# APPEASEMENT DISADVANTAGE

Thesis: The thesis of this disadvantage is that a substantial reduction in the US military presence in the world will be perceived as weakness by Obama, undermining his tough stance against rogue regimes like Iran. Obama is presently engaged in a high stakes gambit to pressure Iran into giving up its nuclear arsenal. However, unilateral troop withdrawals from allied nations will make it appear as if Obama is backing down to rogue nations, emboldening Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to stand firm against Obama. The continuation of Iran’s nuclear weapons arsenal would be disastrous: risking widespread Middle Eastern proliferation and an attack by Israel. Now is a critical moment for Obama to stand firm and not give rogue nations like Iran hope that he will back down to tyrannical regimes. Obama must remember the lesson of the 1930’s and not behave like Neville Chamberlain in the face of despotic, rogue regimes.
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# Appeasement DA Shell (1/2)

## A. UNIQUENESS: Obama is engaging in a successful multilateral approach to pressure Iran over its nuclear program now—he is avoiding perceptions of appeasement in the status quo.

Matt Duss, 2010. “Neocons Dismiss The Views Of The Military (Again) To Call For (Another) Preventive War.” April 20, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://wonkroom.thinkprogress.org/2010/04/20/neocons-dismiss-the-views-of-the-military> -again-to-call-for-another-preventive-war/

Finally, it shouldn’t even need to be said that President Obama’s approach hardly qualifies as “appeasement” of Iran — unless you’re someone for whom any strategy that doesn’t involve huge numbers of people being blown up by U.S. bombs equals “appeasement.” Seriously: President Obama just hosted a very successful nuclear security summit that, in addition to front-and-centering vital nuclear non-proliferation issues that the Bush administration could barely be bothered with, has resulted in significantly more international unity around efforts to pressure Iran over its nuclear program — the very sort of unity made impossible by the Bush administration’s neocon-inspired belligerence. It’s says something very troubling about the lack of accountability in American politics that these same characters should come again now, calling for another preventive war, using the same clever argumentative method of simply insisting that such a war will go splendidly and will achieve all of our aims with no unintended consequences, and be taken remotely seriously.

## B. LINK: American defense pullbacks embolden US adversaries LIKE IRAN—it feeds the perception that Obama is weak.

Robert Kagan, 2009 (senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace), February 3, 2009, “No Time to Cut Defense.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 25, 2010 at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/02/02/AR2009020202618.html>

· What worries allies cheers and emboldens potential adversaries. The Obama administration is right to reach out and begin direct talks with leaders in Tehran. But the already-slim chances of success will grow slimmer if Iranian leaders believe that the United States may soon begin pulling back from their part of the world. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's spokesman has already declared that the United States has lost its power -- just because President Obama said he is willing to talk. Imagine how that perception would be reinforced if Obama starts cutting funding for an already inadequately funded force.

## C. INTERNAL LINK: Iran watches US policy toward other nations—weakness in one area will embolden Iran to stand up to Obama.

Melanie Phillips, 2009. The Spectator. “The fruits of appeasement.” May 27, 2009. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2009 at <http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/3647756/the-fruits-of-appeasement.thtml>

The result of such epic cringing is two fingers from North Korea, with yet further threats today. Iran in particular will now be watching intently to see whether America will once again display weakness and impotence; if the US won’t even act to stop North Korea from going nuclear, Iran will be reinforced in its belief that it can develop its own nuclear weapons with impunity. So far, Obama has ‘rushed out a special statement’ in which he said ‘I strongly condemn [North Korea’s] reckless action’ and promised to ‘redouble’ America’s efforts to stop Pyongyang from acquiring nuclear weapons. Well, that will have them quaking in their boots, for sure. Redoubling weakness simply results in twice as much weakness.

# Appeasement DA Shell (2/2)

## D. IMPACT: Appeasement policies will cause Iranian nuclearization.

Nile Gardiner, 2009. (Director of the Margaret Thatcher Center for Freedom at the Heritage Foundation). June 3, 2009. “Barack Obama Must Heed the Lessons of the Holocaust.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Commentary/2009/06/Barack-Obama-Must-Heed-the-Lessons-of-the-Holocaust>

Ahmadinejad and his acolytes speak the language of Himmler and Goebbels, and such warnings are ignored at great peril. The recent missile test by Iran of the Sejil-2 surface to surface missile with a range of 1,200 miles, capable of striking targets across Israel, the Middle East and southern Europe, further underscores both the conventional and nuclear threat that Iranian aggression presents. There is no sign whatsoever that Tehran is backing down from its ambition of dominating the region, or that the Obama administration's leisurely approach is reaping dividends. The horrors of Buchenwald are an important reminder of the failure of the appeasement polices of the 1930s, and the danger of failing to take genocidal threats seriously. Millions were murdered in Europe at the hands of the Third Reich after the world declined to take early action against a tyrant who later acted upon his menacing words. The president's visit to the camp as well as his discussions with German Chancellor Angela Merkel must reinforce the message that evil must be confronted and defeated. When he travels to Germany, President Obama has a major opportunity to declare that his administration will under no circumstances accept a nuclear-armed Iran, a regime with clearly genocidal intentions. He should make it clear that Tehran will face a dramatic escalation of international economic and political sanctions, the complete isolation of the Iranian government, and possible military action unless it immediately halts its nuclear programme. The president must also press forward with the deployment of a global missile defence system, including installations in eastern and central Europe. Obama should urge his German counterpart, Chancellor Angela Merkel, to end her country's massive economic investment in Iran when the two leaders meet in Dresden. German money is shamefully playing a key role in sustaining a brutal, Holocaust-denying regime that oppresses its own people and poses the biggest state-based threat to global security of this generation. Through its investments in Iran, Germany is also helping finance the world's biggest sponsor of international terrorist organizations, including Hezbollah and Hamas. Germany remains Europe's biggest exporter to Iran, with nearly 4 billion euros worth of exports in 2008, a third higher than its exports to Israel. Last year, German trade and investment with Tehran actually increased 10 percent to record levels, with several thousand German companies still conducting business with the rogue state. Former Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder has been at the forefront of lobbying efforts to advance Iranian-German trade ties, as the honorary chairman of the German Near and Middle East Association (NUMOV). This is a time for robust U.S. leadership in the face of a grave threat, not the adoption of the European Union's failed policy of endless negotiation. It is also a moment for Barack Obama to rethink his flawed strategy of reaching out to dictatorial regimes in the name of "engagement", whether in the form of Iranian Islamist fundamentalists or North Korean Stalinists. The Obama administration's foreign policy doctrine is fraught with risk. As Jimmy Carter discovered to his cost, a United States that looks like a soft touch will swiftly lose the respect of its allies and be outmaneuvered by its foes and rivals. Obama's application of "smart power" is looking increasingly like the appeasement of America's enemies, and on the Iranian nuclear question his administration has projected weakness and confusion. There are striking parallels between the world's initial failure to stand up to Nazi Germany over 70 years ago and the West's inaction today in the face of Iranian aggression. Tehran's drive towards nuclear might can and must be stopped, but only if the United States and its key allies across the Atlantic are willing to do what is necessary.

## E. Iranian proliferation risks a nuclear war:

Nile Gardiner, 2006 (Bernard and Barbara Lomas Fellow @ Heritage Foundation). “Forging a U.S.-British Coalition to End Iran's Nuclear Weapons Program.” April 24, 2006. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/MiddleEast/wm1047.cfm>).

If Iran succeeds in building a nuclear weapon, which it may do within three to ten years, there can be no doubt regarding the regime’s willingness and intent to use it against Israel or other close U.S. allies. Nor is there any doubt regarding Iran’s potential to arm a terrorist organization such as Hezbollah or Al Qaeda with nuclear material. Significantly, a senior Iranian spiritual leader recently issued a fatwa sanctioning the use of nuclear weapons.[4]

# Uniqueness: Obama is Getting Tough With Iran Now

## (--) Obama is getting tough with iran now.

Dr. Bhaskar Balakrishnan, 2010. (former Indian ambassador to Cuba). Khaleej Times. April 26, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticleNew.asp?xfile>= /data/opinion/2010/April/opinion\_April151.xml&section=opinion

Buoyed by a string of recent successes US President Barack Obama has shifted into high gear his drive for sanctions to punish Iran for its nuclear defiance. Iran’s calculated intransigence has compounded matters. The confrontation with the United States also gives Iran’s hardliners a means to strengthen their grip over the country. Now the prospect of new UN sanctions against Iran casts a dark shadow over the region. After Obama’s announcements that he would seek effective sanctions sooner than later, it would be difficult for him to back down. China has come under pressure to play along, or at least not obstruct this effort. In New York, the P-5 plus Germany are negotiating a new UN draft which new curbs on Iranian banking, a full arms embargo, tougher measures against Iranian shipping, moves against members of Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps and firms they control and a ban on new investments in Iran’s energy sector. Sensing the mood, Malaysia’s Petronas has stopped shipments of gasoline to Iran. However, the negotiations are likely to be difficult and protracted. Obama’s recent successes—the healthcare reform package, the New START treaty, and the recent Nuclear Security Summit, plus the barely concealed threat of trade restrictions on China have given fresh momentum to the push for sanctions. This is despite the petulant refusal of Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu to attend the Nuclear Security summit in the wake of US-Israeli differences over the resumption of Israeli settlements activities. Iran’s nuclear programme has moved a notch further towards the nuclear weapons threshold.

# Links: Plan Will Be Perceived as Appeasement

## Defense cutbacks will be perceived as appeasement.

Adm. James A. Lyons, 2009 (former commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet). Washington Times. September 27, 2009. “Making hash of Honduras; Obama.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010.

The Obama administration's position on Honduras is symptomatic of a larger retreat from leadership that has our allies and friends nervous. For example, the administration's scrapping of the planned missile defense system to be deployed in Poland and the Czech Republic by 2013 - with apparently nothing in return - will be seen as selling out our allies in Eastern Europe. Administration funding cuts for our anti-ballistic missile programs and advanced fighters like the F-22 may cause others to doubt America's willingness to defend even itself. This plus Mr. Obama's willingness to embrace America's adversaries will not make for successful foreign policy. Appeasement has not worked in the past and is destined to fail again.

## Unilateral pullbacks of defense commitments will be perceived by rogue nations as appeasement.

Con Coughlin, 2009 (staff writer). The Daily Telegraph. September 18, 2009. “The spirit of appeasement is alive and well in the White House.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010.

Seventy years ago, the West's appeasement of Nazi Germany resulted in the invasion of Poland, the start of the Second World War, and ultimately the deaths of an estimated 50 million people. Barack Obama's decision yesterday to cancel Washington's planned missile defence shield is unlikely to have the same apocalyptic consequences, but it does suggest that the spirit of appeasement is alive and well, and residing in the White House. Mr Obama may claim, as he did yesterday, that there are better ways of defending the West from nuclear strikes by rogue states such as Iran than building a missile defence shield in Eastern Europe. But the programme was about more than protecting Western Europe from attack by rogue states. It was also an important symbol of the West's commitment to maintaining the freedom of those Eastern European countries, such as Poland and the Czech Republic, that were liberated from the Soviet Union following the collapse of the Iron Curtain 20 years ago. It was for this reason that the deal to establish a missile defence system in Eastern Europe, signed by George W Bush and the Polish and Czech governments in August last year, received such a warm reception. It also explains the bitter sense of betrayal Polish and Czech leaders feel over Mr Obama's unilateral decision to abandon the deal. "This is not good news for the Czech state, for Czech freedom and independence,'' lamented Mirek Topolánek, the country's former prime minister. From the outset, Moscow has objected strongly to Washington's plans to locate its missile system so close to the Russian border. Still smarting at the enthusiasm of its former client states for aligning themselves with the West - including signing up to the EU and Nato - the Russians claimed that the American system was directed as much against the Russian heartland as rogue states. They even threatened to launch a new Cold War by redeploying their nuclear warheads close to the Polish border. Mr Obama insists his decision to cancel the programme was taken in response to the latest intelligence assessments, which suggest that Iran is concentrating on developing short- and medium-range missiles rather than the long-range, intercontinental weapons that could threaten Western Europe. He is promising that a "proven, cost-effective'' system that uses land- and sea-based interceptors will be used instead. But I fear that is not how his decision will be interpreted in Moscow - or in Tehran, where the programme's cancellation will be seen as yet more evidence that the Obama administration will do anything to avoid confrontation. The Russians, who take great pride in the resurgent nationalism that epitomised Vladimir Putin's presidency, will claim a victory in their attempts to halt Washington's encroachment into what they regard as their sphere of influence. If the US is no longer prepared to commit itself to the defence of the Poles and the Czechs, there is even less chance of the Obama White House supporting Ukraine, Georgia and the host of other former Soviet satellites that naturally look to America and Nato for protection. Of more concern, though, will be the signal this decision sends to the hardline government of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Iran has until October 1 to respond to Mr Obama's offer, made in the salad days of his presidency, to enter into direct negotiations if the Islamic regime agrees to "unclench its fist''. The omens have not been good. Rather than moderate Iran's stance, Mr Ahmadinejad has continued to insist that the nuclear programme is non-negotiable, and to threaten the West if it tries to interfere.

## Weakening America’s military capabilities emboldens rogue proliferators like Iran and North Korea.

Melanie Phillips, 2009. The Spectator. “The fruits of appeasement.” May 27, 2009. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2009 at <http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/3647756/the-fruits-of-appeasement.thtml>

Not only is America now paying the price of its past defeatism over North Korea, but Obama is now ensuring that the US is weakened even more actively and catastrophically. The insanity of his overall strategy is set out here by James Lewis, who rightly suggests that Obama is simply the very worst person to be sitting in the White House right now. And as John Bolton again wrote in the New York Times: ... the Obama administration is seriously weakening both our strategic offensive and defensive capacity. The Defense Department budget proposes major cuts in missile defense programs, returning to an emphasis both in operational and diplomatic terms on ‘theater’ missile defense (mainly for defending deployed military forces), rather than ‘national’ missile defense (for shielding America’s population from missile attack). ... The Pentagon also proposes ending financing for the Reliable Replacement Warhead, a key to substituting safe, dependable warheads for the ones now aging... The administration is also putting new emphasis on negotiating conventions against the ‘arms race’ in outer space, which would undercut America's current substantial advantage above the earth...Unhappily, the administration is pushing Israel to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty as a ‘non-nuclear-weapons state,’ meaning Israel would have to eliminate its nuclear arsenal. Iran and others will welcome this, given their repeated demands for the same result. Today’s real proliferation threat, however, is not Israel, but states like Iran and North Korea that become parties to the alphabet soup of arms control treaties and then violate them with abandon. Without robust American reactions to these violations--not apparent in administration thinking--more will follow.

## A strong US military is the only way to maintain credibility with rogue states.

Adm. James A. Lyons, 2009 (former commander in chief of the U.S. Pacific Fleet). Washington Times. September 27, 2009. “Making hash of Honduras; Obama.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010.

The practiced cool demeanor of our president will not enhance his stature or his popularity with those who plan to do harm to the United States. Respect for American ideals and the competence of our military forces should be the pillars for our foreign policy, which should support constitutional democracies and defend them against the predations of Mr. Chavez, the Castro brothers, Mr. Ortega and Mr. Morales.

# Links: Iraq Specific

## Pulling troops back from Iraq illustrates weakness to Iran.

James Phillips and Peter Brookes, 2008 (senior research fellows @ the Heritage Foundation). “Yes, a Nuclear Iran Is Unacceptable: A Memo to President-elect Obama.” December 3, 2008. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2008/12/Yes-a-Nuclear-Iran-Is-Unacceptable-A-Memo-to-President-elect-Obama>

\* Maintain the U.S. commitment to building a stable and democratic Iraq. A cornerstone of any policy to contain Iran must be strong support for an independent, democratic Iraq that is an ally in the war against terrorism. On January 20, you will become the commander in chief of the war in Iraq, and it will no longer be "Bush's war." You must reconsider your pledge to withdraw U.S. combat forces from Iraq within 16 months. While this pledge may have made political sense during the campaign when you mistakenly concluded that the war was lost, such a policy will be disastrous if you cling to it as President. It is now clear that the surge has been a success and the war is winnable. If you remain committed to a rapid pullout according to an arbitrary deadline, you risk squandering the hard-won gains of the surge and plunging Iraq into a humanitarian catastrophe that will jeopardize U.S. national security interests, threaten the stability of the oil-rich Persian Gulf, and leave Iraq more vulnerable to Iranian meddling.

# Impacts: Appeasement risks Iranian proliferation

## (--) Only tough sanctions backed with the threat of force will stop Iranian nuclearization.

Dore Gold, 2009 (former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations). Los Angeles Times. August 6, 2009. “Iran’s nuclear aspirations threaten the world.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/06/opinion/oe-gold6>

An Iran with hegemonial aspirations will not be talked out of acquiring nuclear weapons through a new Western incentives package. Only the most severe economic measures aimed at Iran's dependence on imported gasoline, backed with the threat of Western military power, might pull the Iranians back at the last minute. Until now, U.N. sanctions on Iran have been too weak to have any real impact.

## (--) Credible threats are necessary to get Iran to back down from nuclearization—Iran will exploit signs of weakness.

James Phillips and Peter Brookes, 2008 (senior research fellows @ the Heritage Foundation). “Yes, a Nuclear Iran Is Unacceptable: A Memo to President-elect Obama.” December 3, 2008. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2008/12/Yes-a-Nuclear-Iran-Is-Unacceptable-A-Memo-to-President-elect-Obama>

\* Recognize that diplomatic carrots alone won't work because for Tehran, attaining a nuclear weapon is the biggest carrot. The EU-3 diplomatic outreach was heavily based on the offer of economic benefits, technological assistance, and improved diplomatic relations in exchange for Iran's halting of its uranium enrichment activities, but these incentives pale in comparison with the advantages that the regime believes it will attain with a nuclear weapons capability. What is needed is greater focus on tougher disincentives for continuation of Iran's suspect nuclear efforts, including its perceived economic, domestic political, and potential military costs. When Tehran perceives these potential costs as very high, as it did after the overthrow of regimes in Iraq and Afghanistan, it will be more likely to make concessions and freeze its uranium enrichment program. To give diplomacy a chance, the United States and its allies must credibly threaten to impose rising costs on the regime, particularly in ways that threaten its hold on power, which is its highest priority.

## (--) A strong international coalition to isolate Iran can contain and deter Iran’s military power.

James Phillips and Peter Brookes, 2008 (senior research fellows @ the Heritage Foundation). “Yes, a Nuclear Iran Is Unacceptable: A Memo to President-elect Obama.” December 3, 2008. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2008/12/Yes-a-Nuclear-Iran-Is-Unacceptable-A-Memo-to-President-elect-Obama>

The U.S. should mobilize an international coali­tion to raise the diplomatic, economic, domestic political, and potential military costs to Tehran of continuing to flout its obligations under its nuclear safeguards agreements. This coalition should seek to isolate the regime, weaken it through targeted economic sanc­tions, explain to the Iranian people why their gov­ernment's nuclear policies will impose economic costs and military risks on them, contain and deter Iran's mil­itary power, and encourage democratic change.

## (--) Strong international sanctions will cause Iran to back down.

James Phillips and Peter Brookes, 2008 (senior research fellows @ the Heritage Foundation). “Yes, a Nuclear Iran Is Unacceptable: A Memo to President-elect Obama.” December 3, 2008. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2008/12/Yes-a-Nuclear-Iran-Is-Unacceptable-A-Memo-to-President-elect-Obama>

\* Lead an international coalition to impose the strongest possible targeted economic sanctions against Iran. The U.S. should try to toughen sanctions against Iran outside of the U.N. framework by working directly with its Japanese and European allies to impose the strongest possible bans on foreign investment, loans, and trade with Iran. The Achilles' heel of Iran's theocratic regime is its mishandling of the economy. There is growing dissatisfaction with this mismanagement and with corruption, high unemployment, and soaring inflation--officially reported at a 30 percent annual rate in September but believed to be higher. There is rising labor unrest. In October, tire factory workers demonstrated in front of the Labor Ministry to protest the failure of factories to pay six months of unpaid back wages. That same month, bazaar merchants rebelled against the imposition of a value-added tax, closing down the bazaars in many cities and forcing the regime to postpone its implementation. The bazaaris had been a cornerstone of support for the revolution against the shah. Ayatollah Khomeini famously said, "We did not create a revolution to lower the price of melons." But Iran's current leaders lack the personal charisma, religious authority, and popular support needed to ignore the growing backlash against their dysfunctional economic policies, repression of human rights, and failure to meet the needs of the Iranian people. Falling oil prices will further aggravate Iran's festering economic problems and make sanctions more painful. An international ban on the import of Iranian oil is a non-starter. It is unrealistic to expect oil importers to stop importing Iranian oil in a tight, high-priced oil market. Instead, the focus should be on denying Iran loans, foreign investment, and favorable trade deals. The U.S. should cooper­ate with other countries to deny Iran loans from such international financial institutions as the World Bank and any loans for a proposed natural gas pipeline to India via Pakistan. Although Iran is one of the world's leading oil exporters, it must import approximately 40 percent of its gasoline needs due to mismanagement and inadequate investment in refinery infrastructure. An international ban on gasoline exports to Iran would drive up the price of Iranian gasoline and underscore the shortsightedness of the regime in the eyes of the Iranian people.

# Impacts: Strong Military Checks Iranian Proliferation

## (--) Empirically, fears of US military action cause Iran to back down from its nuclear agenda.

James Phillips and Peter Brookes, 2008 (senior research fellows @ the Heritage Foundation). “Yes, a Nuclear Iran Is Unacceptable: A Memo to President-elect Obama.” December 3, 2008. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2008/12/Yes-a-Nuclear-Iran-Is-Unacceptable-A-Memo-to-President-elect-Obama>

\* Recognize that attempts to negotiate a diplomatic deal with Iran represent the triumph of wishful thinking over past experience. Under Ahmadinejad's predecessors, Iran concealed and lied about its nuclear program for two decades before admitting that it had built a secret uranium enrichment plant at Natanz in 2003. When confronted, Tehran agreed to suspend its uranium enrichment program, undoubtedly out of fear of a U.S.-led intervention after America took military action to remove regimes in neighboring states led by Saddam Hussein and the Taliban.

## (--) Perceptions that military action against Iran are diminishing emboldens Iranian nuclearization.

James Phillips and Peter Brookes, 2008 (senior research fellows @ the Heritage Foundation). “Yes, a Nuclear Iran Is Unacceptable: A Memo to President-elect Obama.” December 3, 2008. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2008/12/Yes-a-Nuclear-Iran-Is-Unacceptable-A-Memo-to-President-elect-Obama>

Iran engaged in a half-hearted charade of negotiations with Britain, France, and Germany--the EU-3--in which it temporarily froze its uranium enrichment efforts, only to resume such dangerous activities after Ahmadinejad was installed in power in 2005 and the perceived threat of a possible U.S. military strike diminished. Tehran perceived that the international situation had shifted in its favor. The U.S. faced deteriorating security conditions in Iraq and Afghanistan, in part because of Iranian meddling; oil prices surged, insulating Iran from the threat of sanctions; and Iran cultivated Russia and China to fend off effective sanctions at the U.N. Security Council.

## (--) Appeasement policies only allow Iran to drag out negotiations and avoid de-nuclearization.

Dore Gold, 2009 (former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations). Los Angeles Times. August 6, 2009. “Iran’s nuclear aspirations threaten the world.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/06/opinion/oe-gold6>

Indeed, there are plenty of reasons to be skeptical about sticking to engagement. The main one is that it has already been tried -- and utterly failed. Iran has consistently used the West's willingness to engage as a delaying tactic, a smoke screen behind which Iran's nuclear program has continued undeterred and, in many cases, undetected. Back in 2005, Hassan Rowhani, the former chief nuclear negotiator of Iran during the reformist presidency of Mohammad Khatami, made a stunning confession in an internal briefing in Tehran, just as he was leaving his post. He explained that in the period during which he sat across from European negotiators discussing Iran's uranium enrichment ambitions, Tehran quietly managed to complete the critical second stage of uranium fuel production: its uranium conversion plant in Isfahan. He boasted that the day Iran started its negotiations in 2003 "there was no such thing as the Isfahan project." Now, he said, it was complete. Rowhani's revelation showed clearly how Iran exploited the West's engagement. Moreover, the Iranians violated their 2004 agreement with the EU and brilliantly dragged out further negotiations that followed. Equally important, they delayed Western punitive moves against them, keeping the U.N. Security Council at bay for years. Mohammed Javad Larijani, a former deputy foreign minister and brother to Rowhani's successor as chief negotiator, admitted the logic of diplomatic engagement from the Iranian side: "Diplomacy must be used to lessen pressure on Iran for its nuclear program."

## (--) Acquiescing to Iran will fail.

Dore Gold, 2009 (former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations). Los Angeles Times. August 6, 2009. “Iran’s nuclear aspirations threaten the world.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/06/opinion/oe-gold6>

Halting the Iranian nuclear program is a global imperative; acquiescing to a nuclear Iran in the hope that it will pragmatically understand the limits of its own power would be a colossal mistake.

## (--) Iran will use soft-line approaches to continue its nuclear efforts.

James Phillips and Peter Brookes, 2008 (senior research fellows @ the Heritage Foundation). “Yes, a Nuclear Iran Is Unacceptable: A Memo to President-elect Obama.” December 3, 2008. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2008/12/Yes-a-Nuclear-Iran-Is-Unacceptable-A-Memo-to-President-elect-Obama>

If you sat down with President Ahmadinejad without preconditions, as you said you would, you would hand him an opportunity to practice his own taqiyyah, strut on the world stage, lecture you about the supposed superiority of Iran's Islamic system, and assert Iran's claim to leadership of the Muslim world. Such a meeting would dishearten Iran's repressed opposition, strengthen Ahmadinejad's hard-liners at the expense of reformist groups, give Ahmadinejad a boost in popularity that could greatly improve his chances of being re-elected if the meeting occurred before Iran's June elections, and allow him to go through the motions of a diplomatic dialogue to defuse international pressure while Iran continues its nuclear efforts.

# Impacts: Iranian Nuclearization Risks Nuclear Terrorism

## A) Iranian proliferation risks nuclear terrorism.

Nile Gardiner, 2006 (Bernard and Barbara Lomas Fellow @ Heritage Foundation). “Forging a U.S.-British Coalition to End Iran's Nuclear Weapons Program.” April 24, 2006. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.heritage.org/Research/MiddleEast/wm1047.cfm>).

If Iran succeeds in building a nuclear weapon, which it may do within three to ten years, there can be no doubt regarding the regime’s willingness and intent to use it against Israel or other close U.S. allies. Nor is there any doubt regarding Iran’s potential to arm a terrorist organization such as Hezbollah or Al Qaeda with nuclear material. Significantly, a senior Iranian spiritual leader recently issued a fatwa sanctioning the use of nuclear weapons.[4]

## **B) Nuclear terrorism threatens human survival.**

Yonah Alexander, 2003 (professor and director of the Inter-University for Terrorism Studies). Washington Times, August 28, 2003. “Terrorism myths and realities.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2003/aug/27/20030827-084256-8999r/?page=2

Last week's brutal suicide bombings in Baghdad and Jerusalem have once again illustrated dramatically that the international community failed, thus far at least, to understand the magnitude and implications of the terrorist threats to the very survival of civilization itself. Even the United States and Israel have for decades tended to regard terrorism as a mere tactical nuisance or irritant rather than a critical strategic challenge to their national security concerns. It is not surprising, therefore, that on September 11, 2001, Americans were stunned by the unprecedented tragedy of 19 al Qaeda terrorists striking a devastating blow at the center of the nation's commercial and military powers. Likewise, Israel and its citizens, despite the collapse of the Oslo Agreements of 1993 and numerous acts of terrorism triggered by the second intifada that began almost three years ago, are still "shocked" by each suicide attack at a time of intensive diplomatic efforts to revive the moribund peace process through the now revoked cease-fire arrangements [hudna]. Why are the United States and Israel, as well as scores of other countries affected by the universal nightmare of modern terrorism surprised by new terrorist "surprises"? There are many reasons, including misunderstanding of the manifold specific factors that contribute to terrorism's expansion, such as lack of a universal definition of terrorism, the religionization of politics, double standards of morality, weak punishment of terrorists, and the exploitation of the media by terrorist propaganda and psychological warfare. Unlike their historical counterparts, contemporary terrorists have introduced a new scale of violence in terms of conventional and unconventional threats and impact. The internationalization and brutalization of current and future terrorism make it clear we have entered an Age of Super Terrorism [e.g. biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear and cyber] with its serious implications concerning national, regional and global security concerns.

## (--) A nuclear Iran would trigger worldwide terrorism.

Dore Gold, 2009 (former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations). Los Angeles Times. August 6, 2009. “Iran’s nuclear aspirations threaten the world.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/06/opinion/oe-gold6>

It is critical to understand that an Iran that crosses the nuclear threshold after repeated warnings that doing so is "unacceptable" would be even less likely to be deterred in the future. It would provide global terrorism the kind of protective umbrella that Al Qaeda never had back on 9/11, including Hezbollah cells located at present in Central Europe and Latin America. Some Arab states, like Qatar, have already been largely "Finlandized," to borrow a Cold War term for states that make their foreign policy subservient to the wishes of a powerful neighbor. But as Iran's nuclear program continues unopposed, more Arab states will follow, changing the Middle East entirely.

## (--) Iranian nuclearization emboldens terrorists to take action:

Dore Gold, 2009 (former Israeli ambassador to the United Nations). Los Angeles Times. August 6, 2009. “Iran’s nuclear aspirations threaten the world.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://articles.latimes.com/2009/aug/06/opinion/oe-gold6>

Advocates of engagement with Iran often use an unfair argument to advance their case: Their cause, they claim, is opposed mainly by Israel, which is pushing its own narrow agenda. True, Israel is a target of Iran, whose leadership calls for the "elimination of Israel from the region" -- to quote the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who said this years before President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. So that there would be no confusion about Iranian intent, Khamenei's words were hung from a Shahab 3 missile in a military parade in 2003. But Israel is not Iran's only target. If that was the case, the Iranians would have had no reason to develop missiles that fly well past Israeli territory to Central Europe and beyond. In fact, the greatest engagement skeptics today are the leaders of the Sunni Arab states from Morocco to Bahrain. The Gulf states in particular have repeatedly been the targets of Iranian subversion operations. Bahrain was called the 14th province of Iran earlier this year by one of Khamenei's key advisors. Kuwait and Saudi Arabia have been attacked by Iranian-backed Hezbollah operatives in the past. Iran still occupies islands belonging to the United Arab Emirates, close to the oil tanker routes that go through the Strait of Hormuz. And Cairo just cracked a large Iranian-supported Hezbollah cell that was planning attacks on key economic centers in the Egyptian state. For these reasons, Arab officials don't need prompting from Israel. Their common fear is that a nuclear Iran will embolden groups such as Hezbollah, which will feel it enjoys a nuclear sponsor protecting it from any retaliatory action. Unlike their Western counterparts, these Arab officials are savvy enough to distinguish between status quo states that just want to assure the security of their borders and ideologically driven revolutionary powers like Iran with expansive aims.

# Impacts: Iranian Nuclearization Risks War

## Iranian proliferation won’t be stable in the near term—it risks war by miscalculation.

Joseph Cirincione & Andrew Grotto, 2007(Senior Associate and Director for Non-Proliferation @ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Senior National Security Analyst at the Center for American Progress). “Contain and Engage: A New Strategy for Resolving the Nuclear Crisis with Iran.” Online. Internet. Accessed May 1, 2010 at <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/02/pdf/iran_report.pdf>)

No one knows for sure how the capability or near capability to build a nuclear weapon would shape Iran’s security and ideological ambitions, facilitate Iran’s pursuit of those ambitions, and influence the behavior of states in the region and beyond. It is possible, however, to identify the principle dimensions of the threat. On the one hand, Iran could adopt a more restrained foreign policy, mindful that its new status raises the stakes of any conflict with its neighbors or the United States. This restraint would not guarantee against the possibility of mistake, miscalculation, or even the inadvertent transfer of nuclear materials to a terrorist organization. As the eminent British historian Sir Lawrence Freedman points out, “The prospect of nuclear war may render political leaders cautious, but during the Cold War there was quite a learning process before mutual deterrence appeared at all stable.”38

## Nuclear weaponization would cause Iran to develop a more belligerent foreign policy posture.

Joseph Cirincione & Andrew Grotto, 2007(Senior Associate and Director for Non-Proliferation @ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Senior National Security Analyst at the Center for American Progress). “Contain and Engage: A New Strategy for Resolving the Nuclear Crisis with Iran.” <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/02/pdf/iran_report.pdf>)

On the other hand, nuclear- or near nuclear-weapons capability could embolden Iran to adopt a more disruptive, confrontational foreign policy. It could give Iranian leaders confidence that they can induce strategic restraint in other countries. Iran could adopt a more belligerent posture towards its Sunni Arab neighbors, and perhaps try to drive a wedge between these neighbors and the United States. Iran’s leaders could also conclude that they could safely increase their support to groups such as Hezbollah.

## Iranian nuclearization spills over to Egyptian, Turkish, and Saudi Arabian proliferation.

Flynt Leverett, 2006 (senior fellow at the New America Foundation). “Dealing with Tehran: Assessing U.S. Diplomatic Options toward Iran.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at <http://www.tcf.org/publications/> internationalaffairs/leverett\_diplomatic.pdf.

Other assessments highlight the risks that Iranian nuclearization would prompt states such as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey to seek their own nuclear weapons capabilities, effectively eviscerating nonproliferation efforts both regionally and globally.7

## (--) Widespread proliferation risks human extinction:

**Taylor '02** (Stuart Jr., Senior Writer with the National Journal and contributing editor at Newsweek, Legal Times, September 16, L/N)  
The truth is, no matter what we do about Iraq, if we don't stop proliferation another five or ten potentially unstable nations may go nuclear before long, making it ever more likely that one or more bombs will be set off on our soil by terrorists or terrorist governments. Even an airtight missile defense will be useless against a nuke hidden in a truck, a shipping container, or a boat.  
Unless we get serious about stopping proliferation, we are headed for "a world filled with nuclear-weapons states where every crisis threatens to go nuclear," where "the survival of civilization truly is in question from day to day," and where "it would be impossible to keep these weapons out of the hands of terrorists, religious cults, and criminal organizations," So writes Ambassador Thomas Graham Jr., a moderate Republican who served as a career arms-controller under six presidents and led the successful Clinton administration effort to extend the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty.

# Impacts: North Korean Proliferation

## (--) Appeasement risks North Korean proliferation.

Melanie Phillips, 2009. The Spectator. “The fruits of appeasement.” May 27, 2009. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2009 at <http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/3647756/the-fruits-of-appeasement.thtml>

So now we can see once again the fruits of appeasement. North Korea has tested a second set of nuclear bombs and the west throws up its hands in horror. What did it expect? Once the Bush administration cravenly decided to give up on North Korea (following the similarly short-sighted approach taken by Bill Clinton), Kim Jong-il duly took the opportunity to press full steam ahead with his nuclear programme. Now the same ‘new realists’ who came to power at the tail-end of the Bush presidency and decided to ‘live with’ a North Korean bomb – just as they have apparently decided the US could ‘live with’ an Iranian bomb – are serving in the Obama administration, which of course has taken such imbecility to unprecedented depths. Obama has been abasing himself to every despot on the planet, proclaiming America’s weakness through his ‘hand of friendship’ and infantile belief that talking to tyrants is the route to peace.

## (--) North Korean proliferation risks a military attack by the United States.

Doug Bandow, 2010 (senior fellow, CATO Institute), “An Unstable Rogue.” April 6, 2010. Online. Internet. Accessed April 1, 2010 at <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=23144>

Although the DPRK’s governing structures so far have proven surprisingly resilient, it’s impossible to ignore the possibility of an implosion, military coup or messy succession fight. If North Korea continues to develop nuclear weapons, its actions could trigger two equally explosive responses: a military attack by the United States or decisions by South Korea and Japan to build nuclear weapons in response.

## (--) A new Korean war risks escalation to a nuclear conflict.

Pat Fungamwango, 1999 (staff writer). Africa News. October 25, 1999. Accessed via Lexis/Nexis, April 1, 2010.

If there is one place today where the much-dreaded Third World War could easily erupt and probably reduce earth to a huge smouldering cinder it is the Korean Peninsula in Far East Asia. Ever since the end of the savage three-year Korean war in the early 1950s, military tension between the hard-line communist north and the American backed South Korea has remained dangerously high. In fact the Koreas are technically still at war.

## (--) Conciliatory gestures to North Korea only embolden the regime—risking North Korean nuclearization.

Melanie Phillips, 2009. The Spectator. “The fruits of appeasement.” May 27, 2009. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2009 at <http://www.spectator.co.uk/melaniephillips/3647756/the-fruits-of-appeasement.thtml>

As John Bolton commented a week ago -- correctly predicting the second North Korean test – following remarks by Stephen Bosworth, the US special envoy to the region: Despite Pyongyang’s aggression, Mr. Bosworth has reiterated that the U.S. is ‘committed to dialogue’ and is ‘obviously interested in returning to a negotiating table as soon as we can.’ This is precisely what the North wants: America in a conciliatory mode, eager to bargain, just as Mr. Bush was after the 2006 test. If the next nuclear explosion doesn't derail the six-party talks, Kim will rightly conclude that he faces no real danger of ever having to dismantle his weapons program. North Korea is a mysterious place, but there is no mystery about its foreign-policy tactics: They work.

# Impacts: Middle East Peace Process

## A) Concessions to rogue nations scuttle Israel’s support for the peace process.

Con Coughlin, 2009 (staff writer). The Daily Telegraph. September 18, 2009. “The spirit of appeasement is alive and well in the White House.” Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010.

Moreover, the cancellation of the missile shield coincides with other disturbing signals that the natural authority that goes with being the world's sole superpower is ebbing away from Washington. In Israel, the response of prime minister Benjamin Netanyahu to Mr Obama's appeal to restart the peace process has been to build more settlements in the West Bank. All these issues - Iran included - will come to a head in the next few weeks, as the President seeks to revive the Arab-Israeli peace process. But until he starts achieving results, rather than constantly making concessions, many people will be inclined to agree with the dismissive comment that a former Bush speechwriter claims his boss made last year, when Mr Obama was still only a presidential candidate: "This is a dangerous world, and this cat isn't remotely qualified to handle it.''

## A successful Middle East peace process solves a nuclear war.

Aluf Benn, 2009 (Nuclear diplomacy in the Middle East. August 6, 2009. Online. Internet. Accessed April 26, 2010 at http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1104190.html.

After the Gulf War, Iraq's secret nuclear program was discovered and dismantled by UN inspectors. Since 1993, the knowledge that the Iranians too were striving for nuclear weapons has been at the top of Israel's strategic agenda. It led to the consolidation of the "Rabin doctrine," which was later also supported by Ehud Barak (now defense minister), and holds that it is important to complete the "peace circle" in the region before Iran attains its goal. The basic assumption was that if Israel is at peace with its neighbors, the Iranians' motivation to launch a nuclear war of annihilation will decrease. Another assumption was that it would be easier to achieve peace before the Iranian bomb leads to general radicalization in the region.

## A new Middle Eastern war would escalate uncontrollably.

Business Times Singapore, 2007. January 9, 2007. Accessed via Lexis/Nexis, May 1, 2010.

These developments have the potential to degenerate into a military confrontation that could be transformed into a costly Middle Eastern war, drawing in Iran, the US and other players in the oil-rich region and wrecking the global economy.

# \*\*\*Appeasement DA Answers\*\*\*

## (--) Non-Unique: Obama’s nuclear weapons cut-backs symbolize appeasement:

Jeffrey T. Kuhner, 2010 (president of the Edmund Burke Institute). Washington Times. April 9, 2010. “Does nonproliferation equal capitulation?” Accessed from: Lexis/Nexis.

President Obama has destroyed the world's last superpower. America is no longer the global cop. Enemies no longer tremble at our military might. Our foes no longer respect us. Washington no longer has the will - or stomach - to maintain its hegemonic status. This is the real meaning of the administration's dramatic shift in nuclear security policy. The Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) announced this week represents a geopolitical watershed: the end of the American moment, the point at which the United States abrogated its decisive leadership on the international stage. The NPR states that Washington will never use nuclear weapons against nonnuclear states that sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) - even if one of those nations attacks America with biological or chemical weapons. There is a "carve-out" for Iran and North Korea (both NPT signatories). Otherwise, if some terrorist group linked to a Middle Eastern country murders millions of Americans by blowing up domestic nuclear power plants or through germ warfare, such as with anthrax, a nuclear retaliatory strike is off-limits. This will only embolden America's adversaries. They now know Mr. Obama will never resort to the ultimate weapon - the bomb - no matter how heinous their crime. Moreover, the NPR stipulates that the United States will not modernize its nuclear weapons systems; rather, Washington will rely upon its aging warheads and nuclear infrastructure. China and Russia have gained a decisive advantage in pursuing innovative nuclear weapons technology.

## (--) Non-Unique: US policy toward Iraq illustrates US appeasement policy now:

Frank J. Gaffney, 2010 (president of the Center for Security Policy). April 6, 2010. Washington Times. “War’s outcome now in doubt; Redeployment of forces to Afghanistan is premature.” Accessed via Lexis/Nexis.

The signal of American abandonment was made the more palpable by Team Obama's decision to dispatch Christopher Hill as its ambassador to Iraq. Mr. Hill is the diplomat best known for his determination during the Bush years to appease, rather than thwart the despot most closely enabling the realization of Iran's nuclear ambitions: North Korea's Kim Jong-il. The unreliability of the United States as an ally - a hallmark of the Obama presidency more generally - is reinforcing the sense that it is every man for himself in Iraq.

## (--) No link: Iran perceives actions in the Middle East: not the US approach toward Korea.

## (--) Non-unique: Obama’s approach to the Middle East peace process illustrates appeasement:

Steve Huntley, 2010 (staff writer). Chicago Sun Times. April 16, 2010. “On the path to appeasement.” Accessed from: Lexis/Nexis.

This history no doubt has left many Israelis wary of the peace process. But I've said it before and I'll say again, this conflict will end when the Arab world wants it to end. Obama's policies fail to recognize that simple truth. Think how his actions look to Israel's enemies. Obama makes a settlement freeze a condition for peace talks, something the Palestinians had previously not done. Now they do. He bows to the king of Saudi Arabia but refuses to be seen with the prime minister of Israel on Benjamin Netanyahu's last trip to Washington. Now some wonder whether Obama is promoting government change in Israel rather than regime change in Iran. He decided to return a U.S. ambassador to Syria even as Damascus dictator Bashar al-Assad hosted what can only be described as a terrorist summit with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and Hezbollah chieftain Hassan Nasrallah. Now we learn that Syria has provided Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon with Scud missiles able to reach Tel Aviv and Jerusalem. This week, Obama said the conflict costs America "significantly in terms of both blood and treasure," seemingly insinuating that U.S. soldiers in Afghanistan and Iraq are endangered by it. That's a fundamental misreading of the war with Islamist fanatics. Theirs is a revolt against modernity and the West, of which Israel is a symbol, not a cause. Getting that wrong takes the world down a dangerous path. Lauder got it exactly right: "History is clear . . . appeasement does not work."

## (--) No internal link: No reason a US policy change in Korea will affect international support for sanctions against Iran—which the disad assumes.

## (--) Ahmadinejad’s ideology prevents him from backing down to the West on his nuclear program:

James **Phillips &** Brett **Schaefer, 2006** (Heritage Foundation, March 8, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Iran/wm1010.cfm>)

President Ahmadinejad is a true believer in Khomeini’s 1979 revolution and is **inclined to confrontation**. Unlike his predecessor, President Khatami, who advocated a “Dialogue of Civilizations,” Ahmadinejad **advocates a clash of civilizations**, with Iran **leading the Islamic world against the United States and Israel**. Ahmadinejad will likely continue his defiant rejection of demands that Iran abandon its nuclear ambitions.Already he has ordered “full scale enrichment” of uranium and ended Iranian cooperation with surprise inspections under the additional protocol of the NPT. Moreover, Ahmadinejad has threatened to withdraw from the NPT altogether.

## (--) Despotic nature of Iranian regime prevents any hope at resolving the nuclear crisis:

Steven **Groves, 2007** (March 26, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/WorldwideFreedom/bg2019.cfm>)

Given the despotic nature of the Iranian regime and the status of civil and political rights under the Iranian constitution, the prospect of advancing freedom, democracy, and human rights in Iran is daunting. The regime cannot be taken at its word that it will not build nuclear weapons, and no amount of inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency will guarantee that the mullahs will not continue their efforts to become a nuclear power.

# Appeasement Answers: Extensions: Obama is Appeasing Rogues Now

## Obama’s nuclear policy represents appeasement:

Jeffrey T. Kuhner, 2010 (president of the Edmund Burke Institute). Washington Times. April 9, 2010. “Does nonproliferation equal capitulation?” Accessed from: Lexis/Nexis.

Yet the America that defeated Hitler's Germany and Tojo's Japan was a different nation. It was a superpower on the rise, ready and able to crush its enemies - regardless of the cost. Mr. Obama's America is the very opposite: parochial, self-indulgent, effete and in retreat. Even the thought of using atomic weapons frightens us. That is not enlightened statesmanship; it is moral cowardice. Throughout the George W. Bush years, the progressive left denounced him as a cowboy "unilateralist" who was willing to go it alone - even in the face of intense opposition from the bien-pensant in Germany and France. The truth was the opposite: On Afghanistan and Iraq, Mr. Bush erected broad coalitions. The real unilateralist is Mr. Obama. He is unilaterally disarming America. Under his watch, the United States has agreed to slash its nuclear arsenal in a treaty with Russia. He is forgoing the option of developing the nukes of the future. And he has told our enemies - in no uncertain terms - that the United States will not hit back with our most powerful weapons, no matter how many Americans are slaughtered. Mr. Obama is combining dangerous disarmament with reckless appeasement. He is banning the use of terms such as "Islam," "jihad" and "Islamic extremism" from the government's national security documents related to U.S. strategy in the war on terror. The rationale he is using: The words offend many in the Muslim world.

## Obama looks like a joke to rogue states now:

Jeffrey T. Kuhner, 2010 (president of the Edmund Burke Institute). Washington Times. April 9, 2010. “Does nonproliferation equal capitulation?” Accessed from: Lexis/Nexis.

Mr. Obama's actions represent a profound detachment from reality: an inability to recognize that America is in a life-death struggle with radical Islam. Censoring terminology will not stop jihadists from their goal of imposing a global caliphate. It simply confuses and demoralizes the public at home. By being unable or unwilling to identify our mortal enemy, Mr. Obama has, in effect, abandoned the war on Islamic terrorism. He has transformed America into a nation that is no longer serious about its international responsibilities. He has rendered the country a joke in the eyes of the world - especially to its enemies. Iran's apocalyptic mullahs have caught on. Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad publicly mocked Mr. Obama as an amateur. Iran is on the verge of acquiring the nuclear bomb. Like Adolf Hitler in the 1930s, Mr. Ahmadinejad rightly senses that the West's champion has lost the will to stand up to fascist dictators bent on military expansion. Mr. Obama's policies of appeasement - and threats of hollow sanctions - only elicit contempt from the Persian Nazi strongman.

# Appeasement DA Answers: Extensions—Iran Won’t Give Up Nukes

## (--) Iran won’t give up its nukes—willing to risk a war to preserve its nuclear program:

James **Phillips, 2007** (February 26, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Iran/wm1370.cfm>)

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad defiantly proclaimed on Sunday that "Iran has obtained the technology to produce nuclear fuel, and Iran's move is like a train...which has no break and no reverse gear." He was echoed by Deputy Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mohammadi, who warned that "We have prepared ourselves for any situation, even for war." Iranian officials also claimed to have launched a rocket capable of reaching space, although it reportedly rose only to sub-orbital level. Tehran is clearly signaling **that it will risk war to preserve its nuclear program**.

## (--) Iran extremely reluctant to give up its nuclear arsenal—support for nukes is widespread across the political spectrum:

Zbigniew **Brzezinski and** Robert M. **Gates, 2004** (Iran:Time for a New Approach, [http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Iran\_TF. pdf](http://www.cfr.org/content/publications/attachments/Iran_TF.%20pdf))

Unlike Iran’s other provocative policies, which have provoked intrafactional debate and thereby played into the internal power struggle in the country, the nuclear temptation is widely shared across the Iranian political spectrum. It dates back to the pre-Revolutionary period, when the monarchy began developing a nuclear program that was ostensibly for power generation purposes but understood to be intended as a launch pad for an ongoing weapons research effort. Opponents of crossing the nuclear threshold remain vocal and influential. Still, it is clear that the nuclear potential resonates with a collective set of interests that do not neatly correspond with Iran’s political factions. The prestige factor and the apparent deterrent that a nuclear capability represents will offer powerful incentives for an Iranian regime of any political character.

## (--) Iran won’t cave on its nuclear enrichment program—three reasons:

James **Phillips, 2005** (Research Fellow in Middle East­ern Studies @ Heritage Foundation December 14, <http://www.heritage.org/Research/Iran/bg1903.cfm>)

Tehran made enough tactical concessions to stave off international sanctions and engage the European Union in diplomatic negotiations led by Britain, France, and Germany (the EU-3), tempo­rarily defusing the crisis. Yet Tehran has increas­ingly chafed at the continued suspension of its nuclear enrichment program, which can produce fuel for civilian nuclear reactors or the fissile mate­rial for a nuclear weapon. It now apparently believes that it is in a much stronger negotiating position due to the continued need for **U.S. mili­tary forces in Iraq and Afghanistan**, greater bargain­ing leverage with oil importers because of **higher oil prices**, and its **diplomatic cultivation of China and Russia**, which can dilute or veto resolutions brought before the Security Council.

## (--) Iran will not dismantle its nuclear infrastructure:

Ray **Takeyh, 2007** (Foreign Affairs, March 2007 - April 2007; Lexis)

Given the progress of Iran's nuclear program, this issue deserves priority in second-track talks. The notion that the Islamic Republic will follow the Libyan model and completely dismantle its nuclear infrastructure is not tenable.

## (--) Ahmadinejad won’t give in to US demands to eliminate Iran’s nuclear arsenal:

Ray **Takeyh, 2007** (Foreign Affairs, March 2007 - April 2007; Lexis)

Understandably, too, Ahmadinejad and his allies view the acquisition of nuclear weapons as **critical to consolidating Iran's position** and helping the country eclipse U.S. influence in the region -- a prize worth suffering pain and sanctions to achieve. Ayatollah Mesbah-Yazdi has declared that task a "great divine test," and the newspaper Kayhan, a mouthpiece of the extreme right, has argued that the "knowledge and ability to make nuclear weapons" are "necessary in preparation for the next phase" on "the future battlefield." Given their distrust of Washington, the hard-liners assume that the United States' objections to their nuclear ambitions have less to do with countering proliferation than with exploiting the issue to enlist the support of U.S. allies against Iran. As Ahmadinejad has put it, "If this problem is resolved, then [the Americans] will bring up the issue of human rights. If the human rights issue is resolved, then they will probably bring up the issue of animal rights."

## (--) Iranian government won’t change its stance on uranium enrichment:

Joseph **Cirincione &** Andrew **Grotto**, 20**07** (Senior Associate and Director for Non-Proliferation @ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Senior National Security Analyst at the Center for American Progress <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2007/02/pdf/iran_report.pdf>)

They have produced political pressure inside Iran that seems to have induced President Ahmadinejad to temper his rhetoric. But there is still **no sign** that the Iranian government will **fundamentally change its stance on uranium enrichment.**