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## 1NC

### A. Uniqueness – Obama is pushing the CTBT – It Will pass – predictive trends.

Deaton 6-18. [Paul, weekend editor, “Iowa Get Ready for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty” Blog for Iowa - - <http://www.blogforiowa.com/blog/_archives/2011/6/18/4839420.html> da: 7-13-11]

If most Iowans don’t know that the U.S. Senate may consider ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) again, the signs from Washington, DC are unmistakable. On April 5, 2009, in the Czech Republic, President Obama pledged to work toward a global ban on nuclear testing, to “immediately and aggressively pursue U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.” Some believed that ratifying the treaty would be a slam dunk with 60 of 67 votes needed assured after the Democratic win in the 2008 Presidential election. The balance of power changed, and a less controversial treaty, New START, was a center of attention during the 2010 lame duck session of the Senate. In his closing remarks during the debate on New START, Senator Jon Kyl (R-AZ) expressed his opposition to the CTBT. Opposition notwithstanding, a ratification effort for the CTBT is emerging as a significant “what’s next” for the federal government in curbing nuclear proliferation. On Tuesday, Assistant Secretary for Arms Control, Verification and Compliance Rose Gottemoeller delivered the United States’ statement at the meeting of the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) in Vienna, Austria. She said, “Our recent experience working with the U.S. Senate to gain their advice and consent to ratification of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty – New START – with the Russian Federation has prepared us for what is expected to be an equally thorough and robust debate over the CTBT. We do not expect it will be easy or happen quickly, but we will work hard to make it happen.” Gottemoeller was the chief US negotiator of New START and has standing to make such a statement.

### B. Link --

### [Insert that the plan is unpopular]

### PC key to CTBT

Joseph 9. [Jofi, senior Democratic foreign policy staffer in the United States Senate, “Renew the Drive for CTBT Ratification” The Washington Quarterly -- http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_Joseph.pdf]

The Obama administration cannot take the decision to press the Senate for CTBT ratification before 2012 lightly. It will require a significant investment of political capital by the president and his senior national security team during his first term in office to closely coordinate with the Senate leadership and chairmen of the Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Intelligence Committees. The risks of failure are considerable: a second rejection by the Senate would likely doom the nuclear test ban treaty to oblivion and risk encouraging other states to end their informal moratoria on nuclear testing.

### C. Impact -- US Ratification Is Key To Prevent Global Prolif and Nuke War.

DAVIS 7. [Dr. Ian, Co-Executive Director of the British American Security Information Council, “Getting the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Back on Track” Huffington Post -- April 11]

This can't happen too soon. North Korea has marched through the open door with its first underground test of an atomic device. There is widespread agreement that the test has escalated tension in the region and raised the stakes in the stand-off with the United States. It could also destroy the prospects for the CTBT and open the floodgates to more nuclear-armed states. While we welcome the current agreement with Pyonyang which may ultimately eliminate the North Korean nuclear program, and lead to a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, the details of implementation have yet to be worked out, and already, strong conservative opposition to the agreement is beginning to appear. The door to an alternative way forward is also still open, and the United States could seize the moral high ground by leading the world through it. If President Bush were to press the Senate to reconsider and support ratification of the treaty, it could be part of a far-reaching strategy for shoring up the North Korean agreement, peacefully tackling the Iranian nuclear program and for preventing a world with 40 or more nuclear powers. The North Korean and Iranian nuclear crises exemplify an increasing number of damaging developments that make it clear that the non-proliferation system needs to be strengthened and updated, not neglected or discarded. The international community must not only work together to develop more effective diplomatic approaches towards North Korea and Iran, but it must also apply stricter international safeguards on all nuclear programs, prevent the spread of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, secure a global halt to the production of fissile material for weapons purposes, take new steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons and achieve the entry into force of the CTBT. If, in 1963, at the height of the Cold War, the US, UK, and USSR could negotiate a limited test ban treaty. Why can't we ratify a comprehensive treaty now? Were we less threatened then? Are Iran and North Korea greater threats to the United States than was the USSR? The CTBT is vital to a system of security that does not rely on nuclear weapons. Its entry into force would put a cap on the nuclear age. Posturing for domestic politics and insisting on a macho attitude in international relations has dangerous long-term implications, both for America and the rest of the world. Since the Bush administration has come to power, global non-proliferation has gone into a holding pattern at best, a tailspin at worst. **That can only lead to a world overpopulated with nuclear weapons and a nuclear war** sooner or later. The consequences do not bear thinking about. So it is vital that CTBT supporters put the treaty back on the American and European political agenda and move to secure ratification by other key states.

### Escalates to extinction.

**Utgoff 2** (Victor A., Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis, Survival Vol 44 No 2 Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions, p. 87-90)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

## --- UNIQUENESS/INTERNALS ---

## Yes CTBT

### Obama pushing CTBT – will pass.

Carafano 6-27. [James, senior research fellow for nat’l security @ Heritage, “Nuclear treaty that Obama is pushing will put US at risk” San Francisco Examiner da: 7-13-11]

The “bullets” in this revived game are a variety of bad treaties that have languished in the Senate, unapproved, for years — and with good reason. President Barack Obama seems intent on pushing through at least one them before the election — another “trophy” for his foreign policy wall. The president believes that the U.S. should play a more restrained and humble role in the world. To achieve that goal, he must build up a superstructure of international governance and agreements that substitute for America defending its own interests. Waiting to learn which bad treaty he’ll push has become Washington’s version of Russian roulette. The shot should come soon. Treaties are notoriously difficult to get through the Senate in an election year. Moreover, polls indicate Obama’s party may not control the Senate after next year’s election. Therefore, this year could be his last best chance to ram a treaty through. State Department officials indicate the heavy favorite is the 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Signing onto the ban would cement Obama’s reputation as the “road to zero” president — the man who did everything possible to rid the world of America’s nuclear weapons.

### Building support of CTBT now.

Graham and Bendikova 6-20. [Owen, research coordinator, Michaela, research assistant for missile defense and foreign policy, both at Heritage Foundation’s Davis Institute for Int’l Studies, “Return of the Test Ban Treaty” National Review Online da: 7-14-11]

With the controversial New START agreement already in its pocket, the Obama administration is now working to build support for the CTBT, which would outlaw all nuclear-explosive testing. It would be the next leg of the journey down the president’s fanciful “road to nuclear zero.” The Senate should not go along for the ride. In talking up the CTBT, the administration offers a “moral leadership” argument: By forswearing nuclear testing, the U.S. will inspire other states to forgo nuclear weapons. The folly of that argument is even clearer today that when the Senate rejected it in 1999. We haven’t tested our nukes since 1992. (Yikes!) Since then, Pakistan, India, and even North Korea (originally a non-nuclear-weapons state under the Nonproliferation Treaty) have tested nuclear devices. Iran continues its nuclear-weapons program at full throttle, and all the other nuclear states are modernizing their arsenals. Russia and China, for example, are almost certainly conducting low-yield nuclear-weapons tests.

### Momentum from START debate.

Tauscher 11. [Ellen, Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security at Arms Control Association Annual Meeting at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “The Case for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty”, U.S. Department of State May 10 -- <http://www.state.gov/t/us/162963.htm> -- da:7/15/11]

But let me turn to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. President Obama vowed to pursue ratification and entry into force of the CTBT in his speech in Prague. In so doing the United States is once again taking a leading role in supporting a test ban treaty just as it had when discussions first began more than 50 years ago. As you know, in the aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the United States ratified the Limited Test Ban Treaty, which banned all nuclear tests except those conducted underground. The Cuban Missile Crisis, which was about as close as the world has ever come to a nuclear exchange, highlighted the instability of the arms race. Even though scholars have concluded that the United States acted rationally, the Soviet Union acted rationally, and even Fidel Castro acted rationally, we came perilously close to nuclear war. Luck certainly played a role in helping us avoid nuclear catastrophe. In the months after the crisis, President Kennedy used his new found political capital and his political skill to persuade the military and the Senate to support a test ban treaty in the hopes of curbing a dangerous arms race. He achieved a Limited Test Ban Treaty, but aspired to do more. Yet, today, with more than 40 years of experience, wisdom, and knowledge about global nuclear dangers, a legally binding ban on all nuclear explosive testing still eludes us.This being Washington, everything is seen through a political lens. So before discussing the merits of the Treaty, let me talk about this in a political sense for a moment. I know that the conventional wisdom is that the ratification of New START has delayed or pushed aside consideration of the CTBT. I take the opposite view. The New START debate, in many ways, opened the door for the CTBT. Months of hearings and debate and nine long days of floor deliberations engaged the Senate, especially its newer Members, in an extended seminar on the composition of our nuclear arsenal, the health of our stockpile, and the relationship between nuclear weapons and our national security. When the Senate voted for the Treaty, it inherently affirmed that our stockpile is safe, secure, and effective, and can be kept so without nuclear testing. More importantly, the New START debate helped cultivate emerging new arms control champions, such as Senator Shaheen and Senator Casey, who are here today. Before the debate, there was not a lot of muscle memory on treaties, especially nuclear treaties in the Senate. Now, there is. So we are in a stronger position to make the case for the CTBT on its merits. To maintain and enhance that momentum, the Obama Administration is preparing to engage the Senate and the public on an education campaign that we expect will lead to ratification of the CTBT. In our engagement with the Senate, we want to leave aside the politics and explain why the CTBT will enhance our national security. Our case for Treaty ratification consists of three primary arguments. One, the United States no longer needs to conduct nuclear explosive tests, plain and simple. Two, a CTBT that has entered into force will obligate other states not to test and provide a disincentive for states to conduct such tests. And three, we now have a greater ability to catch those who cheat.

## Obama Push

### Obama push.

Carafano 7-5. [James, senior research fellow for nat’l security @ Heritage, “What’s Next for Nuclear Modernization” Global Security da: 7-12-11]

A wild fire that threatens Los Alamos National Laboratory is not the only "hot" topic regarding nuclear weapons. A fight is brewing between the president and the Congress over nuclear modernization. When pushing for the New START nuclear agreement, "Obama promised to modernize U.S. nuclear stockpiles. Yet when Rep. Michael Turner, R-Ohio, wrote into the Defense Authorization Act provisions to make good on that promise, the president threatened to veto the bill." Furthermore, the administration has shown strong interest in pushing the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty which would close off another to modernizing the US stockpile.

## Ext: PC Key

### PC is key.

NYT 9. [“The Test Ban Treaty” -- May 24 -- <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/25/opinion/25mon1.html> -- da: 7/15/11]

In September 1996, President Bill Clinton was the first leader to sign the treaty. But the drive to bring it into force hit a wall three years later when the Senate voted 51 to 48 against ratification, with most Republicans opposed. President George W. Bush buried the pact even deeper during eight destructive years in which he disparaged arms control and weakened the international rules that for decades helped curb the spread of nuclear weapons. So it is important that President Obama has vowed to “immediately and aggressively” pursue ratification of the test ban treaty. He has asked Vice President Joseph Biden to shepherd the treaty in the Senate. The campaign got an important boost from two Republican former secretaries of state, George Shultz and Henry Kissinger, who have urged ratification. Mr. Shultz was right when he said in Rome last month that the old arguments against the treaty — cheaters might not be detected and the safety and viability of American weapons could not be guaranteed without testing — have been put to rest by advances in technology. A task force led by former Defense Secretary William Perry, a Democrat, and Brent Scowcroft, a Republican former national security adviser, also concluded that the treaty is in America’s national security interests. Still, Mr. Obama and Mr. Biden will have to invest considerable effort and political capital to win ratification. Senate sources say no more than 63 senators would now vote for the treaty, four less than the two-thirds majority needed. Two key Republican senators who need to be won over are John McCain, who said in the 2008 presidential campaign that the treaty deserved another look, and Richard Lugar, former Foreign Relations Committee chairman, who has said he would “study it thoroughly.” We hope they, and any others who are skeptical or undecided, will withhold final judgment until the administration completes a review that aims to answer their doubts with updated data. Another Senate defeat would probably doom the treaty forever. One can shrug and say that such treaties are leftovers from the cold war. That is wrong, especially in a world where nuclear appetites are growing. A test ban will make it technologically much harder for other countries to press ahead with weapons development. And if Washington has any hope of rallying diplomatic pressure and economic sanctions for constraining Iran’s nuclear ambitions or North Korea’s program, it has to show that it, too, is willing to play by the international rules. For both of those reasons, the Senate needs to ratify the test ban treaty.

### PC key.

Kimball 8. [Daryl, exec. Director of Arms Control Association, “The Enduring Value of the Comprehensive Test ban treaty and prospects for its entry into force” Arms Control Assoc, August 22 -- http://legacy.armscontrol.org/node/3300]

Translating pro-CTBT statements into winning over skeptical Senators and amassing a two-thirds majority in favor of ratification will take strong leadership and the commitment of significant political capital. One factor working in favor of a successful second CTBT ratification campaign is the fact that the current and future U.S. Senate is somewhat different from the one that rejected the CTBT in 1999. The number of new Senators is significant because it means that many who voted against the CTBT are no longer in office.

### Strong Obama Action key.

Goldberg 9. [Mark, UN Dispatch writer, senior correspondent at American Prospect, “Feel the Treaty-mentum” UN Dispatch, April 8th -- <http://www.undispatch.com/feel-the-treaty-mentum> -- da: 7/15/11]

A pair of developments this week signal that the Obama administration is ready to put some political capital behind campaign promises to secure American ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). On the former, Walter Pincus reports that Vice President Joe Biden will shepherd the CTBT through the Senate. Ratification requires 67 votes and the last time the CTBT came up for a vote in 1999 it fell more than a dozen votes short of passage. The political dynamics are a bit different this time around, though, and the treaty stands a much better chance of ratification. As Matt Yglesias notes, American ratification of the CTBT would strengthen an the international non-proliferation regime and put meat some behind President Obama’s recent call for global disarmament. Meanwhile, at a meeting of the Arctic Council earlier this week Secretary of State Clinton re-affirmed American support for UNCLOS, which establishes rules of the road for the high seas and sea beds. President Bush also supported UNCLOS, though the treaty never came up for ratification in the Senate. As Don Kraus of Citizens for Global Solutions likes to say, UNCLOS is low hanging fruit. It has wide support from across the political spectrum and from a diverse coalition of interest groups. All that’s needed for ratification is a little effort on the part of the White House and Senate leadership. It would seem that there here is reason to believe the stars are finally alligning to pass both these treaties.

## Lugar Key

### Lugar key to CTBT passage.

Joseph 9. [Jofi, senior Democratic foreign policy staffer in the United States Senate, “Renew the Drive for CTBT Ratification” The Washington Quarterly -- http://www.twq.com/09april/docs/09apr\_Joseph.pdf]

The key player on the Republican side will be the ranking member on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Richard B. Lugar (R-IN). In 1999, he voted against CTBT ratification. Given the close relationship, however, that he has forged with both Obama and Vice President Joe Biden and the strong legacy he has sought to build on internationalist leadership on U.S. foreign policy, Lugar can be expected to give a fair hearing to administration arguments in favor of CTBT ratification. Should he choose to reverse his previous vote on CTBT ratification, he may provide political cover to bring along other Republican votes to secure ratification.

## --- GENERAL IMPACTS ---

## Impact: China MIRVs

### CTBT ratification key to solve Chinese MIRVs

Shalikashvili, Special Adviser to the President and Secretary of State for CTBT and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 00 (John, Federal News Service, March 16, Lexis)

But without testing, no one will be able confidently to develop advanced new nuclear weapons types. Without testing there is no way to be sure that a new design will function as intended, or perhaps at all. The Test Ban Treaty will greatly impede China's ability to modernize its nuclear arsenal, for example by developing smaller warheads that could ride on a MIRVed ICBM. It will also make is much harder for Russia to develop new types of tactical nuclear weapons, where they decide to wish to do that.

### That causes South Asian nuclear war.

Januzzi, former senior East Asia specialist for the minority staff of Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 00 (Frank, “Missile Defense and East Asia: Downside and Risk,” October 13, http://www.icasinc.org/2000/2000f/2000ffsj.html)

If China were to increase its strategic nuclear forces so as to counter our missile defense, it might well decide to MIRV its missiles. After all, that's how you field lots of warheads without having to build so many missiles. China's nuclear doctrine has been based upon an ability to absorb a first strike and then respond. Will they maintain that doctrine if they MIRV their ICBM's? Will they be confident that we can't target their new mobile ICBM's? Or will they put them on "hair-trigger" alert? China has little or no missile warning capability, so a China with MIRV's on hair-trigger alert is not a comforting thought. Consider, also, just how China would MIRV its missiles. Some experts believe that in order to field small enough warheads, China would have to resume nuclear testing. That would put a stake through the heart of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty, and perhaps the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty as well. Does that give us greater security? Most outside experts accept that China's response could have a dangerous ripple effect on India and Pakistan. If China increases its ICBM force, India is very likely to do the same and Pakistan would surely respond to any Indian increases. Neither India nor Pakistan is likely to target us, of course, but they are all too likely to use their weapons against each other. Neither country has an effective missile warning system. Neither country has mature command and control systems. Neither country has a comprehensive doctrine controlling the possible use of nuclear weapons. A nuclear arms race between them would increase the risk of a terrible nuclear war.

### And it causes a Chinese first strike.

Hallinan, Foreign Policy Analyst for Foreign Policy in Focus, 05 (Conn, FPIF Commentary, February 22, http://www.fpif.org/commentary/2005/0502dragon.html)

The Chinese currently have 20 CSS-4 ICBMs, but appear to be increasing that force to between 75 and 100 missiles, as well as upgrading the CSS-4’s guidance systems. It is also only a matter of time before China puts multiple warheads (MIRVs) on their missiles, a deeply destabilizing move. MIRVing is a cost-effective way to overwhelm an ABM system, but one that can also tempt an adversary to launch a first-strike attack.

## Impact: Heg

### Ratification solves US Heg.

Nunn, Former Senator from Georgia and CEO of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, 07 (Sam, Federal News Service, April 11, Lexis)

Number six, we should work to bring the Comprehensive Test Ban treaty into force in the United States and in other key states. And I would urge the committee to go back and take a look at the reasons that people opposed that ratification back a number of years ago and to review those and look at what's happened since then . Look at the stewardship program. Look at the simulation. Look at the technology that we can now use to ease some of the concerns that were legitimate at the time that was debated. I believe that the report of the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, John Shelley Coshevilli (sp), when -- a year or two after that was debated, I think that ought to be reviewed again by the committee and by the Senate, and that the safeguards he recommends as a road map to ratification should be updated and taken very seriously. I think that's very important in terms of the United States' leadership in the world. When we don't ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, it's awfully hard to lead from a position of moral authority throughout the world. I know we have to deal with the problems, but I think they can be dealt with. I would note, Mr. Chairman, that former President Gorbachev, who has recently published his own essay in support of the Schultz/Kissinger/Perry/Nunn essay in the Wall Street Journal, has advocated ratification of the CTBT and removing nuclear weapons from hair-trigger status as two crucial steps that should be taken without delay by the United States and Russia and other members of the nuclear club. And I believe the world should take President Gorbachev up on his challenge. The United States and Russia should also, in my view, move to change the Cold War posture of their deployed nuclear weapons to greatly increase warning time in both countries and ease our fingers away from the nuclear trigger.

### Nuclear War.

Zalmay Khalilzad, RAND, The Washington Quarterly, Spring 1995

Under the third option, the United States would seek to retain global leadership and to preclude the rise of a global rival or a return to multipolarity for the indefinite future. On balance, this is the best long-term guiding principle and vision. Such a vision is desirable not as an end in itself, but because a world in which the United States exercises leadership would have tremendous advantages. First, the global environment would be more open and more receptive to American values -- democracy, free markets, and the rule of law. Second, such a world would have a better chance of dealing cooperatively with the world's major problems, such as nuclear proliferation, threats of regional hegemony by renegade states, and low-level conflicts. Finally, U.S. leadership would help preclude the rise of another hostile global rival, enabling the United States and the world to avoid another global cold or hot war and all the attendant dangers, including a global nuclear exchange. U.S. leadership would therefore be more conducive to global stability than a bipolar or a multipolar balance of power system.

## Ext: Solves Heg

### Ratification sends a key signal – boosts US leadership.

Nunn, Former Senator from Georgia and CEO of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, 07 (Sam, Federal News Service, April 11, Lexis)

So all of those are, I think, important ways that we could lead. I also believe if the Senate of the United States took a real lead in looking again at the comprehensive test-ban treaty it would be to our advantage. I think you'll find that some of those concerns we've already dealt with that were legitimate back then. I think it's time for a fresh look. I think it would send a totally different signal to the world.

### Key to Credibility.

Dunlop and du Preez 9. [Sean, James Martin Center for Non Prolif Studies, Jean, Monterey Institute for Int’l Studies, “The United States and the CTBT: Renewed Hope or Politics as Usual?” Nuclear Threat Initiative -- February -- http://www.nti.org/e\_research/e3\_ctbt\_united\_states.html]

Ratifying the CTBT is unmistakably in the U.S. national security interest. Lawmakers can be confident that the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile will remain safe and reliable without explosive nuclear testing far into the foreseeable future. Today the technology to verify treaty compliance is largely in place and is exceeding performance expectations. U.S. leadership on the CTBT will be crucial for gaining the international support that is needed to tackle other nonproliferation problems, and it comes at a low cost, since the U.S. has been voluntarily complying with the provisions of the Treaty since 1992 and there is no political support for a return to explosive nuclear testing in the near future. As CTBT advocates work to provide senators with the best scientific evidence on the Treaty issues, the administration can send important signals to the international community by continuing to publicly convey its support for the Treaty. The May 2009 NPT PrepCom and the September 2009 Article XIV Conference on Facilitating the Entry into Force of the CTBT offer timely opportunities for the U.S. to send positive messages about its intention to ratify the Treaty.

## Impact: Indo-Pak

### US Ratification is modeled by India and Pakistan.

PTI 06 (Press Trust of India, June 2, http://www.expressindia.com/news/fullstory.php?newsid=68626)

United Nations, June 2: An independent commission seeking ways to end the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction has recommended that all nuclear weapon states, including India, Pakistan, United States and China, ratify the CTBT which prohibits all nuclear weapon testing. The panel, headed by former UN Chief Weapons Inspector Hans Blix, also wants new Delhi and Islamabad to join states which have declared a moratorium on the production of fissile material pending a treaty and increase transparency in the nuclear and missile activities. "The reality is that if the US were to ratify (the CTBT), then China would. If China did, India would. If India did, Pakistan would. If Pakistan did, then Iran would. It would set in motion a good domino effect," Blix told a news conference at which he released the report Wednesday.

### That prevents nuclear war.

Shalikashvili, Special Adviser to the President and Secretary of State for CTBT and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, 00 (John, Federal News Service, March 16, Lexis)

The CTBT reinforces the strategic arms reduction process. It confirms that neither the United States nor Russia is making significant qualitative improvements in its arsenal, which fosters the stable environment for further reductions in nuclear arms. The CTBT can help head off a further nuclear arms race in South Asia, the place where the risk of nuclear war is perhaps the highest now. India and Pakistan are bitter rivals who have fought three wars since independence in 1947, and who both conducted nuclear tests in 1998. Persuading them to formalize their testing moratorium through the CTBT is a major goal of the international community. But it surely is not easy asking them to give up a legal right to test if we desire to retain ours.

### India Pakistan war escalates to extinction.

Fai -01 (Ghulam Nabi, Executive Director, Kashmiri American Council, Washington Times, 7-8)

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary.

## Ext: Solves Indo-Pak

### CTBT functions as a regional stabilizer.

GSI, Global, Security Initiative, March 2009 http://www.gsinstitute.org/gsi/docs/CTBTfactsheets.pdf

The CTBT could also serve as a regional confidence and security building measure. Ratification of the CTBT by states in the Middle East, in particular the Annex 2 States Egypt, Iran and Israel, would be a positive catalyst for other security related issues affecting the region. Similarly, there is a need to engage India and Pakistan on a range of security and arms related issues. The CTBT would naturally be one of them, providing a cap on the further development of nuclear weapons and thus on the further production ofweapons materials to that end. The importance of a legally-binding commitment on nuclear testing in this regional context should not be downplayed. In a wider regional context, much would be gained forconfidence- and security building in Asia if the continent as a whole moved towards ratification.

## Impact: Japan Relations

### Ratification solves US-Japan Relations.

Satu Limaye, Director of Research at the Asia-Pacific Center for Security, 2001 lexis

In terms of U.S—Japan relations, there is evidence that Tokyo has been disappointed with Washington’s “soft” response to India’s and Pakistan’s tests. 1371 The United States’ reluctance to back Japan’s participation in the post- test P-5 foreign ministers’ conference must have rankled deeply, especially since Beijing was the chair. Washington’s unwillingness to back Tokyo’s push to internationalize the Kashmir dispute, lukewarm support for disarmament and demonstrated intention of handling nuclear non-proliferation threats on its own terms has been sobering to Japan. The more recent failure of the U.S. Senate to ratify the CTBT, the central post-tests demand made by both countries of Islamabad and Delhi, has shocked Tokyo. It has also been suggested that Washington ‘s. especially perturbed by Japan’s emphasis on disarmament progress in the wake of the tests. [38] If so ,the differing levels of importance given to disarmament and non-proliferation by Tokyo and Washington could well emerge as an important problem in U.S.-Japan relations Japan’s latent fear of a U.S.—China condominium in Asia was also stoked by the situation in the subcontinent. The US-China joint statement on South Asia has been interpreted at least in some Japanese circles, as signaling a joint security management agreement between Washington and .Beijing. As a NIDS’ annual report concluded: “If the tension in South Asia eases by dint of the diplomatic offensive mounted by the United States and China, their voices in the security of Asia would carry much more weight.” [381 The entire episode suggests that Japan’s dynamic diplomacy brought it few tangible benefits or kudos from its key ally. In the context of a changing world and other problems with Washington, such slights must reinforce Japan’s - frustrations with the alliance.

### Strong alliance is key to check aggressive Japanese rearmament

Cha 7. [Victor D., Former Director for Asian Affairs at the National Security Council from 2004 to 2007, D.S. Song Professor and Director of Asian Studies at Georgetown University, December, P. 98-113 ]

As Japan expands its security profile to become more of a global player, it is doing so wholly within the context of the U.S.-Japanese alliance, which acts as a constraint on more ambitious Japanese rearmament. This should be comforting to other states in the region. Moreover, both Abe's October 2006 visit to Beijing and Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao's wildly popular visit to Japan last April helped thaw Chinese-Japanese relations, which had turned chilly under Abe's predecessor, Junichiro Koizumi. Historically, Asian states have become concerned whenever the United States has grown close to Japan in order to contain China or close to China at the expense of traditional U.S. allies and smaller regional powers. The situation today -- a cooperative U.S.-Chinese relationship, a strong U.S.-Japanese alliance, and good relations between Japan and China -- is a viable equilibrium.

### Nuclear War.

Halperin 00. [Morton H., Director of Policy Planning at State Department, “The Nuclear Dimension of the US-Japan Alliance”, http://www.nautilus.org/archives/library/security/papers/Halperin-US-Japan.pdf]

However, any realistic appraisal of nuclear dangers would suggest that neither rogue states/terrorist groups nor a deliberate Russian attack is the right focus if the goal of U.S. national security policy is to prevent the use of nuclear weapons anywhere in the world. The most immediate danger is that India and Pakistan will stumble into a nuclear war following their nuclear tests and their apparent determination to deploy nuclear forces. A second danger will continue to be that Russian missiles will be fired on the United States by accident or as a result of unauthorized action. Over the longer run, these threats will be eclipsed by the danger that the non-proliferation regime will collapse and other states will develop nuclear weapons. A terrorist threat should, in my view, become a matter of serious concern only if there is much wider dispersal of nuclear weapons among states stemming from an open collapse of the nonproliferation regime.

## US-Japan Relations Good: Asian War

### The US/Japan alliance is key to preventing several scenarios of nuclear war in Asia

INSS Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defense University, 10/11/2000,

<http://www.ndu.edu/inss/strforum/SR_01/SR_Japan.htm>

Major war in Europe is inconceivable for at least a generation, but the prospects for conflict in Asia are-far from remote. The region features some of the world’s largest and most modern armies, nuclear-armed major powers, and several nuclear-capable states. Hostilities that could directly involve the United States in a major conflict could occur at a moment’s notice on the Korean peninsula and in the Taiwan Strait. The Indian-subcontinent is a major flashpoint. In each area, war has the potential of nuclear escalation. In addition, lingering turmoil in Indonesia, the world’ fourth-largest nation, threatens stability in Southeast Asia. The United States is tied to the region by a series of bilateral security alliances that remain the region’s de facto security architecture. In this promising but also potentially dangerous setting, the U.S.-Japan bilateral relationship is more important than ever with the world’s second-largest economy and a well-equipped and competent military , an as our democratic ally, Japan remains the keystone of the U.S. involvement in Asia. The U.S.-Japan alliance is central to America’s global security strategy.

## Impact: Nuclear Terrorism

### Ratification of the CTBT is key to prevent nuclear terrorism.

Strobe Talbott, president of the Brookings Institution, 10-13-2008 http://www.spiegel.de/international/0,1518,583723,00.html

Another valuable but languishing pact is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The single most short-sighted and harmful act by the US Senate in recent years was its refusal to ratify this treaty in 1999. At that time there were Republican senators who privately acknowledged the recklessness of their party's action. Perhaps they will be more outspoken and persuasive in 2009, the 10th anniversary of that colossal blunder. Moreover, it is essential to resurrect the CTBT from the limbo to which the Republican-controlled Senate consigned it eight years ago by refusing to ratify it; and to stop dropping hints that the United States might break out of the CTBT -- that is, begin testing again—in order to develop a new generation of nuclear weapons. The need for a next generation of armaments would be less compelling were there a consensus that the United States should lead the way toward the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. Unless the next president works with the Senate to put the CTBT back on a path toward ratification, it will be difficult, and perhaps impossible, to prevent other nuclear states from resuming testing -- and to keep the nuclear aspirants from testing for the first time. The more nations that have nuclear weapons, the greater the risk that some will fall into the hands of sinister non-governmental organizations, or "non-state actors," such as Al Qaeda. Terrorists with a few primitive nuclear devices are, in their own way, scarier than a superpower with thousands of sophisticated ones. By definition, a suicide bomber is going to be attracted, not deterred, by the prospect of mutual assured destruction. Therefore, the NPT needs to be supplemented by new agreements and enforcement agencies that will keep tight control over lethal technology.

NUCLEAR TERRORISM CAUSES GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR.

Speice 6 (Patrick, JD Candidate, William & Mary Law Review, 47 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 1427, Feb, Lexis)

The potential consequences of the unchecked spread of nuclear knowledge and material to terrorist groups that seek to cause mass destruction in the United States are truly horrifying. A terrorist attack with a nuclear weapon would be devastating in terms of immediate human and economic losses. n49 Moreover, there would be immense political pressure in the United States to discover the perpetrators and retaliate with nuclear weapons, massively increasing the number of casualties and potentially **triggering a full-scale nuclear conflict.** n50 In addition to the threat posed by terrorists, leakage of nuclear knowledge and material from Russia will reduce the barriers that states with nuclear ambitions face and may trigger widespread proliferation of nuclear weapons. n51 This proliferation will increase the risk of nuclear attacks against the United States [\*1440] or its allies by hostile states, n52 as well as increase the likelihood that regional conflicts will draw in the United States and escalate to the use of nuclear weapons.

## Ext: Solves Nuclear Terrorism

### CTBT ratification is key to solving nuclear terrorism

Aust 8 (Anthony, Masahiko Asada, Edward Ifft, Nicholas Kyriakopoulos, Jennifer Mackby, Bernard Massinon, Arend Meerburg, Bernard Sitt, International Group on Global Security, “A New Look at the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)” September)

Since 1996, the threat of terrorism has grown considerably. The knowledge how to make a nuclear explosive device proliferates. As more and more States develop peaceful nuclear capabilities, including sensitive technologies, there is a greater chance in the long run that terrorists will be able to obtain fissile materials to be used in a nuclear explosive. In the short run, highly enriched uranium may be diverted from research reactors and/or obtained (with plutonium) from the black market. It would be much easier to use radioactive material with a conventional explosive, probably not killing many people but effective in creating havoc and making certain areas uninhabitable. Complete nuclear weapons could also fall in the hands of terrorists in a number of countries. The risks of nuclear terrorism have been perceived for some time. Already in 1979, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material 39 was adopted, and amended in 2005 to include also nuclear facilities. IAEA guidelines on this same matter are even older and followed by most States. And, in 2007 the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism 2005 40 entered into force, establishing strict rules and guidelines for implementing penal law against individuals involved in illegal nuclear activities. If the CTBT does not enter into force, the chance of nuclear proliferation is likely to increase, and more countries building bombs provides more possibility for terrorists to get hold of them

## Impact: Russian Relations

### CTBT Ratification solves US-Russian relations.

GSI, Global, Security Initiative, March 2009 http://www.gsinstitute.org/gsi/docs/CTBTfactsheets.pdf

Today’s non-proliferation context is significantly different from the late 1990s. There are new and complex non-proliferation challenges, made even more challenging by an emerging global nuclear renaissance. In addition, nuclear terrorism is widely seen as one of the main threats facing the international community. Viewed against this radically altered backdrop, the relevance of the CTBT has only increased further. The CTBT is not only a measure in its own right (test ban), but also a catalyst for progress in the wider nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament context. Progress towards the CTBT’s entry into force, in particular the ratification by the U.S., will provide new momentum to multilateral arms control efforts. It will likely facilitate agreement in several arms control fora that have been blocked in recent years, notably the Conference on Disarmament. It will also increase the chances of achieving a successful (and badly needed) outcome of the 2010 Review Conference for the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to strengthen the non-proliferation and disarmament regime. In addition, CTBT ratification by the U.S. will be beneficial for the U.S.-Russia strategic relationship.

### US Russian relations solve a laundry list.

National Security Network, 7/1/09 (http://www.nsnetwork.org/node/1354

U.S. cooperation with Russia vital not just for nonproliferation, but for other key national security priorities. The U.S. – Russia relationship is too important to rest on the personality politics, as it did during the Bush administration. In order for the U.S. to solve pressing national security dilemmas, it must put its relations with Russia back on solid, strategic footing. After a meeting this week with his Russian counterpart, General Makarov, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Michael Mullen remarked on the areas of mutual interest in the context of hard security, “There are areas of common interest that we agree we need to work on – Afghanistan – logistic support to the Afghanistan conflict, the issue of counterterrorism, the issue of Iran.” On Afghanistan, Russia hopes to prevent the growth of an insurgency that could threaten its interests. In that spirit, Russia has offered assistance to the U.S. – led international mission to stabilize the country. AFP reports that “[t]he United States and Russia may soon sign a deal boosting the transit of US supplies to Afghanistan through Russia, the Kommersant daily reported Monday, citing diplomatic sources.” The deal would reportedly involve “a dozen US planes flying over Russia each day with military cargos, rather than just rail shipments of non-lethal supplies as Moscow now allows,” according to the original article in the Kommersant Daily. Recent developments have also clarified the importance of Russian involvement in developing an international response to both Iran and North Korea. Russia’s relationship with Iran means that it will be an indispensable interlocutor for any effort to dissuade the country from further developing its nuclear program. Russia has also been cooperative in responding to North Korea’s recent belligerence. According to the New York Times, the latest round of UN sanctions would not have been possible without Russia and also China, which are “the closest thing North Korea has to friends,” both “agreed to a mixture of financial and trade restrictions designed to choke off military development.” Apart from traditional security concerns, Russia is also at the nexus of energy and climate change. A recent Center for Naval Analysis report cites Russia’s status as the “world’s largest exporter of natural gas and the second largest exporter of oil” making U.S. – Russia relations a key energy security consideration. In addition, the Center for American Progress points out that “If the European Union is disaggregated, Russia is the third-largest emitter of carbon dioxide behind the United States and China and still currently ahead of India. More importantly Russian per capita emissions are on the rise, and are projected at this point to approach America’s top rank as per capita emitter by 2030,” suggesting that “[m]aking Russia a partner on these issues could be critical in order to advance a sound global climate change agenda.” And, as Robert Levgold observes in the latest issue of Foreign Affairs, “attempts to reform international financial and security institutions will be optimized only if Russia is given a chance to contribute constructively.” [Admiral Michael Mullen, 6/29/09. AFP, 6/29/09. NY Times, 6/12/09. CNA, May 2009. CAP, 6/30/09. Foreign Affairs, July/August 2009]

## --- PROLIF IMPACTS ---

## Ext: Solves Prolif

### Key to NPT Norms.

**Perry and Scowcroft 9**. [William J., Secretary of Defense under Clinton and Brent, National Security Advisor to Ford and George HW Bush. “U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy- Independent Task Force Report No. 62” Council on Foreign Relations -- Spring]

The CTBT’s entry into force could shore up support among U.S. allies and other nonnuclear weapon states to further strengthen the nonproliferation regime. Although the CTBT itself would not stop a determined proliferator, its conclusion and U.S. support for it were clearly linked to the indefinite extension of the NPT. Thus U.S. ratification has become, in the eyes of many states, a litmus test for U.S. leadership on the overall global efforts to prevent the use and spread of nuclear weapons. Although it would not ensure entry into force, U.S. ratification would put Washington in a position to pressure holdout states to ratify the treaty. Furthermore, U.S. ratification would promote international norm building that would stigmatize states that conduct nuclear testing; it would increase the likelihood that states that violate this norm would be punished. The entry into force of the CTBT would also deter a state from conducting tests as a form of blackmail, intimidation, or political posturing. For example, the primary purpose of the North Korean test may have been to blackmail China, the United States, Japan, and South Korea for more aid. The Indian tests in May 1998 are also widely believed to have been a means to consolidate support for the nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party, which had risen to power just a few months before the tests and had made testing part of its political campaign platform. Given the daunting, if not impossible, task of delinking the CTBT from the nonproliferation regime, what options are in U.S. interests? For one, the United States could continue its testing moratorium without ratification. This option would obviously not bring the CTBT into force and would not garner the political and technical benefits discussed.

### Spurs Non-Prolif momentum – key to control escalation.

**AMA 9**. [Arms Control Association, “Realizing the Promise of the CTBT -- Statement by Representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations on the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) to the Preparatory Meeting for the 2010 Review Conference for the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons” Arms Control Association -- May 5]

Entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) is within sight. Since the idea of a ban on nuclear testing was first proposed in the 1950s, it has stood among the highest priorities on the international nonproliferation and disarmament agenda. The CTBT is more important now than ever. By banning all nuclear weapon test explosions, including very low-yield hydronuclear explosions, the CTBT limits the ability of established nuclear-weapon states to field more sophisticated warheads and makes it far more difficult for newer members of the club to perfect smaller, more easily deliverable warheads. For this reason, CTBT ratification has long been considered essential to the fulfillment of Article VI of the NPT and the goal of "effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." The CTBT also serves to reinforce the nonproliferation system by acting as a downstream confidence-building measure about a state's nuclear intentions and, in this regard, it can help head-off and de-escalate regional tensions. With no shortage of conflict and hostility in the Middle East, ratification by Israel, Egypt and Iran would reduce nuclear-weapons-related security concerns in the region. It would also help create the conditions necessary for the realization of a zone free of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, as called for in the Middle East Resolution adopted by the 1995 NPT Review Conference. India and Pakistan could substantially ease regional tensions and demonstrate nuclear restraint by converting their unilateral test moratoria into a legally-binding commitment to end nuclear testing through the CTBT. With the CTBT in force, global and national capabilities to detect and deter possible clandestine nuclear testing by other states will be significantly greater. Entry-into-force is essential to making short-notice, on-site inspections possible and maintaining long-term political and financial support from other nations for the operation of the International Monitoring System and International Data Center. The CTBT has near-universal support: 180 nations have signed and 148 have ratified the Treaty. Last fall, the UN General Assembly voted 175-1 in favor of The CTBT-and we expect that the one "no" vote by the United States to become a "yes" vote this year. We applaud those states that support of the Treaty and make their full financial contribution to the build-up and operation of the international monitoring and verification system. Unfortunately, broad support is not enough. Article XIV of the Treaty provides that in order to enter into force, ratification is needed from a number of key players. Nine necessary states have failed to ratify the CTBT and are therefore delaying its entry into force. Ratification by the United States and China is particularly important. Given their existing nuclear test moratoria and 1996 signature of the CTBT, Washington and Beijing already bear most CTBT-related responsibilities, yet their failure to ratify has denied them and others the full security benefits of CTBT entry into force. The United States is poised to be a leader on the CTBT once again as President Barack Obama has pledged to achieve ratification "as soon as practical." We applaud his April 5 statement in Prague in which he said: "To achieve a global ban on nuclear testing, my administration will immediately and aggressively pursue U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. After more than five decades of talks, it is time for the testing of nuclear weapons to finally be banned." To do so, President Obama must convince two-thirds of the Senate that the treaty enhances U.S. security, is effectively verifiable, and would not compromise future efforts to maintain the reliability, safety, or security of the United States' remaining stockpile of nuclear warheads. Technical advances in each of these areas over the past decade should make the case for the CTBT even stronger than it was in 1999 when the Senate failed to provide its advice and consent for ratification. The Obama administration's effort will require sustained, top-level leadership. His efforts will have the full support of a wide array of NGOs in the United States and around the globe. For years, Chinese government representatives have reported that the CTBT is before the National People's Congress for consideration but has apparently taken no action to win legislative approval needed for ratification. Washington's renewed pursuit of CTBT ratification opens up opportunities for China and other Annex II states, such as Indonesia, to lead the way toward entry into force by ratifying before the United States does. Action by Beijing would increase its credibility as a nonproliferation leader and improve the chances that other states in Asia, as well as the United States, would follow suit. Ratification by Indonesia would enhance its reputation as a world leader and agent for international security.

### Solves comparatively better than deterrence.

**ACTON ET AL 9.** (James M. Acton and George Perkovich are, respectively, associate and director in the Nonproliferation Program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and co-editors of Abolishing Nuclear Weapons: A Debate. Pierre Goldschmidt is nonresident senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and former deputy director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency, head of the department of safeguards, “Defending U.S. Leadership on Disarmament”, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 7/7, http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=23354)

This analysis must take into account the effects on other states of a decision by the US to modernize its nuclear arsenal. Too many people, especially those connected with the American defense establishment, seem to ignore the vast majority of states that are neither close allies nor sworn adversaries of the US. These states vehemently reject the discriminatory nature of the nonproliferation regime and are urging the US and other nuclear-armed states to live up to their commitments to work towards disarmament. Even when it comes to US adversaries, Senator Kyl and Mr. Perle overstate their case. They state that “a robust American nuclear force is an essential discouragement to nuclear proliferators.” Yet, the United States’ huge nuclear arsenal failed to deter North Korea’s and Iran’s nuclear programs and has done nothing to help it resolve these crises. President Obama stated this week in Moscow that it is essential for the US to lead the world by example. He correctly believes that if there is to be the required international support for a much-needed strengthening of the nonproliferation regime the US must take its disarmament commitments seriously. Ratification of the CTBT before the 2010 NPT Review Conference should be a top priority.

### Solves miscalc.

Blinken et al. 8 [A Phoenix Initiative Report. by Antony J., staff director of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Lael Brainard, Vice President and Director of Global Economy and Development and the Bernard L. Schwartz Chair in International Economics at Brookings Institution. Kurt M. Campbell is Co-Founder and CEO of the Center for a New American Security. Ivo H. Daalder is a Senior Fellow and the Sydney Stein, Jr. Chair at Brookings Institution. Bruce W. Jentleson is a Professor of Public Policy Studies and Political Science at Duke University. Michael a. Mcfaul is Peter and Helen Bing Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution and Professor of Political Science at Stanford University. He is also the Director of the Center on Democracy, Development and Rule of Law at Stanford. James C. O’Brien is a Principal of The Albright Group and Albright Capital Management. Formerly, he was presidential envoy for the Balkans and principal deputy in the Office of Policy Planning at the State Department. Anne-Marie Slaughter is Dean of the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University and Co-Director of the Princeton Project on National Security. Gayle e. Smith is a Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, Co-Chair of the ENOUGH Project, and Director of the International Rights and Responsibilities Program. James b. Steinberg is Dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas-Austin, “Strategic Leadership: Framework for a 21st Century National Security Strategy” July -- http://www.cnas.org/files/documents/publications/SlaughterDaalderJentleson\_StrategicLeadership\_July08.pdf]

At the end of the Cold War, many had hoped and believed that the risks of nuclear war would be sharply reduced. The United States and Russia agreed to deep reductions in their massive nuclear arsenals —including the elimination of whole classes of weapons —and Britain, China, and France followed suit. The nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was extended indefinitely in 1995, and the treaty appeared to be gaining near-universal adherence. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) was concluded in 1996. In the immediate post-Cold War period, some were even speaking of the world entering a post-nuclear age. Many of these positive developments have come to a halt or, worse, have been reversed. The essential bargain that stands at the core of the nuclear nonproliferation regime —that states should have access to peaceful uses of nuclear technology but foreswear developing nuclear weapons while states that have nuclear weapons would reduce and ultimately eliminate them—is unraveling. The Iranian and North Korean cases have demonstrated that making clear distinctions between civilian and military nuclear programs is becoming increasingly difficult. Knowledge about nuclear weapons and the technology to build them has spread beyond the tightly knit group of established world powers, creating the basis for a global cartel to proliferate nuclear components and know-how to anyone willing to pay the price. The diffusion of technology enhances the prospect of nuclear materials and weapons falling into the hands of terrorists with global reach. Unlike states, which may be deterred by the prospect of devastating retaliation, terrorists will have little compunction about using whatever means of mass destruction they acquire. The “renuclearization” of global politics has made the world a far more dangerous place. The United States should lead an international effort to reverse course and to reestablish an effective nuclear regime that serves both the interests of the United States and of the rest of the world. It is a perfect opportunity to exercise strategic leadership. The next president should reaffirm that America seeks a world free of nuclear weapons. This goal, as George Shultz, henry Kissinger, Sam Nunn, and William Perry—now supported by 14 former U.S. secretaries of state and defense and national security advisers —have proclaimed, should become the guiding objective of American nuclear weapons and nonproliferation policy. To that end, it is critical that the next president works with all the other countries around the world to renew the essential bargain at the core of the nuclear nonproliferation regime both by reducing reliance on nuclear weapons and forging a new global consensus on limiting access to nuclear technology used for peaceful purposes. The nuclear-weapons states, starting with the United States and Russia, must begin the process by reducing their reliance on nuclear weapons and negotiating new agreements that sharply reduce the number of forces they will retain. The United States should propose to Moscow new negotiations that would reduce their respective nuclear inventory to 1,000 weapons of all ranges. The inspection and transparency provisions of existing arms control agreements that are due to expire in 2009 would be maintained. And remaining forces would end their reliance on hair-trigger alerts to ensure survivability. In addition, the United States should ratify the CTBT at the earliest practical opportunity and propose to negotiate a worldwide, verifiable ban on the production of fissile materials for weapons purposes. A far-reaching effort along these lines would do much to reestablish American credibility on the nuclear nonproliferation front. Success, however, will require that other countries —especially the non-nuclear-weapons states —also agree to limit their access to nuclear technology, especially reprocessing and enrichment technologies for producing nuclear fuel, which by their nature are indistinguishable from the technologies necessary to develop nuclear weapons. As a first step, the United States should fully support International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Director General Mohamed ElBaradei’s proposal for a five-year halt on constructing new facilities that enrich uranium or separate plutonium. This moratorium can be the first step toward forging a new international consensus on rules to manage the spread of technologies that can be used for both civilian and weapon purposes. Specifically, America should build a coalition of countries that have a strong stake in negotiating an agreement that would make all fuel cycle facilities multinational in ownership. The world’s leading uranium enrichment company, Urenco, is a multinational consortium among France, Germany, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom. The European Union (EU) may thus be well placed to take the lead on this issue. Multinational control of enrichment and reprocessing facilities makes economic sense and builds confidence that they are only being used for rightful, peaceful purposes. An international fuel bank run by the IAEA could guarantee a supply of nuclear fuel to any country that is in full compliance with the NPT. The road to a world free of any nuclear weapons is bound to be a long one. But its length should not deter us from setting out on the journey. The next president can bring U.S. nuclear weapons policy in line with present-day requirements — which means continuing to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons while committing to further sharp reductions in force levels. Doing so will restore America’s credibility in leading, in tandem with others, the international effort to combat the spread of nuclear capabilities around the world. For failing to do so would represent not only a grave danger to our own security, but to the security of all nations —be they nuclear haves or have nots —that would suffer the consequences of a nuclear accident or attack.

### Builds international consensus.

GSI, Global, Security Initiative, March 2009 http://www.gsinstitute.org/gsi/docs/CTBTfactsheets.pdf

The CTBT is a strong instrument for non-proliferation. It limits the ability of countries that do not have nuclear weapons to develop these weapons. A country that does not have the capability beforehand and builds a nuclear device will face many uncertainties with regards to the performance of the device. Uncertainty will increase when trying to make it deliverable by cruise or ballistic missile when weight is a major factor. This in turn greatly reduces the possibility of integrating nuclear weapons in military planning or strategic doctrines. The CTBT is therefore the last hurdle to a significant nuclear weapons capability. This is of particular significance in light of current non-proliferation challenges, such as Iran and North Korea.4 In addition, the issue of nuclear testing is clearly separate from the inalienable right of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes under Article IV of the NPT, as testing is not necessary to pursue a peaceful nuclear program. If Iran wishes to restore confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of its nuclear programme, CTBT ratification would be a logical step. This is a requirement around which international consensus could be easily built. In the case of North Korea, the importance of a legally binding ban on nuclear testing is evident, and should be considered as a next logical step in the Six Party talks.

### More ev.

Kimball, Executive Director of the Arms Control Association, 08 (Daryl G., “The Enduring Value of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and Prospects for its Entry into Force,” August 22, http://www.armscontrol.org/node/3300)

The history of the nuclear age makes it clear that opportunities to reduce the risks posed by nuclear weapons are often very fleeting. When the right political conditions are in place, governmental leaders must seize the chance to make progress. In 1958 and again in 1963, U.S. and Soviet leaders attempted to negotiate a comprehensive ban on all nuclear test explosions. They came close but failed to seal the deal. While the latter effort led to the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty, it took another three decades of on-and-off efforts to conclude negotiations on a comprehensive test ban treaty. During that time, hundreds more underground tests propelled further arms racing and proliferation. Today, the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) remains a vital disarmament and nonproliferation instrument. By prohibiting all nuclear test explosions it impedes the ability of states possessing nuclear weapons to field new and more deadly types of warheads, while also helping to prevent the emergence of new nuclear-armed states. Moving forward quickly on the CTBT is also an essential step towards restoring confidence in the beleaguered Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) regime. The nuclear-weapon states’ commitment to achieve the CTBT was a crucial part of the bargain that won the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995 and the 2000 NPT Review Conference document.

## Prolif Impact

### Proliferation causes escalating nuclear war –it uniquely increases the risk and magnitude of conflicts.

**SOKOLSKI 9.** (Henry, Executive Director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center and serves on the US congressional Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, “Avoiding a nuclear crowd,” Policy Review, June/July)

There are limits, however, to what this approach can accomplish. Such a weak alliance system, with its expanding set of loose af!liations, risks becoming analogous to the international system that failed to contain offensive actions prior to World War I. Unlike 1914, there is no power today that can rival the projection of U.S. conventional forces anywhere on the globe. But in a world with an increasing number of nuclear-armed or nuclear-ready states, this may not matter as much as we think. In such a world, the actions of just one or two states or groups that might threaten to disrupt or overthrow a nuclear weapons state could check U.S. influence or ignite a war Washington could have difficulty containing. No amount of military science or tactics could assure that the U.S. could disarm or neutralize such threatening or unstable nuclear states. 23 Nor could diplomats or our intelligence services be relied upon to keep up to date on what each of these governments would be likely to do in such a crisis (see graphic). Combine these proliferation trends with the others noted above and one could easily create the perfect nuclear storm: small differences between nuclear competitors that would put all actors on edge; an overhang of nuclear materials that could be called upon to break out or signi!cantly ramp up existing nuclear deployments; and a variety of potential new nuclear actors developing weapons options in the wings. In such a setting, the military and nuclear rivalries between states could easily be much more intense than before. Certainly each nuclear state’s military would place an even higher premium than before on being able to weaponize its military and civilian surpluses quickly, to deploy forces that are survivable, and to have forces that can get to their targets and destroy them with highly levels of probability. The advanced military states will also be even more inclined to develop and deploy enhanced air and missile defenses and long-range, precision guidance munitions, and a variety of preventative and preemptive war options. Certainly, in such a world, relations between states could become far less stable. Relatively small developments—e.g., Russian support for sympathetic near-abroad provinces; Pakistani-inspired terrorist strikes in India, such as those experienced recently in Mumbai; new Indian "anking activities in Iran near Pakistan; Chinese weapons developments or moves regarding Taiwan; state-sponsored assassination attempts of key !gures in the Middle East or South West Asia, etc.—could easily prompt nuclear weapons deployments with “strategic” consequences (arms races, strategic miscues, and even nuclear war). As Herman Kahn once noted, in such a world “every quarrel or difference of opinion may lead to violence of a kind quite different from what is possible today.” 24 In short, we may soon see a future that neither the proponents of nuclear abolition, nor their critics, would ever want. None of this, however, is inevitable.

## Impact: Prolif Cred -- Iran

### CTBT Key to solve US Prolif Cred.

Drell, Professor Emeritus at Stanford University, 07 (Sid, CQ Congressional Testimony, July 18, Lexis)

It would be an important action for the United States to strengthen the existing moratorium on underground nuclear tests by moving ahead to ratify the CTBT--a treaty that we were the first to sign in 1996 but have since failed to ratify. Such an action would strengthen our leadership role in strengthening the nonproliferation regime. But more than that, it would add an important technical strength to the ability to verify worldwide compliance with a ban on testing by bringing into force the full power of the International Monitoring System of hundreds of detection sensors around the world.

Prolif Cred Spills over – solves Iran nuclearization

NSN, 5/28/09 (National Security Network, http://www.nsnetwork.org/node/1319)

The spread of nuclear weapons is a tremendous global challenge -- and a threat we can do something about, one where other nations actually desire US leadership. Two recent high-level bipartisan statements -- a Council on Foreign Relations task force report chaired by William Perry and Brent Scowcroft and a Partnership for a Secure America statement signed by 30 senior figures -- call for American leadership to address the non-proliferation challenge through a combination of tough diplomacy, strong safety measures, and renewed efforts to build global rules that stop weapons’ spread. The challenges we face are real: North Korea’s recent nuclear test and military posturing, Iran’s nuclear program, and the dangerous India-Pakistan arms race. But as bipartisan security leaders recognize, those problems cannot be solved without recommitting nations all over the world to safeguarding and reducing nuclear weapons, and that demands US leadership. President Obama recognized this on April 5 in Prague, when he laid out an ambitious agenda to combat nuclear proliferation: bilateral talks with the world’s second nuclear superpower, Russia; secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within four years; and US leadership to strengthen and update the international agreements that make up the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. Cont… North Korean nuclear challenge reminds us of both the seriousness of the threat and the need for diplomacy. There are no good military options to address the nuclear proliferation challenges in North Korea, Iran, and the sub-continent. Instead intensive diplomacy is required, **and new responsiveness from Russia and China indicates that** commitment to a broader non-proliferation strategy will pay dividends in dealing with the hard cases. In response to North Korea the Obama administration has ramped its diplomatic efforts, as the Washington Post writes, “At the United Nations, diplomats are pushing for sanctions with teeth against the government of Kim Jong Il. Proposals include freezing assets, banning travel for elites and cutting access to international banks. Japan and the United States want a new resolution that makes cargo inspections of North Korean vessels ‘compulsory’ for U.N. members.” This has included unusually assertive steps from Russia -- “Russia's ambassador to the United Nations convened an emergency meeting of the Security Council to condemn the test and pledged to support a strong new resolution against North Korea.” The Post attributes this to the improvement in U.S.-Russian relations: “Medvedev may see the issue in the context of his efforts to improve relations with the United States, [Vasily] Mikheev added. ‘Nonproliferation is one of the most important areas where Russia and America can work together,’ he said.” As Radio Free Europe noted progress is being made as, “the United States and Russia have begun talks in Moscow aimed at replacing the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START).” There have also been cautious signs that China – which has historically been reticent to confront North Korea – is more open to a U.S.-led diplomatic effort aimed at addressing the regime’s behavior. The Washington Post reports: “The United States has long sought help from China, North Korea's largest trading partner, in pressuring North Korea's reclusive leaders to give up their nuclear ambitions. But China has tried to win North Korea's cooperation through favors... and has blocked sanctions pushed by Washington...U.S. officials say they sense a different tone in China's response this time.” [Washington Post, 5/28/09] Regional and global diplomacy is also a necessary response to other non-proliferation. The Obama administration’s diplomatic approach to Iran is also expected to benefit from increased willingness by Russia, China and Europe to support the US as they perceive it to be more interested in supporting global standards against the spread of nuclear weapons. The Washington Post reported today on the increasing worries over nuclear proliferation and an arms race emanating from South Asia. “U.S. and allied officials and experts who have tracked developments in South Asia have grown increasingly worried over the rapid growth of the region's more mature nuclear programs, in part because of the risk that weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists. India and Pakistan see their nuclear programs as vital points of leverage in an arms race that has begun to take on the pace and diversity, although not the size, of U.S.-Soviet nuclear competition during the Cold War, according to U.S. intelligence and proliferation experts.” India and Pakistan have often cited US unwillingness to limit or reduce its own nuclear arsenal as justification for their pursuit of weapons and disinterest in joining international regimes to safeguard nuclear weapons and materials. In this tense environment, the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as special envoy, and high-level attention from Secretaries Clinton and Gates and chairman of the Joint chiefs Admiral Mullen, are welcome. [Washington Post, 5/28/09. CFR, 5/09]

IRANIAN PROLIFERATION CAUSES MIDDLE EAST INSTABILITY.

The Heritage Foundation Iran Working Group6/4/09 (“Iran’s Nuclear Threat; The Day After,” http://www.heritage.org/Research/NationalSecurity/sr0053.cfm)

Once it acquires a nuclear weapon, Iran’s radical regime will pose a much greater threat to the U**nited** S**tates, to  U.S. allies,** and to the stability of the Middle East than it does today. In particular, an Iranian nuclear capability  would pose an existential threat to Israel, a key U.S. ally that Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and other  Iranian leaders repeatedly have promised to destroy.  The United States’ unrivalled military power would be a powerful deterrent against an Iranian direct nuclear  attack, but relying on the threat of massive retaliation could be risky. The Iranian hard-liners could miscalculate **and  misperceive**; they **are profoundly ignorant about the outside world and** have shown a tendency to gamble recklessly.  They frequently proclaim their conviction that the United States would not or could not attack them. In addition,  there are legitimate questions about whether Ahmadinejad, who reportedly harbors apocalyptic religious beliefs  regarding the return of the Mahdi, or others in the Iranian regime like him would have the same cost-benefit calculus  about a nuclear war that other leaders would have. Moreover, Tehran could pass nuclear weapons on to terrorist sur-  rogates in hopes of escaping retaliation for a nuclear surprise attack launched by an unknown attacker.

GLOBAL NUCLEAR WAR

Steinbach -02 (John, Center for Research on Globalization, 3-3, http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/STE203A.html)

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum(and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major(if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon- for whatever reason- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration." (44)

## Ext: Solves Prolif Cred

### CTBT is the most important step to increase US prolif leadership.

Kittrie, Professor at the Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies, 08 (Orde F., CQ Congressional Testimony, July 24, Lexis)

Article VI of the NPT specifies that "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." Many nonnuclear weapon states have long accused the NPT nuclear weapons states, and particularly the United States, of not acting in good faith to make progress towards nuclear disarmament. While it seems unlikely that this perception of U.S. failure to hold up its end of the NPT bargain has directly contributed to any country proliferating, the perception has clearly made it harder for the U.S. to gain support in international fora for its efforts to isolate proliferators. The following are specific steps that Congress could take to increase the perception and enhance the reality of U.S. movement towards the goal of nuclear disarmament: CTBT -- The most important short-term step that the United States can take towards the goal of nuclear disarmament is to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. To date, 138 states have ratified the CTBT, including France, Russia, and the UK. For the CTBT to come into force it must be ratified by ten more specified states including the United States. The argument for ratifying the CTBT is even stronger today than it was when the Senate rejected the Treaty in 1999, as significant progress has been made in the U.S. capability to detect foreign noncompliance with the Treaty and ensure confidence in the reliability of our nuclear deterrent in the absence of nuclear testing. Congress should work with the next President to ratify the CTBT.

### US Leadership key to global nonproliferation.

Graham and Kampelman, chairman of the Bipartisan Security Group and former head of the U.S. delegation to the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, 08 (Thomas and Max, Washington Times, April 2, Lexis)

U.S. leadership is essential to achieving this goal. We cannot control what others may do with their own weapons, current or potential, but our urging can have a tremendous impact on their policies. We know that the nonproliferation regime is growing and sincerely trying to meet our moral as well as treaty obligation to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." This language is drawn from Article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which we, along with 188 other states, have ratified. The road from the world of today, with thousands of nuclear weapons in national arsenals to a world free of this threat, will not be an easy one to take, but it is clear U.S. leadership is essential to the journey and there is growing worldwide support for that civilized call for zero. The British foreign minister has publicly declared the government's commitment to that goal and the Norweigian government recently sponsored an international conference at which George Shultz opened the session by using the theme of nuclear weapons as the goal of the event.

## Iran Impact: Israeli Strikes

### Iranian proliferation ensures Israeli strike.

Russell 9. [James A., managing editor of Strategic Insights, the quarterly ejournal published by the Center for Contemporary Conflict at the Naval Postgraduate School, Spring http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite\_defense/PP26\_Russell\_2009.pdf]

As suggested by Schelling, asymmetries in actor interests can complicate the functioning of the bargaining framework for actor participants. As outlined above, the interests and objectives of the participants differ in ways that potentially undermine predictable interactions of the framework participants. Also surrounding these asymmetries in interests are the circumstances of the present, in which **there is a growing perception that the “window of opportunity” for preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon may be closing.50 This perception creates** conditions under which **nuclear status quo powers such as the** Israel **or the United States** may contemplate a preventive military strike. The likelihood of such a first strike attack in these circumstances is inversely related to calculations over the size of the window of opportunity.51 As long as Iran is believed to be years away from achieving operational capability, the prospect of an attack remains low. The more advanced Iran’s capabilities become, the higher the prospect of an attack. The inverse relationship is reflected in figure one below. The most likely escalation trigger in the framework is a preventative conventional attack by the United States and/or Israel on Iran’s nuclear infrastructure if either or both actors become convinced that Iran was on the verge of operationalizing a weapon. Estimates vary on when this may occur. The U**nited** S**tates** Director of National Intelligence, J. Michael McConnell, testified in February 2008 that Iran could compile sufficient quantities of highly enriched uranium to build a nuclear device by 2010- 2015 – with 2009 representing the earliest date Iran could achieve this goal.52 Israel shares the basic outlines of the U.S. assessment, but takes a more alarmist view. Israeli Deputy Prime Minister Shaul Mofaz stated in August 2008 that “Our estimation is that already by [2009] Iran will reach enrichment capability and as soon as 2010 will have option to reach [uranium production] at military levels.”53 Israeli plans for a preventative strike on Iranian nuclear sites appear periodically in the press,54 and Israel has undertaken a series of military exercises intended to demonstrate its military capabilities to attack Iran’s nuclear infrastructure. In June 2008, Israel mounted an exercise using 100 F-15 and F-16 aircraft traveling over 900 miles with aerial refueling tankers and pilot recovery operations that was widely seen as a rehearsal for such an attack.55 The United States reportedly told Israel in the summer of 2008 that it would not actively support a preventative attack.56 **Despite the absence of a “green light” for the attack, the United States nonetheless agreed** in September 2008 **to provide** $77 million for 1,000 GBU-**39 bunker busting smart bombs** that can reportedly penetrate up to six feet of reinforced concrete. The sale bolsters Israel’s ability to threaten Iran’s nuclear sites, IRGC and Hezbollah underground bunkers.57

EXTINCTION.

Hirsch 5. [Jorge, Physics Professor at UC San Diego, “Can A Nuclear Strike on Iran Be Averted”, Anti-War, 11-21, http://www.antiwar.com/orig/hirsch.php?articleid=8089]

The Bush administration has put together all the elements it needs to justify the impending military action against Iran. [Unlike in the case of Iraq](http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/01/20020129-11.html), it will happen without warning, and most of the justifications will be issued after the fact. We will wake up one day to learn that facilities in Iran have been bombed in a joint U.S.-Israeli attack. It may even take another couple of days for the revelation that some of the U.S. bombs were nuclear. [Continues…] Why a Nuclear Attack on Iran Is a Bad Idea Now that we have outlined what is very close to happening, let us discuss briefly why everything possible should be done to prevent it. In a worst-case scenario, the attack will cause a violent reaction from Iran. Millions of "[human wave](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_wave_attack)" Iranian militias will storm into Iraq, and just as Saddam [stopped them with chemical weapons](http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Jan2003/n01232003_200301234.html), the U.S. will stop them with nuclear weapons, resulting potentially in hundreds of thousands of casualties. The Middle East will explode, and popular uprisings in Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, and other countries with pro-Western governments could be overtaken by radical regimes. Pakistan already has nuclear weapons, and a nuclear conflict could even lead to Russia's and Israel's involvement using nuclear weapons. In a best-case scenario, the U.S. will destroy all nuclear, chemical, and missile facilities in Iran with conventional and low-yield nuclear weapons in a lightning surprise attack, and Iran will be paralyzed and decide not to retaliate for fear of a vastly more devastating nuclear attack. In the short term, the U.S. will succeed, leaving no Iranian nuclear program, civilian or otherwise. Iran will no longer threaten Israel, a regime change will ensue, and a pro-Western government will emerge. However, even in the best-case scenario, the long-term consequences are dire. The nuclear threshold will have been crossed by a nuclear superpower against a non-nuclear country. Many more countries will rush to get their own nuclear weapons as a deterrent. With no taboo against the use of nuclear weapons, they will certainly be used again. Nuclear conflicts will occur within the next 10 to 20 years, and will escalate until much of the world is destroyed. Let us remember that the destructive power of existing nuclear arsenals is approximately [one million times that of the Hiroshima bomb](http://www.wagingpeace.org/articles/1997/00/00_babst_consequences.htm), enough to erase Earth's population many times over.

## Iran Impact: Turkey Relations

### Failure to deal with Iranian prolif crushes US-Turkey relations.

Lesser 4. [Ian, Vice President, Director of Studies Pacific Council on International Policy, “Turkey, Iran and Nuclear Risks,” http://medadvisors.net/documents/Turkey\_IranandNuclearRisks.pdf]

Second, a nuclear Iran would severely complicate Turkey’s security relationships with Washington, Israel and Europe. A new nuclear threat to Turkish territory, however theoretical, might encourage a convergence of strategic perception among those most affected by this development. In practical terms, however, Ankara will confront a series of new security dilemmas. Turkey’s sense of regional exposure, and the need to “live” with neighbors, however unpalatable, is already a strong influence on the calculus of defense cooperation, as seen on numerous occasions since 1990, and as shown quite clearly in 2003. The potential for nuclear retaliation on Turkish territory would revive questions of alliance vulnerability, coupling, de-coupling, “singularization,” etc., familiar from the late Cold War. Given the near-term potential for Western and Israeli intervention in Iran, these would not be theoretical considerations for Ankara. Indeed, the very existence of a nuclear arsenal in Iran would immediately raise the likelihood of and stakes surrounding intervention – at least until Iran acquires a sufficiently credible nuclear capability to deter a conventional first strike. At which point a very different calculus will emerge, with Turkey playing a role analogous to Germany during the Cold War. Under these conditions, Turkish strategists will need to consider whether a nuclear confrontation between Iran and the West is likely to be fought over their heads – possible if Iran develops ballistic missiles of intercontinental range – or on Turkish territory. The prospect would surely reopen doctrinal debates about nuclear strategy within NATO, at a time when the Alliance is contemplating a formal role in security across the “greater Middle East”.

### Key to Central Asian stability.

UPI 3. [8/27 -- lexis]

Turkey is important to the United States for many reasons. First of all, **it occupies a pivotal role in Central Asia**. It controls the Bosphorus and helps to keep the Black Sea stabilized. It counters Russian influence in the Caucasus and serves as a land bridge to the Caspian Sea and its hydrocarbon resources. And Turkey is one of the rare Muslim countries that is a democracy.

### US-Russian accidental nuclear war.

SHORR 1. [Ira, An Analyst with the Institute for Policy Studies “Greatest Peril is still Nuclear” 10-14-01, The Record]

While these actions helped the nuclear superpowers back away from using weapons of mass destruction at a precarious time, it's sobering to note that the United States and Russia are still courting nuclear disaster. Despite no longer being strategic foes they still maintain thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert -- poised for a quick launch. This is a threat that no missile defense system will ever be able to protect us from. **This process of keeping nuclear weapons on a hair-trigger means that leaders on both sides have just minutes to assess whether a warning of an attack is real or false**. And while the threats we faced during the Cold War came from Soviet strength -- the danger today comes more from Russia's weakness. For example, Russia's troubled economy has led to the profound decay of its early warning satellite system. A fire last May that destroyed a critical facility used to control Russian warning satellites has made things even worse. "Russia has completely lost its space-based early warning capabilities," says Bruce Blair of the Center for Defense Information. "In essence, the country's ability to tell a false alarm from a real warning has been nearly crippled. " False alarms on both sides have already brought us to the brink of nuclear war. What will happen now if there is a war in the volatile neighborhood of Central Asia -- a region that includes nuclear powers **India ,Pakistan, and Russia**? Former Sen. Sam Nunn brought the point home in a recent speech: "The events of Sept. 11 gave President Bush very little time to make a very difficult decision -- whether to give orders to shoot down a commercial jetliner filled with passengers. Our current **nuclear** posture **in the United States and Russia** could provide even less time for each president to decide on a nuclear launch that could destroy our nations. " Nunn called on Presidents Bush and Putin to "stand-down" their nuclear forces to "reduce toward zero the risk of accidental launch or miscalculation and provide increased launch decision time for each president. " Inthe spirit of the courageous steps his father took to decrease the nuclear threat 10 years ago, President Bush should take action now to remove nuclear weapons from hair-triggeralert. This would send a signal to the world that in this volatile time, the U.S. is serious about preventing the use of nuclear weapons

## Prolif Cred Impact: Mid East

### Strong U.S. Non-prolif cred spills over – solves Middle East war.

Steinberg ’98 (Gerald, Prof Political Science – Bar Ilan U., U.S. Responses to Proliferation of Weapons Of Mass Destruction in the Middle East, Middle East Review of International Affairs, Vol. 2, No. 3, September)

The U.S. responses to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) proliferation in the Middle East is a core issue in the U.S. regional role no less important than the peace process. Over the past 10 years, the peace process has claimed most of the time and resources of those responsible for formulating and implementing U. S. regional policy in the Middle East. The accelerating proliferation of WMD in the region is often relegated to secondary status except during periods of crisis and sudden and intense activity. In Washington, some policy makers have claimed that the state of relations between Israel and the Palestinian Authority (PA) are important factors in determining the U.S. ability to influence Iraqi and Iranian WMD acquisition. In this article, I argue that the causality is reversed. It is U.S. actions, or lack of action, with respect to WMD proliferation that affects the U.S. ability to influence the peace process. **[Continued…]** Security, for most states, is indivisible, and this is particularly the case for Israel. Insecurity in one area or with respect to one threat source leads to fears in other areas as well. If Israelis are threatened with terrorism from Scud attacks and chemical weapons, and U.S. pledges to end this threat are not implemented, Washington's credibility on preventing a future Palestinian state from becoming a haven for terrorists is also reduced. If the current political division in Iran do not lead to a fundamental change in policies with respect to Israel, and a nuclear-armed Iran becomes the leader of the rejectionist camp, this will have profound impacts on Israeli security, making Israel even more reluctant to take the risks of redeployment in the West Bank. A few months ago, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State and former Ambassador to Israel Martin Indyk claimed that Israeli policies on the peace process were interfering with American efforts to forge an Arab coalition in order to attack Iraq. There, are of course, many other, far more significant reasons for American inability to gain Arab support against Iraq--most notably, the Arab view that again, as in 1991, the United States would not finish the job, leaving Saddam in power and the rest of the region having to appease him. U.S. policymakers should also understand that a weak response from Washington to the Iraqi and Iranian threats also makes Israel less willing and able to take security risks in the Palestinian peace process. In other words, the causal effect is reversed. U.S. weakness in dealing with proliferation, for whatever reason, **has reinforced Israeli threat perceptions** that reemerged when the Oslo process began to go wrong with the waves of suicide bombings. It is possible that a strong U.S. response to Iraq and Iran would have led to decreased Israeli regional security concerns, thereby creating some maneuvering room with respect to security issues and the Palestinians. However, when Palestinians rally and cheer for Saddam Hussein, and see that this brutal dictator has succeeded in defying the United States, they are less likely to tame their own terrorist infrastructure. CONCLUSIONS The United States is the only potential extra-regional actor that can slow or block proliferation in the Middle East but its responses to date have often been a story of "too little, too late." In terms of rhetoric, non-proliferation, Middle East stability and guarantees of Israeli security are indeed high on America's list of priorities. But in practice, other policies, such as supporting the Yeltsin government in Russia and preventing a rift with key European states, have greater importance. Without a change in U.S. policy in this sphere, by the year 2000, the threats warned about by President Kennedy and by every American president since, will finally become a reality. The long period of nuclear stability, with five recognized weapons states was shattered by the Indian and Pakistani tests, but an even greater danger is posed by accelerated proliferation in the Middle East. The United States may be uncomfortable playing the world's policeman, but otherwise, at least on this vital issue, the alternative is a very violent, chaotic Middle East with spillovers to the rest of the world.

### Global Nuclear War

Steinbach -02 (John, Center for Research on Globalization, 3-3, http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/STE203A.html)

Meanwhile, the existence of an arsenal of mass destruction in such an unstable region in turn has serious implications for future arms control and disarmament negotiations, and even the threat of nuclear war. Seymour Hersh warns, "Should war break out in the Middle East again,... or should any Arab nation fire missiles against Israel, as the Iraqis did, a nuclear escalation, once unthinkable except as a last resort, would now be a strong probability."(41) and Ezar Weissman, Israel's current President said "The nuclear issue is gaining momentum(and the) next war will not be conventional."(42) Russia and before it the Soviet Union has long been a major(if not the major) target of Israeli nukes. It is widely reported that the principal purpose of Jonathan Pollard's spying for Israel was to furnish satellite images of Soviet targets and other super sensitive data relating to U.S. nuclear targeting strategy. (43) (Since launching its own satellite in 1988, Israel no longer needs U.S. spy secrets.) Israeli nukes aimed at the Russian heartland seriously complicate disarmament and arms control negotiations and, at the very least, the unilateral possession of nuclear weapons by Israel is enormously destabilizing, and dramatically lowers the threshold for their actual use, if not for all out nuclear war. In the words of Mark Gaffney, "... if the familar pattern(Israel refining its weapons of mass destruction with U.S. complicity) is not reversed soon- for whatever reason- the deepening Middle East conflict could trigger a world conflagration." (44)

## Prolif Cred Impact: Russia Relations

### Non Prolif Cred Spills over to US Russia cooperation – solves relations generally

NSN, 5/28/09 (National Security Network, http://www.nsnetwork.org/node/1319)

The spread of nuclear weapons is a tremendous global challenge -- and a threat we can do something about, one where other nations actually desire US leadership. Two recent high-level bipartisan statements -- a Council on Foreign Relations task force report chaired by William Perry and Brent Scowcroft and a Partnership for a Secure America statement signed by 30 senior figures -- call for American leadership to address the non-proliferation challenge through a combination of tough diplomacy, strong safety measures, and renewed efforts to build global rules that stop weapons’ spread. The challenges we face are real: North Korea’s recent nuclear test and military posturing, Iran’s nuclear program, and the dangerous India-Pakistan arms race. But as bipartisan security leaders recognize, those problems cannot be solved without recommitting nations all over the world to safeguarding and reducing nuclear weapons, and that demands US leadership. President Obama recognized this on April 5 in Prague, when he laid out an ambitious agenda to combat nuclear proliferation: bilateral talks with the world’s second nuclear superpower, Russia; secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within four years; and US leadership to strengthen and update the international agreements that make up the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. Cont… North Korean nuclear challenge reminds us of both the seriousness of the threat and the need for diplomacy. There are no good military options to address the nuclear proliferation challenges in North Korea, Iran, and the sub-continent. Instead intensive diplomacy is required, and new responsiveness from Russia and China indicates that commitment to a broader non-proliferation strategy will pay dividends in dealing with the hard cases. In response to North Korea the Obama administration has ramped its diplomatic efforts, as the Washington Post writes, “At the United Nations, diplomats are pushing for sanctions with teeth against the government of Kim Jong Il. Proposals include freezing assets, banning travel for elites and cutting access to international banks. Japan and the United States want a new resolution that makes cargo inspections of North Korean vessels ‘compulsory’ for U.N. members.” This has included unusually assertive steps from Russia -- “Russia's ambassador to the United Nations convened an emergency meeting of the Security Council to condemn the test and pledged to support a strong new resolution against North Korea.” The Post attributes this to the improvement in U.S.-Russian relations: “Medvedev may see the issue in the context of his efforts to improve relations with the United States, [Vasily] Mikheev added. ‘Nonproliferation is one of the most important areas where Russia and America can work together,’ he said.” As Radio Free Europe noted progress is being made as, “the United States and Russia have begun talks in Moscow aimed at replacing the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START).” There have also been cautious signs that China – which has historically been reticent to confront North Korea – is more open to a U.S.-led diplomatic effort aimed at addressing the regime’s behavior. The Washington Post reports: “The United States has long sought help from China, North Korea's largest trading partner, in pressuring North Korea's reclusive leaders to give up their nuclear ambitions. But China has tried to win North Korea's cooperation through favors... and has blocked sanctions pushed by Washington...U.S. officials say they sense a different tone in China's response this time.” [Washington Post, 5/28/09] Regional and global diplomacy is also a necessary response to other non-proliferation. The Obama administration’s diplomatic approach to Iran is also expected to benefit from increased willingness by Russia, China and Europe to support the US as they perceive it to be more interested in supporting global standards against the spread of nuclear weapons. The Washington Post reported today on the increasing worries over nuclear proliferation and an arms race emanating from South Asia. “U.S. and allied officials and experts who have tracked developments in South Asia have grown increasingly worried over the rapid growth of the region's more mature nuclear programs, in part because of the risk that weapons could fall into the hands of terrorists. India and Pakistan see their nuclear programs as vital points of leverage in an arms race that has begun to take on the pace and diversity, although not the size, of U.S.-Soviet nuclear competition during the Cold War, according to U.S. intelligence and proliferation experts.” India and Pakistan have often cited US unwillingness to limit or reduce its own nuclear arsenal as justification for their pursuit of weapons and disinterest in joining international regimes to safeguard nuclear weapons and materials. In this tense environment, the appointment of Richard Holbrooke as special envoy, and high-level attention from Secretaries Clinton and Gates and chairman of the Joint chiefs Admiral Mullen, are welcome. [Washington Post, 5/28/09. CFR, 5/09]

### Relations solve accidents.

Martin 8. [Matthew is a program officer in Policy Analysis and Dialogue at the Muscatine-based Stanley Foundation, July, Avoiding an Accidental Nuclear War, http://www.stanleyfoundation.org/articles.cfm?id=498]

Common sense might indicate that better relations between the two countries would mean that less oversight is needed. But due to the history of the Cold War and the nature of the arsenals as discussed above, precisely the opposite is true, especially if the goal is to reduce the danger of an accidental nuclear launch. Surviving the Cold War without a nuclear exchange demanded intense and sustained efforts on a range of fronts from the political to the military, and as the global community strives to move beyond a Cold War mindset, it is clear that succeeding in this new world will as well. It is good that President Bush has found in Russian president Medvedev a smart colleague who understands the issues. The question is how will these two leaders apply their smarts and understanding in order to avoid an accidental nuclear war.

### Extinction.

**American Prospect**, 2/26/**01**

The bitter disputes over national missile defense (NMD) have obscured a related but dramatically more urgent issue of national security: the 4,800 nuclear warheads -- weapons with a combined destructive power nearly 100,000 times greater than the atomic bomb that leveled Hiroshima -- currently on "hair-trigger" alert. Hair-trigger alert means this: The missiles carrying those warheads are armed and fueled at all times. Two thousand or so of these warheads are on the intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) targeted by Russia at the United States; 1,800 are on the ICBMs targeted by the United States at Russia; and approximately 1,000 are on the submarine-based missiles targeted by the two nations at each other. These missiles would launch on receipt of three computer-delivered messages. Launch crews -- on duty every second of every day -- are under orders to send the messages on receipt of a single computer-delivered command. In no more than two minutes, if all went according to plan, Russia or the United States could launch missiles at predetermined targets: Washington or New York; Moscow or St. Petersburg. The early-warning systems on which the launch crews rely would detect the other side's missiles within tens of seconds, causing the intended -- or accidental -- enemy to mount retaliatory strikes. "Within a half-hour, there could be a nuclear war that would extinguish all of us," explains Bruce Blair. "It would be, basically, a nuclear war by checklist, by rote."

## --- ANSWERS TO ---

## AT: Allied Prolif

### Nuclear weapons not key to extended deterrence.

Perkovich 9. [George, VP for studies and director of the Nonprolif Program @ Carnegie “Extended Deterrence on the Way to a Nuclear-Free World,” May, http://www.icnnd.org/latest/research/Perkovich\_Deterrence.pdf]

These questions go to the heart of what is a genuine challenge to reassure allies about extended deterrence. The answers to these questions, which this paper will explore, suggest that the nuclear component in extended deterrence is exaggerated today in ways that obscure the more pressing questions and challenges of building security in Eurasia and East Asia. Nuclear weapons simply are not as useable as the authors of nuclear doctrine pretended in the Cold War. American presidents and military leaders have come to realize this. As Henry Kissinger wrote recently in the International Herald Tribune, “The basic dilemma of the nuclear age has been with us since Hiroshima: how to bring the destructiveness of modern weapons into some moral or political relationship with the objectives that are being pursued. Any use of nuclear weapons is certain to involve a level of casualties and devastation out of proportion to foreseeable foreign-policy objectives. Efforts to develop a more nuanced application have never succeeded, from the doctrine of a geographically limited nuclear war in the 1950s and 1960s to the ‘mutual assured destruction’ theory of general nuclear war in the 1970s.” This does not mean that the need to help allies deter adversaries has disappeared. It merely means that the role of nuclear weapons in extended deterrence has shrunk much more radically than many people assume.

### Nuclear weapons not key to extended deterrence.

Speed and May 5. [Roger and Michael, affiliate of the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University and director emeritus of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March 1, Lexis Academic)

Under extended deterrence, the United States gives the cover of its protective "nuclear umbrella" to its allies to persuade them not toprocure their own nuclear weapons. In many ways, the extended deterrence requirements are the same as for central deterrence, and the contribution of the new weapons under consideration would seem to be marginal. In most cases, if a regional power attacked a U.S. ally, the United States could respond with an overwhelming conventional attack that could severely damage the attacker's forces and infrastructure, perhaps causing its government to collapse, even without resorting to nuclear weapons. This in itself is likely to be a sufficient deterrent. If a regional power that threatened a U.S. ally was capable of striking the United States with nuclear weapons (or other WMD), the issue would become more complicated, and extended deterrence might be weakened. If the United States intervened, the regional power's decisionto escalate to an attack on the United States would probably depend on its perception of U.S. objectives. If a hostile regime is convinced that the United States will overthrow it no matter what, any kind of deterrence is likely to be less effective, if effective at all. In that case, a hostile regime might resort to drastic means (such as a nuclear warning shot at the United States) to try to forestall its destruction. In short, the credibility and efficacy of extended deterrence, as of central deterrence, is not likely to depend on the development of new nuclear weapons concepts, but on such matters as U.S. conventional capabilities, the long-range weapon capabilities of the adversary, U.S. defenses, and U.S. war aims. The United States could in principle use nuclear threats against nuclear-armed regional powers in order to deter conventional aggression against its allies. This is in many ways just a subset of the extended deterrence problem. But an additional complication is that if the United States has an announced policy of nuclear first-use to defeat a conventional attack by a nuclear state, it might provoke the opponent to use nuclear weapons (or biological or chemical weapons) from the beginning. This could put the United States at a larger disadvantage than if it tried to deter a conventional attack with conventional weapons. A publicly announced U.S. policy, which would be necessary if it were to act as a deterrent, of threatening to initiate a nuclearwar against a country would raise many political issues. Furthermore, the U.S. ally being defended might think it is not in its best interest to become a nuclear battlefield (as did America's European NATO allies during the Cold War) and reject this nuclear warfighting strategy.

## AT: Cheating

### There’s no impact to clandestine testing.

NAS 02 (National Academy of Sciences, Technical Issues Related to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, p.78, http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\_id=10471&page=78)

In relation to two of the key “comparison” questions posed at the beginning of this chapter about the implications of potential clandestine testing, then, we conclude as follows: Very little of the benefit of a scrupulously observed CTBT regime would be lost in the case of clandestine testing within the considerable constraints imposed by the available monitoring capabilities. Those countries that are best able to successfully conduct such clandestine testing already possess advanced nuclear weapons of a number of types and could add little, with additional testing, to the threats they already pose or can pose to the United States. Countries of lesser nuclear test experience and/or design sophistication would be unable to conceal tests in the numbers and yields required to master nuclear weapons more advanced than the ones they could develop and deploy without any testing at all. The worst-case scenario under a no-CTBT regime poses far bigger threats to U.S. security interests—sophisticated nuclear weapons in the hands of many more adversaries—than the worst-case scenario of clandestine testing in a CTBT regime, within the constraints posed by the monitoring system.

### Cheaters either fail or will be detected – no impact.

NAS 02 (National Academy of Sciences, Technical Issues Related to the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, p.78, http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\_id=10471&page=78)

The capabilities to detect and identify nuclear explosions without special efforts at evasion are considerably better than the “one kiloton worldwide” characterization that has often been stated for the IMS.[**37**](http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=10471&page=58#p2000a4488960058001) If deemed necessary, these capabilities could be further improved by increasing the number of stations in networks whose data streams are continuously searched for signals. In the history of discussions of the merits of a CTBT, a number of scenarios have been mentioned under which parties seeking to test clandestinely might be able to evade detection, identification, or attribution. With the exception of the use of underground cavities to decouple explosions from the surrounding geologic media and thereby reduce the seismic signal that is generated, none of these scenarios for evading detection and/or attribution has been explored experimentally. And the only one that would have a good chance of working without prior experimentation is masking a nuclear test with a large chemical explosion nearby in an underground mine. The experimentation needed to explore other approaches to evasion would be highly uncertain of success, costly, and likely in itself to be detected. Thus, the only evasion scenarios that need to be taken seriously at this time are cavity decoupling and mine masking. In the case of cavity decoupling, the experimental base is very small, and the signal-reduction (“decoupling”) factor of 70 that is often mentioned as a general rule has actually only been achieved in one test of very low yield (about 0.4 kiloton). The practical difficulties of achieving a high decoupling factor—size and depth of the needed cavity and probability of significant venting—increase sharply with increasing yield. And evaders must reckon with the high sensitivity of the global IMS, with the possibility of detection by regional seismic networks operated for scientific purposes, and with the chance that a higher-than-expected yield will lead to detection because their cavity was sized for a smaller one. As for mine masking, chemical explosions in mines are typically ripple-fired and thus relatively inefficient at generating seismic signals compared to single explosions of the same total yield. For a nuclear explosion that is not also cavity-decoupled to be hidden by a mine explosion of this type, the nuclear yield could not exceed about 10 percent of the aggregate yield of the chemical explosion. A very high-yield, single-fired chemical explosion could mask a nuclear explosion with yield more comparable to the chemical one, but the very rarity of chemical explosions of this nature would draw suspicion to the event. Masking a nuclear yield even as large as a kiloton in a mine would require combining the cavity-decoupling and mine-masking scenarios, adding to the difficulties of cavity decoupling already mentioned. Taking all factors into account and assuming a fully functional IMS, we judge that an underground nuclear explosion cannot be confidently hidden if its yield is larger than 1 or 2 kilotons. Evasion scenarios have been suggested that involve the conduct of nuclear tests in the atmosphere or at the ocean surface where the event would be detected and identified but attribution might be difficult. NTM of the United States and other nations might provide attribution, without being predictable by the evader. The task of monitoring is eased (and the difficulty of cheating magnified), finally, by the circumstance that most of the purposes of nuclear testing—and particularly exploring nuclear-weapon physics or developing new weapons—would require not one test but many. (An exception would be the situation in which an aspiring nuclear-weapon state had been provided the blueprints for a weapon by a country with greater nuclear-weapon capabilities, and might need only a single test to confirm that it had successfully followed the blueprints.) Having to conduct multiple tests greatly increases the chance of detection by any and all of the measures in use, from the IMS, to national technical means, to sensors in use for other purposes. It can be expected, in future decades, that monitoring capabilities will significantly improve beyond those described here, as instrumentation, communications, and methods of analysis improve, as data archives expand and experience increases, and as the limited regions associated with serious evasion scenarios become the subject of close attention and better understanding

### AT: Water testing 🡪 cheating.

Clery 9. [Daniel Deputy News Editor - Science Magazine, 7-24-2009 http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/325/5939/382]

IMS also has a smaller network of sensors to listen for explosions carried out underwater, just above the ocean surface, or below the ocean bottom. Sound travels very efficiently in water: Kiyoshi Suyehiro of the Institute for Research on Earth Evolution in Kanagawa, Japan, says a 20-kilogram test charge of TNT was detected 16,000 kilometers away. As a result, IMS has just 11 hydroacoustic stations positioned around the vast expanses of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans in the Southern Hemisphere. Sound propagates in deep water especially well at a depth of about 1000 meters in what is known as the sound fixing and ranging (SOFAR) channel. Six of the IMS's hydroacoustic stations consist of SOFAR hydrophones in deep water as much as 100 kilometers from the coast of remote islands. Each is a set of three hydrophones anchored to the seabed and connected to shore-based stations by cable. In addition to hydrophones, IMS has five stations to detect T-phase waves, the third or tertiary waves, after P and S, from a seismic tremor. These seismic stations pick up waves that have traveled into the ocean as hydroacoustic waves and then back into the ground. To get the best results, such stations need to be sited near coasts or on small islands. Researchers here were enthusiastic about the scientific spinoff of the hydroacoustic network because nothing on this scale has been available before. "The data from this network are unprecedented. Many applications ... we haven't even touched yet," says Harry Miley of the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in Richland, Washington.

## AT: Hurts Deterrence

### No effect on deterrence – modeling and no cheaters.

Choubey 9. [Deepti, former deputy director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment, “The CTBT’s Importance for U.S. National Security” Carnegie Endowment, October 14 -- http://www.carnegieendowment.org/2009/10/14/ctbt-s-importance-for-u.s.-national-security/kcl]

The past decade has brought about a lot of progress that helps answer three of the key criticisms that were raised ten years ago when the Senate last considered the treaty. Those three criticisms were: 1) will cheaters be detected? 2) will the United States have the capacity it needs to assure that its arsenal works correctly without nuclear tests? And 3) if the United States ratifies, will others?In terms of the first concern, which is will cheaters be detected, we now have empirical evidence that that will be the case and that’s because of the North Korean test. As the international monitoring system’s stations have come online, we have greater assurance that we will be able to detect any nuclear test of military significance. Secondly, in terms of the United States’ own capacity to ensure that its arsenal works, this has largely been a question of supercomputing speeds. Thankfully we have now entered, in the last few years, into the range of what is actually necessary to ensure that our nuclear weapons simulations work the way that we need to so that we don’t have to conduct nuclear tests. And third, in terms of the other states that are required to ratify, we have already seen some great progress, largely due to President Obama’s pledge to seek U.S. ratification. For instance, this past June Foreign Minister Wirajuda of Indonesia promised that Indonesia would immediately ratify after the United States does. Secondly, it is largely speculated that China would ratify either right before or right after the United States does. So, in a very tight time period, if the United States seriously moves towards ratification, out of the nine hold-out states one-third of them will have ratified. That’s progress.

### Conventional deterrence solves the impact.

Daley and Martin 2009 (Tad Daley, Writing Fellow with International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Kevin Martin, executive director of Peace Action , the largest peace advocacy organization in the United States, “Obama, Medvedev, and the Demise of Nuclear Deterrence,” http://ippnweupdate.wordpress.com/2009/07/03/obama-medvedev-and-the-demise-of-nuclear-deterrence-by-tad-daley-and-kevin-martin/)

And, however much those of us in the peace advocacy arena might deplore that reality, what it means today is that nuclear weapons have become militarily unnecessary for the United States. Any military mission that nuclear weapons can achieve for the United States can now be fully accomplished by its conventional weapons alone. That is true not only of Iran but also North Korea. There is simply no need for Washington to extend a “nuclear umbrella” over South Korea, because the United States can threaten North Korea with complete and utter destruction without any need to resort to nuclear weapons – and thereby hopefully deter North Korea from external aggression. To protect American national security, to defeat any enemy, and to dissuade any potential aggressor by threatening to inflict catastrophic retaliatory destruction upon it, America’s conventional military power alone can fully do the job.

### Ratification bolsters US nuclear superiority.

Daalder and Lindsay 2. [Ivo, senior fellow in Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution and a former director for European affairs at the National Security Council, James, senior fellow in Foreign Policy Studies at the Brookings Institution and a former director for global issues and multilateral affairs at the National Security Council. Feb http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/Files/rc/papers/2002/02weapons\_daalder/pb94.pdf]

Ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Putting the CTBT into effect would reduce the nuclear proliferation threat by making it easier to detect clandestine nuclear explosions—the treaty creates a worldwide monitoring system with sensors in countries such as China and Iran that are closed to U.S. intelligence. The move would preserve U.S. nuclear superiority and deflect the main threat to its conventional superiority. Investments now being made in the Department of Energy’s Stockpile Stewardship Program ensure that U.S. nuclear weapons will remain both safe and reliable. Should any questions arise about the effectiveness of the CTBT or its impact on the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile, the United States retains the option of withdrawing from the treaty upon giving six months notice.

## AT: Moratorium Solves

### Moratorium alone doesn’t solve.

Laicie Olson, BA in Political Science from The George Washington University and is currently a candidate for a Masters in International Affairs from St. Mary’s University. She previously served in positions at Global Green USA and The Counter Terrorist Finance Network, Physicians for Social Responsibility, June 2009, http://www.psr.org/assets/pdfs/ctbt-today-more-reasons-for.pdf

The current moratorium on nuclear testing is not sufficient to ensure the continued protection of American citizens. Technological and political advancements, including the increased terrorist threat and increasing danger of nuclear weapons falling into the wrong hands, make it imperative that we allow the CTBTO to operate at 100 percent capacity, ensuring that no new nuclear weapons can be tested or ultimately used. The U.S. must take the lead once again on nuclear non-proliferation and ratify the CTBT.

### Ratification is Key – Moratorium will inevitably fail destabilizing Non-Proliferation goals.

Laicie Olson, BA in Political Science from The George Washington University and is currently a candidate for a Masters in International Affairs from St. Mary’s University. She previously served in positions at Global Green USA and The Counter Terrorist Finance Network, Physicians for Social Responsibility, June 2009, http://www.psr.org/assets/pdfs/ctbt-today-more-reasons-for.pdf

Finally, some suggest the U.S. might enjoy the same benefits by indefinitely continuing the U.S. moratorium on nuclear explosive testing in the hopes that others would do the same. This logic is flawed. Without an endpoint in sight, other countries will be less likely to sustain their testing moratoria, seeing them only as interim measures to an eventual goal. Further, other countries could renounce their moratoria more easily than the U.S., France or Britain could. Each state would define its own obligations, leaving no international verification regime such as that which exists in the CTBT. In addition, without U.S. support behind the CTBT, other nations may conclude that the non-proliferation effort is dying and question their own support for the NPT, creating a far less stable environment than that which exists today.

### More.

Evans and Kawaguchi 9. [Gareth, Chancellor of the Australian National University, an Honorary Professorial Fellow at the University of Melbourne and President Emeritus of the Brussels-based International Crisis Group, AND, Yoriko, Member of the House of Councillors for the Liberal Democratic Party since 2005. She was Special Adviser to the Prime Minister of Japan, “REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION AND DISARMAMENT” -- http://www.icnnd.org/reference/reports/ent/part-iii-11.html]

Before the treaty’s conclusion in 1996, the world had conducted 2,044 nuclear explosions, roughly one every nine days for 50 years. Although the CTBT is still not yet in force (because it requires ratification from 44 specifically identified states – those with nuclear reactors at the time – nine of whom are still holding out), an informal moratorium has been in effect since then, with the only tests subsequently carried out being those by India and Pakistan in 1998, and by North Korea in 2006 and 2009. But the moratorium remains fragile so long as the CTBT and its monitoring regime are not in formal legal effect, and bringing the treaty into force – with the U.S. needing to play a leadership role in this respect – must be a central short term priority.

# \*\*\*AFF\*\*\*

## --- UNIQUENESS ---

## No CTBT

### ZERO CHANCE CTBT PASSES – TROUBLES WITH START.

BROOKES 6-9. [Peter, Heritage Foundation senior fellow, “Another bad arms control idea” New York Post]

So now President "Who Needs Nukes?" Obama wants to re-engage the Senate on the once-rejected 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It's unclear why the administration believes a re-heated version of the treaty (which bans explosive nuclear-weapons testing) is any more palatable today than it was when it was first served up to the Senate in 1999. Deepening skepticism will be the emerging problems with the US-Russia New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, which the Obama team rammed through during the lame-duck Congress late last year. Senators likely won't have much appetite for another helping of arms control anytime soon -- especially last century's leftovers.

### NOPE.

GERTZ 6-23. [Bill, defense and national security reporter, “No early intercept defense” The Washington Times -- lexis]

A classified State Department cable from 2008 made public Saturday revealed the Obama administration's strategy for trying to win Senate confirmation of the previously defeated Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. During a meeting with India's foreign minister, Ellen Tauscher, the undersecretary of state for arms control, was quoted in the cable as saying that Vice President Joseph R. Biden was leading domestic U.S. efforts to win passage of the treaty that bans underground nuclear tests. According to the cable, made public by WikiLeaks, Mr. Biden would not take the treaty to the Senate for a vote unless the required 67 votes are ensured, Mrs. Tauscher said. The treaty was voted down in 1999 as not in the national security interest. Ms. Tauscher said in May that the administration plans to launch an education campaign aimed at winning Senate approval for the treaty.So far, there are no signs of the campaign, and the outlook for ratification remains bleak.

## Won’t Push

### OBAMA WON’T PUSH CTBT – ZERO TIMEFRAME.

Deaton 6/18 (paul, weekend editor, " Iowa Get Ready for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty ", Blog for Iowa, http://www.blogforiowa.com/blog/\_archives/2011/6/18/4839420.html)

It seems doubtful that President Obama will make ratification of the CTBT a top priority, near term. There are other pressing issues: reaching a budget agreement with the Congress, our wars and dealing with lackluster economic growth. But the wheels are in motion, and Iowans can expect to hear more of the reasons for banning nuclear test explosions in the near future.

## --- IMPACT DEFENSE ---

## CTBT Fails: Cheating

### Cheating inevitable – no clear definition of testing.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

The CTBT has serious inherent deficiencies. First, it actually fails to define a “nuclear test,” the very action the treaty is supposed to prohibit. Consequently, parties to the treaty must decide for themselves precisely what constitutes a test. As a result, varying definitions of what is prohibited by the treaty are possible. The United States interprets the treaty as prohibiting tests that produce any nuclear yield, i.e., a “zero-yield” standard. Others apparently have different standards. Russia, for example, reportedly conducts hydronuclear tests that produce a nuclear yield; such tests can be highly useful in assuring the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons, and in their modernization.

### For suresies cheating.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

Second, the treaty is not verifiable. States can cheat in a variety of ways, with very low risk of detection. For example, a nuclear explosion can be decoupled by conducting it in an underground cavity and/or in a special container. This can reduce the seismic signal below the threshold of detectability. Other cheating scenarios are also possible. Some CTBT proponents argue that any such undetected low-yield or masked cheating would be militarily insignificant. However, nuclear testing at a sub-kiloton level and up to a kiloton or more—a range that would be exceedingly difficult to detect—can be used to develop new nuclear weapons as well as to ensure the safety and reliability of existing nuclear warheads. Additionally, such testing can enable a state to develop and maintain the skills and facilities that support nuclear weapons research, development, and maintenance. Even proponents of the CTBT concede that useful nuclear tests can be conducted with little chance of detection. For example, the 2002 study by the National Academy of Sciences on CTBT verification reported: At the lower end of the very-low-yield category, Russia could develop and test new very-low-yield tactical weapons in the range of 10 to 100 tons. With respect to seismic detection, the 10-ton weapon could confidently be adequately testedunder decoupling conditions even at Novaya Zemlya [Russia’s nuclear test site], and might even be tested in a steel or composite containment so that it would give no ground shock at all. Indeed, with its experience in testing and weapons design, Russia could develop a 10-ton nuclear weapon using only hydronuclear tests in the kilogram-yield range, and be reasonably confident of its performance.2

### Yes cheating – underwater testing.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

A second type of cheating scenario is simply to test without attribution. For example, a cheater could conduct a test of any desired yield under or on the ocean surface by using a submarine or surface vessel to place the nuclear device. It can then be detonated hours or days later, escaping not detection, but attribution. The IMS would detect, identify, and probably measure the yield for the testing nation (which, if a treaty party, would have access to all IMS data). Even if it could pinpoint a very precise location of the test after the fact, there probably would be no debris left at the detonation site. An example of this second type of cheating may have taken place in 1979 in the south Indian Ocean. A U.S. Vela satellite detected a double flash of light characteristic of a nuclear explosion. Although scientists at the U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories and analysts at the Defense Intelligence Agency were convinced that the signal was an unattributed nuclear test, a Presidential Panel subsequently concluded this event was probably due to a small meteoroid striking the satellite and reflecting sunlight into the Vela’s sensors. However, many scientists and intelligence experts find more plausible the explanation offered in a recent book by former Secretary of the Air Force Thomas Reed and former Director of Intelligence at Los Alamos, Danny Stillman. These authors claim that this event was a nuclear test and a joint undertaking between Israel and South Africa.59

## CTBT Fails: No Modeling

### Can’t solve the impact: No modeling.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

The CTBT shall enter into force 180 days after 44 specific states have deposited instruments of ratification. The 44 states are those with nuclear reactors that participated in the work of the Conference on Disarmament’s 1996 session and were Conference members as of June 18, 1996. Of the 44, India, North Korea, and Pakistan have not signed the treaty; China, Egypt, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, and the United States have not ratified it. Treaty supporters argue that once the United States has ratified the CTBT, diplomacy can convince the remaining eight to ratify. This again is solely an expression of hope. For some states, it is highly unlikely. The past decade of unsuccessful diplomatic interactions with Iran and North Korea to persuade them to forgo nuclear weapons indicates that they are not particularly amenable to such diplomacy and that North Korea would likely use the occasion to extort favors from the international community. Even if the United States were to ratify the treaty, it would not enter into force until the remainder of the 44 have signed and ratified it. Thus, if the United States ratified the CTBT, the U.S. “...would be bound by restrictions that other key countries could ignore.”65

## AT: Heg Impact

### Heg claims are false.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

Some treaty proponents also argue that a nuclear test ban would bolster U.S. moral leadership and other nations would follow the U.S. example. Yet again, the evidence is to the contrary. Since 1992, when the current U.S. nuclear testing moratorium began, there have been the following known nuclear tests by nations other than the five nuclear- weapons-states recognized by the NPT: India May 11 and 13, 1998 Pakistan May 28 (five tests claimed) and 30 (one test), 1998 North Korea October 16, 2006 and May 25, 2009 Today, many states have the capability to create a functioning nuclear explosive. The limitation is not technology;20 it is a matter of resources and intent. Some states may view nuclear weapons as a means to gain international clout and as vital to their security. When fundamental national security interests are at risk, security concerns typically trump international political norms. All three nations listed above chose to tolerate international condemnation for the sake of improving or demonstrating their nuclear weapons capabilities. France, too, was willing to endure similar condemnation when it conducted its most recent series of nuclear tests in 1995-1996.

## AT: Prolif Impact

### Can’t Solve prolif.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

How effective can the CTBT be in halting horizontal proliferation? Certainly from a technical standpoint, a test ban—even one scrupulously adhered to—would not prevent a nation from developing and deploying fission-type weapons. As Harold Agnew, former director of Los Alamos National Laboratory wrote in 1996, “…with a supply of plutonium… and/or enriched uranium, any nation with a munitions industry can develop a multi-kiloton device. It may be large and unsophisticated, but the designers can be assured it will work without testing.”16 South Africa proved this when it clandestinely built nuclear weapons without testing. “Little Boy,” the U.S. gun-assembly type weapon used against Japan, had not been tested prior to its use. Pakistan and India17 developed nuclear weapons without testing prior to demonstrating their nuclear weapon capability in May 1998. In short, there is ample evidence that demonstrates beyond doubt that CTBT could not prevent proliferant countries from developing nuclear weapons.

## AT: Prolif Cred Impact

### CTBT ratification insufficient to solve prolif cred- other issues overwhelm

PONI 9. [CSIS Blog which provides a space where members and other people with nuclear weapons expertise can debate a variety of nuclear issues, the blog features guest commentary from senior experts 4-29-2009 http://forums.csis.org/poni/?p=110]

The U.S. is just getting back to zero– While it is likely that the U.S. will try to take steps such as negotiating a START follow-on and ratifying the CTBT in the lead up to the May 2010 RevCon in part to score image points, it begs the question of what we look like right now. U.S. credibility has eroded to the point were CTBT ratification, for example, will be seen as making good on long overdue debts (the 1995 RevCon indefinite extension deal) rather than leading the charge forward. Countries will also continue to criticize us that we still have not gone far enough to meet Article VI demands. B. Nuclear elephants in the room 1. Russia/China- U.S. nonproliferation credibility is only a fraction of the problem for NNWS concerned about nuclear weapons. China may sign the CTBT at or around the time of the U.S. and does not like being isolated internationally but at the same time there are strongly opposed to transparency measures (necessary for any serious move towards zero) and show no signs of slowing modernization. Likewise, a START follow-on is probably in Russia’s interest but they are also modernizing and increasing reliance on nuclear weapons in their posture to offset conventional inferiority. These are both huge obstacles to progress that will not be easy to tackle. 2. Israel/India/Pakistan- These 3 nuclear elephants represent fundamentally unacceptable circumstances for some countries. Egypt, for example, held the 2005 RevCon hostage and will not discuss CTBT ratification (necessary for entry into force) because of the Israel question. While the prospects for roping these countries into the NPT are dim, this will be a challenge that has to be dealt with at some point for major nonproliferation gains to be made. C. NPT Loopholes- Even if U.S. nonproliferation credibility is top of the line, the credibility of the NPT hinges on its ability to prevent NNWS members from acquiring nuclear weapons. The ability for countries to stay in bounds and learn about things nuclear and then call no joy under Article X (North Korea) or make potentially worrying progress towards a nuclear weapons capability while roughly staying in bounds (Iran) casts doubt on the NPT as a whole to be an effective mechanism for curbing proliferation. U.S. credibility may lead to slightly increased international support for punitive measure (although by no means guaranteed) but does not serve as a major driver for whether these type of countries make the decision to try for a bomb. The argument is not that we should not pursue nonproliferation credibility but the estimated impact it will have needs to be realistically assessed. One small step for US nonproliferation credibility does not automatically mean one giant leap for nonprolifkind.

## AT: Japan Re-Arm

### Japan won’t go nuclear- 4 reasons

Oros 03 (Assistant Professor of Political Science and International Studies, Washington College (Andrew, “"Godzilla's Return: The New Nuclear Politics in an Insecure Japan"’, Japan's Nuclear Option: Security, Politics, and Policy in the 21st Century, Benjamin Self and Jeffrey Thompson (eds), Washington, DC: The Henry L. Stimson Center)

Four primary alternative explanations can be identified which attempt to explain the broad continuity in Japan’s security policies in the post-Cold War period despite dramatic changes in Japan’s domestic and international political environment. Each of these explanations contributes to an account of why Japanese policymakers will not decide to embark on a nuclear weapons program anytime soon, despite mounting pressures to consider this option. They are: 1) the continuing (and perhaps even increased) power of the political opposition (i.e., non-LDP politicians and active civil society groups); 2) the continuing influence over policy decisions (both electoral and consumer opinion); 3) institutional lag resulting in a continuation of such institutions as Article 9 of the Constitution and the limitations on the SDF and JDA; and 4) concerns about its international reputation (particularly with China and South Korea, but vis-à-vis other states in the international system). Each of these explanations is linked by its synthesis into the existing political boundaries of domestic antimilitarism.

### Japan won’t go nuclear- several reasons

Thompson and Self 03 (Research Associate of the East Asia Program at the Henry L. Stimson Center and Senior Associate, The Henry L. Stimson Center Adjunct Lecturer, American University School of International Service (Jeffrey, Benjamin, “Nuclear Energy, Space Launch Vehicles, and Advanced Technology: Japan’s Prospects for Nuclear Breakout”, Stimson East Asia Center Report)

Japan maintains nuclear transparency and accepts inspections and safeguards. Japan has kept most of its surplus plutonium overseas, and the remainder in oxide rather than metal form. Japan has no expertise in bomb or warhead design—such expertise is not just avoided but forbidden by law. Japan’s rockets have been developed far past the point of suitability for ballistic missile use, a level of capability Japan had perhaps four decades ago. Japan has no cruise missile technology, neither stealth nor bomber technology, and no suitable submarine technology. And the human dimension remains an obstacle to development of a nuclear deterrent, as there are cross-cutting and interconnected bodies to forestall any clandestine program, and no organization to control a possible nuclear arsenal. Based on Japan’s behavior in these areas, it is clear that Japan is not currently preparing to develop a nuclear deterrent. What it may do in the future is hard to know, as discussed in the other chapters. But because of the gaps Japan has scrupulously maintained with regard to technical and policy aspects of nuclear arms, we need not fear a nuclear breakout in Japan.

## --- IMPACT TURNS ---

## Turn: Allied Prolif

### Ratification causes allied prolif.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

As stated previously, U.S. self-imposed policy constraints, including its strict interpretation of a zero-yield test moratorium, have prevented modernization of the nuclear arsenal. Such modernization could include advanced safety and security features and weapon characteristics that strengthen deterrence of adversaries and assurance of allies. At some point, the security needs of the United States and its allies may require nuclear weapons with characteristics that differ from those developed during the Cold War. Since different types of U.S. nuclear weapons may be needed to support the deterrence of war in the future, the prerogative of nuclear testing should not be forever forsworn as under the CTBT. For more than a half century, U.S. extended nuclear deterrence commitments to allies have been critical to U.S. strategy, alliances, and nonproliferation goals. Even allies such as Japan, that support the general concept of a CTBT and steps toward globalnuclear disarmament, have conditioned that support on maintenance of U.S. nuclear forces they deem critical to the continued deterrence of war. If allies perceive that the U.S. nuclear deterrent is not keeping pace with the requirements imposed by new threats they face and their confidence in the U.S. nuclear umbrella erodes, they may seek their own nuclear weapons. In contrast to the expressed hopes of CTBT proponents, U.S. CTBT ratification actually has the potential to inspire proliferation.

### Extinction.

**Utgoff 2** (Victor A., Deputy Director of the Strategy, Forces, and Resources Division of the Institute for Defense Analysis, Survival Vol 44 No 2 Proliferation, Missile Defence and American Ambitions, p. 87-90)

In sum, widespread proliferation is likely to lead to an occasional shoot-out with nuclear weapons, and that such shoot-outs will have a substantial probability of escalating to the maximum destruction possible with the weapons at hand. Unless nuclear proliferation is stopped, we are headed toward a world that will mirror the American Wild West of the late 1800s. With most, if not all, nations wearing nuclear 'six-shooters' on their hips, the world may even be a more polite place than it is today, but every once in a while we will all gather on a hill to bury the bodies of dead cities or even whole nations.

## Ext: Causes Allied Prolif

### Sparks allied prolif.

David 9. [Jack deputy assistant secretary of defense from September 2004 to September 2006, There's No Reason for a Nuclear Test Ban, WSJ, 2-21-09, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB123517461151837309.html]

As a practical matter, by ratifying the CTBT the U.S. will impede its own potentially necessary testing even if it does not restrict action by any other country. Given that CTBT proponents argue that ratification will "send a message," there is little doubt that, upon ratification, the U.S. will honor its zero-yield standard and claim "credit" for abiding by the CTBT. The safety and reliability of our nuclear arsenal is a major concern. In 1999, when the Senate rejected the CTBT, experts testified that parts of our nuclear weapons wear out, corrode or decay and are difficult to replace. A letter opposing ratification signed by six former secretaries of defense -- James Schlesinger, Frank Carlucci, Dick Cheney, Melvin Laird, Casper Weinberger and Donald Rumsfeld -- was submitted to the Senate. The letter stated that the computer simulations we now count on for assurance that our aging nuclear weapons and their parts are reliable and safe may one day be insufficient and actual testing may become necessary. Moreover, dozens of our allies and partners depend upon U.S. nuclear weapons for their security. The letter from the six defense secretaries observed that if the U.S. were to ratify the CTBT, "confidence in the reliability of our nuclear weapons stockpile would inevitably decline, thereby reducing the credibility of America's nuclear deterrent." If this were to happen, they said, our allies and partners "could well feel compelled to seek nuclear capabilities of their own." The secretaries concluded that the CTBT is "incompatible with the nation's international commitments and vital security interests."

### Ratification causes allied prolif.

Monroe 7 (Robert R., former director of the Defense Nuclear Agency, Washington Times, December 4, Factiva)

Reality No. 3 is that U.S. ratification of the CTBT would increase proliferation. Some 30 states (e.g., Japan, Germany) depend upon the U.S. nuclear umbrella rather than having their own nuclear forces. If we ratify the CTBT, denying ourselves the ability to transform our arsenal, the failure of our once-credible deterrent will force our allies and friends to develop their own nuclear weapons.

## Turn: Deterrence

### Ratifying the CTBT destroys deterrence.

Woolsey and Payne 11. [R. James, Chairman, Woolsey Partners, former Director – CIA, Commissioner, Congressional Commision on the Strategic Posture of the US, Keith B., President – National Institute for Public Policy, Head – Grad Defense & Strategic Studies @ Missouri State, Commissioner, Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the US, “The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: An Assessment of the Benefits, Costs and Risks” National Institute for Public Policy -- <http://www.nipp.org/CTBT%203.11.11%20electronic%20version.pdf>]

This assessment also explains why the problem attending CTBT ratification is not simply that the hoped-for benefits are unlikely ever to be realized, there also are prospectively large risks for the United States and its allies. The CTBT cannot prevent opponents from developing or taking steps to modernize nuclear weapons, but conversely, U.S. ratification could hinder our capability to modernize nuclear weapons as necessary for deterrence purposes. If we ratify the CTBT, we will adhere to the U.S. “zero-yield” criterion while other countries would be free to interpret the CTBT restriction on nuclear testing—undefined in the treaty—in a less rigorous fashion. The U.S. “zero yield” criterion could undercut our capability to develop new capabilities critical to deter future threats, while opponents choosing a less rigorous testing restriction could conduct nuclear experiments that produce yield and potentially provide important military advantages. CTBT ratification would have the effect of closing off a deterrence safety route that we may need to take without providing a barrier to the range of threat developments that may drive us to seek that safety route. In this sense, it is worse than a “feel good” gesture without substance; it could threaten our capability to deter threats to us and our allies. Erecting such a solid legal barrier to testing could be incompatible with future needs that cannot now be known with certainty, but may require timely U.S. action. International relations are unpredictable; this is particularly true with regard to the potential for the rapid development of severe security threats. Increasingly, technology spread, global communications, and cultural developments abroad have joined to make the United States the object of animosities and to shrink the security value of the greatdistances that separate us from most centers of serious threat. Technology spread, including biological and nuclear weapons, has also increased the potential lethality of otherwise second- and third-rate military powers. What does this have to do with CTBT? We can no longer afford to believe that we have the luxury of waiting for serious new threats to be manifest before we consider the possibilities and prepare for them. Codifying a commitment not to test nuclear weapons reflects a pre-21st century American way of thinking about threats, i.e., that we can rest in our knowledge (or our ability to confirm what we think is knowledge) and capabilities because we can count on seeing threats far enough in advance to change course and respond as necessary. No one knows what types of nuclear weapons may be needed in the future to deter new threats, but they may not be the nuclear weapons we designed and built during the Cold War. That much is likely to be the case simply because conditions and foes can change rapidly and because the character of our enemies' nuclear and other highly lethal forces are not locked in and would not necessarily be so under CTBT. It is unclear whether we will be able to design and produce reliably the future new types of capabilities we might need for deterrence based solely on our past testing experience. The option of testing could be very important for some types of new capabilities important to our future ability to deter attacks. If so, precluding our ability to test with an enduring legal instrument like the CTBT is to curry the risk that we will not have the deterrent capabilities necessary to prevent war in a timely fashion. Ratification would ensure that any future testing we might be compelled to undertake to help deter newly- emerging threats would be burdened by delay and an extended prior period of intense internal review and argument. That delay and burden may have been survivable in the 18th-20th centuries. It now would be a risk unless the CTBT also can preclude the developments that might compel us to test in the future—if only to have specific new types of nuclear deterrence capabilities. Those capabilities could include some weapon characteristics about which we may now be largely unaware or uninterested. The CTBT, however, cannot prevent the development of new threats which may demand new U.S. capabilities because it does little or nothing to make current and future enemies less hostile toward us, less able to reach us, and less able to attack us and our allies with nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction. CTBT is analogous to the 1972 ABM Treaty which restricted the U.S. development and deployment of any serious defenses against long-range missiles and effectively constrained U.S. defenses against shorter-range missile threats, but did nothing to reduce missile threats to us or our allies. It was based explicitly on a benign expectation of how the future would unfold, but precluded the development of defensive capabilities that would facilitate timely recovery if international relations proceeded in a different direction. As history actually unfolded, the need to withdraw from that treaty became blatantly obvious—but withdrawal continued to face enormous political challenges. And, if not for the shock of 9/11, it is doubtful that we would have withdrawn from the ABM treaty as quickly as we did and our capability to defend against offensive missiles would be far behind the need. The moral here is useful when thinking about CTBT. The arguments in favor of CTBT are based on hope that the future will unfold in benign directions—to note that there is evidence contrary to this hope is an understatement. CTBT cannot stop the pace of lethal change and surprise in the development of the threats that we face, but its ratification would create a significant legal obstacle in front of our ability to adjust as may be necessary to deter new threats.

### U.S. nuclear deterrence prevents proliferation, nuclear war, and world wide aggression

Carafano, Phillips, and Hulsman 5 (James Phillips is Research Fellow in Middle East-ern Studies, John C. Hulsman, Ph.D., is Senior Research Fellow in European Affairs, James Jay Carafano, Ph.D., is Senior Research Fellow for National Security and Homeland Security, Heritage Foundation, “Countering Iran’s Nuclear Challenge,” Dec 14, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Iran/bg1903.cfm)

Nuclear Deterrent. America’s nuclear forces are in danger of atrophying. The U.S. missile force and warhead inventory is aging. The United States should be developing next-generation nuclear weapons. The American nuclear deterrent has been an effective guarantor against nuclear conflict for more than half a century, and U.S. nuclear power has helped to dissuade other nations from acquir-ing these weapons. Failing to retain an effective and dependable nuclear deterrent will simply invite aggression, not only against United States, but against other free nations as well.

## Ext: Crushes Deterrence

### Ratifying the CTBT crushes our deterrence.

Monroe 7 (Robert R., former director of the Defense Nuclear Agency, Washington Times, December 4, Factiva)

Reality No. 2 is that we are now 16 years late in starting to transform our nuclear deterrence strategy and our weapons. Our arsenal is still composed of aging Cold War "massive retaliation" weapons, with moderate accuracy, very high yields, and "dirty" radiation outputs. They are virtually irrelevant today for deterring our proliferating adversaries. These rogue states have buried their nuclear weapons facilities deep underground, frequently locating them near deliberately exposed civilian populations. Any U.S. nuclear weapons that do not have high accuracy, very low yields, reduced collateral damage, and reduced residual radiation will not be credible of use, and our attempted deterrence will fail. To be effective deterrents, these new weapons also need tailored outputs (earth penetration, neutralization of chem-bio agents, etc.). All these new capabilities will require nuclear testing.

## Deterrence Good: Long But Good Impact

### Effective nuclear deterrence key to solve multiple scenarios for nuclear and WMD use

Foster and Payne 7 (John S. Foster, Jr., is Chairman of the Board of GKN Aerospace Transparency Systems and former Director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and Dr. Keith B. Payne, Head of Missouri State University's Graduate Department of Defense and Strategic Studies and chair of the Policy Panel of U.S. Strategic Command's Senior Advisory Group, October, “What Are Nuclear Weapons For?”, Forum on Physics and Society of the American Physical Society, Vol. 36, No. 4, http://www.aps.org/units/fps/newsletters/2007/october/foster-payne.html)

As a matter of fact, the on-going development and deployment of new nuclear weapons in Russia and China and the spread of mass destruction weapons to rogue states make effective deterrence as important now as it was during the Cold War, and nuclear weapons are likely to continue to be **critical** to effective deterrence. And, while superficially counterintuitive***, the net effect of U.S. nuclear capabilities almost certainly is a positive and essential contribution to nuclear non-proliferation.*** The following provides a brief elaboration of four reasons why nuclear weapons remain critical to U.S. and allied security. To address the question “What are nuclear weapons for?” requires that we examine the multiple roles served by nuclear weapons. We need to look beyond the military characteristics of U.S. nuclear weapons and address the broader spectrum of national defense goals that they serve. These goals - deterrence, assurance, and dissuasion - reflect our long-standing core objectives of protecting the United States and allies, working to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and steering potential adversaries away from military challenges and competition. There should be no desire to rely on nuclear weapons per se; precision conventional weapons and defensive capabilities may rightly assume a relatively greater role, as was emphasized in the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review. There is, however, a continuing need for nuclear weapons to support these overarching U.S. defense goals of deterrence, assurance, and dissuasion. None of these roles for nuclear weapons follows from a “war-fighting” policy orientation, or presumes the actual military employment of nuclear weapons, or entails a requirement to do so. The value of nuclear weapons for these traditional core goals of deterrence, assurance and dissuasion resides in their continued role as a withheld threat. Identifying these roles for nuclear weapons in the new strategic environment was a focus of the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). Deterrence: The value of effective deterrence did not end with the Cold War; it remains essential to national security, and nuclear weapons remain essential to effective deterrence. By helping to prevent war and the need to use force, nuclear deterrence does not represent a disdainful “trap” as some commentators have claimed. Nuclear weapons are an enormously valuable tool of deterrence in the contemporary strategic context and should be given up only after long and careful consideration. As Winston Churchill observed, “Be careful above all things not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure and more than sure that other means of preserving peace are in your hands!”[3] Strategic nuclear weapons that can threaten an adversary’s valued targets from afar are, and are likely to remain, essential for holding particularly well-protected targets at risk for deterrence purposes. These targets are, for all practical purposes, invulnerable to non-nuclear threats and are likely to remain so for the foreseeable future. For example, during the 1991 Gulf War many hardened Iraqi facilities were destroyed but some bunkers were, “virtually invulnerable to conventional weapons.”[4] Similarly, according to statements by Clinton Administration senior officials in 1996, the Libyan chemical weapons plant located inside a mountain near Tarhunah could be threatened with destruction only by nuclear weapons.[5] The potential importance to effective deterrence of the U.S. capability to hold these types of targets at risk from afar is suggested by the attention and resources some adversaries devote to protecting and shielding them. Adversaries unsurprisingly seek to protect what they value. And, as Dr. Harold Brown, Secretary of Defense during the Carter Administration, emphasized when in office, U.S. deterrence threats should be capable of holding at risk those assets particularly valued by the adversary. In some important cases U.S non-nuclear threats cannot do so and can promise little deterrent effect***.*** In addition, there is no doubt that some opponents who were not deterrable via U.S. non-nuclear threats were in fact deterred by what they interpreted to be nuclear threats. This deterrent effect is a matter of adversary perceptions, not our preferences: Whatever we believe about the lethality of U.S. non-nuclear weapons and what should be their deterrent effect, and whatever our hopes might be about how adversaries should think and behave, the actual behavior of past adversaries, including Khrushchev, Mao, and Saddam Hussein, has shown beyond doubt that there can be a profound difference between the deterring effects of nuclear and non-nuclear weapons. In some cases, given the adversary’s views and the context, **only nuclear deterrence works**. To assert that nuclear weapons now are unimportant is to suggest either that deterrence is no longer important, or that the future will be much more benign than the past, and that we will not again confront such opponents armed with dangerous weapons. There is every reason to reject both propositions. U.S. policy with regard to nuclear weapons should not be based on optimistic hopes that so contrast with the actual past behavior of foes. Given past experience, the burden of proof is on those who now contend that nuclear deterrence no longer is necessary to preserve the peace. The question is not whether we “want” to rely on nuclear weapons for deterrence. It is whether we are willing to accept the risk of deterrence failure that would be introduced by our inability to threaten some adversaries’ highly-valued targets that may be essentially impervious to non-nuclear weapons and/or our inability to threaten nuclear escalation in response to a severe provocation. The risk of deterrence failure flowing from such inabilities can not be calculated with precision. Because multiple contemporary opponents possess nuclear and/or biological weapons, the consequences of deterrence failure could be measured in thousands to millions of U.S. and/or allied casualties. The risk of deterrence failure following from U.S. abandonment of nuclear capabilities may be low or high depending on the opponent and context. But even lowprobability events deserve serious consideration if they have potentially severe consequences. The move to reliance on nonnuclear weapons to hold enemy targets at risk would carry the increased risk of deterrence failure, and the probability may not be low.

## Deterrence Good: CBW Attack

### Nuclear weapon credibility key to deter CBW Attack

Payne 09 (Keith B, president of the National Institute for Public Policy, a full professor and department head at the Graduate Department of Defense and Strategic Studies, Missouri State University, chairman of the Policy Panel of the US Strategic Command’s Senior Advisory Group, co-chair of the Nuclear Strategy Forum, and a member of the Department of State’s International Security Advisory Board, was deputy assistant secretary of defense for forces policy,was the co-chair of the Deterrence Concepts Advisory Group, Office of the Secretary of Defense. He has served as a consultant to the White House, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the Department of Defense, and as a member of the Department of State’s Defense Trade Advisory Group. “One Nuclear Deterrence and Assurance,‛ Strategic Studies Quarterly, Spring 2009 <http://www.au.af.mil/au/ssq/2009/Spring/payne.pdf>)

This proposition is logical but artificially narrow. It misses other severe nonnuclear threats to the United States and allies that may not be deterred reliably absent US nuclear capabilities, such as threats posed by chemical and biological weapons (CBW). Commentators can claim for political reasons that US nuclear capabilities should be considered **pertinent for deterring only nuclear threats but CBW threats** are real and growing and there is no basis to conclude that US nonnuclear capabilities would suffice to deter them. Even if the vision of the complete worldwide elimination of nuclear weapons were to be realized, CBW threats would remain. The most that can be said in this regard is that US nuclear weapons might or might not be necessary for this deterrence goal—hardly a robust basis for making profound policy decisions about the most fundamental security questions. Thinking through some plausible scenarios may be helpful in this regard. For example, if an opponent were to escalate an intense, ongoing conventional conflict by employing CBW with horrific effect against US forces, civilians, or allies, a high-priority US goal would likely be to deter the opponent’s subsequent use of CBW. The US deterrence message to the opponent in this case could be that **the opponent would suffer exceed ingly if it were to repeat CBW use**—that the United States would so raise the risks of the conflict for the opponent that it would choose not to repeat its use of CBW (even if its initial employment proved useful militarily or politically). This message could be intended to deter a second CBW attack during the crisis at hand and also to send a message to any hostile third parties that they must never consider CBW use against the United States and its allies.

### CB attacks cause nuclear retaliation – despite promises against it.

Utgoff 97 (Victor A., “Nuclear Weapons and the Deterrence of Biological and Chemical Warfare”, Occasional Paper, no. 36, Washington DC, The Henry L. Stimson Center)

The paper concludes with four implications of this analysis. Fist, any prewar declaration promising no nuclear retaliation for CB attacks cannot be counted on to hold in the aftermath of such an attack, at least under present conditions.nuclear retaliation is seen at the time to offer the best prospects for suppressing further CB attacks and speeding the defeat of the aggressor, and if the original attacks had caused sever damage that had outraged American or allied publics, nuclear retaliation would be more than just a possibility, whatever promises had been made.

### Bioweapons cause extinction.

Ochs 2. [Richard, BS in Natural Resource Management from Rutgers University, with honors, BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MUST BE IMMEDIATELY ABOLISHED, http://www.freefromterror.net/other\_articles/abolish.html]

Of all the weapons of mass destruction, the genetically engineered biological weapons, many without a known cure or vaccine, are an extreme danger to the continued survival of life on earth. Any perceived military value or deterrence pales in comparison to the great risk these weapons pose just sitting in vials in laboratories. While a "nuclear winter," resulting from a massive exchange of nuclear weapons, could also kill off most of life on earth and severely compromise the health of future generations, they are easier to control. Biological weapons, on the other hand, can get out of control very easily, as the recent anthrax attacks has demonstrated. There is no way to guarantee the security of these doomsday weapons because very tiny amounts can be stolen or accidentally released and then grow or be grown to horrendous proportions. The Black Death of the Middle Ages would be small in comparison to the potential damage bioweapons could cause. Abolition of chemical weapons is less of a priority because, while they can also kill millions of people outright, their persistence in the environment would be less than nuclear or biological agents or more localized. Hence, chemical weapons would have a lesser effect on future generations of innocent people and the natural environment. Like the Holocaust, once a localized chemical extermination is over, it is over. With nuclear and biological weapons, the killing will probably never end. Radioactive elements last tens of thousands of years and will keep causing cancers virtually forever. Potentially worse than that, bio-engineered agents by the hundreds with no known cure could wreck even greater calamity on the human race than could persistent radiation. AIDS and ebola viruses are just a small example of recently emerging plagues with no known cure or vaccine. Can we imagine hundreds of such plagues? HUMAN EXTINCTION IS NOW POSSIBLE.

## Deterrence Good: China War

### Strong nuclear deterrent key to prevent US-China war over Taiwan.

Dunn 7. [Lewis, former Assistant Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Summer, “Deterrence Today, Roles, Challenges and Responses,” IFRI Security Studies Center]

Unlike the case with Russia, a U.S.-China nuclear crisis or even confrontation is not inconceivable. Precipitous action by Taiwan could be one trigger; a decision by Chinese officials to act against Taiwan another. In any such confrontation over Taiwan, it is conceivable that Chinese officials could miscalculate the readiness of the United States to support Taiwan. Chinese officials also could miscalculate their ability to manage the risks of escalation. In that regard, some Chinese experts have stated informally that such an asymmetry of stakes would put the United States at a fundamental disadvantage in any China-Taiwan-U.S. crisis. That is, in their view, given asymmetric stakes, the United States would be reluctant to escalate even after a Chinese limited use of a nuclear weapon.30 The U.S.-China strategic relationship also is characterized by mutual uncertainties about each other’s longer-term strategic intentions in both Washington and Beijing. In Washington, the scope and goals of China’s planned nuclear modernization as well as its readiness to play a constructive role in dealing with pressing non-proliferation problems remain open questions. Beijing’s decision to test an anti-satellite weapon in January, 2007 clearly reinforced those uncertainties. In Beijing, the scope and goals of U.S. deployment of missile defenses and advanced conventional weapons is being closely watched given concerns about a possible U.S. pursuit of a disarming first strike against China’s nuclear arsenal. For their part, China’s experts and officials have signaled that the scope and pace of China’s nuclear modernization is linked to those American deployments. So viewed, China is prepared to do whatever it takes to preserve a limited nuclear deterrent.31 Against this backdrop, the U.S. extended nuclear deterrent has a role to play in lessening the risk of Chinese miscalculation over Taiwan. More broadly, as suggested above, the American presence in Asia and the U.S. nuclear deterrent also is seen by some Japanese and other officials as a reassuring factor in the context of China’s growing military capabilities and political rise in Asia. U.S. officials need to continue to make clear U.S. support for a peaceful resolution of the Taiwan question. U.S. officials need to be prepared to counter Chinese perceptions that an asymmetry of stakes reduces the risks of China of threats or use of force should any confrontation over Taiwan occur. The steps set out above to buttress the U.S.- Japan and U.S.-Korea alliance relationship also provide a broader reassurance vis-à-vis China. Nonetheless, a U.S.-China confrontation over Taiwan is not inevitable. Indeed, unlike in the late 1990s and early 2000s, current Chinese thinking emphasizes the manageability of the Taiwan issue. Its resolution, so it seems, can be deferred for some time to come. The key is that Taiwan’s leadership exercises restraint on the matter of independence, a factor seen as more likely given the very extensive economic and people-topeople interaction across the Taiwan Straits. Moreover, China’s rise in Asia and globally need not result in growing instability and insecurity for the countries in that region. Rather both U.S. and Chinese interests – as well as those of China’s neighbors – would be well served by moving over time toward a non-adversarial strategic relationship as part of greater politicaleconomic- security cooperation.

### Extinction.

Straits Times -2K (Straits Times, June, 25, 2000, No one gains in war over Taiwan] (PDNSS2115)

THE DOOMSDAY SCENARIO -THE high-intensity scenario postulates a cross-strait war escalating into a full-scale war between the US and China. If Washington were to conclude that splitting China would better serve its national interests, then a full-scale war becomes unavoidable. Conflict on such a scale would embroil other countries far and near and -horror of horrors -raise the possibilityof a nuclear war. Beijing has already told the US and Japan privately that it considers any country providing bases and logistics support to any US forces attacking China as belligerent parties open to its retaliation. In the region, this means South Korea, Japan, the Philippines and, to a lesser extent, Singapore. If China were to retaliate, east Asia will be set on fire. And the conflagration may not end there as opportunistic powers elsewhere may try to overturn the existing world order. With the US distracted, Russia may seek to redefine Europe's political landscape. The balance of power in the Middle East may be similarly upset by the likes of Iraq. In south Asia, hostilities between India and Pakistan, each armed with its own nuclear arsenal, could enter a new and dangerous phase: Will a full-scale Sino-US war lead to a nuclear war? According to General Matthew Ridgeway, commander of the US Eighth Army which fought against the Chinese in the Korean War, the US had at the time thought of using nuclear weapons against China to save the US from military defeat. In his book The Korean War, a personal account of the military and political aspects of the conflict and its implications on future US foreign policy, Gen Ridgeway said that US was confronted with two choices in Korea -truce or a broadened war, which could have led to the use of nuclear weapons. If the US had to resort to nuclear weaponry to defeat China long before the latter acquired a similar capability, there is little hope of winning a war against China 50 years later, short of using nuclear weapons. The US estimates that China possesses about 20 nuclear warheads that can destroy major American cities. Beijing also seems prepared to go for the nuclear option. A Chinese military officer disclosed recently that Beijing was considering a review of its "non first use" principle regarding nuclear weapons. Major-General Pan Zhangqiang, president of the military-funded Institute for Strategic Studies, told a gathering at the Woodrow Wilson International Centre for Scholars in Washington that although the government still abided by that principle, there were strong pressures from the military to drop it. He said military leaders considered the use of nuclear weapons mandatory if the country risked dismemberment as a result of foreign intervention. Gen Ridgeway said that should that come to pass, we would see the destruction of civilization. There would be no victors in such a war. While the prospect of a nuclear Annaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

## Deterrence Good: Saudi Prolif

### Loss of credible U.S. extended deterrence leads to Saudi prolif

Scheber 9. [Thomas, Vice President of the National Institute for Public Policy, May, “Contemporary Challenges for Extended Deterrence,”]

Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and other predominantly Sunni states in the region have expressed a renewed interest in nuclear energy. This interest in nuclear technology by oil-rich states in the Middle East is judged by many to be a thinly veiled hedge against Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon capability. If Shi’a-dominated Iran is unchecked in its development of a nuclear arsenal, Sunni Muslims are likely to anticipate that they will be among the targets of coercion—or worse. On the margins of a UN meeting on December 16, 2008, six Arab states—Bahrain, Egypt, Jordan, Kuwait, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates—met with then-Secretary of State Rice and expressed their concern about Iran’s nuclear policies and its regional ambitions. A news report greatly understated their concern when it said, “these countries have very deep interests in how this issue is resolved.”8 Iran’s nuclear weapon aspirations could trigger nuclear proliferation by one or more of these countries who are not currently beneficiaries of U.S. extended nuclear guarantees. An official of the United Arab Emirates stated that the United States should consider countering an Iranian threat by offering Middle East allies Protection under a nuclear umbrella.9 Saudi officials are reported to have made statements that, in response to an Iranian nuclear threat, they would prefer to rely on a U.S. nuclear umbrella. However, if they believe the “United States lacks the will or capability to defend Saudi Arabia against a nuclear-armed Iran, Saudi Arabia is more likely to pursue a nuclear weapon capability of its own.” If needed, they would seek “a nuclear guarantee from Pakistan.”10

### Spurs Mid East arms race.

McInnis 5. [Kathleen J., coordinator of the Project on Nuclear Issues and a research associate at CSIS, “Extended Deterrence,” <http://www.twq.com/05summer/docs/05summer_mcinnis.pdf> ]

A recent UN report recently warned that “[w]e are approaching a point at which the erosion of the nonproliferation regime could become ir- reversible and result in a cascade of proliferation.” 1 One major challenge to the nonproliferation regime appearing on the strategic horizon is the likely development of an Iranian nuclear capability, which could spark a wave of pro- liferation throughout the Middle Eastern region. With this in mind, can U.S. nuclear, conventional, and missile defense capabilities help bolster the security of U.S. allies against the threats posed by Iranian nuclear proliferation? In addition to deterring its own adversaries, the U.S. nuclear arsenal has in the past played a vital but often overlooked role of reassuring U.S. allies against their adversaries. This assurance was a key tool in preventing nuclear proliferation among allies in the European and Asian theaters during the Cold War, despite the threat posed by the nuclear capabilities of their en- emies. In today’s security environment, assurance remains an important policy objective for the U.S. arsenal. The 2002 Nuclear Posture Review states that “U.S. nuclear forces will continue to provide assurance to secu- rity partners…. This assurance can serve to reduce the incentives for friendly countries to acquire nuclear weapons of their own to deter such threats and circumstances.” 2 Will this strategy work in practice? In the Asian theater, extended deterrence has been effective, and the United States possesses some decent options for ensuring its effectiveness in the future. The long-standing commitment of the United States to the sur- vival of democratic states in the region, reinforced by security treaties with Japan and South Korea, has created a great deal of U.S. political credibility in the region. This political credibility, combined with U.S. military capabili ties, could be employed to deter the North Korean threat and assure U.S. allies in the region, thereby reducing the chance that they will respond to Pyongyang by building their own nuclear weapons program. The U.S. political commitment to its allies in Asia has been and remains robust, bolstered by the U.S. troop presence in Japan and South Korea for the past 50 years. This remains true de- spite the drawdown of U.S. forces in the Asian theater. Furthermore, should al- lies begin to doubt U.S. nuclear assurances, steps can be taken to reinforce the policy’s credibility. As such, despite the major challenges presented by Pyongyang’s nuclear declaration in February 2005, it is reasonably likely that East Asian allies will continue to choose to rely on the U.S. nuclear umbrella well into the future rather than set off a regional nuclear domino effect. U.S. relationships in the Middle East, however, have a strikingly different character, more akin to hesitant engagement than to Washington’s well-es- tablished partnerships in Asia. A rising tide of Islamic fundamentalism, coupled with growing anti-U.S. sentiment, has strained these tenuous rela- tions. As then–Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security John Bolton recently stated, “Iranian nuclear capabilities would change the perceptions of the military balance in the region and could pose serious challenges to the [United States] in terms of deterrence and de- fense.” 3 One such challenge is the prospect of multiple nuclear powers emerg- ing in an already volatile Middle East. The outcome of this scenario depends in part on the capacity and credibility of U.S. strategic capabilities, includ- ing the nuclear deterrent. Ultimately, if key “nuclear dominos” in the re- gion, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, decide that U.S. security guarantees are insufficient, they may be tempted to acquire their own nuclear weapons. A U.S. extended deterrent policy in the Middle East would lack credibility, not due to a lack of physical capability or presence in the region, but rather as a result of the fragility of U.S. relations with its allies in the region, creat- ing a uniquely dangerous situation.

### Mideast arms race causes nuclear war

Blank 4. [Stephen, Prof @ the US Army War College, Spring Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations, Vol.3, No.1]

Even if we were not living in an age of military-technological revolution, the Revolution in Military Affairs (RMA) such regional security tendencies would have the following impacts. • All forms of conventional war in the Middle East now become possible simultaneously as nuclear power possession diffuses. Iran can employ terrorism against Israel or another state, relatively secure in the knowledge that it controls the escalation ladder and can turn this weapon on or off given its nuclear deterrence of even conventional warfare on the other side in response to the threat. These threats are not directed only at Israel but also can be directed at U.S. forces, installations, or allies, e.g. Saudi Arabia or the Gulf Emirates. They can be used in a time of “peace” to undermine the credibility of U.S. guarantees to its regional allies which ultimately take the form of guaranteed extended deterrence. Certainly possession by regional aspirants to hegemony would threaten the U.S.’ conventional ability to project power by targeting American or allied targets to deny U.S. forces access to bases, propositioned stocks, ports, or any kind of lodgment in the Middle East as a whole. • In that case, no six-month buildup in Saudi Arabia as in 1990 would now be possible. Nor would the kinds of strikes that the United States carried out against Iraq be feasible because ports, air bases, staging areas, and the like would be unavailable to it. Either U.S allies, fearing the prospect of becoming targets would deny it the access or it would just be too risky to employ those “platforms” given enemy capabilities. • States having even a minimum nuclear deterrent or WMD capability could then pursue conventional superiority over their neighbors or rivals regenerating the arms race at both ends throughout the region and further stressing already under developed local economies.83 • Not only would nuclear or chemical and biological weapons in the hands of rivals deter American and allied forces in the Middle East, the significance of nuclear weapons would change from being a primarily defensive weapons that ensured the status quo to being an offensive weapon with distinct uses in wartime beyond merely brandishing threats. That transformation would undermine one of the foundation stones of American global strategy since 1945 but it would also herald the return of limited (and possibly even unlimited) nuclear war as a viable operational mission.

## Impact Booster: Conflict Escalation

### Deterrence solves conflict escalation

GSO 5. [Global Security Organization. “Military: Force Projection.” April 27, 2005. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/library/policy/army/fm/100-7/f1007\_11.htm]

Deterrence is preferable to war. Effective deterrence can prevent escalation of a crisis. Deterrent action can resolve a crisis on favorable terms. When the opportunity exists, the use of a deterrent action, such as a show of force, can send a clear signal of US resolve to intervene should the threat of unfavorable crisis resolution continue.

## Turn: India Relations

### CTBT Ratification jacks US-Indian relations.

Gould 9. [Harold visiting scholar in the Centre for South Asian Studies at the University of Virginia, Camelot or estrangement: US-India relations in Obama era (Comment), 8-30 -- http://www.thaindian.com/newsportal/world-news/camelot-or-estrangement-us-india-relations-in-obama-era-comment\_100240132.html]

What remains questionable is how harmoniously this relationship will endure when the differences in perspective between the new administration and its predecessor surface on the critical issues of non-proliferation and global climate change. In the words of Strobe Talbott: “Mr. Obama… is committed to ratifying the CTBT, strengthening the NPT, and pursuing other treaties to prevent the spread of dangerous material and technology.” Should this happen, the zone of ambiguity which benefitted the Talbott-Singh dialogue will disappear, which will pave the way for the re-entry of the non-proliferation hardliners back into the fray, and lead to US-Indian relations, including the strategic agreement, relapsing back into ‘estrangement’.

### Relations key to prevent Indo-Pak war.

Willard 9. [Adm. Robert F., commander of the Pacific Fleet, CQ Congressional Testimony, Senate Armed Services Committee --- Joint Chiefs, Pacific Command Nominations, 7-10]

“India’s growing economic, diplomatic and military power makes them a key player not only in South and Central Asia but globally as well,” said Admiral Robert Willard, in his confirmation hearing for Commander of US Pacific Command on Thursday. “A strong positive relationship with India is essential to achieving long-term US goals such as regional security and stability, reduced tensions with Pakistan, and wide-ranging cooperation to counter extremism,” he told the Senate Armed Services committee. “We should continue to expand our military-to-military engagement to include multi-lateral partners and increasingly complex exercise scenarios that help to advance India’s military capabilities,” the admiral said in written responses to questions from the panel. “In coordination with US Central Command, we will develop confidence building measures and events that help reduce India-Pakistan tension and support the greater US- Afghanistan-Pakistan Strategy,” he said.

### India Pakistan war escalates to extinction.

Fai -01 (Ghulam Nabi, Executive Director, Kashmiri American Council, Washington Times, 7-8)

The foreign policy of the United States in South Asia should move from the lackadaisical and distant (with India crowned with a unilateral veto power) to aggressive involvement at the vortex. The most dangerous place on the planet is Kashmir, a disputed territory convulsed and illegally occupied for more than 53 years and sandwiched between nuclear-capable India and Pakistan. It has ignited two wars between the estranged South Asian rivals in 1948 and 1965, and a third could trigger nuclear volleys and a nuclear winter threatening the entire globe. The United States would enjoy no sanctuary.