

State of nuclear energy in germany

[Science](#), [Social Science](#)



Select any two of the four basic strategies used to preserve security. Identify and describe what assumptions are made about the opponent according to each of the two strategies you chose.

From the four basic strategies that are used to promote and preserve security, this student has chosen deterrence and détente diplomacy as the ones which will be discussed and identified. As such, deterrence means exactly what it implies; i. e. dissuading an attack from an enemy or group of enemies by showing the very high cost that should an attack would necessarily entail upon the perpetrator/perpetrators. The main assumption of such an approach is that the perpetrator will be a rational actor who will consider the something akin to a SWOT approach when deciding whether or not it is opportunistic to engage in aggression with another party. If the other actor is rational then such an approach, if practiced correctly can ultimately help to keep a state free from interference of an aggressive manner.

The second of these strategies which will herein be discussed is that of détente diplomacy. Naturally, this ultimately represents a form of soft power in that it works to ease tensions between groups by engaging in different mediums of hostility relaxation. As a function of using this particular strategy, the actors are assuming that the other side can ultimately be convinced of their own viewpoint and that a certain amount of give and take or compromise can ultimately be affected (Mueller, 2011).

Give an example of each of the two strategies in current world politics and speculate on their effectiveness.

An example of deterrence in global politics can of course be inferred by the very public displays of military might and power that the Islamic Republic of

Iran puts on display during the anniversary of the Islamic Revolution.

Likewise, an example of détente can be seen in the way that UN diplomats as well as Russian and Western diplomats have been hard at work seeking to work out an end to the bloodshed that is continuing in Syria.

Based on current events, describe the state of nuclear energy and its peaceful uses in at least one country.

The country that this student has chosen to analyze is that of Germany.

Although Germany is considered to be one of the most technologically advanced nations in the world, it has announced that it plans to take all nuclear plants operating within the country offline within the next 10 years.

This has been a function of the events that have taken place within Japan as a result of the Fukushima Daiichi disaster (Funabashi & Katazawa, 2012). As such, Germany provides something of a role model for other advanced states that continue to cling to nuclear energy as a means of producing a high level of cheap energy for their population.

In your opinion, which is the greater threat, the use of nuclear weapons in war or the peaceful use of nuclear energy? Explain your answer.

Without a doubt, the threat of the use of nuclear weapons during war is the greater threat. Although occasional industrial accidents can and have occurred such as Three Mile Island, Chernobyl, and the aforementioned Fukushima Daiichi disaster, the fact of the matter is that only a handful of people have been exposed or have ultimately died as a result of such occurrences. Conversely, a nuclear weapon used in war in a highly populated area has the potential to harm and/or kill millions.

Do you foresee a time when total nuclear disarmament will occur worldwide?

Why or why not?

With regards to foreseeing a time in which nuclear disarmament will occur worldwide, it is the strongly held belief of this student that this will not occur.

Due to the fact that all world participants and governments are self interested actors which continually seek a degree of "one up-manship" upon the other participants, foreseeing a time in which such a human emotion and desire will suddenly evaporate is hard to imagine (McDonnell, 2013).

However, that being said, the one situation in which this could occur would be in which an even more deadly weapon was developed which neutralized the deterrent effect of nuclear weapons.

References

Funabashi, Y., & Kitazawa, K. (2012). Fukushima in review: A complex disaster, a disastrous response. *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientists*, 68(2), 9-21. doi: 10. 1177/0096340212440359

McDonnell, T. (2013). Nuclear pursuits: Non-P-5 nuclear-armed states, 2013. *Bulletin Of The Atomic Scientists*, 69(1), 62-70. doi: 10. 1177/0096340212470816

Mueller, W. (2011). Recognition in Return for Détente?. *Journal Of Cold War Studies*, 13(4), 79-100.