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#### The aff is not topical --- introducing armed forces only refers to human troops, not weapons systems such as nuclear weapons --- prefer our interpretation because it’s based on textual analysis, legislative history, and intent of the WPR

Lorber 13 – Eric Lorber, J.D. Candidate, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Ph.D Candidate, Duke University Department of Political Science. January 2013, "Executive Warmaking Authority and Offensive Cyber Operations: Can Existing Legislation Successfully Constrain Presidential Power?" University of Pennsylvania Journal of Contsitutional Law, 15 U. Pa. J. Const. L. 961, lexis nexis

As is **evident from a** textual analysis, n177 an examination of the legislative history, n178 and **the broad** policy purposes behind the creation of the Act, n179 [\*990] "armed forces" refers to U.S. soldiers and members of the armed forces, not weapon systems or capabilities such as offensive cyber weapons. Section 1547 does not specifically define "armed forces," but it states that "the term "introduction of United States Armed Forces' includes the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government." n180 While this definition pertains to the broader phrase "introduction of armed forces," the clear implication is that **only members of the armed forces count for the purposes of the definition under the WPR.** Though not dispositive, **the term "member" connotes a human individual who is part of an organization.** n181 Thus, it appears that the term "armed forces" means human members of the United States armed forces. However, there exist two potential complications with this reading. First, the language of the statute states that "the term "introduction of United States Armed Forces' includes the assignment of members of such armed forces." n182 By using inclusionary - as opposed to exclusionary - language, one might argue that the term "armed forces" could include more than members. This argument is unconvincing however, given that a core principle of statutory interpretation, expressio unius, suggests that **expression of one thing (i.e., members) implies the exclusion of others (**such as non-members **constituting armed forces)**. n183 Second, the term "member" does not explicitly reference "humans," and so could arguably refer to individual units and beings that are part of a larger whole (e.g., wolves can be members of a pack). As a result, though a textual analysis suggests that "armed forces" refers to human members of the armed forces, such a conclusion is not determinative.¶ **An examination of the legislative history also suggests that Congress clearly conceptualized "armed forces" as human members of the armed forces**. For example, disputes over the term "armed forces" revolved around who could be considered members of the armed forces, not what constituted a member. Senator Thomas Eagleton, one of the Resolution's architects, proposed an amendment during the process providing that the Resolution cover military officers on loan to a civilian agency (such as the Central [\*991] Intelligence Agency). n184 This amendment was dropped after encountering pushback, n185 but the debate revolved around whether those military individuals on loan to the civilian agency were still members of the armed forces for the purposes of the WPR, suggesting that Congress considered the term to apply only to soldiers in the armed forces. Further, during the congressional hearings, the question of deployment of "armed forces" centered primarily on past U.S. deployment of troops to combat zones, n186 suggesting that **Congress conceptualized "armed forces" to mean U.S. combat troops.**¶ **The broad purpose of the Resolution aimed to prevent the large-scale but unauthorized deployments of U.S. troops into hostilities**. n187 While examining the broad purpose of a legislative act is increasingly relied upon only after examining the text and legislative history, here it provides further support for those two alternate interpretive sources. n188 As one scholar has noted, "the War Powers Resolution, for example, is concerned with sending U.S. troops into harm's way." n189 The historical context of the War Powers Resolution is also important in determining its broad purpose; as the resolutions submitted during the Vietnam War and in the lead-up to the passage of the WPR suggest, Congress was concerned about its ability to effectively regulate the President's deployments of large numbers of U.S. troops to Southeast Asia, n190 as well as prevent the President from authorizing troop incursions into countries in that region. n191 The WPR was a reaction to the President's continued deployments of these troops into combat zones, and as such suggests that Congress's broad purpose was to prevent the unconstrained deployment of U.S. personnel, not weapons, into hostilities.¶ This analysis suggests that, when defining the term "armed forces," Congress meant members of the armed forces who would be placed in [\*992] harm's way (i.e., into hostilities or imminent hostilities). **Applied to offensive cyber operations, such a definition leads to the conclusion that the** W**ar** P**owers** R**esolution likely does not cover such activities**. Worms, viruses, and kill switches are clearly not U.S. troops. Therefore, the key question regarding whether the WPR can govern cyber operations is not whether the operation is conducted independently or as part of a kinetic military operation. Rather, the key question is the delivery mechanism. For example, if military forces were deployed to launch the cyberattack, such an activity, if it were related to imminent hostilities with a foreign country, could trigger the WPR. This seems unlikely, however, for two reasons. First, it is unclear whether small-scale deployments where the soldiers are not participating or under threat of harm constitute the introduction of armed forces into hostilities under the War Powers Resolution. n192 Thus, **individual operators deployed to plant viruses in particular enemy systems may not constitute armed forces introduced into hostilities or imminent hostilities.** Second, such a tactical approach seems unlikely. If the target system is remote access, the military can attack it without placing personnel in harm's way. n193 If it is close access, there exist many other effective ways to target such systems. n194 As a result, unless U.S. troops are introduced into hostilities or imminent hostilities while deploying offensive cyber capabilities - which is highly unlikely - such operations will not trigger the War Powers Resolution.

#### Vote negative for predictable limits --- nuclear weapons is a whole topic on its own --- requires research into a whole separate literature base --- undermines preparedness for all debates.
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#### Congress will successfully avert a government shutdown now, but time is super tight

Fox News, 9-11-2013, “House pulls spending bill amid backlash as government shutdown looms,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2013/09/11/house-leaders-pull-temporary-spending-bill-after-conservative-backlash/

House Republican leaders pulled their plan Wednesday to temporarily fund the federal government after rank-and-file party members said it sidestepped “defunding” ObamaCare. The action further narrowed Congress’ time to strike a budget deal before an Oct. 1 government shutdown. House Speaker John Boehner and his team pulled the plan, which could have gotten a full chamber vote as early as Thursday, after a conservative backlash led by the Tea Party movement and Heritage Action for America. The plan essentially called for the House to vote on defunding ObamaCare and the temporary spending bill, then send the package to the Democrat-controlled Senate, which almost certainly would have jettisoned the defund part and allowed the chambers to negotiate on a “clean” funding bill. “The Ruling Elite is up to it again,” the Tea Party Patriots group said Wednesday. “They want you to think they have voted for defunding ObamaCare. But it’s another shell game.” Meanwhile, Congress must also work on several other pressing issues, especially agreeing to increase the debt ceiling, which the government could hit as soon as mid-October, according to a recent Treasury Department assessment. Boehner defended his defund-spending plan Tuesday, saying his chamber has already voted 40 times to “defund, repeal and change” ObamaCare, so the Senate must now take up the fight. Although Boehner pulled the bill because he didn’t have the votes, sources tell Fox News the speaker has no intention of changing the plan and might revisit it next week -- after members realize its strengths. Meanwhile members from both parties appear optimistic about avoiding a partial government shutdown, despite the looming deadline and the potential for another internal House struggle. “We've got some time left,” Kentucky Republican Rep. Hal Rogers, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, told Fox News. “It's not time to panic.” The postponement of a Capitol Hill vote on a military strike on Syria will indeed eliminate the related hearings and classified briefings that slowed work on other pending issues, including immigration reform, the Farm Bill and whether to limit the extent to which the National Security Agency can collect data on Americans in its efforts to thwart terrorism.

#### The plan would trade off with Congress’s ability to avert the shutdown - GOP has momentum and will, but they need literally every hour to get it done

Frank James, 9-13-2013, “Congress Searches For A Shutdown-Free Future,” NPR, http://www.npr.org/blogs/itsallpolitics/2013/09/13/221809062/congress-searches-for-a-shutdown-free-future

The only thing found Thursday seemed to be more time for negotiations and vote-wrangling. Republican leaders recall how their party was blamed for the shutdowns of the mid-1990s and earnestly want to avoid a repeat, especially heading into a midterm election year. Cantor alerted members Thursday that during the last week of September, when they are supposed to be on recess, they will now most likely find themselves in Washington voting on a continuing resolution to fund the government into October. It looks like lawmakers will need every hour of that additional time. While talking to reporters Thursday, Boehner strongly suggested that House Republicans weren't exactly coalescing around any one legislative strategy. "There are a lot of discussions going on about how — about how to deal with the [continuing resolution] and the issue of 'Obamacare,' and so we're continuing to work with our members," Boehner said. "There are a million options that are being discussed by a lot of people. When we have something to report, we'll let you know."

#### Shutdown wrecks the economy

Yi Wu, 8-27-2013, “Government Shutdown 2013: Still a Terrible Idea,” PolicyMic, http://www.policymic.com/articles/60837/government-shutdown-2013-still-a-terrible-idea

Around a third of House Republicans, many Tea Party-backed, sent a letter last week calling on Speaker John Boehner to reject any spending bills that include implementation of the Affordable Care Act, otherwise known as Obamacare. Some Senate Republicans echo their House colleagues in pondering this extreme tactic, which is nothing other than a threat of government shutdown as neither congressional Democrats nor President Obama would ever agree on a budget that abolishes the new health care law. Unleashing this threat would amount to holding a large number of of the federal government's functions, including processing Social Security checks and running the Centers for Disease Control, hostage in order to score partisan points. It would be an irresponsible move inflicting enormous damage to the U.S. economy while providing no benefit whatsoever for the country, and Boehner is rightly disinclined to pursue it. Government shutdowns are deleterious to the economy. Two years ago in February 2011, a similar government shutdown was looming due to a budget impasse, and a research firm estimated that quater's GDP growth would be reduced by 0.2 percentage points if the shutdown lasted a week. After the budget is restored from the hypothetical shutdown, growth would only be "partially recouped," and a longer shutdown would result in deeper slowdowns. Further, the uncertainties resulting from a shutdown would also discourage business. A shutdown was avoided last-minute that year, unlike in 1995 during the Clinton administration where it actually took place for four weeks and resulted in a 0.5 percentage-point dent in GDP growth. Billions of dollars were cut from the budget, but neither Boehner nor the Republicans at the time were reckless enough to demand cancellation of the entire health care reform enacted a year before.

#### Global nuclear war

Harris & Burrows 9 Mathew, PhD European History @ Cambridge, counselor of the U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) and Jennifer, member of the NIC’s Long Range Analysis Unit “Revisiting the Future: Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis” http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the **harmful effects on fledgling democracies** and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which **the potential for** greater **conflict could grow** would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. **Terrorism**’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any **economically-induced drawdown** of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states in the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, **acquire additional weapons**, and consider pursuing their own **nuclear ambitions**. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an **unintended escalation** and **broader conflict** if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential **nuclear rivals** combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on **preemption** rather than defense, potentially leading to **escalating crises**. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in **interstate conflicts** if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### 1NC

#### Security is a psychological construct—the aff’s scenarios for conflict are products of paranoia that project our violent impulses onto the other

Mack 91 – Doctor of Psychiatry and a professor at Harvard University (John, “The Enemy System” http://www.johnemackinstitute.org/eJournal/article.asp?id=23 \*Gender modified)

The threat of nuclear annihilation has stimulated us to try to understand what it is about (hu)mankind that has led to such self-destroying behavior. Central to this inquiry is an exploration of the adversarial relationships between ethnic or national groups. It is out of such enmities that war, including nuclear war should it occur, has always arisen. Enmity between groups of people stems from the interaction of psychological, economic, and cultural elements. These include fear and hostility (which are often closely related), competition over perceived scarce resources,[3] the need for individuals to identify with a large group or cause,[4] a tendency to disclaim and assign elsewhere responsibility for unwelcome impulses and intentions, and a peculiar susceptibility to emotional manipulation by leaders who play upon our more savage inclinations in the name of national security or the national interest. A full understanding of the "enemy system"[3] requires insights from many specialities, including psychology, anthropology, history, political science, and the humanities. In their statement on violence[5] twenty social and behavioral scientists, who met in Seville, Spain, to examine the roots of war, declared that there was no scientific basis for regarding (hu)man(s) as an innately aggressive animal, inevitably committed to war. The Seville statement implies that we have real choices. It also points to a hopeful paradox of the nuclear age: threat of nuclear war may have provoked our capacity for fear-driven polarization but at the same time it has inspired unprecedented efforts towards cooperation and settlement of differences without violence. The Real and the Created Enemy Attempts to explore the psychological roots of enmity are frequently met with responses on the following lines: "I can accept psychological explanations of things, but my enemy is real. The Russians [or Germans, Arabs, Israelis, Americans] are armed, threaten us, and intend us harm. Furthermore, there are real differences between us and our national interests, such as competition over oil, land, or other scarce resources, and genuine conflicts of values between our two nations. It is essential that we be strong and maintain a balance or superiority of military and political power, lest the other side take advantage of our weakness". This argument does not address the distinction between the enemy threat and one's own contribution to that threat-**by distortions of perception**, provocative words, and actions. In short, the enemy is real, but we have not learned to understand how we have created that enemy, or how the threatening image we hold of the enemy relates to its actual intentions. "We never see our enemy's motives and we never labor to assess his will, with anything approaching objectivity".[6] Individuals may have little to do with the choice of national enemies. Most Americans, for example, know only what has been reported in the mass media about the Soviet Union. We are largely unaware of the forces that operate within our institutions, affecting the thinking of our leaders and ourselves, and which determine how the Soviet Union will be represented to us. Ill-will and a desire for revenge are transmitted from one generation to another, and we are not taught to think critically about how our assigned enemies are selected for us. In the relations between potential adversarial nations there will have been, inevitably, real grievances that are grounds for enmity. But the attitude of one people towards another is usually determined by leaders who manipulate the minds of citizens for domestic political reasons which are generally unknown to the public. As Israeli sociologist Alouph Haveran has said, in times of conflict between nations historical accuracy is the first victim.[8] The Image of the Enemy and How We Sustain It Vietnam veteran William Broyles wrote: "War begins in the mind, with the idea of the enemy."[9] But to sustain that idea in war and peacetime a nation's leaders must maintain public support for the massive expenditures that are required. Studies of enmity have revealed susceptibilities, though not necessarily recognized as such by the governing elites that provide raw material upon which the leaders may draw to sustain the image of an enemy.[7,10] Freud[11] in his examination of mass psychology identified the proclivity of individuals to surrender personal responsibility to the leaders of large groups. This surrender takes place in both totalitarian and democratic societies, and without coercion. Leaders can therefore designate outside enemies and take actions against them with little opposition. Much further research is needed to understand the psychological mechanisms that impel individuals to kill or allow killing in their name, often with little questioning of the morality or consequences of such actions. Philosopher and psychologist Sam Keen asks why it is that in virtually every war "The enemy is seen as less than human? He's faceless. He's an animal"." Keen tries to answer his question: "The image of the enemy is not only the soldier's most powerful weapon; it is society's most powerful weapon. It enables people en masse to participate in acts of violence they would never consider doing as individuals".[12] National leaders become skilled in presenting the adversary in dehumanized images. The mass media, taking their cues from the leadership, contribute powerfully to the process.

#### Don’t call it an alternative---our response is to interrogate the epistemological failures of the 1ac---this is the only way to solve inevitable extinction

Ahmed 12 Dr. Nafeez Mosaddeq Ahmed is Executive Director of the Institute for Policy Research and Development (IPRD), an independent think tank focused on the study of violent conflict, he has taught at the Department of International Relations, University of Sussex "The international relations of crisis and the crisis of international relations: from the securitisation of scarcity to the militarisation of society" Global Change, Peace & Security Volume 23, Issue 3, 2011 Taylor Francis

While recommendations to shift our frame of orientation away from conventional state-centrism toward a 'human security' approach are valid, this cannot be achieved without confronting the deeper theoretical assumptions underlying conventional approaches to 'non-traditional' security issues.106 By occluding the structural origin and systemic dynamic of global ecological, energy and economic crises, orthodox approaches are incapable of transforming them. Coupled with their excessive state-centrism, this means they operate largely at the level of 'surface' impacts of global crises in terms of how they will affect quite traditional security issues relative to sustaining state integrity, such as international terrorism, violent conflict and population movements. Global crises end up fuelling the projection of risk onto social networks, groups and countries that cross the geopolitical fault-lines of these 'surface' impacts - which happen to intersect largely with Muslim communities. Hence, regions particularly vulnerable to climate change impacts, containing large repositories of hydrocarbon energy resources, or subject to demographic transformations in the context of rising population pressures, have become the focus of state security planning in the context of counter-terrorism operations abroad.

The intensifying problematisation and externalisation of Muslim-majority regions and populations by Western security agencies - as a discourse - is therefore not only interwoven with growing state perceptions of global crisis acceleration, but driven ultimately by an epistemological failure to interrogate the systemic causes of this acceleration in collective state policies (which themselves occur in the context of particular social, political and economic structures). This expansion of militarisation is thus coeval with the subliminal normative presumption that the social relations of the perpetrators, in this case Western states, must be protected and perpetuated at any cost - precisely because the efficacy of the prevailing geopolitical and economic order is ideologically beyond question.

As much as this analysis highlights a direct link between global systemic crises, social polarisation and state militarisation, it fundamentally undermines the idea of a symbiotic link between natural resources and conflict per se. Neither 'resource shortages' nor 'resource abundance' (in ecological, energy, food and monetary terms) necessitate conflict by themselves.

There are two key operative factors that determine whether either condition could lead to conflict. The first is the extent to which either condition can generate socio-political crises that challenge or undermine the prevailing order. The second is the way in which stakeholder actors choose to actually respond to the latter crises. To understand these factors accurately requires close attention to the political, economic and ideological strictures of resource exploitation, consumption and distribution between different social groups and classes. Overlooking the systematic causes of social crisis leads to a heightened tendency to problematise its symptoms, in the forms of challenges from particular social groups. This can lead to externalisation of those groups, and the legitimisation of violence towards them.

Ultimately, this systems approach to global crises strongly suggests that conventional policy 'reform' is woefully inadequate. Global warming and energy depletion are manifestations of a civilisation which is in overshoot. The current scale and organisation of human activities is breaching the limits of the wider environmental and natural resource systems in which industrial civilisation is embedded. This breach is now increasingly visible in the form of two interlinked crises in global food production and the global financial system. In short, industrial civilisation in its current form is unsustainable. This calls for a process of wholesale civilisational transition to adapt to the inevitable arrival of the post-carbon era through social, political and economic transformation.

Yet conventional theoretical and policy approaches fail to (1) fully engage with the gravity of research in the natural sciences and (2) translate the social science implications of this research in terms of the embeddedness of human social systems in natural systems. Hence, lacking capacity for epistemological self-reflection and inhibiting the transformative responses urgently required, they reify and normalise mass violence against diverse 'Others', newly constructed as traditional security threats enormously amplified by global crises - a process that guarantees the intensification and globalisation of insecurity on the road to ecological, energy and economic catastrophe. Such an outcome, of course, is not inevitable, but extensive new transdisciplinary research in IR and the wider social sciences - drawing on and integrating human and critical security studies, political ecology, historical sociology and historical materialism, while engaging directly with developments in the natural sciences - is urgently required to develop coherent conceptual frameworks which could inform more sober, effective, and joined-up policy-making on these issues.
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#### Conventional wars against nuclear-armed adversaries require primacy to control escalation---otherwise adversaries will use nuclear weapons first

Lieber and Press 10 – Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at Dartmouth College, March/April 2010, “Second Strike: Is the U.S. Nuclear Arsenal Outmoded?,” Foreign Affairs

Nuclear weapons are a boon for vulnerable states. During the Cold War, the United States deployed them in Europe to defend NATO because Soviet conventional forces seemed overwhelming. Now, the tables are turned: the United States' potential adversaries see nuclear weapons as a vital tool to counter U.S. conventional military superiority. Facing defeat on the battlefield, adversaries would have powerful incentives to use nuclear forces coercively, just as NATO planned to do during the Cold War. The fates of Manuel Noriega, Slobodan Milosevic, Radovan Karadzic, and Saddam Hussein have taught a grim lesson: use every weapon at your disposal to prevent defeat.

When Jan Lodal and James Acton call for the elimination or devaluation of nuclear weapons, they assume that U.S. adversaries can be convinced to accept perpetual vulnerability. The Soviet Union could not talk NATO into surrendering its nuclear arsenal during the Cold War, nor can the United States dupe its adversaries into disarming today. The challenge is to grapple with the problem of deterring nuclear escalation during conventional wars, when U.S. adversaries will have every incentive to use their nuclear arsenals to compel a cease-fire. Toward this end, Washington must retain a range of counterforce capabilities, including conventional and low-casualty nuclear weapons.

Hans Kristensen, Matthew McKinzie, and Ivan Oelrich raise several technical objections concerning the United States' ability to launch a successful counterforce strike. They dispute whether 3,000 pounds per square inch (PSI) of overpressure produced by low-yield airbursts would be enough to wreck Chinese silos. The use of 3,000 PSI in our model, however, is conservative. Many analysts believe that U.S. Cold War estimates exaggerated the hardness of enemy silos, and analysts with considerable technical expertise on this matter believe that our estimated requirement of 3,000 PSI probably overstates the hardness of China's silos. Most important, our results are not sensitive to moderate changes in assumptions about silo hardness. The United States could conduct a low-casualty nuclear strike--producing fewer than 1,000 fatalities--against all 20 Chinese silos even if they were built to withstand 5,000 PSI.

Kristensen, McKinzie, and Oelrich also contend that airbursts alone cannot destroy missile silos. This is incorrect. Airbursts can produce sufficient overpressure to crush the caps that protect missiles in the ground. In fact, the Pentagon assigns "vulnerability numbers" to silos on the basis of their resistance to overpressure. And McKinzie co-authored a 2001 Natural Resources Defense Council report that contradicts the claims that he, Kristensen, and Oelrich make here. The report listed the overpressures required to destroy various Russian missile silos, and it argued that even Russia's silos--which are probably much more robust than China's--are highly vulnerable to a U.S. airburst attack.

Our critics further suggest that the existence of mobile missiles obviates our analysis. If the launchers can be located, the argument goes, conventional weapons are sufficient to destroy them; if the launchers cannot be found, even nuclear weapons are useless. But the greatest challenge of targeting mobile missiles is not locating them momentarily; it is continuously tracking them and identifying where they have stopped. Hitting mobile launchers with conventional weapons requires near-perfect real-time intelligence--locating them within a few dozen yards. Even low-yield nuclear warheads would significantly reduce the targeting problem; locating the launchers within about half a mile would suffice if a five-kiloton warhead were used.

Kristensen, McKinzie, and Oelrich also note that the U.S. military's current delivery systems are not optimized for a counterforce mission: the most accurate systems (bombs and cruise missiles) are not prompt, and the most prompt systems (ballistic missiles) are not the most accurate. This is true. But current U.S. delivery systems are adequate given the weakness of the adversaries the United States now faces. If Washington wishes to retain effective low-casualty counterforce options, the next generation of nuclear delivery systems should further combine prompt delivery with high accuracy.

Lodal tries to link our discussion of counterforce options with the views held by senior officials in the George W. Bush administration. The fact of the matter is that nuclear counterforce options have been a core element of U.S. deterrence doctrine during every administration since Harry Truman's. U.S. strategic planners have understood that for deterrence to be credible, the president needs retaliatory options that he might actually use. Especially today, low-yield nuclear counterforce strikes are a better retaliatory option than high-yield nuclear strikes that, regardless of their target, would kill millions of civilians. The latter would be a disproportionate response to many possible enemy uses of nuclear weapons.

Critics of our policy prescriptions must confront two core issues. First, nuclear weapons have fundamentally changed since the Cold War. They once produced stalemate, and nuclear war once meant mass slaughter. For good or ill, that has changed. The revolution in accuracy means that enemy arsenals can be destroyed, and in ways that produce few civilian casualties. Theories of deterrence and beliefs about strategic stability and nuclear force requirements must be reevaluated accordingly.

#### U.S. nuclear primacy prevents nuclear war over Taiwan---the war likely wouldn’t break out and wouldn’t escalate if it did

Lieber and Press 7 - Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, Winter 2007, “U.S. Nuclear Primacy and the Future of the Chinese Deterrent,” China Security, Issue No. 5, online: http://www.wsichina.org/cs5\_5.pdf

Ironically, one of the clearest explanations for how the United States may use nuclear primacy in a crisis or war with China appears in an earlier article by Blair. His recent article with Chen labels our suggestion that the United States might use nuclear threats “the zenith of provocation” and “unthinkable.”23 However, in the autumn 2005 issue of China Security, Blair describes exactly the crisis dynamics we envision leading to U.S. nuclear threats and perhaps even a preemptive nuclear attack. He notes that if China were to alert its strategic nuclear forces during a war with the United States over Taiwan, “the United States would likely act to beat China to the punch.” He continues, “Given constant U.S. surveillance of Chinese nuclear launch sites, any major Chinese preparations to fire peremptorily would be detected and countered by a rapid U.S. preemptive strike against the sites by U.S. conventional or nuclear forces… The United States could easily detect and react inside of the lengthy launch cycle time of Chinese forces.”24

Blair’s words mirror our argument and suggest the two ways that nuclear primacy may benefit the United States. First, if the Chinese were to threaten nuclear escalation in the context of a Taiwan war, the U.S. could strike first and likely destroy the Chinese force on the ground – “beat China to the punch,” as Blair puts it. Second, China’s knowledge of its vulnerability to nuclear preemption might prevent China from alerting its nuclear force – or even attacking Taiwan – in the first place.

#### War over Taiwan is structurally inevitable---U.S. conventional superiority ensures China will rollback their NFU and escalate to nuclear war

Zhang 8 - Baohui Zhang, Associate Professor of Political Science, Lingnan University, Hong Kong, March 2008, “The Taiwan Strait and the Future of China's No-First-Use Nuclear Policy,” Comparative Strategy, Vol. 27, No. 2, p. 164-182

For the above reasons the no-first-use principle remained unchallenged until the 1990s, when a series of new issues began to force some in China to rethink its nuclear principles. These include the ascendance of the Taiwan issue as the central security challenge for China (and, as a result, the increased likelihood of American military intervention in the Taiwan Strait), and the revolution in military affairs (RMA) that has given the United States vast conventional advantage over China.

According to John Wilson Lewis and Xue Litai, during the 1990s Taiwan's tendency to move toward de jure independence led to an increasingly pessimistic view inside China that the Taiwan issue could not be peacefully resolved. More and more Chinese analysts believed that, due to the internal political dynamics of a democratic Taiwan and the rise of Taiwanese identity among its people, peaceful reunification between Taiwan and the mainland has become increasingly hopeless.13 In fact, Jiang Zemin made the famous remark that “a war across the Taiwan Strait is unavoidable.”14 As a result, Taiwan has become the number-one security issue for China, and preparing for a war to prevent Taiwan's independence has become an obsession of the Chinese leadership and military.

The problem for China is that it also increasingly believes that American military intervention can be expected in the event of war in the Taiwan Strait. Inside the Chinese military, due to “America's proclaimed geostrategic interests and recent military actions the prevailing opinion was that U.S. forces would undoubtedly intervene.”15 This scenario presents an extremely daunting challenge: how to defeat the world's most powerful military. This task is particularly daunting since the Chinese military recognizes that the revolution in military affairs has given the United States vast advantages over China. According to military observers, the 1991 Gulf War and the 1999 NATO war against Serbia demonstrated the revolutionary change in warfare through the use of precision-guided weapons linked to information technologies in areas such as intelligence, command and control, and weapon guidance. The Chinese military was keenly aware of the new trend and organized systematic studies of how the American military conducted its operations in this new kind of war.16

In fact, the Chinese military was awed by the American dominance in conventional warfare. As observed by General Wang Baocun, a prominent strategist at the PLA Academy of Military Sciences, the U.S. revolution in military affairs has resulted in a new kind of gap with other countries. Previously, the gap was merely generational. This time, there is a “time gap” in that the U.S. military and others are fighting as if they were from different historical periods. According to Wang, “The time gap in military technologies allows the superior side to possess an absolute advantage while leaving the other side in a position of absolute disadvantage. … The time gap makes it impossible for developing countries to overcome their military disadvantage in confrontations with the United States.” Wang thus reaches a gloomy conclusion: “The military time gap results in serious threats to the national and military security of developing countries. In fact, they are almost in a defenseless situation.”17

Major General Xu Hezhen, who is the Commandant of PLA Army Command Academy in Shijiazhuang, suggests that the RMA allows the U.S. to conduct “no-contact combat” against other militaries through beyond visual range sensor technologies and precision-strike weapons. This revolution in combat “creates a battlefield situation where 'I can see you and hit you but you can't see me and hit back. The situation leaves the weaker side in a position of perpetual disadvantage until it loses the will of resistance.”18

The RMA thus presents a serious problem for China's military planners: how to defeat a technologically far superior enemy such as the United States. In fact, China is no longer confident it can defeat such an enemy due to the vast gap with the United States in conventional military technologies. As Lewis and Xue observe, “As senior PLA planners dissected the American strategy from the Gulf War of 1991 to the lightening war against Iraq in 2003, it was to become painfully evident that no war with the United States could be won or even brought to a reasonable draw.”19

This bleak assessment by Chinese officers of the U.S. conventional dominance in the Taiwan Strait is echoed by American analysis. In a research project for the U.S. Department of Defense, the Rand Corporation analyzed how China may choose to conduct a war against the American military. According to Rand, in the coming decades the U.S. will possess “even greater military advantages over Chinese forces than it currently enjoys.”20 Therefore, if the China intends to fight the U.S. through conventional military modernization, “this option, taken alone, potentially condemns the PLA to evolving relative obsolescence.”21

How to prevent a disastrous defeat in the Taiwan Strait led some in China to question the separation of conventional and nuclear doctrines in Chinese military thinking. While the no-first-use policy can prevent a nuclear attack against China, it cannot deter a large-scale conventional war by a technologically superior enemy. Some believe that the policy can no longer protect China's core national interests, such as preventing de jure independence of Taiwan. According to Alastair Iain Johnston, who was the first Western analyst to notice this trend in the 1990s, some Chinese strategists began to argue that China should develop a nuclear doctrine “suitable for economically and technologically weak states.”22

#### China would perceive any decline in primacy as a green-light to attack Taiwan

CAGS, Center on American and Global Security, 2009, Weapons of Mass Destruction and the Future of U.S. National Security: From Present Problems to Future Challenges, http://www.indiana.edu/~cags/docs/WMDReportFINAL.pdf

Third, the impact of China’s achievement of MAD with the United States would affect calculations concerning unresolved territorial disputes in Asia, especially concerning Taiwan. Under the scenario, the balance of conventional and nuclear forces in Asia has shifted away from the United States towards China, perhaps **increasing China’s willingness to risk conventional war to settle the Taiwan issue** or other territorial disputes it has. The bet would be that the United States would not risk nuclear war with China over Taiwan once China achieves MAD status. This incentive could be another factor influencing China’s decision to go for MAD. However, there is no precedent for determining the escalation risks of two established nuclear powers fighting a conventional war.4

#### Nuclear primacy’s key to hegemony

Craig 9 – Campbell Craig, Professor of International Relations at the University of Southampton, 2009, “American power preponderance and the nuclear revolution,” Review of International Studies, Vol. 35, p. 35-36

As Keir Lieber and Daryl Press have suggested, the US may be on the verge of acquiring a first-strike nuclear capability, which, combined with an effective system of anti-ballistic missile defence, could allow the US to destroy a rival’s nuclear capabilities and intercept any remaining retaliatory missiles before they hit American cities. While this possibility clearly reduces the likelihood of other states seeking to match American power with the aim of fighting and winning a nuclear war, and, if their argument becomes widely accepted, could lead American policy-makers to reject the logic of the nuclear revolution and consider pre-emptive nuclear strikes against large nuclear rivals, it clearly is less germane to the question of small-state deterrence.33 Lieber and Press contend that the US may have the capability to destroy the entire nuclear arsenal of another large nuclear state lest that state use it on America first for the purposes of winning a great war. That, as they say, would mean the end of Mutual Assured Destruction as it existed during the Cold War. However, Washington would have much less reason to use its new first-strike capability against a nation that cannot threaten to destroy the US, and has no ambition to defeat America in a war, but only possesses a second-strike minimum deterrent. Such an attack would turn much of the world against a US willing to use nuclear weapons and kill hundreds of thousands or millions in order to defeat a nation that did not threaten its survival. Perhaps more to the point, an attack like this would be tremendously risky. Even after a perfect first strike some retaliation might get through, which could mean the nuclear destruction of an American city or perhaps the city of an American ally. At the very least, survivors of the attacked state and their allies would seek to unleash destruction upon the US in other ways, including an unconventional delivery of a nuclear, chemical, or biological weapon. An imperfect first strike, or, even worse, a failure of the US anti-missile system, would constitute a total disaster for the US: not only would it incur the world’s wrath and suffer the destruction of one or more of its cities, but such a failure would also expose America as both a brutal and vulnerable state, surely encouraging other states to acquire nuclear weapons or otherwise defy it. The US might have reason to launch a first strike against a large rival that deployed a major arsenal and appeared ready to attack America, as implausible as this scenario is. It would have little reason to do so against a small nation with a second-strike minimum deterrent arsenal.

The nuclear revolution delivers a clear message to any large state considering major war with a powerful nuclear rival. The message is that such a war is likely to escalate to total nuclear exchange, and that in this event a large percentage of its citizenry will be killed or injured, its ability to govern what remains of the nation will be weakened or destroyed, and its power relative to other states that stayed out of the war will be radically diminished. It also delivers a message to any advanced small state eager to obtain security from the possible predation of large ones. The message is that if the small state possesses, or can quickly get its hands on, a few invulnerable and deliverable nuclear weapons, any large state contemplating invading it will have to weigh the benefits of invasion against a new kind of cost – not just a difficult or stalemated conventional war, such as the US faced in Vietnam and faces in Iraq, but the destruction of perhaps one, three, or five of its cities, and the death and injury of millions of its citizens. Unless it is able to obtain an absolutely fool-proof defence against any kind of nuclear retaliation, the choice that any large state is going to make when faced with this new circumstance is so likely to be peace that the small nuclear state can feel confident that it will be safe from conquest.34

The general relevance of these messages to American unipolar preponderance is clear. At the ‘great power’ level, rising states are unlikely to regard major war as a suitable means for overturning the international system and overthrowing American preponderance. The classic means of systemic change – hegemonic war – will not be an attractive option to any state hoping to survive, and the very existence of nuclear arsenals will make all states cautious about provoking conflict with nuclear rivals, especially the heavily armed US.35 Moreover, advanced smaller states know that they can provide for their own security, if they come to believe that it is endangered, not by embarking on large military build-ups or forming alliances with larger states, but by developing a small and invulnerable nuclear arsenal, or at least preparing the way to obtain such an arsenal quickly. This means that small states have a far greater ability to defend themselves from, and therefore be less afraid of, American predation today than comparable states facing dominant powers in previous eras.36

The main effects of the nuclear revolution, then, bolster the general claim of Power Preponderance that unipolarity is enduring. To support their claim, Brooks and Wohlforth specify three factors that dissuade would-be rivals to the US from balancing against it in traditional military terms: the effect of America’s relative geographical isolation from these potential rivals; the fact that American preponderance happened as a fait accompli about which no other nation could do anything; and the vast and growing ‘power gap’ between the US and all other rivals. The next section will describe each factor, and show how the nuclear revolution specifically reinforces each of them.

### 1NC

**Text ---- The United States Executive Branch should establish a declaratory policy that the United States will not use nuclear weapons against a governmental entity, proxy, or group that has not used nuclear weapons against another governmental entity or group.**

#### The plan is action policy and the CP is declaratory policy. Under declaratory NFU, it’s possible that in the face of incontrovertible evidence that an adversary is about to launch a nuclear strike, the U.S. could use nuclear weapons first.

Tertrais 9 – Bruno Tertrais, Senior Research Fellow at the Paris-based Foundation for Strategic Research and Contributing Editor to Survival, October-November 2009, “The Trouble with No First Use,” Survival, Vol. 51, No. 5, p. 26-27

The nuance is important. Declaratory policies (what states claim they would do) and action policies (what states actually plan to do) may not always be identical. However, planning for first use would be legally forbidden if a US president declared a no-first-use policy. 2 Again, vocabulary matters. Preemptive use (in case of incontrovertible evidence of an imminent nuclear attack) would be an act of self defence. Preventive use (a bolt-outof- the-blue nuclear strike) would be a different matter legally, strategically and politically. To the best of my knowledge, no Western country has included it in its nuclear doctrine; contrary to what sources quoted by Sagan claim, there is no evidence that the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review included this option.

#### This solves the case:

#### It’s virtually identical in function---the U.S. would only override a declaratory NFU in an extreme crisis---and global public opinion would rally behind the U.S.

Feiveson and Hogendoorn 3 – Harold Feiveson, senior research scientist and co-director of the Program in Science & Global Security at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, and Ernst Hogendoorn, Ph.D. Candidate at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, Summer 2003, “No First Use of Nuclear Weapons,” The Nonproliferation Review, online: http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/102feiv.pdf

In extremis, of course, a U.S. administration might find compelling reason to override a no-first-use commitment, and actually use or explicitly threaten to use nuclear weapons. Such an act would be taken only in the most dire of circumstances, and in such a situation it is hard to believe that U.S. flaunting of a prior declaratory commitment would weigh much in how the world viewed the U.S. actions.

#### The net-benefit---making NFU an action policy and completely prohibiting all scenarios for first-use costs hundreds of thousands of lives in an inevitable crisis---the CP’s declaratory NFU enables the U.S. to override its declared posture and launch damage-limitation strikes against an imminent nuclear attacker

Tertrais 9 – Bruno Tertrais, Senior Research Fellow at the Paris-based Foundation for Strategic Research and Contributing Editor to Survival, October-November 2009, “The Trouble with No First Use,” Survival, Vol. 51, No. 5, p. 25

A no-first-use policy might also have security costs beyond deterrence. As an action policy (as opposed to merely a declaratory one1), it would prevent a government which has adopted such a principle from striking pre-emptively at an adversary who has unmistakably demonstrated its intention to imminently launch a nuclear attack. Granted, such an extreme ‘damage limitation’ strike could only be executed in absolutely extraordinary circumstances. But it is only a slight exaggeration to say that a leader ready to forfeit it through a no-first-use policy is giving up the possibility of saving hundreds of thousands of his citizens.

#### Only a declaratory NFU creates successful existential deterrence---the knowledge that a declaratory NFU could be revoked in crisis de-escalates tension and prevents conflict

Feiveson and Hogendoorn 3 – Harold Feiveson, senior research scientist and co-director of the Program in Science & Global Security at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, and Ernst Hogendoorn, Ph.D. Candidate at the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton, Summer 2003, “No First Use of Nuclear Weapons,” The Nonproliferation Review, online: http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/102feiv.pdf

Opponents of a strong no-first-use declaration by the United States generally rely on three arguments. The first is that the United States may need nuclear weapons to respond to chemical and biological weapon attacks by rogue countries. This argument mistakenly conflates nuclear weapons with these other weapons of mass destruction, and in fact gives too much status to these "poor man's nuclear weapons." The second argument is that a no-first-use commitment can never be verified. While it is true that such a commitment is inherently uncertain, this uncertainty supports a no-first-use commitment, in that the country undertaking such a commitment will plan not to use nuclear weapons first, but other countries will never be quite sure that their potential adversary will never use nuclear weapons—and so nuclear use remains an existential deterrent regardless of declaratory policy. A third argument—that even if the United States would never actually use nuclear weapons, it is worthwhile to keep potential adversaries uncertain—is similarly flawed. Potential adversaries will always be uncertain. More important is to remove uncertainty from U.S. military commanders, who must never go into battle thinking they can rely on the use of nuclear weapons.

#### The CP’s the best middle ground---it refuses to tie the hands of future presidents while adopting the substance of NFU---the consequences of nuclear war mean declaratory NFU would only be overridden in catastrophic circumstances

Boese 6 – Wade Boese, Research Director of the Arms Control Association, March 25, 2006, “Preventing Nuclear Disaster,” online: http://www.armscontrol.org/print/128

Nuclear weapons possessors should be pushed to adopt no-first-use policies. At this time, China and India are the only two states that have renounced the first use of their nuclear arms.

In the absence of ending its nuclear deployments, the 26-member NATO alliance also should forswear the first use of their nuclear weapons. In its 1999 Strategic Concept, NATO declared that the possible use of nuclear weapons is "extremely remote." But even this is an overstatement given today's political and geo-strategic realities. Moscow's overwhelming superiority in conventional forces that gave rise to NATO's nuclear policy disappeared long ago and so should NATO's readiness to introduce or employ nuclear weapons in a conflict.

Universal adoption of a no-first-use option should particularly appeal to the United States, which possesses the world's most advanced and powerful conventional military. Nuclear weapons are the ultimate equalizer so it is hard to imagine a situation in which the United States would open the door to the only weapon that would moot U.S. conventional superiority. For this reason, as well as others, there really is not much affinity among the uniformed U.S. military for nuclear weapons.

U.S. political leaders also find it difficult to fathom scenarios in which nuclear weapons might be used first, particularly preemptively. Ambassador Linton Brooks, who heads the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration stated November 8, 2005, "While nobody will tie the hands of a president, I can't conceive of circumstances where nuclear pre-emption makes sense…The decision to use nuclear weapons is so apocalyptic that I can't imagine that any president would ever make it lightly." Although Brooks noted that the president's hands should not be tied, they should also not be tethered to nuclear weapons. The president would be liberated, not limited, by removing an option that carries such profound and immeasurable consequences. This holds true for other world leaders as well.

As long as nuclear weapons exist, their role should be confined to deterring a nuclear-weapons attack by another state. Anything more is unjustified. As former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara wrote last year in Foreign Policy, "I would characterize current U.S. nuclear weapons policy as immoral, illegal, militarily unnecessary, and dreadfully dangerous."

## Case

## Heg Advantage

### Conventional Inevitable

#### Unparalleled conventional superiority now

Stimson Center 2009, nonprofit, nonpartisan institution devoted to enhancing international peace and security through a unique combination of rigorous analysis and outreach, http://www.stimson.org/space/?SN=WS20040504680

The United States enjoys unparalleled and unprecedented military superiority. The US will spend close to half a trillion dollars this year on defense (over three times more than Russia, its closest peer competitor). In the 2003 Iraqi war, 130,000 troops decimated opposing forces and occupied a country the size of Montana in three weeks.¶ US conventional superiority provides a powerful deterrent and response to any other state that seeks to damage US space assets-particularly when asymmetric attacks against US space assets are far easier to assign responsibility to than asymmetric warfare waged against soft targets here on earth.

#### AND --- will maintain superiority into the future

Zhang 8 - Baohui Zhang, Associate Professor of Political Science, Lingnan University, Hong Kong, March 2008, “The Taiwan Strait and the Future of China's No-First-Use Nuclear Policy,” Comparative Strategy, Vol. 27, No. 2, p. 164-182

The RMA thus presents a serious problem for China's military planners: how to defeat a technologically far superior enemy such as the United States. In fact, China is no longer confident it can defeat such an enemy due to the vast gap with the United States in conventional military technologies. As Lewis and Xue observe, “As senior PLA planners dissected the American strategy from the Gulf War of 1991 to the lightening war against Iraq in 2003, it was to become painfully evident that no war with the United States could be won or even brought to a reasonable draw.”19¶ This bleak assessment by Chinese officers of the U.S. conventional dominance in the Taiwan Strait is echoed by American analysis. In a research project for the U.S. Department of Defense, the Rand Corporation analyzed how China may choose to conduct a war against the American military. According to Rand, in the coming decades the U.S. will possess “even greater military advantages over Chinese forces than it currently enjoys.”20 Therefore, if the China intends to fight the U.S. through conventional military modernization, “this option, taken alone, potentially condemns the PLA to evolving relative obsolescence.”21

### AT: Heg Impact

#### Heg impact’s empirically denied

Preble 10 – Former prof, history, Temple U. PhD, history, Temple (Christopher, U.S. Military Power: Preeminence for What Purpose?, 3 August, http://www.cato-at-liberty.org/u-s-military-power-preeminence-for-what-purpose/)

Goure and the Hadley-Perry commissioners who produced the alternate QDR argue that the purpose of American military power is to provide global public goods, to defend other countries so that they don’t have to defend themselves, and otherwise shape the international order to suit our ends. In other words, the same justifications offered for American military dominance since the end of the Cold War. Most in Washington still embraces the notion that America is, and forever will be, the world’s indispensable nation. Some scholars, however, questioned the logic of hegemonic stability theory from the very beginning. A number continue to do so today. They advance arguments diametrically at odds with the primacist consensus. Trade routes need not be policed by a single dominant power; the international economy is complex and resilient. Supply disruptions are likely to be temporary, and the costs of mitigating their effects should be borne by those who stand to lose --- or gain --- the most. Islamic extremists are scary, but hardly comparable to the threat posed by a globe-straddling Soviet Union armed with thousands of nuclear weapons. It is frankly absurd that we spend more today to fight Osama bin Laden and his tiny band of murderous thugs than we spent to face down Joseph Stalin and Chairman Mao. Many factors have contributed to the dramatic decline in the number of wars between nation-states; it is unrealistic to expect that a new spasm of global conflict would erupt if the United States were to modestly refocus its efforts, draw down its military power, and call on other countries to play a larger role in their own defense, and in the security of their respective regions. But while there are credible alternatives to the United States serving in its current dual role as world policeman / armed social worker, the foreign policy establishment in Washington has no interest in exploring them. The people here have grown accustomed to living at the center of the earth, and indeed, of the universe. The tangible benefits of all this military spending flow disproportionately to this tiny corner of the United States while the schlubs in fly-over country pick up the tab.

#### No escalation

Haas 8 Richard, President of the Council on Foreign Relations, former director of policy planning for the Department of State, former vice president and director of foreign policy studies at the Brookings Institution, the Sol M. Linowitz visiting professor of international studies at Hamilton College, a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a lecturer in public policy at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, and a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, April, “Ask the Expert: What Comes After Unipolarity?” http://www.cfr.org/publication/16063/ask\_the\_expert.html

Does a non polar world increase or reduce the chances of another world war? Will nuclear deterrence continue to prevent a large scale conflict? Sivananda Rajaram, UK Richard Haass: I believe the chance of a world war, i.e., one involving the major powers of the day, is remote and likely to stay that way. This reflects more than anything else the absence of disputes or goals that could lead to such a conflict. Nuclear deterrence might be a contributing factor in the sense that no conceivable dispute among the major powers would justify any use of nuclear weapons, but again, I believe the fundamental reason great power relations are relatively good is that all hold a stake in sustaining an international order that supports trade and financial flows and avoids large-scale conflict. The danger in a nonpolar world is not global conflict as we feared during the Cold War but smaller but still highly costly conflicts involving terrorist groups, militias, rogue states, etc.

### AT: Taiwan

#### No war and escalation

**GS 6** (Global Security, China's Options in the Taiwan Confrontation, http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/taiwan-prc.htm)

With a belief that the US will come to Taiwan's aid should China initiate action to curb any independence-like moves, Chen has continued a campaign toward independence, betting on sympathetic voters to side with his positions. By 2005, however, the independence card had been trumped by the mainland's policy of reconciliation, and overshadowed by other domestic issues. While China has long avowed to prevent Taiwan's declaration of independence by force, if required, their response to current trends in Taiwan thus far has been **significantly tempered**.¶ China does not want to repeat the results of the 1995-96 Taiwan Strait missile crisis in which PRC military actions adversely influenced (in Beijing eyes) Taiwanese opinions and resulted in President Lee Teng-hui's re-election. Beijing recognizes that the economic and diplomatic costs of **even measured military responses** to the situation in Taiwan would be enormously high, and as such they will reserve such activity as an absolute last resort.¶ Should Chen begin openly promoting an independence platform, Beijing could undertake an escalating series of actions to bring Taiwan back into line. China's leaders will choose their courses of action (COA) based on the COA's perceived impact on internal stability and government authority. They can neither afford to risk growing unemployment during a period of fantastic economic growth nor risk appearing weak in dealing with one of their three primary separatist movements (Taiwan, Xinjiang, and Tibet).¶ It is generally assumed that China would likely attack Taiwan under certain previously defined circumstances [China's "Five Noes"]:¶ a formal declaration of independence by Taipei¶ a military alliance by Taiwan with a foreign power, or foreign intervention in Taiwan's internal affairs¶ indefinite delays in resumption of cross-Strait dialogue, and an unwillingness to negotiate on the basis of 'one China'¶ Taiwan's acquisition of nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction¶ internal unrest or turmoil on Taiwan¶ As of mid-2004 President Hu Jintao's government was emphasizing formal independence, US-ROC cooperation on technology to defeat a PRC attack, and the lack of progress in negotiations.¶ Conversely, China's precise definition of "reunification" is somewhat opaque. In November 2004 Tang Jiaxuan, who was foreign minister until 2003, and serves as a vice minister in the Taiwan Affairs Office of the State Council, said that after reunification, Taiwan would enjoy broader autonomy than Hong Kong and Macao. He suggested that Taiwan could preserve its social system; freely choose its leaders; keep the first right of legal jurisdiction; not pay taxes to the central government; preserve its own armed forces and police; have external foreign commercial, economic, trade and cultural relations; and purchase some offensive weapons. Furthermore, the central government in Beijing would not send officials to Taiwan but island officials could be part of the central government.¶ A walk down the escalation ladder may illustrate the range of possible actions that may be expected. Those rungs on the escalation ladder of greatest interest are those that may not provoke direct American response, but that would demonstrate the dispositive influence of Beijing over the status of the territory presently controlled by the Taipei regime, and Beijing's ultimate control over the relationship between that territory and the rest of the world.¶ Diplomatic Initiatives¶ Although a climb at least mid-way up the escalation ladder has some surface appeal and plausibility, there is surely a case to be made that the costs to Beijing will outweigh the benefits, and that in any event such a provocative course of action would merely play into Taiwan's gameplan for reducing the ambiguity of American commitments in its favor. Taiwan's declaratory shift has not been followed by overt acts, such as President Lee's 1996 visit to the United States, and indeed its declaratory initiative has been rebuffed by the US Government and by others. The counsel of patience would suggest that time is on Beijing's side, and that at some point the post-Lee leadership in Taipei will recognize the futility of his "state to state" formulation and return to some more constructive approach.¶ Military Exercises¶ At a minimum, the PLA may repeat the military posturing of March 1996, and indeed it is difficult to imagine how a response of at least this intensity can be avoided under some circumstances. It is predictable, however, that the United States will respond by the deployment of military forces to some carefully calibrated locale, and that these manuevers alone will do little to resolve the present political crisis. To the extent that Taiwan's political challenge is viewed as being more substantial than that of 1995-96, a simple repetition of the firepower displays of that crisis could demonstrate a lack of credibility and resolve on the part of Beijing, and could be readily characterized as inadequate.¶ Unconventional Warfare¶ Chinese attacks on critical infrastructure could unsettle Taiwan's economy without provoking American military involvement, and perhaps without even being directly attributable to the Chinese government. Although apparently coincidental, the island-wide blackout of late July 1999 is illustrative of such possibilities, and subsequently reported attacks on government computer systems may forshadow more ambitious attacks.¶ On 04 October 2004 Richard Lawless, Deputy Undersecretary of Defence, warned the US-Taiwan Business Council China is developing the means to electronically blockade Taiwan with attacks to the island's vital utilities, the Internet and other communications networks. He warned that China might first target things that keep Taiwan's high-tech society running if a war broke out between China and Taiwan. "China is actively developing options to create chaos on the island, to compromise components of Taiwan's critical infrastructure - telecommunications, utilities, broadcast media, cellular, Internet and computer networks," he saidl. Such a strategy could be called an "acupuncture" attack aimed at "the destruction of a national will" with "the insertion of a hundred needles."¶ It is rather difficult to envision effective modalities for American enhancements to Taiwan's physical or technical security to counter such infrastructure attacks beyond modest technical assistance efforts. Although the potentially unattributable character of infrastructure attacks would deny Beijing the pleasure of explicit mastery over Taiwan, the absence of attribution would not diminish the impact on Taiwan's economy nor would it diminish from the depiction of Taipei as lacking effective control over its nominal territory.¶ Peripheral Assaults¶ Taiwan occupies one island in the disputed Spratly chain, and the handful of small islands occupied by Taiwan near the mainland coast are far less heavily fortified than Quemoy and Matsu. Chinese seizure of these otherwise insiginificant specks of real estate could be accomplished with relative ease, and as with a partial naval blockade would concrete demonstrate Beijing's dispositive influence over territory claimed by Taipei. The United States is extremely unlikely to assist Taiwan in the recovery of the legally disputed Spratly, and would be only somewhat less unlikely to directly participate in the recovery by Taiwan of minor specks of territory in the Taiwan Strait.¶ Naval Blockade¶ The PLA Navy would face serious difficulties in coordinating an effective naval blockade enforced through the combined efforts of air, surface, and submarine forces. But the reaction by Taiwan and the international community to the PLA's March 1996 exercises and missile tests suggests that less comprehensive measures could substantially disrupt Taiwan's economic life, potentially creating pressure over time for a political settlement. Depending on the modalities of such an embargo, the United States might have difficulty in identifying politically appropriate or militarily effective means of countering Beijing's interdiction of international commerce with Taiwan. Mine-sweeping operations might not be sufficiently effective to restore the confidence of commercial shippers, and the US Navy might be loath to proactively sink Chinese submarines that were not immediately attacking friendly shipping. Consequently, a partially effective Chinese blockade of Taiwan would appear to be an attactive option for concretely demonstrating China's ultimate authority over Taiwan without prokoking an American military challenge to this assertion.¶ Air Operations¶ Air operations could be conducted in concert with a naval blockade, amphibious operations, missile strikes against Taiwan-held islands, or missile strikes against Taiwan. Taipei's qualitative advantages would help offset the PLA's numerical superiority. But air operations could cause great damage that might eventually enable China to achieve air superiority, and could force Taipei into a political settlement on China's terms unless Taiwan were to receive external assistance. The United States would almost certainly be prepared to provide aircraft and ordnance to replace combat losses, though it is rather difficult to imagine modern counterparts to the "Flying Tigers." It is unclear how or whether American carrier-based aviation would be used to enforce a no-fly zone in the Taiwan Strait. Such enforcement would probably come towards the end of a military crisis to either administer a cease fire or revser the declining fortunes of Taiwan. American carrier aviation combat operations at the outset of a Chinese air campaign against Taiwan would appear unlikely under current US declaratory policy, although there could be substantial Congressional pressure for such a committment.¶ Full-scale Invasion¶ A main force attack to "Liberate Taiwan" would be an extremely high risk undertaking with uncertain prospects for success. Invasion is unlikely, since the PLA cannot yet transport a credible invasion force to Taiwan. Amphibious forces are capable of transporting no more than a single division [15,000 troops], and military air transports could add possibly an additional divisions worth of troops. Taipei would have significant warning time if Beijing were to prepare for an invasion, and could mobilize significant reserves that would outnumber the invading force by a wide margin. Taiwan retains significant qualitative advantages against the numerically superior PLA in fighter aircraft, surface warships, air defenses, and many ground force capabilities.¶ Although it is unlikely that China would initiate the use of weapons of mass destruction in the context of a conventional invasion of Taiwan, it is possible that Taiwan would initiate the use of chemical weapons in respose to such an invasion in the event that a purely conventional military response appeared inadequate. In any event, if Beijing's amphibious assault did not spontaneously collapse, such an invasion would almost certainly provoke an American intervention sufficient to terminate hostilities on terms unfavorable to Beijing, unless Taiwan collapses before America can intervene.¶ Every spring China masses amphibious units on their coast facing Taiwan. The Pentagon normally dismisses Chinese amphibious exercises as "routine" though they could provide an opportunity for a standing start "out-of-the-blue" (OOTB) surprise attack. Taiwan has responded by having some warships at sea and some aircraft in the air during Chinese exercises.¶ In the 20th Century, China's amphibious exercises were mainly designed to intimidate Taiwan. The annual Dongshan drill started in 1996. In these exercises, the emphasis was on crossing the 130km-wide Taiwan Strait and landing on Taiwan itself. But with the new century, the PLA began to address logistical issues, questions of timing, and command and control problems.¶ Of particular note is the fact that the PLA has been frequently conducting offensive "integrated" (Yitihua) training with a focus on the use of armed forces against Taiwan and blocking the US military intervention. The concepts of integration (yitihua) and seamless operations (feixianxing zuozhan) are defined as tying together the five dimensions of warfare - air, land, sea, space, and the electromagnetic spectrum, integrating sensors with mobile missiles, air, and sea-based forces.¶ In June 2001 the numbers of Chinese forces massing in the "Liberation No. 1." exercise were three times higher than during previous exercises of this kind. The main goals of the exercises were reported to be practicing "attacking and occupying an outlying Taiwanese island and fighting off an aircraft carrier." The exercise, which lasted for four months, was the biggest since 1996.¶ China held two large-scale amphibious exercises in 2004 (division to group-army level in size), one of which explicitly dealt with a Taiwan scenario, bringing the total number of amphibious exercises to ten over the previous five years. In June and July 2004 exercises were conducted on Dongshan Island in southeastern Fujian province, just 150 nautical miles west of Taiwan's Penghu Island. The military wargames were aimed at "taking control of the Taiwan Strait", with 18,000 troops and the amphibious landing of a tank brigade. Soldiers deployed on Dongshan Island in mid-May 2004, with tanks and armoured personnel carriers practicing amphibious landings on Jinluan beach.¶ During July 2004 China conducted exercise "Liberation Number Two", commanded by Chief of General Staff General Liang Guanglie, an expert on amphibious warfare. However, during the 2004 exercise off the Fujian coast, the Chinese military tested its ability to capture the Penghu archipelago not far from Taiwan. This was the first time the chain of 64 islands, lying east of the midway line between Taiwan and the mainland, was the target. Observers sugggested that the People's Liberation Army had adopted a cautious, step-by-step approach in its preparations for a showdown with Taiwan. After the 'Liberation Number One' drill on Dongshan island in 2001, the PLA concluded that it would suffer significant losses if it failed to control Penghu.¶ In 2004 a computer simulation suggested that it would take China six days to complete the occupation of Taiwan. When this was publicly reported, "authoritative military sources" told Taiwan media that, in fact, Taiwan could hold out for two weeks. The logic behind this view is that Taiwan has to hold out until the US comes to its aid and, given thespeed of US military deployment, the longer the better.¶ Early arriving forces, often involving warships stationed close to the Strait, would be of particular importance in a short conflict over Taiwan. At an expected average speed of 25 knots, over long Pacific Ocean distances, US submarines, aircraft carriers, cruisers and destroyers based in San Diego, CA would take nearly 10 days to reach an area east of Taiwan after setting sail. By contrast, a US warship based in Yokosuka, Japan, would take just under two days, one in Guam would take 2.2 days, and a ship sailing from Pearl Harbor in Hawaii would take more than seven days.¶ Nuclear Attack on Taiwan¶ China would almost certainly not contemplate a nuclear strike against Taiwan, nor would Beijing embark on a course of action that posed significant risks of the use of nuclear weapons. The mainland's long term goal is to liberate Taiwan, not to obliterate it, and any use of nuclear weapons by China would run a substantial risk of the use of nuclear weapons by the United States. An inability to control escalation beyond "demonstrative" detonations would cause utterly disproportionate destruction.

### AT: Iran War

#### Multiple factors constrain Iranian aggression or adventurism

Kaye 10—Senior political scientist, RAND. CFR member and former prof at George Wash. PhD in pol sci from UC Berkeley—AND—Nora Bensahel—adjunct prof of IR at Georgetown. PhD in pol sci from Stanford—AND—Jerrold D. Green—research professor, USC. PhD in pol sci from U Chicago—AND—Frederic Wehrey—Senior analyst at RAND. Former Georgetown prof. D.Phil. candidate in IR, Oxford. Master’s in near Eastern studies, Princeton (Dalia Dassa, Dangerous But Not Omnipotent, Report by RAND for the Airforce and DOD, <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG781.pdf>)

To accurately gauge the strategic challenges from Iran over a ten- to fifteen-year horizon, this study sought to assess the motivations of the Islamic Republic, not just its capabilities. This approach, although difficult given the complexities of the Iranian system, is critical in identifying potential sources of caution and pragmatism in Iran’s policy formulation. Our exploration of Iranian strategic thinking revealed that ideology and bravado frequently mask a preference for opportunism and realpolitik—the qualities that define “normal” state behavior. Similarly, when we canvassed Iran’s power projection options, we identified not only the extent of the threats posed by each but also their limitations and liabilities. In each case, we found significant barriers and buffers to Iran’s strategic reach rooted in both the regional geopolitics it is trying to influence and in its limited conventional military capacity, diplomatic isolation, and past strategic missteps. Similarly, tensions between the regime and Iranian society—segments of which have grown disenchanted with the Republic’s revolutionary ideals—can also act as a constraint on Iranian external behavior. ¶ This leads to our conclusion that analogies to the Cold War are mistaken: The Islamic Republic does not seek territorial aggrandizement or even, despite its rhetoric, the forcible imposition of its revolutionary ideology onto neighboring states. Instead, it feeds off existing grievances with the status quo, particularly in the Arab world. Traditional containment options may actually create further opportunities for Tehran to exploit, thereby amplifying the very influence the United States is trying to mitigate. A more useful strategy, therefore, is one that exploits existing checks on Iran’s power and influence. These include the gap between its aspiration for asymmetric warfare capabilities and the reality of its rather limited conventional forces, disagreements between Iran and its militant “proxies,” and the potential for sharp criticism from Arab public opinion, which it has long sought to exploit. In addition, we recommend a new U.S. approach to Iran that integrates elements of engagement and containment while de-escalating unilateral U.S. pressure on Tehran and applying increased multilateral pressure against its nuclear ambitions. The analyses that informed these conclusions also yielded the following insights for U.S. planners and strategists concerning Iran’s strategic culture, conventional military, ties to Islamist groups, and ability to influence Arab public opinion.

### AT: Korean War

#### No Korean war---laundry list---(rational regime, empirics, military inferiority, and it’s all just domestic propaganda)

Fisher 13 Max, Foreign Policy Writer @ Washington Post & Former Editor at the Atlantic, “Why North Korea loves to threaten World War III (but probably won’t follow through)” http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/worldviews/wp/2013/03/12/why-north-korea-loves-to-threaten-world-war-iii-but-probably-wont-follow-through/

North Korea is indeed a dangerous rogue state that has, in the recent past, staged small-scale but deadly attacks on South Korea without provocation. In March 2010, a South Korean navy ship was attacked by a ship of unknown origin, killing 46 on board; though North Korea denied responsibility, an investigation concluded it was likely responsible. A few months later, North Korea fired over 100 artillery shells at Yeonpyeong Island, killing two civilians and wounding 19.

But is North Korea really an irrational nation on the brink of launching “all-out war,” a mad dog of East Asia? Is Pyongyang ready to sacrifice it all? Probably not. The North Korean regime, for all its cruelty, has also shown itself to be **shrewd, calculating, and single-mindedly obsessed with its own self-preservation**. The regime’s past behavior **suggests pretty strongly** that these **threats are empty**. But they still matter.

**For years**, North Korea has threatened the worst and, despite all of its apparent readiness, never gone through with it. So why does it keep going through these macabre performances? We can’t read Kim Jong Eun’s mind, but the most plausible explanation has to do with internal North Korean politics, with trying to set the tone for regional politics, and with forcing other countries (including the United States) to bear the costs of preventing its outbursts from sparking an unwanted war.

Starting World War III or a second Korean War would not serve any of Pyongyang’s interests. Whether or not it deploys its small but legitimately scary nuclear arsenal, North Korea could indeed cause substantial mayhem in the South, whose capital is mere miles from the border. But the North Korean military is antiquated and inferior; it wouldn’t last long against a U.S.-led counterattack. No matter how badly such a war would go for South Korea or the United States, it would almost **certainly end with the regime’s total destruction**.

Still, provocations and threats do serve Pyongyang’s interests, even if no one takes those threats very seriously. It helps to rally North Koreans, particularly the all-important military, behind the leader who has done so much to impoverish them. It also helps Pyongyang to control the regional politics that should otherwise be so hostile to its interests. Howard French, a former New York Times bureau chief for Northeast Asia whom I had the pleasure of editing at The Atlantic, explained on Kim Jong Il’s death that Kim had made up for North Korea’s weakness with canny belligerence:

The shtick of apparent madness flowed from his country’s fundamental weakness as he, like a master poker player, resolved to bluff and bluff big. Kim adopted a game of brinkmanship with the South, threatening repeatedly to turn Seoul into a “sea of flames.” And while this may have sharply raised the threat of war, for the North, it steadily won concessions: fuel oil deliveries, food aid, nuclear reactor construction, hard cash-earning tourist enclaves and investment zones.

At the risk of insulting Kim Jong Eun, it helps to think of North Korea’s provocations as somewhat akin to a child throwing a temper tantrum. He might do lots of shouting, make some over-the-top declarations (“I hate my sister,” “I’m never going back to school again”) and even throw a punch or two. Still, you give the child the attention he craves and maybe even a toy, **not because you think the threats are real** or because he deserves it, but because you want the tantrum to stop.

### AT: US Economic Model

#### Aff’s not key to the US economic model – no reason why improving conventional military forces sustains the US economic system

#### US economic model resilient

APSA 9(American Political Science Association, Task Force Report, U.S. Standing in the World: Causes, Consequences, and the Future, October 2009, http://www.apsanet.org/media/PDFs/APSAUSStandingShortFinal.pdf)

There is, as of yet, no clear finding that U.S. relative standing is suffering in terms of credibility or esteem based on the rise of “competing” models offered by China, Europe, or Russia. Polls in 2009 suggest recent declines in the relative attractiveness of these actors. At the same time, the economic meltdown of 2008-09 has led to widespread critiques of the U.S. economic model. A liberal Chinese economist bemoaned that “the popular view is that the American model is failing.” A Social Democrat in Germany’s parliament concluded, “[the U.S. model] has lost its attraction entirely.” During the last four decades American standing has sometimes seen major declines, but has typically bounced back because the American model continued to have strong appeal (i.e., esteem). One indicator of this is the continuing attractiveness of the U.S. higher education system and the fact that many who come to study in the United States end up staying (See Figure 4). U.S. universities are being used for models and actively establishing programs in places like Qatar, Singapore, and China

## Prolif Advantage

### AT: East Asian Prolif

**Asian prolif doesn’t cause war**

**Alagappa 9**—Distinguished Senior Fellow, East-West Center. PhD, IR, Tufts (Muthiah, The long shadow: nuclear weapons and security in 21st century Asia, ed. Alagappa, 512)

International political interaction among Asian states is for the most part rule governed, predictable, and stable. The security order that has developed in Asia is largely of the instrumental type, with certain normative contractual features (Alagappa 2003b). It rests on several pillars. These include the consolidation of Asian countries as modern nation-states with rule-governed interactions, widespread acceptance of the territorial and political status quo (with the exception of certain boundary disputes and a few survival concerns that still linger), a regional normative structure that ensures survival of even weak states and supports international coordination and cooperation, the high priority in Asian countries given to economic growth and development, the pursuit of that goal through participation in regional and global capitalist economics, the declining salience of force in Asian international politics, the largely status quo orientation of Asia's major powers, and the key role of the United States and of regional institutions in preserving and enhancing security and stability in Asia. I extend that argument in this study to include the effects of nuclear weapons and the strategies for their employment. I argue that although there could be destabilizing consequences, on net, nuclear weapons reinforce deterrence dominance and enhance national security and regional stability in the Asian security region. My claim is supported on the following grounds. First, nuclear weapons assuage the security concerns of vulnerable states. Second, nuclear weapons prevent the escalation of regional conflicts to full-scale war. Third, general deterrence postures assure major powers and help stabilize relations among them. Fourth, nuclear weapons strengthen the political and military status quo by making violent change highly dangerous and unlikely. Finally, nuclear weapons further circumscribe and transform the role of force in Asian international politics. Taken together, these political and military effects of nuclear weapons, along with the absence of intense strategic rivalry and competition among the major powers, reinforce the security and stability that have come to characterize the Asian security region over the last three decades. My argument shares certain features of those advanced by Waltz (1905). Hagerty (1998), and Goldstein {2000). but it is also distinct and grounded in two decades of post-Cold War regionwide experience and linked to other political, strategic, and economic factors that also underpin security and stability in the region. It is important to view the roles and effects of nuclear weapons in this larger context.

### AT: Terrorism

#### No terrorism impact

Zenko & Cohen 12 – Micah Zenko, Fellow in the Center for Preventive Action at the Council on Foreign Relations; and Michael A. Cohen, Fellow at the Century Foundation, March/April 2012, “Clear and Present Safety,” Foreign Affairs, Vol. 91, No. 2, p. 79-93

Take terrorism. Since 9/11, no security threat has been hyped more. Considering the horrors of that day, that is not surprising. But the result has been a level of fear that is completely out of proportion to both the capabilities of terrorist organizations and the United States' vulnerability. On 9/11, al Qaeda got tragically lucky. Since then, the United States has been preparing for the one percent chance (and likely even less) that it might get lucky again. But al Qaeda lost its safe haven after the U.S.-led invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, and further military, diplomatic, intelligence, and law enforcement efforts have decimated the organization, which has essentially lost whatever ability it once had to seriously threaten the United States.¶ According to U.S. officials, al Qaeda's leadership has been reduced to two top lieutenants: Ayman al-Zawahiri and his second-in-command, Abu Yahya al-Libi. Panetta has even said that the defeat of al Qaeda is "within reach." The near collapse of the original al Qaeda organization is one reason why, in the decade since 9/11, the U.S. homeland has not suffered any large-scale terrorist assaults. All subsequent attempts have failed or been thwarted, owing in part to the incompetence of their perpetrators. Although there are undoubtedly still some terrorists who wish to kill Americans, their dreams will likely continue to be frustrated by their own limitations and by the intelligence and law enforcement agencies of the United States and its allies.

### AT: Russia War

#### No impact

David E. Hoffman 10/22/12, contributing editor to Foreign Policy and the author of The Dead Hand: The Untold Story of the Cold War Arms Race and Its Dangerous Legacy, which won the 2010 Pulitzer Prize for general non-fiction, "Hey, Big Spender," Foreign Policy, www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/10/22/hey\_big\_spender?page=full

Despite tensions that flare up, the United States and Russia are no longer enemies; **the chance of nuclear war or surprise attack is nearly zero**. We trade in each other's equity markets. Russia has the largest audience of Facebook users in Europe, and is open to the world in a way the Soviet Union never was.

# Block

## Primacy

### Impact

Nuclear primacy controls escalation---prevents adversaries from escalating conventional wars to nuclear---benefits for escalation and crisis control conclusively outweigh any risk---crises are worse without U.S. nuclear threats

Lieber & Press, November-December 9 - Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, November-December 2009, “The Nukes We Need: Preserving the American Deterrent,” Foreign Affairs, p. 50-51

A second criticism of the argument for retaining and improving certain counterforce capabilities is that the cure could be worse than the disease. Counterforce capabilities may mitigate escalation during a conflict—for example, by dissuading adversaries from nuclear saber rattling, by reassuring allies that the United States can defend them, and, if necessary, by giving the United States the ability to pursue regime change if adversaries brandish or use nuclear weapons. But they may also exacerbate the problem of controlling escalation if an adversary feels so threatened that it adopts a hair-trigger nuclear doctrine. Specifically, the United States’ ability to launch a disarming strike without killing millions of civilians might increase the escalatory pressures that already exist because of the nature of the U.S. military’s standard wartime strategy. Conventional air strikes on radar systems, communication links, and leadership bunkers may look even more like the precursors of a preemptive disarming strike if adversaries know that the United States possesses a well-honed nuclear counterforce capability.

This second criticism has merit. Nevertheless, the benefits of maintaining effective counterforce capabilities trump the costs. Strong counterforce capabilities should make adversaries expect that escalating a conventional war will lead to a disarming attack, not a cease-fire. Beyond deterrence, these capabilities will provide a more humane means of protecting allies who are threatened by nuclear attack and give U.S. leaders the ability to pursue regime change if an adversary acts in a truly egregious fashion. Moreover, some danger of escalation is unavoidable because the style of U.S. conventional operations will inevitably blind, rattle, and confuse U.S. adversaries. If the United States has powerful counterforce tools, these may dissuade its enemies from escalating in desperate times, and U.S. leaders would have a much more acceptable option if deterrence fails.

The nuclear forces the United States builds today must be able to act as a reliable deterrent, even in much darker times. Many of those who recommend a much smaller U.S. nuclear arsenal—and assign little importance to a nuclear counterforce option—fail to consider the great difficulties of maintaining deterrence during conventional wars. The U.S. nuclear arsenal should retain sufficient counterforce capabilities to make adversaries think very carefully before threatening to use, putting on alert, or actually using a nuclear weapon. Any nuclear arsenal should also give U.S. leaders options they can stomach employing in these high-risk crises. Without credible and effective options for responding to attacks on allies or U.S. forces, the United States will have difficulty deterring such attacks. Unless the United States maintains potent counterforce capabilities, U.S. adversaries may conclude—perhaps correctly—that the United States’ strategic position abroad rests largely on a bluff.

#### THIS IS THEIR IRAN/NK IMPACT !!!

Conventional wars with nuclear adversaries are inevitable---counterforce is the only way to keep them from escalating to nuclear war

Lieber & Press 9 - Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, November-December 2009, “The Nukes We Need: Preserving the American Deterrent,” Foreign Affairs, p. 39-41

Unfortunately, deterrence in the twenty-first century may be far more difficult for the United States than it was in the past, and having the right mix of nuclear capabilities to deal with the new challenges will be crucial. The United States leads a global network of alliances, a position that commits Washington to protecting countries all over the world. Many of its potential adversaries have acquired, or appear to be seeking, nuclear weapons. Unless the world’s major disputes are resolved—for example, on the Korean Peninsula, across the Taiwan Strait, and around the Persian Gulf—or the U.S. military pulls back from these regions, the United States will sooner or later find itself embroiled in conventional wars with nuclear-armed adversaries.

Preventing escalation in those circumstances will be far more difficult than peacetime deterrence during the Cold War. In a conventional war, U.S. adversaries would have powerful incentives to brandish or use nuclear weapons because their lives, their families, and the survival of their regimes would be at stake. Therefore, as the United States considers the future of its nuclear arsenal, it should judge its force not against the relatively easy mission of peacetime deterrence but against the demanding mission of deterring escalation during a conventional conflict, when U.S. enemies are fighting for their lives.

Debating the future of the U.S. nuclear arsenal is critical now because the Obama administration has pledged to pursue steep cuts in the force and has launched a major review of U.S. nuclear policy. (The results will be reported to Congress in February 2010.) The administration’s desire to shrink the U.S. arsenal is understandable. Although the force is only one-fourth the size it was when the Cold War ended, it still includes roughly 2,200 operational strategic warheads—more than enough to retaliate against any conceivable nuclear attack. Furthermore, as we previously argued in these pages (“The Rise of U.S. Nuclear Primacy,” March/April 2006), the current U.S. arsenal is vastly more capable than its Cold War predecessor, particularly in the area of “counterforce”—the ability to destroy an adversary’s nuclear weapons before they can be used.

Simply counting U.S. warheads or measuring Washington’s counterforce capabilities will not, however, reveal what type of arsenal is needed for deterrence in the twenty-first century. The only way to determine that is to work through the grim logic of deterrence: to consider what actions will need to be deterred, what threats will need to be issued, and what capabilities will be needed to back up those threats.

The Obama administration is right that the United States can safely cut its nuclear arsenal, but it must pay careful attention to the capabilities it retains. During a war, if a desperate adversary were to use its nuclear force to try to coerce the United States—for example, by threatening a U.S. ally or even by launching nuclear strikes against U.S. overseas bases—an arsenal comprised solely of high-yield weapons would leave U.S. leaders with terrible retaliatory options. Destroying Pyongyang or Tehran in response to a limited strike would be vastly disproportionate, and doing so might trigger further nuclear attacks in return. A deterrent posture based on such a dubious threat would lack credibility.

Instead, a credible deterrent should give U.S. leaders a range of retaliatory options, including the ability to respond to nuclear attacks with either conventional or nuclear strikes, to retaliate with strikes against an enemy’s nuclear forces rather than its cities, and to minimize casualties. The foundation for this flexible deterrent exists. The current U.S. arsenal includes a mix of accurate high- and low-yield warheads, offering a wide range of retaliatory options—including the ability to launch precise, very low-casualty nuclear counterforce strikes. The United States must preserve that mix of capabilities—especially the low-yield weapons—as it cuts the size of its nuclear force.

These wars only stay conventional in a world of U.S. nuclear primacy---we won’t escalate conflicts, but adversaries will

Lieber & Press 7 - Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, Winter 2007, “U.S. Nuclear Primacy and the Future of the Chinese Deterrent,” China Security, Issue No. 5, online: http://www.wsichina.org/cs5\_5.pdf

Third, the growth of U.S. nuclear counterforce capabilities may give U.S. leaders valuable coercive leverage during future crises and wars, including conflicts with China. The United States strongly prefers that its future wars be waged exclusively with conventional weapons; in fact, one of the great quandaries currently confronting U.S. strategists is how to fight conventional wars against nuclear-armed adversaries without triggering escalation. Nuclear primacy may provide one solution: allowing Washington to credibly warn adversaries not to alert their nuclear forces or issue nuclear threats during a conflict. In other words, U.S. nuclear primacy may allow the United States to force its enemies to keep their nuclear forces on the sideline and keep their conflicts with the United States at the conventional level.

### Ov

Perception of declining U.S. deterrence causes fast, global. great power nuclear war

Caves, Senior Fellow at the National Defense University 10 – John P. Caves Jr., Senior Research Fellow in the Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction at the National Defense University, January 2010, “Avoiding a Crisis of Confidence in the U.S. Nuclear Deterrent,” Strategic Forum, No. 252

Perceptions of a compromised U.S. nuclear deterrent as described above would have profound policy implications, particularly if they emerge at a time when a nuclear-armed great power is pursuing a more aggressive strategy toward U.S. allies and partners in its region in a bid to enhance its regional and global clout.

A dangerous period of vulnerability would open for the United States and those nations that depend on U.S. protection while the United States attempted to rectify the problems with its nuclear forces. As it would take more than a decade for the United States to produce new nuclear weapons, ensuing events could preclude a return to anything like the status quo ante.

The assertive, nuclear-armed great power, and other major adversaries, could be willing to challenge U.S. interests more directly in the expectation that the United States would be less prepared to threaten or deliver a military response that could lead to direct conflict. They will want to keep the United States from reclaiming its earlier power position.

Allies and partners who have relied upon explicit or implicit assurances of U.S. nuclear protection as a foundation of their security could lose faith in those assurances. They could compensate by accommodating U.S. rivals, especially in the short term, or acquiring their own nuclear deterrents, which in most cases could be accomplished only over the mid- to long term. A more nuclear world would likely ensue over a period of years.

Important U.S. interests could be compromised or abandoned, or a major war could occur as adversaries and/or the United States miscalculate new boundaries of deterrence and provocation. At worst, war could lead to state-on-state employment of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) on a scale far more catastrophic than what nuclear-armed terrorists alone could inflict.

### China

Credible nuclear primacy deters China from intervening in the first place

Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press is Associate Professor of Government at Dartmouth, 2007, Superiority Complex, http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/print/200707/china-nukes

The most plausible flash point for a serious U.S.-China conflict is Taiwan. Suppose Taiwan declared independence. China has repeatedly warned that such a move would provoke an attack, probably a major air and naval campaign to shatter Taiwan’s defenses and leave the island vulnerable to conquest. If the United States decided to defend Taiwan, American forces would likely thwart China’s offensive, since aerial and naval warfare are strengths of the U.S. military. But looming defeat would place great pressure on China’s leaders. Losing the war might mean permanently losing Taiwan. This would undermine the domestic legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party, which increasingly relies on the appeal of nationalism to justify its rule. A crippling defeat would also strain relations between political leaders in Beijing and the Chinese military. To stave off a regime-threatening disaster, the political leaders might decide to raise the stakes by placing part of the Chinese nuclear force on alert in hopes of coercing the United States into accepting a negotiated solution (for example, a return to Taiwan’s pre-declaration status).

By putting its nuclear forces on alert, however, China’s leaders would compel a U.S. president to make a very difficult decision: to accede to blackmail (by agreeing to a cease-fire and pressuring the Taiwanese to renounce independence), to assume that the threat is a bluff (a dangerous proposition, given that each Chinese ICBM carries a city-busting 4,000-kiloton warhead), or to strike the Chinese missiles before they could be launched.

How do America’s growing counterforce capabilities affect this scenario? First, **American nuclear primacy may prevent such a war in the first place.** China’s leaders understand that their military now has little hope of defeating U.S. air and naval forces. If they also recognize that their nuclear arsenal is vulnerable—and that placing it on alert might trigger a preemptive strike—the leaders may conclude that war is a no-win proposition.

Second, if a war over Taiwan started anyway, U.S. nuclear primacy might help **contain the fighting** at the conventional level. Early in the crisis, Washington could quietly convey to Beijing that the United States would act decisively if China put its vulnerable nuclear arsenal on alert.

Accepting nuclear vulnerability with China accelerates their attempts to exploit it---causes a fast ramp-up of asymmetric capabilities and war---turns every aff arg

Pfaltzgraff 9 – Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, Jr., Shelby Cullom Davis Professor of International Security Studies at Tufts University, April 7, 2009, “China–U.S. Strategic Stability,” online: http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/2009npc\_prepared\_pfaltzgraff.pdf

This, then, leads me to the conclusion that to the extent that the United States perpetuates its vulnerabilities, it provides an open invitation to Chinese efforts to exploit such vulnerabilities. Let me be more specific. There is considerable discussion to the effect that the United States should maintain or develop with China a strategic relationship based on mutual vulnerability and that increased emphasis, notably, on missile defense on our part will lead China to increase its own programs to order to counter such U.S. systems. Aside from the shaky empirical basis for such an assertion, the Chinese emphasis on exploiting U.S. vulnerabilities argues logically for efforts on our part to cut off such U.S. vulnerabilities wherever possible in the forces that will shape the China-U.S. strategic relationship in the years ahead. In fact, I could even argue that the conscious perpetuation of U.S. vulnerability in the mistaken belief that the result will be strategic stability makes no sense. It may even encourage China to attempt to exploit U.S. vulnerability at a time of crisis and lead to undesired escalation based on miscalculation.

### Primacy DA---Link---NFU

NFU makes nuclear primacy inoperative – first-strike threats define primacy

Lieber and Press 6 - Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, March-April 2006, “The Rise of U.S. Nuclear Primacy,” Foreign Affairs

During the Cold War, Washington relied on its nuclear arsenal not only to deter nuclear strikes by its enemies but also to deter the Warsaw Pact from exploiting its conventional military superiority to attack Western Europe. It was primarily this latter mission that made Washington rule out promises of "no first use" of nuclear weapons. Now that such a mission is obsolete and the United States is beginning to regain nuclear primacy, however, Washington's continued refusal to eschew a first strike and the country's development of a limited missile-defense capability take on a new, and possibly more menacing, look. The most logical conclusions to make are that a nuclear-war-fighting capability remains a key component of the United States' military doctrine and that nuclear primacy remains a goal of the United States.

Nuclear first-use threats prevent conflict from escalating, even if they’re not credible enough to deter initial conflict

Chilton 9 – Gen. Kevin Chilton, Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, Spring 2009, “Waging Deterrence in the Twenty-First Century,” Strategic Studies Quarterly, Vol. 3, No. 1, p. 40-41

Many argue that the only legitimate role of nuclear weapons is to deter the use of nuclear weapons in a catastrophic attack against us or our allies. This is indeed their most important role. However, the deterrence roles of the US nuclear arsenal go well beyond deterrence of nuclear attack alone.

US nuclear forces cast a long shadow over the decision calculations of anyone who would contemplate taking actions that threaten the vital interests of the United States or its allies, making it clear that the ultimate consequences of doing so may be truly disastrous and that the American president always has an option for which they have no effective counter. Even in circumstances in which a deliberate American nuclear response seems unlikely or incredible to foreign decision makers, US nuclear forces enhance deterrence by making unintended or uncontrolled catastrophic escalation a serious concern, posing what Thomas Schelling calls “the threat that leaves something to chance.”5 These are deterrence dynamics that only nuclear forces provide.

As a result, US nuclear forces make an important contribution to deterring both symmetric and asymmetric forms of warfare in the twenty-first century. Our nuclear forces provide a hedge against attacks that could cripple our ability to wage conventional war because they would enable the United States to restore the military status quo ante, trump the adversary’s escalation in a manner that improves the US position in the conflict, or promptly terminate the conflict.

### Primacy DA---2NC---AT: Conventional Solves---Escalation

Conventional deterrence is a handicap in crises against nuclear-armed adversaries if we’re perceived as not willing to escalate to nuclear war

Kroenig 9 – Matthew Kroenig, Assistant Professor of Government at Georgetown University, August 27, 2009, “Nuclear Superiority or the Balance of Resolve? Explaining Nuclear Crisis Outcomes,” online: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=1452250

I also include a number of control variables. We may expect states that enjoy conventional military superiority over opponents to be more likely to prevail in nuclear crises. Perhaps states fear the prospect of conventional military invasion more than the threat of nuclear attack and are more likely to back down in the face of greater conventional military capabilities regardless of the nuclear balance. On the other hand, we may expect that conventional military superiority may not be particularly relevant in a crisis among nuclear powers and that conventional superiority may even serve as a handicap in nuclear crises to the degree that it makes conventionally-dominant states reluctant to escalate to the nuclear level. To control for this factor, I generate Capabilities. I employ a standard power ratio variable which assesses the ratio of the capabilities of State A to the capabilities of State B.14 Capability is a composite index containing information on total population, urban population, energy consumption, iron and steel production, military manpower, and military expenditures. Data on capabilities are drawn from the Corelates of War composite capabilities index, version 3.01 (Singer, Bremer, and Stuckey 1972) and extracted using EUGene (Bennett and Stam 2000).

### Nuclear Threats Credible---Crises/Conflicts with Nuclear Adversaries

Nuclear threats are highly credible during crises and conflicts with nuclear-armed adversaries---that’s the only time credibility matters

Lieber & Press 9 - Keir A. Lieber, Assistant Professor of Political Science at the University of Notre Dame, and Daryl G. Press, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Pennsylvania, November-December 2009, “The Nukes We Need: Preserving the American Deterrent,” Foreign Affairs, p. 39-41

The primary purpose of U.S. nuclear forces is to deter nuclear attacks on the United States and its allies. During peacetime, this is not a demanding mission. The chance that leaders in Beijing, Moscow, or even Pyongyang will launch a surprise nuclear attack tomorrow is vanishingly small. But peacetime deterrence is not the proper yardstick for measuring the adequacy of U.S. nuclear forces. Rather, the United States’ arsenal should be designed to provide robust deterrence in the most difficult of plausible circumstances: during a conventional war against a nuclear-armed adversary.

In the coming decades, the United States may find itself facing nuclear-armed states on the battlefield. U.S. alliances span the globe, and the United States is frequently drawn into regional conflicts. Washington has launched six major military operations since the fall of the Berlin Wall: in Panama, Somalia, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and twice in Iraq. Furthermore, most of the United States’ potential adversaries have developed—or seem to be developing—nuclear weapons. Aside from terrorism, the threats that dominate U.S. military planning come from China, North Korea, and Iran: two members of the nuclear club, and one intent on joining it.

The central problem for U.S. deterrence in the future is that even rational adversaries will have powerful incentives to introduce nuclear weapons—that is, threaten to use them, put them on alert, test them, or even use them—during a conventional war against the United States. If U.S. military forces begin to prevail on the battlefield, U.S. adversaries may use nuclear threats to compel a cease-fire or deny the United States access to allied military bases. Such threats might succeed in pressuring the United States to settle the conflict short of a decisive victory.

Such escalatory strategies are rational. Losing a conventional war to the United States would be a disastrous outcome for any leader, and it would be worth taking great risks to force a cease-fire and avert total defeat. The fate of recent U.S. adversaries is revealing. The ex-dictator of Panama, Manuel Noriega, remains in a Miami prison. The former Bosnian Serb leader, Radovan Karadzic, awaits trial in The Hague, where Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic died in detention three years ago. Saddam Hussein’s punishment for losing the 2003 war was total: his government was toppled, his sons were killed, and he was hanged on a dimly lit gallows, surrounded by enemies. Even those leaders who have eluded the United States—such as the Somali warlord Muhammad Farah Aidid and Osama bin Laden—have done so despite intense U.S. efforts to capture or kill them. The United States’ overseas conflicts are limited wars only from the U.S. perspective; to adversaries, they are existential. It should not be surprising if they use every weapon at their disposal to stave off total defeat.

Coercive nuclear escalation may sound like a far-fetched strategy, but it was NATO’s policy during much of the Cold War. The Western allies felt that they were hopelessly outgunned in Europe at the conventional level by the Warsaw Pact. Even though NATO harbored little hope of prevailing in a nuclear war, it planned to initiate a series of escalating nuclear operations at the outbreak of war—alerts, tactical nuclear strikes, and wider nuclear attacks—to force the Soviets to accept a cease-fire. The United States’ future adversaries face the same basic problem today: vast conventional military inferiority. They may adopt the same solution. Leaders in Beijing may choose gradual, coercive escalation if they face imminent military defeat in the Taiwan Strait—a loss that could weaken the Chinese Communist Party’s grip on power. And if U.S. military forces were advancing toward Pyongyang, there is no reason to expect that North Korean leaders would keep their nuclear weapons on the sidelines.

Layered on top of these challenges are two additional ones. First, U.S. conventional military doctrine is inherently escalatory. The new American way of war involves launching simultaneous air and ground attacks throughout the theater to blind, confuse, and overwhelm the enemy. Even if the United States decided to leave the adversary’s leaders in power (stopping short of regime change so as to prevent the confrontation from escalating), how would Washington credibly convey the assurance that it was not seeking regime change once its adversary was blinded by attacks on its radar and communication systems and command bunkers? A central strategic puzzle of modern war is that the tactics best suited to dominating the conventional battlefield are the same ones most likely to trigger nuclear escalation. Furthermore, managing complex military operations to prevent escalation is always difficult. In 1991, in the lead-up to the Persian Gulf War, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker assured Iraq’s foreign minister, Tariq Aziz, that the United States would leave Saddam’s regime in power as long as Iraq did not use its chemical or biological weapons. But despite Baker’s assurance, the U.S. military unleashed a major bombing campaign targeting Iraq’s leaders, which on at least one occasion nearly killed Saddam. The political intent to control escalation was not reflected in the military operations, which nearly achieved a regime change.

In future confrontations with nuclear-armed adversaries, the United States will undoubtedly want to prevent nuclear escalation. But the leaders of U.S. adversaries will face life-and-death incentives to use their nuclear arsenals to force a cease-fire and remain in power.

Nuclear weapons only seem to lack credibility from our perspective---adversaries are forced to moderate their aims in the face of U.S. nuclear threats---that’s not true of conventional deterrence

Payne 9 – Keith B. Payne, President of The National Institute for Public Policy, Spring 2009, “On Nuclear Deterrence and Assurance,” Strategic Studies Quarterly, p. 50-51

Of course, the explanations of apparent Iraqi restraint offered by Tariq Aziz, Wafic Al Sammarai, and Hussein Kamal do not close the issue; they do, however, suggest that nuclear deterrence was at least part of the answer as to why Saddam Hussein did not use WMD in 1991 when he apparently had the option to do so. These explanations also suggest the profound error of those prominent commentators who asserted with such certainty immediately after the 1991 war that nuclear weapons were “incredible as a deterrent and therefore irrelevant,”28 and the fragility of similar contemporary claims that US nuclear threats are incredible and thus useless for contemporary regional deterrence purposes.29

Prominent American commentators can assert that nuclear weapons are incredible and thus useless in such cases; their speculation about US threat credibility, however, ultimately is irrelevant. For deterrence purposes, it is the opponent’s belief about US threat credibility that matters, and that cannot be ascertained from the views of American domestic commentators. The 1991 Gulf War appears to demonstrate that Iraqi officials perceived US threats as nuclear and sufficiently credible to deter, and that this perception was more important to US deterrence strategy than were actual US intentions. Nuclear deterrence appears to have played a significant role despite the fact that US leaders apparently saw no need to employ nuclear weapons and had no intention of doing so.

There is little doubt that US nuclear threats have contributed to the deterrence of additional past opponents who otherwise may have been particularly resistant to US nonnuclear threats. This deterrent effect is a matter of adversary perceptions—which can be independent of our preferences or intentions regarding the use of force. However we might prefer to deter or plan to employ force, the actual behavior of adversaries on occasion suggests that there can be a difference between the deterring effects of nuclear and nonnuclear weapons. In some past cases, given the adversary’s views and the context, it has been “the reality of nuclear deterrence” that has had the desired “restraining effect.”30 In the future, as in the past, the working of deterrence on such occasions may be extremely important.

## Case

#### No transition wars

Parent 11—assistant for of pol sci, U Miami. PhD in pol sci, Columbia—and—Paul MacDonald—assistant prof of pol sci, Williams (Joseph, Graceful Decline?;The Surprising Success of Great Power Retrenchment, Intl. Security, Spring 1, p. 7)

Some observers might dispute our conclusions, arguing that hegemonic transitions are more conflict prone than other moments of acute relative decline. We counter that there are deductive and empirical reasons to doubt this argument. Theoretically, hegemonic powers should actually find it easier to manage acute relative decline. Fallen hegemons still have formidable capability, which threatens grave harm to any state that tries to cross them. Further, they are no longer the top target for balancing coalitions, and recovering hegemons may be influential because they can play a pivotal role in alliance formation. In addition, hegemonic powers, almost by definition, possess more extensive overseas commitments; they should be able to more readily identify and eliminate extraneous burdens without exposing vulnerabilities or exciting domestic populations.

We believe the empirical record supports these conclusions. In particular, periods of hegemonic transition do not appear more conflict prone than those of acute decline. The last reversal at the pinnacle of power was the Anglo-American transition, which took place around 1872 and was resolved without armed confrontation. The tenor of that transition may have been influenced by a number of factors: both states were democratic maritime empires, the United States was slowly emerging from the Civil War, and Great Britain could likely coast on a large lead in domestic capital stock. Although China and the United States differ in regime type, similar factors may work to cushion the impending Sino-American transition. Both are large, relatively secure continental great powers, a fact that mitigates potential geopolitical competition. 93 China faces a variety of domestic political challenges, including strains among rival regions, which may complicate its ability to sustain its economic performance or engage in foreign policy adventurism. 94

#### Zero impact---prefer conclusiveness

Maher 11---adjunct prof of pol sci, Brown. PhD expected in 2011 in pol sci, Brown (Richard, The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, Orbis 55;1)

At the same time, preeminence creates burdens and facilitates imprudent behavior. Indeed, because of America’s unique political ideology, which sees its own domestic values and ideals as universal, and the relative openness of the foreign policymaking process, the United States is particularly susceptible to both the temptations and burdens of preponderance. For decades, perhaps since its very founding, the United States has viewed what is good for itself as good for the world. During its period of preeminence, the United States has both tried to maintain its position at the top and to transform world politics in fundamental ways, combining elements of realpolitik and liberal universalism (democratic government, free trade, basic human rights). At times, these desires have conflicted with each other but they also capture the enduring tensions of America’s role in the world. The absence of constraints and America’s overestimation of its own ability to shape outcomes has served to weaken its overall position. And because foreign policy is not the reserved and exclusive domain of the president---who presumably calculates strategy according to the pursuit of the state’s enduring national interests---the policymaking process is open to special interests and outside influences and, thus, susceptible to the cultivation of misperceptions, miscalculations, and misunderstandings. Five features in particular, each a consequence of how America has used its power in the unipolar era, have worked to diminish America’s long-term material and strategic position. Overextension. During its period of preeminence, the United States has found it difficult to stand aloof from threats (real or imagined) to its security, interests, and values. Most states are concerned with what happens in their immediate neighborhoods. The United States has interests that span virtually the entire globe, from its own Western Hemisphere, to Europe, the Middle East, Persian Gulf, South Asia, and East Asia. As its preeminence enters its third decade, the United States continues to define its interests in increasingly expansive terms. This has been facilitated by the massive forward presence of the American military, even when excluding the tens of thousands of troops stationed in Iraq and Afghanistan. The U.S. military has permanent bases in over 30 countries and maintains a troop presence in dozens more.13 There are two logics that lead a preeminent state to overextend, and these logics of overextension lead to goals and policies that exceed even the considerable capabilities of a superpower. First, by definition, preeminent states face few external constraints. Unlike in bipolar or multipolar systems, there are no other states that can serve to reliably check or counterbalance the power and influence of a single hegemon. This gives preeminent states a staggering freedom of action and provides a tempting opportunity to shape world politics in fundamental ways. Rather than pursuing its own narrow interests, preeminence provides an opportunity to mix ideology, values, and normative beliefs with foreign policy. The United States has been susceptible to this temptation, going to great lengths to slay dragons abroad, and even to remake whole societies in its own (liberal democratic) image.14 The costs and risks of taking such bold action or pursuing transformative foreign policies often seem manageable or even remote. We know from both theory and history that external powers can impose important checks on calculated risk-taking and serve as a moderating influence. The bipolar system of the Cold War forced policymakers in both the United States and the Soviet Union to exercise extreme caution and prudence. One wrong move could have led to a crisis that quickly spiraled out of policymakers’ control. Second, preeminent states have a strong incentive to seek to maintain their preeminence in the international system. Being number one has clear strategic, political, and psychological benefits. Preeminent states may, therefore, overestimate the intensity and immediacy of threats, or to fundamentally redefine what constitutes an acceptable level of threat to live with. To protect itself from emerging or even future threats, preeminent states may be more likely to take unilateral action, particularly compared to when power is distributed more evenly in the international system. Preeminence has not only made it possible for the United States to overestimate its power, but also to overestimate the degree to which other states and societies see American power as legitimate and even as worthy of emulation. There is almost a belief in historical determinism, or the feeling that one was destined to stand atop world politics as a colossus, and this preeminence gives one a special prerogative for one’s role and purpose in world politics. The security doctrine that the George W. Bush administration adopted took an aggressive approach to maintaining American preeminence and eliminating threats to American security, including waging preventive war. The invasion of Iraq, based on claims that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and had ties to al Qaeda, both of which turned out to be false, produced huge costs for the United States---in political, material, and human terms. After seven years of war, tens of thousands of American military personnel remain in Iraq. Estimates of its long-term cost are in the trillions of dollars.15 At the same time, the United States has fought a parallel conflict in Afghanistan. While the Obama administration looks to dramatically reduce the American military presence in Iraq, President Obama has committed tens of thousands of additional U.S. troops to Afghanistan. Distraction. Preeminent states have a tendency to seek to shape world politics in fundamental ways, which can lead to conflicting priorities and unnecessary diversions. As resources, attention, and prestige are devoted to one issue or set of issues, others are necessarily disregarded or given reduced importance. There are always trade-offs and opportunity costs in international politics, even for a state as powerful as the United States. Most states are required to define their priorities in highly specific terms. Because the preeminent state has such a large stake in world politics, it feels the need to be vigilant against any changes that could impact its short-, medium-, or longterm interests. The result is taking on commitments on an expansive number of issues all over the globe. The United States has been very active in its ambition to shape the postCold War world. It has expanded NATO to Russia’s doorstep; waged war in Bosnia, Kosovo, Iraq, and Afghanistan; sought to export its own democratic principles and institutions around the world; assembled an international coalition against transnational terrorism; imposed sanctions on North Korea and Iran for their nuclear programs; undertaken ‘‘nation building’’ in Iraq and Afghanistan; announced plans for a missile defense system to be stationed in Poland and the Czech Republic; and, with the United Kingdom, led the response to the recent global financial and economic crisis. By being so involved in so many parts of the world, there often emerges ambiguity over priorities. The United States defines its interests and obligations in global terms, and defending all of them simultaneously is beyond the pale even for a superpower like the United States. Issues that may have received benign neglect during the Cold War, for example, when U.S. attention and resources were almost exclusively devoted to its strategic competition with the Soviet Union, are now viewed as central to U.S. interests. Bearing Disproportionate Costs of Maintaining the Status Quo. As the preeminent power, the United States has the largest stake in maintaining the status quo. The world the United States took the lead in creating---one based on open markets and free trade, democratic norms and institutions, private property rights and the rule of law---has created enormous benefits for the United States. This is true both in terms of reaching unprecedented levels of domestic prosperity and in institutionalizing U.S. preferences, norms, and values globally. But at the same time, this system has proven costly to maintain. Smaller, less powerful states have a strong incentive to free ride, meaning that preeminent states bear a disproportionate share of the costs of maintaining the basic rules and institutions that give world politics order, stability, and predictability. While this might be frustrating to U.S. policymakers, it is perfectly understandable. Other countries know that the United States will continue to provide these goods out of its own self-interest, so there is little incentive for these other states to contribute significant resources to help maintain these public goods.16 The U.S. Navy patrols the oceans keeping vital sea lanes open. During financial crises around the globe---such as in Asia in 1997-1998, Mexico in 1994, or the global financial and economic crisis that began in October 2008--- the U.S. Treasury rather than the IMF takes the lead in setting out and implementing a plan to stabilize global financial markets. The United States has spent massive amounts on defense in part to prevent great power war. The United States, therefore, provides an indisputable collective good---a world, particularly compared to past eras, that is marked by order, stability, and predictability. A number of countries---in Europe, the Middle East, and East Asia---continue to rely on the American security guarantee for their own security. Rather than devoting more resources to defense, they are able to finance generous social welfare programs. To maintain these commitments, the United States has accumulated staggering budget deficits and national debt. As the sole superpower, the United States bears an additional though different kind of weight. From the Israeli-Palestinian dispute to the India Pakistan rivalry over Kashmir, the United States is expected to assert leadership to bring these disagreements to a peaceful resolution. The United States puts its reputation on the line, and as years and decades pass without lasting settlements, U.S. prestige and influence is further eroded. The only way to get other states to contribute more to the provision of public goods is if the United States dramatically decreases its share. At the same time, the United States would have to give other states an expanded role and greater responsibility given the proportionate increase in paying for public goods. This is a political decision for the United States---maintain predominant control over the provision of collective goods or reduce its burden but lose influence in how these public goods are used. Creation of Feelings of Enmity and Anti-Americanism. It is not necessary that everyone admire the United States or accept its ideals, values, and goals. Indeed, such dramatic imbalances of power that characterize world politics today almost always produce in others feelings of mistrust, resentment, and outright hostility. At the same time, it is easier for the United States to realize its own goals and values when these are shared by others, and are viewed as legitimate and in the common interest. As a result of both its vast power but also some of the decisions it has made, particularly over the past eight years, feelings of resentment and hostility toward the United States have grown, and perceptions of the legitimacy of its role and place in the world have correspondingly declined. Multiple factors give rise toanti-American sentiment, and anti-Americanism takes different shapes and forms.17 It emerges partly as a response to the vast disparity in power the United States enjoys over other states. Taking satisfaction in themissteps and indiscretions of the imposing Gulliver is a natural reaction. In societies that globalization (which in many parts of the world is interpreted as equivalent to Americanization) has largely passed over, resentment and alienation are felt when comparing one’s own impoverished, ill-governed, unstable society with the wealth, stability, and influence enjoyed by the United States.18 Anti-Americanism also emerges as a consequence of specific American actions and certain values and principles to which the United States ascribes. Opinion polls showed that a dramatic rise in anti-American sentiment followed the perceived unilateral decision to invade Iraq (under pretences that failed to convince much of the rest of the world) and to depose Saddam Hussein and his government and replace itwith a governmentmuchmore friendly to the United States. To many, this appeared as an arrogant and completely unilateral decision by a single state to decide for itselfwhen---and under what conditions---military force could be used. A number of other policy decisions by not just the George W. Bush but also the Clinton and Obama administrations have provoked feelings of anti-American sentiment. However, it seemed that a large portion of theworld had a particular animus for GeorgeW. Bush and a number of policy decisions of his administration, from voiding the U.S. signature on the International Criminal Court (ICC), resisting a global climate change treaty, detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib in Iraq and at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, and what many viewed as a simplistic worldview that declared a ‘‘war’’ on terrorism and the division of theworld between goodand evil.Withpopulations around theworld mobilized and politicized to a degree never before seen---let alone barely contemplated---such feelings of anti-American sentiment makes it more difficult for the United States to convince other governments that the U.S.’ own preferences and priorities are legitimate and worthy of emulation. Decreased Allied Dependence. It is counterintuitive to think that America’s unprecedented power decreases its allies’ dependence on it. During the Cold War, for example, America’s allies were highly dependent on the United States for their own security. The security relationship that the United States had with Western Europe and Japan allowed these societies to rebuild and reach a stunning level of economic prosperity in the decades following World War II. Now that the United States is the sole superpower and the threat posed by the Soviet Union no longer exists, these countries have charted more autonomous courses in foreign and security policy. A reversion to a bipolar or multipolar system could change that, making these allies more dependent on the United States for their security. Russia’s reemergence could unnerve America’s European allies, just as China’s continued ascent could provoke unease in Japan. Either possibility would disrupt the equilibrium in Europe and East Asia that the United States has cultivated over the past several decades. New geopolitical rivalries could serve to create incentives for America’s allies to reduce the disagreements they have with Washington and to reinforce their security relationships with the United States.

#### No Middle East impact

Cook 7**—**CFR senior fellow for Mid East Studies. BA in international studies from Vassar College, an MA in international relations from the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, and both an MA and PhD in political science from the University of Pennsylvania(Steven, Ray Takeyh, CFR fellow, and Suzanne Maloney, Brookings fellow, 6 /28, Why the Iraq war won't engulf the Mideast, http://www.iht.com/bin/print.php?id=6383265, AG)

Underlying this anxiety was a scenario in which Iraq's sectarian and ethnic violence spills over into neighboring countries, producing conflicts between the major Arab states and Iran as well as Turkey and the Kurdistan Regional Government. These wars then destabilize the entire region well beyond the current conflict zone, involving heavyweights like Egypt. This is scary stuff indeed, but with the exception of the conflict between Turkey and the Kurds, the scenario is far from an accurate reflection of the way Middle Eastern leaders view the situation in Iraq and calculate their interests there. It is abundantly clear that major outside powers like Saudi Arabia, Iran and Turkey are heavily involved in Iraq. These countries have so much at stake in the future of Iraq that it is natural they would seek to influence political developments in the country. Yet, the Saudis, Iranians, Jordanians, Syrians, and others are very unlikely to go to war either to protect their own sect or ethnic group or to prevent one country from gaining the upper hand in Iraq. The reasons are fairly straightforward. First, Middle Eastern leaders, like politicians everywhere, are primarily interested in one thing: self-preservation. Committing forces to Iraq is an inherently risky proposition, which, if the conflict went badly, could threaten domestic political stability. Moreover, most Arab armies are geared toward regime protection rather than projecting power and thus have little capability for sending troops to Iraq. Second, there is cause for concern about the so-called blowback scenario in which jihadis returning from Iraq destabilize their home countries, plunging the region into conflict. Middle Eastern leaders are preparing for this possibility. Unlike in the 1990s, when Arab fighters in the Afghan jihad against the Soviet Union returned to Algeria, Egypt and Saudi Arabia and became a source of instability, Arab security services are being vigilant about who is coming in and going from their countries. In the last month, the Saudi government has arrested approximately 200 people suspected of ties with militants. Riyadh is also building a 700 kilometer wall along part of its frontier with Iraq in order to keep militants out of the kingdom. Finally, there is no precedent for Arab leaders to commit forces to conflicts in which they are not directly involved. The Iraqis and the Saudis did send small contingents to fight the Israelis in 1948 and 1967, but they were either ineffective or never made it. In the 1970s and 1980s, Arab countries other than Syria, which had a compelling interest in establishing its hegemony over Lebanon, never committed forces either to protect the Lebanese from the Israelis or from other Lebanese. The civil war in Lebanon was regarded as someone else's fight. Indeed, this is the way many leaders view the current situation in Iraq. To Cairo, Amman and Riyadh, the situation in Iraq is worrisome, but in the end it is an Iraqi and American fight. As far as Iranian mullahs are concerned, they have long preferred to press their interests through proxies as opposed to direct engagement. At a time when Tehran has access and influence over powerful Shiite militias, a massive cross-border incursion is both unlikely and unnecessary. So Iraqis will remain locked in a sectarian and ethnic struggle that outside powers may abet, but will remain within the borders of Iraq. The Middle East is a region both prone and accustomed to civil wars. But given its experience with ambiguous conflicts, **the region has** also **developed an intuitive ability to contain its civil strife and prevent local conflicts from enveloping the entire Middle East.**

#### Professors agree---NK has no capability no matter how crazy they are

Neuman ‘13 SCOTT NEUMAN, NPR "How Credible Are North Korea's Threats?," March 9 www.npr.org/2013/03/09/173839660/how-credible-are-north-koreas-threats

Simply possessing a static nuclear device, however, is not the same as having one that can be launched atop a missile, Lind says.

North Korea's claims aside, the physical size of the device used in the most recent test seem likely to be "way too big" to launch on a missile **or even deliver, in any practical sense**, by airplane, she says.

George Lopez, a political science professor at the University of Notre Dame, is more emphatic. Even if the North had a small, deliverable weapon, he says, "I think most of the bets are that they do not have the capability to reliably reach a target."

"They don't seem to have the booster they need to get a workable weapon to land where they want it to," Lopez says.

"Could they build something, load it on an airplane and drop it over South Korea? Maybe, but it would [be] pretty difficult, **probably impossible**."

\*\*\*First 2 paragraphs cite Jennifer Linn, associate professor of government @ Dartmouth

#### No threat to the US model

Posen 9 - deputy director and senior fellow of the Peterson Institute for International Economics (Adam, “Economic leadership beyond the crisis,” http://clients.squareeye.com/uploads/foresight/documents/PN%20USA\_FINAL\_LR\_1.pdf)

Is there an alternative economic model? The preceding description would seem to confirm the rise of the Rest over the West. That would be premature. The empirical record is that economic recovery from financial crises, while painful, is doable even by the poorest countries, and in advanced countries rarely leads to significant political dislocation. Even large fiscal debt burdens can be reined in over a few years where political will and institutions allow, and the US has historically fit in that category. A few years of slower growth will be costly, but also may put the US back on a sustainable growth path in terms of savings versus consumption. Though the relative rise of the major emerging markets will be accelerated by the crisis, that acceleration will be insufficient to rapidly close the gap with the US in size, let alone in technology and well-being. None of those countries, except perhaps for China, can think in terms of rivaling the US in all the aspects of national power. These would include: a large, dynamic and open economy; favorable demographic dynamics; monetary stability and a currency with a global role; an ability to project hard power abroad; and an attractive economic model to export for wide emulation. This last point is key. In the area of alternative economic models, one cannot beat something with nothing – communism fell not just because of its internal contradictions, or the costly military build-up, but because capitalism presented a clearly superior alternative. The Chinese model is in part the American capitalist (albeit not high church financial liberalisation) model, and is in part mercantilism. There has been concern that some developing or small countries could take the lesson from China that building up lots of hard currency reserves through undervaluation and export orientation is smart. That would erode globalisation, and lead to greater conflict with and criticism of the US-led system. While in the abstract that is a concern, most emerging markets – and notably Brazil, India, Mexico, South Africa, and South Korea – are not pursuing that extreme line. The recent victory of the incumbent Congress Party in India is one indication, and the statements about openness of Brazilian President Lula is another. Mexico’s continued orientation towards NAFTA while seeking other investment flows (outside petroleum sector, admittedly) to and from abroad is a particularly brave example. Germany’s and Japan’s obvious crisis-prompted difficulties emerging from their very high export dependence, despite their being wealthy, serve as cautionary examples on the other side. So unlike in the1970s, the last time that the US economic performance and leadership were seriously compromised, we will not see leading developing economies like Brazil and India going down the import substitution or other self-destructive and uncooperative paths. If this assessment is correct, the policy challenge is to deal with relative US economic decline, but not outright hostility to the US model or displacement of the current international economic system. That is reassuring, for it leaves us in the realm of normal economic diplomacy, perhaps to be pursued more multilaterally and less high-handedly than the US has done over the past 20 years. It also suggests that adjustment of current international economic institutions is all that is required, rather than desperately defending economic globalisation itself.

#### No chance of rapid proliferation – leaders don’t believe nuclear weapons are in their interest

Jacques Hymans 6, Assistant Professor of International Relations at USC and former fellow at the Harvard Institution for Strategic Studies, “The Psychology of Nuclear Proliferation: Identity, Emotions, and Foreign Policy,” amazon

For this is not the first time we have faced widespread projections of a coming “second nuclear age.” The 1960s era US government and other estimates foresaw between fifteen and twenty-five nuclear weapons states by the end of the 1970s; 1970s era estimates foresaw as many as thirty-five nuclear weapons states by the end of the 1980s; the early 1990s betting line was that at least Germany and Japan and possibly many more states would soon join the nuclear weapons “club.”3 Such forecasts — even supposedly optimistic ones — have proved too pessimistic. In spite of the breathless reporting about new uranium enrichment or fuel reprocessing capacities, it must be emphasized that the basic pattern in the history of nuclear proliferation to this point is the small number of nuclear weapons states, as compared to the large number of states capable of building those weapons. The expansion of nuclear technological capacities that previous generations feared has indeed occurred, but the expected realization of their military potential has not followed. Today, although nuclear technology is decidedly old technology and cx- Soviet sdentists and fissile material have been on the market for over a decade,4 to the best of our knowledge fewer than ten states actually have the bomb. These are the United States (first nuclear weapons test 1945); Russia (1949); Great Britain (1952); France (1960); China (1964); India (“peaceftil nuclear explosion” 1974; first official nuclear weapons test 1998); Pakistan (1998); plus almost certainly Israel (likely test 1979), and possibly North Korea (no test yet).’ Figure 1 . 1 offers a rough picture of the evolution in the numbers of actual and potential nuclear weapons states over time, adapted from work by Stephen Meyer and Richard Swil on states’ latent nuclear capabilities. Thc figure reports their data at five-year intervals.7 This yawning gap between technical potential and military reality should have led to widespread rethinking of the phenomenon of nuclear . . . . weapons proliferation. To a surprising extent it has not. Much of the proliferation literature continues to focus its attention primarily on the “supply-side” issue of the growth of technical capacities. Volumes with titles like How Nuclear Weapons Spread are devoted entirely to analyses of the technological similarities between civilian and military nuclear pro- grams. Such a focus on technical capacity leads many proliferation specialists to persist in foretelling “life in a nuclear-armed crowd”

a quarter- century after Albert Wohlstetter coined the phrase.° Indeed, William %j has aptly labeled the study of proliferation “the sky-is-still-falling profession.”’° This is not to claim that all ofthe current literature is in denial about the gap between technical potential and military reality. Indeed, awareness of that gap has produced soaring evaluations of the past effectiveness of the “non-proliferation regime” and its centerpiece, the Non-Proliferation Treaty (Nfl). The rising reputation of the regime over the past two decades has been especially noticeable in academic writing on internaI tional relations. Scholars working within all three major international relations paradigms — realists, institutionalists, and consu-uctivists — have pointed to the regime as an essential dam holding back the tide of nuclear proliferation: . Realists stress that the regime provides a framework for joint great power application of export controls, technical safeguards agreements, and other supply-side means of blocking states from acquiring and applying nuclear know-how.” . Neo-liberal institutionalists stress that the regime offers states a functional means to escape the presumed proliferation “prisoner’s dilemma” by giving them the assurance that their rivals are also keeping their nuclear powder ryt2 . Finally, constructivists stress that the regime has contributed to a “nuclear taboo,” an international normative prohibition on the use of nuclear weapons, which has reduced their utility, tarnished their image, and thus diminished their attractiveness.’3 The non-proliferation regime has made a difference. Careful case study research on various countries’ nuclear histories has detailed the regime’s role in easing many of them further down the nuclear weapons- free path.’4 Therefore, the mounting evidence that the regime today is encountering increasing political and technical difficulties is a matter of no little concern. But this begs the real question: has the regime caused states that otherwise rwuld have decided to acquire iudear weapons not to do so, or has it simply reinforced the non-proliferation commitments of already abstaining states? The chorus of praise for the regime implicitly suggests that without it the world would today be home to a “nuclear-armed crowd.” But in fact there is much reason to doubt this counterfactual about the regime’s impact. First of all, if the regime were indeed the key to containing proliferation, then proliferation should have been rampant before the regime became a real factor in states’ calculations, in the mid- 1 970s. Yet as Figure 1.1 shows, already then there was a wide gap between the numbers of nuclear- capable and nuclear weapons states. So, according to the very logic of those who take a “strong” view of the regime’s success, by the time the regime was finally built, it should have been too late to prevent widespread proliferation. Second, if the regime were so crucial, then recent proliferation should have been limited to “rogue states” that do not worry about their position in international society. Such states, not surprisingly, have been the focus ofmost policymakers’ proliferation worries)’ But, in fact, the list of nuclear weapons states is no rogues’ gallery, and two of the youngest nuclear powers, India and Pakistan, are widely internationally recognized states whose ultimate choices for the bomb were even made by democrat- ically elected leaders. Third, for the regime to play the key role that has been ascribed to it, it would have to have created stable expectations among states that it would last. But, in fact, the regime’s survivability is regularly called into question, with the regime’s proponents often the loudest doubters of all. Not only have they viewed all sorts of actions around the world, such as India’s and Pakistan’s 1998 tests, as potential mortal blows to the cause of non-proliferation; they also see various types of inaction, such as the continuing maintenance of large arsenals by the nuclear powers, as equally dangerous to the regime.’6 Given this generalized perception of the regime’s weakness in the policy world (which stands in stark contrast to its glimmering academic reputation), it is hard to buy into the notion that it provides states with the stable expectations they crave. Finally, if the regime is widely perceived as brittle, those who know it best equally perceive it as hollow. Close analysis of the regime’s actual operation finds a set of ambigi.ious and erratically enforced rules, myriad technical loopholes, and underfunded international agencies. For one thing, until recently international inspections were only carried out at declared nuclear facilities.’7 The case ofpre-1991 Iraq shows how easily a determined state could hide the true extent of its nuclear program. Since the possibilities for cheating have been so wide open, the existence of the regime could hardly have reassured any states that were prone to doubt the good faith of their peers. Thus, if this really were a prisoner’s dilemma type situation, they should have cheated and gone nuclear them- selves. But instead, the vast majority of states have not “defected” from the regime. In short, for all its utility, the non-proliferation regime simply cannot support the explanatory weight that it has been asked to bear. What, then, accounts for the slow pace ofproliferation? This book suggests that the answer lies less in external efforts to stop states from going nuclear, and more in the hearts of state leaders themselves. It argues that, in fact, contrary to the conventional wisdom, most state leaders are not sorely tempted by the prospect of “going nuclear.” Rather, state leaders tend to lack sufficient levels of motivation anchor certitude to catapult their states into a new and dangerous world of nuclear deterrence. In short, the Non-proliferation regime has appeared to be a dramatic success because few state leaders have desired the things it prohibits.