and how are they related to “the perpetuation of our political institutions”? According to Lincoln, who has the harder task in perpetuating the institutions—the revolutionary generation or the current generation?
2. What were the different positions of Lincoln and Douglas on the crisis of the 1850s? Does Lincoln’s claim that the meaning of the Declaration of Independence was at the center of the crisis make sense?
3. What were the different views of Lincoln and Douglas on the Declaration of Independence?

6:00 p.m. – 8:30 p.m. Dinner and Speaker
GEN Michael Hayden, former director, Central Intelligence Agency

8:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. Alumni Reception

Thursday, July 10, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Lincoln as President**

- Abraham Lincoln
 - Message to Congress, July 4, 1861, excerpt
 - Letter to Henry L. Pierce & Others, April 6, 1859
 - Letter to Horace Greeley, August 22, 1862
 - Final Emancipation Proclamation, January 1, 1863
 - Gettysburg Address, November 19, 1863
 - Second Inaugural Address, March 4, 1865
 - Letter to Governor Michael Hahn, March 13, 1864

Questions:

1. According to Lincoln, why is secession unconstitutional? Why is the suspension of habeas corpus constitutional?
2. How does Lincoln understand the relation between Union and Emancipation?
3. Before his election, Lincoln often stated that he had no intention, and no constitutional authority, to interfere with slavery in the states where it existed. How, then, did he come to issue the Emancipation Proclamation and how did he justify it?
4. How does Lincoln understand equality and freedom, the key terms of the American creed? Is there a difference between holding equality as a “self-evident truth” and regarding it as a “proposition” to which we must be dedicated? What is the “new birth of freedom” and how does it relate to the original birth of the nation “conceived in liberty”?
5. Does the Second Inaugural read as a speech that you would have expected from the Abraham Lincoln of the 1850s? What “new” themes are found? What is Lincoln’s theology? What is the role of charity in political life?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Tocqueville, *Democracy in America***

- Tocqueville’s Introduction, pp. 3–8, stop at the end of the first paragraph with “it can bestow”; pp.12–15, beginning with the final paragraph on p.12 (“Therefore it is not only to satisfy...”).
- The character of aristocracy, pp. 535–39, 234–35 (begin with “What do you ask of society”)
- The varieties of regimes under the modern condition of “democracy”
 - Mild despotism, pp. 661–65, 671 (begin with “I shall finish”), 676
 - Omnipotence (or tyranny) of the majority, pp. 235–50
 - Single-person (or party) despotism, pp. 52–53
 - Liberal democracy (no further reading)

Questions:

1. How does Tocqueville use the word “democracy”? Be careful; it has a slightly different meaning than our normal use today.
2. What are the purposes of “political science”? (p.7) What work is it supposed to do in the modern era?
3. What does Tocqueville mean by “aristocracy”? Is it just an inequality in wealth or income? How do aristocrats think and feel, and what do they value? Which “regime”—aristocracy or democracy—is preferable? Why?
4. What characterizes each type or kind of rule under the modern condition of democracy?

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Speaker John Walters , former director, Office of National Drug Control Policy

Friday, July 11, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Tocqueville, *Democracy in America***

- Four maladies or dangerous tendencies of democracy and some antidotes
 - Egalitarianism (love of equality), pp. 479–82
 - “Individualism” (better defined as “privatism” or apathy), pp. 482–84, 486 (begin near bottom with “The Americans have combated individualism”), 492, 496–500
 - Materialism, pp. 506–8, 517–24
 - Fatalism, pp. 469–72, 425–26

Questions:

1. Define each malady and how it threatens liberty.
2. If these tendencies are as powerful as they sometimes seem, are the antidotes Tocqueville identifies strong enough to counteract them?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Tocqueville, *Democracy in America***

- The effects of democracy on sentiments and manners, pp. 399–400, 500–503, 506–8, 510–14, 517–24
- The effects of democracy on the family and women, pp. 563–67 and 573–76
- The effects of democracy on thought (“intellectual movement”), pp. 403–10, 417–24, 425–28, 450–52

Questions:

1. What is the doctrine of self-interest rightly understood? What are its strengths? Its limitations?
2. What does Tocqueville mean by greatness?

3. Tocqueville compares a radically individualist (or androgynous) conception of sexual equality with what he believes is a better understanding the Americans have. What are the elements of the American understanding of relations between the sexes? What does Tocqueville mean when he speaks of “the superiority of [America's] women”? Has the ideal that he describes and endorses been refuted or decisively overturned by contemporary feminism or can one still make a case for the desirability or possibility of sexual difference as the foundation of family and community?
4. How far is it possible to explain or deduce thought and ideas from the social state of equality? What are the limitations of this approach, sometimes called “the sociology of knowledge”?
5. *Democracy in America* continually compares democracy and aristocracy. Is there anything we learn about aristocracy that is helpful for guiding life in a democratic age? In what way(s), if any, can aspects of aristocracy be “fit” into democracy?

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Speaker
William Galston, senior fellow, Brookings Institution

WEEK 4 – FOREIGN POLICY STUDIES

Drawing on three weeks of theoretical class work and the practical insights of our guest speakers, we turn to applying these ideas to policy making, beginning with foreign policy. One section examines the nature of world order and America's role in shaping it. A second section takes up US policy toward a rising China. A third section explores the challenge that the Iranian nuclear program poses to the United States. The week begins with a full-day “staff ride” excursion to the Gettysburg Battlefield.

Monday, July 14, 2014

7:30 a.m. – 9:00 p.m. Staff Ride – **Gettysburg Battlefield**
Thomas Donnelly, fellow, American Enterprise Institute
Gary Schmitt, fellow, American Enterprise Institute

- Michael Shaara, *The Killer Angels*, assigned excerpts
- Background information for assigned role

Questions:

1. What were the critical decisions your persona made before, during, and/or after the battle?
2. What factors and judgments led your persona to make the decisions he made?
3. Under the circumstances, did your persona make the right call?

Section 1 – World Order and American Foreign Policy
Robert Kagan, senior fellow, Brookings Institution

What shapes the relationships among nations? How has America influenced the

international order? Is American power and influence growing or declining? This seminar will address the nature of the world order and America's role in shaping it.

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

9:15 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Group Breakfast

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Speaker
LTG Frederick Hodges, commanding general, NATO Allied Land Command

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. What Is World Order and Why Does It Matter?

- Robert Gilpin, *War and Change in World Politics*, Chs. 1–3, 5
- G. John Ikenberry, *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order After Major Wars*, Chs. 1–3

Questions:

1. Is there such a thing as “world order”? If so, what is it? If not, how should we think about the relations among states and people?
2. Is there a “world order” today? How should we characterize the present international situation?

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. America and the World, Past and Present

- Robert Kagan, *Dangerous Nation*, Chs. 2–4, 12
- Stephen Sestanovich, “American Maximalism,” *The National Interest* (Spring 2005)
- Melvyn P. Leffler, “The Emergence of an American Grand Strategy,” in *Cambridge History of the Cold War*, v. 1 (2010)

Questions:

1. Has the United States shaped or reshaped the international order over the past two centuries? And if so, how?
2. Is the United States a source of order or disorder?
3. Are American goals and ambitions in the world different today than in the past?

Thursday, July 17, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Great Powers and Ideology

- Azar Gat, “The Return of Authoritarian Great Powers,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2007)

- Daniel Deudney and G. John Ikenberry, “The Myth of the Autocratic Revival,” *Foreign Affairs* (January/February 2009)
- Ronald Inglehart and Christian Welzel, “How Development Leads to Democracy,” *Foreign Affairs* (March/April 2009)
- Azar Gat et al., “Which Way Is History Marching?,” *Foreign Affairs* (July/August 2009)
- Robert Kagan, “End of Dreams, Return of History,” *Policy Review* 144 (August/September 2007)

Questions:

1. Does ideology still matter in international affairs? Why or why not?
2. What is the relationship between ideology and world order?

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Speaker Charles Murray , author, <i>Coming Apart</i>
------------------------------	--

Friday, July 18, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **What Comes Next?**

- Robert Kagan, *The World America Made*
- G. John Ikenberry, “The Future of the Liberal World Order: Internationalism After America,” *Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2012)
- Charles A. Kupchan, *No One’s World: The West, the Rising Rest, and the Coming Global Turn*, Ch. 7
- Fareed Zakaria, “The Future of American Power,” *Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2008)

Questions:

1. What will the world order look like in 2030?
2. How should the United States attempt to shape the world order in the decades to come? Does it have the capacity to shape the world order?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.	Semiweekly Group Lunch
-------------------------------	------------------------

Section 2 – *Rising China and U.S. Foreign Policy*

Eric Brown, senior fellow, Hudson Institute

Our aim in this seminar will be to explore the future of rising China and alternative U.S. policy approaches for coping with it. A core focus of our discussion will be the domestic sources and drivers of China’s conduct. We will begin by considering the nature of the PRC-Leninist regime that has ruled China since 1949. We will then explore how Chinese nationalism and the PRC party-state’s search for “political security” in the post-Cold War era has shaped the PRC’s efforts to maintain its rule at home as well as its conduct abroad. On the basis of these discussions, we will then evaluate some U.S. policy approaches and requirements for coping with the rise of China and keeping the peace in Asia. On the final day, we will explore alternative U.S. long-range strategies for coping

with China's rise in the course of a crisis simulation.

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

9:15 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Group Breakfast

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Speaker
LTG Frederick Hodges, commanding general, NATO Allied Land Command

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. **Ruling China: The “Great Enterprise”
in the 21st-Century**

- Confucius, *Analects*, Book Thirteen
- Nathan Leites, *The Operational Code of the Politburo*, Ch.3, “Means and Ends”
- David Lampton, “How China is Ruled,” *Foreign Affairs* (January/February 2014)
- Timothy Beardson, *Stumbling Giant, the Threats to China’s Future*, Ch. 7, “Threats to Social Stability”
- Charles Horner and Eric Brown, “A Century After the Qing: Yesterday’s Empire and Today’s Republics,” *China Heritage Quarterly* (September 2011)
- Andrew J. Nathan and Andrew Scobell, “How China Sees America, the Sum of Beijing’s Fears,” *Foreign Affairs* (September/October 2012)
- General Office of the CCP, “Document No. 9: Communiqué on the Current State of the Ideological Sphere”

Questions:

1. What does Confucius mean by the “rectification of names,” and why is this so important to the conduct of a country’s political and strategic affairs?
2. In what ways are “China” and the “PRC” Leninist regime that rules China different, and in what ways are they one and the same?
3. How might domestic factors—including corruption, lack of the rule of law, demographic imbalances, and the booms and busts of economic dynamism—affect the future shape and orientation of the PRC’s rule?
4. What are the implications of “China’s” integration with the Asian liberal order for the “PRC”?

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **“Political Security” and Pathways of Ascent**

- Geremie Barme, “After the Future in China”
- Jacqueline Newmeyer Deal, “China’s Nationalist Heritage,” *The National Interest* (January/February 2013)
- Aaron Friedberg, *A Contest For Supremacy: China, America, and the Struggle For Mastery in Asia*, Ch. 6, “Hide Our Capabilities and Bide Our Time”
- William A. Callahan, “Chinese Visions of World Order: Post-Hegemonic or a New Hegemony?,” *International Studies Review* (2008)
- Liu Xiaobo, *No Enemies, No Hatred*, “Bellicose and Thuggish”

Questions:

1. What are the fears, interests and ambitions that motivate Chinese nationalism?
2. Does Chinese nationalism enhance the security of China and the PRC regime or does it undermine it?
3. What are the implications of Chinese nationalism and the Chinese search for alternative theories of world order for the PRC's relations with its neighbors and with the U.S.?

Thursday, July 17, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. The U.S. and the Asian Order

- John J. Mearsheimer, "Can China Rise Peacefully?"
- Ashley J. Tellis, "Balancing Without Containment: A U.S. Strategy for Confronting China's Rise," *The Washington Quarterly*, Fall 2013.
- John G. Ikenberry, "The Rise of China and the Future of the West: Can the Liberal System Survive?," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2008.
- Liu Xiaobo, *No Enemies, No Hatred*, "Behind the Rise of Great Powers"
- Cui Tiankai and Pang Hanzhao, "On China and U.S. Working Together to Build a New-Type Relationship between Major Countries," *China International Strategy Review*, 2012
- James T.H. Tang, "Northeast Asia Without the United States: Towards Pax Sinica?"

Questions:

1. What kind of "Risen China" does the U.S. want, and what is the U.S. willing to do to achieve this?
2. What instruments of national power does the U.S. have at its disposal to shape the course of China's rise? What new instruments might we need?
3. What are the implications of a weak, unstable, and potentially chaotic China for Asia and for the PRC's conduct in it?

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Speaker Charles Murray , author, <i>Coming Apart</i>

Friday, July 18, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Scenario Exercise

- Aaron Friedberg, *A Contest For Supremacy: China, America, and the Struggle For Mastery in Asia*, Ch. 10, "Alternative Strategies"

On this day we will explore alternative US long-range strategies for coping with the rise of China through a simulation of a protracted crisis in Asia.

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

Section 3 – *The Iran Dilemma*
Michael Doran, senior fellow, Brookings Institution

Nothing in American foreign policy is more controversial than how to deal with Iran's nuclear program. In November 2013, the debate entered a new phase with the signing of the interim deal between Iran and the so-called P5+1 (the United States, China, France, Russia and the United Kingdom). Supporters of the Obama administration depict the agreement as a major breakthrough, one that will possibly lead to an historic reconciliation between the United States and the Islamic Republic. Its detractors, however, see the deal as a capitulation that ultimately will leave the United States in a relatively weakened position.

One's attitude toward the agreement is colored by one's understanding, more generally, of the Iranian threat. One school of thought argues that the Islamic Republic is essentially a defensive power. Its days are numbered; in these, its twilight years, it can easily be contained. According to this school, if the United States and its ally, Israel, will simply avoid rash military action, then they will certainly prevail over Iran. Alternatively, a second school of thought sees Iran as an offensive power. It emphasizes Tehran's hegemonic ambitions, and argues that Iran is hell-bent on acquiring a nuclear weapon, and that it poses a serious danger to regional order, not to mention American primacy. Countries threatened by the Iranian nuclear program, so the thinking goes, will inevitably acquire their own arsenals, and the Persian Gulf, which contains two-thirds of global oil reserves, will become the focal point of a multi-sided nuclear stand-off.

After a brief survey of the historical background, this seminar will investigate the Iran debate in depth and will conclude, on the last day, with a war game.

Tuesday, July 15, 2014

9:15 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. Group Breakfast

10:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Speaker
LTG Frederick Hodges, commanding general, NATO Allied Land Command

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. **The 1953 Coup: An Historical Analogy**

- Michael Axworthy, *A History of Iran: Empire of the Mind*, Ch. 7
- James Risen, "Secrets of History: The C.I.A. in Iran," *New York Times*, April 16, 2000
- Daniel Yergin, *The Prize*, Ch. 23

Questions:

1. Was the United States wise to topple Prime Minister Mosaddeq?
2. What was the alternative?

3. What is the proper role of the United States in the Persian Gulf?

Essay Question 1:

Discuss: "Toppling Mosaddeq caused more problems than it solved."

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.	Semiweekly Group Lunch
------------------------	------------------------

Wednesday, July 16, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. The Dilemma Defined

- Michael Axworthy, *A History of Iran: Empire of the Mind*, Chs. 8–9, Epilogue
- James M. Lindsay and Ray Takeyh, "After Iran Gets the Bomb: Containment and Its Complications," *Foreign Affairs* (March/April 2010)
- Eric S. Edelman, Andrew F. Krepinevich, and Evan Braden Montgomery, "The Dangers of a Nuclear Iran," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 90, No. 1 (January/February 2011)
- Fred Wehrey et al., *The Iraq Effect: The Middle East After the Iraq War*, Ch. 2, "An Altered Strategic Landscape: The Shifting Regional Balance of Power"

Questions:

1. How would you distinguish the nature of the Iranian nuclear threat?
2. What distinguishes a national interest from a *vital* national interest?
3. Is Iran an implacable enemy of the United States?

Essay Question 2:

Evaluate: "There is no need for the United States to be inordinately concerned about the nuclear program of the Islamic Republic of Iran."

Thursday, July 17, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. The Nuclear Deal, For And Against

- Colin Kahl, "Still Not Time to Bomb Iran," *Foreign Affairs*, January 7, 2014
- Mark Landler, "Potent Pro-Israel Group Finds Its Momentum Blunted," *New York Times*, February 3, 2014
- Kenneth Katzman and Paul Kerr, "Interim Agreement on Iran's Nuclear Program," Congressional Research Service, December 11, 2013
- Michael Doran, "I Don't Bluff," *Mosaic Magazine*, February 6, 2013
- Mohammad Javad Zarif, "What Iran Really Wants," *Foreign Affairs* (May/June 2013)

Questions:

1. What is the purpose of Iran's nuclear program?

2. What is the best deal that the United States can realistically expect to get from Iran?

Essay Question 3:

Discuss: "A bad deal is better than no deal."

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Speaker
Charles Murray, author, *Coming Apart*

Friday, July 18, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Policy Exercise/Debate**

At the end of class on Thursday you will be presented with a scenario depicting the United States on the brink of war with Iran. The class will divide into two groups—hawks and doves. Both groups will be called upon to defend their positions before the President in a model National Security Council meeting on Friday.

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

WEEK 5 – DOMESTIC POLICY STUDIES

After exploring American interests abroad, we turn to the art of domestic policy making. One section examines the strengths and weaknesses of the US health care system, and the prospects of current and future reform. A second section examines the transformation of American government through deficits and regulation in recent decades, including the political roots of these changes and their effects in particular areas of policy and political debate. A final section develops an understanding of democratic capitalism and its application to economic policy.

Section 1 – Health Care Policy

James Capretta, senior fellow, Ethics and Public Policy Center

No issue has been more dominant in national politics since 2009 than health care. President Obama made reform of health care his top priority during his first year in office, and Congress passed a sweeping reform plan in March 2010. But the issue has not lost its resonance in the ensuing four years. If anything, our political discourse has grown even more contentious, and the debate is certain to continue for several more years.

This issue stirs deep passions in part because it is about more than technocratic health care policy. It's also about rights and responsibilities, the balance between governmental power and private action, and political power. How the issue is resolved could have important implications for the national economy, the federal budget, and our national political culture.

Monday, July 21, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **The State of U.S. Health Care**

- Uwe Reinhardt, "Reforming the Health Care System: The Universal Dilemma," *American Journal of Law & Medicine*, Vol. XIX, Nos. 1 & 2, 1993
- Atul Gawande, "The Cost Conundrum," *The New Yorker*, June 1, 2009
- James C. Capretta, "What's Ailing Health Care?," *The New Atlantis* (Spring 2007)

Questions:

1. Why has medicine become a political issue?
2. What are the main competing theories about why there are problems in U.S. health care? What are those problems?
3. Are these problems unique to the U.S. situation or universally shared across the developed world?
4. Do these competing diagnoses point in different directions in terms of public policy solutions?

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.	Semiweekly Group Lunch
------------------------	------------------------

2:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Tour – U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Permanent Exhibition
-----------------------	--

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.	Speaker Charles Krauthammer , syndicated columnist, <i>The Washington Post</i>
-------------------------	--

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. **The 2010 Reform Plan (PPACA) and Its Critics**

- Congressional Budget Office, Letter to House Speaker Nancy Pelosi on the PPACA, March 20, 2010
- Jonathan Gruber, "The Impacts of the Affordable Care Act: How Reasonable Are the Projections?," *National Bureau of Economic Research*, June 2011
- Brian Blase et al., *The Case Against Obamacare: A Health Care Policy Series for the 112th Congress*
- James C. Capretta, "The Fiscal Consequences of the New Health Care Law," Testimony Presented to the House Budget Committee, January 26, 2011

Questions:

1. What are the main features of the PPACA?
2. What are the main objections to the law? Are they valid?
3. Are the estimates for the PPACA believable? If not, why not?

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Cost Control and the Economics of Reform**

- Ezekiel Emmanuel et al., “A Systemic Approach to Containing Health Care Spending,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, August 1, 2012
- Joseph R. Antos et al., “Bending the Cost Curve through Market-Based Incentives,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, August 1, 2012
- James C. Capretta and Tom Miller, “The Defined Contribution Route to Health Care Choice and Competition,” American Enterprise Institute, December 7, 2010

Questions:

1. Do health care costs need to be controlled? Why, or why not?
2. Can the federal government control health costs? How? What are the pros and cons of turning cost control over to the federal government?
3. Is there any evidence that a market-based system would work? If it did, what are the pros and cons? Would there be equity concerns?

6:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. Dinner and Speaker Walter Reich , professor, George Washington University
--

Thursday, July 24, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **International Perspectives**

- Karen Davis, Cathy Schoen, and Kristof Stremikis, “Mirror, Mirror on the Wall: How the Performance of the U.S. Health System Compares Internationally,” The Commonwealth Fund, 2010
- Sally Pipes, Testimony on the Canadian Health Care System, Senate HELP Committee, March 11, 2014
- Christopher J. Conover, “Health Care Wasn’t Broken,” *Los Angeles Times*, March 15, 2012
- Christopher J. Conover, “Five Myths About American Health Care,” February 28, 2012

Questions:

1. Is the prevailing perception that U.S. health care is inferior on costs and quality accurate?
2. What explains the popularity of nationalized systems in most of the developed world?
3. Are the data for international comparisons useful? What other factors beyond health might explain these differences?

Friday, July 25, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Mend It, or End It (and Replace It)?

- Dan Diamond, “Five Things Obamacare Got Right—And What Experts Would Fix,” *California Healthline*, March 20, 2013
- Paul Ryan, “The Optimist’s Guide to Repeal and Replace: Patient-Centered Health-Care Reform for the 21st Century,” Speech at the Hoover Institution, September 27, 2011
- Douglas Holtz-Eakin and Avik Roy, “The Future of Free-Market Healthcare,” *Reuters*, February 20, 2013
- Douglas Holtz-Eakin and Avik Roy, “The Critics are Wrong About the Future of Free-Market Health Care Reform,” *Forbes*, February 22, 2013
- James C. Capretta and Robert Moffit, “How to Replace Obamacare,” *National Affairs* 11 (Spring 2012)
- James C. Capretta “What the Health Care Debate Is Really All About,” *Public Discourse*, January 19, 2010

Questions:

1. Is the PPACA here to stay?
2. Will it work, and how well? Will it cover most people? Control costs?
3. What is the likely scenario for changing or repealing it? What replacement plan is most likely, and would it meet the objectives of voters?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

Semiweekly Group Lunch

Section 2 – *The Transformation of American Government* **Christopher DeMuth**, distinguished fellow, Hudson Institute

Today’s front-burner domestic policy debates reflect three fundamental changes in American government that have been in train for several decades and have accelerated dramatically in recent years:

- The decline of Congress as a representative legislature, and the assumption of broad lawmaking powers by the Executive Branch (both the President and the numerous administrative and regulatory agencies) and Federal Reserve.
- Routine deficit spending and growing government debt, accompanied by government promotion of private borrowing for such things as home mortgages and college tuition.
- The shift of federal spending from traditional public goods (e.g., national defense, courts, and transportation infrastructure) to transfer payments to individuals (e.g., Social Security, Medicare, and other “entitlements,” and narrower programs from welfare to farm subsidies).

This course will examine the causes of these developments; their consequences for political debate, policymaking, and public welfare; and the prospects for institutional reform.

Monday, July 21, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Political Change and Legislative Decline

- James Q. Wilson, “American Politics: Then & Now,” *Commentary* (February 1979), reprinted in James Q. Wilson, *American Politics, Then & Now and Other Essays* (2010)
- James Q. Wilson, John J. Dilulio, Jr., and Meena Bose, *American Government: Institutions and Politics* (13th ed., 2013), Ch. 22, “Who Governs? To What Ends?”
- Thomas E. Mann and Norman J. Ornstein, *The Broken Branch: How Congress is Failing America and How to Get It Back on Track* (2008), Ch. 5, “Institutional Decline”

Questions:

1. How, according to our authors, has American politics changed during the past several decades? Do the authors give satisfactory accounts of the causes of those changes? Has politics become more or less “democratic”?
2. What have been the consequences of political change for the structure and output of government? Is “institutional decline” a congressional problem or a broader phenomenon?
3. Is the representative legislature obsolete? Might it be restored—and, if so, would that be desirable?

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

**2:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Tour – U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum
Permanent Exhibition**

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

**10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Speaker
Charles Krauthammer, syndicated columnist, *The Washington Post***

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. Executive Supremacy

- Eric A. Posner and Adrian Vermeule, *The Executive Unbound: After the Madisonian Republic*, Introduction and Ch. 1, “The Constitutional Framework”
- Christopher DeMuth, “Our Regulatory State,” (a version of this essay appeared under the title “The Regulatory State” in *National Affairs* 12, Summer 2012)
- Michael W. McConnell, “Obama Suspends the Law,” *Wall Street Journal*, July 9, 2013
- Tony Pugh, “So Many Changes to Health Care Law, but Are They Legal?,” *Sacramento Bee*, February 24, 2014
- Nicholas Bagley, “The Legality of Delaying Key Elements of the ACA,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, April 2, 2014

Questions:

1. Is “executive supremacy” a mirror image of “legislative decline,” or does it have independent sources?
2. What are the advantages and disadvantages of direct lawmaking by the President and executive agencies? Are these primarily legal, political, or economic?
3. Are the controversies over executive lawmaking likely to outlast the Obama administration and the debates over Obamacare implementation?

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Debt and Democracy

- John J. Dilulio, Jr., “Facing Up to Big Government,” *National Affairs* 11 (Spring 2012)
- Matt Phillips, “The Long Story of U.S. Debt, From 1790 to 2011, in 1 Little Chart,” *The Atlantic*, November 13, 2012
- George P. Shultz, et al., “The Magnitude of the Mess We’re In,” *Wall Street Journal*, September 16, 2012
- Christopher DeMuth, “Our Democratic Debt” (2014)
- John F. Cogan, “Federal Budget,” *The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics*, 1991
- Henry J. Aaron, “Where is the Urgency on the Debt Ceiling?” *Yahoo Finance*, January 9, 2013
- Adam Liptak, “Experts See Potential Ways Out for Obama in Debt Ceiling Maze,” *New York Times*, Oct. 3, 2013

Questions:

1. How has the nature of the debt problem changed over American history? Does “big government” require “big debt”? Is the debt a partisan issue where the interests of political liberals and conservatives conflict?
2. How is today’s high government debt related to the issues discussed in previous sessions—political change, legislative decline, and executive supremacy?
3. If the major entitlement programs such as Social Security and Medicare are running surpluses (with annual program revenues exceeding expenditures), how can they be said to be an important part of the debt problem?

6:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. Dinner and Speaker Walter Reich, professor, George Washington University
--

Thursday, July 24, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. The Growth of Transfer Government

- Nicholas Eberstadt, *A Nation of Takers: America’s Entitlement Epidemic*, with commentaries by William A. Galston and Yuval Levin (2012)

Questions:

1. Do Eberstadt's data and arguments affect your evaluation of the debt problem discussed at the previous session?
2. Would a stronger Congress, or greater checks-and-balances on the executive, or stricter controls over annual deficits, be effective solutions to Eberstadt's "epidemic"?
3. What are Galston's objections and Levin's elaborations to Eberstadt's arguments? Do you find them persuasive?

Friday, July 25, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Debt by Regulation: The Financial Crisis of 2008

- Christopher DeMuth, *Government Regulation and the Financial Crisis of 2008* (2012)
- Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, *Final Report* (Preface and Conclusions) and *Dissenting Statement of Peter J. Wallison* (Introduction and Summary)
- David Skeel, "A Nation Adrift from the Rule of Law," *Wall Street Journal*, August 21, 2012
- C. Boyden Gray and Jim R. Purcell, "Why Dodd-Frank is Unconstitutional," *Wall Street Journal*, June 21, 2012

Questions:

1. In what respects was the financial crisis of 2008 a result of the political and institutional transformations examined in previous sessions? Has the crisis and its aftermath accentuated those transformations?
2. Would greater checks and balances between Congress and the President make it easier or harder to respond to future financial crises?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

Section 3 – Democratic Capitalism
Yuval Levin, editor, *National Affairs*

This intense weeklong course will explore the foundations, forms, and consequences of our economic system, and its deep connections to our political system and to the philosophical tradition of the West. Among other questions, we will consider the origins of our ideas of money, property, and commerce; the tension between wealth and virtue; the original case for capitalism and the critiques of it offered by communism, socialism, and progressivism; the nature of social obligations in a free-market economy; the role of economic ideas in the contemporary left/right divide; the origins, condition, and future prospects of our welfare state; and the rise of inequality.

Our goal will be to see how contemporary policy arguments relate to deeper philosophical and moral questions, and how thinking through those questions could help us better understand what otherwise might seem like arcane, technical debates in Washington.

Monday, July 21, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **The Preconditions for Prosperity**

- Aristotle, *Politics*, Book I, Chs. 8–10
- John Locke, *Second Treatise of Civil Government*, Ch. V
- OPTIONAL: David Hume, *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary*, “Of the Rise and Progress of the Arts and Sciences,” “Of Commerce,” “Of Money,” “Of Refinement in the Arts”

Questions:

1. What lessons should we draw, if any, from the unprecedented growth of wealth beginning in the late eighteenth century?
2. What role does property play in human prosperity?
3. If we think of property as a tool (or set of tools) to solve problems, what problems does it solve, and how does it solve them?

12:30 p.m. – 2:00 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch
--

2:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Tour – U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Permanent Exhibition

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m. Speaker Charles Krauthammer , syndicated columnist, <i>The Washington Post</i>

1:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. **The Commercial Society**

- Adam Smith, *Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Part I, Section I, Chs. I–IV; Part I, Section III, Chs. I–II; Part II, Section II, Chs. I–III.
- Adam Smith, *Wealth of Nations*, Introduction; Book I, Chs. I–II; Book IV, Ch. II; Book IV, Ch. IX.
- OPTIONAL: Voltaire, “On Commerce and Luxury”

Questions:

1. From where do our moral judgments come? What effect do social institutions have on our moral judgments, and on our moral character?
2. Why does Smith think the division of labor is such a good thing? Is it always a good thing?

3. Does commerce presuppose selfishness? Does it encourage selfishness? What bearing on our moral character does, or might, capitalism have?
4. Is there something “natural” about trade and exchange—that is, about capitalism? Are there ways capitalism might be unnatural?
5. What role does Smith believe government should play in our lives?

Wednesday, July 23, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Poverty, Wealth, and Politics**

- Thomas Paine, “Agrarian Justice”
- Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, “Bourgeois and Proletarians”
- Herbert Croly, *The Promise of American Life*, “Democracy and Discrimination”
- Friedrich Hayek, *The Constitution of Liberty*, “The Decline of Socialism and the Rise of the Welfare State”

Questions:

1. What are our obligations toward the poor? What are the government’s obligations?
2. Are people’s moral and philosophical views shaped by their place in society? Do rich and poor think differently?
3. What is government’s role in overseeing a modern economy?
4. What are the benefits and drawbacks of centralized management of the economy?
5. Are markets democratic?

6:30 p.m. – 9:30 p.m. Dinner and Speaker Walter Reich , professor, George Washington University
--

Thursday, July 24, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Freedom, Wealth, and Virtue**

- Students for a Democratic Society, “The Port Huron Statement”
- Irving Kristol, “When Virtue Loses All Her Loveliness”
- OPTIONAL: Milton Friedman, *Capitalism and Freedom*, “The Relation between Economic Freedom and Political Freedom”

Questions:

1. What kind of relationship exists between a society’s economic order and the moral lives of its people?
2. Does living in a wealthy society corrode people’s regard for justice and virtue?
3. Is virtue a precondition for commercial prosperity?

Friday, July 25, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Crisis of the Welfare State

- Jim Manzi, “Keeping America’s Edge,” *National Affairs* 2 (Winter 2010)
- Donald Marron, “America in the Red,” *National Affairs* 3 (Spring 2010)
- Ron Haskins, “Getting Ahead in America,” *National Affairs* 1 (Fall 2009)
- Congressional Budget Office, “Trends in the Distribution of Household Income between 1979 and 2007,” 2011

Questions:

1. Why is our country facing a fiscal crisis? Are the primary causes political, economic, or moral? How are these connected?
2. What is the relationship between economic growth and social cohesion? Are they necessarily in tension? Which should we prefer?
3. Is it important for America to be a global economic leader? Why should we worry about “competitiveness”?
4. Does growing income inequality signal a failure of our economic system? If so, is inequality a symptom or a cause?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

WEEK 6 – POLITICS, NATURE, AND HUMAN EXCELLENCE

We conclude the program with big questions about what we, alone or in association, can and should strive for. As in the preceding two weeks, our three sections pursue three different courses of study. One group explores literature’s capacity, in the hands of a master, to frame politics, in this case Shakespeare’s depiction of Rome. A second group lays bare the assumptions of the modern scientific worldview and the political implications of the project initiated by Francis Bacon. The final group focuses on the claims of reason and revelation as sources of ultimate truth and as guides for the political world.

Section 1 – *Shakespeare’s Rome* **Paul Cantor, professor, University of Virginia**

We will study Shakespeare as a serious political thinker who displays familiarity with Plato and Aristotle, and detailed knowledge of Machiavelli’s *Discourses*. Shakespeare’s Roman plays are a sustained effort to understand what he and his contemporaries regarded as the most successful political community in antiquity and perhaps in all of human history. The Renaissance was an attempt to revive classical antiquity; Shakespeare’s Roman plays are one of the supreme achievements of the Renaissance in the way that they bring alive the ancient city on the stage.

We will study the plays, not in the order in which they were written, but in historical order. *Coriolanus* portrays the early days of the Roman Republic, indeed the founding of the

Republic, if one recognizes the tribunate as the distinctively republican institution in Rome. *Julius Caesar* portrays the last days of the Roman Republic, specifically the moment when Caesar tries to create a form of one-man rule in the city, while the conspirators try to restore the republican order. The issue of Republic vs. Empire stands at the heart of *Julius Caesar*. *Antony and Cleopatra* portrays the early days of the Roman Empire, the emergence of Octavius as the sole ruler of Rome (he went on to become Augustus Caesar, the first official Roman Emperor).

The way Shakespeare arranged his three Roman plays suggests that he was centrally concerned with the contrast between the Roman Republic and the Roman Empire. The Roman plays thus offer an opportunity to study the phenomenon Plato and Aristotle referred to as the regime (*politeia*)—the way a particular form of government shapes a particular way of life. From classical antiquity down to the eighteenth century and such thinkers as Montesquieu and the American Founding Fathers, Rome has been one of the perennial themes of political theory. Shakespeare's Roman plays are his contribution to the longstanding debate about Rome, and also occupy a very important place in his comprehensive understanding of the human condition. The plays are evidence of the crucial importance of politics in Shakespeare's view of human nature, as well as of his sense of the limits of politics.

Monday, July 28, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. ***Coriolanus***

Coriolanus, Acts I–V

Questions:

1. How does Shakespeare characterize the two parties in Republican Rome, the patricians and the plebeians? The two parties are opposed in their interests, but how do they manage to communicate and to some extent work together?
2. What in Coriolanus's character causes him to fail in his bid to become consul?
3. What is the understanding of immortality in republican Rome, and how does it affect the character of the Romans?
4. How are the women in *Coriolanus* portrayed? In particular, what is Volumnia's role in the play? What is the relation of the family to the city of Rome?
5. How would you compare the Volsces with the Romans? Why is Coriolanus able to achieve rule among them, when he was not able to do so among the Romans? How would you compare Aufidius with Coriolanus?
6. Why does Coriolanus eventually abandon his effort to conquer Rome?
7. What do the Romans learn from the story of Coriolanus? What do the patricians in particular learn? What do the plebeians in particular learn? How will these lessons affect the future of Rome as a republic?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Speaker
Peter Thiel, president, Thiel Capital

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. **Coriolanus**

Coriolanus (continued)

Questions:

See questions for previous assignment

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Julius Caesar**

Julius Caesar, Acts I–V

Questions:

1. Compare the opening scene of *Julius Caesar* with that of *Coriolanus*. What does this comparison tell us about the changes that have occurred in the republican regime? How do the plebeians of *Julius Caesar* differ from those of *Coriolanus*? How has the role of the tribunes changed?
2. In Shakespeare's portrayal, what are the strengths and weaknesses of Julius Caesar? How has he gotten to the point where he is on the verge of achieving one-man rule in Rome?
3. Why does the conspiracy form against Julius Caesar? Who are its leaders, and what does each contribute to the enterprise?
4. Why does the conspiracy fail? What are some of the conspirators' specific mistakes, and why do they make them? Could the Republic have been saved?
5. What is Antony's role in the play? Can you compare him to any character in *Coriolanus*? Why does he succeed in defeating the conspirators? What implications does his reaction to Caesar's death have for his future in *Antony and Cleopatra*?
6. How would you compare Brutus's funeral oration with Antony's?
7. How has the status of women changed since the days of *Coriolanus*?
8. How has religion in Rome changed since the days of *Coriolanus*? What does the presence of soothsayers in the play suggest?
9. Cassius is a professed Epicurean; Brutus is a professed Stoic; Cicero is the only "name" philosopher to appear in any of Shakespeare's plays. What does the presence of philosophy in the Rome of *Julius Caesar* suggest?
10. What is the attitude toward suicide in the closing scenes of the play? Has the Roman attitude toward military victory changed?

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Julius Caesar**

Julius Caesar (continued)

Questions:

See questions for previous assignment

Thursday, July 31, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *Antony and Cleopatra*

Antony and Cleopatra, Acts I–V

Questions:

1. How have the political circumstances changed now that the Roman Empire is coming into being? How do these changes affect the lives of the characters in the play?
2. What do you make of Pompey's rhetoric and actions in Act II, scenes 6 and 7? How and why have the terms of politics altered for him?
3. In Act III, scene 1, we see Ventidius, a Roman commander on the frontier of the empire. What does this scene reveal about how politics has changed in Imperial Rome? What are the implications of this scene for the future of Rome?
4. How has the status of women changed in the Empire?
5. How has religion changed in the Empire?
6. How has Rome become Egyptianized in *Antony and Cleopatra*? What does this development tell us about Imperial Rome?
7. Antony expresses a wish to live "a private man in Athens" (Act III, scene 12). If all that matters to him and Cleopatra is their private love affair, why don't they simply abdicate and disappear into the teeming masses of the empire?
8. What is Enobarbus's dilemma, and how is it representative of the changed conditions of the Empire?
9. How has the notion of nobility changed in the world of *Antony and Cleopatra*?
10. For the first time in the Roman plays, we hear talk of an afterlife in *Antony and Cleopatra*. What is the significance of this development?

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Speaker Rep. Tom Cotton , member, U.S. House of Representatives
------------------------------	---

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Tour – U.S. Capitol
------------------------------	----------------------------

Friday, August 1, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. *Antony and Cleopatra*

Antony and Cleopatra (continued)

Questions:

See questions for previous assignment

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Open Forum on the Plays

6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. Closing Reception and Dinner

Section 2 – *Modern Science and Politics*
Tobin Craig, professor, Michigan State University

From a comparative and historical perspective, one of the most unusual features of our public life is the status accorded to the enterprise we call “science.” With perhaps one or two exceptions, no feature of our public life is as uncontested, that is, generally regarded as unworthy of reflection because self-evidently and unproblematically good. It would seem to require a special effort to come to see science—or inquiry into nature with the goal of replacing belief with knowledge—as questionable. We will undertake that effort of inquiring after inquiry, of thinking through the goodness of science. Just what is science for?

For help with this question we turn to certain of the writings of Francis Bacon. Bacon’s answer—which helped transform natural philosophy into the methodical, collective enterprise familiar to us today—remains, in many respects, our answer. In returning to Bacon’s thought, we are thus afforded an occasion to reexamine the purpose of science, and the relationship between science, technology, and politics.

Monday, July 28, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. The Ancients on Science, Technology, and Politics

- Aristotle, *Politics*, Book II, Ch. 8
- Plato, *Laws*, 797a–800b
- *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book X, Chs. 6–9
- Plutarch, “Marcellus”

Questions:

1. What, according to Plato and Aristotle, is the problem with innovation, and innovation in the arts in particular?
2. What, according to Aristotle, is the good of philosophy or science?
3. Plutarch presents Archimedes as aware of the potential practical value of science, but as not regarding this value as especially serious or important. What does Plutarch mean for us to see through his presentation of Archimedes?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. “Daedalus” and “Orpheus”

- Francis Bacon, “Daedalus”
- Francis Bacon, “Orpheus”

Questions:

1. What do we learn from Bacon's presentation of the encounter between Minos (law) and Daedalus (the inventor)? What problems does the inventor pose to politics? What does Bacon's failure to offer solutions suggest?
2. Bacon's Orpheus presents an allegorical presentation of the history of philosophy. What do we glean from considering Orpheus's failures?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Speaker
Peter Thiel, president, Thiel Capital

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. ***The Great Instauration***

Francis Bacon, *The Great Instauration*

Questions:

1. How does Bacon justify his "Instauration," a founding or refounding of science? What's wrong with the existing science?
2. What is the basis for his belief that another science is possible? What are the key innovations in this new science?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. ***Novum Organum***

Francis Bacon, *Novum Organum*, Preface and Book I, Aphorisms I–LXVIII, with a focus on XXXIX–LXVIII.

Question:

What is Bacon's critique of the ancients/ancient philosophy?

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. ***Novum Organum***

Bacon, *Novum Organum*, Book I, Aphorisms LXIX–CXXX, with a focus on LXIX–LXXVII and CVIII–CXXX

Questions:

1. Why does Bacon think something more is possible?
2. Insofar as it is made clear in *Novum Organum*, what would the "institutionalization" of this new science look like in practice?

3. What would this entail for science? For the political community?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *New Atlantis: Introduction and Action*

Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis*

Questions:

1. What happens in the *New Atlantis*? Concentrate on the narrative action—the travel story.
2. Why does the narrator include the details about the arrival and reception of the Europeans to Bensalem?

Thursday, July 31, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. *New Atlantis: Bensalem’s Political History*

Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis* (continued)

Question:

Try to assemble the political history of Bensalem from the details we are provided. Presuming these to be connected to Bensalem’s peculiar felicity, what does this reveal about Bacon’s thought on the relationship of science and politics?

10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. *New Atlantis: Bensalem’s Religious History*

Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis* (continued)

Questions:

1. What is the place of religion in Bensalem?
2. What do you make of the miraculous arrival of Christianity to Bensalem? What does this reveal about Bacon’s thought on the relationship of science, religion, and politics?

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m. Speaker Rep. Tom Cotton , member, U.S. House of Representatives
--

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m. Tour – U.S. Capitol

Friday, August 1, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 10:30 a.m. *New Atlantis: Science and Society*

Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis* (continued)

Questions:

1. The showpiece of *New Atlantis* is the revelation of Salomon's House. What are we meant to see in the enumeration of the findings and activities of Salomon's House?
2. What features of this institution stand out? What do they disclose about Bacon's thought on how science can or should be institutionalized?
3. Is Salomon's House a model? What is the meaning of its extreme secrecy? Its public presentation? Its relationship to the state? Its aim or end?

**10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Teaching of *New Atlantis*:
Politics and Technological Science**

Francis Bacon, *New Atlantis* (continued)

Question:

What is the significance of Bacon's teaching in *New Atlantis* for us today?

6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m. Closing Reception and Dinner

Section 3 – Reason, Faith, and Politics
Robert Kraynak, professor, Colgate University

This seminar will explore the relation between the two highest kinds of knowledge—reason (in the form of philosophy and science) and faith (in the form of divine revelation and theology). We will examine some thinkers who claim that reason and faith are incompatible, requiring an either-or choice because they cannot be synthesized, and other thinkers who claim that the two are compatible and can be reconciled in a harmonious whole in which reason is perfected by faith.

After exploring the relation of reason and faith, we will examine the political teachings of divine law, natural law, and practical reason as they are found in several writings—including the Bible as well as selections from St. Thomas Aquinas, Emil Fackenheim, Reinhold Niebuhr, Martin Luther King, Jr., and papal encyclicals. We will consider what form of government and what kind of social and economic institutions are required by divine and natural law, and also which regime—kingship, theocracy, or liberal democracy—is most compatible with the teachings of divine and natural law.

Monday, July 28, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. Reason and Faith in Conflict

- Leo Strauss, "On the Interpretation of Genesis"
- Leo Strauss, "The Mutual Influence of Philosophy and Theology"
- Soren Kierkegaard, "The Knight of Faith"
- Soren Kierkegaard, "Concluding Unscientific Postscript"

- Soren Kierkegaard, “The Present Age”

Questions:

1. Why does Strauss think that two roots of Western civilization—classical philosophy (Athens) and Biblical faith (Jerusalem)—are in conflict with each other and cannot be synthesized? What advice does Strauss give for living with this unresolvable conflict?
2. Why does Kierkegaard believe that religion is a “leap of faith” into the “absurd”? How is this view of faith reflected in his interpretation of Abraham and Christianity?
3. Why is Christian faith so difficult in the “present age” of democratic mass society?

12:30 p.m. – 2:30 p.m. Semiweekly Group Lunch

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m. Speaker
Peter Thiel, president, Thiel Capital

Tuesday, July 29, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Reason and Faith in Harmony**

- Francis S. Collins, *The Language of God*, Chs. 1–5, 8–10
- OPTIONAL: CS Lewis, *Miracles*, Chs. 1–4

Questions:

1. How does a modern scientist like Francis Collins reconcile his Christian faith with the doctrines of Big Bang cosmology and Darwinian evolution?
2. What does Collins mean by “theistic evolution”? Is his reconciliation convincing or unconvincing?

Wednesday, July 30, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **The Jewish State from Moses to Modern Israel**

- Exodus 19–25
- 1 Samuel 8
- Amos
- Jeremiah 23, 29–31
- Emil Fackenheim, *What is Judaism?*, Chs. 1, 11, 13, 14

Questions:

1. What does the Hebrew Bible teach about the Jewish state in the period of the original Mosaic law? In the period of kingship under Saul, David, and Solomon? In the period of the later Jewish prophets such as Jeremiah and Amos?
2. Why does Fackenheim think that modern philosophy, the Holocaust, and the founding of the State of Israel require a new interpretation of Judaism for the modern age?

Thursday, July 31, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Christianity and Political Realism—Seeking Justice in a Fallen World**

- Matthew 5–6, 22
- Romans 1–5, 13
- Galatians 1–3
- Colossians 1–4
- Reinhold Niebuhr, “Augustine’s Political Realism”
- Reinhold Niebuhr, “Why the Christian Church is Not Pacifist”
- Reinhold Niebuhr, “The Children of Light and the Children of Darkness”

Questions:

1. What do the Gospels teach about politics?
2. What is the meaning of Jesus’ distinction between the duties to God and the duties to Caesar?
3. How do the doctrines of original sin and salvation affect the Christian view of justice in the fallen world?
4. How does Niebuhr derive a teaching about “Christian Realism” from the Gospels and from St. Augustine?
5. Is Niebuhr an optimist or a pessimist about democracy, justice, and war or peace?

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.	Speaker Rep. Tom Cotton, member, U.S. House of Representatives
-----------------------	---

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.	Tour – U.S. Capitol
-----------------------	---------------------

Friday, August 1, 2014

9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m. **Christianity and Political Idealism: Natural Law Justice**

- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae*, I–II, Questions 90.1–4; 91.1–4; 94.2
- Pope Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum*
- Martin Luther King, Jr., Letter from Birmingham Jail

Questions:

1. Why did Christian theologians develop a teaching about natural law in addition to divine law?
2. How did they learn from the classical and modern philosophers about the nature of man as a rational and social animal?
3. What is justice according to the natural law—does it point to monarchy or democracy? Capitalism or socialism? Just war or strict pacifism? A world of nation states or international law and one world government?
4. How does practical reason apply the principles of natural law to the concrete circumstances of politics?

6:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.	Closing Reception and Dinner
------------------------------	------------------------------

Saturday, August 2, 2014

10:00 a.m.	Check-out and Departure
-------------------	-------------------------