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AUTHOR’S NOTE: Because of the evolution of issues with regards to Russia, this draft should serve as an introduction to potential topic areas. The issues addressed in this paper will be updated as we get closer to August.
There has never been a better time to debate a topic that revolves around Russia. Not a day goes by that something doesn’t pop up in the news regarding Putin, U.S. Election tampering, collusion, trade, and a multitude of other issues. By the time this topic would be debated we will have been through the mid-term election cycle which will probably give us even more fodder for debate, along with heading into the 2020 Presidential election cycle.

Russia was last debated as a national resolution in 1998-99 when the resolution was: Resolved: That the United States should substantially change its foreign policy toward Russia. It was again on the ballot for top five in three more years: 2010-11 Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its military and/or economic engagement toward Russia, 2013-14 Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its engagement toward the Russian Federation in one or more of the following: nuclear arms reduction, missile defense cooperation, trade barrier reduction. Most recently in 2017-18 Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase economic, diplomatic, and/or military pressure on the Russian Federation. All of these are prior to the most recent revelations that make Russia even more relevant today.

Potential areas of importance for the 2019-2020 resolution include: the economy, international relations, cyber connections, U.S. elections, energy, and weapons.

**ECONOMY**

Russia’s economy has been suffering over the last two years. Just recently they have seen some improvement with an increase in oil prices. Some would argue that the Russian economy has been hurt by sanctions over their involvement in the Ukraine. One thing most agree on is that the increased sanctions have placed the economy in an even more fragile state. Reuters points out:

“An escalation in U.S. sanctions against Moscow risks derailing a fragile recovery in Russia’s economy, which had just begun to take hold after the Kremlin’s last confrontation with the West in 2014, analysts and investors said on Monday.

The United States imposed major new sanctions against Russia on Friday, striking at senior Russian officials and some of the country’s biggest companies in one of Washington’s most aggressive moves to punish Moscow for its alleged meddling in the 2016 U.S. election and other “malign activity”.

“One gets the impression that since 2014 we have been convinced that sanctions are painless for our economy,” said Kirill Tremasov, head of research at Loko-Invest and former director of the Russian Economy Ministry’s forecasting department.

“This is completely groundless. What happened on Friday opens a new stage in relations with Western countries. We have found ourselves in a new reality. And it is very, very serious.”

Analysts and investors in Moscow said the sanctions could consign Russia to years of low growth, frustrating government efforts to stimulate a rebound from a two-year downturn brought on by low oil prices and Western sanctions over Moscow’s role in the Ukraine crisis.
Others have argued that the sanctions have not been effective, and the Russian economy is improving because of its energy resources. Focus Economics, Economic forecasts from the world’s leading economists indicates:

Rising oil prices, a healthy labor market and improved consumer confidence should cause growth to gather steam this year. However, limited oil output and structural rigidities will hamper activity, while the impact of the fresh sanctions is still uncertain. FocusEconomics Consensus Forecast panelists see GDP expanding 1.8% in 2018, which is unchanged from last month’s forecast. In 2019, growth is seen stable at 1.8%.

The issue is clearly debatable. There are experts on both sides that argue whether the sanctions have impacted the economy and whether the Russian economy will continue to grow.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Clearly this area overlaps with many of the others. Russia can’t sneeze without it impacting some part of its relationship with other countries. Currently, it is argued, that a Cold War mentality has developed in Russia’s relationship with the West. Bloomberg Business reports:

With relations between Russia and the West at their worst since the Cold War, each move by Russian companies to increase investment, military or other ties in the EU’s eastern members has drawn close scrutiny from allies. Hungary’s government, which has clashed with the EU over democratic values, drew criticism in 2014 when it awarded Russia’s Rosatom Corp. the contract for a 12.5 billion-euro nuclear plant expansion just as President Vladimir Putin’s government annexed Crimea from Ukraine.

Backed by the U.S. in its war for independence, Croatia is a strong supporter of EU sanctions against Russia. And while Russian investment has poured into neighboring Serbia and the ethnic-Serb dominated part of Bosnia Herzegovina, in Croatia it has so far been limited to hotels, gas stations owned by Lukoil PJSC, and stakes in a handful of other companies.

U.S. Russia relations are strained, by among other things, the U.S. airstrikes against Syria. CNBC explains:

Russia, which has backed the government of Syrian President Bashar Assad, has joined Damascus in denying an attack even took place — even though U.S. authorities have declared it did with near certainty. The dispute over Syria was the latest wedge between the West and Russia, which has been embroiled in multiple controversies with western governments.

In a statement released on Twitter, Russia's ambassador to the U.S. said the country was being "threatened," and issued an ominous warning that reprisals could follow. Russian President Vladimir Putin, meanwhile, branded the coalition strike as an "act of aggression," as he demanded an emergency session of the U.N. Security Council on Saturday.

Russian foreign policy is a major question at this point. World events have not necessarily gone as expected. Putin’s election to a fourth term brings with it some uncertainty in Moscow. The European Council on Foreign Relations outlines the issue:
...The events of recent years have shattered quite a few foreign policy assumptions in Moscow. The Russian leadership did not expect the West to introduce strong sanctions after Crimea and to stick with them for years. Then, it expected China to compensate for lost Western investments. It expected Hillary Clinton to win the US elections and become a tough anti-Russian president. Then it expected Donald Trump to become a soft Russia-friendly president. It expected the EU to collapse under the weight of its own in internal contradictions at the wake of Brexit. It expected Ukraine to collapse under the weight of its unreformed economy, corruption and unruly political passions. It expected the settlement in Syria to be a lot easier. Alas, the world turned out to be more unpredictable and complicated than many Russians thought.

These failed predictions have occasioned a lively foreign policy debate in Moscow – on the meaning of Donald Trump, on the fate of the European Union, on what to expect from China, on what next in Syria and Donbas.

A key part of Russian foreign policy is its relationship with the U.S. Accusations of close ties between Putin and Trump, along with election tampering, Russian spies, the expulsion of Russian diplomats, all bring us closer to a tipping point in bilateral relations. The Center for Strategic and International Studies points out:

The relationship between the United States and Russia is among the most critical bilateral relationships in the world, with implications well beyond the two states themselves. Today, Russia’s foreign policy is increasingly assertive, the Russian economy is facing tremendous strain, and Russia’s political space is constantly shifting. In this dynamic environment, the imperative to understand Russian interests, actions, and, no less importantly, its people, is as great as it has ever been.

Many things regarding international relations will change by the time a Russia topic is debated. But one thing we can be sure of, there will never be a lack of debatable issues.

**CYBER ACTIVITY**

Russia’s cyber activity has been plentiful, but deniable as far as Russia is concerned. But the U.S. has, for the first time come out and blamed Russia for attacks on the energy grid. Reuters reports:

The Trump administration on Thursday blamed the Russian government for a campaign of cyber attacks stretching back at least two years that targeted the U.S. power grid, marking the first time the United States has publicly accused Moscow of hacking into American energy infrastructure.,. The Department of Homeland Security and FBI said in the alert that a “multi-stage intrusion campaign by Russian government cyber actors” had targeted the networks of small commercial facilities “where they staged malware, conducted spear phishing, and gained remote access into energy sector networks.” The alert did not name facilities or companies targeted.

The direct condemnation of Moscow represented an escalation in the Trump administration’s attempts to deter Russia’s aggression in cyberspace, after senior U.S. intelligence officials said in recent weeks the Kremlin believes it can launch hacking operations against the West with impunity.

So far Trump has been reluctant to hit back in retaliation against Russian cyber attacks. We have put sanctions on individuals, we have expelled others, and we have directly named Russia
as the responsible party. But the administration has not targeted Russian officials or the government. Reuters continues:

The United States slapped sanctions on Russian individuals and entities for U.S. election meddling and cyber attacks but put off targeting oligarchs and government officials close to President Vladimir Putin, prompting lawmakers in both parties to say President Donald Trump needs to do much more.

Others would like to see a more direct U.S. response to Russian hacking. The New York Times reports:

“When we see malicious cyberattacks, whether from the Kremlin or other nation-state actors, we are going to push back,” Rob Joyce, a special assistant to the president and the cybersecurity coordinator for the National Security Council, said in joint conference call with journalists by senior officials in Washington and London. That would include “all elements of U.S. power available to push back against these kinds of intrusions,” he added, including “our capabilities in the physical world.”

Robert Mueller is continuing his investigation regarding election meddling, and we will likely have some resolution prior to the year this topic is debated. Mueller now wants to question Trump regarding his involvement. So, the investigation will go on for some time. Expert pundits will certainly have analyzed and re-analyzed the investigative results by the time we debate the topic. The results most likely will only make a Russia topic more debatable. Internet news source the Daily Dot explains:

Last week, Republicans on the House Intelligence Committee announced they would be shutting down their investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 election and possible ties between the country and the Trump campaign. While the announcement was met with exuberance from Trump on Twitter, Democrats instead released a memo highlighting what they could do in the future, adding that the Republicans shut down the investigation “prematurely.” The memo says they want to continue investigating the hacking of Democratic National Committee emails, whether the Trump campaign knew of the hack, as well as election security, disinformation shared on social media, and other topics. It also lists a number of people they would hope to question as part of the probe.

What has yet to be seen, but will play out before this become a topic, is whether the U.S. is successful in preventing future meddling in the mid-term elections. There are 36 governors being elected along with all 435 seats in the House and 33 of the 100 seats in the Senate. As of now there are no comprehensive plans to prevent future meddling. The Wall Street Journal reports:

The November midterm elections are vulnerable to the Russian interference that plagued the 2016 presidential election, the Trump administration’s top intelligence official said Tuesday.

Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats warned the Senate Intelligence Committee that Moscow could undertake cyber-influence operations in the coming congressional elections similar to those it stands accused of running in 2016.
“Foreign elections are critical inflection points that offer opportunities for Russia to advance its interests both overtly and covertly,” Mr. Coats told the committee during its hearing on world-wide threats facing the U.S., in prepared testimony. “The 2018 U.S. midterm elections are a potential target for Russian influence operations.”

The cyber activity from Russia will most likely not subside soon. The debate will evolve around how to curtail the activity and/or prevent it from harming key U.S. resources. Something that won’t be solved before this topic is debated, but there is guaranteed to be a plethora of opinions and research about how to solve the problem.

ENERGY

Russia has strong oil and gas production networks. Energy resources are critical to the Russian economy. Exports of oil and natural gas prop up an otherwise fragile economy. The U.S. Department of the Army’s Country Handbook tells us that:

> Energy plays a central role in the Russian economy because it drives all the other elements of the system—the industrial, agricultural, commercial, and government sectors. In addition, energy, particularly petroleum and natural gas, is the most important export and source of foreign exchange for the Russian economy. Experts forecast that the energy sector will continue to occupy this central position until Russian manufacturing reaches a level competitive with the West.

Because energy plays such a critical role in the Russian economy, the U.S. has sought to impose sanctions on the energy sector, hoping to hurt Russia and gain some compliance in other areas. But that has not been the case. Russian energy exports continue to grow. The Atlantic Council outlines the impact of U.S. sanctions:

> New US sanctions on Russia now being implemented by the administration were imposed in August 2017 and included additional sanctions on the energy sector. This new legislation both tightens earlier sanctions and includes sanctions against entities supporting or investing in Russia’s oil and gas pipeline networks. The sanctions were intended to delay and hamper Russia’s ability to develop various energy projects, but Russia recently reached noteworthy levels of oil production and gas exports. In his new report, "Impact of Sanctions on Russia’s Energy Sector," Global Energy Center Non-Resident Senior Fellow Bud Coote addresses the impact of US and European Union sanctions on Russia’s energy sector, Moscow’s strategy and actions to deal with energy-related sanctions, and some of the geopolitical and other implications of Russia’s ability to cope with these sanctions. Coote’s analysis highlights how Moscow has managed to successfully pursue its energy goals, despite the broader negative impact of sanctions on other areas of the Russian economy.

Russia is a key player as far as world energy is concerned. They have abundant natural gas and oil production. How the U.S. can leverage this is debatable. Russia’s energy resources are a key bargaining chip worldwide. They allow Russia to sustain their economy and impact relations with their trading partners.

WEAPONS

Russia has certainly always been a threat with conventional, nuclear, chemical and biological
weapons. New information indicates Russia is developing more unique weapon systems. The UK Express reports:

VLADIMIR Putin may have already announced a hypersonic nuclear rangear missile that is undetectable to western radar but he has kept a number of other high-tech weapons a secret, including an unstoppable air-to-surface rocket and new combat robots.

Just before tensions with Moscow ratcheted around the globe following the spy poisoning saga, the Russian President unveiled a string of new weaponry.

It included a new supersonic weapon that cannot be tracked by anti-missile systems.

But he has a number of other surprises up his sleeve, according to pro-Moscow website Russia Insider.

It claims Russia's military are already equipped with Kh-32 air-to-surface missiles.

The rockets enter the stratosphere after being launched before diving back down to earth with such speed and dexterity they cannot be defended against, it is claimed.

Those missiles, capable of carrying nuclear warheads, could be potentially deadly to any surface target, military chiefs say.

They have a range of around 1,000km and can hit speeds of 5,400km per hour, making them more advanced than anything in the US arsenal.

Alongside the missiles, the Kremlin also claims to have developed combat robots that can mount attacks on land.

Russia’s weapons ability will continue to be a worldwide threat. Treaties, agreements etc., have tried to curtail Russian weapons growth, but the lack of effectiveness is an issue. Regardless of actions taken between now and 2019-2020 when this topic will be debated, weapons will still be an issue that needs to be addressed.

WHAT CAN THE UNITED STATES DO WITH REGARDS TO RUSSIA?

It is clear, that the United States needs to do something to contain Russia. There needs to be consequences for Russia’s past actions and we need to prevent future misdeeds. This section will explore some of the actions the United States has taken or could take with regards to Russia. The action could end up on either side of a resolution depending on how it is worded.

Containment via sanctions

Sanctions is a major weapon in our current arsenal to contain Russia. The United States has put on trade sanctions along with diplomatic sanctions against individuals, companies, the Russian government. Most recently, Congress passed Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA). But CAATSA is not perfect.

Alina Polyakova Foreign Policy Fellow, Center on the United States and Europe, Benjamin Haddad is a research fellow at Hudson Institute Brookings Institute March 20 2018
https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/03/20/new-sanctions-on-russia-are-not-enough/

CAATSA, like almost any bill, is also far from perfect as written. Specifically, it poses potential risks for American and European companies alike. According to Ambassador Daniel Fried, who led sanctions
coordination under the Obama administration, “[t]he act includes several provisions so broadly scoped that careless implementation could damage American interests” and lead to “potentially damaging consequences.” Specifically, the legislation allows for new discretionary authority to impose sanctions on energy and arms-related deals with Russian companies and financial institutions. As CAATSA was being drafted, Europeans lobbied against the bill because of concerns surrounding the European energy market. And while the main European concerns on energy were addressed in the final version, the law, if implemented aggressively, could still have far-reaching effects, risking U.S.-EU unity on sanctions. For this reason, Fried and other experts have urged the administration to avoid imposing sanctions mandated under some of the more broad reaching sections.

Analysts argue, that in many cases, the sanctions aren’t effective. Russia can and will continue to grow despite the imposition of sanctions.

Deutsche Welle is Germany’s international broadcaster DW.com May 4 2018
The US is preparing fresh sanctions against Russian oligarchs and people close to President Vladimir Putin, according to reports on Thursday. Many such measures are already in place, with western governments targeting a whole range of individuals, companies, banks and other organizations in Russia. However, the impact of Western sanctions on Russia’s economy has so far been rather insignificant, says Andrey Movchan, Moscow-based head of economic programs with the Carnegie Foundation. "I would say that the actual effect of the sanctions on the GDP has been negligible; a high estimate is at half a percent and it’s probably closer to zero," he told DW.

Experts have argued that the sanctions actually help strengthen Putin’s position in the government. The image of the Russian Federation, specifically Putin, fighting the West is a strong one which helps solidify his position as an effective leader.

Deutsche Welle is Germany’s international broadcaster DW.com May 4 2018
There, too, they appear to be ineffective. Not only has the Kremlin held its political course since 2014, but the sanctions have actually helped Putin strengthen his grip on power, experts say. "Effectively, the sanctions have been one of the major reasons for the increase of support to the central government and the Kremlin in Russia," Movchan explained. "Sanctions have been a clear evidence of the West’s hostility, and the majority of the population took that as an unjust declaration of war against Russia, in the economic sense, of course."

Whether sanctions are quantitatively or economically effective in constraining Russia, there are those that argue that sanctions serve a very useful purpose. Sanctions are still a viable option for the United States. The sanctions allow the U.S. to voice its opposition to actions of the Russian Federation.

Marsha Gessen, staff writer, The New Yorker, April 6 2018
Will these targeted sanctions be effective? Anyone who expects them to change Putin’s behavior will probably be disappointed. Whether they will weaken Putin’s hold on power in the long run is a more complicated question and probably one that cannot be answered. Yet, rather than talk in terms of strategy or punishment, American officials should return to a kind of
thinking that Republicans used to love: values-based foreign policy. The Russian regime commits political assassinations, wages war, breaks international and national law all over the world, and has succeeded in making Western countries complicit in its crimes—by employing Western financial networks and by making European countries, in particular, dependent on its exports of gas and oil. Sanctions should not be thought of as worthwhile because they’re necessarily strategically effective or even “smart” but because it’s morally abhorrent to be complicit in supporting Putinism.

Sanctions can be one of the options to help contain Russian aggression. It is a tool that the United States has and will continue to use.

**Containment via force**

Another possible option of dealing with Russia is to contain their actions via force. Force can take many forms, but the predominate containment via force would be done through military action. Even with military action there are a variety of levels a confrontation could take.


In theory, these are, very roughly, the possible levels of confrontation:

1. A military standoff à la Berlin in 1961. One could argue that this is what is already taking place right now, albeit in a more long-distance and less visible way.
2. A single military incident, such as what happened recently when Turkey shot down a Russian SU-24 and Russia chose not to retaliate.
3. A series of localized clashes similar to what is currently happening between India and Pakistan.
4. A conflict limited to the Syrian theater of war (say like the war between the UK and Argentina over the Malvinas Islands).
5. A regional or global military confrontation between the USA and Russia.
6. A full scale thermonuclear war between the USA and Russia

Confrontation could also involve our allies. The United States may or may not act unilaterally to counter Russian actions. It may need the help of our allies. The problem being that the practices of the current administration have weakened our relationships with our allies. It will difficult to predict whether the U.S would have the backing of other countries should it decide to use force to confront the Russian Federation.

Michael McFaul is a professor of political science at Stanford University. The Globe and Mail May 4 2018  https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-the-cold-war-is-over-but-theres-hot-peace-between-the-us-and/

With its powerful and loyal alliances, the United States still maintains a major advantage over Russia, but the strength of these military ties has waned. The United States’ alliances help it maintain a major advantage over Russia, but Mr. Trump’s governance has weakened some of those bonds; a Pew Research survey shows citizens in nine of its allies – France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Spain, and Turkey – now trust Mr. Putin more than Mr. Trump to do the right thing in international affairs.

During the Cold War, the use of force was measured by the numbers of weapons and the theory of Mutually Assured Destruction. We now have a new Cold War, or as some would call it
a Hot Peace where it is not the number of weapons but the types of weapons that matter. So we need to examine if the containment by force option is more or less feasible in today’s world.

Michael McFaul is a professor of political science at Stanford University. The Globe and Mail May 4 2018 https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-the-cold-war-is-over-but-theres-hot-peace-between-the-us-and/

This Cold War analogy is imprecise. The West’s new confrontation with Russia resembles some aspects of the Cold War, but also features new dynamics, some of which may be even more dangerous than the Cold War. Rather that labelling our era a new Cold War, I call it a Hot Peace.

The Hot Peace has added a new destabilizing dynamic regarding our nuclear standoff with Moscow. During the Cold War, the United States and the Soviet Union engaged in a quantitative nuclear arms race, in which we eventually counted the number of nuclear weapons in the two countries by the tens of thousands. We have now begun an equally frightening qualitative nuclear arms race. In March, 2018, Vladimir Putin revealed Russia’s development of several new types of offensive nuclear weapons, including a nuclear-armed long-range torpedo. The United States will have to respond. Russia and the United States also are racing to develop new missile-defense systems. If left unchecked, future military advances could make the Cold War look stable by comparison.

The use of force may no longer rely on MAD type strategies. Strategic weapons could be a major player in confronting the Russian Federation. This leaves the United States with a decision of whether force is going to be a viable option to deal with Russia. Regardless of the weapons, the United States could look at a strategy of containment via force to control Russia.

Containment via Cyber warfare

Attack on the 2016 U.S elections is a prime example of the intrusions Russia is capable in cyber warfare. Russia has been able to penetrate U.S. defenses and wage a war that is not readily recognizable by the average person.

Michael McFaul is a professor of political science at Stanford University. The Globe and Mail May 4 2018 https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-the-cold-war-is-over-but-theres-hot-peace-between-the-us-and/

Our hyperconnected world offers Mr. Putin and his agents new opportunities to pursue this ideological war through the use of disinformation, bots and fake identities now capable of reaching deep into democratic societies to push anti-democratic ideas and fuel societal discord. The asymmetries of openness also favour Moscow. Kremlin propagandists and their proxies can penetrate democratic societies through cable television, Facebook, YouTube, Twitter or Instagram much more easily than we can influence Russian society. Putinism shares few themes with communism from the Cold War, but the scope of Russia’s new campaign, like the old, is international and messianic again.

It is critical the United States get a handle on both deterring cyber attacks and possibly using them against Russia as a consequence for its misbehavior. But as of now this option has not been fully explored and the U.S is not in a position to wage a comparable cyber war.

The United States must demonstrate its cyber warfare capabilities to help deter sophisticated attacks from Russia and other adversaries while building strategies on a battlefield still misunderstood by commanders and senior officials, a panel of defense experts told lawmakers Thursday. "Cyber operations are a legitimate means of projecting national power, especially when proportionately supplemented by kinetic force, and we should advertise them accordingly," retired Navy Adm. James Stavridis, the former leader of European Command, told the Senate Armed Services Committee in prepared remarks.

Strengthening our cyberwarfare capabilities would be a viable option to counter Russian cyberattacks. Along with strengthening warfare capabilities we also need to bolster our defense against cyberattacks.

**Containment via Diplomatic Engagement/Normalization**

Engaging Russia on a level short of the use of force may be an option that could head us into more normalized relations with Russia. There are those who would argue that as a responsible government we should be looking to engage Russia and normalize relations.


To avoid these costs, any responsible U.S. government should want to normalize the relationship with Moscow. The objective should not be to become allies or friends, neither of which is possible or advisable. Instead, Washington should seek a narrow dialogue to avoid an unintended military confrontation, manage differences more effectively and, at times, work together where interests and priorities overlap.

On the contrary, many believe that as of now, this normalization cannot happen.


WASHINGTON (Sputnik) - The United States is not at a point where relations with Russia will normalize in the near future, US Department of State spokesperson Heather Nauert said during a press briefing. "Our relationship with Russia is not at a point where it looks like it is going to be normalized anytime soon," Nauert said on Tuesday.

The effectiveness of diplomatic engagement working toward normalization may be in question. But that hasn’t stopped the administration from trying diplomatic solutions.


“Our relationship with Russia is worse now than it has ever been, and that includes the Cold War. There is no reason for this. Russia needs us to help with their economy, something that would be very easy to do, and we need all nations to work together. Stop the arms race?” Trump wrote.

The theory being that we can’t afford NOT to try all channels short of the use of force. Diplomacy of engagement has been on the U.S. agenda for decades.

The first and most important task for any U.S. administration is to protect the survival and security of the American people. That is why no responsible administration could refuse to pursue a more stable relationship with Russia. It is why every new administration since the end of the Cold War has tried to do just that. No matter how futile these efforts may seem, the United States cannot afford to dismiss diplomacy with Moscow out of hand. Failing to try risks fueling a highly destructive self-fulfilling prophecy that could undermine U.S. national security, as well as America’s foreign-policy objectives around the globe.

Engagement/normalization could be an option available to help contain Russian actions throughout the world. There are arguments on both sides as to whether it is advisable and/or even workable. It still remains an option.

**Containment by Ignoring**

One method of dealing with Russia is basically to ignore them. Many say that is the practice of the current administration. President Trump is ignoring the wrong-doings of the Russian Federation.


Imagine if, after 9/11, the president had said that the World Trade Center and Pentagon could have been attacked by “China” or “lots of other people.” Imagine if he had dismissed claims of al-Qaida’s responsibility as a “hoax” and said that he “really” believed Osama bin Laden’s denials. Imagine if he saw the attack primarily as a political embarrassment to be minimized rather than as a national security threat to be combated. Imagine if he threatened to fire the investigators trying to find out what happened. Imagine, moreover, if the president refused to appoint a commission to study how to safeguard America. Imagine if, as a result, we did not harden cockpit doors. If we did not create a Transportation Security Administration and a Department of Homeland Security. If we did not lower barriers between law enforcement and intelligence. If we did not pass a USA Patriot Act to enhance surveillance. And if we did not take myriad other steps to prevent another 9/11. That’s roughly where we stand after the second-worst foreign attack on America in the past two decades. The Russian subversion of the 2016 election did not, to be sure, kill nearly 3,000 people. But its longer-term impact may be even more corrosive by undermining faith in our democracy.

Administration critics say that an increased federal role is needed but Mr. Trump refuses to recognize the issue.


Just as Sept. 11 made clear that private security could not safeguard the aviation system, so the 2016 Russian attack made clear that social media companies cannot safeguard the electoral system. A greater federal role is needed, yet Trump refuses to even admit that the problem exists.

The problem occurs when the US ignores Russia that feeds into the problems of the past. The past neglect has caused Putin and Russian Federation to act in a way that makes them look stronger so they cannot be ignored.
The crux of Putin’s argument is that Russia was ignored during its years of weakness and is only taken seriously now because it looks threatening. Putin recounted that before he took power, “the military equipment of the Russian army was becoming obsolete, and the armed forces were in a sorry state.” With the collapse of the Soviet Union, he said, “the nation had lost 23.8 percent of its territory, 48.5 percent of its population, 41 percent of its gross domestic product and 44.6 percent of its military capability. “Nobody really wanted to talk to us about the core of the problem [of the nuclear-weapons balance], and nobody wanted to listen to us. So listen now,” he demanded.

Ignoring Russia could also lead to global catastrophe. It allows Russia to act without any repercussions for their actions.

Yet failing to arrest the downward spiral in U.S.-Russia relations poses real dangers. The most dramatic, if least likely, is a direct military confrontation leading to uncontrollable escalation and potentially a global catastrophe...Setting aside nuclear apocalypse, forsaking diplomacy with Moscow because it legitimizes an unsavory government and rewards bad behavior could prompt Russian officials to conclude that they have little left to lose and must weaken and confront what they would view as an unrelentingly hostile America. Interfering in the 2016 election could pale by comparison to serious and sustained attacks on infrastructure, financial systems and other foundations of American society, all of which are highly vulnerable to cyberattack.

While some argue the practice of the current administration is to ignore Russia, others argue that Trump has actually applied consequences for Russian misbehavior.

Alina Polyakova Foreign Policy Fellow, Center on the United States and Europe, Benjamin Haddad is a research fellow at Hudson Institute Brookings Institute March 20 2018 https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2018/03/20/new-sanctions-on-russia-are-not-enough/
Much more can and should be done to deter Moscow. But just because the response to Russian provocations may not have been as strong as we might have liked to have seen, it’s important to remember that the Trump administration has been acting—baby steps, perhaps, but in the right direction. From providing weapons to Ukraine to increasing spending for European security, and most recently to striking a convoy of Russian mercenaries near Deir Ezzor, Syria—it all adds up to a stronger response than the dominant narrative implies. Still, one glaring gap in the administration’s policy all along has been the lack of enthusiasm for implementing sanctions against Russia for its interference in the 2016 elections. This has led to accusations of complacency—and far worse.

Whether or not the administration is ignoring Russia, the strategy appears to one possible option of dealing with Russian misdeeds.

SUMMARY

There are many potential areas for debate topics. Even though issues continue to evolve regarding Russia, it is doubtful that there will be any areas that are considered “solved” and no
longer debatable. In fact, some areas will become more debatable. By 2019-2020 the Mueller investigation should have concluded, we will have gone through the mid-term election cycle, we will be gearing up for another presidential cycle, the Iran deal will either be or not, along with a multitude of other items and potential solutions. All these issues will have some sort of proposed resolution. The researchers, experts, analysts, and others will certainly have time to dissect the current events and there will be voluminous research available on both sides, whatever happens.
NFHS Criteria

Resolutions

PAST RESOLUTIONS
1. Resolved: That the United States should substantially change its foreign policy toward Russia. (1998-99 National Topic)
2. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its military and/or economic engagement toward Russia. (2010-2011 top 5)
3. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its engagement toward the Russian Federation in one or more of the following: nuclear arms reduction, missile defense cooperation, trade barrier reduction. (2013-2014 top 5)
4. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase economic, diplomatic, and/or military pressure on the Russian Federation.( 2017-2018 top 5)

OTHER OPTIONS
1. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its diplomatic engagement, economic engagement, and/or military engagement toward the Russian Federation.
2. Resolved: The United States federal government should normalize relations with the Russian Federation.
3. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its strategic stability with the Russian Federation.
4. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase sanctions on the Russian Federation.
5. Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its engagement toward the Russian Federation in one or more of the following: arms reduction, cyberwarfare, economic and/or diplomatic sanctions.

Timeliness
As indicated earlier in this paper, there will always be something going on with regards to Russia. This is probably the best time to be debating a Russia topic. Nothing will ever really be solved but there will be solutions attempted, solutions that fail, and plenty of analysis as to why each was a success or failure. The research and expert opinions will be plentiful. Donald Trump will most likely provide us with future fodder for debate as he prepares for re-election when this topic will be debated.

Scope
Being an international topic there will be not be any region of the country that will have issues debating a Russia topic. All areas of the country should have no problem with this area. The scope of a Russian resolution could encompass a wide variety of issues related to Russia. This
does not have to be a one issue topic. The areas identified earlier in this paper may only scratch the surface of the issues in Russia.

**Range**
The skill sets debaters will use can be wide and varied. There is fertile ground with stock issues debate along with kritiks and other philosophical issues. Beginning debaters will have no problem understanding issues and advanced debaters can utilize in-depth arguments and strategies.

**Quality**
The issues addressed in this area will be ones currently applicable to the world. The quality of debate should be excellent because of recent and ongoing events. The depth of research available will provide solid information on both sides of issues for debaters to explore.

**Material**
Material will be readily available given the nature of the topic. Open any news website and you should find large quantities of quality information. In depth research on issues is ongoing so more scholarly works will be available once some of the current issues come to fruition.

**Interest**
This topic area should be of interest because it will be in the news daily. Russia has been a part of pretty much every topic for many years. Whatever Russia does certainly impacts the U.S. and the world.

**Balance**
The area itself provides natural balance to the issues. They are debated regularly on the world stage and in most cases, there is no one right, terminal answer. Topics should be able to be worded to provide balance on aff and neg. Past topics have had a good balance of aff and neg ground.
TOPIC SPECIFIC DEFINITIONS

Author’s note: While not considered an authoritative source, Wikipedia is used for some definitions to provide a more common understanding of a word or phrase.

CHANGE

change

verb (used with object), changed, changing.

1. to make the form, nature, content, future course, etc., of (something) different from what it is or from what it would be if left alone: to change one’s name; to change one’s opinion; to change the course of history.

2. to transform or convert (usually followed by into): The witch changed the prince into a toad.

3. to substitute another or others for; exchange for something else, usually of the same kind:

She changed her shoes when she got home from the office.

Dictionary.com http://www.dictionary.com/browse/change

Change

A1 [ T ] to exchange one thing for another thing, especially of a similar type:

She's just changed jobs. Let's change the subject (= talk about something different).

A2 [ I or T ] to make or become different:

I almost didn't recognize her - she'd changed so much.

That was 20 years ago and things have changed since then. Nothing changes, does it - I've been away two years and the office still looks exactly the same. People have changed their diets a lot over the past few years. I'm going to change my hairstyle.


DIPLOMATIC ENGAGEMENT

Diplomatic engagement

Engagement is applied in diplomacy as a synonym for a wider range of more specific practices of contact between an international actor and a foreign public, including public diplomacy, communication and the deployment of international aid.

Diplomatic engagement is an interaction between two entities, usually to work towards peace. A diplomatic engagement can be a meeting between two countries that is working to cause some good between them. [https://hinative.com/en-US/questions/1080562](https://hinative.com/en-US/questions/1080562)

Diplomatic engagement


Abstract: While the Department of State is the lead foreign policy organization within the U.S. government, the Department of Defense plays an increasingly important role in diplomacy largely through its a long tradition of international engagement through shaping the security environment. With a forward presence, large planning staffs, and various engagement tools, geographic combatant commanders pursue regional-level engagement by hosting international security conferences, promoting transparency through military-to-military contacts, and providing American military training and equipment. Throughout history, officers, such as Commodore Matthew Perry, General Tony Zinni, and Admiral Joseph Prueher, have played critical roles in U.S. foreign policy formulation and implementation. Officers like these provide ready evidence that the military does much more than “fight the nation’s wars.” This paper considers military diplomatic engagement activities as a part of U.S. grand strategy and explores the legal and policy implications of an increasingly militarized foreign policy

ECONOMIC ENGAGEMENT

Economic Engagement—as used in prior topic related research

An accurate accounting of a nation's total engagement must include economic policies as well as, trade, remittances, and foreign direct investment. In these areas, the U.S. leads the world in total economic engagement with the developing world.

definitions of terms on the economic engagement topic - NFHS

[https://www.nfhs.org/media/869098/topic-lecture-2013.pdf](https://www.nfhs.org/media/869098/topic-lecture-2013.pdf)

Kahler and Kastner define the engagement policies as follows: “It is a policy of deliberately expanding economic ties with an adversary in order to change the behavior of the target state and improve bilateral relations.” It is an intentional economic strategy that expects bigger benefits such as long term.

definitions of terms on the economic engagement topic - NFHS

[https://www.nfhs.org/media/869098/topic-lecture-2013.pdf](https://www.nfhs.org/media/869098/topic-lecture-2013.pdf)

What is Total Economic Engagement?


Total Economic Engagement seeks to integrate and coordinate all U.S. economic instruments and programs into our regional and country strategies. The Bureau of Economic, Energy and Business Affairs’ (EEB) broad cross-section of economic disciplines, interagency contacts, and expertise in such areas as
trade, finance, energy, development, transportation, and telecommunications help ensure this coordination.

EEB is actively involved in the entire range of international economic issues affecting America’s security and well-being. Our priorities extend from securing reliable, sustainable energy supplies to increasing market access for U.S. goods and services. Protection of American interests, such as intellectual property rights, fair play in international business, and shutting down terrorist access to financial networks, is not only part of our work, it is the foundation on which our efforts rest.

But promoting U.S. economic and security interests is not a short-term endeavor; dealing creatively with emerging markets and alleviating poverty are priorities that are even more important in the era of rapid globalization than they were in the wake of World War II.

**ENGAGEMENT**

en·gage·ment--noun

noun: engagement; plural noun: engagements

1. a formal agreement to get married. synonyms: marriage contract;
2. an arrangement to do something or go somewhere at a fixed time.
   synonyms: appointment, meeting, arrangement, commitment;
3. the action of engaging or being engaged.

"Britain's continued engagement in open trading"

4. a fight or battle between armed forces.

synonyms: battle, fight, clash, confrontation, encounter, conflict, skirmish;


**FOREIGN POLICY**

Foreign policy

political science, Written By: The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica

Foreign policy, General objectives that guide the activities and relationships of one state in its interactions with other states. The development of foreign policy is influenced by domestic considerations, the policies or behaviour of other states, or plans to advance specific geopolitical designs. Leopold von Ranke emphasized the primacy of geography and external threats in shaping foreign policy, but later writers emphasized domestic factors. Diplomacy is the tool of foreign policy, and war, alliances, and international trade may all be manifestations of it.

https://www.britannica.com/topic/foreign-policy

Foreign Policy
Plan of action adopted by one nation in regards to its diplomatic dealings with other countries. Foreign policies are established as a systematic way to deal with issues that may arise with other countries.


Foreign Policy

Foreign policy describes the laws, orders or actions of a national government with regard to other nations and international bodies. Foreign policy includes activities such as adhering to international laws and conventions; membership and involvement of multilateral bodies like the United Nations; alliances and security agreements; trade agreements; and supplying foreign aid to developing countries or areas affected by natural disaster. Foreign policy is a critical area of policy because it shapes the nation’s relationship, reputation and trade status with its neighbours. It also affects a nation’s international standing, or how it is viewed by the rest of the world.

Lawgovpol.com http://lawgovpol.com/foreign-policy-domestic-policy/

MILITARY ENGAGEMENT

Military engagement

A military engagement is a combat between two forces, neither larger than a division and not smaller than a company, in which each has an assigned or perceived mission.


Definition of "military engagement " (US DoD)

Routine contact and interaction between individuals or elements of the Armed Forces of the United States and those of another nation’s armed forces, or foreign and domestic civilian authorities or agencies to build trust and confidence, share information, coordinate mutual activities, and maintain influence. (JP 3-0)


Military engagement


For one thing, there’s no singular ‘military-to-military engagement’. It consists of dozens of activities and programs, from joint training and professional military education to arms sales and military dialogues. Each of these has different logics and functions, and there’s no one-size-fits-all approach to evaluate
their value or problems. Sweeping statements that military engagement is either useful or repulsive provide us with little understanding about what specific promises and pitfalls they might have.

For another, there are different ways we could measure the effects and value of military engagement and assistance. Different bilateral military engagements have different historical donor–recipient contexts. Many donors and recipients in Southeast Asia, however, consider the value of military assistance or engagement to be primarily political.

**NORMALIZE/NORMALIZE RELATIONS**

normalize relations: if two countries normalize relations, they have a friendly relationship again after a war or disagreement

(https://www.macmillandictionary.com/us/dictionary/american/normalize-relations)

normalization

The process of bringing or returning something to a normal condition or state.

‘the normalization of the situation will make the area more conducive to business activities’
‘he paved the way for normalization of relations between the two countries’
(https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/normalization)

normalization - return to a standard state or condition. In political speech it refers to when a state brings its relations with another state back to normal after a period of rupture, as when the U.S. decided to normalize its relations with Vietnam in 1995.

(iAmerican Spirit Political Dictionary, http://www.iamericanspirit.com/)


(CNN) Russian Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov has called for the "re-establishment of normal relations" between Russia and the United States under the Trump administration.

His desire for better US-Russian relations on Wednesday echoes previous statements by US President Donald Trump and his Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin.

"Following the difficult relations we had under Barack Obama, President Putin is ready to meet in the interests of global security and stability," Lavrov said, in remarks to Russia's lower house of parliament. "We share the position expressed by President Trump for re-establishing normal relations. This means we need to work in a businesslike way."
Lavrov also urged a normalization of ties between Russia and the European Union and said "Russophobia" must be combated.

"We cannot build our relations other than on mutual respect," he said.

The Boston Globe November 17, 2016

Several sub-senses of normalization are specific to politics. When two countries are in conflict, normalization — meaning resumption of peaceful relations — is often the goal. A 1940 use in the journal Pacific Affairs is interesting in hindsight: “The USSR seeks to avoid war with Japan and to normalize relations with that country.” A recent Bloomberg piece echoes this theme: “Putin, Trump Discussed Ways to Normalize US-Russia Relations.” President Obama has gotten credit and blame for attempting to normalize relations with Iran and, as seen in a recent headline from The Nation, Cuba: “Normalization of Relations With Cuba Is All But Irreversible Now.”

Study Hall Rocks July 8 2015
http://www.yttwebzine.com/today/2015/07/08/117830/normalization_definition

But how, in effect, does normalization change the dynamics between two countries? Here is a rundown:

Diplomatic relations: In January 1995, the U.S opened a liaison office in Hanoi, and Vietnam opened a liaison office in Washington. Soon after Clinton’s announcement, both nations upgraded those offices to embassy status, according to the U.S. Embassy in Hanoi.

Trade: Trade deals can benefit American businesses. In announcing normalization of relations with Cuba, Obama said that “U.S. financial institutions will be allowed to open accounts at Cuban financial institutions. And it will be easier for U.S. exporters to sell goods in Cuba.”

Human rights: Normalized relations could potentially give once-isolated activists a foothold to improve the human rights conditions in a country. But this can be an uphill battle. In June, the State Department’s report on human rights violations in Cuba stated: “The principal human rights abuses included those involving the abridgement of the ability of citizens to change the government and the use of government threats, extrajudicial physical assault, intimidation, violent government-organized counter-protests against peaceful dissent, and harassment and detentions to prevent free expression and peaceful assembly.” (See more on the State Department’s website.)
Travel: The United States-Vietnam joint vision statement released July 7 said that both countries “expect to consider visa facilitation measures to encourage greater numbers of tourists, students, and business visitors.”

Security: Through diplomacy, former enemies can work together on security issues. In Asia, for example, a maritime dispute threatens to erupt, as countries haggle over rights to resources in the South China Sea. The United States-Vietnam joint vision statement outlined concerns about “recent developments in the South China Sea that have increased tensions, eroded trust, and threatened to undermine peace, security, and stability. They recognize the imperative of upholding the internationally-recognized freedoms of navigation and overflight; unimpeded lawful commerce, maritime security and safety; refraining from actions that raise tensions; ensuring that all actions and activities taken comply with international law; and rejecting coercion, intimidation, and the use or threat of force.”

Global threats: Diplomatic relations can facilitate efforts to tackle global issues such as climate change. Obama and Chinese President Xi Jinping in November 2014 announced a joint plan to curb carbon emissions. (See details on the White House website.)

PRESSURE
Pressure
Definition of pressure
1 a : the burden of physical or mental distress
   b : the constraint of circumstance : the weight of social or economic imposition
2 : the application of force to something by something else in direct contact with it : compression
3 archaic : impression, stamp
4 a : the action of a force against an opposing force
   b : the force or thrust exerted over a surface divided by its area
   c : electromotive force
5 : the stress or urgency of matters demanding attention : exigency people who work well under pressure
6 : the force of selection that results from one or more agents and tends to reduce a population of organisms
7 : the pressure exerted in every direction by the weight of the atmosphere
8 : a sensation aroused by moderate compression of a body part or surface
Merriam Webster https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/pressure

Pressure--noun
1. the exertion of force upon a surface by an object, fluid, etc., in contact with it:
the pressure of earth against a wall.
3. Meteorology. atmospheric pressure.
Dictionary.com http://www.dictionary.com/browse/pressure

Pressure politics generally refers to political action which relies heavily on the use of mass media and mass communications to persuade politicians that the public wants or demands a particular action. However, it commonly includes intimidation, threats, and other covert techniques as well.

RUSSIA AND RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Russia

Russia definition. A vast nation that stretches from eastern Europe across the Eurasian land mass. It was the most powerful republic of the former Soviet Union; ethnic Russians composed about half of the population. It is the world’s largest country. Its capital and largest city is Moscow.

Russia | Define Russia at Dictionary.com www.dictionary.com/browse/russia

Russia—Wikipedia

Russia, the world’s largest nation, borders European and Asian countries as well as the Pacific and Arctic oceans. Its landscape ranges from tundra and forests to subtropical beaches. It’s famous for Moscow’s Bolshoi and St. Petersburg’s Mariinsky ballet companies. St. Petersburg, founded by Russian leader Peter the Great, has the baroque Winter Palace, now housing part of the State Hermitage Museum’s art collection

Russia

North Asia bordering the Arctic Ocean, extending from Europe (the portion west of the Urals) to the North Pacific Ocean
The largest country in the world in terms of area but unfavorably located in relation to major sea lanes of the world; despite its size, much of the country lacks proper soils and climates (either too cold or too dry) for agriculture; Mount El'brus is Europe's tallest peak; Lake Baikal, the deepest lake in the world, is estimated to hold one fifth of the world's fresh water.


Russian Federation

The Russian Federation (Российская Федерация, Rossiyanskaya Federatsiya), commonly known as Russia (Rossiya), is a transcontinental country extending over much of northern Eurasia (Asia and Europe). Apr 29, 2014

Russian Federation - New World Encyclopedia www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Russia

Russian Federation

The Russian Federation has more territory than any other country in the world, spanning two continents and northern Eurasia. It has a population of 142 million people, 80% of whom are ethnic Russians. Russia remains a diverse country, however, with populations of over 150 different ethnic groups and indigenous peoples living within its boundaries. Its political structures are governed by the constitution adopted in 1993 under Boris Yeltsin. Though nominally a democracy with periodic elections, this constitution granted to the Presidency extensive power over both the legislative process and the state's executive functions.

Amnesty USA https://www.amnestyusa.org/countries/russian-federation/

SANCTIONS—ECONOMIC/MILITARY/DIPLOMATIC

Definition of sanction

1 : a formal decree; especially : an ecclesiastical decree

2 a obsolete : a solemn agreement : oath

b : something that makes an oath binding

3 : the detriment, loss of reward, or coercive intervention annexed to a violation of a law as a means of enforcing the law

4 a : a consideration, principle, or influence (as of conscience) that impels to moral action or determines moral judgment

b : a mechanism of social control for enforcing a society's standards

c : explicit or official approval, permission, or ratification : approbation

5 : an economic or military coercive measure adopted usually by several nations in concert for forcing a nation violating international law to desist or yield to adjudication
Sanctions can either be positive (rewards) or negative (punishment). Sanctions can arise from either formal or informal control. With informal sanctions, ridicule or ostracism can realign a straying individual towards norms. Informal sanctions may include shame, ridicule, sarcasm, criticism, and disapproval. May 5, 2016

What is an example of a formal sanction and an informal sanction ...

https://www.quora.com/What-is-an-example-of-a-formal-sanction-and-an-informal-sanc...

In international relations, sanctions are a tool that nations and nongovernmental agencies use to influence or to punish other nations or non-state actors. Most sanctions are economic in nature, but they may also carry the threat of diplomatic or military consequences as well. Sanctions can be unilateral, meaning they are imposed only by one nation, or bilateral, meaning a bloc of nations (such as a trade group) is imposing the penalties.

Barry Kolodkin is a consultant, expert on U.S. relations in Eastern Europe. ThoughtCO.com
https://www.thoughtco.com/what-are-sanctions-3310373

Economic sanctions – typically a ban on trade, possibly limited to certain sectors such as armaments, or with certain exceptions (such as food and medicine) Diplomatic sanctions – the reduction or removal of diplomatic ties, such as embassies. Military sanctions – military intervention.


Governments and multinational bodies impose economic sanctions to try to alter the strategic decisions of state and nonstate actors that threaten their interests or violate international norms of behavior. Critics say sanctions are often poorly conceived and rarely successful in changing a target’s conduct, while supporters contend they have become more effective in recent years and remain an essential foreign policy tool. Sanctions have become the defining feature of the Western response to several geopolitical challenges, including North Korea’s nuclear program and Russia’s intervention in Ukraine.

Council on Foreign Relations https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-are-economic-sanctions

Economic sanctions are defined as the withdrawal of customary trade and financial relations for foreign and security policy purposes. They may be comprehensive, prohibiting commercial activity with regard to an entire country, like the long-standing U.S. embargo of Cuba, or they may be targeted, blocking transactions of and with particular businesses, groups, or individuals.
Since 9/11, there has been a pronounced shift toward targeted or so-called “smart” sanctions, which aim to minimize the suffering of innocent civilians. Sanctions take a variety of forms, including travel bans, asset freezes, arms embargoes, capital restraints, foreign aid reductions, and trade restrictions. (General export controls, which are not punitive, are often excluded from sanctions discussions.)

Council on Foreign Relations https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-are-economic-sanctions

Diplomatic sanctions

Sanctions in a broad sense, or diplomatic sanctions, include actions such as the interruption of diplomatic relations with the targeted country, or the coordinated recall of diplomatic representatives of the EU and its member states.


Security Council sanctions have taken a number of different forms, in pursuit of a variety of goals. The measures have ranged from comprehensive economic and trade sanctions to more targeted measures such as arms embargoes, travel bans, and financial or commodity restrictions. The Security Council has applied sanctions to support peaceful transitions, deter non-constitutional changes, constrain terrorism, protect human rights and promote non-proliferation.

Sanctions do not operate, succeed or fail in a vacuum. The measures are most effective at maintaining or restoring international peace and security when applied as part of a comprehensive strategy encompassing peacekeeping, peacebuilding and peacemaking. Contrary to the assumption that sanctions are punitive, many regimes are designed to support governments and regions working towards peaceful transition. The Libyan and Guinea-Bissau sanctions regimes all exemplify this approach.


**Strategic Stability**

Strategic stability came to be defined during the Cold War in terms of deterrence: the relationship between the United States and the Soviet Union was stable as long as both sides knew that each could respond in a devastating way to a nuclear attack by the other.

Strategic Stability: www.pircenter.org/media/content/files/10/13538686602.pdf

Strategic stability usually refers to a state of affairs in which countries are confident that their adversaries would not be able to undermine their nuclear deterrent capability. It is generally believed that, if the nuclear deterrence potentials are secure, nuclear powers would not feel the need to build up their strategic arsenals and, most important, would not be under pressure to launch their missiles in a crisis. Understood this way, strategic stability does not seem a particularly controversial concept. Few people would advocate instability in matters that involve nuclear weapons. But the problem is that the key elements of the concept are so poorly defined that it has no useful meaning and virtually no practical value.

*Michael S. Gerson is a principal analyst and project director at the Center for Naval Analysis, Elbridge Colby is a principal analyst and division lead for global strategic affairs at the Center for Naval Analysis. Strategic Stability: Contending Interpretations February 2013 ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pdffiles/pub1144.pdf*

Strategic stability emerged as a concept during the Cold War as part of an effort to find a *modus vivendi* for the two hostile superpowers. Its basic logic was to stabilize the bipolar confrontation by ensuring that each side had the ability to strike back effectively even after an attempted disarming first strike by its opponent. This would give each party the confidence to wait even in the event of attack by the other party, while removing the obverse temptation to strike first to gain fundamental advantage. Thus the chances of war through the fear of disarmament or through the temptation to gain an advantage by attacking first would lessen.

*Michael S. Gerson is a principal analyst and project director at the Center for Naval Analysis, Elbridge Colby is a principal analyst and division lead for global strategic affairs at the Center for Naval Analysis. Strategic Stability: Contending Interpretations February 2013 ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pdffiles/pub1144.pdf*

In this light, strategic stability should be understood to mean a situation in which no party has an incentive to use nuclear weapons save for vindication of its vital interests in extreme circumstances.

*Michael S. Gerson is a principal analyst and project director at the Center for Naval Analysis, Elbridge Colby is a principal analyst and division lead for global strategic affairs at the Center for Naval Analysis. Strategic Stability: Contending Interpretations February 2013 ssi.armywarcollege.edu/pdffiles/pub1144.pdf*

In a strategically stable situation, then, a nation would see neither need nor incentive to use nuclear weapons except to make clear to an opponent that he had crossed a most vital red line with the probability that he would suffer further—and perhaps catastrophic—loss if he continued his aggression.

Strategic stability has been defined as a characteristic of deterrence based on mutual assured destruction and has been measured largely in terms of the potential vulnerability of strategic force components, notably land-based missiles. This conception does not incorporate the effects on the strategic balance of the opposing systems of command, communications and control which given current force levels constitutes perhaps its most sensitive dimension. The implications of command structure stability are explored and found to contradict the prescriptions derived from the standard definition. This fact poses a major analytic problem and casts serious doubt on any conclusions about desirable changes in force structure until reasonable trade-offs are established between the conflicting principles.

**SUBSTANTIALLY**

sub·stan·tial·ly

adverb: substantially

1. to a great or significant extent. "profits grew substantially" synonyms: considerably, significantly, to a great/large extent, greatly, markedly, appreciably "the cost has fallen substantially" antonyms: slightly

2. for the most part; essentially. "things will remain substantially the same over the next ten years" synonyms: largely, for the most part, by and large, on the whole, in the main, mainly, in essence, basically, fundamentally, to all intents and purposes "the draft was substantially accepted"


**substantial**

adjective

1. of ample or considerable amount, quantity, size, etc.: a substantial sum of money.

2. of a corporeal or material nature; tangible; real.

3. of solid character or quality; firm, stout, or strong: a substantial physique.

4. basic or essential; fundamental: two stories in substantial agreement.

5. wealthy or influential: one of the substantial men of the town.

6. of real worth, value, or effect: substantial reasons.

7. relating to the substance, matter, or material of a thing.

Dictionary.com http://www.dictionary.com/browse/substantially
Something substantial is large in size, number, or amount: If you want to say someone spent a lot of money without being too specific, you could say they spent a substantial amount of money. The adjective substantial derives from the Latin substantia "substance," which means "stuff."

substantial - Dictionary Definition : Vocabulary.com

https://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/substantial
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