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# Reduce

## Reduce – Dictionary

### Reduce – Decrease

#### Reduce means to decrease in size

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 9

(“reduce”, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/reduce>, accessed 9-9-9)

 \* Main Entry: re·duce

 \* Pronunciation: \ri-ˈdüs, -ˈdyüs\

 \* Function: verb

 \* Inflected Form(s): re·duced; re·duc·ing

 \* Etymology: Middle English, to lead back, from Latin reducere, from re- + ducere to lead — more at tow

 \* Date: 14th century

transitive verb 1 a : to draw together or cause to converge : consolidate <reduce all the questions to one> b (1) : to diminish in size, amount, extent, or number <reduce taxes> <reduce the likelihood of war> (2) : to decrease the volume and concentrate the flavor of by boiling <add the wine and reduce the sauce for two minutes> c : to narrow down : restrict <the Indians were reduced to small reservations> d : to make shorter : abridge

2 archaic : to restore to righteousness : save

3 : to bring to a specified state or condition <the impact of the movie reduced them to tears>

4 a : to force to capitulate b : force, compel

5 a : to bring to a systematic form or character <reduce natural events to laws> b : to put down in written or printed form <reduce an agreement to writing>

6 : to correct (as a fracture) by bringing displaced or broken parts back into their normal positions

7 a : to lower in grade or rank : demote b : to lower in condition or status : downgrade

8 a : to diminish in strength or density b : to diminish in value

9 a (1) : to change the denominations or form of without changing the value (2) : to construct a geometrical figure similar to but smaller than (a given figure) b : to transpose from one form into another : convert c : to change (an expression) to an equivalent but more fundamental expression <reduce a fraction> 10 : to break down (as by crushing or grinding) : pulverize 11 a : to bring to the metallic state by removal of nonmetallic elements <reduce an ore by heat> b : deoxidize c : to combine with or subject to the action of hydrogen d (1) : to change (an element or ion) from a higher to a lower oxidation state (2) : to add one or more electrons to (an atom or ion or molecule) 12 : to change (a stressed vowel) to an unstressed vowelintransitive verb 1 a (1) : to become diminished or lessened; especially : to lose weight by dieting (2) : to become reduced <ferric iron reduces to ferrous iron> b : to become concentrated or consolidated c : to undergo meiosis

2 : to become converted or equated

synonyms see decrease, conquer

— re·duc·er noun

— re·duc·ibil·i·ty \-ˌdü-sə-ˈbi-lə-tē, -ˌdyü-\ noun

— re·duc·ible \-ˈdü-sə-bəl, -ˈdyü-\ adjective

— re·duc·ibly \-blē\ adverb

#### Reduce means diminish

Words and Phrases, 2002

(Volume 36B, p. 80)

The word “reduce” is its ordinary signification does not mean to cancel, destroy, or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower, or bring to an inferior state. Green v. Sklar, 74 N.E. 595, 188 Mass. 363

#### Reduce means to cut down

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“reduce”, WordNet 3.0, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=reduce>, accessed 9-9-9)

Verb

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=0&h=00000000000000000000" \l "c) (v) reduce, [cut down](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=cut+down), [cut back](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=cut+back), [trim](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=trim), [trim down](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=trim+down), [trim back](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=trim+back), [cut](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=cut), [bring down](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=bring+down) (cut down on; make a reduction in) "reduce your daily fat intake"; "The employer wants to cut back health benefits"

#### Reduce means to lessen, make smaller

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“reduce”, WordNet 3.0, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=reduce>, accessed 9-9-9)

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=7&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) reduce (lessen and make more modest) "reduce one's standard of living"

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=8&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) reduce, [scale down](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=scale+down) (make smaller) "reduce an image"

#### Reduce means to lessen in quantity

Oxford English Dictionary, 89

(“Reduce”, second edition, <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50200322?query_type=word&queryword=reduce&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=2&search_id=pM7h-QBwUxa-9739&hilite=50200322>, accessed 9-9-9)

26. a. To bring down, diminish to a smaller number, amount, extent, etc., or to a single thing.

1560 J. DAUS tr. Sleidane's Comm. 341b, When thys..semed over long, Clement the sixt reduced [L. redegit] the same unto fifty yeres. 1627 MAY Lucan VII. Mviijb, To what small number is mankind reduc'd. 1662 STILLINGFL. Orig. Sacræ II. vi. §4 But Aquinas doth better reduce the two former to one. 1667 MILTON P.L. I. 790 Thus incorporeal Spirits to smallest forms Reduc'd thir shapes immense. 1678 BUTLER Hud. III. iii. 330 All dangers are reduc'd to Famine. 1762 Ann. Reg. I. 147/1 What remained..were further reduced to half-price. 1781 COWPER Conversat. 403 Recovering..The faculties that seemed reduced to nought. 1827 SCOTT Napoleon Introd., Wks. 1870 IX. 218 Danton and Robespierre, reduced to a Duumvirate might have divided the power betwixt them. 1853 A. SOYER Pantroph. 271 Wine, reduced to two-thirds by boiling, was added. 1871 DAVIES Metric System III. 187 He finds by experience that these [two] may with increased convenience be reduced to one. 1903 E. A. ROSS in Amer. Jrnl. Sociol. IX. 197 There never has been a good reason for supposing we shall be able to reduce everything social to a single element. Ibid. 198 It is certain, nevertheless, we cannot reduce the whole man to a ‘cell’ in a ‘social organism’. 1920 Psychol. Rev. XXVII. 71 The psychological simplification of human behaviour, which reduces instinctive conduct to the functioning of psychical dispositions or impulses.

 b. To lower, diminish, lessen.

1787 BENTHAM Def. Usury vii. 69 No law can reduce the rate of interest below the lowest ordinary market rate, at the time when the law was made. 1833 I. TAYLOR Fanat. vi. 169 Every attempt to reduce the plain import of certain passages in the Gospels. 1856 KANE Arct. Expl. I. x. 114 Step by step..we went on reducing our sledging outfit. 1878 HUXLEY Physiogr. 42 If a current of warm and moist air meet a colder current its temperature is reduced.

 c. intr. To become lessened or limited. Also, to condense, come down to.

1811 L. M. HAWKINS C'tess & Gertr. II. 368 Miss Mendax has now lived, for a long time, on a biscuit per diem... She certainly does not reduce on it. 1885 Pall Mall G. 25 June 4/2 Diseased he was, and of a harsh Northern strain, but all the carping reduces at last to this. 1895 J. R. HARRIS in Expositor Nov. 352 They reduce to two classes. 1924 Times Lit. Suppl. 6 Nov. 704/2 His success or failure hangs..on the degree of intensity with which he fuses his material{em}and perhaps the old distinction between fancy and imagination reduces in the end to that. 1953 J. B. CARROLL Study of Lang. iii. 78 The problem of describing verbal behaviour..reduces to the problem of describing the strengths..of verbal responses under various stimulus conditions. 1956 E. H. HUTTEN Lang. Mod. Physics iii. 109 The equations of motion for a material particle as given by the general theory reduce to the equations of motion of Newton, when we consider the simplest case of a Euclidean, limited, region of space. 1971 Ideal Home Apr. 69/1 The size of houses in sq. ft. has tended to reduce quite rapidly over the last few years. 1973 Daily Tel. 15 May 19 (Advt.), After only 8 years the amount you need to pay in cash will reduce and if present conditions continue you pay nothing after 10 years. 1978 Amer. Polit. Sci. Rev. Sept. 964/1 Over time those claims reduce to nothing more than rationalizations to maintain power. 1979 Daily Tel. 1 Dec. 27 (Advt.), The Company invests 98% to 113% of each payment (depending on your starting age), except in the first two years when these figures reduce to 73% to 89%.

### Reduce – Weaken

#### Reduce means bring to a weaker state

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“reduce”, WordNet 3.0, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=reduce>, accessed 9-9-9)

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=1&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) reduce (make less complex) "reduce a problem to a single question"

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=2&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) reduce (bring to humbler or weaker state or condition) "He reduced the population to slavery"

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=3&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) reduce (simplify the form of a mathematical equation of expression by substituting one term for another)

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=4&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) reduce (lower in grade or rank or force somebody into an undignified situation) "She reduced her niece to a servant"

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=5&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) reduce, [come down](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=come+down), [boil down](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=boil+down) (be the essential element) "The proposal boils down to a compromise"

#### Reduce means to weaken

Dictionary.com, 9

(“reduce”, Dictionary.com Unabridged, Based on the Random House Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2009. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reduce>, accessed 9-9-9)

2. to lower in degree, intensity, etc.: to reduce the speed of a car.

3. to bring down to a lower rank, dignity, etc.: a sergeant reduced to a corporal

4. to treat analytically, as a complex idea.

5. to lower in price.

6. to bring to a certain state, condition, arrangement, etc.: to reduce glass to powder.

7. to bring under control or authority.

### Reduce – Is Not Eliminate

#### Reduce does not mean eliminate

Words and Phrases, 2002

(Volume 36B, p. 80)

The word “reduce” is its ordinary signification does not mean to cancel, destroy, or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower, or bring to an inferior state. Green v. Sklar, 74 N.E. 595, 188 Mass. 363

## Reduce Reliance (from Topic Paper)

#### Includes arms control, declaratory policy, force posture changes, and quantitative reductions (and has link uq issues)

Costlow 21 – Senior Analyst at the National Institute for Public Policy and formerly Special Assistant in the Office of Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy at the Pentagon

Matthew R. Costlow, “Reducing U.S. Reliance on Nuclear Weapons While Others Do Not,” Real Clear Defense, 4-20-21, https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2021/04/20/reducing\_us\_reliance\_on\_nuclear\_weapons\_while\_others\_do\_not\_773422.html

The 2010 NPR stated that the United States reduced, and sought to reduce more, its reliance on nuclear weapons both through arms control (e.g., the New START Treaty) as well as unilateral initiatives (declaratory policy and force posture changes). While reductions in the number of U.S. nuclear weapons during the Obama administration were part of its overall effort to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons in U.S. national security strategy, the 2010 NPR demonstrates that cuts to the U.S. nuclear arsenal are not the only means of reducing reliance on nuclear weapons.

#### Reducing a stockpile’s size is “reducing” “reliance”

NATO 23 – North Atlantic Treaty Organization

“NATO’s nuclear deterrence policy and forces,” North Atlantic Treaty Organization, last updated 4-11-23, <https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50068.htm>

NATO seeks its security at the lowest possible level of forces and is fully committed to arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Since the height of the Cold War, it has reduced the size of its land-based nuclear weapons stockpile by over 90 per cent, reducing the number of nuclear weapons stationed in Europe and its reliance on nuclear weapons in strategy.

#### It includes downsizing the role and number of nukes

Bradley 15 – analyst for the National Institute for Public Policy and provides on-site support at United States Strategic Command in the Plans and Policy Directorate

Jennifer Bradley, “Increasing Uncertainty: The Dangers of Relying on Conventional Forces for Nuclear Deterrence,” Air & Space Power Journal, July–August 2015, pg. 72, <https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/ASPJ/journals/Volume-29_Issue-4/V-Bradley.pdf>

Reduced Emphasis on Nuclear Weapons

The first priority of the NPR was to reduce the dangers of nuclear proliferation and the threats of nuclear terrorism. Part of the road map to this goal involved diminishing the reliance on nuclear weapons in US security strategy. The rationale was that by demonstrating its commitment to downsizing the role and numbers of nuclear weapons, the United States would “persuade our NPT [Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty] partners to join with us in adopting the measures needed to reinvigorate the non-proliferation regime and secure nuclear materials worldwide against theft or seizure by terrorist groups.”10

## Reduce Role

### Reduce Role – Nukes Context

#### Interim National Security Strategy says US will take steps to reduce the role of nuclear weapons

Bennett, Adjunct International/Defense Researcher; Professor, Pardee RAND Graduate School Adjunct Professor & International/Defense researcher, 21

[Bruce W., 10-20-21, Rand, “Reducing the Role of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Could Make North Korea Happy”,

<https://www.rand.org/blog/2021/10/reducing-the-role-of-us-nuclear-weapons-could-make.html>, accessed 6-3-23, AFB]

According to President Joe Biden's Interim National Security Strategy issued in March, the United States “will take steps to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy, while ensuring our strategic deterrent remains safe, secure, and effective and that our extended deterrence commitments to our allies remain strong and credible.” Biden believes “that the sole purpose of the U.S. nuclear arsenal should be deterring—and, if necessary, retaliating against—a nuclear attack.” But many U.S. officials believe that a deterrent threat can be ineffective unless military plans and capabilities are prepared to exercise that threat. A U.S. Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) underway will examine these issues.

#### Sole purpose would reduce the role

Erasto, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Weapons of Mass Destruction Programme senior researcher & Tophychkanov, Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Weapons of Mass Destruction Programme Associate Senior Researcher, 20

[Tytti & Petr, May 2020, SIPRI Insights on Peace & Security, “Towards greater nuclear restraint: Raising the threshold for nuclear weapon use,”, p. 17, accessed 6-3-23, AFB]

Adopting a sole purpose declaration

The NWS could further reduce the role of nuclear weapons by adopting a ‘sole-purpose’ declaration. In a partial overlap with both NSA and NFU, this would restrict the role of nuclear weapons to deterring a nuclear attack. By ruling out the application of nuclear deterrence to conventional, chemical or biological weapon use or cyberattacks, a sole-purpose doctrine would reduce existing uncertainties around first strikes among nuclear-armed states and potential nuclear attacks against NNWS.

### Cards From Topic Paper

#### Reduce the Role allows every aff in the appendix—sole purpose/NFU, cyber, ICBMs, etc—guarantees assurance/deterrence DAs

Rusten, Vice President of the Global Nuclear Policy Program at the Nuclear Threat Initiative, 2021 (Lynn Rusten, 10-7-2021, "Reducing the Role of Nuclear Weapons Will Make America Safer," National Interest, <https://nationalinterest.org/feature/reducing-role-nuclear-weapons-will-make-america-safer-194957>, DoA 4/29/2023)

What a U.S. president says about the role of nuclear weapons is vitally important. It not only establishes nuclear policy for the U.S. government, it tells the world—allies and adversaries alike—how the United States views the role of nuclear weapons in national and global security, now and in the future. Further, **a president’s public expression on the role of nuclear weapons matters for U.S. leadership on**[nonproliferation](https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/last-thing-middle-east-needs-nuclear-arms-race-194886)**.**

Nuclear weapons have not been used in more than seventy-five years, but the possibility they could be used is rising due to tensions among nuclear-armed states, advances in technologies such as cyber that introduce new avenues for miscalculation, and the erosion of arms control and other measures that limit nuclear competition and paths to conflict.

The **Nuclear Posture** Review **should be** guided by the objective President Joe Biden articulated as a presidential candidate: **to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in national security strategy. As long as nuclear weapons exist, they will play an important role in deterrence. But reducing their role means limiting—not increasing—the circumstances under which the United States would contemplate the use of nuclear weapons. U.S. policy should state**, as candidate Biden [proposed](https://apnews.com/article/election-2020-nuclear-weapons-elections-joe-biden-russia-1299ae16f3f21db12e4a41ce2392a0f7), **that the sole purpose of nuclear weapons is to deter or, if necessary, respond to the use of nuclear weapons by other countries.** **Moving toward this policy will require close coordination with allies to strengthen their confidence in our conventional capacity to deter, and if necessary, respond to non-nuclear attacks, including cyber.**

**The president** must also review the $1.5 trillion nuclear modernization effort to consider whether all programs now underway are required to meet his policy objectives. He **should cancel the proposed nuclear sea-launched cruise missile—a system that would be highly destabilizing. The largest yield nuclear bomb in the U.S. arsenal**, the forty-year-old B83 designed to be delivered by aircraft, **was slated for elimination** by the Obama administration, **but revived by** the **Trump** administration. **It should be retired. Whether and when to replace the current**[intercontinental ballistic missile](https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/roll-back-nuclear-modernization-programs-mr-president-194912)**force with a new missile, the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, also merits close examination.**

**The president should take immediate steps to reduce the risks of nuclear use, including by miscalculation or inadvertent actions, and to reassure the American people as well as other countries regarding U.S. processes and procedures. He should put guardrails around the**[sole authority](https://www.voanews.com/a/usa_us-politics_democrats-want-biden-relinquish-sole-authority-nuclear-launches/6202565.html)**of the president to authorize a nuclear strike by establishing procedures providing for, time permitting, consultations with key members of the cabinet and with congressional leaders, should such a contingency arise. He should order a “failsafe review” of U.S. nuclear weapons and command and control and warning systems to ensure they are continually hardened against cyber interference that could lead to the unintended or miscalculated use of a nuclear weapon.** The review should consider other steps to protect against unintended failures of the systems and procedures in place to ensure that they will operate correctly and only as intended.

Biden must also define his objectives for U.S.-Russian and U.S.-Chinese nuclear relations. The United States and Russia possess [more than 90 percent](https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-russia-say-held-intensive-substantive-arms-control-talks-geneva-2021-09-30/) of the world’s nuclear arsenals, and nuclear arms competition and the risk of conflict between these nuclear superpowers persists. While the president was wise to extend the New START Treaty with Russia through 2026, now our two countries have only a few years to negotiate a new set of agreements to maintain verifiable limits on U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear forces beyond 2026. Such agreements must also address [other types](https://nationalinterest.org/feature/art-negotiating-non-strategic-nuclear-weapons-186848) of nuclear weapons and strategic non-nuclear capabilities. The posture review should enable further nuclear limits and reductions with Russia to enhance security for the United States and our allies.

As for China, its nuclear arsenal is [growing](https://nationalinterest.org/blog/buzz/pentagon-sounds-alarm-about-china%E2%80%99s-nuclear-weapons-expansion-191669) but currently less than one-tenth of that of the United States or Russia. The review must assess the near and longer-term implications of China’s nuclear modernization. But it would be a monumental mistake to determine that China’s nuclear program today precludes the United States from pursuing limits and reductions with Russia in a successor agreement to New START. To the contrary, China is more likely to engage in multilateral arms control once the United States and Russia have further reduced their arsenals. As a priority, the United States should pursue crisis management, risk reduction, and strategic stability dialogue with China. Near-term steps to reduce the risk of conflict, to better understand each side’s security concerns, and to discuss concerns including questions about China’s nuclear policies and plans, will provide the foundation for future risk reduction, confidence-building, and arms control measures.

**The president’s focus and leadership are essential to ensuring that the Nuclear Posture Review reflects his priorities and his deeply held views on the role and future direction of nuclear weapons in U.S. and global security. Our world—and his legacy—depend on it**.

#### Reduce the role – ax-scalpel-sledgehammer approaches

Brad Roberts 21, Director of the Center for Global Security Research at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Nuclear and Missile Defense Policy in the U.S. Department of Defense, Ph.D. in International Relations from Erasmus University, “Orienting the 2021 Nuclear Posture Review,” The Washington Quarterly, Vol. 44, No. 2, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2021.1933740>

There are three basic approaches to further reducing the role of nuclear weapons in US defense strategy: one is to wield an ax—to eliminate one of the remaining functions. The second is to wield a scalpel—to pare back more judiciously, putting the emphasis on changes to the “how” rather than the “what.” The third is to wield a sledgehammer—to entirely replace current strategy with a radical alternative. As it works to reduce the role, what else should the Biden administration do to ensure that deterrence remains effective and that the extended deterrence commitment to allies remains strong and credible?

#### Reduce role works for disarm/non-prolif

Cirincione, 2022 (Joseph, President of the Ploughshares Fund, February 7, "Achieving a Safer U.S. Nuclear Posture," Quincy Institute for Responsible Statecraft, <https://quincyinst.org/report/achieving-a-safer-u-s-nuclear-posture/>, DoA 4/29/2023)

Carnegie Endowment scholars Toby Dalton and Ariel Levite warn that “**stalled progress toward nuclear disarmament by states with nuclear weapons,” and the spread of sensitive nuclear materials and technologies, have pushed the global nonproliferation regime to the breaking point**. Biden’s AUKUS deal, announced simultaneously in Canberra, London, and Washington last September, sets a dangerous precedent, allowing Australia for the first time to enrich uranium to near-bomb levels of purity to fuel nuclear reactors in new attack submarines it will now acquire, thus opening the door to future proliferation. **Urgent steps are needed**, argue Dalton and Levite, “**to restore the nonproliferation regime’s role as a bulwark of global stability.”**

**Restoring the regime will require policies that reduce the role and number of U.S. nuclear weapons, that recognize the profound moral questions raised by the use of these weapons** (and the consequent civilian toll), **and that seek to avoid risky or dangerous doctrines and postures that can trigger nuclear war**, as Kennedy put it, “by accident, miscalculation, or madness.” Nuclear weapons may be a means of deterrence in some cases, but they are never a tool for waging war.

#### Reduce used in context of disarmament

Gastellum, Researcher at PNNL, 2012 (ZN, “Denuclearization and Nuclear Disarmament – Present Situation and Prospects”, prepared for the Department of Energy, <https://www.pnnl.gov/main/publications/external/technical_reports/PNNL-22092.pdf>, DoA 4/29/2023)

According to the Nuclear Threat Initiative, **the international community has not yet agreed upon a legal definition of nuclear disarmament. However, international agreements generally describe nuclear disarmament as “the process of reducing the quantity and/or capabilities of military weapons and/or military forces**.” For the purpose of this paper**, nuclear disarmament will be defined as the act of reducing, limiting, or abolishing nuclear weapons.**

The term denuclearization is even less agreed upon in the international community, and appears rarely in the context of arms control and nuclear nonproliferation. For the purpose of this paper, denuclearization will be defined as the elimination of the military infrastructure and materials necessary for nuclear weapons production.

#### Reduce the role works for sole purpose affs

Kimball, Executive Director of the Arms Control Foundation, 2021 (Daryl, October 17, "Biden’s NPR Must Reduce the Role of Nuclear Weapons," No Publication, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2021-10/focus/bidens-npr-must-reduce-role-nuclear-weapons>, DoA 4/29/2023)

President Joe **Biden** clearly recognizes the problem and the value of diplomacy and nuclear restraint in solving it. His **Interim National Security Strategic Guidance states that his administration will** seek to “re-establish [its] credibility as a leader in arms control” and “**take steps to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in [U.S.] national security strategy**.” In February, Biden and Russian President Vladimir Putin agreed to extend the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) and negotiate further nuclear limits.

But it remains to be seen whether Biden’s recently launched Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) will lead to meaningful adjustments in the dangerous Cold War-era nuclear policies and costly nuclear modernization programs he inherited. Earlier this year, [Biden blew the chance](https://www.armscontrol.org/issue-briefs/2021-07/bidens-disappointing-first-nuclear-weapons-budget) to meaningfully scale back his predecessor’s bloated $44 billion annual nuclear budget.

Going forward, Biden needs to play a more direct role in the NPR to ensure it reflects his priorities and does not reinforce the dangerous overreliance on nuclear weapons and exacerbate global nuclear competition. As I and other experts recommended in a [recent letter to the White House](https://www.armscontrol.org/sites/default/files/files/documents/Letter_NPR_POTUS-09152021.pdf), the president should make important changes in several key areas.

First, t**he NPR should include a declaratory policy that substantially narrows the role of nuclear weapons**, consistent with Biden’s stated views. In 2020, he wrote, “I believe that **the sole purpose of the U.S. nuclear arsenal should be deterring—and, if necessary, retaliating against—a nuclear attack**. As president, I will work to put that belief into practice.”

**A “sole purpose” policy that rules out the use of nuclear weapons in a preemptive strike or in response to a nonnuclear attack on the United States or its allies would increase strategic stability, reduce the risk of nuclear war, and help operationalize the principle that** Biden and Putin agreed to in July that “**a nuclear war cannot be won** and must never be fought.” The more options there are to use nuclear weapons, the more likely it is that they will be used.

#### Reduce the Role—deterring North Korea

Bennett, 2021 (Bruce W., Professor, Pardee RAND Graduate School, October 20, "Reducing the Role of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Could Make North Korea Happy," No Publication, <https://www.rand.org/blog/2021/10/reducing-the-role-of-us-nuclear-weapons-could-make.html>, DOA 4/29/2023)

**According to President Joe Biden's**[Interim National Security Strategy](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2021/03/03/interim-national-security-strategic-guidance/) issued in March, **the United States “will take steps to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy, while ensuring our strategic deterrent remains safe, secure, and effective and that our extended deterrence commitments to our allies remain strong and credible**.” [Biden believes](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2021-10/focus/bidens-npr-must-reduce-role-nuclear-weapons)**“that the sole purpose of the U.S. nuclear arsenal should be deterring—and, if necessary, retaliating against—a nuclear attack.**” But many U.S. officials believe that a deterrent threat can be ineffective unless military plans and capabilities are prepared to exercise that threat. A [U.S. Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) underway](https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2021-09/news/biden-administration-begins-nuclear-posture-review) will examine these issues.

**The threats emanating from North Korea pose a useful case study for the potential implications of reducing the role of U.S. nuclear weapons**. North Korea has [apparently produced several dozen nuclear weapons](https://www.38north.org/2021/04/estimating-north-koreas-nuclear-stockpiles-an-interview-with-siegfried-hecker/) and [has threatened to use them to defend North Korea](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/north-korea-under-no-circumstances-will-give-up-its-nuclear-weapons/2017/08/07/33b8d319-fbb2-4559-8f7d-25e968913712_story.html). Of course, we have to remember that [North Korea claims that](https://www.rfa.org/english/news/korea/625-06252021155957.html) it was invaded by South Korea in 1950 to start the Korean War when the opposite is true. Thus, **the United States has to anticipate that North Korea could use nuclear weapons in any new aggression against South Korea.**

## Reduce Size – Dictionary

### Reduce Size – Physically Shrink

#### Reduce means to make smaller in size

Dictionary.com, 9

(“reduce”, Dictionary.com Unabridged, Based on the Random House Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2009. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/reduce>, accessed 9-9-9)

re⋅duce

  /rɪˈdus, -ˈdyus/ Show Spelled Pronunciation [ri-doos, -dyoos] Show IPA verb, -duced, -duc⋅ing.

Use reduce in a Sentence

See web results for reduce

See images of reduce

–verb (used with object)

1. to bring down to a smaller extent, size, amount, number, etc.: to reduce one's weight by 10 pounds.

#### Reduce means to physically shrink in size

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“reduce”, WordNet 3.0, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=reduce>, accessed 9-9-9)

[S:](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=reduce&i=6&h=00000000000000000000#c) (v) [shrink](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&s=shrink), reduce (reduce in size; reduce physically) "Hot water will shrink the sweater"; "Can you shrink this image?"

## Reduce Size – Nukes Context

### Reduce Size – SORT Method

#### Moving operational deployed to reserve/hedge or inactive status (limited life components removed) is a reduction – does not have to be dismantled or destroyed – based on how SORT counted reductions

Friedman, Center for Defense Information Research Assistant, 2

[Ben, 3/20/2002 “When is a Nuke not a Nuke?”, accessed 9-9-9]

In May 2002, U.S. President George W. Bush will be in Moscow. There, he and Russian President Vladimir Putin hope to sign a written document that will codify their November handshake agreement to reduce strategic nuclear arsenals from current levels of 6,000 apiece to 1,700-2,200 by 2012. While any reduction in weapons deployed must be lauded as a step forward, according to the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), the Bush-Putin plan nonetheless will leave the United States with the potential to deploy around 15,000 nuclear weapons.

The critical issue at stake is the counting rules being used: in particular, U.S. plans to keep many more than 2,200 weapons in storage for potential re-deployment later. With nuclear weapons kept in various stages of readiness and dismantlement, there are many ways to measure when a nuclear weapon is no longer a nuclear weapon, and thus many ways to count them. The recent U.S. Nuclear Posture Review reveals that despite the rhetoric focusing on cuts to the number of weapons actually deployed and ready to go, the Bush administration wants to keep the strategic flexibility a massive nuclear arsenal provides.

When politicians talk about nuclear weapons, they are usually talking about only a small portion of the U.S. warhead arsenal — the strategically or operationally deployed warheads. Those are the weapons Bush and Putin's agreement refers to and that are restricted under the START treaties. (The Bush-Putin agreement supplants START II, which called for reductions in deployed strategic nuclear arsenals to 3,500 each.) Under the agreement now being negotiated, the strategically deployed bucket will be partially emptied, while other buckets fill up.

According to the NRDC, the **United States now has about 10,650 intact warheads in its nuclear arsenal. In addition, there are enough disassembled components for another 5,000 warheads in storage - the U.S. strategic reserve. The intact nuclear stockpile can be divided into two parts, active and inactive weapons. Weapons in the inactive stockpile have had their limited life components, such as tritium, removed. The active stockpile has three subsections: deployed weapons, the responsive capacity or hedge, and spares.** Deployed warheads can be either operationally deployed or in overhaul. Operationally deployed warheads are attached to a delivery system, such as an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM). At any given time, a certain percentage of the deployed warheads are in overhaul, being tested and updated. Warheads in the hedge are separated from their delivery vehicles, be they missiles or planes. Spare warheads can replace warheads in the responsive or operationally deployed categories. Out of all these categories, only the operationally deployed warheads are likely to be restricted by the Bush-Putin agreement.

While the reduction plan has not been finalized, if the agreement follows the Nuclear Posture Review, the majority of the "reduced" weapons in the U.S. arsenal will move from being operationally deployed into either the responsive or inactive categories. Very few warheads will be dismantled or destroyed. By 2012, there will probably be around 600 fewer warheads in the U.S. arsenal, because of the retirement of one type of warhead, the W62. That would represent a 6 percent reduction in intact nuclear warheads.

### Reduce Size – AT – Requires Dismantlement

#### Reductions don’t require immediate dismantlement – SORT reductions in the size of the stockpile prove – 2004 reductions were met by 2007, without being fully dismantled

Norris, Natural Resources Defense Council & Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists, 9

(Robert S. & Hans M., March/April, “Nuclear Notebook: U.S. nuclear forces, 2009”, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, <http://thebulletin.metapress.com/content/f64x2k3716wq9613/fulltext.pdf>, p. 60-62, accessed 9-8-9)

As of January 2009, the U.S. stockpile contained an estimated 5,200 nuclear warheads: approximately 2,700 operational warheads comprised of 2,200 strategic and 500 nonstrategic warheads; and about 2,500 additional warheads in reserve (including some 150 spares).2 **An** additional 4,200 warheads await dismantlement as a consequence of the Bush administration’s announcement in 2004 to reduce the U.S. stockpile by “nearly 50 percent” by 2012.3 This reduction was achieved in December 2007, five years early, and an additional 15 percent reduction is scheduled to be completed by 2012, leaving a stockpile of approximately 4,600 warheads.4

### Reduce Size – ICBMs

ICBM reductions can include retaining them for reserve

Kile, et al., Stockholm International Peace Research Institute Non-proliferation and Export Controls Project senior researcher, 6

(Shannon N., Vitaly Fedchenko (Russia) is a Researcher with the SIPRI Reinforcing European Union Cooperative Threat Reduction Programmes Project, with responsibility for nuclear security issues and EU–Russian relations & Hans M., Kristensen, Federation of American Scientists Nuclear Information Project director., “World Nuclear Forces, Appendix 13A.” <http://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2006/files/SIPRIYB0613a.pdf>, p. 641-2, accessed 9-6-9)

Land-based ballistic missiles

On the basis of the estimate for January 2006, the US ICBM force was reduced in 2005 by 10 missiles with the retirement of the Peacekeeper (MX) ICBM. The 500 W87 warheads from the 50 retired Peacekeeper missiles will be modified to replace W62 warheads on Minuteman ICBMs beginning in financial year (FY) 2006. With a yield of 310 kt, the W87 is nearly twice as powerful as the W62, which will broaden the range of hardened targets that can be held at risk with the Minuteman force. The W62 will be retired by 2009. During 2005 work continued on modernizing the guidance and propulsion systems of the Minuteman ICBM force.

The USA abandoned the START II Treaty in 2002 and now plans to retain a multiple warhead capability for its ICBM force. The number of warheads deployed on ICBMs will be reduced to 500 to comply with the SORT ceiling of no more than 2200 operationally deployed strategic warheads by 2012. However, hundreds of additional ICBM warheads will be retained in the ‘responsive force’ reserve for potential uploading onto Minuteman missiles.

Four Minuteman IIIs were test-launched in 2005 from Vandenberg Air Force Base (AFB) in California; three with a single re-entry vehicle and one with three re-entry vehicles. One of the missiles with a single re-entry vehicle (from Malmstrom AFB) was a demonstration test for adapting the W87 warhead from the retired MX/Peacekeeper for deployment on the Minuteman III.7

Work is continuing on designing a new ICBM to begin replacing Minuteman III missiles from 2018. The Mission Need Statement (MNS) for the new ICBM states that nuclear weapons will ‘continue to play a unique and indispensable role in US security policy’ and that a credible and effective land-based nuclear deterrent force ‘beyond 2020’ will ‘prepare the US for an uncertain future by maintaining US qualitative superiority in nuclear war-fighting capabilities in the 2020–2040 time frame’.8

### Reducing ≠Dismantle/Destroy

Reducing nuclear weapons does not require dismantlement or destroying

Friedman, Center for Defense Information Research Assistant, 2

[Ben, 3/20/2002 “When is a Nuke not a Nuke?” <http://www.cdi.org/nuclear/when-nuke-pr.cfm>, accessed 9-9-9]

While the reduction plan has not been finalized, if the agreement follows the Nuclear Posture Review, the majority of the "reduced" weapons in the U.S. arsenal will move from being operationally deployed into either the responsive or inactive categories. Very few warheads will be dismantled or destroyed. By 2012, there will probably be around 600 fewer warheads in the U.S. arsenal, because of the retirement of one type of warhead, the W62. That would represent a 6 percent reduction in intact nuclear warheads.

## Restrict

### Reduce & Restrict – Decrease & Limit

#### Substantially reduce and restrict should be measured quantitatively. Reduce and restrict together mean “to decrease and hold within a certain limit.”

Words and Phrases, 2002

(Volume 36B, p. 80)

The word “reduce” is its ordinary signification does not mean to cancel, destroy, or bring to naught, but to diminish, lower, or bring to an inferior state. Green v. Sklar, 74 N.E. 595, 188 Mass. 363

Corpus Juris Secundum, 1931

(Volume 54, p. 735)

RESTRICT: To confine; to limit; to prevent (a person or thing) from passing a certain limit in any kind of action; to restrain; to restrain without bounds

### Restrict – Restrain

#### Restrict is to prevent

Corpus Juris Secundum, 1931

(Volume 54, p. 735)

RESTRICT: To confine; to limit; to prevent (a person or thing) from passing a certain limit in any kind of action; to restrain; to restrain without bounds.

#### To restrict is to prohibit

Oxford English Dictionary, 89

(“restrict”, Second edition, <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50204487?query_type=word&queryword=restrict&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=2&search_id=pM7h-54U2cC-10065&hilite=50204487>, accessed 9-9-9)

 b. To restrain by prohibition.

1835 Penny Cycl. III. 381/1 The act of 1797, which restricted the Bank from making payments in gold.

 2. To tie up, confine by tying. rare{em}1.

1824 J. H. WIFFEN Tasso XVI. xxiii, Gathering up..Her hair, restricting each resplendent tress.

#### Restrict is to set bounds on

Merriam-Webster Online Thesaurus, 9

(“restrict”, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

Entry Word:

 restrict

Function:

 verb

Text: 1 to set bounds or an upper limit for<will restrict access to the laboratory>— see limit 1

### Restrict – Limit Meaning Of

#### Restrict is to limit the meaning of

Merriam-Webster Online Thesaurus, 9

(“restrict”, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/thesaurus/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

2 to limit the meaning of (as a noun)<if you want to suggest a sense of foreboding, maybe you should restrict the word “darkness” with an adjective like “vast” or “eerie”>— see qualify 1

### Restrict – Limit

#### Restrict is to limit

Merriam Webster Dictionary of Law, 1

(“Restrict”, Lawyers.Com Glossary of Legal Terms

<http://research.www.ww.lawyers.com/glossary/restrict.html>, accessed 9-9-9)

Restrict

Definition - Transitive Verb

1 : to subject to bounds or limits <~ the height of buildings> <~ visitation rights>

#### Restrict means to limit use of

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“restrict”, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=restrict&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=000000000>, accessed 9-9-9)

 \* S: (v) restrict, restrain, trammel, limit, bound, confine, throttle (place limits on (extent or access)) "restrict the use of this parking lot"; "limit the time you can spend with your friends"

#### Restrict is to limit in options

Dictionary.com, 9

(“restrict”, Random House Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2009, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

re⋅strict

  /rɪˈstrɪkt/ Show Spelled Pronunciation [ri-strikt] Show IPA

Use restrict in a Sentence

See web results for restrict

See images of restrict

–verb (used with object)

to confine or keep within limits, as of space, action, choice, intensity, or quantity.

Origin:

1525–35; < L restrictus drawn back, tightened, bound, reserved, orig. ptp. of restringere to restrain, equiv. to re- re- + strictus strict

Related forms:

re⋅strict⋅er, re⋅stric⋅tor, noun

Synonyms:

curb, circumscribe, abridge, restrain.

Antonyms:

free.

#### Restrict is to subject to bounds

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law, 96

(“restrict”, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

Main Entry: re·strict

Function: transitive verb

1 : to subject to bounds or limits <restrict the height of buildings> <restrict visitation rights>

#### Restrict is to confine within particular limits

Oxford English Dictionary, 89

(“restrict”, Second edition, <http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50204487?query_type=word&queryword=restrict&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=2&search_id=pM7h-54U2cC-10065&hilite=50204487>, accessed 9-9-9)

 1. trans. To confine (some person or thing) to or within certain limits; to limit or bound.

1535 LYNDESAY Satyre 3813 Verteous men that labours with thair hands, Resonabillie restrictit with sic bands, That thay do service. 1570 FOXE A. & M. (ed. 2) 1474/1 Neither shoulde we haue any more wherwith to vexe them with confessions, cases reserued, restricted, or ampliated for our gayne. 1731 ARBUTHNOT Aliments vi. (1735) 218 In the Enumeration of Constitutions..there is not one that can be limited and restricted by such a Distinction. 1776 ADAM SMITH W.N. III. ii. (1904) I. 430 The common law of England..is said to abhor perpetuities, and they are accordingly more restricted there than in any other European monarchy. 1836 J. GILBERT Chr. Atonem. viii. (1852) 224 God himself is yet restricted in the exercise of his compassion. 1874 GREEN Short Hist. vii. §1. 351 The power of preaching was restricted by the issue of licences only to the friends of the Primate.

#### Restrict is to limit use of

American Heritage® Dictionary of the English Language, 9

(“restrict”, Fourth Edition, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

re·strict (rĭ-strĭkt')

tr.v. re·strict·ed, re·strict·ing, re·stricts

To keep or confine within limits. See Synonyms at limit.

[Latin restringere, restrict- : re-, re- + stringere, to draw tight; see streig- in Indo-European roots.]

re·stric'tor, re·strict'er n.

#### Restrict is to restrain

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 9

(“restrict”, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

 \* Main Entry: re·strict

 \* Pronunciation: \ri-ˈstrikt\

 \* Function: transitive verb

 \* Etymology: Latin restrictus, past participle of restringere

 \* Date: 1535

1 : to confine within bounds : restrain

2 : to place under restrictions as to use or distribution

synonyms see limit

#### Restrict is to limit ability

Roget’s 21st Century Thesaurus, 9

(“restrict”, 3rd edition, Thesaurus.com <http://thesaurus.reference.com/browse/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

Main Entry: restrict

Part of Speech: verb

Definition: confine, limit situation or ability to participate

Synonyms:

 bind, bottle up, bound, chain, check, circumscribe, come down on, constrict, contain, contract, cool down, cramp, curb, decrease, define, delimit, delimitate, demarcate, demark, diminish, encircle, enclose, hamper, handicap, hang up, hem in, hold back, hold down, impede, inclose, inhibit, keep within bounds, keep within limits, moderate, modify, narrow, pin down, prelimit, put away, put on ice, qualify, reduce, regulate, restrain, send up, shorten, shrink, shut in, surround, temper, tether, tie

Antonyms:

 enlarge, expand, free, let go, release

### Restrict – Curtail

#### Restrict means to curtail

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“restrict”, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=restrict&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=000000000>, accessed 9-9-9)

Verb

 \* S: (v) restrict, curtail, curb, cut back (place restrictions on) "curtail drinking in school"

### Restrict – Qualify

#### Restrict means to qualify

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“restrict”, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=restrict&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=000000000>, accessed 9-9-9)

 \* S: (v) qualify, restrict (make more specific) "qualify these remarks"

### Restrict – Restriction on Use

#### Restrict is to place under restrictions as to use

Merriam Webster Dictionary of Law, 1

(“Restrict”, Lawyers.Com Glossary of Legal Terms

<http://research.www.ww.lawyers.com/glossary/restrict.html>, accessed 9-9-9)

2: to place under restrictions as to use or distribution <~ed the land to recreational use>

#### Restrict means to place under restrictions

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“restrict”, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=restrict&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=000000000>, accessed 9-9-9)

 \* S: (v) restrict (place under restrictions; limit access to) "This substance is controlled"

#### Restrict is to place under usage restrictions

Merriam-Webster's Dictionary of Law, 96

(“restrict”, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

2 : to place under restrictions as to use or distribution <restricted the land to recreational use>

### Restriction – Codified Limitation

#### Restriction is a codified limitation

Law.com 9

(“restriction”, The People's Law Dictionary by Gerald and Kathleen Hill (legal writers), <http://dictionary.law.com/Default.aspx?selected=1835&bold=restrict>, accessed 9-9-9)

restriction

n. any limitation on activity, by statute, regulation or contract provision. In multi-unit real estate developments, condominium and cooperative housing projects managed by homeowners' associations or similar organizations, such organizations are usually required by state law to impose restrictions on use. Thus, the restrictions are part of the "covenants, conditions and restrictions" intended to enhance the use of common facilities and property which are recorded and incorporated into the title of each owner.

#### Restriction is a limitation by regulation

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“restriction”, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=restriction&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=0000>, accessed 9-9-9)

 \* S: (n) limitation, restriction (an act of limiting or restricting (as by regulation))

 \* S: (n) restriction, confinement (the act of keeping something within specified bounds (by force if necessary)) "the restriction of the infection to a focal area"

#### Restriction is a regulation, rule

Dictionary.com, 9

(“restriction”, Based on the Random House Dictionary, © Random House, Inc. 2009 <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/restriction>, accessed 9-9-9)

re⋅stric⋅tion

  /rɪˈstrɪkʃən/ Show Spelled Pronunciation [ri-strik-shuhn] Show IPA

Use restriction in a Sentence

See web results for restriction

See images of restriction

–noun

1. something that restricts; a restrictive condition or regulation; limitation.

2. the act of restricting.

3. the state of being restricted.

Origin:

1375–1425; late ME < LL restrictiōn- (s. of restrictiō), equiv. to L restrict(us) (see restrict ) + -iōn- -ion

Synonyms:

rule, provision, reservation, restraint.

#### Restriction codifies a limitation

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 9

(“restriction”, Fourth edition, <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/restriction>, accessed 9-9-9)

re·stric·tion (rĭ-strĭk'shən)

n.

 1.

 1. The act of restricting.

 2. The state of being restricted.

 2. Something that restricts; a regulation or limitation.

#### Restriction is a regulation

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 9

(“restriction”, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/restriction>, accessed 9-9-9)

 \* Main Entry: re·stric·tion

 \* Pronunciation: \ri-ˈstrik-shən\

 \* Function: noun

 \* Etymology: Middle English restriccioun, from Anglo-French restriction, from Late Latin restriction-, restrictio, from Latin restringere

 \* Date: 15th century

1 : something that restricts: as a : a regulation that restricts or restrains <restrictions for hunters> b : a limitation on the use or enjoyment of property or a facility

2 : an act of restricting : the condition of being restricted

### Restriction – Limitation

#### A restriction is a limitation, regulation

Merriam Webster Dictionary of Law, 1

(“Restriction”, Lawyers.Com Glossary of Legal Terms

<http://research.www.ww.lawyers.com/glossary/restrict.html>, accessed 9-9-9)

Restriction

Definition - Noun

1 : something that restricts: as

a : a regulation that restricts or restrains

b : a limitation on the use or enjoyment of property or a facility

2 a : an act of restricting

b : the state of being restricted

#### Restriction is a limitation

WordNet, Princeton University Cognitive Science Laboratory

(“restriction”, <http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=restriction&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o7=&o5=&o1=1&o6=&o4=&o3=&h=0000>, accessed 9-9-9)

Noun

 \* S: (n) restriction, limitation (a principle that limits the extent of something) "I am willing to accept certain restrictions on my movements"

### Restrict Role – Nukes Context

#### Sole purpose/NFU restrict the role of nuclear weapons

Davenport, Director for Nonproliferation Policy, 22

[Kelsey, March 2022, Arms Control Association, “Nuclear Declaratory Policy and Negative Security Assurances,” <https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/declaratorypolicies>, accessed 6-3-23, AFB]

France

France maintains a policy of calculated ambiguity regarding first-use of nuclear weapons. A 2013 French government defense white paper states that “the use of nuclear weapons would only be conceivable in extreme circumstances of legitimate self-defence” and that “[b]eing strictly defensive, nuclear deterrence protects France from any state-led aggression against its vital interests, of whatever origin and in whatever form.”

France issued negative security assurances at the UN in 1987 and 1995. In its 1995 statement to the UN, France pledged not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon states that are party to the NPT “except in the case of invasion or any other attack on France, its territory, its armed forces or other troops, or against its allies or a State toward which it has a security commitment, carried out or sustained by such a State in alliance or association with a nuclear-weapon State.”

At the 2010 NPT Review Conference, France called for nuclear possessor states to “work resolutely to advance disarmament in all its aspects; in which the doctrines of nuclear powers will restrict the role of nuclear weapons solely to extreme circumstances of self-defence where their vital interests are under threat.”

#### Restricting the role solely to deterrence is a thing [and side note – preventing modernization/FMCT/CTBT is described as distinct from reducing arsenal]

Kimball, Arms Control Association executive director, 11

[Daryl G., Jan/Feb 2011, Arms Control Association, ‘After New START, What Next?”, <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2011-01/after-new-start-what-next>, accessed 6-3-23, AFB]

After just two years in office, the administration of President Barack Obama has put the United States back in the role of global nuclear risk-reduction leader. In April 2009, Obama recommitted the United States to the goal of a “world without nuclear weapons,” beginning with overdue reductions in U.S. and Russian stockpiles, steps to strengthen the beleaguered nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), reconsideration of the long-delayed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and action toward a fissile material cutoff treaty (FMCT).

By last summer, Obama and his team had guided the 2010 NPT Review Conference to a successful conclusion, negotiated and signed the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, and hosted a historic nuclear security summit.

The nuclear risk reduction effort got another big boost last month when 13 Republicans joined 58 Democrats and independents to approve ratification of New START, which will verifiably cut deployed arsenals to 1,550 warheads each. The strong vote for the treaty is remarkable in this time of hyper-partisanship in Washington. As Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chair John Kerry (D-Mass.) noted, “[I]n today’s Senate, 70 votes is yesterday’s 95.”

Kerry and Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.), along with Obama and Vice President Joe Biden, pursued a smart, patient plan to consult with Republican senators and take their concerns into account. They turned back treaty-killing amendments from a small group of obstinate treaty critics led by Minority Whip Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) that would have required renegotiation with Russia.

In the end, New START won the Senate’s support because it makes sense and had strong support from the U.S. military and national security establishment. Passage of New START will boost U.S.-Russian cooperation to contain Iran’s nuclear program and secure vulnerable nuclear material, and open the way for further Russian and U.S. nuclear arms reductions.

The next steps will not be easy, but they must be pursued. Twenty years after the end of the Cold War, it is in the best interests of Russia and the United States to reduce their huge strategic nuclear stockpiles further, phase out their Cold War-style targeting plans, restrict the role of nuclear weapons solely to deterring nuclear attack by others, account for and reduce tactical nuclear bombs, and, as Obama has promised, engage the other nuclear-armed states in a dialogue on nuclear disarmament.

Further U.S.-Russian reductions should cover all types of nuclear weapons and, ideally, be secured through a follow-on treaty. In the interim, the two governments should consider unilateral reciprocal actions that accelerate the reductions mandated by New START and go further—by cutting their deployed strategic stockpiles to 1,000 or fewer warheads before the 2017 New START implementation deadline.

Not only must the United States and Russia further reduce their arsenals, they must work harder to prevent other states from building up and improving their nuclear arsenals. To succeed, the United States needs to revive efforts for a global ban on fissile material production for weapons and solidify the global moratorium on nuclear test explosions by ratifying the CTBT.

In 2009, Obama pledged to “lead a global effort” to negotiate a verifiable FMCT, but talks at the 65-nation Conference on Disarmament (CD) remain blocked due to opposition from Pakistan, which is locked in an arms race with India.

If talks at the CD do not begin soon, the Obama administration should pursue parallel, open-ended talks involving the eight states with fissile material production facilities that are not legally required to be under international safeguards. Even if talks do begin, they will likely drag on for years. To hasten progress, all states with facilities not subject to safeguards should agree voluntarily to suspend fissile material production.

The New START vote suggests it is possible for the Senate to reconsider and come together around the CTBT, which cannot enter into force without U.S. ratification. The case for the test ban treaty is even stronger than it was when the Senate considered it in 1999. Nearly two decades after the last U.S. nuclear test explosion, it is clear that the United States no longer needs or wants nuclear testing and further testing by other states could help improve their nuclear capabilities.

The Obama administration’s robust, $85 billion, 10-year plan for upgrading the nuclear weapons complex should give skeptical senators greater confidence that nuclear testing is no longer needed to maintain the effectiveness of the U.S. arsenal.

The New START vote shows that controversial treaties can be approved without the support of top Republicans when the White House, backed by the military and the national laboratory directors, pursues a sustained, high-profile campaign. It is time for Obama to launch such a campaign to explain how the CTBT strengthens U.S. security.

The American people expect their leaders to take action to reduce the nuclear weapons threat. Doing nothing or delaying action on pragmatic nuclear risk-reduction steps is not an option.

#### Sole purpose would restrict the role of nuclear weapons in deterrence
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*Adopting a sole purpose declaration*

The NWS could further reduce the role of nuclear weapons by adopting a ‘sole-purpose’ declaration. In a partial overlap with both NSA and NFU, this would restrict the role of nuclear weapons to deterring a nuclear attack. By ruling out the application of nuclear deterrence to conventional, chemical or biological weapon use or cyberattacks, a sole-purpose doctrine would reduce existing uncertainties around first strikes among nuclear-armed states and potential nuclear attacks against NNWS.

#### Sole purpose would restrict the use
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[Tytti & Petr, May 2020, SIPRI Insights on Peace & Security, “Towards greater nuclear restraint: Raising the threshold for nuclear weapon use,”, p. 17, accessed 6-3-23, AFB]

As noted above, the logic of nuclear first use relies on hypothetical assumptions that might not hold in real life: a nuclear strike by one side might provoke rather than deter further escalation by the other, and a preventive attack could lead to nuclear retaliation despite the attacker’s confidence in its defensive systems. The mere perception of readiness for nuclear first use by one side can undermine strategic stability by leading to new armament competition, and by increasing the likelihood of nuclear war based on miscalculation.

On the basis that such risks outweigh any perceived benefits of nuclear first use, several experts have called for other NWS to follow the example of China by adopting an NFU doctrine.76 If all the nuclear-armed states were to restrict the potential use of nuclear weapons to retaliatory second strikes— and adopt sole purpose declarations (see below)—this would, in principle, rule out the possibility of intentional nuclear war.