

Nuclear Security

CAS IR 353/CAS PO 356

Fall 2024

Class Hours: Mondays and Wednesdays, 4:30 pm – 5:45 pm

Classroom: 565 Commonwealth Avenue, Room KCB 107

Instructor: Professor Sanne Cornelia J. Verschuren

Email: sversch@bu.edu

Office Hours: Mondays, 2:30 – 4:00 pm and Wednesdays, 1:30 – 3:00 pm

Office Hours Sign-Up Sheet: <https://calendly.com/sversch/officehours>

Office: 152 Bay State Road, Room 225

Course Description

What role do nuclear weapons play in international politics? Why do states develop nuclear weapons? How are these weapons used in crises? This course introduces students to different aspects of nuclear politics. As part of the first module, we examine how the bomb was created and how it shaped the early stages of the Cold War. The second module is dedicated to the meaning, operationalization, and shortcomings of nuclear deterrence. In the third module, we investigate why countries seek to build nuclear weapons and how the international community has attempted to make it harder for countries to do so. The fourth module revolves around contemporary challenges, including the puzzle of non-use, nuclear policy in an era of increased security competition, resistance to the bomb, and the interaction between nuclear weapons and the climate. The course will train students to pay attention to theoretical debates around nuclear weapons, how they speak to policy considerations, and assess these arguments by using historical and contemporary empirical evidence.

Short Course Description: Provides students with the foundation for understanding nuclear security in the twenty-first century. Emphasis on the American Cold War experience, the growing threat of nuclear proliferation, the renaissance of civilian nuclear power, safeguards, and nuclear weapons under budget constraints.

Learning Goals

By the end of this course, you will be able to:

- Summarize historical and contemporary debates around the politics of nuclear weapons in international relations.
- Identify key political, social, legal, and cultural factors in the development of nuclear weapons.
- Apply critical thought and creativity to these problems by exploring different strands of the academic and policy-relevant literature, as well as by using and assessing primary source materials.
- Generate a relevant “political science”-type argument, both in oral and written format.

BU Hub Learning Outcomes

Teamwork/Collaboration: Students will participate in in-class group activities and simulations. These in-class exercises are designed to put students in the place of policymakers. They will be given a scenario and tasked, with their group members, to advise the policymaker or defense organization in question, on future policy. Students will then debrief as a team and as a class after each exercise to assess what worked and did not work and how they were constrained by the needs of the bureaucratic office or organization in question.

Ethical Reasoning: Students will grapple with the use of and the threat of mass killings and debate the degree to which living in a nuclear shadow promotes peace in the international system. As the United States, for example, is at a budgetary crossroads vis-à-vis its nuclear weapons programs, students will address the degree to which the United States should devote scarce resources to continue its nuclear weapons program or abolish them and risk losing its nuclear deterrent capability. Relatedly, students will assess the decision to invest in multibillion-dollar nuclear defense program (e.g. “Star Wars”) or continue to rely on nuclear deterrence.

Oral and/or Signed Communication: During the group exercises, students will have to present and advocate for their policy positions as agreed upon in their simulation exercise to each other as well as either to guest speakers (acting as designed policy makers) or to the instructor.

Course Format

This course consists of a mixture between lectures and in-class exercises. At the beginning of class, I will typically give a brief lecture, providing students with a sense of what is at stake, an overview of the relevant literature, and a presentation of the core concepts. Subsequently, you will be asked to share your insights about the readings, discuss the contemporary relevance of the theories and concepts, and engage in one-on-one, small-group, or class discussions about key issues as they relate to the topic of the class. The goal is to have you embrace a range of theoretical arguments, to apply these insights to historical current strategic discussions, and to prepare you for future scholarly research and policy analysis.

Your active participation is a crucial part of this seminar. This means that you should come to class prepared to discuss the readings. The readings will be distributed through the course site on Blackboard (“Course Content”). If you have questions about the readings or the assignments, you can post those on Blackboard (“Discussion”), and we will try to answer them collectively.

As part of this course, you will be introduced to different types of materials. Readings include seminal research pieces (book chapters or articles) in the field of nuclear security, documentaries and audio fragments, opinion pieces by scholars or practitioners, and primary source documents. With regard to the latter, you will be reading documents that have been curated by me, as well as by government agencies, archives, and historical organizations. You will be expected to go through them thoroughly. When reading through these documents, you should ask yourself the following questions: When was the document written?; What agency, institution, or individual was responsible for writing the document? What is the position of the office or the person who wrote the document? What is the format of the document (e.g. briefing, memo, letter, transcript)?; What is the purpose of the

document?; Who was the intended audience for the document?; What evidence, knowledge, or insights did the intended audience gain from the document?; and How does this document fit into the broader historical context?

I have an open-door policy, meaning that you can reach me via email, visit my office during office hours, or set up an appointment for another time. My office hours are Mondays 2:30 – 4:00 pm and Wednesdays 1:30 – 3:00 pm (sign up via [Calendly](#)). My office is located in 152 Bay State Road, Room 225. You can ask me questions about the course materials, course requirements, your academic experiences, and your career aspirations. I expect you to meet with me during office hours at least once per semester. You can also always reach out to me via email for questions and comments. In light of research, travel, and other teaching obligations, please allow 24-48 hours for me to respond to your email.

I invite you to bring your experiences and backgrounds into our class discussions. However, you are not expected, nor should you feel pressured to share personal information or to “represent” the perspective of any particular socio-cultural group. While it is important to explore and be aware of the different ways that we individually relate to the course material, my goal is that everyone should feel comfortable speaking about the texts and materials that we will be examining. Our classroom is a space where we can learn from one another, and this happens best when we build a community of compassion, curiosity, and respect together. If you ever feel that the classroom environment is discouraging your participation or is problematic in any way, please contact me.

Assessment & Grading Policy

As part of this course, you will have to complete a number of assignments—each of them aimed at helping you grapple with the complexities of nuclear politics and developing or refining your analytical, writing, and communication skills. These assignments consist of (1) active participation in class, (2) three short essays, (3) a simulation, and (4) a final exam.

If you have any questions about these assignments, please do not hesitate to ask them in class, on Blackboard (“discussions”), or to reach out to me about them.

Active Participation in Class (10 percent of your overall grade)

As this course combines a lecture-format with seminar-style discussions, your **active participation** is key. Your participation will be graded. Students’ participation grade has three components: (1) **attendance of the sessions** (20 percent of the active participation grade), (2) **interventions and participation in class discussions** (20 percent of the active participation grade), and (3) **active participation in group exercises** (60 percent of your active participation grade). For the group exercises, please sign up [here](#).

You will be assessed not just on being present, but also how often you speak up in class or small group discussions, as well as the quality of your remarks. While it may be scary to speak up in class, I have planned a variety of activities that will help you to do so.

If you cannot attend class due to medical, family/personal, or religious exceptions, please reach out to me with the required documentation **in advance of the class that you cannot attend**. For additional details on BU's Absence Policy and Policy on Religious Observance, see:

<https://www.bu.edu/academics/policies/attendance/>

and <https://www.bu.edu/academics/policies/absence-for-religious-reasons/>.

Short Essays (45 percent of your overall grade, 15 percent for each essay)

You are expected to write **three short essays** for this class. In doing so, we will experiment with different forms of writing. Each essay will have to be **1500 words, including footnotes and bibliography**. Essays should be uploaded to Blackboard ("Assignments"). To guide you through the writing process, additional instructions will be distributed in advance.

- A **policy memo**, in which you advise the U.S. President on the appropriate response to the Soviet Union's first successful nuclear weapons test. The policy memo is due **Sunday September 22nd at midnight**.
- A **scholarly essay** that describes a nuclear accident or crisis of your choosing, explains what the driving factors behind the crisis or accident were, as well as explores what kept the accident or crisis from spiraling out of control. The scholarly essay is due on **Tuesday October 15th at midnight**.
- An **opinion piece** for a general audience, in which you describe a contemporary challenge for nuclear security (from the course's materials or beyond), identify its implications for international security, and propose a policy recommendation to move forward. The opinion piece is due on **Friday December 6th at midnight**.

Your essays will be assessed on the quality of your argument/thesis, the evidence/examples that you use, the way that you embed your argument within the scholarly literature, the structure of your essay, the quality of the sources that you are using, and your writing style.

Simulation (15 percent of your overall grade)

It is early April 1995. Every five years, State Parties to the NPT come together to assess the implementation of and compliance with the Treaty's obligations. This year is different. The stakes of this review conference are particularly high. State Parties must decide whether and under what conditions they will extend the Treaty. For the simulation, we will replay **the negotiations in the lead-up and during the 1995 NPT Review Conference**.

You will sign up [here](#) for one of the country's delegations by Wednesday October 30th. Each delegation needs to produce one **three-page single-spaced policy memo** that includes (1) an analysis of what is at stake for their country in the NPT review conference; (2) what your country wants to achieve during the NPT review and why; and (3) how your country will conduct the negotiations (who to align with, what to compromise on, etc.). The memos are due on **Friday November 8th at midnight** and should be uploaded on Blackboard ("Assignments"). The simulation will take place in class on Monday November 11th and Wednesday November 13th.

The simulation will count towards 15% of your overall grade. You will be graded on the quality of your policy memo, as well as your performance during the plenary sessions and in the negotiations.

Grades will be given per group. Policy memos and the delegation's negotiation positions should be well researched. They should provide an answer to the three points that are listed above. You should use academic writings, newspaper articles, as well as what you can find on government websites to build your country's position. Please include references to these sources in your policy memo.

Final Exam (30 percent of your overall grade)

To gauge your comprehension of the course's concepts and theories, we will be doing a **final exam**. The precise date of the exam will be given to you after the first week of classes. The exam will consist of **short answer questions and a brief essay**.

You will be graded on your knowledge of the key concepts and theories (from both the readings and the class), as well as your ability to provide fitting examples for each of them.

To prepare you for the midterm, I recommend you to take good notes of the readings, as well as in-class lectures and discussions. I will ensure to upload the PowerPoint slides after each session. This material will help you to prepare for the final exam. We will also hold a review session on Monday December 9th. Please bring your questions to the review class. You can also upload questions on Blackboard ("Discussions").

Grade Distribution

The breakdown of your grades is as follows:

Active Participation	10%
Short Essay I	15%
Short Essay II	15%
Short Essay III	15%
Simulation	15%
Final Exam	30%

Work will be graded on the following scale:

- 90%-100%: A- and up = Extraordinary, excellent work and mastery of concepts
- 80%-89%: B- and up = Good work and solid command of concepts
- 70%-79%: C- and up = Adequate work and sufficient understanding of concepts
- 60%-69%: D and up = Poor work and little understanding of concepts
- 0%-59%: F = Lack of work and no understanding of concepts

Guidelines for Written Assignments

Electronic copies of written assignments (PDF only) should be submitted on Blackboard by the deadline. Please ensure that your work is typeset according to the following guidelines:

- **PDF only (!)**
- Times New Roman font (12 point)
- Double spaced
- 1-inch margins on all sides

- Numbered pages
- Date of the Assignment
- Don't forget to add your name to the document!

Late Assignments

An assignment will be considered late if it is turned in a day after it is due. **A late assignment will be penalized 2% of its final grade per day that it is late.** Please contact me **prior** to the deadline, if you encounter a medical, family or personal emergency and need an extension. Extension requests made after the deadline will be declined.

Academic Integrity

All members of the University are expected to maintain the highest standards of academic honesty and integrity, and the CAS [Academic Conduct Code](#) will be strictly enforced. The online environment does not change your responsibility to follow the Academic Conduct Code. The work you submit must be your own, with clear and accurate citations for the source of any quotations, data, or ideas. ChatGPT and other forms of AI are considered plagiarism.

Plagiarism and cheating are serious offenses and will be punished in accordance with BU's [Academic Conduct Code](#).

Inclusive Learning Environment

In this class, we will work together to develop a learning community that is inclusive and respectful. Our diversity may be reflected by differences in race, culture, age, religion, sexual orientation, socioeconomic background, and myriad other social identities and life experiences. The goal of inclusiveness, in a diverse community, encourages and appreciates expressions of different ideas, opinions, and beliefs, so that conversations and interactions that could potentially be divisive turn instead into opportunities for intellectual and personal enrichment. A dedication to inclusiveness requires respecting what others say, their right to say it, and the thoughtful consideration of others' communication. Both speaking up and listening are valuable tools for furthering thoughtful, enlightening dialogue. Respecting one another's individual differences is critical in transforming a collection of diverse individuals into an inclusive, collaborative, and excellent learning community. Our core commitment shapes our core expectation for behavior inside and outside of the classroom.

A critical part of building a learning environment that is inclusive of sexual orientation and gender identity is asking and correctly using someone's name and pronouns. You can add your pronouns in Blackboard at the beginning of the term so that we can refer to you using the correct pronouns. If your pronoun set is not available in Blackboard, please let me know so that I can use the correct pronouns. Preferred names and pronouns may change during the term, so feel free at any point to let me know that you would like to be addressed differently. As a community, we will strive to address each other with the names and pronouns identified in Blackboard. If we make mistakes or are corrected, we will briefly apologize and correct ourselves.

Accessibility

Boston University is committed to providing equal access to our coursework and programs to all students, including those with disabilities. In order to be sure that accommodations can be made in time for all exams and assignments, please plan to turn in your accommodations letter to me as soon as possible after the first class, but no later than 14 days prior to the midterm. After you turn in your letter, please meet with me to discuss the plan for accommodations so we can be sure that they are adequate and that you are supported in your learning. If you have further questions or need additional support, please contact the [Office of Disability Services](#).

BU Resources for Students

BU offers a variety of resources to support you in your learning. Please find a non-exhaustive list of these resources below. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

- BU Research Guides: <https://library.bu.edu/guides/>
- BU Libraries – Ask a Librarian: <https://askalibrarian.bu.edu>
- The CAS Writing Center: <https://www.bu.edu/writingprogram/the-writing-center/>
- BU Diversity & Inclusion: <https://www.bu.edu/diversity/resources/student-resources/>
- BU Mental Health Resources: <https://www.bu.edu/shs/behavioral-medicine/behavioral-resources/>

Resources on Nuclear Politics

For analyses of latest issues and developments:

- Arms Control Association
- Arms Control Wonk
- Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists
- Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
- Center for Nonproliferation Studies
- Center for Strategic and International Studies
- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization
- Council on Foreign Relations
- Federation of American Scientists
- Henry L. Stimson Center
- International Atomic Energy Agency
- International Institute for Strategic Studies
- Lawfare
- Nuclear Suppliers Group
- Partnership for Global Security Nuclear News
- Political Violence at a Glance
- Proliferation News
- The Stanton Foundation

- Stockholm International Peace Research Institute
- Union of Concerned Scientists
- War on the Rocks

Other useful sources:

- Federation of American Scientists Nuclear Notebook: contains details of all the nuclear programs of the world.
- Nuclear Threat Initiative: contains many resources and data on nuclear, biological, radiological, and cyber-nuclear threats.
- Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists: articles and analysis of current and past nuclear issues.
- Harvard Project on Cold War Studies: contains links to declassified documents in many international archives.
- Cold War International History Project: contains documents and reports on various historical events from the Cold War.
- National Security Archive, an independent, non-governmental organization that files Freedom of Information Act requests and publishes online documents related to the Cold War.
- Office of the Historian, U.S. Department of State publishes Foreign Relations of the United States series.

Course Schedule

MODULE 1: The Onset of the Nuclear Age

Session 1 (Wednesday September 4th): What are nuclear weapons?

- John Hersey. 24 August 1946. "Hiroshima." In *The New Yorker*.
<http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/1946/08/31/hiroshima?intcid=mod-most-popular>.

Session 2 (Monday September 9th): The Creation of the bomb

- Einstein's Letter to President Roosevelt. 2 August 1939. JFK Library.
- Arthur H. Compton. National Academy of Sciences Committee on Atomic Fission to Frank Jewett, President, National Academy of Sciences. 17 May 1941. Secret. National Security Archives.
- Vannevar Bush to President Roosevelt. 9 March 1942, with memo from Roosevelt attached, 11 March 1942. Secret. National Security Archives.
- Stanley Goldberg. 1992. "Inventing a Climate of Opinion: Vannevar Bush and the Decision to Build the Bomb." In *Osiris*. 83: pp. 429-452.

Session 3 (Wednesday September 11th): The decision to drop the bomb

- Memorandum by Leslie R. Grove. "Policy Meeting, 5/5/43." Top Secret. National Security Archives.
- Memo from General Groves to the Chief of Staff [Marshall]. "Atomic Fission Bombs – Present Status and Expected Progress." 7 August 1944, Top Secret, excised copy. National Security Archives.
- Memorandum from Major J. A. Derry and Dr. N.F. Ramsey to General L.R. Groves. "Summary of Target Committee Meetings on 10 and 11 May 1945." 12 May 1945. Top Secret. National Security Archives.
- Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy. "Memorandum of Conversation with General Marshal. 29 May 1945 – 11:45 p.m." Top Secret. National Security Archives.
- Memorandum from Arthur B. Compton to the Secretary of War, enclosing "Memorandum on 'Political and Social Problems.' from Members of the 'Metallurgical Laboratory' of the University of Chicago." 12 June 1945. Secret. National Security Archives (summary ONLY!)
- Ward Wilson. 2007. "The Winning Weapon?: Rethinking Nuclear Weapons in Light of Hiroshima." In *International Security* 31(4): pp. 162-179.

Session 4 (Monday September 16th): Now What? Constructing a World with Nuclear Weapons

- Memorandum from Vannevar Bush and James B. Conant, Office of Scientific Research and Development to Secretary of War. 30 September 1944. Top Secret. National Security Archives.
- Achenson-Lilenthal Report. March 1946: pp 5-16, 26-28, and 29-30 ONLY!
- Alex Wellerstein. 2021. *Restricted Data: The History of Nuclear Secrecy in the United States*: pp. 135-178.

Session 5 (Wednesday September 18th): The Soviet Nuclear Test and the End of the United States' Nuclear Monopoly

- David Holloway. 1994. "Stalin and the Bomb." Yale University Press: pp. 116-149 (Chapters 6 and 7).
- Director of Central Intelligence R.H. Hillenkoetter. 6 July 1948. Memorandum to the President. "Estimate of the Status of the Russian Atomic Energy Project." Top Secret. National Security Archives.
- Policy Planning Staff. 21 September 1949. "Questions and Answers Versions, 9/21/49-9/22." Top Secret. National Security Archives.
- Doyle Northrup and Donald Rock. Fall 1966. "The Detection of Joe 1." Central Intelligence Agency, Studies in Intelligence. Secret, excised copy. National Security Archives.

Session 6 (Monday September 23rd): The Beginning of the Arms Race

- NSC-68, 1950. *Office of the Historian, State Department.*

MODULE 2: Nuclear Deterrence and its Limits

Session 7 (Wednesday September 25th): The ABC's of Nuclear Deterrence

- Thomas C. Schelling. 2008. *Arms and Influence.* The Henry L. Stimson Lectures Series. Yale University Press: pp. 92–125.
- Albert Wohlstetter. 1959. "The Delicate Balance of Terror." In *Foreign Affairs*: <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/1959-01-01/delicate-balance-terror>.
- Watch Dr. Strangelove (or: How I Learned to Stop Worrying and Love the Bomb).

Session 8 (Monday September 30th): Nuclear Deterrence in Practice

- Robert S. Hopkins and Bruce G. Blair. 2019. "How the Strategic Air Command Would Go Nuclear." In *National Security Archives*: <https://nsarchive.gwu.edu/briefing-book/nuclear-vault/2019-02-25/how-strategic-air-command-would-go-nuclear-war>.
- 2022 Nuclear Posture Review. <https://crsreports.congress.gov/product/pdf/IF/IF12266>.

Session 9 (Wednesday October 2nd): A Critical Lense on Deterrence

- Carol Cohn. 1987. "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals." In *Signs* 12: pp. 687-718.
- Hugh Gusterson. 1999. "Nuclear Weapons and the Other in the Western Imagination." In *Cultural Anthropology* 14(1): pp. 111-143.
- Rose McDermott, Anthony C. Lopez, and Peter K. Hatemi. 2017. "Blunt Not the Heart, Enrage It." In *Texas National Security Review*: pp. 68-88.

Session 10 (Monday October 7th): The Command and Control Conundrum

- Giles David Arceneaux. 2023. "Nuclear Command and Control and Strategic Stability." In *The Hague Centre for Strategic Studies*.
- Alice Satlini. 2023. "AI and Nuclear Command, Control and Communications: P5 Perspectives." In *The European Leadership Network*.

Session 11 (Wednesday October 9th): The Curious Case of Missile Defenses

- Donald Rumsfeld. 2000. "Summary of Ballistic Missile Defense Task Force." Library of Congress. Rumsfeld Papers. Box II: 174.
- Joseph R. Biden. 2000. "The Biden Letters." Clinton Presidential Archives. Accessed Online.
- John D. Maurer. 2018. "The Purposes of Arms Control." *Texas National Security Review* 2(1): 8-27.

Session 12 (Tuesday October 15th): What Will This Cost? Modernization and the Budget

- PBS. "How Should the U.S. Deal with Decaying Nuclear Arms Infrastructure." <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/show/u-s-deal-decaying-nuclear-infrastructure>.
- Arms Control Association. U.S. Nuclear Modernization Programs. August 2024. <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/us-modernization-2024-update#:~:text=As%20of%202024%2C%20the%20United,%24540%20billion%20in%20acquisition%20costs>.
- Peter Huessy, "Why America Must Modernize its Nuclear Forces," *War on the Rocks* Op-Ed - <https://warontherocks.com/2018/03/why-america-must-modernize-its-nuclear-forces/>.
- "The U.S.'s Plans to Modernize Nuclear Weapons are Dangerous and Unnecessary." In *Scientific American*: <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-u-s-s-plans-to-modernize-nuclear-weapons-are-dangerous-and-unnecessary/>.

Session 13 (Wednesday October 16th): Nuclear Crises & Accidents

- Episode 5. "War Games." In *Turning Point: The Bomb and the Cold War*. Netflix.
- Scott Sagan. 1993. *The Limits of Safety: Organizations, Accidents and Nuclear Weapons*. Princeton University Press: pp. 11-52.
- Hyun-Binn Cho. 2021. "Nuclear Coercion, Crisis Bargaining, and The Sino-Soviet Border Conflict of 1969." In *Security Studies* 30(4): pp. 550-577.
- Benoît Pelopidas and Alex Wellerstein. 10 August 2022. "The Reason We Haven't Had Nuclear Disasters Isn't Careful Planning. It's Luck." In *The Washington Post*: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2020/08/10/reason-we-havent-had-nuclear-disasters-isnt-careful-planning-its-luck/>.

Session 14 (Monday October 21st): Wargame

- Read Background Materials

Session 15 (Wednesday October 23rd): Wargame

- No Readings

Session 16 (Monday October 28th): Guest Lecture by Professor Lauren Sukin on Nuclear Weapons and Alliance Dynamics

- No Readings

MODULE 3: Nuclear Proliferation

Session 17 (Wednesday October 30th): The Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

- Scott D. Sagan. 1996. “Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb.” In *International Security* 21(3): 54-88.
- Jacques E. C Hymans. 2006. “Leaders’ National Identity Conceptions and Nuclear Choices.” In *The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation: Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy*. Cambridge University Press: pp. 16-46.
- Vipin Narang. 2017. “Strategies of Nuclear Proliferation: How States Pursue the Bomb.” In *International Security* 41(3): 110–150.

Session 18 (Monday November 4th): Three Cases of Nuclear Proliferation

- Jayita Sarkar. 2022. *Ploughshares and Swords: India’s Nuclear Program in the Global Cold War*. Cornell University Press: pp. 1-15 (Introduction) and pp. 167-201 (Chapter 7).
- Målfrid Braut-Hegghammer. 2018. “Why North Korea succeeded at getting nuclear weapons — when Iraq and Libya failed.” In *Monkey Cage blog*.
- Mariana Budjeryn. 2022. *Inheriting the Bomb: The Collapse of the USSR and the Nuclear Disarmament of Ukraine*. Global Security Studies Speaker Series:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jdPOPBA6sA0&t=2398s> (watch until 40:00 mins)
 - For those who prefer to read, see pp. 6-15 (Introduction) and 109-128 (Chapter 5)

Session 19 (Wednesday November 6th): The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Architecture

- The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).
<https://disarmament.unoda.org/wmd/nuclear/npt/text/>
- Intelligence Memo. 9 June 1966. “The US, the USSR and the Issue of Nonproliferation.” CIA Archives.
- Intelligence Memo. 27 November 1968. “Prospects for a Nonproliferation Treaty.” CIA Archives.
- Jonathan R. Hunt. 2022. *The Nuclear Club: How America and the World Policed the Atom from Hiroshima to Vietnam*. Stanford University Press: pp. 172-191 (Chapter 7).
- Daniel Khalessi. 2015. “Strategic Ambiguity: Nuclear Sharing and the Secret Strategy for Drafting Articles I and II of the Nonproliferation Treaty.” In *The Nonproliferation Review* 22(3–4): pp. 421-439.

Session 20 (Monday November 11th): NPT Simulation

- No Readings.

Session 21 (Wednesday November 13th): NPT Simulation

- No Readings.

MODULE 4: Nuclear Weapons in the Contemporary Era

Session 22 (Monday November 18th): The Puzzle of Nuclear Non-Use

- Reid B.C. Pauly. 2018. “Would U.S. Leaders Push the Button? Wargames and the Sources of Nuclear Restraint.” In *International Security* 43(2): pp. 151-192.

- Nina Tannenwald. 1999. “The Nuclear Taboo: The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use.” In *International Organization* 53(3): pp. 433-468.
- Daryl G. Press, Scott D. Sagan, and Benjamin A. Valentino. 2013. “Atomic Aversion: Experimental Evidence on Taboos, Traditions, and the Non-Use of Nuclear Weapons.” In *The American Political Science Review* 107(1): pp. 188-206.

Session 23 (Wednesday November 20th): Guest lecture by Professor Michal Smetana on the Contested Nuclear Taboo in the Third Nuclear Age

- No Readings

Session 24 (Monday November 25th): Nuclear Weapons in an Era of Renewed Strategic Competition

- Tong Zhao. 2024. *Political Drivers of China’s Changing Nuclear Policy: Implications for U.S.-China Relations and International Security*. Carnegie Endowment for Peace: pp. 7-30 ONLY (chapters 1 and 2).
- Fiona S. Cunningham. 2022. “Strategic Substitution: China’s Search for Coercive Leverage in the Information Age.” In *International Security* 47(1): 46-92.
- David Logan. 2020. “Are they reading Schelling in Beijing? The dimensions, drivers, and risks of nuclear-conventional entanglement in China.” In *Journal of Strategic Studies*, 46(1): 5–55.

Session 25 (Monday December 2nd): Resistance, the Anti-Nuclear Movement, and Disarmament

- Vincent J. Intondi. 2015. “‘Desegregation Not Disintegration’: The Black Freedom Movement, Vietnam, and Nuclear Weapons.” In *African Americans Against the Bomb: Nuclear Weapons, Colonialism, and the Black Freedom Movement*. Stanford University Press: pp. 63-84.
- Andrew Latham. 2017. “Lessons from the Nuclear Freeze.” In *Boston Review*: <https://bostonreview.net/articles/andrew-lanham-latham-nuclear-freeze/>.
- Laura Considine. 2019. “Contests of Legitimacy and Value: The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and the Logic of Prohibition.” In *International Affairs* 95(5): 1075-1092.
- Donald MacKenzie and Graham Spinardi. 1995. “Tacit Knowledge, Weapons Design, and the Uninvention of Nuclear Weapons.” In *American Journal of Sociology* 101(1): pp. 44-99.

Session 26 (Wednesday December 4th): Nuclear Weapons and Climate Change

- Lelsey M. Blume. 20 July 2023. “Trinity Nuclear Test’s Fallout Reached 46 States, Canada and Mexico, Study Finds.” In *The New York Times*: <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/07/20/science/trinity-nuclear-test-atomic-bomb-oppenheimer.html>.
- Dan Zak. 27 November 2015. “A Ground Zero Forgotten: The Marshall Islands, Once a U.S. Nuclear Test Site, Face Oblivion Again.” In *The Washington Post*: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/sf/national/2015/11/27/a-ground-zero-forgotten/>.
- Jamie Kwong. 10 July 2023. “How Climate Change Challenges the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent.” In *Carnegie Endowment for Peace*: <https://carnegieendowment.org/research/2023/07/how-climate-change-challenges-the-us-nuclear-deterrent?lang=en>.

Session 27 (Monday December 9th): Wrapping up and Exam Review