

The Cuban Missile Crisis

Aftermath and Lessons

Housekeeping

Last Response Today

Tomorrow's Class. 8:00 U43

Negotiating the final agreement

Blockade Remains in Place

The agreement so far:

1. The Soviets remove missile and offending weapons
2. The US pledge not to attack Cuba
3. Secret agreement to remove missiles from Turkey

Issues:

1. What kind of guarantee for US pledge: UN-brokered treaty?
2. What are offensive weapons? Bombers? Tactical Nuclear weapons?
3. What kind of verification? On-site inspection? Fly-bys?

Complications: Soviet Relations with Cuba

Castro is ANGRY

Not consulted on the issue: hears it from Radio announcement

Unsatisfied with results: no real guarantee

Mikoyan sent to placate them

Khrushchev consults

Bombers: Khrushchev agrees to remove them, Castro does not.

US agrees to remove blockade, take Khrushchev's word

Verification: U-2 flights, check cargo of outgoing ships

Tactical nuclear weapons: Khrushchev decides to remove them

Khrushchev's Post-Cuba situation

Still very powerful

Tries to put a good face on it

Argues he saved Cuba, which was his goal all along

Argues that US finally understood what it meant to have nuclear threat breathing down their neck

Clearly his authority hurt

Military: Feel necessary to build up more weapons quickly

Hardline Party leaders: Feel Khrushchev weakened Soviet position relative to China

China: Argue his move into Cuba was reckless, and his retreat weak

Kennedy's Domestic Position

- Greatly enhanced
- Demonstrated his strength, restraint

The Thaw

Both Khrushchev and Kennedy Change Foreign Policy After Cuba

Do not abandon ideological positions; competition

Do relax “bargaining from strength” ideology

Recognize need to avoid crises in future

Improve communications: Create the hotline

Khrushchev declares Berlin issue settled

John F. Kennedy’s Speech to American University Graduates in May,
1963

John F. Kennedy's Speech to American University



The Test Ban Treaty

Goal: Comprehensive Test Ban

The Issue: Verification: US wanted 12, Soviet would accept 3

The Achievement: The Partial Test Ban

The End of the Thaw

Kennedy is assassinated, November 23, 1963

Lyndon Baines Johnson: More interested in domestic politics

Relies heavily on Kennedy advisers

Distracted by Vietnam War

Khrushchev: Soviet Economy falters

Defense spending increases, moves for national liberation movements

Looks for more reforms in Soviet system that endangers elite

October 14, 1964: Khrushchev Removed

Cuban Missile Crisis mentioned, but not crucial

The Lessons Learned

Khrushchev and Kennedy don't institutionalize the lessons they learned from Cuba

More caution around nuclear weapons on both sides, but

THE UNITED STATES: The Lesson: Strength wins

“Eyeball to Eyeball, and the Other Side Blinked”

THE SOVIET UNION: We will never be in a position of inequality again

More support for national liberation movements

QUESTION

- If the United States and China get into a strategic crisis over the future of Taiwan, what lessons could Joe Biden and Xi Jinping learn from the history of the Cuban Missile Crisis? Does the fact that China did not participate in that crisis make a difference?

Paragraphs

- What do they do?
 - Take one concept in the argument, or perhaps one aspect of a concept, and develop it
 - Provide a visual signal regarding the organization of the paper

Paragraphs

- How should they constructed?
 - They should state clearly what idea will be developed in the paragraph and how it fits in the argument.
 - This usually comes in the form of a topic sentence with a transitional clause, but may have a transitional sentence and a topic sentence
 - They should be limited to that idea, to the extent possible. If you include more than one idea, then you defeat the purpose of signaling the organization of the argument
 - They should not be too long. If they get too long, think about splitting it in two paragraphs centered around different aspects of the same idea.
 - They should not use the last sentence to repeat the topic—if you keep it short that will not be necessary.
 - They should not use the last sentence to introduce the next idea. That should be in the topic sentence of the next paragraph.

Putnam Examples

- The politics of many international negotiations can usefully be conceived as a two-level game. At the national level, domestic groups pursue their interests by pressuring the government to adopt favorable policies, and politicians seek power by constructing coalitions among those groups. At the international level, national governments seek to maximize their own ability to satisfy domestic pressures, while minimizing the adverse consequences of foreign developments. Neither of the two games can be ignored by central decision-makers, so long as their countries remain interdependent, yet sovereign.
- Each national political leader appears at both game boards. Across the international table sit his foreign counterparts, and at his elbows sit diplomats and other international advisors. Around the domestic table behind him sit party and parliamentary figures, spokespersons for domestic agencies, representatives of key interest groups, and the leader's own political advisors. The unusual complexity of this two-level game is that moves that are rational for a player at one board (such as raising energy prices, conceding territory, or limiting auto imports) may be impolitic for that same player at the other board. Nevertheless, there are powerful incentives for consistency between the two games. Players (and kibitzers) will tolerate some differences in rhetoric between the two games, but in the end either energy prices rise or they don't.
- The political complexities for the players in this two-level game are staggering

Example from Earlier Response

- As for Khrushchev's decision, I would ascribe the greater role to international politics, mainly because the USSR was facing a significant deficit in its nuclear capabilities compared to the USA. The USA was able to threaten their mainland, both their bombers and missiles placed in Turkey could reach there reliably. The Soviets, on the other hand, had only one option, ICBMs, but these were unreliable and inefficient. This disparity was in my view the most important, although by no means the only, factor in making the decision.