**Sample Negative Case**

“Government is instituted for the common good; for the protection, safety, prosperity, and happiness of the people”. Because I agree with John Adams I must disagree with the resolution:

**Resolved, states ought not possess nuclear weapons.**

**My Value is National Security**

National Security is an extension of the value of safety. Aggression against the nation threatens our safety and security as much as does crime, catastrophic plague, or natural disaster. National Security preserves fundamental American values. Our values of freedom and liberty are jeopardized when national security is endangered.

**My Criteria is maintaining military dominance**  
  
Peaceful democracies, such as the United States and Britain must maintain military dominance in the world in order to protect against vicious governments, like those in Iran and North Korea. During World War II the U.S. realized that handing over military dominance to Nazi Germany or Imperial Japan would forever endanger the world and would threaten human rights on a global scale. It is only when rational democracies have dominant militaries that the world can seek a secure and peaceful future.

**Contention 1: Nuclear weapons promote peace and security among Democratic nations**

Empirically, nuclear weapons have been beneficial.  The sixty-five years since nuclear weapons were created have been the longest period of peace ever.  As Kenneth Waltz explains, “Half a century of nuclear peace has to be explained since divergence from historical experience is dramatic.  Never in modern history, conventionally dated from 1648, have the great and major powers of the world enjoyed such a long period of peace.”  This “nuclear peace” happened because nuclear weapons act as a deterrence against war.

Along with deterrence, nuclear weapons also encourage crisis de-escalation.  Because of the devastating potential of nuclear weapons, leaders of nuclear powers embroiled in crises look not for ways to use the weapons at their disposal, but for ways not to use them.   Faced with the risk of overwhelming loss, states look for ways to limit conflict and are increasingly cautious.

To preserve their own National Security, nuclear countries work peacefully together, recognizing that with the great power of military dominance comes great restraint.

**Contention 2: There is no evidence that nuclear weapons will fall into the hands of terrorists**

Karl Kamp wrote, “As plausible as it may seem that terrorists would consider the threat of nuclear destruction as the ultimate means of enforcing their demands, there has never been a genuine nuclear threat.  Not a single instance has occurred in which a non-governmental group of individual has come anywhere close to obtaining nuclear weapons.”   It is argued that terrorists would not be able to obtain nuclear weapons because states would not supply them when the terrorists could potentially turn and use them against their citizens.  Even if terrorists acquire nuclear weapons, NEST, the Nuclear Emergency Search Team, established by the United States stands ready to be transported on short notice to locations around the world to search for nuclear materials.  Once found, they are equipped to disable and neutralize the nuclear weapons.

The threat posed by terrorist groups getting a nuclear weapon is small, our National Security is maintaining strict control over nuclear materials and weapons.

**Contention 3: Our security is at risk; we need our military dominance to ensure safety.**

According to a report titled Rebuilding America's Defenses, “America must defend its homeland. During the Cold War, nuclear deterrence was the key element in homeland defense; it remains essential. But the new century has brought with it new challenges. While reconfiguring its nuclear force, the United States also must counteract the effects of the proliferation of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction that may soon allow lesser states to deter U.S. military action by threatening U.S. allies and the American homeland itself. Of all the new and current missions for U.S. armed forces, this must have priority.

The United States is the world’s dominant conventional military power. But it is precisely because we have such power that smaller adversarial states, looking for an equalizing advantage, are determined to acquire their own weapons of mass destruction. Whatever our fondest wishes, the reality of the today’s world is that there is no magic wand with which to eliminate these weapons (or, more fundamentally, the interest in acquiring them) and that deterring their use requires a reliable and dominant U.S. nuclear capability.” (Rebuilding America’s Defenses: strategy, forces and resources for a new century, *a report of*

*The Project for the New American Century,* September 2000*)*

When we value our National Security first, we recognize that even if the U.S. gave up its nuclear weapons, we would still be the target of enemy states, the U.S. must have a nuclear arsenal in order to secure our country.

**I would now like to address the arguments presented in the affirmative case:**

My opponents value was: Human Life. This value is very closely related to my own of National Security, what I am telling you, however, is that the possession of nuclear weapons is what is actually preserving human lives, as I explained in my first contention. It is also important to note that in the real world the enemies of the United States do not value our lives and it is the primary role of the state to protect its citizens - which nuclear weapons are doing right now.

My opponent proposed the criterion of utilitarianism, or doing what is best for the greatest number of people. If you look worldwide, democratic nuclear states are providing tremendous benefits for the people of the world. Because of our military dominance we are able to help secure freedoms for people in oppressive countries, think of the NATO mission in Libya. Without nuclear weapons, major portions of the world's population might be under the control of Nazi Germany or Imperial Japan, would that be the greatest good for the greatest number of people? My criteria, maintaining the military dominance of the United States does provide the greatest good for the greatest number of people.

My opponents 1st Contention claimed that nuclear proliferation is increasing the prospects of conflict and is threatening human life.

The evidence presented assumes there will be future nuclear conflict, but please cross-apply my 1st Contention where I show that the major world powers have been living in a state of relative peace and that they show considerable caution towards one another because they have the threat of nuclear war. My opponent wants you to give up possession of nuclear weapons not based on the actual historical record but on some unprovable prediction of future tragedy.

The 1st Contention also presented a poll of national security experts to prove that some people believe that terrorists might get a hold of these weapons. Please note that only 20% or 1/5 of the respondents believed there was a probability of an attack in the next ten years. That means that 80% of the people in the poll do not believe that such an attack is probable.

My opponent's 2nd Contention stated that the danger of accidental launch is a substantial threat to human life.

Again, this argument asks you to assume that the potential threat to human life should be evaluated above the lives that are actually being currently preserved because of American military dominance. Please recognize that through our valuing National Security we can take the necessary steps to avoid accidents while not leaving ourselves vulnerable to enemy aggressors.

My opponent's 3rd Contention said that the environmental consequences of nuclear weapons injure and destroy human life.

There are negative consequences to all weapons. Aristotle said, “We make war so that we may live in peace.” While we all wish that we could live in a world free from human conflict, the reality is that there will always be violent individuals who will seek to abuse and destroy. Our question is to determine whether or not we, as moral thinking individuals, are willing to respond to those threats in an attempt to counter the pain they inflict on the world. It is true that there will always be some negative outcomes to our promoting our national security, but those outcomes are far less dreadful than the alternative of losing military dominance in the world.

**Answer to: Nuclear weapons do unnecessary harm,**

All of war is harmful. In the nuclear bombing of Japan during WWII it is true that 210,000 people lost their lives. But did you know that it was conventional bombs, not nuclear weapons, that were responsible for the deaths of 183,637 Japanese and 305,000 Germans? (http://necrometrics.com/20c5m.htm Source List & Detailed Death Toll) That is more than twice as many civilian and enemy forces killed by non-nuclear arms. Yet, we wouldn't dare to say that states ought not possess any type of weapons. The affirmative must justify why the destruction caused by nuclear weapons should be considered greater than conventional weapons.