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-- No theft – storage solves.

Handler, ‘3

(Joshua, Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Emergent Threats in an Evolving Security Environment, p. 32)

Ensuring the security of tactical nuclear weapons has been a major concern of many analysts and commentators. It is frequently claimed that the security of tactical nuclear weapons is somehow worse than for strategic nuclear weapons and, thus, that special steps are somehow merited. However, one result of the PNI’s is that [TNW’s] tactical nuclear weapons are now approximately **as secure** as strategic nuclear weapons. It is now as good—or as bad—and this is a large chance from the 1990-91 time frame. [TNW’s] Tactical nuclear weapons in the United States and Russia are in many cases collocated with strategic nuclear weapons in major nuclear weapons storage facilities that contain multiple bunkers. Moreover, major changes in deployment patterns **have improved the security situation** for tactical nuclear weapons. There are almost no forward-deployed or dispersal tactical nuclear weapons on land, and there are no such weapons deployed on U.S. or Russian ships or submarines. The only exception is U.S. tactical nuclear weapons aircraft bombs in Europe, which are now kept in weapons storage vaults (WSV) set into the floor of hangers where aircraft can be located. In the case of Russia, some tactical nuclear weapons may be located in storage areas in the vicinity of an airfield, but unlike the United States, they are most likely not on the airfield area proper. Lastly, many of the supposedly smaller and more easily transportable tactical nuclear weapons, such as artillery shells, may almost be or have been completely eliminated. Thus concerns about them being stolen are now (or soon to be) **moot.**

-- Withdrawal causes dismantlement which increases the theft risk.

Sokolsky, ‘2

(Richard, Distinguished Research Fellow at INSS-NDU, Survival, August, p. 142)

A separate issue is what to do with the warheads. Here, the NPR critics are off-target. To achieve ‘real’ reductions, they argue, the United States should destroy rather than store all decommissioned warheads. One of their chief concerns is that storing warheads will encourage Russia to do the same, thereby increasing the vulnerability of these weapons to terrorist theft or unauthorized diversion. This concern is misplaced. It is the fissile material from weapons that have been dismantled or retired, rather than the warheads themselves, that is the main proliferation danger. The warhead destruction process generates an increased among of weapons-grade and weapons-usable material that is being placed in storage facilities without adequate safeguards. Russian strategic nuclear warheads are most secure when they are deployed on active systems under the control of Russia’s strategic forces. They are only slightly less secure when stored at Russia’s reasonably well-protected national stockpile sites. The least secure of the three alternatives is fissile material from dismantled weapons. If Russian ‘loose nukes’ is the critics’ real concern, they should be advocating storage under tight military control rather than dismantlement under the aegis of the trouble-ridden Ministry of Atomic Energy nuclear weapons complex (where, according to US estimates, only about one-third has been secured through US assistance). The key to this problem, as leaders of the G7 recognized in their June 2002 summit, is a substantial boost in US and international funding to provide adequate protection for material on a faster schedule than is currently planned. Increased transparency and safeguards for Russia’s vast stockpile of tactical nuclear weapons, which are more prone to theft and diversion than Russian strategic nuclear weapons, would also be a significant step forward.
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-- PALS solve.

NAPF, ‘9

(Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, “NATO’s Positions Regarding Nuclear Non-Proliferation, Arms Control, and Disarmament and Related Issues,” NuclearFiles.org)

NATO's nuclear weapons are stored under highly secure conditions. They have been well-tested and meet the highest safety standards. The U.S. PAL devices ensure an additional safeguard against accidental or unauthorized use. Allies are confident in the safety and security of their nuclear weapons.
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**Nuke terrorism impossible—all internal links impossible**

**Gavin ‘10**

(Francis J. Gavin is Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin “Same As It Ever Was” International Security 34:3 January 7, 2010. http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7)

Coherent policies to reduce the risk of a nonstate actor using nuclear weapons clearly need to be developed. In particular, the rise of the Abdul Qadeer Khan nuclear technology network should give pause.49 But again, the news is not as grim as nuclear alarmists would suggest. Much has already been done to secure the supply of nuclear materials, and relatively simple steps can produce further improvements. Moreover, **there are reasons to doubt both the capabilities and even the interest many terrorist groups have in detonating a nuclear device on U.S. soil**. As Adam Garfinkle writes, “**The threat of nuclear terrorism is very remote.”**50 Experts disagree on whether nonstate actors have the scientific, engineering, financial, natural resource, security, and logistical capacities to build a nuclear bomb from scratch. According to terrorism expert Robin Frost, **the danger of a “nuclear black market” and loose nukes from Russia may be overstated**. Even if **a terrorist group did acquire a nuclear weapon, delivering and detonating it against a U.S. target would present tremendous technical and logistical difficulties**.51 Finally, **the feared nexus between terrorists** **and rogue regimes may be exaggerated**. As nuclear proliferation expert Joseph Cirincione argues, states such as **Iran and North Korea are “not the most likely sources for terrorists since their stockpiles**, if any, **are small and exceedingly precious, and** hence **well-guarded**.”52 Chubin states that **there “is no reason to believe that Iran today**, any more than Sadaam Hussein earlier, **would transfer WMD** [weapons of mass destruction] **technology to terrorist groups** like al-Qaida or Hezbollah.”53

Nuclear terrorism impossible—technical failure—catastrophic thinking prevents real action

Gavin ‘10

(Francis J. Gavin is Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin “Same As It Ever Was” International Security 34:3 January 7, 2010. http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7)

**Even if a terrorist group were to acquire a nuclear device**, expert Michael Levi demonstrates that effective planning can prevent catastrophe: **for nuclear terrorists, what “can go wrong might go wrong, and when it comes to nuclear terrorism,** **a broader, integrated defense, just like controls at the source of weapons and materials, can multiply, intensify, and compound the possibilities of terrorist failure, possibly driving terrorist groups to reject nuclear terrorism altogether.”** Warning of the danger of a terrorist acquiring a nuclear weapon, most analyses are based on the inaccurate image of an “infallible tenfoottall enemy.” **This type of alarmism**, writes Levi, **impedes the development of thoughtful strategies that could deter, prevent, or mitigate a terrorist attack:** “Worst-case estimates have their place, but the possible failure-averse, conservative, resource-limited five-foot-tall nuclear terrorist, who is subject not only to the laws of physics but also to Murphy’s law of nuclear terrorism, needs to become just as central to our evaluations of strategies.”54
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**No interests for nuclear terrorism**

Gavin ‘10

(Francis J. Gavin is Tom Slick Professor of International Affairs and Director of the Robert S. Strauss Center for International Security and Law, Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin “Same As It Ever Was” International Security 34:3 January 7, 2010. http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdfplus/10.1162/isec.2010.34.3.7)

A recent study contends that **al-Qaida’s interest in acquiring and using nuclear weapons may be overstated**. Anne Stenersen, a terrorism expert, claims that “**looking at statements and activities at various levels within the al-Qaida network, it becomes clear that the network’s interest in using unconventional means is** in fact **much lower than commonly thought**.”55 She further states that “**CBRN** [chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear] **weapons do not play a central part in al-Qaida’s strategy**.”56 In the 1990s, members of al-Qaida debated whether to obtain a nuclear device. Those in favor sought the weapons primarily to deter a U.S. attack on al-Qaida’s bases in Afghanistan. This assessment reveals an **organization at odds with that laid out by nuclear alarmists of terrorists obsessed with using nuclear weapons against the U**nited **S**tates **regardless of the consequences**. Stenersen asserts, “**Although there have been** various **reports** stating that al-Qaida attempted to buy nuclear material **in the nineties**, and possibly recruited skilled scientists, **it appears that al-Qaida central have not dedicated a lot of time or effort to developing a high-end CBRN capability**. . . . Al-Qaida central never had a coherent strategy to obtain CBRN: instead, its members were divided on the issue, and there was an awareness that militarily effective weapons were extremely difficult to obtain.” 57 **Most terrorist groups “assess nuclear terrorism through the lens of their political goals and may judge that it does not advance their interests**.”58 As Frost has written, “The risk of nuclear terrorism, especially true nuclear terrorism employing bombs powered by nuclear fission, is overstated, and that popular wisdom on the topic is significantly flawed.”59