103 Section
March 13, 2003

Logistics:
- Broken coffee pot.
- Spring break plans?
- Questions?

Letter to the Editor:

IR:

- NORMS
  - What are norms?
    - Definition: a standard of appropriate behavior for actors of a given identity.
  - What are some examples of norms (either from daily life or international relations)?
    - Raising hand in class.
    - Not talking too loud on bus.
    - Nukes shouldn't be used.
    - Human rights should be respected (even during war).
  - What might realists say about norms? Do you agree?
    - Norms would say norms are irrelevant. POWER, POWER, POWER.
    - Constructivists would argue that these norms (in addition to and beyond power) make a difference for state action and state behavior.
      - For example, power-wise, the US could have used small nukes in the 1991 Gulf War, but they didn't. Why? Constructivists would say that this is because there is a norm against their use. Even powerful states are constrained by norms.
- DETERRENCE
  - What is it?
    - Definition: The threat to use force in response as a way of preventing the first use of force by someone else.
    - Examples: Cuban Missile Crisis (USSR trying to deter an American attack by putting weapons in Cuba; US trying to deter Soviet action through the blockage).
  - How do you make deterrence more effective?
    - Make the deterrent threat more *credible.*
      - Clear communication.
      - Appear a little insane, imprudent (e.g. the obviously insane man with a gun).
      - Dr. Strangelove – automatic response.

- Make the deterrent threat more *costly*.
  - NUKES!!!
  - MAD: argument that any attack will bring immediate response and both sides will be completely destroyed by nuclear weapons. Thus NO side (out of fear of this destruction) will dare attempt any sort of attack.
  - Is this a good strategy?
    - YES: it kept the peace between US/USSR
    - Potential for VAST destruction.
    - Potential for mistakes.
    - Expensive ($4,000,000,000,000)
    - Relies on the rationality of the Soviets. Actual argument was that the Soviets didn't care about their population, so they wouldn't care if there was mass destruction. MAD wouldn't work. Sting – "Russians."
    - Encourages peripheral wars – 125 million people have died in wars since 1945. How stable are we?
  - Nuclear proliferation
    - What is it?
    - Waltz's argument.
- *SDI (Missile Defense)*
  - **Pros:**
    - Protects us from major destruction and removes the uncertainty of MAD.
    - Gives us the moral high ground – we don't have to protect ourselves by aiming nuclear weapons at our enemies (a la MAD).
    - Provides protection from both major war and smaller launches.
    - Provides protection from rogue states whom may not be affected by traditional deterrence.
  - **Cons:**
    - Destabilizing. As Schelling (1960) advises, increasing defense means decreasing deterrent stability – making a preeminent strike possible.
    - Provides a *false* security because of the technological difficulties.
    - Violates international law – and the possibility of suffering reputational costs as a result.
    - Expensive.