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#### Obama will win now – polls and economic momentum

Nate Silver (Pollster and creator of fiverthirtyeight) July 2 2012 “July 2: Obama’s Lead Holds, but Manufacturing Report Could Mean Trouble”, http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/07/02/july-2-obamas-lead-holds-but-manufacturing-report-could-mean-trouble/#more-31696

President Obama’s position improved modestly in Monday’s FiveThirtyEight presidential forecast. He is given a 68.6 percent chance of winning the Electoral College on Nov. 6, up slightly from 67.8 percent on Friday. Mr. Obama broke something of a stalemate in the forecast last week, buoyed by a series of national and battleground state polls that showed him slightly ahead of Mitt Romney. He was also helped by increasing investor optimism about the situation in Europe after a debt agreement there, which manifested itself in a stock market rally and correspondingly improved the model’s economic index. Two new national polls out on Monday showed Mr. Obama with a lead over Mr. Romney, including the Gallup tracking poll, which had him five percentage points ahead. A third poll, from Rasmussen Reports, had him slipping behind Mr. Romney over the weekend. Mr. Obama’s position in the polls seems to have improved slightly from the middle of June, but the reason remains somewhat unclear. There has been relatively little change in Mr. Obama’s approval ratings, which could suggest the change in national polls is in part a statistical fluke. The model’s view in June had been that the national polls slightly underestimated Mr. Obama’s standing: state-level data had seemed to suggest that he was slightly ahead of Mr. Romney rather than tied with him. Now, the national polls may be slightly overestimating his numbers instead.

#### Transporation funding unpopular with the public – spending concerns – outwiehgs the “crumbling infrastructure” claims

Ken Orski (editor and publisher of Innovation NewsBriefs, He served as Associate Administrator of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration under President Nixon and President Ford, J.D. degree Harvard Law School) 02/05/2012 NewGeography http://www.newgeography.com/content/002662-why-pleas-increase-infrastructure-funding-fall-deaf-ears

Finding the resources to keep transportation infrastructure in good order is a more difficult challenge. Unlike traditional utilities, roads and bridges have no rate payers to fall back on. Politicians and the public seem to attach a low priority to fixing aging transportation infrastructure and this translates into a lack of support for raising fuel taxes or imposing tolls. Investment in infrastructure did not even make the top ten list of public priorities in the latest Pew Research Center survey of domestic concerns. Calls by two congressionally mandated commissions to vastly increase transportation infrastructure spending have gone ignored. So have repeated pleas by advocacy groups such as Building America’s Future, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the University of Virginia’s Miller Center. Nor has the need to increase federal spending on infrastructure come up in the numerous policy debates held by the Republican presidential candidates. Even President Obama seems to have lost his former fervor for this issue. In his last State-of-the-Union message he made only a perfunctory reference to "rebuilding roads and bridges." High-speed rail and an infrastructure bank, two of the President’s past favorites, were not even mentioned. Why pleas to increase infrastructure funding fall on deaf ears There are various theories why appeals to increase infrastructure spending do not resonate with the public. One widely held view is that people simply do not trust the federal government to spend their tax dollars wisely. As proof, evidence is cited that a great majority of state and local transportation ballot measures do get passed, because voters know precisely where their tax money is going. No doubt there is much truth to that. Indeed, thanks to local funding initiatives and the use of tolling, state transportation agencies are becoming increasingly more self-reliant and less dependent on federal funding Another explanation, and one that I find highly plausible, has been offered by Charles Lane, editorial writer for the Washington Post. Wrote Lane in an October 31, 2011 Washington Post column, "How come my family and I traveled thousands of miles on both the east and west coast last summer without actually seeing any crumbling roads or airports? On the whole, the highways and byways were clean, safe and did not remind me of the Third World countries. ... Should I believe the pundits or my own eyes?" asked Lane ("The U.S. infrastructure argument that crumbles upon examination"). Along with Lane, I think the American public is skeptical about alarmist claims of "crumbling infrastructure" because they see no evidence of it around them. State DOTs and transit authorities take great pride in maintaining their systems in good condition and, by and large, they succeed in doing a good job of it. Potholes are rare, transit buses and trains seldom break down, and collapsing bridges, happily, are few and far between.

#### Obama’s pushing to ratify CTBT – his defeat crushes the initiative

Chris Schneidmiller ,"Senate Decision Key to Future of Test Ban Treaty," Global Security Newswire, 7-18-11, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20110714\_9351.php

The Obama administration is preparing for a lobbying campaign that could determine the future of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (see GSN, July 15). Administration officials have declared in recent months that they intend to follow through on their long-stated pledge to seek the U.S. Senate’s advice and consent on the accord. Still to be determined are when that will occur and whether the White House can overcome entrenched divisions on Capitol Hill to secure necessary Republican support for ratification. The stakes are significant: U.S. approval could draw other holdout nations into the treaty regime, bringing it that much closer to becoming international law, proponents say. Failure would provide those states with continued reason to dismiss the pact -- though critics say they might do that anyway. Before seeking a vote, the administration intends to carry out a program to educate lawmakers and the public on the value of the treaty, Undersecretary of State for Arms Control and International Security Ellen Tauscher has said on multiple occasions this year (see GSN, May 11). The effort would address issues likely to be debated in the Senate -- the viability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal without testing, whether all CTBT member states have accepted an absolute ban on any trial blasts, and the ability to catch any state that attempts to cheat. “We continue a long, methodical process to lay the groundwork for Senate consideration of the CTBT,” the State Department said last month in a statement to Global Security Newswire. “Currently, we are in the process of engaging with members of the Senate and their staff on the importance of the CTBT.” It added: “We are not moving for a Senate vote, don’t expect one anytime soon, and will not push for one until we have done the engagement work needed to secure approval.” Several analysts agreed that the White House would not begin the fight until it felt secure the result would be an improvement on the last time a Democratic president tried to persuade the Senate to approve the treaty. The United States signed the pact in 1996, but three years later the Clinton administration ratification effort ran into a brick wall of skeptical lawmakers. The Senate voted 51-48 against approval. A two-thirds affirmative vote would be required for the United States to become a full participant in the accord. Washington is among 44 capitals that must ratify the test ban before it can enter into force. Thirty-five nations have taken that step, leaving only China, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan and the United States. President Obama might wait to make his push until after publication of a new National Academy of Sciences report on the treaty, said arms control specialist Jeffrey Lewis. The follow-up to a 2002 academy study is expected to assess the effect that ratification would have on the U.S. capability to keep its nuclear weapons in working order without testing and on the capacity to identify atomic detonations in other nations. The new report is undergoing classification review, which could take weeks or years, according to Lewis. A classified National Intelligence Estimate on the matter was sent to Capitol Hill last August, but has not been seen by most lawmakers, said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. The document is said to offer an updated, thorough assessment of the ability to detect secret nuclear tests, according to Kimball. Senator Robert Casey (D-Pa.) suggested at the Arms Control Association’s annual meeting in May that the Senate might not take up the treaty until after the 2012 election. "In my judgment, we should act before the 2012 elections. I don't have a high degree of confidence that we will," the lawmaker said, echoing time line estimates from other observers. “I don’t think [the Obama administration is], at least in the near term, serious about putting this to a vote,” said Lewis, director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. “I don’t think there’s a desire to have a vote if they think they’re going to lose, and I don’t think the votes are there yet.” Only 41 lawmakers who considered the treaty in 1999 remain in the Senate, Kimball said in a recent issue brief. Newer senators must be briefed on the matter, while the chamber as a whole must be informed of technical developments since 1999 that would promote entry into force. Politics plays a role in congressional policy debates and nuclear security will be a topic of discussion during the 2012 presidential election campaign, Kimball said. The White House is already taking heat over what Republicans say are inadequate attempts to rein in suspected proliferation activities in nations such as Iran and Syria (see GSN, March 30). Still, the Senate’s ratification last year of the U.S.-Russian New START nuclear arms control pact is cause for optimism about the test ban’s chances on Capitol Hill, Kimball said. Thirteen GOP senators voted in favor of the bilateral agreement. The two years it took Moscow and Washington to negotiate and approve New START “was relatively fast for a treaty,” according to Kimball. He said the administration should take whatever time is needed to see the test ban passed. “I would hope that the issue of the test ban treaty does not become a partisan political football because there is strong Republican support for the test ban treaty out there,” Kimball said. “If the treaty is not seriously considered by the Senate until after 2012, that will be because it took that much time to sort through the issues and to develop enough support to go ahead with the final stages of the ratification effort.” That plan, though, would hinge on Obama’s re-election. Should he be defeated next year, the pact would almost certainly remain frozen in place in Washington.

#### US Ratification Is Key To Prevent Global Prolif and Nuke War.

Ian Davis, Co-Executive Director of the British American Security Information Council, “Getting the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Back on Track” 05-11-2009.

This can't happen too soon. North Korea has marched through the open door with its first underground test of an atomic device. There is widespread agreement that the test has escalated tension in the region and raised the stakes in the stand-off with the United States. It could also destroy the prospects for the CTBT and open the floodgates to more nuclear-armed states. While we welcome the current agreement with Pyonyang which may ultimately eliminate the North Korean nuclear program, and lead to a nuclear-free Korean peninsula, the details of implementation have yet to be worked out, and already, strong conservative opposition to the agreement is beginning to appear. The door to an alternative way forward is also still open, and the United States could seize the moral high ground by leading the world through it. If President Bush were to press the Senate to reconsider and support ratification of the treaty, it could be part of a far-reaching strategy for shoring up the North Korean agreement, peacefully tackling the Iranian nuclear program and for preventing a world with 40 or more nuclear powers. The North Korean and Iranian nuclear crises exemplify an increasing number of damaging developments that make it clear that the non-proliferation system needs to be strengthened and updated, not neglected or discarded. The international community must not only work together to develop more effective diplomatic approaches towards North Korea and Iran, but it must also apply stricter international safeguards on all nuclear programs, prevent the spread of uranium enrichment and plutonium reprocessing, secure a global halt to the production of fissile material for weapons purposes, take new steps to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons and achieve the entry into force of the CTBT. If, in 1963, at the height of the Cold War, the US, UK, and USSR could negotiate a limited test ban treaty. Why can't we ratify a comprehensive treaty now? Were we less threatened then? Are Iran and North Korea greater threats to the United States than was the USSR? The CTBT is vital to a system of security that does not rely on nuclear weapons. Its entry into force would put a cap on the nuclear age. Posturing for domestic politics and insisting on a macho attitude in international relations has dangerous long-term implications, both for America and the rest of the world. Since the Bush administration has come to power, global non-proliferation has gone into a holding pattern at best, a tailspin at worst. That can only lead to a world overpopulated with nuclear weapons and a nuclear war sooner or later. The consequences do not bear thinking about. So it is vital that CTBT supporters put the treaty back on the American and European political agenda and move to secure ratification by other key states.
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#### Extend the Silver 7/2 evidence – Obama will in now – he has small leads in the most recent national polls and he is enjoying a bounce due to economic rebounds in Europe and the US stock market

#### Obama win now – demographic shifts and swing state advantage

Frontrunner, 6/11

The New York Times (6/9, Harwood, Subscription Publication, 1.23M) reported that in several presidential swing states, "demographic changes add another variable to a campaign conversation that has largely revolved around high unemployment and slow growth" -- and could work to President Obama's advantage. An analysis "for the liberal Center for American Progress" concluded that "that in 12 battleground states, the proportion of votes cast by working-class whites, a group Mr. Obama lost lopsidedly in 2008, will drop by three percentage points this fall," while "the proportion cast by minority voters, who backed Mr. Obama by overwhelming margins, will rise by two percentage points." The Chicago Sun-Times (6/10, Sweet, 370K) reported that Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel, in an interview to air on CNN's Fareed Zakaria GPS Sunday, "predicted that the presidential election will be decided in 'five states, 500 precincts.'" He did not specify the states. Several Swing States Have A Relatively Low Unemployment Rate. Charles Babington, in a piece for the AP (6/11) titled, "Ohio's Job Growth Doesn't Guarantee An Obama Win," says, "About 10 battleground states will decide the election, and seven of them have employment levels that beat the US average." Babington adds, "Most of the states are led by Republican governors eager to highlight their progress in creating jobs," which "complicates...Romney's claim that the economy has been so mismanaged that Obama deserves to be ousted." Babington says Ohio Gov. John Kasich "tries to finesse the political dilemma by saying jobs have increased despite Obama's policies."

**Obama winning election now—national polls consensus**

Cohen, politics writer NYTimes 538 blog, 2012 (Micah, NYTimes, June 10, <http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/10/where-electoral-forecasts-agree-and-disagree/> accessed tm)

FiveThirtyEight’s initial 2012 presidential forecast found President Obama as a slight favorite to win re-election. These projections are unique, both in [means](http://fivethirtyeight.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/07/election-forecast-obama-begins-with-tenuous-advantage/) and ends, but the FiveThirtyEight model is operating in a crowded field. State-by-state race ratings have been published by [The New York Times](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/electoral-map) (these come from the politics desk and are distinct from FiveThirtyEight’s forecast), [The Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/special/politics/election-map-2012/president/), [RealClearPolitics](http://www.realclearpolitics.com/epolls/2012/president/2012_elections_electoral_college_map.html), [Pollster](http://elections.huffingtonpost.com/2012/romney-vs-obama-electoral-map#map), [CBS News](http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-57444136-503544/the-electoral-college-map-how-obama-or-romney-could-win/) and [NPR](http://www.npr.org/2012/04/24/150488863/the-road-to-270-predict-the-2012-presidential-race) (actually, many more projections are available, but these maps use the same five-level ratings scale, making comparisons easier). Although each map takes a slightly different approach to projecting state-by-state results, they all have Mr. Obama leading Mitt Romney in “solid” and “leaning” electoral votes. It’s in the breadth of that lead and the most likely paths to those vote totals where disagreements arise. The New York Times sees Mr. Obama with the slimmest edge, a mere 11 electoral votes. Pollster, on the other hand, has Mr. Obama with 270 electoral votes, a 79-vote advantage over Mr. Romney and already enough for a second term.

#### Obama lead is small – NO MARGIN FOR ERROR

**National Journal**, **6/8**/2012 The Presidential Race, p. http://www.nationaljournal.com/magazine/no-margin-for-error-for-obama-20120607

President Obama’s bid for a second term stands on the edge of a knife. That’s the overriding message of the latest Allstate/National Journal Heartland Monitor Poll. In the survey, the country divides almost in half on Obama’s overall performance as president, his impact on the economy, and the choice between him and Republican Mitt Romney in the 2012 election. On the ballot test, the needle bends slightly toward Obama; on the critical job-approval measure, it tilts slightly away from him. But all of these gauges show that the president is operating with virtually no margin for error—a conclusion underscored by the fact that this survey was completed before the release of last week’s deeply disappointing jobs report. The latest Heartland Monitor Poll surveyed 1,000 adults, including 871 registered voters, by landline and cell phone from May 19-23. It has a margin of error of plus or minus 3.1 percentage points for the entire sample and 3.3 percentage points for the registered-voter subset. The poll’s first 2012 ballot test has Obama leading Romney among registered voters by 44 percent to 41 percent. (Unlike some other polls, this survey did not push undecided voters to lean toward one candidate.) But Obama’s job-approval rating, usually the most revealing measure of an incumbent’s standing, dipped to 47 percent in the latest poll, with 48 percent disapproving. That’s a decline from a 51 percent approval rating in the Heartland Monitor survey last March, albeit within the margin of error.

### Obama win – likability

#### Obama will win now - likeability

**New Straits Times 06/26/12,** “Whether you like it or not, liking a politician is crucial” LexisNexis, LV

GREAT PERSONALITY: With the US economy floundering, [Barack Obama's](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Barack%20Obama's%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) best bet of winning in November is his sheer personality .The most recent Gallup poll has United States President [Barack Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Barack%20Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) and [Mitt Romney](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Mitt%20Romney%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) in a dead heat. Americans are split down the middle with 46 per cent of voters saying they would vote for [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) and another 46 per cent saying they will vote for Romney. While it is too early in the election cycle for any solid predictor on who will win come November - Kerry would lead Bush during this same period, as Carter would against Reagan - these numbers, while proving little else, have this presidential election down as being one of the closest in history. The one thing that [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) has to his advantage is that he is the more likable candidate. A poll conducted last month finds registered voters nearly twice as likely to pick [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) as the more likable candidate over Romney. [Obama's](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama's%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) 60 per cent to 31 per cent lead over Romney has many political pundits wondering just what likability means in a presidential election. Likability has played a crucial role in recent elections with the more favorable candidate often coming out victorious. Reagan would defeat Carter. Clinton would beat George H. W. Bush. And [George W. Bush](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE0009XP1%23&searchTerm=George%20W.%20Bush%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) would just about edge out both Al Gore and John Kerry. While gauging likability isn't in any way a precise science, it has proven to be more than just a threshold factor. It isn't enough for a candidate to be tolerated. A candidate needs to be liked. You can blame TV pioneer Philo Farnsworth for that. It was all his fault. It was all because of television. It would forever change the way elections are run. It would usher in the age of the manicured candidate, carefully crafted to not just play the part but also sound like and look the part. Former US president John F. Kennedy was the first to figure it out. That politics at this level had nothing to do with policy and everything to do with personality. Popularity and perception would become the order of the day. Elections would be about image and charisma. It would be about whether you were liked. As a candidate. As a person. The problem with the Kennedy phenomenon is that it would be short-lived and we had no way of discerning if the cult of personality would result in a transformative presidency. Fast forward 20 years to Reagan. Then again to Clinton, to [George W. Bush](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE0009XP1%23&searchTerm=George%20W.%20Bush%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) and to [Obama.](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama.%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) All individuals with personalities so strong, so charismatic, so irresistible that even those with drastically differing ideologies would be drawn to their side and their style of politics. Image was now paramount in politics. Gerald Ford will forever be perceived as a clumsy oaf thanks to news footage of him tripping over a step on Air Force One. Carter would be remembered as the weak one following that televised speech where he appeared in a sweater, in front of a fireplace, looking meek and, God forbid, defeated. Could the population at large bring themselves to like a president who was graceless? How about one who appeared frail? Feeble even? One cannot overemphasize the importance of being liked in politics. It allows for an entirely different conversation. The politician who is liked is able to connect with his electorate in a far more intimate manner. And ideology suddenly plays second fiddle to charm. And politics suddenly becomes flexible in the face of personality. Four years ago, it was a combination of the candidate's cult of personality and the tragedy that was eight years of [George W. Bush](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE0009XP1%23&searchTerm=George%20W.%20Bush%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) that led to the American people electing [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) president. For [Obama,](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama,%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) it was a strategy that didn't just capture the imaginations of Americans, but of everyone, everywhere. You could ask anyone outside America what the last presidential election was about and the answer wasn't the economy, or Roe v Wade, or immigration, or even Iraq. The answer was always: [Obama.](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama.%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) In fact, it is something that the president is counting on to carry him through yet another election season. With the economy still floundering, with an electorate that is far more jaded than they were four years ago, with a political system that is gridlocked, [Obama](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lnacui2api/search/XMLCrossLinkSearch.do?bct=A&risb=21_T15015988132&returnToId=20_T15015988185&csi=151977&A=0.4522708631079335&sourceCSI=9369&indexTerm=%23PE000A0BO%23&searchTerm=Obama%20&indexType=P" \t "_parent) has to rely on the sheer force of his personality to convince the people to give him four more years.

### Obama win – swing states

#### Obama will win – swing states

RTT 6-27-12 (RTT Staff Writer, “Obama Lead In Three Swing States Could 'Assure Re-election': Poll”, <http://www.rttnews.com/1913396/obama-lead-in-three-swing-states-could-assure-re-election-poll.aspx?type=pn&node=b1&pageNum=1>, CF)

President Barack Obama leads Republican candidate Mitt Romney in the three vital swing states of Florida, Ohio and Pennsylvania, a new Quinnipac poll released Wednesday says. Every president ever elected has won at least two of these three states in the general election, making this poll a closely watched forecast of a possible outcome in November. "President Barack Obama has decent margins over Gov. Mitt Romney in Ohio and Pennsylvania and a smaller advantage in Florida," Peter A. Brown, Assistant Director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute in a press release. "If he can keep those leads in all three of these key swing states through election day he would be virtually assured of re-election." "Of course the election is more than four months away, which is a lifetime in politics," he added. The poll surveyed around 1,200 voters in the three states between June 19-25 of this year on their views of the two men's [economic](http://www.rttnews.com/1913396/obama-lead-in-three-swing-states-could-assure-re-election-poll.aspx?type=pn&Node=B1) and immigration policies as well as overall impression. In the three states, Hispanics, African Americans and women are skewed heavily on the side of the president while Romney is favored among whites and men. Although the president also leads on immigration policy, the states are split on who would best handle the economy. In Florida, always a hotly contested state, voters skewed on the side of the president, but only slightly. Obama lead Romney 45 to 41 percent among those polled, with 56 percent of Hispanics, 85 percent of African Americans and 47 percent of women saying they would vote to re-elect the president. Although slightly more Floridians say Romney would do a better job on the economy (46 versus 44 percent), the overall approval rating of the president is much higher, at 47 percent versus Romney's 37. This might be due to the president's recent change in immigration policy to allow younger illegal immigrants to temporarily avoid deportation, what some people are calling Obama's "mini DREAM Act." In Florida, 58 percent say they would support the change in policy and 46 percent said the president would do better on immigration policy. Voters in Pennsylvania, although they prefer the president to Romney at 45 to 39 percent, are split on specific issues. Specifically, those polled split exactly even on who would handle economy better, with 44 percent favoring each man. Additionally, the president's overall job [performance](http://www.rttnews.com/1913396/obama-lead-in-three-swing-states-could-assure-re-election-poll.aspx?type=pn&Node=B1) approval rating is in the negative here, at 45 percent approving to 49 disapproving. A higher percentage, 47 percent, believe he should not be re-elected than those who do at 45 percent. But, the race in Ohio is much more firmly in President Obama's hands. Overall, 47 percent favor Obama over Romney at 38 percent. The president's overall approval rating is also much higher than Romney's, at 50 percent versus 32 percent. Although here too the voters are almost split on whether he should be re-elected, they agree Obama would do better handling the economy than Romney, at 47 versus 42 percent. A majority also favor his new immigration policy change. However, a specific number to watch is independent voters in the three states. The president leads among independent voters in Florida and Ohio but not in Pennsylvania. In fact, his lead in Ohio "is largely due to his lead among independent voters, the group that usually decides Ohio elections," Brown said. If the president can increase his favorability among independent voters in Pennsylvania and widen the margin among this voting bloc in the other two states, he will have a much better chance at taking all three states and then the general election.

#### Obama wining three key states

Condon June 27 12 – (Stephanie Condon, a political reporter for CBSNews.com, June 27, 2012, Swing state voters split on whether Romney, Obama better for the economy, <http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-57461650-503544/swing-state-voters-split-on-whether-romney-obama-better-for-the-economy/>, ea)

(CBS News) The struggling economy is without question the best issue for Mitt Romney on the presidential campaign trail, but a new poll shows that voters in three key swing states are split over whether he or President Obama would be a better economic steward. Additionally, the new Quinnipiac poll shows that voters in Ohio, Pennsylvania and Florida approve of Mr. Obama's new immigration policy and believe the president would be better than Romney at handling the issue of immigration. Voters in Florida -- where the Latino vote could play a key role -- approve of Mr. Obama's new policy by the widest margin. The president holds leads over Romney in all three states -- he leads by four points in Florida, nine points in Ohio and six points in Pennsylvania -- but this far from Election Day, those numbers could easily change. Peter Brown, assistant director of the Quinnipiac University Polling Institute, noted in the poll's release that for much of the last year, more swing state voters thought Romney would do a better job handling the economy, but that advantage has disappeared for now. In Ohio -- a must-win state for Romney -- voters say 47 percent to 42 percent that Mr. Obama would be better than Romney at handling the economy. Similarly, they say Mr. Obama would be better for their personal economic future, 47 percent to 42 percent. In Florida, voters say Romney would do a better job than Mr. Obama at handling the economy, 46 percent to 44 percent -- within the poll's 2.8 percent margin of error. Forty-six percent say Mr. Obama would be better for their personal economic future while 45 percent say Romney would. Pennsylvania voters are split at 44 percent to 44 percent over which candidate would do a better job handling the economy. Forty-four percent say Mr. Obama would be better for their personal economic future, compared to 43 percent who say Romney.

### Obama win – youth vote

#### Obama has young votes.

Boaz, 12 – (david boaz, executive vice president of the cato institute and has played a key role in the development of the cato institute and the libertarian movement, june 1, 2012. president obama and the youth vote, http://www.cato.org/publications/commentary/president-obama-youth-vote,ea)

President Obama won 66 percent of the 18-29 vote in 2008. But young voters may not embrace the reality of Obama in 2012 as they did the promise in 2008. A new Gallup poll finds that Obama still gets 64 percent of the youth vote, but only 56 percent of young people say they definitely intend to vote — compared with more than 80 percent in other age groups. And a new poll from Harvard University's Institute of Politics has even worse news: Among college-age youth, only 50 percent approve of Obama's performance, only 39 percent approve of his handling of the economy, and only 41 percent say they'll vote for him, to 29 percent for Mitt Romney. Obama has been working hard to fire up his youth base. He's stumped the country promising to keep interest rates low on student loans, and every voter likes free money. And then perhaps more importantly, he re-established his cool by endorsing gay marriage. Hope and change are back. For many young voters, this reconnected them to the hip young Obama of 2008. Nevertheless, he's carrying a lot more baggage than he was four years ago, when every voter could see what he or she wanted in the largely unknown young senator. Take a look at a few issues that may disillusion young voters.

### Obama win – latinos

#### Obama wining Latino votes

Nhan, 12 – (Doris Nhan, social editor for the Next America initiative, an in-depth look at how demographic shifts in America are affecting politics and policy, Hispanic Support for Obama on the Rise--But Will It Remain Until November?, <http://www.nationaljournal.com/thenextamerica/politics/hispanic-support-for-obama-on-the-rise-but-will-it-remain-until-november--20120628>, ea)

Support among Latino voters for President Obama, his immigration policies, and Democrats in the House jumped significantly after the June 15 announcement that the federal government would stop deporting young illegal immigrants, according to a survey released on Wednesday. In a conference call announcing the latest results from a poll of Latino voters in five key battleground states, there was a “very visible” shift in the data after the Homeland Security Department announcement, suggesting that it did indeed boost Latino support for Obama, said Matt Barreto, principal at Latino Decisions, which conducted the survey in partnership with the left-leaning organization America’s Voice. The poll interviewed 2000 eligible Latino voters divided among Arizona, Colorado, Florida, Nevada, and Virginia between June 12 and 21. The weeklong sampling included respondents who answered questions before and after the DHS announcement. Before June 15, there was an even split among Latino voters polled, 45 percent to 42 percent, with the slight majority saying they approved of Obama’s immigration policies. After June 15, support for his policies rose to 61 percent, versus 30 percent who disapproved. The aftereffects of Obama’s announcement also translated into support for the House, with 59 percent saying they would be inclined to vote Democratic, and 22 percent leaning Republican. This was about a 10 percent increase in support for the Democrats after June 15, the survey found. With all of the data combined, Obama maintains his majority among Latino voters in these states; 63 percent said that they would vote for him. Both the Senate and House also have majorities leaning to the left -- 55 percent and 56 percent, respectively. But the poll also found a good pocket of undecided voters. Ten percent remained undecided on their vote for president, while 17 percent and 19 percent were undecided for the Senate and House, respectively. Enthusiasm also increased after June 15, according to the poll. In November 2011, 47 percent of Latinos said they were “very enthusiastic” about voting in the election. After the announcement, the number of “very enthusiastic” voters jumped to 63 percent. While voters in this poll show an upward trend in enthusiasm, it remains to be seen whether Obama can translate this to the polls in November. Primaries in states with large Hispanic populations, including Texas and California, suffered huge hits in voter turnout.

# Links – plan unpopular

### 2nc link wall

#### Extend the Orski 2012 evidence – voters will reject the calls for new transporation spending because they believe to be wasteful, and they will not but the “crumbling infrastructure” or “will create jobs” hype. No risk of a link turn

#### Transportation funding triggers public backlash – viewed as pork barrel spending

Natter, ‘8 (Ari, Columnist @ Bloomberg news, Ranking Member Transportation Committee, Pacific Shipper, 11/3, lexis)

Perhaps more than any national campaign in recent history, the major candidates have staked out very clear and decidedly different stances on transportation infrastructure investment. McCain has made criticism of earmarks something of a crusade in his campaign, and says he wants to send more decisions on spending priorities to the states. "I believe that a higher share of the taxes collected at the gas pump should go back to the state where those taxes were paid," the Arizona Republican told the American Automobile Association in an interview with AAA newsletter, "and I've co-sponsored legislation that would allow states to keep almost all of their gas tax revenues for their own transportation projects without interference from Washington." "We've got a problem," Mortimer Downey, a former deputy secretary of transportation in the Clinton administration and an adviser to the Obama campaign, told a public forum in Washington last week on transportation policy. "Infrastructure needs more investment. It is important, it is crumbling, and other countries are doing more than we are. We've got national issues we need to deal with, and transportation is the critical tool for doing that." He said the Obama camp has "a vision" for the next highway bill. "It should be a much better bill than the last couple. It shouldn't have so many earmarks in it," Downey said. At the same forum, Douglas Holtz-Eakin, chief economic adviser to the McCain campaign, said the spending priorities are critical. "There is no area where earmarking has been more visible than in highway bills. We have to get more bang for the buck." James Burnley, a former DOT secretary under two Republican presidents who also has advised the McCain campaign, said in an interview that if McCain is elected, "You will have two additional issues; one, he has said he is against increasing any taxes; second, he is deadly serious when he says he is not going to accept earmarks, so I think you would have the ultimate historic constitutional clash about the earmarking issue." Downey notes the earmark approach "is going to be a very tough diet to get off of," and comments from transportation backers in Congress suggest just how strong the opposition to a McCain plan would be. "If John McCain wants to say earmarks to build bridges on the I-5 so trucks don't have to detour across the Cascade Mountains are pork, well then he's an idiot," Rep. Peter DeFazio, D-Ore., said at an American Road and Transportation Builders Association conference in September. "If John McCain is elected, we are going to have a diminutive surface transportation bill," DeFazio said last month. "McCain's attitude on infrastructure is like that of the public's, that it's just a bunch of boondoggle pork barrel bridges to nowhere," said Robert Dunphy, a senior resident fellow at the Urban Land Institute.

#### Failure to be fiscally sound sooms Obama – independents will bail on the president

Douglas, Schoen (pollster for President Bill Clinton) July 11 2010 NY Daily News, 7/11, http://articles.nydailynews.com/2010-07-11/news/29438716\_1\_fiscal-discipline-swing-voters-president-obama

What Bam can learn from Bill: President Clinton's ex pollster tells Obama how to win independents The news for President Obama is bad. Very bad. This week's Gallup tracking poll indicates that public support for Obama has fallen to a record low - with his job approval rating dropping to 45% among all voters and 38% among Independents. With ratings this low, the President and his party will almost certainly be unable to avoid devastating losses in the fall midterm elections. The only hope is a fundamental midcourse correction. What then should the President do? The independent swing voters who hold the fate of the Democratic Party in their hands are looking for candidates and parties that champion fiscal discipline, limited government, deficit reduction and a free market, pro-growth agenda. They respect leadership that bucks the Washington establishment and the special interests. Above all else, these swing voters will not tolerate any lack of focus on the most pressing economic concerns: reigniting the economy and creating jobs while simultaneously slashing the deficit and exhibiting fiscal discipline. Some say these are mutually exclusive objectives. They are not. I should know. When I first met with former President Bill Clinton privately in late 1994, jobs and the deficit were major concerns. In the aftermath of that year's devastating mid-term elections when the Republicans gained control of Congress for the first time since 1954, I emphasized that unless Clinton simultaneously stressed fiscal discipline and economic growth, he simply could not be reelected in 1996. By adopting a bold new agenda that included a balanced budget, frank acknowledgment of the limits of government, welfare reform, as well as the protection of key social programs, we were able to win a decisive victory over former Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole in 1996. Without that fundamental repositioning, Clinton would almost certainly have lost. While the circumstances are different, the electorate now wants the same things that it wanted back then. The American people, exhausted and demoralized by a sluggish economy, recognize that the stimulus package, as currently crafted and implemented, has at best produced short-term results through subsidization of the public sector. And they are increasingly uneasy about rising deficits, which remain the independent voter's touchstone. The left-wing economists urging Obama to ignore the latter concern and pour more taxpayer money into the economy now, regardless of the impact on the deficits, are prescribing electoral suicide.

### Deficit spending

#### Plan swings the election to Romeny – deficit spending unpopular

Josh Kraushaar may 14 2012, National Journal <http://decoded.nationaljournal.com/2012/05/romneys-targeted-deficit-messa.php>

If unemployment was the only factor driving this presidential election, Mitt Romney would not be spending much time campaigning in Iowa, where the state's agricultural economy is relatively healthy, and the state boasts a 5.2 percent unemployment rate, the lowest for any battleground state. But spending and debt are big issues in the American heartland, too. And that's why Romney spent time on the trail in Des Moines Tuesday, with a speech decrying excessive government spending. Concern over federal spending is what drove the tea party movement into existence in 2009, and it's an issue that hasn't gone away in 2012. It's what's driving Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's momentum in next month's gubernatorial recall, with a deficit-conscious GOP base showing high levels of enthusiasm. (It's also an effective message with independents: Check out this new ad from Republican New Mexico Senate candidate Heather Wilson that's focused squarely on the debt, deficit and spending -- in a Democratic-leaning state.) When pollsters ask voters what their most important issue is, the catch-all "jobs and the economy" comes first. But the number of voters naming the deficit rose in 2010 and has remained largely constant, and it's an issue that's driving conservatives to the polls. It's also a way for Romney to criticize the president on the economy in states that haven't suffered the brunt of the downturn. New Hampshire is another state with a solid economy, but one receptive to Romney's small-government messaging. Indeed, the RNC held a conference call today, featuring former New Hampshire Gov. John Sununu and former New Hampshire Rep. Jeb Bradley, decrying Obama's record on debt and deficits. Obama may be leading in early Granite State polls, but the Romney campaign is optimistic about their chances there, hoping to take advantage of the state's "live free or die" sentiment. If Obama needs high levels of youth and minority turnout to win a second term, Romney needs a restive base anxious about the fiscal future of the country to show up in big numbers. That's the ticket to a Romney victory in states like Iowa, New Hampshire, and Virginia -- where the economy is pretty good but voter dissatisfaction still runs high.

#### Plan generates deficict fights – that allows GOP to galvanize support

**Gruenberg, ’12** (Mark, editor of Press Associates Inc. (PAI), a union news service, 1/20/12, <http://peoplesworld.org/labor-maps-legislative-battle-for-201/>

In a Jan. 17 interview with Press Associates Union News Service, Samuel said the list includes fighting for a two-year transportation (highway-mass transit) funding bill, pushing for final resolution of a long-running war over airport construction and airways modernization - and union rights for airline workers - and extension of jobless benefits. It also includes legislation to curb Internet piracy of intellectual property, since the piracy robs dollars from royalty-based wages for musicians, actors, screenwriters, and other unionized creative professionals. And the agenda includes a longer extension of emergency federal jobless benefits for the long-term unemployed. **But the outlook is cloudy for all**. Even the jobless benefits bill, which both parties agree upon, is hung up by a partisan dispute over how to pay for the $150 billion measure. Congress returned to town Jan. 17 to start this year's session, after a first year characterized by Senate GOP filibusters on just about everything and by a tea party-dominated House GOP attacking spending and workers. Samuel expects those attacks to continue. He forecasts congressional Republicans will use the Congressional Review Act - a Gingrich-era GOP law - to try to overturn new federal rules streamlining union recognition election procedures. The big fights will be over job creation. Samuel expects the Obama administration to again support the infrastructure bill, jobless benefits, and other measures, though he concedes that aid to state and local governments may be iffy. Obama will outline his agenda in the Jan. 24 State of the Union address. Labor may have, finally, won one battle with the House GOP, Samuel said, over recognition elections for airline and railroad workers. "The Chamber of Commerce has finally dropped its opposition" to new rules for those elections, contained in the airport construction and modernization bill. That legislation would create 80,000-100,000 jobs. House Transportation Committee Chairman John Mica, R-Fla., has insisted that rules governing union recognition elections at airlines and railroads should force unions to win an absolute majority of all eligible voters at a worksite, with non-voters counted as "no" votes. That was the rule until last year when, after pressure from the labor movement and its allies, the government changed it. The requirement in union elections now is the same as in any other election - the winner is determined by the majority of those who actually cast ballots. Business and Mica fought the change, but with the 23rd temporary extension of the airport and airspace construction bill set to expire at the end of January, business seems to have given up. The question for congressional negotiators is if Mica will. As for extending jobless benefits, "we and the Democrats are hopeful" that Congress will OK an extension before the benefits expire Feb. 29, Samuel said. He also said the Democrats are holding fast against cutting any major programs to pay for the cost - even though in the past, Congress did not require cuts elsewhere to pay for aiding the unemployed. The House GOP is insisting on cuts, at least so far. If the GOP holds fast to its no-taxes-on-millionaires stand and the Democrats protect major programs, there could be a stalemate on jobless benefits, Samuel concedes. "But the Republicans badly miscalculated" when the last benefits extension was debated in December that their no-taxes stand was a winner. Instead, they got a political black eye for protecting the rich at the expense of unemployed workers. The two-year highway-mass transit bill, worth $106 billion plus inflation, still needs some details: Its mass transit sections are incomplete and so is its financing, outside of the federal gasoline tax. The measure would create tens of thousands of construction jobs and its passage is a major goal of building trades unions. Once Senate panels finish drafting the measure, the Democratic-run Senate is expected to approve it, Samuel said. The problem is the GOP-run House, again. Mica earlier proposed a five-year bill with much less spending per year - so much less that Laborers President Terry O'Sullivan called Mica's legislation a "job killer."

### Wasteful spending

#### Triggers election backlash - Public opposition growing and GOP base hates it

William Reinhardt (Founder Public Works Financing) 2/27/12 Engineering News Record, lexis

Peter Ruane, CEO of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, calls Washington a «fact-free zone.» The firewall that for 56 years has protected the federal Highway Trust Fund from being used for deficit reduction is in grave danger of being breached. «We're going to be fighting for every penny,» he says. The battle lines will be drawn next November. If the «no compromise» wing of the Republican Party gains ground, then the «starve the beast» option will be on the table, and nothing is sacred. Certainly not the Highway Trust Fund, which conservative activist Grover Norquist views as a deep barrel of pork. If not direct federal investment, then what about tax credits and other leveraging tools? Advocates for these programs have been pulling their hair out for years over how tax credits are scored for infrastructure programs. There is no acknowledgement of the federal revenue upside created by public investment in mobility, safe water, etc. That's not going to change easily because those rules are embedded in the federal budget bureaucracy. Because so much is political, the members of the elite infrastructure technocracy in the U.S. too often are forced to bow to the politicians who dispense the subsidies. Compliance with unending regulations is seen as a cost of doing business, but taxpayers, not contractors, pay full price. U.S. construction companies are carrying a much heavier regulatory burden under the Obama administration than ever before. EPA is an untethered driver of regulations. Owners, public and private, are as likely to find themselves in court as under construction. Enforcement actions under federal set-aside programs are up by 10 times in the past three years, and U.S. Dept. of Labor audits are up by 25 times. «There is a huge new regulatory component to our work and more political impact,» says Bruce Grewcock, CEO of Kiewit Corp., whose managers generate 50 million man-hours of craft labor a year. «The Obama administration is listening to a different audience,» he says. Powerful advocates for smaller government charge that the federal public-works budget is so skewed toward social goals and political insiders that any increase in taxes or user fees should be opposed as wasteful. They have a large and growing audience of believers because they are partly correct. Consider this from the director of a major U.S. infrastructure investment fund: «Every big transportation project in America is political now. It has very little to do with delivering infrastructure projects when there's big money involved.» He continues, «Lobbyists have found out that the money is at the project level, not in Washington. They add a political tone to everything, and they've convinced local governments that they need political influence to get anything done.» Too little gets built because decisions are not made based on merit. Ever-growing competition for scarce public investment capital is embedded in our social contract. In a study last year, venture capitalist Mary Meeker noted that, since 1965, the GNP grew by 2.7 times and entitlements grew by 11 times. Frighteningly, Meeker identified an 82% correlation between rising entitlement spending and falling personal savings rates. Posterity is rarely mentioned these days. So, we are at a crossroads. No amount of «needs» surveys will spur voters or politicians to support a major commitment to meet future demands for transportation, water, public buildings and other critical infrastructure services. The best hope is for public and private planners, designers, builders and operators of these facilities to convince a skeptical public that it is getting the services it pays for at a fair price and without political favoritism. Build local support for good projects. A good place to start is for the infrastructure technocracy to take back its industry from the political operatives who promise subsidy but deliver mainly invoices. ?

#### Hot button issues – voters will perceive

Gannett News 7/14/2010

Hundreds of millions of dollars in unspent transportation earmarks would be returned to the federal treasury under a bill introduced Wednesday. The bill drew praise from two government waste watchdog groups, which cited it as an example of long-overdue reform. "Long-term economic growth and recovery can't happen unless we cut wasteful government spending and tackle our exploding deficit," said the bill's sponsor, Rep. Betsy Markey, D-Colo. "These old earmarks are a waste of taxpayer money and cutting them just makes sense." The unexpended earmarks in some cases go back more than two decades and range in amounts from 2 cents to $26.8 million. Earmarks are specific directives from Congress on how an appropriation should be spent. Current law allows the Transportation Department to allocate some unspent transportation earmarks to other projects. Markey's bill would require that all unspent money be returned to the treasury and used to reduce the national debt, now at about $13.2 trillion. Markey's office included a list of projects totaling $713.2 million that could be affected. If all that money were returned to the treasury, it would reduce the debt by about five-thousandths of a percent. "This is good stuff. This is the kind of thing we like to see from members of Congress, that they're taking this seriously," said David Williams, vice president of policy for Citizens Against Government Waste. Erich Zimmerman, a senior policy analyst for Taxpayers for Common Sense, sounded a similar note. "Cutting more than $700 million in unneeded and unnecessary transportation earmarks is as good a place as any to start," he said. "This should serve as a cautionary tale as Congress begins to cobble together the next highway bill and ensure that we don't return to the wasteful days of the past. Too often, an earmark is a tiny down payment on a project that a state cannot afford and has not prioritized," Zimmerman said. Williams said lawmakers have known for years about the unspent transportation earmarks but haven't done anything about it. "I suspect that we're in such a political climate where government spending, especially during an election year, is such a hot-button issue, and everybody wants to be seen as a fiscal conservative," he said.

### Public opposition

#### Public opposition to transportation spending – plan can only signal speninding, not job creation

Stephen Kull (Principal Investigator at the Program on International Policy Attitudes) March 5 2005 http://www.pipa.org/OnlineReports/DefenseSpending/FedBudget\_Mar05/FedBudget\_Mar05\_rpt.pdf

When presented most of the major items in the discretionary federal budget and given the opportunity to modify it, Americans make some dramatic changes. The largest cut by far is to defense spending, which is reduced by nearly one-third, followed by spending on Iraq and Afghanistan, transportation and justice. The largest increases are to reductions in the deficit, various forms of social spending and spending on the environment. Nearly all respondents were able to complete the exercise. And overall, there were many changes made to the proposed budget. The budget items that were most deeply cut were defense spending, the Iraq supplemental, transportation, and federal administration of justice. The budget items that were increased the most were allocations to reduce the budget deficit and spending on education, conserving and developing renewable energy, job training and employment, and medical research. A more detailed analysis follows. There were also domestic spending items that majorities chose to reduce. Transportation was cut $12.6 billion, from $69.4 billion to $56.8 billion (an 18% cut), with 58% making cuts. The federal administration of justice went from $41.1 billion to $32.4 billion (a 21% cut), with 56% making cuts. Space science and research was reduced slightly from $24.7 billion to $23.5 billion (5%), with 53% making cuts. Partisan Variations For 16 out of 18 budget areas, the average changes that were made by Republicans and Democrats went in the same direction relative to the Administration’s proposed budget. There were only slight differences in their allocations for seven of the items: energy and renewable resources, homeland security, transportation, veterans’ benefits, space and science research, medical research, and the federal administration of justice. The remaining items, though, do show noteworthy trends. The category of job training and employmentrelated services has gotten increasingly sharp average increases over the last decade—96% in 1996, 128% in 2000, and a startling 263% in 2005. Perhaps this expresses a growing concern about the impact of globalization and international trade on the capacity of the US work force to adapt and retain its standard of living. For reasons that are unclear, willingness to fund the federal administration of justice has steadily dropped, shifting from an average 10% increase in 1996, to a 12% cut in 2000, to a 21% cut in the 2005 exercise. Willingness to spend on transportation relative to other needs has shown a long-term decline. In 1996 it was increased 40% on average; in 2000, it was kept nearly flat (2% increase); and in 2005, it was cut by 18%.

#### Spending opposition and efficiency concerns swamp theoretical support

Rockefeller Foundation February 6 2011

<http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>

Moreover, few believe that current government spending in this area is efficient and wise, and voters welcome a range of reforms in how transportation projects are financed. At the same time, as is the case with many spending-related issues today, voters are unwilling to personally pay for additional funding of national transportation projects. While wide support exists for encouraging more private investment, imposing penalties on over-budget projects, and establishing a National Infrastructure Bank, there is very little support for increasing the federal gas tax or increasing tolls on interstate highways and bridges.

#### Voters strongly opposed to paying for it – swamps theoretical support

Rockefeller Foundation February 6 2011

<http://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/uploads/files/80e28432-0790-4d42-91ec-afb6d11febee.pdf>

Voters are far less accepting of proposals that would affect their own wallets. Seventy-one percent (71%) say it would be unacceptable to increase the federal gas tax; majorities also are opposed to placing a new tax on foreign oil (51% unacceptable), replacing the federal gas tax with a mileage fee (58%), and adding new tolls to interstate highways and bridges (64%).

### 2nc independents

#### Plan will crush Obama with independent voters

**Schoen**, 2/8/**2012** (Douglas – pollster for President Clinton, The Forgotten Swing Voter, Politico, p. http://dyn.politico.com/printstory.cfm?uuid=7ED8592F-2122-4A55-AA3B-C5460134BE4A)

Neither party focuses on issues that matter most to people: reviving the economy, promoting job creation, balancing the budget, reducing debt and taking on entitlements. Both Republicans and Democrats are virtually ignoring the concerns of swing voters, now close to 20 percent of the electorate, and independents, now at least 40 percent of the electorate and, according to Gallup, the single largest voting bloc. These two groups share similar interests. And both give Republican and Democratic leaders net negative ratings. Independents disapprove of how Obama is doing his job, 52 percent to 37 percent, according to a recent New York Times/CBS poll. Just 31 percent had a favorable opinion of Obama, with two-thirds saying he has not made progress fixing the economy. Six in 10 independents say Obama does not share their priorities for the country. The president’s improved standing in the recent Washington Post poll has probably been overstated and has more to do with Romney’s weakness than with some dramatic turnaround in Obama’s own numbers. A majority of independents still disapprove of his job performance and a clear majority of the electorate disapproves of his handling of the economy, his performance in creating jobs and his efforts to balance the budget. Independents have similar negative impressions of leading GOP presidential candidates Romney and Gingrich, according to a recent Washington Post poll. Independents look unfavorably on Romney, 51 percent to 23 percent, and have an unfavorable impression of Gingrich, 53 percent to 23 percent. Another ominous sign for Romney, still the presumed nominee, is that voter turnout decreased about 15 percent in Florida’s primary from four years ago, and almost 40 percent of the voters said they were not satisfied with the current field. It’s crucial the GOP candidates address these voter concerns. A recent national survey I conducted sheds light on who the swing voters are and what they want from government — which meshes closely with the independents’ policy preferences. I isolated swing voters by looking at those voters who supported Bill Clinton in an imaginary trial heat against Romney but didn’t support Obama in a trial heat against Romney. This came to 15 percent of the electorate. In a two-way race for president between Clinton and Romney, an overwhelming majority prefers Clinton, 60 percent to 24 percent. Meanwhile, between Obama and Romney, voters split almost evenly — with Obama at 45 percent and Romney at 43 percent. A detailed assessment of swing voters shows that they are not liberal Democrats. Over three-quarters (76 percent) are moderates or conservatives, and close to two-thirds (65 percent) are Republicans or independents. Slightly less than half (49 percent) are Southerners. This data underscore the voters’ desire for politicians who advocate for bipartisanship and coalition-building in a polarized country. The substantial degree of support for Clinton versus Romney shows that the more bipartisan, centrist and fiscally conservative the appeal, the broader the support. A Third Way survey conducted after the midterms supports my findings. Sixty percent of voters who supported Obama in 2008, but voted Republican in 2010, feel that Obama is too liberal. About 66 percent say that Obama and the Democrats in Congress tried to have government do too much. A USA Today/Gallup Poll released late last year also shows that the electorate believes Obama is too far left ideologically. Americans were asked to rate their own ideology as well as that of the major presidential candidates on a 5-point scale. Most rated themselves at 3.3 (slightly right of center), and Obama at 2.3 (left of center) — further away than all other major presidential candidates. A majority of Americans, 57 percent, see Obama as liberal, while only 23 percent see him as moderate. Indeed, recent polling shows that independents want to rein in the size and scope of government. Gallup reports that 64 percent of independents say Big Government is the biggest threat to the country. Which may be one reason for Santorum’s growing support. Three-quarters are dissatisfied with the size and power of the federal government, while just 24 percent are satisfied. Other polling shows that these voters want policies that emphasize economic growth and budget reduction. In the wake of the crippling economic downturn, 82 percent believe it is extremely or very important to expand the economy, according to recent Gallup polling. Seventy percent say the federal budget deficit should be cut by a combination of spending cuts and modest tax increases — with many polls showing these voters feel spending cuts are key. Independents do not support more government spending. My polling last year shows independents believe government should refrain from spending money to stimulate the economy, given the large deficit we face, 62 percent to 24 percent. Independents, according to Gallup, are looking for government to expand the economy (82 percent), and promote equality of opportunity (69 percent). They are not looking for government to promote equality of outcome, since just 43 percent say they want to reduce the income gap between the rich and the poor. By 50 percent to 47 percent, they say the divide between the rich and the poor is an acceptable part of the economic system. So it’s clear what these voters are looking for, and also that neither party is addressing their concerns. To be sure, independent voters want conciliation and compromise. Some are more conservative and market-oriented. Others are ready to accept government stimulus spending for our economic recovery. But all share the desire for economic growth, job creation and a path to fiscal stability. The two parties cannot continue to ignore swing voters. Without them, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to win in November. Moreover, to win without addressing their concerns will almost certainly promise four more years of the same gridlock.

#### Independent voters will swing the election --- they make up 40% of the vote

Huma **Khan** 1/9/**2012** Independent Voters on the rise But Do They Matter?, ABC News, p. <http://abcnews.go.com/blogs/politics/2012/01/independent-voters-on-the-rise-but-do-they-matter/>

A day before the nation’s first primary in New Hampshire, Republican front-runner Mitt Romney is busy courting independent voters, a burgeoning group that has the power to sway the results in this year’s presidential election. Forty percent of voters identified themselves as politically independent in 2011, according to a new Gallup poll released today, the highest number recorded in the poll yet. The previous high for independents was 39 percent in 1995 and 2007. Democrats won both presidential races in the following years. Independent voters are an increasingly important voting bloc. They have outnumbered both Democrats and Republicans continuously for the past two and a half years, by far the longest period in which they’ve done so in ABC News-Washington Post polls dating back to 1981.

### Independents dislike the plan

#### The plan swings independents

Kirchgaessner, ’11 (Stephanie, “Obama looks to independent voters,” April 15 2011, http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7dd54d5c-678c-11e0-9138-00144feab49a.html#axzz1T844vB9m

Barack Obama is betting that his attack on the Republican deficit reduction plan, which he has derided as un-American, will resonate with independent voters as he prepares to hit the campaign trail next week. The president will hold town hall meetings in California and two swing states: Nevada and Virginia. The political winds seemed to shift in favour of Democrats this week, with Mr Obama looking – for the first time in months – as if he is primed to lead his party into the difficult fiscal battles that lie ahead. It was, at the same time, a tumultuous week for the increasingly divided Republican majority in the House of Representatives. Party lawmakers called for their leaders to be more aggressive in demanding spending cuts and almost unanimously endorsed a 2012 budget plan that could have dire political consequences in the next election. The proposal by Republican Paul Ryan to cut $5,800bn in the next decade and transform Medicare, the insurance programme for the elderly, passed 235 to 193 in the House without a single Democratic vote. House passes 2012 budget Republicans in the House of Representatives united on Friday behind a 2012 budget plan slashing trillions of dollars in government spending while cutting taxes. The vote effectively serves as the Republicans’ opening gambit in what are likely to be contentious negotiations with President Barack Obama and his Democrats over debt and deficits in the coming months. The U.S. Congress must decide within weeks on raising the $14,300bn US debt ceiling. By a vote of 235-193, the House passed the plan written by House Budget Committee Chairman Paul Ryan for the 2012 fiscal year beginning October 1. Democrats rejected the measure, which proposes slashing spending by nearly $6 trillion over a decade and reducing benefits for the elderly and poor. All but four Republicans supported it. There is almost no chance of the Senate approving the measure in its current form. The White House swiftly condemned the measure but said it was committed to working with Republicans to bring down record deficits that all sides acknowledged imperil the country’s economic future. Reuters “I think Obama has had his best week in a while,” said Democratic strategist James Carville. “His speech really has got Democrats excited again. Also, they feel they are on the right side of public opinion here.” Mr Obama’s address on Wednesday satisfied the liberal base by reaffirming his support of tax increases for the wealthy to pay for entitlement programmes for the poor and elderly. It also spoke to independent voters who abandoned Democrats in last year’s congressional election by reassuring them that he believed the deficit required immediate action.

### 2nc GOP link

#### GOP will mobilize around the plan – they hate it

Thomas Dorsey (CEO of Soul of America) Januarary 25 2012 <http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/>

As much as I’d like to disagree, I think you are correct. The Tea Party GOP is determined not to show any more infrastructure success under President Obama at this time. Team Obama realized this fact, so they didn’t name Transportation funding in his SOTU comment “Split the savings from Defense drawdown to rebuild America and pay down the Debt.” Team Obama deliberately withheld that contentious point so the GOP could not pounce on it in post-SOTU media coverage this week.

### GOP link exts

#### Plan mobilizes gop base and fiscal conservatives – they hate it

Lawder, 12(David, Journalist @ Reuters, Reuters, 6/8, <http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/06/07/usa-infrastructure-boehner-idINL1E8H7AH320120607>)

Boehner also has had a difficult time getting his own caucus to support a transportation bill -- even one with Keystone and new oil drilling rights included -- because of its costs. Many fiscal conservatives backed by the Tea Party movement will not support a multibillion spending bill at a time of high budget deficits

# Links – specifics

### Highway link

#### Highway/Surface Transportation Funding Uniquely unpopular – public has lost all confidence

AGC (The Associated General Contractors Of America) March 2 2011 “THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf

Just because our federal infrastructure investments have delivered tremendous national benefits, that doesn’t mean many current federal infrastructure programs aren’t in need of a change. On the contrary, there is little doubt that our current federal approach to investing in infrastructure is flawed. Indeed, many of those flaws undermine and devalue federal infrastructure investments, helping reinforce public skepticism in the government’s ability to efficiently and effectively meet basic needs. Nowhere are those flaws more glaringly apparent than with our current approach to surface transportation funding. The once-focused federal program that was the envy of the world for building the Interstate Highway System has fallen out of favor with the public and many policy analysts. Yet since the completion of the original Interstate Highway System, there has been no clear role or purpose for the federal transportation program. As a result, politicians have used an ever-greater share of Highway Trust Fund revenue to pay for programs that have little or nothing to do with transportation priorities, or even with transportation at all in some cases. Depending on who is counting, today there are over 100 different federal programs funded by the Highway Trust Fund, including programs to protect historic covered bridges, encourage students to walk to school and to build local bike lanes. While these may all be worthwhile, it is hard to understand why any of those initiatives serve a national objective and should be funded from a Trust Fund financed primarily by highway users that was intended to pay for construction and maintenance of a national highway system. As a result of these continued diversions of Highway Trust Fund revenue, today only about 68 percent of Trust Fund dollars goes to construction and maintenance of highways. This is problematic for many reasons. First, these diversions from the primary purpose of the Trust Fund have turned the gas tax and its other funding sources from user fees into taxes. A user fee is something people pay to use a system, with the understanding that those fees will be reinvested into the system. A tax is something you pay so the government has the revenue needed to fund a host of programs. For much of its existence, the gas tax and other highway user fees were a way for drivers to pay for maintenance and upkeep of the highway system. Today it is a way for them to pay some money into the highway system and a lot of money into programs that do little or nothing to benefit them or the highways they use. As a result of these diversions, the size of the federal surface transportation program continues to grow at rates far greater than increases in highway maintenance and expansion. So even as motorists read about hundreds of billions of dollars going into the Highway Trust Fund, they see comparatively little new capacity or maintenance work underway. Americans are savvy consumers. They know when they are getting a good deal, and they know when they aren’t. And what used to be a good deal – paying a modest gas tax to finance access to the world’s most efficient highway system – is now a bad deal – paying a modest gas tax to finance, among other things, fitness and recreational facilities, covered bridges and other unrelated programs that a small number of politicians favor. It is no coincidence that the gas tax now rates among the least popular of all forms of revenue collection in the U.S.

### HSR links

#### Very unpopular – 2010 election proves

Reuters November 8 2011 <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/11/08/us-infrastructure-congress-idUSTRE6A749F20101108>)

John Mica, who is expected to chair the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, told Reuters in a post-election interview that he would conduct a close review of how money was spent from the 2009 economic stimulus package approved by the Democratic-controlled Congress. He also plans to reevaluate grant programs that bypassed congressional review. The new look at spending comes after voters last week questioned Obama infrastructure priorities in electing Republican governors who campaigned against what they considered unworkable transportation spending. To start, Mica will focus on more than $10 billion in high-speed rail awards and a $1.5 billion transportation construction financing under the so-called TIGER grant program in which funds were sent directly to states on the merit of proposed projects. "We had unelected officials sitting behind closed doors making decisions without any hearings or without any elected officials being consulted. There was no rational explanation," Mica said. "I'm going to have a full review of that." TIGER grants have been oversubscribed and state capitals want them extended, but there is no commitment from Congress to do that. Some of the money could come back to the federal government, according to Mica, who also said that he would look at how to expedite funding in other cases. Mica's scrutiny of high-speed rail projects and other construction spending is shared by some critical Republicans at the state level. Republican gubernatorial candidates who won their races in Ohio, Florida and Wisconsin last week campaigned against high speed rail development, an Obama transportation priority.

#### HSR very unpopular amoung voters

**Koenig**, 6/7/**2012** (Brian, California Voters Turn on High-Speed Rail Project, The New American, p. <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/11646-california-voters-turn-on-high-speed-rail-project>)

After enduring a series of financial and logistical hiccups, California’s landmark high-speed rail project has become increasingly unpopular among voters, as the project’s enormous price tag continues to inflate and as the state’s budgetary woes grow more severe. Without a concrete plan for funding, supporters of the state’s high-speed rail project pitched a revised proposal in April to lawmakers and the general public. Due to severe budget constraints, the updated plan narrowed the scope of the project while speeding up construction to save money. Furthermore, about $1 billion in voter-approved bonds will be available to revamp existing tracks, which will purportedly make rail service more efficient and potentially bring in more customers. In a previous article, The New American reported on the revised proposal: The newly minted plan expedites completion of the first true U.S. high-speed rail system, moving it to 2028, trimming the project timeline by five years and shaving $30 billion off the original budget drafted last year by the California High-Speed Rail Authority. In 2008, when residents first voted to authorize the bonds, they were told the overall cost of the project would be $45 billion — and four years later, the total became $98 billion. The new proposal has reduced that number to $68.4 billion, still $23.4 billion more than the original total. However, despite the purported cost savings, the rail system still relies heavily on shaky federal funding and speculative private-sector investments. "We've seen numbers in the $30 billion, $40 billion, the $90 billion range, and now we're back in the $60 billion range," Sen. Joe Simitian (D-Palo Alto) said at the time. "I think there is understandably both some confusion and skepticism about what is the system going to cost, and then there's the question of where is the money going to come from?" Due to such uncertainty, voters in the state are turning on the project, as a new poll conducted by USC-Dornsife and the Los Angeles Times found that 55 percent of California voters want the $9-billion bond issue — which was approved in 2008 to fund early stages of the rail system — back on the ballot. And a startling 59 percent affirmed that they now would vote against it.

#### Public opposition growing – high cost perception

Devin Nunnes December 15 2010 House Rep, Cong Doc and Publications

Washington, Dec 15 - Today Congressman Devin Nunes testified before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which held an important oversight hearing on the skyrocketing cost of California high-speed rail. "The House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure gave opponents of California high-speed rail a unique opportunity to tell members why they oppose this growingly unpopular project," said Congressman Nunes. "We need to look for better options to high- speed rail, such as freight rail and other transportation projects that are more beneficial to California and don't bankrupt our state. Chairman Mica should be praised for showing considerable leadership in holding this hearing."

# Links – A2 link turn

### A2 jobs turn

#### They hate plan – don’t perceive job benefits

Fred Bergsten (Director of the Peterson Institute for International Economics) March 22 2009 International Economy, lexis

The problem the President will be facing is that Americans do not like government spending and investment, even when it is desperately needed. Our huge trade deficit, for example, is largely composed of consumer goods from Asia and energy, but the public is skeptical of a shift toward spending on public infrastructure that would alter the equation and create more jobs in America. That is why power grids, roads, parks, and public transportation in Europe are dramatically more modern better maintained than they are here. More spending on public facilities and less on imported cars, clothes, and household bric-a-brac would reduce our trade deficit and increase employment here, but the President's grades will be good only if the public begins to believe this.

#### Public will flock to Obama – no perceived jobs benefit

Yonah Freemark (independent researcher currently working in France on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University) Janurary 25 2012 http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/01/25/on-infrastructure-hopes-for-progress-this-year-look-glum/

In the context of the presidential race, Mr. Obama’s decision not to continue his previously strong advocacy of more and more transportation funding suggests that the campaign sees the issue as politically irrelevant. If the Administration made an effort last year to convince Americans of the importance of improving infrastructure, there seems to have been fewer positive results in terms of popular perceptions than hoped for. Perhaps the rebuffs from Republican governors on high-speed rail took their toll; perhaps the few recovery projects that entered construction were not visible enough (or at least their federal funding was not obvious enough); perhaps the truth of the matter is that people truly care more about issues like unemployment and health care than they do for public transit and roads.

#### Will not swing votes

Pew (Pew Research Center) Janurary 20 2011 http://www.people-press.org/2011/01/20/about-the-surveys/

Improving the nation’s roads, bridges, and transportation does not rank as a particularly high priority for Democrats, Republicans or independents. Still, Democrats are more likely to see this as important (41% top priority vs. 30% of independents, 26% of Republicans. This is the case for dealing with obesity as well.

### A2 perception

#### Plan will not be perceived as jobs – media will spin unpopular spending program

AGC (The Associated General Contractors Of America) March 2 2011 “THE CASE FOR INFRASTRUCTURE & REFORM: Why and How the Federal Government http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf

Adding to Americans’ frustration, most of what they learn about the federal government’s role in transportation and other infrastructure investments comes from media coverage of the proliferation of earmarks. Imagine the frustration most motorists and other taxpayers must feel when learning that the money they are paying into the Highway Trust Fund is being used to fund projects in far away parts of the country not because of need, but because some politician sits on a committee. It is hard to find fault with a commuter who asks “why should I pay more in gas taxes” while stuck in traffic on an old and aging bridge on their way to work in Cincinnati, even as residents of Alaska get a new and seemingly unneeded bridge. While earmarks still account for a relatively small portion of the total amount invested in transportation projects nationwide, they have become a significant and debilitating problem when it comes to flood control, levy and lock and dam projects funded by the Army Corps of Engineers. The Corps and Bureau of Reclamation both conduct comprehensive reviews with merit-based criteria and public participation, and usually require local cost-sharing. Yet the Congressional practice of earmarking Corps and Bureau funds for projects favored by certain elected officials means that many vital projects languish, despite the fact they have already been vetted and are needed to protect communities or facilitate maritime commerce. These earmarks have done little to reassure taxpayers of the federal government’s ability to make wise infrastructure investment decisions. Even when their money isn’t being diverted to earmarked projects or unrelated programs, many taxpayers have become jaded by a federal regulatory process that takes years to make basic decisions about whether new projects can proceed. Worse, that inefficient regulatory process also adds tremendous costs in delays and new paperwork requirements. The review process has become so out of control that the average highway project, for example, now takes 13 years to go from concept to completion. Some water and flood protection projects can take up to 20 years to complete, meanwhile, primarily because of the substantial regulatory burdens and the slow pace of funding.

#### Perception of prior failures and lack of performance measures ensure mass voter backlash

James Corless (Campaign Director, Transportation for America) 10/28/2010 http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2010/10/obama-infrastructure-a-top-pri.php?comments=expandall#comments

According to polls, many voters this year are angry and lack confidence in how Washington is spending our money. As Skinner and Mineta point out, we have been forced to bail out our nation’s Highway Trust Fund for several years because our revenue stream hasn’t aligned with infrastructure needs. We have also continued to spend federal transportation dollars without any performance measures or accountability. Both must be addressed and would be if we follow through on the recommendations of Skinner and Mineta, as well as President Obama’s blueprint.

### A2 voters want spending

#### Best studies conclude voters do ot support specific polices – will not like the spending

Hemingway, 12 (Mark, Editor @ Weekly Standard, 2/27, lexis)

This may come as a shock to many pollsters and much of the press corps, but public opinion is a little more complicated than randomly calling 1,000 Americans, asking them a dubiously worded question about a complex political issue, and reporting the aggregate results.Fortunately, at least one prominent assayer of public opinion has taken a good look at this state of affairs and is screaming, Pollster, heal thyself! Scott Rasmussen looks at America's dire fiscal predicament through the lens of polling, and does so based on a simple, neglected insight: Polling voters about broad political sentiments is very different from polling them about specific policy solutions. Sure, voters say they're in favor of more spending on transportation infrastructure; but ask them whether taxpayers should continue, say, subsidizing Amtrak and a large majority is opposed.In The People's Money, Rasmussen takes a look at survey data on competing solutions to our fiscal crisis. With respect to Medicare, for example, he kicks the tires on various proposals: shoring up the trust fund, raising the payroll tax, allowing the purchase of health insurance across state lines. In the end, Rasmussen finds that, contra Obamacare, voters' preferred Medicare solutions have certain commonalities: They embrace the idea of competition: competition among states and competition among insurance companies. And the solution is to shift power away from politicians and bureaucrats so that individuals can have more control over their own lives.Rasmussen repeats this exercise, addressing the full complement of problems Washington has thrust upon us, from the tax code to defense spending. And he handles the policy details in a way that can be clearly comprehended by citizens newly recruited to the budget wars while still leaving grizzled policy nerds plenty to chew on. While details may vary, Rasmussen finds that, regardless of the issue, voters pretty consistently come down on the side of less spending and less government.While this approach is novel and informative, it does have its limitations. Obviously, there are reasons why a constitutional republic is preferable to assessing voter sentiment on every law that comes down from Capitol Hill. And Rasmussen generally does a good job of walking the fine line between explaining the bigger polling picture and relying on mobocracy for guidance. Still, at times, the approach feels a little misguided especially in the chapter on the defense budget. Understanding that voters want fewer American soldiers deployed overseas is worth considering. But if the consequences aren't made clear, what does such a wish really amount to?If The People's Money demonstrates that voters want to rein in spending and expand their personal freedom, why isn't that happening? Because the public doesn't always get its way. Indeed, a National Journal survey of political insiders indicates 59 percent believe the people don't know enough about the issues facing Washington to form wise opinions about what should be done. And those insiders have clout.Rasmussen doesn't remain neutral in the debate between the people and the political class: He flatly states that voters are the solution, not the problem, and declares he's with the 73 percent of American voters who trust the American people more than America's political leaders. He observes that the reason preferred small-government solutions aren't being enacted is that they cut the political class out of the lucrative loop they've created for themselves. The willingness of voters to tackle the big issues means that the only thing standing in the way of solving the budget crisis is a Political Class committed to defending the status quo, writes Rasmussen. Will voters take on the political class? They're more likely to if they read this book

### Link o/w turn – spending largest convern

#### Fiscal policy o/w concern with transportation

Pew (Pew Research Center) Janurary 20 2011 http://www.people-press.org/2011/01/20/about-the-surveys/

Reducing the budget deficit, or national debt, rated as a top policy priority during the 1990s, declined in importance in the early part of this decade, and has made a comeback in recent years. In January 2002, four months after the 9/11 attacks, just 35% said that reducing the budget deficit should be a top policy priority for President Bush and Congress. By the beginning of Bush’s second term, in January 2005, 56% said that reducing the budget deficit should be a top priority. In January 2009, shortly before Obama took office, 53% rated the deficit as a top priority. That increased to 60% last year and 64% in the new survey. Currently, about as many rate the deficit as a top priority as did so in December 1994 (65%), at the end of Bill Clinton’s second year in office. Deficit an Out-of-Power Concern? Typically, members of the party that does not hold the White House view reducing the deficit as a more important priority than do members of the president’s party. This pattern was particularly evident during the Bush administration. From 2002 to 2008, substantially more Democrats than Republicans rated reducing the budget deficit as a top priority. On several occasions during the Clinton administration, more Republicans than Democrats said that reducing the deficit – or paying off the national debt — was a top priority. In the new survey, 68% of Republicans and 61% of Democrats see reducing the budget deficit as a top policy priority (this difference is not statistically significant). While deficit reduction ranks fifth among Republicans, it is the 9th-ranking priority for Democrats. Crime Declines as Public Priority With declining crime rates, the proportion saying that reducing crime should be a top national priority has fallen dramatically. The percentage rating crime as a major priority fell nearly 30 points – from 76% to 47%– between 2001 and 2003. But these percentages subsequently increased – to 53% in 2004 and 2005, and 62% in 2006 and 2007. Since January 2007, the proportion saying that crime should be a top priority for the president and Congress has fallen by 18 points to 44%. Compared with a decade ago, there has been an across-the-board decline in the percentage viewing crime as a major priority. However, as was the case in 2001, poor people and less-educated people are far more likely to rate crime as a top policy priority than are better educated and more affluent people. More than half of those with no more than a high school education (58%) and those with family incomes of less than $30,000 (54%) say that reducing crime should be a top priority. That compares with just 27% of college graduates and an identical percentage of those with family incomes of $75,000 or more. Notably, these gaps were about as wide in 2001, when overall concern over crime was much greater. Persistent Partisan Differences over Priorities Roughly four-in-ten Democrats (41%) say that dealing with global warming should be a top priority for the president and Congress, compared with 29% of independents and just 10% of Republicans. The wide partisan gap over the importance of dealing with global warming is not new – it was approximately as large in 2010 and 2009. Democrats also are far more likely to view reducing health care costs (28-point partisan gap), dealing with the problems of the poor (26 points), protecting the environment (24 points), and improving the educational system (23 points) as top priorities than are Republicans. These differences also are in line with previous policy priority surveys. Improving the nation’s roads, bridges, and transportation does not rank as a particularly high priority for Democrats, Republicans or independents. Still, Democrats are more likely to see this as important (41% top priority vs. 30% of independents, 26% of Republicans. This is the case for dealing with obesity as well.

# Obama Good – CTBT

### 2nc impact overview

#### Obama’s re-election is key to US passage of CTBT and US passage will get other hold outs on board – that’s Schneidmiller

#### And, the CTBT critical to stop a new wave proliferation that sparks a global nuclear war and prevents North Korean war– that’s Davis

#### Prolif casuses EXTINCTION

Stuart Taylor Jr., journalist, LEGAL TIMES, September 16, 2002, LN.

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

#### North Korean war results in extinction

**Africa News**, 10/25/**1999**, p. lexis

Lusaka - 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. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or build-up in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an **apocalypse on earth**. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.

#### Test ban stops development of space weapons

Morris McCain 1989 Understanding Arms Control: The options, p. 203

Some aspects of space-based ballastic missiles defense might also fall victim to a ban on nuclear test. X-ray lasers, currently being developed by Washington for possible use against ballistic missiles, depend upon small nuclear explosions as their energy source. Under a comprehensive test ban treaty we might lose our chance to dicover how this technology works. That, of course, is just what CTBT advocates suggest. They see the next round of the arms race, with its enhanced counterforce weapons ans ballistic missile defrense, as the most destabilizing yet, and they look to a ban on nuclear explosions to stop it in its tracks.

#### space weaponization ensures the most destructive accidental and intentional wars ever seen

Gordon R. Mitchell, Assistant Professor, Communication Studies, University of Pittsburgh, with Kevin J. Ayotte & David Cram Helwich, teaching fellows, “Missile Defence: Transatlantic Diplomacy at a Crossroads,” ISIS BRIEFING PAPER ON BALLISTIC MISSILE DEFENSE n. 6, July 2001,

A buildup of space weapons might begin with noble intentions of 'peace through strength' deterrence, but this rationale glosses over the tendency that '… the presence of space weapons…will result in the increased likelihood of their use'.33 This drift toward usage is strengthened by a strategic fact elucidated by Frank Barnaby: when it comes to arming the heavens, 'anti-ballistic missiles and antisatellite warfare technologies go hand-in-hand'.34 The interlocking nature of offense and defense in military space technology stems from the inherent 'dual capability' of spaceborne weapon components. As Marc Vidricaire, Delegation of Canada to the UN Conference on Disarmament, explains: 'If you want to intercept something in space, you could use the same capability to target something on land'. 35 To the extent that ballistic missile interceptors based in space can knock out enemy missiles in mid-flight, such interceptors can also be used as orbiting 'Death Stars', capable of sending munitions hurtling through the Earth's atmosphere. The dizzying speed of space warfare would introduce intense 'use or lose' pressure into strategic calculations, with the spectre of split-second attacks creating incentives to rig orbiting Death Stars with automated 'hair trigger' devices. In theory, this automation would enhance survivability of vulnerable space weapon platforms. However, by taking the decision to commit violence out of human hands and endowing computers with authority to make war, military planners could sow insidious seeds of accidental conflict. Yale sociologist Charles Perrow has analyzed 'complexly interactive, tightly coupled' industrial systems such as space weapons, which have many sophisticated components that all depend on each other's flawless performance. According to Perrow, this interlocking complexity makes it impossible to foresee all the different ways such systems could fail. As Perrow explains, '[t]he odd term "normal accident" is meant to signal that, given the system characteristics, multiple and unexpected interactions of failures are inevitable'.36 Deployment of space weapons with pre -delegated authority to fire death rays or unleash killer projectiles would likely make war itself inevitable, given the susceptibility of such systems to 'normal accidents'. It is chilling to contemplate the possible effects of a space war. According to retired Lt. Col. Robert M. Bowman, 'even a tiny projectile reentering from space strikes the earth with such high velocity that it can do enormous damage — even more than would be done by a nuclear weapon of the same size !'. 37 In the same Star Wars technology touted as a quintessential tool of peace, defence analyst David Langford sees one of the most destabilizing offensive weapons ever conceived: 'One imagines dead cities of microwave-grilled people'.38 Given this unique potential for destruction, it is not hard to imagine that any nation subjected to space weapon attack would retaliate with maximum force, including use of nuclear, biological, and/or chemical weapons. An accidental war sparked by a computer glitch in space could plunge the world into the most destructive military conflict ever seen.

### 1nc impact – K round – testing

#### CTBT critical to prevent the resumption of nuclear testing

Arms Control Association Feb 2011 http://www.projectforthectbt.org/basics

Nuclear weapons testing is a dangerous and unnecessary vestige of the last century that the United States rejected almost 20 years ago. Following the end of the Cold War and after 1,030 nuclear tests, the United States ended new warhead production and halted nuclear testing in 1992. In September 1996, the United States was the first nation to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which “prohibits any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion,” and establishes a global monitoring network and the option of short-notice, on-site inspections that improves capabilities to detect and deter cheating. Today, there is no military requirement for new nuclear weapons capabilities that might require the resumption of U.S. nuclear testing. The U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories do not need nuclear explosive testing to maintain the effectiveness of the existing U.S. nuclear arsenal. It is in U.S. national security interest to curb the spread of nuclear weapons, prevent nuclear weapons testing by others, and improve U.S. and international capabilities to detect, deter, and respond to possible cheating. Even though the United States has already assumed most CTBT-related responsibilities, it cannot reap the full security benefits of the CTBT until the Senate approves the Treaty by a two-thirds majority. President Barack Obama has declared his support for U.S. ratification of the CTBT as a key component of his broader international efforts to prevent the use and spread of nuclear weapons. A growing list of bipartisan leaders and security experts agree that by ratifying the CTBT, the U.S. stands to gain an important constraint on the ability of other states to build new and more deadly nuclear weapons that could pose a threat to American security. As the Senate revisits the CTBT for the first time in more than a decade, it needs to consider the following ways in which the case for the CTBT has become significantly stronger: [CTBT’s Increasing National Security Value](http://www.projectforthectbt.org/security) Global efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons are in jeopardy. The international legal framework built to stop the spread and use of nuclear weapons, held together by the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), is under stress. Now, unpredictable nations such as North Korea and Iran have active nuclear programs, and Pakistan has been leaking its nuclear weapons know-how. U.S. ratification of the CTBT is an essential first step to rebuilding international support for measures to prevent the use and spread of nuclear weapons. In 1995, the U.S. and the other nuclear powers promised to deliver on the CTBT in exchange for the indefinite extension of the NPT. Action on the CTBT would give the United States more leverage to win support for tougher nuclear safeguards and more effective responses to cases of noncompliance. A global verifiable ban on testing would constrain the ability of nuclear-armed states, such as China, to develop new and more deadly nuclear weapons. Without nuclear weapon test explosions, would-be nuclear-armed nations—like Iran—would not be able to proof test the more advanced, smaller nuclear warhead designs that could be used to arm ballistic missiles. [Proven Ability to Maintain the Arsenal](http://www.projectforthectbt.org/stockpile) Over the past decade, the success of the Stockpile Stewardship Program has demonstrated that the effectiveness of the U.S. nuclear arsenal can be maintained under a CTBT. Life Extension Programs (LEPs) have refurbished and recertified major warhead types without nuclear testing. Key plutonium parts in warheads have been shown to last 85-100 years, much longer than previously thought, and limited production capacity has been established to remanufacture new parts when needed, making new-design "replacement" warheads unnecessary. The United States has no need to resume nuclear testing. It already has the most advanced and deadly nuclear arsenal in the world. The United States has conducted 1,030 nuclear tests, more than all other nations combined, including Russia (715) and China (45). Given this advantage, it is clearly in U.S. national security interests to prevent other nations from testing nuclear weapons. [Proven Ability to Verify Compliance](http://www.projectforthectbt.org/verification) Today, no would-be cheater of the CTBT could confidently conduct an undetected nuclear explosion large enough to threaten U.S. security. The international verification system, together with U.S. national technical means of verification, will detect militarily significant tests. However, unless it ratifies the Treaty, the United States cannot take advantage of the international system’s full benefits, such as on-site inspections. Over the past decade, national and international test monitoring capabilities have significantly improved. At the end of 1999, only 25% of the CTBT’s 337 monitoring stations had been built. As of 2010, 90% of the planned global verification network is now in place or under construction. North Korea’s nuclear test explosions in 2006 and 2009 demonstrated that the CTBT verification system is working well and can detect very small explosions with high confidence. [The Importance of U.S. Leadership](http://www.projectforthectbt.org/entry) The CTBT has now been signed by 182 nations, including the U.S., Russia, China, Great Britain and France, and ratified by 151, including Russia, Japan, South Korea, Australia, and all of the United States’ NATO allies. The CTBT’s entry into force awaits ratification by nine states, including the United States, China, India, Indonesia, Israel, and Pakistan. U.S. ratification would spur other key nations, such as China, to ratify the Treaty and would reinforce the global taboo against nuclear testing. Without positive U.S. action on the CTBT, the risks of nuclear weapons proliferation and the resumption of testing will only grow.

#### testing risks billions of systemic deaths

Eduardo Gonclaves (Freelance Researcher and Journalist, Author of Broken Arrow) September 22 2001 Earth Island Journal

An estimated 1,900 nuclear tests conducted during the Cold War have released fallout equivalent to 40,000 Hiroshimas in every corner of the globe. Fission products from the Nevada Test Site can be detected in the ecosystems of countries as far apart as South Africa, Brazil and Malaysia. A 1957 US government study predicted that US nuclear tests had produced an extra 2,000 "genetically defective" babies in the US each year, and up to 35,000 every year around the globe. In 1900, cancer accounted for only 4 percent of US deaths. Now it is the second leading cause of premature mortality. Worldwide, the World Health Organisation (WHO) estimates the number of cancers will double in most countries over the next 25 years. Those who lived closest to the test sites -- such as the 100,000 people who were directly downwind of Nevada's fallout -- have seen their families decimated. In the Mormon community of St. George, Utah, 100 miles away from "Ground Zero" -- the spot where the bombs were detonated -- cancer used to be virtually unheard of among its population. Just a few years after the tests began, St George had a leukaemia rate 2.5 times the national average. The number of radiation deaths are said to have totaled 1,600 -- in a town with a population of just 5,000. When the leukemia cases suddenly began to appear, doctors had no idea what it was. Women who complained of radiation sickness symptoms were told they had "housewife syndrome." Many gave birth to terribly deformed children that became known as "the sacrifice babies." As President Eisenhower had said: "We can afford to sacrifice a few thousand people out there in defense of national security." Former army medic Van Brandon later revealed how his unit kept two sets of radiation readings for test fallout in the area, "One set was to show that no one received an [elevated] exposure" while "the other set of books showed the actual reading. That set was brought in a locked briefcase every morning." Continuous Fallout The world's population is still being subjected to the continuous fallout of the 170 megatons of long-lived nuclear fission products blasted into the atmosphere and returned daily to earth by wind and rain -- slowly poisoning our bodies via the air we breathe, the food we eat, and the water we drink. Scientists predict that millions will die in centuries to come from tests that happened in the 1950s and 1960s. More than 400 nuclear bomb factories and powerplants around the world make "routine discharges" of nuclear waste into the environment. Thousands of nuclear waste dumping grounds, many of them leaking, are contaminating soil and water. The production of America's nuclear weapons arsenal alone has produced 100 million cubic metres of long-lived radioactive waste. The notorious Hanford site in Washington state has secretly discharged more than 440 billion gallons of contaminated liquid into the surrounding area, contaminating 200 square miles of groundwater. Officials knew as early as the late 1940s that the nearby Columbia River was becoming seriously contaminated, yet they chose to keep the information secret. In Britain, there are 7,000 sites licensed to use nuclear materials, 1,000 of which are allowed to discharge wastes. Three of them are located near the River Thames -- despite opposition from government officials who objected that the six million inhabitants of London derived their drinking water from the Thames. Cancer clusters have been found around nuclear plants across the globe -- from France to Taiwan, Germany to Canada. A joint White House/US Department of Energy investigation recently found a high incidence of 22 different kinds of cancer at 14 different US nuclear weapons facilities around the country. A Greenpeace USA study of the toxicity of the Mississippi River showed that from 1968 to 1983 there were 66,000 radiation deaths in the counties lining its banks -- more than the number of Americans who died during the Vietnam war. Don't Blame Us Despite the growing catalog of tragedy, the nuclear establishment consistently claims that the everyday doses from nuclear plant discharges, bomb factories and transportation of radioactive materials are "insignificant." It is only very recently that clues have surfaced as to the massive destructive power of radiation in terms of human health. The accident at Chernobyl will kill an estimated half a million people worldwide from cancer, and perhaps more. Ninety percent of children in the neighboring former Soviet republic of Belarus are contaminated for life -- the poisoning of an entire country's gene pool. US physican and nuclear researcher Ernest Sternglass calculates that, at the height of nuclear testing, there were as many as 3 million fetal deaths, spontaneous abortions and stillbirths in the US alone. In addition, 375,000 babies died in their first year of life from radiation linked diseases. Using the official "radiation risk" estimates published in 1991 by the International Commission on Radiological Protection and 1993 radiation exposure data calculated by the UN Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation, researcher Rosalie Bertell (author of the classic book No Immediate Danger) has come up with a terrifying tally: \* 358 million cancers from nuclear bomb production and testing. \* 9.7 million cancers from bomb and plant accidents. \* 6.6 million cancers from the "routine discharges" of nuclear power plants. \* As many as 175 million of these cancers could be fatal. Added to this number are no fewer than 235 million genetically damaged and diseased people and a staggering 588 million children born with a range of teratogenic effects, including brain damage, mental disabilities, spina bifida, genital deformities and childhood cancers. Bertell argues that we should consider these nonfatal cancers and debilitating damages when accounting for insurance and liability purposes. This would include the 500 million babies lost as still-births because they were exposed to radiation while still in the womb. They currently are not counted as "official" radiation victims. The holocaust that peace campaigners warned of if war broke out between the old superpowers has already happened -- and with barely a shot being fired. Its toll is greater than that of all the wars in history, yet no one is counted as among the war dead. Rosalie Bertell argues that we need to learn a new language to express a terrifying possibility: "The concept of species annihilation means a relatively swift, deliberately induced end to history, culture, science, biological reproduction and memory. It is the ultimate human rejection of the gift of life, an act which requires a new word to describe it: omnicide."

### 2nc Impact Calc – K round

#### Disad outweighs the case ---

#### A) Magnitude --- testing kills billions via radiation and cancer --- it’s a form of omnicide that risks planetary destruction and extinction --- that’s Gonclaves

#### B) Probability --- attempts to ‘outweigh’ systemic nuclear testing are a discursive strategy to mask ongoing structural violence and culminates in extermination

Masahide Kato (Political Science – U Hawaii) 1993 Alternatives, 18, p. 347-9

The vigorous invasion of the logic of capitalist accumulation into the last vestige of relatively autonomous space in the periphery under late capitalism is propelled not only by the desire for incorporating every fabric of the society into the division of labor but also by the desire for “pure” destruction/extermination of the periphery.26 The penetration of capital into the social fabric and the destruction of nature and preexisting social organizations by capital are not separable. However, what we have witnessed in the phase of late capitalism is a rapid intensification of the destruction and extermination of the periphery. In this context, capital is no longer interested in incorporating some parts of the periphery into the international division of labor. The emergence of such “pure” destruction/extermination of the periphery can be explained at least partially by another problematic of late capitalism formulated by Ernest Mandel: the mass production of the means of destruction.27 Particularly, the latest phase of capitalism distinguishes itself from the earlier phases in its production of the “ultimate” means of destruction extermination, i.e., nuclear weapons. Let us recall our earlier discussion about the critical historical conjuncture where the notion of “strategy” changed its nature and became deregulated/dispersed beyond the boundaries set by the interimperial rivalry. Herein, the perception of the ultimate means of destruction can be historically contextualized, The only instances of real nuclear catastrophe perceived and thus given due recognition by the First World community are the explosions at Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which occurred at this conjuncture. Beyond this historical threshold, whose meaning is relevant only to the inter-imperial rivalry, the nuclear catastrophe is confined to the realm of fantasy, for instance, apocalyptic imagery. And yet how can one deny the crude fact that nuclear war has been taking place on this earth in the name of “nuclear testing” since the first nuclear explosion at Alamogordo in 1945? As of 1991, 1,924 nuclear explosions have occurred on earth.28 The major perpetrators of nuclear warfare are the United States (936 times), the former Soviet Union (715 times), France (192 times), the United Kingdom (44 times), and China (36 times).2 The primary targets of warfare (“test site” to use Nuke Speak terminology) have been invariably the sovereign nations of Fourth World and Indigenous Peoples. Thus history has already witnessed the nuclear wars against the Marshall Islands (66 times), French Polynesia (175 times), Australian Aborigines (9 times), Newe Sogobia (the Western Shoshone Nation) (814 times), the Christmas Islands (24 times), Hawaii (Kalama Island, also known as Johnston Island) (12 times), the Republic of Kazakhstan (467 times), and Uighur (Xinjian Province, China) (36 times).3° Moreover, although I focus primarily on “nuclear tests” in this article, if we are to expand the notion of nuclear warfare to include any kind of violence accrued from the nuclear fuel cycle (particularly uranium mining and disposition of nuclear wastes), we must enlist Japan and the European nations as perpetrators and add the Navaho, Havasupai and other Indigenous Nations to the list of targets. Viewed as a whole, nuclear war, albeit undeclared, has been waged against the Fourth World, and Indigenous Nations. The dismal consequences of “intensive exploitation, “low intensity intervention,” or the “nullification of the sovereignty” in the Third World produced by the First World have taken a form of nuclear extermination in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations. Thus, from the perspectives of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations, the nuclear catastrophe has never been the “unthinkable” single catastrophe but the real catastrophe of repetitive and ongoing nuclear explosions and exposure to radioactivity Nevertheless, ongoing nuclear wars have been subordinated to the imaginary grand catastrophe by rendering them as mere preludes to the apocalypse. As a consequence, the history and ongoing processes of nuclear explosions as war have been totally wiped out from the history and consciousness of the First World community. Such a discursive strategy that aims to mask the “real” of nuclear warfare in the domain of imagery of nuclear catastrophe can be observed even in Stewart Firth’s Nuclear Playground, which extensively covers the history of “nuclear testing” in the Pacific: Nuclear explosions in the atmosphere ... were global in effect. The winds and seas carried radioactive contamination over vast areas of the fragile ecosphere on which we all depend for our survival and which we call the earth. In preparing for war, we were poisoning our planet and going into battle against nature itself.3’ Although Firth’s book is definitely a remarkable study of the history of “nuclear testing” in the Pacific, the problematic division/distinction between the “nuclear explosions” and the nuclear war is kept intact. The imagery of final nuclear war narrated with the problematic use of the subject (“we”) is located higher than the “real” of nuclear warfare in terms of discursive value. This ideological division/hierarchizatjon is the very vehicle through which the history and the ongoing processes of the destruction of the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations by means of nuclear violence are obliterated and hence legitimatized. The discursive containment/obliteration of the “real” of nuclear warfare has been accomplished, ironic as it may sound, by nuclear criticism. Nuclear criticism, with its firm commitment to global discourse, has established the unshakable authority of the imagery of nuclear catastrophe over the real nuclear catastrophe happening in the Fourth World and Indigenous Nations almost on a daily basis.

### Obama key CTBT

#### Second term key to the CTBT

Mathew 10 (Thomas, Deputy Director General at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, 2010, “In Search of Congruence: Perspectives on India-US Relations under the Obama Administration” Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi)

This commitment to pursue nuclear non-proliferation was not mere election rhetoric. After becoming the President, Obama has evidently pursued his goal with added vigour. He is now more forcefully pursuing his commitments and the appointment of two key arms control officials reveal the vigour with which he could pursue this goal. Both these appointees have a record of a deep anti-India bias. The first such appointment was that of Robert Einhorn, a known critic of India, with 29 years of government experience, as Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s special adviser for non-proliferation and arms control. Einhorn has been one of the harshest critics of the India-US nuclear deal and the Bush administration’s policies that facilitated such cooperation. The appointment of Ellen Tauscher, an influential former Democratic Congresswoman of 13 years and Chairperson of the powerful House Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, as the new Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security, is also a cause for concern. A known critic of the India-US nuclear agreement, she had described it as a “very, very bad deal”,53 and cannot be expected to pursue any policy that could see through the implementation of the agreement in the spirit it has been approved. Together, these two officials could be the President’s gendarme in his “major diplomatic initiative” to get the detractors of NPT to sign the treaty, ensure CTBT’s entry into force and give life to FMCT. It could become more intense if Obama wins a second term in office, as US presidents in the past have vigorously pushed their favoured agenda once re-elected, in their effort to carve for themselves a place in history.

#### Obama key to ratification

The Indian Express (The writer is a Congress MP from Dausa, Rajasthan) 11/6/2008 “has to re-establish the goodwill the united states has lost”

For a nation that gave its black population the right to vote just 44 years ago and for a nation that found it hard to digest the civil rights movement, to overwhelmingly elect a leader who is half black, has the middle name of "Hussein", and just one term as a senator, is to my mind a turning point in US politics and perhaps its future. President Bush's approval ratings are the lowest for any president at the end of his term, so President-elect Obama will have very high expectations to meet. Obama's surfacing on the national scene and his campaign has been a fairytale story of sorts. The tougher battle has no doubt been to win the nomination in the Democratic primaries. To have been able to take on the might of the Clinton electoral machinery itself was a sign that Barack Obama had it in him to go all the way. Now that history is made, the world's attention will be on the first few steps he will take once he formally takes the oath of office in January 2009. Obama has got resounding support from the Indian community in the US, both in raising election funds and getting votes. While not too much has been said by him about India specifically but he has repeatedly said that he will continue to support better relations with India. With eight years of Clinton and eight years of Bush as president, in spite of both presidencies being remarkably different, the one issue that remained unchanged and perhaps only got strengthened was the Indo-US relationship. India's relations with the US are at a point that it does not make too much of a difference whether the Republicans or Democrats occupy the White House. Close to 3 million Indians living in the US and becoming increasingly crucial to the economy and US politics, huge investments of Indian companies in the US and visa versa, cooperation in so many new areas and trade reaching record levels will ensure that with every election and every change of regime, the broad bilateral polices do not undergo paradigm shifts. Many of the challenges that the world faces and indeed, both India and the US face, are the same. Therefore, the new president has to embark on reestablishing some of the goodwill that the US has lost because of its polices, whether it's the Iraq war or lack of positive developments in the Middle East or resistance in global efforts to combat climate change. The financial crisis and the economic meltdown starting in the west is already knocking at our doors here in India, it will take innovative thinking and partnering by Obama and his administration along with bold steps to steer out of the economic downturn. Obama had made "change" the theme of his election campaign and that is exactly what the people expect from him. Barack Obama knows very well that these are tough times and he will have to start delivering almost immediately on all fronts. In the Indian context, he had made statements on some issues but it will be interesting to see what line he will stick to, once in office. Issues such as business processes outsourcing, Kashmir, policy on Pakistan and Afghanistan, non-proliferation, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and climate change will have direct implications on us in India. The new administration will have to deal with a changed economic world where US's role will be crucial. And after a long fought campaign, 21 months of continual promising and bitter divisions, it will take all of Obama's charm and political capital to bring people and stakeholders together to be able to ride over this storm. While breaking away from the past and promising to usher a new beginning, Barack Obama never made the mistake of making this election a referendum on race, ethnicity, religion or personality. By keeping the focus on real issues he not only won the votes of the American people but also been able to capture the imagination of a whole new generation of young people. History has been made. The glass ceiling broken. The American dream can be a reality. This has been a showcase election for the Americans to be able to reassert their faith in their values and democratic strengths. And the world hails them for what they have achieved.

#### Obama will pass CTBT if reelected --- new NRC report provides momentum

**Pifer**, 3/30/**2012** (Steven – senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe at the Brookings Institution, New Support for the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, p. http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2012/0330\_nuclear\_pifer.aspx)

In 1996, the United States became the first country to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), which would ban all nuclear explosions. The Senate, however, failed to ratify the treaty in 1999. If President Obama is reelected, he may ask the Senate to consider it again. On March 30, the National Research Council released a study that bolsters the case for ratification. Two concerns underlay the Senate vote not to ratify the treaty in 1999: the reliability of the U.S. nuclear deterrent absent testing, and the U.S. ability to verify that other states observed the test ban. The National Research Council report addresses both issues. Ellen Williams, who chaired the committee that prepared the report, stated that the United States “has technical capabilities to maintain safe, reliable nuclear weapons into the foreseeable future without the need for underground weapons testing.” This results from the Stockpile Stewardship Program, which was launched in the 1990s to maintain the deterrent without testing. That program has produced significant knowledge about the reliability, sustainability and operation of U.S. nuclear weapons, including yielding information that U.S. scientists never discovered in 47 years of tests. For example, we now know that the nuclear “pits”—the plutonium packages that are the heart of modern U.S. nuclear weapons—can last 85-100 years, far longer than originally believed. The National Research Council study also notes that the techniques for monitoring a comprehensive test ban have improved dramatically over the past decade and can reliably detect nuclear explosions with yields well below one kiloton—the equivalent of one thousand tons of TNT—and in some cases much smaller. In addition to U.S. national means, the Preparatory Commission for the CTBT Organization has brought on line more than 80 percent of its planned international monitoring system, which will ultimately consist of 337 facilities worldwide. When the North Koreans tested a small nuclear device in 2006, 61 international monitoring stations reported the event. The report adds that, while there may be ways to “hide” a very small nuclear test, such test scenarios involve serious costs and practical difficulties, might nevertheless be detected, and would not require that the United States resume nuclear testing.

#### Obama will push CTBT after the election --- prevents a South Asian arms race

**Reif**, 4/9/**2012** (Kingston – director of nuclear nonproliferation at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, The Case for the CTBT: Stronger Than Ever, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, p. <http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/columnists/kingston-reif/the-case-the-ctbt-stronger-ever>)

As of March 2012, 157 countries have ratified the CTBT. However, the treaty will not enter into force until 44 states that have been deemed "nuclear capable" have also ratified it -- including China, Egypt, India, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Pakistan, and the United States. But a move forward by the United States would establish the leadership needed to bring other countries along. If nothing else, China has indicated that it will ratify if the United States does. This would further strengthen the global norm against nuclear testing and encourage other holdouts, such as India and Pakistan, to ratify, reducing the possibility of a dangerous arms race in South Asia. After the longer-than-anticipated effort to win Senate approval of New START, the administration postponed plans to seek a vote on the CTBT in its first term. Instead, the White House has begun a cautious campaign to engage with the Senate on the treaty in preparation for a possible Senate vote in Obama's second term (should he win reelection). A critical piece of this outreach has been to encourage senators to carefully examine the remarkable improvements in America's ability to maintain the arsenal (via the stockpile-stewardship program) and to detect nuclear testing. In order to assist senators, the administration commissioned both the NAS report and a classified National Intelligence Estimate on the US ability to verify compliance with the treaty.

###  A2 GOP vote no

#### New sensors and SSP program will get GOP votes on board

Global Security Newswire 3/17 “Obama Could Launch CTBT Ratification Push in March”, http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\_20110307\_2210.php

The Obama administration is set to submit a new intelligence analysis to the U.S. Senate in March as part of an anticipated push to win congressional approval of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, Kyodo News reported on Sunday (see [GSN](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20110302_2869.php%22%20%5Ct%20%22blank), March 2). Following circulation of the new National Intelligence Estimate, which outlines data said to support the case for ratification, the National Academies of Science is expected this spring to release a separate assessment in support of the pact's ratification, according to a high-level U.S. government source and an expert with administration ties. The administration intends "to move forward starting in March or so to begin providing background information about CTBT to the Senate, all in preparation for initiating a new debate with the intention of getting U.S. ratification," the expert said. In making its argument for the pact's approval, the administration would refer to recent additions to the global array of sensors and laboratories intended for detecting underground test blasts, as well as strides in U.S. capabilities for evaluating the reliability of nuclear weapons without the use of test detonations, the insiders said. "My impression is that these are sincere plans, but of course unexpected political events can quickly change matters," the expert said. In the current Congress, no fewer than 14 Republican senators must endorse the treaty for the pact to gain the 67 votes required for ratification. The GOP-led Senate rejected the pact in 1999. "A key question that will emerge this summer is whether there is time to prepare for a vote before the 2012 presidential and congressional elections begin to get in the way," the expert said. Senator Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) and a number of other legislators critical of the administration are slated to retire in the near future, providing President Obama a potential incentive to hold off for two years on a CTBT ratification campaign, Union of Concerned Scientists senior analyst Gregory Kulacki said. Still, the treaty might enjoy increased GOP support in light of recent advancements to the International Monitoring System for nuclear test blasts, said the U.S. official. The nation's international reputation could suffer if it ended the moratorium on nuclear test detonations declared in 1992 by then-President Bush, the official added. The treaty's ratification prospects could also benefit from advances in the Stockpile Stewardship Program, the U.S. scientific program for maintaining the safety and reliability of the arsenal without testing, the official and expert said.

### A2 others not ratify

#### US ratification key to others signing-

The Salt Lake Tribune 3/7 “U.S. should ratify Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty”

U.S. ratification would provide great momentum for the treaty. Failure of the United States to ratify the treaty thus far has undermined the moral and political authority of diplomatic efforts to persuade other holdouts to sign. Such failure of leadership has diminished our reputation worldwide and is inducing other nations to build their own nuclear arsenals. We don't need nuclear explosions to assure nuclear stockpile reliability. Under the Stockpile Stewardship Program, a combination of testing with dummy warheads, replacement of aging components and computer modeling gives us very high confidence in their effectiveness. To be effective a test ban requires monitoring. Monitoring is already in effect, even though the treaty itself is not yet in force. The Preparatory Commission of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization has taken this initiative. An international monitoring system is currently operational. Today there are 337 monitoring stations worldwide. It is now virtually impossible for anyone to conduct a clandestine test. Real-time information from the monitoring stations is available to signatories to the treaty who can call for investigation of suspicious events, including on-site inspections. Ratification of the CTBT is a crucial, although not final, step toward nonproliferation. A reduction in nuclear arsenals is also required. Progress on this issue has been achieved with the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I, but START I will expire in December 2009, and START II was canceled. Renegotiation of START II is another key step toward nonproliferation. Ratification of the CTBT would support this effort. So, too, will strengthening the cooperative threat reduction program, which is designed to secure "loose nukes," making them less likely to fall into the wrong hands. Ratification of the CTBT would not require swift change in U.S. policy. The United States has maintained a moratorium on nuclear tests since 1992. One might question the importance of the CTBT in light of the moratorium. Recent justification by the United States of pre-emptive, even preventative military strikes (in the case of Iraq) has undermined trust in this temporary moratorium. Ratification of the CTBT would be a powerful, game-changing signal of U.S. movement toward elimination of the global nuclear threat, a priority mentioned in President Barack Obama's inaugural address on Jan. 20.

#### Now is key time- the world will follow Obama’s lead

William J. Perry (Former U.S. Secretary of Defense) 2/24 “Time to Push Reset Button on Dealings with North Korea”, http://www.dailynk.com/english/read.php?cataId=nk00100&num=4622

According to Dr. Perry, the newly-inaugurated Obama administration is faced with the daunting security challenge of preventing a nuclear catastrophe at the hands of terrorists—a problem that can only be dealt with multilaterally. The problem of proliferation is “a global problem that requires a global solution.” Specifically, Dr. Perry offered two suggestions to the Obama administration: “The first is to awaken the world to the dangers of nuclear weapons by using the bully pulpit of the presidency. The entire world is listening to President Obama now, so there cannot be a better time to rally international support.” Second, Perry suggested three steps President Obama should take within his first year to reduce the long-term threat of nuclear proliferation globally: ratifying the comprehensive test-ban treaty, negotiating a new treaty on arms reduction, and supporting the International Atomic Energy Agency’s proposals for the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

#### CTBT is key to non-prolif but has not entered into force—blocked by lack of u.s. ratification

Daryl G. Kimball, President, Arms Control Association, “Revive the Test Ban Treaty,” ARMS CONTROL TODAY, 9—06, <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2006_09/focus>

Ten years ago this month, UN member states overwhelmingly endorsed and later opened for signature the longest-sought, hardest-fought nuclear arms control treaty: the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Today, despite widespread support for the CTBT and a de facto global nuclear-test moratorium, the treaty still has not entered into force. The CTBT is a simple treaty with profound value to the struggle against proliferation. By verifiably prohibiting “any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion,” the treaty would simultaneously help constrain the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons, curb proliferation, advance disarmament, and delegitimize nuclear weapons. Moving forward on the CTBT is an essential step toward restoring confidence in the beleaguered nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) regime. The nuclear-weapon states’ commitment to achieve the CTBT was a crucial part of the bargain that won the indefinite extension of the NPT in 1995. A decade later, it is feared that North Korea may conduct a nuclear test explosion to demonstrate its suspected weapons capability. Iran is threatening to leave the NPT and may be able to produce bomb-grade material within a few years. The existing nuclear-weapon states, including China, India, and Pakistan, could use another round of testing to perfect new and more dangerous nuclear-weapon capabilities. Indeed, support for the treaty has steadily grown, as 176 states have signed the CTBT and 135 have ratified it. But the U.S. Senate’s highly partisan 1999 rejection of the CTBT, the ideologically driven opposition of the Bush administration, and the reluctance of nine other CTBT “rogue states” have delayed its formal entry into force and left the door open to renewed nuclear testing. The current U.S. policy is most problematic and perplexing. Since 2001, the Bush administration has said it will not seek Senate reconsideration and approval for ratification. Senior officials say the CTBT is neither verifiable nor compatible with maintaining the existing U.S. stockpile.

#### Need more ratifications for entry into force, u.s. is key

Daryl G. Kimball, President, Arms Control Association, “Revive the Test Ban Treaty,” ARMS CONTROL TODAY, 9—06, <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2006_09/focus>

The United States is not the only guilty party. China, which signed the treaty in 1996, has said for more than three years that “all necessary work is underway in a serious and orderly fashion” to ratify. Beijing owes the world a detailed explanation for its continued delay. Some prominent non-nuclear-weapon states whose ratification is needed for CTBT entry into force, including Columbia, Egypt, and Indonesia, have not ratified and should do so without delay. Action by these states, along with the United States, could help cure India’s CTBT allergy and lead New Delhi as well as Islamabad to enter into a legally binding test moratorium. Overcoming the reluctance of the few also requires a stronger effort from the many friends of the CTBT. Unfortunately, top leaders of states committed to the CTBT, including Australia, France, Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom, often fail to press their counterparts in the CTBT holdout states when they have the opportunity. CTBT entry into force is within reach. But because of the inaction of a few states, the viability of a verifiable, comprehensive ban on nuclear tests and the future of the NPT itself is in jeopardy. With the 2008 U.S. election approaching, it is vital that CTBT supporters put the treaty back on the U.S. political map and move to secure ratification by other key states before it is too late.

#### Lack of u.s. action keeps treaty from entering into force

Daryl G. Kimball, Executive Director, Arms Control Association, “Prospects for U.S. Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 6—10—08, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Kimball_CTBTJune2008.pdf>

After decades of unsuccessful U.S. and Soviet negotiations to ban nuclear test explosions, multilateral negotiations on a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) succeeded in producing an agreed text in August 1996. On September 24, 1996, the treaty was opened for signature at the United Nations in New York. Today, leaders from 177 countries, including the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China, have signed the CTBT, which prohibits all nuclear test explosions in all environments. Unfortunately, the U.S. Senate’s brief and highly-partisan rejection of the CTBT in October 1999, coupled with the George W. Bush administration’s opposition to the Treaty, have delayed ratification by the United States and several of the other nine states that must ratify before the treaty formally enters into force. Consequently, nearly a dozen years after the CTBT was opened for signature, the goal of CTBT entry into force remains unfulfilled, and U.S. test ban policy remains in an unhelpful state of limbo.

### A2 cheating

#### CTBT good on balance, even if cheating occurs

CBW News, staff, “Panel: Rejecting Nuke Ban a Mistake,” July 31, 2002, [www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/07/31/tech/printable517031](http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2002/07/31/tech/printable517031)

A nuclear test-ban treaty rejected by the Senate in 1999 would have enhanced U.S. national security, even if some countries tried to cheat, a National Academy of Sciences panel concluded in a report released Wednesday. The report rejected the main criticisms of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: That the United States needs to have periodic tests to maintain its nuclear arsenal and that the treaty would do nothing to curb the nuclear ambitions of rogue states like Iraq, Iran and North Korea. "The worst-case scenario under a no-CTBT regime poses far bigger threats to U.S. security -- sophisticated nuclear weapons in the hands of many more adversaries -- than the worst-case scenario of clandestine testing in a CTBT regime," the report said. The United States does not need to perform nuclear explosion tests to safely and reliably maintain its nuclear arsenal, the report concluded. And international monitoring systems are so sophisticated that it would be very difficult for countries to perform such tests without having them detected. The 51 Republican senators who voted against the treaty three years ago argued that ratifying it would have threatened national security by closing off U.S. options to test. President Bush, who opposed the treaty, has pledged to continue long-standing U.S. policy not to conduct nuclear tests.

#### Empirical record proves that ctbt monitoring is effective

Damien J. LaVera, author and formerly of the Office to the Special Advisor to the President and Secretary of sTate for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Office, “The U.S. Senate Vote on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,” ARMS CONTROL TODAY, October 2004, <http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2004_10/LookingBack_CTBT.asp>

Prior to the vote, CTBT opponents argued that the treaty would not be verifiable, that the long-term safety and reliability of our nuclear stockpile could not be ensured without nuclear testing, and that the treaty would be of limited nonproliferation value.[1] Perhaps the most important question was whether the CTBT’s verification and monitoring regime would be capable of deterring and detecting clandestine tests. Opponents argued that this would not be possible because a zero-yield test ban is inherently unverifiable. As Sandia National Laboratory Director Paul Robinson said, “[I]t is very unlikely that the threshold for detection and yield measurement in most parts of the world will ever reach the level to identify these yields as nuclear tests, and hence as violations to the U.S. understanding of the treaty’s central obligation.”[2] Five years later, however, the evidence suggests that the treaty’s verification and compliance regime is up to the task. Take, for instance, the August 2000 explosions that sunk the Russian submarine, the Kursk, in the Baltic Sea. Seismic monitoring stations clearly identified two explosions: one small precursor explosion, followed by a much larger blast 135 seconds later. The second explosion, estimated to be 250 times more powerful than the first, was determined to be equivalent to five tons of TNT.[3] By comparison, the smallest yield for a U.S. nuclear test was the July 1962 test of a shoulder-fired tactical nuclear weapon with a yield of 18 tons,[4] while the smallest of India’s 1998 nuclear tests was claimed to have a yield of 0.2 kilotons, 40 times stronger than the Kursk explosion.[5] The treaty’s monitoring system has also been helpful in evaluating two high-profile explosions in North Korea: the April 2004 railcar explosion and last month’s explosion in the North Korean mountains. The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO) reportedly used data collected by the International Monitoring System (IMS) to correct inaccuracies in North Korean statements about the railcar explosion,[6] while reports indicate that IMS monitoring data helped determine that last month’s explosion was not a nuclear test.[7] These examples demonstrate that IMS detection and monitoring capabilities are highly accurate, are already proving their value to the international community, and will only grow more effective and important as the system is completed. They also confirm the conclusions of a July 2002 National Academy of Sciences (NAS) review of the technical issues involved with the CTBT, which determined that “underground explosions can be reliably detected and can be identified as explosions, using IMS data, down to a yield of 0.1 [kiloton] (100 tons) in hard rock if conducted anywhere in Europe, Asia, North Africa, and North America. In some locations of interest…this capability extends down to 0.01 [kiloton] (10 tons) or less.”[8] Add to this impressive capability the data collected not just by the IMS but also through national technical means and other systems deployed for reasons other than treaty compliance, along with the treaty’s onsite inspection provisions, and would-be cheaters face a virtually impenetrable gauntlet of verification measures. Although CTBT supporters recognized the effectiveness of this system during the 1999 debate, no one could have predicted the seismic shift in the U.S. policy toward arms control verification following the vote. Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) correctly said that effective verification and enforcement provisions are “minimally necessary for sensible treaties.”[9] In the last four years, however, the Senate has ratified the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, which contained no special verification measures, and the administration has decided against pursuing verification and enforcement provisions in proposed fissile material cutoff treaty negotiations. What impact, if any, this will have on the CTBT is still not clear.

#### US adversaries will not be able to improve their warheads using sub-critical tests

Jonathan Medalia, Specialist in National Defense, Foreign Affairs, Defense and Trade Division, Congressional Research Service, “Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty: Background and Current Developments,” CRS REPORT, 5—28—08

Critics expressed concern about the implications of these policies for testing and new weapons. A statement by Physicians for Social Responsibility said, “The Administration’s plan ... would streamline our nuclear arsenal into a war-fighting force, seek the opportunity to design and build new nuclear weapons, and abandon a ten-year-old moratorium on nuclear weapons testing.”5 Another critic felt that increased funding for test readiness would in effect give prior approval for testing. In July 2002 a National Academy of Sciences panel report on technical aspects of the CTBT concluded, in the words of an press release, “that verification capabilities for the treaty are better than generally supposed, U.S. adversaries could not significantly advance their nuclear weapons capabilities through tests below the threshold of detection, and the United States has the technical capabilities to maintain confidence in the safety and reliability of its existing weapons stockpile without periodic nuclear tests.”6

### A2 small test

#### IMS can detect very small explosions

Daryl G. Kimball, Executive Director, Arms Control Association, “Prospects for U.S. Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 6—10—08, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Kimball_CTBTJune2008.pdf>

1. Is the combined national technical means and international monitoring system adequate enough to detect and deter CTBT violations? The short answer is: yes. To address lingering concerns, however, CTBT proponents must document how and why the international monitoring system, on-site inspections, and transparency measures provided for under the CTBT, combined with U.S. intelligence capabilities, are adequate to detect and deter militarily significant cheating. As the 2002 National Academy of Sciences report stated: “The capabilities to detect and identify nuclear explosions without special efforts at evasion are considerably better than the “one kiloton worldwide” characterization that has often been stated for the IMS. If deemed necessary, these capabilities could be further improved by increasing the number of stations in networks whose data streams are continuously searched for signals. Underground explosions can be reliably detected and can be identified as explosions, using IMS data, down to a yield of 0.1 kt (100 tons) in hard rock if conducted anywhere in Europe, Asia, North Africa, and North America. In some locations of interest such as Novaya Zemlya, this capability extends down to 0.01 kt (10 tons) or less.” In addition, the United States benefits from monitoring capabilities that are currently only available through the CTBT’s IMS, including monitoring stations in Russia, China, and other sensitive locations that the United States would otherwise not be able to access.

#### IMS can detect small tests—north korean test proves

Daryl G. Kimball, Executive Director, Arms Control Association, “Prospects for U.S. Ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty,” Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 6—10—08, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/files/Kimball_CTBTJune2008.pdf>

Since the 1999 Senate vote and the 2002 National Academy of Sciences report, the International Monitoring System has only grown in size and sophistication. For example, more than 10 of the IMS primary seismic stations detected the ground tremors produced by the relatively small yield, Oct. 9, 2006 North Korean underground nuclear test explosion near P’unggye, according to the January 2007 newsletter of the CTBTO, Spectrum. The North Korean test blast was estimated by various national, international, and scientific monitors to be less than 1 kiloton (TNT equivalent) in yield. More significantly, one of 10 experimental “noble gas” monitoring stations that are to be part of the IMS detected trace amounts of unique radioactive material that confirmed the explosion was nuclear. The station, which is located near Yellowknife in Canada’s Northwest Territories, detected two spikes in xenon gas readings, on Oct. 22 and 25, which, on the basis of atmospheric modeling, were consistent with the North Korean test, according to diplomats from two countries who are familiar with the data. On Oct. 11, 2006, U.S. national monitoring assets also detected “radioactive debris” that indicated the explosion was nuclear, according to a statement from the office of the U.S. Director of National Intelligence. When the combination of existing national means of intelligence, as well as world’s network of tens of thousands of civilian seismic monitoring stations, plus the option of on-site inspections are taken into account, no would-be cheater could conduct a nuclear weapon test explosion in underground, underwater, or in the atmosphere without a very high risk of detection.

### A2 israel hold out

#### Israel will follow the US lead

Nuclear Fuels 12/15/2008 “Some NSG states would condition Israeli waiver on Dimona shutdown”

If the US ratifies the CTBT, Middle East sources said this fall that Israel would also ratify it, supporting Israel's case for a waiver of NSG sanctions, since India did not agree to join the CTBT as a condition for obtaining its NSG exemption (NW, 27 Nov., 7). Israeli momentum to ratify the CTBT was generated among senior officials surrounding Prime Minster Ehud Olmert, who has led the country since 2006. How Israel responds to anticipated US efforts in 2009 to urge global ratification of the CTBT will depend on the interaction of recently appointed figures at Israel's Atomic Energy Commission and the next Prime Minister, Middle East sources said this month.

#### More evidence

Nucleonics Week 11/27/2008 “Israel prepared to ratify CTBT, resume bid for NSG exemption”

If the US Senate ratifies the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, or CTBT, after Barack Obama is sworn in as president, Israel would follow suit, thereby enhancing its case to get the Nuclear Suppliers Group, or NSG, to lift its nuclear trade embargo against Israel, Middle East diplomatic sources said.

### A2 israel nsg exemption

#### Obama not support Israel NSG exemption

Nucleonics Week 11/27/2008 “Israel prepared to ratify CTBT, resume bid for NSG exemption”

But Obama has made no commitment to support Israel's bid for a similar NSG exemption, sources involved in the Obama campaign said last month. Some sources said doing that might put other Obama foreign policy priorities at risk.

# Obama Good – Russian Reset

### Obama Good – Russia 1nc

#### Obama is critical to US/Russian relations reset

The Moscow Times 10/14 http://www.themoscowtimes.com/mobile/article/445482.html

On the surface, the 2012 outlook for the U.S.-Russian “reset” is looking bleak. Although we are a year away from the U.S. presidential election, the chances that President Barack Obama, the architect and chief supporter of the reset, will be re-elected in 2012 do not look good — if for no other reason than U.S. unemployment is expected to stay at a historical high for the next 13 months. No U.S. president since Franklin Delano Roosevelt during the Great Depression has been re-elected when unemployment has exceeded 8 percent. The unemployment rate currently is 9.2 percent, and many economists believe that it will remain around 9 percent until Election Day. The Congressional Budget Office predicted that if unemployment drops, it would, at best, reach 8.2 percent by November 2012. But even at this level, it would most likely be too high to save Obama’s re-election bid. Meanwhile, Mitt Romney has become — at least for now — the Republican front-runner for the presidential race, which does not bode well for the reset. Last Friday, he told The Washington Post that the reset “has to end.” Romney supports former U.S. President George W. Bush’s plans to deploy elements of a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic, which seriously damaged U.S.-Russian relations for much of the period from 2002 to 2008. Obama was able to partially repair this damage in 2009 by scaling down Bush’s plans and deploying radar and interceptors farther away from Russia’s borders. Romney also criticized Prime Minister Vladimir Putin on Friday, saying Putin wants to “rebuild the Russian empire. That includes annexing populations as they did in Georgia.” This sounds disturbingly like what the neocons used to say about Russia during the Bush years. Conservative political analyst Sergei Kurginyan coined the phrase, “Strike the iron while Obama is in office,” implying that Obama offers a much better opportunity for improved U.S.-Russian relations than an administration dominated by foreign policy neocons. Other analysts, such as television journalist Alexei Pushkov, have warned that the anti-Obama backlash among U.S. voters could pave the way for a neocon to be elected president in 2012. In terms of U.S. policy toward Russia, this could mean, among other things, a revival of Bush’s “Georgia project,” a withdrawal from New START, a more aggressive NATO expansion policy and increased U.S. activity in Ukraine and Central Asia. Things do not look much better from the Russian side, however, particularly given Putin’s likely return to the presidency in 2012. In his next one — or two — terms, Putin will likely maintain his deep mistrust of Washington’s intentions toward Moscow and continue his trademark sharp criticisms of U.S. policies, which are popular among many Russians. This would hardly aid the reset. In Putin’s first decade in power, we all remember, for example, when he claimed “outside forces” — hinting at the United States — were behind the September 2004 Beslan terrorist attack; or his 2007 Victory Day speech, when he likened U.S. foreign policy to the Third Reich; or his December 2010 interview with Larry King, when he said the United States should keep their noses out of Russia’s business. And as fresh reminders to Washington of where he stands, Putin called the United States “hooligans” in July and “parasites” in August. (On Tuesday in China, he softened his statement, saying, “America is being parasitic with the dollar’s monopoly position.”) Meanwhile, Putin’s heavy play of the nationalist card will certainly not help U.S.-Russian relations. The Liberal Democratic Party, A Just Russia and even the Communists are now reaching out to nationalist-minded voters, and Dmitry Rogozin and his 100,000-member Rodina-Congress of Russian Communities last month pledged allegiance to Putin and United Russia. It was Rogozin, by the way, who in July complained about conservative U.S. senators being “monsters of the Cold War.” To be fair, there are plenty of these Cold War “monsters” among political and military leaders on both sides, but the problem is that if both Russia and the United States elect one of them as president in 2012, there could be a real setback in Obama’s reset. It would be easy to dismiss both Romney’s and Putin’s statements as election-year grandstanding that will have no real impact on the reset, whose roots lie in cooperation on Afghanistan and Iran and renewed trade ties, among other things. But at the same time, this type of demagoguery creates a combative and bitter atmosphere in bilateral relations and could instigate a self-perpetuating cycle of accusations and counteraccusations from both sides. The reset works best when demagoguery is minimal. Let’s hope leaders from both sides will put their energy into cooperating rather than blustering after the 2012 elections.

#### Relations solve multiple world problems – each causes extinction

Jeffrey Tayler, 08 -The Atlantic staff writer, “Medvedev Spoils the Party,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2008/11/medvedev-spoils-the-party/7130/

Like it or not, the United States cannot solve crucial global problems without Russian participation. Russia commands the largest landmass on earth; possesses vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and other natural resources; owns huge stockpiles of weapons and plutonium; and still wields a potent brain trust. Given its influence in Iran and North Korea, to say nothing of its potential as a spoiler of international equilibrium elsewhere, Russia is one country with which the United States would do well to reestablish a strong working relationship—a strategic partnership, even—regardless of its feelings about the current Kremlin government. The need to do so trumps expanding NATO or pursuing “full-spectrum dominance.” Once the world financial crisis passes, we will find ourselves returning to worries about resource depletion, environmental degradation, and global warming – the greatest challenges facing humanity. No country can confront these problems alone. For the United States, Russia may just prove the “indispensable nation” with which to face a volatile future arm in arm.

### Obama key russia reset

#### Obama key to cooperation in US/Russian relations

Andrew C. Kuchins (Director and Senior Fellow, Russia and Eurasia Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies) Feb 11 2011 RIA Novosti http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20111102/168361206.html

Do you expect that the relationships between the two countries will undergo drastic changes after 2012 elections in both countries? I do not think they will undergo drastic changes after the [2012 elections in Russia](http://en.rian.ru/trend/Putin_elections_2012/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). I think, that president Medvedev and prime-minister Putin are basically in agreement about the advisability of the, so called “reset” of the Russian-US relations that has taken place over the last nearly three years. I think the much bigger question mark is: what is going to happen in the US elections? If Barak Obama is reelected, then, I think, we will see basically continuation of the policy. From my point of view, the “reset” has been successful. The relationship has been reset. We have now more normal and constructive relationship with Russia, as we should have. I think, we are not going to have that momentum of watershed agreements, (and one of them I forgot to mention, of course, the Civilian Nuclear-1, -2, -3 agreement, which was concluded at the end of last year). Still I think trying to build on the levels of cooperation that we have would be the case with the Obama administration. Republican administration is a much bigger question mark. Maybe it’s just pre-electoral games? Republicans have to play them, trying to undermine the Obama administration as much as possible. Right, the Obama administration views the “reset” as one of the most important foreign policy achievements. Naturally, the opposition party is going to find ways to criticize that, to try to knock it down. When you come to actual governing, it’s a different matter. But still there are problems in our relations. What do you think are the most cunning issues that we have to tackle first of all? There is one other important area where we have seen a greater degree of cooperation and mutual understanding and, I think, accommodation of interests in the past couple of years that we did not see in the Bush administration. That is our views on what is taking place in the countries on Russia’s borders that many refer to as post-Soviet space. I’d like to get away from that terminology. There is a possibility for the conflicts in the Russia-US relationships over our policies and interests in the Caucasus, in the Central Asia and elsewhere, and, of course, the biggest one is Georgia. The Obama administration has spent a lot of time during over the past three years, trying to insure that conflict is not reemerging in Georgia.

# Obama Good – EPA regulations

### Obama Good – EPA 1nc

#### Romeny will undercut if not ban the EPA

[John m. Broder](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/b/john_m_broder/index.html?inline=nyt-per) 8/18/2011 “Bashing E.P.A. Is New Theme in G.O.P. Race”, New York Times.

WASHINGTON — The [Environmental Protection Agency](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/organizations/e/environmental_protection_agency/index.html?inline=nyt-org) is emerging as a favorite target of the Republican presidential candidates, who portray it as the very symbol of a heavy-handed regulatory agenda imposed by the Obama administration that they say is strangling the economy. Representative [Michele Bachmann](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/primaries/candidates/michele-bachmann?inline=nyt-per) of Minnesota wants to padlock the E.P.A.’s doors, as does former Speaker Newt Gingrich. Gov. [Rick Perry](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/primaries/candidates/rick-perry?inline=nyt-per) of Texas wants to impose an immediate moratorium on environmental regulation. Representative [Ron Paul](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/primaries/candidates/ron-paul?inline=nyt-per) of Texas wants environmental disputes settled by the states or the courts. Herman Cain, a businessman, wants to put many environmental regulations in the hands of an independent commission that includes [oil](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/business/energy-environment/oil-petroleum-and-gasoline/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) and gas executives. Jon M. Huntsman Jr., the former Utah governor, thinks most new environmental regulations should be shelved until the economy improves. Only [Mitt Romney](http://elections.nytimes.com/2012/primaries/candidates/mitt-romney?inline=nyt-per), the former Massachusetts governor, has a kind word for the E.P.A., and that is qualified by his opposition to proposed regulation of carbon dioxide and other gases that contribute to [global warming](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/science/topics/globalwarming/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier). Opposition to regulation and skepticism about climate change have become tenets of Republican orthodoxy, but they are embraced with extraordinary intensity this year because of the faltering economy, high fuel prices, the [Tea Party](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/t/tea_party_movement/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) passion for smaller government and an activist Republican base that insists on strict adherence to the party’s central agenda. But while attacks on the E.P.A., climate-change science and environmental regulation more broadly are surefire applause lines with many Republican primary audiences, these views may prove a liability in the general election, pollsters and analysts say. The American people, by substantial majorities, are concerned about air and water pollution, and largely trust the E.P.A., national surveys say. “Not only are these positions irresponsible, they’re politically problematic,” said David Jenkins of [Republicans for Environmental Protection](http://www.rep.org/), a group that believes that conservation should be a core value of the party. “The whole idea that you have to bash the E.P.A. and run away from climate change to win a Republican primary has never been borne out. Where’s the evidence?” But the leading Republican candidates are all linking environmental regulation to jobs and the economy, suggesting that the nation cannot afford measures that impose greater costs on businesses and consumers. Mrs. Bachmann drew loud applause 10 days ago at a [rally in Iowa](http://www.desmoinesregister.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=2011108070316) when she declared: “I guarantee you the E.P.A. will have doors locked and lights turned off, and they will only be about conservation. It will be a new day and a new sheriff in Washington, D.C.” In an earlier debate she said the agency should be renamed the “job-killing organization of America.” She has called global-warming science a hoax. The White House disputes the accusation that it is burdening the economy with regulations. It says that it issued fewer new rules in its first two years than the George W. Bush administration issued in its final two years. “This administration has shown a clear commitment to taking steps to protect our families from dangerous pollution, while at the same time ensuring those steps are implemented in a way that minimizes costs, maximizes flexibility and does not impede our economic recovery,” said Clark Stevens, a White House spokesman. Mr. Perry has been at war with the E.P.A. almost since the day he took office as governor. He is leading a group of states in a [lawsuit](http://www.statesman.com/news/texas-politics/texas-sues-to-stop-epa-from-regulating-greenhouse-245086.html) seeking to block the agency from putting in place rules limiting greenhouse gas emissions from power plants, refineries and other large sources. On Monday, Mr. Perry called on Mr. Obama to [halt all regulations](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bL_HRH8DyqE) because, Mr. Perry said, “his E.P.A. regulations are killing jobs all across America.” In his book, [“Fed Up, Our Fight to Save America from Washington,”](http://www.amazon.com/Fed-Up-Fight-America-Washington/dp/0316132950) Mr. Perry described global-warming science as “one contrived phony mess that is falling apart under its own weight” and a “secular carbon cult” led by false prophets like Al Gore. Such regulatory and financial sentiments are shared by many Republicans in Congress and are encouraged by industries that are reliable financial supporters of Republican candidates — the petroleum industry, utilities, [coal](http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/subjects/c/coal/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) companies, heavy manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Republican presidential candidates cross these interests at their peril. “It remains to be seen of course, but my guess is that in order to get the nomination you’re going to have to be pretty solid on these issues,” said Myron Ebell, of the [Competitive Enterprise Institute](http://cei.org/), a libertarian research and advocacy organization in Washington. “It’s going to be a litmus test or shorthand way for voters to see how the candidate thinks about not only big issues like global warming and energy rationing policies, but it’s indicative of other things as well.” Mr. Ebell said that Mr. Romney, Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Huntsman, who have all said that global warming is real and at least tentatively attributed it to human actions, would suffer for it in the Republican primaries. Mr. Perry’s anti-E.P.A. stance has been popular with Republicans in Texas and could carry him far in the primaries, said Ken Kramer, director of the [Texas chapter of the Sierra Club](http://texas.sierraclub.org/). It may prove a liability in a general election, Mr. Kramer said. “That kind of rhetoric is popular with a certain segment here,” he said. “But a lot of other Texans, especially those in major cities with air pollution problems, are not necessarily supportive of the governor’s war on the E.P.A.” He added, “My sense is there’s definitely a difference between what plays well in Texas from a political standpoint and what plays well in other parts of country.” Mr. Paul holds rather more complex views of the environment and regulation. He generally favors a hands-off approach to federal regulation, although he has backed some tax incentives for clean energy development. He opposes tax breaks for oil and gas companies but supports Arctic drilling. He is skeptical about climate change but said in 2008 that there were [unexplained anomalies](http://www.freakonomics.com/2008/11/20/ron-paul-answers-your-questions-part-two/) in global temperatures. Mr. Romney’s position may be the most complicated of all. In Massachusetts, he proposed plans to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and explored creation of a regional [carbon cap-and-trade](http://topics.nytimes.com/topics/reference/timestopics/subjects/g/greenhouse_gas_emissions/cap_and_trade/index.html?inline=nyt-classifier) program. He has mostly backed away from those positions, but he says there is still an important place for regulation. “I believe we should keep our air and our water clean,” Mr. Romney said at [a town hall-style meeting](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d_AIEPXvQ7A) in New Hampshire last month. “Do I support the E.P.A.?” he said. “In much of its mission, yes; but in some of its mission, no.”  Despite a Supreme Court ruling to the contrary, Mr. Romney said the federal law did not give the agency authority to regulate carbon emissions. “I don’t think that was the intent of the original legislation,” he said, “and I don’t think carbon is a pollutant in the sense of harming our bodies.”

#### EPA key to check runaway warming

Christian Parenti (writer for the Nation) April 2010 NPR "The Nation: The Case for EPA Action"

On April 1 the Environmental Protection Agency established rules restricting greenhouse gas emissions from cars and trucks, starting in 2012. This is the first of what could become a sweeping series of regulations stemming from the agency's conclusion that greenhouse gases harm human health. If the EPA were to act robustly, it could achieve significant and immediate greenhouse gas emissions reductions using nothing more than existing laws and current technology. Doing so would signal to a waiting world that America is serious about addressing climate change. But a dangerous assault on the agency is gathering momentum in Congress, corporate boardrooms, the media and the courts. The swarm of counterattacks all seek to strip the EPA of its power to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources like coal-fired power plants. Some legislative proposals would even undo the EPA's finding that greenhouse gases are hazardous, taking the EPA out of the climate fight altogether. Wonkish at first glance, the fight over EPA rulemaking may be the most important environmental battle in a generation. The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change says rich countries like the United States must cut emissions 25 to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2020--only ten years away--and thereafter make precipitous cuts to almost zero emissions. If we don't act now, average global temperatures will likely increase by more than 2 degrees Celsius and trigger self-compounding runaway climate change, resulting in a massive rise in sea levels, devastated agriculture and attendant social chaos. Not one of the climate change bills up for discussion meets this threshold, and it is looking increasingly unlikely that Congress will be able to pass any comprehensive climate change legislation this session. The failures of Congress and the harrowing facts of climate science mean that aggressive and immediate EPA action is essential. From a legal perspective, the EPA has all the tools it needs to respond adequately to the climate crisis. In fact, "the United States has the strongest environmental laws in the world," says Kassie Siegel, an attorney with the Center for Biological Diversity. The center specializes in suing the government when it violates green laws. "We don't need new legislation. The Clean Air Act can achieve everything we need: a 40 percent reduction of greenhouse gas emissions over 1990 levels by 2020." The two most important things the EPA can do are to halt any permitting of new coal-fired power plants--about fifty new plants are seeking approval--and to force all existing coal-fired facilities to make the technologically feasible switch to natural gas. If this "fuel switching" happened, total nonvehicle US emissions would be reduced by 13 percent or more in a matter of a year or two, say various experts. Natural gas is generally half as polluting as coal. But in the case of old, inefficient coal-fired plants, switching to gas can reduce emissions by as much as two-thirds. And there is plenty of natural gas: discoveries have glutted the market, and prices are down more than 60 percent from their recent peak. Gas is not a solution; it merely offers a realistic "bridging fuel" as we move toward power generated from wind, solar, geothermal and hydro sources. Perhaps the most far-reaching impact of EPA regulation would be to put a de facto price on carbon by leveling fines on greenhouse gas polluters. Such penalties could reach thousands per day, per violation. If targets for emissions reductions are tough enough, few coal plants will be able to meet them and will instead pay fines--what amounts to a carbon tax. Then a cheap source of energy would become expensive, which would drive investment away from fossil fuels toward carbon-neutral forms of energy. At first, President Obama seemed ready to use executive power to do an end run around a sclerotic Congress, when he authorized the EPA to start regulating greenhouse gas emissions under the Clean Air Act. Obama was merely complying with the law: the EPA has been mandated to act since 2007, when the Supreme Court ruled, in Massachusetts v. EPA, that the agency should determine whether greenhouse gases threaten our health. The Bush administration refused to use this authority, but when Obama took office he allowed the EPA to do its job again. This past December the EPA published a science-based "endangerment finding," which found that CO2 and five other greenhouse gases are, in fact, dangerous to human life. Once the EPA issues an endangerment finding, it is legally bound to promulgate regulations to address the problem; the first of these were the vehicle emissions reductions announced on April 1. Now the EPA is following up by drafting regulations for stationary greenhouse gas sources. Called a tailoring rule, it will stipulate when, where and how greenhouse gas pollution must be controlled. At first the agency said it would regulate facilities emitting 25,000 tons or more of greenhouse gases per year. But pressure from fossil fuel industries and Congress has caused the EPA to backpedal to a threshold of 75,000 tons per year, a limit the EPA could raise to 100,000 tons by the time its tailoring rule is finalized. In February, Senator Jay Rockefeller of West Virginia sent a letter urging EPA administrator Lisa Jackson to delay the implementation of greenhouse gas point source review. Signing on with Rockefeller were seven other Democratic senators, all but one from the nation's top coal-producing states. In response, Jackson pushed back any new regulations until 2011--conveniently after this fall's midterm election. Rockefeller wasn't satisfied and has since introduced legislation seeking to suspend EPA action until after 2012. Because the tailoring rule is not yet final, the whole issue of stationary source regulation could get put off indefinitely, or be pre-empted by climate change legislation that strips the EPA of its regulatory powers. The fight over the EPA's role goes back to 1997, when President Clinton signed, but could not get the Senate to ratify, the Kyoto Protocol. Searching for a way around the Senate's blockade, Clinton's EPA administrator, Carol Browner--now director of the White House Office of Energy and Climate Change Policy--took the position that the EPA was already authorized to regulate greenhouse gas emissions under the 1970 Clean Air Act. Soon a coalition of green groups, including Greenpeace and the Center for Biological Diversity, petitioned the EPA to start taking action. The specter of muscular regulations from the EPA caused near-panic among major polluters. In late 1999 the American Petroleum Institute, the trade association of the oil and gas industry, called a meeting of major industrial corporations; twenty-eight executives attended, representing the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce, as well as the aluminum, airline, chemical, electrical power, aerospace, cement, fertilizer, coal and oil industries. The leaked minutes of that meeting revealed a plan to spin the issue of EPA regulation in the media, to fight it in the courts and push legislation that would strip the EPA of regulatory power. The executives also agreed to pressure the EPA directly to reject the petition filed by the green groups. The plan worked; Browner backed off. Then the Bush administration stacked the EPA's ranks with fossil fuel-loving loyalists. When climate change regulation again became an issue in 2009, the industry's counterattack was already in place. Thus, both the House climate bill (Waxman-Markey, which passed in June 2009) and the Senate bill (Kerry-Lieberman-Graham, still under consideration) contain language restricting the EPA's power to control greenhouse gas pollution from stationary sources. Now even more toxic legislation is gathering support. Republican Senator Lisa Murkowski of Alaska--aided by corporate lobbyists like Jeffrey Holmstead, formerly with the Bush EPA and now head of environmental strategies for the lobbying firm Bracewell & Giuliani, and Roger Martella Jr., a partner at Sidley Austin--has written a resolution that would overturn the EPA's original greenhouse gas endangerment finding. Alaska is a big oil, gas and coal producer, and Murkowski is one of the top recipients of petroleum industry campaign donations. So far this year she has received $188,000; only two senators, Democrat Blanche Lincoln and Republican David Vitter, have received more oil and gas money than Murkowski. Murkowski's resolution was introduced January 21 under the little-used Congressional Review Act, which means it needs only fifty-one votes to pass and cannot be blocked from a vote by Senate majority leader Harry Reid. Although it is called a "resolution of disapproval," it would have the force of law. So far forty other senators are on board, including three Democrats--Mary Landrieu of Louisiana, Blanche Lincoln of Arkansas and Ben Nelson of Nebraska. In the House, Joe Barton, a Republican from Texas, has written a companion resolution of disapproval. Not surprisingly, Barton is tight with polluters; over the past two decades he has received more than $2.7 million in direct campaign contributions from electrical utilities and the petroleum industry. Obama would, by all accounts, veto the Murkowski or Barton bill. But their point is not so much to gut the EPA in Congress as it is to intimidate, delay, confuse and blunt into irrelevance any EPA action. Other pushbacks are taking the form of lawsuits and petitions from the Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers and fossil fuel lobbies. Fifteen states have filed suits seeking to block the EPA's endangerment ruling, and at least seventeen state legislatures have seen bills introduced to strip EPA powers. None of these efforts are likely to achieve their stated goals, but they are all part of a right-wing and corporate strategy to send a message to Obama and the Senate, where real EPA-stripping could happen if Kerry-Lieberman-Graham passes. Behind much of this state-level pressure is money from Charles and David Koch, petroleum magnates who are increasingly notorious for funding far-right ventures such as FreedomWorks, a tea party organizer, and think tanks that traffic in climate-change denial. One of their organizations, Americans for Prosperity, is running a Regulation Reality Tour, which is trying to whip up outrage about the "EPA's power grab." Part of this Astroturf campaign involves political theater: fake "carbon cops" in little green Smart cars with flashing lights pull out badges and issue citations for carbon "crimes" like mowing a lawn. But green groups are organized to fight back and are having some success, as witnessed by the EPA's recently issued regulations under the Clean Water Act, which will sharply curtail mountaintop removal [see Eshelman, page 17]. Unfortunately, many big environmental groups in Washington have not made defending the EPA a priority. Most endorsed Waxman-Markey, and in late March twenty of the biggest groups came out in support of the still-unpublished Kerry-Lieberman-Graham bill. Those groups included the Alliance for Climate Protection, Environment America, the League of Conservation Voters, Environmental Defense Fund, National Wildlife Federation, Blue Green Alliance, Natural Resources Defense Council, Center for American Progress Action Fund and Union of Concerned Scientists. The Sierra Club has switched to defending the EPA and opposing any climate change bill that strips the agency of its power; other environmental groups may soon follow. So where is the Obama administration? The president says he prefers climate legislation to EPA regulation. That is an unnecessary concession; Obama does not need to wait for Congress. In this situation, American politics is not hostage to an obstructionist right-wing fringe or the lack of a sixty-vote supermajority. Existing laws allow--even require--broad and robust action. Throughout American history the executive branch has steadily been accruing power. Before the 1930s presidents rarely proposed legislation. Even LBJ worried that his phone calls to lobby senators could violate the "separation of powers doctrine." Nixon created the EPA in 1970 precisely to concentrate more power in the hands of the executive. He gathered up all the existing environmental programs, gave them no extra money and put them in one agency, which answered to a director appointed by the president. The Bush administration practically searched the vest pockets of bureaucrats to find ways (often illegal) to enhance presidential prerogatives. And the current president? "Obama, like Bush before him, is happy to assert unlimited executive authority when it comes to the war on terror, detention without trial, warrantless wiretapping," says Brendan Cummings, senior counsel at the Center for Biological Diversity. "But when it comes to addressing global warming, he refuses to use his clear and lawful executive power to reduce greenhouse pollution to protect people and the planet." "Heading into an election, I think, the administration is very leery of offending powerful corporate interests," says Tyson Slocum of Public Citizen. "That is especially true when those corporate interests make campaign expenditures in swing states." Other greens agree. "At stake in the fight over the EPA's ability to address global warming pollution is not only the president's environmental record but really the core promise of his presidency, to change the way Washington works," says Kert Davies, director of research at Greenpeace USA. "The year behind us on energy and climate policy shows what you get when the Obama administration's seeming compulsion for compromise meets the entrenched power of the coal, oil and nuclear industries." Tragically, climate change is not an issue where compromise will work. Bad healthcare bills can be improved; but on the climate front, time has run out. Atmospheric CO2 concentrations are at 390 parts per million and need to go back to 350 ppm. Already, oyster farms in the Pacific Northwest are in decline because of ocean acidification caused by climate change. Last year many Midwestern crops were too rain-soaked to harvest. Drought, likely linked to climate change, is battering much of Latin America, Africa and Asia. Everywhere signs of nature's unraveling are evident. Allowing Congress to strip the EPA of its review powers or letting the administration dither away its responsibility to act boldly would be a disaster. The EPA is our last, best hope.

#### Try or die – warming makes extinction inevitable –

Bill Henderson (Environmental Scientist) Aug 19 2006 “Runaway Global Warming – Denial,” <http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm>.

The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction. If impossibly Draconian security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of man's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

### Obama key to EPA

#### Obama win key to EPA regs – solves CO2 and oil dependence

Star Ledger June 3 2012 <http://blog.nj.com/njv_editorial_page/2012/06/scary_times_for_environment_--.html>

The grim report on jobs Friday greatly improves the odds that Republicans will win in November, putting Mitt Romney in the White House and bolstering GOP positions in the House and Senate. If that happens, they promise to roll back the progress made under President Obama and Environmental Protection Agency administrator Lisa Jackson. Romney wants to strip the EPA of its power to regulate carbon emissions. Jackson relied on that power to enact rules that will double automobile efficiency standards by 2025 and toughen truck standards, too. Transportation is the largest single source of air pollution. So cutting emissions in half will make a profound change, especially in a car-centric state such as New Jersey. It also will reduce oil imports sharply, lessening our dangerous dependence on unstable regimes in the Mideast. Jackson’s tough limits on coal-fired power plants rely partly on carbon controls, as well. So those gains would be endangered. Again, the air in New Jersey will get dirtier. Because, while our own coal plants have exotic pollution control equipment, those to the west and south do not. Many lack even the most basic filters, known as scrubbers, and rely only on tall smoke stacks to push the toxins higher into the atmosphere.

### Romney gut EPA

#### A Republican president would destroy the EPA

Rettig 11 (Jessica, staff writer, 7/8/11, “EPA Budget and Power Under Attack from Republicans” US News and World Report) http://www.usnews.com/mobile/articles\_mobile/epa-budget-and-power-under-attack-from-republicans

One problem for the EPA is that even for some in the Republican party who support the work of the agency and would like to see climate change addressed, the political winds just don't justify the spending. Another is that the EPA's actions have become a constitutional issue, as members of Congress, like Kentucky Republican Rep. Hal Rogers, depict the agency as the "poster child" of executive overreach. According to Rogers, who says that unlike others in his party he's no climate change naysayer, the bill is more about sending a message to the agency than about climate. "We're for protecting the environment like everyone else. We just think the agency has gone way overboard and beyond their authority," he says. "We want them to abide by the law and live within the authority that Congress has given to them." Republicans, in the past, have labeled the EPA's proposed rules on greenhouse gases under the Clean Air Act as a backdoor way around the failure of cap-and-trade legislation in Congress in 2009, which was intended by its supporters as a way to address climate change. According to Manik Roy, vice president of federal government outreach at the Pew Center on Global Climate Change, despite what some members of Congress say, the EPA is simply following orders according to Congress' authorization of the Clean Air Act and subsequent Supreme Court rulings which upheld the EPA's authority over greenhouse gases. Moran told reporters Thursday that Democrats are "going to have to fight" to keep Republicans from using riders to block EPA's rules. During the budget showdown in the spring, Republicans were nearly able to leverage a ban on the EPA's power to regulate greenhouse gas emissions, like carbon dioxide, but eventually lost that battle. As this funding fight unfolds, the EPA also looms as a possible issue in the 2012 presidential election. Already Minnesota GOP Rep. Michele Bachmann, an avowed climate skeptic who is widely seen as having entered the top tier of candidates, has come out strong against the EPA as the "job-killing organization of America." She even suggested that she'd try to abolish it if in office. [See our cartoons on the 2012 GOP field.] But even with a more moderate candidate like former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney, who has said he thinks climate change should be addressed, the stakes for the EPA could still be significant, especially if the issue of the agency's budget is the focus. Any potential Republican administration would be less likely than President Obama to back the EPA's funding and regulatory power. In that case, the debate over the EPA and climate change would not be whether climate change is a problem, but what the EPA should to do about it, says Roy.

### EPA solves warming

#### EPA regulations limit industrial pollution – solve warming

Smith et al 7. [Brian, Earth Justice, EPA Petitioned to Reduce Global Warming Pollution from Ships, DA 7-15-2010, http://www.earthjustice.org/news/press/007/epa-petitioned-to-reduce-global-warming-pollution-from-ships.html]

The April 2007 decision by the U.S. Supreme Court clearly established that the Clean Air Act gives the EPA authority to address global warming. The EPA must act immediately and issue regulations to limit pollution that contributes to global warming. The petitions filed today begin the process of imposing mandatory regulations on the marine transportation sector. The petitioners asked the EPA to respond within 180 days. The Climate Change Problem The science is unequivocal. Global climate change is real, occurring at an alarming rate with catastrophic consequences, and is caused primarily by human activity. Ships are major sources of greenhouse gas emissions. The global fleet of marine vessels releases almost three percent of the world's carbon dioxide, an amount comparable to the emissions of Canada. Because of their huge number and inefficient operating practices, marine vessels release a large volume of global warming pollutants, particularly carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide and black carbon (or soot). Despite their impact on the global climate, greenhouse gas emissions from ships are not currently regulated by the United States government.  In addition, these emissions are not limited under the Kyoto Protocol or other international treaties that address global warming. Ships' Contribution to the Climate Change Problem Global shipping activity has increased by three percent per year for the last three decades and this rate of growth is projected to increase. If fuel use remains unchanged, shipping pollution will increase substantially, potentially doubling from 2002 levels by 2020 and tripling by 2030. "Global warming pollution from ships is a substantial problem. But fortunately, it's one that can be solved," said Danielle Fugere of Friends of the Earth. "Slower speeds, cleaner fuels, better ships -- the steps that the shipping industry must take are clear. It's up to the EPA to ensure these steps are taken." Why We Should Care Climate change is already causing widespread melting of Arctic glaciers and sea ice, shortening the snow season and raising global temperatures.   The resulting sea level rise could eliminate up to 22 percent of the worlds coastal wetlands and as much as 43 percent of U.S. wetlands. Wetlands provide habitat, protect against floods and storm surges and contribute to local economies. Our oceans and freshwater environments, including organisms at the bottom of the aquatic food chain, are already under stress from climate change. Ranges of algae, plankton and fish have shifted in response to changes in water temperature, ice cover, oxygen content, salinity and circulation. If they die off, entire aquatic ecosystems will follow. Among the species that are struggling to adapt to rapidly changing habitats are cold-water fish, such as salmon and cod, polar bears, walruses, seals, whales, caribou, reindeer, corals, turtles and countless species of migrating sea birds. "If we're going to slow the Arctic melt-down and save Arctic species, we must control global warming pollution from ships," said Kassie Siegel, Climate Program Director for the Center for Biological Diversity. "Implementing the solutions in the petition is the first step toward slowing warming and protecting these species' future." Human health is also impacted by climate change caused by global warming pollution. Climate-related illnesses include air-quality related heart and lung disease, heat-stroke, malnutrition, and casualties from fires, storms and floods. "Climate change is threatening ocean life from the Arctic to the tropics. Shipping pollution has been given a free pass so far and it's way past time to fix that," said Dr. Michael Hirshfield, Oceana's Senior Vice President for North America and Chief Scientist.

#### EPA regulations solve global warming

SNAPE 10. [Bill, Senior Counsel, Center For Biological Diversity, 3/8/2010, http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/03/whats-the-upshot-of-blocking-e.php]

Global warming and associated climate change is the most serious current threat to our planet. Our addiction to fossil fuels, furthermore, catalyzed a now seemingly endless war that has had disastrous consequences for the U.S. budget, the ability of the developed world to focus on meaningful economic challenges, and the countless number of innocent global citizens who have perished for no good reason. Atmospheric heating has already started and will likely accelerate rapidly over the coming years. EPA and other federal agencies already possess the tools under the Clean Air Act and other statutes to begin addressing the problem. There is no reason to wait. If Congress wants to add some progressive mechanisms, such as tax and dividend, into the mix, then so be it. But the federal and state agencies with legal authority must make their move, transparently and objectively, without delay.

#### EPA regulation is key to solve warming

McGowan, 6/30/2010 (“Clean Air Act Proving Effective in CO2 Regulation, Lawyers Tell Their Corporate Clients” http://solveclimate.com/blog/20100630/clean-air-act-proving-effective-co2-regulation-lawyers-tell-their-corporate-clients)

Under the Obama administration, the subtext at EPA is that Congress should be crafting climate change legislation but that the agency will move ahead in the meantime, McKinstry explained. While progress was snail-like after the spring of 2007 when the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that EPA has the authority to regulate greenhouse gases, the agency picked up the pace after Lisa Jackson took over as administrator. Since issuing the endangerment finding in December 2009—which officially found emissions of mobile sources to threaten human health and welfare—EPA has taken several steps forward with insider-baseball names such as the mobile source rule, the trigger rule, the tailoring rule and the reporting rule. Briefly, these rules mean industrial sources of greenhouse gases will be regulated through a process that rolls out gradually over the coming years. For example, the tailoring rule will require about 550 large industrial manufacturers and landfills to obtain permits for emissions beginning in January 2011, with about 900 additional polluters coming under regulatory review each year thereafter.

### A2 cannot solve warming

#### EPA policies and regulations will allow time to adapt and slows warming

Jake Caldwell (Director of Policy for Agriculture, Trade and Energy at American Progress) Feb 2 2011 “EPA and Greenhouse Gases 101”, <http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/02/greenhouse_gases_101.html>

The scientific evidence is clear and substantial that global climate change is occurring. Greenhouse gases, such as carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide, are emitted from power plants, industrial facilities, and other sources, and released into the atmosphere. As the gases linger in the atmosphere they trap heat radiating back from Earth and the surface temperature of our planet rises. The nation’s fossil fuel power plants and oil refineries are collectively responsible for 40 percent of U.S. greenhouse gas emissions per year. The atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide—a major greenhouse gas—is at its highest point in 650,000 years. Global carbon dioxide levels are climbing at an unprecedented pace and steadily drawing global temperature upward. The 2010 calendar year was the hottest on record. And in the last decade the Earth has experienced 9 of the 10 hottest years since data has been recorded. As the atmosphere is destabilized, irreversible damage to our economy and our environment will occur from rising sea levels, increased rainfall, floods, drought, wildfires, and severe storms. This past year’s brutal wildfires and crippling drought in Russia, and devastating flooding in Pakistan, Brazil, and Australia are likely only the beginning of future extreme weather events to come. Add to that the fact that as the global population surges to 9 billion by 2050 our fresh water supplies and worldwide capacity to grow enough food will be severely challenged. The longer we delay taking action to stabilize the climate, the more difficult and expensive the solutions will be. Actions taken today by EPA in accordance with U.S. law can **help reverse this course and slow climate change’s devastating impacts**.

#### Regulations spillover to more actions – key to slow warming

Josh Galperin December 30 2010 “EPA Greenhouse Gas Limits to take Effect in 2011”, <http://blog.cleanenergy.org/2010/12/30/epa-greenhouse-gas-limits-to-take-effect-in-2011/>

Despite what you may have heard about the United States’ continuing failure to address the dangers of global climate change, on January 2, 2011 greenhouse gases (GHGs) will, for the first time ever, be subject to regulation by EPA under the Clean Air Act (CAA). The new “Tailoring” rule will require the largest emitters of GHGs, such as refineries, power plants and cement production facilities, to limit their GHG emissions if they trigger the new regulations by building new emissions sources or making major modifications to existing sources. While this new GHG permitting program is not the result of much needed Congressional action, and it is far from a silver bullet, it does represent a very significant first step in finally addressing global warming pollution from major sources at the federal level. The new GHG paradigm is rooted in a 2003 decision by President Bush’s EPA, in which they refused to address GHG pollution from motor vehicles on the grounds that GHGs are not pollutants. In 2007 the United States Supreme Court disagreed with the Bush EPA and found that carbon dioxide and other GHGs are pollutants under the CAA. In the wake of that ruling, EPA undertook a scientific review and determined that GHGs “cause or contribute” to global climate change and “endanger” human health and welfare as a result. Based on these findings EPA promulgated rules to limit GHG emissions from automobiles. The CAA requires that when a pollutant is regulated under any provision of the Act—for example, when GHG is regulated from automobiles—that the pollutant must also be regulated under the New Source Review Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) program. PSD applicability means that permitting authorities will set enforceable numeric limits on GHG emissions from many polluters. The PSD program, however, is a sweeping program that applies to stationary sources and could conceivably cover emitters of GHGs including small farms, hospitals, restaurants and shopping centers. President Obama’s EPA saw that such a broad regulation would be unworkable and therefore adopted a “Tailoring Rule” so that the new PSD requirements would apply only the very largest GHG emitters – power plants and the like. The new GHG permitting regime will initially apply only to new sources with very significant GHG emissions and even then, only if the source must also undergo PSD review for a pollutant other than CO2 or another GHG. By next summer the permitting requirements will apply to major new sources of GHGs and sources with modifications that significantly increased GHG emissions. Over the next year EPA will consider how to expand GHG permitting in the future. While these are fairly sizable limits on GHG regulation, the tailored approach will actually cover 70% of national GHG emissions from stationary sources. The new paradigm will limit GHGs primarily through the use of Best Available Control Technology (BACT). When a GHG source triggers the permitting requirements, the permitting authority (typically a state agency) will have to establish an emissions limit based on the reductions that a facility could achieve if they installed the best pollution reduction technology. The permitting authority will arrive at these BACT limits through a case-by-case analysis, meaning that each new permit will be evaluated individually. Unfortunately, the case-by-case approach benefits polluters by allowing them to lobby for weaker limits. On the other hand, when a draft permit is complete, the public will also have the chance to weigh in and suggest stricter BACT limits. Despite some shortcomings, GHG permitting, of course, has a number of benefits. The most obvious benefit is that it will ultimately help to reduce GHG emissions. Additionally, for the first time, there will be a legally mandated opportunity for citizens to get involved by commenting on GHG permits and challenging GHG emissions because the CAA permitting program creates a pathway for public input. Finally, the incorporation of GHGs into the CAA is a significant symbolic victory demonstrating that the United States can still respond to pressing environmental issues. The new GHG regulatory framework is only a very modest first step in the long-delayed effort to respond to global climate change and it has come about through complicated legal and bureaucratic channels, not through the political will of enlightened statesmen. While the new rules are an important first step to reducing the massive dumping of GHGs into our atmosphere, a more comprehensive, lasting and impactful plan has to come from Congress and from international cooperation. Nevertheless, the first step is often the hardest. As the regulatory authority continues to broaden and people further understand that the benefits of reducing GHGs far outweigh the speculative burdens, then this first step may not be seen as a trifle, but instead as proof that the United States really can help to slow our changing climate.

### 2nc Climate leadership

#### EPA critical to climate leadership

Terry Chapin [Professor of Ecology, Institute of Arctic Biology, University of Alaska Fairbanks) 3/8/2010, “It's time for U.S. leadership,” http://energy.nationaljournal.com/2010/03/whats-the-upshot-of-blocking-e.php]

It is time for the United States to provide international leadership in reducing rates of climate change rather than to continue being a major international contributor to the problem. The current role assigned to EPA to regulate greenhouse gas emissions from stationary sources will keep the pressure on Congress to consider alternative solutions. Without this pressure, I fear that climate change will continue to be a political football and that the United States will never take the strong actions that are needed.

#### US climate policy is modelled internationally.

Paltsev et al 7 (Sergey, Assessment of US Cap-and-trade proposals, research of MIT’s Joint Program on the Science and Policy of Global Change, a joint center sponsored by the Center for Global Change Science and the Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research, http://tisiphone.mit.edu/RePEc/mee/wpaper/2007-005.pdf)

Also at issue is the equitable sharing of the cost burden of emissions reduction. Such equity concerns are inextricably linked to the strategic objective of getting other countries to mitigate their own greenhouse gas emissions. Poorer countries see a U.S. and developed world that has freely emitted CO2 over the history of fossil use, and are thus responsible for the level of concentrations we see today. And they see economies with far higher incomes that are in a better position to afford the burden of mitigation. Thus, a perception of the U.S. taking on an equitable share of the burden of abatement is probably essential if the U.S. policy is going to serve the strategic goal of moving climate policy forward elsewhere. These issues are well beyond the scope of this analysis but consideration of them is essential in determining the best policy for the U.S.

#### The impact is extinction.

Tickell 08 [Oliver, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction]

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming**,** *Bob Watson told the Gurdian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra*. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean*, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke*, "the end *of living and the beginning of survival"* for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of ourextinction***.*** The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland***.*** *The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land*.Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die.

### Climate leadership – others follow

#### U.S. action is crucial for leadership and for other countries to follow.

WIRTH et al 03 (Timothy E, President of the UN Foundation – along with C. Boyden Gray and John D. Podesta – also of the UN Foundation, “The Future of Energy Policies,” Foreign Affairs, July/August, p. 132, lexis).

Energy is a common thread weaving through the fabric of critical American interests and global challenges. U.S. strategic energy policy must take into account the three central concerns outlined above -- economic security, environmental protection, and poverty alleviation -- and set aggressive goals for overcoming them. Leadership from Washington is critical because the [U.S.] United States is so big, so economically powerful, and so vulnerable to oil shocks and terrorism. This is a time of opportunity, too -- a major technological revolution is beginning in energy, with great potential markets. And finally, the reality is that where the [U.S.] United States goes, others will likely follow. America's example for good or for ill sets the tempo and the direction of action far beyond its borders and far into the future.

### Climate leadership – key hegemony

#### U.S. climate action key to prevent the collapse of overall leadership.

Walter 2 (Norbert, Chief Economist @ Deutsche Bank Group, <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/fullpage.html?res=9907E7DE1F3CF93BA1575BC0A9649C8B63>)

At present there is much talk about the unparalleled strength of the United States on the world stage. Yet at this very moment the most powerful country in the world stands to forfeit much political capital, moral authority and international good will by dragging its feet on the next great global issue: the environment. Before long, the administration's apparentunwillingness to take a leadership role -- or, at the very least, to stop acting as a brake -- in fighting global environmental degradation will threaten the very basis of the American supremacy that many now seem to assume will last forever. American authority is already in some danger as a result of the Bush administration's decision to send a low-level delegation to the World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg -- low-level, that is, relative to America's share of both the world economy and global pollution. The absence of President Bush from Johannesburg symbolizes this decline in authority. In recent weeks, newspapers around the world have been dominated by environmental headlines: In central Europe, flooding killed dozens, displaced tens of thousands and caused billions of dollars in damages. In South Asia, the United Nations reports a brown cloud of pollution that is responsible for hundreds of thousands of deaths a year from respiratory disease. The pollution (80 percent man-made) also cuts sunlight penetration, thus reducing rainfall, affecting agriculture and otherwise altering the climate. Many other examples of environmental degradation, often related to the warming of the atmosphere, could be cited. What they all have in common is that they severely affect countries around the world and are fast becoming a chief concern for people everywhere. Nobody is suggesting that these disasters are directly linked to anything the United States is doing. But when a country that emits 25 percent of the world's greenhouse gases acts as an uninterested, sometimes hostile bystander in the environmental debate, it looks like unbearable arrogance to many people abroad. The administration seems to believe it is merely an observer -- that environmental issues are not its issues. But not doing anything amounts to ignoring a key source of world tension, and no superpower that wants to preserve its status can go on dismissing such a pivotal dimension of political and economic -- if not existential -- conflict. In my view, there is a clear-cut price to be paid for ignoring the views of just about every other country in the world today.The United States is jettisoning its hard-won moral and intellectual authority and perhaps the strategic advantages that come with being a good steward of the international political order. The United States may no longer be viewed as a leader or reliable partner in policymaking: necessary, perhaps inevitable, but not desirable, as it has been for decades. All of this because America's current leaders are not willing to acknowledge the very real concerns of many people about global environmental issues.

#### U.S. environmental leadership prevents global environmental destruction that risks planetary extinction

Harris ’01 (Paul G., Lecturer @ Lignan U, Hong Kong And Associate Fellow at the Oxford Center for Environment, Ethics, and Society at Mansfield College, Oxford University, The Environment, International Relations, and U.S. Foreign Policy, p. 241-2)

Environment, Equity, and U.S. Foreign Policy: Normative Implications In addition to promoting U.S. global interests, a more robust acceptance by the U.S. government of international equity as an objective of global environmental policy—and indeed of foreign policy generally—has potentially **beneficial implications for humankind.** Implementation of the equity provisions of international environmental arrangements may reduce human suffering by helping to prevent changes to local, regional, and global environmental commons that would adversely affect people, most notably the many poor people in the economically developing countries who are least able to cope with environmental changes. Insofar as environmental protection policies focus on sustainable economic development, human suffering may be mitigated as developing countries—especially the least-developed countries—are aided in meeting the basic needs of their citizens. Economic disparities within and between countries are growing. At least one-fifth of the world’s population already lives in the squalor of absolute poverty.59 This situation can be expected to worsen in the future. If this process can be mitigated or reversed by international policies focusing on environmentally sustainable economic development, human well-being on a global scale will rise. ‘What is more, international cooperative efforts to protect the environment that are made more likely and more effective by provisions for international equity will help governments protect their own environment and the global environment if they are successful. Insofar as the planet is one biosphere—that it is in the case of ozone depletion and climate change seems indisputable-persons in every local and national community are simultaneously members of an interdependent whole. Most activities, especially widespread activities in the United States and the rest of the industrialized world, including the release of ozone-destroying chemicals and greenhouse gases, are likely to adversely affect many or possibly all persons on the planet. Efforts to prevent such harm or make amends for historical harm (i.e., past pollution, which is especially important in these examples because many pollutants continue doing harm for years and often decades) require that most communities work together. Indeed, affluent lifestyles in the United States, ‘Western Europe, and other developed areas may harm people in poor areas of the world more than they will harm those enjoying such lifestyles because the poor are ill-equipped to deal with the consequences.6° Furthermore, by concerning themselves with the consequences of their actions on the global poor and polluted, Americans and the citizens of other developed countries will be helping their immediate neighbors—and themselves—in the long run. Actualization of international equity in conjunction with sustainable development may help prevent damage to the natural environment worldwide, thereby promoting human prosperity. The upshot is that the United States has not gone far enough in actively accepting equity as an objective of global environmental policy. It ought to go further in doing so for purely self-interested reasons. But there are more than self-interested reasons for the United States to move in this direction. It ought to embrace international equity as an objective of its global environmental policy for ethical reasons as well. We can find substantial ethical justification for the United States, in concert with other developed countries, to support politically and financially the codification and implementation of international equity considerations in international environmental agreements. The United States ought to be a leader in supporting a fair and just distribution among countries of the benefits, burdens, and decision-making authority associated with international environmental relations.61 To invoke themes found in the corpus of ethical philosophy (but without here assuming the burden of philosophical exegesis!), the United States ought to adopt policies that engender international equity in at least the environmental field (1) to protect the health and well-being of the human species; (2) to promote basic human rights universally; (3) to help the poor be their own moral agents (a Kantian rationale); (4) to help right past wrongs and to take responsibility for past injustices (i.e., past and indeed ongoing U.S. pollution of the global environment); (5) to aid the world’s least-advantaged people and countries (a Rawlsian-like conception); (6) and to fhlflll the requirement of impartiality (among other ethical reasons)62—all in addition to the more dearly self-interested justification that doing so will bolster U.S. credibility and influence in international environmental negotiations and contemporary global politics more generally. One might argue, therefore, that the United States ought to be aiding the developing countries to achieve sustainable development because to do so may simultaneously reduce human suffering and reduce or potentially reverse environmental destruction that could otherwise threaten the healthy survival of the human species**.** Insofar as human-caused pollution and resource exploitation deny individuals and their communities the capacity to survive in a healthy condition, the United States, which consumes vastly more than necessary, has an obligation to stop that unnecessary consumption. From this basic rights perspective,63 the U.S. government should also take steps to reduce substantially the emissions of pollutants from within the United States that harm people in other countries.64 The United States ought to refrain from unsustainable use of natural resources and from pollution of environmental commons shared by people living in other countries—or at least make a good effort toward that end—because the people affected by these activities cannot reasonably be expected to support them (we would not be treating them as independent moral agents, to make a Kantian argument65).

### 2nc Economy – EPA regs key

#### EPA regs key to econ and competitiveness – green jobs, regulatory certainty, innovation, lead in energy tech market

Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, a member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee,, 1/21 2010, ‘Gillibrand: For New York, This Amendment Stands For More Air Pollution In Our Communities, More Acid Rain Devastating Natural Treasures Like The Adirondacks, Ever-Increasing Asthma Rates For Our Children,” http://gillibrand.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/?id=c7e97140-cf14-4772-bf27-cd0c3a210db1

“Mr. President, I rise today to speak against the proposed Amendment from the Senator from Alaska. Mr. President, this resolution of disapproval goes against good public health policy and poses a serious threat to my constituents in New York - and all Americans – undermining our ability to advance efforts to clean our air and water and leave our world a better, healthier place. “This assault on the Clean Air Act would handcuff the Environmental Protection Agency, stripping it of its authority to regulate dangerous greenhouse gases. Mr. President, this amendment would let large scale polluters off the hook by scrapping requirements for electric generation facilities to use modern technology to reduce emissions and produce cleaner energy. “If passed, this amendment would send a message that the United States will remain reliant on outdated and inefficient energy technologies and delay investment in new, clean technologies that would spur innovation and create good-paying, American jobs, all across this great nation. “For my constituents in New York, this amendment stands for more air pollution in our communities, more acid rain devastating natural treasures like the Adirondacks, ever-increasing asthma rates for our children, and a failure to take action when action is long overdue. “Mr. President, regulatory uncertainty is undermining our national interests and giving countries like China and India the ability to eclipse our nation in developing the next generation of energy technologies - that we, the United States, should be leading the way on. “Supporters of this amendment are essentially saying that they do not believe the worldwide scientific consensus regarding climate change, and that they don’t believe greenhouse gases pose a threat to human health - despite decades of world-class science that predate it, and the clarion call from public health advocates across the country.

### Regs key competitiveness

#### Emissions cap key to rapid renewable development – key to competitiveness, business profits in massive markets and low cost emission cuts– gutting their internal links

Hawkins 7 (David -- director of the Climate Center at the National Resources Defense Council. Gristmill – November 28th -- http://gristmill.grist.org/story/2007/9/28/11254/2676)

Between now and 2030 over $17 trillion will be invested globally to meet the growing demand for energy services. Nearly all of this will be spent on fuels and conversion methods selected by private sector actors chasing profitability. The challenge is to focus the incredible power of these private sector actors on energy investments that minimize carbon emissions. To move at the pace and scale required to prevent the worst impacts of global warming we need policies that make clean energy products and services a superior business proposition. Policies that require a clear and steady reduction in emissions will move the private sector in the right direction faster than any government funded program by itself. With a schedule of declining caps on emissions as the law of the land, entrepreneurs in firms large and small will know there is a growing market for clean energy innovations. They will help the nation meet targeted emissions reduction at the lowest possible cost. Nordhaus and Shellenberger ignore the reality of the energy marketplace when they argue that the most important policy to drive new technology is a large government funded program. While incentive funding measures can be an important complementary strategy for clean energy deployment, by themselves they will not move the private sector at the required pace. In arguing for "breakthrough" technologies rather than deployment of today's clean energy solutions, Nordhaus and Shellenberger are peddling the same false choice the Bush administration has used to justify its retrograde policies for the past seven years. The convenient truth is that with intelligent policies to make clean energy more profitable we can get started today and we can set in motion the forces that will deliver the additional breakthroughs we need in the coming decades. This is not an "environmentalist" pipe dream. It is the judgment of the leaders of 27 of the largest American businesses, who have joined with NRDC and others in the U.S. Climate Action Partnership (USCAP), calling for a mandatory declining cap on U.S. global warming emissions. Its members include large energy producers and consumers such as Shell, Rio Tinto, Duke Energy, and Alcoa. These Fortune 500 companies recognize that their future business model depends upon the shift to low carbon technologies and efficiencies made possible through a national program of required emission reductions.

### A2 regs hurt economy

#### EPA regulations would be phased in – ensures business stability

NYT 2/22 2010, “E.P.A. Plans to Phase in Regulation of Emissions,” http://www.nytimes.com/2010/02/23/business/energy-environment/23epa.html

Facing wide criticism over their recent finding that greenhouse gases endanger the public welfare, top Environmental Protection Agency officials said Monday that any regulation of such gases would be phased in gradually and would not impose expensive new rules on most American businesses. The E.P.A.’s administrator, Lisa P. Jackson, wrote in a letter to eight coal-state Democrats who have sought a moratorium on regulation that only the biggest sources of greenhouse gases would be subjected to limits before 2013. Smaller ones would not be regulated before 2016, she said. “I share your goals of ensuring economic recovery at this critical time and of addressing greenhouse gas emissions in sensible ways that are consistent with the call for comprehensive energy and climate legislation,” Ms. Jackson wrote.

#### EPA regulations will be cost effective – claims of harsh regulation, economic or industry collapse are scare tactics

Sierra Club 2009, Q&A for EPA Endangerment Determination, “http://action.sierraclub.org/site/PageServer?pagename=adv\_bigpicture\_endangerment\_qa

This action is part of President Obama's comprehensive clean energy jobs plan. It will help shift U.S. energy production toward cleaner, cheaper sources like the wind and the sun and spur the creation of millions of new clean energy jobs. Building the clean energy economy is the key to getting our economy back on track and reducing our dependence on oil and coal. EPA will only issue the same kind of common sense regulations for carbon dioxide as it has for dozens of other pollutants for decades-regulations that protect both the environment and help grow the economy. In fact, the law only allows EPA to impose regulations that can be implemented on a cost-effective basis. Suggestions that these regulations will bankrupt companies and devastate the economy are merely scare tactics used by people who will say anything to protect Big Oil, Big Coal, and other polluters.

### A2 hurts AG industry

#### EPA regs needed to stop climate change – that kills crops

Christian Christian Parenti is a contributing editor at The Nation and a visiting scholar at the Center for Place, Culture and Politics, at the CUNY Grad Center., April 20, 2010, “The Nation: The Case for EPA Action,” http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126129216

"Obama, like Bush before him, is happy to assert unlimited executive authority when it comes to the war on terror, detention without trial, warrantless wiretapping," says Brendan Cummings, senior counsel at the Center for Biological Diversity. "But when it comes to addressing global warming, he refuses to use his clear and lawful executive power to reduce greenhouse pollution to protect people and the planet." "Heading into an election, I think, the administration is very leery of offending powerful corporate interests," says Tyson Slocum of Public Citizen. "That is especially true when those corporate interests make campaign expenditures in swing states." Other greens agree. "At stake in the fight over the EPA's ability to address global warming pollution is not only the president's environmental record but really the core promise of his presidency, to change the way Washington works," says Kert Davies, director of research at Greenpeace USA. "The year behind us on energy and climate policy shows what you get when the Obama administration's seeming compulsion for compromise meets the entrenched power of the coal, oil and nuclear industries." Tragically, climate change is not an issue where compromise will work. Bad healthcare bills can be improved; but on the climate front, time has run out. Atmospheric CO2 concentrations are at 390 parts per million and need to go back to 350 ppm. Already, oyster farms in the Pacific Northwest are in decline because of ocean acidification caused by climate change. Last year many Midwestern crops were too rain-soaked to harvest. Drought, likely linked to climate change, is battering much of Latin America, Africa and Asia. Everywhere signs of nature's unraveling are evident. Allowing Congress to strip the EPA of its review powers or letting the administration dither away its responsibility to act boldly would be a disaster. The EPA is our last, best hope.

#### Emissions hurt more – warming will destroy crop yields

Lynn Bergeson, Regulatory Editor at chemical processing, 2010, “Prepare to Report Climate Risks,” http://www.chemicalprocessing.com/articles/2010/002.html

There’s no serious question that climate change is real. The Supreme Court directed the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to determine whether greenhouse gas emissions threaten public health and welfare within Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act in Massachusetts v. EPA, 549 U.S. 497 (2007). Earlier this year, EPA issued a proposed “endangerment finding” accompanied by an extensive Technical Support Document (see http://epa.gov/climatechange/endangerment/downloads/TSD\_Endangerment.pdf) containing its analysis of the effects of greenhouse gas emissions. “Pressure on industries with energy-sensitive operations and green house gas emissions will likely increase.” They include substantial economic effects such as crop losses associated with flooding and diminished farmer profits linked to delayed spring planting; forest losses due to warmer temperatures and elevated insect activity; property losses; significant losses in the energy sector; increasing cost associated with water infrastructure; and adverse affects on tourism, among others. EPA issued a final rule in October 2009 requiring large sources of greenhouse gas emissions to report them to EPA each year beginning in 2010.

### A2 hurts chemical industry

#### Emissions limits increase demand for chemical industry products – offsets losses

CAMPOY 9. [ANA, journalist, “Chemical makers poised to gain in new cap and trade system” Wall Street Journal – Jun 5]

With legislation pending in Congress that could put a price on greenhouse-gas emissions, the energy-gulping chemical industry is trying to position itself to emerge as an unlikely winner. Chemical makers are one of the biggest energy users among manufacturers, expelling about 5% of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions, according to government data. They face heavy costs under a proposed system to cap emissions that would require the industry to purchase permits to pollute. But a so-called cap-and-trade system would also boost demand for some chemical companies' products, from insulation to solar-panel components, because those products would help others cut back on the energy use. "This is really our sweet spot," said Calvin Dooley, chief executive of the American Chemistry Council, an industry trade group.

### A2 congressional action required

#### Congress is not necessary to solve

Parenti ’10 (Christian Parenti, a contributing editor at The Nation and a visiting scholar at the Center for Place, Culture and Politics, at the CUNY Grad Center, 4-20-10, “The Nation: The Case for EPA Action,” http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=126129216)

So where is the Obama administration? The president says he prefers climate legislation to EPA regulation. That is an unnecessary concession; Obama does not need to wait for Congress. In this situation, American politics is not hostage to an obstructionist right-wing fringe or the lack of a sixty-vote supermajority. Existing laws allow—even require—broad and robust action. Throughout American history the executive branch has steadily been accruing power. Before the 1930s presidents rarely proposed legislation. Even LBJ worried that his phone calls to lobby senators could violate the "separation of powers doctrine." Nixon created the EPA in 1970 precisely to concentrate more power in the hands of the executive. He gathered up all the existing environmental programs, gave them no extra money and put them in one agency, which answered to a director appointed by the president. The Bush administration practically searched the vest pockets of bureaucrats to find ways (often illegal) to enhance presidential prerogatives.

### No Romney rollback – AFF CARD

#### Even if Romney and GOP win – dems block EPA rollback

Star Ledger, 12 (6/3, <http://blog.nj.com/njv_editorial_page/2012/06/scary_times_for_environment_--.html>)

Yes, there are restraints on how bad this could get. Some of the EPA’s toughest regulations were put in place as a result of lawsuits. One example is the rule limiting mercury emissions from coal plants. New Jersey, in the pre-Christie era, was one of the states that filed that lawsuit. A President Romney might not be able to reverse those regulations without new legislation. And even if Republicans make gains, Democrats will be able to block the worst legislation with 41 votes in the Senate. The dreaded filibuster rule could finally come in handy.

#### Romneys bluffing – its just a campaign tactic

Star Ledger, 12 (6/3, <http://blog.nj.com/njv_editorial_page/2012/06/scary_times_for_environment_--.html>)

And, of course, you never know how seriously to take Romney. You get the sense he might not believe some of the crazy things he says, that he wouldn’t be as bad as he promises to be. As governor of Massachusetts, he imposed tough emissions rules on coal plants, and even stood outside one and said, "This plant kills people."

# October Surprise

### October Surprise 1nc

#### Obama will strike Iran as October Surprise if he’s losing – their “No Strikes” ev doesn’t assume our link

Chemi Shalev is an Israeli journalist and political analyst. Chemi Shalev is a US foreign correspondent for Haaretz newspaper 12-27-2011 <http://www.haaretz.com/blogs/west-of-eden/will-a-u-s-attack-on-iran-become-obama-s-october-surprise-1.403898>

Will a U.S. attack on Iran become Obama’s ‘October Surprise’? Israelis and many Americans are convinced that President Obama will ultimately back away from attacking Iran. They may be wrong. 1. “When American officials declare that all options are on the table, most Israelis do not believe them. They have concluded, rather, that when the crunch comes (and everyone thinks it will), the United States will shy away from military force and reconfigure its policy to live with a nuclear-armed Iran.” This was the bottom line of “What Israelis Hear When Obama Officials Talk About Iran”, an article written by William Galston, a senior research fellow at Brookings, after he canvassed the Israeli participants in the recent Saban Forum held in Washington in early December. Since that diagnosis, rendered only three weeks ago, the content, tone and intensity of American pronouncements on Iran have undergone progressively dramatic changes. These include: • December 16: President Obama, in a speech before the Union of Reform Judaism, goes from the passive “a nuclear Iran is unacceptable” to the assertive “We are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.” • December 19: Secretary of Defense Panetta, hitherto the main articulator of the pitfalls of an attack on Iran, suddenly ups the ante by declaring that Iran might be only a year away from acquiring a nuclear bomb, that this the “red line” as far as the U.S. is concerned, and that Washington “will take whatever steps necessary to deal with it." • December 20: General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, tells CNN that “the options we are developing are evolving to a point that they would be executable, if necessary”, adding: 'My biggest worry is that they (Iranians) will miscalculate our resolve'. • December 21: Dennis Ross tells Israel’s Channel 10 television that President Obama would be prepared to “take a certain step” if that is what is required and “this means that when all options are on the table and if you’ve exhausted all other means, you do what is necessary". • December 22: Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak, commenting on the above statements, says that they "make clear a fact that was already known to us from closed-door (discussions). It makes clear to Iran that it faces a real dilemma." • December 23: Matthew Kroenig, former Special Adviser on Iran at the Pentagon, publishes an article in the prestigious Foreign Affairs, entitled “Time to Attack Iran”, in which he lays out the case for an American offensive against Iran – sooner rather than later. Israeli analysts, however, remain unconvinced. Influenced, perhaps, by their own experience with Israel’s cynical political leadership, they have ascribed much of this newly-found oomph in American utterances to an elections-inspired attempt by the Obama Administration to “show support for Israel” at a time of political need. Conversely, they maintain that the change in the American tone is a result of new intelligence information that was presented by Barak to Obama in their December 16 meeting in Washington. Both of these assessments may or may not be true, but they fail to tell the whole story. The timing of the reinvigorated American rhetoric is undoubtedly tied to the December 18 withdrawal of the last American troops from Iraq. The U.S. Army and the Pentagon have long opposed inflammatory rhetoric toward Tehran during the withdrawal, for fear it might endanger U.S. troops in Iraq. With the withdrawal complete, the Administration felt free to adopt a much more belligerent tone, literally overnight. As to the substance of American policy, Israelis appear to have persuaded themselves that, despite his vigorous prosecution of the war in Afghanistan and his successful and deadly pursuit of al-Qaida, Obama remains “soft” on Iran and will ultimately back down when push comes to shove. This perception has been fed by Obama’s ill-fated attempt to “engage” with Iran, his initial courtship of the Arab and Muslim world, what is widely perceived as his pro-Palestinian tendencies – and the overall animosity and prejudice directed at the president by many of his detractors. The Republicans are so convinced, in fact, that they are basing much of their foreign policy campaign against Obama on the assumption that he will ultimately capitulate to Tehran. That may be a dangerous assumption on their part. In his speech at the Nobel Peace Prize ceremony in December 2009 – possibly forgotten because of the ridiculously premature or spectacularly misdirected awarding of the prize - Obama spoke of a "just war" which can be waged “as a last resort or in self-defense”. After warning of the danger posed by Iran’s nuclear campaign, he said “those who seek peace cannot stand idly by as nations arm themselves for nuclear war.” In the days after that speech in Oslo, Christian theologian Reinhold Niebuhr was often cited as a source of inspiration for Obama, and it was Niebuhr who wrote, “contemporary history refutes the idea that nations are drawn into war too precipitately. It proves, on the contrary, that it is the general inclination of democratic nations at least to hesitate so long before taking this fateful plunge that the dictator nations gain a fateful advantage over them.” Obama may not want to fall into that pattern. People believe what they want to believe, but Obama has already proven - in Afghanistan, in Libya, in the offensive against al-Qaida, in the drone war in Somalia, Pakistan and Yemen – that he is no pacifist and does not shy way from using military force when necessary. And while he has stuck to his prepared script that “all options are on the table," people who have heard Obama speak about Iran in closed sessions have no doubt that if all else fails, including “crippling” sanctions and international isolation, Obama would order a U.S. attack on Iran, if he was convinced, as he appears to be, that it posed a clear and present danger to America’s national security. 2. And there can be no doubt - notwithstanding claims by the radical left and the isolationist right - that a nuclear Iran would be an unmitigated disaster for American interests, above and beyond the existential threat to Israel. Arab countries would be confronted by a stark choice between subservience to Tehran and the dangerous pursuit of their own nuclear prowess; Muslim extremism would flourish at a particularly precarious juncture in Arab history, compelling newly-emergent Muslim parties, especially in Egypt, to opt for extreme belligerence toward America and Israel; under a protective nuclear umbrella, Hamas and Hezbollah and others of their ilk would be able to run amok with impunity; the entire Middle East would be destabilized and America’s oil supplies held hostage by a self-confident and bellicose Iran. The standing of the U.S., after it is inevitably perceived as having lost out to the Ayatollahs, would reach an all-time low. Russia and China would gradually become the dominant powers in the region. Tehran would be free to expand and further develop its nuclear arsenal and ballistic missile capability. And Israel, America’s main ally in the region – perhaps in the world – would face a continuous mortal and ultimately paralyzing threat from an increasingly implacable enemy. Given their doubts about Obama’s resolve to order a U.S. military attack, Israeli analysts have tended to focus on the existence, or lack thereof, of an American “green light” for an Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear facilities. Indeed, one of the arguments made by Kroenig in Foreign Affairs is that a U.S. attack “can also head off a possible Israeli operation against Iran, which, given Israel’s limited capability to mitigate a potential battle and inflict lasting damage, would likely result in far more devastating consequences and carry a far lower probability of success than a U.S. attack.” But it is far from clear whether America’s acknowledged operational and logistical advantage is the most compelling argument against an Israeli attack, and whether Israel is indeed incapable of “inflicting lasting damage” on Iran. After years and years of preparation, and with the wily Barak at the helm, one should “expect the unexpected” from an Israeli attack. It would definitely not be a rerun of the 1981 bombing raid on Iraq’s nuclear reactor at Osirak, not in scope, not in intensity, not in the means of delivery and not in the yield and sophistication of the weapons that will be thrown into battle. But there are other profound drawbacks to an Israeli attack and corresponding advantages to an American offensive. An Israeli attack would rally the Arab and Muslim world behind Iran, strengthen radical Islamists, neutralize potentially sympathetic countries as Saudi Arabia and further distance Turkey from Israel and the West. The U.S. would have no choice but to support Israel, even though such support would inflame animosity toward Washington throughout the Muslim world. An American attack, on the other hand, would restore Washington’s stature and power of deterrence in the Arab world, could unite most of the Sunni monarchies and oil Sheikdoms in tacit assistance, at the very least, for the military effort, could facilitate Turkish neutrality and enable European support, and would sideline the incendiary issue of Israel, just as it did when Jerusalem maintained a “low profile” during the first two Gulf wars. It might also decrease the intensity of a combined Iranian-Hamas-Hezbollah and possibly Syrian counterattack against Israel, and would, in any case, free Israel to defend itself and to effectively deal with such an onslaught. And yes, though hardly devoid of risks, it might very well ensure Barack Obama’s reelection next November. 3. To be sure, despite Republican protestations to the contrary, American voters are ambivalent about a U.S. attack on Iran. In a recent Quinnipiac University Survey, 55 per cent of voters said the U.S. should not take military action against Iran – but 50 per cent would nonetheless support it, if all else fails. And 88 per cent believe that a nuclear Iran posed a serious threat or a somewhat serious threat to American national security. In the end, it would all come down to timing. The closer to elections that an American attack on Iran would take place, the more it would work in Obama’s favor. Though his left wing flank and possibly large chunks of the Democratic Party would not differentiate between Iraq and Iran, would draw historic parallels with the Bush Administration’s bogus evidence of Iraq’s WMD capabilities and would vehemently criticize Obama for “betraying his principles” - Obama would probably sway most independents and even moderate Republicans who would be swept up in the initial, patriotic wave of support for a campaign against a country that the Republican candidates for the presidency have described as America’s number one enemy. And Obama could point out to the American public that contrary to Iraq, no ground troops would be involved in Iran. A significantly earlier attack, however, would be far riskier. The initial patriotic fervor might dissipate and the wider ramifications would begin to sink in, including potential Iranian retaliation against American targets, and, perhaps more significantly, the disruption of oil supplies, an unprecedented spike in oil prices and an ensuing and crippling blow to U.S. economic recovery. If one wants to be absolutely cynical, perhaps Panetta’s one-year deadline was intentionally calibrated with this election timeline. Though there is no basis to suspect Obama of making political calculations, and without detracting from what is sure to be a serious American effort to get sanctions and possibly regime change to do the trick – October would be ideal. That’s the month that Henry Kissinger chose in 1972 to prematurely declare that “peace is at hand” in Vietnam, thus turning Richard Nixon’s certain victory over George McGovern into a landslide; that’s the month that Ronald Reagan feared Jimmy Carter would use in 1980 in order to free the Iran hostages and stop the Republican momentum; and that’s the month that many of Obama’s opponents are already jittery about, fearing the proverbial “October Surprise” that would hand Obama his second term on a platter. Two things are certain: the Republicans, who are now goading Obama for being soft on Iran and beating their own war drums, would reverse course in mid air with nary a blink and accuse the president of playing politics with American lives and needlessly embroiling it in a war which probably could have been avoided if he had been tough on Iran in the first place. And what about the Jewish vote? That would be Obama’s, lock, stock and barrel, including those Jewish voters who cannot forgive him for the Cairo speech, the bow to King Abdullah, the 1967 borders, the lack of chemistry with Netanyahu and that the fact that he has yet to produce evidence that he isn’t, after all, a closet Muslim. And in Israel, no doubt about it, he would be forever revered as the ultimate Righteous Gentile.

#### Iran strikes causes multiple scenarios for extinction.

Chossudovsky -06 (Michel Chossudovsky, The Next Phase of the Middle East War, Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=3147)

The Bush Administration has embarked upon a military adventure which threatens the future of humanity. This is not an overstatement. If aerial bombardments were to be launched against Iran, they would trigger a ground war and the escalation of the conflict to a much broader region. Even in the case of aerial and missile attacks using conventional warheads, the bombings would unleash a "Chernobyl type" nuclear nightmare resulting from the spread of nuclear radiation following the destruction of Iran's nuclear energy facilities. Throughout history, the structure of military alliances has played a crucial role in triggering major military conflicts. In contrast to the situation prevailing prior to the 2003 invasion of Iraq, America's ongoing military adventure is now firmly supported by the Franco-German alliance. Moreover, Israel is slated to play a direct role in this military operation. NATO is firmly aligned with the Anglo-American-Israeli military axis, which also includes Australia and Canada. In 2005, NATO signed a military cooperation agreement with Israel, and Israel has a longstanding bilateral military agreement with Turkey. Iran has observer status in The Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and is slated to become a full member of SCO. China and Russia have far-reaching military cooperation agreements with Iran. China and Russia are firmly opposed to a US-led military operation in the diplomatic arena. While the US sponsored military plan threatens Russian and Chinese interests in Central Asia and the Caspian sea basin, it is unlikely that they would intervene militarily on the side of Iran or Syria. The planned attack on Iran must be understood in relation to the existing active war theaters in the Middle East, namely Afghanistan, Iraq and Lebanon-Palestine. The conflict could easily spread from the Middle East to the Caspian sea basin. It could also involve the participation of Azerbaijan and Georgia, where US troops are stationed. Military action against Iran and Syria would directly involve Israel's participation, which in turn would trigger a broader war throughout the Middle East, not to mention the further implosion in the Palestinian occupied territories. Turkey is closely associated with the proposed aerial attacks. If the US-UK-Israeli war plans were to proceed, the broader Middle East- Central Asian region would flare up, from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Afghan-Chinese border. At present, there are three distinct war theaters: Afghanistan, Iraq and Palestine-Lebanon. An attack directed against Iran would serve to integrate these war theaters transforming the broader Middle East Central Asian region into an integrated war zone. (see map above) In turn the US sponsored aerial bombardments directed against Iran could contribute to triggering a ground war characterized by Iranian attacks directed against coalition troops in Iraq. In turn, Israeli forces would enter into Syria. An attack on Iran would have a direct impact on the resistance movement inside Iraq. It would also put pressure on America's overstretched military capabilities and resources in both the Iraqi and Afghan war theaters. In other words, the shaky geopolitics of the Central Asia- Middle East region, the three existing war theaters in which America is currently, involved, the direct participation of Israel and Turkey, the structure of US sponsored military alliances, etc. raises the specter of a broader conflict. The war against Iran is part of a longer term US military agenda which seeks to militarize the entire Caspian sea basin, eventually leading to the destabilization and conquest of the Russian Federation.

### October Surprise – Obama losing = strikes

#### Obama will strike Iran if he starts to lose the election- prefer our evidence- media reports underestimate this risk

J. D. Longstreet is a thirty-year veteran of the broadcasting business, as an “in the field” and “on-air” news reporter (contributing to radio, TV, and newspapers) and a conservative broadcast commentator. 1-14-2012 <http://www.federalobserver.com/2012/01/14/war-clouds-continue-to-gather/>

So when will this war begin. Well, let me put it this way: The Iranians should carefully watch Obama’s poll numbers. If those numbers continue their slide downwards, the Iranians are going get the heck bombed out of them. Americans are extremely reluctant to change Presidents in the middle of a war. Obama knows this and is expected to act accordingly. Some conservative writers and commentators expect that war in the Middle East is currently scheduled for October 2012. That would be the famed “October Surprise.” On the other hand, those in my camp believe the Iranians, in all their hyped-up passion, will do something stupid like firing on a tanker or a US warship or aircraft, or even worse, make an attempt to close the Straits of Hormuz by sewing it with mines and other hazards to maritime traffic. That would be the spark that would bring down the considerable wrath of that naval armada lying off their shores. Then there are the Israelis. They have had enough of Iran’s threats and Iran’s war on Israel by proxy. Israel’s secret war of sabotage in Iran can only deliver limited success at delaying and derailing Iran’s race to build or acquire a nuclear bomb. Israel could decide, at any moment, that enough is enough and launch their fighter-bombers and cruise missiles at Iran’s nuclear facilities. Even if it only buys a few months or a couple of years of breathing space for Israel, it is becoming clear there is no other way to effectively deter Iran from building their coveted Islam Bomb. The situation in the Middle East today is far, far, more dangerous than the US media is reporting. A single spark will ignite a devastating war that will affect practically every nation on earth to some degree or other. Those of us who continue to sound the warning bell of a huge war in the Middle East are being compared to the boy Peter in the story of “Peter and the Wolf.” An article at Haaretz.com noted that those who make such public comparisons seem always to leave out the end of Aesop’s famous tale of the boy who called wolf too much. In the end, the wolf actually DID come — and the sheep were slaughtered. (SOURCE) So, with that ending in mind, I have no concern about continually pointing to those dark, foreboding, clouds gathering in the east. Since the mainstream media seems to be ignoring a certain war to protect Obama’s prospects in the coming election, someone must stand as a watchman on the ramparts and sound the alarm when clouds of dust from the approaching armies of the enemy is sighted and when the sound of distant war drums is heard. Today those dust clouds are clearly seen over the horizon and the pounding of the drums can be heard in the distance — and we are sounding the alarm.

#### October surprise possible- election fate and Jewish vote determine strikes

Paul R. Pillar (visiting professor at Georgetown University for security studies) 3-7-2012 <http://consortiumnews.com/2012/03/07/an-israeli-october-surprise-on-obama/>

The greatest danger the United States (and any peace-loving person in the Middle East) currently faces is that Barak and Prime Minister Netanyahu will spring an October surprise (or a surprise in any month between now and the first Tuesday of November) in the form of an armed attack on Iran. [For more on a historical precedent, see Consortiumnews.com’s “The CIA/Likud Sinking of Jimmy Carter.”] A key consideration for them is the possibly different reactions of a U.S. president facing a fight for reelection (while also facing that political muscle represented at the convention center) and a newly reelected president who knows he never would be running for anything again.

#### Obama will strike Iran if he gets behind in the polls- sees it as his get out of jail free card

Jeremy Slate, Bachelor's Degree in Judaism and Catholic Theology, and a Master's Degree in European History, 2-12-2012 <http://www.jeremyrslate.com/2012/02/art-of-october-surprise.html>

This time of year we are all looking for surprises. However, this Christmas season, I would like you consider a different type of surprise; an October Surprise. This probably conjures up mental images of ghosts, Goblins and pumpkins, but this line of thinking is completely off track. Typically, elections in the US take place the Tuesday after the first Monday in November; making events in October politically expedient. It is fitting the first October Surprise was conducted by Richard Nixon, a very "surprising" individual. Nixon is involved in two October Surprises, the second, in 1972, coining the phrase. In 1968, peace was a real possibility in Vietnam. It caused democrat, Hubert Humphrey to surge past Nixon in the polls. Nixon advisory, Henry Kissinger, spoke to the North Vietnamese, causing them to walk away from the peace treaty. Nixon would benefit again from Vietnam in 1972, when 12 days before the election, peace was announced, once again propelling Nixon to victory. Reagan had his own October Surprise fears due to Jimmy Carter in 1980. Carter believed the Iranian hostages safe return would cement his own campaign. The surprise was not to be; the hostages were not released until January 20, 1981, the day of Reagan's inauguration. In the 2000 election, George W. Bush almost lost the election due to October accusations of DWI. An October 2004 reduction of Saudi oil prices helped to cement Bush's reelection campaign. This is very interesting because there is a new October Surprise on the way. Barack Obama fears he will not win his reelection bid, seeing we is losing to "generic republican" in the polls. Mr. Obama has an ace in the hole, an October Surprise. The United States and Iran have been doing a lot of posturing. There was even a recent Daily Caller article blaming Iran for 9/11. Apparently, that card worked so well with Iraq and Afghanistan, so its being played again with Iran. Obama's Keynesian policies have failed and he is looking for a get out of jail free card. General Wesley Clark warned citizens in 2003 that the ultimate goal of the US was open war with Iran. Obama would even sway some of the war hungry Neo-Cons to his side. Israel will go to war with Iran around August, and the US will come in October to aid. It is important that it happens in October, so the media has no time to cover the story. A sitting president has never lost a reelection campaign during a time of war.

#### More ev

Jason Ditz Antiwar.com, 2-17-2012 <http://news.antiwar.com/2012/02/17/obama-officials-iran-sanctions-will-fail-leading-to-war/>

The new reports come just one day after Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta conceded that Iran isn’t actually developing a nuclear weapon, and DIA chief Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess said that Iran was unlikely to start any war on their own. Officials say Obama has been telling Israel he wants to “give sufficient time” to the current round of sanctions before starting the war, though they say that in the end the result will start be a war because Iran is “behaving like sanctions don’t matter.” It does seem to have pushed back the start of the war a bit, however, as Panetta had previously predicted Israel would launch an attack between April and June, but Obama advisors are now calling September or October the “sweet spot.” This could mean a literal October surprise, with President Obama either starting a huge war with Iran just ahead of the 2012 presidential election, or having Israel do so and jumping in immediately thereafter. Such a timing for the war could be seen as politically desirable for the president, with several of the Republican candidates condemning him for not being more hawkish against Iran, and likely to center a foreign policy debate on his not starting this particular war.

### October Surprise – A2 Obama Will Never Strike

#### Obama willing to do it for political reasons- private comments and recent statements

News Max, 12-31-2011 <http://www.newsmax.com/InsiderReport/October-Surprise-Against-Iran/2011/12/31/id/422683>

Recent statements from the Obama administration have led at least one Israeli observer to suspect that the president is preparing for an attack on Iran — and political considerations would dictate an assault in October. Writing in the Israeli newspaper Haaretz, Chemi Shalev notes that on Dec. 16, Obama switched his rhetoric from "a nuclear Iran is unacceptable" to the assertive "we are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons." On Dec. 19, Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, who had previously warned about the pitfalls of an attack on Iran, declared that the United States "will take whatever steps necessary to deal with" the Iranian nuclear threat. The next day, Gen. Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said, "My biggest worry is that [the Iranians] will miscalculate our resolve." Shalev observes that with the withdrawal of American troops from Iraq, there is no longer fear that an attack on Iran would endanger U.S. forces there. And he discloses that people who have heard Obama speak about Iran in closed sessions believe he would order an attack if he is convinced that a nuclear-armed Iran poses a clear danger to America's national security.

#### Advisors are pushing and campaign knows boost will happen

Jeffrey T. Kuhner is a columnist at The Washington Times and president of the Edmund Burke Institute. 3-9-2012 <http://www.worldnewstribune.com/2012/03/09/obamas-october-surprise/>

Is President Obama planning to launch military strikes against Iran in order to ensure re-election? Is there an October surprise being hatched by the White House? All the signals are: yes. Recently, Mr. Obama told an audience at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee’s (AIPAC) annual policy conference in Washington, D.C. that a nuclear-armed Iran is “unacceptable.” He said that all options—including military force — are “on the table.” And he warned Teheran’s mullahs not to “call my bluff.” In short, the clouds of war are looming on the horizon. Yet, at the same time, Mr. Obama is strongly pressuring Israel not to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities. The administration argues that diplomacy, sanctions and covert operations are starting to take their toll on the Islamic Republic. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has warned Mr. Obama that Jerusalem cannot wait much longer; Iran is about to enter the “zone of immunity” where it will acquire the capacity to build a nuclear weapons program — crossing the threshold whereby the ayatollahs cannot be stopped from getting the bomb. Mr. Obama has assured Mr. Netanyahu not to worry; America will destroy Iran’s nuclear program if necessary. The president vowed at AIPAC that “I have Israel’s back.” He doesn’t. Mr. Obama is playing a cynical game, using the existential fate of the Jewish state as a political trump card to guarantee his re-election in November. He is the most anti-Israel president in U.S. history. Mr. Obama doggedly opposed the sanctions imposed on Iran — especially, on its central bank. The only reason he begrudgingly signed on was because they were embedded as part of the defense bill. Yet, he now claims credit for their impact. He has repeatedly called for diplomatic engagement with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. In 2009, when millions of pro-democracy protesters poured onto the streets of Tehran and other Iranian cities to protest the rigged elections, Mr. Obama did the unthinkable: He remained silent. He refused to lift a finger or say a word of encouragement to help the brave democrats seeking to overthrow the clerical fascist regime. Mr. Ahmadinejad is the Hitler of our time. He has repeatedly called for the destruction of Israel, pledging to wipe the Jewish state off the map. The Iranian strongman is a radical Shi’ite revolutionary, who hopes to erect a world Muslim empire on the ashes of the Jews. In short, he is not just the mortal enemy of Israel — and the West — but a genocidal madman. Mr. Obama’s dithering and feckless diplomacy has given the mullahs the one thing they desperately crave: time. They are running out the clock in order to achieve an Islamic bomb. Instead of stopping them, Mr. Obama has only emboldened their nuclear ambitions. Moreover, the administration has called for Israel to enter peace talks with the Palestinians based on a return to the pre-1967 borders. This would effectively force Jerusalem to accept territorial boundaries that would leave it defenseless against any future Palestinian or Arab invasion. Mr. Obama also withdrew support for Egypt’s pro-American dictator, Hosni Mubarak. The result is that the Muslim Brotherhood has come to power. Mr. Mubarak was many things — venal, corrupt and brutal. But he kept the peace with Israel and helped to advance America’s national interests in the region, especially, in fighting Islamic terrorists. This has now changed. The Muslim Brotherhood aims to forge a Sunni theocracy, transforming Egypt into an anti-Semitic, anti-Western hotbed. Hence, under Mr. Obama’s leadership, the Jewish people find themselves encircled by dangerous Islamists. Providing Mr. Obama with control over Israel’s future is like trusting Dracula with a blood bank. It is an act of folly. Mr. Obama refuses to give Israel the green light to launch military strikes on Iran. Israeli intelligence officials admit that, privately, the White House has warned Mr. Netanyahu that in the event of an attack Israel — and not Iran — will be blamed by the administration. In short, Mr. Obama is trying to tie Mr. Netanyahu’s hands, coercing him to wait for Washington to take decisive action. The record, however, is clear: sanctions have not — and will not — work. Russia and China continue to prop up Teheran. Moreover, the mullahs are not driven by economic considerations; a messianic theocracy is not concerned about growth rates or improving living standards. It cares about cementing its grip on power. A bomb will ensure the survival of the Islamic Republic. It will be untouchable. This is why a regional showdown is inevitable. Mr. Obama is blatantly attempting to maximize his political capital. He is hoping to keep the charade of diplomacy and sanctions going until the summer or early fall. And then, when he believes Iran is on the cusp of going nuclear, Mr. Obama will order an American — not Israeli — air strike on Teheran’s key facilities. The result will be a temporary boost in his popular approval, as Americans rally around their commander-in-chief. It will make Mr. Obama look decisive, strong and presidential. It will propel him to victory, riding a wave of patriotic emotion.

# Obama Good – Iran Strikes BAD

# Iran strikes – internals

### Romney = Iran Strikes

#### GOP win causes Iran strikes

Dilek 9-20-11 (Emine, addicting info, “All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran” http://www.addictinginfo.org/2011/09/20/all-republican-candidates-favor-war-with-iran/, jj)

All Republican Candidates Favor War with Iran Prepare yourself my fellow Americans. If you elect a Republican President in the 2012 elections, more than likely we will be at war with Iran before his or her Presidency is over. In a disturbing new article written by Trita Parsi, a columnist for Salon.com, he expertly connects the dots on which single foreign policy issue is uniting all GOP candidates: Iran. He writes that when it comes to Arab Spring and all other foreign policy issues, GOP candidates are all over the place. But when it is about Iran, they all agree; USA must be tougher. Parsi asserts that “Republicans will present a narrative that diplomacy was tried and failed, sanctions are tough but insufficient, and the only remaining option is some form of military action. As the memory of the Iraq invasion slowly fades away, Republican strategists calculate, the American public will return to rewarding toughness over wisdom at the ballot boxes.” Although I agree with Parsi’s claim that Iran is the only foreign policy matter that unites all GOP candidates, I do not believe the memory of Iraq invasion is slowly fading. Contrary to his assertion, I believe Americans are fed up with the unending wars.

#### GOP win causes Iran strike

Jon Swaine, 11-13-2011, “Republican hopefuls would go to war with Iran,” Telegraph, <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/republicans/8887247/Republican-hopefuls-would-go-to-war-with-Iran.html>

Republican hopefuls would go to war with Iran Republican presidential hopefuls have promised to go to war to stop Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon, painting Barack Obama's handling of Tehran as the most serious of a string of overseas failures. Mitt Romney, the favourite to clinch the party's candidacy, said that he would direct US forces to pre-emptively strike Iran's nuclear facilities if "crippling sanctions" failed to block their ambitions. "If all else fails, if after all of the work we've done, there's nothing else we could do besides take military action," Mr Romney said at a debate on foreign policy in South Carolina on Saturday night. The former Massachusetts governor's pledge was echoed by Newt Gingrich, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives, who over the weekend rose to second place in some national opinion polls. "You have to take whatever steps are necessary to break its capacity to have a nuclear weapon," said Mr Gingrich, who also proposed covert actions such as "taking out their scientists," to applause. Rick Santorum, a former Senator for Pennsylvania, said the US should support an Israeli intervention. Their remarks came at the end of a week of heightened tensions following the UN nuclear watchdog's confirmation that Iran had acquired the expertise and material required to build its first nuclear weapon. Related Articles The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) also acknowledged for the first time that Tehran was conducting secret experiments whose only purpose could be the development of weaponry. As his potential Republican rivals spoke, Mr Obama was being rebuffed by Presidents Hu Jintao of China and Dmitry Medvedev of Russia as he sought international support for sanctions against Tehran. After meetings at an Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation (APEC) summit in Hawaii, Mr Obama said that Russia had agreed to "work to shape a common response" to Iran's threatening manoeuvres, and that China wanted Tehran to obey "international rules and norms".

#### Romney favors preemptive military action

National Journal Subscriber, 3-4-2012 <http://www.nationaljournal.com/whitehouse/obama-plays-hawk-in-chief-on-iran-20120304>

On the campaign trail, Republican candidates Mitt Romney and Rick Santorum have both come close to promising U.S. preemptive war against Iran—and soon—if elected. At the most recent GOP presidential debate in Arizona, Romney said that for him, military action wouldn't be merely "an option." Obama, Romney said, has "made it clear through his administration and almost every communication we've had so far that he does not want Israel to take action, he opposes military action. He should have instead communicated to Iran that we are prepared, that we are considering military options. They're not just on the table. They are in our hand."

are mere preludes to the existential risks that we will encounter in the 21st century.

# Iran strikes – Israel

### Israel – no attack

#### Israel won’t attack 5 reasons

**Elam 11/8/11** (Yohay, author and analyst, http://seekingalpha.com/article/306183-5-reasons-why-israel-will-not-attack-iran-but-if-it-does-how-will-currencies-react)

The chances of an airstrike happening are low. 5 reasons are detailed below. But if tensions rise, how will this impact currencies? Why there's a low chance of a strike: Israeli threats add to pressure on sanctions: The Western countries will want to increase sanctions on Iran, while Russia and China are reluctant to do so. Raising the threat to attack puts pressure for more sanctions and helps the U.S. and its allies. Israeli government under internal pressure: The J14 social justice movement continues to be very active. The government led by Netanyahu managed to divert attention from the recent protest on October 29th through a mini-escalation in Gaza. Keeping Iran in the headlines also helps move public attention to external enemies and diverts attention from internal economic issues. Also the release of abducted soldier Gilad Shalit has a lot to do with this internal pressure. **But will the government go ahead with a strike? Probably not – polls show that only half of the population supports an attack, and that most Israelis are convinced it will trigger a full scale conflict. So it’s better to keep the media busy with threats, but to avoid acting.** No U.S. Approval for an Israeli strike: It is hard to believe that Israel will act on its own in attacking Iran. In the past, a different U.S. administration gave Israel a clear red light regarding such an attack. The U.S. may express concern about Israel doing it on its own, but it also goes to show that there is no U.S. approval. In addition, it is uncertain if a full scale destruction of the Iranian nuclear plants can happen without military assistance from the U.S. The U.S. doesn’t need another war: The U.S. economy is still in dire straits, despite some encouraging signs seen lately. Obama just announced a retreat from Iraq. Allocating resources to the same region once again will strain the U.S. budget, just as the super committee is trying to find ways to reduce the deficit, and isn’t having a lot of success. Another war, even if the U.S. participation is limited, will put a lot of pressure on U.S. finances one year before the elections, and when the U.S. is finally showing some signs of recovery. Iran also prefers to focus on external enemies: The Arab spring has also reached the Islamic Republic. Protests were crushed in Teheran a few months ago. But now there are tensions within the ruling elite that have been surfacing. Keeping tension high with the U.S. and Israel means less awareness of internal issues. Iran certainly want tension and it recently said that it will cause “1 million Israeli casualties with only 4 missiles”. But a full escalation isn’t desired in Teheran either.

#### Israel won’t attack – not successful, regional war, no US support, sanctions work

**Yoffie 1/12/12** (Eric, Rabbi and analyst for the Jerusalem Post, http://blogs.jpost.com/content/us-will-not-attack-iran-and-neither-will-israel)

The United States will not attack Iran to prevent her from acquiring nuclear weapons—and neither will Israel. This prediction does not make me happy. Iran is a grave threat to her neighbors and the world, and in certain circumstances, a military attack by America might be the best way to deal with an Iranian bomb. But the evidence suggests that this will not happen. Geo-political realities discourage American military action. A bombing raid would have to be intensive and prolonged, lasting 2 to 3 weeks, and even then, may not work. It would lead to attacks on American embassies and to missile attacks on Israel’s civilian population. Furthermore, in a military campaign lasting several weeks, the entire Moslem world would rally to Iran’s side. The recent rise of the Islamist parties in the Arab world also makes the Americans reluctant to act. It is not yet known if these parties will adopt a radical or moderate course, and an attack on a Moslem country would push them in the radical direction. Add to all of this America’s economic difficulties and the war-weariness of the American people, and any American government will prefer economic sanctions against Iran to the uncertainties of a military strike. The Obama administration has asserted that all options remain on the table, but its preferred course is the program of sanctions that it has advocated, with considerable success, at home and in Europe. Dennis Ross, writing in the Wall Street Journal shortly after leaving the administration, made the case for the effectiveness of economic pressure in changing Iran’s policies. And what is true for the Obama administration will be true for a Republican administration. Mitt Romney, who will be the Republican nominee for President, is a thoughtful and cautious man, the clear choice of the American business community and the Republican establishment.   He has emerged as the overwhelming favorite for the nomination because of his relentless focus on America’s economic ills. When it comes to foreign policy, he has said the right things in order to win his party’s nomination, but he does not bring the same expertise and passion to foreign affairs that he brings to economic matters, and if elected, there is no reason to expect that he will depart from current American policy.   Mr. Romney’s most important statement to date on Iran appeared in the Wall Street Journal on November 10, 2011. Romney declared that he would not let Iran get nuclear weapons, but the essence of the article was a critique of Barack Obama for being insufficiently aggressive in his rhetoric on Iran, along with a call for tougher economic sanctions and more military coordination with Israel. In short, it had a tough tone but a moderate thrust. And the two most outspoken Republican candidates on the Iranian threat, Newt Gingrich and Rick Santorum, did very badly in New Hampshire, while Ron Paul, whose policies are isolationist and anti-Israel, came in second behind Romney.    Some will argue that since America will not act, Israel must act on its own, but the simple fact is that Israel does not have the capacity to destroy Iran’s nuclear facilities without the military and political backing of the United States—and this, for the reasons stated above, will not be forthcoming.   What this means is that unconventional methods short of outright war—such as the elimination of Iran’s nuclear scientists—must continue, and that those of us in America who worry about Iran need to be even more assertive in discussing the Iranian threat with our fellow citizens.  And since economic sanctions are likely the best outcome that we will get, it is essential that these sanctions be exceedingly tough and cause maximum pain to Iran’s vulnerable economy.

#### Strikes will not happen the rhetoric is just a bid to get sanctions to work

**Hounshell 2/2/12** (Blake, *Foreign Policy*, “The latest Iran Frenzy’, http://blog.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/02/02/the\_latest\_iran\_frenzy)

Today, Washington Post columnist David Ignatius threw another log on the fire when he reported that U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta "believes there is a strong likelihood that Israel will strike Iran in April, May or June" and that the Obama administration is "conducting intense discussions about what an Israeli attack would mean for the United States." He added: "U.S. officials don’t think that Netanyahu has made a final decision to attack, and they note that top Israeli intelligence officials remain skeptical of the project." (Reuters notes archly that Ignatius was "writing from Brussels where Panetta was attending a NATO defense ministers' meeting.") There have also been a number of items in recent days about Iran's murky ties to al Qaeda, including this Foreign Affairs article by Rand analyst Seth Jones and what appeared to be a follow-up report in the Wall Street Journal (never mind that the information was nearly two years old), as well as a steady drumbeat of alarmist quotes from top Israeli officials -- all reminiscent of the run up to the Iraq war. Add to this mix Iran's threat to shut down the Strait of Hormuz, an ongoing congresssional push for tougher sanctions, and the heated rhetoric coming from Obama's Republican challengers, and you have a recipe for a media feeding frenzy. Most likely, the real drivers of this latest round are the Western attempts to persuade Iran's Asian customers -- China, India, Japan, South Korea -- to stop buying Iranian oil by persuading them that the only alternative is war. Those efforts are probably doomed, despite Israel's increasingly convincing ambiguity about its ultimate intentions. Asian countries simply don't care all that much about the prospect of an Iranian nuclear weapon -- they care about their own prosperity above all. So, is Israel going to attack Iran, despite all of the doubts many have raised? There are only two people who know the answer to that question -- Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and his Defense Minister Ehud Barak -- and I don't think they'll announce their decision in the New York Times. The smart money's still betting against an Israeli strike, but the odds do seem to be getting shorter.

### Isreal – Israel military prevents

#### IDF leaders want to stop strikes – bad intelligence, sanctions, and Iranian retaliation

**Sengupta and Macintyre 2/2/12** (Kim and Donald, *The Indipendent*, Tel-Aviv desk, “Israel’s military leaders warn against Iran attack”, http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/middle-east/israels-military-leaders-warn-against-iran-attack-6298102.html)

Almost the entire senior hierarchy of Israel's military and security establishment is worried about a premature attack on Iran and apprehensive about the possible repercussions, a former chief of the country's defence forces told The Independent yesterday. Lt-Gen Amnon Lipkin-Shahak, who is close to Defence Minister Ehud Barak, said there had been little analysis of what happens the "day after" when the Tehran regime and its paramilitary allies retaliate. He warned that an assault may lead to Mahmoud Ahmadinejad benefiting from popular anger against foreign aggression. General Lipkin-Shahak stressed that Iran with a nuclear arsenal would be a hugely destabilising factor in the region. But, he said: "It is quite clear that much if not all of the IDF [Israeli Defence Forces] leadership do not support military action at this point." The risks of military action underlined by the highly decorated former commander show the apparent divisions within the establishment over the best way to combat Iran's nuclear programme. The Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, and Mr Barak are reported to be veering towards military action while fellow ministers as well as the defence and intelligence communities have reservations about this path. The General's comments follow the public intervention in the Iran debate by a former head of Mossad, Israel's intelligence service. Meir Dagan said that following such a course of action would plunge the region into war with Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza. General Lipkin-Shahak stressed he had no idea what decision the security cabinet would reach. He said the current Chief of General Staff (CGS), Lt-Gen Benny Gantz, and Mr Dagan's successor at Mossad, Tamir Pardo, would offer advice. "We have to remember that the CGS and the head of Mossad are there to serve the State of Israel, they are not party political. They will no doubt offer judgement and advice on what is best for Israel," he said. "In the past the advice of the head of the IDF and the head of Mossad had led to military action being stopped." Sanctions on Iran imposed by the EU and the US, including an oil embargo, were stronger than many people had expected, said Lt-Gen Lipkin-Shahak. "They are already having some impact on the Iranians on the street, they are worried. They may feel that it is the actions of the [Iranian] government which has created this situation. So one would think it would be worth seeing what impact the sanctions have before taking the next step." General Lipkin-Shahak said that depending on intelligence does not always work. "Let's not forget that an Israeli soldier, Gilad Shalit, was held for five years just five, six kilometres from our border, and despite doing our best we had not been able to free him, despite the fact we were getting lots of intelligence reports." Israel was forced to obtain the soldier's release by freeing more than 1,000 Hamas detainees. "Even if there was 100 per cent intelligence, even if the Americans knew the exact locations of the sites, it could be very difficult to hit what is inside. The Iranians are not stupid, we should not underestimate their intelligence."

### Israel – prior warning

#### Israel will not strike without prior warning – IAEA investigators prove

**Sick 1/29/12** (Gary, Adjunct Professor at Columbia School of International and Public Affirs, “Will Israel Really Attack Iran?”, http://garysick.tumblr.com/post/16718681764/will-israel-really-attack-iran)

Not only is his conclusion at odds with virtually everything he produces as evidence, but there are some omissions in his analysis that regrettably have become predictably routine in talking about the Iranian nuclear program: He darkly quotes “the latest intelligence” about the number and current activity of Iran’s centrifuges. Where did he get that secret information? Well, just like you or me, he can read the periodic reports of the International Atomic Energy Agency, which are published on the web virtually the same day they are handed to member states.  How did the IAEA get that “intelligence?” Not hard: they have inspectors in all the sites where Iran is producing enriched uranium. These inspectors, who make frequent surprise visits, keep cameras in place to watch every move, and they carefully measure Iran’s input of feed stock to the centrifuges and the output of low enriched uranium, which is then placed under seal. You would think that would be worth mentioning, at least in passing, but it gets overlooked by virtually every journalist writing on this subject.  Like virtually all other commentators on this issue, Bergman slides over the fact that the IAEA consistently reports that Iran has diverted none of its uranium to military purposes. Like others, he focuses on the recent IAEA report, which was the most detailed to date in discussing Iran’s suspected experiments with military implications; but like others, he fails to mention that almost all of the suspect activity took place seven or more years ago and there is no reliable evidence that it has resumed. A problem, yes; an imminent threat, no. Bergman also overlooks the fact that Iran has almost certainly NOT made a decision to actually build a bomb and that we are very likely to know if they should make such a decision. How would we know? Simply because those pesky IAEA inspectors are there on site and Iran would have to kick them out and break the seals on their stored uranium in order to produce the high enriched uranium needed for a bomb. Would Israel actually attack while these international inspectors are at work? No, they would need to give them warning, thereby giving Iran warning that something was coming. The IAEA presence is a trip wire that works both ways. It is an invaluable resource. Risking its loss would be not only foolhardy but self-destructive to Israel and everyone else. Bergman’s dramatic statement that “I have come to believe that Israel will indeed strike Iran in 2012,” is also nothing new — it simply changes the date. We heard the same thing a year ago from Jeffrey Goldberg of The Atlantic, and two years before that from uber-hawk John Bolton, who confidently predicted that the U.S. and/or Israel would strike Iran before George W. Bush left office.  It is becoming almost an annual ritual.  Why do these false alarms keep going off? Bergman suggests an answer with disarming honesty: “Some have argued that Israel has intentionally exaggerated its assessments to create an atmosphere of fear that would drag Europe into its extensive economic campaign against Iran…” To this, the ubiquitous “senior American official” adds that “It is unclear if the Israelis firmly believe this or are using worst-case estimates to raise greater urgency from the United States.” In other words, Israel benefits by keeping the pot near the boiling point so that no one can ignore the Iran issue, even for a moment. If that is true, then Israeli strategists and American hawks should be overjoyed at Bergman’s analysis.

### Israel – no attack – Obama block

#### Obama will stop a strike on Israel – the US won’t go to war in an election year

**Weisbrot 2/15/12** (Mark, Co-Director of the Center for Economic and Policy Research, http://www.commondreams.org/view/2012/02/15-4)

Last week the New York Times reported on an interesting telephone conversation in January between President Obama and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. According to the report, Obama tried to convince Netanyahu, with some success, that the time was not right for military action against Iran. The Times report noted that “Senior Israeli officials, including the foreign minister and leader of the Mossad, have traveled to Washington in recent weeks to make the case” that Iran would very soon reach the point where bombing could no longer disrupt its nuclear program. The argument is that once Iran moves enough of its equipment and materials to impregnable underground facilities, these could no longer be destroyed with even the biggest bombs. So Israel must strike soon, perhaps as early as a few months from now, these officials argued. For Brazilians or Americans who do not follow this issue closely, a process of mass brainwashing is taking place through the major media. Iran, which even the U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has acknowledged is not pursuing a nuclear weapon, is portrayed as hell-bent on getting one. And why? So they can nuke Israel and become the first nation on Earth to commit mass suicide, since Israel has enough nuclear weapons to kill every Iranian several times over. It all makes sense, if you assume that mass suicide is Iran’s deepest national aspiration. However, most experts believe that Iran is seeking not nuclear weapons, but the capacity to produce them. This is a capacity shared by Brazil, Argentina, Japan, and other countries with civilian nuclear reactors – who could produce nuclear weapons within a matter of months. Iran, like these other countries – and unlike Israel – is in compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, and will remain so even if it develops such a capacity. Back to the U.S.: The good news is that Israel will not attack Iran before the U.S. presidential election. Many people see Obama as a pushover – he got rolled by his generals in Afghanistan, by Wall Street on financial reform, etc. But woe unto him who tries to mess with Obama’s re-election. He will crush them. And a war with Iran – no matter who starts it -- is much too risky for an election year. It’s a safe bet that Obama reminded the Israelis who is boss, and who gives billions of dollars annually to whom. To drive the message home, last week two unnamed Obama administration officials told the press that Israel was funding and training Iranian terrorists to kill nuclear scientists, including five murdered since 2007. This “leak” was another way of showing the Israelis that Obama is serious, and perhaps also that he doesn’t want assassinations at this time, which could increase the chances of escalation and war.

### Israel - US won’t be drawn in

#### The US will not act with Israel and Israel will not ask the US to act

**Ignatius 2/2/12** (David, senior reporter at the Washing Post covering foreign affirs, “Is Israel preparing to attack Iran?”, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/is-israel-preparing-to-attack-iran/2012/02/02/gIQANjfTkQ\_story.html)

This U.S. policy — signaling that Israel is acting on its own — might open a breach like the one in 1956, when President Dwight Eisenhower condemned an Israeli-European attack on the Suez Canal. Complicating matters is the 2012 presidential campaign, which has Republicans candidates clamoring for stronger U.S. support of Israel. Administration officials caution that Tehran shouldn’t misunderstand: The United States has a 60-year commitment to Israeli security, and if Israel’s population centers were hit, the United States could feel obligated to come to Israel’s defense. Israelis are said to believe that a military strike could be limited and contained. They would bomb the uranium-enrichment facility at Natanz and other targets; an attack on the buried enrichment facility at Qom would be harder from the air. Iranians would retaliate, but Israelis doubt that the action would be an overwhelming barrage, with rockets from Hezbollah forces in Lebanon. One Israeli estimate is that the Jewish state might have to absorb 500 casualties. Israelis point to Syria’s lack of response to an Israeli attack on a nuclear reactor there in 2007. Iranians might show similar restraint, because of fear the regime would be endangered by all-out war. Some Israelis have also likened a strike on Iran to the 1976 hostage-rescue raid on Entebbe, Uganda, which was followed by a change of regime in that country. Israeli leaders are said to accept, and even welcome, the prospect of going it alone and demonstrating their resolve at a time when their security is undermined by the Arab Spring. “You stay to the side, and let us do it,” one Israeli official is said to have advised the United States. A “short-war” scenario assumes five days or so of limited Israeli strikes, followed by a U.N.-brokered cease-fire. The Israelis are said to recognize that damage to the nuclear program might be modest, requiring another strike in a few years.

# Iran strikes – iran prolif

### Iran prolif – long TF

#### Iran has not decided to build a bomb and they are still years from having one if they decide to build it

**Peterson 2/16/12** (Scott, Staff Writer, CS Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0216/What-would-happen-if-Iran-had-the-bomb)

It is not a fait accompli, of course, that Iran will build a bomb, even though it sometimes seems as if it is – and many Americans believe the country already has. As recently as 2010, for instance, a CNN poll found that 71 percent of Americans believed Iran has a nuclear arsenal. Yet American intelligence agencies agree that Tehran hasn't yet decided to go for a nuclear bomb – and that even if it chose to, it would take years to create one and the means to deliver it. Israeli intelligence [has] is also reported to have reached the same conclusion. In testimony before Congress in late January, the US director of national intelligence, James Clapper, said Iran is "keeping open the option" to develop nuclear weapons. But, he added, "we do not know" if it will. The United Nations' nuclear watchdog agency, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), in its latest report last November, detailed alleged weapons-related work for the first time, but said "systematic" work was halted in 2003. Tehran has long claimed it wants only to make nuclear power peacefully, and in Iran, embracing "nuclear rights" enjoys wide, popular support because it blends national pride and scientific prowess. Publicly, Iranian rulers profess to reject atomic weapons, and at the highest levels they evoke Islamic religious reasons to oppose all weapons of mass destruction.

#### Iran over hyped its progress on the advancement of nukes, they are still behind schedule

**Casey and Kutsch 2/16/12** (Mary and Tom, *Foreign Policy*, http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/02/16/iran\_agrees\_to\_talks\_after\_announcing\_nuclear\_breakthrough)

Iran has claimed a nuclear breakthrough, reporting the production of its own nuclear reactor fuel plates and the building of new uranium enrichment centrifuges. State media broadcasted footage of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad inserting what they referred to as the first Iranian produced fuel rod to a test reactor in Tehran. Al Jazeera's Dorsa Jabbari notes that "this is a huge achievement...because these fuel rods are actually produced domestically." Additionally, Ahmadinejad said Iran has built 3,000 centrifuges to add to the 6,000 that are currently working.  The announcement has meanwhile been met with skepticism by the United States. Chief State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland said  "This is not big news; in fact, it seems to have been hyped." She continued that according to Iran's own schedule, the program is actually behind, and the announcement was made merely for a domestic audience as pressure mounts from increased isolation and recently heightened sanctions. U.S. officials and some analysts see the statement as part of a recent wave of aggressive and desperate gestures, including this week's assassination attempts on Israeli diplomats in several countries. For his part Ahmadinejad asserted that "the era of bullying nations has passed," but top Iranian officials have also said they are willing to participate in negotiations, responding positively to an invitation from the European Union's foreign policy chief, Catherine Ashton. Iran's chief negotiator Saeed Jalili wrote, "I propose to resume our talks in order to take fundamental steps for sustainable cooperation in the earliest possibility in a mutually agreed venue and time."

### Iran prolif – Sanctions solve

#### Iran not seeking the bomb – sanctions are too tough and the benefit is too small

**Zakaria and Hosenball 1/26/12** (Tassum and Mark, Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/26/us-usa-iran-nuclear-idUSTRE80P05X20120126)

Iran is unlikely to move toward building a nuclear weapon this year because it does not yet have the capability to produce enough weapon-grade uranium, a draft report by the Institute for Science and International Security said on Wednesday. The report by the institute founded by nuclear expert David Albright offered a more temperate view of Iran's nuclear program than some of the heated rhetoric that has surfaced since the United States and its allies stepped up sanctions on Tehran. "Iran is unlikely to decide to dash toward making nuclear weapons as long as its uranium enrichment capability remains as limited as it is today," the report said. The United States and Iran are engaged in a war of words over sanctions, with Iran threatening to retaliate by blocking oil shipping traffic through the Strait of Hormuz. The United States said it would not allow that to happen. The escalating rhetoric and tensions have led to concerns about the potential for missteps between the adversaries that might spiral into a military confrontation that neither wants. But the report, financed by a grant from the United States Institute of Peace, said Iran had not made a decision to build a nuclear bomb. The USIP is an independent, non-partisan center created by the U.S. Congress in 1984 that receives federal government funding. "Iran is unlikely to break out in 2012, in great part because it is deterred from doing so," said the ISIS report, which has not yet been publicly released. The report turns down the temperature, saying that sanctions and the fear of a military strike by Israel on Iran's nuclear facilities have worked as a deterrent. The institute has advised U.S. and foreign governments about Iran's nuclear capabilities and Albright is considered a respected expert on the issue. The report tracks closely with what is known of official U.S. government assessments. U.S. officials say Iran has not made the decision to build a nuclear weapon and that Iranian leaders haven't made the decision because they have to weigh the cost and benefits of building a nuclear weapon. Much of what the Iranians are doing with their nuclear program has civilian uses, but they are keeping their options open, which significantly adds to the air of ambiguity, U.S. officials told Reuters on condition of anonymity. Some conservative and Israeli analysts in the past have challenged these types of assessments, asserting that Iranian nuclear efforts are sufficiently advanced that they could build a bomb in a year or less. But according to the institute's report: "Although Iran is engaged in nuclear hedging, no evidence has emerged that the regime has decided to build nuclear weapons." "Such a decision may be unlikely to occur until Iran is first able to augment its enrichment capability to a point where it would have the ability to make weapon-grade uranium quickly and secretly," the report obtained by Reuters said. It added that despite a report last November by the United Nations' International Atomic Energy Agency alleging that Iran had made significant progress on nuclear weaponization, "Iran's essential challenge remains developing a secure capability to make enough weapon-grade uranium, likely for at least several nuclear weapons." Some European intelligence officials have disputed a U.S. National Intelligence Estimate published in 2007 which said that Iran had stopped working on a program it had launched earlier to design and build a bomb. The Europeans maintain that Iran never stopped research and scientific development efforts which could be bomb-related. Tensions spiked after Iran announced earlier this month that it had begun to enrich uranium deep inside an underground facility near the holy city of Qom. The secretly built facility was publicly revealed by the United States in 2009.

#### Iran has signaled that it is willing to work on the bomb in international talks

**Dahl 2/16/12** (Fredrick, Rueters, “Iran offers “new initiatives” for talks with powers”, http://www.montrealgazette.com/news/Iran+offers+initiatives+talks+with+powers/6162117/story.html)

Iran, facing sanctions that could cripple its oil exports, has told world powers it wants to resume long-stalled talks with "new initiatives", and France said it might be open to addressing suspicions about its nuclear program. Tehran made the offer in a letter to the EU's foreign policy chief obtained by Reuters on Thursday, a day after it trumpeted several advances in nuclear know-how and sent oil prices upward. Iran's president vowed no retreat from its nuclear program on Wednesday but state television announced the proposal to re-launch talks after a year's hiatus. Iranian chief negotiator Saeed Jalili's letter said he would have "new initiatives" but did not spell them out. He made one reference to "Iran's nuclear issue", without spelling out whether Tehran was prepared to negotiate on it. French Foreign Minister Alain Juppe said that while the letter was "ambiguous" it seemed to signal "the start of opening up from Iran" with respect to discussing its nuclear activity. A Feb. 20-21 visit to Iran by top UN nuclear watchdog officials would help determine whether Tehran was serious about tackling international concerns, Juppe told reporters. The UN team, led by the International Atomic Energy Agency's chief inspector, will again try to extract Iranian explanations, after three years of stonewalling, for an IAEA investigation driven by intelligence reports that suggest Tehran has researched sophisticated ways to build atomic bombs. Jalili's letter was a reply to one from Ashton in October in which she said the big powers could meet with Iran within weeks if it was ready to "engage seriously in meaningful discussions". Jalili said he welcomed an earlier statement by Ashton on respecting Iran's right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy. "(A) constructive and positive attitude towards the Islamic Republic of Iran's new initiatives in this round of talks could open positive perspective for our negotiation," Jalili said in the brief English-language letter. "Therefore . . . I propose to resume our talks in order to take fundamental steps for sustainable co-operation in the earliest possibility in a mutually agreed venue and time." Jalili urged a focus "on a spectrum of various issues" to lay groundwork for "constructive, forward-looking co-operation".

#### Sanctions are working now Iran will only develop if stuck

**Mulrine 2/16/12** (Anna, Staff Writer, CS Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Military/2012/0216/Threats-to-US-Pentagon-officials-drop-three-surprises/Doubts-about-Iran-s-nuclear-ambitions)

Despite the hype surrounding Iran’s pursuit of nuclear technology, the country's leaders are “not likely” to develop weapons unless attacked, the panel said.  The same goes for plans to close the vital Strait of Hormuz waterway, according to General Burgess. Though Iran can close the strait (“at least temporarily”), launch missiles, and even tap terrorist surrogates worldwide “if attacked,” military-intelligence officials assess that it is “unlikely to initiate or unintentionally provoke a conflict.” What’s more, senior intelligence officials expressed some doubt that Iranian officials are actively interested in developing a nuclear weapon. Said James Clapper, director of national intelligence (DNI): “There are certain things that they have not yet done and have not done for some time.” On this point, the panel was robustly challenged by some lawmakers. “I’m very convinced that they’re going down the road to developing a nuclear weapon,” said Sen. Lindsey Graham (R) of South Carolina. Still, the Pentagon officials stuck to their analysis. Though Iran has enough highly enriched uranium to build a weapon “if political leaders chose to do so,” Burgess explained, he said that the prospect of stepped-up sanctions is frightening to Iranian officials. “I don’t think they want a nuclear weapon at any price.”

### Iran prolif – containment solves

#### Iran nukes have no impact – containment and a low risk of nuke terror means there is no impact

**Collard-Wexler 1/26/12** (Pre-doctoral research fellow Brookings Institiution, Canadian International Council, “Iran: To strike or to Strangle?”, http://www.themarknews.com/articles/8078-iran-to-strike-or-to-strangle)

Understanding the potential uses and consequences of Iranian nuclear weapons is crucial to understanding the cost and benefits of current sanctions and future strikes. If the tense history of the Cold War has taught us one thing, it is this: The uses of nuclear weapons are limited, regardless of regime or religion. Because of this basic fact, the West has an interest in continuing to tighten sanctions on Iran, but not in striking Iranian nuclear facilities. Nuclear weapons can conceivably be used for four purposes: deterrence, blackmail, shielding, and martyrdom. **Deterrence:** Nuclear weapons are the ultimate insurance policy, serving to deter an invasion of the homeland and prevent foreign nuclear strikes. No nuclear-armed regime has ever been overthrown or hit by nuclear weapons. Iran lives in a bad neighbourhood surrounded by foes, such as Iraq, that have sought nuclear weapons, and states, such as the U.S., that have openly called for regime change. As such, deterrence is the most plausible use of Iranian nuclear weapons. Although the West may deplore the regime of the Ayatollahs, its treatment of women, and its gross violation of human rights, the maintenance of the regime through nuclear deterrence is not a sufficient reason to launch preventative strikes on Iran. **Blackmail:** Iran may use nuclear weapons to blackmail its opponents and bully its neighbours. Yet, there is not a single record of any state successfully blackmailing another state using nuclear weapons. The threat of a nuclear attack is simply not credible, because few foreign-policy interests are great enough to justify breaking the nuclear taboo. If no one believes you will carry out a threat, then there is no point in damaging your reputation by making one. This is why nuclear-armed states have accepted losing wars with non-nuclear states rather than blackmailing them with nuclear strikes. Moreover, nuclear blackmail is not useful against other nuclear-armed powers since they would only invite a devastating nuclear retaliation. As it turns out, the two greatest threats to Iran – the U.S. and Israel – are nuclear powers. Importantly, both states have secure second-strike capabilities, meaning that Iran could never hope to wipe out its enemies’ arsenals in an overwhelming first strike. Israel may be three times smaller than New Brunswick, but it has invested in submarines carrying nuclear-tipped missiles, guaranteeing deadly Israeli retaliation. **Shielding:** The most realistic and serious concern of an Iranian nuclear arsenal is its use of a shield under which Iran will pursue a more aggressive foreign policy. In other words, nuclear weapons will prevent states from forcefully retaliating to Iranian provocations. Yet, even in this more plausible scenario, it’s important to consider how nuclear weapons would change current Iranian foreign policy. In Iraq, Iran has already secured greater influence thanks to demographic dominance of the Shia population rather than military force. In Syria, Iran is currently losing a regional ally and will therefore have fewer opportunities for influence. In Afghanistan, it faces a resurgent Taliban, who are viscerally opposed to Shia Islam, and who went to the brink of war with Iran in 1998. In both Lebanon and Gaza, a nuclear Iran could mean a more dangerous Hezbollah and Hamas. However, Iran has become a victim of its own success as both groups have transformed into powerful political parties. Will they be willing to jeopardize hard-earned political gains simply to curry favour with Iran? Lastly, closing the Straits of Hormuz would be self-defeating, shutting off Iran’s main export hub and pushing Gulf States further into the arms of the West. In short, as with the Soviet Union during the Cold War, an emboldened nuclear Iran can be contained. **Martyrdom and Terrorism:** The wild card in dealing with Iran is the potential that the regime would use nuclear weapons as martyrs to achieve transcendental goals, which defy worldly cost-benefit calculations. In a recent CBC interview, Prime Minister Harper stated regarding Iran’s leadership: “In my judgment, these are people who have a particular, you know, fanatically religious worldview, and their statements imply to me no hesitation of using nuclear weapons if they see them achieving their religious or political purposes.” For all their talk and bluster, Iran’s leaders are hardy political survivors – not suicidal fanatics – who have gone to extraordinary lengths to retain their grip on power. The logic of political survival domestically, combined with mutually assured destruction internationally, limits the potential uses of nuclear weapons. Could Iran provide nuclear weapons to terrorists to carry out its deeds instead? The potential for nuclear terrorism is horrifying, particularly because terrorists do not have a return address to keep them in check. However, nuclear materials carry distinct “fingerprints,” which allow nuclear forensics to identify the source of nuclear material, and therefore deliver swift retaliation. Partially for this reason, no state has ever provided non-state actors with nuclear weapons. The risks of a nuclear Iran are undoubtedly real, and justify the strengthening of international sanctions. At a minimum, preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons will strengthen the non-proliferation regime, and will mean fewer twitchy fingers on fewer triggers and the attendant risks of nuclear accidents. However, the risks of a nuclear Iran do not justify the alternative risks of launching a preventative war.

### Iran prolif – iran not use

#### Iran won’t attack unless they are hit first

**CBS News 2/16/12** (http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-202\_162-57379278/general-iran-unlikely-to-strike-unless-hit/)

Testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Defense Intelligence Agency chief Lt. Gen. Ronald Burgess said Iran is unlikely to initiate or intentionally provoke a conflict. His comments came amid growing international fears that Israel would launch military strikes against Iran to thwart its nuclear ambitions and counter recent diplomatic attacks in Thailand, India and Georgia. Israel has accused Iran of trying to kill its diplomats.

### Iran prolif – A2 NPT collapse

#### Even if Iran gets the bomb the NPT will not collpase Gulf States won’t move for nukes

**Peterson 2/16/12** (Scott, Staff Writer, CS Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0216/What-would-happen-if-Iran-had-the-bomb)

Despite these impulses, says Mr. Heinonen, Persian Gulf states would be more likely to follow the model of his native Finland, which in the 1960s served as a businesslike bridge between the Soviet Union and the West. "From my perspective ... that's what going to happen with Kuwait, Bahrain, [the United Arab] Emirates," says Heinonen. "They will say, 'OK, let's not pick a fight here. After all, we all want to sell oil. There is a Big Brother that's behaving a little bit badly, but let's keep him happy and not antagonize him.' So I don't think a nuclear domino comes here." Saudi Arabia and Egypt "might think differently," says Heinonen. Either way, the NPT is not likely to collapse. Such analysis hasn't clouded the dark scenarios of many politicians and pundits, however. "Over the years [the Americans] developed a whole theology of fear about other countries acquiring nuclear weapons," says Van Creveld, the Israeli historian. "First was the Soviet Union, which we all know was hegemonic and expansionistic and Marxist and Godless, and they didn't like apple pie," he says. "Then it was against England and France, for all kinds of obscure reasons linked with NATO. Then it was Mao Zedong who was going to blow up the world, and then it was us [Israelis] though they never said so publicly. Then India ... "All these thousands and thousands of [nuclear] warnings which have been issued since 1949, and none ... ever came true."

### Iran prolif – A2 terrorist hand-off

#### Iran would not use terrorist proxies for the bomb the suply would be too limited

**Peterson 2/16/12** (Scott, Staff Writer, CS Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0216/What-would-happen-if-Iran-had-the-bomb)

NATO says it is "unlikely" that Iran would pledge nuclear protection of its proxies like Hezbollah – and makes no mention of sharing such hard-won nuclear technology with them, which is a frequent refrain of hawks and doomsday politicians. Chubin states in his book on Iran's nuclear ambitions that "there is no reason to believe that Iran today, any more than Saddam Hussein earlier, would transfer WMD [weapons of mass destruction] technology to terrorist groups like Al Qaeda or Hezbollah." Likewise, proliferation expert Joseph Cirincione, in his 2007 book "Bomb Scare," points out that nations like Iran and North Korea are "not the most likely sources for terrorists since their stockpiles, if any, are small and exceedingly precious, and hence well guarded."

### Iran prolif – A2 nuclear blackmail

#### Nukes would not be used to blackmail other countries or attack US interests in the region

**Walt 12/21/11** (Stephen, professor of IR at Harvard, *Foreign Policy*, “The worst case for war with Iran”, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/21/the\_worst\_case\_for\_war\_with\_iran)

He also declares, "With atomic power behind it, Iran could threaten any U.S. political or military initiative in the Middle East with nuclear war." Huh? If this bizarre fantasy were true, why couldn't the former Soviet Union do similar things during the Cold War, and why can't other nuclear powers make similar threats today when they don't like a particular American initiative? The simple reason is that threatening nuclear war against the United States is not credible unless one is willing to commit national suicide, and even Kroenig concedes that Tehran is not suicidal. Nuclear weapons are good for deterring attacks on one's own territory (and perhaps the territory of very close allies), but that's about it. They are not good for blackmail, coercive diplomacy, or anything else. And if Kroenig is right in warning that an Iranian nuclear weapon might lead others to develop them too, then Iran would end up being deterred by the United States, by Israel, and by some of its other neighbors too. (As I've noted before, Iran's awareness of this possibility may be one reason why Tehran has thus far stayed on this side of the nuclear threshold.)

### Iran prolif – deterrence solves

#### Iran acts rationally it will do whatever it takes to keep the state intact

**Eisenstadt 1/17/12** (Mike, Director Military and Security Studies Washington Institute for Near East Policy, “US-Israel and Iran: Looming Military Confrontation?: Transcript”, http://www.acus.org/event/us-israel-and-iran-looming-military-confrontation/transcript)

Will deterrence work against Iran? That’s the $64 million question. No one can know ahead of time, but I would suggest to you that if you study the history of the Islamic Republic of Iran, there is no evidence to suggest the Islamic Republic of Iran is suicidal or seeking to end itself in a mass moment of Armageddon. In fact, to the contrary. The underlying motif of this revolution from day one has been the survival of the revolution, to keep a revolution alive in Iran, not to lose that. And the keeper of that philosophy is the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. That is why they were created, and that is what motivates their behavior. And, I think, as we have seen them become more important in recent years, we can see that that is their underlying motive more than anything else.

#### Iran is a rational actor – deterrence would work no impact to nukes

**Peterson 2/16/12** (Scott, Staff Writer, CS Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0216/What-would-happen-if-Iran-had-the-bomb)

The tone on the US presidential campaign trail is no less dire. GOP hopeful Rick Santorum recently told a crowd that if Iran gets nuclear weapons, "let me assure you, you will not be safe, even here in Missouri." One of his opponents, former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, claims an Iranian strike on the US is "a real danger" that would make the 9/11 attacks look small. "Now imagine an attack where you add two zeros, and it's 300,000 dead," he said in early February. "This is not science fiction." Yet it is also far from likely – even if Iran were to build a nuclear arsenal. In fact, say analysts and nonproliferation experts who have studied the effect of the bomb on countries, coexisting with a nuclear-armed Iran – or at least a nuclear-capable Iran – may well be possible, even inevitable, whether a military strike delays that outcome or not. Analysts say Iran is not an irrational, suicidal actor that can't be deterred. Nor do they believe it is determined to destroy Israel at all costs. A recent Israeli think tank simulation of "the day after" an Iranian nuclear test came to the same conclusion: that nuclear annihilation will not automatically result.

### Iran prolif – Israel second strike solves

#### Iranian nukes would have not effect in the region – Israeli nukes would check Iranian aggression

**Peterson 2/16/12** (Scott, Staff Writer, CS Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0216/What-would-happen-if-Iran-had-the-bomb

If Iran were to become a nuclear power, the most immediate question would be what it means for Israel, where warnings have reached histrionic heights. "Absolutely nothing will happen," says Martin Van Creveld, an Israeli historian and author of some 20 books on military strategy. "Israel has what it takes to deter Iran, and the Iranians know it." Mr. Van Creveld is implying that Israel's own nuclear arsenal of an estimated 200 warheads would prevent any Iranian first strike. Israel has the only such arsenal in the Middle East, and – unlike Iran's program – it has never been subject to UN inspection or safeguards. "Say they build one bomb – it's not good enough. They need how many – 2, 3, 5, 10, 20? And that will take them a long time, so it's all nonsense," says Van Creveld. Iran is "not going to commit suicide by dropping the bomb – or even threatening to drop the bomb – on us."

#### Israeli conventional and nuclear deterrence would check Iran – delivery systems, conventional force, and second strike

**Eisenstadt 1/17/12** (Mike, Director Military and Security Studies Washington Institute for Near East Policy, “US-Israel and Iran: Looming Military Confrontation?: Transcript”, http://www.acus.org/event/us-israel-and-iran-looming-military-confrontation/transcript)

So the more important question is, is it an existential threat to Israel? The defense minister of Israel, Ehud Barak, has said it is not. Three – not two, three former heads of the Mossad – Shabtai Shavit, Efraim Halevy and Meir Dagan – all of whom had Iran as their number one responsibility, say it is not an existential threat. Why? Because the balance of power between Israel and Iran will remain overwhelmingly in Israel’s favor, even if Iran acquires nuclear weapons. First of all, the conventional capability: Israel has the finest conventional military force in the Middle East. It has no real rival. It has the capability through its air force to project power in ways that no one else in the region can do so. Iran, on the other hand, has an air force which is composed of antiques bought by the Shah and poorly maintained since then. Thanks to the U.N. arms embargo adopted by the United Nations Security Council in 2010, it is frozen with those conventional capabilities. There has never been an arms embargo as tight as the one that’s in the U.N. Security Council resolutions. Does that mean Iran can’t get any widget? Of course it can get a widget or two. Can it build a conventional military force to challenge Israel? Absolutely not. Not as long as that resolution in – is in effect. And that resolution, I would remind you, had the affirmative votes of Russia and China. But it’s not just conventional military. It’s the nuclear balance of power. And this is the issue that we just don’t talk about. Israel has had nuclear weapons since at least the late 1960s, if not 1967. No one knows, outside of the Israeli military establishment and few within the establishment – know how many bombs it has, but the conventional wisdom of think tanks around the world is in excess of a hundred. And it has multiple delivery systems provided by: in the case of the Jericho, France; in the case of the F-15, the United States; and in the case of the Dolphin, Germany. That’s a pretty good international support base for your delivery systems.

#### US has been increasing Israeli second strike capacity for years

**Eisenstadt 1/17/12** (Mike, Director Military and Security Studies Washington Institute for Near East Policy, “US-Israel and Iran: Looming Military Confrontation?: Transcript”, http://www.acus.org/event/us-israel-and-iran-looming-military-confrontation/transcript)

Israel, of course, also has the support of the United States: $3 billion every year ever since the early 1970s. No American politician, with one exception – (laughter) – has ever seriously challenged the idea of continuing to provide $3 billion in aid to Israel. And when Governor Perry stepped on it, he learned right away that that wasn’t the smartest thing in the world to do, to talk about zeroing out Israeli military assistance, and he backtracked. Of course, he had misspoke from the beginning. What ally, on a military side, does Iran have? Syria. Not exactly the most impressive military power in the best of times, and certainly not an impressive military power when it’s the midst of a civil war. I would argue that the United States can do more to enhance Israel’s delivery capabilities to ensure a second strike capability, and that we should do so now. I would also argue, the Obama administration’s been doing that – (chuckles) – for the last three years; it just never puts it in the terms that I just put it to you today. We’ve been enhancing Israel’s long-term strategic strike capability for several presidencies. I would go one step further and look into doing what we can to enhance its naval capabilities and its submarine capabilities to ensure the balance of terror is overwhelmingly in Israel’s favor.

### Iran prolif – good – MAD stability

#### Iranian nukes would stabilize the region – MAD stability

**Peterson 2/16/12** (Scott, Staff Writer, CS Monitor, http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Middle-East/2012/0216/What-would-happen-if-Iran-had-the-bomb)

Riedel, of the Brookings Institution, envisions a kind of "mutual assured destruction" stability, too. Since the 1979 Islamic revolution, "there is no evidence to suggest the Islamic Republic of Iran is suicidal or seeking to end itself in a mass moment of Armageddon," he says. "In fact, to the contrary, the underlying motif of this revolution from Day 1 has been the survival of the revolution, to keep a revolution alive in Iran." In Israel, even talking about living with a nuclear-armed Iran has long been taboo because it might appear to concede that what the US, Israel, and Europe have declared "unacceptable" is, in fact, acceptable. Yet that was the scenario of a simulation last October by the Institute for National Security Studies (INSS), an Israeli think tank affiliated with Tel Aviv University, that gave insights into what might happen across the region if Iran became a nuclear state. The surprising result, the day after a hypothetical Iranian nuclear test, was not war. Instead, all the main players – from Washington to Moscow to Tel Aviv – adjusted rather easily to the new reality, with few dramatic changes in behavior. Even Iran, rather than wielding its handful of new atomic bombs as a sword of Damocles over a fearful region, attempted "to use them to reach an agreement with the major powers to improve its strategic standing," according to the INSS report on the simulation published in January. "The sky won't fall the day after," says Yoel Guzansky, a research fellow at INSS who shaped the simulation and was an Iran specialist in the Israeli prime minister's office for four years until 2009.

# Iran strikes – they fail

### Strikes fail – comparative evd – A2 Kroenig

#### Their ev is based on flawed best case analysis, ignores alternatives and exaggerates the threat

Colin h. Kahl (Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security) April 2012 Foreign Affairs

In "Time to Attack Iran" (January/February 2012), Matthew Kroenig takes a page out of the decade-old playbook used by advocates of the Iraq war. He portrays the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran as both grave and imminent, arguing that the United States has little choice but to attack Iran now before it is too late. Then, after offering the caveat that "attacking Iran is hardly an attractive prospect," he goes on to portray military action as preferable to other available alternatives and concludes that the United States can manage all the associated risks. Preventive war, according to Kroenig, is "the least bad option." But the lesson of Iraq, the last preventive war launched by the United States, is that Washington should not choose war when there are still other options, and it should not base its decision to attack on best-case analyses of how it hopes the conflict will turn out. A realistic assessment of Iran's nuclear progress and how a conflict would likely unfold leads one to a conclusion that is the opposite of Kroenig's: now is not the time to attack Iran.

### Strikes fail – multiple reasons

#### Strikes fail – dispersed centrifuge, easy construction, and back-up facilities

**Zakaria and Hosenball 1/26/12** (Tassum and Mark, Reuters, http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/01/26/us-usa-iran-nuclear-idUSTRE80P05X20120126)

Among possible policy options for halting Iran's nuclear program, one of the least likely to be successful is a military attack on its nuclear program, according to the institute's report. Limited military options, such as airstrikes against nuclear facilities, are "oversold as to their ability to end or even significantly delay Iran's nuclear program," the report said. Limited bombing campaigns would be "unlikely to destroy Iran's main capability" to produce weapon-grade uranium, it said. Iran has taken precautions by dispers[ed]ing the centrifuges it uses for enrichment to multiple locations, has mastered the construction of centrifuges, and has probably stockpiled extra centrifuges, the institute said. A bombing campaign that did not totally eliminate these capabilities would leave Iran "able to quickly rebuild" its nuclear program and even motivate it to set up a Manhattan Project-style crash program to build a bomb, which would only make the region more dangerous and unstable, according to the institute.

### Strikes fail – intelligence

#### Pre-emptive destruction of Iran’s nuclear facilities will fail due to a lack of intelligence – even if they succeed they can only delay the program and increase anti-American resentment which supports the current regime

Fallows, National Correspondent for the Atlantic, 2004

(James, The Atlantic December, <http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200412/fallows> [gjm])

What about a pre-emptive strike of our own, like the Osirak raid? The problem is that Iran's nuclear program is now much more advanced than Iraq's was at the time of the raid. Already the U.S. government has no way of knowing exactly how many sites Iran has, or how many it would be able to destroy, or how much time it would buy in doing so. Worse, it would have no way of predicting the long-term strategic impact of such a strike. A strike might delay by three years Iran's attainment of its goal—but at the cost of further embittering the regime and its people. Iran's intentions when it did get the bomb would be all the more hostile.

#### No adequate intelligence

Logan, foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, 2007

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

Worse intelligence than in Iraq? The U.S. government appears to know very little about Iran’s nuclear program. It is quite difficult to gather worthwhile intelligence on a country with which America has not had commercial or diplomatic relations for almost three decades, and a successful attack against a nuclear program as dispersed and effectively hidden as Iran’s apparently is would require very good intelligence. In 2002, the U.S. learned of startling advances in Iran’s nuclear program after revelations regarding the Natanz enrichment facility and the Arak heavy water reactor were made very publicly by the Mujahedeen- e-Khalq’s (MEK’s) political arm, the National Council of Resistance in Iran (NCRI). Given that these facilities obviously would rank highly on any list of potential targets, we must understand that the Iranian leadership knows that we know about them. It is likely that the leadership in Tehran has taken into account that those locations would be first on a list of American aim points, and have adjusted their programs accordingly, either by diversifying the locations even further than they were, or by relocating nuclear activity.

### Strikes fail – underground locations

#### Air strikes cannot take out Iranian underground facilities – too deep for our best bunker buster

Logan, foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, 2007

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

There are other uncertainties about Iran’s program as well. Iran has alleged, for example, that the facilities at Natanz are buried 18 meters underground, whereas retired Air Force Col. Sam Gardiner contends that they are 15 meters underground. Either way, this would raise questions about how air strikes could destroy the facility. The most effective conventional bunker-busting bomb in the U.S. arsenal, the GBU-28, can penetrate approximately six meters of rock and hardened concrete. That depth would be insufficient to destroy some Iranian targets.

#### Iranian nuclear tech is protected from surgical strikes

Daily Times**,** Monday, January 24, 2005

<http://dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=story_24-1-2005_pg4_21> [gjm]

Iran is believed to protect its most sensitive facilities by dispersing, burying and hardening them, learning from the 1981 Israeli air strike on Iraq’s Osirak nuclear reactor.  So the payoff from surgical strikes on suspected nuclear facilities would be uncertain and temporary, Carafano said.

### Strikes fail – cause prolif

#### Attacks fail and cause faster prolif – rebuild, hard-liners gain support, and withdrawal from the NPT

**Kahl 1/17/12** (Colin, Associate Professor for Security Studies Georgetown, “Not Time to Attack Iran”, *Foreign Affirs*, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show#)

Even if a U.S. strike went as well as Kroenig predicts, there is little guarantee that it would produce lasting results. Senior U.S. defense officials have repeatedly stated that an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would stall Tehran's progress for only a few years. Kroenig argues that such a delay could become permanent. "Those countries whose nuclear facilities have been attacked -- most recently Iraq and Syria," he writes, "have proved unwilling or unable to restart their programs." In the case of Iraq, however, Saddam Hussein restarted his clandestine nuclear weapons program after the 1981 Israeli attack on the Osirak nuclear reactor, and it required the Gulf War and another decade of sanctions and intrusive inspections to eliminate it. Iran's program is also more advanced and dispersed than were Iraq's and Syria's, meaning it would be easier to reconstitute. A U.S. strike would damage key Iranian facilities, but it would do nothing to reverse the nuclear knowledge Iran has accumulated or its ability to eventually build new centrifuges. A U.S. attack would also likely rally domestic Iranian support around nuclear hard-liners, increasing the odds that Iran would emerge from a strike even more committed to building a bomb. Kroenig downplays the "rally round the flag" risks by noting that hard-liners are already firmly in power and suggesting that an attack might produce increased internal criticism of the regime. But the nuclear program remains an enormous source of national pride for the majority of Iranians. To the extent that there is internal dissent over the program, it is a discussion about whether the country should acquire nuclear weapons or simply pursue civilian nuclear technology. By demonstrating the vulnerability of a non-nuclear-armed Iran, a U.S. attack would provide ammunition to hard-liners who argue for acquiring a nuclear deterrent. Kroenig suggests that the United States should essentially ignore "Iran's domestic political tussles" when pursuing "its vital national security interest in preventing Tehran from developing nuclear weapons." But influencing Iranian opinion about the strategic desirability of nuclear weapons might ultimately offer the only enduring way of keeping the Islamic Republic on a peaceful nuclear path. Finally, if Iran did attempt to restart its nuclear program after an attack, it would be much more difficult for the United States to stop it. An assault would lead Iran to distance itself from the IAEA and perhaps to pull out of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty altogether. Without inspectors on the ground, the international community would struggle to track or slow Tehran's efforts to rebuild its program.

#### Iran would quickly reconstitute the program

Kahl, 12
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THE COST OF BUYING TIME Even if a U.S. strike went as well as Kroenig predicts, there is little guarantee that it would produce lasting results. Senior U.S. defense officials have repeatedly stated that an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would stall Tehran's progress for only a few years. Kroenig argues that such a delay could become permanent. "Those countries whose nuclear facilities have been attacked -- most recently Iraq and Syria," he writes, "have proved unwilling or unable to restart their programs." In the case of Iraq, however, Saddam Hussein restarted his clandestine nuclear weapons program after the 1981 Israeli attack on the Osirak nuclear reactor, and it required the Gulf War and another decade of sanctions and intrusive inspections to eliminate it. Iran's program is also more advanced and dispersed than were Iraq's and Syria's, meaning it would be easier to reconstitute. A U.S. strike would damage key Iranian facilities, but it would do nothing to reverse the nuclear knowledge Iran has accumulated or its ability to eventually build new centrifuges.

#### Iran prolif not inevitable – strikes guarantee it by removing internal political constraints
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 A U.S. attack would also likely rally domestic Iranian support around nuclear hard-liners, increasing the odds that Iran would emerge from a strike even more committed to building a bomb. Kroenig downplays the "rally round the flag" risks by noting that hard-liners are already firmly in power and suggesting that an attack might produce increased internal criticism of the regime. But the nuclear program remains an enormous source of national pride for the majority of Iranians. To the extent that there is internal dissent over the program, it is a discussion about whether the country should acquire nuclear weapons or simply pursue civilian nuclear technology. By demonstrating the vulnerability of a non-nuclear-armed Iran, a U.S. attack would provide ammunition to hard-liners who argue for acquiring a nuclear deterrent. Kroenig suggests that the United States should essentially ignore "Iran's domestic political tussles" when pursuing "its vital national security interest in preventing Tehran from developing nuclear weapons." But influencing Iranian opinion about the strategic desirability of nuclear weapons might ultimately offer the only enduring way of keeping the Islamic Republic on a peaceful nuclear path.

#### Strikes make Iran prolif even easier – destroys inspection regime
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 Finally, if Iran did attempt to restart its nuclear program after an attack, it would be much more difficult for the United States to stop it. An assault would lead Iran to distance itself from the IAEA and perhaps to pull out of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty altogether. Without inspectors on the ground, the international community would struggle to track or slow Tehran's efforts to rebuild its program.

### Strikes Fail – Radicalize Iran

#### Strikes would fail and would radicalize Iran

**Sorcher 11/15/11** (Sara, national security and foreign policy for the National Journal, *National Journal*, “National Security Insiders: Don’t Launch Iran Strike”, http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/national-security-insiders-don-t-launch-iran-strike-20111114)

"An attack would set in motion a conflagration, set back the Arab Spring, and destroy what little is left of U.S. credibility as an arbitrator of the Middle East peace process." "War with Iran would be far more damaging to U.S. interests than any danger from Iranian nuclear weapons." "Iran is internally weaker than we seem to realize. There are better ways to undermine this regime without resorting to military strikes. Military strikes would be met with Iranian actions to spread the conflict throughout the Persian Gulf region and very likely to Israel." "A military strike presumes we know where all of the essential components of the Iranian program are, and that a strike would eliminate or slow these programs. Especially in the case of Iran, both of these requirements are questionable at best." "It's a dream for us to think that a strike will solve this problem." "Moreover, many Iranians who have grown disillusioned with theocratic and increasingly dictatorial governance would turn against America should it or Israel launch a military strike, easing the task of authoritarian rulers." "The consequences of failing to keep Iran from getting the bomb will be costly and preoccupying for a long time to come. But trying to solve the problem militarily at this late stage is just too big a leap in the dark."

#### Limited air strikes fail – create a nationalist backlash – strengthen hard liners – disrupt oil lines and lead to Iranian sponsored attacks on troops in the region

Dueck**,** Ass’t Prof Public and Int’l Affairs at GMU & Takeyh, Senior Fellow for Middle Eastern Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2007

(Ray, Political Science Quarterly, v122 n2, Summer,

<http://www.psqonline.org/cgi-bin/99_article.cgi?byear=2007&bmonth=summer&a=01free&format=view> gjm)

Simply hoping for Iranian democratization, on the other hand, is not really a coherent strategy. We can certainly root for the eventual victory of dissident democratic reformers within Iran, but there are no indications of their immi- nent success, to say the least. In practical terms, direct military rollback is not a serious option either. An American invasion and occupation of Iran aimed at dismantling Tehran’s nuclear capabilities is simply not going to happen. Even more-limited U.S. air strikes against Iran and its weapons sites would probably fail to destroy Iran’s nuclear program, and the political fallout would be im- mense: a nationalist backlash among the Iranian public, international con- demnation of the United States, the strengthening of Iran’s hard-liners, the potential disruption of Persian Gulf oil supplies to the industrialized world, and Iranian-sponsored attacks against American troops and interests throughout the region.23

### Strikes fail – undermine US credibility

#### Strikes on Iran would cause a massive international backlash on the US and Israel and cause Iran to gain legitimacy

**Riedel 1/17/12** (Bruce, Senior Brookings Institution, “US-Israel and Iran: Looming Military Confrontation?: Transcript”, http://www.acus.org/event/us-israel-and-iran-looming-military-confrontation/transcript)

MR. RIEDEL: This is actually scary because I wrote down, UNSC question mark, to raise this issue the next time it came up. So you either have superb eyesight, or we’re on exactly the same wavelength. If either Israel or the United States chooses to carry out a military strike against Iran, I presume that we will want it to be with no advance warning. That means, by definition we’re not going to go to the U.N. Security Council and get a resolution authorizing the use of force. I don’t think we could get it under any imaginable circumstances, so that isn’t a big downside to start with. But that said, that means that if we do it or Israel does it, we will be, in the eyes of many countries in the world, the aggressor. We will have initiated a military action, and we will have started a war. Now, we will argue that we had just reason to do so, that Iran had violated numerous Security Council resolutions. But certainly the Russians, the Chinese and a lot of other countries are going to say, that may be the case, but under international law, as the United States has demonstrated in Iraq and Afghanistan and Libya, you have to go to the Security Council first and get a “Mother, may I?” approval, and you didn’t do it. I would think that would be (a) very, very difficult international situation for the United States to manage, and I think the Iranians will find someone who will introduce a resolution in the Security Council condemning the United States and asking for the imposition of sanctions on the United States. It’ll be even easier to do in the case of Israel. Now, we’ll veto it, and we’ll probably get Britain and France to support us in that. But it certainly will not be the kind of international consensus against Iran’s nuclear ambitions that we have today. And we could see some very valuable and important accomplishments of the last several years lost pretty quickly. I think that arms embargo will be dead in the water. I think notions of reducing Iran’s sale of oil to other countries will be dead in the water. And there are several regimes in the region which will find themselves in an exquisitely difficult place. The Saudi royal family may privately be gung ho, the UA family – UAE family is publicly gung ho, but I can tell you, Hamid Karzai’s worst nightmare is being put in the middle of a war between the United States and Iran. And our former friend – I’m not sure he’s our friend anymore – Mr. Maliki in Baghdad would also find himself in a very, very difficult situation under these environments.

### Strikes fail – undermine containment

#### A strike would cause Iran to lash out and would make post-strike containment impossible

**Kahl 1/17/12** (Colin, Associate Professor for Security Studies Georgetown, “Not Time to Attack Iran”, *Foreign Affirs*, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show#)

Kroenig argues that "a nuclear-armed Iran would not intentionally launch a suicidal nuclear war" but still concludes that it is ultimately less risky to attack the Islamic Republic now than to attempt to contain it later. He warns that containment would entail a costly forward deployment of large numbers of U.S. forces on Iran's periphery for decades. But the United States already has a large presence encircling Iran. Forty thousand U.S. troops are stationed in the Gulf, accompanied by strike aircraft, two aircraft carrier strike groups, two Aegis ballistic missile defense ships, and multiple Patriot antimissile systems. On Iran's eastern flank, Washington has another 90,000 troops deployed in Afghanistan and thousands more supporting the Afghan war in nearby Central Asian states. Kroenig claims that it would take much more to contain a nuclear-armed Iran. But U.S. forces in the Gulf already outnumber those in South Korea that are there to deter a nuclear-armed North. It is thus perfectly conceivable that the existing U.S. presence in the region, perhaps supplemented by a limited forward deployment of nuclear weapons and additional ballistic missile defenses, would be sufficient to deter a nuclear-armed Iran from aggression and blackmail. To be sure, such a deterrence-and-containment strategy would be an extra-ordinarily complex and risky enterprise, and there is no doubt that prevention is preferable. Given the possible consequences of a nuclear-armed Iran, the price of failure would be very high. But Kroenig's approach would not solve the problem. By presenting the options as either a near-term strike or long-term containment, Kroenig falls into the same trap that advocates of the Iraq war fell into a decade ago: ignoring postwar scenarios. In reality, the strike that Kroenig recommends would likely be a prelude to containment, not a substitute for it. Since a military raid would not permanently eliminate Iran's nuclear infrastructure, the United States would still need to construct an expensive, risky postwar containment regime to prevent Iran from reconstituting the program, much as it did in regard to Iraq after the Gulf War. The end result would be strikingly similar to the one that Kroenig criticizes, requir[e]ing Washington to maintain sufficient air, naval, and ground forces in the Persian Gulf to attack again at a moment's notice. A strike carried out in the way Kroenig advocates -- a unilateral preventive attack -- would also make postwar containment more difficult and costly. Many countries would view such an operation as a breach of international law, shattering the consensus required to maintain an effective poststrike containment regime. The likelihood that the United States could "reduce the political fallout of military action by building global support for it in advance," as Kroenig suggests, would be extremely low absent clear evidence that Iran is dashing for a bomb. Without such evidence, Washington would be left to bear the costs of an attack and the resulting containment regime alone. Finally, the surgical nature of Kroenig's proposed strike, aimed solely at Iran's nuclear program, would make postwar containment much harder. It would leave Tehran wounded and aggrieved but still capable of responding. Kroenig's recommended approach, then, would likely be just enough to ensure a costly, long-term conflict without actually compelling Iran to change its behavior.

# Iran strikes – casue war

### Strikes = war – regional instability

#### Strikes would spark a protacted war with high casualities causing regional instability

**MPAC in 10** (Muslim Public Affirs Committee, July 1, http://www.mpacuk.org/story/010710/analysis-what-would-happen-if-israel-attacked-iran.html)

Indeed, even an Israeli war-game exercise based on an attack on Iran shocked its own designers and the Israeli intelligence agencies. The academic study by Prof. Moshe Vered of Bar Ilan University looked at what might cause a conflict, how long it would go on and its final likely outcome. Vered warned: “The war could be long, its length could be measured in years.” How might the post-bombing play out? “The means that may be most effective for the Iranians is war by proxies: Syria, Hizbullah and Hamas. (There will be) ongoing and massive rocket fire (and in the Syrian case, also various types of Scud missiles), which will cover most of the area of the country, disrupt the course of everyday life and cause casualties and property damage. The effect of such fire will greatly increase if the enemy fires chemical, biological or radiological ordnance… massive Iranian support, by money and weapons, will help the organizations (Hizbullah and Hamas) continue the fire over a period of indeterminate length…” Add to the military consequences for the U.S. and Israel the almost certain skyrocketing of oil prices, and you have the makings of a genuine global disaster in the making.

#### Destabilizes region, causes terrorism and collapses US influence – even if most arab leaders support it
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 A strike could also set off wider destabilizing effects. Although Kroenig is right that some Arab leaders would privately applaud a U.S. strike, many on the Arab street would reject it. Both Islamist extremists and embattled elites could use this opportunity to transform the Arab Spring's populist antiregime narrative into a decidedly anti-American one. This would rebound to Iran's advantage just at the moment when political developments in the region, chief among them the resurgence of nationalism in the Arab world and the upheaval in Syria, are significantly undermining Iran's influence. A U.S. strike could easily shift regional sympathies back in Tehran's favor by allowing Iran to play the victim and, through its retaliation, resuscitate its status as the champion of the region's anti-Western resistance.

### Strikes = war – regional conflict

#### Strikes would cause a massive regional conflict drawing in every actor in the region

**Kahl 1/17/12** (Colin, Associate Professor for Security Studies Georgetown, “Not Time to Attack Iran”, *Foreign Affirs*, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show#)

Keeping other states in the region out of the fight would also prove more difficult than Kroenig suggests. Iran would presume Israeli complicity in a U.S. raid and would seek to drag Israel into the conflict in order to undermine potential support for the U.S. war effort among key Arab regimes. And although it is true, as Kroenig notes, that Israel remained on the sidelines during the 1990-91 Gulf War, the threat posed by Iran's missiles and proxies today is considerably greater than that posed by Iraq two decades ago. If Iranian-allied Hezbollah responded to the fighting by firing rockets at Israeli cities, Israel could launch an all-out war against Lebanon. Syrian President Bashar al-Assad might also try to use the moment to divert attention from the uprising in his country, launching his own assault on the Jewish state. Either scenario, or their combination, could lead to a wider war in the Levant. Even in the Gulf, where U.S. partners are sometimes portrayed as passive, Iranian retaliation might draw Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates into the conflict. The Saudis have taken a much more confrontational posture toward Iran in the past year, and Riyadh is unlikely to tolerate Iranian attacks against critical energy infrastructure. For its part, the UAE, the most hawkish state in the Gulf, might respond to missiles raining down on U.S. forces at its Al Dhafra Air Base by attempting to seize Abu Musa, Greater Tunb, and Lesser Tunb, three disputed Gulf islands currently occupied by Iran. A strike could also set off wider destabilizing effects. Although Kroenig is right that some Arab leaders would privately applaud a U.S. strike, many on the Arab street would reject it. Both Islamist extremists and embattled elites could use this opportunity to transform the Arab Spring's populist antiregime narrative into a decidedly anti-American one. This would rebound to Iran's advantage just at the moment when political developments in the region, chief among them the resurgence of nationalism in the Arab world and the upheaval in Syria, are significantly undermining Iran's influence. A U.S. strike could easily shift regional sympathies back in Tehran's favor by allowing Iran to play the victim and, through its retaliation, resuscitate its status as the champion of the region's anti-Western resistance.

### Strikes = war – middle east

#### Multiple factors cause regional escalation
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SPILLOVER Keeping other states in the region out of the fight would also prove more difficult than Kroenig suggests. Iran would presume Israeli complicity in a U.S. raid and would seek to drag Israel into the conflict in order to undermine potential support for the U.S. war effort among key Arab regimes. And although it is true, as Kroenig notes, that Israel remained on the sidelines during the 1990-91 Gulf War, the threat posed by Iran's missiles and proxies today is considerably greater than that posed by Iraq two decades ago. If Iranian-allied Hezbollah responded to the fighting by firing rockets at Israeli cities, Israel could launch an all-out war against Lebanon. Syrian President Bashar al-Assad might also try to use the moment to divert attention from the uprising in his country, launching his own assault on the Jewish state. Either scenario, or their combination, could lead to a wider war in the Levant. Even in the Gulf, where U.S. partners are sometimes portrayed as passive, Iranian retaliation might draw Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates into the conflict. The Saudis have taken a much more confrontational posture toward Iran in the past year, and Riyadh is unlikely to tolerate Iranian attacks against critical energy infrastructure. For its part, the UAE, the most hawkish state in the Gulf, might respond to missiles raining down on U.S. forces at its Al Dhafra Air Base by attempting to seize Abu Musa, Greater Tunb, and Lesser Tunb, three disputed Gulf islands currently occupied by Iran.

#### Iran strikes would escalate into a broader Middle East conflagration

Michel Chossudovsky, Center for Research on Globalization, 1/16/07 “Editorial Note – Iran: Pieces in Place for Escalation” <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=4483>

The following text by Colonel Sam Gardiner (USAF, Retired) confirms our worst fears. The US is in an advanced state of readiness to wage war on Iran. To reverse the tide requires a massive campaign of networking and outreach to inform people across the land, nationally and internationally, in neighborhoods, workplaces, parishes, schools, universities, municipalities, on the dangers of a US sponsored war, which contemplates the use of nuclear weapons. The message should be loud and clear:  It is not Iran which is a threat to global security but the United States of America and Israel.  Even without the use of nukes, the proposed aerial bombardments could result in escalation, ultimately leading us into a broader war in the Middle East.   Debate and discussion must also take place within the Military and Intelligence community, particularly with regard to the use of tactical nuclear weapons, within the corridors of the US Congress, in municipalities and at all levels of government. Ultimately, the legitimacy of the political and military actors in high office must be challenged. The corporate media also bears a heavy responsibility for the cover-up of US sponsored war crimes. It must also be forcefully challenged for its biased coverage of the Middle East war.  What is needed is to break the conspiracy of silence, expose the media lies and distortions, confront the criminal nature of the US Administration and of those governments which support it, its war agenda as well as its so-called "Homeland Security agenda" which has already defined the contours of a police State. The World is at the crossroads of the most serious crisis in modern history. The US has embarked on a military adventure, "a long war", which threatens the future of humanity.  It is essential to bring the US war project to the forefront of political debate, particularly in North America and Western Europe. Political and military leaders who are opposed to the war must take a firm stance, from within their respective institutions. Citizens must take a stance individually and collectively against war.

### Strikes = war – laundry list

#### Striking Iran would be disastrous – Oil shocks, Regional war, Terrorist attacks, Afghan conflict

**Eisenstadt 1/17/12** (Mike, Director Military and Security Studies Washington Institute for Near East Policy, “US-Israel and Iran: Looming Military Confrontation?: Transcript”, http://www.acus.org/event/us-israel-and-iran-looming-military-confrontation/transcript)

More importantly, the advice it has gotten from the Pentagon, both the civilian side and the military side, for three years has been adamantly against a military strike. I can’t prove that. I’m not privy to their conversations in the Situation Room. But I think I’m on strong ground in saying (it ?). Two secretaries of defense, both of whom I think will be recognized as among the best in American history, have made it abundantly clear they think strike, war with Iran is a bad idea. And if you look at the reasons why they lay it out, I think it answers many of the questions Americans and Israelis have about the advisability of a military strike against Iran. Simply comes down to the negatives far outweigh the positives. Secretary Panetta in his remarks in December – which, I have to remind you, were made at the Saban Forum, the Saban Forum – one more time, the Saban Forum – (laughter) – laid out the gains. In his appreciation, a military strike would at best set back Iran’s nuclear program one to two years. That is not a big gain. The downsides include: - the impact on the world energy market; - the global economy at a perilous time for both the American and European economies as well as other economies around the world; - the threat of Iranian retaliation in the Gulf, in Iraq, in other places – the Iranians, I think, very deliberately use this specter of closing the Straits of Hormuz as a code name for something much bigger. They’re not just talking about a blockade of the straits; they’re talking about all the things they could do on the southern littoral of the Persian Gulf, from missile strikes into Abu Dhabi into refining centers to putting a few mines in. They don’t have to close the Straits of Hormuz to make sure that the price of gasoline in the United States goes through the roof; - to terrorism, to terrorism in Thailand, to terrorism in Georgetown; - One area that gets very little appreciation in most of the debate about Iran in the United States is Iran’s capacity to hurt us in “Obama’s war” – the war in Afghanistan. The Iranians are superbly placed to make the war in Afghanistan, which is already difficult, impossible. If there is a second country providing sanctuary and safe haven for the insurgency, the chances of success on the timeline the administration has laid out is virtually nil. The Iranians can simply cut off the highway that links western Iran to the Persian Gulf, making Afghanistan again totally dependent on Pakistan. They can turn out the lights literally on half of Afghanistan any time they want to. And they could make the Italian and Spanish NATO missions in Afghanistan impossible to sustain in the West, I would suggest to you, in a matter of days. The American public hasn’t focused on this, but I can assure you that the Joint Chiefs and especially CENTCOM have focused on this vulnerability. - And then, of course, there’s the question of Lebanon, another war with the Hezbollah and what that would mean.

### Strikes = war – Russia/China

#### China and Russia will go to war to defend Iran – China has 3000 nukes and would use them

**EU Times 12/7/11** (“China Joins Russia, Orders Military To Prepare For World War III”, http://www.eutimes.net/2011/12/china-joins-russia-orders-military-to-prepare-for-world-war-iii/)

A grim Ministry of Defense bulletin issued to Prime Minister Putin and President Medvedev today states that President Hu has “agreed in principal” that the only way to stop the West’s aggression led by the United States is through “direct and immediate military action” and that the Chinese leader has ordered his Naval Forces to “prepare for warfare.” Hu’s call for war joins Chinese Rear Admiral and prominent military commentator Zhang Zhaozhong who, likewise,warned this past week that: “China will not hesitate to protect Iran even with a Third World War,” and Russian General Nikolai Makarov who grimly stated last week: “I do not rule out local and regional armed conflicts developing into a large-scale war, including using nuclear weapons.” A new US intelligence report has also stated that China has up to 3000 nuclear weapons compared with general estimates of between 80 and 400. To further pour more gasoline on the fire, the Washington Times has just reported that North Korea is making missile able to hit the US.

#### The impact is extinction

Bostrom 2 (Nick, Dir. Future of Humanity Institute and Prof. Philosophy – Oxford U., Journal of Evolution and Technology, “Analyzing Human Extinction Scenarios and Related Hazards”, 9, March, <http://www.nickbostrom.com/existential/risks.html>)

The first manmade existential risk was the inaugural detonation of an atomic bomb. At the time, there was some concern that the explosion might start a runaway chain-reaction by “igniting” the atmosphere. Although we now know that such an outcome was physically impossible, it qualifies as an existential risk that was present at the time. For there to be a risk, given the knowledge and understanding available, it suffices that there is some subjective probability of an adverse outcome, even if it later turns out that objectively there was no chance of something bad happening. If we don’t know whether something is objectively risky or not, then it is risky in the subjective sense. The subjective sense is of course what we must base our decisions on.[2] At any given time we must use our best current subjective estimate of what the objective risk factors are.[3] A much greater existential risk emerged with the build-up of nuclear arsenals in the US and the USSR. An all-out nuclear war was a possibility with both a substantial probability and with consequences that might have been persistent enough to qualify as global and terminal. There was a real worry among those best acquainted with the information available at the time that a nuclear Armageddon would occur and that it might annihilate our species or permanently destroy human civilization.[4] Russia and the US retain large nuclear arsenals that could be used in a future confrontation, either accidentally or deliberately. There is also a risk that other states may one day build up large nuclear arsenals. Note however that a smaller nuclear exchange, between India and Pakistan for instance, is not an existential risk, since it would not destroy or thwart humankind’s potential permanently. Such a war might however be a local terminal risk for the cities most likely to be targeted. Unfortunately, we shall see that nuclear Armageddon and comet or asteroid strikes

### Strikes = war – Russia/China exts

#### The attack would be the worst thing ever – global terrorism, war with Russia, and war with China would ensue

ULLLAH JAN 06 Head of Independent Centre of Strategic Studies (Canada, Ottawa).

[Abid, 2/20/06, http://mathaba.net/0\_index.shtml?x=528456]

If Iran has no nuclear weapons, as concludes Mohammed el-Baradei the respected chief of the IAEA, the war on Iran, in itself, will not lead to the speculated World War 3. It will only worsen the situation worldwide. Instead of directly ending up in a World War, the war on Iran will only become a next phase in spreading the World War that is already on without our realizing that we are passing through its initial phases. [1] On the other hand, a false assumption that Iran has no nuclear weapons will, in fact, quickly engulf many more countries and take the World War that is already on to a quick climax.[2] Under-estimating Iran’s nuclear capacity is pushing the extremists in Washington into launching a war that the US administration has been planning since a long time. The IAEA’s inspections and confirmation that Iran has no nuclear weapons and there is no nuclear program in operation are no different than the confirmation by the United Nations weapons inspectors in Iraq that Saddam had no weapons of mass destruction. Confirmation of the absence of weapons actually led to the United States' final decision to launch a war of aggression on Iraq. This time around, the United States is in for a big trouble. It is attacking Iran, not for the reason that it has, or it is planning to have nuclear weapons, but only because it has assumed that Iran is years away from producing nuclear weapons. Many analysts believe that an attack on Iran will turn into a World War because the Iranian government has a long-range strategy for "asymmetrical" warfare that will disrupt the flow of oil and challenge American interests around the world. Certainly, if one is facing an implacable enemy that is committed to "regime change" there is no reason to hold back on doing what is necessary to defeat that adversary. However, the main reason for escalation of the conflict will be exactly the assumption on the part of the United States, Israel and Britain that Iran cannot respond with nuclear weapons. At a time when nuclear material—including red mercury and different forms of Uranium—were flowing in the streets of Pakistan, a high ranking Pakistani official, working in the Iranian consulate, told this writer that Iran is obtaining smuggled nuclear material from its field commanders in Afghanistan. It was well before the nuclear testing by India and Pakistan took place. Keeping this fact in mind, it is simply naïve to assume that the United States or Israel will launch an un-provoked war of aggression on Iran, and Iran will remain a sitting duck and not retaliate with what it must have refined and retooled since mid-nineties.[3] Even if we assume that the Iranian government purchased nuclear material without any intention of putting it to use, it is highly unlikely that it will still let this material gather dust while it is being openly and seriously threatened by the United States and Israel. If scientists in Germany and the United States could work to develop nuclear weapons from scratch during the World War II, how long will it take a nation pushed against the wall and with all the ingredients available to put something workable together and retaliate with a bang? So, the practical chances of Iran’s retaliation with a nuclear weapon in the face of a war of aggression imposed on it are far more than the theoretical assumptions that Iranian Intelligence will plan covert operations which will be carried out in the event of an unprovoked attack on their facilities. It is true that a nuclear response from Iran would mean a definite suicide when looked in perspective of the nuclear power of the United States and Iran. But it also doesn’t make any sense that the United States would keep bombing Iran, the way it has planned, into the Stone Age, yet despite being able to respond, Iran will simply turn the other cheek. This chain of inevitable reactions will in fact lead a wider conflagration that the warlords in Washington and Tel Aviv have not even imagined. Emboldened by their adventures in Afghanistan and Iraq, and deluded by the IAEA conclusion that Iraq has no nuclear weapons, the warlords are set to go into a war that will definitely lead to massive bloodshed in the Middle East and the downfall of the United States as we see it. Despite Bush and company’s claims that the world is not the same after 9/11, the world remained more or less the same after 9/11. However, their world will surely turn upside down with their miscalculation of going into a third war of aggression in five years. The Russian and Chinese stakes in this issue cannot be ignored altogether. Attacking Iran would prove too much for Russia and China. Russia has snubbed Washington by announcing it would go ahead and honor a $700 million contract to arm Iran with surface-to-air missiles, slated to guard Iran's nuclear facilities. And after being burned when the US-led Coalition Provisional Authority invalidated Hussein-era oil deals, China has snapped up strategic energy contracts across the world, including in Latin America, Canada and Iran. It can be assumed that both China and Russia will not sit idly by and watch Iran being annihilated by the United States. If Iran is attacked with lethal force, it will retaliate with the utmost force available at its disposal; that much is certain. Remembering my discussion 9 year ago with a well informed source who was working for the Iranian government, I am pretty sure that the utmost force in the hands of Iran definitely includes nuclear weapons. One of the signs for that is the confidence with which the Iranian government responds to US threats. Iranian leaders have acted responsibly and reasonably so far. It is always the mistake of extremists to misjudge the behavior of reasonable men. The Iranians tried to avoid purchasing nuclear material from the Pakistani black market to avoid arousing unnecessary suspicion. They kept their nuclear program limited to energy production. It is the United States and its allies which are provoking it into reaction. As a result, it has been a mistake of reasonable men in Iran to mistake the behavior of extremists in Washington and not getting out of NPT or testing a few nuclear devices to balance its power against its enemies. Many analysts are predicting that attack on Iran will be provoked because a majority of Americans are not in favor of a new war. Although setting up a pre-text for domestic support cannot be ruled out, one can say with certainty from the track record of Bush and company that they will hardly bother to engineer another terrorist attack.[4] In the fits of madness, they have already made themselves believe that they have enough justification to wage a war or aggression on Iran. The Washington Times has already started beating war drums and promoting "policy experts" who believe the US must go alone if needed (Feb 6, 2006).[5] Irrespective of any pretext and going alone or in a coalition of barbarians, the signs tell us that the warlords are not going to relinquish their totalitarian dreams. It is very unfortunate on their part that they are putting their hands in hornet nest where they may get stung with nuclear weapons. Their retaliation, for sure, will lead to total disaster. A disaster, far worse than what the title "World War 3" can convey.

### Strikes = war – US/China cooperation

#### Iran strikes crushes US-Sino ties, and suck China into global conflict

RNVA ‘9

The Romanian National Vanguard News Agency is an independent international new agency – in this instance they are reporting Russian and Chinese reactions to an Israeli strikes – “Russia and China Warn US That Israeli Attack On Iran Means World War” – July 19th – 2009 – http://news.ronatvan.com/2009/07/19/russia-and-china-warn-us-that-israeli-attack-on-iran-means-world-war/

**A chilling report circulating in the Kremlin** today **states that** President **Medvedev and Chinese President Hu** **have issued an “urgent warning” to the United States that says if the Americans allow an Israeli nuclear attack upon Iran, “World War will be our response”.**  Fueling Russian and Chinese fears are intelligence reports stating that Israel has moved over three-quarters of its Naval Forces through the Suez Canal and has assembled over 30 of its US-built fighter jets inc for a planned attack using American made “bunker busting” bombs and nuclear armed cruise missiles. Russian Military Analysts state in these reports that Israel first plans to use its US-built fighter jets to target Iran’s nuclear facilities, and upon a combined Iranian and Lebanonese Hezbollah “response”, that is said will “rain missiles down upon Israel”, Israeli submarines and surface vessels with unleash nuclear armed cruise missiles against Iran’s military, religious and political infrastructure. Israeli news sources are also confirming Russian and Chinese fears over an attack by their country upon Iran, and as we can read as reported the Haaretz News Service: “Israel’s recent deployment of warships across the Red Sea should be seen as serious preparation for an attack on Iran, an Israeli defense official told the Times of London on Thursday. “This is preparation that should be taken seriously. Israel is investing time in preparing itself for the complexity of an attack on Iran. These maneuvers are a message to Iran that Israel will follow up on its threats,” the official was quoted as saying.” President Bush had become so alarmed over Israel’s plan to attack Iran that in an unprecedented move, just prior to leaving office, he refused the Israelis “secret request” for 1,000 of the American bunker busting bombs they wanted, but, Israel had obtained 100 of these dreaded weapons in a 2005 deal with the Pentagon. Upon Obama assuming the US Presidency, Israel’s Prime Minister gave the American leader a stark warning that “Either you take care of Iran-quickly-or I will”, a challenge that Obama, while in Russia last week, slapped down by warning that the United States is “absolutely not” giving Israel a green light to attack Iran, a curious statement, however, when viewed in the light of the American Vice President Biden stating just days before that “Israel is free to do whatever it deems necessary to remove the Iranian nuclear threat”. Fueling Russian and Chinese fears over Israel’s planned attack on Iran, these reports continue, is the Jewish states planned use of Iraqi territory from their Kurdistan region which borders Iran, and which this past week furthered its goal to become an independent Nation with the adopting of a new constitution, and with its Israeli trained army can expect an “immediate” invasion from both its sworn enemies Turkey and Iran. Even worse, Syria’s leader has reportedly warned the US that upon Turkey and Iran declaring war upon Kurdistan and Israel it would “no choice” but to honor its defense agreements with the Iranians calling for their Nations to protect each other in times of peril. Further complicating this mess is Turkey’s membership in NATO, and which under that alliances agreement calls for the United States and Europe to join with the Turkish military in fighting against what in essence would be their own allies of Israel and Kurdistan. Not being known to the American people is that while their Military Forces have been fighting in Iraq, the United States and Iran have longstanding agreements allowing the Iranians to shell Iraqi Kurd territory without fear of reprisal, an agreement that also includes Turkey who have battled against the Iraqi Kurds for decades. Most ominously in these reports though, both **Russia and China state that they will have “no choice” but to place an “immediate embargo” against any oil and gas coming from the Middle East and weapons to the region the United States may try to supply.** **China further states in this warning that upon an Israeli attack upon Iran they will “immediately cease” to purchase any more US debt,** and with the American deficit hitting $1 Trillion for the first time in their history, and with it expecting to exceed $2 Trillion by the end of the fiscal year on September 30th, a particually grave threat being that **China’s** $2 Trillion in re**serves are the only thing keeping the US economy afloat.** Russian Intelligence Analysts further report that the long-serving head of Iran’s Atomic Energy Organization, Gholam Reza Aghazadeh, resigned today over fears for his and his family’s safety upon an attack by Israel upon the Persian Nation. What is not known at this time, these reports summarize, is if Israel’s Iron Dome missile defense system, which the Israelis report has been “successfully tested”, would be able to withstand the estimated 6,000 plus missiles expected to be fired at it by the combined powers of Iran, Syria and Hezbollah. But, to Israeli war leaders believing that upon the conventional destruction of Iran’s nuclear facilities, the Persian Nation will “sue for peace” rather than be hit by nuclear weapons, these reports state, unequivocally, **that Iranian leaders are “fully prepared” to engulf the entire World in “brutal fire”** rather than to ever “kneel down” before the “Zionists” they have long stated have no right being in the Middle East in the first place.

### Strikes = war – Russia draw-in

#### Iran strikes suck Russia into global conflict

RNVA ‘9

The Romanian National Vanguard News Agency is an independent international new agency – in this instance they are reporting Russian and Chinese reactions to an Israeli strikes – “Russia and China Warn US That Israeli Attack On Iran Means World War” – July 19th – 2009 – http://news.ronatvan.com/2009/07/19/russia-and-china-warn-us-that-israeli-attack-on-iran-means-world-war/

**A chilling report circulating in the Kremlin** today **states that** President **Medvedev and** Chinese President Hu **have issued an “urgent warning” to the United States that says if the Americans allow an Israeli nuclear attack upon Iran, “World War will be our response”.**  Fueling Russian and Chinese fears are intelligence reports stating that Israel has moved over three-quarters of its Naval Forces through the Suez Canal and has assembled over 30 of its US-built fighter jets inc for a planned attack using American made “bunker busting” bombs and nuclear armed cruise missiles. Russian Military Analysts state in these reports that Israel first plans to use its US-built fighter jets to target Iran’s nuclear facilities, and upon a combined Iranian and Lebanonese Hezbollah “response”, that is said will “rain missiles down upon Israel”, Israeli submarines and surface vessels with unleash nuclear armed cruise missiles against Iran’s military, religious and political infrastructure. Israeli news sources are also confirming Russian and Chinese fears over an attack by their country upon Iran, and as we can read as reported the Haaretz News Service: “Israel’s recent deployment of warships across the Red Sea should be seen as serious preparation for an attack on Iran, an Israeli defense official told the Times of London on Thursday. “This is preparation that should be taken seriously. Israel is investing time in preparing itself for the complexity of an attack on Iran. These maneuvers are a message to Iran that Israel will follow up on its threats,” the official was quoted as saying.” President Bush had become so alarmed over Israel’s plan to attack Iran that in an unprecedented move, just prior to leaving office, he refused the Israelis “secret request” for 1,000 of the American bunker busting bombs they wanted, but, Israel had obtained 100 of these dreaded weapons in a 2005 deal with the Pentagon. Upon Obama assuming the US Presidency, Israel’s Prime Minister gave the American leader a stark warning that “Either you take care of Iran-quickly-or I will”, a challenge that Obama, while in Russia last week, slapped down by warning that the United States is “absolutely not” giving Israel a green light to attack Iran, a curious statement, however, when viewed in the light of the American Vice President Biden stating just days before that “Israel is free to do whatever it deems necessary to remove the Iranian nuclear threat”. Fueling Russian and Chinese fears over Israel’s planned attack on Iran, these reports continue, is the Jewish states planned use of Iraqi territory from their Kurdistan region which borders Iran, and which this past week furthered its goal to become an independent Nation with the adopting of a new constitution, and with its Israeli trained army can expect an “immediate” invasion from both its sworn enemies Turkey and Iran. Even worse, Syria’s leader has reportedly warned the US that upon Turkey and Iran declaring war upon Kurdistan and Israel it would “no choice” but to honor its defense agreements with the Iranians calling for their Nations to protect each other in times of peril. Further complicating this mess is Turkey’s membership in NATO, and which under that alliances agreement calls for the United States and Europe to join with the Turkish military in fighting against what in essence would be their own allies of Israel and Kurdistan. Not being known to the American people is that while their Military Forces have been fighting in Iraq, the United States and Iran have longstanding agreements allowing the Iranians to shell Iraqi Kurd territory without fear of reprisal, an agreement that also includes Turkey who have battled against the Iraqi Kurds for decades. Most ominously in these reports though, both **Russia and China state that they will have “no choice” but to place an “immediate embargo” against any oil and gas coming from the Middle East and weapons to the region the United States may try to supply.** China further states in this warning that upon an Israeli attack upon Iran they will “immediately cease” to purchase any more US debt, and with the American deficit hitting $1 Trillion for the first time in their history, and with it expecting to exceed $2 Trillion by the end of the fiscal year on September 30th, a particually grave threat being that China’s $2 Trillion in reserves are the only thing keeping the US economy afloat. Russian Intelligence Analysts further report that the long-serving head of Iran’s Atomic Energy Organization, Gholam Reza Aghazadeh, resigned today over fears for his and his family’s safety upon an attack by Israel upon the Persian Nation. What is not known at this time, these reports summarize, is if Israel’s Iron Dome missile defense system, which the Israelis report has been “successfully tested”, would be able to withstand the estimated 6,000 plus missiles expected to be fired at it by the combined powers of Iran, Syria and Hezbollah. But, to Israeli war leaders believing that upon the conventional destruction of Iran’s nuclear facilities, the Persian Nation will “sue for peace” rather than be hit by nuclear weapons, these reports state, unequivocally, **that Iranian leaders are “fully prepared” to engulf the entire World in “brutal fire”** rather than to ever “kneel down” before the “Zionists” they have long stated have no right being in the Middle East in the first place.

#### Russia will take sides and get involved

Pepe Escobar is the author of Globalistan: How the Globalized World is Dissolving into Liquid War (Nimble Books, 2007) and Red Zone Blues: a snapshot of Baghdad during the surge. He is the roving correspondent for Asia Times and an analyst for the Real News – Asia Times – 10-26-07 – http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/IJ26Ak06.html

A high-level diplomatic source in Tehran tells Asia Times Online that essentially **Putin and the Supreme Leader have agreed on a plan to nullify the** George W Bush administration's **relentless drive towards launching a preemptive attack,** perhaps a tactical nuclear strike, **against Iran.** **An American attack on Iran will be viewed by Moscow as an attack on Russia.**  But then, as if this were not enough of a political bombshell, came the abrupt resignation of Ali Larijani as top Iranian nuclear negotiator. Early this week in Rome, Larijani told the IRNA news agency that "Iran's nuclear policies are stable and will not change with the replacement of the secretary of the Supreme National Security Council [SNSC]." Larijani will keep attending SNSC meetings, now as a representative of the Supreme Leader. He even took time to remind the West that in the Islamic Republic all key decisions regarding the civilian nuclear program are made by the Supreme Leader. Larijani actually went to Rome to meet with the European Union's Javier Solana alongside Iran's new negotiator, Saeed Jalili, a former member of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), just like President Mahmud Ahmadinejad. In itself, the Putin-Khamenei meeting was extraordinary, because the Supreme Leader rarely receives foreign statesmen for closed talks, even one as crucial as Putin. **The Russian president**, according to the diplomatic source, **told the Supreme Leader he may hold the ultimate solution regarding the endlessly controversial Iranian nuclear dossier**. According to IRNA, the Supreme Leader, after stressing that the Iranian civilian nuclear program will continue unabated, said. "We will ponder your words and proposal." Larijani himself had told the Iranian media that Putin had a "special plan" and the Supreme Leader observed that the plan was "ponderable". The problem is that Ahmadinejad publicly denied the Russians had volunteered a new plan. Iranian hawks close to Ahmadinejad are spinning that Putin's proposal involves Iran temporarily suspending uranium enrichment in exchange for no more United Nations sanctions. That's essentially what International Atomic Energy Agency chief Mohammad ElBaradei has been working on all along. The key issue is what - in practical terms - will Iran get in return. Obviously it's not the EU's Solana who will have the answer. **But as far as Russia is concerned, strategically nothing will appease it except a political/diplomatic solution for the Iranian nuclear dossier**.

### Strikes = war – US/Russia relations

#### Strikes ruin US-Russian ties

Pepe Escobar is the author of Globalistan: How the Globalized World is Dissolving into Liquid War (Nimble Books, 2007) and Red Zone Blues: a snapshot of Baghdad during the surge. He is the roving correspondent for Asia Times and an analyst for the Real News – Asia Times – 10-26-07 – http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\_East/IJ26Ak06.html

A high-level diplomatic source in Tehran tells Asia Times Online that essentially **Putin and the Supreme Leader have agreed on a plan to nullify the** George W Bush administration's **relentless drive towards launching a preemptive attack,** perhaps a tactical nuclear strike, **against Iran.** **An American attack on Iran will be viewed by Moscow as an attack on Russia.**  But then, as if this were not enough of a political bombshell, came the abrupt resignation of Ali Larijani as top Iranian nuclear negotiator. Early this week in Rome, Larijani told the IRNA news agency that "Iran's nuclear policies are stable and will not change with the replacement of the secretary of the Supreme National Security Council [SNSC]." Larijani will keep attending SNSC meetings, now as a representative of the Supreme Leader. He even took time to remind the West that in the Islamic Republic all key decisions regarding the civilian nuclear program are made by the Supreme Leader. Larijani actually went to Rome to meet with the European Union's Javier Solana alongside Iran's new negotiator, Saeed Jalili, a former member of the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps (IRGC), just like President Mahmud Ahmadinejad. In itself, the Putin-Khamenei meeting was extraordinary, because the Supreme Leader rarely receives foreign statesmen for closed talks, even one as crucial as Putin. **The Russian president**, according to the diplomatic source, **told the Supreme Leader he may hold the ultimate solution regarding the endlessly controversial Iranian nuclear dossier**. According to IRNA, the Supreme Leader, after stressing that the Iranian civilian nuclear program will continue unabated, said. "We will ponder your words and proposal." Larijani himself had told the Iranian media that Putin had a "special plan" and the Supreme Leader observed that the plan was "ponderable". The problem is that Ahmadinejad publicly denied the Russians had volunteered a new plan. Iranian hawks close to Ahmadinejad are spinning that Putin's proposal involves Iran temporarily suspending uranium enrichment in exchange for no more United Nations sanctions. That's essentially what International Atomic Energy Agency chief Mohammad ElBaradei has been working on all along. The key issue is what - in practical terms - will Iran get in return. Obviously it's not the EU's Solana who will have the answer. **But as far as Russia is concerned, strategically nothing will appease it except a political/diplomatic solution for the Iranian nuclear dossier**.

#### Strikes ruin US-Russian ties – crosses one of their two redlines

Simes ‘7

DIMITRI SIMES, PRESIDENT, THE NIXON CENTER – Federal News Service –December 14, 2007 – lexis

But let me just say that **one of** them who is normally described as one of five **top Russian leaders said that for them there were two red lines with the United States. One was a unilateral U.S. and/or U.S.- Israeli attack on Iran**. And another would be the independence of Kosovo recognized by the United States and the West. **He said if this happened, we would have to decide that some things fundamentally have changed in the Russian relationship with Washington** and Brussels. **He said we are not willing, but we are ready.**

### Strikes = war – Israel/Iran

#### Attacking Iran leads to lash out against Israel which pulls in US and leads to regional instability

Logan, foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, 2007

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

Another worry is the potential for Iran to lash out against Israel. Mohammad-Ebrahim Dehqani, commander of the IRCG’s 300,000 troops, stated in May 2006 that "wherever America does something evil, the first place that we will target will be Israel." In August, a mid-ranking Iranian cleric warned that Israel would be in danger if it "makes an iota of aggression against Iran." It is no secret that the Iranian leadership and public see Israel and the U.S. as close allies, and would look upon an attack by one of them as an act of war by both.

The recent violence in Lebanon and northern Israel has underscored another potential Iranian tactic: the use of proxies such as Hezbollah to attack Israel. Even in the limited conflict between Hezbollah and Israel, the Arab force was able to achieve surprising tactical successes even against tough Israeli targets. Israeli tanks were struck by anti-tank missiles, completely destroying more than a dozen. More notably, Hezbollah’s ability to use a radar-guided missile to disable an Israeli warship on patrol in the Mediterranean Sea indicated a new level of sophistication in its attacks. Hezbollah killed 119 Israeli soldiers throughout the conflict, including many members of the elite Golani brigade. Despite the deaths of 1,140 Lebanese civilians, Hezbollah was able to avoid defeat against the elite Israeli military.

Presumably, if Iran were under attack, Hezbollah would be deployed more fully against Israel, inflicting much more damage than did its recent tactics. If Iran were to assault Israel directly, the U.S. could find itself in a similar situation to the predicament during the first Gulf War, attempting to keep Israel out of a conflict for fear that its involvement could cause the war to escalate and spread throughout the region.

### Strikes = war – Syria/isreal

#### Syria will strike Israel if Iran is attacked – defense pact

**Turkish Weekly in 09** (JPost Staff post, 12 December, http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/93798/iran-syria-sign-defense-pact-against-39-foreign-aggression-39-.html)

Iran and Syria signed a defense agreement on Friday, according to an Iranian Press TV report, just as Iran is coming under strong international pressure to clarify aspects of its nuclear program. The document, signed by Iranian Defense Minister Ahmad Vahidi and his Syrian counterpart Ali Mohammad Habib Mahmoud, aimed to face "common enemies and challenges," the report said. Vahidi praised Syria's great potential in defense and military fields and said that "it is natural for a country like Syria - which has an inhumane and menace predator like Israel in its neighborhood - to be always prepared [against possible foreign aggression]." His visit to Syria comes a week after Saeed Jalili, Secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council, also visited Damascus.

### Strikes = war – Afghanistan

#### Strikes distract US – causes Afghan theater to flare-up

Riedel, Senior Fellow, Saban Center for Middle East Policy, 2007

(Bruce, Speech for the University of Maine School of Policy and International Affairs <http://www.brookings.edu/views/speeches/riedel20070723.htm> gjm)

First, we should recognize clearly how awful the military option is and what a catastrophe war would be for America, for Iran and for the region as a whole. To imagine war with Iran use as your template not the Israeli air strike on Osirak in 1981 but the war last year between Israel and Hizballah in Lebanon with hundreds of clashes, dozens of air strikes and extended salvoes of missiles and rockets – close to 4000 in the end—into Israel's cities, especially Haifa. Only **a war with Iran would not be fought in the relatively small space of the Galilee,** it **would be fought across the whole of the Middle East** from Lebanon to the Khyber Pass. Iran would have every incentive to strike American targets across the region with missiles, terrorists and insurgents.    An early casuality would be the Maliki government in Iraq which could not afford to choose between its two most important sponsors. The Shia street in Iraq would go with Iran as would the Shia warlords Iran has supported there for years. Once again the Kurds would be in a hard place torn between America and Iran. Whether the Karzai government in Kabul could survive is also open to question. So the US would find the twin insurgencies in Iraq and Afghanistan burning more intensely while it struggled to destroy targets deep inside Iran and Iran retaliated with terror on a global scale. And once the fireworks begin to settle down, what then? Do we try to occupy Iran? With what army? This is not an option that serious policy makers should spend much time considering. When we looked at it in the Clinton administration – long before the Iraq war—it was wisely rejected.

### Strikes = war – economic collapse

#### massive oil shock and global economic collapse regardless of Iranian response – countermeasures cant check

Kahl, 12

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Some analysts, including Afshin Molavi and Michael Singh, believe that the Iranians are unlikely to attempt to close the strait due to the damage it would inflict on their own economy. But Tehran's saber rattling has already intensified in response to the prospect of Western sanctions on its oil industry. In the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike on Iran's nuclear program, Iranian leaders might perceive that holding the strait at risk would encourage international pressure on Washington to end the fighting, possibly deterring U.S. escalation. In reality, it would more likely have the opposite effect, encouraging aggressive U.S. efforts to protect commercial shipping. The U.S. Navy is capable of keeping the strait open, but the mere threat of closure could send oil prices soaring, dealing a heavy blow to the fragile global economy. The measures that Kroenig advocates to mitigate this threat, such as opening up the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve and urging Saudi Arabia to boost oil production, would be unlikely to suffice, especially since most Saudi crude passes through the strait. Ultimately, if the United States and Iran go to war, there is no doubt that Washington will win in the narrow operational sense. Indeed, with the impressive array of U.S. naval and air forces already deployed in the Gulf, the United States could probably knock Iran's military capabilities back 20 years in a matter of weeks. But a U.S.-Iranian conflict would not be the clinical, tightly controlled, limited encounter that Kroenig predicts.

### Strikes = war – US hegemony

#### Iran strikes gut US hegemony

Stephen Lendman is a Research Associate of the Centre for Research on Globalization and frequently writes for Global Research Reports –Global Research, March 7, 2007 – cross-posted at: http://www.talkingpointsmemo.com/talk/blogs/911review.

**Attacking Iran will just make things far worse. It would be a fanatical "hail Mary" act of insanity that by one definition is repeating the same mistakes, expecting different results. It has no more chance of success than our misadventures in Iraq and Afghanistan. And if nuclear weapons are used, including so-called low-yield ones, it will be an appalling crime against humanity and catastrophic event potentially affecting millions in the region by radiation poisoning alone. If it happens, it will irreversibly weaken US influence and credibility everywhere accelerating our decline even faster toward second-class status and loss of world leadership already hanging by a thread. It could also be a potentially lethal blow to the benefits of "Western civilization" always arriving through the barrel of a gun and thuggish heel of a colonizer's boot with the US having the biggest barrels and largest shoe sizes.**

### Strikes = war – terrorism

#### Iran strikes gut the war on terror

Logan, foreign policy analyst and member of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy, 2007

(Justin, USA Today, March, <http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=8180> gjm)

The next unintended consequence would be the effect Iranian civilian casualties would have on American diplomatic standing and the hatred of the U.S. that it would generate in Islamic countries. While concern for civilian casualties should not be a debate-stopper in terms of policy decisions, any decision to attack Iran should be evaluated in terms of how it would affect the war on terror. Even the vastly more limited attack against Lebanon by Israel in the summer of 2006, which produced, in the low estimate, casualties in the high hundreds, resulted in an extremely detrimental political blowback against Israel. Civilian casualties in Iran would be aired again and again in Arab and Muslim media, and the political consequences almost certainly would be worse for America than the consequences Israel suffered in the Lebanon war. The fact is, starting a war with a third Islamic country in the span of several years surely would be used as evidence that Osama bin Laden’s predictions about U.S. intentions were correct.

#### And, strikes make terrorism inevitable:

Haass**,** President of the Council on Foreign Relations, 2005

(Richard N., *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, gjm)

Using preventive strikes to destroy Iran's developing weapons program would also be much easier said than done, given the imperfect nature of the intelligence on Iran's program and the operational challenges of attacking its dispersed and buried nuclear facilities. U.S. strikes might succeed in destroying part of Iran's weapons program and set it back by months or even years. But even if this were to occur, Iran would surely reconstitute its program in a manner that would make future strikes even more difficult. Moreover, Iran has the ability to retaliate by unleashing terrorism (using Hamas and Hezbollah) against Israel and the United States or by promoting instability in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Saudi Arabia. A U.S. strike on Iran would also further anger the Arab and Muslim worlds, where many already resent the double standard of U.S. and international acceptance of Israel's and India's nuclear weapons programs. Much of the Iranian population, currently alienated from the regime, would likely rally around it in the case of a foreign attack, making external efforts to bring about regime change that much more unlikely to succeed. Attacking Iran would also lead to sharp and possibly prolonged increases in the price of oil, which could trigger a global economic crisis. Nor would the United States avoid these costs if Israel carried out the strike (a scenario suggested by Vice President Dick Cheney in January 2005), since Israel would be widely viewed as doing the United States' bidding.

### Strikes = war – iran escalation

#### Iran will massively escalate – won’t believe strike is limited

Kahl, 12

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

RIDING THE ESCALATOR Kroenig's discussion of timing is not the only misleading part of his article; so is his contention that the United States could mitigate the "potentially devastating consequences" of a strike on Iran by carefully managing the escalation that would ensue. His picture of a clean, calibrated conflict is a mirage. Any war with Iran would be a messy and extraordinarily violent affair, with significant casualties and consequences. According to Kroenig, Iran would not respond to a strike with its "worst forms of retaliation, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching missiles at southern Europe" unless its leaders felt that the regime's "very existence was threatened." To mitigate this risk, he claims, the United States could "make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government." But Iranian leaders have staked their domestic legitimacy on resisting international pressure to halt the nuclear program, and so they would inevitably view an attack on that program as an attack on the regime itself. Decades of hostility and perceived U.S. efforts to undermine the regime would reinforce this perception. And when combined with the emphasis on anti-Americanism in the ideology of the supreme leader and his hard-line advisers, as well as their general ignorance about what drives U.S. decision-making, this perception means that there is little prospect that Iranian leaders would believe that a U.S. strike had limited aims. Assuming the worst about Washington's intentions, Tehran is likely to overreact to even a surgical strike against its nuclear facilities.

#### Escalation likely – reassurances and redlines fail – deterrence incentives, miscalc, use or lose pressures and unauthorized responses

Kahl, 12

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Kroenig nevertheless believes that the United States could limit the prospects for escalation by warning Iran that crossing certain "redlines" would trigger a devastating U.S. counterresponse. Ironically, Kroenig believes that a nuclear-armed Iran would be deeply irrational and prone to miscalculation yet somehow maintains that under the same leaders, Iran would make clear-eyed decisions in the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike. But the two countries share no direct and reliable channels for communication, and the inevitable confusion brought on by a crisis would make signaling difficult and miscalculation likely. To make matters worse, in the heat of battle, Iran would face powerful incentives to escalate. In the event of a conflict, both sides would come under significant pressure to stop the fighting due to the impact on international oil markets. Since this would limit the time the Iranians would have to reestablish deterrence, they might choose to launch a quick, all-out response, without care for redlines. Iranian fears that the United States could successfully disrupt its command-and-control infrastructure or preemptively destroy its ballistic missile arsenal could also tempt Iran to launch as many missiles as possible early in the war. And the decentralized nature of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, especially its navy, raises the prospect of unauthorized responses that could rapidly expand the fighting in the crowded waters of the Persian Gulf.

#### US wont be able to resist escalation even if Iran limits retaliation – incentives for large scale preemption, political pressures, miscalc

Kahl, 12

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Controlling escalation would be no easier on the U.S. side. In the face of reprisals by Iranian proxies, "token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships," or "the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels," Kroenig says that Washington should turn the other cheek and constrain its own response to Iranian counterattacks. But this is much easier said than done. Just as Iran's likely expectation of a short war might encourage it to respond disproportionately early in the crisis, so the United States would also have incentives to move swiftly to destroy Iran's conventional forces and the infrastructure of the Revolutionary Guard Corps. And if the United States failed to do so, proxy attacks against U.S. civilian personnel in Lebanon or Iraq, the transfer of lethal rocket and portable air defense systems to Taliban fighters in Afghanistan, or missile strikes against U.S. facilities in the Gulf could cause significant U.S. casualties, creating irresistible political pressure in Washington to respond. Add to this the normal fog of war and the lack of reliable communications between the United States and Iran, and Washington would have a hard time determining whether Tehran's initial response to a strike was a one-off event or the prelude to a wider campaign. If it were the latter, a passive U.S. approach might motivate Iran to launch even more dangerous attacks -- and this is a risk Washington may choose not to take. The sum total of these dynamics would make staying within Kroenig's proscribed limits exceedingly difficult.

#### Even purely defensive Iranian response causes full scale escalation by US

Kahl, 12

COLIN H. KAHL is an Associate Professor in the Security Studies Program at Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service and a Senior Fellow at the Center for a New American Security. In 2009-11, he was U.S. Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East, Foreign Affairs, April)

Even if Iran did not escalate, purely defensive moves that would threaten U.S. personnel or international shipping in the Strait of Hormuz -- the maritime chokepoint through which nearly 20 per- cent of the world's traded oil passes -- would also create powerful incentives for Washington to preemptively target Iran's military. Of particular concern would be Iran's "anti-access/area-denial" capabilities, which are designed to prevent advanced navies from operating in the shallow waters of the Persian Gulf. These systems integrate coastal air defenses, shore-based long-range artillery and antiship cruise missiles, Kilo-class and midget submarines, remote-controlled boats and unmanned kamikaze aerial vehicles, and more than 1,000 small attack craft equipped with machine guns, multiple-launch rockets, antiship missiles, torpedoes, and rapid-mine-laying capabilities. The entire 120-mile-long strait sits along the Iranian coastline, within short reach of these systems. In the midst of a conflict, the threat to U.S. forces and the global economy posed by Iran's activating its air defenses, dispersing its missiles or naval forces, or moving its mines out of storage would be too great for the United States to ignore; the logic of preemption would compel Washington to escalate.

### Strikes = war – SOH closure

#### Strikes would for escalation on both sides causing massive oils shocks and the closure of the Straight of Hormuz

**Kahl 1/17/12** (Colin, Associate Professor for Security Studies Georgetown, “Not Time to Attack Iran”, *Foreign Affirs*, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137031/colin-h-kahl/not-time-to-attack-iran?page=show#)

Kroenig's discussion of timing is not the only misleading part of his article; so is his contention that the United States could mitigate the "potentially devastating consequences" of a strike on Iran by carefully managing the escalation that would ensue. His picture of a clean, calibrated conflict is a mirage. Any war with Iran would be a messy and extraordinarily violent affair, with significant casualties and consequences. According to Kroenig, Iran would not respond to a strike with its "worst forms of retaliation, such as closing the Strait of Hormuz or launching missiles at southern Europe" unless its leaders felt that the regime's "very existence was threatened." To mitigate this risk, he claims, the United States could "make clear that it is interested only in destroying Iran's nuclear program, not in overthrowing the government." But Iranian leaders have staked their domestic legitimacy on resisting inter-national pressure to halt the nuclear program, and so they would inevitably view an attack on that program as an attack on the regime itself. Decades of hostility and perceived U.S. efforts to undermine the regime would reinforce this perception. And when combined with the emphasis on anti-Americanism in the ideology of the supreme leader and his hard-line advisers, as well as their general ignorance about what drives U.S. decision-making, this perception means that there is little prospect that Iranian leaders would believe that a U.S. strike had limited aims. Assuming the worst about Washington's intentions, Tehran is likely to overreact to even a surgical strike against its nuclear facilities. Kroenig nevertheless believes that the United States could limit the prospects for escalation by warning Iran that crossing certain "redlines" would trigger a devastating U.S. counterresponse. Ironically, Kroenig believes that a nuclear-armed Iran would be deeply irrational and prone to miscalculation yet somehow maintains that under the same leaders, Iran would make clear-eyed decisions in the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike. But the two countries share no direct and reliable channels for communication, and the inevitable confusion brought on by a crisis would make signaling difficult and miscalculation likely. To make matters worse, in the heat of battle, Iran would face powerful incentives to escalate. In the event of a conflict, both sides would come under significant pressure to stop the fighting due to the impact on international oil markets. Since this would limit the time the Iranians would have to reestablish deterrence, they might choose to launch a quick, all-out response, without care for redlines. Iranian fears that the United States could success-fully disrupt its command-and-control infrastructure or preemptively destroy its ballistic missile arsenal could also tempt Iran to launch as many missiles as possible early in the war. And the decentralized nature of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, especially its navy, raises the prospect of unauthorized responses that could rapidly expand the fighting in the crowded waters of the Persian Gulf. Controlling escalation would be no easier on the U.S. side. In the face of reprisals by Iranian proxies, "token missile strikes against U.S. bases and ships," or "the harassment of commercial and U.S. naval vessels," Kroenig says that Washington should turn the other cheek and constrain its own response to Iranian counter-attacks. But this is much easier said than done. Just as Iran's likely expectation of a short war might encourage it to respond disproportionately early in the crisis, so the United States would also have incentives to move swiftly to destroy Iran's conventional forces and the infrastructure of the Revolutionary Guard Corps. And if the United States failed to do so, proxy attacks against U.S. civilian personnel in Lebanon or Iraq, the transfer of lethal rocket and portable air defense systems to Taliban fighters in Afghanistan, or missile strikes against U.S. facilities in the Gulf could cause significant U.S. casualties, creating irresistible political pressure in Washington to respond. Add to this the normal fog of war and the lack of reliable communications between the United States and Iran, and Washington would have a hard time determining whether Tehran's initial response to a strike was a one-off event or the prelude to a wider campaign. If it were the latter, a passive U.S. approach might motivate Iran to launch even more dangerous attacks -- and this is a risk Washington may choose not to take. The sum total of these dynamics would make staying within Kroenig's proscribed limits exceedingly difficult. Even if Iran did not escalate, purely defensive moves that would threaten U.S. personnel or international shipping in the Strait of Hormuz -- the maritime chokepoint through which nearly 20 per- -cent of the world's traded oil passes -- would also create powerful incentives for Washington to preemptively target Iran's military. Of particular concern would be Iran's "anti-access/area-denial" capabilities, which are designed to prevent advanced navies from operating in the shallow waters of the Persian Gulf. These systems integrate coastal air defenses, shore-based long-range artillery and antiship cruise missiles, Kilo-class and midget submarines, remote-controlled boats and unmanned kamikaze aerial vehicles, and more than 1,000 small attack craft equipped with machine guns, multiple-launch rockets, antiship missiles, torpedoes, and rapid-mine-laying capabilities. The entire 120-mile-long strait sits along the Iranian coastline, within short reach of these systems. In the midst of a conflict, the threat to U.S. forces and the global economy posed by Iran's activating its air defenses, dispersing its missiles or naval forces, or moving its mines out of storage would be too great for the United States to ignore; the logic of preemption would compel Washington to escalate. Some analysts, including Afshin Molavi and Michael Singh, believe that the Iranians are unlikely to attempt to close the strait due to the damage it would inflict on their own economy. But Tehran's saber rattling has already intensified in response to the prospect of Western sanctions on its oil industry. In the immediate aftermath of a U.S. strike on Iran's nuclear program, Iranian leaders might perceive that holding the strait at risk would encourage international pressure on Washington to end the fighting, possibly deterring U.S. escalation. In reality, it would more likely have the opposite effect, encouraging aggressive U.S. efforts to protect commercial shipping. The U.S. Navy is capable of keeping the strait open, but the mere threat of closure could send oil prices soaring, dealing a heavy blow to the fragile global economy. The measures that Kroenig advocates to mitigate this threat, such as opening up the U.S. Strategic Petroleum Reserve and urging Saudi Arabia to boost oil production, would be unlikely to suffice, especially since most Saudi crude passes through the strait.

#### Strikes would fail and cause Iran to launch a counter-attack and causing oil shocks

**Sorcher 11/15/11** (Sara, national security and foreign policy for the National Journal, National Journal, “National Security Insiders: Don’t Launch Iran Strike”, http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/national-security-insiders-don-t-launch-iran-strike-20111114)

A slight majority of National Journal’s National Security Insiders say that a military strike on Iran should not be carried out under any circumstances, despite a recent U.N. nuclear-watchdog report providing evidence of Iran’s ongoing pursuit of nuclear weapons. Discussion about deploying a military option in Iran heated up after the release of the International Atomic Energy Agency report detailing how Iran has carried out computer simulations of nuclear explosions and produced designs to fit atomic warheads to missiles. Israeli media reports maintained that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu and Defense Minister Ehud Barak are pushing to strike Iran. Still, 52 percent of NJ's national-security experts are not in support of taking military action. “The likelihood that bombing would be successful is very small,” one Insider said. “The damage—especially politically—from such a strike would be catastrophic.” It’s “too late” to unleash a conventional military strike that could set back the advanced and dispersed Iranian nuclear-weapon and uranium-enrichment programs, one Insider said. “Unless the West is prepared to blockade the export of Iranian oil—an economic sanction far greater in impact than those imposed to date—Israel and the West will have to settle for a longer-term strategy." The Insider argued for expanded multilateral sanctions, covert actions to disrupt more "vulnerable" nuclear activities in the country, and stepped up support for opponents of the Iranian government. No Insiders called for a unilateral U.S. strike, and only 5 percent said that Israel should launch an attack on its own. But 43 percent said that an attack on Iran’s nuclear facilities would be best carried out by a coalition of countries, which could include Israel, the U.S., and Britain. “A military strike, whether by the U.S., or by Israel, or by both, is still unlikely to succeed in stopping the program, but it will certainly galvanize the Iranian people,” one Insider said, adding that it’s "simply impossible" to ensure Israel will not take action on its own. “The Israelis do believe Iran’s threats…. If indications and warnings point to an imminent attack by Iran, the larger the coalition that preempts militarily, the better. “Bottom line: All the options stink,” the Insider continued. There could be unintended consequences of a strike for the U.S. and the stability of the region, one Insider warned. “It should be understood that the likelihood of $300 for a barrel of oil will follow, [as would] a nightmare of asymmetrical responses from Iran. Are we ready for the consequences? Do we even understand what they might be?”

# Iran strikes – critical stuff

### Critical iran – threat construction

#### Constructing the Iranian threat makes conflict and miscalc inevitable

Fisher 1/31/12 (editor at The Atlantic, “Newt is wrong again, 4 reasons Iran is not nuking Jacksonville”, http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/01/newt-is-wrong-again-or-4-reasons-iran-is-not-nuking-jacksonville/252289/)

Iran is not going to park a nuclear-armed boat at the ports of Jacksonville, New York, or any other American city. There are a number of reasons why -- I explain a few of them below -- but what's more important than the wrongness of Gingrich's comment is the dangerous trend it represents. Republican presidential candidates have been fighting to outdo one another on who can build Iran up as the scariest and most immediate threat. Mitt Romney named it the greatest threat since the Soviet Union, Herman Cain called for outright regime change, Michele Bachmann suggested they were dead set on sparking "worldwife nuclear war." The politics of this are obvious and easy; the scarier you make Iran, the more likely voters are to prefer your confrontational rhetoric. People respond to fear, and it's easier to understand "Iran is evil" than the complexities of why an isolated Iranian regime might seek nuclear capability and how they would use it. But this increasingly outlandish fear-mongering is dangerous in itself.  Imagine you're a high-level Iranian official. All your adult life the only system you've known is Iran's, which is nominally quasi-democratic but strictly authoritarian, a system where everybody gets in line behind the Supreme Leader, whose bidding is law. You hear reports that a prominent American official named Newt Gingrich, whom your advisers tell you could become the next American president, is playing up the threat you pose to the U.S. and openly contemplating a preemptive war against you. Do you respond by shrugging off his comments as meaningless campaign rhetoric that would probably not translate into policy, or do you start thinking about how to defend your country from this apparently erratic threat? The Republican primary field's exaggeration of the Iranian threat might make for good politics, but it misleads both Iranian leaders as well as U.S. voters, making both of them more likely to make bad choices. The U.S.-Iran relationship is complicated and dangerous enough without Gingrich or others disseminating bad information. People tend to behave irrationally and aggressively when they believe they are cornered. This is the situation that some Republicans are trying to portray, with violence as our only option. Iranian leaders may be increasingly perceiving that they are cornered as well (with plenty of help from whomever is killing those Iranian scientists), and according to a U.S. intelligence report, may see attacking the U.S. directly as an increasingly attractive defensive option. There's a lot more than just campaign trail alarmism at play here, but with Gingrich and Romney doing seemingly whatever they can to hype the danger and terrify people, it certainly isn't helping.

### Critical iran – apoc language undermines policy

#### Talking about Iranian nukes in term of doom scenarios constructs the regime as irrational and justifies attack

**Riedel 1/17/12** (Bruce, Senior Brookings Institution, “US-Israel and Iran: Looming Military Confrontation?: Transcript”, http://www.acus.org/event/us-israel-and-iran-looming-military-confrontation/transcript)

MR. RIEDEL: I’ll try to deal with the question about irrationality. Irrationality is often a(n) explanation that people who have difficulty understanding another society’s way of operating use to explain their activity, when, in fact, from the other side, its actions are quite rational. I can’t rule out irrationality. There are – history is replete with irrational, stupid decisions by decision-makers. We cannot eliminate that. You try as best you can, in analyzing the future, to put that in there and to deal with it. What you can do is study the behavior of the Islamic Republic over its now three decades in office. And many things which Americans over those three decades have said seemed to be crazy or irrational, I would argue, as a scholar of Iranian behavior – and I think many others would agree with me – were entirely understandable, in the context of Iran’s decision-makers at the time. The consistent pattern I would say that I see in Iran’s behavior is that even when it takes highly risky steps, when it begins to realize that those steps are now setting it up for very serious, grave consequences, Iran thinks it over and says: Hmm, maybe that’s not the right way to go forward. I don’t want to paint a picture of the mullahs as, you know, Harvard political scientists engaged in think tank discussions about their future. But I would paint a picture of a regime which, so far – and we have a pretty good track record now – has avoided suicidal activities in both its relationships with the United States over that period and in a war that it actually fought for eight years with the Iraqis, in which it was very, very careful, in how it responded to Iraqi provocations over that period, not to put itself in a suicidal position. Let me be clear, in the end. Iran with nuclear weapons is a bad thing. It is a strategic problem of very significant proportions for the United States. But it is not the apocalypse. It is not the end of the world. And in talking about it, it would be much better if our political leaders in the Congress and outside the Congress did not use apoc[alyptic] terms to describe what is a real-world problem which we are probably going to have to grasp with over the course of the next decade. MS. SLAVIN: I think you meant apocalyptic terms – MR. RIEDEL: Apocalyptic. MS. SLAVIN: – as opposed to apocryphal. (Laughter.) MR. RIEDEL: Right. Apocalypse.

### Critical iran – kills innocents

#### The drum beat of preemptive war leads to a view of the necessary killing of the innocent and paints Iran as totally evil able to be killed without impunity

**Walt 12/21/11** (Stephen, professor of IR at Harvard, *Foreign Policy*, “The worst case for war with Iran”, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/12/21/the\_worst\_case\_for\_war\_with\_iran)

When he turns to the case for using force, however, Kroenig offers a consistently upbeat appraisal of how the war would go. (Needless to say, this is not the kind of analysis one would expect from a Georgetown professor.) He knows there are serious objections to his proposed course of action, and he works hard to come up with reasons why these concerns should be not be taken seriously. What if Iran has concealed some of its facilities? Such fears are overblown, he thinks, because our intelligence is really, really good. (Gee, where have we heard that before?) What about facilities that are hardened or defended? Not an insurmountable obstacle, he maintains, and in any case there are plenty of other facilities that are aboveground and vulnerable.  Isn't there a danger of civilian casualties? Well, yes, but "Washington should be able to limit civilian casualties in any campaign." What if Iran escalates by firing missiles at U.S. allies, ordering its proxies to attack Israel, or closing the Strait of Hormuz to oil shipments? Not to worry, says Kroenig, "None of these outcomes is predetermined," and the United States "could do much to mitigate them." (Of course, none of the scary outcomes that Kroenig says would accompany an Iranian bomb are "predetermined" either.) Doesn't starting a war increase the risk of regional conflict, especially if Iran retaliates and Americans or Israelis die? Maybe, but not if the United States makes its own "redlines" clear in advance and if it takes prudent steps to "manage the confrontation." To do this we have to be willing to "absorb Iranian responses that [fall] short of these redlines" and reassure the mullahs that we aren't trying to overthrow them (!). Bombing another country is a peculiar way to "reassure" them, of course, and it's a bit odd to assume that those wicked Iranians will be cooperative and restrained as the bombs rain down. Won't Iran just reconstitute its nuclear program later, and possibly on a crash basis? It might, but Kroenig says that we would have bought time and that whacking the Iranians really hard right now might convince them to give up the whole idea. Or not. You see the pattern: When Kroenig is trying to justify the need for war, he depicts an Iran with far-reaching capabilities and dangerously evil intentions in order to convince readers that we have to stop them before it is too late. But when he turns to selling a preventive war, then suddenly Iran's capabilities are rather modest, its leaders are sensible, and the United States can easily deal with any countermeasures that Iran might take. In other words, Kroenig makes the case for war by assuming everything will go south if the United States does not attack and that everything will go swimmingly if it does. This is not fair-minded "analysis"; it is simply a brief for war designed to reach a predetermined conclusion. And let's be crystal clear about what Kroenig is advocating here. He is openly calling for preventive war against Iran, even though the United States has no authorization from the U.N. Security Council, it is not clear that Iran is actively developing nuclear weapons, and Iran has not attacked us or any of our allies -- ever. He is therefore openly calling for his country to violate international law. He is calmly advocating a course of action that will inevitably kill a significant number of people, including civilians, some of whom probably despise the clerical regime (and with good reason). And Kroenig is willing to have their deaths on his conscience on the basis of a series of unsupported assertions, almost all of them subject to serious doubt. Kroenig tries to allay this concern by saying that the main victims of a U.S. attack would be the "military personnel, engineers, scientists, and technicians" working at Iran's nuclear facilities. But even if we assume for the moment that this is true, would he consider Iran justified if it followed a similar course of action, to the limited extent that it could? Suppose a bright young analyst working for Iran's Revolutionary Guards read the latest issue of Foreign Affairs and concluded that there were well-connected people at American universities and in the Department of Defense who were actively planning and advocating war against Iran. Suppose he further concluded that if these plans are allowed to come to fruition, it would pose a grave danger to the Islamic Republic. Iran doesn't have a sophisticated air force or drones capable of attacking the United States, so this bright young analyst recommends that the Revolutionary Guards organize a covert-action team to attack the people who were planning and advocating this war, and to do whatever else they could to sabotage the forces that the United States might use to conduct such an attack. He advises his superiors that appropriate measures be taken to minimize the loss of innocent life and that the attack should focus only on the "military and civilian personnel" who were working directly on planning or advocating war with Iran. From Iran's perspective, this response would be a "preventive strike" designed to forestall an attack from the United States. Does Kroenig think a purely preventive measure of this kind on Iran's part would be acceptable behavior? And if he doesn't, then why does he think it's perfectly OK for us to do far more?

### Crirtical iran – link – perpetual war

#### Attempts to stop Iran with strikes would lead to a system of perpetual war and strikes spinning the world into perpetual conflict

**American Foreign Policy Project in 09** (http://americanforeignpolicy.org/military-option-iran/attacking-iran)

Bombing an open and declared facility that is enriching uranium to low levels under full IAEA safeguards would constitute a lawless act of agression that would isolate the United States and Israel, not Iran. International law on the use of force is crystal clear: nations may use unilateral force only to defend themselves against attack or imminent threat of attack. more In this case, even Israel's Mossad doesn't claim that Iran will be able to produce a bomb before 2014.4 U.S. intelligence agencies believe it will take until at least 2013.5 So there is not even a figleaf argument that attacking Iran could be justified by self-defense. more Bombing Iran under such circumstances would trample existing law, while perversely reinforcing the discredited doctrine of "preventive war" that President Bush invoked in justifying the war in Iraq: that notion that one country may attack another whenever the first country feels threatened by the second. This is not a prescription for peace and security. It is a formula for perpetual war.

# Obama good – China Bashing

### China bashing 1nc

#### GOP victory leads to China bashing over multiple issues – causes sanctions

Josh Gerstein Noveember 22 2011 “The GOP's China syndrome”, <http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1111/68952.html>

Mitt Romney says America is at war with China — a “trade war” over its undervalued currency. “They’re stealing our jobs. And we’re gonna stand up to China,” the former Massachusetts governor declared in a recent Republican presidential debate, arguing that the United States should threaten to impose tariffs on Chinese imports. When Romney steps on stage tonight for another debate, this one devoted to foreign policy, that kind of China-bashing is likely to be a favorite theme. With a moribund economy and relatively little traction for other international issues, the threat posed by cheap Chinese imports and Chinese purchases of U.S. debt is an irresistible target. The problem, China experts are quick to point out, is that those attacks often fly in the face of the business interests Republicans have traditionally represented, not to mention the record many of the candidates have either supporting trade with China — or actively soliciting it. Just last year, for example, Romney slammed President Barack Obama for growth-killing protectionism after he put a 35 percent tariff on Chinese tires because of a surge of cheap imports. And, Romney wrote in his book, “No Apology: The Case for American Greatness,” “Protectionism stifles productivity.” And though Texas Gov. Rick Perry predicted at a debate this month that “the Chinese government will end up on the ash heap of history if they do not change their virtues,” a picture posted on the Internet shows a smiling Perry on a trade mission to Shanghai and Beijing posing with Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi after presenting him with a pair of cowboy boots. Nor has Perry been shy about encouraging Chinese investments in Texas: In October 2010, he appeared at the announcement of a new U.S. headquarters for Huawei Technologies to be located in Plano, Texas, despite lingering concerns among U.S. security officials that Huawei-made telecommunications equipment is designed to allow unauthorized access by the Chinese government. “There’s a certain pandering going on,” said Nicholas Lardy of the Peterson Institute for International Economics, who adds that the GOP rhetoric is squarely at odds with the views of the U.S. establishment, which believes a showdown with China over the trade issue “will make things worse, not better.” Not all of the 2012 GOP presidential hopefuls have taken to publicly pummeling Beijing. The only bona fide China expert in the group, former Ambassador to China Jon Huntsman, has criticized Romney for being cavalier and simplistic in his talk of tariffs. “You can give applause lines, and you can kind of pander here and there. You start a trade war if you start slapping tariffs randomly on Chinese products based on currency manipulation,” Huntsman said at a recent debate. “That doesn’t work.” Former Sen. Rick Santorum also rejected the idea of slapping tariffs on Beijing if it won’t buckle on the currency issue. “That just taxes you. I don’t want to tax you,” Santorum said. Newt Gingrich says he wants to bring a world of hurt down on Beijing for alleged Chinese cyberattacks on the U.S. and theft of intellectual property, though he’s vague about how. “We’re going to have to find ways to dramatically raise the pain level for the Chinese cheating,” the former house speaker declares. And Herman Cain talks of a threat from China, but says the answer is to promote growth in the U.S. “China’s economic dominance would represent a national security threat to the USA, and possibly to the rest of the world,” Cain wrote in May in the Daily Caller. “We can outgrow China because the USA is not a loser nation. We just need a winner in the White House.” Romney’s rhetoric has been particularly harsh. “It’s predatory pricing, it’s killing jobs in America,” he declared at the CNBC debate earlier this month, promising to make a formal complaint to the World Trade Organization about China’s currency manipulation. “I would apply, if necessary, tariffs to make sure that they understand we are willing to play at a level playing field.” The Romney campaign insists those tariffs are entirely distinguishable from the tire duties Obama imposed in 2009. “The distinction between Obama’s tire action and what Gov. Romney is proposing is simple,” said a Romney aide who did not want to be named. “President Obama is not getting tough with China or pushing them unilaterally, he is handing out political favors to union allies. [Romney’s] policy focuses on fostering competition by keeping markets open and the playing field level.” Romney, who helped set up investment bank Bain Capital, has long been a favorite of Wall Street, so his stridency on the China trade issue has taken some traditional conservatives — for whom free trade is a fundamental tenet — by surprise. National Review said Romney’s move “risk[ed] a trade war with China” and was “a remarkably bad idea.” In fact, many business leaders give Obama good marks for his China policy. “What the Obama administration has done in not labeling China as a ‘currency manipulator’ is correct,” said one U.S. business lobbyist who closely follows U.S.-China trade issues and asked not to be named. “We’re very leery of a tit-for-tat situation,” he added, while acknowledging that the anti-China rhetoric is “good politics.”

#### China bashing will undermine cooperation on North Korea and warming

NYT 10 [“Eye on China, House Votes for Greater Tariff Powers,” http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/30/business/30currency.html?\_r=1&src=un&feedurl=http%3A%2F%2Fjson8.nytimes.com%2Fpages%2Fpolitics%2Findex.jsonp]

The Obama administration never took an emphatic position on the legislation and some officials say that, if passed, signed into law and challenged at the World Trade Organization, it might well be struck down. But this is a case where the symbolism may be more important than the legal niceties, and for that reason, the White House has been of two minds about the bill. Mr. Obama has tried to use the rising public anger over China’s trade advantage to argue to Chinese leaders that the United States would no longer tolerate deliberate currency manipulation, a point Mr. Obama made repeatedly in a meeting last week with Wen Jiabao, China’s prime minister. He did so again on Wednesday in Des Moines, where one businessman asked the president about the issue. “The reason that I’m pushing China about their currency is because their currency is undervalued,” he said, adding: “People generally think that they are managing their currency in ways that make our goods more expensive to sell and their goods cheaper to sell here. And that contributes — that’s not the main reason for our trade imbalance — but it’s a contributing factor to our trade imbalance.” But in conversations with Congress, the Treasury secretary, Timothy F. Geithner, and other officials have warned of the danger of touching off a trade war, in which China blocks American goods in retaliation, that could hurt both economies. The risks go beyond trade. Mr. Obama is pressing China for help on cutting exports to Iran, managing a dangerous leadership transition in North Korea and some kind of accord on curbing carbon outputs that contribute to global warming. He is also coming up with what one senior administration official called on Tuesday “new rules of the road” over disputed maritime territory. But in Beijing, and on Capitol Hill, all that pales in comparison to the currency dispute, which is often portrayed in the Chinese news media as an effort to curb China’s growth, and thus its power. Eswar S. Prasad, a professor of trade policy at Cornell, called the legislation “a shot across the bow that indicates a clear escalation from overheated rhetoric about Chinese currency policy to more substantive action.” While it is unlikely there will be a trade war, he said, “there is now a real risk that a cycle of tit-for-tat trade sanctions could spin out of control and cause some real, if not lasting, damage.” Under the bill, Mr. Obama would not have personal control to turn sanctions on or off. The legislation would make it easier for the Commerce Department to place duties on imports from countries that have “fundamentally undervalued” currencies — defined as “protracted, large-scale intervention” in foreign exchange markets; an undervaluation of at least 5 percent; persistent global current account surpluses; and “excessive” foreign asset reserves. Traditionally, only direct subsidies to an industry, rather than the indirect help that comes from an undervalued currency, have been considered a reason for retaliatory tariffs. Because so many countries have managed their currency rates for so long, it is unclear that the W.T.O. would uphold any American efforts to make the manipulation of a currency a justification for action. While the bill did not mention China by name, the criteria were clearly written with China, the largest creditor of the United States, in mind. In response, the official Xinhua news agency quoted China’s commerce ministry spokesman, Yao Jian, as saying: “Starting a countervailing investigation in the name of exchange rates does not conform with relevant W.T.O. rules.” But later in the day the Chinese Foreign Ministry was more emphatic about its displeasure, saying the House effort could harm economic ties between the two countries. "We firmly oppose the U.S. Congress approving such bills," Jiang Yu, a ministry spokeswoman told reporters in Beijing. "We urge the U.S. congressmen to be clearly aware of the importance of China-U.S. trade and economic relations, resist protectionism so as to refrain from any damage to the interests of both peoples and people around the world." So far the administration has been reluctant to pursue retaliation against China. The Treasury Department has repeatedly declined to formally declare China a currency manipulator. And last month, the Commerce Department decided not to investigate allegations that China’s currency practices amounted to an improper export subsidy. “The United States does not gain leverage in these negotiations by doing things China doesn’t find credible,” said Marc L. Busch, a political scientist at Georgetown. “The Chinese are aware that this is just not going to fly.” But the Obama administration may have few other options and few allies. Europeans are largely uninterested in the problem: the euro has weakened because of the sovereign debt crisis, limiting European incentives to get involved. Japan is intensely interested, and this month intervened in the currency markets for the first time since 2004, moving to devalue the yen unilaterally. But in the House, the politics of the moment seemed more important than the long-run economic strategy of managing economic relations with China. Representative Sander M. Levin, Democrat of Michigan and chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, said that “China’s persistent manipulation of its currency” had resulted in a “tilted field of competition” and the loss of as many as 1.5 million American jobs. “This manipulation is one of the causes of outsourcing of our jobs — manufacturing and other good jobs,” he said. “Talk hasn’t worked.” The top Republican on the committee, Representative Dave Camp of Michigan, said that the Obama administration had been insufficiently engaged in securing international pressure on the Chinese; that the bill would not promote Mr. Obama’s goal of doubling American exports over five years; and that other issues — like China’s tolerance for violations of intellectual property rights — were as significant as the currency undervaluation. Even so, Mr. Camp said, “I will vote for this bill because it signals to China that Congress’s patience is running out.”

#### Extinction – north korea

Pat Fungamwango October 25, 1999 Africa-at-Large; Third world war: Watch the Koreas Africa News

Lusaka - 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. A foreign visitor to either Pyongyong in the North or Seoul in South Korea will quickly notice that the divided country is always on maximum alert for any eventuality. North Korea or the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) has never forgiven the US for coming to the aid of South Korea during the Korean war. She still regards the US as an occupation force in South Korea and wholly to blame for the non-reunification of the country. North Korean media constantly churns out a tirade of attacks on "imperialist" America and its "running dog" South Korea. The DPRK is one of the most secretive countries in the world where a visitor is given the impression that the people's hatred for the US is absolute while the love for their government is total. Whether this is really so, it is extremely difficult to conclude. In the DPRK, a visitor is never given a chance to speak to ordinary Koreans about the politics of their country. No visitor moves around alone without government escort. The American government argues that its presence in South Korea was because of the constant danger of an invasion from the north. America has vast economic interests in South Korea. She points out that the north has dug numerous tunnels along the demilitarised zone as part of the invasion plans. She also accuses the north of violating South Korean territorial waters. Early this year, a small North Korean submarine was caught in South Korean waters after getting entangled in fishing nets. Both the Americans and South Koreans claim the submarine was on a military spying mission. However, the intension of the alleged intrusion will probably never be known because the craft's crew were all found with fatal gunshot wounds to their heads in what has been described as suicide pact to hide the truth of the mission. The US mistrust of the north's intentions is so deep that it is no secret that today Washington has the largest concentration of soldiers and weaponry of all descriptions in south Korea than anywhere else in the World, apart from America itself. Some of the armada that was deployed in the recent bombing of Iraq and in Operation Desert Storm against the same country following its invasion of Kuwait was from the fleet permanently stationed on the Korean Peninsula. It is true too that at the moment the North/South Korean border is the most fortified in the world. The border line is littered with anti-tank and anti-personnel landmines, surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and is constantly patrolled by warplanes from both sides. It is common knowledge that America also keeps an eye on any military movement or build-up in the north through spy satellites. The DPRK is said to have an estimated one million soldiers and a huge arsenal of various weapons. Although the DPRK regards herself as a developing country, she can however be classified as a super-power in terms of military might. The DPRK is capable of producing medium and long-range missiles. Last year, for example, she test-fired a medium range missile over Japan, an action that greatly shook and alarmed the US, Japan and South Korea. The DPRK says the projectile was a satellite. There have also been fears that she was planning to test another ballistic missile capable of reaching North America. Naturally, the world is anxious that military tension on the Korean Peninsula must be defused to avoid an apocalypse on earth. It is therefore significant that the American government announced a few days ago that it was moving towards normalising relations with North Korea.

#### Warming leads to extinction.

Bill Henderson, environmental scientist, “Runaway Global Warming Denial.” Countercurrents.org August 19, 2006. [http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm](https://webmail.whitman.edu/horde/services/go.php?url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.countercurrents.org%2Fcc-henderson190806.htm" \t "_blank).

The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction. If impossibly Draconian security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of man's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

### China bashing – 2nc impact overview

#### Preventing the China currency bill is critical to prevent a collapse in relations with China-That triggers a collapse in cooperation over North Korea and Warming which both trigger extinction-Prefer existential risks like warming and high probability scenarios like North Korea-This turns the case because <INSERT>

#### Conflict with China will escalate to global nuclear war

Lee **Hunkovic** (Professor of Political Science at the American Military University) **2009** “The Chinese-Taiwanese Conflict: Possible Futures of a Confrontation between China, Taiwan and the United States of America”, [http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/ Hunkovic.pdf](http://www.lamp-method.org/eCommons/Hunkovic.pdf))

A war between China, Taiwan and the United States has the potential **to escalate into a nuclear conflict and a third world war**, therefore, many countries other than the primary actors could be affected by such a conflict, including Japan, both Koreas, Russia, Australia, India and Great Britain, if they were drawn into the war, as well as all other countries in the world that participate in the global economy, in which the United States and China are the two most dominant members. If China were able to successfully annex Taiwan, the possibility exists that they could then plan to attack Japan and begin a policy of aggressive expansionism in East and Southeast Asia, as well as the Pacific and even into India, which could in turn create an international standoff and deployment of military forces to contain the threat. In any case, if China and the United States engage in a full-scale conflict, there are few countries in the world that will not be economically and/or militarily affected by it. However, China, Taiwan and United States are the primary actors in this scenario, whose actions will determine its eventual outcome, therefore, other countries will not be considered in this study.

#### U.S.-China conflict is the most probable scenario for great power war

Bates Gill (Freeman Chair in China Studies) and [Michael E. O'Hanlon](http://www.brookings.edu/experts/ohanlonm.aspx) (Senior Fellow, [Foreign Policy](http://www.brookings.edu/foreign-policy.aspx)

International Herald Tribune) December 26 2002 “China and Taiwan: An Offer Washington Ought to Consider”, http://www.brookings.edu/opinions/2002/1226china\_ohanlon.aspx

China has viewed its missile phalanx as its most effective coercive tool against Taiwan, and used it to bracket the island with warning shots in 1995 and 1996. This prompted the United States to implicitly threaten force in return by deploying aircraft carriers to the region. Thus Beijing?s offer—which a senior Chinese official has confirmed, according to a Washington Post report (IHT, Dec. 11)—could be of great significance. But was the offer just a political gesture or a tactical ploy? One thing is clear: Without prejudicing their relationship to Taiwan, U.S. policymakers should test the idea and see how far Beijing is willing to take it. Preoccupation with the war against terror, Iraq and now North Korea must not blind U.S. officials **to any opportunity to defuse the only conflict that could plausibly take America to war against another great power** in the early years of the 21st century. Jiang?s offer may be part of a much larger effort by Beijing during the past 18 months, and especially since the terrorist attacks on the United States in September 2001, to put forward a more constructive and responsible international face, particularly in improving U.S.-Chinese relations. Beijing?s toned down rhetoric in opposition to the U.S. missile defense program, its helpful contributions to the Washington-led counter-terror campaign, its willingness to support a new UN Security Council resolution on Iraq well before Russia or France would, and its recent request to open a security dialogue with NATO are examples of the trend. China?s approach toward Taiwan has appeared markedly less shrill in recent months. Beijing has shown a more nuanced approach, giving greater emphasis to political and economic carrots while still strengthening its military stick. The missile offer could be a piece of that overall approach to draw Taiwan closer into China?s orbit. But the Chinese offer of a trade-off may also be nothing more than a political gesture to gain some diplomatic high ground. Knowing that a missile redeployment or freeze would not substantially alter the real military balance on the ground, and knowing that it is unlikely that the United States would agree to any firm quid pro quo, Beijing can appear the conciliatory party. With some 350 to 400 short- and medium-range missiles positioned opposite Taiwan, it could be that China?s deployments have reached a saturation point in any case. How should Washington and Taipei respond? Some ideas are nonstarters. America should categorically refuse to limit arms sales to Taiwan for nonmissile threats, regardless of China?s willingness to freeze or reduce missile deployments. In particular, the Bush administration should not withdraw its offer to sell Taipei maritime patrol aircraft, submarines, Kidd-class destroyers and improved air-to-air missiles. The United States should still abide by the "six assurances" it offered Taiwan in 1982. In particular, it pledged not to set any date to end arms sales to Taiwan and not to consult with China over the specifics of any weapons sale to Taiwan prior to making that sale. America should also recognize that any reductions in Chinese missile deployments near Taiwan could be quickly reversed, and avoid responses that would be difficult to reverse. Still, the Chinese offer is potentially far too significant to brush aside. The United States should encourage China to reduce its missile deployments unilaterally, and promise that any such decision would have important, if indirect, effects on its arms sales policy. With less of a Chinese missile threat, Taiwan would have less need for controversial Aegis-class destroyers. It still may need improvements to its existing Patriot missile defense technology, but that measure might be postponed. Since Taiwan is having a hard time concluding arrangements for the weapons already promised in 2001, that may be a small price to pay. The United States cannot make concrete promises to China about postponements, but it can suggest a process of phased mutual restraint that could build on itself.

#### Turns the case in less than 15 years – warming causes nuclear conflict

Harris, ‘4. Paul, The Observer, Feb 22, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2004/feb/22/usnews.theobserver>.

Climate change over the next 20 years could result in a global catastrophe costing millions of lives in wars and natural disasters.. A secret report, suppressed by US defence chiefs and obtained by The Observer, warns that major European cities will be sunk beneath rising seas as Britain is plunged into a 'Siberian' climate by 2020. Nuclear conflict, mega-droughts, famine and widespread rioting will erupt across the world. The document predicts that abrupt climate change could bring the planet to the edge of anarchy as countries develop a nuclear threat to defend and secure dwindling food, water and energy supplies. The threat to global stability vastly eclipses that of terrorism, say the few experts privy to its contents. 'Disruption and conflict will be endemic features of life,' concludes the Pentagon analysis. 'Once again, warfare would define human life.'

### Romeny = china bashing

#### Romney election leads to China bashing --- results in a trade war

**Palmer**, 3/27/**2012** (Doug, Romney would squeeze China on currency manipulation-adviser, p. http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/28/us-usa-romney-china-idUSBRE82Q0ZS20120328)

Republican presidential candidate Mitt Romney is looking at ways to increase pressure on China over what he sees as currency manipulation and unfair subsidy practices, a Romney campaign adviser said on Tuesday. "I think he wants to maximize the pressure," Grant Aldonas, a former undersecretary of commerce for international trade, said at a symposium on the future of U.S. manufacturing. Aldonas served at the Commerce Department under Republican President George W. Bush. Romney, the front-runner in the Republican race to challenge President Barack Obama for the White House in November, has promised if elected he would quickly label China a currency manipulator, something the Obama administration has six times declined to do. That would set the stage, under Romney's plan, for the United States to impose countervailing duties on Chinese goods to offset the advantage of what many consider to be China's undervalued currency. Last year, the Democratic-controlled Senate passed legislation to do essentially the same thing. However, the measure has stalled in the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, where leaders say they fear it could start a trade war, and the Obama administration has not pushed for a House vote on the currency bill. The U.S. Treasury Department on April 15 faces a semi-annual deadline to declare whether any country is manipulating its currency for an unfair trade advantage. The department, under both Democratic and Republican administrations, has not cited any country since 1994, when China was last named. Asked if Romney was serious about declaring China a currency manipulator, Aldonas answered: "He is."

#### Romney results in escalating protectionist wars with China

Wall Street Journal, 9/7/**2011** (Mitt Romney’s 59 Economic Flavors, p. http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111904537404576554692126810066.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj)

By far the most troubling proposal is Mr. Romney's call for "confronting China" on trade. This is usually a Democratic theme, but Mr. Romney does Mr. Obama one worse by pledging to have his Treasury brand China a "currency manipulator" if it doesn't "move quickly to bring its currency to full value." He'd then hit Beijing with countervailing duties. Starting a trade war is a rare policy mistake that Mr. Obama hasn't made, but Mr. Romney claims it is a way to faster growth. His advisers say he doesn't favor a 25% tariff on Chinese goods as some in Congress do, but once a President unleashes protectionist furies they are hard to contain. His economic aides say this idea comes directly from Mr. Romney himself, which is even less reassuring. It looks like a political maneuver to blunt the criticism he'll receive because some of Bain Capital's companies sent jobs overseas, or perhaps this is intended to win over working-class precincts in Pennsylvania and Ohio. But giving Americans the impression that a trade war will bring those jobs back to the U.S. is offering false hope. It also distracts from the other fiscal and regulatory reforms that are needed to attract capital and create jobs.

### 2nc trade war impact

#### That causes a US-China trade war – escalates to conflict and collapses global trade

**Droke 10** (Clif, Editor – Momentum Strategies Report, “America and the Next Major War’, Green Faucet, 3-29, http://www.greenfaucet.com/technical-analysis/america-and-the-next-major-war/79314)

In the current phase of relative peace and stability we now enjoy, many are questioning when the next major war may occur and speculation is rampant as to major participants involved. Our concern here is strictly of a financial nature, however, and a discussion of the geopolitical and military variables involved in the escalation of war is beyond the scope of this commentary. But what we can divine from financial history is that "hot" wars in a military sense often emerge from trade wars. As we shall see, the elements for what could prove to be a trade war of epic proportions are already in place and the key figures are easily identifiable. Last Wednesday the lead headline in the Wall Street Journal stated, "Business Sours on China." It seems, according to WSJ, that Beijing is "reassessing China's long-standing emphasis on opening its economy to foreign business....and tilting toward promoting dominant state companies." Then there is Internet search giant Google's threat to pull out of China over concerns of censorship of its Internet search results in that country. The trouble started a few weeks ago Google announced that it no longer supports China's censoring of searches that take place on the Google platform. China has defended its extensive censorship after Google threatened to withdraw from the country. Additionally, the Obama Administration announced that it backs Google's decision to protest China's censorship efforts. In a Reuters report, Obama responded to a question as to whether the issue would cloud U.S.-China relations by saying that the human rights would not be "carved out" for certain countries. This marks at least the second time this year that the White House has taken a stand against China (the first conflict occurring over tire imports). Adding yet further fuel to the controversy, the U.S. Treasury Department is expected to issue a report in April that may formally label China as a "currency manipulator," according to the latest issue of Barron's. This would do nothing to ease tensions between the two nations and would probably lead one step closer to a trade war between China and the U.S. Then there was last week's Wall Street Journal report concerning authorities in a wealthy province near Shanghai criticizing the quality of luxury clothing brands from the West, including Hermes, Tommy Hilfiger and Versace. This represents quite a change from years past when the long-standing complaint from the U.S. over the inferior quality of Chinese made merchandise. On Monday the WSJ ran an article under the headline, "American Firms Feel Shut Out In China." The paper observed that so far there's little evidence that American companies are pulling out of China but adds a growing number of multinational firms are "starting to rethink their strategy." According to a poll conducted by the American Chamber of Commerce in China, 38% of U.S. companies reported feeling unwelcome in China compared to 26% in 2009 and 23% in 2008. As if to add insult to injury, the high profile trial of four Rio Tinto executives in China is another example of the tables being turned on the West. The executives are by Chinese authorities of stealing trade secrets and taking bribes. There's a touch of irony to this charge considering that much of China's technology was stolen from Western manufacturing firms which set up shop in that country. It seems China is flexing its economic and political muscle against the West in a show of bravado. Yet one can't help thinking that this is exactly the sort of arrogance that typically precedes a major downfall. As the Bible states, "Pride goeth before destruction, and an haughty spirit before a fall." In his book, "Jubilee on Wall Street," author David Knox Barker devotes a chapter to how trade wars tend to be common occurrences in the long wave economic cycle of developed nations. Barker explains his belief that the industrial nations of Brazil, Russia, India and China will play a major role in pulling the world of the long wave deflationary decline as their domestic economies begin to develop and grow. "They are and will demand more foreign goods produced in the United States and other markets," he writes. Barker believes this will help the U.S. rebalance from an over weighted consumption-oriented economy to a high-end producer economy. Barker adds a caveat, however: if protectionist policies are allowed to gain force in Washington, trade wars will almost certainly erupt and. If this happens, says Barker, "all bets are off." He adds, "The impact on global trade of increased protectionism and trade wars would be catastrophic, and what could prove to be a mild long wave [economic] winter season this time around could plunge into a global depression." Barker also observes that the storm clouds of trade wars are already forming on the horizon as we have moved further into the long wave economic "winter season." Writes Barker, "If trade wars are allowed to get under way in these final years of a long wave winter, this decline will be far deeper and darker than necessary, just as the Great Depression was far deeper and lengthier than it should have been, due to growing international trade isolationism. He further cautions that protectionism in Washington will certainly bring retaliation from the nations that bear the brunt of punitive U.S. trade policies. He observes that the reaction from one nation against the protectionist policies of another is typically far worse than the original action. He cites as an example the restriction by the U.S. of $55 million worth of cotton blouses from China in the 1980s. China retaliated by cancelling $500 million worth of orders for American rain. "As one nation blocks trade, the nation that is hurt will surely retaliate and the entire world will suffer," writes Barker.

#### US-China war goes nuclear

Johnson 1 (Chalmers, President – Japan Policy Research Institute, “Time to Bring the Troops Home”, The Nation, 4-26, http://ieas.berkeley.edu/cks/k12/girling\_troops.doc)

In East Asia, the United States maintains massive and expensive military forces poised to engage in everything from nuclear war to sabotage of governments that Washington finds inconvenient (for example, the government of former President Suharto in Indonesia, which in May 1998 the US government helped to bring down via troops its Special Forces had trained). At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the United States still deploys some 100,000 military personnel and close to an equal number of civilian workers and dependents in Japan and South Korea. These forces include the Third Marine Expeditionary Force in Okinawa and Japan; the Second Infantry Division in South Korea; numerous Air Force squadrons in both countries (Kadena Air Force Base in Okinawa is the largest US military installation outside the United States); the Seventh Fleet, with its headquarters in Yokosuka, Japan, patrolling the China coast and anywhere else that it wants to go; and innumerable submarine pens (for example, White Beach, Okinawa), support facilities, clandestine eavesdropping and intelligence-collecting units, Special Forces and staff and headquarters installations all over the Pacific. From approximately 1950 to 1990, the US government invoked the cold war to justify these so-called forward deployments--actually, in less euphemistic language, imperialist outposts. During the late 1940s, when it became apparent that the Chinese Communist Party was going to win the Chinese civil war, the United States reversed its policy of attempting to democratize occupied Japan and devoted itself to making Japan Washington's leading satellite in East Asia. The United States entered into an informal economic bargain with Japan: In return for Japan's willingness to tolerate the indefinite deployment of US weapons and troops on its soil, the United States would give it preferential access to the American market and would tolerate its protectionism and mercantilism. These were advantages the United States did not extend to its European allies or Latin American neighbors in the cold war. Oddly enough, this policy is still in effect some fifty-four years after it was first implemented. In return for hosting 40,000 US troops and an equal number of dependents in ninety-one US-controlled bases, Japan still has privileged access to the US economy and still maintains protectionist barriers against US sales and investment in the Japanese market. The overall results of this policy became apparent in the 1970s and led to acute problems for the US economy in the 1980s--namely, huge excess manufacturing capacity in Japan and the hollowing out of US manufacturing industries. The costs for the United States have been astronomical. During the year 2000 alone, it recorded its largest trade deficit ever, of which $81 billion was with Japan. During the mid-1980s, Japan became the world's largest creditor nation and the United States became the world's largest debtor nation, thereby turning upside down the original assumptions on which US economic policies toward Japan were based. But neither the United States nor Japan made any changes in its old trade-for-bases deal, despite occasional and futile protests by US business interests. Meanwhile, from the point of view of US elites committed to maintaining hegemony on a global basis, the sudden and unpredicted collapse of the Soviet Union in the period 1989 to 1991 was a disaster. They had to find some new justifications for their overseas presence, particularly in East Asia, where Japan's inherent power and the emergence of a commercially oriented China offered implicit challenges to the old American order. Among these justifications, one of the cleverest was the so-called two-war strategy, which requires the US military establishment to be able to fight two large wars on opposite sides of the globe at the same time. The beauty of this formulation is that it avoids specifying which nations might conceivably want to go to war with the United States and ignores the historical fact that in America's most recent wars--Korea, Vietnam, the Persian Gulf and Yugoslavia--no second nation (on the other side of the globe or nearby) challenged it. More concretely, Pentagon strategists have tried to find replacement enemies for the former USSR by demonizing North Korea and muttering ominously about China's successful transition from a Leninist command economy to a state-guided market system resembling the other successful capitalist countries of East Asia. Until June 2000, North Korea was routinely described as an extremely threatening "rogue state." Then, on the initiative of the South Korean president, the two Koreas began to negotiate their own reconciliation without asking for US permission. The possibility that North and South Korea might achieve some form of peaceful coexistence totally undercuts the main US rationale for a "national missile defense" and a "theater missile defense." Regardless of which ventriloquist is in charge of him on any given day, George W. Bush shows no sign of comprehending these matters. In March, when South Korean President Kim Dae Jung, last year's winner of the Nobel Peace Prize, visited Washington to ask for help in pursuing his country's rapprochement with the North, the newly designated "leader of the free world" rudely brushed him off. Korea policy has become a plaything of Congressional Republican mastodons, and the Bush White House seems much more interested in pleasing them than in the situation in East Asia. It is easy for the United States to attempt to bully both the North and South Koreas; it has been doing so since 1945. China is another matter. No sane figure in the Pentagon wants a war with China, and all serious US militarists know that China's minuscule nuclear capacity is not offensive but a deterrent against the overwhelming US power arrayed against it (twenty archaic Chinese warheads versus more than 7,000 US warheads). Taiwan, whose status constitutes the still incomplete last act of the Chinese civil war, remains the most dangerous place on earth. Much as the 1914 assassination of the Austrian crown prince in Sarajevo led to a war that no one wanted, a misstep in Taiwan by any side could bring the United States and China into a conflict that neither wants. Such a war would bankrupt the United States, deeply divide Japan and probably end in a Chinese victory, given that China is the world's most populous country and would be defending itself against a foreign aggressor. More seriously, it could easily escalate into a nuclear holocaust.

#### Collapse of trade causes extinction

Pazner 8 (Michael J., Faculty – New York Institute of Finance, Financial Armageddon: Protect Your Future from Economic Collapse, p. 137-138)

The rise in isolationism and protectionism will bring about ever more heated arguments and dangerous confrontations over shared sources of oil, gas, and other key commodities as well as factors of production that must, out of necessity, be acquired from less-than-friendly nations. Whether involving raw materials used in strategic industries or basic necessities such as food, water, and energy, efforts to secure adequate supplies will take increasing precedence in a world where demand seems constantly out of kilter with supply. Disputes over the misuse, overuse, and pollution of the environment and natural resources will become more commonplace. Around the world, such tensions will give rise to full-scale military encounters, often with minimal provocation. In some instances, economic conditions will serve as a convenient pretext for conflicts that stem from cultural and religious differences. Alternatively, nations may look to divert attention away from domestic problems by channeling frustration and populist sentiment toward other countries and cultures. Enabled by cheap technology and the waning threat of American retribution, terrorist groups will likely boost the frequency and scale of their horrifying attacks, bringing the threat of random violence to a whole new level. Turbulent conditions will encourage aggressive saber rattling and interdictions by rogue nations running amok. Age-old clashes will also take on a new, more heated sense of urgency. China will likely assume an increasingly belligerent posture toward Taiwan, while Iran may embark on overt colonization of its neighbors in the Mideast. Israel, for its part, may look to draw a dwindling list of allies from around the world into a growing number of conflicts. Some observers, like John Mearsheimer, a political scientists at the University of Chicago, have even speculated that an “intense confrontation” between the United States and China is “inevitable” at some point. More than a few disputes will turn out to be almost wholly ideological. Growing cultural and religious differences will be transformed from wars of words to battles soaked in blood. Long-simmering resentments could also degenerate quickly, spurring the basest of human instincts and triggering genocidal acts. Terrorists employing biological or nuclear weapons will vie with conventional forces using jets, cruise missiles, and bunker-busting bombs to cause widespread destruction. Many will interpret stepped-up conflicts between Muslims and Western societies as the beginnings of a new world war.

### Trade war = nuke war

#### It goes nuclear

**Taaffe 5** (Peter Taaffe, “China, A New Superpower?,” Socialist Alternative.org, Nov 1, 2005, pg. [http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article11.php?id=30](http://www.socialistalternative.org/news/article11.php?id=30" \t "_blank))

While this conflict is unresolved, the shadow of a trade war looms. Some commentators, like Henry C.K. Liu in the Asia Times, go further and warn that "**trade wars can lead to shooting wars**." China is not the Japan of the 21st century. Japan in the 1980s relied on the U.S. military and particularly its nuclear umbrella against China, and was therefore subject to the pressure and blackmail of the U.S. ruling class. The fear of the U.S., and the capitalists of the "first world" as a whole, is that China may in time "out-compete" the advanced nations for hi-tech jobs while holding on to the stranglehold it now seems to have in labor-intensive industries. As the OECD commented recently: "In the five-year period to 2003, the number of students joining higher education courses has risen by three and a half times, with a strong emphasis on technical subjects." The number of patents and engineers produced by China has also significantly grown. At the same time, an increasingly capitalist China - most wealth is now produced in the private sector but the majority of the urban labor force is still in state industries - and the urgency for greater energy resources in particular to maintain its spectacular growth rate has brought it into collision on a world scale with other imperialist powers, particularly the U.S. In a new **worldwide version of the "Great Game"** - the clash for control of central Asia's resources in the nineteenth century - the U.S. and China have increasingly come up against and buffeted one another. Up to now, the U.S. has held sway worldwide due to its economic dominance buttressed by a colossal war machine accounting for 47% of total world arms spending. But Iraq has dramatically shown the limits of this: "A country that cannot control Iraq can hardly remake the globe on its own." (Financial Times) But no privileged group disappears from the scene of history without a struggle. Donald Rumsfeld, U.S. defense secretary, has stated: "Since no nation threatens China, one must wonder: why this growing [arms] investment? Why these continuing large and expanding arms purchases?" China could ask the same question of the U.S. In order to maintain its position, the U.S. keeps **six nuclear battle fleets** permanently at sea, supported by an unparalleled network of bases. As Will Hutton in The Observer has commented, this is not because of "irrational chauvinism or the needs of the military-industrial complex, but because of the pressure they place on upstart countries like China." In turn, the Chinese elite has responded in kind. For instance, in the continuing clash over Taiwan, a major-general in the People's Liberation Army baldly stated that if China was attacked "by Washington during a confrontation over Taiwan... I think we would have to **respond with nuclear weapons**." He added: "We Chinese will prepare ourselves for the destruction of all of the cities east of Xian. Of course, the Americans would have to be prepared that **hundreds... of cities would be destroyed** by the Chinese." This bellicose nuclear arms rattling shows the contempt of the so-called great powers for the ordinary working-class and peasant peoples of China and the people of the U.S. when their interests are at stake.

### China Bashing Bad – US Economy

#### Sanctions jack the U.S. economy and competitiveness

Lee 5 (Don, Reporter – LA Times, “No Easy Answers on China Trade”, Los Angeles Times, 6-4, Lexis)

If protectionist measures such as Schumer's take hold, analysts said, the outcome could prove as damaging to the U.S. economy as to China's. One big reason: So many things made in China and shipped to the U.S. originate from multinational corporations that have either established their own factories or contracted out to manufacturers in China that produce largely for the American market. The U.S. imported $197 billion of goods from China last year. At the current 30% pace of increase, those imports could reach $254 billion this year. A levy of 27.5% on those products would lead to $70 billion in total tariffs. Of that amount, 70% would be borne by American companies such as Dell Inc., Hewlett-Packard Co., Wal-Mart Stores Inc., Nike Inc. and Liz Claiborne Inc., according to estimates by economist Andy Xie of Morgan Stanley. He said that would deal a big blow to their earnings, jolting stock markets. Companies also may be forced to pass along some of those costs to their customers, which could result in them losing ground to other importers. "For trade-oriented economies," Xie said, "bilateral protectionism decreases competitiveness and simply won't work over time."

#### **Extinction**

Auslin 9 (Michael, Resident Scholar – American Enterprise Institute, and Desmond Lachman – Resident Fellow – American Enterprise Institute, “The Global Economy Unravels”, Forbes, 3-6, http://www.aei.org/article/100187)

What do these trends mean in the short and medium term? The Great Depression showed how social and global chaos followed hard on economic collapse. The mere fact that parliaments across the globe, from America to Japan, are unable to make responsible, economically sound recovery plans suggests that they do not know what to do and are simply hoping for the least disruption. Equally worrisome is the adoption of more statist economic programs around the globe, and the concurrent decline of trust in free-market systems. The threat of instability is a pressing concern. China, until last year the world's fastest growing economy, just reported that 20 million migrant laborers lost their jobs. Even in the flush times of recent years, China faced upward of 70,000 labor uprisings a year. A sustained downturn poses grave and possibly immediate threats to Chinese internal stability. The regime in Beijing may be faced with a choice of repressing its own people or diverting their energies outward, leading to conflict with China's neighbors. Russia, an oil state completely dependent on energy sales, has had to put down riots in its Far East as well as in downtown Moscow. Vladimir Putin's rule has been predicated on squeezing civil liberties while providing economic largesse. If that devil's bargain falls apart, then wide-scale repression inside Russia, along with a continuing threatening posture toward Russia's neighbors, is likely. Even apparently stable societies face increasing risk and the threat of internal or possibly external conflict. As Japan's exports have plummeted by nearly 50%, one-third of the country's prefectures have passed emergency economic stabilization plans. Hundreds of thousands of temporary employees hired during the first part of this decade are being laid off. Spain's unemployment rate is expected to climb to nearly 20% by the end of 2010; Spanish unions are already protesting the lack of jobs, and the specter of violence, as occurred in the 1980s, is haunting the country. Meanwhile, in Greece, workers have already taken to the streets. Europe as a whole will face dangerously increasing tensions between native citizens and immigrants, largely from poorer Muslim nations, who have increased the labor pool in the past several decades. Spain has absorbed five million immigrants since 1999, while nearly 9% of Germany's residents have foreign citizenship, including almost 2 million Turks. The xenophobic labor strikes in the U.K. do not bode well for the rest of Europe. A prolonged global downturn, let alone a collapse, would dramatically raise tensions inside these countries. Couple that with possible protectionist legislation in the United States, unresolved ethnic and territorial disputes in all regions of the globe and a loss of confidence that world leaders actually know what they are doing. The result may be a series of small explosions that coalesce into a big bang.

# Obama Good – Russian Reset

### Russia Reset 1nc

#### Obama is critical to US/Russian relations reset

The Moscow Times 10/14 http://www.themoscowtimes.com/mobile/article/445482.html

On the surface, the 2012 outlook for the U.S.-Russian “reset” is looking bleak. Although we are a year away from the U.S. presidential election, the chances that President Barack Obama, the architect and chief supporter of the reset, will be re-elected in 2012 do not look good — if for no other reason than U.S. unemployment is expected to stay at a historical high for the next 13 months. No U.S. president since Franklin Delano Roosevelt during the Great Depression has been re-elected when unemployment has exceeded 8 percent. The unemployment rate currently is 9.2 percent, and many economists believe that it will remain around 9 percent until Election Day. The Congressional Budget Office predicted that if unemployment drops, it would, at best, reach 8.2 percent by November 2012. But even at this level, it would most likely be too high to save Obama’s re-election bid. Meanwhile, Mitt Romney has become — at least for now — the Republican front-runner for the presidential race, which does not bode well for the reset. Last Friday, he told The Washington Post that the reset “has to end.” Romney supports former U.S. President George W. Bush’s plans to deploy elements of a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic, which seriously damaged U.S.-Russian relations for much of the period from 2002 to 2008. Obama was able to partially repair this damage in 2009 by scaling down Bush’s plans and deploying radar and interceptors farther away from Russia’s borders. Romney also criticized Prime Minister Vladimir Putin on Friday, saying Putin wants to “rebuild the Russian empire. That includes annexing populations as they did in Georgia.” This sounds disturbingly like what the neocons used to say about Russia during the Bush years. Conservative political analyst Sergei Kurginyan coined the phrase, “Strike the iron while Obama is in office,” implying that Obama offers a much better opportunity for improved U.S.-Russian relations than an administration dominated by foreign policy neocons. Other analysts, such as television journalist Alexei Pushkov, have warned that the anti-Obama backlash among U.S. voters could pave the way for a neocon to be elected president in 2012. In terms of U.S. policy toward Russia, this could mean, among other things, a revival of Bush’s “Georgia project,” a withdrawal from New START, a more aggressive NATO expansion policy and increased U.S. activity in Ukraine and Central Asia. Things do not look much better from the Russian side, however, particularly given Putin’s likely return to the presidency in 2012. In his next one — or two — terms, Putin will likely maintain his deep mistrust of Washington’s intentions toward Moscow and continue his trademark sharp criticisms of U.S. policies, which are popular among many Russians. This would hardly aid the reset. In Putin’s first decade in power, we all remember, for example, when he claimed “outside forces” — hinting at the United States — were behind the September 2004 Beslan terrorist attack; or his 2007 Victory Day speech, when he likened U.S. foreign policy to the Third Reich; or his December 2010 interview with Larry King, when he said the United States should keep their noses out of Russia’s business. And as fresh reminders to Washington of where he stands, Putin called the United States “hooligans” in July and “parasites” in August. (On Tuesday in China, he softened his statement, saying, “America is being parasitic with the dollar’s monopoly position.”) Meanwhile, Putin’s heavy play of the nationalist card will certainly not help U.S.-Russian relations. The Liberal Democratic Party, A Just Russia and even the Communists are now reaching out to nationalist-minded voters, and Dmitry Rogozin and his 100,000-member Rodina-Congress of Russian Communities last month pledged allegiance to Putin and United Russia. It was Rogozin, by the way, who in July complained about conservative U.S. senators being “monsters of the Cold War.” To be fair, there are plenty of these Cold War “monsters” among political and military leaders on both sides, but the problem is that if both Russia and the United States elect one of them as president in 2012, there could be a real setback in Obama’s reset. It would be easy to dismiss both Romney’s and Putin’s statements as election-year grandstanding that will have no real impact on the reset, whose roots lie in cooperation on Afghanistan and Iran and renewed trade ties, among other things. But at the same time, this type of demagoguery creates a combative and bitter atmosphere in bilateral relations and could instigate a self-perpetuating cycle of accusations and counteraccusations from both sides. The reset works best when demagoguery is minimal. Let’s hope leaders from both sides will put their energy into cooperating rather than blustering after the 2012 elections.

#### Relations solve multiple world problems – each causes extinction

Jeffrey Tayler, 08 -The Atlantic staff writer, “Medvedev Spoils the Party,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2008/11/medvedev-spoils-the-party/7130/

 Like it or not, the United States cannot solve crucial global problems without Russian participation. Russia commands the largest landmass on earth; possesses vast reserves of oil, natural gas, and other natural resources; owns huge stockpiles of weapons and plutonium; and still wields a potent brain trust. Given its influence in Iran and North Korea, to say nothing of its potential as a spoiler of international equilibrium elsewhere, Russia is one country with which the United States would do well to reestablish a strong working relationship—a strategic partnership, even—regardless of its feelings about the current Kremlin government. The need to do so trumps expanding NATO or pursuing “full-spectrum dominance.” Once the world financial crisis passes, we will find ourselves returning to worries about resource depletion, environmental degradation, and global warming – the greatest challenges facing humanity. No country can confront these problems alone. For the United States, Russia may just prove the “indispensable nation” with which to face a volatile future arm in arm.

### Obama key reset

#### Obama reelection maintains the US/Russian reset --- Romney will collapse relations

**Weir**, 3/27/**2012** (Fred, Obama asks Russia to cut him slack until reelection, Minnesota Post, p. <http://www.minnpost.com/christian-science-monitor/2012/03/obama-asks-russia-cut-him-slack-until-reelection>)

Russian experts say there's little doubt the Kremlin would like to see Obama re-elected. Official Moscow has been pleased by Obama's policy of "resetting" relations between Russia and the US, which resulted in the new START treaty and other cooperation breakthroughs after years of diplomatic chill while George W. Bush was president. The Russian media often covers Obama's lineup of Republican presidential challengers in tones of horror, and there seems to be a consensus among Russian pundits that a Republican president would put a quick end to the Obama-era thaw in relations. "The Republicans are active critics of Russia, and they are extremely negative toward Putin and his return to the presidency," says Dmitry Babich, a political columnist with the official RIA-Novosti news agency. "Democrats are perceived as more easygoing, more positive toward Russia and Putin." Speaking on the record in Seoul, Mr. Medvedev said the years since Obama came to power "were the best three years in the past decade of Russia-US relations.… I hope this mode of relations will maintain between the Russian Federation and the United States and between the leaders." During Putin's own election campaign, which produced a troubled victory earlier this month, he played heavily on anti-Western themes, including what he described as the US drive to attain "absolute invulnerability" at the expense of everyone else. But many Russian experts say that was mostly election rhetoric, and that in office Putin will seek greater cooperation and normal relations with the West. "Russian society is more anti-American than its leaders are," says Pavel Zolotaryov, deputy director of the official Institute of USA-Canada Studies in Moscow. "Leaders have to take popular moods into account. But it's an objective fact that the US and Russia have more points in common than they have serious differences. If Obama wins the election, it seems likely the reset will continue."

### Obama key Russia cooperation

#### Obama key to cooperation in US/Russian relations

Andrew C. Kuchins (Director and Senior Fellow, Russia and Eurasia Program, Center for Strategic and International Studies) Feb 11 2011 RIA Novosti http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20111102/168361206.html

Do you expect that the relationships between the two countries will undergo drastic changes after 2012 elections in both countries? I do not think they will undergo drastic changes after the [2012 elections in Russia](http://en.rian.ru/trend/Putin_elections_2012/%22%20%5Ct%20%22_blank). I think, that president Medvedev and prime-minister Putin are basically in agreement about the advisability of the, so called “reset” of the Russian-US relations that has taken place over the last nearly three years. I think the much bigger question mark is: what is going to happen in the US elections? If Barak Obama is reelected, then, I think, we will see basically continuation of the policy. From my point of view, the “reset” has been successful. The relationship has been reset. We have now more normal and constructive relationship with Russia, as we should have. I think, we are not going to have that momentum of watershed agreements, (and one of them I forgot to mention, of course, the Civilian Nuclear-1, -2, -3 agreement, which was concluded at the end of last year). Still I think trying to build on the levels of cooperation that we have would be the case with the Obama administration. Republican administration is a much bigger question mark. Maybe it’s just pre-electoral games? Republicans have to play them, trying to undermine the Obama administration as much as possible. Right, the Obama administration views the “reset” as one of the most important foreign policy achievements. Naturally, the opposition party is going to find ways to criticize that, to try to knock it down. When you come to actual governing, it’s a different matter. But still there are problems in our relations. What do you think are the most cunning issues that we have to tackle first of all? There is one other important area where we have seen a greater degree of cooperation and mutual understanding and, I think, accommodation of interests in the past couple of years that we did not see in the Bush administration. That is our views on what is taking place in the countries on Russia’s borders that many refer to as post-Soviet space. I’d like to get away from that terminology. There is a possibility for the conflicts in the Russia-US relationships over our policies and interests in the Caucasus, in the Central Asia and elsewhere, and, of course, the biggest one is Georgia. The Obama administration has spent a lot of time during over the past three years, trying to insure that conflict is not reemerging in Georgia.

### Romney crush reset

#### Romney’s policies would isolate Russia --- collapses relations

**Bandow**, 4/23/**2012** (Doug – senior fellow at the Cato Institute, Romney and Russia: Complicating American Relations, National Interest, p. <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/romney-russia-complicating-american-relationships-6836>)

Mitt Romney has become the inevitable Republican presidential candidate. He’s hoping to paint Barack Obama as weak, but his attempt at a flanking maneuver on the right may complicate America’s relationship with Eastern Europe and beyond. Romney recently charged Russia with being America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” As Jacob Heilbrunn of National Interest pointed out, this claim embodies a monumental self-contradiction, attempting to claim “credit for the collapse of the Soviet Union, on the one hand [while] predicting dire threats from Russia on the other.” Thankfully, the U.S.S.R. really is gone, and neither all the king’s men nor Vladimir Putin can put it back together. It is important to separate behavior which is grating, even offensive, and that which is threatening. Putin is no friend of liberty, but his unwillingness to march lock-step with Washington does not mean that he wants conflict with America. Gordon Hahn of CSIS observes: Yet despite NATO expansion, U.S. missile defense, Jackson-Vanik and much else, Moscow has refused to become a U.S. foe, cooperating with the West on a host of issues from North Korea to the war against jihadism. Most recently, Moscow agreed to the establishment of a NATO base in Ulyanovsk. These are hardly the actions of America’s “number one geopolitical foe.” Romney’s charge is both silly and foolish. This doesn’t mean the U.S. should not confront Moscow when important differences arise. But treating Russia as an adversary risks encouraging it to act like one. Moreover, treating Moscow like a foe will make Russia more suspicious of America’s relationships with former members of the Warsaw Pact and republics of the Soviet Union—and especially Washington’s determination to continue expanding NATO. After all, if another country ostentatiously called the U.S. its chief geopolitical threat, ringed America with bases, and established military relationships with areas that had broken away from the U.S., Washington would not react well. It might react, well, a lot like Moscow has been reacting. Although it has established better relations with the West, Russia still might not get along with some of its neighbors, most notably Georgia, with its irresponsibly confrontational president. However, Washington should not give Moscow additional reasons to indulge its paranoia.