Description

The central dilemma of the nuclear age has been how to obtain the benefits but avoid the risks of an extraordinarily powerful technology when no state can control its spread nor protect itself unilaterally against hostile or reckless misuse. PUAF 720 covered choices made about nuclear weapons during the Cold War and its immediate aftermath. PUAF 798M considers how powerful trends associated with globalization affect longstanding issues on the arms control and nonproliferation agenda. It also explores how they are creating new types of challenges, including biosecurity and cybersecurity, which cannot be addressed through purely unilateral means, but which also do not fit well with traditional forms of arms control and nonproliferation. Of particular interest is how the level of international cooperation that would be required to respond effectively to global warming affects the amount and type of cooperation needed to manage nuclear energy, prevent proliferation, and minimize risks from existing nuclear arsenals.

The class begins by examining different kinds of explanations for arms control and nonproliferation outcomes and debates about what, if any, need the United States and the rest of the international community for formal arms control now that the Cold War is over. We will use both the current debate about the best way to reduce risks from Iran’s nuclear program and longstanding arguments over the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty as case studies of the interplay between substance and process during negotiation, ratification, and implementation. The course will then consider questions of central importance to security relations among the United States, Russia, and China, including missile defense, space security, and cybersecurity. It will then consider incremental and transformational proposals for addressing a range of global security challenges where technological advances, empowerment of non-state actors, economic interdependence, and climate change are making it increasingly difficult to achieve core security objectives either through unilateral action or through arms control and nonproliferation strategies developed during the Cold War.

Requirements

This course is designed to help students deepen their substantive knowledge, improve their oral and written communication skills, work collaboratively, and gain experience writing a research paper. Students are expected to prepare thoroughly, attend consistently, and participate actively in class discussions. Students will maintain the highest standards of professional behavior and will adhere to the University of Maryland’s Code of Academic Integrity (www.shc.umd.edu) at all times. Please e-mail me in advance, if possible, if you must miss class for any reason. If you must miss class more than once during the semester, please check with me regarding make-up assignments. If you must miss more than twice for medical reasons, documentation from a health care professional may be required.
Students are expected to keep abreast of current events related to the subject matter of the course and are encouraged to attend relevant events sponsored by CISSM and other UMD and DC-based organizations. Some of the CISSM forums held during lunchtime on Thursdays will be of particular relevance to this class, and students are strongly encouraged to attend. If you are not on the CISSM forum mailing list already, you can subscribe at: www.cissm.umd.edu.

The class typically also includes a field trip downtown to meet with a senior government official working on arms control and nonproliferation policy. I will try to arrange this trip for a Tuesday morning, which may require some rearrangement of our class schedule. Given the difficulties of scheduling with senior officials, though, this trip may be held outside of the normal class meeting time. If so, I will try to avoid conflicts and expect class members to do so, too.

Throughout the semester, students will conduct a policy research project on a topic of their choosing, with the final paper (6,000–8,000 words) due one week after the last class session. Grading criteria will be similar to those for 720 policy memos, but substantial additional research and original analysis will be expected:

1) Does it have a clear, coherent, compelling, and creative central argument?
2) Is that central argument well supported?
3) Are counter-arguments and/or alternative points of view weighed?
4) Are important and interesting policy implications drawn from the analysis?
5) Is the memo professionally written — grammatically correct, appropriate tone, fact-checked, numbered pages, etc.?

Research questions should be approved by the fourth class session (Sept. 22). An analytical outline is due by the seventh session (Oct. 13). Students will give rough drafts to me and a peer editor by the eleventh session (no later than Nov. 16), and receive feedback by the following week (NLT Nov. 20). Students will also give class presentations during the final weeks of the semester.

During the second half of the semester, students will also write an op-ed (700 words) on their research topic or another arms control, nonproliferation, or cooperative security policy issue. An op-ed should present a single, concise argument/point of view in a manner that is accessible to an educated public audience. Where possible, the op-ed should include elements of narrative to raise readers’ interest and to illustrate what is at stake. The op-ed should include only the minimal amount of background information needed for readers to understand the author’s argument. It should contain enough relevant details and sub-arguments to demonstrate a nuanced understanding of the issue, to engage readers, to affect public understanding/opinion, and to potentially impact a policy decision. The op-ed can be about any course-related topic on which the student has a strong opinion; it does not need to relate to the topic under discussion for the week when it is turned in, and it can be related to the student’s research paper topic. For more on writing op-eds, see: http://newsoffice.duke.edu/duke_resources/oped. Op-eds should be sent to the entire class via Canvas by noon on the day before the class session at which it will be discussed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research paper analytical outline</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research paper rough draft</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructive critiques</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research paper presentation</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Op ed</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final policy research paper</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Readings and Resources

One book is required reading for this course. Mohamed El Baradei, *The Age of Deception: Nuclear Diplomacy in Treacherous Times* is available at the University Bookstore.

The course relies heavily on recent articles and reports, many of which are available on the internet, and links have been provided. The remainder of the assigned readings will be placed on reserve using the Canvas system. To access these readings, go to [https://elms.umd.edu](https://elms.umd.edu) and enter your user name and password (the same ones that you use to access your University of Maryland email account), and then click on PUAF 798M. Please let me know ASAP if you have problems accessing any course readings. Depending on class interests and developments in current policy debates, I may supplement or substitute readings as the semester progresses.

Schedule and Reading Assignments

(1) **Introduction (Sept 1)**


(2) **Iran Case Study and Analytical Techniques (Sept. 8)**

Required

Elbaradei, *The Age of Deception*, pp. 191–322


Steven Kull and Nancy Gallagher, “Assessing the Iran Nuclear Deal,” CISSM and VOP, (September 2015), at: [http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2015/09/246574.htm](http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2015/09/246574.htm)

Background Documents

Matthew Bunn, “How IAEA Safeguards Work,” July 8, 2009 Managing the Atom Project Presentation


Optional Readings: (based on questions and suggestions from class members)

http://iranprimer.usip.org/frontpage (This has a huge amount of useful information about decision-making in Iran, Iran’s relations with other countries in the region, etc.)


Gareth Porter, “When the Ayatollah Said No to Nukes,” Foreign Policy (October 2014): http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/10/16/when_the_ayatollah_said_no_to_nukes_iran_khomeini


(3) Theory --- What Explains Arms Control and Nonproliferation Outcomes? (Sept 15)

Understanding how well-written articles are structured will make you a more efficient reader and better writer. Please read: “Writing for International Security,” at http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/156/writing_for_international_security.html

Then, apply the analytical reading summary technique I taught you to the first two, and at least three of the other articles:


(4) **Policy Analysis: Strategic Logics for Arms Control (Sept 22)**

**Research Question Due**

Nancy Gallagher, “Four Logics for Cold War Nuclear Arms Control,” (ms.)

(5) **CTBT Negotiation and Ratification – Substance and Politics (Sept 29)**

The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (September 10, 1996) 
[http://www.state.gov/t/avc/trty/16411.htm](http://www.state.gov/t/avc/trty/16411.htm) (skim).


Rebecca Johnson, “The Role of Civil Society in Negotiating the CTBT,” pp. 96–119 in Melamud, et al., eds, *Banning the Bang or the Bomb?*


National Research Council Committee, The Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty—

Kathleen Bailey and Robert Barker, “Why the United States Should Unsign the
 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Resume Nuclear Testing,” Comparative Strategy 22
(2003), pp. 131-38.

Remarks of Vice President Biden at National Defense University, February 19, 2010, at:
http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-vice-president-biden-national-
defense-university

(6) What Logic for Security with Russia after the Cold War? (Oct 6)

Ashton B. Carter, William J. Perry, and John D. Steinbruner, “A New Concept of

Antonia Handler Chayes and Abram Chayes, “Regime Architecture: Elements and

Ashton B. Carter and William Perry, “Project Sapphire, the Nunn-Lugar Program, and
Arms Control,” pp. 65–91 in Preventive Defense (Brookings, 1999)

Gregory Flynn and Henry Farrell, “Piecing Together the Democratic Peace: The CSCE,
Norms, and the ‘Construction’ of Security in the Post-Cold War Europe,” International
Organization 53:3 (Summer 1999), pp. 505-535

Alexei Arbatov and Vladimir Dvorkin, “The New Treaty on Strategic Offensive Arms:
One Step in the Right Direction,” Carnegie Moscow Center (June 2010), at:
direction.

Lawrence Freedman, “Ukraine and the Art of Crisis Management,” (March 19, 2014)

Alexei Arbatov, “An Unnoticed Crisis: The End of History for Nuclear Arms Control?”
Carnegie Moscow Center (June 2015), at:

Benefit, and Respect,” Deep Cuts Issue Brief #4 (June 2015), at:

Kathryn Stoner and Michael McFaul, “Who Lost Russia (This Time)? Vladimir Putin,”
The Washington Quarterly (Summer 2015)

(7) **Missile Defense – An Obstacle or Opportunity for Cooperation? (Oct 13)**

**Guest speaker: Jaganath Sankaran**

**Analytical Outline Due**


**Question:** Has anything changed that alters Fetter and Glaser’s 2001 assessment that missile defense should be limited and cooperative? What types of cooperation would make the benefits of missile defense outweigh the costs and risks?

(8) **Space Security (Oct 20) Guest Speaker: Theresa Hitchens**


U.S. National Space Policy, August 31, 2006, unclassified summary.

U.S. National Space Policy, June 28, 2010, at:

Draft Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat or Use of Force against Space Objects (Russian and Chinese PAROS proposal, 2-13-08, http://i.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/PPWT.pdf


Theresa Hitchens, “Forwarding Multilateral Space Governance: Next Steps for the International Community” CISSM Working Paper (August 2015) at:

Question: Should the United States pursue any cooperative accords that could constrain its freedom of action in space? If so, what type of agreement(s) should it seek?

(9) Cybersecurity (Oct 27) Guest Speaker: Charlie Harry


Franz-Stefan Gady and Greg Austin, “Russia, the United States, and Cyber Diplomacy: Opening the Doors,” EastWest Institute, 2010, at:

Question: What role should international cooperation play in cybersecurity strategy?

**China (Nov 3)**


**Question:** Do the prospects for closer cooperation with China depend on China becoming more like the United States?

(11) **Nonproliferation and Nuclear Security among States and Non-state Actors (Nov 10)**


“Spanning the NPT Divide” — perspectives from Jayantha Dhanapala, Sergio Duarte, Henk Cor van der Kwast, Andrey Baklitskiy, and Beatrice Fihn, *Arms Control Today* (July/August 2015), pp. 8–22.


**Question:** Is the world doing enough of the right things to prevent proliferation and nuclear terrorism?

*** Rough drafts due NLT Nov 16 ***

(12) **Field Trip (Nov. 17)**
11:00 Discussion with UnderSecretary of State Rose Gottemoeller
12:00 Lunch in Cafeteria with MSPP Alumns

** Constructive Critiques due NLT Nov 20 **

(13) Climate Change, Nuclear Energy, and Cooperative Security (Nov 24)


Question: Can an expansion of nuclear power reduce the risks of global warming without increasing the risks of nuclear proliferation and terrorism?

(14) Emerging Challenges -- Biosecurity (Dec 1)


Question: Can the United States and the rest of the world achieve an acceptable level of biosecurity without committing themselves to any new legally binding rules or more advanced verification and compliance arrangements?

(15) Human Security Challenges (Dec 8) Guest Speaker: Natalie Goldring

Amitav Acharya, “Human Security” (chapter 28) from John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens (eds.), *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. This is not the most recent version of the chapter, but it’s free!  
http://www.amitavacharya.com/?q=content/human-security

Denise Garcia, “Humanitarian Security Regimes”  
https://www.chathamhouse.org/sites/files/chathamhouse/field/field_publication_docs/INTA91_1_04_Garcia.pdf

Arms Trade Treaty, as adopted by the United Nations General Assembly:  
http://www.un.org/disarmament/ATT/docs/ATT_text_(As_adopted_by_the_GA)-E.pdf

January 15, 2014:  