Congressional Research Service
Informing the legislative debate since 1914

U.S. Role in the World: Background and Issues for Congress

Updated December 29, 2020

Congressional Research Service
https://crsreports.congress.gov
R44891

CRS REPORT
Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Summary

The U.S. role in the world refers to the overall character, purpose, or direction of U.S. participation in international affairs and the country's overall relationship to the rest of the world. The U.S. role in the world can be viewed as establishing the overall context or framework for U.S. policymakers for developing, implementing, and measuring the success of U.S. policies and actions on specific international issues, and for foreign countries or other observers for interpreting and understanding U.S. actions on the world stage.

While descriptions of the traditional U.S. role in the world since the end of World War II vary in their specifics, it can be described in general terms as consisting of four key elements: global leadership; defense and promotion of the liberal international order; defense and promotion of freedom, democracy, and human rights; and prevention of the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia.

The issue for Congress is whether the U.S. role in the world has changed, and if so, what implications this might have for the United States and the world. A change in the U.S. role could have significant and even profound effects on U.S. security, freedom, and prosperity. It could significantly affect U.S. policy in areas such as relations with allies and other countries, defense plans and programs, trade and international finance, foreign assistance, and human rights.

Some observers, particularly critics of the Trump Administration, argue that under the Trump Administration, the United States has substantially changed the U.S. role in the world. Other observers, particularly supporters of the Trump Administration, while acknowledging that the Trump Administration has changed U.S. foreign policy in a number of areas compared to policies pursued by the Obama Administration, argue that under the Trump Administration, there has been less change and more continuity regarding the U.S. role in the world.

Some observers who assess that the United States under the Trump Administration has substantially changed the U.S. role in the world—particularly critics of the Trump Administration, and also some who were critical of the Obama Administration—view the implications of that change as undesirable. They view the change as an unnecessary retreat from U.S. global leadership and a gratuitous discarding of long-held U.S. values, and judge it to be an unforced error of immense proportions—a needless and self-defeating squandering of something of great value to the United States that the United States had worked to build and maintain for 70 years.

Other observers who assess that there has been a change in the U.S. role in the world in recent years—particularly supporters of the Trump Administration, but also some observers who were arguing even prior to the Trump Administration in favor of a more restrained U.S. role in the world—view the change in the U.S. role, or at least certain aspects of it, as helpful for responding to changed U.S. and global circumstances and for defending U.S. values and interests, particularly in terms of adjusting the U.S. role to one that is more realistic regarding what the United States can accomplish, enhancing deterrence of potential regional aggression by making potential U.S. actions less predictable to potential adversaries, reestablishing respect for national sovereignty as a guidepost for U.S. foreign policy and for organizing international affairs, and encouraging U.S. allies and security partners in Eurasia to do more to defend themselves.

Congress's decisions regarding the U.S. role in the world could have significant implications for numerous policies, plans, programs, and budgets, and for the role of Congress relative to that of the executive branch in U.S. foreign policymaking.

Contents

Introduction 1
Background 1
Overview of Traditional U.S. Role: Four Key Elements 1
Global Leadership 1
Defense and Promotion of Liberal International Order 2
Defense and Promotion of Freedom, Democracy, and Human Rights 3
Prevention of Emergence of Regional Hegemons in Eurasia 4
Changes over Time 5
Long-Standing Debate over Its Merits 5
Issues for Congress 5
Has the United States Changed Its Role? 6
Some Observers Believe the United States Has Changed Its Role 6
Other Observers Disagree 7
Still Other Observers See a Mixed or Confusing Situation 7
Some Observers Argue That Change Began Earlier 8
Potential Combined Perspectives 8
Implications of a Changed U.S. Role 8
Some Observers View Implications as Undesirable 8
Other Observers View Implications as Helpful 9
Some Related or Additional Issues 10
Potential Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic 10
Costs and Benefits of Allies 10
U.S. Public Opinion 11
Operation of U.S. Democracy 11
Potential Implications for Congress as an Institution 12
Reversibility of a Change in U.S. Role 12
Additional Writings 13

Appendixes

Appendix A. Glossary of Selected Terms 14
Appendix B. Past U.S. Role vs. More Restrained Role 17
Appendix C. Additional Writings 21

Contacts

Author Information 50

Introduction

This report provides background information and issues for Congress regarding the U.S. role in the world, meaning the overall character, purpose, or direction of U.S. participation in international affairs and the country's overall relationship to the rest of the world. The U.S. role in the world can be viewed as establishing the overall context or framework for U.S. policymakers for developing, implementing, and measuring the success of U.S. policies and actions on specific international issues, and for foreign countries or other observers for interpreting and understanding U.S. actions on the world stage.

Some observers perceive that after remaining generally stable for a period of more than 70 years (i.e., since the end of World War II in 1945), the U.S. role in the world under the Trump Administration has undergone a substantial change. A change in the U.S. role in the world could have significant and even profound effects on U.S. security, freedom, and prosperity. It could significantly affect U.S. policy in areas such as relations with allies and other countries, defense plans and programs, trade and international finance, foreign assistance, and human rights.

The issue for Congress is whether the U.S. role in the world has changed, and if so, what implications this might have for the United States and the world. Congress's decisions regarding the U.S. role in the world could have significant implications for numerous policies, plans, programs, and budgets, and for the role of Congress relative to that of the executive branch in U.S. foreign policymaking.

A variety of other CRS reports address in greater depth specific international issues mentioned in this report. **Appendix A** provides a glossary of some key terms used in this report, such as *international order* or *regional hegemon*. For convenience, this report uses the term *U.S. role* as a shorthand for referring to the U.S. role in the world.

Background

Overview of Traditional U.S. Role: Four Key Elements

While descriptions of the traditional U.S. role in the world since the end of World War II vary in their specifics, it can be described in general terms as consisting of four key elements:

- global leadership;
- defense and promotion of the liberal international order;
- defense and promotion of freedom, democracy, and human rights; and
- prevention of the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia.

The following sections provide brief discussions of these four key elements.

Global Leadership

The traditional U.S. role in the world since the end of World War II is generally described, first and foremost, as one of global leadership, meaning that the United States tends to be the first or most important country for identifying or framing international issues, taking actions to address those issues, setting an example for other countries to follow, organizing and implementing multilateral efforts to address international issues, and enforcing international rules and norms.

Observers over the years have referred to U.S. global leadership using various terms, some of which reflect varying degrees of approval or disapproval of this aspect of the U.S. role. Examples of such terms (other than global leader itself) include leader of the free world, superpower, indispensable power, system administrator, hyperpower, world policeman, or world hegemon.

The U.S. role of global leadership has resulted in extensive U.S. involvement in international affairs, and this, too, has been described with various phrases. The United States has been described as pursuing an internationalist foreign policy; a foreign policy of global engagement or deep engagement; a foreign policy that provides global public goods; a foreign policy of liberal order building, liberal internationalism, or liberal hegemony; an interventionist foreign policy; or a foreign policy of seeking primacy or world hegemony.

Defense and Promotion of Liberal International Order

A second key element of the traditional U.S. role in the world since World War II—one that can be viewed as inherently related to the first key element above—has been to defend and promote the liberal international order[1] that the United States, with the support of its allies, created in the years after World War II. Although definitions of the liberal international order vary, key elements of it are generally said to include the following:

- respect for the territorial integrity of countries, and the unacceptability of changing international borders by force or coercion;
- a preference for resolving disputes between countries peacefully, without the use or threat of use of force or coercion, and in a manner consistent with international law;
- respect for international law, global rules and norms, and universal values, including human rights;
- strong international institutions for supporting and implementing international law, global rules and norms, and universal values;
- the use of liberal (i.e., rules-based) international trading and investment systems to advance open, rules-based economic engagement, development, growth, and prosperity; and
- the treatment of international waters, international air space, outer space, and (more recently) cyberspace as international commons rather than domains subject to national sovereignty.

Most of the key elements above (arguably, all but the final one) can be viewed collectively as forming what is commonly referred to as a rules-based international order. A traditional antithesis of a rules-based order is a might-makes-right order (sometimes colloquially referred to as the law of the jungle), which is an international order (or a situation lacking in order) in which more powerful countries routinely impose their will arbitrarily on less-powerful countries, organizations, and individuals, with little or no regard to rules.

[1] Other terms used to refer to the liberal international order include *U.S.-led international order*, *postwar international order*, *rules-based international order*, and *open international order*. Observers sometimes substitute *world* for *international*, or omit *international* or *world* and refer simply to the liberal order, the U.S.-led order, and so on. In the terms *liberal international order* and *liberal order*, the word *liberal* does not refer to the conservative-liberal construct often used in discussing contemporary politics in the United States or other countries. It is, instead, an older use of the term that refers to an order based on the rule of law, as opposed to an order based on the arbitrary powers of hereditary monarchs.

Though often referred to as if it is a fully developed or universally established situation, the liberal international order, like other international orders that preceded it, is

- incomplete in geographic reach and in other ways;
- partly aspirational;
- not fixed in stone, but rather subject to evolution over time;
- sometimes violated by its supporters;
- not entirely free of might-makes-right behavior;
- resisted or rejected by certain states and nonstate actors; and
- subject to various stresses and challenges.

Some observers, emphasizing points like those above, argue that the liberal international order is more of a myth than a reality. Other observers, particularly supporters of the order, while acknowledging the limitations of the order, reject characterizations of it as a myth and emphasize its differences from international orders that preceded it.

As mentioned above, the liberal international order was created by the United States with the support of its allies in the years immediately after World War II. At that time, the United States was the only country with both the capacity and willingness to establish a new international order. U.S. willingness to establish and play a leading role in maintaining the liberal international order is generally viewed as reflecting a desire by U.S. policymakers to avoid repeating the deadly major wars and widespread economic disruption and deprivation of the first half of the 20th century—a period that included World War I, the Great Depression, the rise of communism and fascism, the Ukrainian famine, the Holocaust, and World War II.

U.S. willingness to establish and play a leading role in maintaining the liberal international order is also generally viewed as an act of national self-interest, reflecting a belief among U.S. policymakers that it would strongly serve U.S. security, political, and economic objectives. Supporters of the liberal international order generally argue that in return for bearing the costs of creating and sustaining the liberal international order, the United States receives significant security, political, and economic benefits, including the maintenance of a favorable balance of power on both a global and regional level, and a leading or dominant role in establishing and operating global institutions and rules for international finance and trade. Indeed, some critics of the liberal international order argue that it is primarily a construct for serving U.S. interests and promoting U.S. world primacy or hegemony. The costs and benefits for the United States of defending and promoting the liberal international order, however, are a matter of debate.

Defense and Promotion of Freedom, Democracy, and Human Rights

A third key element of the traditional U.S. role in the world since World War II has been to defend and promote freedom, democracy, and human rights as universal values, while criticizing and resisting authoritarian and illiberal forms of government where possible. This element of the U.S. role is viewed as consistent not only with core U.S. political values but also with a theory advanced by some observers (sometimes called the democratic peace theory) that democratic countries are more responsive to the desires of their populations and consequently are less likely to wage wars of aggression or go to war with one another.

Defending and promoting freedom, democracy, and human rights is additionally viewed as a key component of U.S. soft power, because it can encourage like-minded governments, as well as organizations and individuals in other countries, to work with the United States, and because it has the potential to shape the behavior of authoritarian and illiberal governments that are acting

against U.S. interests by shaming those governments and inspiring prodemocracy organizations and individuals within those countries.

Prevention of Emergence of Regional Hegemons in Eurasia

A fourth element of the traditional U.S. role in the world since World War II—one that U.S. policymakers do not often state explicitly in public—has been to oppose the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia. This objective reflects a U.S. perspective on geopolitics and grand strategy developed by U.S. strategists and policymakers during and in the years immediately after World War II that incorporates two key judgments:

- that given the amount of people, resources, and economic activity in Eurasia, a regional hegemon in Eurasia would represent a concentration of power large enough to be able to threaten vital U.S. interests; and
- that Eurasia is not dependably self-regulating in terms of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons, meaning that the countries of Eurasia cannot be counted on to be able to prevent, though their own actions, the emergence of regional hegemons, and may need assistance from one or more countries outside Eurasia to be able to do this dependably.[2]

Preventing the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia is sometimes also referred to as preserving a division of power in Eurasia, or as preventing key regions in Eurasia from coming under the domination of a single power, or as preventing the emergence of a spheres-of-influence world, which could be a consequence of the emergence of one or more regional hegemons in Eurasia.

U.S. actions that can be viewed as expressions of the U.S. goal of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia include but are not necessarily limited to the following:

- U.S. participation in World War I,[3] World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War;[4]
- U.S. alliances and security partnerships, including
  - the NATO alliance, which was established in large part to deter and counter attempts by the Soviet Union (now Russia) to become a regional hegemon in Europe;

[2] For additional discussion, see CRS In Focus IF10485, *Defense Primer: Geography, Strategy, and U.S. Force Design*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

[3] Although the goal of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons was not articulated in explicit terms (at least not widely) by U.S. strategists until World War II and the years immediately thereafter, U.S. participation in World War I against Germany can in retrospect be viewed as an earlier U.S. action reflecting this goal.

[4] U.S. participation in the Vietnam War was justified in part by the so-called domino theory, which argued that a victory by communist-ruled North Vietnam over South Vietnam could be followed by other countries in the region falling, like dominos in a row, under communist control. Opponents of the domino theory challenged its validity and argue that it was disproven when North Vietnam's defeat of South Vietnam was not followed by other countries in the region falling under communist control. The theory's supporters argue that the theory was not disproven, because the years-long U.S. effort to defend South Vietnam, though ultimately unsuccessful in preventing victory by North Vietnam, gave other countries in the region time and space to develop their political institutions and economies enough to deter or resist communist movements in their own countries. Valid or not, the domino theory's use as a justification links U.S. participation in the war to the goal of preventing the emergence of a regional hegemon (in this case, a communist hegemon of China and/or the Soviet Union).

  - U.S. alliances with countries in East Asia and the Pacific, which were established in large part to deter and counter attempts by the Soviet Union or China to become a regional hegemon in East Asia; and
  - U.S. security partnerships with countries in the Persian Gulf region, which were established in large part to deter or counter attempts by Iran or the Soviet Union (now Russia) to become a regional hegemon in that region; and
- additional U.S. political, diplomatic, and economic actions to contain and oppose the Soviet Union during the Cold War, including the Marshall Plan and subsequent U.S. foreign assistance programs.

In pursuing the goal of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia, U.S. policymakers have sometimes decided to work with or support nondemocratic regimes that for their own reasons view Russia, China, or Iran as competitors or adversaries. As a consequence, the goal of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons in Asia has sometimes been in tension with defending and promoting freedom, democracy, and human rights.

Changes over Time

Although the traditional U.S. role in the world was generally stable over the past 70 years, the specifics of U.S. foreign policy for implementing that role have changed frequently for various reasons, including changes in administrations and changes in the international security environment. Definitions of the U.S. role have room within them to accommodate some variation in the specifics of U.S. foreign policy.

Long-Standing Debate over Its Merits

The fact that the U.S. role in the world has been generally stable over the past 70 years does not necessarily mean that this role was the right one for the United States, or that it would be the right one in the future. Although the role the United States has played in the world since the end of World War II has many defenders, it also has critics, and the merits of that role have been a matter of long-standing debate among foreign policy specialists, strategists, policymakers, and the public, with critics offering potential alternative concepts for the U.S. role in the world.

The most prominent dimension of the debate is whether the United States should attempt to continue playing the active internationalist role that it has played for the past 70 years, or instead adopt a more restrained role that reduces U.S. involvement in world affairs. A number of critics of the U.S. role in the world over the past 70 years have offered multiple variations on the idea of a more restrained U.S. role. (For additional discussion, see **Appendix B**.)

A second major dimension within the debate over the future U.S. role concerns how to balance or combine the pursuit of narrowly defined material U.S. interests with the goal of defending and promoting U.S. or universal values such as democracy, freedom, and human rights. A third major dimension concerns the balance in U.S. foreign policy between the use of hard power and soft power. Observers debating these two dimensions of the future U.S. role in the world stake out varying positions on these questions.

Issues for Congress

The issue for Congress is whether the U.S. role in the world has changed, and if so, what implications this might have for the United States and the world. The sections below provide some discussion of this issue.

Has the United States Changed Its Role?

There currently are multiple views on the question of whether the United States under the Trump Administration has changed the U.S. role in the world, some of which are outlined briefly below.

Some Observers Believe the United States Has Changed Its Role

Some observers, particularly critics of the Trump Administration, argue that under the Trump Administration, the United States has substantially changed the U.S. role in the world by altering some or all of the four key elements of the U.S. role described earlier. Although views among these observers vary in their specifics, a number of these observers argue that the Administration's America First construct, its emphasis on national sovereignty as a primary guidepost for U.S. foreign policy, and other Administration actions and statements form a new U.S. role characterized by

- a voluntary retreat from or abdication of global leadership,
- a greater reliance on unilateralism,
- a reduced willingness to work through international or multilateral institutions and agreements,
- an acceptance of U.S. isolation or near-isolation on certain international issues,
- a more skeptical view of the value of alliances to the United States,
- a less-critical view of certain authoritarian or illiberal governments,
- a reduced or more selective approach to promoting and defending certain universal values,
- the elevation of bilateral trade balances, commercial considerations, monetary transactions, and ownership of assets such as oil above other foreign policy considerations, and
- an implicit tolerance of the reemergence of aspects of a might-makes-right international order.

In support of this view, these observers cite various Administration actions and statements, including, among other things

- the Administration's decisions to withdraw from certain international agreements—including the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) regional trade agreement, the multilateral Paris climate agreement, and the Iran nuclear agreement—and from the World Health Organization (WHO);
- its earlier proposals for reducing State Department funding and foreign assistance funding, and delays in filling senior State Department positions;
- the President's skeptical statements regarding the value to the United States of certain U.S. alliances (particularly with European countries and South Korea) and more generally his apparent transactional and monetary-focused approach to understanding and managing alliance relationships;
- what these observers view as the President's affinity for certain authoritarian or illiberal leaders, as well as his apparent reluctance to criticize Russia and his apparent continued desire to seek improved relations with Russia, despite Russian actions judged by U.S. intelligence agencies and other observers to have been directed against the United States and overseas U.S. interests;

- the President's decision, announced by the Administration on October 6, 2019, to withdraw U.S. troops from northern Syria, and the Administration's initiatives to reduce the U.S. military presence in Germany, Afghanistan, and Iraq;
- the Administration's focus on pursuing bilateral trade negotiations with various countries (as opposed to regional or multilateral trade negotiations); and
- the Administration's infrequent or inconsistent statements in support of democracy and human rights, including the Administration's reaction to the killing of journalist Jamal Khashoggi and some of the President's statements regarding the prodemocracy protests in Hong Kong.

Other Observers Disagree

Other observers, particularly supporters of the Trump Administration, disagree with some or all of the perspective above. While acknowledging that the Trump Administration has changed U.S. foreign policy in a number of areas compared to policies pursued by the Obama Administration, these observers argue that under the Trump Administration, there has been less change and more continuity regarding the U.S. role in the world. In support of this view, these observers cite, among other things

- the Administration's December 2017 national security strategy (NSS) document and its January 2018 unclassified summary of its supporting national defense strategy (NDS) document—large portions of which refer to U.S. leadership, a general emphasis on great power competition with China and Russia, and strong support for U.S. alliances;
- Administration statements reaffirming U.S. support for NATO, as well as Administration actions to improve U.S. military capabilities in Europe for deterring potential Russian aggression in Europe;
- the Administration's willingness to impose and maintain a variety of sanctions on Russia;
- the Administration's Free and Open Indo-Pacific (FOIP) construct for guiding U.S. policy toward the Indo-Pacific region;
- the Administration's more confrontational policy toward China, including its plan to increase funding for U.S. foreign assistance programs to compete against China for influence in Africa, Asia, and the Americas;
- U.S. trade actions that, in the view of these observers, are intended to make free trade more sustainable over the long run by ensuring that it is fair to all parties, including the United States; and
- the Administration's (admittedly belated) support of Hong Kong's prodemocracy protestors, its criticism of China's human rights practices toward its Muslim Uyghur population, and its emphasis on religious freedom as a major component of human rights.

Still Other Observers See a Mixed or Confusing Situation

Still other observers, viewing points made by both of the above sets of observers, see a mixed or confusing situation regarding whether the United States under the Trump Administration has changed the U.S. role in the world. For these observers, whether the U.S. role has changed is difficult to discern, in part because of what they view as incoherence or contradictions in the Administration's foreign policies and in part because the President's apparent views on certain

issues—such as the value of U.S. alliances, the acceptability of certain actions by Russia or North Korea, and the importance of democracy and human rights as universal values—have frequently been in tension with or contradicted by statements and actions of senior Administration officials (particularly those who served during the first two years or so of the Administration), with the President's views being more consistent with the change in the U.S. role outlined by the first set of observers above, and statements and actions of senior Administration officials frequently being more consistent with a continuation of the U.S. role of the past 70 years outlined by the second set of observers above.

Some Observers Argue That Change Began Earlier

Some observers argue that if the U.S. role has changed, that change started not under the Trump Administration, but under the Obama Administration, particularly regarding the question of whether the United States has reduced or withdrawn from global leadership. In support of this view, these observers cite what they views as the Obama Administration's

- focus on reducing the U.S. military presence and ending U.S. combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan in favor of focusing more on domestic U.S. rebuilding initiatives,
- decision to announce but not enforce a "red line" regarding the behavior of the Syrian government, and
- restrained response to Russian actions in Crimea and eastern Ukraine, and more generally, its reluctance, for a time at least, to fully acknowledge and adapt to less cooperative and more confrontational relationships with Russia and China.

Still others view the start of a change in the U.S. role as occurring even sooner, under the George W. Bush Administration—when that Administration did not respond more strongly to Russia's 2008 invasion and occupation of part of Georgia—or under the Clinton Administration.

For these observers, a change in the U.S. role in the world under the Trump Administration may represent not so much a shift in the U.S. role as a continuation or deepening of a change that began in a prior U.S. administration.

Potential Combined Perspectives

The perspectives outlined in the preceding sections are not necessarily mutually exclusive—assessments combining aspects of more than one of these perspectives are possible.

Implications of a Changed U.S. Role

Among observers who assess that there has been a change in the U.S. role in the world in recent years, there are multiple views regarding the potential implications of that change.

Some Observers View Implications as Undesirable

Some observers who assess that the United States under the Trump Administration has substantially changed the U.S. role in the world—particularly critics of the Trump Administration, and also some who were critical of the Obama Administration—view the implications of that change as undesirable. They view the change as an unnecessary retreat from U.S. global leadership and a gratuitous discarding of long-held U.S. values, and judge it to be an unforced error of immense proportions—a needless and self-defeating squandering of something of great value to the United States that the United States had worked to build and maintain for 70

years. More specifically, they argue that the change in the U.S. role in recent years that they see is doing some or all of the following:

- reducing U.S. power and foreign-policy capacity, particularly by weakening or hollowing out the State Department and reducing or devaluing elements of U.S. soft power;
- weakening the U.S. ability to leverage its power and foreign-policy capacity in international affairs—and isolating the United States on certain international issues, effectively turning the concept of America First into "America Alone"—by
  - damaging long-standing and valuable U.S. alliance relationships,
  - reducing U.S. participation in multilateral political and trade negotiations and agreements, and
  - making the United States look more erratic and impulsive as an international actor, and less reliable as an ally and negotiating partner;
- weakening the U.S.-led international order and encouraging a reemergence of aspects of a might-makes-right international order;
- slowing the spread of democracy and human rights, encouraging a moral equivalency between the United States and authoritarian and illiberal countries, and tacitly facilitating a reemergence of authoritarian and illiberal forms of government;
- disregarding the costly lessons of the first half of the 20th century, and how the U.S. role in the world of the last 70 years has been motivated at bottom by a desire to prevent a repetition of the horrific events of that period; and
- creating vacuums in global leadership in establishing and maintaining global rules and norms, on the disposition of specific disputes and other issues, and in regional power balances that China and Russia as well as France, Turkey, Syria, Iran, and other countries are moving to fill, often at the expense of U.S. interests and values.

Other Observers View Implications as Helpful

Other observers who assess that there has been a change in the U.S. role in the world in recent years—particularly supporters of the Trump Administration, but also some observers who were arguing even prior to the Trump Administration in favor of a more-restrained U.S. role in the world—view the change in the U.S. role, or at least certain aspects of it, as helpful for responding to changed U.S. and global circumstances and for defending U.S. values and interests. More specifically, they argue that the change in the U.S. role in recent years that they see is doing some or all of the following:

- winding down U.S. participation in so-called endless wars (aka forever wars) in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq, and also not starting new wars;
- emphasizing religious freedom—a core U.S. value—as a central tenet in U.S. foreign policy;
- adjusting the U.S. role to one that is more realistic regarding what the United States can accomplish in the world today and in the future, particularly given limits on U.S. resources and the reduction in U.S. economic and military

preponderance in recent decades as other countries have grown economically and developed their militaries;

- enhancing deterrence of potential regional aggression by making potential U.S. actions less predictable to potential adversaries;
- reestablishing respect for national sovereignty as a guidepost for U.S. foreign policy and for organizing international affairs;
- encouraging U.S. allies and security partners in Eurasia to do more to defend themselves, thereby reducing U.S. costs and developing Eurasia's potential to become more self-regulating in terms of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons;
- placing an emphasis on countering and competing with China, which poses a uniquely strong and multidimensional challenge to U.S. security and prosperity;
- working to strengthen the security architecture of the Indo-Pacific region under the FOIP construct;
- helping to broker breakthrough improvements in Israel's relations with other countries in the Middle East;
- exploring possibilities for improving relations where possible with countries such as Russia and North Korea; and
- making trade agreements more fair to the United States.

Some Related or Additional Issues

The following sections provide brief discussions of some related or additional issues for Congress regarding the U.S. role in the world.

Potential Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic

A new (i.e., since about March 2020) issue is the question of whether and how the global COVID-19 pandemic might lead to profoundly transformative and long-lasting changes in the U.S. role in the world in areas such as U.S. global leadership, China's potential for acting as a global leader, U.S. strategic competition with China, U.S. relations with allies, and U.S. definitions of U.S. national security. Some observers argue that the COVID-19 pandemic is the first major international crisis since World War II for which the United States has not served as the global leader for spearheading, organizing, or implementing an international response.

Another CRS report provides an overview of the potential implications of the COVID-19 pandemic for the international security environment and the U.S. role in the world, as well as a list of CRS reports addressing various aspects of this issue and examples of other writings addressing this issue from various perspectives,[5] See also some of the more recent writings cited in **Appendix C** of this CRS report.

Costs and Benefits of Allies

Within the overall debate over the U.S. role in the world, one long-standing specific question relates to the costs and benefits of allies. As noted earlier, some observers believe that under the

[5] CRS Report R46336, *COVID-19: Potential Implications for International Security Environment—Overview of Issues and Further Reading for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke, Kathleen J. McInnis, and Michael Moodie.

Trump Administration, the United States has become more skeptical of the value of allies, particularly those in Europe, and more transactional in managing U.S. alliance relationships.

Skeptics of allies and alliances generally argue that their value to the United States is overrated; that allies are capable of defending themselves without U.S. help; that U.S. allies frequently act as free riders in their alliance relationships with the United States by shifting security costs to the United States; that in the absence of U.S. help, these allies would do more on their own to balance against potential regional hegemons; and that alliances create a risk of drawing the United States into conflicts involving allies over issues that are not vital to the United States.

Supporters of the U.S. approach to allies and alliances of the past 70 years, while acknowledging the free-rider issue as something that needs to be managed, generally argue that alliances are needed and valuable for preventing the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia and for otherwise deterring potential regional aggression; that alliances form a significant advantage for the United States in its dealings with other major powers, such as Russia and China (both of which largely lack similar alliance networks); that although allies might be capable of defending themselves without U.S. help, they might also choose, in the absence of U.S. help, to bandwagon with would-be regional hegemons (rather than contribute to efforts to balance against them); that in addition to mutual defense benefits, alliances offer other benefits, particularly in peacetime, including sharing of intelligence, information, and technology and the cultivation of soft-power forms of cooperation; and that a transactional approach to alliances, which encourages the merits of each bilateral alliance relationship to be measured in isolation, overlooks the collective benefits of maintaining alliances with multiple countries in a region.

U.S. Public Opinion

U.S. public opinion can be an important factor in debates over the future U.S. role in the world. Among other things, public opinion can

- shape the political context (and provide the impulse) for negotiating the terms of, and for considering whether to become party to, international agreements;
- influence debates on whether and how to employ U.S. military force; and
- influence policymaker decisions on funding levels for defense, international affairs activities, and foreign assistance.

Foreign policy specialists, strategists, and policymakers sometimes invoke U.S. public opinion poll results in debates on the U.S. role in the world. One issue relating to U.S. public opinion that observers are discussing is the extent to which the U.S. public may now believe that U.S. leaders have broken a tacit social contract under which the U.S. public, and particularly the middle class, has supported the costs of U.S. global leadership in return for the promise of receiving certain benefits, particularly steady increases in real incomes and the standard of living.

Operation of U.S. Democracy

Another potential issue for Congress is how the operation of democracy in the United States might affect the U.S. role in the world, particularly in terms of defending and promoting democracy and criticizing and resisting authoritarian and illiberal forms of government.

During the Cold War, the effective operation of U.S. democracy at the federal level and lower levels was viewed as helpful for arguing on the world stage that Western-style democracy was superior, for encouraging other countries to adopt that model, and for inspiring people in the Soviet Union and other authoritarian countries to resist authoritarianism and seek change in the direction of more democratic forms of government. The ability of the United State to demonstrate

the effectiveness of democracy as a form of government was something that in today's parlance would be termed an element of U.S. soft power.

The end of the Cold War led to a diminution in the ideological debate about the relative merits of democracy versus authoritarianism as forms of government. As a possible consequence, there may have been less of a perceived need during this period for focusing on the question of whether the operation of U.S. democracy was being viewed positively or otherwise by observers in other countries.

The shift in the international environment over the past few years from the post-Cold War era to an era of renewed great power competition[6] has led to a renewed ideological debate about the relative merits of Western-style democracy versus 21st-century forms of authoritarian and illiberal government. Articles in China's state-controlled media, for example, sometimes criticize the operation of U.S. democracy and argue that China's form of governance is more advantageous. The potential issue for Congress is whether, in a period of renewed ideological competition, there is now once again a need for focusing more on the question of whether the operation of U.S. democracy is being viewed positively or otherwise by observers in other countries.

Potential Implications for Congress as an Institution

Another issue for Congress is what implications a changed U.S. role in the world might have for Congress as an institution, particularly regarding the preservation and use of congressional powers and prerogatives relating to foreign policy, national security, and international economic policy, and more generally the role of Congress relative to that of the executive branch in U.S. foreign policymaking. Specific matters here include, among other things, the question of war powers, the delegation of authority for imposing tariffs, and whether a change in the U.S. role would have any implications for congressional organization, capacity, and operations.[7]

Reversibility of a Change in U.S. Role

Another potential issue for Congress is whether a change in the U.S. role in the world would at some point in the future be reversible, should U.S. policymakers in the future desire to return to a U.S. role in the world more like that of the past 70 years. Potential questions for Congress include the following:

- What elements of a change in the U.S. role in the world should be reversed, and what elements should be maintained?
- What elements of change in the U.S. role might be more reversible, less reversible, or irreversible? What elements might be less reversible due to technological developments, changes in international power dynamics, or changes in U.S. public opinion?
- How much time and effort would be required to implement a return to a U.S. role like that of the past 70 years?
- How might the issue of reversibility be affected by the amount of time that a change in the U.S. role remains in place before an attempt might be made to reverse it?

[6] For more on this shift, see CRS Report R43838, *Renewed Great Power Competition: Implications for Defense—Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

[7] For additional discussion, see Kevin Kosar, ed., *Congress and Foreign Affairs: Reasserting the Power of the First Branch*, R Street Institute, 2020, 64 pp.

- How might decisions that Congress and the executive branch make in the near term affect the question of potential downstream reversibility? What actions, if any, should be taken now with an eye toward preserving an option for reversing nearer-term changes in the U.S. role?
- What are the views of other countries regarding the potential reversibility of a change in the U.S. role, and how might those views affect the foreign policies of those countries?

Additional Writings

As potential sources of additional reading, **Appendix C** presents a list of recent writings reflecting various perspectives on whether the United States under the Trump Administration has changed the U.S. role in the world and what the implications of such a change might be.

Appendix A. Glossary of Selected Terms

Some key terms used in this report include the following:

Role in the world

The term *role in the world* generally refers in foreign policy discussions to the overall character, purpose, or direction of a country's participation in international affairs or the country's overall relationship to the rest of the world. A country's role in the world can be taken as a visible expression of its grand strategy (see next item). In this report, the term *U.S. role in the world* is often shortened for convenience to *U.S. role*.

Grand strategy

The term *grand strategy* generally refers in foreign policy discussions to a country's overall approach for securing its interests and making its way in the world, using all the national instruments at its disposal, including diplomatic, informational, military, and economic tools (sometimes abbreviated in U.S. government parlance as DIME). A country's leaders might deem elements of a country's grand strategy to be secret, so that assessments, assumptions, or risks included in the strategy are not revealed to potential adversaries. Consequently, a country's leaders might say relatively little in public about the country's grand strategy. As mentioned above, however, a country's role in the world can be taken as a visible expression of its grand strategy. For the United States, grand strategy can be viewed as strategy at a global or interregional level, as opposed to U.S. strategies for individual regions, countries, or issues.

International order/world order

The term *international order* or *world order* generally refers in foreign policy discussions to the collection of organizations, institutions, treaties, rules, norms, and practices that are intended to organize, structure, and regulate international relations during a given historical period. International orders tend to be established by major world powers, particularly in the years following wars between major powers, though they can also emerge at other times. Though often referred to as if they are fully developed or firmly established situations, international orders are usually incomplete, partly aspirational, sometimes violated by their supporters, rejected (or at least not supported) by certain states and nonstate actors, and subject to various stresses and challenges.

Unipolar/bipolar/tripolar/multipolar

In foreign policy discussions, terms like *unipolar*, *bipolar*, *tripolar*, and *multipolar* are sometimes used to refer to the number of top-tier world powers whose actions tend to characterize or give structure to a given historical period's international security situation. The Cold War that lasted from the late 1940s to the late 1980s or early 1990s is usually described as a bipolar situation featuring a competition between two superpowers (the United States and the Soviet Union) and their allies. The post-Cold War era, which followed the Cold War, is sometimes described as the unipolar moment, with the United States being the unipolar power, meaning the world's sole superpower.

As discussed in another CRS report,[8] observers have concluded that in recent years, there has been a shift from the post-Cold War era to a new international security situation characterized by renewed great power competition between the United States, China, and Russia, leading observers to refer to the new situation as a tripolar or multipolar world. Observers who might list additional countries (or groups of countries, such as the European Union) as additional top-tier world powers, along with the United States, China, and Russia, might also use the term multipolar.

Eurasia

The term Eurasia is used in this report to refer to the entire land mass that encompasses both Europe and Asia, including its fringing islands, extending from Portugal on its western end to Japan on its eastern end, and from Russia's Arctic coast on its northern edge to India on its southern edge, and encompassing all the lands and countries in between, including those of Central Asia, Southwest Asia, South Asia, and Southeast Asia. Eurasia's fringing islands include, among others, the United Kingdom and Ireland in Europe, Sri Lanka in the Indian Ocean, the archipelagic countries of Southeast Asia, and Japan. There are also other definitions of Eurasia, some of which are more specialized and refer to subsets of the broad area described above.

Regional hegemon

The term *regional hegemon* generally refers to a country so powerful relative to the other countries in its region that it can dominate the affairs of that region and compel other countries in that region to support (or at least not oppose) the hegemon's key policy goals. The United States is generally considered to have established itself in the 19th century as the hegemon of the Western Hemisphere.

Spheres-of-influence world

The term *spheres-of-influence world* generally refers to a world that, in terms of its structure of international relations, is divided into multiple regions (i.e., spheres), each with its own hegemon. A spheres-of-influence world, like a multipolar world, is characterized by having multiple top-tier powers. In a spheres-of-influence world, however, at least some of those top-tier powers have achieved a status of regional hegemon, while in a multipolar world, few or none of those major world powers (other than the United States, the regional hegemon of the Western Hemisphere) have achieved a status of regional hegemon. As a result, in a spheres-of-influence world, international relations are more highly segmented on a regional basis than they are in a multipolar world.

Geopolitics

The term *geopolitics* is often used as a synonym for international politics or for strategy relating to international politics. More specifically, it refers to the influence of basic geographic features on international relations, and to the analysis of international relations from a perspective that places a strong emphasis on the influence of such geographic features. Basic geographic features involved in geopolitical analysis include things such as the relative sizes and locations of countries or land masses; the locations of key resources such as oil or water; geographic barriers

[8] CRS Report R43838, *Renewed Great Power Competition: Implications for Defense—Issues for Congress*, by Ronald O'Rourke.

such as oceans, deserts, and mountain ranges; and key transportation links such as roads, railways, and waterways.

Hard power and soft power

In foreign policy discussions, the term *hard power* generally refers to coercive power, particularly military and economic power, while the term *soft power* generally refers to the ability to persuade or attract support, particularly through diplomacy, development assistance, support for international organizations, education and cultural exchanges, and the international popularity of cultural elements such as music, movies, television shows, and literature.

Appendix B. Past U.S. Role vs. More Restrained Role

This appendix provides additional discussion on the debate over whether the United States should attempt to continue playing the active internationalist role that it has played for the past 70 years, or instead adopt a more restrained role that reduces U.S. involvement in world affairs.

Among U.S. strategists and foreign policy specialists, advocates of a more restrained U.S. role include (to cite a few examples) Andrew Bacevich, Doug Bandow, Ted Galen Carpenter, John Mearsheimer, Barry Posen, Christopher Preble, William Ruger, and Stephen Walt. These and other authors have offered multiple variations on the idea of a more restrained U.S. role. Terms such as *offshore balancing*, *offshore control*, *realism*, *strategy of restraint*, or *retrenchment* have been used to describe some of these variations.[9] These variations on the idea of a more restrained U.S. role would not necessarily match in their details a changed U.S. role that might be pursued by the Trump Administration.[10]

Arguments in Favor of a More Restrained U.S. Role

Observers advocating a more restrained U.S. role in the world make various arguments regarding the United States and other countries. Arguments that they make relating to the United States include the following:

- **Costs and benefits.** In terms of human casualties, financial and economic impacts, diplomatic impacts, and impacts on domestic U.S. values, politics, and society, the costs to the United States of defending and promoting the liberal international order have been underestimated and the benefits have been overestimated. U.S. interventions in the security affairs of Eurasia have frequently been more costly and/or less successful than anticipated, making a strategy of intervening less cost-effective in practice than in theory. U.S. interventions can also draw the United States into conflicts involving other countries over issues that are not vital or important U.S. interests.
- **Capacity.** Given projections regarding future U.S. budget deficits and debt, the United States in coming years will no longer be able to afford to play as expansive a role in the world as it has played for the past 70 years. Overextending U.S. participation in international affairs could lead to excessive

[9] The terms *offshore balancing* and *offshore control* refer in general to a policy in which the United States, in effect, stands off the shore of Eurasia and engages in the security affairs of Eurasia less frequently, less directly, or less expansively. The term *retrenchment* is more often used by critics of these proposed approaches.

[10] Debate about this dimension of the U.S. role in the world is not limited to one between those who favor continued extensive engagement along the lines of the past 70 years and those who prefer some form of a more restrained role—other options are also being promoted. For example, one analyst and former White House aide advocates an approach that differs from both retrenchment and reassertion, an approach he labels "re-calibration" to the "geopolitical, economic, technological and other dynamics driving the 21st-century world." Such an approach, he argues, would entail a reappraisal of U.S. interests, a reassessment of U.S. power, and a repositioning of U.S. leadership. (See Bruce Jentleson, "Apart, Atop, Amidst: America in the World," *War on the Rocks*, January 2017.)

As another example, a different analyst argues in favor of a U.S. role based on "a better nationalism"—what he describes as a more benign and constructive form that "would not dismantle the post-war order and America's post war project, but would take a harder-edged and more disciplined approach to asserting U.S. interests." (Hal Brands, "U.S. Grand Strategy in an Age of Nationalism: Fortress American and it Alternatives," *Washington Quarterly*, Spring 2017: 73-93.)

amounts of federal debt and inadequately addressed domestic problems, leaving the United States poorly positioned for sustaining any future desired level of international engagement.

- **Past 70 years as a historical aberration.** The U.S. role of the past 70 years is an aberration when viewed against the U.S. historical record dating back to 1776, which is a history characterized more by periods of restraint than by periods of high levels of international engagement. Returning to a more restrained U.S. role would thus return U.S. policy to what is, historically, a more traditional policy for the United States.
- **Moral standing.** The United States has not always lived up to its own ideals, and consequently lacks sufficient moral standing to pursue a role that involves imposing its values and will on other countries. Attempting to do that through an interventionist policy can also lead to an erosion of those values at home.
- **Public opinion.** It is not clear that U.S. public opinion supports the idea of attempting to maintain a U.S. role in the world as expansive as that of the past 70 years, particularly if it means making trade-offs against devoting resources to domestic U.S. priorities. In public opinion polls, Americans often express support for a more restrained U.S. role, particularly on issues such as whether the United States should act as the world's police force, funding levels for U.S. foreign assistance programs, U.S. participation in (and financial support for) international organizations, and U.S. defense expenditures for defending allies.

Arguments that these observers make relating to other countries include the following:

- **Growing wealth and power.** Given the rapid growth in wealth and power in recent years of China and other countries, the United States is no longer as dominant globally as it once was, and is becoming less dominant over time, which will make it increasingly difficult or expensive and/or less appropriate for the United States to attempt to continue playing a role of global leadership.
- **Ideas about international order.** Other world powers, such as China, have their own ideas about international order, and these ideas do not match all aspects of the current liberal international order. The United States should acknowledge the changing global distribution of power and work with China and other countries to define a new international order that incorporates ideas from these other countries.
- **Eurasia as self-regulating.** Given the growth in the economies of U.S. allies and partners in Europe and Asia since World War II, these allies and partners are now more capable of looking after their own security needs, and Eurasia can now be more self-regulating in terms of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons in Eurasia. Consequently, the level of U.S. intervention in the affairs of Eurasia can be reduced without incurring undue risk that regional hegemons will emerge there. The current substantial level of U.S. intervention in the affairs of Eurasia discourages countries in Eurasia from acting more fully on their own to prevent the emergence of regional hegemons.
- **Hegemons and spheres of influence.** Even if one or more regional hegemons were to emerge in Eurasia, this would not pose an unacceptable situation for the United States—vital U.S. interests could still be defended. Similarly, the emergence of a spheres-of-influence world need not be unacceptable for the

United States, because such a world would again not necessarily be incompatible with vital U.S. interests.

Arguments in Favor of Continuing U.S. Role of the Past 70 Years

Observers who support a continuation of the U.S. role in the world of the past 70 years generally reject the above arguments and argue the opposite. Arguments that these observers make relating to the United States include the following:

- **Costs and benefits.** Although the costs to the United States of its role in the world over the past 70 years have been substantial, the benefits have been greater. The benefits are so long-standing that they can easily be taken for granted or underestimated. U.S. interventions in the security affairs of Eurasia, though not without significant costs and errors, have been successful in preventing wars between major powers and defending and promoting vital U.S. interests and values. A more restrained U.S. role in the world might be less expensive for the United States in the short run, but would create a risk of damaging U.S. security, liberty, and prosperity over the longer run by risking the emergence of regional hegemons or a spheres-of-influence world.
- **Capacity.** Projections regarding future U.S. budget deficits and debt need to be taken into account, but even in a context of limits on U.S. resources, the United States is a wealthy country that can choose to play an expansive role in international affairs, and the costs to the United States of playing a more restrained role in world affairs may in the long run be much greater than the costs of playing a more expansive role. Projections regarding future U.S. budget deficits and debt are driven primarily by decisions on revenues and domestic mandatory expenditures rather than by decisions on defense and foreign-policy-related expenditures. Consequently, these projections are an argument for getting the country's fiscal house in order primarily in terms of revenues and domestic mandatory expenditures, rather than an argument for a more restrained U.S. role in the world.
- **Past 70 years as a historical aberration.** Although a restrained U.S. foreign policy may have been appropriate for the United States in the 18th and 19th centuries, the world of the 18th and 19th centuries was quite different. For example, given changes in communication, transportation, and military technologies since the 18th and 19th centuries, the Atlantic and Pacific oceans are much less effective as geographic buffers between the United States and Eurasia today than they were in the 18th and 19th centuries. Experiences in more recent decades (including World Wars I and II and the Cold War) show that a more restrained U.S. foreign policy would now be riskier or more costly over the long run than an engaged U.S. foreign policy.
- **Moral standing.** The United States, though not perfect, retains ample moral authority—and responsibility—to act as a world leader, particularly in comparison to authoritarian countries such as China or Russia.
- **Public opinion.** Other public opinion poll results show that Americans support a U.S. global leadership role.

Arguments that these observers make relating to other countries include the following:

- **Growing wealth and power.** Although the wealth and power of countries such as China have grown considerably in recent years, future rates of growth for those countries are open to question. China faces the prospect of declining rates of economic growth and the aging and eventual shrinkage of its population, while Russia has a relatively small economy and is experiencing demographic decline. The United States has one of the most favorable demographic situations of any major power, and retains numerous advantages in terms of economic and financial strength, military power, technology, and capacity for innovation. Although the United States is no longer as dominant globally as it once was, it remains the world's most powerful country, particularly when all dimensions of power are taken into consideration.
- **Ideas about international order.** The liberal international order reflects U.S. interests and values; a renegotiated international order incorporating ideas from authoritarian countries such as China would produce a world less conducive to defending and promoting U.S. interests and values. Americans have long lived in a world reflecting U.S. interests and values and would not welcome a world incorporating Chinese values on issues such as the rule of law; the scope of civil society; political and human rights; freedom of speech, the press, and information; and privacy and surveillance.
- **Eurasia as self-regulating.** Eurasia historically has not been self-regulating in terms of preventing the emergence of regional hegemons, and the idea that it will become self-regulating in the future is a risky and untested proposition.
- **Hegemons and spheres of influence.** A regional hegemon in Eurasia would have enough economic and other power to be able to threaten vital U.S. interests. In addition to threatening U.S. access to the economies of Eurasia, a spheres-of-influence world would be prone to war because regional hegemons historically are never satisfied with the extent of their hegemonic domains and eventually seek to expand them, coming into conflict with other hegemons. Leaders of regional hegemons are also prone to misjudgment and miscalculation regarding where their spheres collide.

Appendix C. Additional Writings

As potential sources of additional reading, this appendix presents a list of writings over the past six months reflecting various perspectives on whether the United States under the Trump Administration has changed the U.S. role in the world and what the implications of such a change might be, listed in chronological order, with the most recent on top. Writings from more than six months ago can be found in earlier versions of this report.

Samantha Power, "The Can-Do Power, America's Advantage and Biden's Chance," *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2021.

John J. Mearsheimer, "Joe Biden Must Embrace Liberal Nationalism to Lead America Forward," *National Interest*, December 29, 2020.

Doug Palmer, "Turn It Up to 11: Trump's Trade Carnage Went Beyond Tariff Wars," *Politico Pro*, December 29, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "When To Fold 'Em: What Biden Should Do About Trump's Lesser Known Foreign Policies," Cato Institute, December 28, 2020.

Colum Lynch, "How Trump's Assault on International Organizations Benefits Beijing, The United States Was Already Fighting with China for Influence at Global Organizations, But the Pandemic Made Everything Worse," *National Interest*, December 28, 2020.

Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Does the International Liberal Order Have a Future? The Difficult Question for Biden Will be Whether the United States and China Can Cooperate in Producing Global Public Goods While Competing in the Traditional Areas of Great Power Rivalry," *National Interest*, December 28, 2020.

Michael Rubin, "Joe Biden's Biggest Foreign Policy Challenge: Irredentism, The United States Was Never the Catalyst for Conflict but Rather Was the Lid on the Pressure Cooker. America's Retreat Opens the Door to Dictators and Despots to Pursue Their Own Revanchist Ideologies," *National Interest*, December 28, 2020.

Patrick Mendis and Antonina Luszczykiewicz, "To Balance China, Joe Biden Should Build upon Trump's India Strategy," *National Interest*, December 27, 2020.

Robert W. Merry, "Can Joe Biden Really Overcome America's Divisions? Can Biden Craft a Trade Policy that Keeps Overseas Markets Open to U.S. Goods While Protecting the Interests of Working-Class Americans Devastated by Past Unfair Practices by American Trading Partners, Particularly China?" *National Interest*, December 27, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "A Restart for U.S.-China Relations? There Presently is Little Trust or Rapport between the U.S. and China. That is Unlikely to Change; The Two Governments Nevertheless Must Find a Way Forward," Cato Institute, December 26, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "Between Biden and Beijing, A Biden Administration Has Important Incentives and Justifications for Trying to Restore the More Cooperative Status Quo that Existed Before Donald Trump Became President," Cato Institute, December 26, 2020.

John O'Sullivan, "Biden Should Pursue a Trump 2.0 Foreign Policy, On a Range Of Issues—Trade Negotiations, Relations with China, Balancing between Iran and the Sunni Arab States in the Middle East—Biden Should Be Thinking of Pursuing a Better-Managed Version of Trump's Foreign Policy," *National Interest*, December 26, 2020.

Paul R. Pillar, "Why There Won't be a Biden Doctrine, Biden's Legacy Will Rest on How Well He Performs the Repair Job, More than on Any Programs to Move the Country Ahead from Where It Stood as of 2016," *National Interest*, December 25, 2020.

Nikolas K. Gvosdev, "Why Americans Are Turning Inwards, The New Administration Has an Opportunity to Define an Affirmative Vision for the 2020s that Can Both Advance America's Geopolitical Position on the World Stage, but Also Be Linked to Concrete Benefits that Americans Will Receive," *National Interest*, December 24, 2020.

Melinda Haring, "How to Reinvent Democracy Promotion, The United States Cannot Credibly Promote Democracy Abroad Any Longer, and the Biden Administration Must Act Swiftly to Remedy Our Own Deficiencies," *National Interest*, December 24, 2020.

Pranshu Verma and Jeffrey Gettleman, "Biden Is Expected to Expand U.S.-India Relations While Stressing Human Rights," *New York Times*, December 24, 2020.

James Jay Carafano et al., *Why the United States Needs an Atlantic Strategy*, Heritage Foundation, December 23, 2020, 24 pp.

Jack Detsch, "Forever's Gonna Stop Tonight, Trump Pledged to End America's 'Forever Wars.' He Almost Managed To—But Left Carnage Behind," *National Defense*, December 23, 2020.

Barry Gewen, "Why Joe Biden Will Confront the Limits of American Power, We Are No Longer the 'Exceptional Nation,' Whatever that Means. Who These Days Believes that the United States Is an Ethical Paragon for the Rest of the World to Emulate, or that American Ideals Are Universal Aspirations?" *National Interest*, December 23, 2020.

Jared Keller, "Do Americans Really Care About War Crimes? Trump's Pardoning of Four Blackwater Contractors Underscores America's Apathy towards War Crimes Committed Abroad," *Task and Purpose*, December 23, 2020.

Jeremy Page, "How the U.S. Misread China's Xi: Hoping for a Globalist, It Got an Autocrat," *Wall Street Journal*, December 23, 2020.

Stephen M. Walt, "America's History of Luck Is Running Out, The Country's Rise Was Fueled by Fortunate Circumstances that Seem Unlikely to Last Much Longer," *Foreign Policy*, December 23, 2020.

Austin Bay, "On Point: The Enemy Is Fragility: Pompeo's New Strategy," *Strategy Page*, December 22, 2020.

Zack Cooper and Laura Rosenberger, "Democratic Values Are a Competitive Advantage, The Contest with Authoritarianism Requires the United States to Understand Its Strengths," *Foreign Affairs*, December 22, 2020.

Evan A. Feigenbaum, "Meeting the Challenge in Asia, To Succeed in Asia, President-Elect Joe Biden Will Need an Administration that Whines Less, Competes More, and Leverages American Strengths in the Asia that Actually Exists, Not the One of Its Wishes, Dreams, and Fantasies," *National Interest*, December 22, 2020.

Yoichi Funabashi, "Three Challenges Biden Must Confront, Maintaining the Liberal International Order Requires Addressing Covid-19, Foreign Policy with a Focus on China, and International Trade," *National Interest*, December 22, 2020.

Jeff M. Smith, "Avoiding an Early Blunder: Why the U.S. Must Not Abandon the Indo-Pacific," Heritage Foundation, December 22, 2020.

Tony Walker, "Joe Biden's Approach to the Middle East Could be a 180 from Trump, Especially on Iran," *National Interest*, December 22, 2020.

Ahmed Charai, "Don't Underestimate American Resilience, For an Outside Observer Who Believes in the 'American Dream,' the Problems of Today Look Like Just Another Catalyst for America's Relentless National Spirit to Innovate Solutions that Will Make The Country Stronger," *National Interest*, December 21, 2020.

Paula J. Dobriansky, "Time for a New American Century, The President-Elect Advance a Strategy Clearly Elaborating the Principles of U.S. Foreign Policy and Why the Protection of Vital National Interests Require American Global Leadership," *National Interest*, December 21, 2020.

Emma M. Ashford, "Why Joe Biden Can't Restore the Foreign Policy Status Quo, Donald Trump, Though Not a Good President, Created a Window of Opportunity for Reform in U.S. Foreign Ppolicy. Biden Would Be Wise to Seize that Opportunity," *National Interest*, December 20, 2020.

David Bromwich, "The Demise of American Exceptionalism, The Best Thing the Policy Elite Could Do, for the United States and the World, Would Be to Put Themselves Out of Business," *National Interest*, December 20, 2020.

Jackson Diehl, "Trump Has Pressed Hostile Regimes to Release American Prisoners. His Favorite Dictators, Not So Much." *Washington Post*, December 20, 2020.

Jacob Heilbrunn, "What Is the Purpose of American Foreign Policy? Several Experts Debated What Is the Purpose of America and U.S. Power," *National Interest*, December 20, 2020.

Dimitri K. Simes, "Why America Needs a Foreign Policy Reset, We Must Recognize that World Affairs are Rarely Black and White, that Alliances Should Serve as Instruments of U.S. Policy Rather than as Ends in Themselves, and that—Like It or Not—History as We Always Knew It Has Returned," *National Interest*, December 20, 2020.

Dan Balz, "America's Image Has Tumbled During Trump's Presidency. Can Biden Turn It Around?" *Washington Post*, December 19, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Joe Biden Needs a Pivot to a Humbler Foreign Policy, The Past 20 Years Have Brought Little Except Failure and Destruction. Rather than Listen to Antony Blinken, Biden Should Change," Cato Institute, December 18, 2020.

Robert M. Gates, "The World Is Full of Challenges. Here's How Biden Can Meet Them. The Incoming Administration Needs to Update American Policy to Meet the Challenges of the 21st Century," *New York Times*, December 18, 2020.

David Frum, "13 Things Trump Got Right, Nobody Does Nothing As President, Not Even Someone Who Watches Television For Five Or Six Hours A Day," *Atlantic*, December 18, 2020.

David A. Graham, "Trump Failed to Protect America, The President's Decision Not to Push Back Aggressively Against Putin's Meddling Seems Only to Have Encouraged It," *Atlantic*, December 18, 2020.

James M. Lindsay, "Transition 2021: How Much Foreign Policy Leverage Is Trump Leaving Biden?" Council on Foreign Relations, December 18, 2020.

Jacob Heilbrunn, "Can Joe Biden Take America Back to the Future? For All Biden's Promises to Restore American Leadership—a Decorous Word for Predominance—the Era of Liberal Interventionism is Likely Over. Trump Tried to Bury It; Biden May Sign the Death Certificate," *National Interest*, December 17, 2020.

Mai Truong, "How Trump and the 2020 US Election Are Helping Authoritarians' Domestic Causes, The Trump Administration Has Gifted Autocrats with Three Key Tools for Consolidating Their Strength at Home," *Diplomat*, December 17, 2020.

Helle C. Dale, "New Leadership Is Exactly What Voice of America Needs," Heritage Foundation, December 16, 2020.

Nikki Haley, "Nikki Haley: Biden Shouldn't Reject All of Trump's Foreign Policies. Here Are Three He Should Keep," *Washington Post*, December 16, 2020.

Anders Fogh Rasmussen, "A New Way to Lead the Free World, The Authoritarian Tide Has Risen, but a Global Alliance of Democracies Would Help Turn It Back," *Wall Street Journal*, December 15, 2020.

Luis Simon, "Biden and Europe's Dilemmas," *War on the Rocks*, December 15, 2020.

Jennifer Steinhauer and Michael Crowley, "Biden to Face a Confrontational Russia in a World Changed From His Time in Office," *New York Times*, December 15, 2020.

Loren Thompson, "Love Him Or Hate Him, President Trump's Defense Legacy Is Profound," *Forbes*, December 15, 2020.

James Goldgeier and Bruce W. Jentleson, "A Democracy Summit Is Not What the Doctor Ordered, America, Heal Thyself," *Foreign Affairs*, December 14, 2020.

Walter Russell Mead, "Can Biden Find Clarity on China and Russia? Shared Interests Help Shape Geopolitical Rivalries, but They Can't Erase Them," *Wall Street Journal*, December 14, 2020.

Alex Ward, "The Single Biggest Foreign Policy Decision Joe Biden Faces, Will Biden's Foreign Policy Be One Of Restoration, Reformation, Or Revolution?" *Vox*, December 14, 2020.

Andrew A. Michta, "America's Fin de Siècle: How Unbound Liberalism Has Brought the Country to Its Knees," *National Interest*, December 13, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "Joe Biden Might Have Good Instincts, But His Foreign Policy Team Doesn't," *American Conservative*, December 11, 2020.

Stephen M. Walt, "Biden Sees the A-Team. I See the Blob," *Foreign Policy*, December 11, 2020.

Dan DePetris, "Milley Is Right—the U.S. Should Reevaluate Its Military Commitments," *Defense News*, December 10, 2020.

Mary Harris, "Maybe the U.S. Shouldn't Be the World's Leader," *Slate*, December 10, 2020.

Emilie Kao and Brett D. Schaefer, "Can Human Rights Be Rescued From Human Rights Activists' Overreach?" Heritage Foundation, December 10, 2020.

Reuters staff, "U.S. Blacklists People in Russia, Haiti, Yemen for Rights Abuses," *Reuters*, December 10, 2020.

Ian Talley, "U.S. Sanctions Accused Human Rights Abusers in Several Countries," *Wall Street Journal*, December 10, 2020.

Isaac Chotiner, "The Next Stage of the Ideological Struggle Between the U.S. and China," *New Yorker*, December 9, 2020.

Dan Lamothe, "Like Trump, Biden has promised to end the 'forever wars.' The landscape remains complicated," *Washington Post*, December 9, 2020.

Paul Sonne, "To Counter China and Russia, Biden Has Said He Will Strengthen Alliances," *Washington Post*, December 9, 2020.

Nick Wadhams and Saleha Mohsin, "Trump Set Record Sanctions Use That Biden Is Likely to Keep," *Bloomberg*, December 9, 2020.

Michael T. Klare, "Trump Is Leaving Us With a New Cold War," *Nation*, December 8, 2020.

Simon Lester, "President Biden Must Restore American Trade Leadership," Cato Institute, December 8, 2020.

Danielle Pletka, "On Foreign Policy, Trump Created Opportunities for Biden, Will the President-Elect Build on Them or Rush to Repudiate Trump's Legacy?" *Dispatch*, December 8, 2020.

Alex Ward, "The Revenge of the Blob, Presidents Obama and Trump Kept the Nation's Foreign Policy Establishment at Arm's Length. President-Elect Biden Has Warmly Embraced It," *Vox*, December 8, 2020.

Edward Alden, "Report Sheds Light on How Biden's Future NSC Chief Wants to Reshape U.S. Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy*, December 7, 2020.

Ryan P. Burke, "The Hidden Dangers in Biden's Foreign Policy, The President-Elect's Stated Agenda Will Antagonize China and Lead to Conflict," *Defense One*, December 7, 2020.

Austin Doehler, "Great Power Competition Is Too Narrow a Frame, The United States Cannot Hope to Prevail and Prosper Unless It Broadens Its Conception of the Global Struggle," *Defense One*, December 6, 2020.

Michael Hirsh, "Why Liberal Internationalism Is Still Indispensable—and Fixable," *Foreign Policy*, December 5, 2020.

Evan Sankey, "Damage Done: Why Joe Biden Needs to Leave Trump's Policies Alone," *National Interest*, December 5, 2020.

Zachary Shore, "Divided We Fall: Why the 'America First' Policy Has Created New Problems," *National Interest*, December 4, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "The Blob Is Back And It's Ready For War," *American Conservative*, December 3, 2020.

Samuel Barnett, Natalie Thompson, and Sandy Alkoutami, "How Gen Z Will Shake Up Foreign Policy," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, December 3, 2020.

Niall Ferguson, "Cold War II," *National Review*, December 3, 2020.

Thomas Joscelyn, "Trump's Wish to End the 'Endless Wars' Denies Reality, ISIS Isn't Dead, al-Qaeda Is Not a 'Shadow of Its Former Self,' and the Taliban Is Not Our Counterterrorism Partner," *Dispatch*, December 3, 2020.

Amy Mackinnon, "Biden Expected to Put the World's Kleptocrats on Notice, The U.S. President-Elect and His Top Advisors Have Made the Fight Against Dirty Money One of Their Early Priorities," *Foreign Policy*, December 3, 2020.

Peter Beinart, "Biden Wants America to Lead the World. It Shouldn't. U.S. 'Leadership' Is a Favorite Trope of the Foreign Policy Establishment. It's Outdated and Dangerous," *New York Times*, December 2, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "Why Can't Europe Defend Itself?" *National Interest*, December 1, 2020.

Scott Cullinane, "Biden, the Transatlantic Relationship and a Changing America," *The Hill*, December 1, 2020.

Ash Jain and Alex Pascal, "Alliances First: Joe Biden's Historic Opportunity to Reshape Global Order," *National Interest*, December 1, 2020.

Jonathan Stearns, "EU Leaders Plan Appeal to Biden to Rebuild Transatlantic Ties," *Bloomberg*, December 1, 2020.

Hannah Beech, "'Trump Is Better': In Asia, Pro-Democracy Forces Worry About Biden," *New York Times*, November 230 (updated December 1), 2020.

Dolf Gielen and Morgan Bazilian, "How John Kerry Will Restore America's Climate Leadership," *National Interest*, November 29, 2020.

James Marson, "Biden's NATO Amity Sparks Debate Among European Allies," *Wall Street Journal*, November 28, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Team Trump Determined to Drop Foreign Policy Bombs on the Way Out," Cato Institute, November 27, 2020.

David von Drehle, "Joe Biden Says America Is Back. Back to What?" *Washington Post*, November 27, 2020.

Benjamin H. Friedman and Stephen Wertheim, "Say No, Joe, On U.S. Foreign Policy, There's No Going Back to the Status Quo," *Foreign Policy*, November 25, 2020.

Colum Lynch, "Biden Likely to Lift Sanctions on ICC Chief Prosecutor," *Foreign Policy*, November 25, 2020.

Anne-Marie Slaughter and Alexandra Stark, "Crafting a Diplomacy-First US Foreign Policy," *Strategist*, November 25, 2020.

Dolf Gielen and Morgan Bazilian, "How Biden and Kerry Could Rebuild America's Global Climate Leadership," *The Conversation*, November 24, 2020.

Michael R. Gordon, "National-Security Picks Combine Diverse Backgrounds, Singular Aims," *Wall Street Journal*, November 24, 2020.

Kim Hjelmgaard and Deirdre Shesgreen, "Even Trump's Fiercest Critics Say He May Have Gotten Some World Affairs Right," *USA Today*, November 24, 2020.

Trevor Hunnicutt and Humeyra Pamuk, "Rejecting Trump's Foreign Policy Approach, Biden Says 'America Is Back,'" *Reuters*, November 24, 2020.

Annie Karni and David E. Sanger, "Biden's National Security Team Offers a Sharp Turn. But in Which Direction?" *New York Times*, November 24, (updated December 8), 2020.

Charles A. Kupchan, "Aspects of Trump's Foreign Policy Were Good for the U.S., Biden Should Keep Them," *Washington Post*, November 24, 2020.

Carol Morello, "Foreign Observers Shocked by Chaos over U.S. Election," *Washington Post*, November 24, 2020.

David Rothkopf, "Biden's National Security Team Reveals He Has Learned from the Mistakes of Past Presidents," *USA Today*, November 24, 2020.

Frederic Wehrey, "How Joe Biden Can Rein in Donald Trump's Reckless Middle East Policy," *Politico*, November 24, 2020.

Jorge G. Castañeda, "Biden Can Inspire Latin America, A Domestic Transformation of the United States Would Have a Tremendous Impact in the Region," *New York Times*, November 23, 2020.

Gregory D. Foster, "We Have Met the Enemy, and It Is Us: Restoring American Power, Getting the Nation's House in Order—Restoring Our Integrity and Dignity—is a Precondition for Reestablishing Our Standing in the World," *Defense One*, November 23, 2020.

Robbie Gramer, Jack Detsch, and Amy Mackinnon, "In Break From Trump, Biden Opts for Experience, Expertise for Top National Security Jobs," *Foreign Policy*, November 23, 2020.

Eli Lake, "Progressives May Not Like Biden's Foreign Policy, The President-Elect's National Security Cabinet Will be Too Centrist for the Left Flank of His Party," *Bloomber*g, November 23, 2020.

Matthew Lee, "Biden's Choice for UN Envoy Signals Return to US Engagement," *Associated Press*, November 23, 2020.

Matthew Lee, "Trump Aims to Box in Biden Abroad, but It May Not Work," *Associated Press*, November 23, 2020.

Charles V. Peña, "Why Joe Biden Should Lead a Reboot of NATO," *National Interest*, November 23, 2020.

Kori Schake, Jim Mattis, Jim Ellis, and Joe Felter, "Defense In Depth, Why U.S. Security Depends on Alliances—Now More Than Ever," *Foreign Affairs*, November 23, 2020.

Jackson Diehl, "Trump's Overarching Middle East Strategy Reaches a Disastrous Dead End," *Washington Post*, November 22, 2020.

Thomas Wright, "The Fraught Politics Facing Biden's Foreign Policy, His Presidency May be the Establishment's Last Best Chance to Demonstrate that Liberal Internationalism is a Superior Strategy to Populist Nationalism," *Atlantic*, November 22, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "President Joe Biden Confronts A Radically Different World Than When He Was Veep, America's Foreign Entanglements Are Unnecessary. Joe Biden Has a Chance to End Them," *American Conservative*, November 20, 2020.

Jason Blazakis, "Trump Abused U.S. Sanctions and Failed to Get Results. Biden Can Do Better," *Foreign Policy*, November 19, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "Will Biden Jettison the Anti-Russia Hysteria?" *Antiwar.com*, November 19, 2020.

Daniel Fried and Benjamin Haddad, "Biden Knows Europe, and Europe Knows Biden. That's Not Enough. How to Start a New—and Overdue—Chapter of Trans-Atlantic relations," *Foreign Policy*, November 19, 2020.

Sushma Raman, "Getting Human Rights Right, Before Biden Can Lead in the World, He'll Have to Lead at Home," *Foreign Policy*, November 19, 2020.

Jonathan Tepperman, "Can Biden End America's Forever Wars? Delivering on His Promise Will Prove Extremely Difficult—but So May the Consequences of Not Doing So," *Foreign Policy*, November 19, 2020.

Anne Applebaum, "The World Is Never Going Back to Normal, Other Countries Are Learning to Live without America. Biden Can't Restore the Pre-Trump Status Quo," *Atlantic*, November 18, 2020.

Walden Bello, "What Will a Biden Presidency Bring to the Asia Pacific?" Foreign Policy in Focus, November 18, 2020.

Giselle Donnelly, "Can Joe Biden Save the World America Made? He May be the Last Man in Position to Reverse the Wreck of US Post-Cold War Foreign Policy and Preserve What Remains of the Liberal International Order," *National Interest*, November 18, 2020.

Daniel Immerwahr, "Should America Still Police the World? On the Problem—and Potential—of a Seventy-Year-Old Superpower," *New Yorker*, November 18, 2020.

Corina Rebegea, "Inbox: Reviving the Transatlantic Democratic Agenda," Center for European Policy Analysis, November 18, 2020.

Andrew J. Bacevich and Adam Weinstein, "Trump Demands Afghan Withdrawal and Washington Panics. But It's Time to Leave, Now," *Responsible Statecraft*, November 17, 2020.

Robin Emmott and John Irish, "After Trump, Europe Aims to Show Biden It Can Fight for Itself," *Reuters*, November 17, 2020.

Thomas Gibbons-Neff, Najim Rahim and Fatima Faizi, "U.S. Troops Are Packing Up, Ready or Not," *New York Times*, November 17, 2020.

Robert A. Manning, "A Gaping Hole in US Indo-Pacific Strategy," *The Hill*, November 17, 2020.

Tom McTague, "Joe Biden Has a Barack Obama Problem, Many Leaders in Asia, in Particular, Remain Unhappy with the Former President's Foreign Policy," *Defense One*, November 17, 2020.

William Ruger and Rajon Menan, "It's Time to Withdraw from Afghanistan," *Washington Post*, November 17, 2020.

Josh Rogin, "Trump's Latest Summit No-shows Are His Final Insult to America's Asian Allies," *Washington Post*, November 17, 2020.

Stephen M. Walt, "Trump Is in Denial—and America Is Unsafe, A House Divided against Itself Can't Compete on the World Stage," *Foreign Policy*, November 17, 2020.

Alex Ward, "The 3 Elements of Trump's Foreign Policy Biden Should Keep, Trump's Foreign Policy Was Terrible. But Biden should still follow parts of it," *Vox*, November 17, 2020.

Katie Bo Williams, "Trump Orders Hasty Afghanistan, Iraq Drawdowns to Beat Biden Inauguration," *Defense One*, November 17, 2020.

Jordan Fabian and Jennifer Epstein, "Biden Vows to Rebuild U.S. Ties With World: 'America Is Back,'" *Bloomber*g, November 16, 2020.

Charles A. Kupchan, "For the West, There Is No Road Back to a Time Before Trump, Europeans Are Relieved by Biden's Victory But Will Be Very Disappointed If They Don't Heed the Lessons of the Past Four Years," *Foreign Policy*, November 16, 2020.

Jean-Yves Le Drian and Heiko Maas, "French and German Foreign Ministers: Joe Biden Can Make Transatlantic Unity Possible," *Washington Post*, November 16, 2020.

Ania Nussbaum, "Macron Says EU Can't Go Back to Relying on U.S. Under Biden," *Bloomberg*, November 16, 2020.

Eric Schmitt, Thomas Gibbons-Neff, Charlie Savage, and Helene Cooper, "Trump Is Said to Be Preparing to Withdraw Troops From Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia," *New York Times*, November 16, 2020.

Ray Takeyh, "Trump's Parting Gift to Biden: A More Stable Middle East, He Was Successful Because Only an Iconoclastic President Could Have Rejected False Assumptions and Failed Strategies," *Foreign Policy*, November 16, 2020.

Jeanne Whalen, "Biden Likely to Remain Tough on Chinese Tech Like Huawei, But with More Help from Allies," *Washington Post*, November 16, 2020.

Paola Tamma, "Europe's Biden bind: Stick with US or go it alone? Continent Split Between Wanting Close Ties to Washington and Desire to Develop Its Own Power," *Politico*, November 15, 2020.

Luke McGee, "Joe Biden's Victory Isn't Enough on Its Own to Heal the Wounds Trump Inflicted on Europe," *CNN*, November 14, 2020.

Brandon Valeriano and Eric Gomez, "A Biden Foreign Policy: Restraint By Circumstance, Not Design," *American Conservative*, November 14, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Joe Biden Should Break Ranks and Stop the New Cold War With Russia," Cato Institute, November 13, 2020.

Tom McTague, "Europe Can't Blame Donald Trump Anymore, The Question for the Continent's Leaders Now is Whether They Can Agree on What They Are Collectively For, Not Just What They Are Against," *Defense One*, November 13, 2020.

Tara Varma and Jeremy Shapiro, "The European Offers America Cannot Refuse," *War on the Rocks*, November 13, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "Will the Democrats and Biden Continue to Treat Russia as the Enemy?" Cato Institute, November 12, 2020.

Fred Kaplan, "What Will Joe Biden's Foreign Policy Look Like? The President-Elect's Emphasis Will Be on Restoring U.S. Alliances. But is it Too Late for That?" *Slate*, November 12, 2020.

Suzanne Nossel, "Biden Must Restore America's Reputation as a Beacon of Press Freedom, After Four Years of Hostility to Journalists and a Free Press, the United States Must Repair the Damage Trump Has Done at Home and Abroad," *Foreign Policy*, November 12, 2020.

Matthieu Vallières, "Joe Biden's Empathy May Result in a 'Therapeutic' Foreign Policy," *The Conversation*, November 12, 2020.

Paul D. Shinkman, "How President Trump's Foreign Policy Could Actually Help President-Elect Biden, The Incoming Administration is Poised to Try to Undo Four Years of Trump's Foreign Policies. In Some Cases, Biden Would be Unwise to Even Try, Analysts Say," *U.S. News & World Report*, November 11, 2020.

Robin Wright, "The Seven Pillars of Biden's Foreign Policy," *New Yorker*, November 11, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "When America's Election Is Over, Americans Will Have to Address China," Cato Institute, November 10, 2020.

Theodore R. Bromund, "The U.S. Must Promote Democratic Leadership in Interpol," Heritage Foundation, November 10, 2020.

Michael Crowley, "An Obama Restoration on Foreign Policy? Familiar Faces Could Fill Biden's Team," *New York Times*, November 9, 2020.

Richard Haass, "Repairing the World, The Imperative—and Limits—of a Post-Trump Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, November 9, 2020.

Sara Khorshid, "What Trump's Loss Means for Authoritarian Leaders, From Cairo to Riyadh, Autocrats Are Nervous about What a Biden Administration Might Mean for Their Relationship with Washington," *Foreign Policy*, November 9, 2020.

Charles V. Peña, "Biden Shouldn't Toss All of Trump's Foreign Policies, From Ending Forever Wars to Pressing Allies to Shoulder More of Their Defense Loads, the Next President Should Pursue at Least Some of His Predecessor's Goals," *Defense One*, November 9, 2020.

David E. Sanger, "The End of 'America First': How Biden Says He Will Re-engage With the World, Those Who Have Known President-Elect Joseph R. Biden Jr. for Decades Say They Expect Him to Move Carefully, Providing Reassurance with a Few Big Symbolic Acts," *New York Times*, November 9 (updated November 12), 2020.

Matthew Karnitschnig, "What Biden Means for Europe, On Key Issues from Climate Change to China, How the Next US President Will Revamp Transatlantic Ties," *Politico*, November 8, 2020.

Tom McTague, "Joe Biden Won't Fix America's Relationships, Serious Questions about America's Role in the World Will Not Go Away Just Because Donald Trump Was Defeated," *Atlantic*, November 8, 2020.

James Stavridis, "A Preview of Biden's Foreign Policy," *Bloomberg*, November 8, 2020.

Rick Gladstone, "Biden to Face Long List of Foreign Challenges, With China No. 1," *New York Times*, November 7 (updated November 15), 2020.

Barry Pavel et al., "Joe Biden Just Won the Presidency: What Does that Mean for America's Role in the World?" Atlantic Council, November 7, 2020.

James Palmer, "Don't Expect a Biden Win to Boost U.S. Favorability, Obama Won Hearts All over the World, but People Have Been Burned Twice Now," *Foreign Policy*, November 6, 2020.

Anchal Vohra, "Trump Promised to End America's Wars. Biden Might Actually Do It. The Former Vice President Contributed to a Legacy of Failed Wars in the Middle East. Can He Fix It?" *Foreign Policy*, November 6, 2020.

Peter Feaver, "What Trump's Near-Victory Means for Republican Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy*, November 5, 2020.

Jessica T. Mathews, "Time for a New Approach to Foreign Affairs," *New York Review of Books*, November 5, 2020.

Josh Rogin, "The Election Has Already Changed the Politics of U.S. Foreign Policy," *Washington Post*, November 5, 2020.

Valerie Volcovici and Kate Abnett, "U.S. Formally Exits Global Climate Pact amid Election Uncertainty," *Reuters*, November 4, 2020.

Liam Kennedy, "Has Donald Trump Tarnished America for Good?" *National Interest*, November 3, 2020.

Daniel Kochis, "NATO Allies Now Spend $50 Billion More on Defense Than in 2016," Heritage Foundation, November 3, 2020.

James M. Roberts, "Changing International Aid," Heritage Foundation, November 3, 2020.

Editorial Board, "Another Alliance Trump Didn't Break, U.S. and India Will Share Intelligence as the China Threat Looms," *Wall Street Journal*, November 2, 2020.

Edith M. Lederer, "Over 70 ICC Nations Support Court and Oppose US Sanctions," *Associated Press*, November 2, 2020.

National Security Council, "President Trump on China: Putting America First," White House, November 2, 2020.

Ishaan Tharoor, "When America Decided to Rule the World," *Washington Post*, November 2, 2020.

Kurt Volker, "US Foreign Policy After November 3: More Continuity than Change," Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA), November 2, 2020.

Ryan Crocker, "The World Won't Organize Itself, Biden Understands What Career Diplomats Know: America's Relationships Overseas Require Hands-on Management, and Conditions in the Field Are Messier Than They Appear," *Atlantic*, November 1, 2020.

Sumantra Maitra, "Trump's Foreign Policy Legacy Is His Ability to Balance Chaos in Asia, Trump's Facilitating an Alliance with India and Arming Taiwan as a Frontier State Against a Rising China Will Be His Defining Legacy, a Strategy That Will Likely Continue Even if Joe Biden Wins the Presidency," *National Interest*, November 1, 2020.

Patrick Mendis Joey Wang, "Can the United States Leave Behind the Partisan Politics of 'America First' in Foreign Relations?" *National Interest*, November 1, 2020.

Christopher Mott, "The Death of Exceptionalism and the Birth of a New Foreign Policy," *National Interest*, November 1, 2020.

Hillary Clinton, "A National Security Reckoning, How Washington Should Think About Power," *Foreign Affairs*, November/December 2020.

Anne Applebaum, "How China Outsmarted the Trump Administration, While the U.S. Is Distracted, China Is Rewriting the Rules of the Global Order," *Atlantic*, November 2020.

"End the War in Afghanistan and Unwind Post-9/11 Mistakes," *Defense Priorities*, November 2020.

Peter Baker, "George Shultz Speaks Out for Renewing U.S. Leadership Overseas, At a Moment When the United States Has Pulled Back from Its Allies, the Former Secretary of State Lamented the Trump Administration's Allergy to International Accords," *New York Times*, October 31, (updated November 2), 2020.

Michael Birnbaum and Loveday Morris, "Whether Trump or Biden Wins, Europe Doesn't Think It Can Depend on U.S.," *Washington Post*, October 31, 2020.

Zack Brown, "The Myth of American Primacy, Does Global Armed Dominance Still Pay?" *National Interest*, October 31, 2020.

Karen DeYoung and Steve Hendrix, "Trump Critics Hail Accords between Israel and Arab Countries Even as Original Goal of Palestinian Peace Remains Unmet," *Washington Post*, October 31, 2020.

Farah N. Jan Kolby Kaller, "Trump's Big Mistake: America Is Making China Great Again, Beijing is Quietly Taking Advantage of American Isolationist Policies and is Advancing its Image as the Next Global Leader," *National Interest*, October 31, 2020.

Timothy McLaughlin, "Trump Is a 'Necessary Evil' for Some, Despite His Own Assault on Democratic Norms, the President Is Lauded in Parts of Asia for His Hawkishness Toward China," *Atlantic*, October 31, 2020.

Dakota Wood, "The Myth of Endless Wars," *National Interest*, October 31, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "Nation Building Overseas? America's Own Neighborhood Is Becoming More Violent, Mexico Is Descending Even Further into Carnage and Dysfunction. So Why Are We So Focused on the Middle East?" *American Conservative*, October 30, 2020.

Thomas L. Friedman, "Trump Has Made the Whole World Darker," *New York Times*, October 30, 2020.

Shalom Lipner, "Donald Trump's Fire-Sale of International Peace Agreements, With Polls Indicating a Likely Biden Win, International Leaders Are Lining up to Cut Last-Second Bargains with a Highly Transactional President Trump," *National Interest*, October 30, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "The 'Adults In The Room' With Trump Weren't Adults At All, A New Book Tour by H.R. McMaster Shows How Little the Foreign Policy Professionals Have Learned from Two Decades of Endless War," *American Conservative*, October 29, 2020.

Roger Cohen, "How Trump Lowered America's Standing in the World," *New York Times*, October 29, 2020.

Tom McTague and Peter Nicholas, "How 'America First' Became America Alone, In His Desperation to Restore and Showcase American Strength, Donald Trump Has Made the Country Weaker," *Atlantic*, October 29, 2020.

Kori Schake, "Threats and Border Walls Are Destroying the United States' Biggest Strategic Advantage, Restoring a Common Purpose with Canada and Mexico is the Lowest-Hanging Fruit in U.S. Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy*, October 29, 2020.

Riley Walters, "How to Use the World Trade Organization to Deal with China," Heritage Foundation, October 29, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, "The Fight Over the World Trade Organization Has Begun," Heritage Foundation, October 28, 2020.

Steven A. Cook, "Trump's Middle East Legacy Is Failure, The President Has Had a Handful of Successes—But Never Anything Approaching a Strategy," *Foreign Policy*, October 28, 2020.

Melanie Israel and Grace Melton, "The Trump Administration Won't Accept Abortion as a Human Right," Heritage Foundation, October 28, 2020.

Edward P. Joseph, "How Trump Lost the Balkans, The Administration's See-No-Evil Diplomacy Has Produced a Dangerous Unraveling Across the Region," *Foreign Policy*, October 28, 2020.

Bonnie Kristian, "All U.S. Troops in Afghanistan Should Come Home by Christmas," *National Interest*, October 28, 2020.

Willis Krumholz, "America Enforcing a Core NATO Pledge Does Not Mean It's Abandoning Allies," *Defense News*, October 28, 2020.

Inu Manak, "WTO Director-General's Race Shows the United States is Not Interested in Reform," Cato Institute, October 28, 2020.

James A. Winnefeld, Michael J. Morell, and Graham Allison, "Why American Strategy Fails, Ending the Chronic Imbalance Between Ends and Means," *Foreign Affairs*, October 28, 2020.

Joseph Bosco, "Trump Team Reinforces a Fundamental Reality: China Must Change," *The Hill*, October 27, 2020.

Colum Lynch, Amy Mackinnon, Robbie Gramer, "Trump Appointee Seeks to Turn U.S. Media Agency Into a Political Cheerleader," *Foreign Policy*, October 27, 2020.

Will Moreland, "To Compete with China and Russia, America Needs a New Era of Mmultilateralism, Progressives Want to Revive Global Cooperation. But the US Must Compete, Not Just Cooperate," *Vox*, October 27, 2020.

Rebecca Ray, "Donald Trump's Trade Wars Did More Harm Than Good," *National Interes*t, October 27, 2020.

Charles A. Kupchan, "What Americans Can Learn From Their Isolationist Past," *National Interest*, October 26, 2020.

Michael Lind, "Why America First Is Here To Stay, Even if Donald Trump Is Defeated," *National Interest*, October 26, 2020.

Philip Zelikow, "The U.S. Foreign Service Isn't Suited for the 21st Century, Created for Another Age, Washington's Foreign-Policy Institutions Have Atrophied. The Next Administration Should Rebuild and Reshape Them," *Foreign Policy*, October 26, 2020.

Philip Rucker and Shane Harris, "Tumult at Home, Ailing Alliances Abroad: Why Trump's America Has Been a 'Gift' to Putin," *Washington Post*, October 25, 2020.

Emma Ashford and Matthew Kroenig, "Trump and Biden Are Both Touting Foreign-Policy Failures as Achievements," *Foreign Policy*, October 23, 2020.

Daniel Davis, "Risk to America of Maintaining Forever-War Status Quo Dangerously High," *Military Times*, October 23, 2020.

Editorial Board, "The Arab-Israeli Peace Cascade," *Wall Street Journal*, October 23, 2020.

Van Jackson and Hunter Marston, "Trump, Not Biden, Wrecked American Power in the Pacific, The Damage Done to U.S. Standing in Asia Will Take Decades to Repair," *Foreign Policy*, October 23, 2020.

Jeffrey A. Stacey, "The Era of Full-Spectrum War Is Here, China Won Round One, and Round Two Went to Russia. Can the United States and Its Allies Take the Third?" *Foreign Policy*, October 23, 2020.

Katie Bo Williams and Patrick Tucker, "What Would a Second Trump Term Mean For Foreign Policy?" *Defense One*, October 23, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "America's Language of Mass Destruction Convinces Nobody," *Foreign Policy*, October 22, 2020.

Matthew Duss, "U.S. Foreign Policy Never Recovered From the War on Terror, Only a Reckoning With the Disastrous Legacy of 9/11 Can Heal the United States," *Foreign Affairs*, October 22, 2020.

Irene Entringer Garcia Blanes, Alexandra Murphy, Susan Peterson, Ryan Powers, and Michael J. Tierney, "Poll: How Biden and Trump Differ on Foreign Policy, A Survey of Academics Underscores Sharp Divergences on Key Issues but Expects Bipartisan Alignment Next Year on China, Cybersecurity, and counterterrorism," *Foreign Policy*, October 22, 2020.

Steven Erlanger, "Europe Wonders if It Can Rely on U.S. Again, Whoever Wins, America's Deeply Polarized Politics Have Marked Foreign Policy, Too, Undermining Washington's Authority and Reputation for Reliability," *New York Times*, October 22, 2020.

Jamie McIntyre, "Trump's Four-Year National Security Report Card: As, Bs, Cs, and Several Incompletes," *Washington Examiner*, October 22, 2020.

Rodger A. Payne and Kurt Mills, "Does Donald Trump's America First Strategy Mean Human Rights Last?" *National Interest*, October 22, 2020.

Daniel L. Davis, "Trump Or Biden Can Still Fix America's Failing Foreign Policy," *National Interest*, October 21, 2020.

Charles A. Kupchan, "America's Pullback Must Continue No Matter Who Is President, For All the Talk of a New Administration Boldly Reengaging With the World After Four Years of 'America First,' Trump's Strategic Retrenchment Can Only Be the Start," *Foreign Policy*, October 21, 2020.

Tom McTague and Peter Nicholas, "The World Order That Donald Trump Revealed, When It Comes to Foreign Policy, the President's Most Important Characteristic Is Not Amorality or a Lack of Curiosity; It Is Naïveté," *Atlantic*, October 20, 2020.

Loren Thompson, "Get Ready For President Biden To Throw U.S. Security Policies Into Reverse," *Forbes*, October 20, 2020.

Dan Caldwell, "The Politics of Restraint," *Real Clear World*, October 19, 2020.

CAP National Security and International Policy Team, "The First 100 Days: Toward a More Sustainable and Values-Based National Security Approach," Center for American Progress (CAP), October 19, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, "It's Not NATO, but Quad Group Can Get Results in Asia," Heritage Foundation, October 19, 2020.

Daniel L. Davis, "What Americans Want in Foreign Policy (No Matter if Biden or Trump Wins)," *National Interest*, October 19, 2020.

Michael Rubin, "The Dangerous Decline of U.S. Diplomacy," *National Interest*, October 19, 2020.

Michelle Fitzpatrick, "EU-US Alliance 'On Life Support' After Four Years of Trump," *Agence France-Presse*, October 18, 2020.

Pranshu Verma, "Trump's Sanctions on International Court May Do Little Beyond Alienating Allies," *New York Times*, October 18, 2020.

George Beebe, "Balancing Great Power Politics in 2021 and Beyond, The Distance Between U.S. Aspirations for Dealing with Great Power Rivals and Its Capacity for Reaching Its Goals Has Never Been Greater," *National Interest*, October 17, 2020.

Hans Binnendijk, America Is Clearly in Decline. But It Can Be Reversed," *National Interest*, October 17, 2020.

Serge Schmemann, "The Foreign Policy That Wasn't," *New York Times*, October 16, 2020.

Eric Schmitt, "Trump's Tweets on Troop Withdrawals Unnerve Pentagon, The President's Demands to Draw Down Forces in Afghanistan, Somalia and Syria Seek to Fulfill a Campaign Promise. But Officials Warn Rapid Troop Reductions Could Bolster Adversaries," *New York Times*, October 15 (updated October 21), 2020.

Stephen Wertheim, "America Has No Reason to Be So Powerful, Eighty Years Ago, the United States Made a Tragic Decision to Pursue Global Supremacy. The Project Has Outlived Its Purpose," *New York Times*, October 15, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, Luke Coffey, and Daniel Kochis, "A Golden Opportunity for the U.S. to Lead NATO Into the Future," Heritage Foundation, October 14, 2020.

Olivia Enos and Emilie Kao, "Religious Persecution in China Must Be Called Out," Heritage Foundation, October 14, 2020.

Robbie Gramer, "Trump's Foreign-Policy Adventures Haven't All Flopped, For All the Chaos, the Trump Administration Has Notched Some Notable Victories Abroad. The Question Is Whether They Outweigh Everything Else Trump Brought to Washington—and the World," *Foreign Policy*, October 14, 2020.

Ezra Klein, "The Case for Trump's Foreign Policy, The President Has Shifted How Both Parties Think About Trade, Alliances, Russia, and China. Is That a Good Thing?" *Vox*, October 14, 2020.

Scott Lincicome, "Calculating the True Cost of Trump's 'Trade Wars,'" Cato Institute, October 14, 2020.

Jamie McIntyre, "Trump Pledge to 'End Endless Wars' Reportedly Targets Somalia for Next US Troop Withdrawal," *Washington Examiner*, October 14, 2020.

James Jay Carafano and Ana Rosa Quintana, "U.S. Empowering Women to Bolster Peace and Security," Heritage Foundation, October 13, 2020.

Luke Coffey, "Managing America's Alliance System," Heritage Foundation, October 13, 2020.

Richard Fontaine, "America Must Promote Democracy, Despite Trump's Disdain for It, Even If 2020 Marks a Low Point of U.S. Democratic Practice, Supporting Liberalism Abroad Must Remain a Vital Element of U.S. Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy*, October 13, 2020.

Nick Wadhams and Jennifer Jacobs, "Trump Demands a Plan to Withdraw U.S. Troops From Somalia," *Bloomberg*, October 13, 2020.

Walter Russell Mead, "A World of Geopolitical Opportunity, America's Global Position Is Stronger Today Than in 2016 in Some Important Ways," *Wall Street Journal*, October 12, 2020.

Michael Crowley, "Trump's Campaign Talk of Troop Withdrawals Doesn't Match Military Reality," *New York Times*, October 11 (updated October 22), 2020.

David M. Halbfinger, Ben Hubbard, and Farnaz Fassihi, "For Trump, Defying Mideast Truisms Produced Breakthroughs and Backfires, Disregarding Norms and Accepted Wisdom, President Trump Went His Own Way in the Middle East and, in Some Cases, Got What He Wanted," *New York Times*, October 11 (updated October 22), 2020.

Jackson Diehl, "Trump's Continuing Vandalism of the Voice of America," *Washington Post*, October 11, 2020.

Editorial Board, "Trump's Latest Rantings Will Please the Taliban, If No One Else," *Washington Post*, October 9, 2020.

Ravi Agrawal, "Why the Quad Is the One Alliance Trump Cares About, The United States May Shun Multilateralism, But It Is Successfully Uniting Australia, India, and Japan against China," *Foreign Policy*, October 8, 2020.

Lolita C. Baldor and Kathy Gannon, "Military Blindsided by Trump's New Afghan Troop Withdrawal," *Associated Press*, October 8, 2020.

Joshua Keating, "Mike Pence and Donald Trump Have Two Different Foreign Policies, They Only Occasionally Overlap," *Slate*, October 8, 2020.

Josh Rogin, "U.S. Foreign Policy Might Be Too Broken for Biden to Fix," *Washington Post*, October 8, 2020.

Missy Ryan, Karen DeYoung, and Susannah George, "After Trump Promises a Swift Troop Exit from Afghanistan, Confusion Grows About U.S. Stance," *Washington Post*, October 8, 2020.

Lara Seligman and Connor O'Brien, "Trump Undercuts His National Security Adviser on Troop Withdrawal," *Politico*, October 8, 2020.

Brett D. Schaefer, "Prioritizing Global Freedom and Prosperity at the United Nations and International Organizations," Heritage Foundation, October 8, 2020.

Philip Stephens, "Democracy Faces Bigger Threats Than Vladimir Putin or Xi Jinping, Western Governments Must Counter Autocrat Aggression, But Saving Democracy Starts at Home," *Financial Times*, October 8, 2020.

Mike Gonzalez and Helle Dale, "The Axis of Disruption," Heritage Foundation, October 7, 2020.

David Ignatius, "The Rest of the World Is Taking Advantage of a Distracted America," *Washington Post*, October 6, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "South Korea Doesn't Need U.S. Military Babysitting," *Foreign Policy*, October 2, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "How Our Pointless Wars Made Life Hell For Religious Minorities," *American Conservative*, October 1, 2020.

Eric Brewer, "Why Trump's Retreat from US Allies Could Have Nuclear Consequences, For Decades, America Gave Allies and Partners Good Reason to Shelve Their Nuclear-Weapons Efforts," *Defense One*, October 1, 2020.

Lewis Libby and Hillel Fradkin, "The UAE/Bahrain–Israel Deal: A Time for Celebration and Critical Self-Reflection," *National Review*, October 1, 2020.

Grace Melton, "U.N. Should Recommit to Pro-Woman Agenda by Dropping Push for Abortion," Heritage Foundation, October 1, 2020.

Charles Ray and Kevin Green, "Needed: American Diplomacy, Defense, Democracy, In the Past Century the World Has Seen What Happens When the United States Leads and When It Does Not. We're All Better Off When It Does," *U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings*, October 2020.

Robbie Gramer and Colum Lynch, "Trump Officials Seek to Push Social Conservative Values in International Agreements," Foreign Policy, September 30, 2020.

Rebecca Lissner and Mira Rapp-Hooper, "A Foreign Policy for the Day After Trump, Reimagining—not Restoring—the Liberal International Order," *Foreign Affairs*, September 30, 2020.

Wesley J. Smith, "Does Pompeo Care More about Chinese Catholics than the Pope Does?" *National Revi*ew, September 30, 2020.

Thomas Wright, "What a Second Trump Term Would Mean for the World," *Atlantic*, September 30, 2020.

Jonathan Alter, "How the United States Learned to Love Human Rights," *Foreign Policy*, September 29, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, "Mike Pompeo's South America Trip Demonstrates Need for Sustained Commitment," Heritage Foundation, September 29, 2020.

Amitai Etzioni, "America Has a Shameful Double Standard on Human Rights," *National Interest*, September 29, 2020.

Augusta Saraiva, "Washington's 'Blind Eye' Toward Human Rights Abuses in Latin America," *Foreign Policy*, September 29, 2020.

Brett Schaefer and Danielle Pletka, "The Human Rights Council Must Reform to Earn U.S. Re-Engagement," Heritage Foundation, September 29, 2020.

Alexander Vindman and John Gans, "Trump Has Sold Off America's Credibility for His Personal Gain," *New York Times*, September 29, 2020.

Joschka Fischer, "The Transatlantic Tragedy," *Project Syndicate*, September 28, 2020.

Seth J. Frantzman, "Can Trump's 'Transactional' Diplomacy Get More Wins in the Middle East? In One Sense This Transactional Diplomacy Is Not Entirely Foreign to the Nature of US Foreign Policy Over the Last Two Hundred Years," *Jerusalem Post*, September 28, 2020.

Susan B. Glasser, "Biden Will Restore America's Moral Leadership," *New Yorker*, September 28, 2020.

Donna Rachel Edmunds, "Pompeo: The Chinese Communist Party is re-writing the Bible, Speaking at a Recent Summit, State Secretary Mike Pompeo Said That America Was Standing Up for Religious Freedom Worldwide, As Where It Fails, Totalitarism [sic] Soon Follows," *Jerusalem Post*, September 27, 2020.

Charles A. Kupchan, "*Isolationism* Is Not a Dirty Word, Americans Have Lost Touch With a Crucial Strain of Their Foreign-Policy Tradition," *Atlantic*, September 27, 2020.

James Goldgeier and Bruce W. Jentleson, "The United States Is Not Entitled to Lead the World, Washington Should Take A Seat at the Table—But Not Always at Its Head," *Foreign Affairs*, September 25, 2020.

Evan Osnos, "The TikTok Fiasco Reflects the Bankruptcy of Trump's Foreign Policy," *New Yorker*, September 25, 2020.

Jimmy Quinn, "Europe Makes Its Choice," *National Review*, September 25, 2020.

William J. Burns, "The Blob Meets the Heartland, Foreign Policy Should Work Better for America's Middle Class," *Atlantic*, September 24, 2020.

Kristine Lee, "The United States Can't Quit on the UN, When America Withdraws, China Wins," *Foreign Affairs*, September 24, 2020.

Armstrong Williams, "How Donald Trump Is Shaping History, At the End of the Day, There Is Only One Person in Charge, One Person to Whom We Can Credit This Deal That So Many Doubters Thought Would Never Come. That Person is Donald Trump," *National Interest*, September 24, 2020.

William J. Burns and Linda Thomas-Greenfield, "The Transformation of Diplomacy, How to Save the State Department," *Foreign Affairs*, September 23, 2020.

Zachary Cohen, "Trump Says He Likes Putin. US Intelligence Says Russia Is Attacking American Democracy," *CNN*, September 22, 2020.

Editorial Board, "Trump's Contempt for Truth Leaves a Toxic Legacy Around the World," *Washington Post*, September 22, 2020.

Jen Kirby, "At the UN, China's Xi Showed He Understands the System Better Than Trump, The US Is Ceding Leverage, Which Is Giving China the Influence It Craves," *Vox*, September 22, 2020.

Grant Newsham, "Did Trump Really Spoil America's Asia Alliances? In Reality, Trump Has Moved US Closer to India, Japan, Australia and Southeast Asian Allies Than His Predecessor Ever Did," *Asia Times*, September 22, 2020.

Brett D. Schaefer, "In U.N. Speech, Trump Highlights U.S. Response to COVID-19, Faults China," Heritage Foundation, September 22, 2020.

F. Cartwright Weiland, "Pompeo's Critics Misrepresent the Commission on Unalienable Rights, The NGOs and Activists Criticizing the Commission's Inaugural Report Are Distorting Its Contents," *Foreign Policy*, September 22, 2020.

WSJ Staff, "Where Trump and Biden Stand on China, Hard Line on Beijing Likely to Continue Regardless of U.S. Election Outcome," *Wall Street Journal*, September 22, 2020.

Robbie Gramer, Jack Detsch, and Colum Lynch, "U.S. Isolated at U.N. as Push to Ramp Up Pressure on Iran Fails," *Foreign Policy*, September 21, 2020.

Nahal Toosi, "The Trump Foreign Policies Biden Might Keep," *Politico*, September 21, 2020.

Nick Wadhams and David Wainer, "U.S. Issues New Iran Sanctions, But Most Nations Reject Move at UN," *Bloomberg*, September 21, 2020.

Douglas Bulloch, "A Method in the Madness? Donald Trump Restores 'Interests' to the Center of U.S. Foreign Policy," *National Interest*, September 20, 2020.

Warren P. Strobel and Michael R. Gordon, "Where Trump and Biden Stand on Foreign Policy, President Has Questioned U.S. Alliances, While Democratic Challenger Wants to Rebuild Relationships After the Election; Both Are Wary of Troop Deployments," *Wall Street Journal*, September 19, 2020.

Andrew Bacevich, "The Endless Fantasy of American Power, Neither Trump Nor Biden Aims to Demilitarize Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, September 18, 2020.

Matthew Continetti, "How Trump Changed the World, Column: By Defying Conventional Wisdom on the Middle East and China, He Reshaped Both Political Parties," *Washington Free Beacon*, September 18, 2020.

Rich Lowry, "Jared Kushner Was Right," *National Review*, September 18, 2020.

Yuki Tatsumi, "Needed: Restoration of U.S. Credibility in the Indo-Pacific Region," Stimson Center, September 18, 2020.

Dan Balz and Scott Clement, "Poll: Sharp Partisan Differences Now Exist on Foreign Policy, Views of American Exceptionalism," *Washington Post*, September 17, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Trump Challenges Pro-War Foreign Policy Elite," *American Conservative*, September 17, 2020.

Kevin Baron, "Nobody Wants America to Rule the World, Foreign Confidence in the U.S. Is Sinking Even Faster Than the Share of Americans Who See the Benefits of Engagement Beyond Our Borders," *Defense One*, September 17, 2020.

David Harsanyi, "Why Trump's Mideast Peace Deals Matter," *National Review*, September 17, 2020.

David Ignatius, "The Middle East's Winners and Losers After Trump's First Term Are Telling," *Washington Post*, September 17, 2020.

Eli Lake, "The Kurds Have Paid Dearly for Trump's Recklessness, A New Report Details the Horrific Consequences of the U.S. Withdrawal from Syria Last Year," *Bloomberg*, September 17, 2020.

David McKean and Bart M. J. Szewczyk, "The World Still Needs a United West, How Europe and the United States Can Renew Their Alliance," *Foreign Affairs*, September 17, 2020.

Dina Smeltz, Ivo Daalder, Karl Friedhoff, Craig Kafura, and Brendan Helm, *Divided We Stand, Democrats and Republicans Diverge on US Foreign Policy, Results of the 2020 Chicago Council Survey of American Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy*, Chicago Council on Global Affairs, undated, released September 17, 2020, 47 pp.

Sylvie Kauffmann, "Can Biden Fix What Trump Broke? E.U. Leaders Are Still Learning to Navigate a World Ever More Dangerous for Them, While Relations with the United States Grow More and More Awkward," *New York Times*, September 16, 2020.

Kevin D. Willioamson, "The World Sours on Washington, Our Credibility Is Waning, and We Should Care," *National Review*, September 16, 2020.

Jon B. Alterman, "Stumbling Out of the Middle East is No Better Than Stumbling In," *Defense One*, September 15, 2020.

Joseph Bosco, "Trump's Foreign Policy Successes Confound His Detractors," *The Hill*, September 15, 2020.

Alison Durkee, "U.S. Popularity Plummets Worldwide Amid Widely Criticized Coronavirus Response, Poll Finds," *Forbes*, September 15, 2020.

Rich Lowry, "How Trump Defied the Experts and Forged a Breakthrough in the Middle East," *National Review*, September 15, 2020.

Jimmy Quinn, "When the United States Stands Alone," *National Review*, September 15, 2020.

Oma Seddiq, "Trump Is Less Trusted Than Putin and Xi and the US Is Hitting Historic Lows of Approval from Its Closest Allies," *Business Insider*, September 15, 2020.

Paul Sonne and John Hudson, "Faced with Russia Crises, Trump and Top Aides Strike Different Tones," *Washington Pos*t, September 15, 2020.

Adam Taylor, "Global Views of U.S. Plunge to New Lows Amid Pandemic, Poll Finds," *Washington Pos*t, September 15, 2020.

Richard Wike, Janell Fetterolf, and Mara Mordecai, "U.S. Image Plummets Internationally as Most Say Country Has Handled Coronavirus Badly," Pew Research Center, September 15, 2020.

Jeffrey Goldberg, "Alexander Vindman: Trump Is Putin's 'Useful Idiot,'" *Atlantic*, September 14, 2020.

Joseph Krauss, "Trump's Mideast Deals Tout 'Peace' Where There Was Never War," *Associated Press*, September 14, 2020.

Bret Stephens, "A Rare Middle East Triumph, And—Yes—A Triumph for Trump, Too," *New York Times*, September 14, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Trump Is Right To Be Antiwar," *American Spectator*, September 12, 2020.

Samuel Ramani, "France and the United States Are Making West Africa's Security Situation Worse," *Foreign Policy*, September 12, 2020.

Michael Brendan Dougherty, "Bring Them Home, If We Want to End These Wars, We Can Look to Trump and Say: 'Do It, or We'll Find Someone Who Will,'" *National Review*, September 11, 2020.

Christopher A. Preble and Mathew Burrows, "Foreign Policy Elites Ignore Public Sentiment at Their Peril," *National Interest*, September 11, 2020.

Paul R. Pillar, "Donald Trump Is Putting America on the Wrong Side of War Crimes," *National Interest*, September 10, 2020.

Russell A. Berman, "The Kosovo-Serbia Agreement: Another Step Forward for Trump Foreign Policy," *National Interest*, September 9, 2020.

Robert Burns and Zeke Miller, "US Withdrawing Thousands of Troops from Iraq and Afghanistan," *Associated Press*, September 9, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, "James Carafano: US Troop Withdrawals from Iraq and Afghanistan Show Progress in Resolving 'Endless Wars,'" *Fox News*, September 9, 2020.

Joseph J. Collins, "Assessing Trump's National Security Record, How Has He Done Against Four Main Threats Our Nation Faces?" *Defense One*, September 9, 2020.

Daniel L. Davis, "America's Alliance with NATO Needs to Change," *National Interest*, September 9, 2020.

Colum Lynch, Robbie Gramer, and Allison Meakem, "Trump Administration Orders U.S. Diplomats to Curtail Contact With WHO," *Foreign Policy*, September 9, 2020.

Lara Seligman, "General Announces Iraq, Afghanistan Troop Drawdowns as Trump Looks to Fulfill Campaign Pledge," *Politico*, September 9, 2020.

Leo Shane III, "New Book Accuses Trump of Blasting Top Military Generals as 'P******' for Defending Foreign Alliances," *Military Times*, September 9, 2020.

Jamil Aderlini, "China's Middle East Strategy Comes at a Cost to the US, Beijing Gains in Oil and Influence as Successive Presidents in Washington Withdraw," *Financial Times*, September 8, 2020.

Sebastian Sprenger, "German Defense Leaders Place a Somber Bet on the US Election," *Defense News*, September 8, 2020.

Matthew Choi, "Trump Says Pentagon Chiefs Are Accommodating Weapons Makers," *Politico*, September 7, 2020.

Brittany Bernstein, "Trump Oversees 'Breakthrough' Serbia-Kosovo Agreement to Normalize Economic Relations," *National Review*, September 4, 2020.

Jimmy Quinn, "The Surprisingly Pragmatic Plan for WHO Withdrawal, The Trump Administration Is Walking a Tightrope on the WHO," *National Review*, September 4, 2020.

Michael Crowley, "Allies and Former U.S. Officials Fear Trump Could Seek NATO Exit in a Second Term," *New York Times*, September 3, 2020.

Michael Crowley and Maggie Haberman, "As Others Condemn Putin Critic's Poisoning, Trump Just Wants to 'Get Along,'" *New York Times*, September 3, 2020.

Anne Gearan and Paul Sonne, "Trump Administration Denounces Attack on Russian Dissident, Hints at Sanctions," *Washington Post*, September 3, 2020.

Katie Bo Williams, "As Russia Provokes, Trump Remains Silent," *Defense One*, September 3, 2020.

Colum Lynch, Robbie Gramer, and Jack Detsch, "Trump Appointee Takes 'Slash and Burn' Approach to Key USAID Bureau," *Foreign Policy*, September 2, 2020.

Katrina vanden Heuvel, "Trump Hasn't Ended Endless Wars. Congress Must Use the War Powers Resolution," *Washington Post*, September 1, 2020.

Richard Haass, "Present at the Disruption, How Trump Unmade U.S. Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2020.

Margaret MacMillan, "Which Past Is Prologue? Heeding the Right Warnings From History," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2020.

Shivshankar Menon, "League of Nationalists, How Trump and Modi Refashioned the U.S.-Indian Relationship," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2020.

Ben Rhodes, "The Democratic Renewal, What It Will Take to Fix U.S. Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2020.

Nadia Schadlow, "The End of American Illusion, Trump and the World as It Is," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2020.

Ganesh Sitaraman, "A Grand Strategy of Resilience, American Power in the Age of Fragility, *Foreign Aff*airs, September/October 2020.

Doug Bandow, "When Will Donald Trump Stop Even One Endless War? Time To Halt America's Illegal Occupation of Syria," *Antiwar.com*, August 31, 2020.

William J. Burns, "'America First' Enters Its Most Combustible Moment, If the Next 150 Days Turn Out to Be Trump's Final Days in Office, He Could Still Wreak a Lot of Havoc on American Foreign Policy," *Atlantic*, August 29, 2020.

Emma Ashford and Matthew Kroenig, "Is Trump Touting His Diplomatic Achievements to Get Reelected?" *Foreign Policy*, August 28, 2020.

James Jay Carafano and Kiron K. Skinner, "Why Donald Trump Needs a Supportive State Department," *National Interest*, August 28, 2020.

Chuck DeVore, "Biden Majors in the Minors. Trump Focuses on Existential Threats | Opinion," *Newsweek*, August 28, 2020.

Richard Grenell, "How to Remake the Foreign Service and Embassies for Today's World," *The Hill*, August 28, 2020.

Eli Lake, "Trump Doctrine: End Wars But Keep Threatening Enemies, The RNC Tried to Sell Voters on a Foreign Policy of Strength without Entanglements," *Bloomberg*, August 28, 2020.

Thomas Wright, "Will Trumpism Change Republican Foreign Policy Permanently?" *Defense One*, August 28, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Despite Military Resistance, Our Footprint In Iraq Is Finally Shrinking," *American Conservative*, August 27, 2020.

Philip H. Gordon, "What the Republican National Convention Tells Us About Trump's Foreign Policy," *Foreign Policy*, August 27, 2020.

Klaus W. Larres, "Trump's Foreign Policy Is Still 'America First'—What Does That Mean, Exactly?" *The Conversation*, August 27, 2020.

Kenneth Roth, "Pompeo's Commission on Unalienable Rights Will Endanger Everyone's Human Rights," *Foreign Policy*, August 27, 2020.

Leo Shane III, "Trump Vows to Continue Military Rebuild, Halt Endless Wars in Convention Finale," *Military Times*, August 27, 2020.

Richard Sisk, "At Conventions, Both Parties Endorse Military Pay Raises and Decry 'Endless Wars,'" *Military.com*, August 27, 2020.

James Traub, "Biden Is Getting Ready to Bury Neoliberalism, The Potential Next Democratic Administration Is Preparing to Upend Decades of Dogma on Globalization," *Foreign Policy*, August 27, 2020.

Mark Cancian, "The Fuzzy Outlines Of Biden's National Security Policies," *Breaking Defense*, August 26, 2020.

Alex Ward, "'America First, But on Steroids': What Trump's Second-Term Foreign Policy Might Look Like," *Vo*x, August 26, 2020.

Emma Ashford, "Biden Wants to Return to a 'Normal' Foreign Policy. That's the Problem. America Can't Go Back to Being Everywhere and Solving Every Problem," *New York Times*, August 25, 2020.

David Ignatius, "Pompeo Praises Trump, But Doesn't Have Much to Point to," *Washington Post*, August 25, 2020.

Michael Rubin, "Pompeo's Sudan Visit Shows the Way to Handle Rogue Regimes," *Washington Examiner*, August 25, 2020.

Leo Shane III, "GOP Leaders Promote Trump as a Wartime Commander Focused on Security and Peace," *Military Times*, August 25, 2020.

Nahal Toosi and Jacqueline Feldscher, "Pompeo Defends 'America First' Policies in Controversial Convention Appearance," *Politico*, August 25, 2020.

Leo Shane III, "Trump's Second-Term Plan Includes Stopping 'Endless' Wars, Boosting Military Support," *Military Times*, August 24, 2020.

Stephen M. Walt, "All Great-Power Politics Is Local, When It Comes to Building International Power, There's Growing Reason to Think That Foreign Policy Barely Matters," *Foreign Policy*, August 24, 2020.

Francis J. Gavin, "Blame It on the Blob? How to Evaluate American Grand Strategy," *War on the Rocks*, August 21, 2020.

Lanhee Chen, "Lead from the Front," *Washington Examiner*, August 20, 2020.

Victor David Hanson, "Goodbye—Sort of—to Germany? Why Should America Anchor Germany's Defense? It Cuts Deals with Russia, Has Never Met Its NATO Commitment, and Is the Most Anti-American Nation in Europe," *National Review*, August 20, 2020.

Thomas Joscelyn, "Endless Jihad, The Problem with Pledging to End Our 'Endless Wars,'" Foundation for Defense of Democracies, August 20, 2020.

Leo Shane III, "Biden Vows to Restore Global Respect, Military Integrity in Acceptance Speech," *Military Times*, August 20, 2020.

James Traub, "The Biden Doctrine Exists Already. Here's an Inside Preview," *Foreign Policy*, August 20, 2020.

Aaron David Miller, "Opinion: Israel And UAE's Accord Is A Big Win, But Don't Overplay It," *NPR*, August 19, 2020.

Klaus W. Larres, "Biden's Long Foreign-Policy Record Signals How He'll Reverse Trump, Rebuild Old Alliances and Lead the Pandemic Response," *The Conversation*, August 18 (updated August 19), 2020.

Jonathan Schanzer and Mark Dubowitz, "The Dangerous Illusion of Restraining U.S. Power, Isolationists Among Both Democrats and Republicans Want to Withdraw from Foreign Entanglements. That Would Make the World Much Less Safe," *Foreign Policy*, August 18, 2020.

Alex Ward, "Joe Biden's Plan to Fix the World, 'He's Looking at an Across-the-Board Restoration Project,' Said a former Obama Administration Official," *Vox*, August 18, 2020.

Micah Zenko and Rebecca Lissner, "This Is What America Looks Like Without Grand Strategy, The Verdict Is In: Donald Trump's Shallow Approach to Foreign Policy Has Damaged the United States," *Foreign Policy*, August 18, 2020.

Mathew Burrows and Robert A. Manning, "What Happens When America Is No Longer the Undisputed Super Power? Chief Among the Flawed Assumptions Undergirding American Foreign Policy Is the Belief That Perpetual U.S. Primacy is Both Desirable and Possible, the 'indispensable nation'—a Cliché Well Past Its Sell-by Date," *National Interest*, August 17, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, "Israel-UAE Agreement Shows Trump's Middle East Policy Succeeding," Heritage Foundation, August 17, 2020.

Fred Kaplan, "Alone Against the World, Pompeo's Regime Change Obsession Has Left America More Isolated Than Ever," *Slate*, August 17, 2020.

William Ruger, "Why Americans Want a President Who Ends Endless Wars," *National Interest*, August 17, 2020.

Brett D. Schaefer and Danielle Pletka, "How the WHO Can Earn Back U.S. Support," Heritage Foundation, August 17, 2020.

Jeremy Shapiro and Philip H. Gordon, "Trump and the Rise of Sadistic Diplomacy, His Administration Spent Four Years Mostly Failing to Reach Diplomatic Agreements. What It Did Instead Was Far More Disturbing," *Foreign Policy*, August 17, 2020.

Anthony B. Kim and Terry Miller, "Secretary Mike Pompeo's Ringing Call to Secure Human Rights and Liberty," Heritage Foundation, August 16, 2020.

Tiana Lowe, "Middle East Consolidates Against Iran, Disproving the Obama Doctrine," *Washington Examiner*, August 16, 2020.

Jared Kushner, "Jared Kushner: The Historic Deal Between Israel and the UAE Shows Trump's Strategy Is Paying Off," *Washington Post*, August 15, 2020.

Olivia Enos, "3 Reasons the U.S. Should Prioritize Human Rights With China," Heritage Foundation, August 14, 2020.

John Hannah, "The Israel-UAE Deal Is Trump's First Unambiguous Diplomatic Success, It's a Historic Achievement That Eluded Other Presidents. Trump Will Try to Make the Most of It," *Foreign Policy*, August 14, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "The United States Can't Handle China Alone, A Coordinated Strategy Is Emerging Among Allies, Despite Trump's Best Efforts," *Foreign Policy*, August 13, 2020.

Economist, "The Dereliction of American Diplomacy, Donald Trump Dismisses It as the 'Deep State Department'. Yet America Needs It More Than Ever," *Economist*, August 13, 2020.

Editorial Board, "Trump's Mideast Breakthrough, The Israel-UAE Accord Discredits Obama's Regional Vision," *Wall Street Journal*, August 13, 2020.

Richard Grenell, "Israel-UAE Breakthrough Proves Trump's Critics Wrong—Again," *The Hill*, August 13, 2020.

David Ignatius, "Trump Is Right. The Israel-UAE Agreement Is a Huge Achievement," *Washington Post*, August 13, 2020.

Dimitri K. Simes, "The Case For Trump, Donald Trump Isn't the Better Choice to Secure America's Future. He Is the Only Choice," *National Interest*, August 13, 2020.

Edward Wong, "Waning of American Power? Trump Struggles With an Asia in Crisis," *New York Times*, August 13, 2020.

Dov S. Zakheim, "The Case Against Trump, By the Time Trump's Term Reaches Its Unhappy Conclusion, He May Well Have Overtaken Andrew Johnson as the Most Dangerous Chief Executive Ever to Occupy the Executive Mansion," *National Interest*, August 13, 2020.

Jacob Helberg, "In the New Cold War, Deindustrialization Means Disarmament, Chinese Security Threats Offer the Chance to Rethink the U.S. Economy," *Foreign Policy*, August 12, 2020.

Matthew Lee, "Pompeo Urges Europe's Young Democracies to Embrace Freedoms," *Associated Press*, August 12, 2020.

Scott Lincicome, "We Can Finally Stop Pretending Trump Isn't a Protectionist," Cato Institute, August 12, 2020.

Matthew Lee, "In Europe, Pompeo Warns of China, Russia Authoritarianism," *Associated Press*, August 11, 2020.

David Ignatius, "Putin Is Reckless Because We Allow Him to Be," *Washington Post*, August 11, 2020.

Ted Galen Carpenter, "Trump's Latest Move in Europe Is a Betrayal of Foreign Policy Realism," *National Interest*, August 10, 2020.

Birgit Jennen and William Horobin, "Germany, France Balk at U.S. Bid to Overhaul WHO While Leaving," *Bloomberg*, August 10, 2020.

David Nakamura, "Once Reluctant to Hit China on Human Rights, Trump Moves to Use the Issue as a Cudgel Amid Growing Tensions," *Washington Post*, August 9, 2020.

Ashley Parker, "A President Ignored: Trump's Outlandish Claims Increasingly Met with a Collective Shrug," *Washington Post*, August 9, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "The Problem with Allies: It's Time to Unfriend a Few Countries," *American Spectator*, August 8, 2020.

Max Bergmann and James Lamond, "Why Trump's Troop Withdrawal from Germany Is Only the Beginning, There Has Been a Clear and Consistent Pattern of Hostility from Donald Trump Toward NATO and America's Closest Democratic Allies in Europe," *National Interest*, August 8, 2020.

Saeid Jafari, "Trump Has Pushed Iran Into China's Arms," *Foreign Policy*, August 8, 2020.

Andrew Roberts, "It's Time to Revive the Anglosphere, The U.K. Should Form a New Union with Canada, Australia and New Zealand to Work as a Global Partner of the U.S.," *Wall Street Journal*, August 8, 2020.

Matthew Kroenig, "Washington Needs a Better Plan for Competing With China," *Foreign Policy*, August 7, 2020.

Salvatore Babones, "Trump Has Alienated Allies—but Has Them Acting in America's Interest (and Their Own)," *Foreign Policy*, August 6, 2020.

Jim Sciutto, "Trump Advisers Hesitated to Give Military Options and Warned Adversaries over Fears He Might Start a War," *CNN*, August 6, 2020.

Daniel Dammann and Price Floyd, "To Rebuild America's Weakened Alliances, Heal Its Diplomatic Corps," *Defense One*, August 5, 2020.

Paul R. Pillar, "Trump Administration Commission Caters to the Anti-Government Political Right," *National Interest*, August 4, 2020.

Riley Walters, "China: Trump Administration Needs to Align Trade Policies with Priorities," Heritage Foundation, August 4, 2020.

Jackson Diehl, "Trump Has Wasted His Chance to Rally U.S. Allies Against China," *Washington Post*, August 2, 2020.

Robert C. O'Brien, "President Trump Is Committed to Defending the U.S., and Russia Knows It," *Washington Post*, August 2, 2020.

Anthony Vinci, "How to Stop China From Imposing Its Values, America's Alliances Were Built to Address a Soviet Military Threat. The Economic Bullying That Beijing Uses Requires a Different Kind of Collective Self-Defense," *Atlantic*, August 2, 2020.

Karen DeYoung, "Dissonance Between Trump and Administration Officials over Russia Disguises Lack of Strategic Approach to Moscow," *Washington Post*, August 1, 2020.

Ahmed Charai, "America Must Become a World Model Again, In Recent Years, America Has Become a Country Engulfed in Turmoil, Withdrawn from the World, Wanting for Leadership," *National Interest*, July 31, 2020.

Conor Murray, "Is pulling US troops from Germany really a 'gift to Russia'?" *Vox*, July 31, 2020.

David Shambaugh, "As the U.S. and China Wage a New Cold War, They Should Learn From the Last One," *Wall Street Journal*, July 31, 2020.

Wendy R. Sherman, "The Total Destruction of U.S. Foreign Policy Under Trump," *Foreign Policy*, July 31, 2020.

Max Boot, "In a New Interview, Trump Again Shows That He's Putin's Puppet," *Washington Post*, July 29, 2020.

Editorial Board, "Trump's Spite-Germany Plan," *Wall Street Journal*, July 29, 2020.

Philip H. Gordon and James Steinberg, "Trump's Flip-Flops on China Are a Danger to National Security," *Foreign Policy*, July 29, 2020.

Fred Kaplan, "Trump's Troop Tantrum, There's No Strategy Behind the Decision to Withdraw U.S. Troops from Germany. It's About the President's Anger and Ego," *Slate*, July 29, 2020.

William Saletan, "Trump's Dismissal of Russian Bounties Adds to His Record of Treachery," *Slate*, July 29, 2020.

Robin Wright, "Why Trump Will Never Win His New Cold War with China," *New Yorker*, July 29, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "America Can't Contain China, but Maybe Proliferation Can," Cato Institute, July 28, 2020.

Daniel Schwammenthal, "To America, From a Worried European Friend, A Country Convinced That It Is Irredeemably Racist Can't Lead the World as the 'Indispensable Nation,'" *Wall Street Journal*, July 28, 2020.

Christopher Smart, "To Avoid a Coronavirus Depression, the U.S. Can't Afford to Alienate the World," *Foreign Policy*, July 28, 2020.

Dan Balz, "America's global standing is at a low point. The pandemic made it worse. Under Trump, the United States Retreats from Collaborative Leadership at a Time of Global Crisis," *Washington Post*, July 26, 2020.

Joseph Bosco, "Pompeo's Clarion Call on Communist China: 'We Can't Ignore It Any Longer,'" *The Hill*, July 25, 2020.

Richard Haass, "What Mike Pompeo Doesn't Understand About China, Richard Nixon and U.S. Foreign Policy," *Washington Post*, July 25, 2020.

By Roger Pilon and Aaron Rhodes, "A Missed Opportunity In the Struggle for Human Rights," *Real Clear Markets*, July 25, 2020.

Gary Schmitt, "Pompeo's China Speech at Odds with Trump's 'America First' Foreign Policy," *The Hill*, July 25, 2020.

Edward Wong and Steven Lee Myers, "Officials Push U.S.-China Relations Toward Point of No Return," *New York Times*, July 25 (updated July 31), 2020.

Thomas Wright, "Pompeo's Surreal Speech on China, An Ideological Struggle Is Under Way Between Beijing and Free Societies, and the Trump Administration Is on the Wrong Side," *Atlantic*, July 25, 2020.

Editorial Board, "The New China Reality, The Tougher U.S. Policy Is More Than an Election-Year Gambit," *Wall Street Journal*, July 24, 2020.

Nikolas K. Gvosdev and Ray Takeyh, "The Sad Story of Superpower America's Foreign Policy Failures," *National Interest*, July 24, 2020.

Fred Kaplan, "Don't Pick a Cold War You Can't Win," *Slate*, July 24, 2020.

James Palmer, "Pompeo's Strategy Depends on Beijing's Own Paranoia," *Foreign Policy*, July 24, 2020.

Tom Rogan, "Mike Pompeo and the Threat of Xi Jinping's Dream," *Washington Examiner*, July 24, 2020.

Bret Stephens, "The Two China Fires, Is America prepared for a Cold War with China?" *New York Times*, July 24, 2020.

Cameron Stewart, "US Secretary of State Mike Pompeo Calls on Free World to Unite Against Chinese 'Tyranny,'" *Australian*, July 24, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "The U.S. Should Not Lead The World," *American Conservative*, July 23, 2020.

Daniel DePetris, "Trump's All-Stick, No-Carrot Approach Has Brought Two US Adversaries Together, The Blooming China-Iran Bilateral Relationship Serve[s] as a Warning to U.S. Policymakers," *Defense One*, July 23, 2020.

Michael H. Fuchs, "A Foreign Policy for the Post-Pandemic World, How to Prepare for the Next Crisis," *Foreign Affairs*, July 23, 2020.

Seth Kaplan, "Human Rights Are in Recession. Can That Be Reversed?" *Foreign Policy*, July 23, 2020.

Michael R. Pompeo, "Communist China and the Free World's Future," Speech, Yorba Linda, California, The Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, July 23, 2020.

Stephen M. Walt, "How to Ruin a Superpower, Washington's Status as a Superpower Has Been Declining for Years. Trump's Handling of the Pandemic Is Killing It Off," *Foreign Policy*, July 23, 2020.

Editorial Board, "Trump Threatens a New Troop Withdrawal. It Would Endanger Yet Another U.S. Relationship," *Washington Post*, July 22, 2020.

Max Boot, "No One Does More to Hurt America and Help China than Trump," *Washington Post*, July 21, 2020.

Karen DeYoung and Missy Ryan, "Trump Is Determined to Bring Home U.S. Military Forces from Somewhere," *Washington Post*, July 21, 2020.

Clifford D. May, "Mike Pompeo's Fight for Unalienable Rights, The Human Rights Establishment Wants Him Out of the Marketplace of Ideas," *Washington Times*, July 21, 2020.

Ian Bremmer, "Trump's Biggest Foreign Policy Win So Far," *Time*, July 20, 2020.

Gene Park and Mieczysław Boduszynski, "Trump Has Damaged the U.S.-Japan-South Korea Alliance—And China Loves It," *National Interest*, July 20, 2020.

Missy Ryan and Sudarsan Raghavan, "U.S. Remains on the Sidelines in Libya's Conflict as Russia Extends Its Reach," *Washington Post*, July 20, 2020.

Ramon Marks, "America's Days of International Policing are Over, The United States Can No Longer Act as the Lone, Dominant Military Power Around the Globe," *National Interest*, July 19, 2020.

Laura Kelly, "Democrats Raise Alarm about New US Human Rights Priorities," *The Hill*, July 18, 2020.

Joel Wuthnow and Phillip Saunders, "America Has Created a 'China-Iran Collaboration' Monster, Beijing and Tehran Could Use the Prospects of Deeper Bilateral Cooperation to Generate Leverage with Foreign Leaders—Leaving Washington Out in the Cold," *National Interest*, July 18, 2020.

Hunter Marston and Ali Wyne, "America's Post-Coronavirus Diplomacy Needs Middle-Powers Alliances, Focusing on China Alone Would Be Counterproductive," *Foreign Policy*, July 17, 2020.

Jeremi Suri, "What American Century? Those Who Worry About—or Cheer—Its Demise Don't Realize That There Never Was One," *Foreign Policy*, July 17, 2020.

Stephen M. Walt, "Countries Should Mind Their Own Business, Two Cheers for a Classic Idea That's Been Out of Fashion for Too Long: State Sovereignty," *Foreign Policy*, July 17, 2020.

Rori Kramer, "Mike Pompeo Wants to Nationalize Human Rights," *Washington Post*, July 16, 2020.

Michael R. Pompeo, "Unalienable Rights and the Securing of Freedom," Speech, Philadelphia, PA, National Constitution Center, July 16, 2020.

Ralph Reed, "Ralph Reed: Trump, Pompeo Human Rights Agenda Strong in Face of Abuses Across the Globe," *Fox News*, July 16, 2020.

Pranshu Verma, "Pompeo Says Human Rights Policy Must Prioritize Property Rights and Religion," *New, York Times*, July 16 (updated July 21), 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Allies Are Supposed to Help the US, but Americans Always Do the Paying," *Antiwar.com*, July 15, 2020.

William J. Burns, "The United States Needs a New Foreign Policy, The Global Order Is Crumbling, Domestic Renewal Is Urgent, and America Must Reinvent Its Role in the World," *Atlantic*, July 14, 2020.

Pete Buttigieg and Philip H. Gordon, "Present at the Destruction of U.S. Power and Influence," *Foreign Policy*, July 14, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "George Washington Tried To Warn Americans About Foreign Policy Today," *Antiwar.com*, July 13, 2020.

Zachary Karabell, "The Anti-American Century, The Old U.S.-led Order Has Crumbled. What Will Replace It May Be Just What the World—and the United States—Needs," *Foreign Policy*, July 13, 2020.

Ben Smith, "While America Looks Away, Autocrats Crack Down on Digital News Sites," *New York Times*, July 12 (updated July 14), 2020.

Robert D. Blackwill Thomas Wright, "Why COVID-19 Presents a World Reordering Moment," *National Interest*, July 11, 2020.

Christopher J. Fettweis, "The Ghost of Donald Trump Will Haunt Us For Years, Visions of Trump Will Haunt All Interaction with the United States as Long as There Are People Alive Who Remember Him," *National Interest*, July 10, 2020.

Micah Zenko, "The Foreign-Policy Blob Is Structurally Racist," *Foreign Policy*, July 10, 2020.

Luke Baker, Andreas Rinke, Philip Blenkinsop, "Post-Trump Era a Possibility, Europeans See No Quick Fix to U.S. Ties," *Reuters*, July 9, 2020.

Washington Examiner, "US Withdrawal from WHO Can't Come Soon Enough," *Washington Examiner*, July 8, 2020.

Michael Auslin, "Trump's New Realism in China, Critics Aside, the Administration Does Have a Strategy, and It Is Based on Reciprocity," *Foreign Policy*, July 7, 2020.

Hal Brands, "The Upside of a New Cold War With China, Competition with the Soviet Union Brought Out the Best in American Democracy," *Bloomberg*, July 7, 2020.

Matthew Karnitschnig, "Merkel Looks East as Ties Fray Between Germany and U.S., Berlin Aims to Reenergize Commercial Links with Beijing Amid the Coronavirus Crisis," *Politico*, July 7 (updated July 8), 2020.

Matthew M. Kavanagh, Mara Pillinger, "Leaving the WHO Will Hurt Americans' Health," *Foreign Policy*, July 7, 2020.

Jeremy Shapiro, "Ask Not What Your Country Can Do for Foreign Policy," *War on the Rocks*, July 7, 2020.

Michael Schuman, "Why China Wants Trump to Win, Four More Years Might Present Tantalizing Opportunities for Beijing to Expand Its Influence Around East Asia and the World," Foreign Policy, July 7, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, "Despite the Media's Efforts, Trump Taking a Measured Approach to Foreign Policy," Heritage Foundation, July 6, 2020.

James Jay Carafano, "Michael Pack Will Need to Tackle America's Great-Power Problem," *National Interest*, July 6, 2020.

Gregory Mitrovich, "Beware Declinism: America Remains Poised for Greatness," *National Interest*, July 5, 2020.

David B. Rivkin Jr. and George S. Beebe, "Why we need a little Skepticism, and More Evidence, on Russian Bounties," *The Hill*, July 5, 2020.

Oona Hathaway and Scott J. Shapiro, "Welcome to the Post-Leader World, The United States Has Abdicated Its Dominant Role. Here's How to Fill the Gap," *Foreign Policy*, July 4, 2020.

Luke McGee, "Cracks in the Trump-Europe Relationship Are Turning into a Chasm," *CNN*, July 4, 2020.

Paul Sonne, "Trump Remains Silent on Putin Despite Uproar Over Alleged Russian Bounty Payments," *Washington Post*, July 4, 2020.

Anne Applebaum, "Trump Is Turning America Into the 'S***hole Country' He Fears, The President's Mindless Nationalism Has Come to This: Americans Are Not Welcome in Europe or Mexico," *Atlantic*, July 3, 2020.

Doug Bandow, "Dancing With Dictators: Trump's Human Rights Policy," *American Conservative*, July 3, 2020.

Kim Hjelmgaard, Tom Vanden Brook, and Deirdre Shesgreen, "Do 'Bounties' on US Troops in Afghanistan Reflect a Line Crossed or 'Nothing New' in Long US-Russia history?" *USA Today*, July 3, 2020.

Andrew Higgins and Andrew E. Kramer, "Russia Denies Paying Bounties, but Some Say the U.S. Had It Coming, Russia's Grievances Against What It Sees as American Bullying and Expansion into Its Own Zones of Influence Have Been Stacking Up for Decades," *New York Times*, July 3 (updated July 13), 2020.

By Sue Mi Terry, "The Unraveling of the U.S.-South Korean Alliance, Trump Allows a Cornerstone of U.S. Defense Strategy in Asia to Wither," *Foreign Affairs*, July 3, 2020.

Robin Wright, "To the World, We're Now America the Racist and Pitiful," *New Yorker*, July 3, 2020.

Wesley K. Clark, "The United States Has Nothing to Fear From the ICC," *Foreign Policy*, July 2, 2020.

Richard Fontaine and Ely Ratner, "The U.S.-China Confrontation Is Not Another Cold War. It's Something New," *Washington Post*, July 2, 2020.

Tim Weiner, "Putin Still Plays by the Ruthless Rules of the Cold War. Because Trump Lets Him," *Washington Post*, July 2, 2020.

Matthew Lee, "Trump's Two Russias Confound Coherent US policy," *Associated Press*, July 1, 2020.

Michael McFaul, "Trump Would Do Anything for Putin. No Wonder He's Ignoring the Russian Bounties," *Washington Post*, July 1, 2020.

David E. Sanger and Eric Schmitt, "Trump's New Russia Problem: Unread Intelligence and Missing Strategy," *New York Times*, July 1 (updated July 13), 2020.

Tori K. Smith and HyunJoo Lee, "Congress and the Administration Should Advance Free Trade to Aid in COVID-19 Economic Recovery," July 1, 2020.

Jonathan Spyer, "Trump's Syria Policy Is Working, The Assad Regime Is Cracking under the Pressure of Stalemate—Just Like the State Department Planned," *Foreign Policy*, July 1, 2020.

Francis Wilkinson, "Trump Is Testing Putin's Campaign Strategy," *Bloomberg*, July 1, 2020.

Robert M. Gates, "The Overmilitarization of American Foreign Policy, The United States Must Recover the Full Range of Its Power," *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, 2020.

H.R. McMaster, "The Retrenchment Syndrome, A Response to 'Come Home, America?'" *Foreign Affairs*, July/August 2020.

Carl Bernstein, "From Pandering to Putin to Abusing Allies and Ignoring His Own Advisers, Trump's Phone Calls Alarm US officials," *CNN*, updated June 30, 2020.

Colum Lynch and Robbie Gramer, "World Rebukes U.S. Over Ian, With Trump's Re-election Prospects Up in the Air, a Heated U.N. Meeting on Iran Shows World Powers' Fading Fear of Confronting the United States," *Foreign Policy*, June 30, 2020.

Susan E. Rice, "Why Does Trump Put Russia First?" *New York Times*, June 30, 2020.

Stephen M. Walt, "Everyone Misunderstands the Reason for the U.S.-China Cold War," *Foreign Policy*, June 30, 2020.

Author Information

Ronald O'Rourke
Specialist in Naval Affairs

Acknowledgments

The other original co-author of this report was Michael Moodie, who was Assistant Director of the Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division of CRS and a Senior Specialist in Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade until his retirement from CRS in December 2020.

Disclaimer

This document was prepared by the Congressional Research Service (CRS). CRS serves as nonpartisan shared staff to congressional committees and Members of Congress. It operates solely at the behest of and under the direction of Congress. Information in a CRS Report should not be relied upon for purposes other than public understanding of information that has been provided by CRS to Members of Congress in connection with CRS's institutional role. CRS Reports, as a work of the United States Government, are not subject to copyright protection in the United States. Any CRS Report may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without permission from CRS. However, as a CRS Report may include copyrighted images or material from a third party, you may need to obtain the permission of the copyright holder if you wish to copy or otherwise use copyrighted material.