

POLS 490RSWR: Nuclear Weapons
Fall 2008

Professor Kyle Beardsley
kyle.beardsley@emory.edu
Tarbutton 317
Office hours: Thurs. 2:30-4:00

Overview:

The purpose of this course is to understand the role that nuclear weapons have played in international relations and to understand the ongoing policy debates regarding proliferation. The course will combine topics related to nuclear deterrence theory, the history of proliferation and contemporary policy debates. Students will learn how nuclear weapons shape international politics in both theory and practice.

The format of the course will be primarily discussion oriented. Each student will come to class prepared to assess that day's assigned readings in detail. There will be no formal lecture, although I will provide material not in the readings when needed and will direct the discussion toward a thorough understanding of the material. When a topic is especially interesting to a student, he/she is encouraged to read material outside of the assigned reading and/or to come to class with a few questions prepared in advance for the class to discuss. This is optional but will be an important part of each student's ability to get the most out of the seminar experience.

This is a writing intensive course, so the students are expected to excel in expressing their thoughts on paper. The course will combine smaller writing assignments with a major research paper. The highest standards of grammar and argumentation are demanded in these assignments.

Requirements:

Since the course is a seminar-style structure, students will be graded on their ability to contribute to the discussion. This will require each student to do the assigned reading and come prepared to discuss. Attendance will be taken at each class, and absences will only be excused if the student has proper documentation of an illness or university-related travel.

The students will write 5 response papers throughout the semester. They are 1-2 pages in length (single spaced), similar to the style of an article in the *Economist* magazine. In these papers, the students will briefly summarize one of the key issues discussed during a class and provide a thoughtful policy position which addresses that issue. Since the students are expressing sincere opinions, there are no "right" answers. The student will be graded on the clarity of the presentation and the degree to which the student demonstrates mastery of the course material. The students may choose to write a response paper on any class topic, but they must submit their paper within one week after the class has occurred. The first response paper will be ungraded, to give the students a "trial run," and the remaining four response papers are worth 5% each. Students are allowed to use the grade on the first response paper in place of the grade on a later one if desired.

The students will write the term paper in two increments and have the opportunity to revise each part before turning in the final draft. The theme of the term paper is "Was it worth it?" Students

will choose one country that has developed nuclear weapons besides the US and then research the circumstances in which they proliferated and how their nuclear arsenals have affected their security.

The first section of the paper, due 10/9 (at the beginning of class), provides the history of the selected country's nuclear weapons program, the author's thesis statement and a very brief overview of the argument that will be explored in the second section. The student will have conducted the bulk of the research at this stage and will draw heavily from scholarly books and articles in presenting the historical information. This section should be about 7-8 pages long (double spaced).

The second section of the paper, due 11/13 (at the beginning of class), contains the student's defense of the thesis statement. The student will describe the country's security environment since the development of the nuclear weapons. Then he/she will make the case for whether or not the nuclear weapons improved the state's security through relating specific examples and drawing heavily from the course concepts. The student should discuss both the positive benefits of the weapons and the negative consequences. The student should strive to demonstrate both a deep knowledge about the selected country and a firm understanding of the course concepts and debates about the relationship between nuclear weapons and international security. This section should be about 12-13 pages (double spaced).

The final paper is due on 12/11 at 4:30 PM, which is the time that the final exam would have occurred if there were one. Students will have made edits along the lines that I suggested after grading the individual sections. The total length of the two sections should be no longer than 21 pages (I will stop reading at the end of page 21). The final grade for the term paper will reflect both the overall quality of the paper and the ability for the student to follow my suggestions. As a result, it is possible that the final paper will receive a lower grade than the earlier drafts. Papers turned in on the due date, but after the assigned time, will receive one letter grade deduction. No credit will be given for papers turned in after the day they are due. No extensions will be given.

Grading:

Participation: 10%

Response Papers (5): 20%

Term Paper: 70%

 Introduction/literature review/thesis: 15%

 Argument and evidence: 15%

 Final draft: 40%

Books for purchase:

Freedman, Lawrence. 2003. *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy*, 3rd ed. New York: Palgrave.

Jervis, Robert. 1989. *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Sagan, Scott D. and Kenneth N. Waltz. 2003. *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Course Outline:

I. Foundations

- 8/28: Intro to the class
- 9/2: Nuclear Physics 101
Barnaby, Frank. 2004. *How to Build a Nuclear Bomb*. New York: Nation Books.
Ch. 1
- 9/4: The Proliferators
Scott D. Sagan, "Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? Three Models in Search of a Bomb," *International Security* 21 (Winter 1996/97): 54-86.

Joseph Cirincione, *Bomb Scare*, New York: Columbia University Press. Ch. 5.
Pp. 84-109
- 9/9: History: Developing the Bomb
Freedman, Chs. 1&2

Recommended: Gar Alperovitz, "Hiroshima: Historians Reassess," *Foreign Policy* no 99 (Summer 1995): 15-34.
- 9/11: No Class
- 9/16: Nuclear Weapons and the Long Peace
Kenneth Waltz, in Sagan & Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons*, Ch. 1.

Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution*, Ch. 1.

Recommended: John Mueller, "The Essential Irrelevance of Nuclear Weapons: Stability in the Postwar World," *International Security* 13 (Fall 1988).
- 9/18 NPT
George Bunn, "The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty: History and Current Problems," *Arms Control Today* 33 (December 2003).

Jean du Preez. 2006. "Half Full or Half Empty? Realizing the Promise of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty." *Arms Control Today* 36: 6-12.

II. Deterrence

- 9/23: Concepts of Coercive Diplomacy
Freedman, Chs. 3, 5 & 6

Recommended: Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution*, Ch. 2.

Recommended: Thomas Schelling, *Arms and Influence*, Ch. 1
- 9/25: Limited War
Freedman, Chs. 7 & 8

Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution*, pp. 237-243.

9/30: First Strike Possibilities

Freedman, Chs. 9-11

Recommended: Marc Trachtenberg, "Preventive War and U.S. Foreign Policy," *Security Studies* 16 (January-March 2007): 1-31.

10/2: Bargaining in the Shadow of Nuclear Weapons: Brinkmanship and the Stability-Instability Paradox

Freedman, Chs. 12 & 14

Recommended: Thomas Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict*, Ch. 8

10/7: MAD

Freedman, Chs. 15 & 16

Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution*, Ch. 3

10/9: Extended Deterrence

Freedman, Chs. 19-21

10/16: Cuban Missile Crisis

Aleksandr Fursenko and Timothy Naftali, *"One Hell of a Gamble": Khrushchev, Castro, and Kennedy, 1958-1964* (New York: Norton, 1997), Chs. 12-14.

III. Nonproliferation and Counter-Proliferation

10/21: Risks of Proliferation

Sagan & Waltz, *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons*, Chs. 2-4.

10/23: Morality & Taboos

Nina Tannenwald, "Stigmatizing the Bomb: Origins of the Nuclear Taboo," *International Security* 29 (Spring 2005): 5-49.

Jervis, *The Meaning of the Nuclear Revolution*, Ch. 4

10/28: Atoms for Peace?

Chaim Braun. 2006. "The Nuclear Energy Market and the Nonproliferation Regime." *The Nonproliferation Review* 13 (3): 627-644.

Stephanie Cooke. 2006. "Just within Reach?" *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* (July/August) 2006. Pp. 14-17.

S.V. Ruchkin and V.Y. Loginov. 2006. "Securing the Nuclear Fuel Cycle: What Next?" *IAEA Bulletin* 48 (1): 24-26.

The Economist, "Stopping the Wrong Sort of Chain Reaction," 22 May 2008.

10/30: Are Nuclear Weapons Still Needed for Deterrence?

Freedman, Chs. 26 & 27.

11/4: Moving Toward Disarmament ?

Ariel Levite, "Never Say Never Again: Nuclear Reversal Revisited,"
International Security 27 (Winter 2002/2003): 59-88.

Scoblic, J. Peter. 2008. "Disarmament Redux." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 64 (1): 34-39.

11/6: Prevention and Preemption

Dan Reiter, "Preventive Attacks Against Nuclear Programs and the 'Success' at Osiraq," *Nonproliferation Review* 12 (July 2005), 355-371.

Freedman, Ch. 28.

Recommended: Jeremy Tamsett, "The Israeli Bombing of Osiraq Reconsidered: Successful Counterproliferation?" *Nonproliferation Review* 11 (Fall/Winter 2004), 70-85.

IV. Current Issues

11/11: Nuclear Posture Review

Charles L. Glaser and Steve Fetter, "Counterforce Revisited: Assessing the Nuclear Posture Review's New Missions," *International Security* 30 (Fall 2005): 84-126.

Wolfgang Panofsky. 2007. "Nuclear Insecurity; Correcting Washington's Dangerous Posture." *Foreign Affairs* 86 (5): 109-

Recommended: Payne, Keith B. 2005. "The Nuclear Posture Review: Setting the Record Straight." *The Washington Quarterly* 28 (3): 135-151.

11/13: Missile Defense

Charles L. Glaser and Steve Fetter. 2001. "National Missile Defense and the Future of US Nuclear Weapons Policy." *International Security* 26 (1): 40-92

George N. Lewis & Theodore A. Postol. 2008. "The European Missile Defense Folly." *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* 64 (2): 32-39.

11/18: Testing

Garwin, Richard L. 1997. "The Future of Nuclear Weapons without Nuclear Testing." *Arms Control Today* 27 (8).

Hugh Gusterson. 2007. "Taking RRW Personally." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 63(4): 42-45.

The Economist, "Just Talk to Yourself," 8 March 2007.

11/20: Technology Transfers

The Economist, "A Hero at Home, A Villain Abroad," 19 July 2008.

Sheena Chestnut, "Illicit Activity and Proliferation: North Korean Smuggling Networks," *International Security* (Summer 2007): 80-111.

Leonard Weiss. 2007. "U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation." *Nonproliferation Review* 14 (3): 429-457.

The Economist, "Blast from the Past," 30 November 2006.

11/25: India-Pakistan

Kapur, S. Paul. 2005. "India and Pakistan's Unstable Peace." *International Security* 30 (2): 127-152.

12/2: North Korea

Siegfried S. Hecker. 2008. "Denuclearizing North Korea." *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 64(2): 44-49.

The Economist, "Dance of the Seven Nuclear Veils," 17 July 2008.

12/4: Iran

Scott D. Sagan, "How to Keep the Bomb From Iran," *Foreign Affairs* 85 (September/October 2006).

Frank Barnaby, *Would Air Strikes Work? Understanding Iran's Nuclear Programme and the Possible Consequences of a Military Strike* (London: Oxford Research Group, 2007).

The Economist, "A Surprising Move," 17 July 2008.

12/9: Terrorism

Peter D. Zimmerman and Jeffrey G. Lewis, "The Bomb in the Backyard," *Foreign Policy* no. 157 (November/December 2006), 33-39.

Jessica Stern, "Terrorist Motivations and Unconventional Weapons," in Peter R. Lavoy, Scott D. Sagan, and James J. Wirtz, eds., *Planning the Unthinkable: How New Powers Will Use Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Weapons* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), 202-229.

12/11: Final Paper due by 4:30, no in-class exam

GRADING STANDARDS:

The following standards will be applied to the evaluation of assignments in the class.

A Exceptional Performance.

Consistently outstanding work on all course-related tasks at a level that distinguishes the student from other members of the class. A comprehensive and incisive command of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A frequently demonstrated exceptional capacity for original, creative, critical and logical thinking. The ability to master and integrate large amounts of factual material and abstract theories. An outstanding ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

A- Excellent Performance.

Consistently strong work on all course-related tasks. A comprehensive command of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A clearly demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical and logical thinking. Understands well and can integrate the relevant factual and theoretical material central to the course. A strong ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

B+ Very Good Performance.

Consistently above average work on all course-related tasks. A very good grasp of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A generally demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical, and logical thinking. A very good command of factual and theoretical material, and some capacity to integrate the two. A solid ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

B Good Performance.

Good and generally consistent work on all course-related tasks. A general understanding of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. Modest evidence of the capacity for original, creative, critical and logical thinking. A good understanding of factual and theoretical material, but limited evidence of the capacity to integrate the two. A basic ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

B- Satisfactory Performance

Satisfactory work on course-related tasks. A reasonable understanding of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. An infrequently demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical and logical thinking. Understands at a basic level the facts and theories related to the course, but demonstrates weak integration skills. A limited or inconsistent ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

C+/C/C- Adequate Performance

Adequate performance on course-related tasks. An understanding of the basic elements of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A rarely demonstrated capacity for original, creative, critical and logical thinking. An inability to go beyond a recitation of basic factual material related to the class. Demonstrated weaknesses in the ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

D/D+ Minimal Passing Performance.

Barely acceptable work on course-related tasks. A generally superficial and often inconsistent familiarity with the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. A failure to demonstrate the capacity for original, creative, critical and logical thinking related to course content. An uneven understanding of basic factual material related to the course; no evidence of fact/theory integration. Demonstrates significant gaps in the ability to discuss effectively course subject matter using both written and oral communication skills.

F Unacceptable Performance

Fails to meet minimum course expectations. Unable to understand even the most basic elements of the issues, literature, and substantive information relevant to the course. Demonstrates an inability to engage in coherent written or oral discussion of course material. Does not satisfy specific course expectations with respect to attendance, deadlines, participation, etc.