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A. No PGS now – START killed it.

Brookes 5/15 (Peter, Senior Fellow for National Security Affairs [http://www.realclearpolitics.com/ articles/2010/05/15/a\_late\_look\_at\_a\_troubling\_treaty\_105593.html] AD: 6/30/10)JM

That's right: Moscow can actually raise the number of its launch/delivery platforms under new START. In other words, the "reduction" in START applies mostly to us . . . \* US conventional warheads on ICBMs are counted toward the treaty's nuclear-warhead limit. This would strangle Prompt Global Strike -- a new ICBM armed with a non-nuclear payload that could be used globally on short notice. That sort of quick, reach-out-and-touch-you capability would sure be nice if you knew where Osama bin Laden was going to be in an hour but didn't have any forces nearby. The same is true for other quick-turnaround military scenarios that don't require nukes, such as taking out a WMD-armed ballistic missile ready for launch or vaporizing some counterspace weapons before they strike your satellites.

B. Even if the U.S acquired PGS, use would be minimal.

ACA 8 (Arms Control Association, nonpartisan organization promoting public understanding of and support for arms control, September 3, [http://www.armscontrol.org/print/2384] AD: 6/30/10)JM

In addition to being used against terrorists, the panel said prompt global strike systems could be employed at the outset, or “leading edge,” of major combat operations. In such a scenario, the panel cautioned that misinterpretation risks would rise. The brief time frames associated with prompt global strike also present difficulties, according to the panel. It stated that getting accurate and reliable short-notice data on a target would be a “daunting challenge” and warned that decision-makers would have to rapidly weigh potential collateral damage and other risks. The panel predicted that the actual use of prompt global strike weapons would be rare, numbering “at most a few dozen” instances during their first decade of service. It calculated that “only a few terrorist leaders would merit use of such a weapon.”

C. **Overseas basing is the key justification for stopping PGS use – without it, Congress spurs PGS use.**

Manzo 8 (Vince, Center for Defense Information Research Assistant, [http://www.cdi.org/pdfs/PGSfactsheet.pdf] AD: 7/2/10)JM

In light of these risks and potential operational complications, it is worth questioning the rationale of the PGS program. The Pentagon has not demonstrated why strategically deployed forward operating bases do not provide sufficient rapid strike capabilities against rogue states and terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), the two most frequently cited justifications for a PGS capability. Similarly, if the United States possesses the rapid and precise intelligence gathering capability necessary to execute a PGS, this capability by itself may create alternative options that obviate the need for a rapid military strike. In addition to questions about the primary rationale for PGS, the question of whether or not the United States will ever possess the commensurate intelligence capabilities to execute a PGS casts doubt on the feasibility of the PGS concept. Nevertheless, interest in PGS capability within the Pentagon and in Congress remains strong. The Fiscal Year 2009 (FY 09) House and Senate defense authorization bills recommend additional funding for DOD efforts to achieve a PGS capability with hypersonic vehicle technology. Since PGS can be implemented in many different ways, it gives DOD a broad mandate to pursue a variety of new weapon systems. As this report demonstrates, the Pentagon may not closely examine the political and strategic implications of every weapon system it explores; it may also fail to develop the commensurate enabling capabilities that are necessary for these systems to execute a PGS. Therefore, it is imperative that Congress exercise strict oversight over all aspects of any PGS program. For starters, Congress should make further funding of PGS weapons system studies contingent upon their verifiable inclusion of enabling capabilities. The Rationale for a Prompt Global Strike Capability The U.S. PGS program aims to provide the president with the ability to plan and deliver limited duration and extended range strikes anywhere on the globe in less than one hour. The 2001 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) formally introduced the global strike concept as part of a new triad that integrates conventional and nuclear force options into an offensive strike capability suited for the 21st century: “To meet the nation’s defense goals in the 21st century, the first leg of the New Triad, the offensive strike leg, will go beyond the Cold War Triad…with non-nuclear strategic capabilities that strengthen the credibility of our offensive deterrence.”1 Gen. James Cartwright of the Marines, the former commander of U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM), argued in a 2006 congressional hearing that a PGS capability is necessary because “it is unlikely that we will have forces in every place we need them at the crucial moment when have an opportunity to stop a WMD-armed threat far from our shores.”2 Based on this justification, two critical assumptions underlying PGS are that elusive threats to U.S. national security can emerge and that the United States must possess the capability to strike rapidly without relying on existing forward bases. Therefore, the rationale for the PGS mission is that new capabilities are required to effectively respond to new threats.

1NC (2/2)

D. PGS kills non proliferation efforts leading to Taiwanese conflict.

Davis and Dodd 6 (Ian and Robin, independent human security and arms control consultants, [http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Papers/BP51.pdf] AD: 6/29/10)JM

The PGS capability also raises serious non-proliferation issues. First, it is likely to lead to a new arms race in ballistic missiles and countermeasures as other countries seek to match the US system and/or seek to protect their sovereignty by building weapon systems to counter US capabilities. It seems likely, for example, that other nuclear powers, such as China and Russia, would embark on similar SLBM and ICBM conversion projects. This could in turn ratchet up the potential for major armed conflict in areas, such as the Taiwan Straits, where tensions already run high. Second, PGS clearly undermines ballistic missile non-proliferation efforts, such as the 2002 Hague Code of Conduct Against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, which calls for greater restraint in developing, testing, using, and spreading ballistic missiles.22 At the signing of the Code, John Bolton, then US Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, affirmed US support for it, but also highlighted a number of qualifying factors and reservations. One such reservation concerning pre-launch notifications was that the United States ‘reserves the right in circumstances of war to launch ballistic missile and space-launch vehicles without prior notification’.23 If the US administration is also asserting its ‘right’ to pre-emptive launch of a PGS capability the Code is as good as dead and buried. Third, it will lower the threshold of use for such weapons. And as Steve Andreason, a former US Nation Security Council staffer has pointed out: “Long-range ballistic missiles have never been used in combat in 50 years”. But once the United States starts indicating that it views these missiles as no different than any other weapon, “other nations will adopt the same logic”, he said.24 4

E. The aftermath of the war is extinction.

Cheong 2k (Ching, senior journalist with the Strait Times, June 25, 2000, lexis, AD: 6/21/10)JM

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 possibility of 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 Armaggedon over Taiwan might seem inconceivable, it cannot be ruled out entirely, for China puts sovereignty above everything else.

\*\*\*Uniqueness\*\*\*

UQ – No Support

No PGS now – status quo doesn’t have the will.

Gormley 9 (Dennis M., Senior Fellow at Center for Non-Proliferation Studies, Fall, [http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite\_defense/PP29\_Gormley.pdf] AD: 6/30/10)JM

Arming Trident with a conventional warhead is not the only way to deal with fleeting terrorist targets. As examined earlier in this paper, the combination of U.S Special Forces on the ground and armed Predator UAVs in the air represents a potent and now broadly used new capability to deal with fleeting targets. The NRC panel noted the importance of UAVs and special forces as sources of intelligence supporting conventional Trident strikes, which begs the question: why can’t less provocative capabilities – if perhaps less effective under some circumstances – obviate the need for conventional Trident in regard to this limited mission?70 Another option to evaluate would be a new missile altogether, rather than one with a nuclear legacy, like the U.S. Navy’s concept of a “Sea-Launched Global Strike Missile”, or even the Navy’s effort to develop a supersonic version of the Tomahawk cruise missile.71 For the time being, the Obama administration and Congress have taken an appropriate time out with Prompt Global Strike, which will surely not allay Russian concerns over the long run. But it does provide space to consider future prompt-strike missile options and their effect on military stability in the context of a world that may well become far less dependent on long-range, nuclear-armed ballistic missiles in future. Research and development programs attempting to achieve technological breakthroughs in global strike capabilities by 2025 are, frankly speaking, problematic at best. These include the hypersonic cruise vehicle that could take off and land from a U.S runway and be anywhere in the world in one to two hours. The idea for such a space plane has been around since the 1950s.72 President Ronald Reagan accelerated the push in his 1986 State of the Union Address, yet his director of the Strategic Defense Initiative (Star Wars), Henry Cooper, told a congressional panel in 2001 that after the expenditure of some $4 billion on the development of the space plane concept from the early 1970s to the end of the 1990s (discounting various programs in the 1950s and 1960s, as well as the space shuttle investment), the only thing produced was “one crashed vehicle, a hangar queen, some drop-test articles and static displays”.73 Current Pentagon hypersonic programs face, among many, the difficult challenge of developing lightweight and durable high-temperature materials and thermal management techniques needed to cope with hypersonic speeds. This is because hypersonic glide vehicles require a thermal protection system capable of preventing their payloads from melting at reentry speeds of up to Mach 25 (or 25 times the speed of sound). The quest to master and deploy hypersonic systems will not come easily, not only because of the huge technical challenges associated with these systems but also because the strategic environment is so uncertain. No defense agency would likely be willing to bet on any one solution to the global-strike requirement under such circumstances. However, the U.S. Congress appears to have chosen to continue down the risky and potentially costly path of pursuing hypersonic delivery vehicles. If nothing else, this course removes the nearer-term solutions like conventional Trident from becoming any kind of impediment to progress in strategic arms control negotiations.

UQ – No Use

PGS systems won’t be used because of the risk of an accident with Russia

Podvig 7 (Pavel, Researcher at the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University, “Conventional Trident is Back?”<http://russianforces.org/blog/2007/04/conventional_trident_is_back.shtml>)KFC

Finally, there is a lot of talk about confidence-building measures that are supposed to provide Russia with "assurance strategy", but nobody has seen those measures yet. In fact, the only "confidence-building measure" that has been discussed so far was how to get rid of that launch notification agreement, since the 24-hour notification of launch it requires is certainly incompatible with the idea of Prompt Global Strike. As I understand, the ideas that are circulating in the military are that that agreement does not cover "operational launches". In other words, Russia is going to be told that the agreement that was designed to prevent accidents will not cover the events that carry the biggest risk of an accident. It's a very strange idea of confidence-building.

UQ – Funding

No PGS now – Congress is refusing funding.

Davis and Dodd 6 (Ian and Robin, independent human security and arms control consultants, [http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Papers/BP51.pdf] AD: 6/29/10)JM

The ‘stand-off’ nature of any fully operational PGS system, and therefore lack of risk to US military personnel, at first sight appears to offer any President a military option at a politically acceptable price. However, many US lawmakers are reportedly highly sceptical of the PGS concept and have twice before turned down funding requests for this same concept (once after 9/11 and again in 2003/04). Not only do tests such as ‘Divine Strake’ suggest a lowering of the nuclear threshold but also the idea of launching conventional SLBMs or Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs) creates a dangerous international ambiguity.

Funding has been cut for the program.

Pike 4/27 (John, one of the world's leading experts on defense, space and intelligence policy, [http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/systems/ctm.htm] AD: 6/29/10)JM

Consistent with the House-passed FY2007 bill authorizing appropriations for the Defense Department, the House Appropriations Committee recommends $30,000,000 in RDT&E, Navy for development of a modification to the Trident Weapon System to accommodate non-nuclear payloads. The President's budget included $127,000,000 for this program, including $77,000,000 in research and development and $50,000,000 in procurement accounts. The Committee believes the proposed schedule for this program is unrealistic, and prejudges the outcome of internal planning and programming reviews, including the analysis of alternatives and the vetting and documentation of operational requirements. While agreeing to provide some funds for this new start, the Committee remains concerned that important strategic, international, and operational considerations have not been fully addressed, and the Department's acquisition community has not completed its review. The FY2008 budget requested $175.4 million. But the Conventional TRIDENT Modification (CTM) program was "cancelled" in FY08 Appropriations Bill and funding was realigned to a defense-wide account [0604165D8Z - Prompt Global Strike Program] to investigate all prompt global strike alternatives and technologies.

DoD support of PGS is irrelevant – insiders indicate Congress will not allow its development.

Clark 8 (Colin, reporter on national security for Congressional Quarterly and editor of Defense News, May 2nd, [http://defensetech.org/2008/05/02/prompt-global-strike-not-quite-there-yet/] AD: 6/29/10)JM

UPDATE: One congressional aide told me: “Global strike, particularly long-range conventional prompt global strike, hasnt come very far since its inception in the 2001 Nuclear Posture Review. One of the reasons is that the Administrations preferred approach — Conventional Trident Modification — was a non-starter with a majority of congress. It took DoD a number of years before this fact set in. There now appears to be consensus in Congress for this type of capability; it will be up to the next administration to put forth a technically and operationally viable concept that is also politically acceptable.”

UQ – Brink

The military is holding back on Conventional Tridents now but they’ll push them if they have to – they’re the only near term capability that fulfills Global Strike

Sweetman, 9 (Bill, editor and chief of Defense Technology International, “Instant Sunshine,” Defense Technology International, Sept. 1, http://www.aviationweek.com/aw/generic/story.jsp?id=news/NUKE090309.xml&headline=U.S.%20Rethinks%20Nuclear%20Strategy&channel=defense)KFC

A new deterrent posture could include conventional ballistic missiles (CBMs), a new factor in deterrence, but so far more dangerous to careers than to adversaries. Asked about CBMs at the Space and Missile Defense Conference in Huntsville, Ala., in August, Marine Corps Gen. James E. Cartwright, vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, responded: "You want to see the scar tissue?" The case for CBMs is strong. "The only systems that we have that can get to the fight in minutes have been nuclear warheads," Cartwright says. "Is that prudent? It is relevant, in that the enemy believes we will use it." Air Force Gen. (ret.) Eugene Habiger, involved in the CBM effort, notes, however, "a 1,000-lb. conventional warhead with a few meters CEP (circular error probable) has the same effect as 50 kilotons at 3,000 ft." CBM, Habiger told the Omaha conference, "was a great idea. The Navy calculated that they could provide 100 CBMs for $500 million. But Stratcom didn't get the regional [commanders-in-chief] involved to persuade the secretaries of State and Defense that we needed it, and that was a great way to kill it." However, as Cartwright noted, the initial CBM--Conventional Trident--is being brought to a point where it could be fielded within 18 months (as Congress directed). Also, tests being conducted in "four to five months" will demonstrate technologies to deal with "ambiguity issues"--the problem of demonstrating that a missile launch is not nuclear. "That's seen as more of a way forward."

UQ – Timeframe

No PGS until 2020.

Sanger and Shanker 4/22 (David E. and Thom, reporters for the New York Times, [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/23/world/europe/23strike.html] AD: 6/28/10)JM

Under the Obama plan, the Prompt Global Strike warhead would be mounted on a long-range missile to start its journey toward a target. It would travel through the atmosphere at several times the speed of sound, generating so much heat that it would have to be shielded with special materials to avoid melting. (In that regard, it is akin to the problem that confronted designers of the space shuttle decades ago.) But since the vehicle would remain within the atmosphere rather than going into space, it would be far more maneuverable than a ballistic missile, capable of avoiding the airspace of neutral countries, for example, or steering clear of hostile territory. Its designers note that it could fly straight up the middle of the Persian Gulf before making a sharp turn toward a target. The Pentagon hopes to deploy an early version of the system by 2014 or 2015. But even under optimistic timetables, a complete array of missiles, warheads, sensors and control systems is not expected to enter the arsenal until 2017 to 2020, long after Mr. Obama will have left office, even if he is elected to a second term.

UQ – Reducing Talks

There are talks of reducing TNWs between Russia and the US

The Voice of Russia 10 (Apr 1, 2010, <http://english.ruvr.ru/2010/04/01/5899853.html>)KFC

The U.S Assistant Secretary for weapons control and international security, Ellen Toscher says that the U.S President, Barack Obama now wants to discuss with Russia a possible reduction of tactical nuclear weapons after the signing of the START agreement. She said that the START agreement creates a healthy atmosphere for the strengthening of the nonproliferation treaty. Russia welcomes all the U.S intentions about nuclear disarmament, but while hailing the desire of the current incumbent in the White House to rid the world of nuclear arms, two important things should be pointed out. First, the Russian head of state has repeatedly been canvassing that idea, meaning that Obama is not a pioneer or path finder. It is extremely important though that both leaders are ready to work toward achieving the most desirable goal. In the middle of the last century, the then leaders of the demised Soviet Union proposed for the first time that mankind should be rid of nuclear threat once and for all time. It is quite possible, as several experts contend, that it was a pure propaganda gimmick, but the thinking of the then Soviet leaders was in the right direction, and if their suggestion had been heeded, the world would not be in the terrible situation that it now finds itself. Moscow has been proposing to Washington for many years, that they should start talks aimed at reducing the numbers of their tactical nuclear weapons, but in February this year, the Russian foreign minister, Sergei Lavrov declared that it has proved impossible to make American partners listen to Russia's appeal. Russian leaders say that before the talks about cutting back on the numbers of tactical arms can take off, both sides must agree to remove such weapons from Europe. The U.S still has plenty of tactical weapons in Britain, Germany, Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey. Russia on the other hand, has tactical weapons only on its own territory. The ball is in the American court. If the U.S is serious and sincere about wanting to start negotiations on the reduction of tactical arms, it should begin to remove its stockpile of the weapons from Europe. It can and should be done; parliaments in Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Luxemburg and Norway have asked Washington to take away its tactical arms from their countries, the more so, that NATO is currently re-examining its strategic concept.

UQ – Laundry List

PGS won’t be funded in the status quo—START, Budget, and fears of miscalculation

Gormley 9(Dennis, Senior Fellow@Monterey Institute, Fall, “The Path to Deep Nuclear Reductions: Dealing with American Conventional Superiority”, http://cns.miis.edu/other/PP29\_Gormley.pdf, Accessd 6/29/10)jn

Where does Prompt Global Strike stand today in the aftermath of Barack Obama’s election and the Democrats taking decisive control of both houses of the U.S. Congress? The Next-Generation Bomber, originally slated for deployment by 2018, has been delayed not only because of budget limitations but also due to uncertainties with respect to what kind of impact current Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) renewal will have on the mix of nuclear delivery systems. 66 According to congressional staff member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, there is no longer any prospect for either Trident or Minuteman land-based nuclear missiles undergoing conversion to meet the Pentagon’s requirement for prompt conventional strikes, while research funding for hypersonic glide vehicles will remain in place, but without prospect for any deployment decisions any time soon. 67 As one senior U.S. Strategic Command officer evinced to this writer recently, “Global Strike has been throttled back”. 68 One might argue, of course, and the Russians do, that the requirement for converting Trident might be resurrected in future. They surely observed that an independent study panel of the bipartisan National Research Council (NRC) had endorsed a limited application for the conventionally-armed Trident before the 2008 election. The NRC panel only gave its support for the mission of a time-critical strike against a fleeting target of opportunity (e.g., counterterrorist target or rogue state activity), which would involve no more than one to four weapons. The U.S. Navy had pressed for funding to convert two Trident missiles on each of 12 deployed Trident submarines for a total of 24 conventionally armed Tridents. Importantly, the NRC panel drew a distinction between the more limited mission and conventional Trident’s broader application. The limited use would not carry the same stiff operational and political demands as a larger use of conventional Trident would in providing leading edge attacks in support of major combat operations. In the latter regard, Trident would probably join substantial numbers of Tomahawks and other PGMs on bombers as part of a counterforce strike at the outset of a major regional contingency. The NRC panel properly noted that in contrast to using one to four Tridents alone, any large-scale prompt conventional strike would present much stiffer operational demands related to intelligence support and command and   control, as well as drastically different political implications with regard to warning ambiguity. Whether the contingency involves using one or many conventional Tridents, as the NRC panel observed, “the ambiguity between nuclear and conventional payloads can never be totally resolved . . .”. 69 Yet, the larger the Trident salvo of conventional missiles, the higher the prospects for misinterpretation and inadvertent responses. At the same time, because Russian early-warning systems are incomplete, even smaller numbers may be wrongly interpreted as a larger-than-actual salvo or incoming missiles. Concerns about ambiguity leading to inadvertent nuclear war – rightly or wrongly conceived – largely explain the congressional decision not to support conventional Trident’s funding.

No PGS—funding

Bennett 9(John, Reporter@Defense News, June 4, “Cartwright: U.S. Force-Sizing, Basing Strategy Need Overhaul”, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4123641&c=AME&s=LAN, accessed 6/29/10)

Additionally, Cartwright said he continues to press for development of a new weapon that would allow Washington to take out a fleeting target in a manner of minutes. The Marine Corps general said he has concluded conventionally armed bombers are "too slow and too intrusive" for many "global strike missions." Cartwright for several years has advocated for a "prompt global strike" weapon, which would be ultra-fast and fitted with a conventional warhead. Congress, due largely to worries that other nations, like Russia, would be unable to quickly determine whether an in-flight warhead was nuclear, has refused to fund the program.

UQ – AT: NPR

NPR commitment to PGS is irrelevant – it empirically changes nothing.

Kaplan 3/3 (Fred, journalist for Slate magazine with a PhD in poli sci from MIT, [http://www.slate.com/id/2246737/pagenum/all/#p2] AD: 7/2/10)JM

This posture review, like the two before it (the first under Bill Clinton in 1994, the second under Bush in 2002), will almost certainly not result in anything new, even if it alleges otherwise. Even if President Barack Obama does pursue some new nuclear policies, this document will have had little to do with it. Whatever fuss the review kicks up, four facts are clear. First, there is no substantial constituency, in Congress or elsewhere, to build any new U.S. nuclear weapons, nor has there been for decades. Second, Obama has already said that he wants to slash the nuclear arsenal. There is no rational basis for not slashing it, but whether that happens will not be determined by the conclusions of an executive review. Third, whatever Obama says about the circumstances under which he'd use nuclear weapons (for instance, were he to say that he'd never use them first), there is no reason for other world leaders to believe him or to assume that some future president might view the matter differently. Fourth, however deeply the United States and Russia cut their nuclear arsenals, the move won't dissuade other nuclear wannabes from pursuing arsenals of their own. In other words, whatever this document ends up saying (and, apparently, there's still some internal debate on the fine points), it is unlikely to be a game-changer.

\*\*\*Links\*\*\*

Link – Drones/Troops

The presence of ground based military units stops PGS use – it makes it unnecessary .

Cirincione 4/23 (Joe, expert advisor to the Congressional Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United States, [http://www.ploughshares.org/news-analysis/blog/global-strikeout] AD: 6/29/10)JM

But does the United States need this capability? No. It is difficult to imagine a scenario in which the United States would use this weapon. The Pentagon has better weapons in its arsenal that, if updated, could accomplish long-range strikes. Joint Chiefs of Staff Vice Chairman Gen. James Cartwright favors using modern, precision-guided conventional munitions to replace nuclear weapons now assigned to such missions. He's right. The United States is currently fighting two wars against enemies with no air defenses, planes, or ships. The terrorists and insurgents on the other side are effectively handled by ground forces, tactical air forces, and, increasingly, drones. Drones are already deployed, and they can track and kill fleeting targets. Why would the U.S. military need to launch a missile from California to deliver a bomb to a cave in Afghanistan, when it already has drones on bases, ready to drop a bomb within minutes?

Link – Troops

A reduction in overseas forces spurs PGS use.

Bille and Lorenz 1 (Matt, ANSER, and Major Rusty, AFSPC/DRM, May, [http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA394591] AD: 7/1/10)JM

Why PGS? • Threats to US interests have multiplied, diverged since end of Cold War • Forward-Deployed and –Deployable Forces (FDFs) limited in number, very expensive, and face antiaccess strategies • Adding a PGS as complement to FDFs could allow faster, cheaper response with reduced risk Air Force Doctrine Document 1 (AFDD-1): "US forces overseas have been reduced significantly, while rapid power projection based in the continental United States has become the predominant military strategy."

Overseas basing is keeping the DoD from needing to develop PGS.

Borger 3 (Julian, reporter for the Guardian, 6/30/3, [http://www.rense.com/general38/superwp.htm]AD: 7/2/10)JM

The Pentagon is planning a new generation of weapons, including huge hypersonic drones and bombs dropped from space, that will allow the US to strike its enemies at lightning speed from its own territory. Over the next 25 years, the new technology would free the US from dependence on forward bases and the cooperation of regional allies, part of the drive towards self-sufficiency spurred by the difficulties of gaining international cooperation for the invasion of Iraq.

Link – Bases

When the US can’t use overseas bases, it will resort to global strike capabilities.

Meilinger 8 (Phillip, retired Col. of the USAF, *Air & Space Power Journal*, Spring, p. 64)JM

The United States requires access to overseas bases near a crisis area. In operation Iraqi freedom, the Air force used 36 air bases, many of which it had to hastily construct or upgrade. This is not a new problem. Air operations at the beginning of both the Korean and vietnam Wars were constrained by a shortage of air bases having the requisite runways, ramp space, utilities access, and maintenance facilities.3 Air Base Politics As mentioned above, we may not have assured access in future crises for two reasons. the first is political: a country may prove unwilling to allow US military forces to use its soil or overfly its territory. It may wish to help but nonetheless demur due to disagreements over US objectives, domestic concerns, or fear of reprisal.4 We witnessed a demonstration of the first case during Iraqi freedom when france and Germany did not agree that an invasion of Iraq was necessary and lent no support to the US-led effort. Similarly, after operation Desert Storm, Saudi Arabia was reluctant to allow US aircraft to use its bases for strikes against Iraq because of domestic opinion. furthermore, Spain’s withdrawal from Iraq in 2004 after a terrorist attack on the Madrid train system showed how reprisals can dictate government policy.5 operational flexibility and foreign-policy initiatives can mitigate these concerns. thus, despite the denial of airfields in Saudi Arabia, facilities in Kuwait, bahrain,Qatar, Pakistan, and elsewhere proved sufficient. Yet, the coalition air commander in Iraqi freedom—t. Michael “buzz” Moseley, then a lieutenant general— warned that the United States could not count on such bases: “In the future, we will require deep strike capabilities to penetrate and engage high-value targets during the first minutes of hostilities anywhere in the battlespace.”6 In short, we have assumed that if a country is in trouble and requests our help, then it will make bases available for our use. now, however, the United States finds itself in need. We require bases in order to prosecute the war on terrorism. Will they be available?

Link – Nukes

Decreased reliance on nukes increases PGS use – empirically proven.

Grossman 8 (Elaine, reporter with Global Security Newswire, Nov 7, [http://gsn.nti.org/gsn/ts\_20081107\_5200.php] AD: 6/30/10)JM

WASHINGTON — With the U.S. Congress having eliminated funds for a Bush administration proposal to develop a new nuclear warhead for the second year in a row, the focus of the strategic arms budget for fiscal 2009 has largely turned to conventional weaponry (see GSN, Sept. 15). (Nov. 7) - Hypersonic Test Vehicle technology, developed by the Air Force and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, could be used in the first conventional “prompt global strike” weapon (U.S. Defense Departmentl). The trend might just sit well with President-elect Barack Obama, who said last year that, if voted into the White House, he would “take the lead to work for a world in which the roles and risks of nuclear weapons can be reduced and ultimately eliminated.” The impending rise of long-range conventional arms comes principally in the form of two futuristic efforts: an Air Force “Conventional Strike Missile” and an Army “Advanced Hypersonic Weapon.” These are the leading candidates to become “prompt global strike” weapons, which defense leaders envision as a partial alternative to nuclear arms under limited circumstances (see GSN, Oct. 29). For the new fiscal year, Congress has appropriated nearly $82 million to develop prompt strike weapons, while zeroing a requested $33 million in Defense and Energy department funds for design work on a Reliable Replacement Warhead to upgrade the nuclear stockpile. "A nuclear weapon is still a viable part of our inventory, but ... one size does not fit all," Gen. James Cartwright — at the time the top U.S. strategic commander — told a Senate Armed Services panel in March 2006. "What we'd like to do is ... field a [conventional] weapon that will give us a broader and potentially more appropriate choice for the nation." For the emerging conventional mission, the Defense Department seeks the capacity to attack targets anywhere around the world within 60 minutes of a launch order. Commanders have said such a capability could be crucial if the nation were confronted by a serious but fleeting threat, such as a terrorist leader pinpointed at a safe house or a weapon of mass destruction being readied for firing by a rogue nation. Currently, the only U.S. weapons with sufficient range and speed to undertake the mission are nuclear-armed ballistic missiles. As a U.S. president would be unlikely to launch a nuclear weapon against such targets, conventional ballistic missiles should be developed that might be used more readily, defense leaders have argued (see GSN, May 28). “In light of the appropriately extreme reluctance to use nuclear weapons, conventional prompt global strike could be of particular value in some important scenarios in that it would eliminate the dilemma of having to choose between responding to a sudden threat either by using nuclear weapons or by not responding at all,” stated an August report by a National Academy of Sciences panel (see GSN, Aug. 15).

Link – Troop Takeout

Troop withdrawal would further the defensive shield of the US

Juul 9 (Peter, guardian.co.uk, 24 July 2009, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/cifamerica/2009/jul/23/clinton-iran-defence-umbrella-gulf)KFC

In the wake of the Iranian elections, the Obama administration has probably downgraded its own internal estimates of the prospects for the success of talks with Iran on the nuclear issue. After all, if the Iranian government can't obey its own internal rules, how can the US trust it to hold to an international agreement? Still, the administration wants to give talks with Tehran a shot at success. As Clinton herself put it: "We will still hold the door open." What Clinton's remarks should do is start a debate on what the security system of the Persian Gulf should look like after the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq in 2011. Since the end of the cold war, the US has used its military power to manage the security problems of the Gulf. But with the withdrawal of US troops from Iraq, the US will be stepping back from a direct role in Gulf security for the first time in over two decades. Talk of a defensive umbrella for US allies in the Gulf indicates that the US is trying to create a more self-sustaining security architecture that requires outside involvement only in extremis. In the same interview in which she gave her defence umbrella remarks, Clinton said the US was "working to upgrade the defence of our partners in the region". With the exception of missile defence, however, America's Gulf allies have equipment that's far superior in both quantity and technological quality than Iran's.

Link – Troop withdrawal

If the US is not in the theater, we will use PGS

Reed 3/22 (John, 22 March 2010, http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4547989)KFC

As the U.S. military focuses on fighting in a world where it can no longer count on unfettered access to the airspace over hostile territories, the Pentagon is looking at developing a new generation of precision weapons that can penetrate 21st-century air defenses and hit targets from thousands of miles away. "In the future, U.S. forces conducting power-projection operations abroad will face myriad challenges," reads the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). It goes on to say that potential enemies like Iran and North Korea are acquiring a broad range of weapons and sensors aimed at impeding the deployment of U.S. forces to the theater and blunting the operations of those forces that deploy forward. In such an environment, the United States won't be able to position jets at forward bases or fly from aircraft carriers sailing near enemy coastlines to launch airstrikes. Even if U.S. jets can operate from bases or carriers near an enemy, next-generation air defense systems that are being sold around the world mean that only the most advanced jets will be capable of surviving over enemy territory in the future. To counter these new air defenses, the Pentagon wants to build a host of precision weapons that can hit any target from thousands of miles away. Known as a family of systems, these weapons could include whatever the Air Force chooses as its next bomber, a new set of cruise missiles and even, someday, hypersonic weapons developed under the Pentagon's Prompt Global Strike program that would give the speed and range of an ICBM to a conventional warhead.

Link – Forward Base

If there is not a forward base, PGS systems will be used

Shull 5 (Todd C., September 2005, http://www.nps.edu/Academics/Centers/CCC/research/StudentTheses/shull05.pdf)KFC

Given the difficulty the United States has experienced in its efforts to field a ballistic missile defense system designed to intercept relatively unsophisticated intercontinental missiles, one can safely assume that it will be some time before effective defenses against conventional PGS capabilities proliferate widely. Advanced air defenses are not the only threat or obstacle that adversaries may employ to deny U.S. forces access. Adversaries may threaten the use or actually use WMD against potential U.S. forward bases, which could delay effective combat operations pending elimination of the WMD threat. The threat of WMD use may also serve to limit the willingness of third-party nations to allow U.S. forces to operate from their territories or through their airspace. Conventional PGS weapons and other global strike platforms circumvent the first part of this anti-access strategy by operating from bases outside the range of the adversary’s offensive systems. The refusal to grant over-flight permission can significantly impair the utility of aircraft and cruise missiles to access the enemy’s territory. At best, these restrictions will only add distance to the mission. At worst, attacks against a land-locked country/target could be impossible without over-flight permission from the bordering nations. Operation EL DORADO CANYON against Libya on 14 to 15 April 1986 provides an example of the first possible outcome. A major portion of the U.S. attack plan relied on F-111F aircraft based in the United Kingdom. France and Spain denied the United States over-flight rights, so the strike aircraft had to fly a circuitous route over the Atlantic Ocean and then through the Straights of Gibraltar to gain access to the Mediterranean Sea and Libya.272 The route flown was easily twice as far as would have been necessary with French or Spanish over-flight permissions that resulted in a 13-hour round trip for the F-111s.273 It is easy to imagine a situation where the denial of over-flight rights by a third-party nation makes an attack impossible. For example, if the United States had been unable to gain over-flight rights from Pakistan in 2001, Operation ENDURING FREEDOM would have been significantly more difficult. Of course, if the national need is great enough, the United States could choose the diplomatically (and potentially militarily) risky option of penetrating the third-party’s airspace against their wishes.

\*\*\*Impacts\*\*\*

Impact – More Effective

The Minuteman missile system is not as effective as the PGS system.

Naval Studies Board 8 (US Conventional Prompt Global Strike, Natl Academies Press, p. 216)KFC

Early in the course of this study, the Committee on Conventional Prompt Global Strike Capability was indeed puzzled that the Department of Defense’s (DOD’s) list of actively considered options did not include putting a conventional warhead on the Minuteman III missile, since those missiles and operational procedures exist, are well understood, and have significant payload. Moreover, various possible applications for the missiles have been suggested over the years by scientific panels; conventional global strike seemed to be another natural application to consider. Upon further inquiry, however, the committee independently concluded that for reasons described below, the Minuteman option is not as attractive as the sea-based alternatives for the near term, and that it is not as attractive as a number of the longer-term options. The salient points are best read sequentially: • The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) of 1991 may well be extended, in which case using the Minuteman for conventional prompt global strike (CPGS) would probably require treaty modifications that would have to be negotiated with Russia and other countries, raising the possibility of complications, delays, and uncertainties. • If treaty issues did not exist, the Minuteman launched from current installations in California or Florida would often have to overfly Europe, Russia, or China, creating nontrivial risks of international incidents and possible ambiguities during crisis. • Deploying the Minuteman elsewhere, such as in Hawaii, which the committee analyzed, could largely avoid the overflight problems, but the political, economic, and procedural difficulties of introducing a new and secure operational base for strategic missiles, even if the missiles are few in number and conventionally armed, might prove considerable and cause delays. • Even if the basing difficulties could be resolved quickly, the Minuteman option proves not to have any particular attractions relative to the submarine-based approaches. Indeed, it would probably have to be modified to use something very similar to the Conventional Trident Modification’s (CTM’s) front end in order to achieve adequate accuracy and to build conservatively on past technology. Moreover, such a modification would take time and testing and would incur the difficulties that arise when one organization is asked to use technology developed by another (e.g., technology tested in a Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency [DARPA] program). The difficulties are not merely parochial, but also technical: organizations have rich infrastructures developed over decades, which include people with a great deal of tacit knowledge that must also somehow be captured and transferred. The Air Force might find it necessary or expedient to develop its own version of a CTM-like front end, in which case additional years might be required. Further, development risk would be higher than in the Navy’s incremental approach within a mature organization that has a long-term record of success with almost precisely the same components as in the CTM or CTM-2. • The committee reasoned, nonetheless, that if concerns about ambiguity problems in time of crisis were a dominant consideration, then perhaps the Minuteman option would nonetheless have some advantages. It should be possible to provide on-site inspections and persistent instrumentation that would provide nations such as Russia with a reasonably high level of assurance that any launches would contain conventional weapons (“reasonably high” because nearly any system of assurances could probably be defeated with sufficient cunning and lapses of diligence by the observer). However, the committee’s analysis concluded that with only modestly more creative measures, such assurances could be provided with submarine-based options (see Appendix H). For all of these reasons, then, as well as the fact that the DOD had earlier considered the option and rejected it, the committee did not analyze the Minuteman option to the same extent that it did the others.

Impact – Stability

PGS undermines international stability.

Davis and Dodd 6 (Ian and Robin, independent human security and arms control consultants, [http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Papers/BP51.pdf] AD: 6/29/10)JM

The launch of a conventionally armed ICBM brings an inherent risk of triggering a nuclear war. It seems likely, for example, that Russian and Chinese early warning radars would be unable to differentiate between US nuclear and conventional SLBM and/or ICBM launches, as the heat signatures of both would be the same.21 The ambiguity, by causing doubt and uncertainty, and possible delay in response, will also inevitably strengthen the capacity for a successful US nuclear first strike. Countries targeted by any ICBM strike would need to treat any attack as a nuclear one if they were to avoid being open to a successful surprise US nuclear first strike. This would contribute to instability, particularly if US commanders may at times be insensitive to the unintentional ramifications of the launch of a conventional ICBM.

Impact – Russia Relations

PGS systems are key to Russia relations

Gormley 9 (Dennis, Center for Nonproliferation Studies-Monterey Inst, *The path to deep nuclear reductions*, <http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite_defense/PP29_Gormley.pdf)KFC>

Arming Trident with a conventional warhead is not the only way to deal with fleeting terrorist targets. As examined earlier in this paper, the combination of U.S Special Forces on the ground and armed Predator UAVs in the air represents a potent and now broadly used new capability to deal with fleeting targets. The NRC panel noted the importance of UAVs and special forces as sources of intelligence supporting conventional Trident strikes, which begs the question: why can’t less provocative capabilities – if perhaps less effective under some circumstances – obviate the need for conventional Trident in regard to this limited mission?70 Another option to evaluate would be a new missile altogether, rather than one with a nuclear legacy, like the U.S. Navy’s concept of a “Sea-Launched Global Strike Missile”, or even the Navy’s effort to develop a supersonic version of the Tomahawk cruise missile.71 For the time being, the Obama administration and Congress have taken an appropriate time out with Prompt Global Strike, which will surely not allay Russian concerns over the long run. But it does provide space to consider future prompt-strike missile options and their effect on military stability in the context of a world that may well become far less dependent on long-range, nuclear-armed ballistic missiles in future.

Impact – Russia Relations

Russia wants three things – No missiles placed outside of jurisdiction, PGS systems be treated like all nukes, and the BMD system be removed.

Weitz 9 (Richard, Hudson Inst, 7-9, <http://www.eurasianet.org/departments/insightb/articles/eav070209a.shtml)KFC>

In return, they insist on resolving three issues separate from the weapons totals. First, they want to preserve START provisions prohibiting the stationing of strategic offensive weapons outside a country's national territory. Since Russian negotiators have not indicated they seek to restrict the patrols of strategic nuclear submarines and strategic bombers, this limit would presumably exclude the basing of long-range ballistic missiles in foreign countries or in outer space. Given that the Obama administration has no plans for such deployments, meeting this requirement should not be difficult. Second, Russian officials have demanded that the next address the so-called "prompt global strike" program developed by the George H. W. Bush administration. This Bush program would equip long-range ballistic missiles with conventional warheads in order to rapidly attack hard-to-reach targets, such as terrorists in Central Asia or Pakistan who have seized a nuclear weapon. Although Russian officials would like to prohibit this option because of the difficulties of determining whether an ICBM in flight has a conventional rather than a nuclear warhead, US negotiators have indicated they could accept the Russian fall-back position to count all warheads, whether nuclear or conventional, under a common ceiling in the next treaty. Third, Russian leaders have demanded that the United States address Russia's concerns that US ballistic missile defense programs (BMD) could threaten Russia's nuclear forces. In recent statements, Medvedev did not explicitly demand that the United States cancel the BMD systems planned for deployment in Poland and the Czech Republic. [For background see the Eurasia Insight archive]. Instead, the Russian president simply insisted that Washington acknowledge in the next treaty the inter-relationship between strategic offense and strategic defense.

PGS systems prevent Russia escalation and are efficient

Owens 8 (Randall, Col-USAF, AF War College, www.afresearch.org/skins/rims/q\_mod\_be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153/q\_act\_downloadpaper/q\_obj\_36454d29-b24a-412c-b445-515dacfadd7c/display.aspx)KFC

The use of a CSM or CTM in a theater of operations would require a cooperative approach to ease tensions and prevent an escalation of military activity by regional states. Specific measures to alleviate concern would include education and open dialogue. However, regional leaders will most likely not know of an attack until after the fact. As a preventive measure, the US could train and exercise with alliance and coalition partners in the region, including scenario building requiring the use of a PGS weapon. Of prime concern for the US would be its ability to acclimate the civilian and military leadership on the differences and unique circumstances required for a launch. This in turn would provide a better foundation to judge the appropriate regional reaction to such an event. The potential for an arms race or the development of defensive measures to counter the US use of a PGS weapon would likely involve current US near-peer competitors. However, the financial cost in the development of such a program would be high. The only nations capable of such an escalation would involve China and Russia. Current Chinese development and procurement of such a system is beyond reach at this time. Likewise, the chances of a missile launch against Russia seem remote given its weapons arsenal and retaliatory capability. Even without the introduction of a PGS weapon to a region, increasingly the US will be faced with the further proliferation of missile technology. As such, the US must take the lead in developing technology which will thwart attempts of rogue states or terrorist factions to achieve first-strike capability.

Impact – Terrorism

PGS systems are worth their risk to fight terrorism.

Arms Control Today 7 (<http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2007_06/GlobalStrike>)KFC

Still, the experts asserted that a prompt global strike capability is worth pursuing. “Given the pace of terrorism’s spread and the consequent uncertainty about where terrorist operations will occur, coupled with the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, a truly global capability may soon be required, if it is not required today,” the panel stated. In addition to being used against terrorists, the panel said prompt global strike systems could be employed at the outset, or “leading edge,” of major combat operations. In such a scenario, the panel cautioned that misinterpretation risks would rise. The brief time frames associated with prompt global strike also present difficulties, according to the panel. It stated that getting accurate and reliable short-notice data on a target would be a “daunting challenge” and warned that decision-makers would have to rapidly weigh potential collateral damage and other risks. The panel predicted that the actual use of prompt global strike weapons would be rare, numbering “at most a few dozen” instances during their first decade of service. It calculated that “only a few terrorist leaders would merit use of such a weapon.”

Impact – Nuclear War, Prolif

PGS triggers nuclear response and proliferation

Krepinevich and Kosiak 98(Andrew, defense policy analyst, and Steven, Director of Defense and International Affairs@The office of Management and Budget, *The Bulliten of the Atomic Sciences*, November/December, pg. 30-1) jn

On the other hand, there is a danger that the transition to a highly effective non-nuclear strategic strike capability could actually make nuclear war more likely, by blurring the distinction—or “firebreak”—between non-nuclear and nuclear capabilities. In other words, there is a danger that the United States will feel freer than it has in the past to conduct strategic strikes—because it will be able to do so without resorting to nuclear weapons. However, the country on the receiving end may not view the distinction as particularly meaningful and may well feel compelled to retaliate with nuclear weapons. Similarly, there is a danger that the development of an effective non-nuclear strategic strike capability by the United States—because it would appear to be much more usable than a nuclear strike capability—would increase the incentives for potential adversaries to acquire at least a small nuclear arsenal, so that they too would have their homeland, or at least some portion of strategic targets within it, accorded “sanctuary” status. This may be especially true with less developed countries, which may view the acquisition of a substantial conventional strategic strike capability as well beyond their means, but view nucleaer weapons as a relatively cheap, albeit primitive, counter to non-nuclear strategic strike operations.

PGS lowers the first-use threshold, escalates conflict, and causes proliferation

Davis and Dodd 6(Ian, BASIC director, and Robin, independent human security and arms control activist, June, “US ‘Prompt Global Strike’ Capability: A New Destabilising Sub-State Deterrent in the Making?”, http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Papers/BP51.pdf, Accessed 6/29/10)jn

The PGS capability also raises serious non-proliferation issues. First, it is likely to lead to a new arms race in ballistic missiles and countermeasures as other countries seek to match the US system and/or seek to protect their sovereignty by building weapon systems to counter US capabilities. It seems likely, for example, that other nuclear powers, such as China and Russia, would embark on similar SLBM and ICBM conversion projects. This could in turn ratchet up the potential for major armed conflict in areas, such as the Taiwan Straits, where tensions already run high. Second, PGS clearly undermines ballistic missile non-proliferation efforts, such as the 2002 Hague Code of Conduct Against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, which calls for greater restraint in developing, testing, using, and spreading ballistic missiles.22 At the signing of the Code, John Bolton, then US Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, affirmed US support for it, but also highlighted a number of qualifying factors and reservations. One such reservation concerning pre-launch notifications was that the United States ‘reserves the right in circumstances of war to launch ballistic missile and space-launch vehicles without prior notification’.23 If the US administration is also asserting its ‘right’ to pre-emptive launch of a PGS capability the Code is as good as dead and buried. Third, it will lower the threshold of use for such weapons. And as Steve Andreason, a former US Nation Security Council staffer has pointed out: “Long-range ballistic missiles have never been used in combat in 50 years”. But once the United States starts indicating that it views these missiles as no different than any other weapon, “other nations will adopt the same logic”, he said.24

Impact – Prolif

PGS causes prolif

Cabasso 8(Jacqueline, Activist for After Downing Street, “The Hidden Architecture of U.S. Militarism” http://www.afterdowningstreet.org/militarism, accessed 6/29/20)jn

In its June 2006 report, Weapons of Terror: Freeing the World of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Arms, the Hans Blix-led Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission recommended, “All states possessing nuclear weapons should commence planning for security without nuclear weapons.” But, while advocating, “preparing for the outlawing of nuclear weapons through joint practical and incremental measures…” the Commission did not directly address what “security without nuclear weapons” means. One rather disquieting view of security without nuclear weapons was offered last year by Robert Einhorn, a Clinton administration nuclear policy expert and arms control advocate. “We should be putting far more effort into developing more effective conventional weapons,” he said. “It’s hard to imagine a president using nuclear weapons under almost any circumstance, but no one doubts our willingness to use conventional weapons.” This statement, unfortunately, is all too true. But an even more overpowering conventional U.S. military threat surely is not the desired outcome of the nuclear disarmament process. Moreover, how practical would that approach be? How would countries with fewer economic resources - especially those on the “enemies” list - respond? Wouldn’t they have an incentive to maintain or acquire nuclear weapons to counter overwhelming U.S. conventional military superiority? And wouldn’t that, in turn, even further entrench U.S. determination to retain and modernize its own nuclear arsenal, thus rendering the goal of nuclear disarmament nearly impossible? This conundrum is one of the biggest challenges we face and it cannot be ignored. To its credit, the Blix Commission ended its report by acknowledging: “The perspective of a world free of WMD must be supplemented by the perspective of a world in which the arsenals of conventional weapons have been reduced drastically.” The Commission concluded: “Tensions between rich and poor societies, the spread of diseases like HIV and avian flu, environmental threats, competition over energy, the functioning of international trade and financial markets, cross-border crime and terrorism, and so forth, will be challenges for all. They will require the development of an international society organized through cooperation and law rather than one controlled by overwhelming military force, including weapons of mass destruction.”

Impact – Accidents

PGS allows for a high risk of accidental nuclear escalation

Podvig 6(Pavel, Stanford U, December 8, “Russia and the Prompt Global Strike Plan”, http://russianforces.org/podvig/2006/12/russia\_and\_the\_prompt\_global\_s.shtml accessed 6/29/10) jn

Serious questions exist about the feasibility of Prompt Global Strike. These include questions about the ability of intelligence-gathering networks to provide adequate support for the global-strike plan, as well as the capacity of existing intercontinental delivery systems to provide the combination of accuracy and power required to attack a broad enough range of targets. Most troubling, perhaps, is the possibility that the implementation of Prompt Global Strike would increase the probability of an accident involving strategic nuclear forces. Early warning satellites and radars cannot distinguish between the launch of a conventional missile and that of a nuclear one. This could lead to misinterpretations or misunderstandings with potentially extremely serious consequences. Furthermore, the short flight time of ballistic missiles, which makes them attractive for prompt global-strike missions in the first place, leaves very little time for an assessment of the situation, putting an enormous strain on national decisionmaking mechanisms and increasing the probability of an accident.

PGS causes reactionary full-scale nuclear retaliation

Manzo 8(Vince, CDI Research Assistant, “An Examination of the Pentagon’s Prompt Global Strike Program: Rationale, Implementation, and Risks”, http://www.cdi.org/pdfs/PGSfactsheet.pdf, accessed 6/29/10)jn

Given that U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and SLBMs have previously only carried nuclear warheads, many analysts argue that other countries, such as Russia or China, might “misinterpret the launch of a conventionally-armed ballistic missile and conclude that they are under attack with nuclear weapons.” 35 Although this concern has been expressed in context of both Navy and Air Force conventional missile programs, concern over the CTM program is more acute: “To outside observers, the [Trident] sub’s conventional and nuclear weapons would appear identical—the same size, the same speed, shooting from the same locations.”36 Ian Davis and Robin Dodd argue that the deployment of conventional ballistic missiles will inject an additional dose of uncertainty into any U.S. long-range missile launch. As a consequence, countries “targeted by any ICBM strike would need to treat any attack a nuclear one if they were to avoid being open to a successful surprise US nuclear first strike.” 37 In other words, the United States could potentially exploit this capability by initiating a nuclear first strike under the guise of a conventional long-range missile launch. The implication of this argument is that deploying long-range ballistic missiles with conventional warheads will further complicate any efforts to reduce the readiness level of other states’ nuclear weapons, as they will feel that their arsenals are even more vulnerable to a U.S. first strike. Whether reducing the readiness level of nuclear weapons should be on the agenda in future arms control negotiations is a separate issue, but its omission from such should be the result of a conscious policy decision, not an unintended and unexamined consequence of a new weapon deployment. A recent article in Arms Control Today quotes a Russian source echoing this very concern: “Prompt global strike is very dangerous [because] you never tell what the load [is] when a strategic missile is launched.” 38 Former Russian President Vladimir Putin has expressed similar concerns: “The launch of such a missile could provoke an inappropriate response from one of the nuclear powers, could provoke a full-scale counterattack using strategic nuclear forces.” 39 Similarly, the congressionally-mandated NAS report affirmed that such concerns “merit serious consideration,” and also recommended “providing a modest amount of applied research (6.2) funding towards measuring the more challenging hypersonic flight technologies needed for other longer-term CPGS [conventional prompt global strike] options envisioned by the Air Force and the Army.” 40

Impact – Kills Russian Relations

PGS kills U.S. Russian relations—potential nuclear escalation

Arms Control Association 8(June, Russia Wants Limits on Prompt Global Strike <http://www.armscontrol.org/print/2945>, accessed 6/29/10)jn

One divisive issue in U.S.-Russian talks on a future strategic weapons treaty is Russia's interest in having that agreement limit long-range missiles and delivery systems armed with non-nuclear warheads. The Bush administration is seeking such weapons to expand U.S. quick-strike options against targets around the world, but Congress and a recent government watchdog report have raised some concerns about the initiative. Current U.S. efforts to develop long-range conventional-strike weapons grew out of calls for such a capability in the Pentagon's 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review and the Bush administration's Nuclear Posture Review the same year. (See [ACT, January/February 2002](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2002_01-02/nprjanfeb02) .) Administration officials contend that those weapons, now generally referred to as "prompt global strike" and intended to strike targets in less than an hour, would provide a military option when the United States might otherwise face the choice of using nuclear weapons or not acting against a potential danger. Officials acknowledge those moments might be rare, but they include scenarios such as terrorists meeting briefly in remote locations or foes preparing a missile launch threatening U.S. troops, allies, or satellites. Russia objects, saying such weapons would be destabilizing because their use could be misconstrued as a nuclear attack against it, leading Russia to potentially launch nuclear weapons at the United States. U.S. officials maintain there are measures, such as pre-launch notifications or basing non-nuclear missiles separately from nuclear missiles, to minimize possible misperceptions. (See [ACT, May 2006](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2006_05/GlobalStrike) .)

Impact – Doesn’t Improve 1st Strike

PGS doesn’t solve their impacts—apprehension, risks accidental nuclear retaliation

Andreason 6(Steve, National Security consultant, “Off Target? The Bush Administration's Plan to Arm Long-Range Ballistic Missiles with Conventional Warheads”, http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2006\_07-08/CoverStory#bio, accessed 6/29/10)jn

Second, although the use of lethal force against a terrorist threat involving weapons of mass destruction is a capability that the United States must have and use if necessary to prevent an attack, the notion that conventional long-range ballistic missiles are an indispensable silver bullet for our military deserves close scrutiny. In short, we know where rogue regimes are located, we know where “ungoverned” areas provide terrorist havens, and we are improving our existing and planned conventional capabilities to deal with these threats. Moreover, it is far from clear that using a conventional long-range ballistic missile would in practice be “quicker” than using other conventional assets, given challenges associated with identifying and locating targets, receiving authority to fire, and having submarines in position to shoot. There may be other scenarios, for example, using U.S. long-range conventional ballistic missiles to pre-emptively strike North Korean ballistic missiles or China’s nuclear forces during a conflict over Taiwan. If North Korea were about to launch a nuclear missile at the United States, however, there would be more—much more—than conventional Trident missiles heading toward North Korea. A U.S. conventional ballistic missile attack against China’s nuclear forces would run a big risk of nuclear retaliation by Beijing. We also need to look closely at the opportunity cost of the development, deployment, and potential use of long-range conventional ballistic missiles. The achievement of our core security interests, including preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction and protecting against terrorists, requires the judicious expenditure of U.S. resources. This is particularly true in the context of the ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, which the Congressional Budget Office now estimates will cost $811 billion. Simply put, is it a wise investment to spend hundreds of millions of dollars on conventional long-range ballistic missiles compared with other urgent defense priorities such as global port security, military personnel, and threat reduction programs? What of the risks? Is the niche capability that conventional Trident missiles might provide worth it if it leads to more countries with more ballistic missiles more willing to use them in their own pursuit of their security interests? Moreover, would any president take the risk of launching a conventional long-range ballistic missile against a terrorist target if there was even the smallest chance of a mistaken retaliatory launch directed at the United States, perhaps with a nuclear-tipped missile? Up to this point, the answers and assurances that have been provided by U.S. officials with respect to a mistaken retaliatory launch have not been reassuring. For example, transparency relating to missile test launches or exercises would provide no reassurance regarding an operational launch of a Trident missile. Moreover, it is difficult to conclude that transparency and Joint Data Exchange are “starting to work,” as Cartwright claims, when there is no system of shared early warning of operational missile launches in place among the United States, Russia, and other states. Even if there was, it may not work or be credible. Moreover, the argument that we have years of experience with nuclear and conventional “dual-capable” systems as a palliative ignores the uniquely destabilizing and destructive characteristics of long-range ballistic missiles, in particular their ability to deliver nuclear payloads globally in near real time. Finally, the issue of conventional Trident missiles embedded in the concept of Prompt Global Strike provides another opportunity to examine whether we are pursuing the right balance in defending the United States, in particular whether we are effectively utilizing all elements of U.S. power or relying too heavily on our military to win the global war on terrorism. Our strategy against terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction must be more than just reducing the time to target our enemies. Indeed, the use of long-range conventional ballistic missiles in volatile regions of the globe might easily lead to greater instability rather than fewer terrorists, especially when factoring in the political fallout overseas from employing long-range ballistic missiles for the first time in combat. In this context, our continuing search for another first-use weapon to deal with the security challenges of the 21st century may in fact be a symptom of a much larger problem: the failure to better use other aspects of U.S. power—economic, political, diplomatic, and cultural—in our national security policy.

Impact – Fails: Intelligence

PGS fails—lack of intelligence prevents accuracy of use

Andreason 6(Steve, National Security consultant, “Off Target? The Bush Administration's Plan to Arm Long-Range Ballistic Missiles with Conventional Warheads”, http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2006\_07-08/CoverStory#bio, accessed 6/29/10)jn

The use of long-range ballistic missiles as strategic conventional weapons requires the intelligence community to promptly and precisely identify time-urgent, high-value targets with high confidence to the National Command Authority. Just looking back over the past decade or so, although there have been some successes in gathering blue-chip intelligence of this sort—most recently, the success in tracking down a leading al Qaeda terrorist in Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi—there are a number of public examples of just how difficult this is. For instance, the United States and many other states were confident there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq before the U.S.-led March 2003 invasion, but there were not. The United States tried unsuccessfully to locate Saddam Hussein at the outset of the war, but even after U.S. troops occupied the country, it took eight months to find Hussein (and three years to find al-Zarqawi). Since 2001, the most intense manhunt in international history has failed to locate Osama bin Laden. In 1999 the United States insisted on inspecting a suspected North Korean nuclear site at Kumchang-ni and found nothing. In 1993 the United States identified a Chinese freighter, the Yin He, for inspection, believing it was carrying precursors for chemical weapons. Again, nothing was found.

Impact – Hegemony

Turns heg - PGS destroys credibility, causes rogue aggression and global insecurity

Davis & Dodd 6 (Ian, Arms Control Consultant, and Robin, British American Security Council, British American Security Information Council, Occasional Papers, International Security Policy 51, June 2006, http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Papers/BP51.pdf/)KFC

The Pentagon’s desire to field a PGS capability marks yet another dangerous precedent in recent US defence policy. As the Bush administration continues in what has been described as its ‘quest for absolute security’, serious questions must be asked not only regarding the feasibility of such a quest, but also as to the toll in terms of real security that projects such as PGS have on the rest of the international community.25 In its pursuit of a unilaterally shaped global security paradigm the present US administration threatens to destroy an international order that ‘has been patiently built up for 50 years’.26 In turn, this not only de-legitimises US power, but also creates in the process a world that is ever more insecure. The complex range of security dilemmas that the international community is faced with requires a multilateral and international law-based response that takes into account the security concerns of the community as a whole. The PGS capability is born of a narrow neo-realist perspective and seeks to buy security at the end of a $500 million missile system. Such an approach will further antagonise US allies and also create a heightened sense of global insecurity. And the more ‘rogue’ elements of the international community will already be preparing their own asymmetric response to this latest proposed big stick in the US arsenal.

Impact – China Nuke War

CBMs won’t work and take out solvency – impact is global nuclear war with China

Shachtman 6 (Noah, contributing editor at Wired magazine, and the editor of its national security blog, “Red Phones vs. Tridents,”<http://www.noahshachtman.com/archives/002465.html>)KFC

It would be China’s worst nightmare. Perhaps in the midst of some mutual sabre-rattling over Taiwan, a Chinese satellite detects a missile launch from the Pacific Ocean. A Trident missile is headed China’s way. Computers race to determine the target while Chinese ICBMs go on high alert. The clock is ticking … and millions of lives are in the balance. This apocalyptic scenario is becoming increasingly plausible as the U.S. military considers arming some of its Trident D5 submarine-launched ballistic missiles with conventional warheads. A conventionally-armed Trident has certain advantages over bombers, cruise missiles, or Special Forces for taking out high-value targets. It’s unmanned, extremely accurate for a missile and fast: a Trident can hit any spot on the globe around 30 minutes from launch. But space sensors can’t tell a TNT-tipped Trident from one carrying a 100-kiloton nuclear warhead. So every time the U.S. fired a conventional Trident at a terrorist camp, Russia, China and every other nuclear power would suffer a major freak-out. [Inside Defense has been all over this controversy for a while -- ed.] In this month’s Proceedings (not yet online), Navy Capt. Terry Benedict admits the diplomatic complications of using conventional Tridents. But he believes we can resolve them: “This change in our nation’s strategic force will require that no stone be left unturned to improve the measures we have in place to prevent misunderstandings. Areas under investigation and review include existing hotlines and other communications with Russia and China, diplomacy, military dialogue, plus training, tests and exercises.” The only workable solution in Benedict’s list is a hotline by which the U.S. would warn other nuclear powers before launching a conventional Trident. But the hotline would be just one link in a long chain of comms connecting national command authorities to strategic forces: this chain would have to function perfectly — and quickly — every time to avoid a major incident. And consider this: to veto a strike, a Chinese leader would only have to refuse to pick up the buzzing red phone.

Impact – Russia Nuke War

Only a US/Russian war causes extinction

Bostrom 2 (Nick , professor of philosophy - Oxford University, March, 2002, Existential Risks: Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards, Journal of Evolution and Technology, p. <http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html>)KFC

A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

Impact – China Nuke War

Turn – crisis stability – impact is war with China

Bolkcom et al 6 (Christopher, Shirley A. Kan, and Amy F. Woolf , Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division of the CRS, 2006. “US Conventional Forces and Nuclear Deterrence: A China Case Study,” ftp.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/ RL33607.pdf)KFC

While these new conventional weapons might enhance deterrence, they might also detract from crisis stability if a conflict were to occur. For example, in Scenario C (combined arms attack), neither U.S. nor Chinese nuclear forces appear postured in a way that would exacerbate a crisis over Taiwan. Neither is vulnerable to a first strike from the other. However, the same may not be true of conventional forces. China may believe that its forces are vulnerable to an attack by either Taiwan or the United States., and that such an attack is about to occur. It may then believe that, in spite of the risk of escalation and possible attacks (conventional or nuclear) on its own territory, that it would be better off initiating the conflict during the crisis. In essence, then, the U.S. ability to defend Taiwan by attacking targets, especially “centers of gravity,” in China could actually make a crisis worse, and could spur China to begin or expand its attack on Taiwan. It can also be argued that potent conventional forces, those that truly overmatch China’s defenses, may weaken deterrence. As described in the background section of this report, during the Cold War, relatively weak U.S. conventional forces were viewed by many as consistent with strong deterrence because the United States would have to quickly fall back on nuclear weapons if attacked by more potent Warsaw Pact forces in Europe.

Impact – Status Quo Solves

We have the capability to take down targets without PGS

Sigger 9(Jason, Defense Policy Analyst, July 6, “Why ‘Prompt’ Global Strike?”, http://armchairgeneralist.typepad.com/my\_weblog/2009/07/why-prompt-global-strike.html, accessed 6/29/10)jn

I've been puzzled by General Kevin Chilton's push for what they call "prompt" global strike for the US military. You see, it's not enough that we can target and engage an enemy nearly anywhere in the world. He believes (and I'm sure there are others) that we need a conventional weapon that can strike anywhere in the world within an hour of launch - and that otherwise we have to rely on nuclear weapons. Oh, and he wants it in the next five or six years. We can't get the president's next generation helicopter in five to six years, and he wants super-fast conventional strike weapons... Under the conventional prompt global strike mission, the Pentagon anticipates an ability to hit targets anywhere around the world within just 6o minutes of a launch order. Lacking such a capability, the only long-range attack option typically available to a U.S. president under urgent circumstances would be a nuclear weapon, which military officials have described as unlikely to be used. Prompt global strike advocates say the conventional capability could be useful in hitting fleeting targets like a terrorist leader in a safe house or a weapon of mass destruction being prepared for launch. Above-ground launch facilities would be easily distinguishable from nuclear missile silos in Wyoming, Montana and North Dakota, so potential adversaries like Russia or China would be unlikely to misinterpret a launch as the onset of a nuclear war, according to officials. "If you have more time, then there are better systems out there and more affordable systems to close" in on a target with conventional weapons, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. James Cartwright told a Senate panel last month. For example, if bomber aircraft are based close enough to a target, they might be used more affordably in place of long-range missiles. Each Conventional Strike Missile could cost tens of millions of dollars to procure -- or to replace after launch. Let's forget for the moment that the research and development hasn't been done to allow such an ambitious project to successfully field a such capability. The real question is, why? The scenario sounds like something out of a "24" television show. "We have to get that high-value target within the hour, or... the world will be forfeit!" Is there any personal target that is worth tens of millions of dollars per missile to take out? Do we lack any number of conventional weapon systems and personnel skilled to do these missions? Considering that we control the skies over any battlefield, is there any doubt that a good fire control specialist could bring down havoc on any target? This is another bad idea by someone who thinks that there has to be a technical solution to every possible military challenge. Tell me why a JDAM bomb off of a large UAV drone, or a conventional cruise missile at the worst, won't do the same thing that this "prompt global strike" does but much, much cheaper. Of course, we'd have to assume that our military actually can plan things before it acts. That's not too much to ask, is it?

Impact – Instability

The US is creating a false sense of denuclearization, when in fact PGS increases threats.

Smith 5/6 (Jack A, Asia Times, 2010, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/LE06Ak02.html)KFC

The State Department on April 8 made a special point of the fact that "the new START treaty does not contain any constraints on current or planned US conventional Prompt Global Strike capability". We have no evidence but assume the Russians must have raised the point and lost since Moscow is on record as strongly opposing PGS. The QDR and NPR, followed by the Obama administration's April 12-13 nuclear summit meeting of 47 nations in New York are intended to set the stage for promoting the US agenda at the May 3-28 meeting of the UN's important 2010 review conference of the parties to the treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Washington wants its principal priorities - strengthening the NPT and intensifying efforts against nuclear terrorism - to be acted upon. It seeks to have Iran and North Korea punished. And it wants to be looked on as being compliant with the NPT in terms working toward complete nuclear disarmament. Above all, the Obama administration seeks to convey the impression to the people of the US and the world that it is diligently trying to reduce weapons, ease world tensions, and diminish the danger of more war. In reality, the US government is widening the wars, hiking military spending, introducing an entirely new and disruptive weapon, while erecting obstacles to the swift attainment of nuclear disarmament.

Impact – Russians/Chinese

The NPR allowed the use of PGS systems, which will undoubtedly scare the Chinese and Russians

Farley 4/7 (Robert, April 7, 2010, <http://www.lawyersgunsmoneyblog.com/2010/04/prompt-global-strike-not-dead>)KFC

I’ll have an article about the NPR coming out tomorrow at TAP, but suffice to say that I’m not particularly impressed with the Obama NPR. Every policy document requires compromise, and this is particularly true of a document focusing on nuclear weapons. A multitude of different agencies and vested interests have fingers in the pie, and each demands to be part of the decision-making process. In this case, the administration has managed to achieve a caveated-to-death no first use pledge at the cost of two apparent compromises; missile defense, and prompt global strike. Josh Rogin takes a look at the missile defense bit here; I raised some questions about the presence of prompt-global strike language back in the QDR, and suffice it to say that the NPR does not assuage my concerns. Prompt global strike is mentioned a several points in the NPR as a replacement for first strike nuclear capabilities and a large nuclear stockpile. While prompt global strike doesn’t necessarily mean conventionally armed SLBMs and ICBMs, nothing in the language of the NPR excludes such options. Prompt global strike sounds, on the surface, like a good idea; an Ohio class submarine could deliver a conventional warhead in half and hour to almost any target in the world. The devil is in the details; intel is rarely good enough to require such speed, and the possibility of conventional SLBMs being regularly launched from submerged subs would freak the hell out of the Chinese and the Russians. In other words, not such a good idea. Perhaps the thinking is that rhetorical support of the program now won’t necessarily mean appropriation for it later. If that’s true, I’m not sure that the history of the missile defense program is terribly comforting.

AT: No Retaliation

Don’t get optimistic – nuclear policy requires you to assume worst case scenarios when making your decision

Oelrich 6 (Ivan, President of the Federation of American Scientists, 2006. “Make Trident Conventional,”<http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2006/05/make_trident_conventional.php>)KFC

The implausibility of a target is really a **minor** problem**; by itself that would mean this new system would be, at worst, simply a waste of money.** A **much** graver concernisthe dangers such a system might raise**. If the** Russia**ns** and **the** Chin**ese** can detect Trident missiles launches **(and both can to a limited degree),** then, when the missile breaks the surface**,** how do these **potential target** nationsknowthat the missile is **a** conventional **missile headed toward North Korea** and not a nuclear **missile headed toward them? While thinking about this, consider that the Russians are not stupid, they can look at the US nuclear force posture and figure out what its primary mission is. Also,** when considering nuclear weapons, a cautious worst-case analysis is called for**.** We should plan **for a time** when relations with China or Russia are strained**. Does the “they’ll trust us” argument work the day after a US reconnaissance plane has been forced down?** If the Chinese or Russians see a Trident launch, they will assume **(a)** that it is nuclearand **(b)** headed toward them **until they get evidence that it is not.**

AT: Impact NUQ/No Brink

Russia is okay with minimal use of PGS, but only minimal use.

Scheber 8 (Thomas, researcher for the National Institute for Public Policy, July 1, *Comparative Strategy*, 27 p. 343)JM

Third, in December 2007, a team of retired senior Russian military officers met with their American counterparts in Washington, D.C. The purpose of the visit was to dispel misunderstandings regarding the nuclear weapon policies of each country. The Russian visitors included retired Major General Vladimir Dvorkin, a senior researcher at the Center for International Security at the Russian Academy of Sciences. Previously, Dvorkin has spoken about the 1995 incident in which a Norwegian weather rocket triggered an alarm in Russia. Dvorkin dismissed as nonsense concerns that Russian officials would misinterpret the launch of a few CPGS weapons and respond with a nuclear strike. Dvorkin stated that launching 1, 2, 3, or even 5 U.S. missiles would not pose a problem. “No one [in Russia] will launch a nuclear strike in response to a few missiles.” The other retired, senior Russian generals present agreed and opined that development of conventionally armed ballistic missiles is the natural progression of technology and is being pursued in Russia. Russia currently deploys such missiles in short-range versions.9

AT: No Miscalculation

PGS causes high miscalc—no missile differentiation, communication, or transparency

Podvig 6(Pavel, Stanford U, December 8, “Russia and the Prompt Global Strike Plan”, http://russianforces.org/podvig/2006/12/russia\_and\_the\_prompt\_global\_s.shtml, accessed 6/29/10) jn

Other signs that Russia has begun the process of improving the capabilities of its space-based early warning system also exist. In 2006, Russia began to upgrade its network of early warning radars and launched a satellite to augment its first-generation system. A new radar is being constructed near St. Petersburg; at least one more is scheduled to be deployed in southern Russia. Based on this activity, one cannot reliably assume that the coverage provided by the Russian early warning network is or will remain limited. Second, while notification about upcoming missile launches can be an important mechanism for providing transparency and facilitating confidence building, at this time no comprehensive notification arrangement, whether bilateral or multilateral, exists. The notification mechanisms in place are incompatible with the prompt global-strike plans. The relevant U.S.-Russian agreement stems from the 1988 Ballistic Missile Launch Notification Agreement. In 1991, provisions of this agreement were included in the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), and responsibility for handling the notifications was transferred to the Nuclear Threat Reduction Centers. This is the only existing formal arrangement requiring the United States and Russia to provide advance notification of launches of sea- or land-based strategic ballistic missiles. The mechanism, however, requires notification at least 24 hours in advance and, therefore, does not allow for attacks on targets within an hour’s notice – the goal of Prompt Global Strike. This means that should the United States proceed with its plan, it would have to abandon or significantly weaken the existing launch notification mechanism. A potential substitute to the 1988 agreement is the Joint Data Exchange Center (JDEC) arrangement, which calls for establishing a jointly operated center that would allow U.S. and Russian military operators to exchange information provided by their early warning systems almost in real time. The JDEC project, however, has serious limitations. First of all, it is not even clear if the center will become operational. In the more than eight years since the agreement was signed in 1998, neither side has expressed sufficient interest in pursuing the idea. No legal issues associated with JDEC have been resolved and the construction of the facilities required has not yet begun. Second, the arrangement is far from comprehensive, allowing, for example, the withholding of information about certain space launches. The most serious problem with a center like JDEC, however, is that it was designed to rely on real-time communication and that it provides no way to corroborate data provided during the exchange. This means that in a crisis situation a center like JDEC is more likely to add to risks than to mitigate them. Third, for Russia to recognize that a global-strike missile launch is not directed against it requires the capability to accurately determine the trajectory of the missile and to predict its target. At this time, Russia’s early warning system may or may not have this capability. Even if it does, however, some of the global strike scenarios could still trigger an alarm. The early warning and command-and-control systems were designed to react to a wide range of events in predetermined ways, and it is virtually impossible to know how these systems might react to certain developments. It is also impossible to know the exact circumstances that would surround a global strike launch and the extent to which these could contribute to misunderstandings and miscommunications. The probability of coincidences which could lead to such mistakes is very small, but it should not be underestimated. For example, on the day of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, Russian strategic aviation was conducting an exercise that involved flights of strategic bombers in the direction of the United States. On the same day, the U.S. air defense command, NORAD, was planning to conduct an exercise, known as Vigilant Guardian, which “postulated a bomber attack from the former Soviet Union.” We should also not underestimate the degree to which the Russian or U.S. military would be ready to consider the possibility of an attack from the other side. The pilot of one U.S. fighter that was scrambled on September 11, 2001, for example, admitted that he “reverted to the Russian threat,” believing that “the bastards snuck [a cruise missile] by us.” Ultimately, changes in the relationship between Russia and the United States have not led to equally substantial changes in the operations of these countries’ strategic forces. Both justify their strategic arsenals by the existence of those on the other side. The United States and Russia continue to regularly conduct exercises that involve emulating nuclear strikes, often limited ones, against each other. As long as this practice continues, there will always be an opportunity for misunderstandings and misinterpretations. An even deeper problem is that the United States and Russia have been scaling back efforts to develop and sustain a network of mutual cooperation and transparency. Many positive changes in the U.S.-Russian relationship have been a result of mechanisms of dialogue, cooperation, and information exchange that were established in the late 1980s and early 1990s. These mechanisms include arms reduction negotiations, dialogues on missile defense, the START treaty process, and joint peacekeeping missions. If these mechanisms were developed, improved, and further strengthened, they could conceivably bring the U.S.-Russian relationship to a level of true partnership, from which they would not have to worry about problems that could result from operating their strategic forces or from implementing programs like Prompt Global Strike. This, however, has not happened. Most mechanisms for promoting transparency and cooperation have been neglected or phased out. Some of their key elements, like START verification and information exchange mechanisms, are unlikely to be around much longer. This creates an environment in which the probability of misunderstanding and misinterpretation is too large to ignore. If the United States goes ahead and implements the Prompt Global Strike plan, this probability will only increase.

AT: No Miscalculation

Russia is distrustful and paranoid – likelihood of a miscalculation is high

Zaitchik 4 (Alexander, Reporter, Freezer Box, “Hair Trigger Planet,”  <http://www.freezerbox.com/archive/article.php?id=285>)KFC

These are just a few of the lapses and loopholes that have been reported. As U.S. and Russian officials dither about in distrust, the risk of launch by accident, sabotage or radar misreads continues to grow. The possibility of Russia or the U.S. misinterpreting a situation has led many experts and planners in both countries to push for a policy of "launch-after-attack." This means attack orders would only be given after a nuclear detonation is recorded on the ground and its launch trajectory confirmed beyond doubt. Another way to reduce the chance of accidental nuclear war is "de-alerting." This would entail taking missiles off a hair-trigger footing and adding steps to the physical launch procedure, thus lengthening the minimum response time to any attack. The argument for doing this rests on the assumption that both sides have enough missiles to absorb a first strike and still guarantee the destruction of the enemy after the facts are in. This would provide an enormous margin of safety against starting a war over a suspicious weather balloon, as well as reduce the risk of accidental or terrorist launch. But the Pentagon's declaration of its intent to achieve decisive U.S. military advantage--"full spectrum dominance"--over any conceivable adversary does not encourage the kind of thinking that leads to de-alerting and other trust-building measures, in Russia or anywhere else. Quite the opposite. And this is where U.S. policy after the Cold War enters into the picture. Russian hypersensitivity about U.S. intentions doesn't exist in a vacuum. While the paranoia and bitterness at the highest levels of the Russian military are partly a result of history and disposition, U.S. actions can modulate how this paranoia and bitterness translates into policy. In 1991, a recently retired member of the General Staff named General Yuriy Kirshin gave a talk in Washington, DC, in which he discussed the dilemma of overwhelming U.S. power in the face of Russian weakness. "The most important thing the U.S. can do to contribute to world peace," he said, "[is] convince the [Russian] General Staff that the U.S. does not want to conquer the world." Since the end of the Cold War, the dialectic has been clear: Whenever the U.S. flexes its military muscle in breach of international law, announces hegemonic ambitions or presses for strategic advantage, Russia (and, increasingly, China) has responded with sharp rhetoric and a recalibration of its nuclear doctrine. Operation Desert Fox, the bombing of Belgrade, the expansion of NATO eastward, the declaration of America's intent to "own" and weaponize space, the proposed building of a missile defense system and other high-tech weapons that threaten the effectiveness of Russia's nuclear deterrent--all are instances in which U.S. policy after the Cold War has sharpened tensions with Russia and increased the risk of nuclear war.

AT: Obama Will Use PGS Now

Obama wouldn’t utilize PGS.

Sanger and Shanker 4/22 (David E. and Thom, reporters for the New York Times, [http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/23/world/europe/23strike.html] AD: 6/30/10)JM

“Who knows if we would ever deploy it?” Gary Samore, Mr. Obama’s top adviser on unconventional weapons, said at a conference in Washington on Wednesday. But he noted that Russia was already so focused on the possibility that it insisted that any conventional weapon mounted on a missile that could reach it counted against the new limit on the American arsenal in the treaty. In a follow-on treaty, he said, the Russians would certainly want to negotiate on Prompt Global Strike and ballistic missile defenses. If Mr. Obama does decide to deploy the system, Mr. Samore said, the number of weapons would be small enough that Russia and China would not fear that they could take out their nuclear arsenals.

\*\*\*Aff Answers\*\*\*

NUQ – Obama Pushing PGS

DoD pursuing PGS now.

Homeland Security Newswire 4/26 (Homeland Security Newswire, leading e-information service, [http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2502952/posts] AD: 7/2/10)JM

The Obama administration is about to take up one of the more controversial schemes of the Rumsfeld-era Pentagon. The New York Times reported (see also Robert Farley’s blog entry) that the Defense Department is once again looking to equip intercontinental ballistic missiles with conventional warheads. The missiles could then, in theory, destroy fleeing targets a half a world away — a no-notice “bolt from the blue,” striking in a matter of hours. Noah Shachtman writes that there is just one problem: the launches could very well start a Third World War.

DoD funding for PGS is there – they’ve already begun testing.

Van Auken 4/24 (Bill, writer for the World Socialist Website and former presidential candidate, [http://www.sott.net/articles/show/207487-Obama-administration-spending-billions-on-new-global-strike-weapons] AD: 7/2/10)JM

The Obama administration is spending billions of dollars to develop new weapons systems, including powerful conventional warhead missiles capable of striking any target in the world within less than an hour. The US Air Force carried out two separate test launches April 22 - one at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California, and the other at Cape Canaveral, Florida - designed to further the development of these weapons systems. The first system, known as Conventional Prompt Global Strike, or CPGS, would be capable of striking anywhere across the globe within under an hour of a launch order, using intercontinental ballistic missiles fired from the US to deliver conventional warheads against targets in other countries. Capable of striking a target with an impact speed of up to 4,000 feet per second and a payload of up to 8,000 pounds, these warheads would be able to obliterate everything within a 3,000-foot radius. The Obama administration has requested $240 million in appropriations by Congress to pay for developing CPGS in 2011, an increase of 45 percent over this year's budget. The total cost of the program is expected to mount to over $2 billion by 2015, by which time the Pentagon hopes to have deployed the first elements of the weapons system. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) carried out a test launch Thursday of a space plane known as the Falcon, or Hypersonic Technology Vehicle (HTV-2), a suborbital vehicle that is the prototype for the CPGS delivery system

NUQ – Reform

The White House is reforming its nuclear shield, and will include PGS

Heinrichs 6/21 (Rebeccah, June 21, 2010, http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/06/21/rebeccah-heinrichs-obama-russia-new-start-treaty-senate-pentagon-gates-clinton/)KFC

The administration claims that current bombers will continue to meet national security threats over the next two decades. But Air Force officials argue that they will need a next-generation bomber by 2018, not because they expect their existing B-52 bombers to be insufficient -- though most of them are now decades older than the pilots who fly them -- but because the B-52s carry the air-launched cruise missile, which is itself nearing retirement. Compounding the problem, the 1251 plan also punts the decision to replace the ALCM. The same problem exists for land-based nuclear forces, which are comprised of Minuteman III missiles. These are slated to be maintained through 2030, but it is unclear what happens after this. The 1251 plan also fails to mention the administration’s intention to field a system of non-nuclear ICBMs called Prompt Global Strike. The White House agreed to count PGS against the already dramatically reduced number of nuclear delivery systems allowed under the New START Treaty. This is yet another foolish concession, though judging by the looks of the plan, the administration wasn’t planning to build PGS anyway.

NUQ – PGS Devlopment

The US is currently developing PGS systems

Rozoff 4/10 (Rick April 10, 2010, <http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/04/10/prompt-global-strike-world-military-superiority-without-nuclear-weapons/)KFC>

The long-delayed Nuclear Posture Review Report of earlier this month asserts the Pentagon’s plans for “maintaining a credible nuclear deterrent and reinforcing regional security architectures with missile defenses….” [3] It also confirms that the addition of “non-nuclear systems to U.S. regional deterrence and reassurance goals will be preserved by avoiding limitations on missile defenses and preserving options for using heavy bombers and long-range missile systems in conventional roles.” At an April 6 press conference on the Nuclear Posture Review with Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Navy Admiral Michael Mullen, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Secretary of Energy Steven Chu, Gates said “we will maintain the nuclear triad of ICBMs [Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles], nuclear-capable aircraft and ballistic-missile submarines” and “we will continue to develop and improve non-nuclear capabilities, including regional missile defenses.” Mullen spoke of “defend[ing] the vital interests of the United States and those of our partners and allies with a more balanced mix of nuclear and non-nuclear means than we have at our disposal today.” [4]

NUQ – No Nukes

The US will not use nuclear weapons

Yao5/6 (Yunzhu, Proliferation Analysis, MAY 6, 2010, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/?fa=view&id=40758>)KFC

The Obama administration’s Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) makes some encouraging changes. The reorientation of threat perception provides the basis for further nuclear disarmament, strengthening of the nonproliferation regime, and broader international cooperation on nuclear security to counter nuclear terrorism, and to facilitate peaceful nuclear use. The declaratory policy makes it clear that the United States will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) non-nuclear-weapon-states who comply with their treaty obligations, even if they were to pose threats of chemical weapon—and less clearly, biological weapon—attacks. This indicates that the possible use of U.S. nuclear weapons would occur only against the other established nuclear-weapon states, non-NPT states, and NPT members who do not comply with treaty obligations. The NPR further promises that nuclear use will only be considered in “extreme circumstances” and for the “vital interest” of the United States, its allies and partners. Although it fails to adopt the “sole purpose policy” that many have called for, it does make such a policy an objective in the future. The continued nuclear reduction in the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) should be cheered as a step in the right direction, though not as big a step as expected. The significance lies in the momentum the treaty helps to build up. The decision to forsake new nuclear capabilities aimed to fulfill new military missions should not be underappreciated either.

NUQ – PGS Now

The NPR is changing the US’s stance on weaponry – PGS not Nukes

Smith 5/6 (Jack A, Asia Times, 2010, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/LE06Ak02.html)KFC

The NPR's second objective is "reducing the role of US nuclear weapons". This does not mean reducing the number, deployed or in storage, just the role. And there is a very good reason to reduce the role: The US is developing a major non-nuclear alternative. It's called Prompt Global Strike (PGS) and sometimes Conventional Prompt Global Strike (CPGS). The US government realizes that there are serious problems with using nuclear weapons. Such weapons may be justified as a deterrent to avoid a nuclear exchange because strike and counter-strike would result in mutually assured destruction. But the entire world would object to a preemptive unilateral strike against a non-nuclear state. For instance, had the Bush administration's "shock and awe" terror bombing of Baghdad included nuclear weapons, the global outcry - substantial to begin with - would have been magnified a hundred fold, and the act would never be forgiven by much of the world. Indeed, it would spark proliferation as countries scrambled to build nuclear deterrents of their own, as did North Korea, to forestall a possible nuclear attack. The document barely mentions Prompt Global Strike (PGS), revealing only that the Pentagon "is studying the appropriate mix of long-range strike capabilities, including heavy bombers as well as non-nuclear prompt global strike". Global Strike usually means nuclear bombs and missile warheads. PGS or CPGS means conventional, i.e., non-nuclear. Prompt Global Strike relies on high-speed missiles, satellite mapping and other cutting edge military technology to launch a devastating non-nuclear payload from a military base in the US to destroy a target anywhere in the world in less than one hour. The purpose is to resolve the conundrum posed by the global inhibition toward the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states, thus greatly strengthening the Obama administration's full spectrum military dominance.

NUQ – PGS Now

The US military has a PGS systems now – and its improving.

Gormley 9 (Dennis, Center for Nonproliferation Studies-Monterey Inst, *The path to deep nuclear reductions*, <http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite_defense/PP29_Gormley.pdf)KFC>

U.S. plans to arm Trident D-5 missiles with conventional payloads as part of its plans for prompt global strike has already raised concerns – in the United States and Russia alike – about missile warning ambiguity and inadvertent retaliatory actions. These developments are of sufficient concern to Russian planners that Moscow arms officials have proposed strategic conventional delivery vehicles as candidates for possible limits in future strategic weapons treaties with the United States.60 If U.S. strategic conventional denial capabilities are just emerging today, Russian military planners must also worry about where such programs might be in a decade or two. The U.S. Strategic Command’s initial complement of forces comprising the Global Strike mission included the U.S. Air Force’s F-22 fighter providing penetration corridors for B-52, B- 1, and B-2 bombers loaded with conventional precision strike weapons.61 The U.S. Navy has converted four of its 18 Trident Ohio-class submarines to each carry 154 Tomahawk land-attack cruise missiles, the latest version of which features a two-way satellite data link that permits the missile to attack one of 16 preprogrammed targets or take new GPS coordinates to attack a fleeting target of opportunity. Assuming it has reserve fuel, the missile can also loiter in the area for hours awaiting a more important target, as well as pass information from its own TV camera on battle damage. Instead of filling each of the four Trident submarines with its full complement of 154 Tomahawks, a few missiles can be traded of for special-operations mini-subs or small reconnaissance UAVs. The Pentagon has also sought, without success thus far, to spend $503 million to outfit a small number of the Trident D-5 nuclear missiles on the remaining 14 Ohioclass Trident submarines with conventional warheads (either small diameter bombs or bunker-buster penetrating warheads). Even more robust global strike systems could emerge from current research and development programs, including small launch boosters capable of launching highly maneuverable hypersonic glide vehicles armed with a 500kg conventional payload over international distances and reusable unmanned hypersonic cruise vehicles capable of carrying 5,500kg payloads over 14,500km within two hours.62

The US military increasing its PGS systems.

Gormley 9 (Dennis, Center for Nonproliferation Studies-Monterey Inst, *The path to deep nuclear reductions*, <http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite_defense/PP29_Gormley.pdf)KFC>

Where does Prompt Global Strike stand today in the aftermath of Barack Obama’s election and the Democrats taking decisive control of both houses of the U.S. Congress? The Next-Generation Bomber, originally slated for deployment by 2018, has been delayed not only because of budget limitations but also due to uncertainties with respect to what kind of impact current Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) renewal will have on the mix of nuclear delivery systems.66 According to congressional staff member on the Senate Armed Services Committee, there is no longer any prospect for either Trident or Minuteman land-based nuclear missiles undergoing conversion to meet the Pentagon’s requirement for prompt conventional strikes, while research funding for hypersonic glide vehicles will remain in place, but without prospect for any deployment decisions any time soon.67 As one senior U.S. Strategic Command officer evinced to this writer recently, “Global Strike has been throttled back”.68 One might argue, of course, and the Russians do, that the requirement for converting Trident might be resurrected in future. They surely observed that an independent study panel of the bipartisan National Research Council (NRC) had endorsed a limited application for the conventionally-armed Trident before the 2008 election. The NRC panel only gave its support for the mission of a time-critical strike against a fleeting target of opportunity (e.g., counterterrorist target or rogue state activity), which would involve no more than one to four weapons. The U.S. Navy had pressed for funding to convert two Trident missiles on each of 12 deployed Trident submarines for a total of 24 conventionally armed Tridents. Importantly, the NRC panel drew a distinction between the more limited mission and conventional Trident’s broader application. The limited use would not carry the same stiff operational and political demands as a larger use of conventional Trident would in providing leading edge attacks in support of major combat operations. In the latter regard, Trident would probably join substantial numbers of Tomahawks and other PGMs on bombers as part of a counterforce strike at the outset of a major regional contingency. The NRC panel properly noted that in contrast to using one to four Tridents alone, any large-scale prompt conventional strike would present much stiffer operational demands related to intelligence support and command and control, as well as drastically different political implications with regard to warning ambiguity. Whether the contingency involves using one or many conventional Tridents, as the NRC panel observed, “the ambiguity between nuclear and conventional payloads can never be totally resolved . . .”.69 Yet, the larger the Trident salvo of conventional missiles, the higher the prospects for misinterpretation and inadvertent responses. At the same time, because Russian early-warning systems are incomplete, even smaller numbers may be wrongly interpreted as a larger-than-actual salvo or incoming missiles. Concerns about ambiguity leading to inadvertent nuclear war – rightly or wrongly conceived – largely explain the congressional decision not to support conventional Trident’s funding.

**Link Turn – Nukes K2 Deterrence**

**The US needs to maintain TNW to detour Iran and North Korea**

**McNamara and Spring 3/4**(Sally, Baker, March 4, 2010, http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2010/03/President-Obama-Must-Not-Remove-Nuclear-Weapons-from-Europe)KFC

From a strategic standpoint, a proactive national defense relies on the ability to defend physical territory, as well as the ability to deter an enemy attack in the first place. In a highly dangerous world where hostile states—such as Iran and North Korea—possess both nuclear and conventional forces capable of striking the U.S. and its allies, a credible nuclear deterrence, not unilateral disarmament, is the best chance for peace. Therefore, the U.S., in consultation with its allies, should use nuclear weapons in Europe and in the U.S. to protect and defend the U.S. and its allies against strategic attack. This position is consistent with a more defensive, broader strategic posture that would require the deployment of robust defensive systems, including ballistic missile defenses. This posture would also require modernizing the nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal, including their delivery systems, to make them better suited to destroying targets that are likely to be used to launch strategic attacks against the U.S. and its allies, as well as targets whose destruction requires the more powerful force of nuclear weapons. These targets could include missiles in hardened silos, deeply buried command and control facilities, and heavily protected nuclear weapons depots.

Impact Turn – Rapid Deployment

PGS key to military rapid deployment – solves terrorism.

Grossman 6 (Elaine, reporter with Global Security Newswire, April 8, [http://www.military.com/features/0,15240,93616,00.html] AD: 6/28/10)JM

U.S. Strategic Command chief Gen. James Cartwright has said he needs a prompt global strike capability to hold fleeting targets at risk. He would like a conventional weapon that could arrive on target within one hour of an order to launch, a capability currently offered only by nuclear-armed missiles. A conventional alternative would make U.S. threats more credible against targets such as a terrorist leader staying briefly at a safe house or a North Korean nuclear missile being readied on a launch pad, defense analysts say.

PGS revolutionizes U.S rapid deployment – we would be able to contain threats anywhere on the globe.

Shactman 6 (Noah, nonresident fellow at the Brookings Institution, December 4 [http://www.popularmechanics.com/technology/military/4203874?page=1] AD: 6/28/10)JM

A tip sets the plan in motion--a whispered warning of a North Korean nuclear launch, or of a shipment of biotoxins bound for a Hezbollah stronghold in Lebanon. Word races through the American intelligence network until it reaches U.S. Strategic Command headquarters, the Pentagon and, eventually, the White House. In the Pacific, a nuclear-powered Ohio class submarine surfaces, ready for the president's command to launch. When the order comes, the sub shoots a 65-ton Trident II ballistic missile into the sky. Within 2 minutes, the missile is traveling at more than 20,000 ft. per second. Up and over the oceans and out of the atmosphere it soars for thousands of miles. At the top of its parabola, hanging in space, the Trident's four warheads separate and begin their screaming descent down toward the planet. Traveling as fast as 13,000 mph, the warheads are filled with scored tungsten rods with twice the strength of steel. Just above the target, the warheads detonate, showering the area with thousands of rods-each one up to 12 times as destructive as a .50-caliber bullet. Anything within 3000 sq. ft. of this whirling, metallic storm is obliterated. If Pentagon strategists get their way, there will be no place on the planet to hide from such an assault. The plan is part of a program -- in slow development since the 1990s, and now quickly coalescing in military circles -- called Prompt Global Strike. It will begin with modified Tridents. But eventually, Prompt Global Strike could encompass new generations of aircraft and armaments five times faster than anything in the current American arsenal. One candidate: the X-51 hypersonic cruise missile, which is designed to hit Mach 5 -- roughly 3600 mph. The goal, according to the U.S. Strategic Command's deputy commander Lt. Gen. C. Robert Kehler, is "to strike virtually anywhere on the face of the Earth within 60 minutes."

PGS key to rapid deployment and decreased reliance on our nuclear arsenal.

Times of India 4/2 (The Times of India, newspaper with largest circulation among all English-language newspapers in the world, [http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/In-the-works-A-missile-to-hit-anywhere-in-1-hr/articleshow/5857401.cms] AD: 6/28/10)JM

WASHINGTON: Haunted by the memory of a lost opportunity in 1998 to kill Osama Bin Laden in Afghanistan, even before he could hatch the plan to attack the World Trade Center in New York, US military planners have won President Barack Obama's support for a new generation of high-speed weapons that are intended to strike anywhere on Earth within an hour. The non-nuclear weapons programme, called Prompt Global Strike, would feature hypersonic missiles that can deliver with such accuracy and force that they would greatly diminish America's reliance on its nuclear arsenal. Yet even now, concerns about the technology are so strong that the Obama administration has acceded to a demand by Russia that the US decommission one nuclear missile for every one of these conventional weapons fielded by the Pentagon. That provision, the White House said, is buried deep inside the New Start treaty that Obama and Russian President Dmitri Medvedev signed in Prague two weeks ago. The system is designed for tasks like picking off Osama in a cave, if it could be found; taking out a North Korean missile on its way to the launch pad; or destroying an Iranian nuclear site all without crossing the nuclear threshold.

Impact Turn – Rapid Deployment/Nukes

The PGS system’s speed increases rapid deployment capabilities and trades off with nukes.

Grossman 6 (Elaine, reporter with Global Security Newswire, July 1, [http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20090701\_5635.php] AD: 6/28/10)JM

Under the conventional prompt global strike mission, the Pentagon anticipates an ability to hit targets anywhere around the world within just 6o minutes of a launch order. Lacking such a capability, the only long-range attack option typically available to a U.S. president under urgent circumstances would be a nuclear weapon, which military officials have described as unlikely to be used.

Prompt global strike advocates say the conventional capability could be useful in hitting fleeting targets like a terrorist leader in a safe house or a weapon of mass destruction being prepared for launch. Above-ground launch facilities would be easily distinguishable from nuclear missile silos in Wyoming, Montana and North Dakota, so potential adversaries like Russia or China would be unlikely to misinterpret a launch as the onset of a nuclear war, according to officials.

"If you have more time, then there are better systems out there and more affordable systems to close" in on a target with conventional weapons, Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. James Cartwright told a Senate panel last month. For example, if bomber aircraft are based close enough to a target, they might be used more affordably in place of long-range missiles. Each Conventional Strike Missile could cost tens of millions of dollars to procure -- or to replace after launch (see GSN, Nov. 26, 2008).

"But we do have challenges around the globe with strategic depth and [a] lack of [nearby] infrastructure and basing," said the Marine Corps general, explaining the limitations of using bomber aircraft. "We've got to have a way to address those [urgent targets] credibly for our deterrent postures [to work]."

Impact Turn – Readiness

PGS systems are a valuable assists on the battle field.

Sugden 9 (Bruce, Defense analyst, International Security 34(1), Muse)KFC

Proponents of the PGS mission argue that there is an immediate, niche mission that can be fulªlled only by CBMs. They also argue that, over the long term, CBMs might become more useful in large-scale missions to penetrate sophisticated air defenses and provide a wider range of prompt, nonnuclear strike options to the United States. Furthermore, some advocates of CBM deployment assert that the weapons could be used in a large-scale counternuclear role and to shape adversary military investments. As background, the U.S. global strike regime is a comprehensive network of intelligence-gathering sensors; command, control, and communications assets; military bases; logistical support; weapons; weapons delivery vehicles; and decisionmakers. The regime’s purpose is to strike high-value targets and to gain and maintain U.S. access to enemy airspace. These strikes may be executed within short time lines and at extended distances from the continental United States and forward operating bases. Within this regime is a six-stage “kill chain”: ªnd, ªx, track, target, engage, and assess. As discussed below, the PGS mission and CBMs are directed at compressing the “engage” part of the cycle, but some PGS weapons system options, such as aircraft, can play roles in reducing time lines in other areas as well, such as the amount of time required for ªnding a target.12

Impact Turn – Readiness

PGS systems are the best option on today’s battle field.

Sugden 9 (Bruce, Defense analyst, International Security 34(1), Muse)KFC

The strongest rationale for expanding the use of CBMs would be defeating sophisticated anti-access and area-denial threats. U.S. aircraft and many standoff missiles designed for stealthy defense penetration are capable of circumventing and defeating the threat, but this capability might grow relatively weaker. Because the primacy of low-observable, stealthy aircraft and standoff missiles over air-defense systems should not be assumed to hold far into the future, it behooves the defense community to conduct a functional net assessment of foreign advances in area-denial technology vis-à-vis U.S. defense penetration capabilities. The ªndings of this future study could help determine midterm and long-term requirements for PGS weapons systems. Second, given that the large-scale use of CBMs would likely contribute to greater risks for miscalculation between nuclear-armed states, U.S. policymakers should support this option only from sites outside the continental United States that could more easily avoid generating concerns over nuclear ambiguity. This recommendation would change, however, if the United States developed CBMs with extended range and reentry vehicles capable of cross-range maneuvers. These capabilities would allow strike missions to follow routes that circumvent nuclear-armed states when launched from the continental United States. Third, for the long term, the United States should continue investing resources into research and development of improved ballistic missile technologies and payloads. If it becomes feasible to build improved boosters and reentry vehicles, such as the hypersonic glide vehicle, that can accurately deliver heavy payloads comparable to aircraft in a cost-effective manner, then CBMs would become more useful against hard and deeply buried targets. Fourth, to cover the emerging target set and compensate for potential longterm capabilities gaps, the United States should build a portfolio of PGS options encompassing CBMs and long-range, stealthy, unmanned aircraft. Moreover, in case physical destruction of hard and deeply buried targets using CBMs remains infeasible, analysts should continue studying the requirements for functionally defeating such targets. These requirements will encompass technological capabilities and tactics. Fifth, if CBMs cannot use GPS assistance for greater weapons delivery accuracy, it then follows from the analysis that the United States should focus more resources on using stealthy, armed UAVs for the PGS mission. UAVs can carry the same payloads as manned aircraft but have longer ºight endurance. To avoid prolonged violations of sovereign airspace, the UAVs might have to loiter outside, as their remote pilots await execution orders. This option would put a premium on forward-based, long-range UAVs. This would not be the optimal option for PGS missions, but it would be the best option if CBMs do not achieve the required accuracy. In the long term, aircraft capable of hypersonic speeds might be able to execute PGS missions from the continental United States. Finally, to enhance U.S. conventional, long-range strike capabilities and prepare for technological breakthroughs, U.S. policymakers should consider renegotiating articles of arms control treaties that constrain CBM options. Soft-site launch pads, for example, would beneªt CBM operations in Guam and other forward operating locations. This treaty option must be weighed, however, against the costs of opening up strategic options for other states.

Impact Turn – Deterrence

PGS solves our failing deterrent.

Whitlock 4/8 (Craig, Washington Post staff writer, [http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/04/07/AR2010040704920.html] AD: 6/28/10)JM

"Capabilities like an adaptive missile defense shield, conventional warheads with worldwide reach and others that we are developing enable us to reduce the role of nuclear weapons," Vice President Biden said in a February speech at the National Defense University. "With these modern capabilities, even with deep nuclear reductions, we will remain undeniably strong." Nuclear arms have formed the backbone of U.S. deterrence strategy for six decades. Although the strategy worked during the Cold War, military leaders say they need other powerful weapons in their arsenal to deter adversaries who assume that the United States would refrain from taking the extreme step of ordering a nuclear strike. "Deterrence can no longer just be nuclear weapons. It has to be broader," Marine Gen. James E. Cartwright, vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and a leading proponent of Prompt Global Strike, told a conference last month. Some U.S. military officials say their current nonnuclear options are too limited or too slow. Unlike intercontinental ballistic missiles, which travel at several times the speed of sound, it can take up to 12 hours for cruise missiles to hit faraway targets. Long-range bombers likewise can take many hours to fly into position for a strike.

PGS systems are a safer deterrence system the nuclear weapons.

Sugden 9 (Bruce, Defense analyst, International Security 34(1), Muse)KFC

Should the United States deploy conventional ballistic missiles (CBMs) in support of the prompt global strike (PGS) mission?1 Most important, do the political-military beneªts outweigh the costs and risks of CBM deployment and use? The U.S. Department of Defense proposes to widen the range of conventional global strike options to shape the military investment decisions and defense policy choices of potential adversaries, to enhance U.S. nonnuclear deterrent options, and to hedge against future strategic uncertainty.2 Foremost among these options is the Conventional Trident Modiªcation (CTM) proposal, which entails deploying two Trident D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), armed with conventional warheads, aboard every 24-tube Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine.3

PGS systems allow for use and deterrence.

Kamp 6 (Karl, Aug, Konrad-Audenauer-Siftung-Security policy coordinator, <http://www.kas.de/wf/doc/kas_8973-544-2-30.pdf)KFC>

Given the nuclear crisis in Iran or the atomic ambitions of North Korea, nuclear weapons have once again become the focus of much public attention. While nuclear debates in Europe are frequently limited to the conviction that the idea of nuclear determent has at least partly lost validity in the 21st Century and urgently needs to be updated for the future requirements, in the USA this process has long been in effect. Largely unnoticed by Europeans, the United States has been fundamentally changing its nuclear strategy and the associated arsenal. Since new developments in strategic planning by the U.S. as the key ally in NATO have always had significant effects on the European partners, these developments should no longer be ignored in Europe. The experiences of the last decades have shown, especially in the nuclear area, that the USA is ready to take the strategic ideas and concerns of the Europeans into consideration, as long as they are coherently formulated. Given that, as in the past, American nuclear weapons are stationed on European soil through NATO, Europeans cannot avoid articulating their ideas on the role of nuclear weapons. This holds particularly true for Germany as one of the major NATO-partners and as a country where parts of NATO’s nuclear posture are still deployed.

Impact Turn – Alliances/Deterrence

PGS key to extended deterrence and maintaining relations with allies.

Scheber 8 (Thomas, researcher for the National Institute for Public Policy, July 1, *Comparative Strategy*, 27 p. 337)JM

Strike capabilities can hold at-risk or attack military forces that threaten U.S. allies and friends. For most contingencies, allies and friends will likely find it more reassuring that the United States will come to their aid with effective non-nuclear strike capabilities rather than with nuclear weapons. Nonetheless, for threats of nuclear, biological, chemical, or overwhelming conventional attacks, U.S. security partners may seek assurance in pledges of nuclear deterrence and response capabilities on their behalf. Such pledges support U.S. nonproliferation efforts by reducing the incentives for friendly countries to acquire nuclear weapons of their own. The commitment of the United States to its security obligations can be demonstrated through overseas deployments of certain nuclear and non-nuclear strike forces. The fielding of advanced non-nuclear weapons systems that manifest American preeminence in advanced military technology, and the maintenance of a nuclear force of the first rank can bolster the ability of the United States to lead alliances and coalitions.

Impact Turn – Nuclear Terror

PGS Systems key to prevent detonation of future nuclear terror attacks—no risk of accidents

Schlesinger 6(James, Secretary of Defense under Nixon and Ford, May 22, “A Missile Strike Option We Need”. http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/publication/1554/missile\_strike\_option\_we\_need.html?breadcrumb=%2Fexperts%2F335%2Fjames\_schlesinger, accessed 6/29/10)jn

Within the past hour, a terrorist organization, known to have acquired several nuclear weapons, has been observed by a U.S. imaging system loading the weapons onto vehicles and preparing to leave for an unknown destination. A delay of even an hour or two in launching a U.S. strike on that location could mean the group would depart, contact might be lost, and the weapons would be smuggled into the United States or an allied nation and detonated. If the terrorist group happened to be close to an Air Force deployment or the right kind of Navy force, an air attack might conceivably be carried out within a few hours -- possibly catching the group still in camp and unaware. But if the terrorists were far from U.S. aircraft or cruise missiles, the only option available to the president would be to order the use of a ballistic missile -- a land-based Minuteman or submarine-based Trident D5 -- either one of which could hit a target almost anywhere on the globe within a half-hour. One big problem, though: At present, all of these missiles are equipped only with nuclear warheads. Would the president order a preventive nuclear strike in such circumstances? It's conceivable, but very unlikely. There would still be doubts as to whether the intelligence was accurate, and even if it was, the consequences of an unprecedented action of this kind might well be regarded as unacceptable -- in terms of the risk to innocent lives, of environmental damage and of the expected political repercussions around the world. More than likely, the president would order U.S. intelligence and military forces to try to track the terrorist group and seek later opportunities to hit it with Special Forces or aircraft armed with conventional weapons. This might work, but if it didn't the consequences could be catastrophic. It is because of the increasing likelihood of such scenarios -- requiring prompt, precise, nonnuclear strikes -- that the Pentagon is seeking congressional authorization to replace the nuclear warheads on two of the Trident D5 missiles on every deployed strategic submarine with a new type of warhead incorporating four highly accurate, independently targetable, nonnuclear reentry bodies. These are likely to be very effective against surface targets, such as exposed missiles, docked ships and vehicles, and aircraft on the ground -- capable of attacking such targets virtually anywhere in Europe, Africa or Asia within one hour of a command to do so. And not only would the strike be prompt and precise, it could also hit the target without warning. The new weapon would probably not be effective against most hardened targets, say, missile silos, or deeply buried targets such as command posts. It is not intended for, nor would it be capable of, countering the deterrent capability of Russian or Chinese nuclear forces. The early missile stages would be programmed to splash down in the ocean, thus avoiding potential problems of damage from their reentry. Later stages of the missile's trajectory might fly over the territory of other countries, but they would not fall outside the target area. Only the Russian early-warning system has any possibility of detecting a launch from the submarines' standard operating areas, and the risk of a misinterpretation of the aim point would be lower than with the launch of a land-based intercontinental ballistic missile. Nevertheless, to our surprise, there has been opposition to the proposal on Capitol Hill. Some have argued that it is unwise to substitute conventional warheads for nuclear ones on strategic submarines even if it's only on two missiles per submarine. They fear it could be the beginning of a wholesale attempt to replace nuclear capabilities with conventional weapons. Given that submarine-based warheads constitute roughly two-thirds of the U.S. deterrent, and are the component best able to survive, these capabilities should not be compromised, they maintain. But the concept does not require a reduction in submarine-based warheads. Additional nuclear warheads would be added to the remaining nuclear-armed missiles on each submarine to keep the number constant. Others assert that mistakes could be made in the action messages conveyed to the submarines or that, for some other reason, the granting of a dual mission to strategic submarines could compromise the strict controls that ensure that nuclear missiles are not launched inadvertently. But the Navy has worked out both procedural and physical measures that will avoid any such problems, and it has high credibility in this regard. For decades during the Cold War the Navy maintained both conventional and nuclear versions of air defense missiles, cruise missiles, torpedoes and bombs on its ships and submarines without serious incident. Still others are concerned that the launch of even one long-range ballistic missile, nuclear-armed or not, could trigger an adverse reaction from Russia and even a counter-launch if Russian leaders feared that they themselves were under attack. Past experience indicates that detection of a single missile launch (especially from a submarine operating area), even if detected and unannounced, might raise a diplomatic issue, but it wouldn't trigger a military response. In any case, Russian leaders could be notified and the reasons for the strike disclosed as the missile neared its target. The detonation of a nuclear weapon in the United States by a terrorist group would be an unprecedented disaster. It is essential that Congress approve the funds for this program. Moreover, a small reprogramming action in the current fiscal year could accelerate the missiles' initial deployments. In a world in which terrorist groups may have access to nuclear weapons, it is imperative to give future U.S. presidents more options to prevent nuclear attacks.

Impact Turn – Nuclear Terror

PGS key to prevent nuclear terrorism

Major Seyer 9(Jason, USAF Chief, February, *High Frontier*, Volume 5, No. 2 http://www.afspc.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-090224-115.pdf , accessed 6/29/10)jn

An al-Qaeda terrorist cell in Iran has recently acquired a WMD and intelligence reports indicate this cell plans to employ the weapon at a crucial US command and control node and center of gravity, within the next three hours. Iran has fielded and flight-tested a new short-range ballistic missile (SRBM) that can easily reach the node with minimal indication and warning. The terrorist cell has stolen a missile-erectorlauncher (MEL) with an SRBM loaded and ready for launch. Intelligence efforts have geo-located the site of the training camp where the MEL is in garrison and the coordinates have been confirmed. Time is of the essence, the US must act now! As long as the US is engaged in the Global War on Terrorism, which it will be for the near future, we must be prepared to deal with this type of scenario because it gives terrorists the ability to attack US interests on non-US soil. A number of countries with regional ambitions do not welcome the US role as a stabilizing power in their regions and have not accepted it passively. Because of their ambitions, they want to place restraints on the US capability to project power or influence into their regions. They see the acquisition of missile and WMD technology as a way of doing so. 1 With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the rise of international terrorism, and the availability of WMD, the situations in which the US may be required to defend our national interests have changed drastically. A variety of Congressional Research Service (CRS) reports have identified a number of scenarios like the one previously mentioned that require rapid response and precise targeting on a global scale. 2 CRS Report RS21057, Missile Defense, Arms Control, and Deterrence: A New Strategic Framework, 31 October 2001, states “the challenge is to deter multiple potential adversaries not only from using existing weapons but also dissuade them from developing new capabilities in the first place. These potential adversaries include nations such as China and a number of other states such as North Korea and Iran for whom terror and blackmail are a way of life. These nations might threaten US allies and interests, US forces advancing US interests, and US territory in an effort to blackmail the US to retreat from its interests around the world.” It is crucial to understand an adversary’s mindset as terror and blackmail could be a means to carry out their deterrence strategy. The future will continue to be dynamic and complex, with greater emphasis placed on non-traditional struggles, environments, and adversaries. The spectrum of projected threats to national security includes enduring and emerging nuclear challenges, proliferation of WMD and delivery systems, large conventional forces, and non-traditional threats and adversaries. 3 According to G. Peter Nanos, former director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, there are two reasons why a country would want to acquire WMD. The first reason is to counter an overwhelming conventional threat and the second is they want to be perceived as a bad actor on the international scene. The US must be postured to counter and defeat these future challenges. Dr. Lewis Dunn, senior vice president with Science Application International Corporation and a former assistant director of the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated in a peer review titled, “Cooperative Security Management—Exploring a Concept” that there are three strategic challenges in terms of containing the threats of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear terrorism. First, the US must continue to strengthen global habits of cooperation across a spectrum of responses. The second challenge is building up national control capabilities. The third deals with reducing terrorist cell’s motivation behind acquiring and ultimately using WMD. The March 2006 National Security Strategy stated the Department of Defense (DoD) is transforming itself to better balance its capabilities across four categories of challenges: (1) traditional challenges posed by states employing conventional armies, navies, and air forces in well-established forms of military competition, (2) irregular challenges from state and non-state actors employing methods such as terrorism and insurgency to counter our traditional military advantages, (3) catastrophic challenges involving the acquisition, possession, and use of WMD by state and non-state actors, and (4) disruptive challenges from state and non-state actors who employ technologies and capabilities … in new ways to counter military advantages the US currently enjoys. For the purpose of this article, the irregular challenges described in number two above are synonymous with irregular warfare. The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review defines irregular warfare as conflicts in which enemy combatants are not regular military forces of nation states. When the US has no forwardbased military presence or when faced with robust enemy air defenses, we must turn to an unconventional use of conventional capabilities to deter and defeat irregular warfare challenges. The Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) of 2001 put in motion a major role of nuclear forces in our deterrent strategy. The NPR emphasized the need for a broader range of deterrent options and capabilities and established a new triad composed of offensive strike systems (nuclear, non-nuclear, and non-kinetic); defenses (both active and passive); and a revitalized defense structure—all supported by adaptive planning, command and control, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities (reference figure 1). The new triad intends to reduce our dependence on nuclear weapons and improve our ability to deter attack in the face of proliferating WMD. 4 The NPR called for the integration of precision conventional weapons with strategic nuclear forces in the offensive strike systems. Ballistic and non-ballistic missiles armed with conventional warheads are one possible option for a new type of precision conventional weapon. In addition, the Pentagon identified a new mission—Prompt Global Strike (PGS). 5

Impact Turn – Power Projection

PGS deters and takes out attempts to launch nukes

Davis and Dodd 6(Ian, BASIC director, and Robin, independent human security and arms control activist, June, “US ‘Prompt Global Strike’ Capability: A New Destabilising Sub-State Deterrent in the Making?”, http://www.basicint.org/pubs/Papers/BP51.pdf, Accessed 6/29/10)jn

The PGS concept is an entirely predictable extension of current US ‘pre-emptive’ strategic thinking. Indeed, its conceptual development from a purely strategic to a viable tactical weapon mirrors the subtle way (since 2002) the Bush doctrine of ‘preemption’ has increasingly become one of ‘prevention’. The evolving rationale behind the PGS concept reflects a shift in emphasis away from a ‘one size fits all’ nuclear deterrent to a more ‘tailored deterrence’ designed to counter each individual threat or adversary as or when it should arise. 11 A fully operational PGS system would provide military commanders with an ‘on-demand’ force projection capability designed to ‘hold at risk’ a variety of perceived threats, both strategic and tactical. On a strategic level these threats would range from ‘rogue’ regimes and terrorist networks to nearpeer competitors and potential major adversaries such as China. ‘‘This weapon would give the US global conventional pre-emption – a strike first capability – in 30 minutes, to attack North Korean or Iranian WMD or leadership facilities”, said William Arkin, a former Army intelligence analyst and independent defence consultant. 12 On a tactical level, the range and immediacy of the weapon would also permit the US military to take out ‘time-urgent’ or ‘fleeting targets’ – such as enemy WMD being deployed for launch or use – in restricted or ‘anti-access’ environments or environments where the US military has a limited forward-deployed presence. The missile’s payload would also enable the US military to target what are commonly referred to as ‘hard and deeply buried targets’.

Impact Turn – Preemptive Strike

Preemptive strikes always end in war.

Gormley 9 (Dennis, Center for Nonproliferation Studies-Monterey Inst, *The path to deep nuclear reductions*, <http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite_defense/PP29_Gormley.pdf)KFC>

As U.S. and Russian planners look toward the challenges and pitfalls of achieving deep reductions in nuclear arsenals, they should begin systematically to appraise additional novel ways of achieving stability as arsenals drop to less than 500 warheads and then fall further. The recent turn by many states toward adopting preemptive strike doctrines employing advanced conventional weapons does not augur well for achieving a stable world. However difficult it surely will be for states to shed this predilection toward preemption – or prevention – through prompt action, if history tells us anything, it is that while such practices may succeed in achieving some initial battlefield success, they do so at the grave cost of war and its inevitable political and financial consequences. Witness America’s eightyear tragedy in Iraq. Preemptive strike doctrines employing conventional weapons are clearly unacceptably dangerous in a nuclear-armed world. But they will also be dangerous in a world devoid of all nuclear weapons, particularly as they may be destabilizing during regional or international crises. One way is to tone down, if not entirely eliminate, the preemption option now. It is needlessly reckless to elevate such a military choice – assessed as absolutely critical under dangerously threatening circumstances – to a national doctrine, as the Bush administration did after 9/11

Impact Turn – WMDs

PGS systems are key to prevent the use of WMDs on US troops.

Owens 8 (Randall, Col-USAF, AF War College, www.afresearch.org/skins/rims/q\_mod\_be0e99f3-fc56-4ccb-8dfe-670c0822a153/q\_act\_downloadpaper/q\_obj\_36454d29-b24a-412c-b445-515dacfadd7c/display.aspx)KFC

The US should fully fund the Navy CTM program over consideration of the Air Force CSM program. The Navy CTM program provides the only near-term solution for a current gap in the US long-range PGS capabilities. The Navy CTM program provides the best chance of achieving a capable weapon without incurring significant developmental, operational, command and control, and political risk. Associated concerns regarding the use of the Navy CTM can be sufficiently mitigated by various diplomatic and military assurance measures. The US must act now in order to prepare itself for the full range of likely future contingency operations including defense against the further proliferation of WMD and anti-western ideology and the eventual use of WMD on US personnel and forces.

Impact Turn – Hegemony

Key to heg

Rozoff 4/10 (Rick April 10, 2010, <http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/04/10/prompt-global-strike-world-military-superiority-without-nuclear-weapons/)KFC>

A war can be won without being waged. Victory can be attained when an adversary knows it is vulnerable to an instantaneous and undetectable, overwhelming and devastating attack without the ability to defend itself or retaliate. What applies to an individual country does also to all potential adversaries and indeed to every other nation in the world. There is only one country that has the military and scientific capacity and has openly proclaimed its intention to achieve that ability. That nation is what its current head of state defined last December as the world’s sole military superpower. [1] One which aspires to remain the only state in history to wield full spectrum military dominance on land, in the air, on the seas and in space.

Impact Turn – No Nukes

PGS systems will be used instead of nuclear arms.

Rozoff 4/10 (Rick April 10, 2010, <http://rickrozoff.wordpress.com/2010/04/10/prompt-global-strike-world-military-superiority-without-nuclear-weapons/)KFC>

Having gained that status in large part through being the first country to develop and use nuclear weapons, it is now in a position to strengthen its global supremacy by superseding the nuclear option. The U.S. led three major wars in less than four years against Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Iraq from 1999-2003 and in all three cases deployed from tens to hundreds of thousands of “boots on the ground” after air strikes and missile attacks. The Pentagon established military bases in all three war zones and, although depleted uranium contamination and cluster bombs are still spread across all three lands, American troops have not had to contend with an irradiated landscape. Launching a nuclear attack when a conventional one serves the same purpose would be superfluous and too costly in a variety of ways. On April 8 American and Russian presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev signed a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) agreement in the Czech capital of Prague to reduce their respective nation’s nuclear arsenals and delivery systems (subject to ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Russian Duma). Earlier in the same week the U.S. released its new Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) which for the first time appeared to abandon the first use of nuclear arms.

PGS systems will be used in place of nuclear weapons.

Gormley 9 (Dennis, Center for Nonproliferation Studies-Monterey Inst, *The path to deep nuclear reductions*, <http://www.ifri.org/files/Securite_defense/PP29_Gormley.pdf)KFC>

Another option to evaluate would be a new missile altogether, rather than one with a nuclear legacy, like the U.S. Navy’s concept of a “Sea-Launched Global Strike Missile”, or even the Navy’s effort to develop a supersonic version of the Tomahawk cruise missile.71 For the time being, the Obama administration and Congress have taken an appropriate time out with Prompt Global Strike, which will surely not allay Russian concerns over the long run. But it does provide space to consider future prompt-strike missile options and their effect on military stability in the context of a world that may well become far less dependent on long-range, nuclear-armed ballistic missiles in future.

AT: Miscalculation

No chance of miscalculation – tech solves.

Grossman 6 (Elaine, reporter with Global Security Newswire, April 8, [http://www.google.com/search?sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8&q=Elaine+M.+Grossman] AD: 6/28/10)JM

In defending the Pentagon decision to move ahead with the conventional Trident, some defense officials have suggested a conventional land-based alternative could be problematic because Russia or China may misinterpret a launch as a potential nuclear threat to their nations. Patenaude took pains to make clear the Air Force “has no plans to put conventional warheads on current operational ICBMs or [use] their silos.” Other defense officials have described how a land-based missile could be configured so it is incapable of carrying a nuclear payload and use a trajectory to its target that would not threaten other nuclear weapons nations. It also could be inspected by the Russians under existing arms control regimes; based on a U.S. coastline in Florida or California so launch debris could fall in the ocean rather than on land; and made capable of being rapidly retargeted. By contrast, critics have complained the Trident submarines would use a weapon virtually identical to its nuclear-armed twin; remain on patrol typically just off Russian coasts, potentially posing at least a debris threat to Russia; likely be closed to Russian onsite inspection; and possibly take hours or longer to receive target data and steam within range of nations where fleeting threats may appear. Cartwright offered subtle acknowledgment of the geographic challenge during March 29 testimony before the Senate Armed Services strategic forces subcommittee. “Prompt global strike . . . starts to get at the issue of those targets that will not necessarily emerge next to where we're based or where our normal patrol routes are,” he said. Although there would be some technologies common to both nuclear-armed ICBMs on alert and the new Conventional Strike Missile, the land-based option offers some “unique advantage[s],” says Col. Patenaude. One is “the ability to geographically separate conventional and nuclear capabilities,” he says. “That separation is a significant factor in reducing international concerns of misinterpretation and misunderstanding.” A conventional land-based missile also would differ from its nuclear counterparts in its “performance requirements, operational environments and concepts of operations,” according to Patenaude. In Senate testimony alongside Cartwright on March 29, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Policy Peter Flory said of the Trident concept that the Pentagon could use diplomatic tools to increase transparency and mitigate the risk of misunderstandings. The Navy might also alter the way in which it launches the conventional D-5 from Trident submarines so that Russia (or, in the future, other nations with early warning capability) could differentiate it from a nuclear-tipped missile, he said. “In addition to hotlines and the potential for advanced notification of a launch, we have other means for creating transparency and building confidence. One of those would include military-to-military talks between our respective forces so others would understand our concept of operations for this new capability,” Flory told lawmakers. “Other options would include ways in which we could structure and operate the system to provide a notably different phenomenology about a launch, so that a launch of one of these systems would not in fact look just like a launch of a nuclear system.” “There's all sorts of technical things that you might be able to do,” Cartwright told ITP during a brief recess in the hearing. The Navy could “alter the flight profile [or] change the range to convert energy,” among other possibilities, he said.

AT: Not Safe

PGS systems can be safe.

Naval Studies Board 8 (US Conventional Prompt Global Strike, Natl Academies Press, p. 216)KFC

It is clear that cooperative technical measures can be implemented at low cost and low risk, and, even more so, that these same measures would alleviate nuclear ambiguity in the event that a non-nuclear warhead was launched from a U.S. silo or submarine. Of course an engineering study needs to be done to choose the appropriate encrypted, validated camera approach for this cooperative mitigation of ambiguity. It is not the purpose of this appendix to advocate the adoption of the cooperative measures described here. As described in the main text of the report, the committee concluded that the ambiguity problems could be managed with low risk. However, for readers who disagree and believe that ambiguity is a major concern, this appendix outlines a feasible technical solution that depends only on a low-risk extension of proven technology. For those who doubt the utility of this solution, it should be noted again—as in the main text—that a nuclear weapon could be delivered by any long-range aircraft or missile, even if that aircraft or missile had not previously been associated with nuclear weapons. That would be easier than finding a way to trick the technical safeguard described above. The fundamental ambiguity problem of CPGS would not be resolved by adopting a strategic delivery platform other than the Trident.