

Strategies Against WMD Proliferation

Yale University, College Seminar Program (CSTD 311(b))

Spring 2006

Derek D. Smith

Objective: Virtually the only point of agreement between Senator Kerry and President Bush during the presidential debates of 2004 was that the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) poses the single greatest threat to the national security of the United States. Disagreement persists, however, over how to respond to such a danger. This seminar will explore the challenges presented by WMD proliferation from a historical, theoretical, and strategic perspective, considering a wide range of political viewpoints. The first few sessions will introduce several foreign policy options for reducing the WMD threat, including arms control, deterrence, and defense. The rest of the seminar then applies these concepts to a variety of international crises and conflicts, drawing conclusions for crafting an effective American strategy against WMD.

To Purchase:

- Joseph Cirincione, Jon Wolfsthal, and Miriam Rajkumar, eds., *Deadly Arsenals: Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Threats*, Second Edition (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, July 2005) (available at the Yale Bookstore)
- 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, NY: Cornell University Press, 2000) (available at the Yale Bookstore)
- Seminar Reader (available at TYCO on Elm St)

To Order (free):

- George Perkovich, et al., *Universal Compliance: A Strategy for Nuclear Security* (Washington D.C.: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, March 2005). Visit <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/>

Seminars: Tuesdays from 1:30-3:20 pm, with one exception listed below. Attendance is mandatory.

Grades: Based on a mid-term 4-5 page memo assignment (20%)(Due February 14), a final research paper of 15-20 pages (60%)(Due April 28), and seminar participation (20%).

Research Lunches: In order to develop topics for your final paper, as well as share ideas with your fellow students, I will divide the class in half and hold two lunch sessions with each group. At the first meeting (Weeks 7 and 8) you will present your proposed topic and thesis statement, after which we will discuss possible avenues of research. At the second meeting (Weeks 11 and 12) you will give an overview of your main arguments and research results, which we will aim to refine as you prepare your final draft.

Contact Information:

- Email: derek.smith@yale.edu
- Office Hours: after seminar or by appointment

Week One (January 10): Introduction

As enrollment will not yet be finalized, I will begin by reviewing the seminar's selection procedure and syllabus. Then we will have a general discussion on the danger of WMD proliferation, with particular emphasis on political differences over the perception of threat and how best to respond.

Week Two (January 24): The WMD Threat in Historical Perspective

WMD, particularly biological and chemical weapons, are not of recent origin. This week examines historical efforts to grapple with the security dilemmas they pose.

- *Planning the Unthinkable*, pp. 1-15 (Wirtz)
- *Deadly Arsenals*, pp. 3-18, 45-82
- George W. Christopher, et al., "Biological Warfare: A Historical Perspective," in *Biological Weapons: Limiting the Threat* (1999), pp. 17-35
- Wikipedia, "Chemical Warfare," pp. 1-17
- Geneva Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare, June 1925, pp. 1-5
- Baruch Plan, presented to the U.N. Atomic Energy Commission, June 1946, pp. 1-8
- Bernard Brodie, "Implications for Military Policy," in *The Absolute Weapon* (1946), pp. 70-107

Week Three (Friday January 27**): Arms Control and Interdiction**

Efforts to combat proliferation sensibly begin with attempts to prevent weapons from reaching the wrong hands in the first place. Arms control involves restrictions on exports, as well as securing and reducing existing supplies of WMD material. Interdiction, similarly, seeks to intercept the transfer of weapons between third parties. We will explore the feasibility of these measures and consider possibilities for reform.

- *Deadly Arsenals*, pp. 18-24, 27-43, 421-42
- *Universal Compliance*, pp. 53-71, 83-125
- Graham Allison, "How to Stop Nuclear Terror," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 83, no. 1 (January/February 2004): pp. 64-74
- Andrew Winner, "The Proliferation Security Initiative: The New Face of Interdiction," *The Washington Quarterly* vol. 28, no. 2 (spring 2005): pp. 129-43
- Michael Byers, "Policing the High Seas: The Proliferation Security Initiative," *American Journal of International Law* vol. 98 (July 2004): pp. 526-45
- Derek D. Smith, "Establishing a Global Quarantine Against WMD," pp. 1-9

Week Four (January 31): Deterrence

Some scholars contend that the U.S. threat to resort to massive retaliation should suffice to convince any adversary not to carry out an attack. This logic was of little comfort vis-à-vis the Soviet Union, and is increasingly questioned in a post-9/11 world. We will consider the deterrence dilemmas faced by the superpowers during the Cold War, as well as those presented by supposed "rogue" states.

- Derek D. Smith, "Deterrence and Counterproliferation in an Age of Weapons of Mass Destruction," *Security Studies* vol. 12, no. 4 (summer 2003): pp. 152-68
- Albert Wohlstetter, "The Delicate Balance of Terror," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 37, no. 2 (January 1959): pp. 211-34
- Fred Charles Ikle, "Can Nuclear Deterrence Last Out the Century?" *Foreign Affairs* vol. 51, no. 2 (January 1973): pp. 267-85
- Paul H. Nitze, "Deterring Our Deterrent," *Foreign Policy*, no. 25 (winter 1976-77): pp. 195-210
- Richard K. Betts, "What Will it Take to Deter the United States?" *Parameters* vol. XXV, no. 4 (winter 1995-96): pp. 70-79

Week Five (February 7): Defense

Since deterrence may fail, it is only prudent to take protective measures to limit the damage from any attack. Thus, the United States has long contemplated missile defenses, despite their uncertain feasibility and potential to destabilize existing deterrence relationships. This week will weigh both sides of the missile defense debate, as well as evaluate other forms of homeland defense.

- Charles L. Glaser and Steve Fetter, "National Missile Defense and the Future of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy," *International Security* vol. 26, no. 1 (summer 2001): pp. 40-92
- U.S. Government, *National Strategy for Homeland Security* (2002), vii-xiii, 37-40
- Jonathan B. Tucker, "Bioterrorism: Threats and Responses," in *Biological Weapons: Limiting the Threat* (1999): pp. 283-320
- Stephen E. Flynn, "The Neglected Home Front," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 83, no. 5 (September/October 2004): pp. 20-33
- Benjamin Friedman, "Homeland Security," *Foreign Policy* no. 149 (July/August 2005): pp. 22-28

Week Six (February 14): Preemption and Prevention (Memo Due**)**

If one lacks faith in deterrence and defense, it may be tempting to elect to disarm a potential adversary, by force if necessary. Under traditional conceptions of international law, states could only authorize such a drastic measure as a preemptive action in circumstances of imminent threat. However, some analysts claim that the "Bush Doctrine" seeks to expand legitimate attacks to include preventive wars prior to any imminent threat. We will examine both sides of this issue, critically analyzing the right to use force in self-defense.

- *Universal Compliance*, pp. 71-82
- Robert S. Litwak, "The New Calculus of Pre-emption," *Survival* vol. 44, no. 4 (winter 2002-03): pp. 53-80
- Terrence Taylor, "The End of Imminence?" *Washington Quarterly* vol. 27, no. 4 (Autumn 2004): pp. 57-72
- James J. Wirtz and James A. Russell, "U.S. Policy on Preventive War and Preemption," *Nonproliferation Review* (spring 2003): pp. 113-23
- Neta C. Crawford, "The Slippery Slope to Preventive War," *Ethics in International Affairs* vol. 17, no. 1 (2003): pp. 30-36
- United Nations, *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*, Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change (2004), pp. 61-67
- Lee Feinstein and Anne-Marie Slaughter, "A Duty to Prevent," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 83, no. 1 (January/February 2004): pp. 136-51

Week Seven (February 21): Iraq

After helping to arm Saddam Hussein in his war against Iran in the 1980s, in the wake of the Kuwaiti invasion the United States embarked on a quest to disarm Iraq that lasted more than a dozen years. We will examine the WMD threats and counter-threats that surrounded both the 1990-91 and the 2003 Gulf wars, observing the functioning of deterrence in practice.

- *Deadly Arsenals*, pp. 329-61
- *Planning the Unthinkable*, pp. 47-78 (McCarthy and Tucker)
- Derek D. Smith, "Crisis and Conflict with Iraq," pp. 1-14
- Barry Posen, "U.S. Security Policy in a Nuclear-Armed World, or What if Iraq Had Had Nuclear Weapons?" in *The Coming Crisis* (2000), pp. 158-91
- Richard K. Betts, "Suicide From Fear of Death," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 82, no. 1 (January/February 2003): pp. 34-43
- John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, "An Unnecessary War," *Foreign Policy* no. 134 (January/February 2003): pp. 50-59
- U.S. Government, *What Does Disarmament Look Like?* (January 2003), pp. 1-9
- Charles Duelfer, Testimony Before the Senate Governmental Affairs Committee (November 2004), pp. 1-6
- *Comprehensive Report of the Special Advisor to the DCI on Iraq's WMD*, Selected Key Findings (September 2004)

Week Eight (February 28): North Korea

As with Iraq, the United States has struggled for years to disarm North Korea, including a crisis in 1993-94 that came frighteningly close to war. This week we will consider what strategies against WMD (if any) might be successful in the future, paying particular attention to the similarities and differences between the Republican and Democratic approaches.

- *Deadly Arsenals*, pp. 278-93
- *Planning the Unthinkable*, pp. 182-201 (Bermudez)
- Derek D. Smith, "Deterrence and Compellence With North Korea," pp. 1-17
- Victor D. Cha and David C. Kang, "The Korea Crisis," *Foreign Policy* no. 136 (May/June 2003): pp. 20-28
- Gary Samore, "The Korean Nuclear Crisis," *Survival* vol. 45, no. 1 (spring 2003): pp. 7-24
- Selig S. Harrison, "Did North Korea Cheat?" *Foreign Affairs* vol. 84, no. 1 (January/February 2005): pp. 1-6
- Mitchell B. Reiss and Robert L. Gallucci, "Red-Handed," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 84, no. 2 (March/April 2005): pp. 1-5
- *Universal Compliance*, pp. 186-90

Week Nine (March 21): Iran

Rounding out the famous “axis of evil,” Iran is in the news virtually every day regarding the mysteries surrounding its uranium enrichment program. As we did with North Korea, we will apply the theoretical tools introduced in Weeks 3-6 to consider how best to respond to the Iranian WMD threat.

- *Deadly Arsenals*, pp. 294-313
- *Planning the Unthinkable*, pp. 79-103 (Giles)
- Shahram Chubin and Robert S. Litwak, “Debating Iran’s Nuclear Aspirations,” *Washington Quarterly* vol. 26, no. 4 (autumn 2003): pp. 99-114
- Ray Takeyh, “Iran Builds the Bomb,” *Survival* vol. 46, no. 4 (autumn 2004): pp. 51-63
- Christopher de Bellaigue, “Iran,” *Foreign Policy* no. 148 (May/June 2005): pp. 18-24
- Jason Zaboriski, “Deterring a Nuclear Iran,” *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 3 (summer 2005): pp. 153-67
- Kenneth Pollack and Ray Takeyh, “Taking on Tehran,” *Foreign Affairs* vol. 84, no. 2 (March/April 2005): pp. 1-7
- International Atomic Energy Agency, *Implementation of the NPT Safeguards Agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran* (September 2005), pp 1-15
- *Universal Compliance*, pp. 169-77

Week Ten (March 28): India and Pakistan

WMD proliferation has not only taken place as a strategic response to the United States. In South Asia, two bitter rivals with nuclear weapons at the ready square off over a very real territorial conflict. Consequently, this region provides both a frightening test of nuclear deterrence, as well as an object lesson in the proliferation that even one arms merchant (A.Q. Khan) can cause.

- *Deadly Arsenals*, pp. 220-258
- *Planning the Unthinkable*, pp. 125-181 (Sidhu & Cheema)
- S. Paul Kapur, “India and Pakistan’s Unstable Peace,” *International Security* vol. 30, no. 2 (fall 2005): pp. 127-152
- Michael Quinlan, “India-Pakistan Deterrence Revisited,” *Survival* vol. 47, no. 3 (autumn 2005): pp. 103-115
- *Universal Compliance*, pp. 159-69

Week Eleven (April 4): Proliferation Reversal?

Muammar Gaddafi’s decision to renounce Libya’s WMD programs in December 2003 was a remarkable victory for U.S. nonproliferation efforts. What lessons, if any, can we draw from this and other examples of states electing to forego WMD possession?

- *Deadly Arsenals*, pp. 316-27, 364-418
- *Universal Compliance*, pp. 127-57
- Ariel E. Levite, “Never Say Never Again,” *International Security* vol. 27, no. 3 (winter 2002-03): pp. 59-88
- Jonathan Schell, “The Folly of Arms Control,” *Foreign Affairs* vol. 79, no. 5 (September/October 2000): pp. 22-46

Week Twelve (April 11): Terrorism and Al Qaeda

Especially after September 11th, national security experts began to identify international terrorism as the greatest threat facing the United States. Can traditional strategies against WMD proliferation apply to individuals? If so, which ones are preferable? If not, what alternative solutions should we consider?

- *Planning the Unthinkable*, pp. 202-229 (Stern)
- U.S. Government, *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism* (February 2003), pp. 1-30
- U.S. Department of State, *Patterns of Global Terrorism* (2003), pp. 85-93
- Thomas Homer-Dixon, "The Rise of Complex Terrorism," *Foreign Policy* no. 128 (January/February 2002): pp. 52-62
- Philip B. Heymann, "Dealing with Terrorism," *International Security* vol. 26, no. 3 (winter 2001/02): pp. 24-38
- Stephen M. Walt, "Beyond bin Laden: Reshaping U.S. Foreign Policy," *International Security* vol. 26, no. 3 (winter 2001/02): pp. 56-78
- Daniel Whiteneck, "Deterring Terrorists: Thoughts on a Framework," *The Washington Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 3 (summer 2005): pp. 187-99
- Daniel L. Byman, "Al-Qaeda As Adversary: Do We Understand Our Enemy?" *World Politics* vol. 56, no. 1 (October 2003): pp. 139-63
- Jason Burke, "Al Qaeda," *Foreign Policy* no. 142 (May/June 2004): pp. 18-26

Week Thirteen (April 18): Strategies Against WMD

We will conclude by synthesizing our theoretical and historical knowledge into a more generalized assessment of U.S. WMD policy. Ideally the final papers should provide some food for thought in generating ideas for future reform.

- U.S. Government, *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* (December 2002), pp. 1-6
- *Universal Compliance*, pp. 33-49
- United Nations, *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*, Report of the Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change (2004), pp. 39-47
- Ashton Carter, "How to Counter WMD," *Foreign Affairs* vol. 83, no. 5 (September/October 2004): pp. 72-85
- Anthony J. Blinken, "From Preemption to Engagement," *Survival* vol. 45, no. 4 (winter 2003-04): pp. 33-60