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NEGATIVE: Submarines

TOPICALITY

1. No commitment. (If only there were a commitment!)

**The NEG philosophy in this debate round is that the US Navy isn't really committed to new submarine building, but we wish they would be, because new submarines are essential to national defense.**

As of November 2020: Navy isn't committed to submarine purchasing. 2 ship building company bosses and a Navy official say we're waiting to see whether the Navy is "committed" or "serious" about it

Megan Eckstein 2020. (journalist) " Submarine Industrial Base Ready to Grow – But Only If Pentagon, Congress Send the Right Signals" 6 Nov 2020 https://news.usni.org/2020/11/06/submarine-industrial-base-ready-to-grow-but-only-if-pentagon-congress-send-the-right-signals (first brackets (Huntington) added; final brackets (requests for proposals) in original; ellipses in original)

[Huntington Ingalls ship building company CEO Mike] Petters said he was confident industry could act to grow their capacity faster than the government could actually get appropriations and contract modifications into place – though he said industry would only make moves to expand if the government was truly committed to buying more submarines over a long timeframe. **[END QUOTE**] “I think the shipyards will have to build, maybe invest in more capacity and more workforce. I think that we’re going to have to create some parallel capacity, maybe think a little bit more about buying pieces that we were doing organically before, maybe structural units or fittings or foundations or something like that. … And then I think you really have to be focused: if you ‘re going to get it there, you really have to get the supply chain up to speed. Our supply chain in support of all of shipbuilding, but in particular our nuclear enterprise, it’s very capable, but it’s also kind of thin. So you really need to have a persistent, consistent, sustainable set of messaging to the industry that you’re going to sustain this rate for a significant time to create or attract the investment in technology, capital and people that the supply chain’s going to need to go do,” Petters said. I think there is the capacity to go do that, but it ain’t a light switch and you don’t turn it on overnight. My rule of thumb though is that if you’re persistent on these signals from the government, the capacity in the industry can be built faster than the government can appropriate the funding to go do it. It takes so long to get to the appropriations process, there’s a whole set of signals and long lead times and [requests for proposals] and things like that that would let the industry know you’re really serious about doing it,” he added. [**THE ARTICLE GOES ON LATER IN THE SAME CONTEXT TO SAY QUOTE**:] Navy acquisition chief James Geurts and Electric Boat President Kevin Graney spoke at a separate event Thursday and reiterated to reporters that the whole industry was in a position to ramp up if the Navy became serious about buying more than two Virginias a year.[**END QUOTE**]

**[Note: "Virginias" are referring to "Virginia Class" submarines, the next latest and greatest model of subs being developed.]**

Definition of "COMMITMENT"

Merriam Webster online Dictionary copyright 2021. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/commitment

an agreement or pledge to do something in the future

Violation: Can't follow the resolution if there's no commitment

You can't substantially reduce something that doesn't exist. Our evidence even uses the word "committed" to describe what the Status Quo doesn't have in regard to Navy submarines. So whatever definition that word has, the Status Quo doesn't have a commitment.

Impact: No Affirmative team means a Negative ballot

Nobody showed up in the debate round to actually affirm the resolution. Since there is no Affirmative team, no matter who wins, you should vote Negative.

INHERENCY

1. Sub fleet already being cut in Status Quo

We're already cutting the sub fleet by 20% in this decade. Further cuts aren't needed (and are unwise!)

Connie Lee 2020. (journalist) 19 March 2020 "Congress Pushes Back on Virginia-Class Submarine Cut" NATIONAL DEFENSE MAGAZINE https://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/articles/2020/3/19/copy-of-congress-pushes-back-on-virginia-class-submarine-cut

Rep. Joe Courtney, D-Conn., chairman of the subcommittee, said the move was at odds with the Navy’s priorities. “Year after year, Congress has heard from Navy leaders, combatant commanders and experts about the growing demand for submarine capabilities as countries like China and Russia step up their undersea activity,” he said in a statement. “They have urgently warned us that we need more submarine construction, not less, in order to mitigate the nearly 20 percent reduction in the fleet we presently face within this decade.”

2. A/T "Shipyards can't build more subs, cuts are needed"

Not a problem, they'll figure it out. We should go ahead and keep building new subs, not make any cuts

Connie Lee 2020. (journalist) 19 March 2020 "Congress Pushes Back on Virginia-Class Submarine Cut" NATIONAL DEFENSE MAGAZINE https://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/articles/2020/3/19/copy-of-congress-pushes-back-on-virginia-class-submarine-cut (brackets added; ellipses in original)

“They’re still building submarines on a pretty good schedule,” [senior fellow at the Hudson Institute, Bryan] Clark said. “They’ve been building Virginia-class submarines in approximately five and a half years … which is a little bit quicker than what the original plan was.” However, with the Columbia-class starting and the Virginia-class transition to Block V — which is a 30 percent larger submarine — the industrial base “is pretty much at capacity now,” he added. However, the Defense Department should make its decision on the number of Virginia-class boats based on its strategic priorities, not on the industrial base, he suggested. “Go ahead and buy the submarine and then let the industrial base sort out when they would be able to deliver it, because the capability requirement, apparently, is the highest priority in the service right now,” he said.

HARMS / SIGNIFICANCE

1. A/T "New subs are expensive / facing production delays"

Doesn't outweigh national security. Lives are at stake: let's fix the problems and get the subs built.

Steven Bucci 2020 (visiting fellow at The Heritage Foundation; previously served as a U.S. Army Special Forces officer and is a former deputy assistant secretary of defense for homeland defense) 19 June 2020 "The narrowing of the defense-industrial base has reached critical levels" DEFENSE NEWS https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2020/06/19/the-narrowing-of-the-defense-industrial-base-has-reached-critical-levels/

In the face of this situation, we cannot tolerate any glitches or slowdowns in the very tight production schedules in the two submarine programs. Unfortunately, that is exactly what we are facing because of the previously mentioned lack of diversity and restricted options in the defense-industrial base. The complex schedule and the challenges that already exist to keep these programs on time are daunting. The Virginia and Columbia classes will have to be constructed at the same time, and [complex carrier builds](https://www.defensenews.com/naval/2019/04/04/the-us-navy-seeking-savings-shakes-up-its-plans-for-more-lethal-attack-submarines/) are also ongoing. A specific recent example of the defense-industrial base problems is the critical missile tubes that are the main armament of both of these world-class vessel types. They are the critical path for production, with the rest of the boat literally being built around them. If the tubes are “late,” the entire production cycle is held up. That is exactly what is happening, and it is putting our national security at risk. This is not an inconvenience, folks — people’s lives are at stake.

2. Constitutional duty outweighs

Constitutional duty to "provide for the common defense" outweighs other priorities

James Di Pane and Janae Diaz 2020 (DiPane - Research Associate, Center for National Defense, Heritage Foundation. Diaz - Fall 2020 member of the Young Leaders Program at The Heritage Foundation) https://www.heritage.org/defense/commentary/global-threats-are-high-now-not-the-time-shortchange-national-defense-budget

As the leadership of our nation weighs the balance between domestic spending priorities and the fate of future defense budgets, they should not lose sight of the federal government’s solemn constitutional duty: to provide for the common defense.

3. Lack of Affirmative threat analysis

Affirmative advocacy for defense cuts fails because they don’t provide the analysis showing why the threats have reduced to the point that would justify it

Frederico Bartels 2020. (Senior Policy Analyst for Defense Budgeting at Heritage Foundation) The Defense Budget’s Brewing Storm 30 Oct 2020 https://www.heritage.org/defense/commentary/the-defense-budgets-brewing-storm

Instead of discussing how to reduce the defense budget simply because the number looks big—or because some have designs to divert the funding to their pet causes—the nation should focus on understanding the threats posed by Russia and China around the globe, both today and in the future, and ensure that our military is on the right path to counter those threats.

DISADVANTAGES of the Affirmative plan.

1. Lose naval competition with China

Link: US doesn't have enough subs to keep up with China's expanding fleet. We must build more NOW

Steven Bucci 2020 (visiting fellow at The Heritage Foundation; previously served as a U.S. Army Special Forces officer and is a former deputy assistant secretary of defense for homeland defense) 19 June 2020 "The narrowing of the defense-industrial base has reached critical levels" DEFENSE NEWS https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2020/06/19/the-narrowing-of-the-defense-industrial-base-has-reached-critical-levels/

The present sub fleet is the envy of the world. Our boats are a marvel and can easily over match five to 10 of the subs of any one of our adversaries. (Editor’s note: The United States, China and Russia have roughly the same number of submarines.) This sounds great, doesn’t it? Except that on any given day, enemies like Russia and China can put nearly 10 boats in the water for every one of ours. Think about that. That is, at best, a dead heat; or put a different way, a “fair fight.” That is the last thing we ever want to have. Therefore, improving our fleet and getting more top-line boats at sea is vitally important.

Brink: Now is a really bad time to be talking about cutting Navy ships. We don’t have time to wait or delay growing the size of the Navy because we’re in serious great power competition

Brent Sadler 2020 (senior fellow for naval warfare and advanced technology at The Heritage Foundation; 26-year veteran of the Navy; M.S. from National War College; established the Navy Asia Pacific Advisory Group (NAPAG), providing regionally informed advice directly to Chief of Naval Operations) 19 Aug 2020 “The Navy Needs More Ships—And Vision, Too” https://www.heritage.org/defense/commentary/the-navy-needs-more-ships-and-vision-too

Without a clear and accessible vision of how a larger Navy competes in great power competition, the effort to grow the Navy from today’s 299 ships will falter in the headwinds of a questioning Congress, distracted leadership, and a confused electorate. And, most importantly, as the fleet operates with a shortage of ships, captains will struggle to find the time to adequately train their crews. China and Russia will continue to press their interests against ours at sea. This will not allow the Navy the luxury of a timeout to sort out either its culture or its seamanship. Real action is needed today, propelled by leadership with a vision and the fire to drive the Navy forward.

Impact: Imbalance of naval forces versus China can provoke a war, possibly going nuclear

Seth Cropsey 2018 (*director of the nonprofit*[Hudson Institute](https://www.hudson.org/)*’s Center for American Seapower. He served as a naval officer and as deputy Undersecretary of the Navy in the Reagan and George H. W. Bush administrations*) 25 Feb 2018 “American naval power: The last great impediment to China's global dominance” THE HILL https://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/372342-american-naval-power-the-last-great-impediment-to-chinas-global

Playing catch-up with a Chinese navy projected to break 400 ships by 2030 after another decade and a half of U.S. military stagnation is not an option. No lapsed great power has ever recovered its position. A substantive imbalance in forces could tempt China (or China together with other adversaries) to strike first against a U.S. that belatedly seeks to regain hard power, leading to, at best, a multi-year war or, at worst, the destruction of the U.S. Pacific Fleet or a nuclear exchange.

Impact: National survival and fate of the world depend on US Navy capabilities

Seth Cropsey 2018 (*director of the nonprofit*[Hudson Institute](https://www.hudson.org/)*’s Center for American Seapower. He served as a naval officer and as deputy Undersecretary of the Navy in the Reagan and George H. W. Bush administrations*) 25 Feb 2018 “American naval power: The last great impediment to China's global dominance” THE HILL https://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/372342-american-naval-power-the-last-great-impediment-to-chinas-global

The Trump administration’s actions on the question of the U.S. Navy’s future will be the single most consequential policy decision of the next four years, if not the next decade. Its decisions will affect our national security, if not our national survival — and with those, the fate of the world as well.

2. Vanishing industrial base

**The "industrial base" is the technological and physical manufacturing plant capacity to build military hardware in the United States. There are very very few corporations that have the technology, skilled workers, and physical machinery and manufacturing plants to build nuclear submarines. You can't just pick them up at Wal-Mart any time you need one. Canceling orders for subs means the companies that make them either go out of business or switch to other lines of work. That means the United States loses the capacity to ever in the future build submarines. We also lose the ability to improve sub technology over time. The subs we have now will be the last ones we ever have, and when they wear out or become obsolete, the Navy's submarine capability will disappear.**

Link: Canceling or delaying Navy ship contracts drives manufacturers out of business. Brink: 2018 Pentagon report says they're on the brink right now

**[The author of this quote is specifically talking about Navy submarines in this context, although the material she references applies generally to all Navy ships. "BWX" is a US company that makes submarine parts under Navy contract.]**

Emma Watkins 2019 (research assistant for the Center for National Defense at The Heritage Foundation) 19 Aug 2019 "Is the Navy’s Submarine Missile Program Going Down the Tubes?" https://www.heritage.org/missile-defense/commentary/the-navys-submarine-missile-program-going-down-the-tubes (brackets in original)

In fact, the Pentagon’s 2018 report “[Assessing and Strengthening](https://media.defense.gov/2018/Oct/05/2002048904/-1/-1/1/ASSESSING-AND-STRENGTHENING-THE-MANUFACTURING-AND%20DEFENSE-INDUSTRIAL-BASE-AND-SUPPLY-CHAIN-RESILIENCY.PDF) the Manufacturing and Defense Industrial Base and Supply Chain Resiliency of the United States” highlights the shipbuilding industry as having experienced some of the worst effects of reduced competition among suppliers.  The report also notes that this boom-and-bust cycle “result[s] in longer construction times and increased costs.” Each time a shipbuilding program’s timeline is delayed, the Navy’s goal of a 355-ship fleet becomes that much further out. Moreover, increased production costs mean that the Navy will be unable to procure ships at an adequate scale.  That reality has created inconsistency for shipbuilders’ profits, forcing them to make tough decisions about the future of their businesses.  Rex Geveden, BWX’s president and CEO, put it bluntly: “We’re not interested in the future orders unless we do have a way to make money on these orders.”  Geveden’s sentiment is echoed throughout the defense industry. These companies cannot economically justify keeping their doors open out of sheer patriotism alone.  Contractors require steady and predictable orders that generate actual profits to sustain their businesses. Inconsistent funding and underfunding continue to hamstring the defense industrial base and jeopardize the future of new entrants into the defense market.

Link: Canceling submarine orders means losing industrial capacity. Brink: Losing even 1 supplier would be a consequential blow to Navy programs, and we're on the brink of losing 1 supplier right now

Emma Watkins 2019 (research assistant for the Center for National Defense at The Heritage Foundation) 19 Aug 2019 "Is the Navy’s Submarine Missile Program Going Down the Tubes?" https://www.heritage.org/missile-defense/commentary/the-navys-submarine-missile-program-going-down-the-tubes

BWX Technologies is [threatening to reallocate](https://breakingdefense.com/2019/08/weld-problems-spread-to-second-navy-sub-program/?utm_campaign=Breaking%20News&utm_source=hs_email&utm_medium=email&utm_content=75720814&_hsenc=p2ANqtz-9oXa3Ig4N-wt9WbaYU34JQbNvA4doJpKcqkz73Glcjo9V2xnJiGYKhL716IDml4MsQf6Pf5tIL-yG2SiHC4-r6dzSwsM-9JLa68CbgCxfoWkBkNVA&_hsmi=75720814) its industrial capacity to other programs. Based in Lynchburg, Virginia, the company is facing difficulties meeting the exacting specifications necessary and lacks the certainty of future missile-tube orders. The loss of BWX, a company that produces the tubes for Columbia- and Virginia-class submarines, from the tube-making business would deliver a consequential blow to the stability of those Navy programs and to the health of the military industrial base overall.

Link & Brink: Inadequate naval shipyard capacity puts the Navy on the brink of not being able to defend the country

J. William Middendorf II 2020. (former Secretary of the Navy and former Ambassador to the Netherlands ) 24 Nov 2020 " Why Our Military Is Only Marginally Able to Defend Our National Interests" https://www.heritage.org/defense/commentary/why-our-military-only-marginally-able-defend-our-national-interests

According to The Heritage Foundation’s recently published [2021 Index of U.S. Military Strength](https://www.dailysignal.com/2020/11/17/americas-might-again-rated-as-marginal-in-index-of-military-strength/), the U.S. military is only marginally able to meet the demands of defending America’s vital national interests. The [index](https://www.dailysignal.com/2020/10/15/the-status-of-us-military-power-in-2020/) is an authoritative and comprehensive [assessment of America’s military power](https://www.dailysignal.com/2020/09/23/strengthening-americas-armed-forces-military/), the operating environments around the world relevant to America’s vital national interests, and the threats posed to the United States by our [adversaries](https://www.dailysignal.com/2020/07/08/how-we-will-ward-off-21st-century-adversaries/). The Navy is rated as “marginal,” but is trending toward a “weak” rating because the Navy needs 400 ships to meet demand and currently has a fleet of 300 aging ships and overstretched shipyards inadequate to defend the nation’s interests.

Impact: Lost naval industrial base = losing US national security. Risk of losing outweighs any AFF advantages

Steven Bucci 2020 (visiting fellow at The Heritage Foundation; previously served as a U.S. Army Special Forces officer and is a former deputy assistant secretary of defense for homeland defense) 19 June 2020 "The narrowing of the defense-industrial base has reached critical levels" DEFENSE NEWS https://www.defensenews.com/opinion/commentary/2020/06/19/the-narrowing-of-the-defense-industrial-base-has-reached-critical-levels/

The nation should not and cannot take risks here, which could otherwise be mitigated. They must go with known competence. The Navy should look to known suppliers who have developed complex, new technologies. It must diversify the industrial base because growing the size of the industrial base is essential for the long-term stability of this program and others.[**END QUOTE]** The bottom line is simple, but clearly not easy. The leadership of the Navy, at the highest levels, must step into this issue. Anyone too mired in “the usual” ways of doing things should not be trusted to solve it. The aperture of options needs to be opened widely, to seek solutions from sources that are not on the tip of the tongue, and priorities (and money) needs to be shifted to fix this now. [**LATER IN THE CONTEXT HE GOES ON TO CONCLUDE QUOTE**:] We have allowed the shipbuilding capacity of the nation to atrophy; it must be rebuilt. That will take time. This problem must be addressed in the present. Pay the price: The nation’s security requires it.

3. Lost nuclear deterrence

Link: Submarines are key to deterring nuclear attack on the United States

Peter Brooks 2020 (former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific affairs; Senior Research Fellow, Weapons of Mass Destruction and Counter Proliferation, Davis Institute for National Security and Foreign Policy, Heritage Foundation) 6 Oct 2020 " The U.S. Must Respond to North Korea’s Emerging Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missile Program" https://www.heritage.org/missile-defense/report/the-us-must-respond-north-koreas-emerging-submarine-launched-ballistic

Like other strategic weapons, SLBMs can play an important role in nuclear plans, policy, and strategy. For instance, because of their potential retaliatory value, these missiles can be used to dissuade or deter enemy attacks. [**END QUOTE**] An SLBM can also grant an actor a punitive, preemptive, or preventive first-strike capability to delay or deny an opponent’s attack. These weapons can give an SLBM-possessing state added political and military leverage in diplomatic negotiations and crisis management. In addition, due to the unique properties of the ocean (e.g., temperature gradients or “thermoclines”) and advanced silencing capabilities, capable submarines and commanders can move furtively through the Earth’s vast waters, making them harder to detect and track. With these unique capabilities, SSBs can function as the most survivable nuclear deterrent or strike platform in a nuclear state’s arsenal. In general, while the locations of airfields that can support nuclear-capable bombers and intercontinental ballistic missile fields are fixed and locationally well-known, modern, mobile, sea-based (or land-based) ballistic missiles can be difficult to track and target. [**HE GOES ON LATER IN THE CONTEXT TO SAY QUOTE:**] In sum, because of its mobility, stealth, and survivability in the world’s oceans, the SSB can both provide potent strike and deterrence capabilities to an adversary’s armed forces and significantly enhance its government’s ability to influence events. [**END QUOTE**]
SLBMs, Nuclear Force Structure, and North Korea
[**HE GOES ON LATER IN THE CONTEXT TO SAY QUOTE**:] Traditionally, nuclear strategists have maintained that to field a credible, flexible, and survivable nuclear deterrent, a nation must possess a full nuclear triad featuring air-based, sea-based, and land-based nuclear weapons. The preface to the U.S. Department of Defense’s 2018 Nuclear Posture Review, for example, notes that maintaining America’s nuclear triad “is the most cost-effective and strategically sound means of ensuring nuclear deterrence.”

Nuclear submarines (SSBNs) are the most important element of nuclear deterrence. Reducing or "not modernizing" them would jeopardize our ability to deter nuclear attack

Dr. Evan B. Montgomery 2013. (PhD in foreign affairs; Senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments) THE FUTURE OF AMERICA’S STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DETERRENT (month of publication not given in the article) https://csbaonline.org/uploads/documents/The-Future-of-Americas-Strategic-Nuclear-DeterrentU.pdf



Impact: Risk of nuclear war. Credible deterrence is essential to prevent nuclear attack

Gen. C. Robert Kehler 2019 (retired US Air Force general; f*ormer Commander, U.S. Strategic Command*) 20 Aug 2019 “The U.S. Needs a New ICBM Now” https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2019/08/20/the\_us\_needs\_a\_new\_icbm\_now\_114680.html

The U.S. faces far more diverse security problems and uncertainty than it did during the Cold War and the threats are growing, including nuclear.  Russia and China seek to change the international order and have aggressively modernized their nuclear arsenals as part of strategies designed to diminish U.S. power and prestige, coerce our allies, and reduce our global influence.  North Korea has acquired nuclear weapons and others have expressed interest in pursuing nuclear weapons programs. The great paradox of the nuclear age remains with us; in order to prevent the use of nuclear weapons our deterrence threats must be credible.

4. Secondary nuclear crisis

Link: Submarines (because of their mobility) ensure the U.S. can use its nuclear arsenal in a conflict without triggering a secondary nuclear crisis with some other country

Dr. Evan B. Montgomery 2013. (PhD in foreign affairs; Senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments) THE FUTURE OF AMERICA’S STRATEGIC NUCLEAR DETERRENT (month of publication not given in the article) https://csbaonline.org/uploads/documents/The-Future-of-Americas-Strategic-Nuclear-DeterrentU.pdf (marginal bracket notations added)



Impacts: Either 1) lose nuclear deterrence; or 2) secondary nuclear crisis

Either we become afraid to use nuclear weapons, which means we lose deterrence (cross apply the impacts in DA 4). Or else we aren't afraid, but then it triggers a nuclear confrontation or nuclear war with some other country besides the one we were trying to deal with.

5. Lose US hegemony

Link: Naval forces are key to US hegemony and international order. Brink: We’re at risk right now

Seth Cropsey 2018 (*director of the nonprofit*[Hudson Institute](https://www.hudson.org/)*’s Center for American Seapower. He served as a naval officer and as deputy Undersecretary of the Navy in the Reagan and George H. W. Bush administrations*) 25 Feb 2018 “American naval power: The last great impediment to China's global dominance” THE HILL https://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/372342-american-naval-power-the-last-great-impediment-to-chinas-global

Naval forces are therefore the most important military variable in this Sino-American rivalry. A strong U.S. Navy and Marine Corps is essential to maintaining freedom of navigation, ensuring effective security relations with allies, deterring enemy escalation and, in the event of a confrontation, neutralizing any threat with overwhelming firepower. To put it more broadly, the prerequisite for an international order, especially a liberal one that depends on free trade and unmolested global commerce, is naval dominance. Ours is at risk.

Impact: World peace & prosperity at risk without US influence. US hegemony is key to global peace & prosperity

Capt. M. V. Prato 2009 (United States Marine Corps,Command and Staff College, Marine Corps Combat Development Command,Marine Corps University) “The Need for American Hegemony” http://www.dtic.mil/dtic/tr/fulltext/u2/a508040.pdf

The world witnessed a vast shift in the polarity of geopolitics after the Cold War. The United States became the world’s greatest hegemon with an unequalled ability to globally project cultural, political, economic, and military power in a manner not seen since the days of the Roman Empire. **[END QUOTE]** Coined the “unipolar moment” by syndicated columnist Charles Krauthammer, the disparity of power between the U.S. and all other nations allows the U.S. to influence the world for the mutual benefit of all responsible states. Unfortunately, the United States is increasingly forced to act unilaterally as a result of both foreign and domestic resentment to U.S. dominance and the rise of liberal internationalism. [**He goes on to conclude later in the same context QUOTE**:] The United States must exercise benevolent global hegemony, unilaterally if necessary, to ensure its security and maintain global peace and prosperity.

Impact: Decline into anarchy with decline of US dominance and rise of Russia and China. Massive loss of life, money and freedom

Dr. Robert Kagan 2017. (PhD in American history; Stephen & Barbara Friedman Senior Fellow - [Foreign Policy](https://www.brookings.edu/program/foreign-policy/), [Project on International Order and Strategy](https://www.brookings.edu/project/project-on-international-order-and-strategy/) at Brookings Institution) 6 Feb 2017 ‘Backing into World War III” <https://www.brookings.edu/research/backing-into-world-war-iii/>

Think of two significant trend lines in the world today. One is the increasing ambition and activism of the two great revisionist powers, Russia and China. The other is the declining confidence, capacity, and will of the democratic world, and especially of the United States, to maintain the dominant position it has held in the international system since 1945. As those two lines move closer, as the declining will and capacity of the United States and its allies to maintain the present world order meet the increasing desire and capacity of the revisionist powers to change it, we will reach the moment at which the existing order collapses and the world descends into a phase of brutal anarchy, as it has three times in the past two centuries. The cost of that descent, in lives and treasure, in lost freedoms and lost hope, will be staggering.