

[MUSIC PLAYING]

Today's debate about American intervention-- whether in Iraq, Afghanistan, or Syria-- is only the latest episode in a debate that has divided the American soul for 120 years. With a new president in office, questions of expansion and intervention are already animating today's most urgent foreign policy discussions. And these discussions will continue to shape the world we live in.

From Brown university's Watson Institute for International and Public Affairs, this is *Trending Globally*. I'm Sarah Baldwin.

[MUSIC PLAYING]

Today, we're joined by award-winning journalist and former foreign correspondent for *The New York Times*, Stephen Kinzer.

He's currently a senior fellow at the Watson Institute and a columnist on world affairs for the Boston Globe. Welcome, Stephen, and thanks for being here.

Always great to be with you, Sarah.

Today, you're going to read from your latest book, *The True Flag-- Theodore Roosevelt, Mark Twain, and the Birth of the American Empire*. But before you do, just give us the basics of the story. It's 1898. And what you call the mother of all debates is raging in the US senate. So briefly, what was at stake? And why does it matter today?

This was the great debate in which the United States made a fateful choice. And that was the choice to begin projecting military and coercive power around the world. So we had reached the end of our borders in North America. Then we had to ask ourselves, do we keep expanding as we effectively have since the pilgrims landed? Or are we now having fulfilled our manifest destiny to fill up this continent satisfied with what we've accomplished. And we'll turn our attention inward.

So this great debate consumed the United States. And in my book, I posit Theodore Roosevelt as the central and most colorful figure advocating the imperial expansion policy. Whereas on the other side, advocating the policy of prudent restraint and noninterference was Mark Twain. And they were wonderfully matched characters, very different views of the world but still two different people who were very conscious of their own image and wanted to be public figures as well as just thinkers.

So Twain and Roosevelt are the opposite poles of this argument. While Teddy Roosevelt was riding a horse up San Juan Hill in Cuba to fulfill his lifelong dream of killing someone, Mark Twain was living in Vienna with a circle that included Mahler and Freud and Arthur Schnitzler and the other great intellectuals of that age.

He arrived home in 1900 to find himself in the middle of this enormous debate. And that's the scene with which this chapter of my book begins.

OK, great.

"Reporters swarmed around the end of a New York pier as the liner, SS Minnehaha, docked on October 15, 1900. Mark Twain was coming home. He was among the most beloved of all Americans. And newspapers treated his return as epochal. Twain appeared at the top of the gangplank in his mature persona, complete with bow tie, thick mustache, and unkempt shock of curly white hair. Correspondents shouted questions. Several pressed Twain about his recent criticism of the Philippine war.

Before leaving London, he had told a reporter for *The New York World* that the war was a quagmire, that the islands should be ruled according to Filipino ideals, and that the United States should not try to get them under our heel or intervene in any country that is not ours.

'You've been quoted here as an anti-imperialist,' one reporter cried out. 'Well, I am.' Twain replied. 'A year ago, I wasn't. I thought it would be a great thing to give a whole lot of freedom to the Filipinos. But I guess now that it's better to let them give it to themselves.'

With those words, Twain plunged into the great debate. Quickly, he became its brightest celebrity. He gave a stream of interviews that filled many anti-imperialists with new hope and zeal. After a string of disappointments, they had a new champion. Twain happily explained his conversion to *The New York Herald*.

'I left these shores at Vancouver a red, hot imperialist,' he said. 'I wanted the American eagle to go screaming into the Pacific. It seemed tiresome and tame for it to content itself with the Rockies. Why not spread its wings over the Philippines, I asked myself. And I thought it would be a real good thing to do. I said to myself, here are a people who have suffered for three centuries.

We can make them as free as ourselves, give them a government and country of their own, put a miniature of the American Constitution afloat in the Pacific, start a brand new republic to take its place among the free nations of the world. It seemed to me a great task to which we had addressed ourselves.

But I have thought some more since then. And I've read carefully the Treaty of Paris. And I have seen that we do not intend to free but to subjugate the people of the Philippines. We have gone there to conquer, not to redeem.

And so I am an anti-imperialist. I am opposed to having the eagle put its talons in any other land.'

Over the next few weeks, Twain composed a series of devastating critiques of the expansionist ethos. Two became the best-selling items ever offered for sale by anti-imperialist leagues. First was a brief but savage salutation speech from the 19th century to the 20th taken down in shorthand by Mark Twain. It appeared in the *Minneapolis Journal* on December 29, 1909 and was so delightfully sardonic that the New England anti-imperialist league printed it as a New Year's card and sold thousands.

Encouraged by the success of his salutation speech, Twain decided to set down his anti-imperialist creed in a full-length essay. The result was one of his most powerful pieces to the person sitting in darkness. It is a slashing attack on the so-called civilized powers-- Britain for its brutality in South Africa, others for their dismemberment of China, and the blessings of civilization trust for dealing in what Twain called 'glass beads and theology, maxim guns, and hymn books.'

Twain especially rues the bad mistake the United States made in annexing the Philippines. At the end of his essay, Twain imagines himself explaining annexation of the Philippines to an ignorant person sitting in darkness. This is the wickedest paragraph in the literature of American anti-imperialism.

'There have been lies, yes, but they were told in a good cause. We have been treacherous, but that was only in order that real good might come out of apparent evil. True, we have crushed a deceived and confiding people. We have turned against the weak and the friendless who trusted us. We have stamped out a just and intelligent and well-ordered republic.

We have stabbed an ally in the back and slapped the face of a guest. We have bought a shadow from an enemy that hadn't it to sell. We have robbed a trusting friend of his land and his liberty. We have invited our clean young men to shoulder a discredited musket and do bandit's work under a flag which bandits have been accustomed to fear, not to follow.

We have debauched America's honor and blackened her face before the world. But each detail was for the best. And as for a flag for the Philippine province, it is easily managed. We can have a special one. Our states do it. We can have just our usual flag with the white stripes painted black and the stars replaced by the skull and crossbones.'

This essay, which appeared in the February 1901 issue of *The North American Review* was one of the most popular Twain ever wrote. The anti-imperialist league published it as a pamphlet and distributed 125,000 copies. It was reprinted across the country. Some newspapers ran editorials about it day after day.

'Mark Twain,' *The Springfield Daily Republican* reported, 'has suddenly become the most influential anti-

imperialist and the most dreaded critic of the sacrosanct to person in the White House that the country contains.' Andrew Carnegie sent him an admiring note. 'There is a new gospel of St. Mark in *The North American*, which I like better than anything I've read for many a day,' Carnegie wrote to Twain.

'I am willing to borrow \$1,000 to distribute that message in proper form. And if the author don't object, may I send that sum when I can raise it to the anti-imperialist league Boston to which I am a contributor, the only missionary work I am responsible for? Just tell me you are willing, and many thousands of the holy little missiles will go flying out.'

Thank you. That was Stephen Kinzer reading from his latest book, *The True Flag*. That was great. Thank you so much. It's odd to imagine Andrew Carnegie and Booker T. Washington and Jane Addams in the same camp. But they were all fervent anti-imperialists as you say in your book. Can you talk to us about this curious mix of figures on both sides of the debate?

Every major political and intellectual figure in America took sides in this dispute. The entire country was riveted on this question. Having sat for many hours in libraries while I was researching this book, I can tell you that the front pages of newspapers month after month were filled with debate over this great question.

When the Senate began its debate, one senator started out by saying, this is the greatest question that has ever been presented to the American people, the question of whether the United States should begin projecting its forceful power beyond North America. The titans who arose on both sides truly are an inspiration to anybody involved in foreign affairs or global affairs now, particularly as we debate these same issues.

So on the imperialist side-- the side that favored imposing America's will on Cuba, taking the Philippines, absorbing Puerto Rico, and going from there to see whatever else we could capture in the world-- you had three major figures. The most public face of the imperialist or expansionist project was Teddy Roosevelt. He was irrepressibly active and a wonderfully appealing figure who embodied the impatient enthusiasm and activism of America at the end of the 19th century.

The message that we had to intervene in other countries because the poor people in those countries were being brutalized by evil overlords, which is a message that always plays well in the American mind, was projected principally by William Randolph Hearst. He was the newspaper publisher who became a second part of the imperialist triumvirate. Hearst was the master and one of the founders of what was then called yellow journalism. We now call it fake news.

But you can see in his newspaper coverage of the early period in 1898 as we were trying to decide whether to go to war in Cuba that his pages are full of heart-rending stories about the brutalities visited on poor Cubans, many of

them written by reporters who had never even been in Cuba.

So with that kind of reporting and his oversensationalizing of the sinking of the US Maine, a warship that sank in Havana Harbor and that Hearst portrayed as having been the victim of Spanish attack when actually it was blown up by a spark within the ship, Hearst did manage to drive Americans wild on the interventionist idea.

He understood something that's still true. And that is that Americans are very compassionate people. We hate the idea that anybody is suffering anywhere. And if you can just show us a few stories about poor, starving people or torture victims, we want to go to war. So Hearst wanted to promote the war idea because it would be a way for him to sell newspapers. And sure enough, in the space of less than a year, his *New York Journal* went from a circulation of 80,000 to about 800,000.

The third member of the imperialist triumvirate was Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts. So he was the Mephistopheles in Washington who conceived and managed the imperial project. So those were your three figures on that side-- Teddy Roosevelt, William Randolph Hearst, and Henry Cabot Lodge. And they're all hugely colorful figures and make great characters in this book.

On the other side, as you point out, we have a richly varied group. The president of the anti-imperialist league was one of the founders of the Republican Party, George Boutwell, who had been Secretary of the Treasury and US senator and governor of Massachusetts. Other anti-imperialists included the leader of the Democratic Party, William Jennings Bryan, the most previous Democratic President, Grover Cleveland, and the most previous Republican President, Benjamin Harrison.

It also included the richest man in America, Andrew Carnegie, who was a bitter anti-imperialist. And it also included, as you point out, certain figures in American life, who you wouldn't expect to see sitting around the table with a plutocrat like Andrew Carnegie. And those would have included Jane Addams, the great social reformer, Booker T. Washington, who was the leading African-American figure of that age, and Jane Addams, the social reformer.

So you had a constellation of brilliant figures. I think you could legitimately argue that only once in American history, at the time of the founding of our nation when the Constitution and Declaration of Independence were in, did so many brilliant Americans come together to debate a question that was so heavily fraught with meaning for the whole world.

Do you think that could happen today?

One thing that's inspirational in reading the debates that the Senate went through, an enormously impassioned

32-day debate, is that the issues that were debated then are the same issues we're debating now. All the arguments in favor of pushing American power overseas in 1898 and '99 are the same ones we use today. When we've argued about our intervention in Vietnam or Central America or Iraq, all of our arguments are taken, whether we know it or not, from this original great debate that shook America at the end of the 19th century.

Now, the depressing part of that debate is that the senators were so much more articulate then. Even the bad guys were brilliant. Their speeches are masterpieces of classical oratory brilliantly structured with biblical cadences and obscure historical references to Persian emperors and figures in the Roman Empire, the subjects you'd never dream of discussing with a US senator today.

So I wonder if we're able to rouse ourselves for this debate. So in 1899, the Senate debated this huge question for 32 days. Newspapers all over America were full of calculations as to how many senators had come up on this side, who was wavering, what were the counts day by day. Diplomats from other countries based in Washington would be sending back accounts of how the debate seemed to be going.

And in the end, it was very close, the vote, to ratify the Treaty of Paris.

So at the end of 1898, the US imposed a treaty on Spain by which we took their islands, including the Philippines. And this treaty had to be ratified by the US senate. That was this grand debate that began at the beginning of 1899. The outcome is also, to me, a great piece of American history that we've lost, just like this whole debate. And the fact that this debate ever happened and seized America so fully is not known. It's certainly something I never realized.

And then the outcome is also remarkable and contradicts, I think, an assumption that many of us have. If we ever consider this question of when and why America decided to become a global or overseas military power, I think we assume that it came, more or less, automatically. We didn't have to decide or discuss or debate. But that's not true.

In fact, this entire debate, as I said, seized the attention of Americans. And the outcome was very narrow. So that treaty was approved by just one vote more than the required 2/3 majority. And that was not just a vote about one treaty or about taking one set of islands. It was a vote to set the United States on the world path that we've been on ever since.

After that narrow victory for the imperial side with one vote to spare, the anti-imperialists took their case to the Supreme Court. They argued that it was not constitutional for Americans to govern or impose their will on any other people without giving those people constitutional rights. The Supreme Court disagreed, but by a vote of 5 to 4. So just one vote would have swung the project the other way.

One of the things I hope to bring out in this book is that those of us who feel that American foreign policy should change direction and that we should be more restrained and prudent rather than promiscuous in our overseas interventions are not making this up.

This is not a new argument. We are in a rich American tradition that goes back 120 years. We're standing on the shoulders of titans. And this is not a marginal point of view. It has a rich, anchored history in American tradition. And that's something I'm trying to make clear with this book.

Yeah, I was fascinated to hear you point out that America is not old enough to understand the long arc of history, that history is long, and that America's dominance is not predestined or a foregone conclusion or eternal, even though, I think, most Americans accept it as such. And I wonder what you think it will take for us to develop a radically different approach to foreign policy.

When you look around the world at countries or empires that have survived over many, many centuries, you don't find too many. But there are a few like China, for example, or Iran. Those are countries that have survived 25, 35 centuries. You find that they have one quality that allows them to survive this long. And that is, they learn how to ride the currents of history. They realize that no country or nation or empire dominates forever.

If you can accept that and realize that you'll rule for a while, then you won't rule. But time will come again, and you'll be up again. And then you'll be way up. And you might go down a little. And you may go further down. And then you can come up again. Iranians, or Persians, what we would then call them, and Chinese have assimilated this lesson.

But we haven't. There is nothing in the American psyche, or in American history, that prepares us for anything other than dominance. Yet guaranteed dominance is certainly not our future. We have to make an adaptation if we want to survive as a nation over the long run. But yet nothing in our national DNA prepares us to make that adaptation.

The arc of our history is very short. And it's misleading. It teaches us that we always get richer and we always get more powerful and we always have more. Everything always gets better. That's never happened for any power before. We've been told that, America is so exceptional, the patterns and rules of history don't apply to us. This is not true. History catches up with all countries. It will catch up to the United States.

So I think this is our great challenge over the mid to longer-term future to adapt to the fact that we can preserve the benefits that we've achieved as a nation but only if we can somehow pull back from the strong American drive to win and to dominate and to direct others. If we can pull back from that, I think we'll have a rich and warm and prosperous future. But nothing in our past prepares us to do that.

Yeah, it'll be interesting to see if that becomes possible and that all the money spent on wars and interventions could come home and fund education and infrastructure and health care.

I do think there is a coalition out there in America, a constituency for a more restrained foreign policy. It's never had the political or intellectual leadership to give it coherence. But I sense that many Americans are unhappy with the idea of constant American interventions.

Now, people on what is considered the right of the political spectrum and those on the left may ultimately come to agree on this question. You've mentioned the savings that would come to America if we stopped having 700 or 800 military bases around the world and we're constantly involved in wars on the other side of the planet.

Conservatives and liberals could argue about what they would do with those savings. People on the far right might say, we'll just use it to cut taxes. We won't spend it on anything. Liberals would say that money could be used to fund domestic projects. But those two groups should be able to agree that the policy of relentless foreign intervention not only is expensive. But it ultimately weakens our own national security.

We forget these interventions as soon as we carry them off. But people in other countries don't forget. These memories fester and burn in people's hearts and souls. And decades, or even generations, later, the blowback comes. So I think there is dissatisfaction out there. But America's soul is divided. We are interventionists. But we're also anti-interventionists.

We want to guide every country to give them all the benefit of our knowledge. But we also want every country to guide itself. Those are contradictory impulses. They're opposites. You can't believe both of them. But we do. And I think that inability to choose shapes our conflicted approach to the world.

Well, now, I have two questions for you. Do you think that Trump's soul is divided in this sort of very American way? That's one question. And my other question is, isn't there an expectation that the US will intervene often and it's criticized when it doesn't or when it's too slow? I'm thinking of Rwanda or the Balkans.

First of all, about Trump, I do think that he reflects this divided American soul on the issue of foreign intervention. He's showing his division or the depth of the inconsistency in his political soul if such there is in a more open way than most other Americans and American political leaders. He has made some remarkably anti-interventionist statements. However, he's contradicted all of those with some other tweet.

So you could really match up his two columns of tweets. And you'd see the two sides of the American soul. We're not going to have regime change wars. We're not going to escalate in the Middle East. On the other hand, we're going to have a no-fly zone in Syria. Iran, we are on notice. We're going to watch what you're doing. We're going

to punish you. So I wonder, which is it? Which tweet do I believe? And I think that does reflect something that's quite widespread in the American mind.

As for the future of American intervention, it's inevitable given the size and power and wealth of the United States and the desire of many people in the world to have our help and guidance that we will be intervening all around the world. We will be actively participating in politics in many, many places.

The question is, how do we do that? With what tools? Our foreign policy has become so militarized that, whenever we feel like a project needs to be done anywhere in the world, the army is the only tool that we have. The British used to have a colonial service made up of people who spent their lives immersing themselves in languages and cultures of other nations. We can't do that because we'd like to pretend we would never need such people because we never do the things the British did like try to build whole nations. And when we step in to do that, the only people we have to do it are soldiers.

So the question of when to intervene, particularly when to intervene with military force, is a very active one in my business, the business of international relations. It's almost a parlor game among our professors to come up with your own list of criteria for intervention.

All American foreign policy questions ultimately come down to this one word. It's intervention. When do we do it? How do we do it? With what tools? With what goals? So there are a variety of lists floating round of the criteria that the US should try to fill before we go to war.

I'm going to posit one that I like that was drawn up by former Secretary of State Colin Powell. Unfortunately, he drew this up after he participated in the Iraq war. But maybe it informed his wisdom. So he lists for criteria. The United States should go to war in another country if four criteria are met.

And these are the four-- number 1, a vital interest of the United States must be at stake; number 2, we have a clear goal and an exit strategy; number 3, the American people support this intervention; and number 4, there is no way to achieve our goal other than military force. That's a pretty high bar. But I think that's one I could accept. And I think we would be much better off holding our decisions on foreign intervention to that kind of a standard.

What do you think that Trump's recent appointment of HR McMaster as national security advisor tells us about what his approach to foreign policy will be?

We're in an odd situation where bringing the person who has been one of the overseers of our Iraq adventure and then a secretary of state who has been the chairman of Exxon Mobil are supposed to be our saviors. They're the people in whom we're placing our greatest hope. We'd have to wait to see how that plays out.

I think it's interesting that the national security advisor, McMaster, has written a book highly critical of American foreign policy during the Vietnam period. And he particularly blamed dysfunction in the National Security Council for that debacle. You'd like to think that the military people who have seen war close up might be a little bit more reluctant to plunge us into it. That's not always the case.

I don't think it's automatically bad that the president has surrounded himself with military men as his principal advisors. What I fear more is the policy they bring with them, the mindset they bring with them. If the policy is right, then the people who are immediately around the president implementing it aren't so important.

But if the presence of generals will continue the overemphasis of military power as the way America projects itself into the world, then it's bad. One thing that always strikes me when I'm traveling is that huge numbers of people around the world greatly admire the United States. For all of our sins, they envy us. They want to have what we have. They admire our prosperity, our democracy, our stability.

America has a great story to tell in the world. But we're not telling it. We've closed down so many of our consulates and our libraries and our America house projects. We don't try to win the hearts and minds anymore. And this is the greatest font of our world power. You can't name any country in the world where lots of people really admire Russia or China. They don't have the kind of appeal in the world. We do. It's our great asset.

Too many people in the world, however, are coming to see the US as the country of night raids and drone strikes and Guantanamo and anti-foreigner rhetoric. This cuts away at our great asset. And to me, that's the great challenge of foreign policy for military or civilian advisors to the president.

Let's talk about journalism for a second. You've noted the very different rhetoric being used to cover, say, the retaking of Aleppo by the Syrian government forces and the coverage of the Battle for Raqqa. As you look back on your career as a journalist, do you think you were ever guilty of writing through a certain lens?

We are all products of our experiences, our upbringing, and everything that has shaped our characters. We all have prejudices. I think even journalists have to recognize this fact. You can't get away from them because they're who you are. We all have a lens through which we see the world.

The key is to be aware that you're seeing the world through a certain lens and that you have certain prejudices. Once you're aware of that, you can try to work with it. But I think it's foolish for journalists any more than anyone else to pretend that you're seeing everything the way it really is.

Americans tend to be teachers. We like to show other people how to do things. We're a teaching nation. It's time we could become more of a learning nation. Journalists also can be in the same trap. We want to fulfill the needs of a certain narrative. That's always dangerous for journalists. You never want to come into a story or a situation

with the idea that you've, more or less, figured it out, you know what's there.

That's always difficult. I don't think people who aren't in that business realize sometimes how hard it is to recognize your prejudices and try to put them aside and place yourself in the shoes of other people. Americans are not so good at doing that. Journalists always have to. So it's a constant struggle.

I always felt that objectivity might be the wrong word to use since I didn't become a journalist to be objective between the torturer and the torture victim. But I do think maybe a better word would be fairness. Try to be fair to all sides and allow the reader to participate in forming a judgment about events. Don't hit the reader over the head with your conclusions-- this is bad, this is good.

Let the reader use what you're reporting to filter facts through his or her own set of prejudices and come up with his or her own opinion. Too much of journalism about the world today that's being given to Americans is coming out of Washington. And that's deadly because you talk to the same people in the same echo chamber. And you produce reports that always reinforce the given paradigm.

So I think that helps explain why Americans get caught up in these periodic panics and surges of fear or hatred of one nation or another. The press is supposed to play the role of standing back from that consensus. But too often, it leaps in to join it.

You were a *New York Times* bureau chief in Nicaragua during the 1980s, which must have been a wild time to be there. And then in the '90s, you were bureau chief in Germany and Turkey. And now, you're based here in Providence at Brown University and the Watson Institute where you teach and write. And I wonder, do you miss the life of a foreign correspondence? And how did those years shape your world view?

I don't miss it because I think, as I've gotten older, I've realized life comes in phases. I think was a great thing to do when I was a younger guy and was crazy and did things and took risks I would never consider now. Now, I've had so many experiences in so many countries, I think I'm at a stage where I'm trying to figure out what it all meant. Everything went by so quickly.

Now, I'm trying to slow it down and try to pull out lessons from it. I've seen enough situations so that I can try to draw comparisons and look at situations from higher up. It's a little bit different from what academics do because they tend to specialize more narrowly. An academic's knowledge is much deeper than that of a journalist. But it might not be as broad.

There are plenty of academics, for example, who know far more than I do about the American coup in Iran in 1953. They may have spent decades researching that one episode. But they're not also knowledgeable about the

transformations in Rwanda or what happened in Central America during the 1980s. So I'm able to make comparisons across boundaries. And I think journalism does provide you with that background.

As for how being a foreign correspondent shaped my view of the world. Looking back, I think it might help to explain why so often I'm the skunk at the garden party. Most of the people in the American foreign policy elite that shapes Washington come out of a fairly similar background. They went to the same handful of international relations schools. They read the same textbooks. Then they went to work for certain think tanks. Then they went to work on a congressional staff. They immersed themselves in the Washington ecosystem.

And that is the way to make your way in this world. That is an ecosystem that's based on a set of assumptions about America's role in the world, the exceptionalist perspective that posits us as the indispensable nation. That consensus embraces Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, and shapes policies under normal circumstances for both parties.

But I don't come out of that background. I actually saw American foreign policy not from classrooms and seminar rooms. But I saw it from the perspective of the results of the people who saw what American foreign policy meant on the ground. It wasn't theoretical to me.

Like what's an example?

I saw our policy toward Nicaragua in the 1980s from the perspective of Nicaraguans. I was listening to the radio and hearing our president and other American leaders warn about the terrible threat that Nicaragua posed to the United States. This was supposed to justify the spending of hundreds of millions of dollars to support an insurgency in which school buses were being blown up every morning in Nicaragua.

And I didn't see the country that Americans were told was Nicaragua. When I would have friends visit me sometimes down there, I'd take them in my car to some of these miserable shanty towns where people were living in cardboard shacks in mud. And I'd say, you've been hearing about the threat from Nicaragua. Take a look. That's the threat.

So the Nicaragua that I saw living there for six years while that country was under armed attack by groups sponsored by the United States was not the Nicaragua that Americans were hearing about from their political leaders. And the idea that you could transcend all this and make it into a sterile political discussion was harder for me to accept.

I was in Baghdad watching kids die as a result of American sanctions on Saddam Hussein's regime. So when I heard the Secretary of State say on TV that, yes, it was worth it that 500,000 children died in Iraq for those sanctions in order to make a political point about Saddam, I have a harder time grasping that because I've been

there on the ground. And I think that might explain why I'm sometimes the dissenter from the consensus on foreign policy.

Well, Stephen, we are out of time. And I wish we weren't. But I hope everybody reads your book and gets a fresh look at what still remains debatable.

And let's think globally.

And let's think globally. Thanks for being here today.

Thank you.

This has been *Trending Globally-- Politics and Policy*. You can subscribe to the podcast on iTunes, SoundCloud, and Stitcher. For more information, go to watson.brown.edu.

[MUSIC PLAYING]