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#### US hegemony is a double-edge sword – even if it does create stability it does so by antagonizing other great powers – creating instability

Layne 02 Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University [Christopher Layne PhD, March 1, 2002 Offshore Balancing Revisited Washington Quarterly]

In the wake of September 11, saying that everything has changed has become fashionable. Yet, although much indeed has changed, some im- portant things have not. Before September 11, U.S. hegemony (or primacy, as some call it) defined the geopolitical agenda. It still does. Indeed, the attack on the United States and the subsequent war on terrorism waged by the United States underscore the myriad ways in which U.S. hegemony casts its shadow over international politics. The fundamental grand strategic issues that confronted the United States before September 11 are in abeyance temporarily, but the expansion of NATO, the rise of China, and ballistic missile defense have not disappeared. In fact, the events of September 11 have rendered the deeper question these issues pose—whether the United States can, or should, stick to its current strategy of maintaining its post– Cold War hegemony in international politics—even more salient. Hegemony is the term political scientists use to denote the overwhelming military, economic, and diplomatic preponderance of a single great power in international politics. To illustrate the way in which U.S. hegemony is the bridge connecting the pre–September 11 world to the post–September 11 world, one need only return to the “Through the Looking Glass” collection of articles in the summer 2001 issue of The Washington Quarterly. A unifying theme runs through those articles: the authors’ acknowledgment of U.S. pri- macy and their ambivalent responses about it. Collectively, the “Through the Looking Glass” contributors make an im- portant point about U.S. power that policymakers in Washington do not al- ways take to heart: U.S. hegemony is a double-edged sword.

In other words, U.S. power is a paradox. On one hand, U.S. primacy is acknowledged as the most important factor in maintaining global and regional stability. “[I]f not for the existing security framework provided by bilateral and multilateral alliance commitments borne by the United States, the world could, or perhaps would, be a more perilous place.”1 On the flip side of the coin, many—in- deed most—of the contributors evince resent- ment at the magnitude of U.S. power and fear about how Washington exercises that power. China, specifically, wants the United States to accommodate its rise to great-power status and stop interfering in the Taiwan issue. The political elite in Moscow wants Washington to treat Russia like a great power equal to the United States and stop meddling in Russia’s domestic affairs.2 Warnings are issued that for its own good—and the world’s—the United States must change its ways and transform itself into a benign, or “enlightened,” superpower. As the contributions to “Through the Looking Glass” demonstrate, the paradox of U.S. power evokes paradoxical reactions to it. U.S. primacy is “bad” when exercised unilaterally or to justify “isolationist” policies, but U.S. hegemony is “good” when exercised multilater- ally to advance common interests rather than narrow U.S. ones.3

#### Sustaining hegemony undermines a more effective global structure – it makes conflict more likely, fuels anti-americanism, and risks prolif

Nuscheler 01 Director of the Institute for Development and Peace at the Gerhard Mercator University, Duisburg, and Deputy Chair of the Development and Peace Foundation’s Executive Committee [Franz Nuscheler, Multilateralism¶ vs. Unilateralism Cooperation vs. Hegemony in Transatlantic Relations, <http://www.inef.uni-duisburg.de/page/documents/pp16_engl.pdf>. January 2001]

Risks and counterproductive effects of unilateralism

A Brzezinski-style plea for a ‘superpower politics’ ignores or overlooks some counterproductive effects that are mitigated only by the fact that the international community is closer to a tolerably “functioning structure of worldwide cooperation” than Brzezinski was willing to perceive, the US being, if need be, prepared to accept multilateralism—though only if need be, and then at terms defined by the US.

First, the “Pax Americana” is a shaky peace order, more wish and claim than actual potential. The superpower is incapable of keeping or making peace throughout the world. Many global conflicts cannot be solved by military action. Peacekeeping too must be organized on a multilateral basis, because the militarily overpowerful hegemon is neither able nor—the debacle of Somalia still in mind—willing to intervene wherever anarchy threatens to prevail. On the contrary: the hegemon is less and less willing to play the role of the world policeman whenever the interests at stake are not its own vital interests. Such world regions of lesser interest include, above all, Subsaharan Africa.

Second, the talk of the “unipolar superpower” fuels anti-Americanism throughout the better part of the world¶ and cannot fail to provoke resistance. An imprudent display of superiority just about inevitably leads to the formation of anti -hegemonic alliances. The NATO allies are also reluctant to accept a hegemon that calls for obedience. Russia and China are resisting its claim to world leadership, and are already forging an alliance. Nor were threats of sanctions enough to prevent India and Pakistan from conducting their nuclear weapons tests. “Asianism”, which is not without its prophets in Japan as well, bears anti-Western and in particular anti-American undertones.

Third, hegemony runs counter to cooperation, above all when the hegemon seeks to use the existing power differentials to achieve its interests and increase its own advantages at the expense of the “mutual benefit”. While it can afford not to give in and not to have to learn, since it is less vulnerable than its outpowered negotiating partners, this inability to learn harbors the seeds of the end of its superiority, as the history of the “rise and fall of empires” (Paul Kennedy) teaches us.

Fourth, the US’s claim to world leadership means that it must go on with high arms spending, and the funds needed can be mobilized only at the expense of urgently required social reforms and infrastructure investment. Paul Kennedy's warning that the costs of securing power overburden empires has not at all been rendered obsolete by world history. Many observers already regard the mighty USA as a “weakened giant” that will be unable to use a policy of sheer power to hold its own in the long run.

Fifth, huge stockpiles of arms for use in securing hegemonic power not only conjure up the possibility of an arms race, this striving for global hegemony by means of military omnipotence and omnipresence is also heading back into a world-historical atavism. Ernst-Otto Czempiel (1966) situates thinking of this kind in a pre-democratic epoch in that it is in no way compatible with the “outward self-projection of a developed democracy”. Even worse: the thinking and the deeds of a world power that sees itself as the “realm of light” inevitably influence the thought and action patterns of rising great powers: This is the master summoning spirits that he is unable to rein in with the powers at his disposal.

Sixth, international law, the foundation of civilized international relations comes about not on the basis of hegemonic dictates but through consensus and persuasion. The hegemon loses its claim to moral authority by refusing to abide by important international treaties. Only by accepting the norms of a global rule of law can it demand the same of “rogue states”. Claims to world political leadership rest not only on power but on authority and legitimacy as well.

Recommendation:

Unilateralism is blocking the development of a multilateral architecture of global governance. It is not only detrimental to a culture of cooperation, it is also costly. Cooperation and burden-sharing save political and financial expenses. And global problems can no longer be solved by a powerful hegemon. United States refusal to cooperate provokes other countries to refuse their cooperation in dealing with problems that affect the hegemon itself. Yet the willingness to cooperate is given only when all negotiating partners can expect a fair reconciliation of interests. It would therefore be in the enlightened self-interest of the US to put more of its trust in partnerly cooperation, in this way reducing the resistance that any hegemonic claim to leadership inevitably entails.

#### Proliferation risks nuclear conflict—inexperienced nations will be more likely to use their nukes

Horowitz 9­­—Professor of Political Science at University of Pennsylvania [Michael Horowitz, “The Spread of Nuclear Weapons and International Conflict: Does Experience Matter?” *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, Volume 53 Number 2, April 2009 pg. 234-257]

Learning as states gain experience with nuclear weapons is complicated. While to some extent nuclear acquisition might provide information about resolve or capabilities, it also generates uncertainty about the way an actual conflict would go – given the new risk of nuclear escalation – and uncertainty about relative capabilities. Rapid proliferation may especially heighten uncertainty given the potential for reasonable states to disagree at times about the quality of the capabilities each possesses. 3

What follows is an attempt to describe the implications of inexperience and incomplete information on the behavior of nuclear states and their potential opponents over time. Since it is impossible to detail all possible lines of argumentation and possible responses, the following discussion is necessarily incomplete. This is a first step. The acquisition of nuclear weapons increases the confidence of adopters in their ability to impose costs in the case of a conflict and the expectations of likely costs if war occurs by potential opponents. The key questions are whether nuclear states learn over time about how to leverage nuclear weapons and the implications of that learning, along with whether or not actions by nuclear states, over time, convey information that leads to changes in the expectations of their behavior – shifts in uncertainty – on the part of potential adversaries.

Learning to Leverage?

When a new state acquires nuclear weapons, how does it influence the way the state behaves and how might that change over time? Though nuclear acquisition might be orthogonal to a particular dispute, it might be related to a particular security challenge, might signal revisionist aims with regard to an enduring dispute, or might signal the desire to reinforce the status quo.

This section focuses on how acquiring nuclear weapons influences both the new nuclear state and potential adversaries. In theory, system-wide perceptions of nuclear danger could allow new nuclear states to partially skip the early Cold War learning process concerning the risks of nuclear war and enter a proliferated world more cognizant of nuclear brinksmanship and bargaining than their predecessors. However, each new nuclear state has to resolve its own particular civil-military issues surrounding operational control and plan its national strategy in light of its new capabilities. Empirical research by Sagan, Feaver, and Blair suggests that viewing the behavior of other states does not create the necessary tacit knowledge; there is no substitute for experience when it comes to handling a nuclear arsenal, even if experience itself cannot totally prevent accidents (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992; Sagan 1993). Sagan contends that civil-military instability in many likely new proliferators and pressures generated by the requirements to handle the responsibility of dealing with nuclear weapons will **skew decision-making towards more offensive strategies** (Sagan 1995). The questions surrounding Pakistan’s nuclear command and control suggest there is no magic bullet when it comes to new nuclear powers making control and delegation decisions (Bowen and Wolvén 1999).

Sagan and others focus on inexperience on the part of new nuclear states as a key behavioral driver. Inexperienced operators, and the bureaucratic desire to “justify” the costs spent developing nuclear weapons, combined with organizational biases that may favor escalation to avoid decapitation, the “use it or lose it” mindset, may cause new nuclear states to **adopt riskier launch postures**, like launch on warning, or at least be perceived that way by other states (Blair 1993; Feaver 1992; Sagan 1995). 4

Acquiring nuclear weapons could alter state preferences and make them more likely to escalate disputes once they start, given their new capabilities.5 But their general lack of experience at leveraging their nuclear arsenal and effectively communicating nuclear threats could mean new nuclear states will be more likely to select adversaries poorly and find themselves in disputes with resolved adversaries that will reciprocate militarized challenges.

The “nuclear experience” logic also suggests that more experienced nuclear states should gain knowledge over time from nuclearized interactions that helps leaders effectively identify the situations in which their nuclear arsenal is likely to make a difference. Experienced nuclear states learn to select into cases where their comparative advantage, nuclear weapons, is more likely to be effective, increasing the probability that an adversary will not reciprocate.

Coming from a slightly different perspective, uncertainty about the consequences of proliferation on the balance of power and the behavior of new nuclear states on the part of their potential adversaries could also shape behavior in similar ways (Schelling 1966; Blainey 1988). While a stable and credible nuclear arsenal communicates clear information about the likely costs of conflict, **in the short-term** nuclear proliferation is likely to increase **uncertainty** about the trajectory of a war, **the balance of power**, and the preferences of the adopter.

### Overview
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## Causes Conflict

### Backlash

#### U.S. heg provokes geopolitical backlash- triggers conflicts with world powers.

Layne 06- Christopher Layne is Associate Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A & M University. (Fall 2006, The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment, Vol. 31, No. 2) SA

U.S. hegemony cannot endure indefinitely. Even the strongest proponents of primacy harbor an unspoken fear that U.S. hegemony will provoke the very kind of geopolitical backlash that they say cannot happen (or at least cannot happen for a very long time).119 In fact, although a new geopolitical balance has yet to emerge, there is considerable evidence that other states have been engaging in balancing against the United States—including hard balancing. U.S. concerns about China’s great power emergence reflect Washington’s fears about the military, as well as economic, implications of China’s rise. Other evidence suggests—at least by some measures—that the international system is closer to a multipolar distribution of power than primacists realize. In its survey of likely international developments through 2020, the National Intelligence Council’s report Mapping the Global Future notes: “The likely emergence of China and India as new major global players—similar to the rise of Germany in the 19th century and the United States in the early 20th century— will transform the geopolitical landscape, with impacts potentially as dramatic as those of the previous two centuries. In the same way that commentators refer to the 1900s as the American Century, the early 21st century may be seen as the time when some in the developing world led by China and India came into their own.”120 In a similar vein, a recent study by the Strategic Assessment Group projects that by 2020 both China (which Mapping the Global Future argues will then be “by any measure a ªrst-rate military power”) and the European Union could each have nearly as much power as the United States.121 Projecting current trends several decades into the future has its pitfalls (not least because of the difficulty of converting economic power into effective military power). But if this ongoing shift in the distribution of relative power continues, new poles of power in the international system are likely to emerge in the next decade or two.

#### U.S. presence bad- triggers instability and resentment

Frost 03- Paul G. Frost is a Program Officer at the Institute for the Study of Diplomacy. He holds a Masters degree from the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies at the University of California San Diego. (Spring 2003, Unintended Consequences of an Expanded U.S. Military Presence in the Muslim World, <http://isd.georgetown.edu/files/military.pdf>) SA

Downsides of expanded military presence

A number of participants argued that expanded military presence in the Muslim world has a number of downsides for the U.S. First, several members argued that by occupying Iraq, we have taken a step down a “slippery slope” of empire, while lacking the human and political capital to sustain or even complete what we have begun in Iraq and Afghanistan. One member commented that the U.S. is acting like an “angry giant” and predicted that at some point global sentiment toward the U.S. will turn from fear and respect to resentment, dissipating our ability to influence and inspire throughout the globe. Another member countered that while the U.S. does not seek empire, it does seek the ability to confront and deal with threats wherever they appear, which is a reason for devising ways to send troops to faraway places without necessarily being stationed here permanently. Second, some members argued that the current approach is too heavily geared toward an unending, worldwide war against terror in which we will never be completely successful. Yet threats and problems other than terrorism remain. Prior to September 11, the administration was focused on China as an emerging threat.Worrisome trends of failing states in Africa and Latin America continue to multiply. However, we seem ﬁxated on preparing for possible smaller wars in the “arc of instability” that runs from the Andean region in the Southern Hemisphere through North Africa to the Middle East and into Southeast Asia. As a result, our course could be in a state of continuous ﬂux, driven by events as viewed through the single lens of countering terrorism. U.S. military deployment in Muslim nations relates to the larger debate about U.S. hegemony and a possible realignment of power. Several participants voiced concern that the reality of U.S. hegemony, when combined with a certain arrogance of tone and style, led to the trans-Atlantic dispute over Iraq, and could spawn the forming of alignments of different states opposing U.S. hegemony. One member suggested that the administration should more readily acknowledge allied cooperation — particularly from “old” Europe — in law enforcement and intelligence sharing against terrorist groups. Several members argued that NATO could play a strong role in the post-conflict reconstruction of Iraq, in addition to being a force for stability throughout the region, if the U.S. can win over the most inﬂuential members in the Organization. Another participant argued that, despite the trans-Atlantic crisis over Iraq, the Bush team has been able to maintain fairly good relations with all of the world’s major powers. This has enabled the administration to press forward on many major issues such as North Korea and the Middle East peace process. In sum, as another participant noted, it is still possible for the U.S. to pursue both liberal internationalism and realism at the same time.

#### Heg creates instability – leads to war via challengers

Samantha Blum2003

[Samantha Blum Ph.D. in political science at George Washington University (2003) Journal of Contemporary China (2003), 12(35), 239–264 Chinese Views of US 12:35, 239-264, (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1067056022000054597>)]

The Western political science theories of hegemonic stability and unipolar stability contend that there are numerous beneﬁts that can accrue to the world under US hegemony. However, they both run counter to the common Chinese argument that the US is the source of instability throughout the globe. ‘Hegemony and power politics are still rampant everywhere which is the real root-cause of turmoil in the world today.’38 Further, the unipolar stability theory also contradicts several points made by Chinese advocates of multipolarity. This section will look both at speciﬁc Chinese articles which critique the two theories, as well as at the debate in the US over whether the current situation constitutes a state of unipolarity, and how such a debate is reﬂected in similar discussions among PRC analysts. The ‘hegemonic stability theory’ ﬁrst proposed by neo-realists in the 1970s, holds that ‘order is created and maintained by a hegemonic state, which uses power capabilities to organize relations among states. The preponderance of power held by a state allows it to offer incentives, both positive and negative, to the other states to agree to participation within a hegemonic order’, thus creating international stability. This stable order disappears, however, if another state grows strong enough to challenge the hegemon. Therefore, as time passes, the ‘distribution of power shifts, leading to conﬂicts and ruptures in the system, hegemonic war, and the eventual reorganization of order so as to reﬂect the new distribution of power capabilities’.39

### Causes Counter-Balancing

#### Increase US hegemony leads to rivaling and opposing countries

Christopher Layne 2002

[Christopher Layne PhD, Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University March 1, 2002 Offshore Balancing Revisited Washington Quarterly (http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=95a0b289-4c27-4cc1-ab1c-318968dfb7fa%40sessionmgr110&vid=2&hid=103)]

Surely, no great power in the history of the modern international system (since approximately 1500) has ever been as dominant as the United States in global politics. Still, history suggests a note of caution is appropriate. The United States is merely the most recent great power to seek hegemony. When examining the fates of previous hegemonic contenders, a clear lesson emerges: aspiring to hegemony or even attaining it for a short period of time is different than maintaining it. Although at first the conclusion may appear counterintuitive, states that seek hegemony invariably end up being less, not more, secure. Being powerful is good in international politics, but being too powerful is not. The reasoning behind this axiom is straightforward as well as the geopolitical counterpart to the law of physics that holds that, for every action, there is an equal and op- posite reaction. Simply put, the response to hegemony is the emergence of countervailing power. Because international politics indeed is a competitive, “self-help” system, when too much power is concentrated in the hands of one state, others invariably fear for their own security. Each state fears that a he- gemon will use its overwhelming power to aggrandize itself at that state’s ex- pense and will act defensively to offset hegemonic power. Thus, one of hegemony’s paradoxes is that it contains the seeds of its own destruction. This insight is not merely abstract academic theorizing but is confirmed by an ample historical record. Since the beginning of the modern international system, a succession of bids have been made for hegemony: the Habsburg Em- pire under Charles V, Spain under Philip II, France under Louis XIV as well as Napoleon, and Germany under Hitler (and, some historians would argue—a though the point is contested—under Wilhelm II). None of these attempts to gain hegemony succeeded. Why did these hegemonic contenders fail? First, although not actually great powers, one or more states throughout most of international history have clearly been candidates for that status be- cause of their latent power. The threat posed to their security by a rising hege- mon has served as the catalyst for these candidates to adopt the necessary policies to mobilize their resources and transform their latent power into actual great-power capabilities. Two prior “uni- polar moments” in international history illustrate this point. When France under Louis XIV briefly attained hegemony in Europe, both England and Austria rose from candidate status to great-power status and used their newly acquired capabilities to end France’s geopolitical preeminence. Similarly, England’s mid-nineteenth-century global pre- ponderance (the fabled Pax Britannica) spurred the United States, Germany, and Ja- pan to emerge as great powers, largely to offset British supremacy. In each of these instances, for reasons of self-defense, states that were candidate great powers were impelled to come forward and emerge as full-fledged great powers in order to ensure that they would not fall victim to the reigning hegemon.11 Second, hegemons invariably are defeated because other states in the inter- national system, frequently spearheaded by newly emerged great powers, form counterbalancing coalitions against them. Thus, the English and the Dutch defeated Philip II. Various coalitions anchored by Holland, the newly emerged great powers of England and Austria, and an established great power in Spain undid Louis the XIV. A coalition composed of England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia rebuffed Napoleon’s bid for hegemony. Instead of war, the enervating economic effects of trying to maintain primacy against the simultaneous challenges of the United States, Russia, France, and Germany undermined British hegemony in the nineteenth century. The wartime grand alliance of the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union defeated Hitler. Commenting on this historical record, Henry Kissinger has rightly observed, “Hegemonic empires almost automatically elicit universal resistance, which is why all such claimants sooner or later exhausted themselves.” 12 A simple fact explains this pattern: left unbalanced, hegemonic power threat- ens the security of the other major states in the international system. In the first few decades of the twenty-first century, U.S. primacy will likely prompt the same response that previous hegemonic aspirants provoked: new great powers will emerge to offset U.S. power, and these new great powers will coalesce to check U.S. hegemonic ambitions. Nothing suggests that the United States will be exempt from the tendency of others to contest its global preeminence. Yet, in the latest twist on “American exceptionalism,” U.S. strategists apparently do believe “it won’t happen to us.” They think that the United States is a qualitatively different type of hegemon: a “benevolent” hegemon whose “soft power” immunizes it against a backlash, that is, its liberal democratic ideology and culture make it attractive to others. U.S. policymakers also believe that others do not fear U.S. geopolitical preeminence because they believe that the United States will use its unprecedented power to promote the common good of the inter- national system rather than to advance its own selfish aims. As then-national security adviser Sandy Berger put it: We are accused of dominating others, of seeing the world in zero-sum terms in which any other country’s gain must be our loss. But that is an utterly mistaken view. It’s not just because we are the first global power in history that is not an imperial power. It’s because for 50 years we have consciously tried to define and pursue our interests in a way that is consistent with the common good—rising prosperity, expanding freedom, collective security.13 U.S. strategists may believe that others view U.S. hegemony this way, but the “others” do not—a point clearly evident in the articles in “Through the Looking Glass.” Well before September 11, indeed throughout most of the past decade, a strong undercurrent of unease on the part of other states about the imbalance of power in the United States’ favor has existed. This simmering mistrust of U.S. power burst into the open during the final years of the Clinton administration. Russia, China, India, and even European allies such as France and Germany feared that the United States was unilaterally seeking to maintain its global military dominance.

#### Increased US heg leads to declining allies and rival nations such as China, Russia, India

Christopher Layne 2002

[Christopher Layne PhD, Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University March 1, 2002 Offshore Balancing Revisited Washington Quarterly (http://web.ebscohost.com.proxy.library.emory.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=95a0b289-4c27-4cc1-ab1c-318968dfb7fa%40sessionmgr110&vid=2&hid=103)]

As history would lead us to expect, others responded to U.S. hegemony by concerting their efforts against it. Russia and China, long estranged, found common ground in a nascent alliance that op- posed U.S. “hegemonism” by seeking to reestablish a multipolar world. Similarly, U.S. European allies were openly expressing the view that something must be done geopolitically to rein in a too powerful United States. French president Jacques Chirac and his foreign minister, Hubert Vedrine, gave voice to Europe’s fears. Arguing that U.S. economic and military dominance is so formidable that the term “superpower” is inadequate to convey the true extent of U.S. preeminence, Vedrine called the United States a “hyperpower” and added, “We cannot accept either a politically unipolar world, nor a culturally uniform world, nor the unilateralism of a single hyperpower. And that is why we are fighting for a multipolar, diversified, and multilateral world.” 14 Ironically, it was U.S. intervention in Kosovo that crystallized fears of U.S. hegemony. As a result, an incipient anti-U.S. alliance comprising China, Russia, and India began to emerge. Each of these countries viewed the U.S.-led intervention in Kosovo as a dangerous precedent establishing Washington’s self-declared right to ignore the norm of international sover- eignty and interfere in other states’ internal affairs. The three states in- creased their military cooperation, especially with respect to arms transfers and the sharing of military technology, and, like the Europeans, declared their support for a “multipolar” world, that is, a world in which countervailing power offsets U.S. power. The Kosovo conflict—fought in part to validate NATO’s post–Cold War credibility—had the perverse effect of dramatizing the dangerous disparity between U.S. and European geopolitical power. It prompted Europe to take its first serious steps to redress that power imbal- ance by acquiring through the European Defense and Security Policy (EDSP) the kinds of military capabilities it needs to act independently of the United States. If the European Union (EU) fulfills EDSP’s longer-term goals, it will emerge as an independent strategic player in world politics. The clear objective of investing Europe with the capacity to brake U.S. hege- monic aspirations will have driven that emergence. If any doubt remained that U.S. hegemony would trigger a nasty geopolitical “blowback,” it surely was erased on September 11. The Middle East is an extraordinarily complex and volatile place in terms of its geopolitics, and the reaction there to U.S. hegemony is somewhat nuanced. Nothing, how- ever, is subtle about the United States’ hegemonic role in the Persian Gulf, a role that flows inexorably from the strategy of U.S. primacy. With the onset of the Persian Gulf War, the United States began to manage the region’s se- curity directly. The subsequent U.S. policy of “dual containment”—directed simultaneously against the region’s two strategic heavyweights, Iran and Iraq—underscored the U.S. commitment to maintaining its security inter- ests through a hegemonic strategy, rather than a strategy of relying on local power balances to prevent a hostile state from dominating the region or relying on other great powers to stabilize the Gulf and Middle East. The U.S. role in the Gulf has rendered it vulnerable to a hegemonic backlash on several levels. First, some important states in the region (including Iran and Iraq) aligned against the United States because they resented its intrusion into regional affairs. Second, in the Gulf and the Middle East, the self-perception among both elites and the general public that the region has long been a victim of “Western imperialism” is widespread. In this vein, the United States is viewed as just the latest extraregional power whose imperial aspirations weigh on the region, which brings a third factor into play. Be- cause of its interest in oil, the United States is supporting regimes—Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, and the Gulf emirates—whose domestic political legitimacy is contested. Whatever strategic considerations dictate that Washington prop up these regimes, that it does so makes the United States a lightning rod for those within these countries who are politically disaffected. More- over, these regimes are not blind to the domestic challenges to their grip on power. Because they are concerned about inflaming public opinion (the much talked about “street”), both their loyalty and utility as U.S. allies are, to put it charitably, suspect. Finally, although U.S. hegemony is manifested primarily in its overwhelming economic and military muscle, the cultural di- mension to U.S. preeminence is also important. The events of September 11 have brought into sharp focus the enormous cultural clash, which inescap- ably has overtones of a “clash of civilizations,” between Islamic fundamentalism and U.S. liberal ideology. The terrorism of Osama bin Laden results in part from this cultural chasm, as well as from more traditional geopolitical grievances. In a real sense, bin Laden’s brand of terrorism—the most dramatic illustration of U.S. vulnerability to the kind of “asymmetric warfare” of which some defense ex- perts have warned—is the counterhegemonic balancing of the very weak. For all of these reasons, the hegemonic role that the strategy of preponder- ance assigns to the United States as the Gulf’s stabilizer was bound to pro- voke a multilayered backlash against U.S. predominance in the region. Indeed, as Richard K. Betts, an acknowledged expert on strategy, presciently observed several years ago, “It is hardly likely that Middle Eastern radicals would be hatching schemes like the destruction of the World Trade Center if the United States had not been identified so long as the mainstay of Israel, the shah of Iran, and conservative Arab regimes and the source of a cultural assault on Islam.” 15 (Betts was referring to the 1993 attack on the World Trade Center.) In the wake of U.S. diplomatic and battlefield success in the first phase of the war on terrorism, some doubtless will conclude that victory has erased the paradox of U.S. power. The United States, after all, stands at the zenith of its hegemonic power—militarily, diplomatically, economically, and cultur- ally. When even potential rivals such as China and Russia have been folded into the U.S.-led coalition against terrorism, concluding that U.S. primacy is secure for a long, long time is tempting indeed. The outlook for U.S. pri- macy, however, may not be quite so rosy. Appearances can be deceiving, and the paradox of U.S. power remains.

### Miscalc

#### Heg leads to wars – lack of trust in the hegemon’s intentions

Monteiro 11 [Nuno P. Monteiro - is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University; “Unrest Assured Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful”; http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00064] RahulNambiar

A unipole carrying out a defensive-dominance strategy will seek to preserve all three aspects of the status quo: maintaining the territorial boundaries and international political alignments of all other states, as well as freezing the global distribution of power.60 This strategy can lead to conflict in two ways, both of which stem from uncertainty about the unipole’s intentions. First, not knowing the extent of the unipole’s determination to pursue a strategy of de- fensive dominance may spur some minor powers to develop their capabilities. Second, uncertainty about the degree to which the unipole will oppose small changes to the status quo may lead some minor powers to attempt them. In both cases, the opposition of the unipole to these actions is likely to lead to war. In this section, I lay out these two pathways to conoict and then illustrate them with historical examples. To be sure, states can never be certain of other states’ intentions.61 There are a couple of reasons, however, why this uncertainty increases in unipolarity, even when the unipole appears to be determined to maintain the status quo. First, other states cannot be certain that the unipole will always pursue nonre- visionist goals. This is particularly problemsatic because unipolarity minimizes the structural constraints on the unipole’s grand strategy. As Waltz writes, “Even if a dominant power behaves with moderation, restraint, and forbear- ance, weaker states will worry about its future behavior. . . . The absence of serious threats to American security gives the United States wide latitude in making foreign policy choices.”62 Second, unipolarity takes away the principal tool through which minor powers in bipolar and multipolar systems deal with uncertainty about great power intentions—alliances with other great powers. Whereas in these other systems minor powers can, in principle, attenuate the effects of uncertainty about great power intentions through external balancing, in a unipolar world no great power sponsor is present by deanition. In effect, the systemic imbalance of power magniaes uncertainty about the unipole’s intentions.63 Faced with this uncertainty, other states have two options. First, they can ac- commodate the unipole and minimize the chances of conflict but at the price of their external autonomy.64 Accommodation is less risky for major powers be- cause they can guarantee their own survival, and they stand to benefit greatly from being part of the unipolar system.65 Major powers are therefore unlikely to attempt to revise the status quo. Minor powers are also likely to accommo- date the unipole, in an attempt to avoid entering a confrontation with a pre- ponderant power. Thus, most states will accommodate the unipole because, as Wohlforth points out, the power differential rests in its favor.66

#### U.S. heg makes miscalc more likely.

Layne 06- Christopher Layne is Associate Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A & M University. (Fall 2006, The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment, Vol. 31, No. 2) SA

In a unipolar world, however, balance of threat theory is less useful. The greater the concentration of power in the international system, the more dangerous it becomes to make determinations of threat based on intentions rather than capabilities. Unipolarity substantially erases the distinction between balancing against threat versus balancing against power, because the threat inheres in the very fact that hard-power capabilities are overconcentrated in the hegemon’s favor. As Colin Elman suggests, “It is possible that, when states are approaching capabilities of hegemonic proportions, those resources alone are so threatening that they ‘drown out’ distance, offense-defense, and intentions as potential negative threat modifiers.” The consequences of guessing wrong about a hegemon’s intentions are likely to be far worse in a unipolar system than in a multipolar system. Precisely because unipolarity means that other states must worry primarily about the hegemon’s capabilities rather than its intentions, the ability of the United States to reassure others is limited by its formidable—and unchecked— capabilities, which always are at least a latent threat to other states. This is not to say that the United States is powerless to shape others’ perceptions of whether it is a threat. But doing so is difficult because in a unipolar world, the burden of proof is on the hegemon to demonstrate to others that its power is not threatening. Even in a unipolar world, not all of the other major powers will believe themselves to be threatened (or to be equally threatened) by the hegemon. Eventually, however, some are bound to regard the hegemon’s power as menacing. For example, although primacists assert that U.S. hegemony is nonthreatening because U.S. power is “offshore,” this manifestly is not the case. On the contrary, in Europe, East Asia, and the Middle East, American power is both onshore (or lurking just over the horizon in the case of East Asia) and in the faces of Russia, China, and the Islamic world. Far from being an offshore balancer that is “stopped by water” from dominating regions beyond the Western Hemisphere, the United States has acquired the means to project massive military power into, and around, Eurasia, and thereby to establish extraregional hegemony in Europe, East Asia, and the Persian Gulf.

### Overstretch

#### U.S heg triggers unnecessary wars – risks overstretch

Layne 06- Christopher Layne is Associate Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A & M University. (Fall 2006, The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment, Vol. 31, No. 2) SA

Conclusion

The United States has a hegemony problem because it wields hegemonic power. To reduce the fear of U.S. power, the United States must accept some reduction in its relative hard power by adopting a multipolar—and essentially unilateral—offshore balancing strategy that accommodates the rise of new great powers.130 It also must rein in the scope of its extravagant ambitions to shape the international system in accordance with its Wilsonian ideology. The United States does not need to be an extraregional hegemon to be secure. Its quest for hegemony is driven instead by an ideational, deterritorialized conception of security divorced from the traditional metrics of great power grand strategy: the distribution of power in the international system and geography.131 Thus, to reduce others’ concerns about its power, the United States must practice self-restraint (which is different from choosing to be constrained by others by adopting a multilateral approach to grand strategy). An America that has the wisdom and prudence to contain itself is less likely to be feared than one that begs the rest of the world to stop it before it expands hegemonically again. If the United States fails to adopt an offshore balancing strategy based on multipolarity and military and ideological self-restraint, it probably will, at some point, have to fight to uphold its primacy, which is a potentially dangerous strategy. Maintaining U.S. hegemony is a game that no longer is worth the candle, especially given that U.S. primacy may already be in the early stages of erosion. Paradoxically, attempting to sustain U.S. primacy may well hasten its end by stimulating more intensive efforts to balance against the United States, thus causing the United States to become imperially overstretched and involving it in unnecessary wars that will reduce its power. Rather than risking these outcomes, the United States should begin to retrench strategically and capitalize on the advantages accruing to insular great powers in multipolar systems. Unilateral offshore balancing, indeed, is America’s next grand strategy.

### Escalation

#### More wars are likely – hegemony means draw in happens

Monteiro 11 [Nuno P. Monteiro - is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University; “Unrest Assured Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful”; http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00064] RahulNambiar

After correcting for these two limitations, it becomes clear that unipolarity possesses much potential for conflict. Contrary to what Wohlforth argued, unipolarity is not a system in which the unipole is spared from any conflicts and major powers become involved only in peripheral wars. Instead, a unipo- lar system is one that provides incentives for recurrent wars between the sole great power and recalcitrant minor powers, as well as occasional wars among major and minor powers. That is the central prediction of my theory. To be sure, the unique historical character of the current unipolar era makes the task of building a general theory of unipolarity difacult. Particularly, it re- quires great care in distinguishing between those features of the post–Cold War world that are intrinsic to a unipolar system and those that stem from speciac aspects of contemporary international politics. Two points deserve mention. First, my theory of conflict in unipolarity is robust to changes in military technology. Still, some such changes would mean the end of unipolarity. At one end of the scale, some scholars argue that the widespread possession of equalizing technologies such as nuclear weapons would turn all minor powers into major powers and decrease the use of the unipole’s power-projection ca- pabilities in ways that might invalidate the label of unipolarity.113 At the other end of the scale, should the unipole develop a splendid arst-strike capability against all other states—an unlikely prospect, no doubt—its relative power would increase, perhaps replacing anarchy with hegemony.114 Both of these developments would mean that my theory no longer applies. Second, my argument is robust to changes in the geographical conaguration of the distribution of power. Were a future unipolar era to feature a continen-tal, rather than an offshore, unipole, the paths to conflict described above would still apply. A continental unipole’s inability to disengage from its neigh- bors might increase the proportion of conflict in which it will be involved at the expense of conflicts between others, but the conflict-producing mecha- nisms would remain the same.115

### A2 creates stability

#### Heg doesn’t solve wars – last 2 decades of instability prove

Monteiro 11 [Nuno P. Monteiro - is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yale University; “Unrest Assured Why Unipolarity Is Not Peaceful”; http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00064] RahulNambiar

In contrast, the question of unipolar peacefulness has received virtually no attention. Although the past decade has witnessed a resurgence of security studies, with much scholarship on such conoict-generating issues as terrorism, preventive war, military occupation, insurgency, and nuclear proliferation, no one has systematically connected any of them to unipolarity. This silence is unjustiaed. The past two decades of the unipolar era have been anything but peaceful. U.S. forces have been deployed in four interstate wars: Kuwait in 1991, Kosovo in 1999, Afghanistan from 2001 to the present, and Iraq between 2003 and 2010.22 In all, the United States has been at war for thirteen of the twenty-two years since the end of the Cold War.23 Put another way, the past two decades of unipolarity, which make up less than 10 percent of U.S. history, account for more than 25 percent of the nation’s total time at war.24 And yet, the theoretical consensus continues to be that unipolarity encourages peace. Why? To date, scholars do not have a theory of how unipolar systems operate.25 The debate on whether, when, and how unipolarity will end (i.e., the debate on durability) has all but monopolized our attention.

### A2 Withdrawal 🡪 Conflict

#### US withdrawal doesn’t risk conflict – Europe proves – countries would just focus on cooperation

Layne 06- Christopher Layne is Associate Professor at the Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A & M University. (Fall 2006, The Unipolar Illusion Revisited: The Coming End of the United States' Unipolar Moment, Vol. 31, No. 2) SA

Second, although regional balancing could work to the United States’ advantage, it would be more likely to do so in a future multipolar system rather than in a unipolar one. The Cold War illustrates this point. During the Cold War, the United States was hegemonic in the non-Soviet world. Although deeply ambivalent (or worse) about U.S. hegemony, the West Europeans nonetheless accepted—reluctantly—U.S. primacy because the United States protected them from the Soviet threat. In the absence of a hostile countervailing pole (or poles) of power in today’s unipolar world, however, there is a higher risk that others—even erstwhile U.S. allies—will come to see U.S. hegemony as a greater threat than U.S. preponderance during the Cold War. The likelihood that the major Eurasian powers may engage in regional balancing, in fact, is a more powerful argument for an offshore balancing strategy than it is for a hegemonic one: as an offshore balancer in a multipolar world, the United States could safely retract its military power from Eurasia because the regional powers would focus their strategic attention primarily on the security threats posed by their neighbors rather than on the United States. The United States could enhance its relative power position simply by standing on the sidelines while security competitions sapped the relative power positions of the major Eurasian powers.

## Proliferation

### Prolif from Heg snowballs

#### Heg incentives prolif that snowballs – enemies seek power against and then allies have fears

Jervis, 2009 (Robert- Robert Jervis is the Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Affairs at Columbia University, and has been a member of the faculty since 1980, Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/wp/summary/v061/61.1.jervis.html>, Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009 , pp. 188-213)

Failure would not mean that the system will soon cease being unipolar, however. Only if Europe truly unites (an increasingly distant prospect) could bipolarity be restored. Barring drastic internal instability, the PRC is likely to continue to rise but cannot be a global challenger in the foreseeable future. The most likely system-changing force is proliferation, and ironically unipolarity gives many states good reasons to seek nuclear weapons. Although allies sometimes doubted the American commitment during the cold war, the very strength of the Soviet Union meant that the U.S. would pay a high price if it did not live up to its promises to defend them. The unipole has more freedom of action. Even if the unipole’s costs of protecting others are lower, those states have less reason to be confident that it will stand by them forever. The existence of a security community does not entirely displace the fear of an uncertain future that is the hallmark of international politics. American enemies like North Korea and Iran face more immediate incentives to defend themselves, incentives that were increased but not created by the overthrow of Saddam’s regime. Indeed, the U.S. has spurred proliferation by stressing the danger posed by “rogue” states with nuclear weapons, treating North Korea much more gingerly than Iraq, and indicating that it can be deterred by even a few atomic bombs. Its very efforts to stop other countries from getting nuclear weapons imply that the consequences of their succeeding will be great, a belief that is questionable but could easily be self-fulfilling. Furthermore, regional domino effects are likely: a growing North Korean nuclear force could lead Japan to develop nuclear weapons, and if Iran continues its program others in the region may follow suit. Thus both American overexpansion and the fear that it will eventually withdraw will encourage others to get nuclear weapons.

### Prolif to Balance

#### US hegemony increases proliferation – incentivizes desire to balance.

Joon and Gartzke 2007

[Dong-Joon Department of International Relations University of Seoul, Korea Erik Gartzke Department of Political Science Columbia University, New York, “Determinants of Nuclear Weapons Proliferation.’ Source: The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Feb., 2007), pp. 167-194 (<http://www.jstor.org.proxy.library.emory.edu/stable/27638542>)]

Ironically, our research implies that United States hegemony has the potential to encourage nuclear proliferation. The United States appears much more willing to intervene in contests that previously would have invited opposition from the Soviet Union. States in the developing world can no longer look to the nuclear umbrella of the Soviet Union to protect them. The lack of a nuclear defender increases the willingness to proliferate, provided that a state possesses a nuclear program. Meanwhile, the diffusion of nuclear knowledge and technology continues. Middle powers, opposed to U.S. hegemony and which currently lack nuclear programs, may be the most easily dissuaded of all nuclear proliferators. A strong policy of asymmetric nuclear deterrence may deliver the United States a world with few nuclear adversaries but at the risk of greater friction and possibly nuclear war. Similarly, while a national missile defense system might make it harder for proliferators to directly challenge the United States (Powell 2003), states facing more proximate conventional threats or states that plan to target U.S. allies may still find that nuclear weapons are an appealing option in an uncertain world.

#### US structure changes motivate terrorism – easier to get the latent abilities

Joon and Gartzke 2007

[Dong-Joon Department of International Relations ¶ University of Seoul, Korea ¶ Erik Gartzke ¶ Department of Political Science ¶ Columbia University, New York¶ Determinants of Nuclear

Weapons Proliferation: The Journal of Conflict Resolution, Vol. 51, No. 1 (Feb., 2007), pp. 167-194 (<http://www.jstor.org.proxy.library.emory.edu/stable/27638542>)]

We examine the nuclear proliferation process in terms of two conceptual components: willingness and opportunity. Some states are willing to seek nuclear options ¶ because of their external concerns. (1) States facing major conventional security ¶ threats may use nuclear proliferation to countervail conventional disadvantage ¶ (Israel and Pakistan). (2) Nuclear defenders do discourage a deepening of nuclear ¶ proliferation among protégés, but there is not much difference between states pos ¶ sessing or lacking nuclear defenders in terms of the likelihood of having a nuclear ¶ weapons program (Romania and South Korea). (3) Perhaps fearing nuclear preemption (Jervis 1984), states facing threats from nuclear powers demonstrate a signifi ¶ cantly lower propensity to pursue nuclear programs or weapons proliferation (Cuba). ¶ (4) Major powers have been far more likely to develop nuclear weapons programs ¶ and nuclear weapons. (5) Regional powers are prone to develop programs but are ¶ only slightly likelier to produce weapons (Argentina, Brazil, India, and South ¶ Africa). (6) Pariah states are neither more likely to initiate nuclear weapons ¶ programs nor to possess nuclear weapons. Other considerations appear only marginally to affect states' decisions to pursue ¶ proliferation. (7) Democracy turns out to deepen nuclear proliferation once a nuclear ¶ weapons infrastructure is in place, but there is no difference between democracy and ¶ autocracy in terms of a tendency to pursue nuclear weapons production programs. ¶ (8) Leaders facing domestic unrest or internal bureaucratic pressures to proliferate ¶ seldom activate the nuclear card for these reasons (India). (9) Membership in the ¶ NPT tends modestly to encourage states to maintain pledges of nonproliferation, ¶ while systemic normative constraints of the NPT regime do not exist or are counter ¶ acted by the other part of the NPT bargain, the dissemination of technology and ¶ nuclear know-how. The complement to nuclear proliferation willingness is opportunity. Since it ¶ remains difficult to obtain nuclear weapons by trade, states that lack the requisite ¶ production capabilities have largely been precluded from proliferating. States that ¶ lack the ability to produce nuclear weapons are likely to seek other options such as ¶ enhancing their conventional forces or pursuing diplomatic solutions (Libya). (10) ¶ We find that latent nuclear production capabilities increase the predicted probability ¶ of having nuclear weapons programs but that latent production capabilities do not ¶ have any substantial impact on the conditional decision to produce nuclear weapons. ¶ Thus, latent nuclear capability is a critical factor early in proliferation but less so ¶ later on. (11) The diffusion of nuclear knowledge and technology eases opportunity ¶ barriers to the proliferation of programs and nuclear weapons. ¶ Our research allows us to offer predictions about several nuclear proliferation ¶ trends. The number of states with either nuclear weapons programs or nuclear ¶ weapons is likely to continue to grow at a gradual, though gradually increasing pace, ¶ buffeted at times by changes in the structure of threats, such as the U.S. preemption policy. As they less often possess the latent ability to produce nuclear weapons and ¶ are more likely to succumb to pressure from the international community, minor ¶ powers will generally not attempt to proliferate. At the same time, most major pow ¶ ers already have nuclear weapons or are precluded from acquiring them. It is thus ¶ regional and other middle powers that are most likely to proliferate. Many of these ¶ states have already attained latent nuclear weapons production capabilities but have ¶ refrained from nuclear weapons development for a variety of idiosyncratic reasons. ¶ When they face security threats in terms of conventional capabilities, midsized powers are much more likely to attempt to pursue the nuclear option. Yet even if regional ¶ and middle powers develop nuclear weapons, this does not appear to increase the ¶ proliferation risk among neighboring states, perhaps because small nuclear arsenals ¶ are seen as largely defensive.

### Anti-Americanism Motivates Prolif

#### Anti-Americanism spurs prolif- Iran and North Korea alliance

Rosett 4-10-13 (Claudia Rosett is an American writer and journalist. She is journalist-in-residence at the Foundation for the Defense of Democracies, a policy institute based in Washington, D.C, went to Yale then Columbia, The Pyongyang-Tehran Proliferation Playbook, http://www.forbes.com/sites/claudiarosett/2013/04/10/the-pyongyang-tehran-proliferation-playbook/)

Clearly the dangers posed by North Korea reside not only in its arsenal, but in the precedents Pyongyang keeps setting for just how much a rogue regime can get away with in this era of receding American power. As North Korea hones its missile reach and nuclear abilities — while threatening to incinerate Seoul, [Washington](http://www.forbes.com/places/dc/washington/) and U.S. bases in the Pacific — it appears the limits of such behavior have yet to be discovered. That spectacularly dangerous message is surely being read with interest by other anti-American regimes, especially by North Korea’s chief partner in proliferation, [Iran](http://www.forbes.com/places/iran/). Iran’s interest in the North Korean playbook goes back some three decades, to the early days of the Islamic Republic. It extends beyond a shared interest in military hardware, to a mutually reinforcing policy of threatening the U.S. A signal event in this relationship took place in 1989, shortly after the end of the 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq War, in which North Korea supplied weapons, including knock-offs of Soviet Scud missiles, to Iran. In May of 1989, Iran’s then-president Ali Khamenei paid a visit to Pyongyang, then ruled by Kim Il Sung, grandfather of North Korea’s current tyrant, Kim Jong Un. The gist of Khamenei’s message during that visit is important, because less than a month later Iran’s revolutionary tyrant Ayatollah Khomeini died, and Khamenei took over as Iran’s Supreme Leader — which he remains to this day. During his 1989 trip to North Korea, Khamenei was full of praise for North Korea’s heavily armed hostility toward the U.S. In a statement to Kim Il Sung, broadcast by Tehran Radio, and reported at the time by the Associated Press, Khamenei said, “Anti-Americanism can be the most important factor in our cooperation with the People’s Democratic Republic of North Korea.” He added, admiringly, “You have proved in Korea that you have the power to confront America.” Plenty has changed in the world, but the anti-American alliance between Iran and North Korea has endured. In 2009, according to a laudatory account by Pyongyang’s Korean Central News Agency, Iran held a ceremony at its embassy in Pyongyang to commemorate the twentieth anniversary of the meeting between Iran’s Supreme Leader Khamenei and North Korea’s late Great Leader Kim. In 2012, when a high-level North Korean delegation to Tehran signed a Scientific Cooperation Agreement with Iran, fraught with nuclear overtones, Khamenei gave his public blessing to the deal — citing a shared need to defy “common enemies.” Underpinning this cozy anti-American axis are decades of weapons development and trade. Iran has the oil money that cash hungry North Korea craves for its weapons programs, and North Korea has the willingness to pioneer ever more dangerous means of threatening America and its allies. Following unconfirmed press reports of Iranians being present at North Korea’s third nuclear test this February, the news has been full of stories about the North Korea-Iran axis of proliferation. But some particularly horrifying information can be found in a 2011 paper published by the Seoul-based Institute of National [Security](http://www.forbes.com/security/) Strategy, authored by Larry Niksch, an Asia specialist formerly with the U.S. Congressional Research Service. In this paper, Niksch estimated that North Korea’s regime was earning “between $1.5 billion and $2.0 billion annually from its multi-faceted collaboration with Iran (including support for the terrorist groups Hezbollah and Hamas).”

### Prolif Turns Heg Good

#### Prolif turns the reasons heg is good – undermines the influence of power.

Jervis, 2009 (Robert- Robert Jervis is the Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Affairs at Columbia University, and has been a member of the faculty since 1980, Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/wp/summary/v061/61.1.jervis.html>, Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009 , pp. 188-213)

This raises the question of what would remain of a unipolar system in a proliferated world. The American ability to coerce others would decrease but so would its need to defend friendly powers that would now have their own deterrents.55 The world would still be unipolar by most measures and considerations, but many countries would be able to protect themselves, perhaps even against the superpower. How they would use this increased security is far from clear, however. They might intensify conflict with neighbors because they no longer fear all-out war, or, on the contrary, they might be willing to engage in greater cooperation because the risks of becoming dependent on others would be reduced. In any event, the polarity of the system may become less important. Unipolarity—at least under current circumstances—may then have within it the seeds if not of its own destruction, then at least of its modification, and the resulting world would pose interesting challenges to both scholars and national leaders.

## Terror/Anti-Americanism

### Terrorism Module

#### US heg motivates terrorism – fear of no support or aggression

Jervis, 2009 (Robert- Robert Jervis is the Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Affairs at Columbia University, and has been a member of the faculty since 1980, Unipolarity: A Structural Perspective, <http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/wp/summary/v061/61.1.jervis.html>, Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009 , pp. 188-213)

Some classical balance thinking still applies, however. States have a variety of security concerns that require influencing or acting independently from the superpower, and they have interests that extend beyond security that may call for a form of counterbalancing. Even if others do not fear attack from the unipole, they may believe that the latter’s behavior endangers them, a worry that parallels that of traditional alliance entrapment.46 Thus today some states believe that the way the U.S. is pursuing its “war on terror” increases the chance they will be the victim of terrorist attacks and decreases stability in the Middle East, an area they depend on for oil. So there is reason for them to act in concert to restrain the U.S.47 The point is not to block the U.S. from conquering them, as in traditional balancing, but to increase their influence over it. Although such efforts will not be automatic and their occurrence will depend on complex calculations of costs, benefits, and the possibilities of success, these concerns provide an impetus for trying to make it harder for the unipole to act alone. Others may also fear that the unipole will refuse to act when their security, but not its own security, is at stake. As Waltz notes, “absence of threat permits [the superpower’s] policy to become capricious.”48 It is not surprising that American policy has changed more from one administration to the next after the cold war than it did during it, and the fear of abandonment may be the main motive behind the Europeans’ pursuit of a rapid reaction force. With it they would have the capability to act in the Balkans or East Europe if the U.S. chose not to, to intervene in small humanitarian crises independently of the U.S., and perhaps to trigger American action by starting something that only the U.S. could finish. This is not balancing against American power, but, rather, is a hedge against the possibility that the U.S. would withhold it, perhaps in response to European actions of which the U.S. disapproved. 49

### Heg 🡪 Resistance

#### U.S. primacy bad- spurs local conflicts and global resistance

Shor 10- Francis Shor teaches in the History Department at Wayne State University. (War in the Era of Declining U.S. Global Hegemony, Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies, Issue 2 (2010), <http://www.criticalglobalisation.com/Issue2/65_81_DECLINING_US_HEGEMONY_JCGS2.pdf>) SA

There can be no doubt that a more emboldened imperialism and militarism have been the hallmarks of recent U.S. geopolitical strategy. Carl Boggs has traced that ‘revitalized U.S. imperialism and militarism’ to a number of factors: “a growing mood of American exceptionalism in international affairs, the primacy of military force in U.S. policy, arrogation of the right to intervene around the world, the spread of xenophobic patriotism, [and] further consolidation of the permanent war system”(2005, p. x).3 However, as acknowledged by Boggs and other critics of U.S. imperialism, such imperialism and militarism not only exacerbate and/or even create local insurgencies, but constant saber-rattling by the U.S. also produces global resistance, such as the massive world-wide mobilization of millions that occurred on the eve of the U.S. military invasion of Iraq in February 2003. In effect, the pursuit of imperial dominance through geopolitical militarism and war contains contradictions that further undermine hegemony abroad and legitimacy at home, reinforcing, in the process, a crisis of empire.

#### U.S. unipolarity bad- strengthens terrorism and raises security threats

Pape 05- Robert A. Pape is Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago. (Soft Balancing against the United States. Summer 2005, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/1019-is-30-1\_final\_02-pape.pdf)

For other major powers, the main threat to their security stems not from the risk that the United States will eventually pose a direct threat to attack their homelands, but that the U.S. policy of preventive war is likely to unleash violence that the United States cannot fully control and that poses an indirect threat to their security. As a result, even though the United States means them no harm, other major states must still contend with the spillover effects of U.S. unilateral uses of force. These indirect effects are especially pronounced for U.S. military adventures in the Middle East, which could stimulate a general rise in the level of global terrorism targeted at European and other major states. As the French foreign policy adviser Bruno Tertrais explains: “The implementation of the U.S. strategy [of preventive war] tends to favor, rather than reduce, the development of the principal threats to which it is addressed: terrorism and proliferation. . . . The Al Qaeda organization . . . has now reached the shores of Europe, as shown by the [terrorist attacks] in Turkey (December 2003) and Spain (March 2004). The campaign conducted by the United States has strengthened the Islamists’ sense of being totally at war against the rest of the world.”

### Heg 🡪 Anti-Americanism

#### US heg fuels Anti-Americanism - international polling proves

Abdallah 2003

[abdel mahdi abdallah [iraqi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iraq) [shi'a](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shi%27a) [politician](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politician), economist, and was one of the vice presidents of iraq from 2005 to 2011. Middle East Review of International Affairs, Vol. 7, No. 4 (December 2003) causes of anti-americanism in the arab world: a socio-political perspective (<http://www.gloria-center.org/meria/2003/12/abdallah.pdf>)]

As demonstrated by the Pew Center's 2003 public opinion survey of 44 countries, in the past few years, the United States has faced rising antiAmericanism almost all over in the world.(1) People in these countries are opposed to American unilateralism, its decision to wage war on Iraq and other countries, its Strategic Defense Initiative (commonly referred to as the 'Star Wars' program), drive for globalization, as well as its business, human rights, and environmental practices. Hatred for America burns brightest in the Arab world and Southwest Asia, where, America's critics claim, the U.S.'s hegemonic designs are centered at present. However, the vast majority of the people in the world believe the United States does not take into account the interests of their countries when making regional or international policies. With this in mind, the war on Iraq threatens to fuel anti-American sentiment and divides the United States from the publics of its traditional allies and new strategic friends. Huge majorities in the Arab and Islamic worlds, France, Spain, Britain, Germany and Russia opposed the use of military force against Iraq. This sentiment was evident in the huge demonstrations and rallies that took place across the globe. Anti-war activists argued that the war was motivated by a colonialist desire to control Iraqi oil, and they asserted that the conflict between the Israelis and Palestinians was the greater threat to stability in the Middle East. Moreover, many Arabs believe that the real intention behind the U.S. occupation of Iraq is a desire to further Israel's security and oil supply. The sources of Arab anti-American attitudes are complicated and cannot be explained on the basis of one single factor. Rather, there are internal and external reasons for Arab hatred of the United States, which can be divided into four groups: 1. America's support for Israel and its position on the Arab-Israeli conflict. 2. U.S. military attacks and sanctions against some Arab countries and its military bases in the Arab world. 3. U.S. support for some authoritarian Arab regimes, and its hostile policies toward Islam, and its own citizens of Arab and Muslim origin. 4. U.S. hypocritical behavior regarding democracy and human rights in the Arab world. The following will explore the logic behind each of these arguments.

#### American predominance is the reason for global rise in anti-Americanism- opinion polls show

Maher, 2011 (Richard- a Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University., a B.A. in Political Science from the University of Michigan, an M.Sc. in Political Theory from the London School of Economics, and an M.A. in Political Science from Brown University.research areas include alliance politics, American foreign policy, European foreign and security policy, nuclear weapons, and international security., The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0030438710000633>, Volume 55, Issue 1, 2011, Pages 53–68-aayush)

It is not necessary that everyone admire the United States or accept its ideals, values, and goals. Indeed, such dramatic imbalances of power that characterize world politics today almost always produce in others feelings of mistrust, resentment, and outright hostility. At the same time, it is easier for the United States to realize its own goals and values when these are shared by others, and are viewed as legitimate and in the common interest. As a result of both its vast power but also some of the decisions it has made, particularly over the past eight years, feelings of resentment and hostility toward the United States have grown, and perceptions of the legitimacy of its role and place in the world have correspondingly declined. Multiple factors give rise to anti-American sentiment, and anti-Americanism takes different shapes and forms.17 It emerges partly as a response to the vast disparity in power the United States enjoys over other states. Taking satisfaction in the missteps and indiscretions of the imposing Gulliver is a natural reaction. In societies that globalization (which in many parts of the world is interpreted as equivalent to Americanization) has largely passed over, resentment and alienation are felt when comparing one's own impoverished, ill-governed, unstable society with the wealth, stability, and influence enjoyed by the United States.18 Anti-Americanism also emerges as a consequence of specific American actions and certain values and principles to which the United States ascribes. Opinion polls showed that a dramatic rise in anti-American sentiment followed the perceived unilateral decision to invade Iraq (under pretences that failed to convince much of the rest of the world) and to depose Saddam Hussein and his government and replace it with a government much more friendly to the United States. To many, this appeared as an arrogant and completely unilateral decision by a single state to decide for itself when— and under what conditions—military force could be used. A number of other policy decisions by not just the George W. Bush but also the Clinton and Obama administrations have provoked feelings of anti-American sentiment. However, it seemed that a large portion of the world had a particular animus for George W. Bush and a number of policy decisions of his administration, from voiding the U.S. signature on the International Criminal Court (ICC), resisting a global climate change treaty, detainee abuse at Abu Ghraib in Iraq and at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba, and what many viewed as a simplistic worldview that declared a “war” on terrorism and the division of the world between good and evil. With populations around the world mobilized and politicized to a degree never before seen—let alone barely contemplated—such feelings of anti-American sentiment makes it more difficult for the United States to convince other governments that the U.S.’ own preferences and priorities are legitimate and worthy of emulation.

## Alternative to Heg

### Multipolarity good

#### Mutlipolarity insures global sustainability and security – solves the reasons heg is good.

Layne, 2009 (Christopher Layne, PhD is Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, The Waning of U.S.¶ Hegemony—Myth or¶ Reality?, <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/isec.2009.34.1.147>, July 7, 2009.)

unipolar stability? Superficially, Brooks and Wohlforth make a strong¶ case for unipolar stability. But there is less to their argument than meets the¶ eye.42 Their case is based on a freeze-frame view of the distribution of capabilities in the international system; they do not engage the argument that, like all¶ hegemonic systems, the American era of unipolarity contains the seeds of its¶ own demise. Hegemons sprint to the front of the great power pack because of¶ economic leadership based on productivity and technological innovation.¶ Over time, however, know-how, technology, and managerial skills diffuse¶ throughout the international economic system, which allows other states to¶ catch up. Similarly, leadership costs sap the hegemon’s power and push it into¶ decline.43 A key question is whether the early decades of the twenty-first century will witness the decline of U.S. hegemony. In this respect, the debate¶ about unipolar stability is misleading. After all, despite their claim at the beginning of World Out of Balance that unipolarity is robust and that U.S. hegemony will endure well into the future, Brooks and Wohlforth actually concede¶ that unipolarity is not likely to last more than another twenty years, which is¶ not very long at all.44 Not only is this a weak case for unipolarity; it is also an¶ implicit admission that—although it has yet to bear fruit—other states are engaged in counterbalancing the United States, and this is spurring an ongoing¶ process of multipolarization.45 toward multipolarity? The ascent of new great powers would be the¶ strongest evidence of multipolarization, and the two most important indicators of whether this is happening are relative growth rates and shares of world¶ GDP.46 Here, there is evidence that as the NIC, Khanna, Mahbubani, and, to a¶ point, Zakaria contend, global economic power is flowing from the United¶ States and Europe to Asia.47 The shift of economic clout to East Asia is important because it could propel China’s ascent—thus hastening the relative decline of U.S. power—and also because emerging regional multipolarity could¶ trigger future major power war.¶ China, of course, is the poster child for Asia’s rise, and many analysts—¶ including the NIC, Khanna, and (implicitly) Mahbubani and Zakaria—agree¶ that China is the rising power most likely to challenge U.S. hegemony.48 Unsurprisingly, Brooks and Wohlforth are skeptical about China’s rise, and they¶ dismiss the idea that China could become a viable counterweight to a hegemonic United States within any meaningful time frame.49 Their analysis, however, is static. For sure, the United States still has an impressive lead in the¶ categories they measure.50 Looking ahead, however, the trend lines appear to¶ favor China, which already has overtaken the United States as the world’s¶ leading manufacturer—a crown the United States wore for more than a century.51 China also may overtake the United States in GDP in the next ten to fifteen years. In 2003 Goldman Sachs predicted that China would pass the¶ United States in GDP by 2041, but in 2008 it revised the time frame to 2028.52¶ And, in early 2009, the Economist Intelligence Unit predicted that China’s¶ GDP would surpass the United States’ in 2021.53 Empirically, then, there are¶ indications that the unipolar era is drawing to a close, and that the coming decades could witness a power transition.54¶

## Sustainability Debate

### Decline Inevitable – Economy

#### US decline inevitable – macroeconomic flaws

Layne, 2009 (Christopher Layne, PhD is Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, The Waning of U.S.¶ Hegemony—Myth or¶ Reality?, <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/isec.2009.34.1.147>, July 7, 2009.)

The warning signs with respect to U.S. decline are a looming fiscal crisis and¶ doubts about the future of the dollar as the reserve currency, both of which are¶ linked to the fear that after recovery, the United States will face a serious¶ inflationary threat.77 Optimists contend that once the United States recovers, fears of a fiscal crisis will fade: the country faced a larger debt to GDP ratio after World War II, and yet embarked on a sustained era of growth. The postwar¶ era, however, was a golden age of U.S. industrial and financial dominance,¶ trade surpluses, and sustained high growth rates. The United States of 2009 is¶ far different from the United States of 1945, however, which is why many¶ economists believe that even in the best case, it will emerge from the current¶ crisis with serious macroeconomic handicaps.78 Chief among these handicaps¶ are the increase in the money supply (caused by the massive amount of dollars¶ the Federal Reserve and Treasury have pumped into circulation to rescue the¶ economy), and the $1 trillion plus budget deficits that the Brookings Institution and the Congressional Budget Ofªce (CBO) project the United States will¶ incur for at least a decade.79 When the projected deªcits are bundled with the¶ persistent U.S. current account deªcit, the entitlements overhang, and the cost¶ of two ongoing wars, there is reason to worry about the United States’ longterm ªscal stability.80 The CBO states, “Even if the recovery occurs as projected¶ and the stimulus bill is allowed to expire, the country will face the highest¶ debt/GDP ratio in 50 years and an increasingly urgent and unsustainable fiscal problem.”81 If the Congressional Budget Office is right, it spells trouble¶ ahead for the dollar.¶ As Jonathan Kirshner noted on the eve of the meltdown, the dollar’s vulnerability “presents potentially signiªcant and underappreciated restraints upon¶ contemporary American political and military predominance.”82 The dollar’s¶ loss of reserve currency status would undermine U.S. dominance, and recent¶ events have magnified concerns that predated the ªnancial and economic crisis.83 First, the other big players in the international economy now are either military rivals (China) or ambiguous “allies” (Europe) that have their own ambitions and no longer require U.S. protection from the Soviet threat. Second,¶ the dollar faces an uncertain future because of concerns that its value will diminish over time. Because of these two factors, as Eric Helleiner notes, if the¶ dollar experiences dramatic depreciation in the future, there is a “risk of defections generating a herd-like momentum” away from it.84¶ To defend the dollar, in coming years the United States will be under increasing pressure to prevent runaway inºation through some combination of¶ budget cuts, tax increases, and interest-rate hikes.85 Given that the last two options could choke off renewed growth, there is likely to be strong pressure to¶ slash the federal budget. For several reasons, it will be almost impossible¶ to make meaningful cuts in federal spending without deep reductions in defense expenditures. First, discretionary nondefense spending accounts for only¶ about 20 percent of annual federal outlays.86 Second, there are obvious “guns¶ or butter” choices. As Kirshner points out, with U.S. defense spending at such¶ high absolute levels, domestic political pressure to make steep cuts in defense¶ spending is likely to increase greatly.87 If this analysis is correct, the United¶ States may be compelled to retract its overseas military commitments.88

### Decline Inevitable - China

#### Hegemony coming to an end – relative power declining

Christopher Layne 2012

Christopher Layne PhD, Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University 2012 This Time It’s Real: The End of Unipolarity and the¶ Pax Americana Quarterly 56, 203–213

American decline is part of a broader trend in international politics: the shift of economic power away¶ ¶ from the Euro-Atlantic core to rising great and regional powers (what economists sometimes refer to as¶ ¶ the ‘‘emerging market’’ nations). Among the former¶ ¶ are China, India, and Russia. The latter category¶ ¶ includes Indonesia, Turkey, South Korea, Brazil, and¶ ¶ South Africa. In a May 2011 report, the World Bank¶ ¶ predicted that six countries—China, India, Brazil,¶ ¶ Russia, Indonesia, and South Korea—will account¶ ¶ for one-half of the world’s economic growth between¶ ¶ 2011 and 2025 (Politi 2011; Rich 2011). In some¶ ¶ respects, of course, this emergence of new great¶ ¶ powers is less about rise than restoration. As Figure 1¶ ¶ indicates, in 1700 China and India were the world’s¶ ¶ two largest economies. From their perspective—especially Beijing’s—they are merely regaining what they¶ ¶ view as their natural, or rightful, place in the hierarchy of great powers.¶ ¶ The ascent of new great powers is the strongest¶ ¶ evidence of unipolarity’s end. The two most important indicators of whether new great powers are rising are relative growth rates and shares of world¶ ¶ GDP (Gilpin 1981; Kennedy 1987). The evidence¶ ¶ that the international system is rapidly becoming¶ ¶ multipolar—and that, consequently, America’s relative power is declining—is now impossible to deny,¶ ¶ and China is Exhibit A for the shift in the world’s¶ ¶ center of economic and geopolitical gravity. China¶ ¶ illustrates how, since the Cold War’s end, potential¶ ¶ great powers have been positioning themselves to¶ ¶ challenge the United States.¶ ¶ To spur its economic growth, for some three decades (beginning with Deng Xiaoping’s economic¶ ¶ reforms) China took a low proﬁle in international¶ ¶ politics and avoided confrontation with the United¶ ¶ States and its regional neighbors. To spur its modernization as well, China integrated itself in the¶ ¶ American-led world order. China’s self-described¶ ¶ ‘‘peaceful rise’’ followed the script written by Deng¶ ¶ Xiaoping: ‘‘Lie low. Hide your capabilities. Bide your¶ ¶ time.’’ The fact that China joined the international¶ ¶ economic order did not mean its long-term intentions were benign. Beijing’s long-term goal was not¶ ¶ simply to get rich. It was also to become wealthy¶ ¶ enough to acquire the military capabilities it needs¶ ¶ to compete with the United States for regional hegemony in East Asia.2¶ ¶ The Great Recession caused a¶ ¶ dramatic shift in Beijing’s perceptions of the international balance of power. China now sees the United¶ ¶ States in decline while simultaneously viewing itself¶ ¶ as having risen to great-power status. China’s newly¶ ¶ gained self-conﬁdence was evident in its 2010 foreign policy muscle-ﬂexing.¶ ¶ Objective indicators conﬁrm the reality of China’s¶ ¶ rise, and the United States’ corresponding relative¶ ¶ decline. In 2010, China displaced the United States¶ ¶ as the world’s leading manufacturing nation—¶ ¶ a crown the United States had held for a century.

### Decline Inevitable – Counter-Balancing

#### Decline inevitable – counterbalancing – which isn’t a bad thing

Maher, 2011 (Richard- a Ph.D. candidate in the Political Science department at Brown University., a B.A. in Political Science from the University of Michigan, an M.Sc. in Political Theory from the London School of Economics, and an M.A. in Political Science from Brown University.research areas include alliance politics, American foreign policy, European foreign and security policy, nuclear weapons, and international security., The Paradox of American Unipolarity: Why the United States May Be Better Off in a Post-Unipolar World, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0030438710000633>, Volume 55, Issue 1, 2011, Pages 53–68-aayush)

As we witness the emergence (or re-emergence) of great powers in other parts of the world, we realize that American predominance cannot last forever. It is inevitable that the distribution of power and influence will become more balanced in the future, and that the United States will necessarily see its relative power decline. While the United States naturally should avoid hastening the end of this current period of American predominance, it should not look upon the next period of global politics and international history with dread or foreboding. It certainly should not seek to maintain its predominance at any cost, devoting unlimited ambition, resources, and prestige to the cause. In fact, contrary to what many have argued about the importance of maintaining its predominance, America's position in the world—both at home and internationally—could very well be strengthened once its era of preeminence is over. It is, therefore, necessary for the United States to start thinking about how best to position itself in the “post-unipolar” world.

#### Heg unsustainable – Russia and China

Posen 13 [Barry Posen - Ford International Professor of Political Science at MIT and the director of MIT's Security Studies Program. An expert in the field of security studies, he currently serves on the editorial boards of the journals International Security and Security Studies and is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and served as a study group member for the Hart-Rudman Commission; ‘Pull Back: The Case for a Less Activist Foreign Policy’; http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138466/barry-r-posen/pull-back] RahulN

American activism has also generated harder forms of balancing. China has worked assiduously to improve its military, and Russia has sold it modern weapons, such as fighter aircraft, surface-to-air missiles, and diesel-electric submarines. Iran and North Korea, meanwhile, have pursued nuclear programs in part to neutralize the United States' overwhelming advantages in conventional fighting power. Some of this pushback would have occurred no matter what; in an anarchic global system, states acquire the allies and military power that help them look after themselves. But a country as large and as active as the United States intensifies these responses. Such reactions will only grow stronger as emerging economies convert their wealth into military power. Even though the economic and technological capacities of China and India may never equal those of the United States, the gap is destined to narrow. China already has the potential to be a serious competitor. At the peak of the Cold War, in the mid-1970s, Soviet GDP, in terms of purchasing power parity, amounted to 57 percent of U.S. GDP. China reached 75 percent of the U.S. level in 2011, and according to the International Monetary Fund, it is projected to match it by 2017. Of course, Chinese output must support four times as many people, which limits what the country can extract for military purposes, but it still provides enough resources to hinder U.S. foreign policy Meanwhile, Russia, although a shadow of its former Soviet self, is no longer the hapless weakling it was in the 1990s. Its economy is roughly the size of the United Kingdom's or France's, it has plenty of energy resources to export, and it still produces some impressive weapons systems.

## Answers to Neg Arguments

### A2 heg good

#### Hegemony good is wrapped in ignorance – anti-americanism is rampant

Shor, 2010(Francis , Francis Shor teaches in the History Department at Wayne State University. His most recent book is Dying Empire: US Imperialism and Global Resistance. He is a long-time peace and justice activist, War in the Era of Declining U.S. Global Hegemony, <http://www.criticalglobalisation.com/Issue2/65_81_DECLINING_US_HEGEMONY_JCGS2.pdf>, Journal of Critical Globalisation Studies, Issue 2)

Clearly, the pursuit of such wars also engenders resistance abroad and potential dissent at home, the latter, however, contingent on some fundamental understanding of the whys and wherefores of prosecuting war. Certainly, resistance to a militarized U.S. foreign policy is evident in various guises, from local insurgencies to global protests. Irrespective of the form such resistance may take, including insurgencies that engage in terror, the U.S. will encounter resistance as long as it insists on imposing its sense of order in the world. In effect, a “system of global domination resting largely on military force, or even the threat of force, cannot in the greater scheme of things consolidate its rule on a foundation of legitimating beliefs on values” (Boggs, 2005, p. 178). On the other hand, U.S. perception of that resistance, whether by the ruling elite, corporate media, or the public at large, is filtered through an ideological smokescreen that either labels that resistance as “terrorism” or some primitive from of know-nothing anti-Americanism. Part of the inability to recognize the reality of what shapes the lives of others is the persistence of a self-image of U.S. benevolence or innocence, even in the face of the realities spawned by U.S. intervention and occupation.20 Also, what remains both contentious and difficult to face is the degree to which the United States, especially in its pursuit of global dominance through military imperialism, has become, to quote Walter Hixson, a “warfare state, a nation with a propensity for initiating and institutionalizing warfare” (2008, p. 14). For Hixson the perpetuation of that warfare state requires reaffirming a national identity whose cultural hegemony at home can provide ideological cover for “nation building, succoring vicious regimes, bombing shelling, contaminating, torturing and killing hundreds of thousands of innocents, and destroying enemy others” (2008, p. 304).

### A2 benign Heg

#### Don’t trust pro-US hegemony authors – signing their own praises.

Samantha Blum2003

[Samantha Blum Ph.D. in political science at George Washington University (2003) Journal of Contemporary China (2003), 12(35), 239–264 Chinese Views of US 12:35, 239-264, (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1067056022000054597>)]

Although Yan’s point does not go quite as far, his view to some extent is related to one put forward by John Ikenberry (an advocate of the neo-liberal school), that ‘Western order has what might be called “constitutional characteristics”—a structure of institutions and open polities that constrain power and facilitate “voice opportunities”, thereby mitigating the implications of power asymmetries and reducing the opportunities of the leading state to exit or dominate’.34 However, Yan does go on to argue that ‘an institutionalized system of hegemony, created by establishing international norms accepted by a majority of countries, causes the US policy of hegemony to be legitimized, so that it can obtain the political support of more countries, and in its policy of hegemony, reduce an excessive reliance on armed force’.35 American efforts to ‘legitimize’ the country’s hegemony have also been noted by other analysts, particularly the notion that it is ‘benevolent’. While some Chinese authors are less harsh than others in their depictions of the nature of US hegemony, it is likely that none would be willing to accept that it is ‘benign’, as some American politicians and political scientists would argue. According to Christopher Layne, there are three reasons why some Americans believe US hegemony will be accepted and not countered throughout the world: They argue that others do not balance against overwhelming power per se. Rather, they assert that states balance against those who act in a threatening manner, which the US, as a ‘benign’ hegemon does not. Second, scholars and policy makers believe that because the US takes into account other states’ interests, far from balancing against the US, others want to ally with it. Finally, it is claimed that America’s ‘soft power’—the appeal of America’s liberal democratic values and culture—legitimates the exercise of its hegemonic power.36 However, Zhou Yuhong, who quotes Layne’s article, argues that the above efforts to ‘legitimize’ US hegemony are really just Americans ‘superﬁcially singing their own praises’, for ‘there is not any country that will construct its own security on the good will of another, after all, good and honest aspirations can be transient and quickly pass, while hegemonic threats cut through the skin’. Plus, Zhou adds, it will be even more difﬁcult for the US ‘to have its wishes fulﬁlled’ with regard to ‘democratic values and cultural charm conquering the world’, for in the current international environment of ‘intense pluralism and conscious efforts to keep the initiative in one’s own hand’, they would likely cause ‘aversion and contradictions’ with other countries.37

### A2 China

#### China wont challenge U.S- They will push for multipolarity

Layne, 2009 (Christopher Layne, PhD is Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, The Waning of U.S. Hegemony—Myth or Reality?, <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/isec.2009.34.1.147>, July 7, 2009.)

For an overview of trends that could affect international politics over the next two decades, a good starting point is the National Intelligence Council’s (NIC’s) Global Trends 2025: A Transformed World.15 Global Trends 2025 is not light reading, but it is significantly more insightful and intellectually courageous than typical government reports. Its key geopolitical conclusion is that the U.S.-dominated unipolar world will give way to multipolarity during the next two decades spurred by two causal mechanisms: the emergence of new great powers (and potentially important regional powers); and economic, financial, and domestic political constraints that may erode U.S. capabilities. China, India, and possibly Russia are emerging great powers.16 As Global Trends 2025 points out, the rise of China and India to great power status will restore each to “the positions they held two centuries ago when China produced approximately 30 percent and India 15 percent of the world’s wealth” (p. 7). Their ascent is being propelled by “the global shift in relative wealth and economic power” from North America and the Euro-Atlantic world to Asia— a shift “without precedent in modern history” (ibid.). By 2025, China figures to have the world’s second-largest economy (measured by gross domestic product [GDP]) and will be a first-rank military power (p. 30). India, buoyed by its strong economic growth rate, will “strive for a multipolar system with New Delhi as one of the poles” (ibid.). Although both states could encounter speed bumps that might slow—or even derail—their ascents to great power status, the NIC believes that the “chances are good that China and India will continue to rise” (p. 29).17 Because of uncertainties about economics, energy prices, domestic governance issues, and especially demography, Russia’s great power trajectory is more problematic than China’s or India’s (pp. 31–32).18 Between 2009 and 2025, Russia’s population is forecast to drop from 141 million to below 130 million, affecting the availability of manpower for both the military and the labor pools (pp. 23–24, 30). If Russia overcomes its demographic challenge and continues its revival as a great power, however, the NIC believes it “will be a leading force in opposition to U.S. global dominance” (p. 32). Because its great power status is closely tied to its ability to control both the energy resources and pipelines of Central Asia and the Caucasus, Russia will also seek to reestablish its sphere of influence in the “near abroad” (pp. 32, 82). According to the NIC, in addition to relative decline, the United States will confront other constraints on its international role. U.S. military supremacy will no longer be as dominant as it has been since the Cold War’s end (p. 93). The United States’ soft power may diminish as its liberal model of political and economic development is challenged by authoritarian/statist alternatives (pp. 3, 8–9, 13–14). At home, economic and political constraints may undermine U.S. hegemony. Global Trends 2025 was published just before the full scope of the global financial and economic crisis became apparent. Nevertheless, the NIC did have an inkling of the meltdown’s potential long-term implications for U.S. power. In particular, Global Trends predicts that over the next two decades, the dollar’s role as the international economy’s preeminent reserve currency will erode. Although at the time this issue went to press, the dollar remained strong and will continue to be the reserve currency for some time to come, China’s spring 2009 call to replace the dollar with a new reserve currency signals that the NIC’s long-term worries may be justified.19

### A2 Impact is perception based

#### Perception of decline now

Layne, 2009 (Christopher Layne, PhD is Robert M. Gates Chair in Intelligence and National Security at the George Bush School of Government and Public Service at Texas A&M University, The Waning of U.S. Hegemony—Myth or Reality?, <http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/isec.2009.34.1.147>, July 7, 2009.)

Although a consensus exists that international institutions need to be overhauled, pressures for reform are pushing in the opposite direction than the one prescribed by Brooks and Wohlforth, because the impetus for change is coming from China and the other emerging powers. This became evident during the lead-up to the April 2009 London meeting of the Group of 20, when China and other rising powers argued that international institutions need to be revamped to give them a greater voice, and also that the international privileges enjoyed by the United States and Europe need to be rolled back. These developments highlight a weakness in the institutional “lock in” and “twenty years’ opportunity” arguments: if they perceive that the United States is in decline, rising powers such as China need to wait only a decade or two to reshape the international system themselves. Moreover, because of the perception that the United States’ hard power is declining, and because of the hit its soft power has taken as a result of the meltdown, there is a real question about whether the U.S. hegemon retains the credibility and legitimacy to take the lead in institutional reform.73

### A2 Heg key to Econ

#### No economic increase from US leadership – no evidentiary support.

Daniel W. Drezner 2013

[Daniel W. Drezner international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University 2013 Military Primacy Doesn’t Pay (Nearly As Much As You Think) vol:38 iss:1 pg:52 (http://www.mitpressjournals.org.proxy.library.emory.edu/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00124)]

This argument is one of several that analysts have made about the economic benefits to the United States of possessing military predominance and deep engagement with the rest of the world.4 Critics, however, have long questioned whether military preeminence yields the benefits claimed by proponents.5 Those criticisms have only intensified since the 2008 financial crisis.6 While arguments in favor of military predominance are frequently asserted in policy circles, there is less discussion about their theoretical and empirical foundation. What can international relations scholarship say about the relative economic benefits of military primacy? This article evaluates whether the economic benefits of military preeminence and deep engagement are as great as proponents suggest. This evaluation begins by breaking down the arguments that military primacy yields economic returns into the most commonly articulated causal mechanisms. It then assesses what the scholarly literature and evidence can conclude about those causal mechanisms. The three most plausible pathways are the geoeconomic favoritism that foreign capital inºows provide for military superM powers; the geopolitical favoritism gained from an outsized military presence; and the public goods benefits that ºow from hegemonic stability. Each of these arguments is less empirically persuasive than is commonly articulated in policy circles. There is little evidence that military primacy yields appreciable geoeconomic gains. The evidence for geopolitical favoritism is much more robust during periods of bipolarity than it is under unipolarity, which suggests that primacy in and of itself does not yield material transfers. The evidence for public goods benefits is strongest, but military predominance plays a supporting role in that causal logic; it is only full-spectrum unipolarity—a condition in which a single actor is universally acknowledged to be the dominant actor across a variety of power dimensions—that yields appreciable economic gains. The economic benefits from military predominance alone seem, at a minimum, to have been exaggerated in policy and scholarly circles. While there are economic benefits to possessing a great power military, diminishing marginal returns are evident well before achieving military primacy. The principal benefits that come with military primacy appear to flow only when coupled with economic primacy. These standings have significant implications for theoretical debates about the fungibility of military power, and should be considered when assessing U.S. fiscal options and grand strategy for the coming decade. The article’s first section frames the current discourse about the economic benefits of military primacy in the context of U.S. budgetary debates. The second section evaluates the geoeconomic favoritism hypothesis. The third section considers the geopolitical favoritism argument. The fourth section assesses the public goods logic. The final section summarizes and discusses the implications of the article ‘standings for international relations theory and U.S. foreign policy.

### A2 Econ Decline accesses Heg

#### Economic Decline doesn’t lead to hegemony loss

Daniel W. Drezner 2013

[Daniel W. Drezner international politics at The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University 2013 Military Primacy Doesn’t Pay (Nearly As Much As You Think) vol:38 iss:1 pg:52 (http://www.mitpressjournals.org.proxy.library.emory.edu/doi/pdf/10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00124)]

The 2008 financial crisis dramatically worsened the fiscal future of the United States. In the first five years of the Great Recession, the debt-to-gross domestic product ratio of the United States more than doubled, and multiple bond-ratings agencies downgraded U.S. federal government debt. The inevitable debate in Washington is where and how much to cut federal spending. The national security budget is a natural target for fiscal conservatives. Their logic is clear-cut: defense and war expenditures are not the primary culprits for the parlous fiscal state of the United States, but they acted as accessories. For the 2013 fiscal year, the U.S. federal government has budgeted more than $685 billion in defense expenditures.1 Tacking on budgeting for intelligence and nuclear forces raises that figure to more than $725 billion. With the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan winding down and al-Qaida’s top leadership decimated, the security threats to the United States have also declined.2 At the same time, the country possesses an unparalleled lead in defense assets and expenditures. Given its unchallenged military supremacy, targeting cuts toward defense spending after a decade of dramatic budgetary increases is a natural ambition. A future of limited defense budgets has nevertheless triggered anxiety from some quarters of the U.S. national security community. Advocates for a large military argue that the world is safer and more prosperous today precisely because of the United States’ outsized security capacities and deep engagement with the rest of the world. Ostensibly, by acting as a guarantor of the peace in hotspots such as the Middle East and Pacific Rim, the United States keeps the international system humming along—which in turn yields significant benefits to the United States itself. A smaller military budget would make keeping the peace that much more difficult. When budgetary constraints began to appear on the horizon in 2010, the presidents of the American Enterprise Institute, Heritage Foundation, and Foreign Policy Initiative explicitly argued in the Wall Street Journal that “military spending is not a net drain on our economy.”3

### A2 Your Cards aren’t about our Leadership

#### All the phrases are just used by different groups but refer to the same thing – US leadership

Krahmann2005

[Elke Krahmann Department of Politics, University of Bristol, U.K American Hegemony or Global Governance? Competing Visions of International Security¶ International Studies Review, Vol. 7, No. 4 (Dec., 2005), pp. 531-545 (http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdfplus/3699673.pdf)]

The recent literature on US political and military preeminence is characterized by a ¶ confusing variety of terms and concepts, including unipolarity, primacy, hegemony, ¶ and imperialism (Agnew 2003). Moreover, these terms have been combined or ¶ juxtaposed in multiple ways. Thus, varying authors distinguish between "non- ¶ hegemonic" and "hegemonic" unipolarity, between "benign" and "(neo) imperialist" ¶ hegemony, or between "benevolent" and, presumably, "evil" empires. Furthermore, ¶ there is no clear consensus as to which of these terms applies to the United States in ¶ the post-Cold War international environment. Only a systematic analysis can estab- ¶ lish the differences between these concepts and their interpretation of American ¶ primacy. Specifically, it seems necessary to distinguish between three distinct, but ¶ interrelated, concepts: unipolarity, hegemony, and imperialism. ¶ The concept of polarity has traditionally been defined as the relative distribution ¶ of capabilities within the global international system. It is a structural concept. In ¶ the bipolar system of the Cold War, polarity was characterized by the overwhelming ¶ political, military, and economic resources of the United States and the Soviet Un- ¶ ion-the two "superpowers"--in relation to other states. Since 1990, the break-up ¶ of the Soviet Union has left the United States as the sole superpower and the only ¶ "pole" within the international system. It is, thus, widely accepted that we are ¶ currently in a unipolar system (Wilkinson 1999:141; Wohlforth 1999:7; Posen ¶ 2003:6). No other states, including Russia, the United Kingdom, France, or China, ¶ can compare to the United States in terms of military capabilities or political ¶ influence. ¶ The concept of hegemony is also typically defined in terms of the distribution of ¶ capabilities within the international system. However, unipolarity does not neces- ¶ sarily entail hegemony; nor can hegemony only be found in unipolar structures. ¶ What distinguishes hegemony from unipolarity appears to be a relational element. ¶ Hegemony can be defined as capabilities that are matched by influence over other ¶ states in the international system (Wilkinson 1999:142).2 During the Cold War, that ¶ is, under bipolarity, hegemony was thus ascribed to the United States in relation to ¶ its allies within the North Atlantic Alliance and in Asia. However, in spite of its ¶ capabilities, during this time period the United States was not in a hegemonic ¶ position vis-a-vis the members of the Warsaw Pact. Under the conditions of uni- ¶ polarity, the United States appears to have further expanded its hegemony, for ¶ instance with the enlargement of NATO. Yet, American hegemony is far from ¶ global, with major powers such as Russia and China resisting US leadership. ¶ The definition of imperialism, conversely, can be said to rest on policies in ¶ addition to capabilities and influence (Ikenberry 2002). Imperialism builds onunipolarity and hegemony because it suggests not only having the resources and ¶ power to shape international relations but also the willingness to do so and-if ¶ necessary-to do so coercively. John Agnew (2003:876) argues that one difference ¶ between hegemony and empire is "its reliance, to some degree, on persuading or ¶ rewarding subordinates rather than immediately coercing them, although even ¶ empire ... is never reliably achieved by purely coercive means." Moreover, impe- ¶ rialist powers seek to expand their influence and capabilities and to prevent other ¶ states from challenging their preeminence within the international system through ¶ conquests and interventions (Jervis 2003). ¶ Based on this differentiation between unipolarity, hegemony, and imperialism, ¶ the diverging interpretations of the US position in international affairs since the ¶ early 1990s become explicable. The policy shift of the George W. Bush adminis- ¶ tration after September 11 may justifiably have transformed perceptions of the ¶ United States from that of a benign hegemon to a neoimperialist power. In sum, the ¶ above suggests that although the condition of unipolarity remains unaltered, ¶ changes in influence and policies determine whether we are faced with nonhege- ¶ monic, hegemonic, or imperialist unipolarity (Wilkinson 1999).

### A2 Kagan

#### Kagan never uses dada or evidence in his studies.-prefer our authors

Keohane 2012

[Robert O. Keohane Professor of International Aªairs at Princeton ¶ University.

Hegemony and After¶ What Can Be Said About the Future of ¶ American Global Leadership? July/August 2012 (http://www.princeton.edu/~rkeohane/publications/HegemonyandAfter.pdf)]

General readers might not realize how conventional this interpretation of world politics is, since Kagan strikes a pose of embattled iconoclasm, ignoring most of the major authors who developed the case—such as E. H. Carr, Hans Morgenthau, and Kenneth Waltz—and claiming to refute other scholars with whom he supposedly disagrees, such as G. John Ikenberry and Joseph Nye. Unfortunately, Kagan’s method of disagreement is unconvincing. When he raises an opposing claim, he almost never provides data or even systematic evidence; instead, he relies on a counterassertion with a few carefully selected examples. More annoying, he typically overstates the argument in question, stripping it of its original nuance, before claiming to refute it. One of his favorite rhetorical tactics is to assert that his opponents think some trend is “inevitable” or “irreversible”—the dominance of the Americanled liberal order, the rise of democracy, the end of major war. Another is to suggest that his targets believe in “multipolar harmony.” But two of the most ¶ ¶ basic propositions of contemporary international relations, certainly accepted ¶ ¶ by all the writers he dismisses, are that world politics is a realm of inherent uncertainty and that it is characterized by a natural absence of harmony. Since practically everybody knows that nothing in world politics is inevitable and ¶ ¶ harmony is virtually nonexistent, attributing the opposite beliefs to one’s opponents assures one of victory in a mock combat.

# Hegemony Good

### Solves Everything

#### We access every impact

Khalilzad 95 Defense Analyst at RAND , (Zalmay, “Losing the Moment? The United States and the World After the Cold War” The Washington Quarterly, RETHINKING GRAND STRATEGY; Vol. 18, No. 2; Pg. 84)

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

### Global Stability

#### Hegemony is the lynchpin of global security and transnational cooperation

Beckley, ’11 [Michael Beckley is a research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs. He will become an assistant professor of political science at Tufts University in the fall of 2012. “China’s Century?”. International Security, Winter 2011/12, Vol. 36, No. 3, Pages 41-78. December 28 2011. http://www.mitpressjournals.org/doi/abs/10.1162/ISEC\_a\_00066]

The other potential reaction is retrenchment—the divestment of all foreign policy obligations save those linked to vital interests, defined in a narrow and national manner. Advocates of retrenchment assume, or hope, that the world will sort itself out on its own; that whatever replaces American hegemony, whether it be a return to balance of power politics or a transition to a postpower paradise, will naturally maintain international order and prosperity. Order and prosperity, however, are unnatural. They can never be presumed. When achieved, they are the result of determined action by powerful actors and, in particular, by the most powerful actor, which is, and will be for some time, the United States. Arms buildups, insecure sea-lanes, and closed markets are only the most obvious risks of U.S. retrenchment. Less obvious are transnational problems, such as global warming, water scarcity, and disease, which may fester without a leader to rally collective action. Hegemony, of course, carries its own risks and costs. In particular, America’s global military presence might tempt policymakers to use force when they should choose diplomacy or inaction. If the United States abuses its power, however, it is not because it is too engaged with the world, but because its engagement lacks strategic vision. The solution is better strategy, not retrenchment. The first step toward sound strategy is to recognize that the status quo for the United States is pretty good: it does not face a hegemonic rival, and the trends favor continued U.S. dominance. The overarching goal of American foreign policy should be to preserve this state of affairs. Declinists claim the United States should “adopt a neomercantilist international economic policy” and “disengage from current alliance commitments in East Asia and Europe.” 161 But the fact that the United States rose relative to China while propping up the world economy and maintaining a hegemonic presence abroad casts doubt on the wisdom of such calls for radical policy change.

#### Decline destroys stability and cooperation – causes chaotic anarchy

Brzezinski ’12 [Zbigniew Brzezinski, CSIS counselor and trustee and cochairs the CSIS Advisory Board, the Robert E. Osgood Professor of American Foreign Policy at the School of Advanced International Studies @ Johns Hopkins University, cochair of the American Committee for Peace in the Caucasus, member of the International Advisory Board of the Atlantic Council, national security adviser to Jimmy Carter, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power. Ebook.]

IF AMERICA FALTERS, THE WORLD IS UNLIKELY TO BE DOMINATED by a single preeminent successor, such as China. While a sudden and massive crisis of the American system would produce a fast-moving chain reaction leading to global political and economic chaos, a steady drift by America into increasingly pervasive decay and/or into endlessly widening warfare with Islam would be unlikely to produce, even by 2025, the “coronation” of an effective global successor. No single power will be ready by then to exercise the role that the world, upon the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, expected the United States to play. More probable would be a protracted phase of rather inconclusive and somewhat chaotic realignments of both global and regional power, with no grand winners and many more losers, in a setting of international uncertainty and even of potentially fatal risks to global well-being. dWhat follows analyzes the implications of that historically ominous—though certainly not predetermined—“if.” 1: THE POST-AMERICA SCRAMBLE In the absence of a recognized leader, the resulting uncertainty is likely to increase tensions among competitors and inspire self-serving behavior. Thus, international cooperation is more likely to decline, with some powers seeking to promote exclusive regional arrangements as alternative frameworks of stability for the enhancement of their own interests. Historical contenders may vie more overtly, even with the use of force, for regional preeminence. Some weaker states may find themselves in serious jeopardy, as new power realignments emerge in response to major geopolitical shifts in the global distribution of power. The promotion of democracy might yield to the quest for enhanced national security based on varying fusions of authoritarianism, nationalism, and religion. The “global commons” could suffer from passive indifference or exploitation produced by a defensive concentration on narrower and more immediate national concerns. Some key international institutions, such as the World Bank or the IMF, are already under increasing pressure from the rising, poorer, but highly populated states—with China and India in the forefront—for a general rearrangement of the existing distribution of voting rights, which is currently weighted toward the West. That distribution has already been challenged by some states in the G-20 as unfair. The obvious demand is that it should be based to a much greater degree on the actual populations of member states and less on their actual financial contributions. Such a demand, arising in the context of greater disorder and percolating unrest among the world’s newly politically awakened peoples, could gain popularity among many as a step toward international (even though not domestic) democratization. And before long, the heretofore untouchable and almost seventy-year-old UN Security Council system of only five permanent members with exclusive veto rights may become widely viewed as illegitimate. Even if a downward drift by America unfolds in a vague and contradictory fashion, it is likely that the leaders of the world’s second-rank powers, among them Japan, India, Russia, and some EU members, are already assessing the potential impact of America’s demise on their respective national interests. Indeed, the prospects of a post-America scramble may already be discreetly shaping the planning agenda of the chancelleries of the major foreign powers even if not yet dictating their actual policies. The Japanese, fearful of an assertive China dominating the Asian mainland, may be thinking of closer links with Europe. Leaders in India and Japan may well be considering closer political and even military cooperation as a hedge in case America falters and China rises. Russia, while perhaps engaging in wishful thinking (or even in schadenfreude) about America’s uncertain prospects, may well have its eye on the independent states of the former Soviet Union as initial targets of its enhanced geopolitical influence. Europe, not yet cohesive, would likely be pulled in several directions: Germany and Italy toward Russia because of commercial interests, France and insecure Central Europe in favor of a politically tighter EU, and Great Britain seeking to manipulate a balance within the EU while continuing to preserve a special relationship with a declining United States. Others still may move more rapidly to carve out their own regional spheres: Turkey in the area of the old Ottoman Empire, Brazil in the Southern Hemisphere, and so forth. None of the foregoing, however, have or are likely to have the requisite combination of economic, financial, technological, and military power to even consider inheriting America’s leading role. Japan is dependent on the United States for military protection and would have to make the painful choice of accommodating China or perhaps of allying with India in joint opposition to it. Russia is still unable to come to terms with its loss of empire, is fearful of China’s meteoric modernization, and is unclear as to whether it sees its future with Europe or in Eurasia. India’s aspirations for major power status still tend to be measured by its rivalry with China. And Europe has yet to define itself politically while remaining conveniently dependent on American power. A genuinely cooperative effort by all of them to accept joint sacrifices for the sake of collective stability if America’s power were to fade is not likely.

### A2 Antagonizes States

#### Unipolarity allows the US to assuage others’ status concerns

Wohlforth 09 – Professor of government @ Dartmouth College [[William C. Wohlforth](http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/world_politics/v061/61.1.wohlforth.html#back), “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” World Politics, Volume 61, Number 1, January 2009, http://www.polisci.wisc.edu/Uploads/Documents/IRC/Wohlforth%20(2009).pdf]

Given its material dominance and activist foreign policy, the United States is a salient factor in the identity politics of all major powers, and it plays a role in most regional hierarchies. Yet there is scant evidence in U.S. foreign policy discourse of concerns analogous to late cold war perceptions of a Soviet “thrust to global preeminence” or mid-nineteenthcentury British apprehensions about Tsar Nicholas’s “pretensions to be the arbiter of Europe.” Even when rhetoric emanating from the other powers suggests dissatisfaction with the U.S. role, diplomatic episodes rich with potential for such perceptions were resolved by bargaining relatively free from positional concerns: tension in the Taiwan Strait and the 2001 spy plane incident with China, for example, or numerous tense incidents with Russia from Bosnia to Kosovo to more recent regional disputes in post-Soviet Eurasia. On the contrary, under unipolarity U.S. diplomats have frequently adopted policies to enhance the security of the identities of Russia, China, Japan, and India as great (though second-tier) powers, with an emphasis on their regional roles. U.S. ofﬁcials have urged China to manage the six-party talks on North Korea while welcoming it as a “responsible stakeholder” in the system; they have urged a much larger regional role for Japan; and they have deliberately fostered India’s status as a “responsible” nuclear power. Russia, the country whose elite has arguably confronted the most threats to its identity, has been the object of what appear to be elaborate U.S. status-management policies that included invitations to form a partnership with NATO, play a prominent role in Middle East diplomacy (from which Washington had striven to exclude Moscow for four decades), and to join the rich countries’ club, the G7 (when Russia clearly lacked the economic requisites). Status management policies on this scale appear to be enabled by a unipolar structure that fosters conﬁdence in the security of the United States’ identity as number one. The United States is free to buttress the status of these states as second-tier great powers and key regional play-ers precisely because it faces no serious competition for overall system leadership.

### Better than the Alternative

#### America’s hegemony is good for the majority of the world-an alternative would be costly

Kagan 1998

[Robert Kagan 1998 senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International The Benevolent ¶ Empire (http://people.cas.sc.edu/rosati/a.kaplan.benevolentempire.fp.sum98.pdf)]

The commingled feelings of reliance on and resentment toward ¶ America's international dominance these days are neither strange nor ¶ new. The resentment of power, even when it is in the hands of one's ¶ friends, is a normal, indeed, timeless human emotion--no less so than ¶ the arrogance of power. And perhaps only Americans, with their rather ¶ short memory, could imagine that the current resentment is the unique ¶ product of the expansion of American dominance in the post-Cold ¶ War era. During the confrontation with the Soviet Union, now ¶ recalled in the United States as a time of Edenic harmony among the ¶ Western allies, not iust French but also British leaders chafed under the ¶ leadership of a sometimes overbearing America. As political scientist ¶ A.W. DePorte noted some 20 years ago, the schemes of European unity ¶ advanced by French financial planner Jean Monnet and French foreigminister Robert Schuman in 1950 aimed "not only to strengthen ¶ Western Europe in the face of the Russian threat but also--though this ¶ was less talked about--to strengthen it vis-a-vis its indispensable but ¶ overpowering American ally." Today's call for "multipolarity" in inter- ¶ national affairs, in short, has a history, as do European yearnings for ¶ unity as a counterweight to American power. Neither of these pro-fessed desires is a new response to ¶ the particular American hegemony ¶ of the last nine years. ¶ And neither of them, one sus- ¶ pects, is very seriously intended. For ¶ the tnlth about America's dominant ¶ role in the world is known to most ¶ clear-eyed international observers. ¶ And the truth is that the benevolent ¶ hegemony exercised by the United ¶ States is good for a vast portion of the world's population. It is certainly a ¶ better international arrangement than all realistic alternatives. To under- ¶ mine it would cost many others around the world far more than it would ¶ cost Americans--and far sooner. As Samuel Huntington wrote five years ¶ ago, before he joined the plethora of scholars disturbed by the "arrogance" ¶ of American hegemony: "A world without U.S. primacy will be a world ¶ with more violence and disorder and less democracy and economic ¶ growth than a world where the United States continues to have more ¶ influence than any other country shaping global affairs." ¶ The unique qualities of American global dominance have never been ¶ a mystery, but these days they are more and more forgotten or, for con- ¶ venience' sake, ignored.

#### No alternative to US dominance. Even if the US is bad other countries would be worse.

Kagan 1998

[Robert Kagan 1998 senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International The Benevolent ¶ Empire (http://people.cas.sc.edu/rosati/a.kaplan.benevolentempire.fp.sum98.pdf)]

Ever since the United States emerged as a great power, the identifica- ¶ tion of the interests of others with its own has been the most striking qual- ¶ ity of American foreign and defense policy. Americans seem to have ¶ internalized and made second nature a conviction held only since World ¶ War II: Namely, that their own well-being depends fundamentally on the ¶ well-being of others; that American prosperity cannot occur in the ¶ absence of global prosperity; that American freedom depends on the sur- ¶ vival and spread of freedom elsewhere; that aggression anywhere threat- ¶ ens the danger of aggression everywhere; and that American national ¶ security is impossible without a broad measure of international security. ¶ Let us not call this conviction selfless: Americans are as self-interested ¶ as any other people. But for at least 50 years they have been guided by the ¶ kind of enlightened self-interest that, in practice, comes dangerously close ¶ to resembling generosity. If that generosity seems to be fading today (and ¶ this is still a premature judgment), it is not because America has grown ¶ too fond of power. Quite the opposite. It is became some Americans have ¶ grown tired of power, tired of leadership, and, consequently, less inclined ¶ to demonstrate the sort of generosity that has long characterized their ¶ nation's foreign policy. What many in Europe and elsewhere see as arro- ¶ gance and bullying may be just irritability born of weariness. ¶ If fatigue is setting in, then those nations and peoples who have long ¶ benefited, and still benefit, from the international order created and ¶ upheld by American power have a stake in bolstering rather than deni- ¶ grating American hegemony. After all, what, in truth, are the alternatives? ¶ Whatever America's failings, were any other nation to take its place, the rest of the world would find the situation less congenial. America may ¶ be arrogant; Americans may at times be selfish; they may occasionally be ¶ ham-handed in their exercise of power. But, excusez-moi, compared with ¶ whom? Can anyone believe that were France to possess the power the ¶ United States now has, the French would be less arrogant, less selfish, and ¶ less prone to making mistakes? Little in France's history as a great power, ¶ or even as a medium power, justifies such optimism. Nor can one easily ¶ imagine power on an American scale being employed in a more enlight- ¶ ened fashion by China, Germany, Japan, or Russia. And even the leaders ¶ of that least benighted of empires, the British, were more arrogant, more ¶ bloody-minded, and, in the end, less capable managers of world affairs ¶ than the inept Americans have so far proved to be. If there is to be a sole ¶ superpower, the world is better off if that power is the United States.

### Multipolarity Impossible

#### The world isn’t ready for multipolarity

Kagan 1998

[Robert Kagan 1998 senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International The Benevolent ¶ Empire (http://people.cas.sc.edu/rosati/a.kaplan.benevolentempire.fp.sum98.pdf)]

Peace and is director of its U.S. Leadership Project

We should also not forget that utopian fancies about the obsolescence ¶ ¶ of military power and national governments in a transnational, "eco-nomic" era have blossomed before, only to be crushed by the next "war to end all wars." The success of the European Union, such as it is, and, more- ¶over, the whole dream of erasing boundaries, has been made possible only because the more fundamental and enduring issues of European security ¶ ¶ have been addressed by the United States through its leadership of NA'ro, that most archaic and least utopian of institutions. Were American hegemony really to disappear, the old European questions chiefly, what to do about Germany--would quickly rear their hoary heads. ¶ ¶ But let's return to the real world. For all the bleating about hegemony, no nation really wants genuine multipolarity. No nation has shown a willingness to take on equal responsibilities for managing global crises. No nation has been willing to make the same kinds of short-term sacrifices that the United States has been willing to make in the long-term interest of preserving the global order. No nation, except China, has been willing to spend the money to acquire the military power neces-sary for playing a greater role relative to the United States---and China's military buildup has not exactly been viewed by its neighbors as creating a more harmonious environment. If Europeans genuinely sought multipolarity, they would increase their defense budgets considerably, instead of slashing them. They would take ¶ ¶ the lead in the Balkans, instead of insisting that their participation ¶ ¶ depends on America's participation. But neither the French, other Euro- peans, nor even the Russians are prepared to pay the price for a genuinelypared to pay the price for a genuinely multipolar world. Not only do they about shy away from the expense of creat- For all the ing and preserving such a world; hegemony, no nation really they rightly fear the geopolitical wants genuine multipolarity, consequences of destroying Ameri- can hegemony. Genuine multipo- ¶ ¶ larity would inevitably mean a ¶ ¶ return to the complex of strategic issues that plagued the world before ¶ ¶ World War II: in Asia, the competition for regional preeminence among ¶ ¶ China, Japan, and Russia; in Europe, the competition among France, ¶ ¶ Germany, Great Britain, and Russia.

### No Decline

#### No heg decline in the near future - pessimists

Norrlof 2010

[Carla Norrlof Associate Professor in the Department of Political ¶ Science at the University of Toronto.2010 America’s Global Advantage: US Hegemony and International Cooperation Cambridge University Press (http://www.langtoninfo.com/web\_content/9780521749381\_frontmatter.pdf)]

For over sixty years the United States has been the largest economy and most powerful country in the world. However, there is growing speculation that this era of hegemony is under threat as it faces huge trade deficits, a weaker currency, and stretched military resources. America’s Global Advantage argues that, despite these difficulties, the US will maintain its privileged position. In this original and important contribution to a central subject in International Relations, Carla Norrlof ¶ ¶ challenges the prevailing wisdom that other states benefit more from UShegemony than the United States itself. By analysing America’s structural advantages in trade, money, and security, and the ways in which these advantages reinforce one another, Norrlof shows how and why America benefits from being the dominant power in the world. Contrary to predictions of American decline, she argues that American hegemony will endure for the foreseeable future.

#### US heg is sustainable

Păun 2010

[Ştefan Păun Politehnica University is American hegemony stable and sustainable? geopolitics, history, and International Relations (Geopolitics, History, and International Relations), issue: 1 / 2010, pages: 134139 (http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706758)]

Clark claims that hegemony is a status bestowed by others, and rests¶ on recognition by them: the US enjoys substantial, albeit qualified, primacy in international affairs.2 Zakaria states that the US will confront a global order quite different from the one it is used to¶ operating in: it remains the most powerful country in a world with¶ several other important great powers and with greater assertiveness¶ from all actors. The US is the country that is most challenged by the¶ new order (it understands how to handle a traditional militarypolitical¶ advance), and confers legitimacy with regard to what constitutes¶ a problem, crisis, or outrage. Zakaria insists that the US has¶ the opportunity to “remain the pivotal player in a richer, more¶ dynamic, more exciting world,”3 and is “still a strong market for¶ American power, for both geopolitical and economic reasons. But¶ even more centrally, there remains a strong ideological demand for¶ it.”4 Layne points out that globalization has been made possible by¶ America’s military and economic dominance of the post-1991 unipolar¶ system: whether the United States will be able to continue to¶ act as a hegemonic stabilizer is an open question.5 Watson explains¶ that US hegemony is less in command of a world that looks entirely¶ more closed and hostile to American values.

### Decline risks Prolif

#### Decline causes prolif, nuclear great power war, and terrorism

Brzezinski ’12 [Zbigniew Brzezinski, CSIS counselor and trustee and cochairs the CSIS Advisory Board, the Robert E. Osgood Professor of American Foreign Policy at the School of Advanced International Studies @ Johns Hopkins University, cochair of the American Committee for Peace in the Caucasus, member of the International Advisory Board of the Atlantic Council, national security adviser to Jimmy Carter, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Strategic Vision: America and the Crisis of Global Power. Ebook.]

In addition, the control of global nuclear proliferation is essential to the stability of the international system. For some years now, the United States has been the most vocal proponent of minimizing proliferation, even setting as its goal a world with zero nuclear weapons. Moreover, the United States provides security guarantees to specific non–nuclear weapon states that fear their nuclear neighbors by extending to them the US nuclear umbrella. Because the United States is the largest and most advanced nuclear weapon state and because its global position depends on the stability provided by its nuclear umbrella, the responsibility for leadership in the nuclear nonproliferation domain sits squarely on American shoulders. In this domain above all others the world still looks to the United States to lead. Iran’s pursuit of nuclear weapons today, combined with the possible American decline tomorrow, highlights the potential dangers of continuing nuclear proliferation in the twenty-first century: the fading of the nonproliferation regime, greater proliferation among emerging states, extensions of the Russian, Chinese, and Indian nuclear umbrellas, the intensifying of regional nuclear arms races, and the greater availability of nuclear material for theft by terrorist organizations. An American decline would impact the nuclear domain most profoundly by inciting a crisis of confidence in the credibility of the American nuclear umbrella. Countries like South Korea, Taiwan, Japan, Turkey, and even Israel, among others, rely on the United States’ extended nuclear deterrence for security. If they were to see the United States slowly retreat from certain regions, forced by circumstances to pull back its guarantees, or even if they were to lose confidence in standing US guarantees, because of the financial, political, military, and diplomatic consequences of an American decline, then they will have to seek security elsewhere. That “elsewhere” security could originate from only two sources: from nuclear weapons of one’s own or from the extended deterrence of another power—most likely Russia, China, or India. It is possible that countries that feel threatened by the ambition of existing nuclear weapon states, the addition of new nuclear weapon states, or the decline in the reliability of American power would develop their own nuclear capabilities. For crypto-nuclear powers like Germany and Japan, the path to nuclear weapons would be easy and fairly quick, given their extensive civilian nuclear industry, their financial success, and their technological acumen. Furthermore, the continued existence of nuclear weapons in North Korea and the potentiality of a nuclear-capable Iran could prompt American allies in the Persian Gulf or East Asia to build their own nuclear deterrents. Given North Korea’s increasingly aggressive and erratic behavior, the failure of the six-party talks, and the widely held distrust of Iran’s megalomaniacal leadership, the guarantees offered by a declining America’s nuclear umbrella might not stave off a regional nuclear arms race among smaller powers. Last but not least, even though China and India today maintain a responsible nuclear posture of minimal deterrence and “no first use,” the uncertainty of an increasingly nuclear world could force both states to reevaluate and escalate their nuclear posture. Indeed, they as well as Russia might even become inclined to extend nuclear assurances to their respective client states. Not only could this signal a renewed regional nuclear arms race between these three aspiring powers but it could also create new and antagonistic spheres of influence in Eurasia driven by competitive nuclear deterrence. The decline of the United States would thus precipitate drastic changes to the nuclear domain. An increase in proliferation among insecure American allies and/or an arms race between the emerging Asian powers are among the more likely outcomes. This ripple effect of proliferation would undermine the transparent management of the nuclear domain and increase the likelihood of interstate rivalry, miscalculation, and eventually even perhaps of international nuclear terror.

### Prolif Defense

#### No widespread prolif

Hymans 12—Jacques E. C. Hymans is Associate Professor of IR at USC [April 16, 2012, “North Korea's Lessons for (Not) Building an Atomic Bomb,” *Foreign Affairs*, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137408/jacques-e-c-hymans/north-koreas-lessons-for-not-building-an-atomic-bomb?page=show]

Washington's miscalculation is not just a product of the difficulties of seeing inside the Hermit Kingdom. It is also a result of the broader tendency to overestimate the pace of global proliferation. For decades, Very Serious People have predicted that strategic weapons are about to spread to every corner of the earth. Such warnings have routinely proved wrong -- for instance, the intelligence assessments that led to the 2003 invasion of Iraq -- but they continue to be issued. In reality, despite the diffusion of the relevant technology and the knowledge for building nuclear weapons, the world has been experiencing a great proliferation slowdown. Nuclear weapons programs around the world are taking much longer to get off the ground -- and their failure rate is much higher -- than they did during the first 25 years of the nuclear age.

As I explain in my article "Botching the Bomb" in the upcoming issue of Foreign Affairs, the key reason for the great proliferation slowdown is the absence of strong cultures of scientific professionalism in most of the recent crop of would-be nuclear states, which in turn is a consequence of their poorly built political institutions. In such dysfunctional states, the quality of technical workmanship is low, there is little coordination across different technical teams, and technical mistakes lead not to productive learning but instead to finger-pointing and recrimination. These problems are debilitating, and they cannot be fixed simply by bringing in more imported parts through illicit supply networks. In short, as a struggling proliferator, North Korea has a lot of company.

#### Deterrence breakdowns don’t cause full-scale nuclear war

Waltz 3—Kenneth, Emeritus Professor of Political Science at UC Berkeley and Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed, p. 34-35

States are deterred by the prospect of suffering severe damage and by their inability to do much to limit it. Deterrence works because nuclear weapons enable one state to punish another state severely without first defeating it. "Victory," in Thomas Schelling's words, "is no longer a prerequisite for hurting the enemy." 37 Countries armed only with conventional weapons can hope that their military forces will be able to limit the damage an attacker can do. Among countries armed with strategic nuclear forces, the hope of avoiding heavy damage depends mainly on the attacker's restraint and little on one's own efforts. Those who compared expected deaths through strategic exchanges of nuclear warheads with casualties suffered by the Soviet Union in World War II overlooked the fundamental difference between conventional and nuclear worlds. 38

Deterrence rests on what countries can do to each other with strategic nuclear weapons. From this statement, one can easily leap to the wrong conclusion: that deterrent strategies, if they have to be carried through, will produce a catastrophe. That countries are able to annihilate each other means neither that deterrence depends on their threatening to do so nor that they will necessarily do so if deterrence fails. Because countries heavily armed with strategic nuclear weapons can carry war to its ultimate intensity, the control of force becomes the primary objective. If deterrence fails, leaders will have the strongest incentives to keep force under control and limit damage rather than launching genocidal attacks. If the Soviet Union had attacked Western Europe, NATO's objectives would have been to halt the attack and end the war. The United States had the ability to place thousands of warheads precisely on targets in the Soviet Union. Surely we would have struck military targets before striking industrial targets and industrial targets before striking cities. The intent to hit military targets first was sometimes confused with a war-fighting strategy, but it was not one. It would not have significantly reduced the Soviet Union's ability to hurt us. Whatever American military leaders thought, our strategy rested on the threat to punish. The threat, if it failed to deter, would have been followed not by spasms of violence but by punishment administered in ways that conveyed threats of more to come.

A war between the United States and the Soviet Union that got out of control would have been catastrophic. If they had set out to destroy each other, they would have greatly reduced the world's store of developed resources while killing millions outside of their own borders through fallout. Even while destroying themselves, states with few weapons would do less damage to others. As ever, the biggest international dangers come from the strongest states. Fearing the world's destruction, one may prefer a world of conventional great powers having a higher probability of fighting less- destructive wars to a world of nuclear great powers having a lower probability of fighting more-destructive wars. But that choice effectively disappeared with the production of atomic bombs by the United States during World War II.

#### Prolif is super slow—empirics disprove their fear mongering.

Hymans 12—Jacques E. C. Hymans is Associate Professor of IR at USC [May/June 2012, “Botching the Bomb,” *Foreign Affairs*, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137403/jacques-e-c-hymans/botching-the-bomb?page=show]

The chronic problem of nuclear proliferation is once again dominating the news. A fierce debate has developed over how to respond to the threat posed by Iran's nuclear activities, which most experts believe are aimed at producing a nuclear weapon or at least the capacity to assemble one. In this debate, one side is pushing for a near-term military attack to damage or destroy Iran's nuclear program, and the other side is hoping that strict sanctions against the Islamic Republic will soften it up for a diplomatic solution. Both sides, however, share the underlying assumption that unless outside powers intervene in a dramatic fashion, it is inevitable that Iran will achieve its supposed nuclear goals very soon.

Yet there is another possibility. The Iranians had to work for 25 years just to start accumulating uranium enriched to 20 percent, which is not even weapons grade. The slow pace of Iranian nuclear progress to date strongly suggests that Iran could still need a very long time to actually build a bomb -- or could even ultimately fail to do so. Indeed, global trends in proliferation suggest that either of those outcomes might be more likely than Iranian success in the near future. Despite regular warnings that proliferation is spinning out of control, the fact is that since the 1970s, there has been a persistent slowdown in the pace of technical progress on nuclear weapons projects and an equally dramatic decline in their ultimate success rate.

The great proliferation slowdown can be attributed in part to U.S. and international nonproliferation efforts. But it is mostly the result of the dysfunctional management tendencies of the states that have sought the bomb in recent decades. Weak institutions in those states have permitted political leaders to unintentionally undermine the performance of their nuclear scientists, engineers, and technicians. The harder politicians have pushed to achieve their nuclear ambitions, the less productive their nuclear programs have become. Meanwhile, military attacks by foreign powers have tended to unite politicians and scientists in a common cause to build the bomb. Therefore, taking radical steps to rein in Iran would be not only risky but also potentially counterproductive, and much less likely to succeed than the simplest policy of all: getting out of the way and allowing the Iranian nuclear program's worst enemies -- Iran's political leaders -- to hinder the country's nuclear progress all by themselves.

NUCLEAR DOGS THAT HAVE NOT BARKED

"Today, almost any industrialized country can produce a nuclear weapon in four to five years," a former chief of Israeli military intelligence recently wrote in The New York Times, echoing a widely held belief. Indeed, the more nuclear technology and know-how have diffused around the world, the more the timeline for building a bomb should have shrunk. But in fact, rather than speeding up over the past four decades, proliferation has gone into slow motion.

Seven countries launched dedicated nuclear weapons projects before 1970, and all seven succeeded in relatively short order. By contrast, of the ten countries that have launched dedicated nuclear weapons projects since 1970, only three have achieved a bomb. And only one of the six states that failed -- Iraq -- had made much progress toward its ultimate goal by the time it gave up trying. (The jury is still out on Iran's program.) What is more, even the successful projects of recent decades have needed a long time to achieve their ends. The average timeline to the bomb for successful projects launched before 1970 was about seven years; the average timeline to the bomb for successful projects launched after 1970 has been about 17 years.

#### Prolif is slow and stable—their ev is hysteria.

Mueller 9—John Mueller is a professor of political science and Woody Hayes Chair of National Security Studies at the Mershon Center at Ohio State University [October 23, 2009, “The Rise of Nuclear Alarmism,” *Foreign Policy*, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2009/10/23/the\_rise\_of\_nuclear\_alarmism?page=full]

We have also endured decades of hysteria over the potential for nuclear proliferation, even though the proliferation that has actually taken place has been both modest and substantially inconsequential. When the quintessential rogue state, communist China, obtained them in 1964, CIA Director John McCone sternly proclaimed that nuclear war was "almost inevitable." But far from engaging in the "nuclear blackmail" expected at the time by almost everyone (except Johnson, then working at the State Department), China built its weapons quietly and has never made a nuclear threat.

Still, the proliferation fixation continues to flourish. For more than a decade, U.S. policy obsessed over the possibility that Saddam Hussein's pathetic and technologically dysfunctional regime in Iraq could in time obtain nuclear weapons (it took the more advanced Pakistan 28 years), which it might then suicidally lob, or threaten to lob, at somebody. To prevent this imagined and highly unlikely calamity, a war has been waged that has probably resulted in more deaths than were suffered at Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined.

Today, alarm is focused on the even more pathetic regime in North Korea, which has now tested devices that if detonated in the middle of New York's Central Park would be unable to destroy buildings on its periphery. There is even more hysteria about Iran, which has repeatedly insisted that it has no intention of developing the weapons. If that regime changes its mind or is lying, it is likely to find that, except for stoking the national ego for a while, the bombs are substantially valueless, a very considerable waste of money and effort, and "absolute" primarily in their irrelevance.

As for the rest of the world, the nuclear age is clearly on the wane. Although it may not be entirely fair to characterize disarmament as an effort to cure a fever by destroying the thermometer, the analogy is instructive when it is reversed: When a fever subsides, the instrument designed to measure it loses its usefulness and is often soon misplaced. Thus far the former contestants in the Cold War have reduced their nuclear warheads by more than 50,000 to around 18,000. Other countries, like France, have also substantially cut their nuclear arsenals, while China and others have maintained them in far lower numbers than expected.

Total nuclear disarmament hardly seems to be in the offing -- nuclear metaphysicians still have their skill sets in order. But a continued decline seems likely, and experience suggests that formal disarmament agreements are scarcely necessary in all this -- though they may help the signatories obtain Nobel Peace Prizes. With the demise of fears of another major war, many of the fantastically impressive, if useless, arms that struck such deep anxiety into so many for so long are quietly being allowed to rust in peace.

#### Prolif will be slow.

Tepperman 9 (Jonathon, former Deputy Managing Ed. Foreig Affairs and Assistant Managing Ed. Newsweek, Newsweek, “Why Obama should Learn to Love the Bomb,” 44:154, 9-7, L/N)

The risk of an arms race--with, say, other Persian Gulf states rushing to build a bomb after Iran got one--is a bit harder to dispel. Once again, however, history is instructive. "In 64 years, the most nuclear-weapons states we've ever had is 12," says Waltz. "Now with North Korea we're at nine. That's not proliferation; that's spread at glacial pace." Nuclear weapons are so controversial and expensive that only countries that deem them absolutely critical to their survival go through the extreme trouble of acquiring them. That's why South Africa, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan voluntarily gave theirs up in the early '90s, and why other countries like Brazil and Argentina dropped nascent programs. This doesn't guarantee that one or more of Iran's neighbors--Egypt or Saudi Arabia, say--might not still go for the bomb if Iran manages to build one. But the risks of a rapid spread are low, especially given Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's recent suggestion that the United States would extend a nuclear umbrella over the region, as Washington has over South Korea and Japan, if Iran does complete a bomb. If one or two Gulf states nonetheless decided to pursue their own weapon, that still might not be so disastrous, given the way that bombs tend to mellow behavior.

#### Prolif is slow. Err neg—past predictions are empirically denied

Potter 8 (William, Sam Nunn and Richard Mukhatzhanova, Lugar Prof. Nonproliferation Studies and Dir. James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies—Monterey Institute of International Studies, and Guakhar, Research Associate—James Martin Center, International Security, “Divining Nuclear Intentions: A Review Essay”, 33:1, Summer, Project Muse)

Today it is hard to find an analyst or commentator on nuclear proliferation who is not pessimistic about the future. It is nearly as difficult to find one who predicts the future without reference to metaphors such as proliferation chains, cascades, dominoes, waves, avalanches, and tipping points.42 The lead author of this essay also has been guilty of the same tendency, and initially named an ongoing research project on forecasting proliferation he directs "21st Century Nuclear Proliferation Chains and Trigger Events." As both authors proceeded with research on the project, however, and particularly after reading the books by Hymans and Solingen, we became convinced that the metaphor is inappropriate and misleading, as it implies a process of nuclear decisionmaking and a pace of nuclear weapons spread that are unlikely to transpire. The current alarm about life in a nuclear-armed crowd has many historical antecedents and can be found in classified National Intelligence Estimates (NIEs) as well as in scholarly analyses. The 1957 NIE, for example, identified a list of ten leading nuclear weapons candidates, including Canada, Japan, and Sweden.43 Sweden, it predicted, was "likely to produce its first weapons in about 1961," while it was estimated that Japan would "probably seek to develop weapons production programs within the next decade."44 In one of the [End Page 159] most famous forecasts, President John Kennedy in 1963 expressed a nightmarish vision of a future world with fifteen, twenty, or twenty-five nuclear weapons powers.45 A number of the earliest scholarly projections of proliferation also tended to exaggerate the pace of nuclear weapons spread. A flurry of studies between 1958 and 1962, for example, focused on the "Nth Country Problem" and identified as many as twelve candidates capable of going nuclear in the near future.46 Canada, West Germany, Italy, Japan, Sweden, and Switzerland were among the states most frequently picked as near-term proliferators. The "peaceful nuclear explosion" by India in 1974 was seen by many analysts of the time as a body blow to the young NPT that would set in motion a new wave of proliferation. Although the anticipated domino effect did not transpire, the Indian test did precipitate a marked increase in scholarship on proliferation, including an innovative study developed around the concept—now in vogue—of proliferation chains. Rarely cited by today's experts, the 1976 monograph on Trends in Nuclear Proliferation, 1975–1995, by Lewis Dunn and Herman Kahn, set forth fifteen scenarios for nuclear weapons spread, each based on the assumption that one state's acquisition of nuclear weapons would prompt several other states to follow suit, which in turn would trigger a succession of additional nuclearization decisions.47 Although lacking any single theoretical underpinning and accepting of the notion that proliferation decisions are likely to be attributed to security needs, the Dunn-Kahn model rejected the exclusive focus by realists on security drivers and sought to probe [End Page 160] beneath the rhetoric to identify the possible presence of other pressures and constraints. To their credit, Dunn and Kahn got many things right and advanced the study of proliferation. Their forecasts, however, were almost without exception wildly off the mark. Why, one may inquire, were their pessimistic projections about nuclear weapons spread—and those of their past and subsequent counterparts in the intelligence community—so often divorced from reality? Although Hymans and Solingen appear not to have been familiar with the research by Dunn and Kahn on proliferation trends at the time of their books' publications, their national leadership and domestic political survival models offer considerable insight into that dimension of the proliferation puzzle.48 The Four Myths of Nuclear Proliferation Hymans is keenly aware of the deficiency of past proliferation projections, which he attributes in large part to the "tendency to use the growth of nuclear capabilities, stances toward the non-proliferation regime, and a general 'roguishness' of the state as proxies for nuclear weapons intentions" (p. 217). Such intentions, he believes, cannot be discerned without reference to leadership national identity conceptions, a focus that appears to have been absent to date in intelligence analyses devoted to forecasting proliferation.49 Hymans is equally critical of the popular notion that "the 'domino theory' of the twenty-first century may well be nuclear."50 As he points out, the new domino theory, like its discredited Cold War predecessor, assumes an over-simplified view about why and how decisions to acquire nuclear weapons are taken.51 Leaders' nuclear preferences, he maintains, "are not highly contingent on what other states decide," and, therefore, "proliferation tomorrow will probably remain as rare as proliferation today, with no single instance of proliferation causing a cascade of nuclear weapons states" (p. 225). In addition, he argues, the domino thesis embraces "an exceedingly dark picture of world trends by lumping the truly dangerous leaders together with the merely self-assertive [End Page 161] ones," and equating interest in nuclear technology with weapons intent (pp. 208–209). Dire proliferation forecasts, both past and present, Hymans believes, flow from four myths regarding nuclear decisonmaking: (1) states want the bomb as a deterrent; (2) states seek the bomb as a "ticket to international status"; (3) states go for the bomb because of the interests of domestic groups; and (4) the international regime protects the world from a flood of new nuclear weapons states (pp. 208–216). Each of these assumptions is faulty, Hymans contends, because of its fundamental neglect of the decisive role played by individual leaders in nuclear matters. As discussed earlier, Hymans argues that the need for a nuclear deterrent is entirely in the eye of the beholder—a leader with an oppositional nationalist NIC. By the same token, just because some leaders seek to achieve international prestige through acquisition of the bomb, it does not mean that other leaders "necessarily view the bomb as the right ticket to punch": witness the case of several decades of Argentine leaders, as well as the Indian Nehruvians (pp. 211–212). The case of Egypt under Anwar al-Sadat, though not discussed by Hymans, also seems to fit this category. Hymans's focus on the individual level of analysis leads him to discount bureaucratic political explanations for nuclear postures, as well. Central to his argument is the assumption that decisions to acquire nuclear weapons are taken "without the considerable vetting that political scientists typically assume precedes most important states choices" (p. 13). As such, although he is prepared to credit nuclear energy bureaucracies as playing a supporting role in the efforts by Australia, France, and India to go nuclear, he does not observe their influence to be a determining factor in root nuclear decisions by national leaders. Moreover, contrary to a central premise of Solingen's model of domestic political survival, Hymans finds little evidence in his case studies of leaders pursuing nuclear weapons to advance their political interests (p. 213). For example, he argues, the 1998 nuclear tests in India were as risky domestically for Vajpayee as they were internationally (p. 214).