

Iran Disadvantage

Table of Contents

Uniqueness: US anti-Iran nuclear proliferation good now	2
Link: US military presence withdrawal (Middle East)	3
Internal Link: Iraq Withdrawal	4
Internal Link: Turkey Withdrawal	6
Brink: Iran is Threatened	7
Impact 1: Israel Gets Nuked	8
Impact 2: Terrorism	9
Impact 2 Calc: Terrorism is Worst Impact	10
Impact 3: Nuclear War causes Extinction.....	11
Impact 3 Calc: Extinction from Nuclear War is Worst.....	13
AT: Iran's Nuclear Program	15

Uniqueness: US anti-Iran nuclear proliferation good now

The United States' military presence is currently warding off Iran's growing nuclear arsenal.

“US Boosts missile presence in Gulf as warning to Iran,” **The Guardian**, January 31, 2010

The Obama administration is intensifying pressure on Iran by increasing its missile defences in the Middle East to defend against potential missile strikes in the region by Tehran, it emerged today.

The US military has boosted the capability of land-based Patriot defensive missiles in several Arab nations in the Gulf, and one official told the Associated Press the navy was also increasing the presence of ships capable of knocking out hostile missiles in flight.

The move – reported in several US newspapers this morning – appears to be a deliberate attempt by the White House to ratchet up pressure on Iran ahead of attempts to increase sanctions against the country.

The US is reappraising its Iran policy after months of unsuccessful diplomatic moves, and is attempting to win broad international consensus for sanctions against the Iranian Revolutionary Guards, believed to control a covert nuclear arms programme, the New York Times reported.

Last week, in his state of the union speech, Barack Obama spoke of "consequences" if Iran failed to comply with UN demands to stop nuclear fuel production.

Link: US military presence withdrawal (Middle East)

US presence is key to deterring Iran from nuclear weapons. Withdrawing incurs many impacts.

“Losing the Moment? The United States and the World after the Cold War,” Zalmay **Khalilzad**, Washington Quarterly Reader, Order and Disorder after the Cold War, editor Brad Roberts, **1995**, p. 60

In the Persian Gulf, U.S. withdrawal is likely to lead to an intensified struggle for regional domination. Iran and Iraq have, in the past, both sought regional hegemony. Without U.S. protection, the weak oil-rich states of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) would be unlikely to retain their independence. To preclude this development, the Saudis might seek to acquire, perhaps purchase, their own nuclear weapons. If either Iraq or Iran controlled the region that dominates the world supply of oil, it could gain a significant capability to damage the U.S. and world economies. Any country that gained hegemony would have vast economic resources at its disposal that could be used to build military capability as well as gain leverage over the United States and other oil-importing nations. Hegemony over the Persian Gulf by either Iran or Iraq would bring the rest of the Arab Middle East under its influence and domination because of the shift in the balance of power. Israeli security problems would multiply and the peace process would be fundamentally undermined, increasing the risk of war between the Arabs and the Israelis.

The extension of instability, conflict, and hostile hegemony in East Asia, Europe, and the Persian Gulf would harm the economy of the United States even in the unlikely event that it was able to avoid involvement in major wars and conflicts. Higher oil prices would reduce the U.S. standard of living. Turmoil in Asia and Europe would force major economic readjustment in the United States, perhaps reducing U.S. exports and imports and jeopardizing U.S. investments in these regions. Given that total imports and exports are equal to a quarter of the U.S. gross domestic product, the cost of necessary adjustments might be high.

The higher level of turmoil in the world would also increase the likelihood of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and means of their delivery. Already several rogue states such as North Korea and Iran are seeking nuclear weapons and long-range missiles. That danger would only increase if the United States withdrew from the world. The result would be a much more dangerous world in which many states possessed WMD capabilities; the likelihood of their actual use would increase accordingly. If this happened, the security of every nation in the world, including the United States, would be harmed.

Internal Link: Iraq Withdrawal

Withdrawing US military presence from Iraq allows Iran to use nuclear weapons and makes the entire Middle East a breeding ground for 21st century terrorists.

“No safe way for U.S. to leave Iraq, experts warn,” CNN, May 3, 2007

(CNN) -- Pulling U.S. forces from Iraq could trigger catastrophe, CNN analysts and other observers warn, affecting not just Iraq but its neighbors in the Middle East, with far-reaching global implications.

Sectarian violence could erupt on a scale never seen before in Iraq if coalition troops leave before Iraq's security forces are ready. Supporters of al Qaeda could develop an international hub of terror from which to threaten the West. And the likely civil war could draw countries like Turkey, Saudi Arabia and Iran into a broader conflict.

President Bush vetoed a war spending bill Tuesday precisely because the Democrat-led Congress required the first U.S. combat troops to be withdrawn by October 1 with a goal of a complete pullout six months later.

Bush said such a deadline would be irresponsible and both sides are now working on new proposals -- which may have no pullout dates.

A rapid withdrawal of all U.S. troops would hurt America's image and hand al Qaeda and other terror groups a propaganda victory that the United States is only a "paper tiger," CNN terrorism analyst Peter Bergen said.

"It would also play into their strategy, which is to create a mini-state somewhere in the Middle East where they can reorganize along the lines of what they did in Afghanistan in the late '90s," Bergen told CNN.com.

It was in Afghanistan where Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda allied with the Taliban, and were allowed to run terror bases and plan the September 11, 2001 attacks against the United States.

Bergen says it is imperative that the United States not let that happen in Iraq.

"What we must prevent is central/western Iraq [from] becoming a Sunni militant state that threatens our interests directly as an international terror hub," he said.

Don Shepperd, a retired Air Force major-general and military analyst for CNN, agreed that Sunni Muslim fighters who support al Qaeda would seek an enclave inside a lawless Iraq likely riven along sectarian lines into Shiite, Sunni and Kurdish regions.

There would be "increasing attempts by terrorists to establish a training sanctuary in Iraq," Shepperd said.

That's one of the reasons why a fast withdrawal will not happen, whatever the politicians say, the analysts predict.

"Everyone wants the troops home -- the Iraqis, the U.S., the world -- but no one wants a precipitous withdrawal that produces a civil war, a bloodbath, nor a wider war in an unstable Mideast," Shepperd said, adding that the image of the United States was important too.

"And we do not want a U.S that is perceived as having been badly defeated in the global war on terror or as an unreliable future ally or coalition partner."

Shepperd, a veteran fighter pilot of the Vietnam War, has served as a CNN analyst of the Iraq war since it began. Bergen was one of the first Western journalists to ever meet with bin Laden, and is considered a leading authority on al Qaeda.

Shepperd said Iraq's neighbors would be drawn into the all-out civil war likely if U.S. forces left too quickly. Iran could move in to further strengthen its influence in southern Iraq; Turkey likely would move against the Kurds in the north; and Saudi Arabia would be inclined to take action to protect Sunnis in western Iraq, he said.

The oil sector could also get hit hard, with Iran potentially mining the Persian Gulf and attempting to close the Straits of Hormuz, putting a stranglehold on oil flow, Shepperd says.

"Oil prices would skyrocket," he said -- perhaps soaring from current prices of about \$60 a barrel to more than \$100 a barrel, with consequent rises at the gas pump.

And that could bring further trouble, Shepperd added. "Saudi Arabia will not allow increasing Iranian dominance to endanger its regime and oil economy."

On top of that, Iran could speed up its nuclear ambitions, causing a "daunting and depressing scenario" of a nuclear arms race in the Middle East with Saudi Arabia, Syria, Egypt and Turkey trying to get a nuclear bomb, Shepperd says.

Observers such as Jon Alterman, director of the Middle East program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, say a wider Mideast conflict could be avoided.

But Alterman also fears that an Iraq left without U.S. support could turn into a center for international terrorism and a proxy battlefield for regional powers like Iran, Syria and Saudi Arabia.

Internal Link: Turkey Withdrawal

US military presence in Turkey is key to stabilizing the Middle East and deterring Iran from its nuclear ambitions.

“Troubled Partnership: US-Turkish Relations in an Era of Global Geopolitical Change,” **RAND Corporation, 2010**, p. xi

A strong security partnership with Turkey has been an important element of U.S. policy in the Mediterranean and the Middle East since the early 1950s. It is even more important today. Turkey stands at the nexus of four areas that have become increasingly critical to U.S. security since the end of the Cold War: the Balkans, the Middle East, the Caucasus/Central Asia, and the Persian Gulf region. In all four areas, Turkey’s cooperation is vital for achieving U.S. policy goals.

Brink: Iran is Threatened

Iran feels threatened and tensions are rising.

“Iran Nuclear Summit: Iran Says U.S. Nukes Tools of Terror, Intimidation,” **Huffington Post**, April 17, 2010

Three sets of U.N. sanctions have failed to pressure Iran to stop its own uranium enrichment work, which it says is only to produce fuel for power stations. The technology is of international concern because it could give Iran a pathway to warhead production.

Russia's deputy foreign minister, Sergei Rybakov, called for more confidence building measures from Tehran to allay international concerns over its nuclear program.

"We need to reinforce, reinstall full confidence in the exclusively peaceful nature of the Iranian nuclear program," Rybakov said Saturday on Iran's English-language Press TV.

Tehran was angered by Obama's announcement this month of a new U.S. nuclear policy in which he pledged America would not use atomic weapons against nations that do not have them. Iran and North Korea were pointedly excluded from the non-use pledge, and Iranian leaders took that as an implicit threat.

Impact 1: Israel Gets Nuked

Iran is on the brink of destroying Israel.

“Iran’s Nuclear Threat,” Massimo Calabresi, **Time Magazine**, March 8, **2003**

The new discoveries could destabilize a region already dangerously on edge in anticipation of war in Iraq. Israel — which destroyed an Iraqi nuclear plant in Osirak in a 1981 raid — is deeply alarmed by the developments. "It's a huge concern," says one Israeli official. "Iran is a regime that denies Israel's right to exist in any borders and is a principal sponsor of Hezbollah. If that regime were able to achieve a nuclear potential it would be extremely dangerous." Israel will not take the "Osirak option" off the table, the official says, but "would prefer that this issue be solved in other ways."

Impact 2: Terrorism

By withdrawing, the US will not be able to control terrorism in the area, causing a massive outbreak of regional terrorism in the Middle East which is bad.

“Terrorism myths and realities,” Yonah **Alexander**, Inter-University for Terrorism Studies Director, The Washington Ties, August 28, 2003

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.

Impact 2 Calc: Terrorism is Worst Impact

Terrorism is the worst impact because it includes all types of warfare – biological, chemical, nuclear or otherwise – and risks entire global extinction.

“Extinction!” Mohamed **Sid-Ahmed**, staff writer, Al-Ahram Issue 705, September 1, 2004,
<http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/2004/705/op5.htm>

We have reached a point in human history where the phenomenon of terrorism has to be completely uprooted, not through persecution and oppression, but by removing the reasons that make particular sections of the world population resort to terrorism. This means that fundamental changes must be brought to the world system itself. The phenomenon of terrorism is even more dangerous than is generally believed. We are in for surprises no less serious than 9/11 and with far more devastating consequences.

A nuclear attack by terrorists will be much more critical than Hiroshima and Nagasaki, even if -- and this is far from certain -- the weapons used are less harmful than those used then, Japan, at the time, with no knowledge of nuclear technology, had no choice but to capitulate. Today, the technology is a secret for nobody. So far, except for the two bombs dropped on Japan, nuclear weapons have been used only to threaten. Now we are at a stage where they can be detonated. This completely changes the rules of the game. We have reached a point where anticipatory measures can determine the course of events. Allegations of a terrorist connection can be used to justify anticipatory measures, including the invasion of a sovereign state like Iraq. As it turned out, these allegations, as well as the allegation that Saddam was harboring WMD, proved to be unfounded.

What would be the consequences of a nuclear attack by terrorists? Even if it fails, it would further exacerbate the negative features of the new and frightening world in which we are now living. Societies would close in on themselves, police measures would be stepped up at the expense of human rights, tensions between civilizations and religions would rise and ethnic conflicts would proliferate. It would also speed up the arms race and develop the awareness that a different type of world order is imperative if humankind is to survive.

But the still more critical scenario is if the attack succeeds. This could lead to a third world war, from which no one will emerge victorious. Unlike a conventional war which ends when one side triumphs over another, this war will be without winners and losers. When nuclear pollution infects the whole planet, we will all be losers.

Impact 3: Nuclear War causes Extinction

Nuclear war causes global extinction.

“Racing Toward Extinction,” Larry **Ross**, Founder of NZ Nuclear-Free Peacemaking Association, December 10, 2003, <http://nuclearfree.lynx.co.nz/racing.htm>

We have greatly changed our environment with our new destructive tools - nuclear weapons. They have given us a quantum leap in our ability to destroy ourselves and world. Given present trends, we will not adapt, but will continue on the present path to nuclear extinction. However, our brains provide the vital difference between extinct species and us. They can tell us what we have created, and the probable results if we keep repeating our historically destructive behaviour - the thousands of wars in our history. Our unique insight allows us to change our behaviour so we don't repeat our traditional pattern of destruction with our new earth-destroying tools. We have even recognised the extreme risks to ourselves, by creating treaties committing us to vigorously pursue disarmament steps to abolish nuclear weapons before they abolish us. Unfortunately, we have not observed these treaties. The essential question is: Will we use our brains constructively to solve this problem in time to save ourselves? It seems unlikely. We are using our brains to deny the terrifying reality, pretend there is no risk, or that it is insignificant. Many believe that nuclear weapons have been proven over 50 years to give us security. We tend to venerate our leaders, believe and obey them. Like the Germans did with Adolph Hitler, or Italians with Mussolini. Leaders are respected as rational, sensible, honest, moral Christians who could never do anything crazy. However President Bush - the world's most powerful man, and his allies and staff, have lowered the barriers against using nuclear weapons. They have developed new doctrines that allow them to use nuclear weapons in many more war situations and against non-nuclear states - not just in retaliation for a massive attack. The U.S. Congress and mass media have skirted this issue, so you may not know about this 'seismic' change in U.S. policy and its implications. People have forgot, or never learned, how nuclear weapons can destroy our world. Here is a chart with 6,000 dots divided into 100 squares. The one dot in the centre represents all the explosive power of allied bombs dropped in WWII - equal to 3,000,000 tons of TNT or 3 megatons. Millions were killed. We have enough for about 6,000 WWII's. The dots in just one of the 100 squares represent the firepower to kill all life on earth. We have made enough weapons to kill everyone on earth many times over. That is our dire situation today. We are not adapting to change our behaviour, but reinforcing old behaviour that leads to war? The nuclear arms race, accelerated by the vested interests of the military-industrial-political complex, and the phantom threats we invent to sustain it, is the major occupation of many top brains and huge resources today. It has huge momentum and power. It is embedded in U.S. society and some others. It is an accepted part of the culture. This weapons culture and the new doctrines mean that nuclear weapons are no longer treated as a last resort. They can be used in addition to conventional weapons to achieve military goals. . The culture has programmed itself for self-destruction and now has the ideology to continue until they precipitate a nuclear holocaust which kills all life. The quantum leap in destructive power has now been matched by this new will, or self-permission, to use these weapons. Laws, fears and reservations have been swept aside. Humanity seems to have accepted the new doctrines. Few seem

concerned that any usage can kill millions, and quickly expand beyond any countries control, leading to a global nuclear war which ends humanity. We have radically altered our environment in so many other ways as well, that also threaten our existence in the longer term. Population growth and our economic growth ideology augment the trends of climate change - global warming - pollution - dwindling natural resources - deforestation etc. To emphasise again, the biggest change we have made in our environment is the quantum leap in our ability to destroy ourselves. Our psychological and social climate makes it more probable. Most people are not aware of this huge change in our environment. Others just accept it. We have learned to live with and treat nuclear weapons as a normal part of the environment. Many feel that to question or oppose this situation is silly, disloyal or threatens the security we think nuclear weapons give us. Nine countries are dedicated to constantly developing their nuclear arsenals. That makes accidental or intentional usage more likely. That the U.S. has said the nuclear barriers are down adds to the likelihood of nuclear weapons use by some other state. A probable escalation would follow.

Impact 3 Calc: Extinction from Nuclear War is Worst

Because of its scientific probability and global destruction, extinction from nuclear war is the worst impact.

Jonathan Shell, *Fate of the Earth*, 1982, pp. 93-96

To say that human extinction is a certainty would, of course, be a misrepresentation – just as it would be a misrepresentation to say that extinction can be ruled out. To begin with, we know that a holocaust may not occur at all. If one does occur, the adversaries may not use all their weapons. If they do use all their weapons, the global effects in the ozone and elsewhere, may be moderate. And if the effects are not moderate but extreme, the ecosphere may prove resilient enough to withstand them without breaking down catastrophically. These are all substantial reasons for supposing that mankind will not be extinguished in a nuclear holocaust, or even that extinction in a holocaust is unlikely, and they tend to calm our fear and to reduce our sense of urgency. Yet at the same time we are compelled to admit that there may be a holocaust, that the adversaries may use all their weapons, that the global effects, including effects of which we as yet unaware, may be severe, that the ecosphere may suffer catastrophic breakdown, and that our species may be extinguished. We are left with uncertainty, and are forced to make our decisions in a state of uncertainty. If we wish to act to save our species, we have to muster our resolve in spite of our awareness that the life of the species may not now in fact be jeopardized. On the other hand, if we wish to ignore the peril, we have to admit that we do so in the knowledge that the species may be in danger of imminent self-destruction. When the existence of nuclear weapons was made known, thoughtful people everywhere in the world realized that if the great powers entered into a nuclear-arms race the human species would sooner or later face the possibility of extinction. They also realized that in the absence of international agreements preventing it an arms race would probably occur. They knew that the path of nuclear armament was a dead end for mankind. The discovery of the energy in mass – of "the basic power of the universe" – and of a means by which man could release that energy altered the relationship between man and the source of his life, the earth. In the shadow of this power, the earth became small and the life of the human species doubtful. In that sense, the question of human extinction has been on the political agenda of the world ever since the first nuclear weapon was detonated, and there was no need for the world to build up its present tremendous arsenals before starting to worry about it. At just what point the species crossed, or will have crossed, the boundary between merely having the technical knowledge to destroy itself and actually having the arsenals at hand, ready to be used at any second, is not precisely knowable. But it is clear that at present, with some twenty thousand megatons of nuclear explosive power in existence, and with more being added every day, we have entered into the zone of uncertainty, which is to say the zone of risk of extinction. But the mere risk of extinction has a significance that is categorically different from, and immeasurably greater than that of any other risk and as we make our decisions we have to take that significance into account. Up to now, every risk has been contained within the framework of life; extinction would shatter the frame. It represents not the defeat of some purpose but an abyss in which all human purpose would be drowned for all time. We have no right to place the possibility of this limitless, eternal defeat on the same footing as risk that we run in the ordinary conduct of our affairs in our particular transient moment of human history. To employ a mathematician's analogy, we can say that although the risk of extinction

may be fractional, the stake is, humanly speaking, infinite, and a fraction of infinity is still infinity. In other words, once we learn that a holocaust might lead to extinction we have no right to gamble, because if we lose, the game will be over, and neither we nor anyone else will ever get another chance. Therefore, although, scientifically speaking, there is all the difference in the world between the mere possibility that a holocaust will bring about extinction and the certainty of it, morally they are the same, and we have no choice but to address the issue of nuclear weapons as though we knew for a certainty that their use would put an end to our species. In weighing the fate of the earth and, with it, our own fate, we stand before a mystery, and in tampering with the earth we tamper with a mystery. We are in deep ignorance. Our ignorance should dispose us to wonder, our wonder should make us humble, our humility should inspire us to reverence and caution, and our reverence and caution should lead us to act without delay to withdraw the threat we now post to the world and to ourselves.

AT: Iran's Nuclear Program

Iran has proven to have nuclear weapons NOW.

“Iran's ‘Nuclear State’ According to Ahmadinejad,” **The Huffington Post**, February 11, 2010,

TEHRAN, Iran — President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad claimed Thursday that Iran has produced its first batch of uranium enriched to a higher level, saying his country will not be bullied by the West into curtailing its nuclear program a day after the U.S. imposed new sanctions.

Ahmadinejad made the announcement in a speech to hundreds of thousands of cheering Iranians at a rally to mark the anniversary of the 1979 Islamic Revolution. Just two days earlier, Iran said it had begun enriching uranium to higher levels than before, raising fears it may be moving closer to the ability to produce material for a nuclear weapon.