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#### The aff is not topical --- introducing armed forces only refers to human troops, not weapons systems such as nuclear weapons

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 ultimately compromise to avert shutdown – GOP divisions make it more likely, not less

Tom Cohen, 9-20-2013, “Congress: will it be a government shutdown or budget compromise?” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2013/09/19/politics/congress-shutdown-scenarios/index.html?utm\_source=feedburner&utm\_medium=feed&utm\_campaign=Feed%3A+rss%2Fcnn\_allpolitics+(RSS%3A+Politics)

There hasn't been a government shutdown in more than 17 years, since the 28 days of budget stalemate in the Clinton administration that cost more than $1 billion. Now we hear dire warnings and sharpening rhetoric that another shutdown is possible and perhaps likely in less than two weeks when the current fiscal year ends. Despite an escalating political imbroglio, the combination of how Congress works and what politicians want makes the chances of a shutdown at the end of the month uncertain at best. In particular, a rift between Republicans over how to proceed has heightened concerns of a shutdown in the short run, but remains a major reason why one is unlikely in the end. A more probable scenario is a last-minute compromise on a short-term spending plan to fund the government when the current fiscal year ends on September 30. After that, the debate would shift to broader deficit reduction issues tied to the need to raise the federal debt ceiling sometime in October. "There's going to be a lot of draconian talk from both sides, but the likelihood of their being an extended shutdown is not high," said Darrell West, the vice president and director of governance studies at the Brookings Institution. Government shutdown: Again? Seriously? Conservatives tie Obamacare to budget talks While the main issue is keeping the government funded when the new fiscal year begins October 1, a conservative GOP wing in the House and Senate has made its crusade against Obamacare the focus of the debate. They demand a halt to funding for the signature program from President Barack Obama's first term, and they seem indifferent about forcing a government shutdown if that doesn't happen. "I will do everything necessary and anything possible to defund Obamacare," Republican Sen. Ted Cruz of Texas said Thursday, threatening a filibuster and "any procedural means necessary." The GOP split was demonstrated later Thursday by Sen. John McCain, who told CNN that "we will not repeal or defund Obamacare" in the Senate. "We will not, and to think we can is not rational," McCain said. A compromise sought by House Speaker John Boehner and fellow GOP leaders would have allowed a symbolic vote on the defunding provision that the Senate would then strip out. The result would have been what legislators call a "clean" final version that simply extended current levels of government spending for about two months of the new fiscal year, allowing time for further negotiations on the debt ceiling. However, conservative opposition to the compromise made Boehner agree to a tougher version that made overall government funding contingent on eliminating money for Obamacare. Moderate Republicans question the strategy, but fear a right-wing backlash in the 2014 primaries if they go against the conservative wing. In reference to the divisions in the House, McCain said it was "pretty obvious that (Boehner) has great difficulties within his own conference." The House passed the tea party inspired plan on an almost strictly party line vote on Friday, setting in motion what is certain to be 10 days or so of legislative wrangling and political machinations. The measure now goes to the Democratic-led Senate, where Majority Leader Harry Reid made clear on Thursday that any plan to defund Obamacare would be dead on arrival. Instead, the Senate was expected to strip the measure of all provisions defunding Obamacare and send it back to the House. "They're simply postponing an inevitable choice they must face," Reid said of House Republicans. Here is a look at the two most-discussed potential outcomes -- a government shutdown or a short-term deal that keeps the government funded for a few months while further debate ensues. House GOP: defund Obamacare or shut government down Shutdown scenario According to West, the ultimate pressure on whether there is a shutdown will rest with Boehner. With the Republican majority in the House passing the spending measure that defunds Obamacare, Senate Democrats say they will stand united in opposing it. "Don't make it part of your strategy that eventually we'll cave," Sen. Chuck Schumer of New York warned Republicans on Thursday. "We won't. We're unified, we're together. You're not." That means the Senate would remove any provisions to defund Obamacare and send the stripped-down spending proposal back to the House. Boehner would then have to decide whether to put it to a vote, even though that could undermine his already weakened leadership by having the measure pass with only a few dozen moderate Republicans joining Democrats in support. If he refuses to bring the Senate version to the floor for a vote, a shutdown would ensue. "The key player is really Boehner," West said. Polls showing a decrease in public support for the health care reforms embolden the Republican stance. Meanwhile, surveys showing most people oppose a government shutdown and that more would blame Republicans if it happens bolster Democratic resolve. Compromise scenario Voices across the political spectrum warn against a shutdown, including Congressional Budget Office Director Douglas Elmendorf, Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Republican strategist Karl Rove. "Even the defund strategy's authors say they don't want a government shutdown. But their approach means we'll get one," Rove argued in an op-ed published Thursday by the Wall Street Journal. He noted the Democratic-controlled Senate won't support any House measure that eliminates funding for Obamacare, and the White House said Thursday that Obama would veto such a spending resolution. "Republicans would need 54 House Democrats and 21 Senate Democrats to vote to override the president's veto," Rove noted, adding that "no sentient being believes that will happen." West concurred, telling CNN that "you can't expect a president to offer his first born to solve a political problem for the other party." "It's the House split that's causing this to happen," he noted. "People now equate compromise with surrender. It's hard to do anything under those circumstances." Under the compromise scenario, the Senate would remove provisions defunding Obamacare from what the House passes while perhaps making other relatively minor changes to provide Boehner and House Republicans with political cover to back it.

#### 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.
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#### The US has nuclear primacy now vs. every rival---credible threat of first strike is key

Also answers cuts UQ because cuts have affected Russia MORE, which boosts U.S. primacy

Carl Osgood 13 and Rachel Douglas, Executive Intelligence Review, 3/15/13, “U.S. Moves Toward

Nuclear First Strike Capability,” http://www.larouchepub.com/other/2013/4011nuke\_first\_strike.html

On March 1, the Strategic Studies Quarterly, a journal published by the U.S. Air Force's Air University, published an article admitting what both Lyndon LaRouche and EIR, and the Russians, have long been warning against: that U.S. strategic policy under the Obama Administration is seeking to create the capability to launch a first strike against Russia and/or China, without fear of nuclear retaliation, and that this is making nuclear war more, not less, likely.

While the two authors, Keir A. Leiber, associate professor at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University, and Daryl G. Press, an associate professor of government at Dartmouth University, have been warning against this danger since at least 2006, this is the first time one of their articles has appeared in a U.S. military publication, a tacit admission, perhaps, that their argument has merit, and must be considered.

The Strategic Studies article comes on the heels of a report from Moscow, by the Izborsk Club, an association of high-level Russian intellectuals who characterize themselves as "patriotic and anti-liberal," warning of the same danger of an emerging "counterforce" threat to Russia's strategic deterrent, and laying out the steps that Russia must take, militarily, to defend against it.

Since Barack Obama ascended to the office of the Presidency, he has expanded the Bush-Cheney policy of strategic confrontation with Russia, most notably, with respect to Iran and Syria. In Syria, the U.S. policy is one of regime change, a policy strongly opposed by Russia. At the same time, the U.S. has been ringing Russia with missile defenses, including land-based sites in Poland and Romania, and moving forward with a plan to forward-base four Aegis missile defense destroyers in Rota, Spain.

On May 3, 2012, then-Chief of the Russian Armed Forces General Staff Gen. Nikolai Makarov declared that further advances in the deployment of a BMD system by the United States and NATO in Europe would so greatly threaten Russia's security, as to necessitate a pre-emptive attack on such installations: The outbreak of military hostilities between the U.S.A. and Russia would mean nuclear war. "Considering the destabilizing nature of the BMDS," Makarov told an audience including U.S. officials, "specifically the creation of the illusion of being able to inflict a disarming first strike without retaliation, a decision on the pre-emptive use of available offensive weapons will be taken during the period of an escalating situation" (emphasis added).

What Makarov was pointing out is that ostensibly defensive systems can be used in offensive warfare—in this case, to enable the West to launch a pre-emptive first strike without fear of a retaliatory response. Just two weeks later, at a conference in Virginia, former U.S. Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. James Cartwright acknowledged that "there's the potential that you could, in fact, generate a scenario where, in a bolt from the blue, we launch a pre-emptive attack and then use missile defense to weed out" Russia's remaining missiles launched in response. "We're going to have to think our way out of this," he said. "We're going to have to figure out how we're going to do this."

If the alleged threat from Iran, which is used to justify the missile defense deployment in Europe, is so great, then why not cooperate with Russia on missile defense? Indeed, Russia has been proposing such cooperation since 2007, when then-President Vladimir Putin traveled to Kennebunkport, Maine, to propose to then-President George W. Bush, cooperation with the U.S. and NATO on missile defense. Bush never accepted the proposal, and neither has Obama.

If the U.S.-NATO European system is not aimed at Russia, then the U.S. ought to be able to provide guarantees that that's the case, as Russia has been demanding, but this is dismissed by the U.S. and NATO as "unnecessary." The Russians have repeatedly warned that the U.S.-NATO plan upsets the strategic balance and increases the risk of war, and have acted accordingly, even as they have made numerous proposals that would avoid such a confrontation. The U.S. refusal to acknowledge Russian concerns, in concert with its regime-change policies in Syria and Iran, is setting the stage for that confrontation.

U.S. Seeks Strategic Primacy

In their March 1 article, "The New Era of Nuclear Weapons, Deterrence, and Conflict," Leiber and Press posit that, number one, "technological innovation has dramatically improved the ability of states to launch 'counterforce' attacks—that is, military strikes aimed at disarming an adversary by destroying its nuclear weapons." Number two, they argue, is that "in the coming decades, deterring the use of nuclear weapons during conventional wars will be much harder than most analysts believe."

The basis of the authors' first argument is that: "Very accurate delivery systems, new reconnaissance technologies, and the downsizing of arsenals from Cold War levels have made both conventional and nuclear counterforce strikes against nuclear arsenals much more feasible than ever before." During the Cold War, they note, neither the U.S. nor the Soviet Union could launch a disarming first strike against the other because each side had so many weapons deliverable by different modes, that an attempted counterforce strike could not prevent a retaliatory reply. This is no longer the case. The reduction of nuclear arsenals on both sides means there are now fewer targets to hit, especially on the Russian side.

In 2006, Leiber and Press modeled a hypothetical U.S. first strike against Russia. "The same models that were used during the Cold War to demonstrate the inescapability of stalemate—the condition of 'mutual assured destruction,' or MAD—now suggested that even the large Russian arsenal could be destroyed in a disarming strike." Their point was to demonstrate that the Cold War axioms of mutual and assured destruction and deterrence no longer apply.

But the authors go further to argue that the U.S. is knowingly pursuing a strategy of strategic primacy against potential adversaries, "meaning that Washington seeks the ability to defeat enemy nuclear forces (as well as other WMD) but that U.S. nuclear weapons are but one dimension of that effort. In fact, the effort to neutralize adversary strategic forces—that is, achieve strategic primacy—spans nearly every realm of warfare: for example, ballistic missile defense, antisubmarine warfare, intelligence, surveillance-and-reconnaissance systems, offensive cyber warfare, conventional precision strike, and long-range precision strike, in addition to nuclear strike capabilities."

Rather than pointing out the obvious—that the U.S. is building a first-strike capability against any potential adversary, including Russia and China—they ask, instead: "How is deterrence likely to work when nuclear use does not automatically imply suicide and mass slaughter?

( ) Nuclear primacy’s key to hegemony---makes unipolarity durable and deters great power competition

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.

( ) Loss of U.S. hegemony causes nuclear wars around the globe

Kagan 7 – Robert Kagan, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and senior transatlantic fellow at the German Marshall Fund, August/September 2007, “End of Dreams, Return of History,” The Hoover Policy Review, online: http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/8552512.html

The jostling for status and influence among these ambitious nations and would-be nations is a second defining feature of the new post-Cold War international system. Nationalism in all its forms is back, if it ever went away, and so is international competition for power, influence, honor, and status. American predominance prevents these rivalries from intensifying — its regional as well as its global predominance. Were the United States to diminish its influence in the regions where it is currently the strongest power, the other nations would settle disputes as great and lesser powers have done in the past: sometimes through diplomacy and accommodation but often through confrontation and wars of varying scope, intensity, and destructiveness. One novel aspect of such a multipolar world is that most of these powers would possess nuclear weapons. That could make wars between them less likely, or it could simply make them more catastrophic.

It is easy but also dangerous to underestimate the role the United States plays in providing a measure of stability in the world even as it also disrupts stability. For instance, the United States is the dominant naval power everywhere, such that other nations cannot compete with it even in their home waters. They either happily or grudgingly allow the United States Navy to be the guarantor of international waterways and trade routes, of international access to markets and raw materials such as oil. Even when the United States engages in a war, it is able to play its role as guardian of the waterways. In a more genuinely multipolar world, however, it would not. Nations would compete for naval dominance at least in their own regions and possibly beyond. Conflict between nations would involve struggles on the oceans as well as on land. Armed embargos, of the kind used in World War i and other major conflicts, would disrupt trade flows in a way that is now impossible.

Such order as exists in the world rests not merely on the goodwill of peoples but on a foundation provided by American power. Even the European Union, that great geopolitical miracle, owes its founding to American power, for without it the European nations after World War II would never have felt secure enough to reintegrate Germany. Most Europeans recoil at the thought, but even today Europe’s stability depends on the guarantee, however distant and one hopes unnecessary, that the United States could step in to check any dangerous development on the continent. In a genuinely multipolar world, that would not be possible without renewing the danger of world war.

People who believe greater equality among nations would be preferable to the present American predominance often succumb to a basic logical fallacy. They believe the order the world enjoys today exists independently of American power. They imagine that in a world where American power was diminished, the aspects of international order that they like would remain in place. But that ’s not the way it works. International order does not rest on ideas and institutions. It is shaped by configurations of power. The international order we know today reflects the distribution of power in the world since World War ii, and especially since the end of the Cold War. A different configuration of power, a multipolar world in which the poles were Russia, China, the United States, India, and Europe, would produce its own kind of order, with different rules and norms reflecting the interests of the powerful states that would have a hand in shaping it. Would that international order be an improvement? Perhaps for Beijing and Moscow it would. But it is doubtful that it would suit the tastes of enlightenment liberals in the United States and Europe.

The current order, of course, is not only far from perfect but also offers no guarantee against major conflict among the world ’s great powers. Even under the umbrella of unipolarity, regional conflicts involving the large powers may erupt. War could erupt between China and Taiwan and draw in both the United States and Japan. War could erupt between Russia and Georgia, forcing the United States and its European allies to decide whether to intervene or suffer the consequences of a Russian victory. Conflict between India and Pakistan remains possible, as does conflict between Iran and Israel or other Middle Eastern states. These, too, could draw in other great powers, including the United States.

Such conflicts may be unavoidable no matter what policies the United States pursues. But they are more likely to erupt if the United States weakens or withdraws from its positions of regional dominance. This is especially true in East Asia, where most nations agree that a reliable American power has a stabilizing and pacific effect on the region. That is certainly the view of most of China ’s neighbors. But even China, which seeks gradually to supplant the United States as the dominant power in the region, faces the dilemma that an American withdrawal could unleash an ambitious, independent, nationalist Japan.

In Europe, too, the departure of the United States from the scene — even if it remained the world’s most powerful nation — could be destabilizing. It could tempt Russia to an even more overbearing and potentially forceful approach to unruly nations on its periphery. Although some realist theorists seem to imagine that the disappearance of the Soviet Union put an end to the possibility of confrontation between Russia and the West, and therefore to the need for a permanent American role in Europe, history suggests that conflicts in Europe involving Russia are possible even without Soviet communism. If the United States withdrew from Europe — if it adopted what some call a strategy of “offshore balancing” — this could in time increase the likelihood of conflict involving Russia and its near neighbors, which could in turn draw the United States back in under unfavorable circumstances.

It is also optimistic to imagine that a retrenchment of the American position in the Middle East and the assumption of a more passive, “offshore” role would lead to greater stability there. The vital interest the United States has in access to oil and the role it plays in keeping access open to other nations in Europe and Asia make it unlikely that American leaders could or would stand back and hope for the best while the powers in the region battle it out. Nor would a more “even-handed” policy toward Israel, which some see as the magic key to unlocking peace, stability, and comity in the Middle East, obviate the need to come to Israel ’s aid if its security became threatened. That commitment, paired with the American commitment to protect strategic oil supplies for most of the world, practically ensures a heavy American military presence in the region, both on the seas and on the ground.

The subtraction of American power from any region would not end conflict but would simply change the equation. In the Middle East, competition for influence among powers both inside and outside the region has raged for at least two centuries. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism doesn ’t change this. It only adds a new and more threatening dimension to the competition, which neither a sudden end to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians nor an immediate American withdrawal from Iraq would change. The alternative to American predominance in the region is not balance and peace. It is further competition. The region and the states within it remain relatively weak. A diminution of American influence would not be followed by a diminution of other external influences. One could expect deeper involvement by both China and Russia, if only to secure their interests. 18 And one could also expect the more powerful states of the region, particularly Iran, to expand and fill the vacuum. It is doubtful that any American administration would voluntarily take actions that could shift the balance of power in the Middle East further toward Russia, China, or Iran. The world hasn ’t changed that much. An American withdrawal from Iraq will not return things to “normal” or to a new kind of stability in the region. It will produce a new instability, one likely to draw the United States back in again.

The alternative to American regional predominance in the Middle East and elsewhere is not a new regional stability. In an era of burgeoning nationalism, the future is likely to be one of intensified competition among nations and nationalist movements. Difficult as it may be to extend American predominance into the future, no one should imagine that a reduction of American power or a retraction of American influence and global involvement will provide an easier path.

#### 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.

#### 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

#### Taiwan escalates and goes nuclear---no defense

William Lowther 3-16, Taipei Times, citing a report by the Center for Strategic and International Studies, 3/16/13, “Taiwan could spark nuclear war: report,” <http://www.taipeitimes.com/News/taiwan/archives/2013/03/16/2003557211>

Taiwan is the most likely potential crisis that could trigger a nuclear war between China and the US, a new academic report concludes.

“Taiwan remains the single most plausible and dangerous source of tension and conflict between the US and China,” says the 42-page report by the Washington-based Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).

Prepared by the CSIS’ Project on Nuclear Issues and resulting from a year-long study, the report emphasizes that Beijing continues to be set on a policy to prevent Taiwan’s independence, while at the same time the US maintains the capability to come to Taiwan’s defense.

“Although tensions across the Taiwan Strait have subsided since both Taipei and Beijing embraced a policy of engagement in 2008, the situation remains combustible, complicated by rapidly diverging cross-strait military capabilities and persistent political disagreements,” the report says.

In a footnote, it quotes senior fellow at the US Council on Foreign Relations Richard Betts describing Taiwan as “the main potential flashpoint for the US in East Asia.”

The report also quotes Betts as saying that neither Beijing nor Washington can fully control developments that might ignite a Taiwan crisis.

“This is a classic recipe for surprise, miscalculation and uncontrolled escalation,” Betts wrote in a separate study of his own.

The CSIS study says: “For the foreseeable future Taiwan is the contingency in which nuclear weapons would most likely become a major factor, because the fate of the island is intertwined both with the legitimacy of the Chinese Communist Party and the reliability of US defense commitments in the Asia-Pacific region.”

Titled Nuclear Weapons and US-China Relations, the study says disputes in the East and South China seas appear unlikely to lead to major conflict between China and the US, but they do “provide kindling” for potential conflict between the two nations because the disputes implicate a number of important regional interests, including the interests of treaty allies of the US.

The danger posed by flashpoints such as Taiwan, the Korean Peninsula and maritime demarcation disputes is magnified by the potential for mistakes, the study says.

“Although Beijing and Washington have agreed to a range of crisis management mechanisms, such as the Military Maritime Consultative Agreement and the establishment of a direct hotline between the Pentagon and the Ministry of Defense, the bases for miscommunication and misunderstanding remain and draw on deep historical reservoirs of suspicion,” the report says.

For example, it says, it is unclear whether either side understands what kinds of actions would result in a military or even nuclear response by the other party.

To make things worse, “neither side seems to believe the other’s declared policies and intentions, suggesting that escalation management, already a very uncertain endeavor, could be especially difficult in any conflict,” it says.

Although conflict “mercifully” seems unlikely at this point, the report concludes that “it cannot be ruled out and may become increasingly likely if we are unwise or unlucky.”

The report says: “With both sides possessing and looking set to retain formidable nuclear weapons arsenals, such a conflict would be tremendously dangerous and quite possibly devastating.”

U.S. adversaries will use counter-city attacks---only counterforce first-strikes can take out their capabilities before they’re used

Cimbala 6 – Stephen J. Cimbala, Distinguished Professor of Political Science at Pennsylvania State University, December 2006, “Parity in Peril? The Continuing Vitality of Russian-US Strategic Nuclear Deterrence,” Contemporary Security Policy, Vol. 27, No. 3, p. 417-434

The end of the Cold War simplified or eliminated the problem of nuclear alliance management. But equally vexatious problems testing the logic of deterrence await answers in the new world order of failed states and potentially mismanaged proliferation. For example: Cold War deterrence logic assumed that first strikers would seek to destroy the opponent's retaliatory forces, in order to minimise the amount of damage caused by the defender to the attacker's society. This assumption of a counterforce first strike followed by a countervalue retaliation drove most US analysis. Some strategists and policy-makers favoured a counterforce second strike capability in addition to countervalue attacks: only by putting at risk the enemy's remaining deterrent force as well as his cities could US leaders impose de-escalation and war termination on favourable terms.

What was omitted from most of this analysis was the abstract possibility of a decision for a first strike countervalue attack.11 Such an attack seemed irrational against a state that had a secure retaliatory force: it would be an act of apparent national suicide. But two aspects of the nuclear arms race have changed with the end of the Cold War and the 21st century. First, more states will have nuclear forces that are dubiously survivable against first strikes. Second, the motives of some state or other actors may include a willingness for 'first strike, countervalue' attacks despite the ability of the victim to strike back. Miscreant states with ambitions for regional hegemony and lacking a second strike capability against the US or Russia may nevertheless seek to 'deter the deterrent' of nuclear powers and coerce their allies by threatening first strikes against population targets.

Only city attacks cause nuclear winter---other nuclear wars don’t

Robock 9 – Dr. Alan Robock, professor of climatology in the Department of Environmental Sciences at Rutgers University and the associate director of its Center for Environmental Prediction, January 6, 2009, “Nuclear Winter,” online: http://www.eoearth.org/article/Nuclear\_winter

A nuclear explosion is like bringing a piece of the Sun to the Earth's surface for a fraction of a second. Like a giant match, it causes cities and industrial areas to burn. Megacities have developed in India and Pakistan and other developing countries, providing tremendous amounts of fuel for potential fires. The direct effects of the nuclear weapons, blast, radioactivity, fires, and extensive pollution, would kill millions of people, but only those near the targets. However, the fires would have another effect. The massive amounts of dark smoke from the fires would be lofted into the upper troposphere, 10-15 kilometers (6-9 miles) above the Earth's surface, and then absorption of sunlight would further heat the smoke, lifting it into the stratosphere, a layer where the smoke would persist for years, with no rain to wash it out.

The climatic effects of smoke from fires started by nuclear war depend on the amount of smoke. Our new calculations show that for 50 nuclear weapons dropped on two countries, on the targets that would produce the maximum amount of smoke, about 5 megatons (Tg) of black smoke would be produced, accounting for the amount emitted from the fires and the amount immediately washed out in rain. As the smoke is lofted into the stratosphere, it would be transported around the world by the prevailing winds. We also did calculations for two scenarios of war between the two superpowers who still maintain large nuclear arsenals, the United States and Russia. In one scenario, 50 Tg of black smoke would be produced and in another, 150 Tg of black smoke would be produced. How many nuclear weapons would be required to produce this much smoke? It depends on the targets, but there are enough weapons in the current arsenals to produce either amount. In fact, there are only so many targets. Once they are all hit by weapons, additional weapons would not produce much more smoke at all. Even after the current nuclear weapons reduction treaty between these superpowers is played out in 2012, with each having about 2,000 weapons, 150 Tg of smoke could still be produced.

### 1NC

#### Text ---- The United States Executive Branch should establish a declaratory policy that the United States will not introduce nuclear weapons first into hostilities.

#### 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."

# Accidents/Miscalc

#### Breakdown of the nuclear firebreak is inevitable

William Conrad 1, head professor of Aerospace Studies, Kansas State University, July 26, 2001, http://www.ciaonet.org/cbr/cbr00/video/cbr\_ctd/cbr\_ctd\_07.html, accessed August 16, 2003

Regardless of the exact form that conflict will take in the future, however, nuclear weapons will in the future be less contaminating, more discriminate, and more versatile, which, with the decline of conventional forces and the splintering of international conflict, will strengthen the temptation to use them. Indeed, there may be situations in which tactical nuclear weapons will appear to be not only a choice, but the only choice, and it would not be the first time someone argued that nuclear weapons had to be used in order to save lives. The taboo will likely break down to some extent, applying only to particular categories of nuclear weapon rather than nuclear weapons generally, or the use of the weapons against specific targets, freeing decisionmakers to use them. The use of these weapons, in turn, will undermine the taboo, setting a precedent for others. In any case, what would have been condemned in one period, much as had been the case with dynamite, will come to be not merely accepted, but even praised in another, the early prohibition as anachronistic to future observers as the horror with which the Church had regarded crossbows seems to people of our time.

#### Accidental launches won’t happen and wouldn’t escalate

Quinlan 9 [Michael Quinlan, former British Permanent Under Secretary of State for Defence, former Director of the Ditchley Foundation, Visiting Professor at King's College London, “Thinking About Nuclear Weapons: Principles, Problems, Prospects,” Oxford University Press, p. 69]

It was occasionally conjectured that nuclear war might be triggered by the real but accidental or unauthorized launch of a strategic nuclear-weapon delivery system in the direction of a potential adversary. No such launch is known to have occurred in over sixty years. The probability of it is therefore very low. But even if it did happen, the further hypothesis of its initiating a general nuclear exchange is far-fetched. It fails to consider the real situation of decision-makers, as pages 63–4 have brought out. The notion that cosmic holocaust might be mistakenly precipitated in this way belongs to science fiction.

#### No accidental detonation

Quinlan 9 [Michael Quinlan, former British Permanent Under Secretary of State for Defence, former Director of the Ditchley Foundation, Visiting Professor at King's College London, “Thinking About Nuclear Weapons: Principles, Problems, Prospects,” Oxford University Press, p. 67-8]

There have certainly been, across the decades since 1945, many known accidents involving nuclear weapons, from transporters skidding off roads to bomber aircraft crashing with or accidentally dropping the weapons they carried (in past days when such carriage was a frequent feature of readiness arrangements—it no longer is). A few of these accidents may have released into the nearby environment highly toxic material. None however has entailed a nuclear detonation. Some commentators suggest that this reflects bizarrely good fortune amid such massive activity and deployment over so many years. A more rational deduction from the facts of this long experience would however be that the probability of any accident triggering a nuclear explosion is extremely low. It might be further noted that the mechanisms needed to set off such an explosion are technically demanding, and that in a large number of ways the past sixty years have seen extensive improvements in safety arrangements for both the design and the handling of weapons. It is undoubtedly possible to see respects in which, after the cold war, some of the factors bearing upon risk may be new or more adverse; but some are now plainly less so. The years which the world has come through entirely without accidental or unauthorized detonation have included early decades in which knowledge was sketchier, precautions were less developed, and weapon designs were less ultra-safe than they later became, as well as substantial periods in which weapon numbers were larger, deployments more widespread and diverse, movements more frequent, and several aspects of doctrine and readiness arrangements more tense.

# Prolif Adv

#### New proliferators will build small arsenals which are uniquely stable.

**Seng 98** (Jordan, PhD Candidate in Pol. Sci. – U. Chicago, Dissertation, “Strategy for Pandora's Children: Stable Nuclear Proliferation Among Minor States”, p. 203-206)

However, this "state of affairs" is not as dangerous as it might seem. The nuclear arsenals of limited nuclear proliferators will be small and, consequently, the command and control organizations that manage those arsenals will be small as well. The small arsenals of limited nuclear proliferators will mitigate against many of the dangers of the highly delegative, 'non-centralized' launch procedures Third World states are likely to use. This will happen in two main ways. First, only a small number of people need be involved in Third World command and control. The superpowers had tens of thousands of nuclear warheads and thousands of nuclear weapons personnel in a variety of deployments organized around numerous nuclear delivery platforms. A state that has, say, fifty nuclear weapons needs at most fifty launch operators and only a handful of group commanders. This has both quantitative and qualitative repercussions. Quantitatively, the very small number of people 'in the loop' **greatly diminishes the statistical probability** that accidents or human error will result in inappropriate nuclear launches. All else being equal, the chances of finding some guard asleep at some post increases with the number of guards and posts one has to cover. Qualitatively, small numbers makes it possible to centrally train operators, to screen and choose them with exceeding care, 7 and to keep each of them in direct contact with central authorities in times of crises. With very small control communities, there is no need for intermediary commanders. Important information and instructions can get out quickly and directly. Quality control of launch operators and operations is easier. In some part, at least, Third World states can compensate for their lack of sophisticated use-control technology with a more controlled selection of, and more extensive communication with, human operators. Secondly, and relatedly, Third World proliferators will not need to rely on cumbersome standard operating procedures to manage and launch their nuclear weapons. This is because the number of weapons will be so small, and also because the arsenals will be very simple in composition. Third World stares simply will not have that many weapons to keep track of. Third World states will not have the great variety of delivery platforms that the superpowers had (various ballistic missiles, cruise missiles, long range bombers, fighter bombers, missile submarines, nuclear armed ships, nuclear mortars, etc., etc.), or the great number and variety of basing options, and they will not employ the complicated strategies of international basing that the superpowers used. The small and simple arsenals of Third World proliferators will not require highly complex systems to coordinate nuclear activities. This creates two specific organizational advantages. One, small organizations, even if they do rely to some extent of standard operating procedures, can be flexible in times of crisis. As we have discussed, the essential problem of standard operating procedures in nuclear launch processes is that the full range if possible strategic developments cannot be predicted and specified before the fact, and thus responses to them cannot be standardized fully. An unexpected event can lead to 'mismatched' and inappropriate organizational reactions. In complex and extensive command and control organizations, standard operating procedures coordinate great numbers of people at numerous levels of command structure in a great multiplicity of places. If an unexpected event triggers operating procedures leading to what would be an inappropriate nuclear launch, it would be very difficult for central commanders to “get the word out' to everyone involved. The coordination needed to stop launch activity would be at least as complicated as the coordination needed to initiate it, and, depending on the speed of launch processes, there may be less time to accomplish it. However, the small numbers of people involved in nuclear launches and the simplicity of arsenals will make it far easier for Third World leaders to 'get the word out' and reverse launch procedures if necessary. Again, so few will be the numbers of weapons that all launch operators could be contacted directly by central leaders. The programmed triggers of standard operating procedures can be passed over in favor of unscripted, flexible responses based on a limited number of human-to-human communications and confirmations. Two, the smallness and simplicity of Third World command and control organizations will make it easier for leaders to keep track of everything that is going on at any given moment. One of the great dangers of complex organizational procedures is that once one organizational event is triggered—once an alarm is sounded and a programmed response is made—other branches of the organization are likely to be affected as well. This is what Charles Perrow refers to as interactive complexity, 8 and it has been a mainstay in organizational critiques of nuclear command and control s ystems.9 The more complex the organization is, the more likely these secondary effects are, and the less likely they are to be foreseen, noticed, and well-managed. So, for instance, an American commander that gives the order to scramble nuclear bombers over the U.S. as a defensive measure may find that he has unwittingly given the order to scramble bombers in Europe as well. A recall order to the American bombers may overlook the European theater, and nuclear misuse could result. However, when numbers of nuclear weapons can be measured in the dozens rather than the hundreds or thousands, and when deployment of those weapons does not involve multiple theaters and forward based delivery vehicles of numerous types, tight coupling is unlikely to cause unforeseen and unnoticeable organizational events. Other things being equal, it is just a lot easier to know all of what is going on. In short, while Third World states may not have the electronic use-control devices that help ensure that peripheral commanders do nor 'get out of control,' they have other advantages that make the challenge of centralized control easier than it was for the superpowers. The small numbers of personnel and organizational simplicity of launch bureaucracies means that even if a few more people have their fingers on the button than in the case of the superpowers, there will be less of a chance that weapons will be launched without a definite, informed and unambiguous decision to press that button.

#### Prolif will be slow

Tepperman 9 Deputy Editor at Newsweek. Frmr Deputy Managing Editor, Foreign Affairs. LLM, i-law, NYU. MA, jurisprudence, Oxford. (Jonathan, Why Obama Should Learn to Love the Bomb, http://jonathantepperman.com/Welcome\_files/nukes\_Final.pdf)

The risk of an arms race—with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one—is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; that's spread at glacial pace." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors—Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say—might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

#### No domino effect

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, 521-2)

It will be useful at this juncture to address more directly the set of instability arguments advanced by certain policy makers and scholars: the domino effect of new nuclear weapon states, the probability of preventive action against new nuclear weapon states, and the compulsion of these states to use their small arsenals early for fear of losing them in a preventive or preemptive strike by a stronger nuclear adversary. On the domino effect, India's and Pakistan's nuclear weapon programs have not fueled new programs in South Asia or beyond. Iran's quest for nuclear weapons is not a reaction to the Indian or Pakistani programs. It is grounded in that country's security concerns about the United States and Tehran's regional aspirations. The North Korean test has evoked mixed reactions in Northeast Asia. Tokyo is certainly concerned; its reaction, though, has not been to initiate its own nuclear weapon program but to reaffirm and strengthen the American extended deterrence commitment to Japan. Even if the U.S. Japan security treaty were to weaken, it is not certain that Japan would embark on a nuclear weapon program. Likewise, South Korea has sought reaffirmation of the American extended deterrence commitment, but has firmly held to its nonnuclear posture. Without dramatic change in its political, economic, and security circumstances, South Korea is highly unlikely to embark on a covert (or overt) nuclear weapon program as it did in the 1970s. South Korea could still become a nuclear weapon state by inheriting the nuclear weapons of North Korea should the Kim Jong Il regime collapse. Whether it retains or gives up that capability will hinge on the security circumstances of a unified Korea. The North Korean nuclear test has not spurred Taiwan or Mongolia to develop nuclear weapon capability. The point is that each country's decision to embark on and sustain nuclear weapon programs is contingent on its particular security and other circumstances. **Though appealing, the domino theory is not predictive**; often it is employed to justify policy on the basis of alarmist predictions. The loss of South Vietnam, for example, did not lead to the predicted domino effect in Southeast Asia. In fact the so-called dominos became drivers of a vibrant Southeast Asia and brought about a fundamental transformation in that subregion (Lord 1993, 1996). In the nuclear arena, the nuclear programs of China, India, and Pakistan were part of a security chain reaction, not mechanically falling dominos. However, as observed earlier the Indian, Pakistani, and North Korean nuclear tests have thus far not had the domino effect predicted by alarmist analysts and policy makers. Great caution should be exercised in accepting at face value the sensational predictions of individuals who have a vested interest in accentuating the dangers of nuclear proliferation. Such analysts are now focused on the dangers of a nuclear Iran. A nuclear Iran may or may not have destabilizing effects. Such claims must be assessed on the basis of an objective reading of the drivers of national and regional security in Iran and the Middle East.

**NPT fails**

**Betts 2k** – Professor of War and Peace Studies, Columbia (Richard, The Coming Crisis, ed Utgoff, p 69)

First, as useful as treaties are, it is a misconception to see them as a solution. They are effects of nonproliferation, not causes of it. The NPT and CTBT reflect the intent of their adherents to abjure nuclear weapons. To date, the countries considered problematic—those that might acquire nuclear weapons—simply did not join the NPT. (South Africa stayed out while it had a nuclear weapons program and joined when it decided to get rid of it.) Or else they joined and cheated (Iraq and North Korea). The inspection obligations of treaty membership did not reveal or reverse the weapons programs of Iraq and North Korea. Iraq passed International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspections, and it was unilateral U.S. intelligence collection, not the IAEA, that detected the illegal North Korean activity. **If the NPT or CTBT themselves prevent prolif**eration, **one should be able to name at least one specific country that would have sought nuclear weapons** or tested them**, but** refrained from doing so, or **was stopped, because of either treaty. None comes to mind.**

No risk of prolif, it wouldn’t cause a chain reaction, and it would be slow at worst - your evidence is alarmism

Gavin 10 (Francis, Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law @ the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs @ the University of Texas at Austin, “Sam As It Ever Was; Nuclear Alarmism, Proliferation, and the Cold War,” Lexis)

Fears of a tipping point were especially acute in the aftermath of China's 1964 detonation of an atomic bomb: it was predicted that India, Indonesia, and Japan might follow, with consequences worldwide, as "Israel, Sweden, Germany, and other potential nuclear countries far from China and India would be affected by proliferation in Asia." 40 A U.S. government document identified "at least eleven nations (India, Japan, Israel, Sweden, West Germany, Italy, Canada, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Rumania, and Yugoslavia)" with the capacity to go nuclear, a number that would soon "grow substantially" to include "South Africa, the United Arab Republic, Spain, Brazil and Mexico." 41 A top-secret, blue-ribbon committee established to craft the U.S. response contended that "the [1964] Chinese nuclear explosion has increased the urgency and complexity of this problem by creating strong pressures to develop independent nuclear forces, which, in turn, could strongly influence the plans of other potential nuclear powers." 42 These predictions were largely wrong. In 1985 the National Intelligence Council noted that for "almost thirty years the Intelligence Community has been writing about which nations might next get the bomb." All of these estimates based their largely pessimistic and ultimately incorrect estimates on factors such as the increased "access to fissile materials," improved technical capabilities in countries, the likelihood of "chain reactions," or a "scramble" to proliferation when "even one additional state demonstrates a nuclear capability." The 1985 report goes on, "The most striking characteristic of the present-day nuclear proliferation scene is that, despite the alarms rung by past Estimates, no additional overt proliferation of nuclear weapons has actually occurred since China tested its bomb in 1964." Although "some proliferation of nuclear explosive capabilities and other major proliferation-related developments have taken place in the past two decades," they did not have "the damaging, systemwide impacts that the Intelligence community generally anticipated they would." 43 In his analysis of more than sixty years of failed efforts to accurately predict nuclear proliferation, analyst Moeed Yusuf concludes that "the pace of proliferation has been much slower than anticipated by most." The majority of countries suspected of trying to obtain a nuclear weapons capability "never even came close to crossing the threshold. In fact, most did not even initiate a weapons program." If all the countries that were considered prime suspects over the past sixty years had developed nuclear weapons, "the world would have at least 19 nuclear powers today." 44 As Potter and Mukhatzhanova argue, government and academic experts frequently "exaggerated the scope and pace of nuclear weapons proliferation." 45 Nor is there compelling evidence that a nuclear proliferation chain reaction will ever occur. Rather, the pool of potential proliferators has been shrinking. Proliferation pressures were far greater during the Cold War. In the 1960s, at least twenty-one countries either had or were considering nuclear weapons research programs. Today only nine countries are known to have nuclear weapons. Belarus, Brazil, Kazakhstan, Libya, South Africa, Sweden, and Ukraine have dismantled their weapons programs. Even rogue states that are/were a great concern to U.S. policymakers--Iran, Iraq, Libya, and North Korea--began their nuclear weapons programs before the Cold War had ended. 46 As far as is known, no nation has started a new nuclear weapons program since the demise of the Soviet Union in 1991. 47 Ironically, by focusing on the threat of rogue states, policymakers may have underestimated the potentially far more destabilizing effect of proliferation in "respectable" states such as Germany, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan.

#### North Korean prolif inevitable—nothing will stop them

Palla 10(Stephanie, Experts Pessimistic on North Korea’s Willingness to Give Up Nukes, 25 February 2010, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20100225\_7481.php)

Even if North Korea agrees to resume negotiations on its nuclear program, it is unlikely to ever prove willing to give up its strategic deterrent, experts on East Asia's role in international security argued last week (see GSN, Feb. 24). During a panel discussion at the Hudson Institute, speakers addressed the obstacles the United States faces in trying to jump-start the denuclearization process in Pyongyang. Upon taking office in January 2009, the Obama administration made clear its willingness to engage directly with Pyongyang but also that it wanted to push ahead with the six-party talks intended to shutter the regime's nuclear-weapon program. The North responded with an apparent ballistic missile test in April and its second nuclear test in May, and was hit with stronger U.N. sanctions for its efforts. Pressure and heated rhetoric between Washington and Pyongyang have eased since then, according to Victor Cha, Korea chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies. North Korea has expressed a willingness to participate in denuclearization negotiations with China, Japan, Russia, South Korea and the United States, which were last held in December 2008 - but only after being freed from sanctions and beginning peace talks with the United States. Experts voiced their pessimism over the chance of progress in any talks, based on failures by Washington and the other governments to deter North Korea from pursuing nuclear weapons even after giving Pyongyang numerous incentives. "I don't think that this administration or any future administration can promise more," Cha, a former negotiator to the talks, said at the Feb. 18 event. Diplomatic efforts by prior U.S. presidential administrations differed in approach but have offered North Korea the same basic incentives going back to the administration of President George H.W. Bush, Cha said. These promises included energy and economic support, normalization of relations between the Pyongyang and Washington, supporting a civilian nuclear energy program in the North, and consideration of a peace treaty to formally end the Korean War. Under the most recent agreement, in 2007, the Bush administration removed North Korea from the U.S. list of state sponsors of terrorism and joined several other six-party states in providing heavy fuel oil for isolated state. Pyongyang took steps toward disabling its plutonium-producing Yongbyon complex, but never followed through on its pledge to dismantle the site. It has since ejected international monitors and resumed operations there. In previous agreements with the North, the other states "put all the hard requirements down later on in the agreement just so you can get the negotiations going," said Patrick Cronin, senior director of the Asia-Pacific Security Program at the Center for a New American Security. "It's classic confidence building. The problem with that is every time we've done this, it's placed these sort of agreements at risk later on and they fall apart when there's anything serious about to be done." North Korea has conducted two nuclear test blasts and is believed to have sufficient plutonium for several weapons. However, its ability to actually delivery any warhead remains in doubt. The fundamental question underlining the years-long process of the six-party talks was the possibility North Korea could be persuaded to eliminate its nuclear program if given the right incentives. Pyongyang, though, has," and numerous U.S. pledges of its nonhostile intentions have not quelled that mistrust. continually cited the need for nuclear weapons in the face of "external threats This standoff is evidence that no U.S. assurances or incentives would curb North Korean doubts and persuade it to take meaningful steps toward denuclearization, according to Cha. "It is very difficult for me to see this particular regime ever denuclearizing because even if you got rid of every potential external threat to North Korea -- even if you surrounded North Korea with five Costa Ricas -- this regime would still feel insecure," he said. "It's the nature of the regime; its inability to fulfill at least their version of the socialist contract with their people. This is the primary insecurity to the regime." Cronin was similarly downbeat. "I hate to be an additional realist and skeptic on this," he said. "Are we asking and expecting too much from six-party talks?" The United States should not expect the regime's "calculus" to change through negotiations, he added. Instead, the Obama administration should use the talks to maintain and strengthen partnerships with allies South Korea and Japan, according to Cronin. An additional obstacle to North Korean nuclear disarmament is the program's international notoriety, according to one speaker. "I just don't see that the government in Pyongyang has much reason -- or much incentive -- to give away the one thing that has caused the rest of the world to pay them any significant attention whatsoever since the end of the Cold War," said Christopher Ford, director of the Center for Technology and Global Security at the Hudson Institute.

# China Adv

#### SQ solves every impact and locks in relations

Shambaugh 13—Professor of Political Science and International Affairs and Director of the China Policy Program at the George Washington University, a nonresident Senior Fellow in Foreign Policy Studies and Center for Northeast Asian Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution (7/20/13, David, A Big Step Forward in U.S.-China Relations, www.realclearworld.com/articles/2013/07/20/a\_big\_step\_forward\_in\_us-china\_relations\_105332.html)

As a result of the recently concluded U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&ED) the relationship between Washington and Beijing has not only stabilized, but has taken a major step forward-make that major steps. This year's S&ED builds on the new momentum in the relationship spurred by the June presidential summit in Sunnylands, California.¶ The totality of S&ED agreements reached by the two sides July 11-12 is truly impressive-and they outnumber in quantity and quality those reached even during recent presidential state visits (2009 and 2011). The announced agreements-91 on the "strategic track" and a similar number on the "economic track"(although they were not itemized)-are ample testimony to the breadth and depth of the relationship, and they are concrete steps forward in building what Chinese President Xi Jinping has described as building a "new type of major power relations."¶ Of course, the "devil is (always) in the detail" and there may well be a lack of bureaucratic follow-through in implementing such ambitious agreements. In recent years, similar well-intended Joint Statements (2009 and 2011) foundered soon after their issuance and failed to be implemented as intended. This time there seems to be a clearer level of bilateral commitment. A close reading of the strategic track document indicates that the majority of clauses are joint, i.e. "the United States and China affirm their commitment to...). In the past, the language was more often "parallel," i.e. "The United States maintains that...."; "China maintains that..." Such parallel clauses are usually code words for disagreements behind the scenes. This time, much of the language (more notably on the strategic than the economic track) is joint rather than parallel. There are also numerous references that both sides "decided" to undertake various initiatives, while numerous memorandums of understanding (MOUs) and joint "action plans" were agreed and signed. Behind these linguistic nuances lies a new mutual strategic commitment and practical bureaucratic cooperation. ¶The other reason for optimism on implementation is that it appears the two sides have established and expanded the number of joint working groups that will operate throughout the year. New working groups include a Cyber Working Group, U.S.-China Climate Change Working Group, an International Economic Affairs Consultation, a Legal Advisors Consultation, a Dialogue on Global Development, an EcoPartnership Dialogue, an Aviation Energy Conservation and Emission Reduction Initiative, and continued rounds of previously established bilateral mechanisms. Meanwhile, other joint dialogues have been upgraded-such as elevating the Counter-terrorism Consultations to the vice-ministerial level and the Energy Policy Dialogue to the ministerial level. Prior to this year's S&ED, the two governments had in existence around 90 such bilateral dialogues and mechanisms-after the meeting they now top 100. More importantly, as noted above, many will now operate year-round rather than once per year or in an episodic fashion. This will provide sustained momentum to the relationship between the annual S&ED and presidential meetings.¶ The sheer scope of topics covered and agreed are testimony to both the breadth and depth of the relationship. This includes security and military affairs, regional and global diplomacy, human rights, legal affairs and law enforcement, nonproliferation and arms control, customs issues and container security, supply chain security, fisheries and forests, wildlife trafficking and illegal logging, law of the sea and polar issues, marine science and meteorology, climate change, air and water quality, public health, development and aid, peacekeeping, nuclear safety, and a variety of energy-related issues. And these are only issues on the strategic track. The economic track also discussed and reached agreements in a wide range of specialized and technical areas as well: exchange rate liberalization, data transparency, global and regional financial stability, multilateral institutional cooperation (particularly in the IMF, APEC, and G-20), trade and foreign investment, intellectual property rights and protection of trade secrets, government procurement, anti-dumping, export credits and financing, market opening and distribution rights, banking regulations, and other issues.¶ My purpose for detailing this list is not to bore the reader, but to provide a full sense of the extraordinary scope of the U.S.-China relationship today. No other inter-governmental relationship in the world comes close to the breadth and depth of issues of mutual concern to both nations and which they are working to address together. The China-EU and China-Russia and U.S.-EU relationships have their own extensive areas of dialogue and bureaucratic interaction-but they both pale in comparison to the institutionalization of U.S.-China relations today.¶ Institutionalization is one of what I call the "two I's" in U.S.-China relations-the other being interdependence. These "two I's" interact with the "two c's" in the relationship: cooperation and competition. Institutionalization is the outgrowth of interdependence and the manifestation of cooperation-and all three elements serve to bufferand limitthe competition in the relationship.To be certain,competition and mistrust do exist-at the strategic, economic, military, diplomatic, political, and ideological levels-will continue to, and are not to be falsely minimized. But, exercises like the S&ED are tangible expressions that the two sides now seek to manage the competition and forge cooperation where possible. That is the best news we have had in U.S.-China relations for several years, and is good news for global stability and development.

#### Nuclear relations are independently complex---tension over first-use doesn’t undermine overall agreement on nuclear issues

Craig 7 – Susan Craig, China Specialist for PACOM J1, formerly intelligence analyst at the Foreign Military Studies Office for the U.S. Army, July 2007, “Defining the U.S.-China Relationship: Beyond the Cold War and Status Quo Rise Constructs,” Issues & Insights, Vol. 7, No. 8

If the Americans and Chinese could abandon the overly simplistic constructs of the status quo rise and the Cold War, perhaps our conversations could be more productive. Beyond these characterizations, there is much upon which the two countries agree. By exploring where our interests converge, perhaps we can find a more useful construct for our relationship.

The long-term peace and stability of East Asia is in both countries’ interest as is the nonproliferation of nuclear technologies and weapons. Both countries are concerned about affordable, accessible, and abundant energy supplies and the security of sea lanes of communication. Nontraditional transnational issues, such as infectious diseases, drug trafficking, terrorism, and pollution threaten both countries. Deterring a unilateral declaration of independence by Taiwan is also a shared goal.

Evident from the Strategic Dialogue, there is also much the U.S. and China have in common regarding nuclear issues. Whether or not we are equals, both are established nuclear powers. And whether our nuclear doctrine is one of strategic ambiguity or no first use, we both consider nuclear weapons to be a useful deterrent and a weapon of last resort. The security and reliability of both countries’ nuclear weapons stockpiles is an increasing concern, especially given the testing limitations to which both countries adhere. And, both countries recognize the importance of establishing lines of communication that are reliable in times of crisis.

We also share concerns about the other’s nuclear command and control. Both sides are concerned that there is a blurring of conventional and nuclear responsibilities within nuclear deployments and a devolution of nuclear authority has resulted. Further, both sides question the independence the other country’s military commanders have in executing orders from their leadership.

Given these areas of agreement and mutual concern, there is a wealth of opportunities for China-U.S. collaboration. The following recommendations are intended to make the limitations of the Cold War and “status rising power” constructs self-evident so that a more constructive, mutually beneficial status as partners can be pursued.

#### Disputes don’t disrupt strategic cooperation and won’t cause war---\*even on cyber

Sieff 13—Asia and Middle East expert. Chief Global Analyst at The Globalist Research Center and Editor-at-Large at The Globalist. He has been chief news analyst for United Press International and is its former Managing Editor for International Affairs. He has received three Pulitzer Prize nominations for international reporting. (6/24/13, Martin, China, U.S. recognize need for strategic cooperation, <http://apdforum.com/en_GB/article/rmiap/articles/online/features/2013/06/24/china-us-cooperate>, note - [T] added to ‘his’)

China and the United States continue to recognize the need for strategic cooperation and have been working for the past year on improving efforts to work together.¶ Most recently, U.S. President Barack Obama hosted his Chinese counterpart, XiJinpingto discuss security issuesand establish a foundation for cooperative efforts to continue.¶ The preparations for their meeting have been growing over the past year. Even while the two governments traded mutual allegations over such issues as cyber-security and cyber-espionage, they were quietly advancing their strategic ties and cooperation.¶ Over the course of the past year, positive developments included:¶ • The visit to the United States and to the Pentagon of then-Vice President Xi Jinping and of China’s then-Defense Minister Liang Guanglie. Liang was the highest ranking Chinese defense official to visit the Pentagon in nearly a decade;¶ • Former Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Gen. Martin Dempsey and Pacific Command Commander Adm. Samuel J. Locklear all led delegations to China;¶ • The first-ever Chinese delegation participated as observers of the U.S.-Philippine Balikatan exercise;¶ • U.S. and Chinese naval forces carried out their first-ever joint counter-piracy exercise in the Gulf of Aden;¶ • The United States invited China to participate in RIMPAC, the Pacific’s largest multilateral Naval exercise;¶ • The United States concluded an agreement to co-host a Pacific Army Chiefs Conference with China for the first time.¶ Later this year, Chinese Defense Minister ChangWanquan plans to visit the Pentagon.¶ “We are pleased to see this progress,” U.S. Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel told participants at the annual Shangri-La Dialogue in Singapore. “It is important for both the United States and China to provide clarity and predictability about each other’s current and future strategic intentions.”¶ China, U.S. discuss arms control¶ Following Hagel’s speech, the sixth Sino-U.S. consultation on strategic security and multilateral arms control began in Beijing.¶ Chinese Assistant Foreign Minister Ma Zhaoxu and U.S. acting Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Rose Gottemoeller met to discuss building new types of relations between major nations, regional hot spots and multilateral arms control.¶ This careful commitment to improving transparency and communications on both sides is grounded in a fundamental strategic reality: “China and the United States remain critically interdependent in their economies and financial systems. [T]his is the underlying strategic reality behind the recognition of their leaders that continued engagement and understanding is essential,” financial analyst Martin Hutchinson told Asia Pacific Defense Forum [APDF].¶Leading Chinese strategists recognize the same basic reality.¶ Common interests outweigh differences

#### No Chinese backsliding---decades of threats far worse than the status quo prove

Rong and Peng 9 – Rong Yu, Ph. D. candidate at the Institute of International Strategy and Development, School of Public Policy and Management, Tsinghua University, and Peng Guanqian, military strategist with the Chinese Academy of Military Sciences of the People's Liberation Army, Winter 2009, “Nuclear No-First-Use Revisited,” China Security, Vol. 5, No. 1

In addition, at least for now, the declaratory NFU policy, even a unilateral one, is proven to have immense binding power on the states pursuing it. Although some people believe China’s NFU policy is not credible, China has never wavered from its promise during the past 40 years. China had an inferior nuclear arsenal and conventional force when it was on poor terms with the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War. Today, China’s international environment has greatly improved, its economy has strengthened, and its technology capabilities have grown. Yet, China has not moved toward a change in its nuclear policy. Even today, when a possible cross-strait crisis initiated by Taiwanese secessionist activists might involve the nuclear superior United States, China still exerts great restraint in its response and has not wavered in its unilateral NFU policy.

#### China’s modernization is inherently slow and stable---it’s guided by their doctrine which rejects any offensive role for nuclear weapons---there’s no chance modernization turns offensive

Yuan 9 – Jing-Dong Yuan, Director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies and associate professor of international policy studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, April 2009, “China and the Nuclear-Free World,” in Engaging China and Russia on Nuclear Disarmament, eds. Hansell and Potter, online: http://cns.miis.edu/opapers/op15/op15.pdf

China has long maintained that its nuclear weapons development is largely driven by the need to respond to nuclear coercion and blackmail. The role of nuclear weapons, in this context, is purely defensive and retaliatory, rather than war-fighting, as some western analysts suggest.19 Indeed, in the early years, China even rejected the concept of deterrence, regarding it as an attempt by the superpowers to compel others with the threat of nuclear weapons. This probably explains the glacial pace with which China introduced, modified, and modernized its small-size nuclear arsenals over the past four decades. Mainly guided by the principle that nuclear weapons will only be used (but used in a rather indiscriminate way) if China is attacked with nuclear weapons by others, nuclear weapons in China’s defense strategy serve political rather than military purposes.20

PLA analysts emphasize that the terms “nuclear strategy” and “nuclear doctrine” are rarely used in Chinese strategic discourse; instead, a more commonly used term refers to “nuclear policy,” which in turn is governed by the country’s national strategy. Hence, the deployment and use of nuclear weapons are strictly under the “supreme command” of the Communist Party and its Central Military Commission. Nuclear weapons are for strategic deterrence only; no tactical or operational utility is entertained. If and when China is under a nuclear strike, regardless of the size and the yield, it warrants strategic responses and retaliation.21 Chinese leaders and military strategists consider the role for nuclear weapons as one of defensive nuclear deterrence (ziwei fangyu de heweishe). Specifically, the country’s nuclear doctrine and force modernization have been informed and guided by three general principles: effectiveness (youxiaoxing), sufficiency (zugou), and counter-deterrence (fanweishe).22 China’s 2006 Defense White Paper emphasizes the importance of developing land-based strategic capabilities, both nuclear and conventional, but provides no specifics on the existing arsenal, the structure of the Second Artillery Corps (China’s strategic nuclear force) order of battle, or the projected size of the nuclear force. It indicates only that China will continue to maintain and build a lean and effective nuclear force. While Chinese analysts acknowledge that deterrence underpins China’s nuclear doctrine, it is more in the sense of preventing nuclear coercion by the superpower(s) without being coercive itself, and hence it is counter-coercion or counter-deterrence. Rather than build a large nuclear arsenal as resources and relevant technologies have become available, a path pursued by the superpowers during the Cold War, China has kept the size of its nuclear weapons modest, compatible with a nuclear doctrine of minimum deterrence.23 According to Chinese analysts, nuclear weapons’ role in China’s defense doctrine and posture is limited and is reinforced by the NFU position, a limited nuclear arsenal, and support of nuclear disarmament.

# 2NC

## T

### AT: We Meet --- Armed Force Launches Nuke

#### The soldier who presses the button to launch the nuke isn’t in hostilities --- NDAA proves

Healey & Wilson 13 – Jason Healey is the director of the Cyber Statecraft Initiative at the Atlantic Council. AND\*\*\* A.J. Wilson is a visiting fellow at the

Atlantic Council, 2013, “Cyber Conflict and the War Powers

Resolution: Congressional Oversight

of Hostilities in the Fifth Domain,” jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/11\_Dycus.pdf‎

War Powers and Offensive Cyber Operations¶ In a report submitted to Congress in November 2011, pursuant to a mandate in section 934 of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2011, the Pentagon, quoting the WPR’s operative language, stated that:8 **Cyber operations might not include the introduction of armed forces personnel into the area of hostilities.** Cyber operations may, however, be a component of larger operations that could trigger notification and reporting in accordance with the War Powers Resolution. The Department will continue to assess each of its actions in cyberspace to determine when the requirements of the War Powers Resolution may apply to those actions. With the focus on “personnel,” this passage makes clear that the WPR will typically not apply to exclusively cyber conflicts. With cyber warriors executing such operations from centers inside the United States, such as the CYBERCOM facility at Fort Meade, Maryland, at a significant distance from the systems they are attacking and well out of harm’s way. Thus, there is no relevant “introduction” of armed forces. Without such an “introduction,” even the reporting requirements are not triggered. ¶ The view that there can be no introduction of forces into cyberspace **follows naturally from the administration’s argument that the purpose of the WPR is simply to keep US service personnel out of harm’s way** unless authorized by Congress. If devastating unmanned missions do not fall under the scope of the resolution, it is reasonable to argue that a conflict conducted in cyberspace does not either.¶ Arguing the point, an administration lawyer might ask, rhetorically, what exactly do cyber operations “introduce”? On a literal, physical level, electrical currents are redirected; but nothing is physically added to—nor, for that matter, taken away from—the hostile system. To detect any “introduction” at all, we must descend into metaphor; and even there, all that is really introduced is lines of code, packets of data: in other words, information. At most, this information constitutes the cyber equivalent of a weapon. “Armed forces,” by contrast, consist traditionally of weapons plus the flesh and blood personnel who wield them. And that brings us back to our cyber-soldier who, without leaving leafy Maryland, can choreograph electrons in Chongqing. Finally, even if armed forces are being introduced, there are no relevant “hostilities” for the same reason: no boots on the ground, no active exchanges of fire, and no body bags.

### 2NC Nukes Not Hostilities

#### Hostilities implies units of US armed forces engaged in an active exchange of fire with opposing units --- weapons systems don’t count

David W. Opderbeck 13, Professor of Law, Seton Hall University School of Law, 8/2/13, “Drone Courts,” http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\_id=2305315

The WPR does not indicate that Congress has any authority to oversee or control the President’s deployment of armed forces in circumstances other than those involving actual or immanent “hostilities.” Recently the Obama administration has interpreted what “hostilities” means in this context very narrowly in connection with U.S. military involvement in the revolution that overthrew Libyan leader Mohammar Quadaffi.176 As Harold Koh, Legal Advisor to the Department of State, testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations in 2011, “as virtually every lawyer recognizes, the operative term, ‘hostilities,’ is an ambiguous standard, which is nowhere defined in the statute.”177 Koh further noted that “[a]pplication of these provisions often generates difficult issues of interpretation that must be addressed in light of a long history of military actions abroad, without guidance from the courts, involving a Resolution passed by a Congress that could not have envisioned many of the operations in which the United States has since become engaged.”178

In light of these ambiguities, Koh testified, the Executive branch, in league with Congress, has engaged in casuistic efforts to determine when a particular situation does or does not involve “hostilities.”179 Koh noted that a particularly influential effort to frame principles for application was developed in 1975 by his predecessor Monroe Leigh and Defense Department General Counsel Martin Hoffmann, in a letter that has become canonical in this context.180 The Leigh-Hoffmann letter states that “hostilities” implies “a situation in which units of the U.S. armed forces are actively engaged in exchanges of fire with opposing units of hostile forces.”181 As Koh interpreted the Leigh-Hoffman letter, if the mission, exposure of U.S. forces, and risk of elevation are each limited, the military forces are not engaged in “hostilities.”182 Koh therefore argued that the involvement of U.S. forces in airstrikes against Quaddafi’s forces did not constitute “hostilities.”

If the practice of previous administrations supplies guiding precedent, Koh’s argument was sound. As Koh noted, the WPR’s requirements for “hostilities” were not invoked for military operations in Grenada, Lebanon, El Salvador, Iraq (Operation Desert Storm), Kosovo, or Somalia.183 It seems that the use of combat drones for targeted strikes also would not ordinarily constitute “hostilities,” since there is usually no “exchange of fire” under such circumstances.

### AT: Reasonability (Evan’s Block)

#### Reasonability’s arbitrary and undermines research

Evan Resnick 1, assistant professor of political science – Yeshiva University, “Defining Engagement,” Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 54, Iss. 2

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.

## CP

The CP is entirely consistent with China’s view of NFU---they think it’s valuable as a political commitment that doesn’t need to be verified and they don’t read our war-plans to determine intent---they know NFU can be overridden in a crisis

Garrett and Glaser 95 – Banning N. Garrett, Director of Asia Programs at The Atlantic Council of the United States, and Bonnie S. Glaser, Senior Fellow in China Studies at the CSIS, Winter 1995, “Chinese Perspectives on Nuclear Arms Control,” International Security, Vol. 20, No. 1

Most Chinese officials and analysts maintain that as a statement primarily of intentions, an NFU treaty would not require a verification regime. This view was expressed by a senior Foreign Ministry official who insisted that the political decision to adopt an NFU commitment is significant in itself and that verification is unnecessary because the use of nuclear weapons would be "obvious." A COSTIND official also asserted that since an NFU treaty "would only be a political commitment, it would not need to be verified." Many Chinese arms controllers argue that an NFU commitment is not verifiable because even after signing an NFU pledge, a country can change its policy in a crisis. One expert commented that "we don't read your war plans so we don't know if you plan to attack us first." Chinese analysts insist, however, that a nation would pay a high political cost for abandoning its NFU commitment and that this would deter countries from initiating nuclear weapons use. "At this time in international society," a PLA researcher asserted, "if you make a pledge, all members of the international community will know it and will condemn you if you violate it."

No solvency deficits---any uncertainty equally applies to the aff

**Arbatov 8** – Alexei Arbatov, Chair of the non-proliferation program at the Carnegie Moscow Center, November 2008, “NON-FIRST USE AS A WAY OF OUTLAWING NUCLEAR WEAPONS,” online: http://www.icnnd.org/research/Arbatov\_NFU\_Paper.pdf

4. Is a no-first-use credible?

The credibility of such a pledge is a controversial issue. It is virtually impossible to substantiate it in technical way, since any strategic and tactical nuclear weapon which may be used in a retaliatory manner (second-strike), may also be used in a first strike. Among the P5, the concept of first strike is commonly associated with a concept of counterforce (or disarming) nuclear attack. Otherwise a first strike would be a national suicide by provoking a devastating retaliation. Russia and the USA do not have a disarming strategic strike capability against each other at the present time and for the foreseeable future. Hence, nuclear no-first-use between them would be credible not only on political, but also on military-technical grounds. This is all the more so since in a post-Cold War reality, a loss of one or several big cities for the two powers would constitute unacceptable damage in view of the absence of political, ideological, economic or military stakes that would justify the risk of a direct large intentional armed conflict between them.

France and Britain, on the one hand, and Russia on the other, are essentially in a similar situation. Russia’s diminishing nuclear superiority over these two states is fully counterbalanced by NATO nuclear security guarantees to its member states. The same is true for Russian–Chinese strategic relations. Although Russia may retain a disarming strike capability against China’s ICBMs at least for a future decade, Chinese medium-range and tactical nuclear forces would present a prospect of unacceptable damage to Russia’s Siberian and Far Eastern cities.

The United States would probably retain a disarming nuclear strike capability against China for at least a decade to come. Hence, its potential NFU pledge to China would have primarily a political, not a military sense. Still, from the military point of view, China would have some guarantee of the credibility of such a US pledge by holding US troops, military bases and major allies in the region hostages to a devastating retaliation. China naturally would not have a first strike capability against the USA for the foreseeable future, so its pledge towards the USA would be strategically credible.

The CP creates audience costs---makes backsliding incredibly unlikely

Gerson 9 – Michael S. Gerson, Research Analyst at the Center for Naval Analyses, September 29, 2009, “Rethinking U.S. Nuclear Posture,” online: http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/0929\_transcript\_nuclear\_posture1.pdf

I’ll agree that it’s unnecessary, and I’ll be happy, if you want, in Q&A to discuss a little bit more about why I think it’s unnecessary. But what I want to argue is that retaining the option to use nuclear weapons first is not only unnecessary but also potentially dangerous. In arguing for “no first use,” proponents of the policy have not paid enough attention in their arguments to the risks of calculated ambiguity, and that’s sort of what I want to focus on today.

So thus my argument stands in contrast to those who believe that the more options the better, and that ambiguity aids deterrence by creating uncertainty and incalculable risks. My argument comes from a position that a fundamental tenet of deterrence is that limiting your options can in fact enhance deterrence and make you safer.

This notion of deliberately tying one’s hands or limiting one’s options is of course attributed to the work of Tom Schelling who argued that limiting one’s own options could be a commitment tactic to enhance the credibility of one’s threats. Examples in this context are burning a bridge – having your army cross and then burning a bridge so that one could not retreat, or more importantly, making your commitments public. Making statements public in fact becomes a commitment tactic by increasing the cost of going back. The example is, if you’re going to go on a diet, one of the best ways to make sure you actually keep on that diet is to tell everybody you know that you’re going on the diet.

#### Counterplan solves cred and the case

Adrian Vermeule 7, Harvard law prof - AND - Eric Posner - U Chicago law, The Credible Executive, 74 U. Chi. L. Rev. 865

\*We do not endorse gendered language

The Madisonian system of oversight has not totally failed. Some- times legislators overcome the temptation to free ride; sometimes they invest in protecting the separation of powers or legislative preroga- tives. Sometimes judges review exercises of executive discretion, even during emergencies. But often enough, legislators and judges have no real alternative to letting executive officials exercise discretion un- checked. The Madisonian system is a partial failure; compensating mechanisms must be adopted to fill the area of slack, the institutional gap between executive discretion and the oversight capacities of other institutions. Again, the magnitude of this gap is unclear, but plausibly it is quite large; we will assume that it is. It is often assumed that this partial failure of the Madisonian sys- tem unshackles and therefore benefits ill-motivated executives. This is grievously incomplete. The failure of the Madisonian system harms the well-motivated executive as much as it benefits the ill-motivated one. Where Madisonian oversight fails, the well-motivated executive is a victim of his own power. Voters, legislators, and judges will be wary of granting further discretion to an executive whose motivations are un- certain and possibly nefarious. The partial failure of Madisonian over- sight thus threatens a form of inefficiency, a kind of contracting failure that makes potentially everyone, including the voters, worse off. Our central question, then, is what the well-motivated executive can do to solve or at least ameliorate the problem. The solution is for the executive to complement his (well-motivated) first-order policy goals with second-order mechanisms for demonstrating credibility to other actors. We thus do not address the different question of what voters, legislators, judges, and other actors should do about an executive who is ill motivated and known to be so. That project involves shoring up or replacing the Madisonian system to block executive dictatorship. Our project is the converse of this, and involves finding new mechanisms to help the well-motivated executive credibly distinguish himself as such. ¶ IV. EXECUTIVE SIGNALING: LAW AND MECHANISMS ¶ We suggest that the executive’s credibility problem can be solved by second-order mechanisms of executive signaling. In the general case, well-motivated executives send credible signals by taking actions that are more costly for ill-motivated actors than for well- motivated ones, thus distinguishing themselves from their ill- motivated mimics. Among the specific mechanisms we discuss, an important subset involves executive self-binding, whereby executives commit themselves to a course of action that would impose higher costs on ill-motivated actors. Commitments themselves have value as signals of benign motivations. ¶ This departs from the usual approach in legal scholarship. Legal theory has often discussed self-binding by “government” or govern- ment officials. In constitutional theory, it is often suggested that consti- tutions represent an attempt by “the people” to bind “themselves” against their own future decisionmaking pathologies, or relatedly, that constitutional prohibitions represent mechanisms by which govern- ments commit themselves not to expropriate investments or to exploit their populations.72 Whether or not this picture is coherent,73 it is not the question we examine here, although some of the relevant consid- erations are similar.74 We are not concerned with binding the president so that he cannot abuse his powers, but with how he might bind himself or take other actions that enhance his credibility, so that he can generate support from the public and other members of the government. ¶ Furthermore, our question is subconstitutional: it is whether a well-motivated executive, acting within an established set of constitu- tional and statutory rules, can use signaling mechanisms to generate public trust. Accordingly, we proceed by assuming that no constitutional amendments or new statutes will be enacted. Within these con- straints, what can a well-motivated executive do to bootstrap himself to credibility? The problem for the well-motivated executive is to credibly signal his benign motivations. In general, the solution is to engage in actions that are less costly for good types than for bad types. ¶ We begin with some relevant law, then examine a set of possible mechanisms—emphasizing both the conditions under which they might succeed and the conditions under which they might not—and conclude by examining the costs of credibility. ¶ A. A Preliminary Note on Law and Self-Binding ¶ Many of our mechanisms are unproblematic from a legal per- spective, as they involve presidential actions that are clearly lawful. But a few raise legal questions; in particular, those that involve self- binding.75 Can a president bind himself to respect particular first-order policies? With qualifications, the answer is yes, at least to the same extent that a legislature can. Formally, a duly promulgated executive rule or order binds even the executive unless and until it is validly abrogated, thereby establishing a new legal status quo.76 The legal authority to establish a new status quo allows a president to create inertia or political constraints that will affect his own future choices. In a practical sense, presidents, like legislatures, have great de facto power to adopt policies that shape the legal landscape for the future. A president might commit himself to a long-term project of defense pro- curement or infrastructure or foreign policy, narrowing his own future choices and generating new political coalitions that will act to defend the new rules or policies. More schematically, we may speak of formal and informal means of self-binding:

Nuclear doctrine’s not key to relations---it’s not even the most important part of security relations

Brooks 9 – Ambassador Linton Brooks, independent national security consultant and former Director of the National Nuclear Security Administration, September 2009, “The Sino-American Nuclear Balance: Its Future and Implications,” in China’s Arrival: A Strategic Framework for a Global Relationship, ed. Abraham Denmark and Nirav Patel

The nuclear relationship between China and the United States is not the most important component of Sino-American relations; that honor belongs to economics. Nor is the nuclear relationship the most worrisome security issue. China’s growing emphasis on high-technology asymmetric warfare, especially cyber warfare, is likely to require far greater analysis and adaptation by the U.S. national security community. Yet nuclear weapons, because of their destructiveness and the mystique associated with them, remain a unique measure of national power. They have too often been neglected in discussions of Sino-American relations. This chapter, therefore, analyzes what is known about China’s strategic posture, identifies existing ambiguities, and suggests initiatives to improve mutual understanding and reduce the possibility of miscalculation. It does not consider other nuclear weapons-related issues such as the security of nuclear weapons or Chinese non-proliferation policy. 2

U.S.-China relations are complex---nuclear tensions don’t undermine coop in other areas

Craig 7 – Susan Craig, China Specialist for PACOM J1, formerly intelligence analyst at the Foreign Military Studies Office for the U.S. Army, July 2007, “Defining the U.S.-China Relationship: Beyond the Cold War and Status Quo Rise Constructs,” Issues & Insights, Vol. 7, No. 8

This rather paternalistic approach taken by U.S. thinkers and decision-makers is not intended to be condescending. Rather, it is primarily meant to be perceived as a cooperative, friendly approach and as part of our good-natured effort to help China become a “responsible stakeholder.” U.S. policymakers recognize the potential for China to share the burden in addressing the North Korean threat or other transnational problems and business leaders recognize the potential for China’s market. The Chinese also recognize the opportunities provided by a partnership with the United States. Cooperation on issues of common concern, such as trade and investment, infectious diseases, proliferation, and terrorism allows China greater freedom to focus its attention inward and manage and maintain its dramatic growth.

Yet, for all the common strategic interests shared between the two countries, we hardly consider each other to be friends. The Chinese military is focused on developing capabilities to defeat the U.S. Likewise, the U.S. military devotes considerable time and resources to considering and defending against “the China threat.” (The Chinese are quick to point to the Department of Defense’s Annual Report on China as evidence.)

None of these characterizations – friends or foes, equals or unequals – fully captures the complexity of the China-U.S. relationship. But none of them are wrong either. There are two frameworks, however, that are most referenced and least constructive – and the Chinese and Americans are equally guilty in propagating them. The Chinese overuse of their “peaceful rise” or “status quo rise” rhetoric and the U.S. use of the Cold War concept are dangerous mental shortcuts that allow us to apply comfortable but outdated theories of international relations. In this era of globalization, nonstate actors and transnational threats can have as much impact on the balance of power as the rise and fall of nation-states or nuclear parity.

Nuclear issues aren’t central to relations---massive areas of mutual benefit outweigh

Twomey 9 – Christopher P. Twomey, Co-Director of the Center for Contemporary Conflict and assistant professor in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, January-February 2009, “Chinese-U.S. Strategic Affairs: Dangerous Dynamism,” Arms Control Today, online: http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2009\_01-02/china\_us\_dangerous\_dynamism

Many aspects of the Chinese-U.S. relationship are mutually beneficial: some $400 billion in trade, bilateral military exchanges, and Beijing's increasingly constructive diplomatic role. There are other grounds for concern. Each side's militaries view the other as a potential adversary and increasingly make plans and structure their forces with that in mind.

On the conventional side, there are many important areas to consider, but the potential for nuclear rivalry raises monumental risks. This article assesses the dangers in the bilateral nuclear relationship, the potential for traditional arms control to address these challenges, the broadening of the "strategic" military sphere, and the issue of proliferation beyond the bilateral relationship.

Strategic relations are not at the center of Chinese-U.S. relations today. They do not deserve to be tomorrow. They are, however, rising appropriately in importance and must be managed proactively.

## China Adv
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### Primacy

#### Conventional wars against nuclear-armed adversaries require primacy to control escalation---otherwise adversaries will use nuclear weapons first

the U.S. will inevitably fight conventional wars against nuclear adversaries---conventional strength means they’ll escalate to nuclear war unless our nuclear primacy deters escalation

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. 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.

#### The plan’s causes China to ramp up modernization---leads to crisis instability and miscalc

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.

#### they’ll actively undermine U.S. interests

WP 10 – Washington Post, January 3, 2010, “U.S.-China relations to face strains, experts say,” online: http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/01/02/AR2010010201751.html

Still, U.S. officials and analysts have noticed a new assertiveness -- what one senior U.S. official called a "sense of triumphalism" -- on the part of officials and the public in China. This stems from a sense in Beijing that the global economic crisis proves the superiority of China's controlled economy and its authoritarian political system -- and that the West, and in particular the United States, is in decline.

This triumphalism was on display during the recently concluded climate talks in Copenhagen. China only sent a deputy foreign minister to meetings set for the level of heads of state; its representatives publicly clashed with their American counterparts. And during the climax of the conference, China's security team tried to block Obama and the rest of his entourage from entering a meeting chaired by China's prime minister, Wen Jiabao.

That type of swagger is new for China and it could make for a stronger reaction from Beijing.

"If they really believe the United States is in decline and that China will soon emerge as a superpower, they may seek to take on the U.S. in ways that will cause real problems," said Bonnie S. Glaser, an expert on China with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Complicating this picture is the view of some American analysts that the Obama administration -- with its intensive outreach to Beijing -- tried too hard in its first year to cultivate ties with China. Playing hard to get might have helped smooth out China's swagger, they suggest.

"Somehow the administration signaled to the Chinese that we need them more than they need us," Lampton said. "We're in the role of the supplicant."

Nuclear primacy and counterforce are key to deterrence-by-denial---gives the U.S. escalation dominance and deters adversaries from using their arsenals for compellence or aggression

McDonough 9 – David S. McDonough, Doctoral Fellow at the Centre for Foreign Policy Studies at Dalhousie University, March 2009, “Tailored Deterrence: The ‘New Triad’ and the Tailoring of Nuclear Superiority,” online: http://www.canadianinternationalcouncil.org/download/resourcece/archives/strategicd~2/sd\_no8\_200

These nuclear weapons projects and expanded targeting requirements constitute the latest manifestation of a longstanding American trend towards nuclear superiority. The search for some modicum of superiority was especially prevalent in the later years of the Cold War under the Carter and Reagan administrations’ fixation over a countervailing or prevailing strategy, and it appears to have only accelerated – albeit with a different kind of focus – since that period. The Bush administration most recently attempted to redefine its policy by introducing the tailored deterrence concept. In some ways, this description is remarkably apt, in that such a term does properly denote the tailoring of various policies to different adversaries and capabilities. The QDR also goes on to provide a good summary of this strategy, which includes: “prompt global strike capabilities to defend and respond in an overwhelming manner to WMD attacks and air and missile defenses…to deter attacks by demonstrating the ability to deny an adversary’s objectives.”8 The first two legs of the New Triad – offensive strike systems and active defences – are central to tailoring deterrence.

This vision places an emphasis on counterforce or counter-conventional capabilities – both Global Strike and missile defences – that would be designed to deny or eliminate the value of an adversary’s own deterrent. This deterrence-by-denial posture would, according to this logic, thereby deter an adversary from undertaking any means of compellence or aggression, given the surety that the United States would have a wide range of capabilities at all levels of conflict in order to deny the adversary’s objectives. This approach is therefore quite different from the more popularly understood deterrence-by-punishment strategy, which only advocates sufficient nuclear capabilities to punish an aggressor. In some ways, the shift from punishment to denial is a natural outcome of the massive disparity in power between the United States and its current adversaries; unlike during the Cold War, the US can more feasibly deny an adversary’s strategic military capabilities and objectives. Indeed, the denial approach can actually be seen as directed less at threatening a purported adversary and more towards assuring that the US has credible nuclear options that would prevent any immobilizing instance of self-deterrence.

Deterrence-by-denial is often perceived as being more ambitious and aggressive than a nuclear posture guided by punishment. The latter strategy allows for an adversary to maintain its own capability for punishment, and is therefore conducive to the idea of mutual assured destruction (MAD). Deterrence-by-denial, however, places a premium on the ability to deny the value of an adversary’s deterrent capability. MAD would be replaced with unilateral assured destruction and deterrence. Yet the counterforce capabilities tailored to deny an adversary’s objectives might not be clearly perceived as a mechanism to buttress deterrence. By requiring more varied and credible nuclear capabilities and the ability to deny an adversary’s objectives over a range of conflict levels, this approach basically constitutes an escalation dominance posture for the goal of deterrence; it might even look like a splendid first-strike posture to those American adversaries that lack a second-strike capability.

Nuclear superiority is therefore at the heart of the tailored deterrence concept. It is less about tailoring retaliatory and punishing deterrent capabilities against various actors, and more about tailoring counterforce and denial capabilities to negate the utility of an adversary’s own deterrent. This is ostensibly directed at America’s rogue state adversaries, in so far as the US has never accepted any form of mutual deterrent constraints with these states. Such constraints were only reluctantly accepted with the Soviet Union, and even then hawkish strategies to allow for escalatory dominance – with definite overtones of superiority – were advocated and initiated by American nuclear war planners.9

Nuclear primacy allows the U.S. to keep conflicts against nuclear-armed adversaries confined to conventional weapons---makes crisis escalation impossible

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

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.

#### No Syria pounder --- wasn’t an abdication of any authority and won’t set a precedent --- prefer more qualified evidence

- Obama *chose* to ask, he wasn’t forced

- Doesn’t set a precedent because each crisis is different

- Doesn’t apply to the DA because Syria wasn’t a direct threat to US security

- Future presidents will ignore

- The AUMF expands his authority

Jack M. Balkin 9/3/13, is Knight Professor of Constitutional Law and the First Amendment @ Yale Law School, and the founder and director of Yale's Information Society Project, an interdisciplinary center that studies law and new information technologies, “What Congressional Approval Won't Do: Trim Obama's Power or Make War Legal,” 2013, The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2013/09/what-congressional-approval-wont-do-trim-obamas-power-or-make-war-legal/279298/

One of the most misleading metaphors in the discussion of President Obama’s Syria policy is that the president has “boxed himself in” or has “painted himself into a corner.” These metaphors treat a president’s available actions as if they were physical spaces and limits on action as if they were physical walls. Such metaphors would make sense only if we also stipulated that Obama has the power to snap his fingers and create a door or window wherever he likes. The Syria crisis has not created a new precedent for limiting presidential power. To the contrary, it has offered multiple opportunities for increasing it.¶ If Congress says no to Obama, it will not significantly restrain future presidents from using military force. At best, it will preserve current understandings about presidential power. If Congress says yes, it may bestow significant new powers on future presidents -- and it will also commit the United States to violating international law. For Obama plans to violate the United Nations Charter, and he wants Congress to give him its blessing.¶ People who believe Obama has painted himself into a corner or boxed himself in might not remember that the president always has the option to ask Congress to authorize any military action he proposes, thus sharing the responsibility for decision if the enterprise goes sour. If Congress refuses, Obama can easily back away from any threats he has made against Syria, pointing to the fact that Congress would not go along. There is no corner. There is no box.¶ Wouldn’t congressional refusal make the United States look weak, as critics including Senator John McCain warn loudly? Hardly. The next dictator who acts rashly will face a different situation and a different calculus. The UN Security Council or NATO may feel differently about the need to act. There may be a new threat to American interests that lets Obama or the next president offer a different justification for acting. It just won’t matter very much what Obama said about red lines in the past. World leaders say provocative things all the time and then ignore them. Their motto is: That was then, and this is now.¶ If Congress turns him down, won’t Obama be undermined at home, as other critics claim? In what sense? It is hard to see how the Republicans could be less cooperative than they already are. And it’s not in the interest of Democrats to fault a president of their own party for acceding to what Congress wants instead of acting unilaterally. ¶ Some commentators argue (or hope) that whatever happens, Obama’s request for military authorization will be an important precedent that will begin to restore the constitutional balance between the president and Congress in the area of war powers. Don’t bet on it. By asking for congressional authorization in this case, Obama has not ceded any authority that he ­or any other president ­ has previously asserted in war powers. ¶ Syria presents a case in which previous precedents did not apply. There is no direct threat to American security, American personnel, or American interests. There is no Security Council resolution to enforce. And there is no claim that America needs to shore up the credibility of NATO or another important security alliance. Nor does Obama have even the feeble justification that the Clinton Administration offered in Kosovo­: that congressional appropriations midway through the operation offered tacit and retroactive approval for the bombings. ¶ It is naive to think that the next time a president wants to send forces abroad without congressional approval, he or she will be deterred by the fact that Barack Obama once sought congressional permission to bomb Syria. If a president can plausibly assert that any of the previous justifications apply -- ­including those offered in the Libya intervention -- the case of Syria is easily distinguishable. ¶ Perhaps more to the point, Congress still cannot go to the courts to stop the president, given existing legal precedents. Congress may respond by refusing to appropriate funds, but that is a remedy that they have always had -- and have rarely had the political will to exercise. ¶ The most important limit on presidential adventurism is political, not legal. It will turn less on the precedent of Syria than on whether the last adventure turned out well or badly. ¶ In fact, the Syria episode offers Obama­ and future presidents­ new opportunities for increasing presidential power. Obama has submitted a fairly broad authorization for the use of military force (AUMF) proposal to Congress. It is not limited either temporally or geographically; it does not specifically exclude the use of ground troops; and it requires only that the president determine that there is a plausible connection between his use of force and the use of weapons of mass destruction in the Syrian civil war. If Congress adopts this proposal, President Obama ­and every future president ­can simply add it to the existing body of AUMFs and congressional authorizations. ¶ In the American system, presidents often gain the most power not by acting unilaterally or in defiance of congressional statutes but by relying on previous congressional authorizations and interpreting them generously to expand their authority­ -- sometimes in ways that Congress never dreamed of. A case in point is the 2001 AUMF against al-Qaeda, which has no time limit. It has served as the justification for a wide range of executive actions by Presidents George W. Bush and Obama, and it will probably to continue to do so well into the future. That is a good reason to amend Obama’s proposal for a new AUMF to include a sunset clause, a geographical restriction, and a limit on what kinds of forces can be used.

#### Syria doesn’t affect cred because it isn’t a vital interest

Robert Hunter 9/6/13, former US ambassador to NATO and member of the National Security Council staff, former Senior Advisor to the RAND Corporationand Director of the Center for Transatlantic Security Studies at the National Defense University, current Chairman of the Council for a Community of Democracies and member of the American Academy of Diplomacy, “US Credibility Requires More than Enforcing Red Lines on Syria,” http://www.lobelog.com/us-credibility-requires-more-than-enforcing-red-lines-on-syria/

But what are those “consequences?” Are all red lines equally significant? Does failure to honor every declared commitment, formal or informal, large or small, always mean that other US commitments will not be taken seriously? It is hard to accept that proposition at face value — and countries which have tested it have rued the day. Indeed, like beauty, credibility is very much “in the eye of the beholder.”¶ Certainly, some commitments are more important than others. It would not matter if the president promised to quit smoking and did not; but it would matter very much if he pledged to defend the nation against a terrorist attack and sat idly by in face of another 9/11. “Credibility” must thus be seen on a sliding scale, and deciding where on this scale a particular commitment lies is a matter of judgment. (It is also important not to declare a “red line” if it does not truly relate to US national security interests, as Obama did in the current instance.) This is a major reason that most US security commitments take the form of treaties, ratified by the Senate.¶ The first requirement is to match the commitment to an objective reality of US security needs, as clearly understood both by the US and others. While deterring the use of chemical weapons is desirable and has a long history stemming in particular from World War I, what has happened in Syria does not directly impact on the security of the United States (chemical weapons have also accounted for less than two percent of casualties in the Syrian civil war, to which the “international community” has been largely indifferent). It is not like the attack on Pearl Harbor or 9/11. It is not like Saddam Hussein’s 1990 invasion of Kuwait, which put at risk a large fraction of the world’s exportable hydrocarbons. Had the United States not responded with military force to these direct threats, allies could rightly have wondered about American willpower, and enemies could have tested it elsewhere. Not only would US security have been put in jeopardy, so would the confidence that others have reposed in us. That is not now the case in Syria. Nor, despite the president’s assertion, is this a matter of the international community’s credibility, an effort to spread the responsibility and show the American people that the US is just the agent of a broad consensus. The risk in making that assertion is that a large fraction of the world’s nations do not agree that attacking Syria will help, and that list goes far beyond Russia, China and Iran.