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About the Course

Course Description

This course will introduce the student to the politics of nuclear weapons. The course will cover the origins of nuclear weapons, the reasons states seek them, the strategies developed for their use, the consequences of their development, and efforts to control and reverse their spread. In addressing these issues, we will study a variety of countries, including North Korea, India and Pakistan, Israel, Iraq and Iran.

Learning Outcomes

Students are expected to develop an understanding of the following topics.
1. How nuclear weapons are made and what states have them.
2. Why some states develop nuclear weapons and others do not.
3. Whether nuclear weapons make war more or less likely between states.
4. What strategies states develop for the potential use of nuclear weapons and why.
5. The history and debates surrounding efforts to control the spread of nuclear weapons, including prominent arms control treaties.

In addition, students will develop their research and writing skills through working on a 4,000 word research paper.

Mechanics and Details

Meeting Time and Location

Classroom: Social Science 5106  
Lecture Time: Monday-Wednesday: 9:55 to 10:45 pm

Course Website

The course uses the Canvas platform.

Contact Information

Professor: Andrew Kydd  
Email: kydd@wisc.edu  
Office: 322c North Hall  
Office Hours: Monday, 1:00 pm to 3:00 pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Assistants</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Office Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew McWard</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amcward@wisc.edu">amcward@wisc.edu</a></td>
<td>Friday, 10:00 am-12:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon Laaker</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laaker@wisc.edu">laaker@wisc.edu</a></td>
<td>Tuesday, 1:20 pm-3:20 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hohyun Yoon</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hyoon73@wisc.edu">hyoon73@wisc.edu</a></td>
<td>Thursday, 10:00 am-12:00 pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Course Designation and Attributes**

Breadth-Social Science.  
Counts as Liberal Arts and Science credit in L&S.

**Requisites**

1. Sophomore standing or above  
2. An introductory course in international relations, either  
   a. Political Science 140-Introduction to International Relations or  
   b. International Studies 101-Introduction to International Studies

**Readings**

There will be one book available at the University Bookstore for the course.  


The rest of the readings are available on-line at the Canvas website for the course.

**Learning Disabilities**

Students with disabilities should contact the McBurney Center for guidance. We will be happy to accommodate your needs as instructed by the center.

[http://mcburney.wisc.edu](http://mcburney.wisc.edu)

**Academic Integrity**

The papers and exams in this course must be the student’s work alone. Information on how to properly cite sources and avoid plagiarism can be found on the UW Writing Center website. Exams are closed book. Any suspected cases of plagiarism or cheating on exams will be referred to the Dean of Students office.
Course Work and Grading

Grading

The grade will be based on the following five elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Percent of Final Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance and Participation</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Paper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Prospectus</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Draft</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Paper</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grading scheme is the following.

A  93-100
AB 88-92
B  83-87
BC 78-82
C  70-77
D  60-69
F  0-59

Numerical scores will be rounded to integers using the usual convention, so that 87.5 will be rounded up to 88 and therefore get an AB, whereas 87.4 will be rounded down to 87 and get a B.

Attendance and Participation

Attendance at lectures is strongly recommended. Lecture slides will be made available after lecture, but it will be difficult to interpret them unless you have been at the lecture. You are encouraged to interrupt and ask questions at any point.

Discussion sections will be structured around weekly debates on topics that are related to the readings for the week. Participation will be graded on a scale from zero to four, with one point for attendance, and three more for active and constructive participation.

The Research Paper

Each student will write a research paper of around 4,000 words. The paper should take a question or topic we cover in class, or one closely related, present the relevant theoretical arguments, and then consider one or more specific empirical cases in light of these arguments. For instance, the question could be, “does nuclear proliferation make war more or less likely?” and the case could be the relationship between India and Pakistan.
The papers need to start with a topic from the course and the readings related to that topic, but must then make use of at least three substantial sources not on the syllabus.

A suggested outline for your paper is the following.

1. Introduction
   a. What is the question?
      i. Why is it important?
   b. What is your answer or thesis?
   c. What is your theoretical approach?
   d. What empirical cases will you discuss?
   e. Roadmap of the paper.
2. Literature review
   a. Scholarly literature/debate on the question
   b. Policy debate/reporting on the question (optional)
3. Theory section
   a. Exposition of your theory
   b. Discussion of alternative theories, and, possibly, why yours is logically better
4. Empirical section
   a. Why these cases are appropriate to assess your question/theory
   b. Discussion of details of cases, and why they support your thesis/theory better than alternative theories
5. Conclusion
   a. Summary of results
   b. Broader implications

Good writing is a product of planning, drafting and revising. To encourage this process there are three components to the paper project, a one page prospectus, a rough draft, and a final draft.

The One Page Prospectus

In order to make sure that your paper is off to a good start, a one page prospectus of your project is due about a month into the course, on the date noted on the course schedule. You should start thinking about your research paper as soon as possible. Scan down the syllabus to look for topics that are interesting and do a little advance reading to investigate them. The prospectus will be worth five points and be graded according to the following rubric.

1. Is the prospectus on time? (According to the schedule below) (1 point)
2. Is the prospectus correctly formatted? (According to the guidelines below) (1 point)
3. Does the prospectus clearly articulate the question the paper will seek to answer, and is that question appropriate for the class? (1 point)
4. Does the prospectus clearly articulate the research plan? (How will the paper answer the question, what cases or countries will you examine, etc.) (1 point)
5. Does the prospectus adequately discuss some sources you will make use of? (Some from the syllabus and at least three additional sources not on the syllabus. Sources should be academic articles or books comparable to those on the syllabus.) (1 point)

Your TA will provide feedback on the prospectus that will help refine your research plan.

The Rough Draft

The rough draft should reflect a substantial amount of research. It should be basically complete, in the sense that there are no large sections totally missing or represented by “discuss Iran case here” sorts of place holders. However, as a rough draft, it can be unpolished, with some sections more complete than others, and with notes to develop specific ideas or sources further, eg. “find more on Israeli submarines” or “get more on new Chinese mobile missiles.”

The rough draft is worth ten points. It will be graded according to the following rubric.

Format and Style issues
1. Is the draft on time? (According to the schedule below) (1 point)
2. Is the draft correctly formatted? (According to the guidelines below, including citation style.) (1 point)
3. Is the draft clearly structured? (Good introduction, use of sections and headings, etc.) (1 point)
4. Is the writing clear, with complete, grammatically correct sentences? (1 point)
5. Does the draft reflect significant work? The basic metric here will be length. The final draft target is 4,000 words. The rough draft should be between 3,500 and 4,500 words. (1 point)

Content issues
6. Is the question appropriate and clearly articulated? (1 point)
7. Are the theoretical framework and thesis of the paper clear? (1 point)
8. Does the draft adequately engage the existing literature on the question? (Does it refer to the relevant literature from the syllabus and at least three additional sources?) (1 point)
9. Does the draft adequately consider alternative theories or explanations? (1 point)
10. Does the draft adequately discuss and reflect knowledge of the empirical cases? (1 point)

Your TA will give you comments on the rough draft that will help you as you work on the final draft.

The Final Paper
The final paper is the polished version of the rough draft. It should be complete and well written, with any holes identified in the rough draft in logic, evidence or connection to the literature filled in.

The final paper is worth 15 points and is graded according to the following rubric. The first ten categories are carried over from the rough draft, and the remaining five are new.

Format and Style issues
1. Is the paper on time? (According to the schedule below) (1 point)
2. Is the paper correctly formatted? (According to the guidelines below, including citation style.) (1 point)
3. Is the paper clearly structured? (Good introduction, use of sections and headings, etc.) (1 point)
4. Is the writing clear, with complete, grammatically correct sentences? (1 point)
5. Does the paper reflect significant work? The basic metric here will be length. The target is 4,000 words. The paper should be between 3,500 and 4,500 words. (1 point)

Content issues
6. Is the question appropriate and clearly articulated? (1 point)
7. Are the theoretical framework and thesis of the paper clear? (1 point)
8. Does the paper adequately engage the existing literature on the question? (Does it refer to the relevant literature from the syllabus and at least three additional sources?) (1 point)
9. Does the paper adequately consider alternative theories or explanations? (1 point)
10. Does the paper discuss and reflect detailed knowledge of the empirical cases? (1 point)

Quality issues
11. Are the theoretical arguments relatively free from logical gaps? (1 point)
12. Are alternative explanations or perspectives fairly treated? (1 point)
13. Does the empirical discussion support the theoretical argument? (1 point)
14. Have obvious counterexamples that would point the other way been discussed? (1 point)
15. Is the paper free from tendentious or polemical content? (1 point)

Format for Written Work

All written work must have a title page including the title of the document (your project title), your name, the date, the name of the class, the professor and TA’s names, and the type of assignment it is, (one page prospectus, rough draft or final paper). The pages must be numbered. References are to be done with American Political Science Association (APSA) system. Check out the writing center website for information on this citation style: http://www.writing.wisc.edu/Handbook/DocAPSA.html. Make sure to cite specific page numbers so the reader can easily find the source for what you are saying.
The last page in the document should be the reference list. It does not count in the word count for the paper. For help with writing, see the UW Writing Center website, particularly, their writer’s handbook, where you can find information about proper citing.


All documents must be submitted to the appropriate dropbox on the Canvas site for the course. The name of the document must be your last name, followed by P for the paper proposal and 1 for the first draft and 2 for the final draft, followed by the relevant document suffix. For instance, Smith’s proposal would be named SmithP.docx.

The Final Exam

For the final exam you will have to answer eight (out of 10) questions that require written answers of a few paragraphs each. The exam will cover the entire course and will be closed book. A good way to study for the exam is to make an index card for each reading with the author, title, topic, main argument, who they are arguing against, if anyone, and empirical cases discussed. You will need to know the names of authors and associate them with their arguments for the exam. You may be asked what does so and so say about such and such, or you may be asked to review the debate on such and such and be expected to know that so and so wrote on that topic.

The exam location has not yet been scheduled, an announcement will be made in class when we find out.
## Course Schedule: Spring Semester 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Module 1: Nuclear Weapons and How to Get Them</td>
<td>Lecture 1.1 Introduction</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 1.2 Physics</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 1.3 Aid and Bureaucracy</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 2.1 Three Models</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 2.2 India and Pakistan 1</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 2.3 Spiral vs. Deterrence</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 2.4 North Korea</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 2.5 Unit Level Theories</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 2.6 Argentina and Brazil</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 2: Why States Build Nuclear Weapons</td>
<td>Lecture 3.1 Arms Races and War</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>March</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 3.2 Sagan/Waltz Debate</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 3.3 India and Pakistan 2</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 3.4 Iraq</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 3.5 Israel and China</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 3.6 Nuclear Terrorism</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 4.1 The First Use</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>April</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 4.2 Nuclear Strategy</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 4.3 US Primacy?</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 4.4 China and Pakistan</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 4.5 Missile Defense</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 4.6 The Nuclear Taboo</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 4: Nuclear Strategy</td>
<td>Paper First Draft Due (Noon)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Module 5: Arms Control</td>
<td>Lecture 5.1 Arms Control Theory</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 5.2 Superpower AC</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 5.3 NPT and the CTBT</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 5.4 FSU and South Africa</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 5.5 Libya and Iran</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture 5.6 Nuclear Abolition</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finishing Up</td>
<td>Paper Final Draft Due (Noon)</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final Exam</td>
<td>Friday</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time: 2:45 to 4:45 pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Location: TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lectures and Readings:

Module 1: Nuclear Weapons and How to Get Them

Lecture 1.1 Introduction

Lecture 1.2 The Physics of Nuclear Weapons


Lecture 1.3 Scientific Cooperation and Bureaucratic Competence


Module 2: Why States Build Nuclear Weapons

Lecture 2.1 Three Models


Lecture 2.2 Case: India and Pakistan


**Lecture 2.3  The Spiral Model vs. the Deterrence Model**


**Lecture 2.4  Case: North Korea**


**Lecture 2.5  The Unit Level Perspective**


**Lecture 2.6  Cases: Argentina and Brazil**


**Module 3: The Consequences of Nuclear Proliferation**

**Lecture 3.1  Have Arms Races Caused War?**

Lecture 3.2  Is Nuclear Proliferation Good or Bad?


Lecture 3.3  India and Pakistan

Sagan and Waltz, Chapters 3-5, pp. 82-174.

Lecture 3.4  The United States and Iraq


Lecture 3.5  Israel and China


Lecture 3.6  Terrorism


**Module 4: Nuclear Strategy: Use, Non-Use, Deterrence and Defense**

**Lecture 4.1  The First Use**


**Lecture 4.2  Classical Nuclear Strategy**


**Lecture 4.3  US Primacy?**


**Lecture 4.4  China and Pakistan**


**Lecture 4.5  National Missile Defense**


Lecture 4.6   Taboo or Not Taboo?


Module 5: Arms Control

Lecture 5.1   Arms Control Theory


Lecture 5.2   Superpower Arms Control


Lecture 5.3   The NPT and CTBT


Lecture 5.4   Giving up the Bomb: FSU, South Africa


Lecture 5.5   Libya and Iran

Lecture 5.6  Nuclear Abolition


