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#### Restriction is a prohibition

Jean Schiedler-Brown 12, Attorney, Jean Schiedler-Brown & Associates, Appellant Brief of Randall Kinchloe v. States Dept of Health, Washington, The Court of Appeals of the State of Washington, Division 1, http://www.courts.wa.gov/content/Briefs/A01/686429%20Appellant%20Randall%20Kincheloe%27s.pdf

3. The ordinary definition of the term "restrictions" also does not include the reporting and monitoring or supervising terms and conditions that are included in the 2001 Stipulation. ¶ Black's Law Dictionary, 'fifth edition,(1979) defines "restriction" as; ¶ A limitation often imposed in a deed or lease respecting the use to which the property may be put. The term "restrict' is also cross referenced with the term "restrain." Restrain is defined as; To limit, confine, abridge, narrow down, restrict, obstruct, impede, hinder, stay, destroy. To prohibit from action; to put compulsion on; to restrict; to hold or press back. To keep in check; to hold back from acting, proceeding, or advancing, either by physical or moral force, or by interposing obstacle, to repress or suppress, to curb. ¶ In contrast, the terms "supervise" and "supervisor" are defined as; To have general oversight over, to superintend or to inspect. See Supervisor. A surveyor or overseer. . . In a broad sense, one having authority over others, to superintend and direct. The term "supervisor" means an individual having authority, in the interest of the employer, to hire, transfer, suspend, layoff, recall, promote, discharge, assign, reward, or discipline other employees, or responsibility to direct them, or to adjust their grievances, or effectively to recommend such action, if in connection with the foregoing the exercise of such authority is not of a merely routine or clerical nature, but required the use of independent judgment. ¶ Comparing the above definitions, it is clear that the definition of "restriction" is very different from the definition of "supervision"-very few of the same words are used to explain or define the different terms. In his 2001 stipulation, Mr. Kincheloe essentially agreed to some supervision conditions, but he did not agree to restrict his license.

Restrictions on authority are distinct from conditions

William Conner 78, former federal judge for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York United States District Court, S. D. New York, CORPORACION VENEZOLANA de FOMENTO v. VINTERO SALES, http://www.leagle.com/decision/19781560452FSupp1108\_11379

Plaintiff next contends that Merban was charged with notice of the restrictions on the authority of plaintiff's officers to execute the guarantees. Properly interpreted, the "conditions" that had been imposed by plaintiff's Board of Directors and by the Venezuelan Cabinet were not "restrictions" or "limitations" upon the authority of plaintiff's agents but rather conditions precedent to the granting of authority. Essentially, then, plaintiff's argument is that Merban should have known that plaintiff's officers were not authorized to act except upon the fulfillment of the specified conditions.
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Limits

a.) Limits and ground - they make the topic bidirectional and open the floodgates to tons of new affs.

b.) Precision - Our evidence clearly defines restrictions in the context of authority = Precision is key to generate topic education and research.
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#### Did you know somebody could have poisoned your corn-flakes this morning? The affirmative represents the ultimate culmination in paranoia induced politics - it is literally not worth the effort to vote for the aff.

Gartzke 12 - Associate Professor of Political Science at University of California San Diego (Erik, http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/papers/cyberwar\_12062012.pdf, December 7th 2012, The Myth of Cyberwar Bringing War on the Internet Back Down to Earth)

The notion that cyberspace is a new domain where old rules don't apply and where omnipresent vulnerabilities require extensive (and expensive) military reform is both intuitive and widely expressed. Cyberspace could constitute a hidden back door, enabling opponents to undermine U.S. national security and circumvent the terrestrial advantages of the existing western-dominated order. History makes clear that technological innovations or new modes of organization eventually topple every hierarchy.4 However, it is far from clear that we are in the midst of such a transition today. Lacking information about whether developments are transformational or merely incremental, it may make sense to begin with a few guidelines about when panic is in order, and when it is not. A reasonable level of caution is probably provided by common sense. Most readers will lock their doors at night, for example, and refrain from handling large sums of cash in dark alleyways. Imagining what others could do to harm each of us, however, can quickly slide into paranoia. It is not reasonable caution to believe that someone is intent on mischief simply because harm is possible. Even in the safest of societies, individuals, groups and entire communities are subject to an enormous variety of potential hazards. Much could be done to damage each of us, even though few of these possibilities are actually exercised, or experienced, with any regularity. The physical world hosts a multitude of venues for extremely unlikely accident or disease. A small number of people prefer to stay in their homes rather than risk being struck by lightening or struck down by botchulism. Still, individuals with these concerns often receive more attention from psychiatric professionals than from military planners. Being vulnerable should be novel to no one living in the modern world. Indeed, the capacity to harm in a highly integrated world is so ubiquitous that blood would coat the streets if it were not for the fact that relatively little relationship exists between the capacity to attack and the actual prospect that one is invaded, assaulted or otherwise done in.5 Just about anything is possible. Someone may have poisoned your morning Corn Flakes. Terrorists may have singled you out for vengeance, or you might just become one of the unlucky few who are in the wrong place at the wrong time. When a commuter steps outside to start her car or to catch the bus, it is impossible to be certain that no truck will jump the curb and that every asteroid will remain in the heavens. And yet, despite endless possibilities for damage or death, the vast majority of us have yet to harden our living rooms against cruise missiles or falling satellites. In dealing with known unknowns, we became comfortable with the fact that we are unprotected. Few homeowners in California carry earthquake insurance, for example, though it is by no means impossible that \the big one" will strike tomorrow. We do so because security itself has a price; protection from unlikely events is literally not worth the effort. One could buy that bulletproof vest relentlessly listed on Ebay, but then how often would it really be proper attire at the office or in the classroom? Unlike possibilities, the probabilities of esoteric catastrophe are by their nature minute. Unlikely events are unlikely, and so most of us go about our business, without paying undue attention to the potential menace from the skies or, for that matter, from our fellow citizens. Governments face similar realities. Many threats are conceivable, but few are likely to occur. All forms of security involve assessing risks and allocating limited resources to address tractable threats, making the largest ( nite) improvements in protection or, conversely, the greatest increases in in uence.6 Every dollar spent on national defense must be taken from objectives like education, infrastructure, or paying down the debt. Only extremely auent (or paranoid) populations pay the price of pursuing protection from the most exotic hazards. More to the point, protection is inevitably incomplete, and comes with its own consequences, including other forms of insecurity. The risk of attack is never zero, since a potent defense or deterrent endangers the security of others.7 If violence is a perennial possibility, why don't human beings live in consummate fear? Most of us are safe because the multitudes who are capable of causing us harm have little interest in doing so. For the most part, violence does little that potential perpetrators view as worth their while. Much of humanity is protected by an invisible shell of indi erence or ine caciousness. The stranger coming toward you on a busy city street could easily swing out his arm at the last minute, catching you under the chin. He could be carrying an Uzi, which in a fit of rage will leave you and other passersby on the pavement in a pool of intermingling body fluids. We see little such violence because it does little to benefit the violator, just as bludgeoning the odd shopper in the mall fails to profit the bludgeoner. Violence is costly, risky, and mostly unproductive. When we learn of violence, our natural inclination is to ask \why?" Like a police detective, we seek a motive. When on occasion violence occurs with no apparent logic as to target, it is remarkable, and puzzling. Most of us are capable of seriously damaging others, but for the most part we fail to exercise our capabilities because there is no positive reason to strike. The mere capacity to inflict harm is thus not a very good predictor of aggressive behavior. Because few of us are likely to be the target of an attack, each of us can greet each day with minimal anxiety, to say nothing of personal security, not because we are effectively protected from harm, but because harm is inconvenient, unnecessary or pointless for potential perpetrators. Attacking us (or others) serves no purpose. The internet makes it possible to interact with people just about anywhere on the globe as easily, or even more easily, than conversing with the neighbors next door. Initial attention to the mobility of cyberspace focused on the potential for good, but convenience also overcomes natural barriers to conflict. The supply of targets for cyber acts of aggression is certainly huge relative to the supply of perpetrators of physical violence. Viewed in this way, it is remarkable that cyber space is not predominantly the domain of fraud, identity theft, and other acts of predation, interspersed only by porn and the occasional Nigerian emailer looking to deposit millions in your bank account. Yet, if the internet makes it easy to reach out and touch others, it in no way makes those contacts profound. Casual attempts to undermine your welfare abound, but it is with equal casualness that we ignore the bulk of spam, or internet sites marketing lapsed software. Predation continues unabated on the world wide web, but if it is easy to reach us, contact is all the more superficial. The ease of contact is generally inversely related to the prevalence of transgression. Just as a pedestrian can be fairly comfortable walking in front of a stopped vehicle at an intersection, most internet traffic is benign, simply because perpetrators are rare and opportunities are many. Cyber space has not made life more dangerous for the multitudes. There are crimes on the internet, but it is far from clear that the internet has increased overall criminal behavior. Internet crime often substitutes for crimes that would otherwise have been committed in real space. Perhaps even more to the point, much of internet fraud and cyber violence is intrinsically tied to the physical domain; much of the harm initiated on the internet eventually gets perpetrated in more conventional ways. The safety that mass populations achieve from their numbers and anonymity in terms of targeting is denied political institutions and their representatives. Countries and organizations have facilities and personnel that can be targeted with violence. How might the ability to strike institutions and infrastructure change the risk of cyber attack? Once again, we must inquire not about what could happen but why individuals, groups or nations might be motivated to take action. Nations and organizations can be attacked through the internet, just as they have long been attacked in physical space. The ease with which such attacks can be perpetrated are an obvious, and much discussed, phenomenon. Physical space has always been an important barrier to conflict.8 Even today, the single best predictor of interstate conflict is the contiguity of national borders (Hensel 2000, Senese 2005). However, lowering the cost of transmission of an attack is only synonymous with increasing the appeal of a given approach to war if the approach is also effective in achieving certain ends. Beyond being anonymous and a multitude, the main thing that protects individuals from all types of violence is even more potent for political institutions; it is not clear in many cases how force will yield a change in the tide of the a airs of states or organizations. Cyber attacks can be appealing as political acts only to the degree that they affect the decisions organizations and sovereigns make with and without cyber violence. Since understanding when and how cyberwar influences politics is largely identical to understanding how conventional forms of military violence act upon politics, I turn next to an analysis of the nature of terrestrial warfare.

#### Cyber weapons are just an added augment to existing capabilities, they do not change geostrategic calculus - they conflate intent with capabilities.

Gartzke 12 - Associate Professor of Political Science at University of California San Diego (Erik, http://dss.ucsd.edu/~egartzke/papers/cyberwar\_12062012.pdf, December 7th 2012, The Myth of Cyberwar Bringing War on the Internet Back Down to Earth)

A blitz of media, punditry and public pronouncements inform interested observers and policy makers that the next war is likely to be won or lost on the internet. Indeed, events such as the coordinated cyber attacks on Estonia and the Stuxnet worm seem to indicate that cyberwar has already begun. The sense of urgency surrounding cyberwar appears to be tied to perceptions that internet conflict is the newest phase in the ongoing revolution in military affairs, only this time the threat is directed at the sophisticated technological civilizations of the West, rather than at poor developing states or the recipients of inferior second-world military hardware.1 To believe a growing number of pundits and practitioners, cyberwar threatens to render existing military advantages impotent, exposing those nations most dependent on comprehensive information infrastructures to devastating and unpredictable attacks. If powerful states largely immune to terrestrial invasion can have their military might blunted and their factories and cities idled by foreign hackers, then perhaps this latest technological revolution really does presage a \Pearl Harbor" in which the United States and other great powers will be targets, rather than perpetrators, of shock and awe. There is a problem with the growing consensus of impending cyber apocalypse, however: it is far from clear that conflict over the internet can actually function as war. Discussions of cyberwar commit a common fallacy of arguing from opportunity to outcome, rather than considering whether something that could happen is at all likely, given the motives of those who are able to act. Cyber pessimism rests heavily on capabilities (means), with little thought to a companion logic of consequences (ends). Much that could happen in the world fails to occur, largely because those capable of initiating action discern no benefit from doing so. Put another way, advocates have yet to work out how cyberwar actually accomplishes the objectives that typically sponsor terrestrial military violence. Absent a logic of consequences, it is difficult to believe that cyberwar will prove as devastating for world a airs and for developed nations in particular as many seem to believe. This essay assesses the salience of the internet for carrying out functions commonly identified with terrestrial political violence. War is fundamentally a political process, as Clausewitz (1976[1832]) famously explained. States, groups and individuals threaten harm to deter or compel, generating influence through the prospect of damage or loss. Military violence can also be exercised to alter or maintain the balance of power and to resist or impose disputed outcomes. The internet is generally an inferior substitute to terrestrial force in performing the functions of coercion or conquest. Cyber \war" is not likely to serve as the final arbiter of competition in an anarchical world and so should not be considered in isolation from more traditional forms of political violence.2 In fact, the capacity for internet coercion is limited by the same factors that make cyberwar appear at first to be so intimidating. For threats or demands to prove effective, targets must believe both that an attack is likely to follow from noncompliance, and that the attack is destined to inflict unacceptable harm. Yet, as I detail here, the need to apprise targets of internet vulnerabilities in order to make cyber threats credible contrasts with the secrecy needed to ensure an efective attack. Since it is difficult to share operational details of planned attacks without compromising military efectiveness, cyberwar must be practiced more often than threatened. Here too, however, there are critical limitations to what can be achieved via the internet. It is one thing for an opponent to idle a country's infrastructure, communications or military capabilities. It is quite another to ensure that the damage inflicted translates into a lasting shift in the balance of national capabilities or resolve. Cyber attacks are unlikely to prove particularly potent in grand strategic terms unless they are accompanied by terrestrial military force or other actions designed to capitalize on temporary weakness effected over the internet. Perpetrators must therefore be prepared to exploit windows of opportunity generated by internet attacks through other modes of combat. Otherwise, there are few compelling reasons to initiate cyberwar in the rst place. The chief benefciaries of cyberwar are thus less likely to be weak or rising powers than those states that already possess important terrestrial military advantages. Conceived of in this way, the internet is less a revolution in military affairs than it is yet another set of technologies that extend existing disparities in power and influence.

#### The impact is pure war which results in psychological violence and the potential for lashout.

Borg 2003 (Mark; PhD in psychoanalysis, practicing psychoanalyst and community/organizational consultant working in New York City. He is a graduate of the William Alanson White Institute's psychoanalytic certification program and continues his candidacy in their organizational dynamics program. He is co-founder and executive director of the Community Consulting Group, "Psychoanalytic Pure War: Interactions with the Post-Apocalyptic Unconscious": JPCS: Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture & Society, Volume 8, Number 1, Spring 2003, MUSE)

Paul Virilio and Sylvere Lotringer’s concept of “pure war” refers to the potential of a culture to destroy itself completely (12).2We as psychoanalysts can—and increasingly must—explore the impact of this concept on our practice, and on the growing number of patients who live with the inability to repress or dissociate their experience and awareness of the pure war condition. The realization of a patient’s worst fears in actual catastrophic events has always been a profound enough psychotherapeutic challenge. These days, however, catastrophic events not only threaten friends, family, and neighbors; they also become the stuff of endless repetitions and dramatizations on radio, television, and Internet.3 Such continual reminders of death and destruction affect us all. What is the role of the analyst treating patients who live with an ever-threatening sense of the pure war lying just below the surface of our cultural veneer? At the end of the First World War, the first “total war,” Walter Benjamin observed that “nothing [after the war] remained unchanged but the clouds, and beneath these clouds, in a field of force of destructive torrents and explosions, was the tiny, fragile human body”(84). Julia Kristeva makes a similar note about our contemporary situation, “The recourse to atomic weapons seems to prove that horror...can rage absolutely” (232). And, as if he too were acknowledging this same fragility and uncontainability, the French politician Georges Clemenceau commented in the context of World War I that “war is too serious to be confined to the military” (qtd. in Virilio and Lotringer 15). Virilio and Lotringer gave the name “pure war” to the psychological condition that results when people know that they live in a world where the possibility for absolute destruction (e.g., nuclear holocaust) exists. As Virilio and Lotringer see it, it is not the technological capacity for destruction (that is, for example, the existence of nuclear armaments) that imposes the dread characteristic of a pure war psychology but the belief systems that this capacity sets up. Psychological survival requires that a way be found (at least unconsciously) to escape inevitable destruction—it requires a way out—but this enforces an irresolvable paradox, because the definition of pure war culture is that there is no escape. Once people believe in the external possibility— at least those people whose defenses cannot handle the weight of the dread that pure war imposes— pure war becomes an internal condition, a perpetual state of preparation for absolute destruction and for personal, social, and cultural death.

#### Our alternative is to ground our politics within our vulnerability - this critical to engaging with others meaningfully.

Lifton 3 - professor of psychiatry at Harvard [Robert Jay Lifton, Visiting Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, previously Distinguished Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology at the Graduate School and Director of The Center on Violence and Human Survival at John Jay College of Criminal Justice at the City University of New York, 2003 (Superpower Syndrome: America’s Apocalyptic Confrontation With The World, Published by Thunder’s Mouth Press / Nation Books, ISBN 1560255129, p. 196-99)]

Stepping out of that syndrome would also include surrendering the claim of certainty, of ownership of truth and reality. That ownership gives rise to deadly righteousness, with a claim to illumination so absolute as to transcend ordinary restraints against mass violence. The healthier alternative is an acceptance of some measure of ambiguity, of inevitable elements of confusion and contradiction, [end page 196] whether in relation to large historical events or in matters of personal experience. This would include a more nuanced approach to Islam and Islamist thought and behavior that allows for the possibility of evolution and change. It is often claimed that no such acceptance of ambiguity is possible because superpowers, like nations, like people, are uncomfortable with it, that the tendency is always to seek clarity and something close to certainty. But this assumption may well underestimate our psychological capabilities. Ambiguity, in fact, is central to human function, recognized and provided for by cultural institutions and practices everywhere. American society in particular has cultivated the kinds of ambiguity that go with multiplicity and with shifting populations and frontiers. I have tried in my past work to formulate a version of the self as many-sided, flexible, and capable of change and transformation. This protean self (named after Proteus, the Greek sea god who was capable of taking on many shapes) stands in direct contrast to the fundamentalist or apocalyptic self. Indeed, the closed fundamentalist self and its apocalyptic impulses can be understood as a reaction to protean tendencies, which are widely abroad in our world as a response to the complexities of recent history. Any contemporary claim to absolute certainty, then, is compensatory, an artificial plunge into totalism that seeks an escape from the ambiguity that so pervades our historical legacy. American society is more volatile on these matters than [end page 197] many suspect. Over the previous century and at the beginning of a new one, we have been undergoing waves of contending forms of populism—pendulum swings between totalistic impulses and more open, if less clearly formulated, protean principles. How this psychohistorical struggle will develop we have no way of knowing, but we need hardly give up on ambiguity, or on our capacity to combine it with strongly held ethical principles. There is a real sense in which elements of ambiguity are necessary to our well-being. They certainly are necessary to the well-being of our nation, and of the world. To live with ambiguity is to accept vulnerability. American aspirations toward superpower invulnerability have troubling parallels in Islamist visions of godly power. Surrendering the dream of invulnerability, more enlightened American leaders could begin to come to terms with the idea that there will always be some danger in our world, that reasonable and measured steps can be taken to limit that danger and combat threats of violence, but that invulnerability is itself a perilous illusion. To cast off that illusion would mean removing the psychological pressure of sustaining a falsified vision of the world, as opposed to taking a genuine place in the real one. Much of this has to do with accepting the fact that we die, a fact not altered by either superpower militarism or religious fanaticism. A great part of apocalyptic violence is in the service of a vast claim of immortality, a claim that [end page 198] can, in the end, often be sustained only by victimizing large numbers of people. Zealots come to depend upon their mystical, spiritual, or military vision to protect themselves from death, and to provide immortality through killing.
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#### TEXT: The United States federal government ought to statutorily prohibit the authority of the President of the United States to authorize the use of offensive cyber operations except against the nation of North Korea.

#### OCOs give the US coercive leverage to deescalate North Korean nuclear brinksmanship --- speed is key

Martin C. Libicki 13, Senior Management Scientist @ RAND and adjunct fellow @ Georgetown’s Center for Security Studies, “Brandishing Cyberattack Capabilities,” RAND, http://www.rand.org/pub s/research\_reports/RR175.html

Our inquiry is therefore more humble. Could a U.S. threat that it might interfere with a rogue state’s nuclear weapon delivery help shape a nuclear confrontation? For this question, assume a rogue nuclear power with a handful of weapons capable of hitting nearby countries (but generally incapable of hitting the continental United States). The United States has a robust cyberattack capability (in general terms), from which the rogue state’s nuclear arsenal is not provably immune. Although the United States enjoys escalation dominance, the rogue state is far more willing to go to the nuclear brink than the United States is. The rogue state (thinks it) has more at stake (i.e., regime survival). Furthermore, it may act in ways that are irrational by Western perspectives.¶ We first model a two-state confrontation, then later introduce a friendly state on whose behalf the United States has intervened. The United States enters this scenario facing the choice of acting when doing so risks the rogue state releasing a nuclear weapon. Whether the threat is explicit or implicit is secondary. The usual calculus applies. The rogue state is better off if its threat leads the United States to stop. The United States is better off ignoring the threat and going ahead with what it would have done in the absence of the threat if the threat can be nullified but cannot know that it will be for certain. The rogue state understands that if it does use nuclear weapons, it could face great retaliation.1¶ If the United States acts (successfully) in the face of warning and if the rogue state does not use nuclear weapons, the United States achieves its objectives and wins the overall confrontation.2 If the United States flinches, the rogue state wins. If the rogue state uses its nuclear weapons and if, as is likely, the United States responds likewise, the rogue state loses greatly, but the United States is also far worse off.3¶ Two-Party Confrontations¶ In a confrontation in which disaster would result from both sides carrying out their threats, each must ask: Are such threats credible? If one side thinks the other will yield, it pays to stand firm. If it thinks, however, that the other is implacable, it may have no good choice but to yield itself. The projection of implacability is beneficial, but the reality of implacability is frequently suicidal.¶ Note that the basis for the implacability can also be entirely subjective, which is to say, unfounded on the facts of the matter. If one party is convinced that it will never pay a high price for being implacable, communicates as much, and acts as if it were so, the other cannot take any comfort from the fact that the first has no technical basis for the belief. The only consideration is whether the first party actually believes as much, is willing to act accordingly, and can ignore the logic that whispers that no one can possibly be completely confident on the basis of iffy information. To one party, the willingness to act on the basis of the impossible seems like cheating. To use an analogy, imagine a game of “chicken” in which the driver of one of the two oncoming cars throws the steering wheel out the window. This cheat forces the opponent to choose between a certain crash or veering away (and thus losing). However, when the consequences of a crash are far greater than the benefits of winning, this strategy is irrational if there is a nontrivial likelihood that the other side will be intent on punishing cheaters at the cost of all other values. In the analogy, the second driver might rather crash than lose to a cheater.4 But in general, a strategy of implacability, can, if credible, do well, as long as the other side is not equally implacable.¶ So, the United States creates the belief (whether by saying so, hinting, or letting others draw their own conclusion) that the rogue state cannot carry out its nuclear threat. That is, the United States acts as though a flaw somewhere in the nuclear command-and-control cycle, probably an induced flaw, prevents immediate nuclear use. A lesser case is that the command and control is less certain, the weapon is weaker, and/or the delivery system is far less accurate than feared.5 Although permanently disabling a nuclear command-and-control system is quite a stretch for cyberwar, it is less fantastic to imagine that the United States could delay a weapon’s use. A temporary advantage, though, may still give the United States time to cross the red line and thereby attain a fait accompli.¶ So posturing, the United States prepares to cross the red line, while communicating its confidence that the rogue state will not retaliate. This confidence stems from a combination of its own nuclear deterrence capability plus its ability to confound the rogue state’s nuclear capability: The rogue nuclear state probably will not decide to retaliate, and if it did decide to, probably cannot retaliate. The combination, in this case, is what reduces the odds of a nuclear response to a sufficiently low level, if the rogue state is at all rational. Even if it later assures itself and others that its nuclear capacity is intact, but the United States has already acted, the onus then falls on the rogue nuclear state to respond to what could well be a done deal. If the rogue state understands the logic before brandishing its own nuclear weapons, it may choose not to ratchet up tensions in advance of the U.S. crossing red lines.

**An unchecked North Korea causes global catastrophe**

**Hayes and Green, 10**

[\*Victoria University AND Executive Director of the Nautilus Institute (Peter and Michael, “-“The Path Not Taken, the Way Still Open: Denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia”, 1/5, http://www.nautilus.org/fora/security/10001HayesHamalGreen.pdf) uwyo//amp]

The consequences of failing to address the proliferation threat posed by the North Korea developments, and related political and economic issues, are serious, not only for the Northeast Asian region but for the whole international community. At worst, there is the possibility of nuclear attack1, whether by intention, miscalculation, or merely accident, leading to the resumption of Korean War hostilities. On the Korean Peninsula itself, key population centres are well within short or medium range missiles. The whole of Japan is likely to come within North Korean missile range. Pyongyang has a population of over 2 million, Seoul (close to the North Korean border) 11 million, and Tokyo over 20 million. Even a limited nuclear exchange would result in a holocaust of unprecedented proportions. But the catastrophe within the region would not be the only outcome. New research indicates that even a limited nuclear war in the region would rearrange our global climate far more quickly than global warming. Westberg draws attention to new studies modelling the effects of even a limited nuclear exchange involving approximately 100 Hiroshima-sized 15 kt bombs2 (by comparison it should be noted that the United States currently deploys warheads in the range 100 to 477 kt, that is, individual warheads equivalent in yield to a range of 6 to 32 Hiroshimas).The studies indicate that the soot from the fires produced would lead to a decrease in global temperature by 1.25 degrees Celsius for a period of 6-8 years.3 In Westberg’s view: That is not global winter, but the nuclear darkness will cause a deeper drop in temperature than at any time during the last 1000 years. The temperature over the continents would decrease substantially more than the global average. A decrease in rainfall over the continents would also follow…The period of nuclear darkness will cause much greater decrease in grain production than 5% and it will continue for many years...hundreds of millions of people will die from hunger…To make matters even worse, such amounts of smoke injected into the stratosphere would cause a huge reduction in the Earth’s protective ozone.4 These, of course, are not the only consequences. Reactors might also be targeted, causing further mayhem and downwind radiation effects, superimposed on a smoking, radiating ruin left by nuclear next-use. Millions of refugees would flee the affected regions. The direct impacts, and the follow-on impacts on the global economy via ecological and food insecurity, could make the present global financial crisis pale by comparison. How the great powers, especially the nuclear weapons states respond to such a crisis, and in particular, whether nuclear weapons are used in response to nuclear first-use, could make or break the global non proliferation and disarmament regimes. There could be many unanticipated impacts on regional and global security relationships5, with subsequent nuclear breakout and geopolitical turbulence, including possible loss-of-control over fissile material or warheads in the chaos of nuclear war, and aftermath chain-reaction affects involving other potential proliferant states. The Korean nuclear proliferation issue is not just a regional threat but a global one that warrants priority consideration from the international

### Case – Solvency

#### Obama will circumvent the plan --- empirics prove

Levine 12 - Law Clerk; J.D., May 2012, University of Michigan Law School (David Levine, 2013 SURVEY OF BOOKS RELATED TO THE LAW: BOOK NOTICE: A TIME FOR PRESIDENTIAL POWER? WAR TIME AND THE CONSTRAINED EXECUTIVE, 111 Mich. L. Rev. 1195)

Both the Declare War Clause n49 and the War Powers Resolution n50 give Congress some control over exactly when "wartime" exists. While the U.S. military was deployed to Libya during the spring and summer of 2011, the Obama Administration advanced the argument that, under the circumstances, it was bound by neither clause. n51 If Dudziak is worried about "war's presence as an ongoing feature of American democracy" (p. 136), Libya is a potent case study with implications for the use of force over the coming decades. Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution grants to Congress the power to "declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water." n52 Although there is substantial debate on the precise scope of these powers, n53 this clause at least provides some measure of congressional control over significant commitments of U.S. forces to battle. However, it has long been accepted that presidents, acting pursuant to the commander-in-chief power, may "introduce[] armed forces into situations in which they encounter[], or risk[] encountering, hostilities, but which [are] not "wars' in either the common meaning or the [\*1207] constitutional sense." n54 Successive administrations have adopted some variant of that view and have invariably deployed U.S. forces abroad in a limited manner based on this inherent authority. n55 The Obama Administration has adopted this position - that a president has inherent constitutional authority to deploy forces outside of war - and even sought to clarify it. In the Office of Legal Counsel's ("OLC") memo to President Obama on the authority to use military force in Libya, n56 the Administration acknowledged that the Declare War Clause is a "possible constitutionally-based limit on ... presidential authority to employ military force." n57 The memo reasoned that the Constitution speaks only to Congress's ability to shape engagements that are "wars," and that presidents have deployed forces in limited contexts from the earliest days of the Union. n58 Acknowledging those facts, the memo concluded that the constitutional limit on congressional power must be the conceptual line between war and not war. In locating this boundary, the memo looked to the "anticipated nature, scope, and duration" of the conflict to which President Obama was introducing forces. n59 OLC found that the "war" standard "will be satisfied only by prolonged and substantial military engagements, typically involving exposure of U.S. military personnel to significant risk over a substantial period." n60 The Obama Administration's position was not out of sync with previous presidential practice - the Declare War Clause did not require congressional approval prior to executive deployment of troops. In analyzing the "nature, scope, and duration" questions, the memo looked first to the type of missions that U.S. forces would be engaged in. The air missions envisioned for the Libya operation did not pose the threat of withdrawal difficulty or escalation risk that might indicate "a greater need for approval [from Congress] at the outset." n61 The nature of the mission, then, was not similar to full "war." Similarly, the scope of the intended operation was primarily limited, at the time the memo was written, to enforcing a no-fly zone. n62 Consequently, [\*1208] the operation's expected duration was not long. Thus, concluded OLC, "the use of force by the United States in Libya [did not rise] to the level of a "war' in the constitutional sense." n63 While this conclusion may have been uncontroversial, it highlights Dudziak's concerns over the manipulation of the idea of "wartime," concerns that were heightened by the Obama Administration's War Powers Resolution analysis. Congress passed the War Powers Resolution in 1973 in an attempt to rein in executive power in the wake of the Vietnam War. n64 The resolution provides that the president shall "in every possible instance ... consult with Congress before introducing United States Armed Forces into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances." n65 Additionally, when the president sends U.S. forces "into hostilities or into situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated," the resolution requires him to submit a report to Congress describing the circumstances of the deployment and the expected involvement of U.S. troops in the "hostilities." n66 Within sixty days of receiving that report, Congress must either declare war or in some other way extend the deployment; in the absence of some ratifying action, the resolution requires that the president withdraw U.S. forces. n67 Though eschewing the plainly confrontational route of directly challenging Congress's power under the War Powers Resolution, the Obama Administration implicitly challenged Congress's ability to affect future operations. In declining to withdraw forces, despite Congress's lack of approving legislation, President Obama claimed that the conflict in Libya could not be deemed "hostilities" as that term is used in the resolution. This argument was made both in a letter to Congress during the summer of 2011 n68 and in congressional testimony given by Harold Koh, the State Department Legal Advisor under the Obama Administration. n69 [\*1209] Koh's testimony provides the most complete recitation of the Obama Administration's analysis and focuses on four factors that distinguish the fighting in Libya (or at least the United States' participation) from "hostilities": the scope of the mission, the exposure of U.S. forces, the risk of escalation, and the nature of the tactics to be used. First, "the mission is limited." n70 That is, the objectives of the overall campaign led by the North American Treaty Organization ("NATO") were confined to a "civilian protection operation ... implementing a U.N. Security Council resolution." n71 Second, the "exposure" of the U.S. forces involved was narrow - the conflict did not "involve active exchanges of fire with hostile forces" in ways that would endanger U.S. service members' safety. n72 Third, the fact that the "risk of escalation [was] limited" weighed in favor of not categorizing the conflict as "hostilities." n73 Finally, the "military means" the United States used in Libya were limited in nature. n74 The majority of missions were focused on "providing intelligence capabilities and refueling assets." n75 Those American flights that were air-to-ground missions were a mix of suppression-of-enemy-air-defenses operations to enforce a no-fly zone and strikes by armed Predator drones. n76 As a point of comparison, Koh noted that "the total number of U.S. munitions dropped has been a tiny fraction of the number dropped in Kosovo." n77 With the exception of this final factor, these considerations are quite similar to the factors that define whether a conflict is a "war" for constitutional purposes. n78 The result of this reasoning is a substantially relaxed restraint on presidential authority to use force abroad going forward. As armed drones begin [\*1210] to make up a larger portion of the United States' arsenal, n79 and as other protective technologies, such as standoff munitions n80 and electronic warfare techniques, gain traction, it is far more likely that the "exposure" of U.S. forces will decrease substantially. The force used in Yemen and the Horn of Africa is illustrative of this new paradigm where U.S. service members are not "involved [in] active exchanges of fire with hostile forces," n81 but rather machines use force by acting as human proxies. To the same point, if the "military means" used in Libya are markers of something short of "hostilities," the United States is only likely to see the use of those means increase in the coming decades. Pressing the logic of Koh's testimony, leeway for unilateral executive action will increase as the makeup of our arsenal continues to modernize. n82 Dudziak worries about the invocation of "wartime" as an argument for the perpetual exercise of extraordinary powers. The Libya scenario, of course, is somewhat different - the president has argued that the absence of "war" leaves him a residuum of power such that he may use force abroad without congressional input. The two positions are of a piece, though. Dudziak argues that legacy conceptions of "wartime" and "peacetime" have left us vulnerable to the former's use, in and of itself, as a reason for increased executive power. Such literal thinking - that "war" is something specific or that the word "hostilities" has certain limits - also opens the door to the Obama Administration's defense of its position on Libya. And looking at the substance of that position leaves much to be desired. Both Koh's testimony and the OLC memo pay lip service to the idea that the policy considerations underlying their position are consistent with the policy considerations of the Framers with respect to the Declare War Clause and Congress with respect to the War Powers Resolution. But the primary, if not the only, consideration mentioned is the loss of U.S. forces. That concern is front and center when analyzing the "exposure" of service [\*1211] members, n83 and it is also on display with respect to discussions about the nature and scope of an operation. n84 This is not the only policy consideration that one might intuit from those two provisions, however. Using lethal force abroad is a very serious matter, and the U.S. polity might rationally want input from the more representative branch in deciding when, where, and how that force is used in its name. In that same vein, permitting one individual to embroil the nation in foreign conflicts - limited or otherwise - without the input of another coequal branch of government is potentially dangerous. n85 As Dudziak's framework highlights the limits of the Obama Administration's argument for expansive power, so does the Administration's novel dissection of "hostilities" illustrate the limits of Dudziak's analysis. Dudziak presents a narrative arc bending toward the expansion of wartime and, as a result, increased presidential power. That is not the case with Libya: the president finds power in "not war" rather than in "wartime." If the American public is guilty, as Dudziak asserts, of using the outmoded and misleadingly concrete terminology of "wartime" to describe an increasingly complex phenomenon, Dudziak herself is guilty of operating within a paradigm where wartime necessarily equals more executive power (than does "not war"), a paradigm that has been supplanted by a more nuanced reality. Although [\*1212] Dudziak identifies the dangers of manipulating the boundaries of wartime, her catalog of manipulations remains incomplete because of the inherent limits of her framework. This realization does not detract from Dudziak's warnings about the perils of endless wartime, however. Indeed, the powers that President Obama has claimed seem, perhaps, more palatable after a decade in which war has been invoked as an argument for many executive powers that would, in other eras, seem extraordinary. Though he has not explicitly invoked war during the Libya crisis, President Obama has certainly shown a willingness to manipulate its definition in the service of expanded executive power in ways that seem sure to increase "war's presence as an ongoing feature of American democracy" (p. 136). Conclusion Dudziak presents a compelling argument and supports it well. War Time is potent as a rhetorical device and as a way to frame decisionmaking. This is especially so for the executive branch of the U.S. government, for which wartime has generally meant increased, and ever more expansive, power. As the United States continues to transit an era in which the lines between "war" and "peace" become increasingly blurred and violent adversaries are a constant, the temptation to claim wartime powers - to render the extraordinary ordinary - is significant. This Notice has argued that, contrary to Dudziak's concerns, the temptation is not absolute. Indeed, in some instances - notably, detention operations in Iraq and Afghanistan - we are still able to differentiate between "war" and "peace" in ways that have hard legal meaning for the actors involved. And, importantly, the executive still feels compelled to abide by these distinctions and act in accordance with the law rather than claim wartime exceptionalism. That the temptation is not absolute, however, does not mean that it is not real or that Dudziak's concerns have not manifested themselves. This detachment of expansive power from temporally bound periods has opened the door for, and in some ways incentivized, limiting wartime rather than expanding it. While President Obama has recognized the legal constraints that "war" imposes, he has also followed in the footsteps of executives who have attempted to manipulate the definition of "war" itself (and now the definition of "hostilities") in order to evade those constraints as much as possible. To the extent he has succeeded in that evasion, he has confirmed what seems to be Dudziak's greatest fear: that "military engagement no longer seems to require the support of the American people, but instead their inattention" (p. 132).

### Case – Arms Race

Most cyberwarfare is done by non-state actors - aff doesn't solve.

Denning 11 - information security researcher and a graduate of the University of Michigan (Dorothy E., Cyber Conflict as an Emergent Social Phenomenon, http://tinhoc.dyndns.tv:8080/dspace/bitstream/TVHG\_07113876976/1258/1/idoc.vn\_corporate-hacking-and-technology-driven-crime-social-dynamics-and-implications.pdf#page=189, : 10.4018/978-1-61692-805-6.ch009)

It is important to note that the cyber intifada illustrates that there is no hard line between electronic jihad and patriotic hacking. The attacks can be viewed both as electronic jihad by Muslim hackers against Israel and as patriotic hacking by Israeli and Palestinian hackers (and their external supporters) against each other. In addition, there is no hard line between jihadist and patriotic hacker networks. Groups such as GForce and PHC have used their skills to support the jihad as well as their own countries and other Muslim countries and territories. Following the 2000 cyber intifada, hackers aligned with Israel or the Palestinians have engaged in repeated cyber skirmishes, often in conjunction with incidents taking place on the ground. Within 48 hours of Israel’s bombing of Gaza in December, 2008, more than 300 Israeli websites had been defaced with anti-Israel (and anti-US) messages (Higgins, 2008). The hackers came from several countries, including Morocco, Syria, and Iran. Team Evil, a group of Moroccan hackers with a history of attacking Israeli websites, took over an Israeli domain name server and redirected Ynet’s English news site and other websites to phony web pages condemning the Israeli strikes (Paz, 2009). For their part, an Israeli alliance called “Help Israel Win” developed and distributed a software tool for conducting DDoS attacks against Hamas-friendly sites like qudsnews.net and Palestine-info.info. According to the group, more than 8,000 people had downloaded and installed the Patriot software. With websites in Hebrew, English, Spanish, French, Russian and Portugese, the alliance claims to unite “the computer capabilities of many people around the world” (Shachtman, 2009). The cyber attacks against Estonia in April/May, 2007, and in Georgia in August, 2008, put Russian hackers on the front page of news sites. However, patriotic Russians have engaged in cyber attacks since at least 1999, when the Russian Hackers Union defaced a US military website during the Kosovo war with anti-NATO messages. But with the Estonian attacks, the level of activity dramatically increased. Just before the 2008 Georgian cyber assault, Russian hackers attacked Lithuanian websites to protest a new law banning the display of Soviet emblems. They also issued a manifesto called “Hackers United Against External Threats to Russia,” calling for a expansion of targets to include Ukraine, the rest of the Baltic states, and “flagrant” Western nations supporting the expansion of NATO (Krebs, 2008). Then, in January, 2009, the Russian hackers knocked Kyrgyzstan off the Internet (Keizer, 2009). The Estonian and Georgian cyber assaults leveraged large social networks, as well as huge botnets of compromised computers scattered all over the world, mostly for DoS and DDoS attacks (Davis, 2007; Naraine & Danchev, 2008). Postings on Russian-language forums exhorted readers to defend the motherland and provided attack scripts to follow and target websites. The scripts, flooding targets with network traffic, allowed participants to join a loose network of cyber warriors knowing little or nothing about hacking. During the Georgian attacks, the Russian website stopgeorgia.ru offered several DoS tools and a list of 36 targets. According to one report, the site traced back to the Russian Business Network (RBN), a cybercrime ork based in St. Petersburg, Russia (Georgia Update, 2008). Psychological Analysis and Other Reasons for Patriotic Hacking Rosanna Guadagno, Robert Cialdini, and Gadi Evron (2009) offer an interesting social- psychological analysis of the Estonian conflict. They posit that several factors contributed to the assault, including: (i) the loss of status of Estonia’s ethnic Russian minority, following the collapse of the Soviet Union and Estonia gaining independence; (ii) the anonymity and resulting sense of depersonalization coming from online interaction; (iii) group membership and adherence to group norms; and (iv) rapid contagion through online forums. Because most Russian-language Internet users were participating in or endorsing the attacks, such behavior became normative and quickly spread. Despite the ability of non-state actors to inflict considerable damage in cyberspace, many analysts see a government hand in nationalistic cyber attacks, for example, attributing the attacks against Estonia and Georgia to the Russian government. Stephen Blank (2008) of the US Army War College, for example, writes that “the computer attacks … and the other steps taken by Moscow against Estonia were acts sanctioned by high policy and reflected a coordinated strategy devised in advance of the removal of the Bronze Soldier from its original pedestal.” At the same time, there are good reasons to believe that the attacks were primarily, if not entirely, the work of non-state actors. First, some of the attacks have been traced to independent persons and to websites operated and frequented by independent persons. Second, non-state actors are capable of pulling off large-scale attacks such as these on their own. They do not need government resources, including funding. The attacks are cheap, and hackers outside the government have the tools and knowledge to launch them. Third, while the tactics used—including web deface- ments, web flooding, and botnets of compromised computer—are regularly used by non-state actors, there are good reasons why states would not engage in such attacks. They typically violate domestic crime statutes and cause considerable collateral damage, thereby, also violating law of war principles, such as necessity and proportionality. Fourth, states have other means of dealing with conflict; for example, diplomacy, sanctions, and military operations. Cyber attacks might be deployed as part of military operations, but they would more likely be precision strikes against military targets used for command and control, reconnaissance, and communications rather than mass attacks against civilian websites. However, it is possible that the Russian government played some role in the attacks, for example, by encouraging or condoning them. Even when attacks can be traced to government computers, it would be presumptuous to conclude that they were launched by the state. The computers may have been compromised by hackers of any nationality. Even if individuals within the government were responsible for the attacks, they may have been operating on their own, not as agents of their government or under direction from their government. About 7.4% of the participants in a cyber attack against the Mexican Embassy’s London website in June, 1999, for example, apparently had “.mil” addresses; that is, addresses assigned to the US Department of Defense. However, the attacks were not conducted by the Department of Defence. They were conducted by the Electronic Disturbance Theater (discussed earlier), having a history of attacking the websites of the US and Mexican governments, including the Department of Defence websites. The “.mil” participants likely visited the EDT website used to generate the attacks, becoming unwitting participants. One participant in the Estonian attacks, Konstantin Goloskokov, was a commissar of the pro-Kremlin youth movement Nashi, but he said that he and a few friends had operated on their own initiative and not under the direction of the Russian government (Clover, 2009). At least so far, non-state actors appear to be responsible for most cyber conflict, taking advantage of this new medium to conduct rapid, large-scale attacks at low cost. CONCLUSION Cyber conflict, at least so far, is predominantly a non-state activity. Networks of civilian cyber warriors come together to hack for a cause. Typically, the networks center around social activism (hacktivism), jihad (electronic jihad), or nationalism (patriotic hacking). Tools and tactics are adopted from those used by other hackers, while online forums provide the principal means of organization and support. Although cyber attacks launched by non-state networks have been highly disruptive, they have not been lethal or even destructive. Nobody has died, and following an attack, services and data are restored. The attacks look more like the cyber-equivalent of street demonstrations than terrorism or warfare, though even street protests sometimes become destructive and deadly. When Estonia relocated its memorial, for example, riots broke out not only in cyberspace, but also on the streets, the latter leading to one death and 150 injuries (Fritz, 2008, p. 33). Similarly, the street violence that erupted over the Danish cartoons left 139 dead and 823 injured (Cartoon, 2006). However, even if cyber conflict has not been particularly destructive, some of the attacks have inflicted substantial financial costs on their targets, owing to the disruption of services and the need to devote resources to defense and recovery. One Estonian bank targeted during the cyber assault was said to have lost at least $1 million (Landler & Markoff, 2007). Whether cyber conflict will evolve to something more destructive is difficult to predict. Clearly, some jihadists would like to cause greater harm, though they currently lack the knowledge and skills to do so. Other non-state actors may also turn to more destructive cyber attacks, just as they turn to terrorism, insurgency, and other forms of physical violence. Many critical infrastructures are vulnerable to cyber attacks that could be quite destructive, even deadly. Already, cyber attacks have caused raw sewage overflows, disabled emergency 911 services, and disrupted health care in hospitals. In addition, security researchers have demonstrated how cyber attacks could physically destroy electrical power generators (Meserve, 2007). Thus, in the presence of both motivated actors and vulnerable systems, cyber terrorism could morph from the largely theoretical threat it is today to something all too real. Still, most activists are more interested in raising awareness about an issue and pressing for change rather than inflicting serious harm. For them, cyber conflict will retain its characteristic of being primarily disruptive. Exact tactics, however, will change as technology evolves and hacking along with it.

#### No cyber prolif

Libicki 12 - Senior Management Scientist at the RAND Corporation (Martin, "Crisis and Escalation in Cyberspace", http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2012/RAND\_MG1215.pdf)

Nevertheless, the logic that states have to develop offensive cyber-weapons because their rivals do has little basis in theory or fact. First, states have little knowledge of exactly what weapons, as such, are in the arsenal of their rivals. 13 Indeed, if they actually knew precisely what weapons their foes had, they might well know what vulnerabilities such weapons targeted and would fix such vulnerabilities, thereby nullify-ing these weapons. Second, as noted, the best response to an offensive weapon is a defensive weapon, not another offensive weapon. Third, the whole notion of offense-versus-offense requires that the underlying dynamic of attack and retaliation actually makes sense as a warfight-ing and war-termination strategy. Were that so, deterrence would be primary. But deterrence is a very difficult notion in cyberspace. 14 States wanting to hide their own tracks in a cyberattack have a wealth of ways to do so and, often, more than enough motive. Incidentally, it is hard to imagine how an arms race in cyberspace could come close to having a major economic impact. The intellectual skills required to compete in this contest are so specialized that states will run out of such people well before they run out of money paying them.

#### Squo solves cyber aggression.

Nakashima 12 - Washington Post staff writer (Ellen, November 14, "Obama signs secret directive to help thwart cyberattacks", http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/obama-signs-secret-cybersecurity-directive-allowing-more-aggressive-military-role/2012/11/14/7bf51512-2cde-11e2-9ac2-1c61452669c3\_story.html)

President Obama has signed a secret directive that effectively enables the military to act more aggressively to thwart cyber­attacks on the nation’s web of government and private computer networks. Presidential Policy Directive 20 establishes a broad and strict set of standards to guide the operations of federal agencies in confronting threats in cyberspace, according to several U.S. officials who have seen the classified document and are not authorized to speak on the record. The president signed it in mid-October. The new directive is the most extensive White House effort to date to wrestle with what constitutes an “offensive” and a “defensive” action in the rapidly evolving world of cyberwar and cyberterrorism, where an attack can be launched in milliseconds by unknown assailants utilizing a circuitous route. For the first time, the directive explicitly makes a distinction between network defense and cyber-operations to guide officials charged with making often-rapid decisions when confronted with threats. The policy also lays out a process to vet any operations outside government and defense networks and ensure that U.S. citizens’ and foreign allies’ data and privacy are protected and international laws of war are followed. “What it does, really for the first time, is it explicitly talks about how we will use cyber- operations,” a senior administration official said. “Network defense is what you’re doing inside your own networks. . . . Cyber-operations is stuff outside that space, and recognizing that you could be doing that for what might be called defensive purposes.” The policy, which updates a 2004 presidential directive, is part of a wider push by the Obama administration to confront the growing cyberthreat, which officials warn may overtake terrorism as the most significant danger to the country. “It should enable people to arrive at more effective decisions,” said a second senior administration official. “In that sense, it’s an enormous step forward.” Legislation to protect private networks from attack by setting security standards and promoting voluntary information sharing is pending on the Hill, and the White House is also is drafting an executive order along those lines. James A. Lewis, a cybersecurity expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, welcomed the new directive as bolstering the government’s capability to defend against “destructive scenarios,” such as those that Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta recently outlined in a speech on cybersecurity. “It’s clear we’re not going to be a bystander anymore to cyberattacks,” Lewis said. The Pentagon is expected to finalize new rules of engagement that would guide commanders on when and how the military can go outside government networks to prevent a cyberattack that could cause significant destruction or casualties. The presidential directive attempts to settle years of debate among government agencies about who is authorized to take what sorts of actions in cyberspace and with what level of permission. An example of a defensive cyber-operation that once would have been considered an offensive act, for instance, might include stopping a computer attack by severing the link between an overseas server and a targeted domestic computer. “That was seen as something that was aggressive,” said one defense official, “particularly by some at the State Department” who often are wary of actions that might infringe on other countries’ sovereignty and undermine U.S. advocacy of Internet freedom. Intelligence agencies are wary of operations that may inhibit intelligence collection. The Pentagon, meanwhile, has defined cyberspace as another military domain — joining air, land, sea and space — and wants flexibility to operate in that realm. But cyber-operations, the officials stressed, are not an isolated tool. Rather, they are an integral part of the coordinated national security effort that includes diplomatic, economic and traditional military measures. Offensive cyber actions, outside of war zones, would still require a higher level of scrutiny from relevant agencies and generally White House permission.

#### US can’t solve modeling – the development of offensive capabilities is inevitable.

Libicki 9 - Senior Management Scientist at the RAND Corporation (Martin, Senior Management Scientist at the RAND Corporation, "Cyberdeterrence and Cyberwar", http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND\_MG877.pdf)

Historically, arms control has always gone hand in hand with deter- rence and crisis stability, but it would be difficult to be optimistic about its prospects in cyberspace. A good deal depends on what one means by arms control. If the model were to be something like the treaties signed between the United States–NATO and the Soviet Union– Warsaw Pact, which limited certain classes of weapons and banned others, there is little basis for hope. 1 If, instead, the goal were a framework of international agreements and norms that could raise the diffi- culty of certain types of cyberattacks, some progress can be made. Why is it nearly impossible to limit or ban cyberweapons? First, although the purpose of “limiting” arms is to put an inventory-based lid on how much damage they can do in a crisis, such a consideration is irrelevant in a medium in which duplication is instantaneous. 2 Second, banning attack methods is akin to banishing “how-to” information, which is inherently impossible (like making advanced mathematics illegal). The same holds for banning knowledge about vulnerabilities. Third, banning attack code is next to impossible. Such code has many legitimate purposes, not least of which is in building defenses against attack from others. These others include individuals and nonstate actors, so the argument that one does not need defenses because offenses have been outlawed is unconvincing. In many, per- haps most cases, such attack code is useful for espionage, an activity that has yet to be banned by treaty. Furthermore, finding such code is a hopeless quest. The world’s information storage capacity is immense; much of it is legitimately encrypted; and besides, bad code does not emit telltale odors. If an enforcement entity could search out, read, and decrypt the entire database of the world, it would doubtless find far more interesting material than malware. Exhuming digital informa- tion from everyone else’s systems is hard enough when the authorities with arrest powers try it; it may be virtually impossible when outsiders try. The only barely feasible approach is to ban the activity of writing attack code, then hope that the fear of being betrayed by an insider who goes running to international authorities prevents governments from organizing small groups of elite hackers from engaging in such nefarious activities. If the international community had the manpower and access to enforce such norms, it could probably enforce a great many other, and more immediately practical, norms (e.g., against cor- ruption). Such a world does not exist.

#### Aff puts the cart before the horse - unilateral declarations won't solve.

Kanuck 10 - Harvard University, A.B., J.D.; London School of Economics, M.Sc.; University of Oslo, LL.M.; co-author of the 2009 White House Cyberspace Policy Review; member of the United States delegation to the 2009–2010 United Nations group of governmental experts on information security (Sean, Sovereign Discourse on Cyber Conflict Under International Law, Texas Law Review [Vol. 88:1571, https://www.law.upenn.edu/institutes/cerl/conferences/cyberwar/papers/reading/Kanuck.pdf)

Today, the international community lacks consensus regarding the generally accepted principles of law applicable to cyber conflicts.112 While all may agree that certain principles of IHL need to be respected, sovereign nations remain in vocal disagreement regarding the sufficiency of those provisions to regulate sovereign conduct in cyberspace. However, two things are certain. First, experience indicates that cyber threats will be propagated from those jurisdictions that criminals, terrorists, or other malicious actors find most favorable, i.e., those with the least stringent domestic regulations and the greatest inability to monitor or curtail malevolent Internet traffic. In legal terminology, that means the adversary will always have the “choice of venue,” which directly implies the second truism. Namely, the ultimate solution to the systemic insecurity that is engendered by a globally connected infrastructure will not be found in the reinterpretation or reform of any particular state’s legal authorities and enforcement capabilities. Similarly, unilateral declarations or actions are unlikely to resolve the common problems faced by all sovereigns. Cybersecurity has become a worldwide concern which requires the establishment of collective norms and cannot be adequately addressed by any nation in isolation. Those sovereigns wishing to adequately protect their critical information infrastructures will also need to reconsider many of their competing domestic policy objectives. Only by marshaling all of their societal resources will they be able to truly safeguard the economic and political backbone of a modern nation. At least one historical analogy is haunting: In most accounts, France in the late 1930s lacked a coherent national strategy to deal with the German threat. Such a strategy would have linked diplomatic schemes to military strategy, and industrial policy to military doctrine; in principle, it would have orchestrated every national strategic asset from labor power to health policy.113 Only through comprehensive national initiatives and the conclusion of a genuine international legal consensus will the devastating impacts of cyber conflicts that so many sovereigns now fear be averted, or at least mitigated.

#### The threat of preemptive strikes is key to deter rising challengers

Leigh Drogen 13, founder and chief investment officer of Surfview Capital, LLC, a New York based investment management firm, “Why Cyber Weapons Will Make The World Even Safer,” 3/4, http://www.leighdrogen.com/why-cyber-weapons-will-make-the-world-even-safer/

Scene: China has just exchanged fire with Japan over the East China Sea Islands. The US Navy is in theatre and has as promised under its security umbrella treaty with Japan vows to protect the sovereignty of Japanese territory. In response China has threatened to hold US infrastructure (power, water, transportation) hostage and gives the US 48 hours to exit the theatre. The US immediately responds with a similar threat to cripple Chinese infrastructure via cyber attacks unless China relinquishes cyber attacks within 48 hours.¶ Now you can bet your last dollar that the US has been holding war games designed to simulate exactly this scenario. And while we don’t know how they’ve played out, we can make some pretty informed assumptions based on the corollary of nuclear war theory.¶ The ability for foreign agents to hijack critical infrastructure and cripple it within a short period of time is now to the point where we, and our potential adversaries, could face damage many magnitudes higher than a nuclear strike, not in lives lost, but economic, social, and political damage.¶ Cyber warfare has reached a level where we can say that there is mutually assured destruction of critical infrastructure in a war between the US and China.¶ Which is exactly why I’m ready to say that cyber warfare will make the world an even safer place.¶ There is no argument against the claim that nuclear weapons have massively decreased overall warfare across the world since World War II. During that time we haven’t seen a war between two nuclear states.¶ But the more important development, as Tom Friedman loves to point out, we haven’t seen a major conflict between two countries with a McDonalds. Now, look past the frivolity of that statement through to the bigger point, lives lost is no longer the major determinant of why countries decide to forgo war, it is now primarily an economic and social decision.¶ The cost in treasure and political capital that it takes to go to war as a developed economy with another state is massive. The US has had a huge hand in this no doubt playing the world’s policeman since World War II. Police are not very effective at hunting down transgressors, their job is primarily prevention, a job that the US has pretty much perfected at this point.¶ China will not follow through on its cyber war threat because the cost in economic, social, and political damage to the regime from a crippling US cyber attack would be far too much to handle versus the benefit from its move on the islands. What do you think middle and upper class urban Chinese citizens would do if China risked everything they’ve worked so hard to build over the past 25 years for the islands? They risk nothing less than the regime being toppled. They are already walking on thin ice under the unwritten deal they’ve made, continued economic development for the regime’s position in power.¶ Cyber war has reached the level of mutually assured destruction as the damage caused will lead to popular revolt. It certainly would here in the US.¶ The flip side to this argument, as it is made with nuclear weapons, is that non state actors are not tied to the same consequences and therefor are much more dangerous. I would agree, and in the case of cyber war they it’s even scarier as their capability to inflict damage is far greater (this was the theme of Skyfall), it’s hard to obtain and deliver a nuclear weapon.¶ That said, I believe cyber weapons will add to global security as they become more pervasive.

#### Even silky paws need claws. Offensive cyber operations are critical to U.S. deterrence and are not perceived as an act of aggression.

Limnell & Hanska 13 - \*Director of Cyber Security at Stonesoft Corporation, Doctor of Military Science , \*\*Received his doctoral degree from the University of Tampere. He works as an officer in the Finnish Defense Forces and is currently affiliated with the National Defense University. (Dr. Jarno, Dr. Jan, http://www.infosecisland.com/blogview/23036-Silky-Paws-Need-Claws--The-Problems-of-Defensive-Cyberstrategies.html, March 25th 2013)

How many of us have not fondled and marveled at the silky softness of the paws of a cat – only to have fallen seconds later a victim of numerous bloody scratches. Wearing velvet gloves in the issues concerning cyber strategies is not a way to proceed if national security is at a stake. We might benefit more from following U.S. President Teddy Roosevelt’s motto: “speak softly and carry a big stick.” This can be reinterpreted in today’s context as advise not to speak in threatening and jingoistic tones but preparing simultaneously for use of force. For societies and armed forces there is today no credible defense without cyber capabilities. The cyber arms race has started, and its speed is accelerating. Nations and other entities are using online weapons, because they are thousands of times cheaper than conventional armaments. But they are not bloodless, as we would like to think. Cyber weapons can damage a physical object as badly as a traditional weapon. No responsible nation-state should aspire for the role of “North Korea of the cyber space”, issuing hollow threats in aggressive public messages but neither should we discard the notion that Realpolitik seems to be in our contemporary conjunction the way cyber policies work. The U.S. has thus far been the most vociferous proponent of the use of force in relation to cyber threats. These range from the assertion that a cyber attack, when it passes a certain undeclared threshold, will result in retaliation by kinetic weapons to the leaks suggesting that a presidential policy directive has provided the U.S. president with the ability to order a preemptive cyber strike. This is not the way to advance the peaceful development of cyber policies. The U.S. has chosen not only to shout its threats aloud, but also to wave the stick around. In the case of a superpower the claws can remain hidden – the paws themselves are sizable enough to deter aggression since it is obvious that even a careless pelt would cause damage. As is the case with any weapon, when talking about cyber threats, the motive is crucial. Russia today has approximately 5,000 nuclear weapons that could destroy the world several times over. However, Russia lacks the intention to use its nuclear weapons. The same goes for cyber weapons. China already has very destructive cyber weapons to use against the United States’ critical infrastructure. But China does not currently have the motivation to use its cyber weapons against the U.S. It is important to separate the intention and the capability, which together make the threat. In the case of small powers the problem is different and needs to be addressed differently. We are not aggressive in our policies – in the world of “Realcyber” we indeed cannot afford such an approach. We do not stomp around, but tread very softly in the international realm. There is, however, a difference between the soft, feline steps we do wisely to take and “frakfooting” around. If we write our cyberstrategies to be entirely defensive, without even including an offensive element, there is no way to deter aggression. A prospective cyber attacker does not shy away from probing for weaknesses and infiltrating systems and network if the severest result is that the attack will at some point peter out when defensive cyber capabilities are employed. The attack either failed, or was a partial or complete success. It would have been folly not to try, since even in the case of failure there would have been no risk of retaliation and damage from a counter-attack. When the defensive cyber strategy is coupled with offensive capabilities to be automatically employed in a counter-attack the prospective aggressor may be not be all that eager to initiate action – for fear of counter-action. It is an old maxim of Vegetius that if you want peace, prepare for war. Sic vis pacem, para bellum. In cyber strategy this is not war-mongery but a rational approach to security. And cyberwar is comparable to traditional war in many senses as a recent NATO commissioned report Tallinn Manual on the International Law Applicable to Cyber Warfare shows us. The findings of international law experts tell that while in most cases the appropriate response to a cyberattack would be in a retaliation confined to cyberspace, in those cases where the victim has suffered death of severe property damage, it is acceptable and lawful to retaliate with traditional kinetic weapons in its counter-strike. The report also finds that even individual hackers who undertake attacks are legitimate targets for counter-strikes. This basically implies that building and upholding capabilities for offensive cyberwar instead of restricting oneself to merely inventing systems of passive defense would thus not, even from the perspective of international, be considered as acts of aggression. The failure to create a system for offensives, to be used to protect oneself when attacked, might even lead to a situation where one becomes a more probable target of aggression. One of the “natural laws” of traditional Realpolitik was that weakness invites hostility and since cyberspace thus far has not politically developed into the same level of sophistication, agreements and pacts as the international relations of the physical world, it might be wise to adhere to the more pragmatic policy approaches of the past until cyberspace becomes more thoroughly regulated by international agreements. We initiated this article with an allegory by comparing cyber strategy to the behavior of a cat. Indeed, no small nation-state can uphold a distinguished status within the international community by adopting a mad-dog policy of random aggression against any real or perceived threat. Instead, quite a few of the attributes and characteristics of a cat have to be taken into account to master cyber security and create a strategy to answer all the requirements of the fluid developments of today. A plausible approach to cyber security must contain the feline elements of stealth, flexibility, adaptability and dexterity – and not discard the necessity of concealing sharp extendable claws to be used for one’s protection. To settle for mechanisms of passive defense equals not only having a tomcat castrated but declawed at the same time.

#### Brandishing U.S. OCO's create a climate of uncertainty that de-escalates tension between nations and bolsters U.S. deterrence. The U.S. doesn't even need to claim responsibility for the attack, mere perception of system vulnerability dissuades other coutries.

RAND 13 - nonprofit institution that helps improve policy and decisionmaking through research and analysis (Martin C. Libicki, Brandishing Cyberattack Capabilities, This research was sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense and conducted within the International Security and Defense Policy Center of the RAND National Defense Research Institute, http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research\_reports/RR100/RR175/RAND\_RR175.pdf)

Nuclear arms fostered fear, but there was not a great deal of doubt or uncertainty about their applications.2 Cyber may be the opposite—incapable of inducing real fear directly, it may be capable of raising the specter of doubt and uncertainty, especially in the minds of those who might wonder if their military systems and hence their military would work when needed. This would cause queasiness if they had to use force of dubious reliability. The target state need not believe that it will lose a war it otherwise would have won were it not for such implanted logic bombs. To echo Mearsheimer’s argument on conventional deterrence,3 it suffices if the potential attacker believes that its odds of winning quickly are not good enough because its systems have been compromised. An uncertainty-and-doubt strategy may work to the U.S. advantage by persuading other states to be very careful in pursuing a network-centric high-technology force to counter U.S. military capabilities. This means it may be dissuasive. A lot depends on how other states react to the idea that hackers have penetrated their military systems and left behind implants, which, when triggered, could generate rogue messages, alter sensor data, create network dropouts, and even make weapons fail.4 It is possible to conclude that, if the target state believes that (1) it has been so hacked, (2) has no alternative but the systems and equipment it has, (3) its estimate of war’s outcomes are decidedly worse as a result, and (4) it has a choice on whether to go to war, the state’s desire to go to war would decrease. How might such doubt and uncertainty be induced? The most straightforward way is to hack into such systems and then make it obvious that they have indeed been hacked. Claiming responsibility is unnecessary because the point is to emphasize not U.S. power but the vulnerability of targeted systems to cyberattacks in a way that leaves their owners doubting their own systems. But if the point is not to provide proof but to instill uncertainty, making the result obvious beforehand is unnecessary. In fact, it may be unwise if the first demonstration makes the next one harder to accomplish. Thus, proving a system was, is, and will stay hacked may be impossible. However, the hint of an attack leaves no specific trace and hence no specific fix. Even if system owners react to rumors by making general fixes, such as selective disconnection or the installation of anti-malware guards, there will be nothing that suggests which of these general fixes worked. In some cases, rumor can be more powerful than fact. After all, it takes, on average, twice as long to find nothing in a room as to find something there. Worse, if finding something is conclusive but sweeping and finding nothing is inconclusive, it takes far longer than twice as long to know that one has found nothing than to find something. System owners may be unable to rest assured that, having found supposedly rogue code will solve the problem because there is no proof that what was found was the rogue code that rumors referred to; such code could be a glitch unrelated to any malevolent actor or could have been placed there by a third party. A great deal depends on what others are predisposed to believe about U.S. capabilities with technology in general. U.S. cyberwarriors need never reveal the techniques of this or that manipulation but just ensure there are enough hints out there that say they do have the requisite skills. Subjecting that belief to a test could lead to failure and break the spell they may be under. It cannot be overemphasized that the target of the attack is not the system itself but confidence in that system and any other system an adversary depends on.

### 2nc

### case

Takeout.

Cyber Arms 11 (http://cyberarms.wordpress.com/2011/02/15/hacker-group-anonymous-claims-stuxnet/)

he hacker group Anonymous, known for its involvement in the Wikileaks DDoS attacks, now claims to have access to Stuxnet. Stuxnet was used to attack Iranian nuclear plants and has been called the first true cyber weapon. Apparently the hi-tech virus or information about it was obtained by the group after they hacked security company HBGary Federal. The security company had been tracking down leaders of Anonymous and was preparing to release the names at an upcoming security conference. It looks like they social engineered their way into Rootkit.com, a site run by Greg Hoglund co-founder of HBGary. Next got access to a tech support server used by HBGary. Compromised an insecure Web Server, then obtained credentials to the E-Mail system. They used these credentials to siphon about 50,000 company e-mails and then posted them to a public Torrent site. Apparently the data stolen by Anonymous contained part of the Stuxnet code. So what will they do with Stuxnet? No one knows for sure, but some think that they may try to use it against Iran. Anonymous has released a video on YouTube stating their support for the Iranian Opposition. Their target in Iran would be unsure as security researchers report the crucial code needed to attack the Iranian nuclear plants was not obtained by the Anonymous hack. The Stuxnet code appears to be so fine tuned to take out the Iranian plant, it is hard to tell if it could be modified for any other purpose.

### Kritik

#### The university reinforces dominant discoures in the military industrial complex. Challenging pure-war in spaces like debate are key.

Bond Graham 09. Darwin Bond Graham, PhD Sociology UC Santa Barbara, and Hell, UC Fiat Pax Research Project Group, Higher Education Militarization Resource, 2003, “The Militarization of America’s Universities”, Fiat Pax, UC Santa Cruz Press, pages 3-4, http://www.fiatpax.net/demil.pdf, Accessed 10/15/09

This publication is the testimony of our careers as students of a university in service of the warfare state. This publication is founded on a belief that war, no matter how urgent it might seem and no matter how necessary we are made to think it is, can no longer be considered a justifiable act. War is not the last resort, war is not the path to peace, war is not the means to an end, war is never the solution. War is always a failure. This publication is founded on a fact: War is not possible and pursuable in any society without the coordination and resources of a nation’s knowledge base for the purposes of making war. In our society this means that war is made possible only through a permanent technological revolution encompassing most dis- ciplines of science. War is the product of a close relationship between the US military establishment, private corporations, and academic institutions. This is the military-industrial-academic complex. Colleges and universities serve a critical purpose that only they can fulfill by providing access to the best and brightest minds, the product of their research, and the legitimization of war and weapons as high and honorable pursuits. The role that universities collectively play in warfare cannot be over-stated. War as we know it, with all its destructive and horrific capacity, would not be possible were it not for the military-industrial shaping of science, and our institutions of knowledge creation. We are not against science. We are opposed to the manipulation and perversion of science and technology used for the destruction of humankind. We are for the realization of a university that works to better society through research and education. We are in support of science guided by ethics not profits. In a message to the university community dated March 19th, 2003 UC President Richard Atkinson remarked that with respect to the war against Iraq and during times of war in general, "it is important that we all remember, now more than ever, the important role the University plays as a place of reasoned inquiry and civil discourse. While emotions may run high, there can be no room on our campuses for violence or intolerance." President Atkinson is right. There can be no room on our campuses for violence or intolerance. Therefore we must immediately cease all participation in the production of war and the technologies used to fight it. We must mobilize science entirely for peace and the prevention of war. Since the UC laid the foundation for the military-university relationship, it should be the first to sever the ties. We are calling upon the University of California to show leadership by transforming its system of research from war to peace, its economic purpose from destruction to sustainability, and by realizing its motto "Fiat Lux," that progress and a peaceful future is still possible.

#### Default to our politics of self change - if the kritik is a meta-route of analysis that is preferable you should vote neg

Chandler 13 – prof of IR @ Westminster

(The World of Attachment? The Post-humanist Challenge to Freedom and Necessity, Millenium: Journal of International Studies, 41(3), 516– 534)

The world of becoming thereby is an ontologically flat world without the traditional hierarchies of existence and a more shared conception of agency. For Bennett, therefore, ‘to begin to experience the relationship between persons and other materialities more horizontally, is to take a step toward a more ecological sensibility’.78 Here there is room for human agency but this agency involves a deeper understanding of and receptivity to the world of objects and object relations. Rather than the hubristic focus on transforming the external world, the ethico-political tasks are those of work on the self to erase hubristic liberal traces of subject-centric understandings, understood to merely create the dangers of existential resentment. Work on the self is the only route to changing the world. As Connolly states: ‘To embrace without deep resentment a world of becoming is to work to “become who you are”, so that the word “become” now modifies “are” more than the other way around.’ Becoming who you are involves the ‘microtactics of the self’, and work on the self can then extend into ‘micropolitics’ of more conscious and reflective choices and decisions and lifestyle choices leading to potentially higher levels of ethical self-reflectivity and responsibility. Bennett argues that against the ‘narcissism’ of anthropomorphic understandings of domination of the external world, we need ‘some tactics for cultivating the experience of our selves as vibrant matter’. Rather than hubristically imagining that we can shape the world we live in, Bennett argues that: ‘Perhaps the ethical responsibility of an individual human now resides in one’s response to the assemblages in which one finds oneself participating. Such ethical tactics include reflecting more on our relationship to what we eat and considering the agentic powers of what we consume and enter into an assemblage with. In doing so, if ‘an image of inert matter helps animate our current practice of aggressively wasteful and planet-endangering consumption, then a materiality experienced as a lively force with agentic capacity could animate a more ecologically sustainable public’. For new materialists, the object to be changed or transformed is the human – the human mindset. By changing the way we think about the world and the way we relate to it by including broader, more non-human or inorganic matter in our considerations, we will have overcome our modernist ‘attachment disorders’ and have more ethically aware approaches to our planet. In cultivating these new ethical sensibilities, the human can be remade with a new self and a ‘new self-interest’.

#### Their speculatie scenarios exemplify super power syndrome which makes their impacts inevitable and justify massive violence against the other.

Lifton 3 - professor of psychiatry at Harvard [Robert Jay Lifton, Visiting Professor of Psychiatry at Harvard Medical School, previously Distinguished Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology at the Graduate School and Director of The Center on Violence and Human Survival at John Jay College of Criminal Justice at the City University of New York, 2003 (Superpower Syndrome: America’s Apocalyptic Confrontation With The World, Published by Thunder’s Mouth Press / Nation Books, ISBN 1560255129, p. 125-130)]

It is almost un-American to be vulnerable. As a people, we pride ourselves on being able to stand up to anything, solve all problems. We have long had a national self-image that involves an ability to call forth reservoirs or strength when we need it, and a sense of a protected existence peculiar to America in an otherwise precarious world. In recent times we managed, after all, to weather the most brutal century in human history relatively unscathed. THE BLESSED COUNTRY Our attitude stems partly from geography. We have always claimed a glorious aloneness thanks to what has been called the “Free security” of the two great oceans which separate us from dangerous upheavals in Europe and Asia. While George Washington was not the isolationist he is sometimes represented to be, he insisted on his celebrated Farewell Address of 1796, “’Tis our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances, with any portion of the foreign world.” That image has been embraced, and often simplified or distorted, by politicians ever since. (He warned against permanent alliances, not alliances in general).

The idea of our separateness and safety from faraway conflicts has had importance from the time of the early settlers, many of whom left Europe to escape political religious, or legal threats or entanglements. Even if one came as an adventurer or an empire-builder, one was leaving a continent of complexity and conflict for a land whose remoteness could support new beginnings. Abraham Lincoln absolutized that remoteness and security from outside attack in order to stress that our only danger came from ourselves: “All the armies of Europe, Asia and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth (our own excepted) in their military chest; with a Buonaparte for a commander, could not by force, take a drink from the Ohio, or make a track on the Blue Ridge, in a trial of a thousand years.” However much the world has shrunk technologically in the last half century, and however far-ranging our own superpower forays, that sense of geographic invulnerability has never left us. We have seen ourselves as not only separate from but different from the rest of the world, a special nation among nations. That sense of American exceptionalism was intensely observed by Alexis de Tocqueville, the brilliant French politician and writer, in the early nineteenth century. In de Tocqueville’s view of America, “A course almost without limits, a field without horizon, is revealed: the human spirit rushes forward and traverses [it] in every direction.” American exceptionalism has always been, as the sociologist Seymour Martin Lipset has pointed out, “a double-edged sword.” In the psychological life of Americans it has been bound up with feelings of unique virtue, strength, and success. But this has sometimes led Americans to be “utopian moralists, who press hard to institutionalize virtue, to destroy evil people, and eliminate wicked institutions and practices.” That subjective exceptionalism has been vividly expressed in the historian Richard Hofstadter’s observation, “It has been our fate as a nation not to have ideologies, but to be one.” At the time of the Puritans, sentiments of exceptionalism were expressed in biblical terms: America was an “Arcadian image of the New World … an Eden from which the serpent and forbidden trees had been thoroughly excluded,” and “a new Promised Land and a New Jerusalem.” The language was that of a postapocalyptic utopia, and remnants of such sentiments persist whenever we speak of ourselves in more secular terms as the “new world.” Important to this feeling of exceptionalism has been a deep sense that America offered unparalleled access to regenerative power. As Richard Slotkin explains: “The first colonists saw in America an opportunity to regenerate [end page 127] their fortunes, their spirits, and the power of their church and nation,” though “the means to that regeneration ultimately became the means of violence.” Even when Americans played what has been called a “shell game of identity,” they could experience an unlimited capacity for renewal—endless new beginnings as individuals or as a nation. Slotkin speaks of a new relationship to authority in this new world. While “in Europe all men were under authority; in America all men dreamed they had the power to become authority.” These claims of new authority extended to the country as a whole, to America’s authority among nations—a claim to new national authority that was expanded over time thanks to America’s considerable achievements—economic, technological, scientific, and cultural. American exceptionalism has often had the overall psychological quality of a sense of ourselves as a blessed people, immune from the defeats and sufferings of others. But underneath that sense there had to be a potential chink in our psychological armor—which was a deep-seated if hidden sense of vulnerability. OMNIPOTENCE AND VULNERABILITY Ironically, superpower syndrome projects the problem of American vulnerability onto the world stage. A superpower is perceived as possessing more than natural power. [end page 128] (In this sense it comes closer to resembling the comic-strip hero Superman than the Nietzschean Superman.) For a nation, its leaders, or even its ordinary citizens to enter into the superpower syndrome is to lay claim to omnipotence, to power that is unlimited, which is ultimately power over death. At the heart of the superpower syndrome then is the need to eliminate a vulnerability that, as the antithesis of omnipotence, contains the basic contradiction of the syndrome. For vulnerability can never be eliminated, either by a nation or an individual. In seeking its elimination, the superpower finds itself on a psychological treadmill. The idea of vulnerability is intolerable, the fact of it irrefutable. One solution is to maintain an illusion of invulnerability. But the superpower then runs the danger of taking increasingly draconian actions to sustain that illusion. For to do otherwise would be to surrender the cherished status of superpower. Other nations have experiences in the world that render them and their citizens all too aware of the essential vulnerability of life on earth. They also may be influenced by religious and cultural traditions (far weaker in the United States) that emphasize vulnerability as an aspect of human mortality. No such reality can be accepted by those clinging to a sense of omnipotence. At issue is the experience of death anxiety, which is the strongest manifestation of vulnerability. Such a deep-seated [end page 129] sense of vulnerability can sometimes be acknowledged by the ordinary citizens of a superpower, or even at times by its leaders, who may admit, for instance, that there is no guaranteed defense against terrorist acts. But those leaders nonetheless remain committed to eliminating precisely that vulnerability—committed, that is, to the illusory goal of invulnerability. When that goal is repeatedly undermined—whether by large-scale terrorist acts like 9/11, or as at present by militant resistance to American hegemony in Iraq and elsewhere in the Middle East—both the superpower and the world it acts upon may become dangerously destabilized.

#### Their miscalculation scenarios produces the drive for the ego to demand the bomb.

William Chaloupka. [book] Knowing Nukes The Politics and Culture of the Atom. 1992 (pp.60-61)

As Deleuze and Guattari emphasize, this displacing process continu­ally breaks away from the ego, canceling it with several identifiable processes. The law tells us: You will not marry your mother, and you will not kill your father. And we docile subjects say to ourselves: so that's what I wanted! ... There we have a ... displacement. For what really takes place is that the law prohibits something that is perfectly fictitious in the order of desire or of the "instincts," so as to persuade its subjects that they had the intention corresponding to this fiction.' Deleuze and Guattari repeatedly use that exclamation — "So that's what I wanted!" — to bring a metonymy to the fore. This process can be applied to our discussion of nukes. Faced with the Law, the egoistic expression of values, we exclaim, "nobody could possibly want nuclear war." But, un­mistakably, war preparations are everywhere. The reverse logic of deterrence—the weird mission of preparing nukes never to be used—comes home to roost. Desire breaks out of the censorship planned for it. Even if nobody wants nuclear war, people are acting as if they do. So that's what 1 wanted! In this way, the simple repression of nuclearism that liberal humanism tries to turn into a first value, a base agreement, twists out of control. A metonymy forms under the sign of the exclamation heard constantly in American political talk over the last forty years: "Nuke 'em!" The robot, then, may be the ultimate nuclear-age metonymy. We "de­siring machines" (as Deleuze and Guattari refer to modern selves) pro­duce a mirror image onto which these desires and displacements can be grafted. Desire is a feature of bodies, so we give the nuke a body. The opaque machine— a machine-without-parts—becomes a body (in Deleuze and Guattari's schema, a "body without organs"). Rather than making the leap to conclude that all the puzzlement of this new technology must imply a meaning at the core of human life, we could turn the equation around. We could reinterpret the projects surrounding electronic technology. And when we do that, we can hardly miss that a rage for embodiment has been accu­mulating. Computer partisans, critics, and popular artists have all used this embodiment as a way of dealing with technology; computers had to be embodied.

#### Even if they are right about everything they have said, be suspect of their framing. Aff contextualization like 'cyber weapons are more likely to escalate' is a framing which mandates miltary domination and makes their impacts inevitable.

Schneier 11 (Bruce, founder, BT Managfsed Security Solutions; chief technology officer, BT Managed Security Solutions;MA, computer science, American U; “The threat of cyberwar has been hugely hyped” *CNN;* July 7, 2011; <http://edition.cnn.com/2010/OPINION/07/07/schneier.cyberwar.hyped/>

**There's a power struggle going on in the U.S. government right now. It's about who is in charge of cyber security**, and how much control the government will exert over civilian networks. And by **beating the drums of war, the military is coming out on top.** "The United States is fighting a cyberwar today, and we are losing," [said](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/25/AR2010022502493.html?sid=ST2010031901063) former NSA director -- and current cyberwar contractor -- Mike McConnell. "Cyber 9/11 has happened over the last ten years, but it happened slowly so we don't see it," said former National Cyber Security Division director Amit Yoran. Richard Clarke, whom Yoran replaced, wrote an entire [book](http://www.harpercollins.com/books/Cyber-War/?isbn=9780061962233) hyping the threat of cyberwar. General Keith Alexander, the current commander of the U.S. Cyber Command, [hypes](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/04/pentagon-networks-targeted-by-hundreds-of-thousands-of-probes/) it every chance he gets. **This isn't just rhetoric of a few over-eager government officials and headline writers; the entire national debate on cyberwar is plagued with** [exaggerations](http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9174682/Senators_ramp_up_cyberwar_rhetoric_) **and** [hyperbole](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/04/top-officer-fears-cyberwar-hearts-karzai-tweets-with-help/)**. Googling those** [names](http://www.salon.com/news/opinion/glenn_greenwald/2010/03/29/mcconnell) **and** [terms](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2008/01/feds-must-exami/) **-- as well as "cyber Pearl Harbor," "**[cyber Katrina](http://www.businessweek.com/the_thread/techbeat/archives/2009/02/fearing_cyber_katrina_obama_candidate_for_cyber_czar_urges_a_fema_for_the_internet.html)**," and even "cyber Armageddon" -- gives some idea how pervasive these memes are. Prefix "cyber" to something scary, and you end up with** [something](http://www.computerworld.com/s/article/9173967/Cyberattacks_an_existential_threat_to_U.S._FBI_says) **really scary.** Cyberspace has all sorts of threats, day in and day out. Cybercrime is by far the largest: fraud, through identity theft and other means, extortion, and so on. Cyber-espionage is another, both government- and corporate-sponsored. Traditional hacking, without a profit motive, is still a threat. So is cyber-activism: people, most often kids, playing politics by attacking government and corporate websites and networks. These threats cover a wide variety of perpetrators, motivations, tactics, and goals. You can see this variety in what the media has mislabeled as "cyberwar." **The attacks against Estonian websites in 2007 were** [simple hacking](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2007/08/cyber-war-and-e/) **attacks by ethnic Russians angry at anti-Russian policies; these were denial-of-service attacks, a normal risk in cyberspace and hardly unprecedented. A real-world comparison might be if an army invaded a country, then all got in line in front of people at the DMV so they couldn't renew their licenses. If that's what war looks like in the 21st century, we have little to fear. Similar** [attacks](http://www.csoonline.com/article/443579/georgia-cyber-attacks-from-russian-government-not-so-fast) **against Georgia, which accompanied an actual Russian invasion, were also probably the responsibility of citizen activists or** [organized crime](http://www.csoonline.com/article/499778/georgia-cyberattacks-linked-to-russian-organized-crime). A series of power blackouts in Brazil was caused by criminal extortionists -- or was it [sooty insulators](http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2009/11/brazil_blackout/)? China is [engaging](http://www.schneier.com/essay-227.html) in espionage, not war, in cyberspace. And so on. One problem is that there's no clear [definition](http://thehill.com/opinion/op-ed/70319-no-line-between-cyber-crime-and-cyber-war) of "cyberwar." What does it look like? How does it start? When is it over? Even cybersecurity experts don't know the answers to these questions, and it's dangerous to broadly apply the term "war" unless we know a war is going on. **Yet recent news articles have claimed that China** [declared](http://techcrunch.com/2007/10/18/cyberwar-china-declares-war-on-western-search-sites/) **cyberwar on Google, that Germany attacked China, and that a group of young hackers declared cyberwar on Australia. (Yes, cyberwar is so easy that even kids can do it.) Clearly we're not talking about real war here, but a rhetorical war: like the war on terror. We have a variety of institutions that can defend us when attacked: the police, the military, the Department of Homeland Security, various commercial products and services, and our own personal or corporate lawyers. The** legal framework for any particular attack depends on two things: the attacker and the motive. Those are precisely the two things you don't know when you're being attacked on the Internet. We saw this on July 4 last year, when U.S. and South Korean websites were [attacked](http://www.schneier.com/essay-280.html) by unknown perpetrators from North Korea -- or perhaps England. Or was it Florida? We surely need to improve our cybersecurity. But words have meaning, and metaphors matter. **There's a power struggle going on for control of our nation's cybersecurity strategy, and the NSA and DoD** [are](http://www.wired.com/dangerroom/2010/05/cyber-command-we-dont-wanna-defend-the-internet-but-we-just-might-have-to/) **winning. If we frame the debate in terms of war, if we accept the military's expansive cyberspace definition of "war," we feed our fears. We reinforce the notion that we're helpless -- what person or organization can defend itself in a war? -- and others need to protect us. We invite the military to take over security, and to ignore the limits on power that often get jettisoned during wartime. If, on the other hand, we use the more measured language of cybercrime, we change the debate.** Crime fighting requires both resolve and resources, but it's done within the context of normal life. We willingly give our police extraordinary powers of investigation and arrest, but we temper these powers with a judicial system and legal protections for citizens. We need to be prepared for war, and a Cyber Command is just as vital as an Army or a Strategic Air Command. And because kid hackers and cyber-warriors use the same tactics, the defenses we build against crime and espionage will also protect us from more concerted attacks. But **we're not fighting a cyberwar now, and the risks of a cyberwar are no greater than the risks of a ground invasion. We need peacetime cyber-security, administered within the myriad structure of public and private security institutions we already have.**

Part of our alternative is a strategy of 'dumbing it down'. Their overly-serious discourse does not challenge neo-conservatives, our alternative lives with ambiguity and refers their process of political mapping. This is the only way to resolve nuclearism.

William Chaloupka. [book] Knowing Nukes The Politics and Culture of the Atom. 1992 (pp.93-94)

Once we notice the crisis of representation and its first consequence—the demise of the social throughout the theoretical landscape—other ques­tions arise. Returning to the questions posed at the start of the chapter, I can now suggest that insofar as localist interventions have succeeded at dislodging power (at least on occasion) this may have happened for dif­ferent reasons than those suggested by the "opinion model" implied by studies of coherent elite positions. The lifestyle positions *could* be tamed into the categories presented by attitude studies; we might take lifestyle proponents at their word when they say they are trying to change opinions or are modeling a preferred future. I am claiming that such explanations are just too problematic to cohere; something else just must be at work here. As an exercise in form­ing public (and elite) opinion, the lifestyle gestures are incomplete and insufficient. The notion that one could build a society by "acting peace­fully" is naive and limited. The whole lifestyle position presents itself in a fatalistic, simplistic, almost farcical way, inviting exclusion from serious study. We can almost hear Pat Buchanan screeching, "Hug the Soviets? Come on!" So,if that approach "works"—if it influences events, if it is persuasive to serious citizens, as it seems to be—it might be working in some differ­ent way**.** What might that "different way" be? There could, of course, be many different answers; that is the implication of the loss of a social that could firmly ground our interpretations of political acts. Perhaps the in­tentional simplicity—a purposefully dumb stance—expresses the exas­peration of citizens at the brink of destruction, but also at the end of their energies, after prevailing categories collapsed. Or maybe I have only em­phasized the slogan, mistaking it for the analysis; some proponents of the position might point to sophisticated, in-depth analysis, situated just be­hind the slogan. And some activists would contest my abrupt dismissal of modeling and opinion molding; Mom's recycling didn't mean much on its own, of course, but it is how we learned about politics and the prac­tices of everyday life. The point of the demise of the social is that every interpretation does indeed hold a certain credibility, or, to put it more dramatically, none of the interpretations is grounded in any serious way. Strategies of explana­tion constitute their own audience, by means of mechanisms that contem­porary literary criticism introduces. This is a momentous development for all political analysis**,** as I will discuss in the next chapter. For now, I can just forge ahead, opening yet another interpretation and using it to trace the rhetorical devices at work in this one, narrow part of the polit­ical landscape. Doing this kind of interpretation then has inevitable political consequence; every successful reading further undermines the usual discourses of foreign policy, bringing legitimacy issues to the fore, per­haps setting off a clash of discourses that establishes new (if temporary and shifting) pofslitical ground**.** The interpretation —the "spin," to use the Reagan-era term —I want to consider goes like this. Not presuming to enter into the realm of force­ counterforce (and all the other economies of force surrounding military and nuclear matters), the "lifestyle" argument simply intervenes. This intervention produces consequences that are more ironic than represen­tational, more disruptive than analytic. The lifestyle position works by rubbing against a nuclearist discourse that has tried hard to exclude chal­lenges to its logic. In its partial, deconstructive mode, that opposition has worked, putting its own "dumbness," its forced inarticulateness, against the forced coherence of foreign policy discourse. Arrayed against a thor­oughly coded way of speaking, the opposition stripped its own utterances down to a naked minimum —not escaping code (how could anyone pre­sume that?), but forcing the dominant discourse to handle the weight of the codes and substitutions all by itself. My reading works, then, on language-and-politics turf captured by Foucault. I am postulating a specific kind of intervention—one that po­liticizes by noting how language works, without forfeiting the next polit­ical response. Foucault claims this odd and important double move with a distinctive two-part challenge to power**.** Starting with the crisis of rep­resentation and character of language that sets that crisis off—shifting and turning away from either the self who uses it or the phenomenon it tries to capture—Foucault moved on to a description of rules and the ways those rules constitute a generally unrecognized realm of power in con­temporary society.2s The two moves resonate, one exacerbating the other until legitimacy is drawn into the whirl of contested territory. Foucault's conception of language is what funds the possibility of political response, making it possible that such response is neither an arbitrary imposition**,** as has been charged, nor a promise of meaning and representation that cannot be fulfilled. Instead, the political response finds its form exactly at the point where old models of language break down
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#### Yes conflict- china

Lee, 2007 (Dong Sun, Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Science and International Relations, Korea University; Ph.D. in Poli. Sci. from the U. of Chicago, “A nuclear North Korea and the Stability of East Asia: a tsunami on the horizon?” Australian Journal of International Affairs, 61:4, December)

Although North Korean nuclear weapons production is not likely to produce a regional nuclear chain reaction, the development could exacerbate the security dilemma among the region’s major powers and thereby destabilise regional international relations. The North Korean nuclear threat is strengthening the US alliance with Japan in a manner that has significant implications for regional stability. Washington has reaffirmed its nuclear commitment to Tokyo, and these allies are cooperating more extensively in the field of missile defence. Also, Japan is considering improving its surveillance and long-range precision strike capabilities, which could provide Tokyo with an offensive option of preemption. There have been some indications that Japan is interested in acquiring such a capability. In July 2006, for instance, Japanese Prime Minister Abe Shinzo said: ‘If we accept that there is no other option to prevent an attack. . . there is the view that attacking the launch base of the guided missiles is within the constitutional right of self-defence’ (Yamaguchi 2006). In August of the same year, the Subcommittee on Defence Policies in Japan’s Liberal Democratic Party debated whether a military capability to strike ‘a foreign enemy base’ is necessary (Pinkston and Sakurai 2006). There also has been discussion in Japan on preparing a constitutional basis for expanded military activities, including ‘collective self-defence’. While these measures are designed primarily for self-defence, they are arousing significant concerns in Beijing, which regards them as potentially detrimental to its security interests. China suspects that the strengthened cooperation between the United States and Japan might be an attempt to contain its growing power and influence, and that the Allies’ development of a missile defence might be aimed at undermining China’s nuclear deterrent (Friedberg 2005). Chinese officials are particularly concerned that the joint missile defence system might be extended to include Taiwan, neutralising their coercive capabilities and facilitating the island’s formal independence (Cody 2006; China’s National Defense 2006). If Japan (which occupied parts of Chinese territory between 1931 and 1945) acquired any offensive capability, Beijing also would suspect that Japan aggressively intended to expand its influence at China’s expense in order to dominate East Asia (Blanchard 2006). Thus, a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman recently strongly criticised highlevel Japanese politicians’ consideration of a pre-emptive strike as ‘extremely irresponsible’ (Yonhap News 2006a). In response to the increasing military capabilities of its potential adversaries, China will likely expand its own nuclear arsenal to maintain an effective deterrent against the United States (and Japan) and augment its missile and submarine capabilities to restrain Taiwan. (South Korea also feels uneasy about Japanese arms build-ups\*/either conventional or nuclear\*/as demonstrated by its recent negative reaction to Tokyo’s plan for procuring F-22 fighters. Some South Korean leaders even believe that Japan is exploiting the North Korean armament as a pretext for military expansion.) The United States and Japan might in turn interpret these Chinese moves as an aggressive attempt at blackmail aimed at subjugating Taiwan\*/and therefore take countermeasures (such as an increase of their missile defence capabilities). Moreover, Taiwan may also strengthen its own military capabilities (for example, by acquiring ballistic missiles and missile defence systems) to offset China’s augmented offensive capability. These reactions then could further reinforce China’s suspicions about the Allies’ intention and strengthen its effort to expand its military power. In the midst of this arms race, mutual suspicion and tension would further grow, and the region would become unstable.

#### Regional prolif by SK and Japan- destablaizes US influence in the region

Side et al, 2003 (Hu, China Academy of Engineering Physics, Sun Xiangli, Institute of applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, China, and Wu Jun, IAPCM, China, “On the nuclear issue of North Korea,” The XV International Amaldi Conference in Helsinki, September 27, http://www.lincei.it/rapporti/amaldi/papers/XV-HuSunWu.pdf)

It’s still not clear where the North Korea will go in the next step. However, it’s obvious that a nuclear North Korea would bring great impact on the regional security and global non-proliferation regime. In the Japanese history, there have always been some voices advocating developing nuclear weapons in Japan. A nuclear North Korea might provide Japan a pretext to develop nuclear force. In South Korea it’s reported that it once had a nuclear weapon program, and was forced to give up under the U.S. pressure.5 If North Korea develop nuclear forces, and Japan goes to nuclear, then South Korea must feel pressure to develop nuclear weapons. Of course Japan and South Korea have some other options to deal with that situation like strengthening cooperation with the United States in missile defence and nuclear umbrella, but the possibility cannot be ruled out that they choose to develop their own nuclear forces. If Japan and South Korea have their own nuclear weapons, the allied relations among the United States, Japan and South Korea will change, and the Northeast Asia security structure will face major adjustment. So, North Korea’s nuclearization will bring great uncertainty to the strategic structure of this region. Non-proliferation and counter-proliferation are among the priorities of the U.S. national policies. A North Korea with nuclear force is not in the interests of the U.S. regional and global security. The United States will not accept a North Korea with nuclear force. If no agreement can be concluded on the nuclear standoff between these two countries, a series of political, economical or military conflicts will come up, which would greatly endanger the security and stability of this region. The increase of the number of nuclear weapon states in Northeast Asia would also cause new security peril in this region. The probability of nuclear accident and nuclear war would rise. And the prospect of nuclear weapons' falling into terrorists’ hands would get more worrisome. So far, North Korea is the only state that has withdrawn from the NPT treaty and declared to develop nuclear deterrent force. If this issue could not be resolved appropriately, it would create a negative precedent, which would heavily impair the NPT regime. A North Korea with nuclear force will lead to chain reactions which are unfavorable to China’s security. China is focusing on economic development, and a stable and secure periphery environment is crucial to its economic development and social stability. Therefore, realizing peace and stability on a nuclear-weapons-free Korean Peninsula serves best the interests of China. So, China actively supports denuclearizion on this Peninsula. There should be no doubt that realizing denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is the common aim for all states concerned in this region.

#### Nuclear War

**Cirincione 2k** – Ploughshares Fund, Cirincione, Joseph. "The Asian Nuclear Reaction Chain." Foreign Policy, Spring

The blocks would fall quickest and hardest in Asia, where proliferation pressures are already building more quickly than anywhere else in the world. If a nuclear breakout takes place in Asia, then the international arms control agreements that have been painstakingly negotiated over the past 40 years will crumble. Moreover, the United States could find itself embroiled in its fourth war on the Asian continent in six decades--a costly rebuke to those who seek the safety of Fortress America by hiding behind national missile defenses. Consider what is already happening: North Korea continues to play guessing games with its nuclear and missile programs; South Korea wants its own missiles to match Pyongyang's; India and Pakistan shoot across borders while running a slow-motion nuclear arms race; China modernizes its nuclear arsenal amid tensions with Taiwan and the United States; Japan's vice defense minister is forced to resign after extolling the benefits of nuclear weapons; and Russia--whose Far East nuclear deployments alone make it the largest Asian nuclear power--struggles to maintain territorial coherence. Five of these states have nuclear weapons; the others are capable of constructing them. Like neutrons firing from a split atom, one nation's actions can trigger reactions throughout the region, which in turn, stimulate additional actions. These nations form an interlocking Asian nuclear reaction chain that vibrates dangerously with each new development. If the frequency and intensity of this reaction cycle increase, critical decisions taken by any one of these governments could cascade into the second great wave of nuclear-weapon proliferation, bringing regional and global economic and political instability and, perhaps, the first combat use of a nuclear weapon since 1945.

#### Pepsi challenge – make them prove we don’t solve this scenario

Relations don’t solve.

Belaeff 1-8-10 - President, Global Society Institute, Inc. (USA), “Russia Profile Weekly Experts Panel: Iran Testing the US-Russian “Reset””, Russia Profile, http://www.russiaprofile.org/page.php?pageid=Experts%27+Panel&articleid=a1262975990

The above might explain why the “reset” so far has produced few public results of a tension-reducing nature. For example, the deployment of ABM systems in Poland and elsewhere in Eastern Europe has not been cancelled, but only postponed sine die – and can be revived at any moment. Patriot missile batteries will be delivered to Poland; new START negotiations are not progressing as quickly as expected by some observers; America is re-arming and training Georgian military in the face of explicit Russian concerns. There is a view that the American “reset” is mostly a PR smokescreen, which is not currently producing the tangible and positive results that some expected from this initiative. Some wits are noting that the label “peregruzka” (overload) rather than “perezagruzka” (reset) on the ridiculous gift was not necessarily a gaffe at all – but a studied carelessness, a snub to the Russian counterparts, perceived to be so eager for a fresh approach.

Co-operation doesn’t solve anything.

Turkish Weekly 9 - “Normalization In U.s.-russian Relations Not To Change Political Situation In World: Analyst At French Studies Institute”, The Journal of Turkish Weekly, July 8, http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/83734/-normalization-in-u-s-russian-relations-not-to-change-political-situation-in-world-analyst-at-french-studies-institute-.html

Normalization of relations between the United States and Russia will not assume a global significance and will not change the situation in the world, since today Russia does not play the role it played formerly, Dominic Moisi, analyst on Russian-American relations, said. "There is a country that is essential for the future of the world, it is not Russia, but it is China," Moisi, founder and senior advisor at the French Institute for International Relations (IFRI), told Trend News in a telephone conversation from Paris Speaking of the growing role of China, Moisi said that the Chinese are soon going to be the number two economy in the world. Russian economy can not compete. As another important aspect of the increasing weight of China in the world, Moisi considers the absence of problems with the aging of population, unlike European countries, including Russia. "China has still the largest population in the world and it is not being reduced. The population of Russia is reducing strikingly year after year," said Moisi, author of numerous reports on U.S.-Russian relations.

Russia will never trust the US—conventional buildup.

Blank 2009 (Dr. Stephen Blank , Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Strategic Studies Institute of the U.S. Army War College, “Prospects for Russo-American Cooperation in Halting Nuclear Proliferation,” March, <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=892>)

However, we are far away from that environment of concord and evidently moving farther and farther away. Even if we discount the various remarks cited above by Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov, it is clear that Russia cannot and will not base its approach to the United States on any foundation other than the one of mutual suspicion embodied in Mutually Assured Destruction. As he stated in February, 2007, Our main criterion is ensuring the Russian Federation’s security and maintaining strategic stability as much as possible. . . . We have started such consultations already. I am convinced that we need a substantive discussion on how those lethal weapons could be curbed on the basis of mutual trust and balance of forces and interests. We will insist particularly on this approach. We do not need just the talk that we are no longer enemies and therefore we should not have restrictions for each other. This is not the right approach. It is fraught with an arms race, in fact, because, it is very unlikely that either of us will be ready to lag behind a lot.226 Thus Lavrov puts his finger on the fact that in an atmosphere of political mistrust and where both sides’ deployments are still based on the philosophy of deterrence and mutual assured destruction, strategic unilateralism is both unacceptable and indeed dangerous to all because it stimulates arms races across the world. In other words American unilateralism is inherently a threat to Russia wherever it appears because Russia cannot but proceed from the a priori assumption of hostile American interest, i.e., what the German philosopher Carl Schmitt called “the presupposition of an enemy.” Thus the problem and the threats that we face as this relationship erodes are not due to Russia’s military modernization but rather to the overall deterioration of Russo-American relations or to the failure to break out of past cognitive paradigms. And here Russia, precisely because it has reverted to previous policies, structures, and mentalities is as much to blame as is the United States. Whereas the United States is moving or claims that it has sought to move toward a strategic relationship based on partnership with Russia, defense against and dissuasion of enemies, and lessened reliance on nuclear weapons and deterrence vis-à-vis Russia and other states, Russia cannot let go of the past.227 It remains committed to a strategy and posture of deterrence that postulates an inherent adversarial relationship with the United States. In regard to nuclear issues the argument that Washington has also operated on the basis of the same Schmittian presupposition of enemies and a determination to retain nuclear primacy since 1991 can also be made.228 And simultaneously Washington has also striven to ensure its unchallenged conventional superiority and ability to intervene undeterred in foreign countries so that the projection of American conventional military power abroad can take place at minimum risk. The collision of these two strategic worldviews is all but ensured to heighten regional, if not global tensions. Thus neither Washington nor Moscow can escape from the gravitational pull of mutual deterrence by unilateral actions like each side’s effort to start withdrawing from arms control treaties in a unilateral fashion. Even if one accepts Cimbala’s arguments that missile defenses need not destabilize the bilateral contemporary relationship, it is clear that they are doing so right now because there is, as Lavrov suggested, a deficit of trust, and Russia’s internal structure precludes it from conducting any kind of foreign and defense policy other than one based on Schmitt’s presupposition of enemies. Therefore mutual deterrence must remain intact as the foundation of bilateral cooperation until a comprehensive political agreement (possibly in the form of new arms control and nonproliferation treaties) takes hold.229

Missile defense and Afghanistan are key to co-operation, not plan.

Mankoff 9 – Fellow for Russian Studies, “The Tricky U.S.-Russia ‘Reset’ Button”, Council on Foreign Relations, 2/19, http://www.cfr.org/publication/18551/

The diplomatic agenda between the United States and Russia remains focused to a significant degree on military "hard security" issues, largely because of their failure over the past two decades to institutionalize trust and cooperation in the bilateral relationship. While both now appear eager to move ahead with talks on a new strategic arms control pact, developments in two other aspects of the hard security relationship--missile defense and the war in Afghanistan--will determine whether the United States and Russia can move from limited cooperation to a more durable partnership. The danger is that because these issues are so critical and politically sensitive, failure could do real damage, making progress in other areas difficult.