

Disadvantages

Alienation Disadvantage

Summary: Increasing relations with Russia upsets the balance of power, turning the world against us.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Inherency/Uniqueness.....	299
1.1. Status quo is multipolar.....	299
2. General Links: Imbalance of Power.....	300
2.1. Internal Link: US + Russia = Imbalance of power (95% of world's nukes).....	300
2.2. Imbalance triggers counterbalancing (detailed).....	300
2.3. Imbalance triggers counterbalancing (short).....	301
2.4. Overwhelming power alienates other nations.....	301
2.5. Precedent: Russia originally pushed U.S. to China (example).....	301
3. Specific Links.....	302
3.1. Improving relations with Russia straining relations with Europe.....	302
3.2. 22 Eastern European leaders worried about US-Russian relations.....	302
3.3. Precedent: US agreements with Soviets irritated Western Europe.....	302
3.4. US-Russia relations help contain China (alienate China link).....	303
4. Brinks - Scenario Plausibility.....	303
4.1. Europe: could turn to China.....	303
4.2. India: could move away from U.S.....	303
4.3. India: could turn to China.....	304
5. Impacts.....	304
5.1. US-EU rift = economic disaster.....	304
6. Impact: Nuclear Proliferation.....	304
6.1. General Link: Without strong U.S. nuclear guarantees, countries get their own nukes.....	304
6.2. Japan will go nuclear when it can no longer trust in U.S. protection.....	305
6.3. 30 countries could soon have the tech to build nukes.....	305
6.4. List of countries that could weaponize.....	305
6.5. A/T "NPT Solves": Too weak.....	306

INHERENCY/UNIQUENESS

Status quo is multipolar

Prof. Andrei Zagorski (PhD in International Relations, Professor at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, former professor at the Geneva Center for Security Policy) and others, October 2009, European Union Institute for Security Studies, Chaillot Paper, "Global security in a multipolar world", No. 118, <http://www.scribd.com/doc/22100316/Global-Security-in-a-Multi-Polar-World>

After the fall of the Berlin Wall brought about the end of bipolarity, the world has changed no less dramatically since the 1990s witnessed the Balkan wars and the first EU military crisis-management operations. Basically, the post-Cold War 'unipolar' world turned 'multipolar', and as a result the West can no longer tackle global issues - made more pressing indeed due to this very transformation - on its own any more than it can deal singlehandedly with regional crises.

Alienation Disadvantage

GENERAL LINKS: IMBALANCE OF POWER

US-Russia relations increasing upsets the balance of power. The unbalance quickly re-balances back to an equilibrium as countries unite together against the US and Russia, leading to the impacts.

Internal Link: US + Russia = Imbalance of power (95% of world's nukes)

Wei Guoan (writer for Global Research, the web site of the Centre for Research on Globalization), April 2, 2010, "The Danger of Nuclear War: US-Russian Nuke Deal no Cure for Real Threat", <http://www.infowars.com/the-dangers-of-nuclear-war-u-s-russian-nuke-deal-no-cure-for-real-threat/>

With 95 percent of the world's total nuclear warheads, the U.S. and Russia are the world's two largest nuclear powers. Russia has more than 14,000 missiles and the U.S. has more than 9,000.

Imbalance triggers counterbalancing (detailed)

Prof. Kenneth Waltz (PhD, professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley, Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, former president of the American Political Science Association), 2000, "Intimations of Multipolarity", <http://www.palgrave.com/pdfs/0333917782.pdf> (page 1)

In the light of structural theory, unipolarity appears as the least durable of international configurations. This is so for two main reasons. One is that dominant powers take on too many tasks beyond their own borders, thus weakening themselves in the long run. Ted Robert Gurr after examining 336 polities reaches the same conclusion that Robert G. Wesson had reached earlier: 'Imperial decay is . . . primarily a result of the misuse of power which follows inevitably from its concentration.' 3 The other reason for the short duration of unipolarity is that even if a dominant power behaves with moderation, restraint and forbearance, weaker states will worry about its future behaviour. America's founding fathers warned against the perils of power in the absence of checks and balances. Is unbalanced power less of a danger in international than in national politics? Throughout the Cold War, what the United States and the Soviet Union did, and how they interacted, were dominant factors in international politics. The two countries, however, constrained each other. Now the United States is alone in the world. As nature abhors a vacuum, so international politics abhors unbalanced power. Faced by unbalanced power, some states try to increase their own strength or they ally with others to bring the international distribution of power into balance. The reactions of other states to the drive for dominance of Charles I of Spain, of Louis XIV and Napoleon I of France, of Wilhelm II and Adolph Hitler of Germany, illustrate the point.

Alienation Disadvantage

Imbalance triggers counterbalancing (short)

Prof. Kenneth Waltz (PhD, professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley, Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, former president of the American Political Science Association), 2000, "Intimations of Multipolarity", <http://www.palgrave.com/pdfs/0333917782.pdf> (page 14)

Because the end of the Cold War left only one great power standing, the traditional limitations and restraints of international politics apply weakly to it. This, however, is a self-correcting condition. Peace is sometimes linked to the presence of a hegemonic power, sometimes to a balance among powers. To ask which view is right misses the point. It does so for this reason: the response of other countries to one among them seeking or gaining preponderant power is to try to balance against it. Hegemony leads to balance, which is easy to see historically and easy to understand theoretically.

Overwhelming power alienates other nations

Prof. Kenneth Waltz (PhD, professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley, Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, former president of the American Political Science Association), 2000, "Intimations of Multipolarity", <http://www.palgrave.com/pdfs/0333917782.pdf> (page 2)

In international politics, overwhelming power repels and leads others to try to balance against it. With benign intent, the United States has behaved, and until its power is brought into balance will continue to behave, in ways that sometimes frighten others.

Precedent: Russia originally pushed U.S. to China (example)

George Friedman (PhD in government from Cornell University; the founder, chief intelligence officer, financial overseer, and CEO of the private intelligence corporation Stratfor), January 2009, Stratfor, "The Next 100 Years", http://www.stratfor.com/next100years/the_book/overture?page=2 (page 2)

Now imagine the summer of 1980. The United States had been defeated in a seven- year war-not by the Soviet Union, but by communist North Vietnam. The nation was seen, and saw itself, as being in retreat. Expelled from Vietnam, it was then expelled from Iran as well, where the oil fields, which it no longer controlled, seemed about to fall into the hands of the Soviet Union. To contain the Soviet Union, the United States had formed an alliance with Maoist China-the American president and the Chinese chairman holding an amiable meeting in Beijing. Only this alliance seemed able to contain the powerful Soviet Union, which appeared to be surging.

Alienation Disadvantage

SPECIFIC LINKS

Improving relations with Russia straining relations with Europe

June 22, 2010, Foreign Policy Initiative (American think tank "committed to strong U.S. diplomatic, economic and military engagement in the world, support for democratic allies of the U.S., and opposition to "rogue regimes" that threaten American interests"), "FPI Analysis: Evaluating the U.S.-Russian "Reset"', <http://www.foreignpolicy.org/node/19231>

The Obama administration has argued that its efforts to "reset" relations with Moscow have not come at the cost of relations with key allies in Central and Eastern Europe. In one of the earliest enunciations of the "reset" policy, Vice President Joe Biden stated that "We will not agree with Russia on everything...We will not recognize any nation having a sphere of influence. It will remain our view that sovereign states have the right to make their own decisions and choose their own alliances." In reality, the "reset" has put U.S. relations with current and future NATO allies under great strain. In July 2009, a group of distinguished leaders from Central and Eastern Europe wrote a letter to President Obama that welcomed the "reset," but expressed concerns about its impact on their region.

22 Eastern European leaders worried about US-Russian relations

Vanessa Gera (MA, chief correspondent for Poland at the Associated Press), July 16, 2009, "US-Russia Thaw Worries Eastern European Countries", http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/07/16/us-russia-thaw-worries-ea_n_235342.html#

A group of prominent former Eastern European leaders wrote to President Barack Obama on Thursday that their region is gripped by anxiety that his efforts to reach out to Russia could lead him to forget their interests. The 22 former leaders warned U.S. credibility would be damaged if Washington abandons plans for a missile shield, saying they still feel bullied by their giant neighbor and former master. They claimed Russia continues to challenge their sovereignty 20 years after the Cold War's end.

Precedent: US agreements with Soviets irritated Western Europe

Prof. Gang Guo (PhD in Political Science, Professor of Political Science and International Studies at The University of Mississippi), May 10, 2000, "Comparing Nixon/Kissinger Foreign Policy to European Diplomacy in Early to Mid-19th Century", <http://home.olemiss.edu/~gg/paperhtm/blncpowr.htm>

The Western European countries, while having a combined economic power comparable to that of the U.S., did not yet have the combined military clout to stand alone against the Soviet bloc. Therefore, as the United States advocated "self-help" by her allies and reached agreements with the Soviet Union, the Western European countries naturally developed a feeling of irritation toward the U.S. and a suspicion about the credibility of the American nuclear "shield". Ironically, this fact partially contributed to the swerves and reversals in the American foreign policy, as Nixon and Kissinger became convinced of the need for "American leadership" as a solid element on which to build a permanent structure of international stability in 1973 - 74 (Hartley 1975:31), apparently a rejection of the alignment fluidity resulting from the Nixon Doctrine.

Alienation Disadvantage

US-Russia relations help contain China (alienate China link)

M K Bhadrakumar (Indian diplomat, former Indian ambassador to Soviet Union, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Germany, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Uzbekistan, Kuwait and Turkey), May 27, 2010, Asia Times, "China wary of US-Russia nuclear embrace", <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China/LC27Ad02.html>

Two, if Obama gets the "reset" started in the US's troubled relationship with Russia, this would not only ease tensions that accrued during the George W Bush era but also gain leverage to influence the Russian position on vital issues of foreign policy such as the Iran nuclear issue, terrorism, Middle East, energy - and most importantly - China's rise.

BRINKS - SCENARIO PLAUSIBILITY

This section contains evidence on the feasibility of other nations rejecting the U.S., as a response to "that wouldn't actually happen" arguments.

Europe: could turn to China

Prof. Stephen M. Walt (PhD in political science, professor of international relations at Harvard), 2002, America Unrivaled, "Self-Restrain and U.S. Foreign Policy", ISBN:0801488028, http://books.google.com/books?id=_oU6rprRsOcC (page 132)

Viewed as a whole, these trends cast doubt on whether existing Western institutions can hold the United States and its allies together, because institutions can do little if the members are no longer committed to them. Conflicts of interest between the United States and Europe are likely to grow with time, especially if states such as China eventually present a serious challenge to US interests. The Soviet Union threatened U.S. and European interests alike, but a rising China would pose little direct threat to Europe. In the future, European states might even regard China as an attractive strategic partner. The point is not to warn of a dangerous Sino-European alliance, it is merely to underscore that institutions formed in one strategic context are less likely to endure once that context has changed.

India: could move away from U.S.

Prof. Sumit Ganguly (PhD, Professor of Indian Cultures and Civilizations at Indiana University at Bloomington), March 15, 2010, Wall Street Journal, "Putin Steps Into the India Breach", <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703780204575120743519494102.html>

India's prime minister declared Russia a "key pillar of our foreign policy and a valuable strategic partner" Friday. There's no stronger signal that the Obama administration's neglect of India is starting to have real foreign-policy consequences. If the United States doesn't act quickly, much of the progress in U.S.-India relations over the past decade will be lost.

Alienation Disadvantage

India: could turn to China

Suvrokamal Dutta (PhD, chairman of the Global Council for Peace), October 26, 2007, "The India-China-Russia Troika: Is It Possible?", <http://www.merinews.com/article/the-india-china-russia-troika-is-it-possible/127244.shtml>

India's relationship with China has taken a serious U - turn in the last couple of years. With the bad memories of the 1962 war still in our mind, a thing like this happening is in itself significant. The late Prime Minister of India Rajeev Gandhi broke the ice when he visited China. It was followed by high-level delegations from China visiting India. The advent of the NDA regime further warmed this relationship. The visit of the former Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee to that country and his talks with the Chinese Head of State and the joint statement issued thereafter solidified this relationship. This was reflected in the bi-lateral trade between the countries. The latest statistics and annual reports of both the countries on trade reflect this.

IMPACTS

Additional impacts: European relations can be linked to the Hegemony DA with the "European Relations Damaged" link (page 324-B).

US-EU rift = economic disaster

Prof. François Godement (PhD in contemporary history, professor at Sciences Po in Paris, Senior Policy Fellow at European Council on Foreign Relations) and others, 2005, RAND Corporation, "China on the Move", http://www.rand.org/pubs/conf_proceedings/2005/RAND_CF199.pdf (page 6)

A U.S.- European rift could disrupt world trade, weaken global institutions the Americans and Europeans run (WTO, International Monetary Fund, World Bank, UN, etc.), and reinforce U.S. predilections toward unilateralism.

IMPACT: NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

Summary: Without being able to rely on the protection of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, nations will be pursuing their own nuclear weapons. (For impacts to nuclear proliferation, see the Proliferation Disadvantage, page 379.)

General Link: Without strong U.S. nuclear guarantees, countries get their own nukes

Prof. François Godement (PhD in contemporary history, professor at Sciences Po in Paris, European Council on Foreign Relations), March 23, 2009, European Council on Foreign Relations, "Nuke Proliferation Stirs", http://ecfr.eu/content/entry/commentary_nuke_proliferation_stirs/

Another similarity is how proliferation would either encourage their neighbors to acquire similar weapons or require the United States to reiterate more convincingly a form of nuclear guarantee to these potential nuclear states. Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Japan, South Korea and even Taiwan may be next, with the NPT becoming merely a grouping of the weak.

Alienation Disadvantage

Japan will go nuclear when it can no longer trust in U.S. protection

Prof. Kenneth Waltz (PhD, professor emeritus of political science at UC Berkeley, Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, former president of the American Political Science Association), 2000, "Intimations of Multipolarity", <http://www.palgrave.com/pdfs/0333917782.pdf> (page 8)

Japanese officials have indicated that when the protection of America's extended deterrent is no longer thought to be sufficiently reliable, Japan will equip itself with a nuclear force, whether or not openly. Like a number of other countries, Japan has put itself politically and technologically in a position to do so. Consistently since the mid- 1950s, the government has defined all of its Self-Defense Forces as conforming to constitutional requirements. Nuclear weapons purely for defense would be deemed constitutional should Japan decide to make some.

30 countries could soon have the tech to build nukes

October 16, 2006, Fox News, "U.N. Agency: 30 Countries Could Soon Have Nuclear Weapons", <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,221279,00.html>

The head of the U.N. nuclear agency warned Monday that as many as 30 countries could soon have technology that would let them produce atomic weapons "in a very short time," joining the nine states known or suspected to have such arms.

List of countries that could weaponize

October 16, 2006, Fox News, "U.N. Agency: 30 Countries Could Soon Have Nuclear Weapons", <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,221279,00.html>

Canada, Germany, Sweden, Belgium, Switzerland, Taiwan, Spain, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Lithuania are among nations that either have the means to produce weapons-grade uranium if they chose, could quickly build such technology, or could use plutonium waste for weaponization. All are committed non-nuclear weapons states, and no one has suggested they want to use their programs for arms. Japan also says it has no plans to develop atomic weapons, but it could make them at short notice by processing tons of plutonium left over from running its nuclear reactors. South Korea also has spent reactor fuel and was found a few years ago to have conducted small-scale secret experiments on making highly enriched uranium that would be usable in warheads. Other countries considering developing nuclear programs in the near future are Egypt, Bangladesh, Ghana, Indonesia, Jordan, Namibia, Moldova, Nigeria, Poland, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam and Yemen, U.N. officials say.

Alienation Disadvantage

A/T "NPT Solves": Too weak

Rebecca Johnson (PhD from London School of Economics, co-founder of the Acronym Institute), Spring 2008, The Acronym Institute for Disarmament Diplomacy, Disarmament Diplomacy, "Is the NPT being Overtaken by Events?", Issue No. 87, <http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd87/87npt.htm>

In recent years, it has become clear that the NPT as currently interpreted and implemented lacks the institutional rules, practices and powers to deal effectively with proliferation challenges. When North Korea announced its withdrawal in 2003, there was no role for NPT parties, and the Security Council appeared paralyzed. Unable even to address whether Article X could be legitimately evoked for withdrawal by a state that was already being suspected and investigated for noncompliance, the NPT meetings were reduced to dodging the problem by having the Chair take custody of North Korea's name plate. The solution might have been expedient at the time, but it exposed the Treaty to ridicule.