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### AT: First Strike CP Frontline

#### 1. China has second strike capability that would survive a first strike – the US has accepted vulnerability

Phillip C. Saunders; Senior Research Fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University; July 2009 “ Managing Strategic Competition with China;” Strategic Forum; <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/ifnss/0017050/f_0017050_14587.pdf> ET

Potential Dynamics The history of interactions between Chinese strategic nuclear modernization and U.S. efforts to develop ballistic missile defenses illustrates some potential dynam­ics of future U.S.-China competition in other strategic areas. Beijing has sought to limit its vulnerability to nuclear black­mail by developing a viable second-strike capability against potential nuclear-armed adversaries, including the United States. Technological limitations meant that the Chinese deterrent initially relied primar­ily on air-delivered weapons and then on vulnerable silo- and cave-based missiles. Chinese experts privately admitted that the credibility of China’s deterrent rested on a potential adversary’s uncertainty about whether a first strike could destroy all of China’s long-range nuclear missiles. Rather than build large numbers of vulnerable first-generation missiles, China decided to develop a new generation of mobile land- and sea-based missiles that would be more survivable and better able to provide a cred­ible second-strike capability. As these new systems began nearing deployment early in this decade, U.S. withdrawal from the Antiballistic Missile Treaty and deployment of ballistic missile defenses challenged the premises behind mutually assured destruc­tion, prompting Chinese complaints that the United States sought “absolute security” for itself while keeping others vulnerable. Some U.S. policymakers and strategists have been reluctant to accept mutual nuclear vulnerability with China, partly because it implies a reduction in U.S. freedom of action (and a potential increase in China’s ability to take actions that challenge U.S. interests).16 But Beijing appears determined to estab­lish and maintain a credible second-strike nuclear capability through some combination of increased numbers, more survivable mis­siles, ballistic missile defense countermea­sures, and potentially targeting space-based elements of a U.S. missile defense system. The United States ultimately may have no choice but to accept a degree of vulnerability to Chinese nuclear weapons. This issue has been a significant source of tension in Sino-U.S. relations for the past 10 years, and at times has had significant domestic political conse­quences. Despite concerns on both sides, these tensions have not prevented further develop­ment of the U.S.-China relationship and sig­nificant bilateral cooperation on issues such as counterterrorism and denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

#### 2. China has second strike capabilities – but alternate policies solve heg and arms race

Phillip C. Saunders; Senior Research Fellow in the Institute for National Strategic Studies at the National Defense University; July 2009 “ Managing Strategic Competition with China;” Strategic Forum; <http://www.ciaonet.org/wps/ifnss/0017050/f_0017050_14587.pdf> ET

Considered broadly, China’s overall nuclear weapons posture has focused on possessing sufficient nuclear capability to make potential adversaries vulnerable (and therefore restrained in how hard they could push China). Chinese leaders have sought to limit economic and diplomatic costs by maintaining a relatively small nuclear arse­nal, emphasizing China’s no-first-use pol­icy and goal of nuclear disarmament, and explicitly eschewing participation in any nuclear arms races. This suggests that they China’s approach to nuclear modernization, which has sought to induce restraint from other nuclear powers while minimizing economic and political costs, may be a model for China’s future behavior in other strategic areas6 Strategic Forum No. 242, July 2009 saw limited returns from additional nuclear capabilities beyond those needed to create stable deterrence via a survivable second-strike capability. China’s overall approach to nuclear modernization, which has sought to maintain a credible second-strike capa­bility that would induce restraint from other nuclear powers while minimizing eco­nomic and political costs, may be a model for China’s future behavior in other stra­tegic areas. However, specific characteris­tics of these areas—including the expected costs and benefits of competitive behavior and the extent to which deterrence functions effectively—may also influence competitive dynamics. Will the logic underlying China’s nuclear modernization also apply in other strategic areas? stealthy methods required to gain and main­tain the access needed for successful com­puter network attacks may make it difficult to assess the other side’s capability accu­rately or to demonstrate one’s own capability, potentially making stable deterrence more difficult to establish and maintain. China’s efforts to develop and acquire conventional force capabilities that could limit the U.S. ability to operate in the west­ern Pacific represent a more traditional form of military competition. China’s con­ventional attack submarines, Russian destroyers with advanced antiship cruise missiles, more robust air defense and air attack capabilities, and antiship ballistic missiles will pose significant operational challenges for U.S. air and naval forces operating near China. U.S. military plan­ners are already following China’s naval modernization efforts and development of antiaccess capabilities closely.19 Recent U.S. adjustments of its military force deploy­ments in the western Pacific are a partial response to improvements in Chinese capa­bilities (and are certainly viewed that way by Chinese military officers). China justifies acquisition of new and updated capabilities in terms of a defensive strategy, but these capabilities also potentially enable offensive actions against Taiwan by raising the costs and risks of U.S. intervention. Most other countries in Asia have been more concerned about Chinese power projection capabil­ities (and especially its potential acqui­sition of an aircraft carrier) than about improvements in its antiaccess capabilities. However, these capabilities are of particu­lar concern to the United States because its strategy in Asia requires military access to maintain stability and fulfill alliance com­mitments. The conflict between U.S. and Chinese strategies suggests the likelihood of intensified conventional arms competition in the future. Heightened U.S.-China military competition does not make global rivalry or an all-out arms race inevitable, but it will require U.S. policymakers to think more seriously about how to deal with China if the United States no longer enjoys unquestioned dominance in key strategic areas.

#### 3. First strike would cause an expensive war with China

KARL P. MUELLER; associate director of the Strategy, Doctrine, and Resources program at RAND Arroyo Center and senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation; 2006; “STRIKING FIRST - Preemptive and Preventive Attack¶ in U.S. National Security Policy;” RAND Project Air Force; <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND_MG403.pdf> ET

Preempting cross-border aggression against vulnerable allies, in¶ the form either of invasion or of coercive bombardment, could foil or¶ blunt such attacks, especially by North Korea against South Korea or¶ by China against Taiwan. However, a conventional first strike could¶ not be expected to disarm North Korea effectively, let alone China, so¶ while preemptive attack might limit U.S. and allied damage, it would¶ involve starting a very expensive war, and would probably appear unacceptable¶ unless it seemed very certain that an enemy attack was imminent¶ and could not be averted short of war.

### AT: First Strike – Fails

#### Single strike is less effective short of conquering China – deterrence would solve better

KARL P. MUELLER; associate director of the Strategy, Doctrine, and Resources program at RAND Arroyo Center and senior political scientist at the RAND Corporation; 2006; “STRIKING FIRST - Preemptive and Preventive Attack¶ in U.S. National Security Policy;” RAND Project Air Force; <http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2006/RAND_MG403.pdf> ET

The second consideration that continues to limit the policy utility¶ of anticipatory attack is that even when such opportunities do exist¶ they are often militarily unattractive or the military advantages they¶ offer appear meager compared to their potential political costs. In¶ short, a good offense may not be the best defense, or may not be much¶ better than a good defense. Preventive attacks often promise less than¶ decisive results unless the attacker is willing to conquer, occupy, and¶ remake the target state, as the United States concluded when considering¶ attacks against the Soviet Union or China, and is now dealing with¶ in Iraq; in some cases, such as the Osirak raid, a threat may appear so¶ serious that merely delaying its emergence will be worthwhile, but if¶ the costs of striking first are high, marginal benefits will more often be¶ insufficient to justify them.4 Preemptive attacks are often of only marginal¶ military value, if that, simply because striking first is not greatly¶ superior to allowing the adversary to deliver the first blow. Ironically,¶ this is particularly true for the United States. U.S. military power gives¶ Washington unrivaled ability to launch anticipatory attacks, but it also¶ reduces the need for them: The more powerful a state is, the more¶ likely it will be able to deter or defend itself against the threats it faces,¶ although this depends greatly on the nature of the threat. The world is¶ full of political actors that could attack the United States, but that are¶ extremely unlikely to dare to do so, and which U.S. armed forces could¶ easily deal with if they did. That Israel, in contrast, has been relatively¶ willing to launch anticipatory attacks against its enemies has much to¶ do with its perceived military vulnerability.

### AT: First Strike – Asymmetric War

#### China would use asymmetric warfare to kill the economy

David Wall; associate fellow at Chatham House; May 22, 2005; “Betting on World War III;” The Japan Times; <http://www.lexisnexis.com/hottopics/lnacademic/>? ET

Yet, for the foreseeable future, China can do more damage to America through economic policies and through "cyber warfare" than it can militarily. North Korea is said to be training more than 600 technicians in the science of cyber war - how many more is China training? I am sure the number runs into thousands. They could devastate the U.S. economy, and have a go at destroying a good part of U.S. military capability.¶ Simply by threatening to sell its holdings of hundreds of billions of dollars worth of U.S. Treasury Bills, China could wreak havoc in U.S. financial markets. By actually selling them and then refusing to buy any more, it would do serious damage. A Chinese embargo on exports to the U.S. would have U.S. consumers in the streets; many of the U.S. companies that have invested heavily in China would find themselves in bankruptcy.¶ And then of course there is the question of global access to supplies of raw materials, especially the gas and oil that the Chinese are now tying up in contracts.¶ Yes, it does seem as though war between the U.S. and China is inevitable. Some would say that it has already started. It will not be a military war, however. Apart from some local skirmishes, the real war will be in the economy and in cyberspace. U.S. soldiers need not worry about those bull's eyes. Yet.

### AT: Lieber and Press – Wrong

#### China is upgrading their nuclear arsenal, Lieber and Press are wrong

Chase, Yeaw, and Erickson 09 (Michael S. Chase an Associate Research Professor in the Warfare Analysis and Research Department at the U.S. Naval War College in Newport, RI, Christopher Yeaw a Senior Leader executive, is the Chief Scientist, Air Force Global Strike Command, Barksdale Air Force Base, La, and Andrew S. Erickson an Associate Professor in the Strategic Research Department at the U.S. Naval War College and a core founding member of the department’s China Maritime Studies Institute, 2-25-09, Chinese Theater and Strategic Missile Force Modernization and its Implications for the United States, Journal of Strategic Studies, <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01402390802407434>)

Despite major advances in Chinese strategic capabilities, some analysts continue to portray China as being relatively unconcerned about modernizing its missile and nuclear forces. Most prominently, Keir Lieber and Daryl Press argue that Beijing's arsenal is ‘growing at a glacial pace’.[1](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390802407434#FN0001) According to Lieber and Press, ‘It will probably soon be possible for the United States to destroy the long-range nuclear arsenals of Russia or China with a first strike. This dramatic shift in the nuclear balance of power stems from a series of improvements in the United States’ nuclear systems, the precipitous decline of Russia's arsenal, and the glacial pace of modernization of China's nuclear forces.’[2](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390802407434#FN0002) Lieber and Press assess that Chinese nuclear forces are vulnerable to a disarming first strike and conclude that this is unlikely to change anytime soon. In their words, ‘Given the history of China's slow-motion nuclear modernization, it is doubtful that a Chinese second-strike force will materialize anytime soon. The United States has a first-strike capability against China today and should be able to maintain it for a decade or more.’[3](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390802407434#FN0003) Lieber and Press are not the only analysts who portray Chinese nuclear and missile forces as modernizing very slowly despite what Chinese analysts perceive as the security challenges stemming from an increasingly threatening strategic environment. Jeffrey Lewis has argued persuasively that Beijing traditionally believed changes in the size, configuration, and readiness of nuclear forces had little influence on deterrence, and that this conviction allowed China to limit its nuclear capabilities in ways that maximized political control and lowered costs.[4](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390802407434#FN0004) Lewis contends that China's nuclear force is unlikely to change rapidly because of durable beliefs on the part of Beijing's leadership concerning the opportunity costs (particularly in centralized control), and the limited marginal utility, of additional nuclear weapons, especially in sophisticated deployment patterns. Lewis's nuanced assessment of China's nuclear arsenal challenges more aggressive foreign estimates of its qualitative and quantitative modernization, and it correctly reflects the historical context of the country's nuclear development. Although China historically was satisfied with the ‘minimum means of reprisal’, however, much has changed in recent years and there is ample evidence to suggest that Chinese planners and strategists no longer regard minimalism as an appropriate principal upon which to base their calculations about national force structure requirements.[5](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390802407434#FN0005) As this essay will demonstrate, China has clearly discarded the belief that the quantity and quality of its missile and nuclear forces have little influence on deterrence, especially since its planners appear to be changing both, presumably to enhance the credibility of Beijing's deterrent and provide Chinese decisionmakers with a greater range of options in a changing strategic environment. Indeed, China currently perceives a variety of challenges to its strategic security arising from what it sees as Washington's determination to occupy a position of absolute nuclear superiority and the US military's increasingly lethal conventional precision strike capabilities. Consequently, Beijing is far from content to rely on the traditional strategy of minimum deterrence. Instead, Chinese analysts argue that a shift to a more formidable deterrent posture is required to ensure strategic security and promote the stable external environment that Chinese leaders have identified as a necessary condition for continued economic development.[6](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390802407434#FN0006) Moreover, Chinese writers have indicated that nuclear weapons could do more than simply fulfill the traditional missions of supporting the country's great power status and deterring nuclear attack. In the words of PLA National Defense University professor Wang Zhongchun, ‘Nuclear weapons play multiple strategic roles.’ Nuclear weapons underscore China's status as a great power and a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council, deter other countries from using nuclear weapons to attack or coerce China, and potentially ‘can be used at a time when China's core national security and development interests are fundamentally undermined’.[7](http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01402390802407434#FN0007) Consequently, according to Wang, ‘China should actively respond … to these increasingly serious nuclear challenges in order to obtain a peaceful long-term security environment.

#### China would retaliate to US nuclear attack on China – No first use policies don’t apply

Stephanie Spies; research intern for the Project on Nuclear Issues; Oct 20, 2011; “China’s Nuclear Policy: (No) First Use?;” Center for Strategic and International Studies <http://csis.org/blog/chinas-nuclear-policy-no-first-use> ET

Other security experts express similar concerns about China’s commitment to its NFU pledge. According to Justin [Hastings](http://csis.org/files/media/csis/pubs/issuesinsights_v07n08.pdf), a visiting research associate at the Institute of Defense and Strategic Studies at Nanyang Technological University, China’s NFU is not credible to countries like the U.S. who are more focused on Chinese nuclear “capabilities rather than its intentions”. While the threats of a militarily weak country are not credible, “a country with a greatly increased capacity to wage war can credibly change its intentions quickly”, Hastings argues. Such a situation may emerge for China, which according to recent intelligence discussed in an earlier [post](http://csis.org/blog/nuclear-weapons-modernization-russia-and-china-re-cap) is steadily increasing its nuclear modernization efforts and the role of nuclear weapons in its defense policies. According to Hastings’ logic, if a China which feels more confident in its nuclear capabilities is threatened in a future military conflict, particularly one which threatens its core national interests, it may roll back its NFU pledge. Statements by Maj. Gen. Zhu Chenghu, dean of China’s National Defense University, affirm this view, as he [stated](http://se1.isn.ch/serviceengine/Files/ISN/31930/ichaptersection_singledocument/7741B210-9E69-485D-B958-462C66DEDDD9/en/cs1_chapter3.pdf) that “China would have no choice but to respond with nuclear weapons if the United States attacked Chinese territory with conventional (non-nuclear) forces during such a conflict”, even if this violated its NFU commitment. Bruce Blair, President of the World Security Institute, argues that Zhu’s statements implicitly indicate that preventing Taiwanese independence “is an inviolable principle that overrides everything including China’s No-First-Use Declaration”, consistent with stated Chinese policy to “risk everything” in a conflict over Taiwan. According to some analysts, such as Scott [Moore](http://www.nti.org/e_research/e3_80.html) of the East Asia Nonproliferation program at CNS, “hyper-nationalism may come to exert a significant influence on national policy” in such a conflict which threatens Chinese sovereignty and survival, perhaps inducing pressure on President Hu to use nuclear weapons to ensure a Chinese military victory.