

1984

The Prisoners of Insecurity-Nuclear Deterrence, The Arms Race, and Arms Control.

John T. Hanley Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review>

Recommended Citation

Hanley, John T. Jr. (1984) "The Prisoners of Insecurity-Nuclear Deterrence, The Arms Race, and Arms Control.," *Naval War College Review*: Vol. 37 : No. 3 , Article 13.

Available at: <https://digital-commons.usnwc.edu/nwc-review/vol37/iss3/13>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Naval War College Review by an authorized editor of U.S. Naval War College Digital Commons. For more information, please contact repository.inquiries@usnwc.edu.

96 Naval War College Review

Limitations it has, yes, but make no mistake: this is an excellent book. No more solid, reliable, comprehensive compendium on US naval weapons will be found anywhere. If you want a single fundamental reference on the subject, *U.S. Naval Weapons* is it.

Russett, Bruce. *The Prisoners of Insecurity—Nuclear Deterrence, The Arms Race, and Arms Control*. San Francisco: Freeman, 1983. 192pp.

The thesis of this book is that the most fundamental questions about national security and arms control are political rather than technological, and there exists an elite that perpetuates a myth that arms control and security questions should be left to the experts. The purpose of the book, then, is to consider some of the basic questions that should be addressed by the "conscientious" citizen and to provide some of the technical information necessary to an informed discussion.

The author, a professor of political science at Yale University, views the arms race and war as an acute problem and makes no apparent attempt to present his arguments dispassionately. Intended to provide data to support the basic arguments of the nuclear arms activist, the book is an excellent primer on the subject.

The centerpiece of the book is the prisoners' dilemma. This is a game where two people are arrested for a crime and held incommunicado. The prosecutor does not have enough evidence to convict them; but each is told that, if he confesses first, he will be set free—if his accomplice con-

fesses. If both confess on the same day, they will receive stiff sentences. If neither confesses, they will be convicted of some lesser crime for which the prosecution has sufficient evidence. On reviewing the choices in this game, each player is better off if he does not trust his accomplice and confesses, even though they are both likely to end up worse off than if they could trust each other to cooperate. The author draws the analogy to the security dilemma where both sides arguably would be better off if they devoted their resources to social programs rather than to defense but where the consequences of misplaced trust are indeed dire.

The author prepares the reader to enter into arguments on how to reduce the stakes of the prisoners' dilemma by tracing the history of the Soviet-American arms race and analyzing stable deterrence. All of the arguments as to why arms races are bad—guns vs. butter, increasing the destructiveness of war, and arms races as a cause of war—are trooped out. But he then makes it apparent that most of these arguments miss the mark. The key is an element of trust that requires some degree of communication between the superpowers. This communication can be open, including exchange of technical data

and on-site inspection of weapons systems; or it can be sanctioned, permitting surveillance and other means of information collection. The more open the communication, the more confidence each side can have in the intentions and capabilities of the other. From the discussions of crisis stability and the history of arms control in the remainder of the book, one can make a strong case for why communications with the Soviet Union are unlikely to improve and why confidence-building measures are so fragile as to have no lasting effect.

The author conveys the fear and frustration of the nuclear protest group and argues for a nuclear freeze, no first use, and so on down the agenda. But the arguments are unconvincing precisely because the author admittedly falls back on faith and does not offer solutions to the principal dilemma; opening up the Soviet Union and bringing it into the community of nations. I was pleasantly surprised to find the author stating, "If there were easy solutions, we would have taken them by now." Though the author sees the problem of nuclear arms as acute, he offers no short-term solution—only a first step and hope.

I could not help but conclude that the author was incorrect in his primary thesis. This is indeed a subject for experts. The book skips along the surface of a wide range of issues and convinces the reader that serious study is required to have a truly informed opinion. Anyone who could reasonably argue all of the

facets of the nuclear policy would be considered fairly expert. However, the author reserves the term "expert" for one who knows how to calculate the cost effectiveness of nuclear weapons and in doing so reflects a peculiarly Yale judgment that one who understands nuclear weapons effects must not understand the social, political, and economic aspects of current nuclear policy. Overall, the author does succeed in making the case that democracy demands an informed public, and he has contributed a very readable introduction to the complex issues of nuclear arms.

JOHN T. HANLEY, JR.
Oakdale, Connecticut

Freedman, Lawrence. *The Evolution of Nuclear Strategy*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983. 473pp. \$10.95

Kaplan, Fred. *The Wizards of Armageddon*, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983. 452pp. \$18.95

Lefever, Ernest W. and Hunt, E. Stephen, eds. *The Apocalyptic Premise: Nuclear Arms Debated*, Washington, DC: Ethics and Public Policy Center, 1982. 429pp. \$14 paper \$9

The ground swell of public interest in nuclear weapons, their use, control or elimination, stimulated a flood of activity in the bookstalls, with at least three dozen new volumes coming off the presses this year. These are three of the best. Lawrence Freedman, professor of war studies at the University of London, and Fred Kaplan, an American journalist,