Deterrence Theory in a Multipolar Nuclear World: A Critical Assessment

Tyler Benjamin Gray

Georgia Tech

Classical deterrence theory developed during Cold War bipolarity. Nine nuclear-armed states now exist. Schelling's work on commitment credibility, brinkmanship, and compellence emerged from and addressed dyadic nuclear confrontation (Schelling, 1966). This raises a critical question: Is deterrence theory still relevant in a multipolar world with multiple nuclear-armed states?

This essay argues that deterrence theory retains conceptual utility for understanding bilateral nuclear relationships but faces severe operational limitations in a multipolar context. The analysis establishes classical deterrence theory's framework through Schelling's core mechanisms, challenges foundational assumptions through Sagan's alternative models, and demonstrates bilateral complexity through Kroenig's empirical findings on nuclear superiority, extrapolates these complications to multipolar scenarios.

Schelling's commitment mechanisms operate through psychological credibility rather than physical capability. Automatic triggers (trip-wires, troop deployments) relinquish initiative to create inviolable thresholds. Brinkmanship manipulates shared risk of inadvertent escalation. Commitment interdependence means defending peripheral interests demonstrates willingness to defend vital ones (Schelling, 1966, pp. 86-99). These mechanisms assume bilateral dynamics: the brinkmanship metaphor envisions two climbers roped together, not a multipolar climbing party where each stumble drags multiple actors over different edges. Commitment interdependence strengthens deterrence in dyadic contexts but creates cascading vulnerabilities when chains multiply.

Classical deterrence theory rests on assumptions about rational security-maximizing behavior that become questionable in practice even in bilateral situations. Sagan reveals that nuclear decision-making deviates systematically from deterrence theory's predictions, suggesting fundamental problems that intensify in multipolar environments.

Sagan challenges the consensus view that states build nuclear weapons for security as inadequate. His three-model framework exposes deterrence theory's core weakness: states do not acquire or maintain nuclear weapons solely through rational security calculations. Two alternative models reveal non-security motivations that undermine deterrence logic.

The domestic politics model demonstrates that nuclear weapons are political tools used to advance parochial domestic and bureaucratic interests rather than responses to external threats (Sagan, 1997, p. 55). India's 1974 nuclear test provides compelling evidence. The decision occurred during severe domestic political crisis (Sagan, 1997, p. 68). Critically, senior defense and foreign affairs officials were excluded from the decision process (Sagan, 1997, p. 67). This pattern "suggests that security arguments were of secondary importance, and at a minimum, were not thoroughly analyzed or debated before the nuclear test" (Sagan, 1997, p. 67). Post-test polling showed 91% public awareness and 90% personal pride, suggesting political rather than security motivation (Sagan, 1997, p. 68).

The norms model demonstrates that nuclear weapons serve as "normative symbols of a state's modernity and identity" (Sagan, 1997, p. 55). This explains puzzling cases where security logic fails: France pursued nuclear weapons partly for De Gaulle's "grandeur" or national prestige rather than Soviet threat response. Conversely, Ukraine surrendered inherited Soviet weapons partly due to NPT norms despite facing potential Russian threats. When states acquire or relinquish nuclear capabilities for identity reasons, deterrence theory's assumption that nuclear postures reflect security calculation collapses. Different cases follow different causal logics, making deterrence-based predictions systematically unreliable.

Even when restricting this analysis to security-motivated bilateral relationships, Kroenig's empirical findings reveal that deterrence operates far more unpredictably than theory suggests. He challenges the assumption that nuclear parity produces stability. States possessing nuclear superiority "won 54 percent of the crises in which they have been involved, compared to

only 15 percent for states that were in a position of nuclear inferiority, and 35 percent for all

crisis participants" (Kroenig, 2013, p. 158).

Kroenig's theoretical mechanism operates through resolve rather than capability. Nuclear

superiority functions by "increasing their effective levels of resolve, and improving their

prospects of victory in a crisis" because superior states face lower expected costs in nuclear

exchange scenarios (Kroenig, 2013, p. 152). He finds "the expected probability of victory in a

nuclear crisis for a country in a position of nuclear inferiority is 6 percent" while "a country that

enjoys nuclear superiority…enjoys an expected probability of victory of 64 percent" representing

"a 57 percent increase in the expected probability of victory" (Kroenig, 2013, p. 159).

While Kroenig's data derives from historical bilateral crises, the resolve mechanisms he

identifies compound when applied to multipolar scenarios involving extended deterrence

commitments.

These bilateral asymmetries compound catastrophically in multipolar contexts. When

China possesses superiority over India, India over Pakistan, and the U.S. over North Korea, but

Russia and the U.S. maintain rough parity, crisis outcomes become indeterminate. Kroenig

documents 64% vs. 6% probability spreads in bilateral crises (Kroenig, 2013, pp. 158-159), but

these findings assume isolated dyadic interactions. Multipolar systems eliminate isolation: Indian

resolve against Pakistan depends on simultaneous Chinese posture toward India. U.S. superiority

over North Korea matters less when North Korea can credibly threaten to trigger Sino-American

crisis through provocation. The resolve asymmetries that predict bilateral outcomes cancel,

overlap, or amplify unpredictably when three or more nuclear-armed states interact

simultaneously. Deterrence theory provides no framework for calculating these interdependent

probability distributions.

The bilateral complications identified by Sagan and Kroenig intensify catastrophically in

multipolar contexts, beginning with the collapse of extended deterrence credibility. Schelling's

commitment interdependence logic assumes defending peripheral interests proves willingness to

defend vital ones. This logic requires that each commitment reinforces all others in that

defending Berlin proves one will defend Maryland. Yet multipolarity renders this mathematically

impossible. The United States cannot credibly threaten nuclear response across thirty-plus

alliance commitments simultaneously facing potential adversaries in China, Russia, North Korea,

and Iran. Gavin demonstrates that U.S. policy has consistently "threatened coercive actions,

including sanctions or abandonment, against ostensible Cold War allies such as West Germany,

Taiwan, South Korea, and Pakistan to prevent them from developing nuclear weapons" (Gavin,

2015, p. 15). This pattern reveals the underlying problem in that each additional commitment

dilutes credibility of all others. Adversaries exploit this through sequential probing, forcing

defenders to either respond everywhere or reveal commitment hierarchies. If the U.S. fails to

respond to Russian aggression in Georgia, does this signal lack of commitment to Taiwan? The

classical assumption that defending one ally strengthens deterrence for all collapses when

commitment chains multiple faster than credible response capabilities.

Multipolar systems generate simultaneous overlapping crises impossible in bilateral

contexts. India-Pakistan-China triangular relationships create interdependent deterrence failures.

Chinese pressure on India undermines Indian deterrence of Pakistan; Pakistani nuclear

assertiveness complicates U.S. extended deterrence to India. North Korean brinkmanship

exploits U.S. commitments to South Korea and Japan simultaneously, forcing choices that reveal

alliance hierarchies.

Classical deterrence theory also fails to account for alliance defection risks that

multipolarity introduces. Extended deterrence assumes alliance cohesion in that U.S. protection

prevents allied proliferation. Yet Gavin demonstrates consistent U.S. threats of "sanctions or

abandonment" against allies pursuing nuclear weapons (Gavin, 2015, p.15). This reveals

deterrence theory's internal contradiction in multipolar contexts. If the U.S. abandons allies to

prevent proliferation, it undermines the extended deterrence that makes proliferation unnecessary. If it maintains commitments despite proliferation, it incentivizes further proliferation. Germany, Japan, and South Korea currently rely on U.S. extended deterrence. Simultaneous crises in Europe and Asia would force explicit priority revelation. The credible threat of U.S. abandonment creates the security motivation for indigenous capabilities that deterrence theory claims unnecessary under effective extended deterrence. The theory produces policy recommendations that undermine their own prerequisites.

Deterrence theory's inadequacy in multipolar contexts demands reconstruction across three dimensions, each addressing a specific failure mode demonstrated in the preceding analysis. The credibility dilution problem in which commitment chains multiply faster than response capabilities can sustain requires abandoning extended deterrence universality and accepting that commitment credibility cannot scale beyond limited geographic scope, necessitating regional proliferation acceptance. The indeterminate probability distributions created when three or more nuclear-armed states interact simultaneously where resolve asymmetries that predict bilateral outcomes cancel, overlap, or amplify unpredictably require developing n-player game-theoretic models that formalize triangular deterrence relationships and interdependent crisis dynamics impossible in bilateral frameworks. Sagan's demonstration that states pursue weapons for domestic and normative reasons rather than security calculations requires integrating these alternative causal models into stability analysis, since deterrence predictions fail when nuclear postures reflect non-security motivations. Current policy proceeds as if bilateral deterrence theory scales to multipolar contexts. The evidence demonstrates it does not. The analytical gap between classical theory and multipolar reality demands theoretical reconstruction, not incremental adjustment.

References

Gavin, F. J. (2015). Strategies of inhibition: U.S. grand strategy, the nuclear revolution, and

nonproliferation. *International Security*, *40*(1), 9-46. https://doi.org/10.2307/24480594

Kroenig, M. (2013). Nuclear superiority and the balance of resolve: Explaining nuclear crisis

outcomes. *International Organization*, *67*(1), 141-171.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818312000367

Sagan, S. D. (1997). Why do states build nuclear weapons? Three models in search of a bomb.

International Security, 21(3), 54 – 86. https://doi.org/10.2307/2539273

Schelling, T. C. (1966). *Arms and influence*. Yale University Press.